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# Transcription conventions and notes

Based on Hutchy and Wootit (1998 77-92)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Overlapping utterances</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[]</td>
<td>Used when speakers start a turn simultaneously. In other words, it is used when two speakers start at the same moment:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>117 Elizabeth [I think the only ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>118 Harry [[ohhhh you don’t ] have your birthday party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>=</td>
<td>A single speaker's utterance which is a continuous flow of speech but has been separated graphically in order to accommodate intervening interruption. The two parts of the utterance are connected by equals signs, with the embedded utterance transcribed in the line between.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A second utterance being latched immediately to the first utterance with no overlap.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>()</td>
<td>Short untimed pause within an utterance (less than 0.2 of a second)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(pause)</td>
<td>Long untimed pause within an utterance or between utterances.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2.5)</td>
<td>Timed pause (in seconds). These may occur ‘within a turn’ or ‘between turns’. Especially in the Speaker articulation stage, I have put the timed pauses ‘within the turn’. Whereas in the Unit Meeting (UM) transcription, I have put timed pauses between turns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(( ))</td>
<td>Description of non-verbal elements in the conversation, e.g. ((laugh)), ((knock)) or describing Speaker action, e.g. ((Harry picks up diagram and starts to read.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It is also used for descriptive properties of the speaker’s voice. This may be a comment on key ((frustrated voice)) or some other noteworthy aspect of the voice characteristic. Inverted commas are also used to distinguish the voiced chunk. For example, ‘study leave’ in the following example has a sing-song quality:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.) inasmuch as this is what I do and I’ve got this</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>((in a sing song voice)) “study LEA::VE” at the moment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>When the Speaker is voicing either someone else’s spoken words, their internal thought process or an imagined position, I have used “double” inverted commas when an obvious spoken particle like “Okay” or “well” is present. The rest of the ‘voiced’ utterances is in ‘single’ inverted commas.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>( )</strong> Used when it is not clear what the Speaker has said. Again the length of the bracket will depend on amount of talk that is indecipherable in comparison with surrounding tempo etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>'h'</strong> <em>(hhh)</em> Exhalation (assessed impressionistically, relative to general tempo of surrounding talk)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*<em>',h'</em> <em>(hhh)</em> Inhalation (assessed impressionistically, relative to general tempo of surrounding talk)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>(h)</strong> Breathy quality. When there is a breathy quality to the start of a word a bracketed (h) is used. So for example ‘by’ in the example below has a breathy quality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>something slightly different and (h)by God like</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>italics</strong> Laughter is distinguished by use of italics. Those sections which are delivered while laughing are rendered onomatopoeically</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>seeing the stages of your thinking () and realising that in fact you get down in a mess just like me [ I do ha he hhaaa</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ha ha or hee hee etc.</strong> Laugh particles - onomatopoeic renditions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CAPS</strong> Used for loudness (in comparison with surrounding talk) Segment of speech noticeably louder than surrounding delivery</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong><em>—</em></strong> Underlining is used to show the prominent tonic syllable in each act e.g. I had thirty at one point.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>...</strong> Intervening utterances which have been taken out</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>(yeah)</strong> Back-channel cues (in detailed transcription these are fully transcribed e.g. yup, yes, uhhuh etc). Sometimes used in long articulations where there are numerous back-channel cues.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>&gt; &lt;</strong> Segment of speech noticeably quicker than surrounding delivery</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>. .</td>
<td>Segment of speech noticeably quieter than surrounding delivery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| ? | Questioning intonation  
Sometimes ? is used more than once if there is more than one element of questioning intonation in any one syntactic question, as in the following:  
Nicholas: but I'll just have to do some and do the other. (.) is there any sense in which? it's- (.) the whole person part of the decision is to some extent still more of an abstraction? |
| , | Continuing intonation (often used where there is a continuation key at the end of a move or turn)  
A comma is also used to indicate a continuing tone. In the examples like the following the last syllable is often also elongated using a colon:  
holds (.) .hhh if we are (.) working >as a group< quite closely linked by our attempts to provide _empathy_ for each other (.) and if I can supply that kind of mental; (.) (.) intellectual; (.) emotional; (.) energy into the group as the Speaker is |
| . | Falling intonation |
| ! | Used where there is extra feeling or emotion in the voice. |
| : | Elongated sound (e.g. that's ni::ce) |
| - | Stammer, halt in delivery or sound which indicates change in direction of syntax (e.g. that- that's not the point). |
Case 1

GDM19.05.98

Vince as Speaker:
Planned talk and prepared talk
Vince and I'm the one in the headset today=
Nicholas yes you are just today
Emma [Vince how do you
Vince being open?
Nicholas [the nineteenth of May
Vince that's fine *yeah*
Emma okay
Vince I'm happy with the door)
Nicholas and as you say (*) Vince
Vince well my first observation that that it's
been a strange day (*) one of the strangest days
since I've been here (*) un in the sense that
we've been doing a lot of different things (*) and it's
not totally unconnected with what I want to explore
today (*) but before I start to talk about the topic
I just wanted to say that I've deliberately (*) not planned
anything I'm going to say today (*) just chosen a topic
which is fairly vague (*) because I have a strong sense that
the benefits of this kind of talking (*) is that it gives
you the chance to explore something (*) in a quite different
way from the kind of talk that you normally engage in
Nicholas (*)
Vince and err (*) on the few occasions that I talked like this
and got someone to listen during the course (*) I found
it a very positive experience (*) so I'm not quite sure
what I want to talk about today (*) it's a kind of drifting
session (*) but there are a couple of things and one is
the relationship between planned discourse (*) and kind
of improvised (*) off the cuff talking (*) and for whatever
reason (*) I've got a strong sense that I'm much better
at improvising and off the cuff talking (*) than I am at
planning (*) as soon as I enter into a planned world
(*) in terms of talking (*) it seems to cause some kind of
stress (*) which I think I feel imposing on me
Nicholas (*)
Vince ant that imposition (*) this - this structure that I've
pre-planned (*) I find (*) is a:
Nicholas (1.2)
Vince a hh saddle (*) a (*) chain (*) a something which inhibits
me (*)
Nicholas so can we (*) just clarify where we are now (*) you're
now into (*) what may not be a continuing topic (*)
but the first area of topic focus (*) is what you're working
on now (*) that is this preference of your (*) for off-the-cuff
talk (*) as opposed to planned talk (*) you're saying (*) that as:
(*) if you plan something then when you start to talk
you feel that that plan is an imposition on you (*) and
it constrains you and ties you down (*) and you feel that
you're not being as productive as you could be in you talk
Vince yes [ that's right ]
Nicholas [ is that right? ]
Vince and I think it has a - in the experiences of public
talk that I've ha:
Nicholas *yeah*
Vince where I've planned to a higher degree (*) to a higher
degree (*) I've had a very strong feeling that I haven't
ended up communicating very much at all (*) because
of that - that structure (*)
Harry c- could you just clarify something about this pressure
when you say that it's like an imposition it's- is that
an imposition in the sense that consciousness of-
the plan places a psychological pressure on you
or is that having the plan constrains what you can say
() or is it both?

Vince .huh I think it's both () I mean the interesting thing
about the second the constraint element is that
a lot of the thoughts this vague thought that I've got
relates the work that I've done in drama where you have
a choice between scripted performance and improvisation
and back in () eighty hhh one () I was part of a theatre
group that did impro () improv it was called () Harry
Johnson developed these ideas () where you had very
loose structures () and you walk onto stage as a group and
you () you improvise () I suppose it's very much like
jazz () where you play together () and the more you get
to know each other that more you know how you might do () but
the actual line that you're going to take () is often supplied by the
audience () and I think there's a parallel there () with the kind of
public talking that we do () where the more constrained
you are () the more planned it is () the less able you are to
respond to your audience () to the people you're trying
to communicate something with
(1.8)

* * * I think for a long time I believed () that that
really I would be better () having a very loose structure
and walking in to do whatever I do () a lecture, or a
presentation, () a talk.=

Emma =um so picking up what you said about audience ()
do you feel that () do you feel that you've had experiences
where () you've received some kind of signal () from
the audience and been unable to change in response to it
(2.2)

Vince I think it's partly that () and partly the fact that I don't
feel open to any signals () but=

Emma ==so you don't feel you see them?

Vince hhh I see the two things you know in opposition
this driving force to get through this plan does mean
that perhaps I don't even see the signals never mind
invite them or deal with them

Elizabeth so it's as if you're looking back into your head
all the time () rather than looking out towards
the audience ()' who are communicating (away ')

Vince yes
(6.2)

Vince I had the same feeling with today's speech event
earlier () in front of the cameras () that () you
.huh have a choice to plan something () and to
have a clear idea of what you want to say () or
-t- to allow yourself to be: () to be open () and
to respond () to whatever comes up () and I found
() every- as a group that we're involved in so
many different speech events () like the brainstorming session
() there's a lot more elements of- there's
a lot more interruption () and the turn taking rights
are- () are fairly aggressive an- nd quite () err () I don't
think competitive but it's a very different sort of talk
from this talk () and it's a very different talk from the talk
in front of the camera () err () 'I'm not sure how important
that is* (.) I think that might be a bit of red herring (.) but I
I think the video and this experience (.) I feel a lot more
comfortable (.) allowing myself to drift to drift and to see if
any thoughts come out of that openness (.)
and you're feeling this same? (.) this feeling of a preference
for off the cuff (.) is common to those different speech
events that you've been through (.) yeah? (.) it's not as
though you prefer to be more of less planned in one or the
other (.) you're saying your preference is generally (.) across
these different speech events (.) for improv (.)
(yeah)

[and I think it's obviously a personal thing (.) because
you do look around and people do plan
(0.6)

it interesting with that article in Elizabeth Willis's
collection (.) the planning time for tasks (.)
is it Martin Bygate?

Mmm

I do want students to plan things and what
sort of effect does that have on the language
(.) it's perceived as being a good thing (.) a
benefit to allow students to- to plan (1.4)
and that's- that's an interesting issue as well

I can inquire something about (.) your drama
illustration (.) what you first of all described
reminds me of African drama (.) where they don't
have lines (.) they just have a story and they
come on with it and they act it out

mum

quite naturally (.) but you mentioned another
thing which is audience involvement
(.) audience participation actually changing
the story line (.) or (.) have I got that right?

yeah yeah

have I got that right? (.) is that right? (.) does
that- (.) how important is that element (.) in this
in other words (.) I can understand that you don't
know where to go (.) is it the

case that you don't know where to go
until someone has made a contribution?

I think (.) there are plenty of places I could go:
with a talk opportunity (.) I'm not talking
about knowing nothing about the area you've allotted to talk
about I'm not talking about no preparation (.) no
reading no thinking around the area (.) but the
more experience I have of this kind of teacher
education (.) the more comfortable I am with the
idea of taking my thoughts (.) my current understanding
in (.) without a clear (.) without a clear structure

mmm

and at the same time I know that- that audiences
sometimes like to see clear structure because they
take that as the sign of a good- of a
professional (.) somebody who has planned
and I think there will always be those who:: (.)
if you don't say 'look' there are five stages to
my presentation today (.) I'm going to cover
this that and the other they will assume
that you haven't prepared even
Nick mmm ( ) and that's the big distinction I hear now
in what you're saying ( ) between being
prepared ( ) to enter the arena ( ) and the idea
of having a plan which you think will
ride roughshod over the various discourse possibilities
that could have occurred in that arena
Vince yes yes ( ) and another thought hits me from
that ( ) it's- it's the preparation planning distinction
that if an athlete ( ) doesn't necessarily prepare
for the 100 meters by doing the 100 meters ( )
( ) they prepare in lots of different ways ( ) that to
plan for a speech event ( ) if you take that metaphor
to it's conclusion ( ) it's not a good way ( ) to- ( ) to
prepare ( ) by preparing in exactly the same way
as the speech event is going to- ( ) to take the form
of ( ) there are probably other ways which are
the limbering up ( ) the warming up exercises ( )
and that ( ) that metaphor I think is a strong one
for me in terms of improvisation ( ) that ( ) it's
practicing talking ( ) answering questions ( ) exploring
the area ( ) that's a different sort of preparation from
to actually having that hour to plan ( ) and I've never
ever been able to do that ( ) I've had a- say at IATEFL
I remember the first time I did a presentation there ( )
I was I was screwed up with ( ) stress ( ) because
I'm wondering ( ) whether that's related to over-preparation
to=
Nicholas [mm
Vince =feeling that I had to- to get this right ( ) the way that I'd
set it up
(1.6)
Emma and are you saying that ( ) that it's partly your perception
of the audience ( ) as requiring evidence of a plan ( )
Vince mmm
Emma that makes you feel ( ) you've got to provide one ( )
(1.0)
Vince yes I think so ( ) but when I did the improvisation
I know that audience responds much much
more positively to- to actors who are prepared
to take risks and to walk onto a stage without
the plan ( ) because that's a form of real ( ) a form
of real communication ( ) there's something very
contrived about- about planning something
that you're going to say ( ) maybe it's just a
different sort of event ( ) a scripted one and an
improvised one
(0.6)
Nicholas and you've talked a— you've mentioned tension
and being screwed up by tension and pressure
quite a lot ( ) that's the feeling that comes from
this kind of plan ( )
Elizabeth or is it the feeling that comes from the degree
of publicness and non-familiarity with the audience
(5.4)
Vince I think it's a:: ( ) a mixture of those two factors
the- ( ) being
(2.4)
there's a ( ) that link I've ment- there's
a distinction that I've mentioned to Nicholas a
couple of times ( ) that I don't know where
t comes from and I'd like to find out ( ) between
tenseness and tension ( ) that tenseness is bad
for any kind of communication ( ) in a classroom
or- or as professionals that if we're tense ( )
then- then that obviously inhibits ( ) our ability
to communicate with *who-ev-* >we're talking to<
but ( ) a TENSION ( ) and that's where a warming up
comes in ( ) the preparation ( ) that you need to reach
that pitch where you're excited enough to talk ( )
and I think- what ( ) maybe one realisation which
is even clearer to me now is that ( ) I need to try
( ) to not wrack myself up with a high planned
product and to take a few risks with a couple of
presentations
Nicholas because the highly planned product brings you ignseness
( ) whereas a well prepared improvisation gives you
tension
Vince yes ( ) yes
Nicholas [yeah?]
Vince I've got to ( ) I started to say this earlier ( ) and I
somehow got side-tracked ( ) but in terms of
preparation ( ) I've never been able to say
right ( ) this presentation's an hour ( ) I'm going
to rehearse this ( ) I'm going to put a clock dwon
and I'm going to give this presentation to nobody for
an hour ( ) I just can't dw ( ) and ( ) th ( )
there are other things ( ) I can do snippets ( ) I can- can
read ( ) I can voice things ( ) there are other forms
of warming up ( ) that I think that I feel more comfortable
with ( )
(1.8)
Robert there's a certain ( ) "I don't know whether" argh
( ) you must >tell me later that we're not allowed to
ask this ( ) but it seems to me valid just to give you
a little reference ( ) there's a novel by Michael Frayn
a long time ago ( ) called the Tin Men ( ) and in that
there's a character who's a writer who used to write
his own reviews ( ) before he wrote his novel ( ) I remember
him saying 'Roe' ( ) his name was Roe ( ) Roe Roe Roe is
the most brilliant crh ( ) etc ( ) now hahhh
( ) the way this is put in mind ( ) I wonder ( ) when you
say anticipating audience reaction ( ) whether to a certain
extent that you're writing your own reviews
(4.0)
before you: ( ) before you in other words ( ) maybe
we all do that to a certain extent ( ) that when you are
performing ( ) do you anticipate? in any very
specific and direct way what the audience ( ) do you
anticipate audience evaluation as ( )?
Vince "is what I'm trying to get at*
Vince I err think that ( ) audience evaluation ( ) is going back to
this point of people's perceptions of what a clued up
professional ought to do ( ) erm ( ) I don't think I do:: think
( ) that doesn't really rsonate with the idea of a ( )
thinking about how they would evaluate * the performance
or the talk*
Harry could I ask you something< ( ) s- erm < ( )
before where you started in a sense< ( ) yeah you talked
about this erm< ( ) this difference and the feelings that
you get in these two approaches< ( ) err< ( ) I wonder if
that's something that has become more pressing for you
has become more pressing for you over time
* or is it something that?< ( ) it something that< ( )

Vince well I think< ( ) I've always thought with this
job that there aren't enough opportunities
for- for talk< ( ) that- there< ( ) ther- the
opportunities are so rare< ( ) in the situation
we find ourselves in here< ( ) that for me< ( ) it's
one of the unhealthy parts of working in the CELU
that erm< ( ) that- that sense of excitement
that preparation to talk publicly is something
that I do need< ( ) I like that< ( ) optimum degree of
adrenaline< ( ) and working with people< ( ) and
working with and I've felt that quite strongly
in the couple of visits to Japan pre this one
where you had an expectant group< ( ) and- and
probably there's an element of power there isn't
there?< ( ) of having people dependent on< ( ) on
things that- I think that's a slightly negative
way of looking< ( ) there is that element< ( ) the
positive part is that you feel valuable because
you've got something valuable to share with
people and that they are interested in< ( )
so that< ( ) I think that made me think of that Harry
that we don't have the opportunities for it< ( )
and going to Kenderby the other day< ( ) is
all part of this< ( ) that< ( ) I spoke about something
that I'm quite familiar with< ( ) I didn't overprepare
it< ( ) and I really enjoyed that experience< ( ) and
I think that's something that's missing< ( ) from
what we do

Elizabeth so when you went to Kenderby< ( ) were you aware
that you had a goal< ( ) something you wanted to
get across< ( ) but you weren't sure quite how you
were going to get there?< ( ) I mean did you know
were you talking to a group?

Vince I was talking to a group, yeah

Elizabeth did you know what you wanted to have achieved
by the end< ( ) but you just didn't know the direction
( ) you knew where you wanted to get to< ( ) but
you didn't quite know which route< ( )

Vince well actually I planned in the same< ( ) in the same way that I have
for other "conferences"< ( ) and I decided after I'd done
that< ( ) the kind of preparation "that I'm not sure
whether I like"< ( ) I just d-< ( ) I made a very conscious
decision that I was going to throw that out of the
window< ( ) and I was going to< ( ) I was going to
leave that behind< ( ) and I think that's one of the first
times< ( ) where in this particular line of work< ( ) that
I've felt confident enough to do< ( ) so I had a-
so the goal shifted from what I wanted to say
to communication and leaving space< ( ) cos that's the other-
you probably feel you'd had very similar experiences
with- with presentations that you don't leave enough
Nicholas: so that distinction that you're talking about here has already been the basis for action, it is that clear for you that you've been through that process of thinking, "hello! I'm doing this planning again," and I'm going to stop and I'll just be prepared so that's a working distinction for you already?

Vince: yes I think so. I think err- with the proviso that there aren't that many opportunities for trying it=

Nicholas: [yeah]

Vince: [yeah] the limited opportunities I think I'm beginning to feel that that is the best way forward I look around sometimes you do with your peers and you as I think I've thought as a student you were all there in terms of being tutors and subject specialists and I don't think there's a right way to do it there's only a right way for you and that's our philosophy with students everybody needs to find the best way for them to do it and I have this strong sense that even in the kind of professional talking that we do, that people will probably have the best way but whether whether everybody in their professional life realises their best way takes the risks I think some people are better scripted actors and some people are better improvisers and the two things are not the same.

Nicholas: was there some tension earlier when you were talking about student expectations or audience expectations do you also feel a tenseness between the way you want to be and that expectation does that also lead to tenseness?

Vince: [can you] [can you run-]

Nicholas: [is that someone] [else]

Vince: run that through again it's not your fault

Nicholas: *yeah no*

Vince: my brain just went then

Harry: *sh-ha hhhh*

Vince: I think it's the stage of the day

Nicholas: you talked about tenseness being produced when you put yourself into this role of being carefully prepared=

Vince: *mumm*

Nicholas: that produces tenseness and is there also a tenseness sometimes when you've prepared yourself the way you want to but tenseness is created by this other figure of the planned operator that you feel possibly people will possibly expect you to be or part of you thinks you ought to be or is it exactly that tenseness that you're now working on getting rid of?

Vince: sorry that's not very coherent

Nicholas: I'm not sure there is definitely the tenseness that comes from audience expectations and I don't think you know what the audience really expects.
you can go out and talk to a few people beforehand

errm you can find out what the group in Turkey

in METU is likely to be there are a number of

variables that you can be prepared for to for level

but there is probably an expectation for a lot of

people that something needs to be planned that*

kind of event needs to be planned* so that begs the

question if it's not going to be are you honest

about that do you say I haven't planned this

or do you say I haven't got a clear agenda I had

deliberately not constrained myself how do you

say that it's just something like writing an e-mail

you need to get the phrase right to put it in a positive

light I don't want if you keep the structure fairly loose

maybe you don't need to overtly say anything

Robert

my perception of what you've said is that you're a person

who prefers to respond on the spot rather than that

take a plan of action maybe

that's your nature maybe that's the way you want to

go away and is it the case that you see that there is

other world which may be better in other words the rigorous

planned and stratified one is there a conflict

Vince

I'm not sure I'm not sure if that's something

that I've that I'm exploring right at this moment

and I don't have any strong views on where I should go

but I think I've reached the end of my thinking about

this matter actually

Elizabeth

can I just ask you a question

Vince

mm

when you've planned something rigorously and you decide

not to stick to the plan and that was really successful

how far do you think that's because you have planned

it then thrown the plan away that you've actually gone

through all that thinking in your head first so you feel

very confident about it all and you're ready to launch

into it I mean does the actual planning that you've

done thinking that you'd use it actually give to the

then what becomes an unplanned presentation

Vince

yeah there is an element of that I don't think

I've had enough opportunities to try to try

these different scenarios there's the highly

planned and then the throw it away and don't

hope that the structure's still there but I=

Elizabeth

or even not hope that the structure is still there

Vince

I think I haven't moved to the point where I would

consider right I'm going to Turkey I'm gonna

have I've got the title and I'm going to improvise

when I get there I going to we're my preparation will

be reading articles and talking to a few people

about that topic and then I'll use that information

I mean when you go to conferences you unless

you're on the first day one of the things

that really impresses me about talkers is when they

are able to bring in things that they've recently heard

and again that's openness that being open

to what other people are saying in the conference and

being able to draw those things in in a real way
not in a contrived way (.) cos I think there’s a little bit
of sort of ngme dropping as well (.) and paying your dques to
people giving plenaries (.) that you seem to be (.) I think that
that’s an element that’s connected to that (.) I don’t think
I have done that (.) maybe it’s not a good idea (.) but-but
there is one other thing that is related to this (.) is that
I’ve always wanted to write a paper (.) where I get a group of
students to (.) to do tasks in different ways (.) they’d be drama
tasks probably (.) one with a high degree of preparation
and able to have a script (.) and the other one with
improvisation (.) a lot of the dissertations that I’ve had
recently like Mary Baggley’s I’ve thought that would be
a nice piece of research to do

(2.8)

Nicholas when you started you said you hadn’t really (.) thought too
much about what you were going to talk about (.) and then
the topic that you did move into was very related to that
opening statement (.)

Vince uhmm

Vince the fact that you hadn’t thought too much about what
you were talk about

Vince yeah deliberately

Nicholas yeah so that the one did lead quite naturally into the other (.)

Vince deliberately not planning anything to say (.) cos I think
the temptation (.) I think there’s an element of trust
as well (.) that- that (.) you walk into a group (.) that
we know each other well enough to be able to take that risk
(.) but there is always a temptation to think >you know< Christ
I’m going to talk to that lot for 30 minutes I better have
something intelligent to say (.) and (.) you know (.)
what could I say (.) that- I think I have that element
to me (.) the egoistical (.) I hope people think I’m >you know<
an intelligent person (.) you know (.) that’s always
there (.) and that’s probably (.) that’s also related to my
relative newness (.) that (.) “you have” (.) there is
that element (.) I don’t think (.) I feel comfortable enough
not to- to let that come into play that side (.) but I think
it’s related (.) this whole idea of planning and being
impressive (.) and having a big idea (.) I think for those
of us that don’t have a big idea we’re better off
improvising and communicating with people

(2.4)

Nicholas having a big idea relates to (.) preparation? (.)

Elizabeth [*or planning*]

(0.6)

Nicholas sorry t- planning yes (.) having a big idea relates
to=

Vince =I think in my mind

Nicholas [planning

Vince there is (.) there may be some relation (.) in that we’re
under pressure to have a big idea (.) to have a (.) to
have a book (.) that’s the academic’s life isn’t it that-
(.) maybe this unit is hhhhhh ha slightly::different
because that’s not our philosophy (.) the philosophy
is let people theorise their practice (.) work from their
context

Nicholas [yeah yeah
maybe I'm in a lucky position to be able to come in and ramble on like this.

I think there is an element of truth there which is important and it's a part of what we're doing. This session is a session where somebody can come in and have a really highly charged highly planned slant on something they're currently thinking about or people are welcome to come in like me and be totally un...

Do you want a break at that point.

Yeah I think I've exhausted my big idea. Heh.

I thought the last point you raised there is in fact so interesting.

It got very interesting.

Shall we shift into the other mode there is there anything that anybody here feels that they want to say about themselves relating to what Vince’s been talking about.

Yeah I think I can say yeah I can respond to that it's where I live I feel exactly the same planning just gets right up my snout.

And I'll spend hours and hours planning plenaries so I've got exactly 45 minutes cos that's what you have to have if you've got a plenary plus ten for questions and then not actually look at it at all=

When I'm doing it.

But having got the plan I've got the confidence to then do it if I didn't have the plan I'd be awake all night worrying about it it would be really high tense so having planned it gives me the confidence to then put that down it's there if I need it but I don't use it.

That's right.

But I only throw it away last minute I don't do what you did ha hihhh

Yes and that's where I live I throw the plan away only afterwards.

I always have to have a plan but if I have a plan I don't use it but if I don't then I'm finished.

If I don't I'm I wouldn't even appear.

That's right.

I'd just run away.

Yeah I like t-

I love it when things go wrong=

But that's only=

The best ones have always been when something goes wrong=

Sure.

Not with me or with the equipment or whatever.

>when fate takes over.
[ * you* get thrown off
[if we go
back to what Vince was saying (. ) about
the dramatic thing (. ) when the audience
intervenes (. ) and the audience intervention
changes the nature of the event (. ) rather
than that you go back to your script (. )

Elizabeth mm

mmm

Robert is that what you were saying?

Vince yeah I think so (. ) that link with what

Harry has just said is really powerful

for me (. ) because I think we live in

live in- like even television values (. ) that

that there are the height- y- there’s nothing

in-between (. ) there’s the high production values

and there’s the (. ) there’s the off-the-cuff >you know we’re

making< a television programme (. ) come over

here (. ) get a close up of this (. ) it’s like living

in a- (. ) one is living in the- in the immediate (. )

here and now world (. ) where- for me there’s

a high degree of honesty (. ) and lack of pretence

and I think some people (. ) I nearly said it

earlier but I didn’t (. ) but Harry is the one person

in the group (. ) who I felt his lectures are probably

closest to- (. ) to the sort of style (. ) that I feel

(. ) is my best forward

Nicholas mm

Elizabeth * mm*

(2.2)

Harry * thank you*

Vince [[it’s not ]

Harry [[cos I feel as]

Vince it’s not that- it’s not that I- in- as- and I=*

Harry =no no=

Vince =I feel the need to clarify cos it- (. ) it’s not that

I enjoyed Harry’s (. ) sessions

Harry [no no

> I didn’t take it that way but<

Nicholas [no no ]

Harry [when I ta-]

Vince [I’m sure ] you didn’t=

Elizabeth [( )]

Harry =>when I said thank[you I meant< thank ]you =

Vince [I’m sure you didn’t ]

Harry =for responding to my point=

Vince =yeah=

Harry =so what you’re saying is- when I said I feel

the same as you do (. ) you saying yes I connect

Vince that’s- that’s [the way ]

Harry [ ( ) ] the lectures yeah

they’re just the style (. ) yeah

Nicholas yes=

Vince = and when you said things going wrong as well

that the- (. ) the working from things going wrong

(. ) being open to using things that happen

(1.2)

Harry yeah=

Vince =for me (. ) I’m much more able to do that if I’m

not too planned about it
Harry yeah
Robert I once heard an interview with the Italian tenor
     Gee ( ) and he was asked ( ) erm Maestro ( )
     you've been doing this so long ( ) of course
     you 'don't' have the butterflies you used to have when
     you were young ( ) when you go on stage and so forth
     ( ) and he says if I didn't have the tension ( ) when
     I go on stage ( ) I couldn't perform ( )
Vince mmm
Elizabeth [mm]
Robert the only thing ( ) is ( ) don't get choked ( ) it doesn't
     go away ( ) it is just part of the act ( ) and maybe the
tension is just an inevitable part of the deal ( ) you've got to
learn to cope with it
Nicholas it's what keeps you in shape
Harry or not ( ) because I don't feel it ( ) I mean that's the
difference ( ) I don't ( ) be[cause of that ]
Nicholas [yes you've said ] that before
Harry you don't=
       =I mean there are occasions when I do ( ) but it's not-
Nicholas ( ) you see to me there's a ( ) there are difficulties with
       the statements that you've made there ( ) in the way
       that I Resonate to them
Harry mm
Nicholas err, ( ) the idea of responding when things go wrong
       ( ) to me ( ) presupposes that you had some idea of what
       would be right
Elizabeth mm=
Harry =no
Nicholas [and if you had some idea of what would be right
       then we're talking about some sort of a ( ) a direction
       a progression ( ) that I might think of as preparation
       and ( ) my responding to the unexpected ( ) say ( ) I think
       is enhanced when I've set off ( ) with a feeling of how
       I'm going to go about this=
Emma yes I think t-
Nicholas [I don't have to do all those things=
Emma =yes
Nicholas but my entry into the arena ( ) my whole me:
       ( ) is ( ) I think closer to the me-ness ( ) I'm much
       more myself when I go in with a sense of how I'm
       going to go about this ( ) I think that's how- ( ) I do
       think we're only talking about the ways that different
       people engage at their best
Vince mmm
Harry yeah
Robert * but I think that* in fact Vince raised for me
     also a very important point ( ) in it is this business
     of going onto the stage and having audience participation
     and ( ) I reckon any teacher has to do that ( ) a:nd
     ( ) you go places that you hadn't ( ) planned on going
     at all ( ) and I think it's necessarily so ( )
Harry can I? ( ) I think this is something that comes in for me here
     is this business about ( ) people and getting messages ( )
because I guess the thing about going on ( ) it could
     be technical, ( ) it could be in terms of s- making
     impossible something that I thought would be possible
     ( ) my general plan if you like
Nicholas [uhumm     [uhumm=
Emma
Keith =but I think what I get excited by is that I'm never completely sure when I stand up and I start talking about whether people are listening to me or the message whether we're really connecting (and when something goes wrong all of sudden) I get that feeling that there's me and the people out there and there isn't anything there's anything any=
Nicholas =there's no message getting in the way?
Harry there is no there's no preconceived message there's no preconceived message there's no what they expect to get or what I expect to be getting in the way of my direct contact and my direct delivery of this message now this is very difficult to put this=
Nicholas =yea:::h
Harry okay let me start again
Nicholas no that was tremendous for me that's no; that's now made me think is that:::t (1.0)
Nicholas damn that's what they were talking about all the time (and is: ha ha that's that's made me think have to remember what it was is that when I engage there is really only the message
Harry mm
Elizabeth mmm.
Harry yeah,
Nicholas it's not me and them at all it's being involved in the message=
Harry =that's it that's what I mean yeah >I put it the other way round<
Nicholas [it's not what it means
Harry [exactly
Harry yes it's not me it's not me and my preconceptions or them or their preconceptions it's just the two of us and therefore the message it's just
Elizabeth but the message is like it is because of them and the way they react to you
Harry but what I'm the message you see I'm trying to do it here the image of I guess
(2.0)
Harry it's this business of image and medium and the something between me and the audience and when something goes wrong it shatters that and there's just me and them and that thing that went wrong and that thing that went wrong (> <)
together and I feel very close and the messages that are coming out then seem to me to be genuine and it's not connected with the title of the talk:
B083 (or Harry Sugdon or: the theme of the conference it's just what we're putting across right now in this at this moment
Nicholas yeah I think we're talking about very different things
Harry yeah
Nicholas yeah:::
Harry that's why I wanted to know if what I said earlier on=
Robert =are you talking about the event taking over and running itself in some way
Harry yeah but more than that I think I'm talking about going back to what Vince said about lectures and the way
that they work out (:) I love it when- when someone
says something that I hadn’t expected (:) or the- whole
the [whole bus line=]
Robert
[ sure sure ]
Harry =of this- the unplanned (:) it’s back to Vince’s planned and
unplanned (:) it’s only through the unplanned (:) hhh I
guese: hhh it’s like this (:) in conferences >you know<
big nmes (:) and nodding towards big nmes (:) I really
feel that that gets in the way of so much
Vince
mmm
Elizabeth
[mm
Harry
and there’s so many things that can get in the way ()
I’m talking about those moments when nothing’s getting
in the way, (:) there’s just you and the audience and you’re
connecting in a way that
Vince
[ >'s funny you use that< I was just
about to say that everything you’re saying to me (:) is-
saying to us (:) is about interconnectivity (:) there is=
[yeah
Harry
Vince
= moments of- (:) wher- where there is a real connection
Harry
yes
Vince
whether it’s (:) because there’s a mistake or: (:) or because
of something they say that was unexpected (:) but they are
moments of interconnectivity
Harry
[ absolutely just- yeah
Vince
[ and- and
they maybe there are at the other end of (:) message ()
that if message gets in the way (:) th- there is the message
but there is the interconnectivity (:) is not necessarily related
to message
Harry
mmm
(0.6)
Harry
yes (:) I:
(1.8)
Nicholas
I- this- the- I now (:) this is- (:) mmm
ha humhaaa
Harry
ha " he he" (0.6)
Nicholas
that was what I was trying to say before
this is- I thin- (:) for me=
Harry
[ or-
Nicholas
=what I heard you saying was talking about
(:) those (:) moments when (:) some unforeseen
evnt (:) takes away the expectations, the planning
the preparation, the everything else (:) and allows
you to get into real (:) immediate here and now contact
with those people=
Harry
=yes that’s what I meant
Nicholas
yes?=  
Harry
=yeah=  
Nicholas
yeah
Harry
and that- >and then< Vince’s just put that
I think more coherently (:) you know the
interconnectivity (:) direct contact (:) and
I guess what I was picking was an example
of what breaks down the barriers that otherwise
exist (:) to enable that (:) getting the message
across (:) like that
Nicholas
well- a- (:) well if the last bit you say is- (:) is
for me the distinction (,) I’m sorry=

Harry =no (,) no get it (,) no no really (,) * I r-*

Nicholas no I he:- yeah (,) because of that connection

you feel you can then communicate the things

you want to co[mmunicate ]

Harry [yes exactly (,) exactly

Nicholas yes (,) yes

Harry [exactly

Vince [yeah

Harry that’s

Nicholas [yeah

Nicholas and somehow I was feeling (,) well I’ll just have to

think a lot more about this because I’ve never

thought it before< (,) but I never thought it before

but I was feeling that (,) when I’m at my best, (,)

(2.2)

Nicholas I don’t think there’s very much (,) of me or them

(,) it’s the message (,) it’s erm (,) it’s those

meanings out there in the world (,) and it’s

very little to do with people (,)

Harry arrh:::

Nicholas I’m afraid

Vince yeah

Harry right=

Nicholas =it’s not me getting close to them as people

it’s just hshshh:::::::wsh (,) it’s this

Harry yes but the point is when you get that close

the this is all there is

(0.6)

Harry you’re not conscious of this being me and th-

that being them (,) you’re just conscious

of a connection (,) and you’re talking about the

message (,) we’re talking about the connection

but the::: (,) the thing is the same (,) its

Nicholas yeah (,) but I hate what I’m saying

Harry oh really (,) oh right >I love it<

Nicholas ha ha

Robert [hsh ha=

Harry =I tell you (,) while we’re opening up on this

can we carry on in this mode (,) because what

interests (,) you know you talking about planning (,)

what- what I reckon (,) and messages (,) where

that works best (,) and it’s usually the case is

(,) where I’ve got a really really simple message

(,) and I actually could say it (,) in one sentence

but I’m going to take an hour (,) to say it (,) but

at some point (,) suddenly (,) but at some point

suddenly (,) that message is com- coming across

>you know *when you say get the mess-*< (,) just

in the right way (,) and that’s really the whole

B120 (,) it’s the (,) the hour is just a way of giving

me the opportunity of somehow getting that across

Nicholas yeah

Harry do you see what I mean?=                  

Nicholas =yeah=

Harry =and when that goes across (,) you know it

(,) and it only comes through that point of

human contact (,) and you can feel it (,) it’s

visceral
Nicholas: mmm
Harry: and sometimes you walk away and you haven’t felt it and it’s not visceral and you know they’ve gone away and they’ve listened to Harry Stephens talk on the subject of the classroom door or whatever looking out and looking in and it’s another hour out of their lives gone.
Nicholas: half a credit on the err=
Harry: that’s the one yeah.
Robert: that’s where you have to distinguish between words and the message I mean the words do nothing for me even the same words and it’s creating the context that takes the hour into which in the context of which those words will generate the message because meaning is all in context. ( )< you have created the meaning and those words there at the end trigger without that context you couldn’t ( ) words wouldn’t right.
Nicholas: the other stuff that I’d like to put out erm is the Briggs Myers the personality.
Harry: B137 index stuff where I don’t know if you know it some of us have worked on it and some of us haven’t it’s just that what we’ve been talking across it seemed to me as we were talking ( ) a CLASSIC erm I P distinction
Nicholas: between you know if (1.8)
Nicholas: all we do as err- a human beings in one sense is we perceive the world and we make evaluations I mean that’s it (1.2)
Nicholas: and some of us put more emphasis on the on going perception and live from that and some of us put more emphasis on the judgements and we live from that and it seems to me that was what was hanging-
Harry: [mmm]
Nicholas: away when you were talking the need that some of us have to: leave things loose enough don’t block up my perceptions cos I’m here and I’m now and I want to be in this moment and some of us are saying look let me just sort out what I’m doing here don’t don’t just make me you know run out there and leap about like an idiot cos I need to be ready
Nicholas: mmm
Nicholas: and I thought that’s just what we were talking across (0.8)
Nicholas: respecting you know the differing gifts that we have
Harry: yeah
Nicholas: yeah
Nicholas: anybody else like to say anything at this point or I'd like to go back to Vince and erm (.) ask him to take it up again (.) did anybody else want to come in=

Elizabeth: =I've got one: thing that isn't actually do with what we've been talking about directly (.) but you know the feeling you get when you are going to (.) talk (.) when you think the group that you're going to talk to is large (.) like you think the in-house course is going to have 16 people on it

Nicholas: mmm

Elizabeth: and then you walk in there (.) you've only got six =

Nicholas: =hhhh ye- ha .hh

Vince: mm

Elizabeth: and you think I can't engage with this group

Nicholas: yes

Elizabeth: there's not enough of them to bother about (.) now why (.) I was trying to think =I mean=< it's happened every time the in-house course gets smaller (.) I feel (.) I feel that (.) and if you go to- if you- not many people come to your session at a conference (.) you prepare for sixty and maybe thirty come (.) thirty's a lot but you don't feel it is a lot (.) and oppositely if three hundred come and you expected (.) sixty or something then you get more of a buzz (.) is it the idea? (.) but is that to do with? (.) is that to do with? forgetting there's an audience out there (.) and it's just the message

Nicholas: well (.) I personally was going to respond along those lines I think (.) the erm: the smaller

Elizabeth: yeah (.) funny isn't it?

Nicholas: yeah

Elizabeth: if it's a group you don't know

Nicholas: sh hhhh ha yes (.) the fewer people there are the more I'm called upon to engage with those people (.)

Harry: yes

Nicholas: a::nd,

(2.0)

Nicholas: at the beginning of all those relationships I always get a bit scared

Elizabeth: mmm

Nicholas: so there probably is a connection between that (.) and what I was saying earlier about (.) the message

Robert: for me it becomes a different evnt (.) depending on participation size (.) I always see these things as social (.) events (.) yeah? (.) and the number of people determine the kind of social evnt (.) that it can be (.) so if there are only five or ten people there (.) I go into seminar mode yeah?

(° °)
Elizabeth: it's funny isn't it? (; because it's you
and your message (; and a lot of individuals
and for each of those individuals (; you
are hoping that the message is going to
be the same (; and it shouldn't matter whether
there's 7, 70 or 700 (; because
Robert: y- that [ I would be to ] say
Elizabeth: [ do you see what ]
Nicholas: mmm
Robert: to say that you'd not changed mode
Elizabeth: hhhhh (; well I can see that you've changed
mode (; sorry I accept what you say exactly
(; but it's this feeling of tension (; buzz (;
whatver (; that's what I wanted to explain=
Robert: = another worry that I have (; very often I
talk (; when I give big public things (; not
so much here (; right? (; I start off by saying
well thank you for spending an hour of your life
with me (; erm (; I will try to make it worthwhile
(; then the question is what is going to be worthwhile
(; certainly not my message (; 'I mean' we don't believe
in messages here (; we believe in development (;
and all we can possibly hope to do: (; is that this
bunch of ten or a hundred individuals (; a development
takes place individually in them (; they're
individual plants and I'm the gardener (; and I've
only got a few watering cans (; it's something like
that (; cos if anyone takes my words away (;
they're not taking anything (; at least this is how
I feel about it (; including in classes here (;
doesn't matter how clever I am or anything
Robert: that I say (; all I'm doing (; all I can hope to do
(; is to stimulate growth and development (;
Elizabeth: you might be sowing seeds (; as well as
watering
Robert: yeah (; sowing seeds or watering plants that have
been planted before (; I mean (; I don- (; in one sense
I don't believe in sowing seeds I only believe
in watering seeds that are already there (; (" and
I think will grow (; but you know I- it depends
on what nutrients I- (; I- I put the (nutrients) (;
so in that sense I don't know (; maybe it's just
a matter of semantics (; but maybe Harry did
not mean message in that sense
(1.0)
Robert: that is a message that can be put down on paper
Harry: yeah (; I didn't have that in mind but
I mean it doesn't matter I think
Robert: hmm
Harry: connect in terms of having (; aims (; higher
aims if you like (;
Nicholas: due to the time discipline we have I'd like
B206: to turn things back to Vincent and errrm (; well
I just did
Vince: yeah (; I::
(1.6)
Vince: I think it's been useful for me (; just to clarify
a couple of distinctions (; this message, interconnection
( ) distinction ( ) and when Elizabeth was talking then ( )
this idea of having a message ( ) maybe it’s not just
planning ( ) it’s pre-ordaining the message ( ) is also
part of the choice for me ( ) that ( ) that- be- that
improvisation ( ) is walking into the ( ) situation
to connect and to talk and to communicate
and the message in that case can’t be preordained
but conferences are designed in- in- terms
of papers ( ) that we predict the message before
the whole thing ( ) maybe that- ( ) maybe
I’m in the wrong sort of ( ) I should be in
colloquia or workshops o: r ( ) I do usually find
that I’m much more interesting “them than papers”
( ) that’s not- ( ) that’s a development rather than
a s- summing up ( ) I like also that- that distinction
( ) erm
(1.6)
Vince remind me what that distinction was you mised
(looking at Nicholas) ( ) J and P
Nicholas ahhh: ( ) between the;; perceiving and the judging ( )
Vince ye:::s ( ) I think ( ) I’m going to think a little bit
more about this idea of interconnectivity ( ) and
perception of where people are ( ) and what
they want to say ( ) and responding in the instant
and ( ) judgment ( ) I think I’d like to think about
that a bit more
Vince (2.4)
it’s been useful for me ( ) thanks
Nicholas okay shall we stop?
Emma thank you
Harry [thanks
Robert [thanks Vince
Nicholas yeah
((Tape is switched off))
Case 2

GDM26.10.98

Elizabeth as Speaker:
Lexical chunks
Harry saying what's in the news, yeah
> it's a good idea actually <
Nicholas (Elizabeth walks in and says) can you have video films
that actually move, show a piece of film
Harry unfortunately - well I suppose you could
Elizabeth because I saw the most wonderful sight Sunday
afternoon, was the River Kent was in spate and
and the salmon were leaping up its waterfalls
Harry eeeehooh there you go
Elizabeth [and I was thinking it would
be wonderful to had all the autumn colours and the
Harry [naa, you got something like

that * of Mali and believe me you don't want that
on it's [one of those ]=
Elizabeth [a little bit of ] video a little bit of video
Harry vivid orange red jobs
Elizabeth [like just and when three tree four leapt together
an one fell back and splatted on the rocks
Nicholas [sounds wonderful yeah
Elizabeth it was an absolutely primeval
Harry great
Elizabeth and I have loved it was - was so good I'd
just love to have it all on my screen (.) with all the
autumn wind and the colours blowing the trees
go over the waterfall as well=
Robert = well you provide the video it can easily be done
Harry yeah
Robert certainly a still photo
Elizabeth [yeah they've only got a week to run
apparently
Harry = uhhhh, right
Elizabeth I only thought about this for ten minutes last
night (.)> at about midnight <, so I haven't kind of
prepared and my first feeling was when I thought
' oops' it's Tuesday tomorrow was this is the first
session that we have actually done that has been
based on: (.) err: a specific:: > sort of < research topic so I
wasn't quite sure how to do it, (.) so I thought I
(bh)would, ((trying to put down chair)) > doesn't go
down any further does it? <=
Robert = no=
Elizabeth = I- hhhaa ha mmmmm, (.) I'd like to go through
(.) very quickly and speed me up if I'm to slow (.) a
kind of chronological process of where I started at (.)
with the landmarks and turning points along the
way (.) just to:: bring you into the > kind of < flow of things and
the excitement (.) mainly ups but < you know > a few
downs of what I've been trying to do (0.6) ummm
and there have been about three turning points in
in the last six months or so ummm (.) I'd
like to (.) vaguely outline those (.) and then (.) ummm (0.8) ask
you:: whether you think (.) or just how you feel about
what do you think a good way ahead would be (.)
I've got three pieces of data just to show you (.) not
to actually analyse (.) but just to put you into the
picture of what I have been doing (.) and one:: actual
piece of data which I've had Tgm's feedback on
but I'd really like your feedback on as well (.) is that
okay?

what was the... <sorry I guess that was the last
thing you said maybe> () so the () the goal for you out of
the session would be() to tell us where you have
been coming from for the last few months to get
here () what the GQAL for you () is to get feedback () on
these piece of data?

Ummm (2.2) yes () and I guess I wanted to share
the process with you () so that you would () recognise
if you:: heard anything at a conference or read any
student's:: work () that would actually feed into it ()
right? () so that you would be consciousness raised
towards what I'm trying to do () so that: if you heard
of anything or saw of anything that might be
useful () or had a student, () like Harry passed on as
student to me because it seemed they were doing
something up my street
right! so it'll be () for us to have much more
insight into your work
think that's one of my goals () because I'm sure if
you had a bit more insight then you could help
me just standing in the corridor saying < 'oh' by the
way I had an idea about so and so> () for example

so there is a watershed between as Understanders
and us as contributors?

yeah I think- I
I'm not quite sure <as I said> I
don't quite know how it's going to work out () but I
think () yes! the goal will be: () I'll tell you what I
intend to do () what I would like to do () with my
research time this year () and I would like ()
feedback on that () how do it () given- () what
you know is in store for us * this year*

is that OK? (0.6)) ummmm (5.2) I've bought
a few  illustrate things with me () because I thought
it was easier just to show you something rather than
talk about it <at some time> errm hh () okay () so there
might be little bits of silence () ummm OK () I started off
being real::ly aware of the importance of CHUNKS of
language () ummm () when I was working on the
NU-CORP project () following a lexical syllabus ()
so a chunk that I remember thinking about is the
"the thing is" () but we don't think about saying the
"thing is" () it is a >sort of< subliminal chunk () we use it all the
time and no one ever teaches it () and this seems to me
the:: () whole problem () in a nutshell () that we use
chucks subliminally () no one ever puts them on
syllabuses () and sssoooo only your - the
learners in acquisition rich environments actually
cere get to pick up then up naturally (0.6) and then they
often don't appear in textbooks () so this was the start
the of my interest () in lexical phrases or chunks or
whatever you like to call them (3.0) ...hh the first real
turning point was reading John Sinclair's >Corpus
Concordance and Collocation< chapter 8 () which was
there he made the distinction between people
comprehending he now says also composing
comprehending discourse by ummm (1.0)
through either idiom principle or open choice
principle (1.5) it works better for me if I think
composing discourse so that open choice
about principle is like the view of language where
there's a slot and filter (0.6) where you kind of think
‘right’ we've got to have a subject and a verb and
an object and there is various sets of Lexis that
you can put into each slot so that at any point in
the discourse ah-. hhh anything would go and in fact
what happens in discourse is that there are very few options available
(3.0) ummm so that we tend to speak and e-also to write in
erm hhh in chunks that are already fabricated in our mind
there are the stages at which open choices work
( ) or are needed but there are also stages where our
whole precomposed chunk is available we just
write it or speak it in one go: without even thinking
about it (3.0) ummm (2.0) John Sinclair calls it
idiom principle I think that's misleading
because it's nothing to do with idioms really its to
do with pre- fabricated or semi- fabricated
chunks ummm but idiom is a good word
because it gets teachers going teachers love
idioms the problem with idioms is that they are
very very rare and they occur only once in every one million
words or < something like that > students love
learning them but erm then tend to overuse them
( ) and I thought if we can popularize lexical
chunks as idioms have been popularised we might
be getting further with helping people learn
languages and the problem is how to do it (1.0)
Nicholas (121) Could I just check an idea with you there
then? perhaps the last point especially that
ummm the excitement that I thought I heard there
was this idea of taking the idea of the lexical chunk and
managing to represent that to teachers in such a way that
will generate in teachers the same enthusiasm
(Elizabeth: yes) and excitement (Elizabeth: yes) that they
have from the idea of teaching idioms
Elizabeth yes, yes, yes=
Nicholas =yeah that's the buzz
Elizabeth [yes yes yes=
Nicholas =yeah=
Elizabeth absolutely
Emma but there's also from research point of view a
difficulty and therefore a challenge of finding
out what because these chunks are subliminal
(Elizabeth: yes) ( ) of finding out what (Elizabeth: yes) they
are (Elizabeth: yes) or what - what yeh=
Nicholas [yes yes
Emma =and so that's still a challenge for you (Elizabeth yes)
and- but its interesting for that reason=
Nicholas =yes=
Robert =do you think you think we can in fact find out
what these are?
Elizabeth ummmm ( ) can I come onto that?
Robert yes
Elizabeth because that's what I'll be leading through to
Robert: "yeh"
Elizabeth: "hh (1.5) okay (12.0) hh one reason why I think teachers might be interested in finding out what they are is because( ) reports from various student dissertations that I’ve read ( ) and other people as well ( ) have found that grad examiners tend to mark higher and examiners of written ( ) term papers give higher grades to students who use lexical chunks without actually knowing what lexical chunks are ( ) so even if their grammar is up the creek ( ) even if their open choice grammar ( ) is not particular good ( ) if that student has used a lot of lexical chunks ( ) they usually get quite high marks in oral exams and in written exams ( ) and this has been( ) we’ve had various students who have written about this thing ( ) so that I find exciting ( ) and that’s something that motivates teachers <you’re students will get better grades> if they- it- it- they are a marker of fluency (0.6) and are rewarded even if examiners can’t actually ( ) pick them out explicitly they seem to be aware of the fact that hh ( ) hh these students are fluent and in the:: research that’s been done looking at the recorded tran- the transcripts of their work ( ) there’s a far higher incidence of lexical chunks in the writing- writing of students who are highly graded ( ) and in the speech of students who are graded highly ( ) than students who are low graded <so there seems to be> a definite correlation there (Vince: mmm) it’s interesting (3.0), hh ummm ( ) in writing they seem to impress members ( - ) if you want to belong to an audience of particular genre- oh hang on ( ) in order to gain entry into the membership of a particular s- ESP genre ( ) you need to you know the language and you- ( ) basically it boils down to knowing what the common collocations are:: ( ) and how the frameworks are built up within that subject ( ) and ( ) it seems to me from looking at ( ) ummm ( ) bits of ( ) discourse that it is nearly all ( ) it’s not so much a question of open choice grammar ( ) it is nearly all a question of knowing the phrases that that go with that genre ( ) so to gain entry into a discourse community ( ) knowing the right chunk seems to be a great help ( ) at least you can kid people that you know all about the subject if you can talk about it using the right words ( ) even if you don’t ( ) at least this an assumption I’ve made ( ) but it does seem to be the case from - and that’s fairly heresy ( )

(161)

Nicholas: I haven’t done any research on that.
Elizabeth: =yes lots=
Nicholas: and signal membership of=
Elizabeth: =yes yeah=
Nicholas: where that specificity would not depend on ( ) a particular lexical nub ( ) we’re not talking about what could be more easily defined as a- as a word that’s genre specific <you are saying> there’s something
about the whole unit (Elizabeth: yes) which is (Elizabeth: 
yes) specific in [that sense ye]ah=

Elizabeth
[yes yes yes]
= I mean there will obviously be words that are higher on an
ESP word list in frequency

Nicholas
[yeah yeah]
= but that’s not the point you were making=

Elizabeth
= that’s not the point I am making

Nicholas
= and those lexical: (. ) units (. ) chunks or
prefabricated (. ) stgs >or whatever< would not be
(. ) defined by the presence of those (. ) words (. ) there
something elks going on=

Elizabeth
= yes

Nicholas
[that defines them yeah?]

Elizabeth
yes

Robert
[yes yes

Elizabeth
would you agree?

Robert
yeah! ( . ) yes this is [good keep going keep GO ]ing!

Elizabeth
[yeah OK I’m wondering ( . ) ]

whether

Nicholas
<Robert’s not here [ to agree > ]

Elizabeth
[ no no I’m ]just

Robert
[I he hehe haa haa

Emma
[ha ha haa haa

Robert
this is err err this is the right stuff ( . ) yeah? I’ll come
in later hhha ha

Elizabeth
right OK ( . ) so when I actually got in - en on
my sabbatical ( . ) when I got into reading seriously
about this ( . ) ummm ( . ) I discovered that there
were something like - -> in fact this is only half of
them< that many numbers of w- ways of labeling
lexical chunks ( . ) and that different researchers call
different things by different nmes ( . ) there was-
and it’s- they are very very very slippery

beings (2.0). hhh ummm (2.0) my other key quote
<found a nice blank page for you> is a quote from
Widdowson which is ([read aloud]) communicative
cmpetence is not matter of knowing
rules for the composition of sentences ( . ) it’s
much more a matter of knowing a stock of
partially pre- assembled patterns ( . ) formulaic
frameworks ( . ) and a kit of rules ( . ) so to speak ( . ) and
being able to apply the rules ( . ) to make whatever
adjustments are necessary ( . ) according to the
* contextual demands. * <this is going back to Sinclair
open choice> ( . ) so communicative cmpetence in
this way is essentially a matter or adapt- adaptation and
the rules are subservient

Robert
what’s the date?

Elizabeth
of this? ( . ) >dunno< ( . ) ummm ( . ) I’ve got it on my
reading list ( . ) err I’ve lost the end of the quote ( .
( reads again ) ) the rules are: not generative but regulative and
subservient ( . ) eighty nine=

Robert
= that’s ( . ) early

Elizabeth
[yeah

Robert
that’s early ( . ) yes=

Elizabeth
= I don’t know whether he would still believe in that
but it’s nice [of describing ] people that [ they’re =]
Robert
[ <I tell you also? > ] do::

you see a difference between this and the Becker which is that
you drew my attention< to the Becker

Yeah

is he saying anything different?

(3.0) well Becker certainly talks in terms of
partially pre-assembled patterns, formulaic
frameworks,≈

exactly (.) exactly (.) I think it's exactly the
same thing

It's exactly the same

that was ninety seventy five

yeah I've got the Becker quote hgre too (.) Becker
says >I can't use this in-< in erm mm (.) conferences
anymore because everyone- no-one knows what a
swatch means (.) they all think its a Swiss swatch
(2 voices?: mmmmm) Becker wrote in seventy five
((reads)) I suspect that we speak mostly by
stitching together swatches of text that we have
heard before (.) productive processes have a
secondary role of adapting the old phrases to the
new situation (.) so that's your idiom principle
and open choice (.) > the open choice<
grammar comes in when you have
to adapt (.) you choose the tense of the verb or
the mood (.) in order to... (.) in order to hhh=

= "I like the French ones"

[add it together (.) the French

are lovely!

the others ones I don't kn [ow

? =

freeja (.) hh (2.5) okay (.) ummm (.) so hhh (.) the other
problem I had researching (.) was that and I still have this if
I'm going to write anything up on this (.) it's a terrible
quagmire (.) and maybe I don't need to but (.) erm::
(.) that researchers have all classified things
differentially (.) for slightly different purposes (.) and
so it's really difficult to draw parallels or links
between their work (.) hhh (.) very few of them are
suitable for pedagogic purpose (.) even Natt- Nattiner and

de Carriço (.) I mean they wrote that in (.) eight four or
something? (.) ninety fr- (.) ninety two (.) ninety two (.)
ninety three (.) and it never caught on- hasn't caught on (.) and the-
the way that they do it just doesn't seem to work- it
doesn't seem to be accessible for teacher trainers-
it doesn't seem (.) to be pass dgmnable to the >sort of< pedagogic
(scene) (.) so I thought there must be another way
of trying to do this (.) and that's what I've been
looking for (.) erm (.) Lewis has tried (.) but
Lewis's attempts are vastly unsystematic and
unsatisfactory (4.4) hhh (.) erm (.) okay (.) can I just
define what I now think I mean by lexical chunk
(3.0) Can I just- can I just <sort of> clarify where
we've got <if that's OK with you?>

yes

at the start you said you were really excited

because this was the key (.) in terms of language
learning and success (.) and you know- success in
using language "sorry" (.) a key (.) and then you <sort
of> went through:: err work that'd been done on it (.)
and now you've got to really rub of your
research (this is what I wanted to clarify) (Elizabeth: mmm) which is really (to find a way of translating what is understood into terms which are pedagogically usable for teachers and that's really that's really what we're looking at (Elizabeth: yes) I just wanted to clarify that that's (Elizabeth: yes) what we're actually - that's of the focus of your research it's not lexical chunks as such it's the key it's the translat- er it's giving teachers a way of accessing that yeah?

Elizabeth (224) [and giving syllabus designers a way of putting them on syllabuses]

Harry right (so it's not just teachers) it's syllabus designers >as well< so it's a way of describing (that will work for syllabus designers and a way of <if you like> explicating that will work for teachers?

Elizabeth yes (yes) yes yes

Harry [yeah okay thanks I just wanted to get that-]

Elizabeth yes (and one thing that made me very excited was when I read ermm various people's estimates of the proportion of text that is probably made up of lexical chunks and of course it varies tremendously (in a research article it varies from ermm introduction to conclusion ermm in spoken it varies er I mean native speaker spontaneous is far higher it's something like sixty five seven per cent lexical chunks in particular situations but in planned situation where they're reporting that will be far lower so I mean huh there are estimates, guesstimates ermm that err between sort of thirty five and sixty five seven per cent of some interactions are made up of ermm strings of words <this is were the single definition comes in> (reads) {a string of words stored in the memory as a item} they can be: (retrieved and used) as a single chunk as it stands or with minimal adaptation in other words there are sometimes slots in the middle that can be changed or in frames there are words at the end that can be changed but the basic chunk the frame is static (Computer sound) [be brr bu]

Robert and you're referring to things like tense and pronouns which are substitutable within a chunk like that but it's still the same chunk

Nicholas ummmm yes very often they're grammatical choices

Robert [it's tweakable it's grammatically tweakable it]

Elizabeth [sometimes they're sometimes they're grammatically tweakable sometimes they are not]

Robert =yeah

Elizabeth ummm sometimes they have an environment =

Robert [does that correspond]

Elizabeth = which is favoured like 'set eyes on' is nearly always present perfect tense and it's nearly always 'on her' or 'on him' [interestingly you mentioned]

Robert (so there are favoured grammatical environments so that's a very loose one but there are
other far tighter ones=

Robert = you mentioned de Carrico does this correspond
with their canonical and ngn- canonical contrast?

Elizabeth => yeah roughly< () no sorry () no it doesn’t () because
some- like ‘by and large’ is ngn- canonical () it doesn’t make sense
grammatically =

Robert = it’s also non- tweakable

Elizabeth it’s also non- tweakable

Robert [<so it would correspond in that sense>=

Elizabeth => yeah suppose it would< () yeah () hhh in speech-
phonologically they normally form phonological
units () spoken without hesitation (1.2) they tend to
come out as a chunk () except when there’s a
word that can change the end of it () there’s
sometimes a little pause there () and someone
else suggested the internal grammar is often you know<
redundant () to know the meaning of the chunk
you don’t need to know the internal grammar
works

Nicholas [uhh huh

Robert absolutely

Elizabeth that’s caused a lot of erm ((she taps her papers)) academic
agenda that one

Robert [ha aaaa haaa: he

Elizabeth [okay:;

so, () emmm there seem to be general consensus
there are far more variable chunks then there are
fixed chunks () hh erm () so on other words () chunks
with odd words that - with a class word () >like< ‘the
thing is’, the fact is’, the point is’. () where there is a
class of words that go in () and they are all () they’re nearly
vocabulary three items () and they’re all to do with ‘fact’, ‘point’,
‘problem’ (Nicholas: mmm) okay

Robert () er mm () so looking at the grammar of
class () in conjunction with () with that kind
of chunk is also very useful () which we’ll talk about at
the end () and () to go back to what Emma was picking
up () identification is really problematic () hhhhh erm
and there are two ways of identifying, ‘by intuition’,
or by computational analysis () and I’ve started off
with intuition () because at that point

there were no p- () programmes apart from wordsmith
>which only does a little bit < () there were very few
programmes available which could actually get
hold of and say which is are the most common chunks
so looking at intuition which is what most teachers have to use in
the classroom () emmm () I did this about over a 100 times with
various () emmm groups of () whenever I did a talk or lecture
<when I was invited out to do a talk or lecture> I did the same
piece of data () and I got the whole audience () having explained
what a chunk was () I got the whole audience just to
go through () a piece of data () emmm it’s mainly
spoken () there’s a little bit of written in the
middle () hh erm <let me have a look at that> Rbobert
knows it I think () emmm and to circle what
they thought were the () chunks () whether they were
variable or not variable () and I did the same bit
of data <sort of> about a 100 times and I got
between emmmm () with emmm and I split it up
according to native, () non- native, emmm non- native-
specialised, native specialised and so on (.) because I thought there would be a difference (.) I hypothesised there would be a difference between native and non-native recognition (.) because in my first in-house group where I did it (.) there was a definite difference (.) but that seemed not to be the case (.) the case wgs whether they had actually known about lexical chunks before hand (.) if I gave a seminar on lexical chunks they could get more (.) hhh ermm (.) they found far more (.) than if I just explained what they were and gave them some examples (.) the difficulty was (.) the range (.) that in any one group there'd be people finding 7 chunks and people finding 20 (.) so the range is the problem (.) hhh even with more specialised people (.) the gap was smaller (.) but it was st- it went from say between 20 and 70 (.) so your average teacher in the average classroom (.) if they're told look here's a nice text (.) let's pick out the chunks (.) some classes might have a teacher who's good at it (.) and they'd get a far richer (.) ermm (.) awareness raising lesson or <you know> they get a far richer (Nicholas: mmm) source (Nicholas: mmm) than they would if teachers didn't see them (.) and so this was a big problem (.) ermm (.) interesting (.) someone (.) Elsie Roberts has just done the same with her data (.) seven linguists (.) all whom know about lexical chunks (.) and she got a surprising degree of consistency (.) so it does seem to be (.) people with an awareness of what they are (.) do get much closer (.) hhh ermm and it does seem to be improbable (.) by an hour seminars on lexical chunks (.) but that's all (.) but it's obviously not happy (.) it's not a happy situation as far as syllabus design or (.) teaching's concerned (.) ermm so my next move was actually to try and find a way of doing it by computer and finally (.) ermm managed to find Marti of NU-CORP (.) now this is where I had to join up with Donald because I was using Newchester university research time and money and so Donald and I got together thought about the best way of doing it talked to <what's his name> Jeremy Clear and after two months he finally managed to write a program for us that would do it so get brought ermm he (.) we decided that we would retrieve from the NU-CORP spoken and written corpus separately (.) ermm we started with what he calls 'four grams' or in other words four word chunks (.) every word in the chunk is from to 10,000 words of English (.) <in other words> we don't have any chunks that have one word that's outside the top 10,000 words (.) we thought that would be a good cut off point (.) we had to pick something otherwise it would have been an enormous programme (.) and he had finally managed to and this was the breakthrough that he has actually finally managed to (.) ermm (.) get a list of the most frequent chunks in different types of data (.) which I've photocopied for you but now I've lost (.) ermm (.) oh can I say also that I ran that test also with a piece of ESP text which
Robert will recognise data from Financial Times corpus () and we got the same kind of range on an ESP text that's just a sample of some data I got () so looking at the chunks in the text itself () a tremendous range of ability to pick them out () ermmm (5.6) so what we got () that was the () that was the data where people found between 7 and 70 chunks, () and this err () please excuse the scribbles because I couldn't find a fair copy () this is an example of the list of- () this is the top 200-200 odd () chunks that actually came out of the NU-CORP written corpus () I chose written because I thought that might be more valid to what most of you are doing (4.2) ermm () the written corpus com () is novels () and masses and masses of newspaper stuff () Okay so () in our search for ermm finding a way of identifying chunks this goes at it from a different angle () I mean the problem () with the problem with this is do we <-L now get teachers to learn them all these which is obviously not the thing to do L> ermm but () ermm how do we classify them how do we categorise them () in an acceptable way so that they are accessible to teachers and learners (2.2) because it's all very well to say ermm okay <the end of the> and a little bit of further down you find at 'at the end of' and a bit further down you find 'end of the day' () ermm () so we all recognise that 'at the end of the day' is one of the most common six word chunk that exists in the written corpus () ermm [can I just ask do we]

Emma (363)

then- do we then () how do we teach it?

Elizabeth before we go on to the next bit can I ask you a question about what this means to you?

Emma (Elizabeth: mmm) <so to speak> what the- what the ermm () NU-CORP computer exercise() what the outcome of the NU-CORP computer represents ermm you said it () it takes- it is selective () it's criteria for selecting chunks () is that all:: () all 4 words in the chunks must be () in the () among the most frequently used words <you know> without considering whether they are a chunk or not

Emma yes () yes yes =

Elizabeth =yes () so ((coughs)) (;0 so that given that presumably so:: () so how does that tie in for you () with err () what you were saying about () subliminal storage and er-production and that sort of thing

Elizabeth mmm,

(4.8) I think it might () he::lp () if we looked at it from the teachers point of view () in the classroom thinking () if we can think some way () to help teachers recognise what the most common chunks are () and what the most common patterns in the most common chunks are() then they're more likely to recognise similar ones () or ones that fit into both classes () when they see them in written text () of hear them in spoken discourse

Robert what do you think would be advantage () of being able to do that?
Elizabeth: of teachers being able to do that or syllabus designers being able to do it? (.) that they would be able to highlight them to students and say this is useful (. ) learn it ( . ) and it may be a question of having> like you have a vocab book ( . ) you have a phrase book useful ( . ) or don't answer=

Robert: but my question is why do you think it would be useful ( . ) or because if teachers could

Nicholas: = I understood Elizabeth's answer to have been that it would be useful (. ) because if teachers could recognise these most useful chunks ( . ) then the learner's attention could be drawn to these most useful chunks ( . ) and that would increase the amount of affordance available in their context ( . ) and that as far as method of learning is concerned ( . ) it might be as crude as saying rather than having a vocab book ( . ) here are some useful chunks you want to learn

Elizabeth: the other thing which I haven't said ( . ) so you- ( . ) I intended to say right at the beginning ( . ) when you are actually speaking spontaneously or writing fast ( . ) you don't have the chance to compose word by word by word so if you your syllabuses are grammar on the one hand and words on the other ( . ) to take a very extreme case ( . ) you've got all your words you've got all your grammar ( . ) it takes it takes a hell of a long time to slot and fill assemble them ( . ) if you've got to get your sentence in your head ( . ) before you start writing it down ( . ) or before you start saying it ( . ) I'm sure that is why Japanese students are very slow > to say something< ( . ) because they make their sentence first and they say it ( . ) so that if you can teach these larger units and make them aware of what can be generated what can be slotted into those units ( . ) they then don't have to ( . ) they don't have to compose from scratch all the time.

Robert: am I allowed to relate a little incident with somebody ( . ) between me and somebody who is very well known to everybody here ( . ) and when I raised this point with him ( . ) why doesn't one teach these things? he says 'there's' thousands of em ( . ) you can't teach them all=

Elizabeth: uhhmm ( . )

Robert: = do you know who that was

Elizabeth: ermm ( . ) it is probably Donald-

Robert: Eh haa ya:üssshha::

Elizabeth: but he's- ( . ) that's based on other research as well ( . ) mean there are ( . )

Robert: ha ha

Elizabeth: this is only this is only the top thousand and they are only I mean they are occurring hundreds of times

Robert: [yeah how many do you think there are=

Elizabeth: = absolutely no idea ( . ) because I mean that's how long a piece of string =

Robert: = ten to the power of?

Elizabeth: I have no idea ( . ) because ( . ) it depends on whether you want them all from the top ten thousands words ( . ) or whether you were going to include words from the top two hundreds thousand or what ( . )
there's an awful lot
Harry [is there (>)] I mean<
are we into giving - you know exchanging ideas or things like
that (>)
<==
Elizabeth = there's just one thing I want-
there's just one thing that I wanted to say first
is that in order to (.) in order to for people to
recognise them (.) and break them down and organise them is
for learners (.) what I tried to do is make a pedagogic classification
of lexical phrases (.) and this is nothing to do with a research
classification (.) ermm (.) which is done for analytic purpose
this is something which I thought students could relate to (.) I did a
survey around teachers (.) just an informal survey round teachers
and I tried lots and lots of different ones (.) and in the end I went
back to something that Butler had worked on and it was basically a
Hallidayan three-way thing (.) I don't want to go into the pros and
cons of it (.) but the pros of it are (.) that if you've got topic
related chunks (.) they may not be in the top (.) most
frequents ones (.) but if they are related to topics
that students are keen on talking about (.) they need
to know what those chunks are (.) cos they've got a personal interest
they need to know (.) in their subject area (.) what you are like
talking about or writing about (.) how you can get good at writing
about that topic (.) so there are topic related chunks (.) umm (.) so I
did this three way classification - (.) I did this three way
classification which I thought I'd give you (.) cos this is where now
I'm at (.) I've got the three- I've got this - well actually
its four way (.) because the bottom left hand corner
ummm is a ragbag (.) so this is just a neat ummm
( .) this is - this is just an attempt to get written with
examples- to put examples into this ( .) into that sort
of hierarchy ( .) and the categories I broke down
I got from various students assignments and
looking dissertations - there are about six Norton
students involved in this ( .) and looking at what Lewis and
other people had done outside Norton and these
categories seemed ( .) to be few enough to be ( .) just
about memorised- memorise - memorizable? ( .) yeah ( .)
ermm ( .) but enough broad ( .) inclusive enough to
include most of the chunks that we mgt ( .) so
so my present ( .) what I am doing now is going them ( .)
through the lists of the most frequent ones ( .) and
trying to classify them according to this classification ( .)
to see how they work ( .) and what types of chunks
are the most common ( .) and on the train last week ( .) I
did a little breakdown of ermm chunks - chunks
that are generally to do with time that are
notionally to do with time of some kind ( .) they're
definitely the highest in the data( .) coming in at
about 45% I think( .) no sorry I've got that written
down somewhere ermm, so ( .) yes ( .) so generally
towards - err time sorry 18% ( .) err place place
position like at the edge of on the brink ( .) and this is
metaphorical position as well as physical position
ermm would be about 12% of all chunks there are
in the top thousand ( .) quantity about 10% ( .) and a
lot of ( .) most of the ( .) in some of the ( .) ermm ( .) err
chunks relating to people like the chief minister of
Justice, ( .) Prince, ( .) Prime Minister ( .) Member of
Parliament ( .) that kind of chunk ( .) about 4% ( .) some of
Tape  B-side

got within this context (.) hhh and some like 'at the end of
time (.) they are:: to see that (.) to identify (.) whether it's
a metaphorical use (.) erm or not (.) so I just thought
there might be (.) and this is basically where I'm at
now (.) I am working through the lists to try to see
whether this breakdown works (.) and I keep
asking teachers to feedback (.) on this (.) and I've
only had two lots of feedback so far so I'm stuck now
because I don't know whether teachers will
like this or whether it'll just go down the same
way as Lewis and Nattinger and de Carrico have gone.

Nicholas  I'd love to invite you to speculate (.) project <a
bit more into the future> about what you think is
coming next (.) where [ is it gonna go ]=
Robert  [where is this ] leading
to that's right

(3.6)

Robert  mmm
Elizabeth  (4.0) where I'd like to go?
Nicholas  yeah
Elizabeth  ummm (.) who was that Norton student who wrote
about vocabulary organisers
Harry  () err someone in Norway
Elizabeth  yes someone in Norway it was () Vince Ch=
Harry  "language teacher"
Elizabeth  [well (3.0)
for the students who like keeping a vocabulary use
book (.) and that's probably about less than half in
the class (.) if they could be persuaded to keep a
vocabulary book which (.) erm under these kind of
breakdowns (.) under these functional and topical
breakdowns (.) they would I think (.) start:: picking
up additional chunks they could slot into those
classes (.) and realising frames (.) realising a sort of
frame there are even more useful words that I can
use with this frame (.) so in other words (.)
recognition of frames or stems (.) chunks that have
erm a slot that can be filled (.) (S: mmm)
recognising what those are and what class of word
goes in them (.) and that (.) should generate (.) a far::
larger (.) use
Nicholas  (1.0)
so beyond that (.) >if I'm getting this right> beyond
your original::
Elizabeth  [that's one=
Nicholas  =suggestion that it might just be vocab book (.) learn
these phrases (.) what you're now suggesting is
that=
Elizabeth  = a very well organised vocab book
Nicholas  [yeah if you're now suggesting that- (.) if
students (.) could first of all have these phrases
pointed out to then (Elizabeth: yes) (.) and given a way or
organising them (.) (Elizabeth: yes) they might start
through that initial having been lged (Elizabeth: yes) so
to be able to recognise and categorise (Elizabeth: yes)
phrases themselves (Elizabeth: yes) (.) so that it would be (.) it
would be a new- a- a new kind of learner training
strategy (Elizabeth; yes) building (Elizabeth; yes) and so
does that relate to you to the question ( ) that Robert
paraphrased from Donald?
Elizabeth yeah ( ) there are so many of them ( ) what do you
do? ( ) yes that’s right! ( ) mmm
Emma =yeah aa=
Nicholas could you say some more about that?
Elizabeth (4.0)
were you going to say something about that
Vince I was going to: but I (fade to mumble)
Elizabeth =no go on
Vince ( ) errmmm
Elizabeth [cos I’ll come back to that in a minute
Nicholas [yeah
Vince I was just interested ( ) you talked ( ) you talked about
it ( ) you concentrated on intuition ( ) statistical corpus
analysis but you also mentioned a third way of ( )
recognition of chunks which was intonation ( ) but
you didn’t talk about that as much ( ) you didn’t
talk about that as much ( ) you didn’t pick that up ( ) do you see that
as a future ( ) something ( ) that teachers can work with ( ) at ( ) in
the classroom?
(3.0)
Elizabeth it is interesting you paused at the open pauses ( ) the open pause
there ( ) open choices urrrrr ( ) hhh I haven’t researched ( )
leaving ( ) I don’t know of any research that does and I haven’t
done any research into the phonological aspects ( ) of ( ) now I am
thinking of how I am talking about it it’s terrible ( ) hhh urrrrr ( )
I would have thought that they’d be an awful lot of chunks ( )
phonological chunks that are not necessarily ( ) uhhh highly
frequent ( ) uhhh highly frequent pre-fabricated
chunks ( ) for one thing they might be just be
high frequent for that person ( ) because that’s
because they’re into that topic or into that subject
( ) I don’t know ( ) I mean I have absolutely no idea
( ) because I would imagine ( ) that we’d need
quite a lot of research to find out ( ) now
we’ve got the frequency lists ( ) and we’ve got
the same for spoken as well ( ) it would be really
interesting to get some onto to do some phonological
research and actually see whether the chunks that
come up without pause ( ) are on this list (Vince:
mmmm) I mean it could be done ( ) yes I hadn’t
thought of that
Robert there’s a=
Elizabeth =as a way in
Robert there is a book I have been reading recently ( ) not
leaving ( ) who states categorically ( ) there is now
or which does have what in French is called ‘La
Prescriptif’ ( ) that is you cannot utter a word
without a value ( ) which you are putting on it ( )
in other words all words are tunable ( ) and
there’s no such thing as an untuned word except in
the mind of a foreign language learner
Elizabeth except for exit when it’s a sign or something
Robert that’s it ( ) this was written in 1929
Elizabeth mmm
Robert but it is very frequently quoted ( ) these days ( ) but
leaving ( ) I think that relates to ( ) to that which is one of
those things it’s you ( ) you- your slot fillers that you-
you- if you have your slots and you have words to
fill them (you can’t get that (there is no room
for it
Emma (103) can I go back to what you were saying about erm
communicating with teachers? (because you’re
talking about how err previous work on (lexical
phrases doesn’t hasn’t you fell successfully
communicated with teachers (Elizabeth = mmm) <I mean>
could you tell us > a bit more< about how you see this (your
framework (communicating with teachers=
Elizabeth = to go back to Nicholas’s question about what I see
happening in the future (if I could get enough
data on- and actually get people to use that
particular breakdown (I mean it would take a
little bit of training (I’m sure (that would have to be::
( it would have to be done through training (so
you’d have to train the trainers (humf (and at
the moment having just spend the weekend with
two Cert- Cert examiners < there doesn’t seem
to be much hope of sort of Trinity College
Diploma trainers actually being interested in
anything like this > (I don’t know <
Emma (cos I am right in thinking that the idea is that if I
was um (teaching if I had been working with
this reasonable long text that people had been
reading or something and I decided that wanted
do some focused work on lexical chunks (then
what I could do:: ask is ask is (well myself (and the
students I could ask people to do to do two tasks
one to:: (isolate what they thought might be chunks
( and then secondly (which for them would be a
way of remembering the letters (I assume trying to
say where in this frame work they might go
Elizabeth ummm
Emma =that’s the kind of work [I cou- (could do:: ]
Elizabeth [ummm but that they ]
find very difficult (but saying how many
phrases expressing time can you find in this
passage (because that’s specific and they
have to think time and you can say > you know < right (guy
concept of time (or how many phrases actually
express position (go through and find those (then
you start building up classes and then you can do
a structural breakdown (so that starting point of
a notion or a function seems to have be- (for a
consciousness raising activity< (seems to have
been far more useful <I mean> (I only ask
teachers to identity chunks cos- (just cold ()
because I just wanted to see if they could (but I
would never do it in a class.
Harry right err
Elizabeth [it’s too broad and too many
people fail (you know some get seven some get
seventy on the whole it’s demotivating for most of the
class.
Nicholas mmm mmm
Harry [can I ask a question? (its-er (ur uh urrm (these
chunks >as you say are all over the place< have
you [actually looked (at (is there- is there such a=
Elizabeth [there’s another on hu hh ]
Harry = thing as umm a chunk rich text (. ) I mean have you
looked into the possibility of chunk rich text
Elizabeth [yes [yes = there are
Harry (129) = there are and have I mean are you talking
Elizabeth [there are some gen- same genres which I ask that
is in terms in pedagogic terms (. ) having chunk rich
texts: (. ) to work with (. ) are err obviously> you
know< starting point ]
Robert [don't read TS ] Elliot=
Elizabeth (0.5) that's right
Robert = [there's not much in chunks
Elizabeth right err err
Harry
Elizabeth ghh some student Simon Wjntert wrote in (. ) Simon
Winter from err (. ) and he said I've just been
reading Shakespeare and he's full of the damn things
<h he said:: hhh haa:: he ] HA:: >
Robert [yeah yeah yeaah= ]
Elizabeth = and he sent me a little bit of Shakespeare with
these circles round it (. ) "I mean" . hhhh=
Robert = but maybe they've only become chunks since
Nicholas ?? [Hamlet
Harry [huu haa
Elizabeth <I mean> when he started composing maybe he
liked the sound of these words (. ) so he bunged them
in all the place (. ) maybe they just happened to be
the right kind of iambic pentameters or whatever
he wrote (. ) was it< <iambic pentameter?
Robert yes
Elizabeth umm (. ) with the Hangover group I just opened the
first thing I could find cos I was in a hurry and I
found that text (. ) the ecological text (. ) and I thought 'gosh'
in the five minutes before the lesson what I
ought to go through to see if I can find any chunks
in it (. ) and- and do them according to this frame and I did
and at the beginning of the Hangover group session
they found sort of six or seven chunks and by the
end it they went through again and they all got
terribly excited because they realised that (. ) chunks
build up as you go through an ESP text (. ) and
what is not a chunk in the first sentence becomes a
chunk (. ) half way through the article
Robert (144) = oh very nice (. ) very nice (. ) absolutely nice
Elizabeth and because they didn't know anything about are
the topic to start with (. ) they hadn't recognised
that a lot of them topic specific chunks and they'd
learnt them by the end of the course and they got
every so excited by it (. ) it was wonderful (. ) what
was supposed to an hour's seminars went on for
two because they wouldn't go home (. ) cos they
kept seeing more chunks in it (. ) so you've got the
non-chunk one and you've got the chunked one
(. ) ummm (. ) and then kind of chunk - well
spoon- spontaneous native speaker recording
of tasks on familiar subjects (. ) are rich (1.8) ummm
(. ) native s- planned native speaker tasks (. ) are
not rich because if they've had time to plan them
(. ) they actually use a far greater lexical; variety (. )
variety of Lexis (. ) far wider range of Lexis and there
are far fewer chunks (.) this is something that has
been done by Pauline Foster so looking at the
difference between planned and unplanned ()
interactive discourse (.) when they've been given ten
minutes to plan what they are going to say <there
are> far fewer chunks in native = speaker that
are in non-native speaker and yet with learner it's
exactly the other way round and when the
learners have to do it spontaneously (.) ummm it
was basically word word word and very few
chunks (.) the only chunks - a lot of chunks came
out were I am agree and they were you know non-
standard chunks a lot of them were non-standard
chunks (.) don't know (.) I think (.) loads and loads of I
thinks erm and when they had time to think
about it they actually remembered things that
they could say and they had more chunks than in
unplanned (.) when they were planned so that's an
interesting observation and I don't know quite
where it takes you (.) but I think it takes you that
you want un- you want recordings (.) spontaneous
recordings (.) if you're r - if teachers are teaching
oral communication (.) of a spontaneous nature
(1:0) they need to hear [gts of recordings that are
they spontaneously recorded without too much
planning time by native speakers (.) if they want
to increase people's vocabulary perhaps want also
to have the same task done (.) after planning because
they'll get a far wider range of vocabulary
Robert Elizabeth (.) the kind of classification that you're an
attempting here (.) would it make any difference?
(170) (.) if you included single words as well as
compounds in that classification? and you also called
your switches and your chunks simply lexical
items (Elizabeth: mmm) because do you want a separate
classification system for single word lexical items
and multi word lexical items (.) might reduce it=
Elizabeth = not really the (.) was it ermmm Schiffin (.)
discourse markers
Harry yeah Schiffin
Elizabeth (.) she was single word discourse maker and two
or three (Harry; oh yeah) or four so <1 mean>
(175) a lot of these functions can be (.) a lot these functions here (.)
can be expressed by [one word (.) but ]
Robert [that's exactly right] therefore the fact that
they've got many [words is:: (.) is it ( .) ? ]
Elizabeth [in fact some word become ] one word like
nevertheless has become one word
Robert [exactly right] [exactly
Elizabeth but you know I've had to draw w
the line somehow (.) so I've drawn the line that I'm
looking at larger word chunks - hardly two words chunks
I'm looking at larger word chunks
Emma and presumably=
Elizabeth = on the whole the two word chunks look after themselves
words like 'of course'=
Emma = I see
Elizabeth ['it's the longer chunks that need [kind of (.) a kind of ]
Emma [yeah that's you're ]
pedagogic assumption (.) is that
Elizabeth [yes it may not be right ]
least >at some common sense level <(Elizabeth: mmm) that people
(J)umm because of the other aspects of the way they’re taught
(J) deal better with (J) well < I don’t know if better’s the
right word> but (J) are accustomed to dealing with single word
lexical items (J) but need to extra help (Elizabeth: mmm) to
(Elizabeth: mmm) regard multi-word (J) erm entity (Elizabeth:
mmm) as a lexical item (Elizabeth: mmm)
Robert this might be a pertinent answer to Harry’s question about
where is all this going? (J) because it’s not in our pedagogic
(panoply) to consider multi-word (senmalkos) say the
words (J) or would that be against what you’ve been doing
Elizabeth?
Elizabeth no I mean I think in the exploration of this (J) ermmm (J) if
teachers can explain things (J) well (J) we have another way of
saying that and that’s a single word (J) fine (J) hhuuu (J) hhh like
(192)
because or: subsequently or with the result (J) I mean grouping
those together functionally <I think> could be useful.
Nicholas you used the (J) little) collocation a while back and I’ve been way
trying to recall (J) the larger context and I can’t but there’s
something about the when you were talking about
identifying chunks or categorising them (J) you talked about
(J) different notions and functions (J) and I wondered if <you
know> and that collocation itself is a very (J) rich and
resonant one in the <history of what we do > (J) notions
and functions (J)
Elizabeth ummm
Nicholas and I wondered if there’s anything more that you have to
say about the relationship between notions and functions (J)
and: (2.2) the kind of creation of chunks that you’re working
“with here”
Elizabeth (5.0)
when I talk to teachers about how they thought it was best
to classify them (J) ermm (J) partly because I’ve been
having an argument with Donald about (J) he reckons it’s best
to classify them structurally, grammatically (J) ermm I was
trying to find out how the teacher would like them
classified(they) they seem to be happy working on (J) kind of
functional (J) sometimes it’s a function transactional type
stuff <you know> I’ll see you later or whatever (J)some -
I mean and different various notions of time or position or
whatever (J)uyrrmmm (J) it just seemed to be for them (J)
they thought that students would find it easier to grasp and
then in fact I think then (J) you would go through once and
you’ve picked up a whole load of phrases about position (J)
you might then look at it structurally to say okay which
have the words of in (J) which ones have the word too (J) and
ones then classify- sub classify those according to structure
pattern and then looking at the links between pattern (J) you
and know the pattern- gram- and stuff (J) looking at the links
between patterns and notions ‘n but that’s something that I
really want to get into (J) but I just haven’t had time to do (J)
my main problem at the moment is trying to is - I just
haven’t got mmm (J) and I can’t see how to find a load of
teachers and a load of texts and a list of things and say
look (J) just go away and try this out in the classroom and see
if it works (J) because I haven’t got that far (J) I haven’t got that
interface going yet (J) I haven’t written for teachers to say
look (J) this is what chunks are (J) this is what they can do (J) this
is why they’re important go away and try this and report
back and it was partly an attempt to go through the literature
and it didn’t fulfil any function

Nicholas: [what we need is a sort of ELTI sort of article that does those ideas]

Elizabeth: [yeah, yeah, yes, because the other people have done the applied linguistics side of it, although what I would like to do is write a synthesis of all that because it makes it - it’s incredibly I did a paper for BAAL that I haven’t written up either looking at applied linguistics side and the problems because no piece of research has been done according to the same labels and the same terms but that’s not actually what I am interested in (5.5)

but I don’t know if you can suggest any ways forward and my other problem is what to do with these general chunks and the only thing that I can think of is there is a lexical syllabus where you classify by the word some of them might fit - <I mean> they might fit in all the verbs like reporting verbs or something (4.5)
a word like even it some in so many different chunks but they could be any of these but somehow it’s easier to identify by the word even

Nicholas: mmm

Elizabeth: (...) so you’ve cross - you’ve got hhhhummmmph, you’ve kind of cross categorising going on as well ( dunno if it’s bad but (...) it’s not clear cut () and some of these could fit into two categories quite easily

Robert: (6.0)

I can only say that I’m very disappointed that you decided not to offer this for doctoral research but erm...

Elizabeth: =ha ha haaaa

Robert: [next year (...) next year I want to book you to talk to my little crew that I’ll assemble

Elizabeth: (1.0)

Robert: I haven’t done enough yet

Elizabeth: [cos it’s either not academic enough or I don’t remember the academic bits because I haven’t actually written them up and this is one problem I’ve got <L in a lot of what I’ve done with L> kha kaa keee=

Robert: [what I’m trying to say is don’t make it more academic for the moment it’s on: exciting lines it’s absolutely for me <if I’m allowed to at this stage am I allowed to make evaluative comment > at this stage?

Elizabeth: =yeah as long as I can add to them

Robert: [call master ha ha ha

Nicholas: I haven’t been acting as a callmaster

Robert: great (umm) absolutely if I could sort of let my absolutely encouragement burst forth ( I really think this is absolutely on the right lines on the right direction

Elizabeth: = you see my worry is that it’s not academically even done respectful to write up for any academically respectable journal because I haven’t the correlation for the figures that I’ve got for the recognition pair and I haven’t had time for the statistical analysis

Robert: [ee hh ee err I-I- don’t think that matters and neither is it worked out enough for the other= 
Robert: it is the design that you've got in mind it's
the foresight it's where you want to go I think that's the
important thing you can always bash the argument into
(267) shape with a little help from your friends later but you can't
nobody is going to help you get where you've got to in
the first place you've got to set your tr - I think it's
absolutely in the right direction it's in parallel with a lot of
developments
Nicholas: but it is also quite singular isn't it - it seems to me (~)

Robert: (~)
Nicholas: singular I mean there - I go - I'm just agreeing with
Robert there's a clear individual contribution albeit in parallel
with other people but saying different things
Robert: it's just that
Nicholas: [but I agree with Robert that-
Robert: yes
Nicholas: I mean I really do agree with Robert that given where your
thinking's got to and how far froward it is making the
argument that gets you more academic is (...) that's the just-
Robert: = the easy bit () yeah () that's the easy bit () absolutely (;)
Nicholas: [interweaving those bits and
filing in those bits () isn't it?
Harry: yeah
Robert: I do it with other students all the time () bit I can only do it
if they've got =
Several: (~)
Harry: the real challenge is to make a sense of it all for teachers
<if mean that's what it all boils down to> and that's the
challenge it's a much bigger challenge than just going
back to the academic=
Robert: = the exciting thing about that () there is a lot of people on
this wavelength () but not pedagogic in the way that Elizabeth has
spelt out () that's the exciting thing
Elizabeth: [you see my big
worry at the moment is that Michael Lewis is overtaking
me on this he's written a couple of books on this and they
are highly unsystematic () he has nothing because he has got
a lot of- of very clever and interesting and good
methodological options and techniques for teaching chunks (),
but no: - nothing about how you do recognise the things
in the first place and nothing about systematic coverage of
them in syllabuses () but at his last presentation some on said
'he's got your three way breakdown now and I thought 'oh'
shite he must have () you know he must have picked that up
<from somewhere >
Robert: that's his strong point
Elizabeth: [so he's using something that's like that
now but without understanding it and I find that really worrying
(0.6)
Elizabeth: so I - you know () people keep asking me to write it up
for MET what is it Modern English Language teacher or something
like that () and I don't want to write it for them () I want to
write it for more academic research
Robert: [no it's not a MET thing
Nicholas: no no
Robert: you are asking much more fundamental issue and I think
there absolutely the right questions () it's certainly
changeling and when you put words on the one hand () slots
on the other () put'em in () it's completely unignorable from
what you're saying (1.0) there has to be
another way (.) I’m quite sure of it

sometime that’s tenable (.) sometime you have to do that

Robert for a different (.) for a different reason (.) can I point to one or

two things in_ reading that you might like consider (.) one

of them:::

Elizabeth I think Emma might be bursting=

Robert =ahh sorry

Emma no (.) I’m sorry (.) I’m just trying to get handle on where the

sessions gone (.) ahh- we’ve changed mode completely (.) haven’t

we?

Elizabeth [yes we have that’s

Nicholas well (.) what I was wanting

to say is that (.) Eliza[beth actually said she [wanted

Elizabeth [I’m sure the time is up ]

Nicholas to be at the B’ham university at 4 o’clock

Elizabeth four fifteen

Nicholas erm was it four fifteen? okay that’s right (.) err

Elizabeth I shall put my bag in a taxi because I’m not going to cycle

through this Sound of heavy rain outside

Harry that’s music

Elizabeth can we have your can we have your what – what I’d like is

your

Emma [it is twenty five two

Emma it’s twenty five two (.) yeah

Elizabeth [<I mean> for me (.) as in evaluation of the session give

me the readings afterwards written down Robert (.) err it has

been very useful because it’s made me think about more

where I’m going it’s given me another insight into (.) if

there’s any other student anyway that want to do

phonological analysis (.) it’s a shame we don’t have a module

on that (.) but that would be another way of looking at it (.) and

I think it’s deepened my resolve to do something more with

it

Emma I don’t know whether we’re going to have the part of the

session where we contribute something from our own

experience (.) but my

Emma >doesn’t look like there’s enough time <

Elizabeth [I’d like there to be - no

Vince I think we’ll have to perhaps have a (.) a clearer time next time

so that we can do that we have twenty minutes at the end where

we can do that

Nicholas yeah well

Elizabeth [I talked too much=

Robert no not true

Vince [no that’s not it I think it is important to have somebody

Nicholas [ the most important part of

the session for me were the last two things that you said (.)
because it was the space that we allowed you (.) to actually talk (.)

Robert if those are the feelings you came out of then I think that’s

tremendous (.) because in my own heart (.) then that’s what these

sessions are about (.) the place where you will take your ideas

to the feeling that you will get to at the end of ‘oh’ I feel a

new commitment to this and (.) I’ve got this new idea

Robert now (.) that to me is what it’s all about (.) the- (.) I’ve got an awful

lot of frustration about the session as a whole (.) but erm I - it

crossed my mind as we started that it might have been worth

trying to remind ourselves what we were trying to do and

where we’ve got to before in the session

Elizabeth [well this is why I wanted to talk to you

Nicholas [between the ] staff meeting and this=
Nicholas [but we never did] [yeah
Elizabeth = what I wanted to talk to you about that
Nicholas [I mean we stumbled through there
was no setting up
Harry NO. so it makes it interesting
Nicholas and (.) nor have we timetabled a session to come back and
listen to bits of the tape and talk about it from that point of
view which is a=
Elizabeth = I was wondering whether we could do that (.) errmm=
Vince [have another session?
Elizabeth and have a tape (.) little hhhh (.) it's going to mean time for
someone but to just use bits of the tape to spark
Vince well (.) I'll do that (.) I mean
Elizabeth [to spark thing off
Vince there is no reason why I can't do that (.) make this one of the
first tapes that I work with so I could do it
Elizabeth [cos I mean I'd really really like hear your - what
it sparked off in you::
Nicholas there are two issues then (.) or >at least two< (.) I mean one is your
desire to have our ideas coming in
Elizabeth [yes which is purely
selfish and greedy *an*
Nicholas [well no that's what the group for
isn't it
Elizabeth uhh uhh
Nicholas it's not what these sessions were set up for (.) but it's a the
perfectly valid request from the group to have those as well (.)
there's that on agenda isn't there there's the agenda of what nature
do we want our exchanges and contributions in these sessions (.) to
be (.) umm and then there's also the issue of Vince wanting to
make this a more formal (.) research issue
Emma sorry (.) this session?
Nicholas no this discourse (.) that we never talked about
Emma mmm
Nicholas more largely as an explicit agenda item (.) yeah is that right?
Harry if I've understood Vince there (.) it was more about the
division (.) er- maybe I misunderstood (.) my understanding of that
( . ) I mean this is to clarify
Emma layer upon layer
Harry [it was
more about it was more
about that that that if I've
understood it correctly (.) there needs to be that chunk of
present and there needs to be a distinct difference (.) a marker (.)
a changeover
Emma [and then when Nicholas said what he said I
changed my mind actually
Elizabeth [what I wanted to do: was like you started Reflecting (.)
right? ( . ) and that was really good and actually when I- in ten
minutes last night when I just scribbled down a few things last night
( . ) cos there's a lot I left out and had to scribble down the things I
wanted to put in ( ) because I didn't want to get sidetracked from
the things knew I'd have to leave out right< hhh and I'd actually
marked pause point for ( . ) Reflection down ( . ) but then I- I didn't I
mean I'd actually thought this is the time I will say 'right' stop
Robert .hh this is why I asked is there a watershed because after
(354) Elizabeth's introduction I felt that we needed to establish the rule ( . )
how much listening versus how much feedback
Elizabeth yeah > and this what I wanted to talk about< to you before
Robert: [and] [and] [I think]

Emma: has pointed out the fact that there wasn’t a clear watershed in fact.

Emma: I was attempting to point to the fact that I felt that discourse that we had towards the end of the session was quite different to anything we’ve had in the previous GD meeting.

Robert: yeah

Elizabeth: [mrmrmm]

Emma: in as much as it was actually evaluative feedback on what Elizabeth had said=

Nicholas: =yes

Emma: and erm I’m not the person to say whether or not that’s appropriate but I think that’s something that we should at least talk about.

Emma: yeah

Elizabeth: [mrmrmm]

Vince: we can do r=that in the next session if we make the session partly a reflection on our views and a chance for Elizabeth to say more and maybe in the second part where we actually talk about the kind of discourse an-

Harry (365): yeah >talk about what we’re doing<

Harry: to come up with goods we need a watershed we need to know where they are moving from one to another and today it’s clearly it’s the first time we didn’t talk about it and it’s gone all sorts of directions=

Harry: =interesting directions

Harry: which make it very interesting to look at

Robert: but the you mark the boundaries

Vince: [I think it will] in that sense it’s ideal

Elizabeth: [I certainly found your Reflections very helpful]

Nicholas: that’s interesting

Elizabeth: right

Nicholas: yeah

Elizabeth: and I had intended there to be more of those well I mean I had envisaged not not intended I had envisioned envisaged that there would be more of those but they came at the start it was noticeable that that’s what you were getting at the start and then at some point there weren’t there any more

Nicholas (373): [well my difficult was that you know ]<I thought> from the very beginning many of the interjections were not of that type right from the beginning there were from different people’s agendas they were evaluative they were

Vince: ["ah right"] right [ah that’s interesting

Nicholas: ["yes’ that’s good Elizabeth you carry on, they were, they were the idea of there being a watershed between the two I was having difficulty with from the very beginning because I didn’t think we actually started in that mode

Elizabeth: [maybe we should]

Harry: just do it again=

Harry: yeah maybe we need to clarify yeah if there is a watershed

Nicholas: [ha ha ha ha]

Elizabeth: [ha ha ha ha]

Emma: [and I h-( ]

Nicholas: >I mean< we had a structure and I think we just need to decide if we want to go back to that structure be reminded of it that structure or have a different structure

Elizabeth: I think to be reminded of it
Emma: but the evaluative said is also important because that’s (yeah)
(4.0)
or maybe that should be a separate session
Em: well I thought that’s what we’d agreed that GD =
N: [yes
= meetings were not evaluative that they were about trying to
a person trying to go through their own development assisted by
Reflection and Understanding and, and I think it would be and
I wonder whether if if I’m sure if you say that right from
the beginning many of the contributions were not like that I
bet there at least two reasons for that on reason might be:
that a person making person- made an evaluative
contribution because they felt that was that they were
supposed to be doing at that point and another thing is that a
person made an evaluative contribution by mistake because
it’s long time since we’ve done this together
N: [its is long time since we’ve done this together
E: yeah that’s right
E: I’m talking for myself here I can’t remember but I myself I
remember making a statement that I meant intended as
Reflect and as I heard myself I thought that it wasn’t that it sounded
like something else
H: (398)
yeah and I think there is perhaps another issue there actually
E: Emma in-in a sense what we haven’t had before because we
haven’t had the research things is something where someone
else or some others of us might actually want to
passionately engage=
V: = yeah =
H: = with that particular issue I mean here you can’t
separate that issue from Robert it’s part of your life and we
haven’t done that before
V: no
H: <I mean> it’s very close to you this and maybe we need to
think about what that means in terms of interaction cos I
sit back not dispassionately but with the same amount of
distance
R: [this is
I can’t here this in the same way I can:
H: [exactly I mean that maybe relevant here I
mean that I found it really interesting and informative
N: [sure it is
sure it is
E: <I mean> that’s interesting because I don’t know whether
you realise Robert I was actually turning away from you::
R: haa (.) haa::
E: [cos I knew this would happen right?
H: ha ha ha
E: so and then (.) at one point I actually said
H: [you actually SAID (.) you
actually asked for it
E: [and then I thought >you know Robert’s going to
talk think I’m completely ignoring him (.) I better ask him because
I then going back to rules of normal social discourse=
R: that’s it
V: [and you’ve talked to about a
lot of these issues with Robert before whereas you haven’t with
any of us (.) you’ve got a previous history
E: [but I was aware
H: that in a reflective mode this could be:: that this could
difficult for Robert because he’s already heard (.) and:::

he wouldn’t=

Vince [mmm

Elizabeth feel the need to Reflect as someone who
hadn’t been through it before

Harry it must be very difficult to Reflect (.) when you’re that
passionately engaged in the issue

Elizabeth [that’s it (.) that’s it

Harry [that’s another point (.) we’ve not been in the
situation before

Robert [there’s (.)

another dimension here

Elizabeth [you want to solve the problems (.) you know - it
becomes

Nicholas mmmm

Robert (429) we have talked about changes in the format of these
meetings (.) and the kind of dialogues and discourse we’re
going to have (.) with an introduction of more business (.)

Harry yes

Robert right? and this - is why I asked my question> you know< (.) I am
saying this really a business meeting (.) is this purely a
listening meeting

Emma cos I didn’t - I don’t - my understanding is not that
we’ve talked about changes in the format of these meetings (.)
my understanding is that we’ve agreed to have other types
of meetings:: as well

Robert ahhh but I didn’t know:: which of them this was

Vince [no that’s fair enough (.)

> I mean< we haven’t talked about it enough to make clear
demarcations bet[ween different types of meeting ]

Harry [ah that’s interesting because at ]one point we did
talk about (.) and I’m perhaps a bit confused here (.) we did talk
about having half of the old style and then moving onto and then
we’ll engage (.) but obviously we then moved on- we changed

Nicholas [I thought we ]

Robert [I thought that this (.) particularly in the light
of Elizabeth’s introduction that that is what we were onto

Emma yeah haa haa

Nicholas mmmm

Elizabeth this is why I needed to talk about it to you before heading- and
Robert 

we needed a callmeister

Harry (1.5)
yeah obviously this is great one it really was

Emma [shall we

Harry > you know<

Emma [draw a veil over this and then I’ll transcribe some bits and
check them back with Elizabeth and then present them to the group

next time we meet?

Elizabeth mmm

Harry "that’d be really"

Vince [talk about those (.)

transcriptions

Harry [we really can learn about all sorts of

things

Robert interesting

Nicholas yeah::

Harry it’s been a great session lots to learn

Emma I have really enjoyed it

Nicholas ta thanks

Robert it’s the deviations that raise the issue
Elizabeth: well yeah
Harry: that’s trouble when you really think you’ve got there and you think you’ve got it really under control (.) you do something slightly different and (h) by God it’s like the you know the skills you t
Elizabeth: [and neither did I have a clock on the table which I always need if I’m talking
Nicholas: [I’m sorry I’m knackered
Harry: [that’s alright
Nicholas: I am just fading rapidly (.) sorry=
Harry: =time to go home
Elizabeth: you only flew in this morning
Nicholas: I came straight from the airport yeah (.) yeah
Elizabeth: I’ll be doing that> a week on Tuesday<
Harry: yeah “after the exam board”
Elizabeth: no (.) no (.) no (.) no I miss the exam board (.) a week on Tuesday I shall be flying in (.) and coming in
Robert: have we run overtime (.) I haven’t got a watch
Elizabeth: we’ve agreed
Emma: [yeah we have we’ve run over by 20 minutes yeah
Elizabeth: no we didn’t start at half past
Emma: no we didn’t
Nicholas: there is a question of when we can get a second meeting in (.) really is err
Emma: I thought we had it (.) we had it
Robert: [well we’ve got a timetable=
Elizabeth: =we didn’t have a second meeting for this one
Nicholas: [we filled all the slots up
Elizabeth: in fact I didn’t think- we filled all the slots at the time to say hey well if that’s Elizabeth’s group development meeting what about
Vince: well (.) when’s the- the next slot?
Nicholas: next week’s=
Elizabeth: [we filled them all them up for this term
Nicholas: [=exam board and er- grading criteria
Emma: and then
Nicholas: the week after that is your pastoral
Vince: Let’s postpone that (.) because I mean the Pastoral Care was a bit of a joke today (.) in the meeting
Harry: [no (.) that’s all the more reason why we need it
Emma: not but I think I think lets while this is still recent it might an idea to make this the session and if that gets pushed a few weeks=
Harry: =if you’re happy with that
Emma: and then you do >pastoral care next week<
Vince: [we have got the option of (470) canceling a staff meeting this we have
Harry: yes
Vince: we have had the option I would like to pick up the pastoral cos I do think it’s important
Emma: [look at that and use that as a staff meeting
Elizabeth: [well why don’t we do pastoral care at the staff meeting=
Nicholas: [but I think =the idea that you know
Elizabeth: [yeah the idea was to for use it
Nicholas: [that we did say (.) the idea of a back up meeting after each content meeting we
have form meeting you know (.) was working well for us

Emma yes (.) it was (.) well I think we should continue with that

Nicholas It's only a post-grad if Vince is up for that

Emma yeah

Nicholas that'd be 2.30 on the 10th of November (.) we'll come back to this

Robert (477) and if the callmeister could please remind us at the beginning 

[about what kind ] of [session we're into ]

Elizabeth [yes that's right ] [can we start we start] with five minutes

Nicholas [well (.) that's a thing we sort out in that meeting isn't it

Elizabeth yeah let's start with five minutes on procedure and end of session and so on

Nicholas I'm very happy to do that

Elizabeth because then that err:

Robert yeah especially as occasionally someone misses a meeting

and missed out on the discussion of what I want to do next

time "and so forth"

Elizabeth but I found the tape you know the meetings I missed (.) I found the tapes really useful

Robert yeah yeah

Nicholas it's ALL interesting (.) isn't it?

Harry "tis"

Emma its really interesting

Nicholas I even think the fact that I was sitting here and not sitting

by the tape recorder=

Vince =I must admit I think a bit like that=

Nicholas =decided me not to make any sort of structural moves (.)

that was all a part of it

Vince I- you looked across at me at one point and I thought 'God' I hope he doesn't expect me to be in charge of this

Robert h ahhhh ahhhhhh

Emma [ha ha

Nicholas that's a part of it

Elizabeth and it's funny that fact that I was in high chair (.) I felt really uncomfortable because I would rather have been lower
down (.) near the table hha haaa hahahaha=

Harry =can I change the subject completely (.) cos I've realise Noreen

something I've forgotten I wanted to check with everyone (.) is it okay if I invite Noreen Simpson to come out with us to Wing Yip next week

Elizabeth I think That's a really nice idea=

Robert =that's a nice idea

Harry [cos I didn't want to do it without checking with everyone

Elizabeth [could you

Harry apologise because I won't be there?

Harry are you coming to Wing Yip?

Nicholas I think probably not

Harry you think not

Nicholas yeah

Harry okay

Nicholas can I borrow a pgm (.) I seem to have ermm

((tape ends))
Case 3

GDM 08.12.98

Nicholas as Speaker: Quantum energy, postmodernism and holistic persons
Nicholas: Have a little test!

Harry: GO::::OOD

Nicholas: I'm always wracked with doubt about these sound tests though (,) just because it worked >when I did the sound test<

Harry: [absolutely yeah!

Nicholas: I obviously did something wrong when I turned it off and turned it back on again

Harry: I did that once (,) I took- I took th- took it out to play it (,) because of course you need it out or it goes wweerrrgghhh (,) when I plugged it in (,) I plugged it in the ear-phones >or something like that< (,) which wasn't so bright "you know".

Nicholas: hhhhh ha ha ha

Harry: hhhhh oh dea::rr

Nicholas: very well (,) oh posterity (,) we have the eight of err (,) December 98 (,) all present except Vnine (.0) out among the pyramids

Elizabeth: in temperatures of 37 degrees I read in the Geneva Tribune (.3) Tribune yesterday

Nicholas: oh really! (.)

Harry: lucky old Vnine

Nicholas: good for him (,) right

Harry: hope he hasn't taken his woolly underwear

Nicholas: hh he he

Harry: distinctly uncomfortable

Nicholas: and it's- it's me as Speaker

(1.8)

Nicholas: an::::d as usual (,) in one of those situations where WHO KNOWS (,) but that's okay (,) I tell you what I want to do (,) erm (1.4)

Nicholas: can I just warm up by telling what I'm not going to do? (,) it's just one of those just need to get going sort of situations (,) (Harry: yeah) (,) I've been thinking a lot obviously about what we've been doing in these sessions (,) but I thought it would simply become too interwound and interwoven and wrapped up in itself if I spent an hour (,) reflecting my reflections on what we've been reflecting on (,) for the last err (,) but (,) inasmuch as this is what I do and I've got this ((in a sing song voice) "study LEA::VE" at the moment as you know I've been working on (,) a research proposal (,) or two (,) and:: trying to get a book proposal (,) or two sorting out (,) and:: ()

I didn't see when I started (,) any idea of a paper coming out of this (,) which I suppose I was a bit niggled about at the time (,) because I'm a great man for short term product (,) I love to see something concrete coming out (,) in short term futures (,) and as I've been doing other things (,) thoughts have passed through and sometimes I've had the wit to scribble them down (,) and this is the piece of paper on which most of the scribbling
has taken place (.) and of late my perceptions been forming
that perhaps there is an article that I want to write
even now already (.) I've got an intuition that we've
already done so much work that's it actually worth
reporting on (.) I mean clearly not in a Darwinian sense
of (.) hhh ha >sort of< wait until we've
really sorted this whole thing out (.) but then::: when
did I ever write anything like that?
(1.4)
Nicholas so what I've brought along (.) today is this piece of
paper with these little notes on that have been going
down over the last few weeks (.) and I'd like to tell you
about them and see if::: in the doing I can forge some shape
out of all these little bits (.) maybe at least clarify my
thinking about some of the bits (.) maybe extend
some of it (.) see if I can make a shape (.) out them that
has some coherence to it (.) hhh so that's what I'm
going to try to do:::
(3.2)
Nicholas I'll start hhhh (.)
(2.0) (Looking at his notes))
Nicholas the bit there with the blue circle (.) around (.) says
((reading)) "take the critical incident for starters" (.) ermm and that's
a reminder that (.) ermm in a sense I want this piece of writing
to be:: of the right nature (.) I don't know if there
is an established genre (.) but I don't want it to be::
the sort of paper that I've usually written (.) the sort
of paper that which is about (.) a process and stands
apart from it (.) I want somehow to try (.) so we're into
the issue of representation (.) how to represent this (.) and
I (.) thought perhaps (.) to start with (.) what for me was the
critical incident of my first session as Speaker (.) which
was when Harry asked me 'what do you mean by CD
rengwal? (.) and I realised that all I had was an emotion
I didn't really have a plan (.) or a response (.) and I might
start the writing actually at that moment (.) and try to:::
put across to the reader what I was feeling then (.) and build
out from that emotion (.) that >>in a sense< would also
give me peg on which to::: (.) (h)hang the idea that came up
somewhere between Elizabeth and Robert’s recently sessions
where we talked about a different Speaker discourse (.)
starting in the moment is an option for the Speaker as
opposed to doing the usual preparation and run up
and this might be a way of reflecting that (.)
and also means that I can come back with a mgta comment
earlier on (.) good::: I didn't know that (.) hhh (.) so
ermm (.) so to take that critical incident (.) for
starters (.) now CLEARly I want to write a paper
that tells people about the regular things (.)
of why we're trying to do this and what we
think it's good for and what we're doing (.) ermm
it's bound to have some how to nature (.) again
because that's the kind of thing I tend to do:::
and I'm quite comfortable with it (.) and I want
this to be how to >>for some people< (.) it's an invitation
at least (.) to get engaged
(2.2)
.hhhhh (.) but there are some newnesses that have
been creeping in (.) and I guess some of the newnesses

56
are some of the things I’d like to work on at the moment
( ) errrm ( ) a part of the newness is::: ( ) >give or take
my pronunciation< ( ) I’ve been reading bits of extracts
and quotes and references to Bakhtin::: ( ) and the idea
of:::
(2.2)
internal dialogue ( ) multiple identities inside the person
( ) differences between that and a dialectic ( ) it seems to
me the much more intensely personal nature of the dialogue
as opposed to the dialectic ( ) the idea::: that ( ) the (h)WHOLE
person ( ) approach to language teaching and being a teacher
which is sort of ( ) had me in its thrall since the mid 70s or
so ( ) and Bakhtin’s multiple identities are::: ( ) necessary
partners of each other ( ) in ways I hadn’t seen before
that ( ) there’s no contradiction in talking about a whole
person and talking about multiple identities ( ) the whole
person is somehow the loose sgm of all those internal
dialogues and that if you put those two together then you’ve
got a way of representing the whole person and the
humanistic tradition ( ) in the postmodern ( ) and pursuing
that ( ) seems to me ( ) to be ( ) a point of interest ( ) hhh
and there’s a possible ( ) a probable link between those ideas
the, multiple identities of the individual ( ) adding up to
whole person ( )
(1.8)
Nicholas there seems to be a parallel in terms of ( ) the group and the:::
multiplicities that we bring to the group ( ) and via the
kind of collegiality that we may be building ( ) a kind of-
( ) well we’ve used in recent sessions ( ) errrm expressions
such as co-operative understanding ( ) and differentiated
understanding ( ) errrm
(1.4)
Nicholas now the dark side of all of this ( ) is the whole group thing
phenomenon where people get together in groups
and everyone agrees with everyone else ( ) and
it’s difficult to break out of that ( ) but it seems
to me that there also is a- ( ) a bright side
different from- from group thing ( ) the idea that::; errr
taking as much time as we are::: ( ) to try to
understand some of the other identities ( ) and
aspects of ourselves that we bring to the job
taking that much time ( ) we’re building a kind
of a group empathy ( ) which is very different than
what most groups have ( ) and that’s reflected in
the different sort of discourse that we can build
in this group ( )
( )
Harry s- can I clarify s- this id- where we’ve gone now=
Nicholas =mmm=
Harry cos I know you said that these would be >sort of<
ideas
Nicholas Mmmm
Harry did you ( ) in presenting them are we expected
to see direct connections ( ) between them?
A102 or is this just ( ) these are the things that are
floating in the air and lets let them:: *float and hold
them in our heads* ( ) do you want me to explain
why I’m asking the question?
Nicholas yeah
Harry yeah ( ) the reason why I’m asking the question is that
erm (.) you started with this idea of:: erm::: the person and the
moment (.) yeah (.) right? (.) and then you moved on to
Bakhtin and the idea of the multiple personalities and what I'm not
able to do (.) and I realise I've been trying to do (.) is
put a connection between those two (.)
Nicholas right (.) erm
(2.8)
Nicholas note that the points >for me as well< coming =
Harry =right yeah
Nicholas [from different times and different thinkings
Harry [yeah
Nicholas starting with the critical moment was probably
the classic move of a linear mind yeah? (.) erm and what
I was referring to there was in fact the whole
presentational aspect (.) was (.) what will somebody
read first they start reading this paper
Harry right=
Nicholas = if and when I write it
and so it was a rhetorical point I was making there=
Harry =right I see
Nicholas [that maybe that's the place at which to
start the writ- (.) err (.) that's where the reader will
start
Harry right
Nicholas IN that moment (.) if you're asking me that question
and me trying to:: clarify it for myself and from that explain
under what circumstances am I trying to clarify this and
to whom an- why would you be asking that in this way an-
right=
Nicholas =and to build- th- for the reader the picture of
what we're trying to do >from that moment out<
so that was a rhetorical thought "that I was having"
Harry gotcha=
Nicholas and then I switched to:: (.) err (.) whether that was
textual (.) I switched to ideational
Harry from the outside (.) having reached the outside
Nicholas I guess yeah (.) I thought now what ideas do I
want to build in to this
Harry gotcha (.) yeah
Nicholas errm,
Harry
Nicholas (1.2)
Nicholas so there's pulling in- in Bakhtin (.) putting that together
putting that together with err Rogers (.) there's the:: individual
meaning of that (.) and there's the potential for group meaning
of that (.) errm:::
(6.2)
Nicholas hhh okay let me have a go at the really freaky stuff (.) because
and again (.) let me start from a particular point (.) I think
it was you Harry who asked at some sta- (.) when we were
having a discussion after a session meeting
(2.4)
Nicholas you said:: (.) something like (.) well when I'm sitting here and I
want to say something (.) and I'm feeling a bit frustrated by
that (.) isn't there a possibility that that's also going to
get in the way of the- (.) and I said something like I have
a relatively mystical (.) position on that (.) this idea
that if you've got this energy which is (.) sometimes represented
as this frustration on the part of the Understander (.) if you
can really get into the feeling and the flow of everything
that’s going on (.) it is as though that energy can be passed
over to the Speaker and become part of the energy the
Speaker can use in developing the Speaker’s ideas (.)
yeah I remember it “and I remember that reply as well.”
well (.) hhhhhhh
(8.2)
ok (.) smiles of embarassment (.)
ha
I don’t know a lot about quantum theory
he he he:::
"ha"
but (.) well I’ve been trying to find out for ages
and ages (.) what quant- why quant- why is it
actually called quantum (.) and bear with me
for the time being (.) because even if it is wrong (.)
you know from bad understandings some ideas can arise
(3.0)
my understanding at the moment is that (.) in classical
physics (.) the idea is that energy moves smoothly
(1.0)
and the idea in quantum physics is that it does not
(.) that it builds up (.) and then::: (.) stuff
happens (.) but it happens >as and when< energy builds up
a cert- (.) a certain amount (.) a certain quantum (.)
and then yes indeed a leap might take place of- of one of those
little bits going round another little bit and we can’t be
absolutely sure exactly whether it’s going to::: (.) make a jump
from one (.) erm ellipsis that its in (.) into the next
obvious one (.) or >it might jump into a totally different one<
we’re not quite sure when enough- when a lump of energy (.) when
a (.) critical amount of energy has been reached exactly what
will happen (.) to that energy (.) there’s a not a smooth
predictable flow (.) energy doesn’t work like that (.)
that’s my very rough ideas that I’m working on at the
moment
(0.8)
err (.)
(2.2)
there’s the::: (.) the added ideas of err (.) >you know< the
uncertainty principle you can only measure so much “in a certain
situation” (.) you can measure::: (.) in terms of the::: (.) particle
moving (.) you can measure its position if you don’t try to measure
its speed (.)>you can measure it’s speed if you don’t try to measure
it’s position < (.) .hh the dual nature of::: light is that it’s particle
or wave depending on how you measure it (.) I’ve played
with these ideas before in the Dance of Shiya article (.)
and::: I’m coming back around to them now::: and now they’re
starting to be meaningful to me (.) clearly again only in
metaphorical terms (.) but (.) for as long as the metaphor
holds (.) .hh if we are (.) working >as a group< quite closely ljnked
by our attempts to provide empathy for each other (.) and if
I can supply that kind of mental::: (.) intellectual;
(emotional::: energy into the group as the Speaker is
working (.) then (.) at least metaphorically why should
it not be the case that when a certain quantum of energy
is provided (.) the Speaker’s thoughts will be able to make
a leap which would (.) not be predictable and not otherwise
have happened (.) so this idea::: which I started off as saying
I’ve got a relatively mystical position on this (.) I think I
want to argue now at least metaphorically in terms of the ideas of
quantum energy.

(3.4)

Nicholas and that’s the line (.) that at the moment I want to build in
(4.2)

Elizabeth can I ask something?

Nicholas yeah (.) do::

Elizabeth an illustration of quantum energy would it be::

your feeling that you’ve got enough energy

there to write this ( ) article?

(1.2)

Elizabeth or is the quantum energy something that
comes from the group to the Speaker only?

Nicholas errm (.) I think they could both be (.) that’s
to say the::

(4.4)

Nicholas .huh (.) it seems to me it’s- it’s an expression
of (.) a quantum approach (.) if you take your (.)
motivation to do:: anything at all (.) errm

which presents some sort of challenge to

you (.) it is perhaps not the case that your

motivation slowly builds up in a logical

smooth progression and then you do it

( .) it is perhaps the case that you’re buggered if you’re going
to do it< and you can’t quite get around to it

but then (.) in a wave of motivation (.) in a

great lump of it (.) you think (.) no (.) I’m going to
do it NOW

Elizabeth mm=

Nicholas = and that seems to me to be an expression of

a quantum approach

Robert could I explore a metaphor (.) what it means
to you (.) because as you know when you offer a metaphor it means
different things to==

Nicholas =yes=

Robert =to different people (.) and:: (.) h my version

of quantum is the smallest atomic unit below

which it doesn’t exist (.) a quantum is the lowest

unit that can exist (.) but as I’m listening to you::

I also get the impression that you’re talking about

macro units that flip (.) now I:: ( .) this is something

that I’m not sure about (.) whether you’re using

quantum as (.) as in fact a large composite (.) that

suddenly migrates (.) as opposed to:: the atomic

sub-elements of which there are very many

Nicholas yes

Robert of which it is composed (.) like a lump of matter

( .) stick of chalk or something< and the billions

of atoms which are the equivalent of a quantum

( .) are you using quantum in that minimalist

atomic sense?

Nicholas that’s the:: ( .) image that I chose in order to explain

what I mean by it (.) yes (.) I don’t know what

you mean I’m afraid by ‘macro matters that flip’

( .) so I can’t really follow you there

Robert right ( .) well the task is not to follow me ( .)

we can do that-;

Nicholas so okay I can’t do that

Robert but
Nicholas: [yeah.
Robert: but I mean I have to (...) in order to understand.
Nicholas: [yes [yes.
Robert: I need to ask co- I cos you talked about waves,
(...) which I empathise with very much.
Nicholas: [when I just talked about motivation (...) yes (...) I heard myself say that word and I wish I hadn't.
Robert: has: ":::
Nicholas: I meant to say that.
(1.8)
Nicholas: reaching the point of motivation to do something
might not be a smooth progression either (...)
it might come in a (...) an unpredictable lump
of motivation that gets you over a barrier (...)
Emma: and is it the case then that you're conceiving (...) errm (...) leaps (...) or::: transitions that the Speaker is able to make (...) primarily in terms of motivation
to make them
Nicholas: no (...) not at all.
Emma: right.
Nicholas: >not at all< (...) I was just trying to pull out another example
of what I (...) at the moment am understanding as a
(...) 'qufuntumy' ((quoted intonation)) (...) way of understanding
how things happen (...) and I was trying to- (...) I've forgotten
what Elizabeth's (...) question was now
Emma: [nè's question was about ]
Elizabeth: [my question was that ]
Emma: whether for the article
Elizabeth: yeah
Emma: it could be
Elizabeth: yeah (...) wou- like does it only come from the group
and the Under...
Nicholas: [okay yeah so ]
Elizabeth: or would you consider that suddenly getting the motivation
to write an article at this point is a result of a quantum leap
(1.0)
Nicholas: yes:: (...) I think the latter (...) in the sense that (...) I don't feel there was a steady progression of me thinking 'oh' if only I had two more ideas (...) then I'd have enough to- (...) there was a time- which I thought 'hells bells' I'm sure if I sorted this stuff out (...) there's something worth saying here and that was what tipped me over (...) over that particular (...) barrier
Elizabeth: [mmm]
Nicholas: ermm and I'm putting forward this idea of:: (...) of group energy (...) and the idea (...) of there being something quantume about this (...) is another example
Elizabeth: mmm
Nicholas: so that
(4.2)
Nicholas: what the group does (...) what you're doing for me at the moment is enabling me to hold on
to this particular idea which I've clearly not very far with (...) but want to (...) to work on (...) and you're enabling me to (...) keep my thinking in a state of perturbation for longer periods than one is normally allowed to (...) in company (...) and you're helping with those perturbations and you're putting
your energies into those perturbations and the
energy there is building up in my thinking (.) and
I DON'T KNOW exactly where its going to go
and nor does anybody else (.) but that seems to me
to be a potentially again (.) at least metaphorically
similar process to wh- when I read about the micro (.) particles

Harry can I

Nicholas [yeah

Harry sorry yeah:: can I go back to the- the starting point which
was that exchange that we had and this idea of
energy being transferred in some way to another
direction (.) so it comes out (.) so if I've understood
you what you're actually saying (.) wh- what this comes
down to (.) is that you can't necessarily explain that
process of transference (.) of- of energy which
would otherwise of-. hhhh frustrat- as (.) I described as
frustration (.) you describe as energy (.) you can't
explain exactly the process by which that energy
might be transferred into something more productive
but::: (.) using this quantum metaphor (.)

Nicholas yes

Harry you have a bigger sense of energy of being there
and being used in ways in which we may not have
considered (.) that it could be used both individually
and in a group sense (.) is that the essence= of? *

Nicholas =yes

Harry yeah right

Nicholas yes (.) and I think now you're shown me that
I think I'd like to make two points out of it (.) I think
first of all (.) it enables me (.) ha ha there's a paradox
here (.) once I've sorted out a clear way of saying it
it enables me to say to you potentially more clearly

Harry right

Nicholas mm

Elizabeth mm

Nicholas perhaps only inasmuch as it gives me a clear
metaphor to work with (.) in order to try and explain it
(.) so there's the (.) there's the communicative potential
of it (.) I think it might help me to explain
to people what I'm trying to say (.) when I'm
at that point again (.) and then there's the
content point of it (.) itself only a metaphor (.) but errm:::
if you're not above >you know reading books that you<
pick up at railway stations and this sort of thing (.) it's
a metaphor that's been used by a lot of people in different
fields (.) mmm (.) Kapra's become a very rich man

hhha ha ha

Nicholas excuse me (.) can I check that this is still going round
yes (.) right (.) cos I thought it would have stopped
but it hasn't

Harry we started five minutes late=

Nicholas =a::right (.) errm (.) can I just hold onto that area for a bit longer
(.) because (.) hhhh (.) hhhhh

Nicholas mmm (.) I don't know (.) whether I'm far enough
to even start talking about this (.) let's just t- (.) see how
it goes yeah?

Nicholas I've come across this:: (.) term (.) again give or
take my pronunciation >although it's English this time<
dissipative structures? dissipative structures?

Harry sorry hhh ha

Emma structures where forces and so on th=

Nicholas =I didn’ know I havn’ got the book

yet but errm

Harry [ha ha:::

Nicholas again it’ s out of the world of physics and it’ s err

(1.8)

Nicholas .hhhh and the person who wrote about it got a Nobel Prize there must be something going on so I’ m looking to see are there are processes if only metaphorical errm it is the natural >sort of< counterblast to entropy the fact that matter and the energy in matter does not only wear down but in fact finds ways of recombining in more complex ways

Robert entropy.

Nicholas oh yeah? and I wonder again if that’ s in part that’ s what we’ re involved in when we have these sessions that we are both at the level of the individual potentially and at the level of the group finding ways of bringing together energies and allowing them to recombine in more complex ways that would otherwise have been available that we’ re creating new structures both not both personal structures, interpersonal structures, conceptual structures, perhaps even language structures in the sense of a genre of professional discourse which we will forge because we have determined to create this sort of space and if language develops to fill the spaces that human beings create with their societies then in some ways by delineating the rules of this little society a language will respond to that and there will be linguaging going on which will be interestingly different I don’ t know whether it’ s possible to map that but again it’ s an idea that seems to me to be worth putting down a marker for

Robert can I ask if your used of the word forge is motivated?

Nicholas .hhhh

Robert cos forging means an input of energy to me that what it means to you

Nicholas err=

Robert =which overcomes entropy

Nicholas yes but I hadn’ t thought of that yes yes

Robert ah okay

Nicholas yes yes thank you

Nicholas so: what have I got so far? I’ ve got

(2.8)

Nicholas can I just haul back out of this for a while now errm I’ ve got a discourse idea for writing which is to write a piece that starts in a moment of exchange and in rhetorical terms that is how the paper will start and coming out of that

Nicholas (3.6)

Nicholas I want to make the point about a potential ‘ new discourse of the Speaker’ where one might start in this way in order to pursue an idea as I build out the content
of what I want to say (.) much of that I want to be:: (.) the
idea of communicating what we’re trying to do in this group
(.) to other people (.) for them to respond to in- in general
ways (.) I’ve got:: (.) I’ve got a weird strand (.) I’ve got this (.)
funny stuff we’ve just been talking about just now (.) which may or
may not be developable here (.) but it’s certainly on my
sheet of paper at the moment
(0.8)

Nicholas I’ve got (.) a discourse strand (.) which I haven’t talked
about at all (.) so leave that aside a minute< (.) I’ve got the
idea of the whole person in the post-modern

A400 ((tape side ends a few bits missing))

Nicholas the whole person in the post-modern (.) this little phrase
I’m bandying about at the moment (.) is not original
it’s from a guy called Nathanial Tsch (.) what it means to
me is:: (.) closely connected to(hh) (.) to our position on::
(.) okay let me get this out (.) in one sense Robert’s
three levels of where we operate between the actual
language learners and our course participants and ourselves
(.) it takes me across all those three levels (.) erm (.) the
>you know< language as whole people (.) and this sort of
business (.) the language learner AS a whole person
the language teacher AS a whole person (.) that approach
is important to me in the work that I do (.) and
the most important part of the postmodern for me::
is the way in which we emphasise in our work (.) the
singularity (.) which I do not mean in quantum physical
senses (.) of err

Robert * hmph ha*

Nicholas of our participants (.) our errrr (.) encouraging people
to work on their own situation (.) their own context (.) don’t
worry about the generalisations (.) try to understand what’s
going on with you (.) this seems to me (.) the trying to
deal with people in the postmodern condition (.) to say
that if we can put together our separate understandings ()
maybe there will be a more general narrative but that’s not
our worry at the moment (.) ermm so::;
(3.2)

Nicholas okay parallel with that (.) another way of saying the same
thing I think (.) the idea of wanting (.) because essentially
we are concerned with people (.) wanting >at one and the
same time< to be able to emphasise:: the elements and aspects
of common humanity (.) that tie us together (.) human
beings learn languages (.) and this sort of thing (.) and at
the same time emphasising (.) the individual, and the cultural,
and the age, and the gender, and all the other differences
that people have to work with (.) trying to sound these
tones at the same time is to me what whole person
in the postmodern brings together

Robert now I am understanding you in- in a number of ways
and the question is how to I check whether I have
Understood you?=

Nicholas =>tell me what I said<=

Robert =or not=

Nicholas in any aspect [that you [want] to check

Robert [erm] [what]

Robert what you have said to me (.) in using the
word postmodern (.) is (.) right you have an
understanding of what is modern (.) and then
what is postmodern () now modern () my understanding
of modern is framed () right? () there's a whole series
of complex frames which we can study and analyse
individually () postmodern is you remove the frames
from the frames () in other words they are frameless
systems () and therefore:: run into one another and are
continuous rather than discontinuous () now that
seems to me () that's what you're saying with your
metaphor on the one hand () and on the other hand
talking about our discourse and community you seem
to be saying the same thing () and therefore () this is
what I have understood

Nicholas yes () you're hearing a connection between what I'm saying
about () our discourse and community and an understanding
of postmodern which emphasizes the removing () of the frames
of interpretation

Robert "yes"
Nicholas and the connection is that () if you remove the frames of
interpretation () then () events and understandings of events
run together () and it's the running together which is the
connection between that and our discourse as our individual
intelligence's run together

(0.8)

Nicholas yes?
Robert that was my understanding
Nicholas yes () erm () I hadn't thought that at all
Robert >ah well< then ahh g-
Harry erm - "I'm sorry"
Robert ma can you correct () it?
Nicholas [yes ]
Nicholas yes () thank you () thank you crmm

(2.2)
Nicholas .hm- ()

(1.2)

Nicholas TECHnically I CAN correct it yes () in th- () but what you've
said is obviously highly highly interesting () uhm () I think the
differences there are simply () or possibly to do with the
way we use headline terms like postmodern and what the
first thing that comes to mind is () and I guess the first
thing that comes to mind is the attack on grand
narratives () erm () is the first thought that comes
to mind when I use that expression () that's what

BOS2 I tend to be meaning by it () and so () the focusing down
onto all the things we've said about situated cognition
the situated nature of understanding and interpretation
and explanation () it's that I was meaning by it
and so () wanting to bring together the commonalities
of being a human being and learning languages with the
individualities () of all that () was the connection that
I had before and now there's another one.

Harry and I was seeing another one () which again might
be way off target () and I was connecting it with the
Bakhtin thing () that I- the idea that for me
in postmodernism () the idea of the whole individual
is problematic () is problematised () and that your
comment on Bakhtin was that you were making
possible () the idea of the whole person () because of
these multiple () th- the internal dialogues and the
multiple () err aspects of that which was then possible
in a postmodern situation (,) those were the connections
that I was drawing (,) obviously connected but different
Nicholas [yes] [yes]

Emma yes and
Nicholas [and the connections that you’re making
are very much the sort of thing that Tosh is talking about
from () phrase=

Harry [right ()]
Harry =right
Nicholas that’s spot on in terms of where that comes from
Robert in your i-
Nicholas [that is the provenance yes
Robert in your terms Bakhtin would be a postmodernist
years before his time
Nicholas yes
Robert ha aah ha ha ((claps his hands)) () click
Nicholas mmm ()
Robert fasten your seatbelts
Nicholas ha ha ha ha:
Elizabeth take another quantum leap
Robert * ha ha ha*
Nicholas WELL () it- I mean () it does seem to describe what
happens doesn’t it? ()
Elizabeth * mmm*
Nicholas so
(1.4)
Nicholas do you want to say something
Emma yes but it was similar to what Harry said though
Robert no it’s alright
Nicholas yeah=
Emma =we’re just thinking along the same [ lines ]
Harry [ yeah ]

Harry same lines yeah
Emma I was also wondering if that was the nature of the
Nicholas connection “you were trying to make”
Emma it wasn’t what I was saying right then
Nicholas but yes (,) that’s to say is very much
(1.4)
Nicholas where this comes [es from ]
Emma [ I also = ]

Nicholas =wondered if it (,) just something that you
mentioned again (,) when we were talking about this
morning (,) that you talked about (,) you referred
to Robert’s hologram idea of the whole thing being
in a bit
Nicholas mmm () yes () erm
(2.2)

Emma and I wondered if that erm (,) multiple aspects of the
personality (,) and yet the whole person (,) I wondered
if that was a connection too? 
Nicholas yes (,) I think it is (,) and again at individual level
but also (,) and also a group level () the idea of
collaborative understanding (,) that came out a couple of sessions ago
along with the idea of differentiated understanding (,) that with the
best will in the world (,) if a group of people are trying
to understand one person (,) they’ve got to pull that
person closer to their frames of reference and therefore use
different words to Reflect and different words to understand=
Robert =which is what we’re experiencing now
712 Nicholas yes () so we’ll see different frames being () put out
713 Robert yes
714 Nicholas an-
(0.6)
715 Robert and you have challenged us successively
716 Nicholas sorry?
717 Robert you have challenged us
(0.8)
718 Robert what- the whole () thing that we’re trying to understand
719 I find challenging
(3.2)
720 Robert forging
721 Nicholas .huh hh () the hologram idea () was errm () there’s
722 something else there
(12.0)
723 Nicholas this idea of the- () the part of it that was most interesting ()
724 when we spoke this morning and I was trying to make
725 a link to () this afternoon is- () is the idea that each part ()
726 each part () in some way contains the whole () contains the
727 information () necessary for the whole () like the DNA strand ()
728 this sort of idea but I can’t make the connection () I don’t know
729 where I was going with it
(2.6)
730 Nicholas errm
(2.2)
731 Nicholas one other thing () then I’m going to stop on this () the
732 other strand I’ve not properly picked up yet () oh that’s where
733 I was sorry () with errm the idea of cooperative understanding,
734 the idea of differentiated understanding () I think over the
735 last couple of discussion sessions () we’ve looked at two
736 B107 very very clear data based examples of those and I think I’d
737 like to get back into those examples and look at the
738 language more closely () where I think >we can< () based
739 on the work that we’ve done () we can actually ()spell out
740 what seems to me to be a new concept () that we’ve
741 developing here and actually look at the language and
742 say what we mean by it in ways that are very very clear().
743 and I think that’s something that I’d like to get out of the
744 data and put up and say does anybody want to say anything
745 about this () so that’s a strand of what I want to put in
746 errrm () okay I’d like to stop there () could we shift into the
747 other phase () that’s to say is there anything that
748 resonates here with you () that you’d like to say
(1.2)
749 Elizabeth I’ve got two things ()
750 Nicholas mmm
751 Elizabeth picking up you last point () about () looking at the language
752 () of the sessions () it did strike me that spontaneous
753 talk is nearly always interactive () very closely interactive
754 () and that sustained talk is nearly always planned () and
755 what you’re doing is spontaneous sustained
756 Robert hmmm " ha ha ha"
757 Nicholas [mmm
758 Elizabeth is it?
759 Robert nice
760 Nicholas hmmm mmm
761 Elizabeth it’s exploratory () spontaneous
762 Nicholas that’s right
but sustained
that’s right
and that’s a different genre (,) I can’t think of another
situation where that occurs (,) can you?
no
except perhaps in tutorials (,) but that’s not so sustained (,)
I doubt it happens much in tutorials (,) it would be
nice if it did
[ and maybe it’s only sustained by default
in tutorials (,)
when the tutors talking ha ha ha:: ha ha
that’s right
ha ha
that’s just a comment
mmm (,) and that links back to an exchange we had
in the last discussion session doesn’t it? (,) yes
yes (,) I’m hearing that (,) yeah
so that was one thing (,) and another thing (,)
totally different (,) when you were talking about
quantum leaps and emotion
and another thing (,) totally different (,) when
you were talking about quantum leaps and the
emotion (0.4) I was thinking of good Away Days
that we’ve had where you come away thinking
WOW! We’ve done a lot and we’ve got all this:: t- to do
and an Away Day somehow seems to gain a momentum of energy=
=mmm=
=nnnd:: (,) be one of those occurrences where:: it does
push you over (,) and is that what you’re talking about?
(0.4)
that what you’re talking about?
yes
I mean could that be an example?
[ ] [ ]
yes
that is (,) yes (,) what [I’m ] talking about (,) yes
[ but-]
this is in fact something different (,) to what extent
do these sessions in fact feed into the Away Days
yeah
Away Days? (,) I mean it’s (,) there’s what? there’s
two of us here and Vince makes six (,) it would be
very difficult for us not to- to transfer (,) and then
that in a sense makes the Away Days (,) possible
to become as successful as they are (,) cos they weren’t
always as successful
(1.0)
. hhh and has that connected again- I know one can
push these thing too far (,) but (,) it can also be
useful to push things too far and see how far they
actually go (,) errmm::
(2.4)
sorry (,) there was a sort of a< link in my mind
when you said that to the idea of again (,) therefore
this little p<rt contains in itself much more of the
whole (,) than one might think it does (,)
it's that reflexive relationship again isn't it? (.) that one

can see it as part of the whole (.) but one can also

see it containing (.) information necessary for the

B154 building of the whole (.) it's hard isn't it? (.) I think

it's hard anyway

Robert Had a couple of-

Nicholas mmm

Robert a couple of thoughts (.) one procedural and (" ")

the procedural one erm is that we have in recent weeks

been saying "oh" that was something new (.) right? (.) maybe

there's something else new coming up (0.6) and I think there has

( .) in-in-in several senses ( .) in other words the topic was

much more challenging it wasn't a bread and butter one

and it was heavily dependent on metaphor (1.0) now this

raises new problems about understanding other people's

metaphors

Nicholas mmm (1.0) mmm

Robert [ Ah ah I find this exciting (.) I-I-I think this

is territory that we have to go into but it is new territory

to where we have been in before (.) because we were even

worried about our using different words to see if I understood

your word (.) right? (.) err like I said ectropy there ( .) simply

confirmation, intended as a Reflection (.) because you had

said the opposite of entropy and I said ah entropy ( .) so -

but ( .) at an earlier stage we would have said 'well' that's a

contribution rather than ( .) a - a Reflection (0.4) but when

it comes to metaphors ( .) one has to explore with a

a less trivial mechanism ((1.2) because mmrm they're

multi-ramifying

Nicholas mmm

Robert and I-I would only say >from a personal point of view<

I would hope for more of this (.)

Nicholas mmm!

Robert in other words that you have lead the way down a

new file >as it were<

(5.2)

Robert or (.) do you not receive it? cr=

Nicholas =I was holding off responding ( .) but I do h-

when it comes back to my turn (0.8) I would like to

say something about that

Robert yeah ( .) th- the other thing was- was something

that it brought up in me: ( .) and that is the whole

time I saw this in terms of another metaphor

and err ( .) on which I had to hold back ( .) right?

because there is a micro metaphor derived from

a French mathematician called Rene Thom ( .) I don't

don't if you've come across him?

Nicholas no

Robert called catastrophe theory ( .) and it is the quantum type

of thing ( .) applied to the social dynamic ( .) and it is such

that there are so many variables around here ( .) right? ( .)

and one of these variables may suddenly increase ( .) right? ( .)

and then decrease ( .) or other ( .) increase <

Nicholas mmm

Robert but it may be that because of all the other variables ( .) in

the context of all the other settings >for those variables<

this variable becomes intolerable ( .) and the whole thing

goes boom

Nicholas mm

Robert and you say >well I'm sorry I've said that <( .) you know
I've knocked that variable down again (.) it doesn't
reinstate (.) you moved into other territory and *you
can't go back* (.)

Nicholas: mmm
Robert: socially (.) right?
Nicholas: [mmm mmmm
Robert: and it seemed to me:. (.) that I was interpreting
what you were saying in terms of (.) in terms of
the social metaphor (.) arrr:. (.) and it seemed to me to fit
Nicholas: mm I'll get that reference if I may (.) yes
Robert: oh absolutely it's ( . ) absolutely
Nicholas: yeah ( . ) good
Robert: catastrophe theory it's called ( . )
Nicholas: yes ( . ) >no I don't know it<
Harry: I've got three ( . ) one emotional, one
79 intellectual, one incidental
Robert: [ ha ha ha ha.....
Nicholas: [ ha ha
Harry: a label for every one
Nicholas: yes (*)( . ) label for everyone*
Harry: y- he he
Harry: so first label ( . ) the emotional what was really
interesting about this was er ( . ) I think this was
biggest for me ( . ) >you say you're a linear person
which you know< we understand the differences here ( . )
( . ) it was wonderful here to be in at the very early
stages of your thinking ( . ) about an article and realising
that in fact you get down in a mess just like I do
and [ roll up your sleeves and root about and pull out
Nicholas: [ ha ha ha..... ha ha ha:
Harry: out all sorts of sad looking objects and wonder where
they might go ( . ) it was great=
Nicholas: = ha ha yes [this is ] true
Harry: [ you know ]
Harry: it's a wonderful experience cos it actually opens up
something that we don't often show to other people
( . ) you know we show them when it's formed a bit
B201 more ( . ) and it's looking a bit more polished ( . ) and
we can be prouder of it than this ( . ) no offence=
Nicholas: -hhh ha
Robert: [ ha hhhha argh HA HA ha.....
Harry: [ and some of us are
Robert: longer in [ that state ] than others
Nicholas: [ ha:..... ]
Nicolas: none taken
Harry: [ so that was wonderful
Nicholas: I really enjoyed that
Nicholas: but I withdraw the invitation for next weekend
Harry: hhhhh [ ha ha ha hekk ] he ( . ) yeah ( . )
Nicholas: [ ha ha ha ]
Harry: that's the big one for me ( . ) the intellectual one ( . )
is a whole huge thing ( . ) and it's been something that's
been growing a little bit with me ( . ) and I think today
in terms of what you were saying and in terms of
what we are doing ( . ) it came stronger ( . ) and it's this
that what we are doing ( . ) I think it is very unnatural ( . )
and I don't mean that in a negative sense= 
Nicholas: =mm
Harry because often what starts off as unnatural becomes natural
when people learn how to do it and they do it normally
and I think what emerged (.) and I think about y- (.) acting
in an unnatural way (.) is that it puts all sorts of pressures
on things (.) and it creates all these odd energies doing
odd things (.) and that’s one thing that emerged clearly
from this (.) in a sense what I was thinking about (.) the
sort of thing that we do (.) came out (.) for me (.) very strongly
today in the sense of feeling your way through this unnatural
process (.) and that was an interesting line I think
I think (c 0 f) the third one is incidental (.) that these
scientists (.) they bang away in their quantitative paradigms
and they err- (.) they come up with whatever they come
up with (.) and a qualitative people (.) which I think
certainly we position ourselves in (.) what we find is the
metaphor (.) and we use it and we take it
Nicholas [yeah]
Harry [yeah]
yeah
Harry they take what they want (.) incidentally produce a metaphor
which they may or may not have any use for (.) but what
we take is what we can use (.) which is the metaphor
>which I think is lovely and is what you were doing today
and Robert’s adding another one< you know (.) hhh so:
there are my three (.)* yeah:: *
Emma "yeah" (.)* well I think I’ve just got one really (.) and I’m just
erm (.) left thinking more about the nature of- changes in a person-
in motivation (.) both at the group level and at an individual
level (.) I mean I (.) certainly agree: (.) never particularly thought
about it before (.) that this situation and also other interactional
situations (.) can be tremendously successful in making
allowing someone to make that jump from (.) err arrhh (.) apathy
no not apathy (.) but from just swimming around
in the mire (.) to actually knowing where the go next
err (.) and err (.) yes (.) and I agree that it happens like that
in these sessions and in others (.) and I think that’s
interesting (.) and also just sort of left thinking about
why is it that people? >such as me< (.) I mean you know
in ordinary circumstances (.) not when they’re feeling
depressed (.) they’re just one day sitting watching the telly
and thinking ‘oh god’ you know it’s warm in here and it’s
a long way down to the study (.)* and oh you know all that
hassele of switching on the computer (.) and suddenly they
just can (.) I don’t know (.)* I’m just thinking (.) I’m just
thinking (.) about it >that’s all<
Elizabeth mm (.)* my mother-in-law had the expression ‘when the
spirit moves you’
Emma YEAH >that’s a b- that’s- isn’t that what it’s like<though
Nicholas [yeah]
Elizabeth I do it when the spirit moves me
Emma yeah
Robert I:==
Elizabeth = and sometimes it moves you tremENDously fast
and excitedly and er-
Emma yeah
Robert if I were to leave it to the spirit all the time=
Emma = he ha ha:
Nicholas 1 ha ha hhhh ha
Harry I have to say I’m yo( ) Robert
Robert ha HA HA ha
Robert but can I pick up=
Nicholas: yeah=

Robert: a couple of these things (,) one is the forging
and one is the control (,) again it’s the entropy
and entropy thing (,) you don’t overcome entropy
other than by forging (,) and I think forging and control
are the same kind of force (,) you do in fact have to
put something into it (,) and somebody said natural
Harry: unnatural=
Robert: unnatural (,) now- (,) in order to be unnatural::
in- in the blandest sense of natural (,) yeah (,) you have
to put something in- (,) you have to go (,) if we could
go back to the de Bono jelly (,) pouring the water down
the jelly (,) it always goes down the same track (,) it
requires considerable effort of some kind to make it
go down a different track (,) and:: (,) I think we have
had to put energy into this =
Harry: *wobble the jelly*
Robert: well n- that is a kind of- yeah=
Harry: =jelly wobbling
Robert: jelly wobbling
Harry: [now] we know what we’re doing
ha hhhh
Robert: jelly wobbling but- (,) I think going against
what is natural (,) can in fact be highly positive
(,) and that progress may consist of going again-
that which is natural
(1.2)
Robert: you may know that in- in philosophical history
nature is in one philosophy (,) is something good
and nature in the other (,) is something bad
Nicholas: mmm
Nicholas: MMMmmm ((appreciative))
Harry: mmm (,) hhhhh
Nicholas: I’m::::::
(2.0)
Nicholas: >I’m very well listened to and understood< (,) >thank you all<
err::
(1.8)
Nicholas: it’s not the case (,) it was clearly not going
to be (,) that I’ve now got a straight line to
go down (,)
Harry: HA ha ha ha
Robert: hhhhh ha
Robert: hopefully not
Nicholas: it was (,) it was err
Robert: * it aint metrical*
Nicholas: it was good for me to hear how far I could
get and how far I couldn’t get with- (,)
with some of these ideas (,) and how you know
the (,) and to see the disparity between the warm feelings
I sometimes have about ‘oh yeah then there’s all
that bit’ (,) and then I come to that bit and realise
I actually start to stammer and I don’t have anything
to say (,) I just have a good feeling (,) it’s good to
get close to that (,) in supportive surroundings (,)
errm () I've got this twinge of a feeling now where ()
I'm not sure that all these bits do fit
into one paper () that probably by the time I
sit down at my desk I shall want them to again
err () I probably will () want them to again
the trouble is that papers are linear () and all we're
talking about is not linear
Nicholas yeah
(0.6)
Nicholas yes that's- () maybe that's what'll come of
it () I- it'll () I'll be forced to face up to
the whole representational issue in ways
that () being a reasonably articulate and linear
writer () I never really have () maybe that's what
I want to have a go at () and see if I can bully
an editor into err- () ha ha ha::: () wanting
a go () at it
(0.8)
Nicholas errm () I know there's this feeling of () Marion
Dadd >you know< who's made a reputation about the importance
B305 of emotion in action research () but there's never a
bleep about any of her emotions () in err () in any
of this () and I do want to get something () out there
ing this field which tries to represent in it's representation
the things it's talking about and maybe that's helped me
see more of that () errm
(2.0)
Nicholas I think I feel more now that () yeah there will be
some kind of a statement () coming out of this
(3.2)
Nicholas I guess () on the what sort of a session it was ()
in terms of my topic () I did feel when I came
in here >I thought< 'hello' he hhh
this is another one of us trying to do something
different again () but one of the things that's been
coming out of these sessions for us () I think ()
I think I've been picking up from most people
who had a go at Speaker () at least () at LEAST
it gives you a chance to clarify you thinking =
Elizabeth [mm
Nicholas = around something () and I thought well what
better than- () as you say if you find these odd
articles in the mud >you know<
Harry he he
Nicholas and that's another way () to go () but my own
feeling is that I wouldn't want us to get away
from the idea of totally free choice for any Speaker
and I- also want to come in an do a strictly practical
'how to' session as well () one time
Harry .hnh
Nicholas you know how am I going to do this
Robert no metaphors=
Nicholas no metaphors () yeah
Elizabeth [mm
Nicholas yes that's right () >how< am I going to
get these particular ducks in a row? () errm
(?) mm
Nicholas and::: () you know anymore than I'd want us
just to go into the professional () because we've
crossed private and professional boundaries before
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and I think it’s all- it’s all just open (.) errr (.)
hhphwoOOh (.) thank you (.) yes
Harry thank you
Robert thanks Nicholas
Emma is it the idea that we reflect on this next Tuesday?
(.) is that the plan?
Nicholas is that okay with everyone (.) that’s what we had in
the diaries (.) is that too much or
Harry no=
Robert =I think we’ve got to
Harry yeah
Emma I was going to ask would anybody mind if we did it
at 2.00 rather than 2.30 (.) I know it doesn’t give
us a break (.) but I ask because of wanting to catch
a train at 3.30 next Tuesday (.) hhhhh hhhhh
Elizabeth well why don’t we have the staff meeting at 12.30
Robert well I don’t think the Staff meeting next
week will last=
Elizabeth = it th- w- l- let’s cut it short
Robert we did today (.) we had a break today (.)
Elizabeth we don’t need to give Stuart too much data now
Harry that’s it - th- we’ll do it on the marketing
thing and (.) I can’t think of anything else
at the moment (.) we need to do (.) yeah that’s
alright with me
Nicholas yeah (.) that’s okay by me
Harry ° °’s no problem°
Elizabeth well if we’ve only got half an hour for-
we can start at 1.00 and finish at half one
Harry that’s true
(0.6)
Harry yeah (.) ° I mean ° ur- (.) lets
lets= Elizabeth >=shall we play it-c (.) shall we see
what else comes up on the agenda (.)
Harry yeah I think that’s a good idea
Elizabeth if we’ve only got the poster
167 to make a quantum leap about=
Emma huh haaa:
Harry yeah
(3.4)
Harry that’s fine=
Nicholas hh (.) alright! I’ll do a bit of editing on
B360 this tape (.) and see (.) mmm
(0.6)
Elizabeth can you say a little bit more next week
about the multiple personality
Robert (.) the Bakhtin
178 the Bakhtin (.) because I think that
it was- (.) when you started talking about that
it was quite difficult cos it was so new to me that
I was having in keeping my mind on track (.)
cos I kept going off track (.) yeah (.) yeah
183 that you gave us one example (.) one specific
bit of personality from you and then you went
onto ggeneral (.) and I’m still (.) I’m still not
Nicholas [hhh
Elizabeth Emma started frowning at the same point
that I started mentally frowning
Emma ha
Elizabeth and I thought ‘ah’ okay=
Nicholas => I can do [that right now<]
Elizabeth [I was pleased ]
Nicholas this is not a great area of expertise of mine (?) ermm but my way (?) yeah [my way into it =]  
Elizabeth [  ( more ]
Nicholas = was to me a very straightforward (?) err EFL example (?) I'd only heard the name  
Elizabeth  mmm  
Nicholas and it was in the whole teacher life (?) area and he interviewed a whole bunch of teachers  
in Poland (?) which is where he married into  
and (?) out of the interview data (?) he followed through some strands which were essentially  
Nicolae economic (?) to do with them having this job  
but they had to have another job because they  
( ) job to live with (?) and then  
they have to move (?) and so they had to >(<  
Robert  the job  
Nicholas [ the job yes  
yes (?) and the whole thing was tracked through in terms of money (?) ermm (?) and then::: (?) a difference he  
found between::: to use the shorthand (?) native speakers of English (?) and Polish speakers of English (?) in other  
words the Brits and Americans in Poland and the Poles in Poland (?) was that the Brits and Americans (?) based their professional status on the fact that they were language teachers (?) whereas the Poles based their professional status on the quality of their English (?) that they were such excellent English (?) and were also translators and interpreters (?)  
((End of tape))
Case 4
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Emma as Speaker: The nature of a part-time academic role
Harry oh I see what you mean (.) the way we
negotiated the thing
Robert yeah
Harry sure (.) absolutely
(0.6)
Harry err Elizabeth and Emma right?
Nicholas yes (.) err (.) Robert (.) errm=
Harry =sorry *can we shift the chairs around a little bit*
Nicholas yeah
((sounds of shifting furniture as Harry shifts desk
in order to bring out black desk swivel chair))
Nicholas Robert did you pick up the e-mail about Elizabeth
Bolton wanting to change the dates=
Robert =yes
Nicholas is that okay with you
Robert [April the fifteenth (.) yes it is
Nicholas good (.) so we ask her to give the talk a bit
caller (.) eleven til twelve (.) rather than
twelve til one (.) if that’s=
Harry =if that’s okay with- (.) Emma (.) would you
prefer this chair or are you okay there?
Emma no (.) I’d prefer this one
Nicholas [that’s okay with you then yeah
Harry that- that’s me clear then (.) because I’ve got errm=
Nicholas =that’s [ excellent ]
Harry [my meet ]ing starts at twelve
with err= sorry about that (.) my meeting
("the dragon awaits") (.) so if she could eleven
to twelve (.) that would be super (.)
Nicholas and then you’re back two thirty okay?
Harry I’ll be back at two thirty definitely whether the meeting
is finished or ngt=
Nicholas [yes
Emma =so what day is that?
Robert [fifteenth with Elizabeth Bolton=
Harry =just need to check with Elizabeth (.) WHEN ELIZABETH
COMES I’LL CHECK WITH HER (.)
Robert ahh hiiiiiiiiii ha
Elizabeth ([from her room ]) * I’m coming I promise you*
Harry WHAT ARE WE TALKING CHRISTMAS OR WHAT?
Nicholas which Christmas is that?
Harry err (.)lets go for the millenium!
(1.0)
Harry NOT THE NEXT ONE (.) THE ONE AFTER
Nicholas the real- (.) no sorry
Emma ha ha
Nicholas HA he he he ha:::::
Nicholas there’s no point in promising anyone else (.) I’ll stop being
boring about that (.) I- I really must promise myself=
Harry =oh what? (.) the promising=never make promises you can’t
keep (.) hhhha
Nicholas we still haven’t – oh yes it’s there
Emma so we’re looking at the fifteenth
Harry fifteenth yeah (.) of course she’s got
to agree to it too hasn’t she
Robert but she’s already
Emma [[(
Harry [she agreed to ]
Harry eleven o’clock I’m talking about whether
she can come down for that
[that's right]
she might not be able to make that (.) I mean.
errrr (.) this business about Elizabeth Bolton
wanting to change the date
yeah
to the fifteenth
>oh I haven't brought 'me diary<
which is the one >you know< we've been
there (.) then we've freed it up again
is it okay with you? (.)
the fifteenth of June?
=yes
that's the day I won't be here
(1.2)
I'm taking leave that day
(0.6)
right
oh is that the birthday thing
yeah
that came out earlier but that
that wouldn't have been (.) oh I see what
you mean (.) that's errr=
no you do it and record and I'll listen
>I mean I'll be sorry to miss her but (.)
no that's the thing y=
yeah [what do you think? ]
you announced that ] long ago
I think if Elizabeth doesn't mind (.) there will
be enough of us wgn't there? (.) I mean the
rest of us are here (.) that gives a group of
five
she's putting forward a- a doctoral proposal to
a committee which has called a meeting on the
8th (.) she says she will come because she
said she would (.) if- you know=
yeah
but I don't think [we really bring her ] down
[ naah: : : : ]
no:
under those conditions=
=NO::: ogh
HA HA ha ha
hhhhhh "ha ha"
what's happened ( ) *
[I would have said the same thing
to be honest anyway (.) I reckon that >you know< (.) if
we put her where Elizabeth is now (.) this is a nice group
this is better than cramming the room full (.) so I think
having Elizabeth missing is not
[YEAH you're cramming the room full Elizabeth
ha
ha HA HA hhhha
[arhhhhhh
[I completely disagree with that
[I think the only ]
[[ ohhhh you don't ] have your bir[thday party ]
[ the only thing ]
Vince  we ca[n't have two ] Elizabth
Elizabeth  [ the only thing is ]
Vince  we've got to get used to having four Emma=
Harry  =that's [ true as well ]
Elizabeth  [ yeah the only ] thing is:: that=
Nicholas  [yeah]
Elizabeth  =it would have [been nice to be ]
Nicholas  [ we all agree to be ] Sam
Elizabeth  [a more feminine presence]
Harry  yeah oo::: a:rr yes () that's true
she's comi-
Elizabeth  [especially since Lawrence was=
Harry  hairy males!
Elizabeth  [a hairy male presence]
Harry  yeah
Vince  mmm
Harry  okay () Emma if you could stay at home as well
we'll really put the () on
Vince  [HA ha:]:
Harry  go on!
Emma  [hhee he
Elizabeth  [[what's happening the ] week after=
Nicholas  [[ in that case ]
Nicholas  =can we go back through this again then?
we've got Emma to be Speaker today
we are not meeting next week=
Harry  =we're not
Nicholas  erm
((All looking through diaries))
(2.2)
Nicholas  which () oh no () bring that up another time () at
the moment () we've got a free on the first ()
on the 8th we were go- we could then meet for this student review
(.) I'm just pulling in other things here that Harry
I don't actually want to talk about that now but
now-
Harry  [we're not- Emma was happy to do on the first
(.) is there something happening on the first?
Emma  no () at the moment we've got the review of student
progress on the first=
Harry  =oh I'm sorry
Emma  [havn't we=
Nicholas  =yes and we shifted from the 8th () I- I can't make
the 1st which is why I was happy to go back the 8th
Harry  right () right
Nicholas  [which was the original suggestion
which we moved because of Elizabeth Bolton
Emma  that's right=
Harry  =gotcha () okay:: so we have the review of
student progress on the 8th then
Nicholas  yeah () we==
Harry  =>leave< "it as it is"
(0.8)
Robert  at what time?
Harry  e- ar- at staff meeting time
Robert  staff meeting time
(1.2)
Harry  erm,
Emma  and if Elizabeth Bolton doesn't come
on the 8th if she moves to the 15th

that’s right=

can we then have in the afternoon

the other grading criteria one or do

we need that afternoon slot?

no because she’ll be doing a talk and then the

afternoon slot won’t she?

yes 2.30 til 3.30

that might come on the three-thirty pattern

we need remember the Lawrence Young

erperience where you need a certain courtesy time

we can’t just turf people out into the corridor

if they decide they want to go on talking

no because they have to go to the toilet

yes=

especially if we go for beer!

so that on the 15th what’s Elizabeth so Elizabeth

will be here on the 15th

yes and will be

[doing 11.00 til 12.00=

= her talk=

= her talk on action research cycles

= can that be recorded?

yeah=

= yes

should do

and then 2.30 to 3.30 the group

development session on a framework

for analysis of same which she’s working

on which is proving lumpy

[[and I’m-

[[and I tell you what and Emma stays at home

and I get crate of tinnies in and give her a really

rough time hhhhh ha

could have the cricket on in the background

that’s it YEAH [haha ] [ha ha ]

[so lets do lets ] get on

[ba:::]d

and sorry I tell the MSc I mean I strongly

urge

yes

the MSc students to=

all of them

to participate

yes

but of course they might not=

the talks 11.00 til 12.00 erm what

what we would like from them is err;

an indication if they’re coming or not

yes=

I also see th-

[are THEY NOT DURING a MAP week?

no because it’s been passed you see

now it’s finished

but it’s well they’re thinking about their

yeah their assignment

they SHOULD come but

[I’ll also alert Nora Townley
who's here this afternoon that if she wants to join
us (.) it would be a good thing if she could get there
at 11.00 on the dot with the rest of the CELU people
too- =
Nicholas = yeah not quarter past (.) quarter past would be less welcome
Harry = yeah less impresssive
Nicholas yeah=
Harry =* yeah=
(0.8)
Nicholas erm:::
Harry > I'll do that< subtilely!
Elizabeth why don't you ask her?
Robert [SUBtlely?! Ha ha
Elizabeth why don't you ask her to the erm (.) afternoon thing?
Nicholas (.) I'd like to ask her to that as a Sp-
as a Visiting Speaker
Harry yeah (.) start her off ( ) it's a bit difficult join-
Nicholas we-
Vince [wh- as her first (.) so the first time she comes into this
is as Speaker?=
Nicholas =that's what I thought
Emma [she'll be quite
Nicholas we haven't talked about it=
Harry =cos as Understaner you couldn't.-
Vince [I'm not sure (.) I think it
may be better (.) I mean give her the choice (.) but
I think if it were me I'd prefer to come in an see
where the land lies=
Harry =yeah=
Vince =and know that it's quite "a" (.) it's not such a
Elizabeth [yeah so would I
Harry =yes but [no: the thing is ]
Vince [we're all very egm ]rtorable with it
Harry I don't think we can have her as an Understaner
with Elizabeth Bolton
Nicholas no
Harry we CAN't have Understaners
Nicholas [and we're not going ( )=
Vince =no that's fair enough
Nicholas [we're not having a spectator ehier=
Harry =no=
Nicholas =so I think visiting Speaker's the only way in to be honest
Harry we:il unless she wants to come into one of our things* yo- o
Nicholas that's true (.)"that's true yeah*
Robert as an auditor in one ours
Vince yeah
Nicholas [yeah
Harry [we'll start there then (.) but not=
Robert =that's how I would do it
Harry okay (.) so we've got Elizabeth Bolton (.) we've got
er- [the review ]
Emma [the review of] student progress on the 8th
Harry we need the evaluation meeting (.) Emma
Emma we do
Harry the err:: the err err the gloss thing
Harry now::: you're not in on the 1st
Nicholas no
Harry but I mean if you don't mind missing that
Nicholas: not at all

Harry: let’s do it on the 1st (.) I think it’s more important
to have the meeting (.) so the staff meeting on the 1st will
be::: err:: (.) a grading criteria

Emma: so it’s the relationship of module glosses (.)

Elizabeth: [that’s a Tuesday is it?]

Emma: [to the core
document

Harry: yeah

Elizabeth: is that a Tuesday?

Harry: it’s just a Tuesday yeah (.) just staff meeting time

Emma: two weeks time

Harry: * yeah yeah * no problem

Nicholas: I’ll try to catch some time either with Emma or with
you Harry (.) to download a couple of thoughts about that

() or I’ll [( )] [that’ll be great (.) that’ll be great

Nicholas: yeah

Elizabeth: what was that called?

Harry: okay that’s good

Robert: module grading criteria=

Nicholas: =SO the 22nd (.) is:::

Harry: >Away Day<

Nicholas: is the Away Day

and the 29th we said we’d meet again for:::

a feedback session (.) which (.) will be by way

of a round up for the summer yeah

Elizabeth: well hang on then (.) there won’t be:::
a feedback session after Elizabeth Bolton?

Harry: yeah

Nicholas: that’s it on the 29th

Elizabeth: that [will be Elizabeth ] Bolton

Harry: [on the 29th ] [can I:: just clarify something

Elizabeth: [[for a round up ]

Nicholas: [[it will also pos ]ibly relate [ to this session ]

Harry: [I was gonna say ]

Nicholas: [today ]

Harry: [cos if ] you’re out on the 1st there’s no

point in having a group development session

(.) to follow up on Emma’s one this week

(.) so Emma’s will have to come in much later (.) if

you don’t mind that Emma?

Emma: it doesn’t bother me

Harry: we’ll do Speaker A and Speaker B on the 29th

Nicholas: yes

Harry: okay

Nicholas: if that’s okay?

Harry: yeah

Nicholas: so:::

Elizabeth: [sorry >on the 29th we do< both Emma and

Elizabeth Bolton

Harry: that could be quite interesting (.) that could be good

actually (.)

Nicholas: and what I’d like to suggest but not spend

long talking about now (.) cos time really

is passing (.) is that when we do look forward
to (.) to starting up again in the autumn (.) we

think about reducing the amount of (.) feedback
discussion sessions (.) and increasing relatively

the number of developmental sessions (.)
Vince: mmm
Robert: we’re mature enough for that
Nicholas: yeah?
Robert: yes
Harry: ooh no (.) I’m sorry (.) yeah a- a- can I just
just Emma is Speaker A now (.)
Nicholas: yeah
Harry: we will have a slot on the 8th
Emma: yeah we can do follow-up Speaker on the 8th
Harry: so we can do that (.) and that’ll fit nicely
Nicholas: oh because that’s a one o’clock thing?
Harry: that’s a one o’clock- oh yeah (.) review of student
progress is one o’clock (.) and then (.) it shouldn’t
take very long (.) it’s simply to have something
on record
Nicholas: okay (.) I thought that was an extra meeting=
Harry: =no (.) it’s one o’clock and I reckon it’s just
each group number says (.) ‘look’ it’s like this
you know (.) this is where we stand and
if there are any issues
Elizabeth: [so it’s different from the:: ]
Nicholas: [I don’t think we ev]er
but don’t let’s discuss it now=
Harry: =NO:: (.) not every[one prepares in advance ]
Elizabeth: [it’s different from the ex ]am board=
Harry: =yeah=
Elizabeth: =in that we’re looking at people who havn’t got to the exam
board stage (.) or::;
Harry: =that’s it (.) just bring them up
> just alerting<
Robert: [now wait a minute (.) what date is that
Harry: that’s the 8th
Emma: [8th of June
Harry: of-
Robert: that’s the meeting on student progress
Harry: at one o’clock
Robert: I’d put it down at 1.15 (.) that’s good
Harry: student progress (.) and on the 15th we
don’t have a meeting in fact (.) erm
(.) except (.) cos I’m at the Dragon Awakes
(.) Elizabeth’s out (.) erm (.) we’ve got
Elizabeth Bolton here (.) I would just suggest
that er- sandwiches are available for anyone
(.) Robert (.) Emma (.) just book the sandwiches
and just have an informal chat *about anything
you know*
Emma: hhhhh ha fine
Nicholas: so 2.30 on the 8th (.) again (.) sorry we’ve got
another group development meeting
Harry: that’s right (.) Speaker A
Nicholas: good
Harry: I’ll talk about this review of student progress
then (.) obviously in the light of that (.) if you don’t
mind Emma (.) at the end of our grading criteria
giggle meeting (.) if you can remind me
Emma: [great
Harry: if you can remind me (.) cos I think it’s important
to get >that in the picture <(.) my idea
was that
Nicholas: [okay
Harry: the real work would be done in the week individually (.) and the group thing would be a shat (.) okay so the follow-up on the 29th will be Speaker H who will be Elizabeth Bolton
Nicholas: yes
Harry: and that's really rather nice isn't it?
Nicholas: excellent
Harry: because that's past the end of term (. we've finished our weekly staff meetings
Nicholas: yes and we'll also want to plan for:
Harry: the Winter term (.) the Michaelmas term
Nicholas: (1.2)
Harry: “get the holly out”
Nicholas: yeah (.) are we good?
Elizabeth: [shall we select a couple of tapes for Nora Townley to listen to?
Nicholas: maybe (.) yeah (.) definitely yeah
Harry: I'll talk with her this afternoon (.) and see and see what the situation is
Nicholas: I mean she's not (.) only if she's coming does it become interesting
Harry: (1.6)
Emma: hhhHA
Harry: okay (.) jolly good
Nicholas: I'm done (.) my diary looks good (.)
Emma: hhhHA
Harry: I dunno whether you want to look at the tape count (. to tell you where this session actually starts (. errm (.) well sometimes we need admin time and we need it (.) so there's no point in maunder[ing on about it ]
Elizabeth: [ the language of ] negotiation
Nicholas: oh dear (( shifts position in his chair, assumes lotus ))
Robert: that's right *
Emma: at this point we stretch (.) we change position (.) ( remove ) jacket
Nicholas: [yes [ygs
(1.4)
Vince: >I'm going to keep [my shoes on< (.] us adopt
Robert: a lotus
Vince: naa::: a ( ) of business
Nicholas: [never could
Emma: * ha hhhhh ha*
Elizabeth: [will it be too noisy if I open a window?
(0.6)
Harry: it normally clacks about like mad=
Vince: =yeah
Harry: [this is the disadvantage of this room
Vince: [yeah I think
if we do open the window (.) we need to get a little wedge to go under that door:: (.) cos that really bugs me (.)
Harry: well let's [see if we can survive with] out
Vince: [that clack clack clacking ] (noise of computer 'you have e-mail' buu: buu))
and that does
Harry: can't do much about that
Vince: how do you transcribe that?
Nicholas okay err Emma
478 Emma right () well () don’t know whether I’m cheating
479 being Speaker so soon after not having participated
480 in these meetings for quite a long time () but there we are
481 () erm I decided to speak about my :: () about how things will
482 be when I come back to work () after my maternity leave
483 () because as I think everybody knows () I am () almost
certainly () your know err final administrative discussions
484 and things still to be had () but it - you know () Harry
485 .hnhhhhh () I’ve talked to Harry about it who’s talked to
486 Elsie Norman about it () it’s () I will be coming back
487 part-time () and erm () I’m very very happy about that
488 in many ways () but I have also some small reservations
489 about it () or queries about it in my mind () and I suppose
490 those are what I’m going to concentrate on () erm ==
492 Nicholas =so you want to focus on the queries and the reservations
493 >that you have<
494 Emma I think so
495 Nicholas yeah=
496 Emma =but I’ll have to say first why I’m happy about it
497 but I won’t take long about that () because I suppose the
498 one thing I do want to make clear is that () I am absolutely
499 sure that that’s what I want to do () I’m not- I’m not
500 still making that decision ()
501 Nicholas mmm
502 Emma and err () the reason is that I want () is that
503 since I’ve had Noah and I’ve been full-time
504 I’ve found it a very very difficult line to hold
505 between () spending what I consider the right
506 amount of time with him () and also giving the right
507 amount of time to the job () errm and I think with two kids
508 I’ll never do it () is what I think () errm () and so I
509 think () it’s ver - so I’m sure from a whole person
510 perspective () being part-time at work for a while
511 is the right thing to do () so that’s why I’m sure about
512 the decision () the reservations that I have about it
513 are to do with () err () what it’s actually possible to:::
514 hnhhhhh
515 (1.2)
516 negotiate I suppose () and what
517 (2.4)
518 whether I’m going to hit any insoluble contradictions
519 () in the sense that () errm () there’s one side of this
520 which is simply a pratical side () which is that Harry
521 and I sit down and negotiate what constitutes a part-time
522 workload
523 Nicholas uhh mm
524 Emma so the way I see it is that by: () you know by- so by
525 giving up- >from a pratical perspective you can say<
526 that by giving up two fifths of my salary I’m earning the
527 right to only work three days a week () errm () but I
528 wonder () or I am concerned () that it may prove to be
529 not quite as simple as that () in that () it’s already
530 become clear to me in conversations that I’ve had
531 with various people () about errm () what I would like
532 to do when I come back () if I actually do all the things
533 I’ve said () I’m going to more work than I’ve got now () not less
534 ha hnhhh hmmm () so clearly () there’s an issue of () errm
535 () things that I would like to do () acadmically or at work
( ) that- ()> that probably don't even fit into a full-time job
let alone a part-time one<

Harry so can I get this straight () what- what- what we're talking
about () if I've understood you () is a meaningful part-time
job for you () and for that part-time job to be meaningful
erm () it has to involve things () obviously some things
that you want to do () but when you've looked at the
things () that you want to do () you're faced with the
difficult situation () that decisions are going to have
to be made () and that's really where the focus is ()
on these decisions or thinking about >is that right<

Emma [that's part of it

that is what I've said so far ()

Harry right=

Emma =there's another [ bit ] as well

Harry [okay ]

Emma which focus () which is to do with () err
the feasibility () this is >just <something I worry about
the feasibility of managing any sort of career
in an academic institution () on a part-time basis
() in the sense that () err () it's one thing ()
if I can <as it were> practically negotiate the right
to- to only do three days work a week () but
in three days () will I::: () I mean >you know<
these are () you know what I mean () obviously
they'll be a certain amount of flexibility () but
broadly sp- () I mean the whole point of going part-time
is to do less work () will it therefore be possible for
me to do::: () the reading, () the conference attendance,
() the networking:: () that we- that will mean () that-
well >that I can- actually do the job half decently ()
or y- () or y- () or not () so that's a worry that
I have ()

Harry so () again () if I can clarify wh- when you talk about
the job () you mean the job in its totality as- as a whole
and I get the impression here () correct me if I'm wrong
that what you've just said is that () you are determined
to give to your children () what they err they need

Emma yeah

Harry and you have that commitment which is absolute

Emma mm

Harry at the same time () you want to give to yourself
through your career the commitment () that you feel
that you want () but there seems to be an almost
irreconcilable tension between the two () as things
stand at the moment

Emma [yeah I fear that there may be: =

Harry =that's the issue "yeah"

Emma [erm

because>as I say< like to: to teach a course at
Master's level () you have to be kind of in
the swim of things () I think you can ()
get by for a while () you know you could have
a period of not being much in contact () if
you needed to be () but it would only be quite
a short period ()

Elizabeth .hhhh

Emma yeah

Elizabeth do you- do you mean? () when you say in the swim
of things () keeping up with the new literature
that’s appearing on the subject () that kind of thing
Emma yeah that sort of thing >yeah<
(1.4)
Emma * hhh ha hmmm*
Nicholas so we’ve got the:: () can I go back a little bit ()
that I had a feeling when- when Harry first ()
first came in () I was trying to capture something
there () around the same area of what you said
but slightly differently () when you said a->a whole
person< () decision about going part-time
Emma mmm
Nicholas and then you thought about all the bits of work
you’ve said to people ‘oh yess’ I’ll be interested ()
I’ll want to do that
(0.8)
Nicholas erm,
(2.0)
Nicholas in one sense I was hearing it
(1.2)
Nicholas It’ll be a question of making of making hard choices
Emma uhmmm
Nicholas but I’ll just have to do some and do the other. () is there
any sense in which? it’s- () the whole person part of the
decision is to some extent still more of an abstraction?
() whereas the real issues you’ve been talking about
() are real things that will need to be done () and that-
that’s a part of the conflict () the: () the decision
the whole person decision to be that sort of person
is still an abstraction and hasn’t actually come up to
the real
Emma do you mean?
Nicholas [distinction
Emma I’m not sure whether I understand you () but do you
mean that I still haven’t worked out what it will mean
in real terms () to be that kind of person () to be a person
who’s employed part-time
(1.0)
Nicholas *maybe* () maybe that’s it
(3.2)
Emma mmmmm?
(2.6)
Emma it might be true that on the work side () I’m not
clear about what that would mean. () whereas
on the home side, () I am () because I mean
I thought about going part-time after I had Noah
() but for various reasons=
Nicholas =mmm=
Emma =it- I didn’t () and I think that () one of the reasons
is that I didn’t have a very clear view of what that
would actually feel like () either on the home front
or on the work front () but I think that now () I do
have a view of what it would feel like on the home
front () because you know () the way I actually tend
to manage erm work () that is I do quite a lot of it
in the evenings () you know when he’s asleep
() so I do have () which you know I’ll be very keen
not to do so much of anymore errm
Vince mm=
Emma =but I do have () kind of () I do have plenty of
parent at home days with him if you like so I think
I have a clear picture of what that's like and I like
it and I feel it's important and I want more of it
errr- but maybe I don't have so clear a picture of
what (,) being in part-time employment really means
(1.4)
Nicholas mmm (,) mmm
(1.0)
Emma and yet I still feel convinced that it's the right thing
for me to do (,) sounds strange. (,)
Harry when you said (,) I think if I can pick up Nicholas's
point (,) that this is- is (,) maybe again it's (,)
but when you said you're not part-time employment
means (,) the way that I took it when you represented
it to us (,) was that it was about (,) going back to
this choosing amongst alternatives (,) and that would
represent (,) fu- you know part-time employment (,)
what I'm finding difficult to get hold of (,) is the
relationship between that (,) and the sense of this being
a fulfilling and >you know< er- er- er- a proper job as it
we're (,) how do the >relative< they seem to be- they
seem to be hanging in the air somewhere there and
I can't quite see (,) maybe that's where the problem
is (,) I don't know
Emma I don't either (,) errm
(6.2)
Robert I'm getting the message that (,) you're not distinguishing
(,) clear boundaries between work and non-work (,)
not like as though your standing at a machine (,) that's
when you're walking (,) when you're not standing at
the machine you're not working
Emma mmm
Robert is that where the-
(1.2)
Robert the vagueness comes?
Emma well that [might be part ] of it (,)
Robert [ ( ) ]
Emma inasmuch as maybe part of umm (,) wanting to
be part time is to do with having those boundaries
a bit clearer (,) and errm
Robert they're not becoming clearer
Emma and the fear is that they won't (,) the fear
is that they actually can't perhaps (,) that
might be part of it (,)
Nicholas is there any sense in which it might be
helpful that- (,) >I don't know if you've got
a way ahead planned< (,)
Emma no (,) hhh hah:
Nicholas [ha ha for this session
Emma I havn't=
Nicholas =might it be:: useful then for you to work
on formulating (,) what your vision of you
as a part-time worker (,) is
Emma yeah (,) I think so (,) I mean I think (,) yeah
Elizabeth can I ask something else before that because
it relates back right to the beginning just before
Harry came in or you came in with your first Understanding
(,) errm (,) you said you were very sure you wanted to come
back because you were happy with that (,) coming back (,)
and then ( ) for all kinds of reasons ( ) and I can now only
remember one ( ) and it maybe my memory or maybe that
you didn’t tell us any other reasons ( ) or maybe it’s a
different meaning of the words happy ( ) and I was looking
for something different
Emma .hmmm ( ) hhhh
Elizabeth errm ( ) you said you were happy because you had ( ) this is
as I understood it ( ) that you had thought a lot about the
decision ( ) that you knew that you couldn’t go back ( ) come back
and work full-time cos I had been difficult with Noah ( ) so
coming back to work part-time ( ) was the right decision
for you
Emma uh hum yeah
Elizabeth and you didn’t give any other- ( ) I didn’t un- I didn’t-
and that seemed to be the reason ( ) that you were happy
about it
(0.6)
Emma [happy about ]
Elizabeth [and I just wondered whether there was anything else
that you wanted to: =
Emma =to [say about ] why I
Elizabeth ( )
Emma why I want to be part-time?
Elizabeth mmm ( ) was it that ( ) you liked ( ) you particularly
liked ( ) particular areas of your job ( ) and you were
happy about doing those
(0.6)
Elizabeth in which case it might link up with what Nicholas’s
Emma [no
Emma no it’s more the oppos- no it’s erm ( ) I think that
having to lose certain areas of the job ( ) is more like ( )
is more of a down side to it ( )
Elizabeth mm
Emma errm ( ) I’m h- the happiness is ( ) because I feel
that ( ) I need more time at home ( )
Elizabeth errm
Emma so ( ) and that I want to have a ( ) I want to have erm
(.) I want to have a completely clear conscience ( ) I’d
much rather be ( ) paid for three days and sometimes=
Elizabeth mmm
Emma =work three and a half ( ) than paid for five days and
sometimes work four and a half ( ) you know ( ) due to
whatever ( ) you know ( ) it- I’ll be happier that way
Nicholas mmm
Harry going back to Nicholas’s thing
Emma [I mean obviously the talking about=
Harry yeah
Emma =days per week is a bit meaningless ( ) really because
that’s not [what it’s like ]
Harry [yeah no no ]
Emma but if you [think of an average ]
Elizabeth [that’s not what it’s like ]
Robert [difficult to classify ]fy
Harry [yeah]
Harry of course
Nicholas sure
Harry I- I think >to go back to Nicholas’s “ thing” <
(.) per- >you know< the picture of the job
as you see it=
Elizabeth mm
Harry =w- > you know < I mean it'd certainly help me ( ) get a ( ) > get a bit of a ( ) > picture *

Emma * well ( ) hmmm *

(3.2) hmmm

(0.6) well okay ( ) it's hhhh ( ) it looks o- ( ) the kind

of job that we all we have here ( ) looks on paper

like a job that you can split up quite easily ( ) and

indeed in our workload weighting we have ( ) erm

but I think that erm ( ) it's not quite like that really

that it's all rather more organic ( ) and rather more

linked ( ) than erm ( ) than it might appear ( )

and therefore ( ) the idea of slicing bits off ( ) actually

feels a bit weird ( ) erm ( ) especially I guess ( ) slicing

certain bits off ( ) I mean one thing ( ) something that

can probably be fairly clearly sliced off because I think

we've seen this with colleagues who are semi retired

( ) is that is like say the teaching of a ( ) of a certain

module

Harry mm

Emma is something that can be erm taken apart ( ) erm

but in my esee ( ) I'm ( ) I mean I think it's

clear from discussions and also ( ) from my

own preferences ( ) that there's no question of

that say teaching a module ( ) or you know

isn't what I'm going to lose ( ) so erm

the ( ) things I could lose ( ) are to

do with ( ) I don't know ( ) > I mean I don't

know what they're to do with ( ) they're

to do with how many tutes I have I guess

they're to do with what ( ) erm ( ) unit wide

responsibilities I have ( ) to do with ( ) erm

how much second marking I do ( ) that kind of s-
you know that's linked with number of tutes

erm ( ) and all those things are a bit more...

(0.8)

Emma those things are a bit more amorphous ( ) am

e making any sense at all ( ) hhh hhh ha ha

Vince yes ( ) you're saying that for you some things

can be ( ) can be split off ( ) and are ( ) and are

self contained ( ) and other things are ( ) am I right?

in- the things that you see as amorphous are the- the

things that are linked ( ) and therefore can't be easily

separated

Emma well I mean I think everything's linked ( ) you know ( )
everything's linked really

Vince mm

Emma but some things are more linked than others ( )

Elizabeth hmmm ha hh

(0.8)

Vince so are there- are there some things ( ) that you:: that-

that in your part-time job ( ) that you see as being

fairly linked and that you ( ) have feelings about

Emma ermmm:

Vince that you would like to do or not like to do=

Emma = like to do or not like to do?

(2.6)

Emma errhhh er hhhhh ( ) there isn't anything ( ) that taken

in itself ( ) I would like not to ( ) but I know I've
got to () I've got () but that's ridiculous () because
that means being full-time

Vince mm

Emma so::: hu () so i- a- as I say () it's partly just a
pract- it's partly a practical question () of what Harry and
I () in different rules () negotiate () but it's also

Vince [mm

Emma but it's also a feeling () question and a nature of the job
question
Nicholas [mm () do you want to talk about that? () the feeling
question and the nature of the job?

Emma I guess I have to in a sense () because in a sense
the practical side isn't going to be resolved here () that's
going to be resolved in a different forum () you know=

Nicholas [mm

Emma = to do with () well to do with all kinds of things () to do
with what other people coming into the unit might
want to do::: () an-

Robert yeah we're not here to resolve anyway of course

() we're here to help you to explore ()

Emma yeah haaaa

Robert ((clears throat)) () I get the impression from the way
you put certain things () that you think that working
full time in fact working full time solves all these problems

(0.6)

Harry ha ha:------ a

Emma [ha hehe ha ha hehe ha

Harry [ha ha

Emma ha () erm

Harry hhh

Emma mmm hmm () ha

Harry ° ha hmmm

(5.2)

Emma so why do I think that working full-time would be more of
a problem than working full-time?

Robert I'm not allowed to ask that question ha ha

Emma ha ha

(2.6)

Emma mmm

(4.0)

Robert because sur- () oh () hhh

(0.8)

Nicholas but it's not the words that you use that count () it's your
intention

Robert hhhhhhhIA hhhhhhh () ha

Harry [hhh

(0.6)

Emma no I don't really () no I don't really know how to:;
you know () it's a pertinent question () but I don't
really know how to answer it () erm

(2.6)

Robert it's not that I thought there was a glib answer lurking there

Emma no

Robert but it seemed- () you were talking about a dichotomy

anyway ()

Emma mmm

Robert right? () and it seemed to me () that () you were ()
suggesting () that () that is where the problem ()
may () the unresolvable problem may lie () that
you've got this amorphous incomplete mass which is
full time working () and you want to () cut it down

to an equally amorphous incomplete mass () but less

[ha]

Emma

Harry

hmm

Emma

hmm

(2.0)

Harry

mm

(4.4)

Harry can I ask you () you talked about that feelings

(.) you said ° about feelings and you° would

it help to talk about the feelings that you have

had or you have () about this () just in feelings

terms about the part-time ()'s job'

Emma

mm

(4.2)

Emma

yeah

(16.0)

Emma what I see as good about it () f- is mainly

(.) y- when I think about it () from () what I

see as good about it () comes very much ()

from the () home perspective () where I

have a vision of myself () as having more time

to be () with my kids () doing things at home

feeling relaxed about things () not having to

stay up til 1.00 in the morning marking bljmm

assignments () and being errm () generally a

calmer and happier human being () haha hhhha=

Robert =Ahhhhhhhhhhh () THAT

Harry

[got it]

Emma

it's errm hah ah

Harry

[ha yes]

Emma I mean you know=

Harry [yeah

Emma I have this vision

Nicholas [yeah

Vince [yes

Emma and this is very positive () clearly

Harry [yeah [absolutely

Emma errrm

(2.2)

Emma and:

(7.6)

Emma suppose what I see and what I fear () is that

(.) actually that won’t be possible () in that

no matter what () errrm () in that no matter what

L- () negotiate practically () and you know

no matter the fact that my () workload weighting

now says () you know () three fifths of the

number of units () you know etc. () errrm

that you know it won’t () ac- () the nature

of the job that we have () means that it won’t

actually be like that () ermmm

Nicholas so that

Emma [does that make any sense?

Nicholas what I hear you saying now is that the:: ()

Emma hhhh

Nicholas the decrease () just to use a pressure metaphor ()

the decrease in pressure you can bring about by

() taking off two fifths of the job () when it’s

>matched up against the increase in pressure
at home by having two children< (...) may in fact
not lead to very much difference (...) in terms
of the:: measuring (...) you know (...) when the demands
of the two come together
Emma yeah that's c- certainly a part of it (...) certainly (.)
"certainly a part of it" (...) and I think the other
part of it (...) is that (...) is- is just in a work way
a self contained work way (...) that erm (...) that
you know (...) as it is at the moment (...) erm
(...) you know being full-time (...) I do have (...) I do:
keep (...) time (...) for home and for Ngah (...) so you
know if I sort of if- if the (...) I'm not a person
who (...) you know except< at certain particular
periods (...) like having a real push on the thesis
or something (...) which is kind of different anyway
Harry mmm mmm
Emma erm (...) I certainly don't (...) I'm not a kind of
seven day a week type person (...) you know (...) whatever
I've got to do (...) I kind of say (...) I must do it in this time
in order to have other time (.)
Elizabeth uh hu
Nicholas [mm
Emma available for other things (...) and so it's you know
its erm (...) err (...) and ummm
(2.4)
Emma but obviously I've been in full-time employment all my
employment life really (...) I mean sometimes in more
than one place ->so to speak< (...) but
Nicholas yeah (...) yeah
Emma really I have (...) and so (...) I suppose I question whether
(...) I'll be able to do that same boundary keeping
(...) which you know is I think important to do
(...) erm (...) when I'm officially part-time not full-time
Nicholas you think keeping boundaries might become more
difficult when you're part-time?
Emma yeah (...) yeah
Nicholas (2.0)
Emma because I think that errm (...) maybe I'll think that errm
(...) perhaps it's just this cliché about work expanding to
fill the time available (...) but it's true in a way
Elizabeth [yeah
Emma >you know< there's a sense in which it's true
Nicholas [mm [mm
Emma errm (...) and because (...) the::
(1.2)
Emma the nature of the job (...) the >sort of <job role is
predicated on a notion of errm full time
commitment (...) this is going to change of course (...) because other people are thinking of part-time things
as well as me and this might be (...) this might be
very interesting (...) but at the moment >you know< we have
a situation where (...) everybody here () those of us
who are () full () fully involved in the CELU still
are all full-timers () and () two colleagues who are still
with us (...) but not () not full time () are now with us
in a very very different sense () to you know () to a
sense in which they used to be with us () errm ()
and the kind of part-time () the kind of part-time
situation that I've () that is envisaged you know
Nicholas: mm (.) mm

Robert: (-) what I'm about to say is not your words (.) but it's something that comes through to me (.) and that is that what you're saying is that (.) what you're entering into (.) is in fact a full-time commitment to less.

Emma: ha hhh.(.) I don't get that (.) ha

Robert: well- err- i- your workload is cut down (.) in terms of the units, (.) how many students,

Emma: [yeah]

Robert: how many modules, and that kind of thing but they are always (.) there are now fewer of those.

Emma: uhuh

Robert: but Parkinson's law and Robert Principle and all that (.) kind of (.) it- it- y- y- you- you are in fact conscious of it (.) all the time.

Emma: yeah

Robert: there are just fewer things (.) that you're responsible for your calls that can be made (.) but in fact (.) what I'm getting at is (.) is it the case that (.) you feel you can't sort of shut (.) them away (.) because you're still responsible for them.

Emma: that is part of it (.) yes I do think that that is part of it yes=

Harry: [g-]

= wh-wh- the picture I get (.) and again (.) correct me if I've (.) not misunderstood (.) but if it's not
the picture (.) that you want to convey (.) I get (.) from what you've been saying (.) and it's connected with Robert's point (.) I get a very strong picture (.) of (.) your home identity (.) that you mother identity (.) that's come across very clearly (.) what I haven't got at all (.) is any picture of your professional identity (.) in the new role (.) is that how you feel about it (.) it ties in with (.) with Robert's point.

Emma: yes (.) I think that's if you like the problem (.)

that's why I say I'm happy about it from

Harry: yes

Emma: because I - my new professional identity isn't clear to me

Harry: yeah right (.) and that's the real (.) (h) worry hhh=

Vince: =and I also have a sense (.) that you want to hang on (.) I mean you just co- (.) you said (.) I can't remember what you exactly said (.) but you made maybe a contrast between you and Tom and Donald (.) and there's a sense that you want to maintain that fullness.

Emma: yeah

Vince: but you want to do it on a part-time basis (.) and there's a tension between (.) and those two.

Emma: [that's right yeah] [well it sounds strange doesn't it? (.) how can you maintain the fullness but also be on a part-time basis]

Nicholas: yeah

Vince: yeah

Emma: that's just it yeah

Harry: so if I could put that

Emma: [because I mean Tom and Donald]

Harry: [* sorry*]
Emma and as I say (.) I'm not (.) you know this isn't
(.) you know this isn't in any way intended to be
a negative comment (.) but they're not participating
fully as team members anymore (.) that's the way
it is (.) they don't come to meetings they don't do
Harry [can I] [right]
Harry I think I may have understood something that I didn't=
Nicholas [mmm]
Harry =think I'd understood (.) but just in case I haven't can I
Robert [ha] [ha]
Harry check it out with you
Emma [yeah] [ha]
Robert [ha]
Harry >it's come (out here <) I didn't understand
(.) what you meant about having less time (.) when you
went part-time about not drawing the boundaries (.) I think
now I understand (.) I may be wrong (.) but (.) it seems
to me that you're saying (.) or what I'm getting (.) is
the picture now (.) the reason that you're worried about that
is that (.) errm (.) in the light of (.) Tom and Donald (.)
because you don't have a clear picture of what you be
in terms of professional identity (.) you no longer have
a position upon which you can draw (.) those (.) to establish
those boundaries (.) that what y- (.) if I've understood you
what you're saying is simply (.) doing in terms of this
and this and this equals a part-time job (.) is a separate
issue from your professionally me person (.) the
professional me that you know now (.) that enables you
to draw lines (.) is not to you clear in the part-time role
(.) there for you have no basis for- and that's what =
Emma [mmm]
Harry =really worries you=
Emma =well I'll need to develop (.) I'll need to develop a new one
(.) you know (.) I'll need to develop a new professional
person (.)
Harry to enable you to >draw the lines and then<=
Emma [yeah]
Emma =yeah=
Harry =you hope you won't
Emma I mean I don't suppose (.) I don't suppose
I mean I'm not thinking for a moment that
I can do that this afternoon
Harry [no no]
Emma it'll be a much longer process (.) but
Harry I have understood then that
Emma yes (.) yes
Nicholas [yes]
Emma because I ne-
Nicholas [I wonder ]
Emma [ yeah]
Nicholas >have a go< at an aspect of that as well (.)
Emma mmm
Nicholas is it then right that (.) it is as though (.) your professional
self (.) is to be redefined negatively (.)
Elizabeth mmm
Nicholas that it is what you are going to lose (.) in order
to make more space for the domestic self (.)
Emma mmm
Nicholas that you want (.) and it is what is going to be lost
and (.) if I can pick up from something that you said
earlier. I think it is not only what is going to be lost
in terms of the quality of you being of this team that
worries you.
mmm
it’s also what is going to be lost in terms of long term
career development which was something you mentioned
as well earlier that both of those are lines
[yeah]
(,) yes they’re both there (,) errm (,) I would
very much like to like to have a way of thinking
of my new professional identity which was not
simply a negative definition (,) the mirror image
of the home identity (,) yes
mm
but at the moment you’re right in saying that
that’s >kind of< what I’ve got (,) because I’m seeing
the home one as expanding and therefore certain bits
of the job as having to be cut off (,) but where
does that leave the whole professional identity
you know how (,) I mean I suppose maybe
these are just things you have to find out as you
go along (,) but errm (,) how will it be possible?
for me to still be as complete a team member as
I am now? (,) but on the other hand (,) not doing
as much work (,) you know (,) haa haa (,) errm::
cos I really hope it will be possible
(3.6)
and yeah (,) long term as well inasmuch as
you know (,) errm (,) I mean I don’t feel
(,) I don’t feel any urges to (,) errm (,) amass a
huge lists of publications, (,) conference presentations
(,) you know I’ve never felt that kind of drive (,) errm
but on the other hand (,) wouldn’t like not to do any
errm (,) or (,) err (,) not sort of (,) not to really feel
that I was continuing to learn in that sense (,) I mean
there is probably another factor that comes into this
(,) I’ve just realised that this is end of Ph.D. time as well
mm
inasmuch as it is what does wh- in that has (,) you know <
for all the time that I’ve been here (,) that has been the main
errm (,) it’s been the main (,) my learning part- aspect (,
and its also been the main career development aspect (,) you
know (,) in that it’s tremendously and useful to have a Ph.D. in
career terms (,
mm
but now that’s alm- says she hopefully I mean well one
never knows ha ha ha haaaaa (,) but now I hope that
that’s kind of nearly done (,) errrm probably there would have
been a question anyway (,) about what was going to
take it’s place or::
mm
whether anything was going to take its place
(4.0)
I don’t know about you but that’s been tremendously helpful
for me (,) haa haa
[ha hahhhhhhh ha
clarified a couple of things (,) is what I’m thinking
shall we (,) are you okay to pause there?
yeah
(0.6)
Nicholas: yeah?

Emma: I mean- yeah (...) I just- yeah

Nicholas: anybody (...) got any Resonances

(2.0)

Nicholas: I have a very straightforward one which is

(...) very clearly I hope nothing to do with you

(...) errm but what a bell that rang very early with me

was errm (...) to do with unemployment and being

unemployed for a while (...) and realising the (...)

the horrific extent to which despite my own avows

(...) what I do for a living had become so important to me

and that not to have a job I felt so diminished (...) and

useless (...) and all those things you read about the

unemployed (...) and what happens to them (...) well that's

JUST how I felt (...) errm (...) and I'd forgotten about that

(...) the way I now

(1.2)

the way I now cheerfully talk about (...) >you know< (...) 10

more years (...) and the serious work that needs to be done

before a person (...) stops having all that professional

identity (...) to lean on (...) it made me think of those

things

(1.4)

Robert: I had a very clear thought (...) nothing to do with this again

with err Emma (...) but some of us are having to log the

number of hours (...) that we work

Harry: haaaaa

Elizabeth: mmm

Robert: and this becomes so nonsensical (...) err to me (...) it's like

standing at the machine (...) and turning the wheel (...) if I'm standing or going out for a walk (...) I might spend

the whole time thinking (...) and it might be my most

productive time (...) but it doesn't come under the rubric

Nicholas: I heard you standing at the machine not standing in the

machine

Robert: eh yeah y- er- that's right (...) ((end of side A of tape))

I spent some time in a Civil Service type of organisation

(...) that meant 24 hours a day (...) >could be called on at

any time< (...) there just weren't any time- (...) there weren't

any hours (...) (2.2)

Robert: and that's the only way that I have of looking at life

(...) the whole thing is all pervading (...) so Emma's problem

becomes that much more acute (...) how do you

make it become more pervading about less

Harry: mmm

Robert: or do you make it less pervading about all

Harry: hehehmm (...) yeah

Robert: ha:::

Emma: hmmm

Harry: yeah (...) the Resonance it wasn't as strong as those

but it was this relationship between work and

enjoyment (...) and it just reminded me that what

I've taken to do (...) now that the children have

a computer which I use (...) for my playing around

with the net (...) but I have discovered that sometime

I have finished work (...) and I've gone down

and I've got the data-bases that we use like BIDS
and this new one ( ) and if I go around on that
and play around with them there ( ) that’s not work
Robert  
HA HA haa haaaa
Harry  
you know that’s having fun
Vince  
mmm
Harry  
and it’s this business ( ) you know ( ) trying to
to draw lines between working and not working
sometime comes down to enjoying yourself
and not enjoying yourself ( ) sometimes not ( )
and if you’re in full time ( ) that doesn’t become
problematic ( ) because ( ) when you come part-time
and if it builds up and up and up ( ) I guess then you’re
in a different situation.

Robert  
= it’s just this hour counting has made me ( ) become
theoretically part-time

Harry  
yeah

Robert  
I mean it- it is
Harry  
YEAH ( ) yeah ( ) it just reminded me how difficult
this whole thing is ( ) chopping things up ( ) it doesn’t
chap ( )

Emma  
no:::
Harry  
ur- ( ) yeah
Emma  
I hope I’m going to remember these RGsoness
because they’ve all made one for me ( ) and I think
I get the chance to talk about=

Nicholas  
mm

Harry  
he HEIH he

Robert  
[HA haa haa
Emma  
[( ) talk about ( ) or I might have to
ask you to say them all again ( ) ha:::

Harry  
“heh”

Nicholas  
we’ll do it on a key word basis

Harry  
he HEIH he he ( ) hhh

Vince  
(0.8)
I think for me with ( ) the interesting thing
is- is something also with young children ( )
is this ( ) is the:: giving to the bgth worlds
and yourselves ( ) and if one of those selves
isn’t very happy ( ) then you can’t ( ) the other
one won’t very well anyway ( )

Elizabeth  
mm

Emma  
Mmmmm
Vince  
and so ( ) getting that balance ( ) right ( ) and even
if it’s a fairly pragmatic and best shot balance ( ) it- you
need to constantly ( ) reassess and think about it ( ) and
it’s almost on an everyday basis that you think well::;
( ) I’ve done all I can do::, ( ) in that ( ) in my professional
self today ( ) and because you’ve reached that feeling of-
of ( ) contentment or fulfillment with that part of yourself
then ( ) your parenting self ( ) can do all the things
with a clear conscience and therefore do them properly
and I’ve found myself a few times ( ) over the last year:
( ) where I’ve been ( ) I- I’m conscious that I haven’t
done every that I’ve needed to have done in the
professional self, ( ) and not enjoyed the time and
been irritable or whatever ( ) and it’s kind of there
all the time ( ) so ( ) the dialogue between those
two selves is a really difficult ( ) but very
important one to keep having ( ) and to try and
reach some kind of balance (.) that you feel happy
with (.) I mean it's really essential (.) but difficult

Harry mmm

Elizabeth I had two: (.) two things struck me (.) at one point
you said (.) you had been quite good at compartmentalising
things (.) and I think yeah "that's really what you need
to be" and I though yeah (.) I must work at that too yeah

Emma .hhhh ha

Harry ha ha ha

Elizabeth [erm (.) and:: I find when I'm here I'm okay (.) but when
I'm working at home (.) I'm either (.) I'm too extreme
(.) on that (.) and it made me explore for myself my
extreme (.) you know< my extremities in that (.)

Harry yeah

Elizabeth and wondering (.) hhhhh (.) hhhhh (.) it's more
difficult to compartmentalise when you're sometimes
at home than it is when you're at work

Emma mmm

Harry mmm

Elizabeth so that was one thing (.) and the other thing that I kept
exploring in my own mind while you were talking was (.)
I was kind of asking myself (.) well okay (.) if I go part-
time too (.) what's the difference?

Elizabeth and thinking (.) that (.) is it? (.) hhhh that you want
to carve ou- that you want to carve- compartmentalise

(0.6)

Elizabeth the::: (.) wor:::k as it now stands into one (.) like take
it (.) say and this is half of it (.) in terms of (.) subject
areas or topics or responsibilities (.) and give someone
else or other- other people those (.) or do some of everything
(.) but only half of everything (.)

Vince mmm

Elizabeth because I was thinking (.) I think mine is will be different
because mine will be like half of everything, (.) instead of
having six months on and six months off (.) the job will
still be the same

Harry [I wish- (.) eh

Elizabeth [I think=

Harry =ha I was thinking that (.) thank God only Emma
will be going through this cos Elizabeth will be working
full-time half the year (.) if you see what I mean?=

Elizabeth yes that's right

Harry "yeah"

Robert quite different=

Emma =yeah

Elizabeth [so I (.)

Emma [different

Elizabeth both Ellie Newcombe and I will be working full-time=

Harry => for half the year<=

Elizabeth =so we'll both do all of it (.) so there's no compartmental=
=well there's there no more- no additional

Elizabeth compartmentalising required

Harry [yes [yes

Elizabeth we'll be either on or we'll be off

Harry >yeah<

Emma mm (.) 'tis different tis different

Harry [verry different ]

Elizabeth [and it's a very ] different pattern isn't it?

Harry yeah
Vince:

Elizabeth:

Harry:

Elizabeth:

[thinking]

Harry:

Elizabeth:

Harry:

Elizabeth:

Harry:

Elizabeth:

Harry:

Elizabeth:

Harry:

Elizabeth:

Harry:

Elizabeth:

Harry:

Elizabeth:

Harry:

Nicholas:

Emma:

Nicholas:

Emma:

Nicholas:

Emma:

Nicholas:

Emma:

Nicholas:

Emma:
Emma: so I think this new social identity (.) will definitely have its advantages (.) but it may have disadvantages as well in terms of being of slightly (.) like you know (.) taken less seriously from a work point of view (.) you know not being such a serious worker if you part-time

Nicholas: mmm

Emma: and then what you ((Harry)) said about work and enjoyment (.) that really made me think of one of my important reasons for (.) being part-time (.) which again (.) one of big hopes (.) is that (.) when I have (.) erm (.) a smaller workload (.) I will again feel free to really enjoy it (.) because before I had Ngah (.) when I could expand into a weekend or whatever (.) no problem (.) if I wanted to (.) then I very much enjoyed my full-time workload (.) since I have had him (.) there’s been times when I haven’t (.) because there’s been times when (.) as I say I don’t sacrifice him (.) that’s not the decision I make (.) but it means I sit here and go jijijiju jijijiju

Harry: mm

Emma: you know I really hope it turns out to be true

Harry: yeah .hh ha

Emma: [hhh ha ha (.) erm, (0.8)

Emma: and then (.) you said about (.) what you said your comment about it being (.) you know (.) you do make it (.) did you say? (.) that less pervades all the time (.) or that all the time pervades less

Harry: [* less* (.) he he

Robert: well- I=

Emma: =yeah

Robert: y- yeah two sides of the same coin

Emma: yeah and erm::=

Robert: =it’s just that with our linear binary Western philosophy way of thinking about things (.) it doesn’t bite on the problem (1.2)

Emma: yrrr (.) well >I mean< it just made me- err that just made me that just made me a bit more of a:: insight into (.) what the nature of the conflict if it is a conflict is: (.) and it’s also to do with what you said earlier about the fact that you know (.) your:: (.) the things that you’re responsible for (.) say >your tutes or whatever< you are responsible for them all the time (.) the fact that you don’t make yourself available to them all the time (.) is one thing (.) but you know they are always there . ha hm*

Robert: =the thing that- that- bothers me or worries about my job is the number of people that I’m supposed to know where they’re at (.) eh?

Emma: yeah (.) yeah

Elizabeth: mm

Robert: and can come and hit me anytime (.) he ha >you know < have I covered my back (.) with all of these people (.) I just hope that I’m lucky

Emma: yeah (.) this is not order but I deliberately want to talk
about Elizabeth’s Resonance last (.) but what you said (.) what
Vince said about >you know< both selves have to be happy
(.) I mean that coincides with what I feel as well and I’ve=
Elizabeth [mmm
=had had your experience that because you don’t feel you’ve
quite done it professionally (.) you’re feeling less (.) you’re
not being able to enjoy your parenting side quite
so much (.) but I definitely have it the other way round
as well (.) that if I feel that I haven’t quite given Noah
what he needs or I’ve had to spend less time with him
or rush out without properly (.) you know I think
I work less effectively (.) than I do on a day when=
Elizabeth [mmm
Emma =I feel that everything’s gone smoothly and well
and that I’ve had time to do what I need to do (.) so
again "I have this" >you know< this hope
that (.) this part-time situation will resolve some of
this,
(1.2)
Emma and then your point about (.) you know how you are
going to do it as opposed to how I’m- (.) proposing
to do it (.) again just- just made me think that it
is really really different (.) and that obviously your-
your (.) solution or your proposed solution isn’t one
that (.) would be any good to me (.) given the reasons
why (.) I’m looking for part-time (.) but it sounded
you know potentially so much clearer and
nicer (.) actually (.) to say okay for six months of the year
are devoted completely to this (.) and for another
six months of the year (.) bye-bye it’s got nothing to
so with me (.) I don’t know if that sounded (.
but I’m probably falling into the old trap
of thinking that another situation is actually
easier (.) but it just sounded very (.) err (.) that sounded
an approach to part-time that avoids a lot of the
difficulties that potentially a- a more conventional
approach to part-time has
Robert I think that’s right (.) I think it’s much easier
to be part-time in Elizabeth’s sense (.) she can’t switch
off 100 % but she could possibly manage 95
(0.6)
Elizabeth w- I can manage 100%
Robert HA HA ha ha ha
Emma [ha ha ha
Harry [he he haa haaa
Nicholas [after the first weekend
Elizabeth after the first hour! (.) I get on that train (.)
voomph (.) yeah
Emma yeah (.) mmm
(2.0)
Nicholas okay
Emma that’s it
Nicholas shall we stop
Emma yeah
Robert yeah
(( end of side B ))
Case 5
GDM 29.02.00
Robert as Speaker: Making sense: aspects of lexis
Vince: those mini disks are GREAT. You can just press a button and it wipes it clean.

Harry: >the whole lot gone<

Vince: mmm

Harry: [yeah] it is good isn’t it and you can cut it into chunks — cut it into whatever chunks you want can’t you?

Vince: yeah

(8.5)

Nicholas: Did you put the date on Vince?

Vince: yes

Nicholas: are we rolling?

Vince: =we’re rolling ( )

Harry: oh REALY

Robert: press the start button then

Nicholas: then Robert

(2.4)

Robert: err my first thought in anticipation of this is what I see as an enormous and unusual privilege of being able to speak for so long without feeling any need to persuade. (2.2)

and at the same time, conjointly with that, without the expectation of being persuaded it is a ((noise of computer)) freedom from a constraint which I hadn’t really thought about until this moment and so I approach it with a degree of awe and reverence and err appreciation (1.2) what I was — want to talk about, I have been thinking about ever since I was in the sixth form in school, I have CALLED it something DIFFERENT just about every YEAR but in fact on reflection it is the same and >when I came here< it just happens to overlap with lexical studies.

Robert: erm I haven’t made any notes (1.4) so that the incoherence becomes part of the picture. (1.2) I thought that was preferable it would have given a wrong impression a to have had notes but it is a LITTLE bit like a 3000 piece jigsaw puzzle and I’ve only got time for 100 PIECES so reflecting back might be a little bit more difficult because you might not enough to see enough to infer what the rest of the picture is I call it search for making sense which is a life-long effort of err making sense and I have a SENSE of how this is done ( ) which of course has developed over the years

Nicholas: mmm

Robert: all I can attempt to do is to show what it looks like right now ( ) but err- by way of introduction ( ) I was looking at a programme: an open university programme on art appreciation and the subject was a painting called springtime by Jackson Pollock ( ) I don’t know if you know this but it’s made up by splashing things on y-y it looks like a bit of junk just like splashing randomly right? and the man >it was a brilliant programme says this probably appears nonsense to you he says, because formlessness equals nonsens- meaninglessness? if it’s formless it’s meaningless what we’ve got to do is look for the form and then you may — if you see the form you’ll see the meaning, ( ) and low and
Nicholas: beholds at the end of that hour now it was brilliant (ha ha)

Robert: photograph (.) of a real painting y-you y- but if you come
to it straight it's nonsense (not going to have that on my wall)
it's a bit like that (.) if you don't see the form you don't see
the meaning (.) (clears throat)

Nicholas: can I? try and- (.) errrm (.) making sense and how one does
is your basic theme which is one "that's been with you
for a long time" (.) errrm you said (.) coincidentally that it
overlaps with lexical studies (.) errrm and maybe that's
something you're going to come back to: (.) I don't know

Robert: yes

Nicholas: that's the feeling that I had and er-

Robert: yes (.) I think inevitably so (.) because the two are so
intertwined (.) one only really goes into a subject
like that >as I went into lexical studies< not because
>it's an interesting academic subject< but because you have
a personal bond.

Nicholas: and the implication that you're now making explicit
is that:: (.) you're not- it's not a coincidence the lexical
stud- your interest in lexical studies and the kind of
interest in you have in lexical studies is another
manifestation of what you've said (.) it's this lifelong
interest in making meaning

Robert: thank you and that makes ha ha haa you are seeing
more pictures than I though I >was putting< that's
qu- entirely right "entirely right"

Nicholas: and you've just given us this parallel with this painting
and the point of that was that:: if you don't see
the form of someone's expression you probably won't
understand what they mean (.) and so there's this need
sometimes for people to be able to explain the form
of (.) of=

Robert: =not=

Nicholas: =so that you can understand its meaning.

Robert: it's not necessarily only the form of what somebody
says (.) there are many other things (.) err that are there and
you see them with them with different eyes (.) you
perceive the form (.) you perceive a- a meaning
(1.2)

Robert: errrm the cruelest way that I think people make sense is:: in the
superverdinate, (.) subordinate, (.) hyperverdinate, (.) in other words
if you can say it is one of those then I have explained
right? (.) if I can further give it a technical name
then I have explained it even better (.) errrm like if you look
in the dictionary it says that a Babab is a west African
tree, (.) adansonia digitata (.) family bombiakiy (.) I have
made sense (.) I have explained and the dictionary calls this
a meaning (.) that is a meaning! (.) now I have to say to
myself THAT's a MEANING?!

Robert: (1.4)

Robert: the next ((clears throat)) stage (.) err in making sense
beyond that is hhh the mutually defining set (.) of terms
(.) which constitutes a network (.) you define this
term A (.) in terms of B and C (.) then you dot- define
B in terms of D and E. (.) you define C in terms of >those<
but in the meantime F has to define itself in terms of A and C (.)
G has to define and so and so like that (.) for each
term there you will probably get three terms
used to define it which are themselves defined later on
the are a whole junk of other words that don’t get
defined and in the end if you pursue a topic ()
Physics, or () Chemistry or whatever the subject is
you will eventually stop () except in as much as
the subject is growing () and you keep adding on to
it but at a particular moment in time () you have this
network of elements that are latticed because
each one is bonded to all those - > you get a feeling
of stability <, the thing won’t crumble () and it’s not like
the house of cards where you put them on top of the last one
() and the stability is () in
the lattice work () and this is something which is
demonstrated () you can in fact do a lexical study on this

Nicholas

Robert

it’s a (0.8) NOW (clears throat) so=

Vince

= can I just check something there () you used two
metaphors earlier ONE was the jigsaw () and you said
that there might be a difficulty in that we - in that
maybe in this session () there’d only have a hundred pieces of
the many MORE available to us () as Understanders ()
and there’s a Jackson Pollock painting where: it seems
to be a lot of disparate things but in that case we see
all of them it’s just that we can’t make sense of them
and is there? () which - which of those metaphors
or both of them are defined by the lattice work which is
becomes like a frame () by which we see () any one of those
which ties in any one of those available bits

Robert

I have put down say two pieces of jigsaw so far () and::
my lattice is when I can put down *enough of these
() if we go back to
the Jackson Pollock thing (1.2) the thing that I
was forced to understand was that what Pollock did, he
put down this long thin canvas and took the paintbrush
and went splash splash splash! () right? () he THEN took
another paintbrush and went splash splash splash in a different
way () so you get two different layers right? () which you could
clearly distinguish () he then took his oil paint tubes and went
and filled in some of the interstices () right? and he THEN
took another little colour and made little marks () right?
as soon as I could see those (0.8) and the way he had gone
about () doing them () err I began to see the thing in three
dimensions () with his intention behind it () and suddenly
I could see Springtime () where there were no Springtime
() before () it - there was a random element but in each
random element there was a design () that I > couldn’t have
seen for myself < () and it was just obvious () it was just
common sense now () now I can see it (coughs) "now"
as far as what I am doing now () "is concerned" () I am doing
the layers () one layer after the other () they’ll be more
layers than that () right? () so it’s a bit like that ()
it’s only the form () when you see the progression from
the superordinate and you put in the class () right then
you’ve explained its meaning () and for a long time
that was meaning () that was the main kind of meaning
that there was around () but when we come into the
scientific age () meaning you need more than that () it
becomes more than that () it becomes three dimensiona
in other words (,) it becomes a lattice (,) and what
177 I’m doing is moving through further stages beyond that
178 yeah? (,) and it is these stages and types of making sense that
179 make sense (,) you can’t make sense until you make sense
180 of all the making sense (,) and these are the things that
181 I’m trying to run through (,) and these are the pieces of
182 jigsaw.<
183 Vince mmmm
184 Robert does that (,) make sense?
185 Vince and the first two layers were that relation and the network
186 relation
187 Robert that’s right and NOW if I’m asked to make sense of
188 molecule (,) I make sense of it by linking it
189 to the next area (,) I don’t do the whole lattice (,) ahh?
190 but I make you happy (,) ahh? (,) I answer your question!
191 by saying >this this this and this yeah?< I give you a
192 little bit of the lattice (,) instead of giving you a flat
193 thing (,) a top and a bottom (,) an up and a dawn ()
194 I give you a round (,) another dimension yeah?
195 Nicholas mmmm
196 Robert now this is a much better, much more satisfying
197 explanation yeah (,) and this is what they use in
198 Star Trek which is one my favourite programmes.
199 I listen to it with fascination, (,) because everything
200 they do is built into these partial networks (,) yeah? (,) you
201 have no idea what the rest of it is but they
202 knit a few terms together in such a way and
203 with such confidence that you give them the
204 trust (,) the benefit that they know what
205 the other bits are (,) and all they have to do
206 is to put a few links in the chain and it is
207 114 convincing (,) now I reckon that a lot of
208 science that we read is of that nature (,) you
209 do it with conviction (,) you assemble a
210 partial lattice (,) and you give them the benefit
211 of the doubt that they know what that lattice
212 is joined up to (,) now I know that lattices are
213 ultimately never joined to anywhere (,) that is they terminate
214 they run out (,) they HAVE to because we’ve run out of
215 words (,) we can extend them indefinitely (,) yes (,) as
216 Goethe and others have said (,) but it’s still a closed-
217 vicious circle “a closed circle” NOW (,) there’s another
218 thing that came in (,) and in the first model (,)
219 the flat model (,) you could count (0.6) in the second
220 model (,) that what typifies it is that you have
221 to measure (,) and all of these things in the lattice have
222 either intrinsic measurements of themselves or
223 measurements of their relationships (0.4) and the more
224 we go on exploring the world (,) and the
225 engineers make their more progress (,) the more we find
226 to measure (,) we have so many units of
227 measurement ending in meter: "m":m
228 altimeter:;:, and bathometer:;,, and calometer:;:
229 and the:; then and so forth (,) ( )
230 generate all these things (clears throat) and
231 using what we call Mathematics (,) we find so
232 many:; patterns in Mathematics, the (Fibonacci) series:;,
233 the somebody else’s series, the cubes and the squares
AND then we measure not only ( ) m-h -how the differences
but we measure how they change, we measure rates of
change, ( ) we measure rates of rates of change and we
find more and more patterns like this ( ) aGAIN there's
a never ENDing thing ( ) cos it's always finite like
the universe ( ) it's an expanding thing but it's *finite
like the universe* (0.6) now (0.8) err into this comes
a further frame we exTEND this ( ) our making sense
we extend our vision ( ) by what is called A_logic and B
the language of Mathematics (0.4) now the metafor
I use for this ( ) is that of the Kaleidoscope (0.4) what
happens in this kind of logic is that you put in your
elements, you formula ( ) your bits of glass ( ) and you
give it a shake and you see something different ( )
but you don’t see anythin_g NEW ( ) all - you CANnot
extract anything new that isn’t already - if you
havn’t pu - already put in there (0.4) but you see
new things ( ) you collect terms, you divide, and you - er-
subtract and you::: err differentiate. ( )
"and so forth" yeah? ( ) and you - you move
out - and you there are things
>that are new for you< ( ) >I didn't know THAT?<!
and sometimes ( ) when you find - that you say
"we’ll" maybe it was reality in life and in the world'
that we can measure ( ) that is like that ( ) sometimes
you find these relationships with nothing to
relate them to ( ) sometimes you find things that have
a relationship but you’ve got no Mathematics for
it ( ) SO ( ) hhhh you ( ) havn’t ( ) got ( ) anywhere
except that you have expanded ( ) what you have already
what you started with ( ) it grows ( ) in other words
but it doesn’t move ( ) there are areas where it doesn’t go
ahh? ( ) because it’s not in the p- err- lattice ( ) and the
Mathematics of logic as I see it ( ) which
doesn’t have to be true but it’s the SEE it which is
the other thing that counts for ME (*
( ) IS (0.6) THAT >language of
( ) which I have studied< yeah >on
doing- on ‘x’ing- you get d y< ( ) and and so forth
( ) if you put these two terms together you get
this ( ) that is without stopping (*
NOW ( ) err and it is only valid in as much
as measurement is possible ( ) however it
is quite clear that we want to make sense of
of more that that which is measureable
(0.8) and::: that scientists talk about VALues ( )
in that sense ( ) but we also talk about
VALues in another sense ( ) err and we talk about
these other things that you cannot measure ( ) there
is no::: ( ) metric associated with these ( ) now the ones
that we’ve been using in this group are ( ) TRUST, ( )
Openness, ( ) honesty, frankness, appreciation, ( ) e:rm
EQUality ( ) evaluation, togetherness ( ) and all of these
words ( ) you-you they don’t fit into this lattice work
at all (0.6) but in some sense ( ) they’re the ones
we attach greater value to ( ) to use the word "in
another sense" ( ) one of the interesting things
that I find happening ( ) is the trick of people attempting
to make NON sense (.) where they in fact blur the edges
(.) and use these as if it were there (.)
Nicholas sq () y- you’ve made a (0.6) >> if I can use that awful
expression< (.) a sort of paradigm shift
at this point of the telling yeah? (.) we’ve talked
about the two dimension, the three dimension and the
extending lattice which is finite (.) as the universe is
(0.4) extensive but finite
Robert [mmmm "yes"
Nicholas and errmm (.) you went on from that to
168 ah no I lost one (.)
Robert hmph HA ha ha
Nicholas anybody help me?
Elizabeth kaleidoscope
Nicholas the kaleidoscope (.) thank you yes and the
ways in which you can take known pieces
and rearrange them
Robert yes
Nicholas to help you see more(.) than you’ve seen before
and now you’re making this paradigm shift
from (.) in rough terms the countable to the
indefinite (.) or the
Robert that’ll do=
Elizabeth =and what you said about the Kaleidoscope
was that there’s nothing actually new
but that you see it in different ways
Robert yes
Elizabeth and that’s a parallel we’re making (.)
> is that right?<
Robert that's RIGHT yes (0.4) there is- there is
no addition to the sum of the knowledge
which the system contains (.) there is only
an addition to the knowledge that we perceive
in the system (.) which is a different thing (.)
ALL together (.) it is just look I'm g- there- there
is an infinite number of ways of looking at the
same thing (.) right? (.) they may not all be very useful
but they- ((Cough)) they cannot extend beyond err beyond
themselves (.) but out into the realm of where
these non-measurables are (.) and for ME the
non-measurables are more valuable. (0.4) they
MATTER (.) whereas the other things are things
that I operate with yeah? (.) o-operate the systems
(0.4) but they don’t affect my values directly
because I can’t measure them (.) the kind of
confUSION that err is perpetrated by >> I think << normally
maliciously (0.4) is the kind of thing you get in
headlines (.) I saw the other day (.) GOvernment IN
CHAos (.) as NHS costs SOAR (.) right? (.) now this is
a mix of the two kinds (.) costs you can point
(.) demonstrably to the costs are more (.) here’s the
book of accounts (.) this is scientific yes? (.) the costs
were there (.) the costs are now * this here* (.) now< (.)
> and they have risen< (.) that would belong to my
previous paradigm but err CHAos and SOARing are - do
n- do not have a place >> for me < (.) errrr (.) in that-
in that - paradigm (.) they are what I would call value
terms (.) soaring and chaos are two value terms (.)
when is it chaos ((clears throat)) (1.4) our value
system errn doesn’t say () arrhh when is it soaring
our value system doesn’t say () it’s it’s open to
something else right? () so () how do we make sense
in this new () we have in fact mentioned this
in an earlier meeting () it is again () the mutual
definition () it is a different kind of mutual
definition which I will illustrate by yet another
metaphor () one has to use these because we
don’t have the language () when in school
children are given three:: disks of coloured glass
through which they shine a light () and the red
one gives a red light, () the blue one gives a blue
light, and the green one gives a green light ()
If the two of those lights are meant () are made
to overlap () you see a completely different colour
right, it is not one of those two colours at all
if the other one is brought in (), where all
three overlap provided the intensities are right
you get white light () right? () completely
what we perceive as a completely new colour (0.8)
now () in the world of values we’re not limited to
tree () three is for me a minimal number () for
dealing with these (((clears throat))) if you say ()
what do you understand by chaos () I say well
it’s partly people not knowing what to do::: it’s
partly something else () and it’s partly something
else (0.4) “OH” you say < it’s people > not knowing
what do is chaos < no > no it’s not < that’s red
light yeah eahh? “’O:::Hi” you mean it’s people err
facing problem > in the next election < () > no no <
that’s blue light *yeah?* but when you put the two
together and you have an exclusion area and an
inclusion area of overlap () then you are getting closer
to making sense () once you’ve got the other one, it is kind
of triangulation () in other words it is not a definition
in the first sense () not a definition in the lattice sense
it is a definition in a third paradigm () > in other words<
but the third paradigm is not the end of the road either ()
because with the third paradigm all your doing is how to:
shed more light on a notion () not what you do with it
*or anything like that*

Harry can I just check I’ve understood you there Robert? () we’ve
obviously moved to another dimension > in a sense < with
this and to a Value dimension () and if I’ve understood
you correctly () what you’re saying is that, that err
() the nearest we can get to understanding there () to
meaning there > if you like < is by taking different
positions as it were () different representations () and
putting them together and in the putting them together
we get a perspective that enables us to understand the
general position < () that’s
(Robert nods)

Harry thanks
Robert yeah no no that’s err that’s comforting () that’s =
Elizabeth = that sometimes we get altogether different
pictures () from that which he hadn’t expected
Harry [yes
(1.2)
Robert: that is the next (...) phase in the paradigm (...) and that
is where does our knowledge of these terms come
from in the first place (...) before I can say it's like
that (...) it's like that (...) it's where those things
overlap<(...)erm I have to: be- have some assurance
that these three things that I'm using (...) the three
lights that I'm shining to get this overlap light ()
are in fact similar to perceive. (1,2) and that is
where we start to lose ah::: any kind of degree of
certainty (...) we enter into the realm of the less
and less certain (...) and that is where I start to
introduce my friend Shank (...) WHERE do these
meanings (...) the sense behind these words come
from? (0.8) I just relate an- anecdotally something
that's been happening in my lexical classes here
(...) that is where this overlap comes in (...) and
you know that I preach the word of the gospel
of the word HAPPy is a kindergarten formation
(...) it gets so in there* (...) and the more I look
at words with these people the more it appears
that these words (...) a large number of words
all come in the same way (...) from the nursery
and a lot of words they can't possibly (...) and the
meanings and values we give come in at this
earl- (...) are very very DEEP in spite of the fact
we don't use them like that (0.6) if anybody
puts the word to us and says to us what does this
mean (...) you think you- you go back (...) to there
now this is not a very sensible way of making
sense (...) it's not sensible in my first flat
paradigm (...) it's not sensible like in the
second the lattice (...) those are sensible
(...) ways (...) those are secure and sure and are either
right or wrong (...) and you can show it and you
can measure it (...) you can demonstrate it and you
can prove it (...) when we move into the third
paradigm (...) we only get areas of somewhat greater
approximation (...) more or less (...) so the idea is
when I say well er er in- this thing I'm trying
to describe A::: it's happy, B it's dignifie::d, C it's
something else (...) right? (...) and of course there's a
non-finite number of mixes I can make like that
but also non-finite mixes that you make, () individually
(...) right? which are gonna be different SO () we have to
live with this degree of not making sense (...) it is
approximation sufficient unto the day (...) now according
to the Schank philosophy () or even more the chap
who writes the introduction to the book () I think
his name is Molsen () he's actually better for me ()
he makes sense of Schank for me () cos Schank
is so anecdotal and fairly lightweight () ermm but the
idea is that all our making sense () and all our
knowledge () understanding intellect and so forth
IS based on experiences that he calls stories () stories
as we know them are simply a type of story for Schank
() ermm (clears throat)) but (0.4) he points out that
we don't carry stories verbatim (0.6) the metaphor I
use here is for marsh get smash () Schank calls it a gist
we store gists and we pour the water of circumstance
on this and it blossoms out and it takes the form
of the story in a form which you can now tgl (0.4) NOT
IMMEDiately because the VERbal stage is later (.) which
explains why:: when we tell a story twice we don’t use the
same words because we store it as a gist (.) which expands
in -> and then we get all the associations with it swells out<
and then we go into the colour of the language (.) very
often we get the same words >YES because we don’t have
much choice< (.) but >by and large< we’re all in
er in fact it is indeterminate exactly how it is going
to come out and he is (.
) in conversation what we’re doing
is telling stories in Schanks terms (.) and that when
I tell a story (.) as I was coming to the office today
som-you:: (.) it triggers in you the GISTS that have
a structural resemblance to my - to my story (.) it
may not be apparent to me at all how I think completely
off the wire huh? (.) but in fact this is what he calls
indexing (.) now (.) and they lived happily every after
and the - the frog turned into a Prince and the beautiful
ugly (.) these are Carlos is now looking at how many
of the words can define a fairy tale (.) that are like that
and the circumstances pin down the meaning of things
like ugly and wicked and sad “and-an-an-an that kind of thing
(.) and the more I look I just supRISE myself the extent to
which this is (.) is true (.) that the meanings of these
words I formed in my very early stages (.) that is “they’re
not the meanings >the dictionary will have for the
meanings<< (0.6) the meanings for me NOW (.) if this
is the case (.) I mean I seek to present any kind of value
(.) the only way I have of accessing you is through
your stories (.) not as I used to think a few weeks ago
ha ha in terms of intertextuality (0.4) because
intertextuality I skipped through here but it is
in fact another paradigm but it doesn’t get me anywhere
because intertextuality is simply the stage of
re-expansion of my gists (.) you bring alive my gists
it swells into a desire to say something (.) it then
GBalises itself (.) and that’s where the interGtxt comes
in (.) it is a later phase but I am a non-Gverbal (.) we
are non-verbal creatures at that level (0.4) it’s only
when we need to communicate (.) when we interact
that it springs the language alive (.) but the stories (.)
we consist of the stories our conscious mind (.) we are-we
have and we are the stories (.) and we carry them round
as little gists however (.) we constantly reindex them (.) they
are not static (.) and our memories are not as things happened
and my memory of last year is not my memory of this year
(.) or any particular point “in the past” (.) it is re-indexed
so when I read Hamlet for the tenth time (.) it is re-indexed
by me as I have been re-indexed
Harry
>sorry can I just check something here< (.) I wanted to check
that I’ve actually understood the shift that’s taken place
(.) >and maybe I haven’t< (.) errm you were talking the last time
I asked you (.) talking about positions if you like and err
finding ermm something which is found >if you like< by
bringing these together (.) and then (.) if I’ve understood you (.)
you've now moved from that >if you like< abstract
conceptualisation to the individualisation of meaning
and if I've understood you what you ( ) what you've
just suggested is that we have all that ( ) all that you
gave us earlier ( ) but on top of that we have to consider
that there are individuals who are making meanings and
as individuals they bring through this re-indexing, through
their own storyings, they bring that dimension to what
is already a complex of dimensions
Robert that does very well ( ) I like the words story I like=
[ ]
Harry okay thanks
Robert =the word story exc- that's err ( ) that's great=
Nicholas =AND (0.6) and you wanted to make a distinction
between that ( ) and the mo:re lit:erally
intertextual links ( ) that one can establish and point to
say I understand this here now because of that there
then
Robert yes yes
Nicholas it- its ( ) you're shifting the emphasis from the actual
language of the links to the p:ooling of the links
Robert yes and- and to ( ) my experiences ( ) right? > now whether
they are conscious or not< I mean >very little of it is
conscious< ( ) these things are happening and we are
what we are ( ) it's all going on ( )
>seen a programme about the sun what's
happening in the sun< ( ) fantastc enormous all
these layers ( ) a bit like that too
Robert constantly a cauldron eh? constantly being
a process of indexng and err re: where we get
our stability from? ( ) I don't know but yes
absolutely ( ) erm and (0.8) the problem that I had is making sense of the whole thing and
distinguishing the parts you know because in
the world today ( ) as you walk down the street
( ) its all convoluted and somebody who
is elgver than I am is pulling my strings ( )
(0.6) this is what I see as the danger yeah? ( ) in ways
that I can't perceive ( ) there are lots of people
who’ve been there before me ( ) elgver people
who know exactly what's going on ( ) and help
to manipulate it ( ) to what extent am I being
manipulated and how bgdly am I being
manipul- >i am being manipulated I know that<
but how bgdly ( (Clears throat)) and so I need
in order to find any kind of answers to that ( ) I need
to ( ) I feel ( ) sort out these different kinds ( ) these
different paradigms ( ) by which these things happen
and how people get at me and err get under the skin
( ) and lead me places that a: part of me might not
want to go ( (finger click?))
Nicholas and that manipulation you were talking about
Robert "yes"
Nicholas which are being accessed by constantly by ( ) other
sources ( ) yeah?
Robert that's ( ) nice ( ) yes I think I would go along with that e
ha that's very comforting actually t-haaaaa to have a mesh
in the- in the discussion and ( ) maybe I could just finish
errr ( ) one of the problems (0.4) well one more obvious
things is the role of story story ( ) what we normally
call story ( ) i:n- in our development (1.4) most-a LOT of
>because I don't know< a lot of the experiences that form us
we only have vicariously ( ) the unicorns ( ) the faires
right? ( ) we have experience of these ( ) they're part of my
story ( ) they're part of me ( ) they're part of make up ( )
unicorns provide a very positive feeling I don't know
full of symbolism (0.4) but who cares about the symbolism
it's the my symbolism that is good or bad right or wrong
you know ( )
we shape people through vicarious experiences that can't
have ( ) now when we do Red Riding Hood or the little
Flower girl or whatever it is ( ) and the child recognises
that they've heard that story before ( ) right? not because
they can repeat it verbatim ( ) they might be able to
re-inFLATE the story ( ) yeah? ( ) and get it approximately
( ) whatever they're indexing to right? (0.4) now (0.4) this
stories of course have always been one of the ways in which
you shape society ( ) all the traditional societies that I've
come across ( ) are big story tellers and the stories reflect
real situations for them=>they become real situations<
which reflect the values of society (0.6) you don't understand
truth and honesty as words ( ) you understand truth and
honesty as stories (0.4) and err the great way in which this
happens of course is in the worlds' religions ( ) I remember
my Granddaughter coming back after Diwali ( ) and saying
we learnt all about Diwali today< ( ) errrm 'yes tell me about
Diwali' =>'well you see< there is this princess and she was
captured by this mgn and he walked across this rainbow
bridge and everybody was scared and when this hero the
prince came along he crossed the bridge and he rescued the
princess' ( ) that's Diwali! HA ff- ha ha ha HA NOW ha ha
I reckon religion in schools is just like that ( ) stories
indexed by a totally other world from the one that
generated the stories in the first place ( ) and it is in the
indexing that counts ( ) all we're left with is the naked
words in that ( ) sense ( ) yeah? (1.2) =>so< this
is how things happen ( ) the truth is only a truth in as
much as it is indexed ( ) and the indexing is different from
one to the other or the same to the extent that we share
( ) now I am finished now and I am reasonably happy
to live with that ( ) because I- less uncertainty I cannot
hope for ( ) at least as far as I have got ( ) it is simply a case
of being able when somebody is trying to make sense to
ms whether maliciously or benignly ( ) to be able to
recognise a little bit of what's going on and to sort
these things out and put them on the different planes

beCAUSE I can distinguish four or five different paradigms
and categories of of-of making sense there ( ) but they
are not MISSable ( ) in other words* if you use ONE
the rules are the other ( ) that is deception ( ) but it can
also be self deception and maybe what I'm most concerned
about is self deception ( ) rather than other's deceiving ms
because I am my only worst enmy HENCE ( ) the why
I attach value to you ( ) I need to do this today without notes
because as I say the notes might create an illusion a clarity
whereas when I speak like this warts and all () the
confusion reflects the confusion "that is in my mind" () but
I'm not unhappy about that () we have to have it () we
have to wrestle with it () and we have to () to continue
(2.2)
Nicholas mmm
Nicholas khhhh (1.8) there was a perhaps trivial Resonance I had early
on () err wh- you were talking about Jackson Pollock
Robert ah yeah=
Nicholas =and and I've recently had a perhaps similar
() experience with Mondrian (1.2) erm () if pushed
I could probably have said "YES" wasn't he the one
who did the nua- the blocks of colour the yellow
and the blues'
Robert [ yeah yeah yeah
Nicholas [ and the reds=
Harry =bet it was early Mondrian cos the la- >SORRY<
Robert & Nicholas HA ha ha ha ha
Harry *but I bet it was*
Nicholas mmmm () and () by simply by reading a little
bit about () yes certainly the early Mondrian came
into this
Harry yeah yeah
Nicholas and the () and what the blocks were meant to
represent according to the rules and reading a
little more the fact that there was a Very Very
() severe philosophical set of philosophical
doctrines () behind what these blocks represented
and how they were to be arranged and () and how
the artists seeks for the symbolic meaning
an- an - an erm >non of which I knew anything about< ()
and so when you talked about >having to understand
something about the form in order to get any of the
meaning< I had a very strong Resonance
Robert yeah
Nicholas with THAT () in part perhaps because the examples were
so close () and what that brought with it was this
strong feeling of ups and downs that I had because
I was quite elated to know this () embarrassing as it
is to reveal this () >particularly in front of Harry<
who has clearly known so much more for so long=
Harry ="na I haven't"=
Nicholas ha ha ha
Harry "just like" ART he ha ha ha
Nicholas cermmm and at the sa- and shortly there after had a
() deep sort of tough of oh that's only one little
thing Nicholas you surrounded all these things
of which you wot naught at all >you know< nor
ever will () and so I had this big emotional up
and down about this little discovery in the face of
this
Harry mmm
Nicholas overwhelming ignorance in which I proceed ()
and then the lit- a bit of an up again because
well >fr- hang o< that is one=
Harry yeah!
Nicholas you know and something so that's that hit
me very early

Harry yes that's helped me and if I can come on the back of that
cos I had a Resonance towards the end Resonance towards the
downdown (and it's only you mentioning that's actually put it
into something-> happened at the weekend< which is also
part of the >Resonance< the RESonance is the story that I've
told many a time but I'll tell it again () when Ella was ()
less that three I think () she was two and a bit () I mean she'd
got to the talking stage and there were loads of Disney
videos and a few Shakespeares 'at the bottom of the telly'
and we had a visitor and the visitor said to Ella what's your
favourite video he said she said 'dider de did:rd (.) dider de did:'
eventually I had to translate it was Richard the Third

Nicholas +1 ha ha ha HHH HA

Harry and the interesting thing was that the visitor really
couldn't connect and I had to get in on this because the
visitor () double checked, () treble checked, () got the video out
yeah dider de did:rd (.) and it was her favourite video and
it's the one that they both watched most (.) and of course the visitor
(.) this is where your indexing comes in (.) was indexing
it as a Shakespeare play with layers of
meaning about Richard the Third

Robert ahh that's that's

Harry but for Ella there was a VERY VERY simple story
about a wicked king that got his comeuppance
and it was the ol- it was the Richard the third
whatishisname with er Olivier with the shadows
and the spider and she would watch WIDE E;YED
they both w- the whole thing! cos they knew what was
going to happen and they wanted it to happen ()
and for her indexing for her was just what you said
but the interesting thing was the indexing
for the visitor was very different and that was
where the miscommunication came (.) and it
wasn't until I (.) I was able "to get in" cos I'd seen
and heard about 'dird a wicked' you know whatever
I knew it (.) and the follow up is that we went down
to err err London at the weekend (.) went to National
Gallery for an exhibition there (.) BUT I always go round
to some sort of pictures with them and I TALK about
them or they pick a picture and I talk about it and Ella said
something to me this weekend which I HADn't connected
until you picked it up saying (.) hhhhh how she loves
looking at pictures and learning more about them
and what's interesting to HER is that each time we look
at the same picture she learns a bit more and when you
learn more about pictures you can enjoy them MORE,
because you KNOW more (.) and it's just struck me
how big a gap there is between the unconscious connection
with the story of the first example (.) and the much more
conscious awareness of - I am getting to know more
therefore I'm enjoying more (.) in terms of indexing
and conscious indexing and its ( ) that sparks=

= so I've got two Resonances there

Robert mm mm mmm

Vince hhh mine's (.) mine's how (.) I think how my indexing
system has changed over the years (,) cos a couple of
days ago I was reading a book of poetry by John
Cooper-Clarke who was the ultimate punk poet ()
in- in the late 70's >sort of< 80's (,) and it really strueck me
how (,) the pieces that I really liked in 1980 (,) are not the
pieces that I like now (,) and that the language (,) the
ones that were really sort of (,) that had a lot of BILE
about Thatcher and about (,) about the state of things
in the country an (,) they were the ones that >at the time<
that meant something to me (,) and the ones that I'd not
noticed (,) were the ones that I liked more NOW
and I think it's because my indexing system has changed
so much in that (,) in that GOD twenty years

Nicholas    Ha ha ha ha ha ha
Vince      [yeah

Elizabeth  that my response was completely different
(2.2)

Elizabeth  I had two totally different tiny tiny flashes (,) one was
Donald and I went to a craft fajir (,) before Christmas
and we saw someone selling little tables that they'd made
hmm on the tops of the tables (,) everyone was different (,)
and there were some that were kind of stripey, and some
that were splodgy, (,) there were some that were (,) hh different
shapes and hh hh >you know< it was all kind of (,) they
were all totally different (,) and there were one or two that
we liked really very much (,) but he wouldn't sell them to us
he said NO you have to come and see me in Appleby (,) crm
because I want you to see how I do them (,) then I can
do some (,) specially for you (1.2) and when
we actually went to see how he did them
(,) he builds them up in depth and depth (0.6)
and now those table tops are not flat
anymore (,) you can actually think if I put my drink on
here it'll fall over (,) because you can actually see the
depth going down "on them" (,)

Robert    hum

Elizabeth  and he gave some for us to borrow while he was making ours
and its interesting because (,) people just put their drinks down
and when you start talking about how you've made them
they go ((demonstrates 'saving' a potentially falling cup of
tea)) like this

Harry     ha ha ha HA ha: ha

Robert    [ ]

Elizabeth  and you- totally stupid Resonance (,) but it
is obviously=

Harry     [ yeah that's lovely

Elizabeth  =quite interesting=

Harry     [ yeah lovely

Elizabeth  =the power OF=

Nicholas  =mmm

Robert    [sure

Harry     [ yeah

Elizabeth  understanding something

Nicholas  mmmm

Harry     [ yeah

Elizabeth  and the second thoughts that you have as a result of it

Harry     yeah (,) yeah (,) inc=

Elizabeth  =and people actually do this afterwards
Harry **ha ha ha ha**

Elizabeth to see if it’s flat (.) and of course it IS flat

Harry yeah

Nicholas mm

Elizabeth so that was just something
totally er v- but that ability of perception
and understanding.

(2.8)

Elizabeth hhhh now in the other little thing was that I
580 can ( .) I still remember ( .) err occasionally
reactions when I hear a word used in a different
way and then realising,
((side of tape ends))

Elizabeth and you kind of go back and you restructure
everything and you kind of go back and think well
was it THAT, or was it THAT?

(2.2)

Nicholas err=

Elizabeth = and what kids mean by the word happy

Robert hhhh ha

Elizabeth when they sing the sky is blue today ( .) the sky
is blue today ( .) happy happy we shall be

Harry [HA ha ha

Elizabeth a bit of data I was transcribing yesterday:

Robert Ribility

Elizabeth what do they think about that? ( .) in terms of
your happy

Robert this is great ( .) I found what err Harry and Vinc
could have said ( .) err greatly reinforcing ( .) because it
fits in ( .) entirely with my present perspective which
is always very good ( .) and err what Nicholas and
Elizabeth had to say ( .) reinforces it but in a different
sense ( .) reinforcing in the awareness of what one
can’t see ( .) and how much there is to see

( .) and how you look ( .) err do I need somebody

there beside me to explain how this surface is
built up? ( .) or how that Pollock picture
is built up? ((clears throat)) I’m not su- a lot
art programmes ( .) errm the um (0.5) the
Open University: err six o’clock on Saturday
morning for example ( .) I find absolutely
brilliant ( .) and it is precisely what you were
saying about the painting that you were looking
at had somebody unfold and say what you’re
looking at is this ( .) I’ve watched a lot of these

Nicholas mmm

Robert AND ( .) I just hadn’t a CLUE::!: that this was what was
going on ( .) I hadn’t got a clue that a painting
of the Prince of so and so Hanover wherever
on his horse ( .) was in fact quite distrgted

Harry mmm

Robert so that you look up to him=

Harry =you have to look up to him

Robert yes ( .)

Harry absolutely yeah=

Robert =yeah

Harry yes that’s err the Van Dyke of Charles the first
"on his horse"

(0.6)
Robert and as you just need somebody (,) I mean I just can’t work it out for myself all the time (,) sometimes I can (,) I can work things out (,) but erm not systematically like that and: (,) so it is great that we live in an age where have access (,) real access to this (,) you still gotta be able < to trust the guy who’s doing the unfolding (,) but I haven’t been finding difficulty (,) with that because then I can do a Jackson Pollock (,) hhh I could see: this thing (,) it was now in four dimensions (,) there were four layers (,) which stood off the page (,) like that but yes that is for me erm reinforcing and looking ahead (0.6) thank you for that.

Nicholas erm

(2.2)

Nicholas can I just th-t, (4.2) I was just getting resonances there between the things that Robert and Elizabeth were saying (,) err I might have lost it by now (,) that the idea that (3.8) Elizabeth’s (0.8) craftsmen artist (1.4) insisting on >as I understood the story < distinguishing between himself (,) and someone in the retail trade

Elizabeth MMmm

Nicholas as saying you know you can’t HAVE this until you know what it is

Harry uh hhm

Elizabeth and what the potentials are="

Nicholas =yeah ha ha ye:::s

Elizabeth yes

Nicholas until he’d actually shown you in Robert’s terms until I’ve shown you the FO::RM and you therefore understand some of the MEANing

Elizabeth mmm

Nicholas you’re not allowed (,) and I was somehow getting a Resonance I can’t make now between that and the Pollock (,) and the layers and thinking how (,) for most paintings for most people they are only ever seen in reproduction

Robert "that’s right"

Elizabeth mmm=

Robert =that’s right

Nicholas as two dimensional flat (,) reproductions and that is the pictorial art form for most of us, almost all the time

Harry that’s what amazes me about Van Gogh

Nicholas yes

Harry his popularity on the basis of prints

Nicholas yeah ye::::s

Harry [I just cannot understand it because they are so different from the original Nicholas ha ha ha [yes

Elizabeth mmm

Harry and I can see nothing in the print of the original Robert yeah that’s right (,) horrible=

Nicholas = so my connection maybe was to do with the
layers (.) it was to do with the dimensions of the:.
(0.4)

Harry a story got- I mean more on stories cos it’s- it’s sort of tied in but I remember it quite distinctly it’s in Disney it in Epcot I think in in “ America” but the only thing I took back from there, with any memory of great affection I have to say and it’s dead simple you

Nicholas =from what

Harry with any affection (.) the memory of this is the only thing I thought I saw in the whole of Disney that left any thing apart from God it’s plastic=

Nicholas =[

Robert =ha ha ha HA ha

Nicholas =ha ha ha ha ha:.

Harry sorry to say it but this really got to me (.) and it’s simple (.) there are two- (.) there are some bars (.) one’s warm and one’s cool (.) and you put your hands on “on” these two things (.) and err okay there’s no problem at all and now he says NOW transfer your hands to this thing in the middle where you’ve got a selection of the bars, (.) thinner bars. (.) and you put your hands out (.) and the first response is it’s BURNing (.) you think your hands- and you’ve >just put it on a red hot je-< awwf - va and he say NO (.) all that’s in the middle are these two bars (.) the cold ones and the warm ones (.) but when you put them together the body can’t distinguish (.) the senses CANnot distinguish between- it confuses the senses and the message it gives is it’s burning (.) and the interesting thing there is (.) and this >turning< to knowledge >w- just talking about< (.) you can know that (.) but the effort it takes when you KNOW that to say okay THIS time I’m going to put my hands on there and leave- you can do it (.) or at least I find that I can do it and then I gave up with Ethel who was (.)

Nicholas = ha ha (

Harry determined it- didn’t care what she KNEW he hands knew something different and they would come off

Robert ha ha ha

Harry and the wonderful thing ab- sometimes KNOWing it isn’t quite enough (.) that the visceral thing is just sort of ( ) even more powerful

Nicholas = mmm mmm

Harry [so there’s an interesting (.) in terms of all that you were saying about connections there’s an interesting (claps his hands three times in short succession) (0.8) touching point there

Robert that’s very strong yeah=

Harry =yeah I remember that distinctly (.) wffff

Robert I must say when I was listening to Elizabeth (.) I was trying to pay attion to what she was saying but at so- all the time it was- er- triggering similar little stories in passing and so forth

Harry = ha ha ha

Robert in m- in my mind yeah? (.) and under gossipy circumstances you’d say “OH” yes I’ll tell you
about "mine"

[ha ha]

[yeah yeah yeah]

but then earlier you were saying about we ARE the stories

(2.2)

Robert yes

Elizabeth [erm]

Robert but

Elizabeth [this struck loads of Resonances with me as well

(·) we are the stories we tell (·) Halliday says we are

what we mean

Robert that's (·) way

Elizabeth is it- is that the quote? (·) I- a person is what he means

(·) from Halliday

(1.2)

Nicholas it fits (·) it makes sense I don't recognise

Elizabeth [ that came back ]

Nicholas I remember how strongly that title learning to mean

hit me when I first came across it

Elizabeth mmm

Nicholas and that would be of a piece wouldn't it? with

Elizabeth mmm=

Harry =yeah

(3.8)

Nicholas Robert thank you=

Harry =thank you yeah

Robert thank you all very much (·) I appreciate the opportunity

((a short discussion on timetable ensues))
Case 6

GDM 25.01.00

Harry as Speaker: Collaborative identity and interaction
Elizabeth: that's pretty

Harry: thank you ( ) yeah I think it's nice in colour ( ) you only

get the black and white version

Elizabeth: yeah well that's not bad

Vince: gosh did you do the bit in the middle?

Harry: I did the bit the middle

Nicholas: what is it?

Harry: well I'll tell you

Nicholas: well alright

Harry: well if I tell you now it'll ruin it won't it? you got to be in

proper Understander mode ( ) I'm not telling you when you're

in this mode ( )

Nicholas: despite all this it's the 25th January, ehm

Vince: 25th January 2000

Harry: 2000, 2000 it is

Nicholas: Harry over to you

Harry: thank you, ( ) okay thanks very much ( ) thanks for giving me

the chance to do this ( ) it's a - erm ( ) it's a research thing

and err (1.0) it's very different from the last one that I did err ( )

and in a sense err, I'll give you some background >because

"it's probably important" <I've thought about this ( ) I

thought about it yesterday erm ( ) and er I thought that hh.

err one of the problems that I had is that I didn't seem

to have a problem >if you see what I mean< I felt that it

it would be good if I could come with an issue that I was

wrestling with ( ) errm and I'm not really conscious of

wrestling with any one issue but as I thought about it more

I - I - I realised that there is actually an issue here and it's

this (1.0) when I started on this which grew out of the Ph.D.

>and what it is< is looking at collaborative interaction ( ) and

the idea of collaborative identity ( ) that there is such a thing

as collaborative identity and you can pin it down (1.0) and

when I started I thought well I'll just be looking at ehm

aspects of that ( ) the sort of thing that came up in the thesis

things such as, ( ) errm the way that a collaborative group

will will will argue I'll talk a bit about that later on >if I

might ( ) "the way in which I might use imagery in their talk"

or they might do various things ( ) I'll open up these

later on but that's a general feeling I have ( ) but the more I

got into it ( ) more I err ( ) found myself thinking hang on

this is actually bigger than that >you know< not bigger in

terms of scope, not the usual thing where you start off

wanting to look at something small and then you want to

look at this and that and then you want to look at the other ( ) I'm

still looking at the same things but I seem to be asking

all the time bigger questions and the challenge that

discovered yesterday that I face and that I want to bring out

here and get a fix on here if I can is where if anywhere

should I draw the line on this ( ) I mean how far do I want

to go in the claims that I want to make ( ) about the research

that I'm doing, so that's the sort of general >sort of < frame of

what I'm going to talk about ( ) okay=

Nicholas: =kn- errm

Harry: yeah

Nicholas: I think I was listening partly through a large lunch

Harry: YEAH=

Nicholas: = ( ) at one point and (1.2) then hhaaa hhaaa

[ ] [ ]
Harry: it's okay, I'm speaking through a large lunch.
Nicholas: and ha ha ha ha ha ha ha ha there's this thing that (.) the thought flashed "past on." what I really want to check with you is that- that I was listening:: in second gear I'm afraid (.) at the beginning (.) and you talked about interaction and corporate interaction
Harry: yeah (.) "collaborative yeah"
Nicholas: co-operative
Harry: collaborative
Nicholas: collaborative interaction (.) and then you said collaborative IDE:NTity
Harry: yes(.) yes the two interact okay let me step back
Nicholas: yeah
Harry: thank you (.) do you want clarification on that
Nicholas: please cos the one to me was ha ha ha ye:s
Harry: yes
Nicholas: the one to me was just fitted into what I could easily listen to and then you said something that I thought was huge (.) and that's w-
Harry: it is huge and that's where the hole is actually
Nicholas: yeah
Harry: it's the gap between the two that's opened up the errm or the ins:gn:ng to bring the two together that's opened up the big questions >and it works like this< (1.0) errm on a VE:ry simplistic view of identity and I made some notes on this but I'm not actually going to use them (.) a very simplistic not very simplistic - a traditional view of identity is that whether it's on a personal or a group level errm that you can - you can - assign identity if you like< on the basis of certain co-ordinates I'm using that metaphorically (.) it's not a term that's used as far as I know (.) what I mean by sort of social co-ordinates errm social you know there's a shape "you know" I am a you know if I am a member of the police force that that carries with it certain recognisable characteristics that can be assigned to me as a member of that category, now in terms of interaction the view that I take (.) and I'll go back and explain it in more detail (.) the view that I take is an Ethnomethodological view (.) not surprisingly (.) a constructivist position that says that that is not the case identity is not something that is simply a matter of assigning particular descriptors or established through certain sort of social errm boundaries or co-ordinates or characteristics (.) identity is something which is constructed and reconstructed in the light of errr changing circumstances, changing contexts errm so that >if you like< it's a view what says that it- that identity (.) in so far as we ever invoke identity in our social engagements is a thing which is interactionally constituted
Robert: Can I ask is that personal identity or co-operative identity?
Harry: Well that's the issue (.) the issue of the personal - the issue of the personal identity (.) and the issue of collaborative identity the idea of this research was to show that to take it beyOND personal identity into the idea
of something as vague as collab-
the
identity of a group (,) a collaborative group (,) and my
research was to look at three groups in very similar
situations (,) us (,) the group of teachers at the school, that I was in
(,) and a group of REsearch scientists (,) all having a
number of key things in common (0.8) ONE they were
small (,) relatively small groups (1.0) TWO they have
split orientation (,) one towards something sort of academic
(,) or (,>) you know (,> err err at least educational erm so
you’ve got the scientists doing their research, giving papers
at conferences, they are research scientists (,) we do our
research (,) we have academic aspects (,) the teachers
went to teacher conferences and did their teaching and talked
about it and that’s one side (,) and the other side was to look
at erm: (,) at the other side we’ve got a view to making
a living that we have to justify our existence by not going
into the reg (,) some as the teachers and the same as these
research scientists and I thought well they’re interesting
aspects and err according to the normal definition of
hhh a collaborative group (,) there are lists of criteria
I don’t know where they’re derived from (,) you know
(,) interviews apparently that are fairly frequently used
to say if you’ve got this characteristic >that characteristic<
(,) we’ve all - all three groups have got these
characteristics (,) if you’re going to do it in terms of
co-ordinates (1.0) you know and I thought well MAYbe
Nicholas [ mmm ]
Harry what I could do (,) I can look at the way these three different
groups interact (,) interactationally construct if you like their
grouphood (,) their being a group (,) and if I could find that
these three different groups but with these things in
common are actually doing in different ways the same
sorts of things (,) then maybe I could make bigger statement
that the individual identity::; and get towards the idea that
a group could have a collaborative identity that was
constructed by the group which reinforces their idea of
being a group and collaborating in the things that they
do (1.2) eh does that?()
Harry [ mmm
that was the idea (,) and it is a bigger thing and that big
gap, that big leap, (,) hasn’t been made because the way
that identity’s been seen from an ethnomethodological
perspective and the way that it’s been seen from err other
interactional perspectives (,) from the work of Sacks who
talked about membership categorisation (,) that in our
talk we’ll invoke a category into which we’ll
put someone and that shifts (,) and the minute you evoke a
category like figther (,) attached to that are all sorts of
err other categories that you would put in and then and then
you interact with that person and those categories are
invoked or not (,) as the interaction develops and that’s
where you get the idea of identity, you can shift
your identity in talk around (,) you know as you
do interactionally different things (,) but it’s only
ever been done on a personal level and I - an and the
other thing is that a lot of recent work has been done
ON the relationship between the IN-group and the
OUT-group (,) errm so that for example doctor-patient
would be a good example like HOW the doctor presents
being a doctor to a patient (.) and >you know< that idea
of - and - no work as far as I know looking at the
way doctors (.) or it's just beginning but not in terms of
identity (.) doctors talk to doctors and create doctorhood

087
and doctors

?? mmm

Harry now what I'm talking about, what I'm looking at is
not BEing an academic or being a research scientist or
being a teacher (.) which is what they've looked at
what I'm looking at is the idea of being a group
(.) which hasn't been looked at interactionally (.) and that's
the big gap (.) does that take you::: (.) does it

Nicholas YEAH (.) so the issue is then as I see it - what (1.0)
question is::: (.) are the somethings that we do::
communicatively, linguistically, interactionally which construct our
groupness and is there something that can be::: (.) described
at some level of abstraction which would be equally true
of the three groups you want to look at

that's right

Nicholas that can be identified as some parameters or somesuch
along which

Harry YES (0.8) and if I can give you an example of that
one thing that I've seen with the way that erm the two
groups I've looked at (.) I haven't looked at the scientists
yet (.) I'm just collecting data on that cos they could
throw everything out in terms of that (.
and this is where this came from (.)
originally (.) and this is where things started getting
bigger (.) was I started looking at argument (.)
because argument it struck me was a very interesting
case in that you've got erm what y- y kk- you've
got centripetal and centrifugal forces that are::: (.) that
argument is- is- (.) the idea of having an argument is
centrifugal (.) it pushes things out because you take
up different positions and of course in any group you
must have discussion you must have argument otherwise
your- your individuality >you know < I'll just go along
with the group (.) I mean that's not the sort of group
I'm looking at (.) no one suggests it is (.) but (.) to have
>an argument with different positions, that pushes you
outwards< but the dominant dynamic of the group of
course is centripetal (.) its to suck towards the centre
so I thought let's have a look at the WAY that groups
ARGue (.) these collaborative groups argue (.) SEE the
way that - and I've found that it is the case that
through arguments they find ways of taking up
different positions (.) hh while at the same time representing
themselves as having the same position (1.2) as a
group and it's a very interesting balancing act (0.6)
that was all going fine (.) I think >you know< well
I wasn't asking big questions then (.) but what came
out of that (.) and this is the point I wonder whether
it's REALLY worth taking it on from here (}
thinking >well if I do that< then
I'm going ( ) and this is the bigger question ( ) I'm
going towards a situation where ((coughs)) I'm
brining together ( ) ethnography and ethnomethodology
in a way that >as far as I can see< hasn't been done
before ( ) and do I want to stand up and say "HEY"
(0.8) listen to me while I revolutionise thinking in
ethnomethodology and ethnography at the same time
( ) you know it's been going on for you know ( ) one
for fifty, hundred years and the other for thirty years
and say "He::y I can put these two together" ( ) or do
I just shut up ( ) and get on with the business of
what I was doing before which was "going very nicely
THANKyou" ( ) do you s- ( ) that I think is the issue
arr instead of ( ) building up more and more examples
( ) more and more of my thinking in this research
thing has been going recently towards kicking around
these ideas ( ) and I've bought it with me to:: ( ) kicking
these ideas, the bigger questions CAN I give
this as an example of what I mean ( ) pin it
down ( ) and then you can tell me if I'm making
se- not TELL me ( ) help me .hh huh terrible isn't
it you get into a mode ( ) what you make of it all
( ) the diagram, the diagram (1.0) this is a diagram
it works- this is just notes it's not a coherent
page "by the way" ( ) I started with an idea which I
represented as that diagram in the middle ( ) and it's
like this ((coughs))

Nicholas I'm sorry ( ) just before you do start ( ) the cough
gave me a chance ( ) and

Harry I'm sorry >&I should leave space<

Nicholas and the

Harry ( )

Nicholas in one sense the issue you're working on is ( ) do you
want to stay with the:: ( ) three part case study that you
outlined to us

Harry yeah

Nicholas ( ) and look for those abstract parameters of how people
construct groups (2.4) a decision between that and getting
involved in much bigger issues

Harry that's right=

Nicholas but still on the basis of those that data

Harry that's absolutely right=

Nicholas =yes those data ( ) with a fundamental issue

Harry [yeah]

Nicholas okay that-that's one point ( ) and now what we're looking
at is an example of one of those big questions that you
can get involved with

Harry that's right and how it came out=

Nicholas =yeah

Harry in a sense ( ) yeah thank you that's exactly it ( ) so that
erm I- I can talk this through because I've thought this
through but I haven't talked this through and I've not talked
through the implications of this ( ) when I did this I didn't
() if you like it was the first=

Elizabeth =((click of fingers)) can I just ask another question because
it's bugging me ( ) when Nicholas talks about parameters is
that the same thing as co-ordinators ( ) you were talking ab=

Harry =NQ ( ) no ( ) the coordinates were just a way of talking
about defining the group ( ) yeah I suppose parameters of
the group did you say?

Elizabeth it seemed to me that you took over the word parameter=

Harry [ ]

yeah probably yeah ya:::errrr

Nicholas = I personally was deliberately choosing a different word
to try and mean something else ( ) but it was probably a
confusing thing to do ( )

Elizabeth well okay ( ) fine=

Nicholas what I was tr=

Robert is it like this? ( ) now you have your data there on
on the table "and if you get down and look at it"
from a certain distance ( ) you see certain pictures
which you were seeing before ( ) and you stand back
and you get a different focus ( ) same dga,=

Harry =NQ it isn’t actually ( ) thanks Robert ( ) it’s not that
its that in looking closely ( ) these things started
bubbling up and its only now (1.0) that I stand back
or only yesterday when I stand back ( ) that I realise
how big the bubbles are if you like ( ) that I realise
how big the foment is there err:::rr

Robert You used the expression stand back ( ) is that purely
figurative?=

Harry =it’s yeah it’s purely figurative yeah ( ) I only stood back
yesterday because t-t-t-te have something to say today
but in a sense I’d already stood way back ( ) I’d been
pushed back by the growth of these ideas ((Coughs))

Robert No it’s the-the-the notion of someone standing back
that >you know< what th-the- the=

Harry =my research has not been=

Robert [ ]

it’s not that actually correlates=

Harry = no it’s not been standing back ( ) the standing back
was purely a >if you like< a heuristic for getting here
today and doing this

Robert uh

Harry (1.2) cos I didn’t want to just go in and muck about
with things ( ) I wanted, I really wanted to see if there
was something, way of FRAMing these issues ( ) so
this not- this is an example of what I mean by it
bubbling up really (0.8) because I- if you look at the top
left hand corner ( ) this is where the question came in
((reads from text in a clipped and hurried tone))

“in any situation where there’s an argument >(< ( )<
a ( ) (state the position should be the same identical
to others in the group unless it’s clearly signaled but
the aim is to represent this as worthy of
being the perspective of the group or as de facto the
perspective of the group so relations in two dimensions
are different but the deeper level is deceptive ( ) because
distances are not between ( ) but within erm ( ) so techniques
depend on establishing this by drawing on common
beliefs, exposing common links, (>establishing
differen( ( ) in the groups< etc etc ( )”

((finishes reading )) this is the line ( ) the thinking of-
( ) you know you talk about the three perspectives
and that helps me ( ) that’s the three perspectives
that I was doing ( ) the group needs to do this when it’s
arguing this was - this was the looking at that (0.8) but
then what emerged from that () right at the bottom of the
>sort of page< there’s a (( reads again )) “reestablish perspective
alignment for recourse to the binding relationships in the
group, establish a common position within which the
individual position is valid through which it is validated”
(( finished reading )) that’s all clear enough

Nicholas mmm
(( coughs )) but then () started thinking about* errm well
this- () how () do- where do these things come from > you
know< in terms of the group, how do we get hold of
them in interaction and I came up with this - these two
diagrams () because () if you look at the top one
() sorry c- can I go back () can I go back (0.6) one of
the things that had been bothering me was conversation
analysis says that you only evoke features of a context
which are made relevant in the interaction that you are
analysing () the context is invoked as appropriate () you
never invoke external context () that sort of position is
thinning a bit () people are > you know< it’s loosening
a bit but it’s very different from the ethnographic which
essentially you try and understand the group from the
insiders’ perspective then you use the context to explain
what is going on () so that top diagram is > if you like< the
errm the errm what will happen if you just look at errm
the surface () you will see all these different people A, B,
C, D. *you know* () interacting and constructing particular
conversation relationships and things like that () now > you see<
you can’t see the interaction below the surface because () there
is none () interaction is all ABOVE the surface so that’s
what you see () > do you see what I mean< that’s the bit
that you actually see () but then I’ve got this diagram here
and it suddenly struck me that these are same dots () you
see, these are the same things (( coughs )) looked at
in a different way () in a group through the history of
that groups interactions () what you actually get is the iceberg
thing but with the connections between them all beneath the
surface () and I was finding constantly in the talk () that
invoked in the talk and THROUGH the talk
were what I call trace elements () from that deeper level ()
those deeper level connections (0.8)

Robert It’s a deep structure,
Harry well you can call it that () but I- ya: know I mean I
wouldn’t because that has Chomskian you know overtones
[ yeah No No yeah
Robert but obviously not like his
Harry but it is a deep < ya- you er< y >
Elizabeth its like previously
Harry that’s it
Elizabeth that we are privy to
Harry yeah exactly
Elizabeth it’s a shared experience thing=
Harry = exactly EXactly () that is exactly what it is () it is
what makes them () but you don’t see it in the
interaction > but the interaction > constantly s- < now
that lead me inevitably to this ethnography, this
ethnography () because ethnography tries to map what
is underneath in order to explain what’s above (. ) it tries
to understand how the group is constituted beneath the
surface in order to explain relations as (. )<
ethnography works with the top bit for any
particular conversation (. ) do you see what I mean< (. ) it
just looks at the top and says “well” it doesn’t matter
what’s underneath because whatever bits underneath are
relevant will be made relevant in the bits (. )>at the top<
and what I’ve discovered (. ) or what I seem to be
finding in my data is that it’s not as simple as that
cos these trace elements have particular meaning for
the group (. ) unless you can penetrate a bit (. ) you can’t
(. ) so— and it was bringing these two together and-n-an-an
in-a nutshell (. ) errrm it works like this (. ) and I think
I’m getting to the issue (. ) in a nutshell errm (0.6) what
I’m actually suggesting (1.2) I think (. ) in the past
ethnography’s tried to errm to map the group if you like
but has never (1.2) got to the point of being able to (. ) or
take account of or wish to take account of particular
interactions in the way that ethnography does (. ) in
the way that err (. ) in the way that conversation analysis
can (. ) errrm and so it’s stuck at the idea of a group in a general
sense (. ) how the group understands itself rather than
<particular interactions> and actions of the group (0.4)
ethnography has been able to do that but without
any sense of the group as a group (. ) because (. ) it doesn’t
penetrate “to that level” (. ) now by going away from the
individual (. ) and towards >I’m thinking this through
now actually (make sense)< by gett- by
looking at THE GROUP what I’m finding is that my
descriptions of particular interactions of these people
because they’re constantly showing these trace elements
(. ) is actually developing into if you like an ethnography of
the group through ethnography (. ) I’m actually getting
a picture of how the group sees itself! (0.4)
ethnography traditionally is not interested in how the
group sees itself (. ) that’s not its field (. ) that’s the field of
ethnography (0.6) but because I’m looking at particular
groups of people (. ) talking within the group (. ) not to
outsiders (. ) what’s emerging through their talk is their
construction of themselves (. ) and in fact (. ) you know the
insiders’ perspective (. ) I’m getting that insiders’ perspective
if you like in a sort of ethnographic (. ) in-in err >from an
ethnographic pers-. <so this big question is do I go in
and say “HEY” (. ) if you do ethnom- if you do
ethnography in this way (. ) if you look at the
way the group (0.6) talks within the group and you
- and you get enough interactions across enough
activity types (. ) eventually you will start getting
an insiders’s perspective because you will actually
see them (. ) you will SEE them making as a group
(1.6) >in other words you will end up< with an adequate
ethnograr- ethnography (. ) through ethnography
(0.4) or if that’s TRUE that’s a massive claim (. ) you
know it’s a huge claim (. ) in research terms and my question
is I’m not sure I really want to go down that line (. ) and
leave behind the simpler things that might have more to
say (0.6) “and that’s the >sort of< thing I’m wrestling with.”
Vince: does that? (.) have I made (0.4)
Harry: mmm
Vince: Can I just check (.) so if you to were to look at enough interactions
Harry: yeah
Vince: with these groups (0.4) these-these these prominent
Harry: >these people yeah (.) these<
Vince: =things that appear=
Harry: =yeah=
Steve: =in an ethn- ethnomethodol- methodological account
Vince: that if you looked at enough of them then you start getting=
Harry: that’s right
Vince: =the history of all these things >which-which become< things
Harry: which are not prominent any particular interaction but
Vince: if you have enough of those interactions (.) over different
Harry: that’s right
Vince: types of generic=
Harry: =yeah=
Vince: (0.4) interaction (.) then (.) you almost slip (.) by default into
ethnography (.)
Harry: yeah=
Vince: =because you enough information to do more (.) than what
Harry: is available in any parTICular interaction
Vince: that’s right (.) that’s right and because of looking a the way
Harry: the group is represented to outsiders (0.4) you’re actually
looking at the way the group is constructing itself to itself
Vince: within itself (.) it’s reflexive >you know< y-rrrrr- w - it’s
Harry: infinitely reflexive if you like >you know< it’s
Vince: exactly what you said (.) you >(.) that picture<
Harry: (0.4) but you see (.) I am not actually sure (0.6) that if
Vince: I start there (.) my worry is that if I start there (.) then it
Harry: across as this (0.4) >HUGE claim< (.) and that’s what
Vince: people are looking at rather than the more modest and
Harry: possibly more interesting (.) exploration of the sorts
Vince: of things that I started out looking at
Harry: mmmm
Vince: and it might be judged if you like on that bigger - "on that
Harry: bigger thing" and A so I wonder whether that is worth (.)
Vince: continuing with=
Harry: .hhh so when you started off (.) there we- I was struck
Vince: by=you said th- there was a big question (.) there were
Harry: big questions=
Vince: =that’s it yeah
Harry: =yeah=
Vince: but then there was a BIG question
Harry: yeah
Vince: j- and the first big question were a series of things
Harry: like argument
Harry: yeah
Vince: that you look at local interactional evnts
Harry: yeah
Vince: but then when you said the BIG question (.) that’s this
Harry: whole nature of the relationship between ethnomethodology
and ethnography
Harry: yeah (.) and more and more my thinking and my (.) >you
know< my notes (.) my own thoughts are heading towards
that bigger direction away from the smaller one (.) and err
it's a different sort of growth from the other growth where
things tend to grow outwards (.) "oh THAT's interesting
I'll collect some of that (.) I'll do some of THAT" and you
get something that is too big to handle (.) but this is a
different sort of erm topsy (0.4) and I'm wondering whether
it'll take me down the same blind alley (.) if it is
it's an experience that I haven't had before (0.4)

Vince

mmm

Harry

>you know< (.) before I've tried to start out with big ideas
and watched them crumble in front of my you know:
(.) eyes (.) but I've never had a big idea topsy "coming" (.) an
it's opened all sorts of other things that- that (0.4) one of
the things that worries me I think (.) is that I-I and I'd not
>reflected on it< I'd not thought about this before but (.)
maybe it hasn't worried me consciously (.) it does NOW
(.) is when I think about it (.) because I'm now thinking
in those terms (.) I'm beginning to come up (.) with
(.) labels (.) much more than I ever did at the start when
I was genuinely interested in the interaction (.) I wonder
((coughs)) in terms of standing off whether I'm standing
of too far.= >I give you an example the other day I came
up with erm (.) oh YEAH! the distinction between erm
(1.4) o::<: I can't rememb- it was (.) it was the
difference between >I don't know< TEXT (.) talk and
text or something (.) and it was that talk is (0.6) is
constructed as-as-as you talk but your representation
of that talk to an outsider is TEXT (.) and what I mean
by that is that what I noticed (.) for example in that (.) in
our own internal meetings (.) sometimes (0.4) when you are
talking ((phone rings)) when something is erm (.) relates
to something that would be said to (.) represented to an
outsider to the group (.) it comes along- across as much more
textual in the way that it's put out (.) that what has been
previously constructed leading to that point=

Elizabeth

[mmmm]

Harry

=so the text (.) and then of course you see (.) I'll give
you an example yeah (.) >this is a good example< cos
how it grows I think "HEY" (0.4) TEXT (.) text is
>you know like< RHEtoric (.) it's Aristotelian it depends
on logic (.) it depends on presenting things logically (.)
so the whole western tradition there has been >I know other
people have said this< you've got this Aristotelian >tradition<
which is REPresentation which is TEXT and then you have
interaction which is constructed which is Dionysian >you
know if you like< if you wanna put som- like completely
wild but with it's own strange rules an-and what I'm-I
guess what yeah what's worrying me is that the further I
go down this line the BIgger you want to get (.) and
sooner or later it's going to turn up with erm turn up as
being >you know< (.) >I dunnaw< Kant or youwys-
>all over again< (.) we'll take ALL that we know and explain
it philosophically as opposed to just JUST being modest
just staying in there and I can imagine myself in ten
years (.) you know >throwing up and growing up< bigger
ideas and still going no further "on the interaction" (0.8) and
so the question I've got for myself is-is it worth it (.)
is it worth getting this big (.) is it worth >you know< am I 

Vince going sort of >you know< " am I going away from".

one thing that (looks towards Elizabeth) "sorry were you 
going to? (0.2) (Elizabeth gestures that Vince should take turn)

Vince one thing that comes across quite strongly is this idea of 

>you know< with the big- the bigness of it (.) that 

also you've also used words like modesty that-that and this is 

(.) this is err something that you're interested in but you feel 

maybe that other people would judge that this is

Harry mmm

Vince (2.2) errrm (0.2) whatever whatever goes with the word 

Harry [ immmodest yeah yeah right yeah 

Vince [ and that (.) there's a tension there that you've come 

Harry big claim >you know<

Vince there's a tension there:: between your actual (.) you've come 

to this position where it's really a very interesting thing 

for you

Harry yeah (0.6 ) I'd not thought of that yeah (.) that's interesting 

Harry [ that's interesting 

Harry No that is very interesting actually the thought that 

yeah (.) deep inside me there is this thought that you know 

"be humble" so >you know that sort of thing<

Harry mmmm

Vince it's Easier if you're modest (.) it's easier I've found out 

(.) along the way >I guess< (.) it's easier if you chip away 

at little things and steer clear of the big ones 

because (.) you know I've thought well the big-

>yeah I guess the big one's have got to< come from 

somewhere >you know<

Robert Do I su- do I gather that? in fact you're looking at 

the thing from two different points of view? (0.4) one is 

through tb- from a public- where the 

340 public are going ( ) from here (.) and the other 

is what you're most interested in

Harry (0.2) hhhhhh yeah I guess there is an element of that 

because obviously this is leading somewhere (.) it 

ought to lead somewhere (.) it ought to lead to some 

sort of publication (.) errm and there is that book that 

I'm supposed to be putting in a proposal for (.) and so 

obviously that's an issue (0.6) but yeah there's an element 
of errm of errr u::::::m (.) I don't I' m not sure that I doing 

d the best (.) by my data if I get pulled away into these big 

ideas and I'd be better off just sticking with it and doing 

a bit more analysis and a bit more chewing away and teasing 

out you know but the minute you start teasing out (.) once 

you've got this idea in your head (.) the bugger keeps 

coming back >you know< you can't shake it (.) it's there 

and it's you know (.) and that in itself is a worry it's another 

thing I haven't thought of (.) that's a worry because it may 

well be that having HAD this idea (.) and that's exactly 

where it grew (gestures to diagram) on that page (.) having 

had this idea it won't go away now (.) and am I going to 

end up distorting the data (0.4) to actually reinforce this idea 

and I guess that's another worry yeah (.)"I'd not thought 

about that"
maybe (0.6) you’re worrying too much about the big issues
and the little issues (.) because it see::ms to me that it’s-
they’re running in parallel (1.6) that you’re only being hit
by the big issues by exploring little ones
by
Harry (0.2) well YE::S=
Elizabeth = and by getting into the argument thing then you thought
Harry aHAA (.) there’s a big issue here=
Elizabeth =yeah
Elizabeth (1.8) so isn’t it like (0.4) two:: (1.2) two parallel:::I lines (.)
one with several little issues, (.) or lots of little issues, and
you thought about the argument one and that’s one and
there probably there’s all the others

Harry [ imagery and err (0.4) stories
Elizabeth [ and each
of those is PUSHing you to think towards the ethno:: (.)
Harry ethno differences=
Elizabeth = yeah the differences between the two ethnos (.) yeah (.)
and so (0.6) hhh yeah I mean I’m not sure that it is a
problem=
Harry =well it can be (0.2) to a certain extent yeah
Elizabeth [ if you just continue going down those two
lines looking at the little issues and then=
Harry =yeah coming off towards the big issues=
Elizabeth =coming onto POSSible things for the big issues as you go
down and then at the end (.) you’ve got to say (0.2) are they
parallel? or which is bigger? (.) and do a kind of total at the
end (.) I mean “I don’t know”=
Harry =yeah the problem with that
thought is that when you’ve got the big issues there
then as I said it-it >you know< just awareness of them
*even in parallel*
Elizabeth that pushes back there=
Harry =they’re pushing back in (.)you’re constantly - so you’re
missing things cos you’re constantly trying to find things
now that’ll back up that and the point about analysis is that
the clearer you can keep your head of the big issues (.) the
beauty of Sacks >I think< is that he always stayed with the
(tiny things) and they exploded into massive issues
naturally (.) and it was only by leaving those behind and
looking at the next little issue that opened up the next big
issue
Elizabeth MMMmmm
Harry and I’m a bit worried that this big issue is carrying on
you know < an-an an- maybe it isn’t influencing you
and maybe there is this sort of ( . ) I mean there are
clearly all sorts of levels “that this is operating at” ( . )
I’m not putting this as a block but >you know< it’s
something that’s reared it’s ugly head and-an-an and it
seemed to be the thing I wanted to talk about rather than
just the research which I’m very happily pottering through
you know < I’ve got some lovely examples of various
things ((end of tape - Robert’s question is
missing))
Harry more what worries me is that the more I look at the
little things I see the big picture (.) may actually big::
because with the big picture in my head (.) >at a
Robert
I wonder whether you'd like to say anything more about
what seems to be a key element here and this is trace elements
Harry
Well I >you know< I just wrote >them down< on that
page I haven't picked them up very much actually mo- I
haven't picked as any-anything that I wanted something (.)
ermm that would capture the idea (.), the general idea
that I had that- that () in any (0.4) talk on the surface (.)
there's stuff that you can actually see and stuff you get on
the tape (0.4)
Vince
mmmm
Harry
ermm () there will be ermm () because the group has this
history of interactions () and it's impossible of course you
can't collect all the group interactions because it's not just
them they are in terms of greater interactions () it's what
Garfinkel said >you start with context< () and it just goes
forever () so - but you do nevertheless () there are
underneath these connections that have been established
through the history of the talk () as we HAVE in this
group (0.4) that are often unsaid () and the point is that-
>you know< they have to be unsaid usually () because you
can't put it on record exp- you don't explicitly say I'm
a member of this group I'M doing THIS () you evoke it
naturally in the TALK () and evoking it naturally in the
talk () what you find is () you find certain things bubbling
up >again and again and again< it's what I call trace elements
because you'll find that >you know< it might be a
completely different interaction () but it's involving the
same people and those these TOP bits the colour might be
very different () cos it's a different thing () it's not a
meeting it's- it's a >you know< it's a casual talk or: (.), ermm
() whatever () or it's a different meeting it's a different
topic () but some of the features that you'll find here (.)
will be the same () and unique () it seems () to groups
(0.2) and >that's what I call trace< because they're
coming up from the shared things of the groups () arr I can
give you an example of that from this other group () particularly (.)
their use of imagery () or () I haven't looked at ours
yet () if indeed it exists () but with them (.) they had a
very powerful thing that they can evoke () where
anything that was active was positive () this is not unique
to them () as such () but anything that was passive was
negative and you could () through invoking images and
argument () the way you would win an argument () the
way they often went about it was actually to present a
picture of a situation which they wanted to represent the
debate and to present it () either as an active thing or as
passive thing () and to get other people in the talk to
accept their terminology () like in one there's SUMP ()
DUMP () something else () all these in ACtive things
(0.2) and to get other people to use the same active to passive descriptors of the thing that you’re focusing on because in that group () it varies from talk causal () and meetings talk () these things crop up again and again and again. () active good passive bad now:: >that’s what I mean< it bubbles up in that group () in various forms and when you recognise if you can see how interactionally its evoked () to achieve interactional aims (0.2) does that help? >with the sort trace element idea? <

Robert yeah yeah abSOluTEly

[ ]

Harry I mean that’s the sort of =

Robert =it leads me to wonder whether the bubbling up *which

I understand* () the bubbling up means it hits the surface

Harry mmm

Robert right? () IF nothing - if there is something that doesn’t

hit the surface it’s not for you a trace element

Harry Oh WELL () NO because it’s - I use the geological
tetaphor where you can find in >you know< () you dig up the soil

that you know is () of a particular type that in it there are tiny other bits of - bits of soil like bits of LEAD ()

that are actually in the mountains somewhere that’ve been swept down or things that you () things that you
don’t associated with particular “soil” but they’re there because they’re there in the underlying geological stratum or strata or whatever >you know< () and it’s that sort of idea that you’ll find bits of this and

Nicholas to follow what I understand Robert’s point to be () you wouldn’t () be dealing with any such trace elements () other that those which had been brought to your attention because (0.4) some point of them had broken the surface

Harry yes

Nicholas because >they would have to have done that< to have been=

[ ]

Harry that’s absolutely it

Nicholas =picked up in the original=

Harry =that’s absolutely it

Nicholas [ investigation of the data

Harry you’re absolutely right () and the KEY () and that takes me right back which is a connection I’d not made but it’s >you know it’s like obvious when you see it< but the whole point of this thing I was mentioning earlier on of collecting lots of different interactions with a particular group (0.4) is that >of course< as conversation analysis tends to () a particular interaction rather than a whole series of them () >certainly not within a group< in any particular interaction you don’t recognise these as trace elements () they’re elements with the same value as any other elements in that interaction () that’s how you treat them () but if you’re dealing with lots and lots of interactions by the same group then or course you are able to identify things that are common ()

Vince mmm=

Harry =in these interactions and there you know they’re trace elements () >do you see what I mean?<

Nicholas might:: it be at all usef ul () to try to articulate then () sorry

Harry I’m interpreting what you’re saying so far ()

Harry nngh=
Nicholas =if you take the big issue to be a very fundamental
CHALLENGe to the methodology of the
ethnomethodologists =

Harry = yes yes
Nicholas and to the claims that they make and to their (1.0)
it's to the claims that they make and to the methods
that they pursue () towards the purposes and the claims
that they make (0.2) might there be any point in you trying

to articulate what you think that challenge might be?

Harry it's not so much a challenge as a development (0.4) erm I
I-I I must admit () the more I read about ethnomethodology ()
the more I read about conversation analysis () the more
"analysis I read" () the more convinced I am that >you
know< it's got th- "not got the answers" that's too
strong () it's >you know< what I can buy as an idea
I think () that it throws up so many interesting things
that other forms of analysis don't () and it * rests on the
idea that* () (clears throat) () that erm () that-that err
() >you know< Everything is (0.4) is constructed jointly
constructed by the participants () involved () the only
() not the only but the ONE >sort of< nagging fea- >apart
from one or two particular features that are not important<
() one of the big nagging issues () is this idea of context
that the original purist position that all context is invoked
has come in for:: even among leading exponent () for a
good deal of questioning and they've admitted that "well yes"
to some extent you can invoke context because if it's

doctor-patient () you can recognise certain common things about
doctor-patient interactions ()a-a-across the board () however
as SchleglA correctly points out () just because you can do
that you mustn't assume that any interaction between a
doctor and a patient is doctor-patient interaction because
going back membership catorisation () one minute the
doctor is the doctor who's tapping your chest >next minute<
erm he's just someone who is knocking over the water
() the man who has knocked over the water and that's a
whole different way of () it alters the interaction () but
nevertheless th-th-th they say they're coming sort of yeah
can bring in some outside <elements< and to my
knowledge () there hasn't been used though to actually look
at the way in which particular groups () cos there hasn't
been interest in THE group () the group as-as a thing
except as invoked in talk has not been interesting () I
understand why and I accept that () so it's not so much
a challenge as saying "Hey (0.6) we could take this further
if we actually look within groups and not what has been
a common thing so far () in group out group if you like
() it's not looked at group() and doctor, patient, midwife:,
visitor:, or >you know< just casual conversation. and err
() if we just wait a minute and just settle on some
groups and look at their talk across lots of different things
and think not in terms of err err >you know< err think ()
actually think actually think in terms of THE GROUP
as a collaborative entity which of course conversation
analysis of course wouldn't because=

Nicholas =mmmm=

Harry th ( () is invoked () I'm not challenging it
I'm saying "Hey" you can still use your techniques' and in
the end if you can use them like that you may well end up with a (0.6) something approaches an adequate ethnography (.) so it's not a challenge it's a we can take it this far (.) and we can forget this business of about how do we bring in ethnography and ethnomethodology together (.) in fact (.) if you push it far enough one will lead into the other (0.8)

Vince
Nicholas (0.2) because this approach is being taken to the idea of group as group as opposed to gr- well as distinct from (.) >a group being made up of an number of separate individuals< and the point is (.)

Harry yes
Nicholas to chart the interaction between those individuals
Harry yeah that's right
Nicholas (yeah that’s the difference and those individuals (.) in prior work they will have identities (.) they’ll have particular identities (.) and there’s been a distinction between situated identity and discourse identity and that’s an interesting one but it doesn’t undermine that idea (.) and what I’m actually saying is that I did it with the stories thing >in a way< saying that stories actually serve err all sorts of: "obviously functions" but one of the functions of stories (.) is to actually reinforce the idea of the group (.) of being a group of people who see it in this way (.) who share these things and err (.) and I guess that’s the - yeah it’s-it's an advance it’s a can? we take ethno- can we take ethnomethodology? >ethnomethodology is you know< the roots but can we take conversation analysis (.) this far (.) and with this sort of an agenda do we throw up some you know (* * ) I mean that’s the yeah (.) that—that’s the sort of thing that - and maybe if I just keep working at it (.) the end of the err the end of the research I will perhaps be able to say “hey well it’s taken me that far (.) doesn’t it begin to look like an ethnography?

Elizabeth
Harry (you know< your thing (.) leave it aside and see if that’s where I (.) where I end up
Nicholas and that is now explanatory to me of this:: (.) what was already a resonant phrase but I wasn’t sure what it meant (.) descriptive - sorry (0.8) ‘distances are not between but within ‘

Harry yeah (.) yes yes
Nicholas yeah
Harry (1.2) yeah (0.4) it’s—it’s yeah it’s yeah that’s it and I d- and it was at that point that I did this sort of diagram because I wanted to get that err (.) err >you know< errm yeah it-it- YES absolutely (.) yeah (.) cos you could say an awful lot >you know< just looking at that about their relationships (.) you don’t need to dig that far (.) but what I’m saying is that if you look hard enough at that you begin to get some sort of picture there (.) and that yeah (.) that’s the sort of thing that I got interested in (.) I err (.) I see that you know there were dangers there that I hadn’t thought about but maybe there are (.) maybe I can just plug on with these bits of interaction and (.) and if I end up with an adequate
Vince: mmmm
Harry: (0.2)
Nicholas: can I ask you one more
Harry: yah
Nicholas: just trying to (.) then (5.2) .hh when I asked you a question
Harry: before I talked about a challenge and you corrected that
Nicholas: = and you corrected that and said it's not a challenge (.) > it's a different application or an extension < or taking it somewhere (.) somewhere slightly different =
Harry: [yeah [yeah [yeah
Nicholas: = and using it there (.) yeah?
Harry: yes
Nicholas: and so this is where I think I was getting challenge from
Harry: and I'd like to sort it why =
Nicholas: = yeah please do
Harry: that (.) as you say (.) you can see lots of interesting things
Nicholas: about these points here
Harry: (1.6) AND (0.2) they would be (.) to use this terminology here descriptive of the distances between in a sense yeah and (.) as you're taking this work (0.6) into the identity of a group
Harry: mmm
Nicholas: (2.2) you're saying that (1.2) to try to describe the distances within (1.0) you need to refer to more than the data of the interaction (.) you need to refer to some of the substrata: that are evoked (0.8) by the peaks > so to speak <=
Harry: [yeah
Nicholas: = through a series of interactions yeah
Harry: (1.2) and then (0.4) what you are: ngt doing (1.8) is to sort of throw the depth of this back into the face of this (.)
Harry: yes that's right I'm not Nicholas: and s- yeah (.) and that's where I was hearing challenge
Harry: and that's not what you are doing yeah=
Harry: [yeah
Nicholas: = if anywhere you could say that I'm throwing it at ethnography because I'm saying "hey well we can do that too" but I'm not really throwing at anybody (.) yes you're right I'm not no (.) and nor am I suggesting that we shouldn't begin with that (.) I'm not suggesting that "hey we should begin with that" (.) cos you can't get at that except through this (.)
Nicholas: yeah
Harry: I'm saying that we should do more of that (.) but maybe we should look much more within groups and look at other errm (.) yeah look at things like that start collecting bodies of this sort of interaction and seeing whether it actually it tells us a lot more about (.) the way that people actually don't just actually construct their understanding of of of what's going on here in this interaction the (.) why this here now (.) the what I call the gate here now context > you know < we're making this talk now go beyond that (.) and
actually start asking questions about how the
talk is used to actually (0.2) construct the BEing a group
as well as acting as a group (.) the doing being a group is
ethnomethodology (.) you know (.) and err I guess what
I’m saying is that a lot of talk (0.4) ends up >you know<
ends up (.) >you know< doing being group talk (.) as opposed
to (.) >you know< arguing or something else (.) can I
just look at this (.) see on page 69 just in case there’s anything
worth I did- I-I shall (.) NO (.) errrm (.) errr er ohh(;) yeah
erm sorry (1.4) >yeah err I YES that’s what I’ve done< (.) (Harry
is looking at a page of his diary) yeah (.) can I can I (2.2)
ah (.) it’s what I’ve just said actually it’s a (>)
< when I talk about looking at (.) how the group
constructs it’s own identity through it’s talk (.) there is a
sense in which I’m trying to bring ethnography and
ethnomethodology together (.) (reads from text) an adequate
ethnography would do precisely this (.) get a sense of the
groups view of itself from the inside (.) CA true to it’s
ethnomethodological roots isn’t concerned with this but if
we can look at the insiders’ construction of their identity
from inside through their own talk (.) what emerges (.) is
an ethnography (.) because if this is NOT then (.) what is
it? (.) what are they constructing (.) mmm and that’s
the sort of question I’m not kicking around (.) you know
“these bloody big questions” as opposed to looking at a the
way people talk together (.) errrm but THAT’s () yeah (.)
that’s clearer to me now (0.6) errrm (0.6) ("
( on the way ¬)
Nicholas (2.2) mmm (.) shall we take a pause then and see if there
any Resonances around the group (.) cos we’re 45
minutes in
Harry "thanks"
Nicholas (0.4) so this must be a 60 minute tape
Harry heeeee ha
Vince "must be¬
Elizabeth >I’ve got a((). sorry a VErV VErV personal one which is
probably quite silly (.) but when you were talking about
text and how you react to text (.) without all this underneath
(0.4) has it every happened to you in your >sort of <
family life (.) that (.) someone says they’ve told you
something (.) and you say no you haven’t (.) >and they say<
yes I have (.) I told you that last week and I think I
sometimes reject to that sort of thing
(as text (.) without (0.4)
Harry right
Elizabeth (0.4) you know okay
[ ]
Harry yeah yea::hh
Elizabeth the word’s have passed but I haven’t bothered to kind of
(0.6) errrm integrate them into your list
[ ]
Robert "adjust to the rest of your world”
Nicholas mmm (.) cos we don’t take the implications very well
(0.4) (.) that NO we’re not going out tonight=
Harry =YES
Elizabeth ha ha OHHHH (.) I told you (.) no you didn’t
Nicholas MMMmnm=
Harry =yeah=
Elizabeth =cos we’ve just taken on- we’ve just taken on
we've just taken (.) we've rejected like this

Nicholas }
ffh haa as sorry about this
(ye:::s yes

Harry yeh

Nicholas that's so strong when talking to 14 year old
daughters about what was or was not exchanged

Harry OH yes oh that's ( 
ye:::

Elizabeth do you think? (.) do you think that (.) I mean I don't
know it was just-just this (.) >I thought< (.) that's
what's been happening

Harry THAT cx-oh sorry I'll get back to you later cos it's
not my turn *orthree* (.) thank you yea:::HR (.) does

Elizabeth okay ()

Harry >> had an issue at the weekend<

Elizabeth and then the second thing was (.) just that I know why
you've done the transparent box (.) but it doesn't stop
outside of the box does it?

Harry OH NO:: (.) no it carries on (.) I just >select *the group<

Elizabeth and of course it connects in all:: sorts of ways= 

Harry ( .) it should actually

Elizabeth there's this stuff sure yeah

Harry =I'm just- (.) sliced it off=

Elizabeth oh but it's it very strong

Harry ( .)

Elizabeth it should actually

Harry this should not be like that (.) that should be a slice actually

Elizabeth do you know what I mean< this should be (.) that-that

Harry should cut off sharply (.) but I've tried to get the sense of

Elizabeth yeah (.) yeah okay

Robert (1.4) there are all kinds of buzzings going on and I was

erm (.) I had a >slight- careful wanted to::< ask questions
rather than make erm Reflgesions (.) and made me think
that it might be nice to have a different mgde at some

Robert stage (1.0) you know (.) where someone like that presents

Elizabeth in a different modality (.) where we are allowed to:

Nicholas =WELL Harry can offer us a s-seminar on this at any point=

Robert well do-d-you (.) well I'm not allowed to say that=

Harry [I "**" ""]

Robert =but it might s- hhha haa (.) however it made me::: (.) there are

things which for me are very important (0.4) very

fundamental there (.) and one of them if I might mention

because it relates to my subject so this is a -a Resonance

err the more that I look at lexical studies (.) the more

that I am convinced (.) that what is negotiated in the group (.)
is in fact not wrtrable (.) in other words not transcribable

to the extent that- (.) if you listened to a conversation where

you can't quite hear the words (0.4) you have a jolly good

idea of what is being negotiated or what these trace elements
err might be there’s a very great deal because if
somebody puts in a strident note it sticks out
like a irrespective of what the of what the words are
(0.4) and I’m coming across in lexical studies more and
more instances of actually the meaning is not in the words
>you don’t know what the word means until it is written
down< not just because it’s out of context but you
>don’t know how it’s pronounced< (0.4) and there are lots of
er mm lots and lots of minimal pairs (0.2) when you
pronounce it like that it means one thing when you
pronounce it like that it means another with the
intonation pattern the dictionary lists all the meanings
but it doesn’t say there is a special way of saying it that
carries that meaning and a different way which carries
that in other words you can disambiguate out of
c context (0.4) now if THAT is the case I W O N d er
and this is the thought that comes to me (0.4) how far beyond
the lexical level (0.2) errrrrm does that extend (0.4) because we
all know we can interpret the interaction what’s going on<
() and it still amounts to these peaks but err non err
() non verbal it’s just a thought that I have that is
pre-occupying me

Nicholas mmmm
Vince (2.0) hhhhh (2.2) I also had I think lots of lots of
bzzzz lots of trace elements all these things
some of these things are buzzing around (0.4) I think
erm() I’m err very interested in this idea of trace
elements and these aspects of identity which you
might get at somehow:: lexically () by looking at
phrases and metaphors () I mean we’ve done it again
today with the way we’ve constructed this metaphor
you used of digging digging down () and err
whether this this surface surface conversations
that we have washed down to further things
is it just a case of looking at surfaces () but
(1.0) the way that our identity our interactional
identity is built up through the adoption of
certain phrases certain metaphors (0.6) and
our:: interactional identity in the way that we
actually take turns and the kinds of discourse
that we’re developing here (1.2) errrm (0.4) and
this sense of personhood and individualism (0.2)
this (0.4) this constant flux between us as
individuals and “man who dropped the water”
or father or-or () people who are annoyed by
phone ringing () there are just a constant flunk-
flux () between=

Harry mmmm
Vince =these parts of our () group identity and our
personal identity which may or may () not
interaction at any particular time
Harry yeah
Vince and err() it’s getting at this sense of identity
and group identity and trying to pin it down
through all of these indicators which is () which is
fascinating
Harry (2.2) yeah
Nicholas (3.8) hh YEA sp(); I don’t think that I do:: have a
Resonance in the sense that I’ve come to understand
the word and >that we’ve used> ->you know< I’ve
got things I want to say and arguments and references
and (.)

Elizabeth [mmmm
Robert [the same
Nicholas [responses and reactions but not in that sense of
ohhh and this makes me think OF () it doesn’t it makes
me think of this (.) it doesn’t make me think of anything
else ()

Harry [ ha ha
Robert [ haaa
Nicholas it makes me think of this hha haa mmmm (0.4
Harry (bizarre Resonance and it IS a Resonance) yehh
Nicholas it makes me think aABOUT this
Harry mm
Robert .hhhhhh
Harry (1.4) well yeah (1.6) and that’s in a sense what Robert
and Vince () have just done
Vince uhh rmm (.) can I just check then they wouldn’t be
Resonances in the way () for you the sense of Resonance
is is that it makes you think something other than that
that would take you back into the things that Harry has
talked about
Nicholas .hhhhhh (2.2) NO it seemed to me:: (.) sorry can I
just
Vince yeah=
Nicholas =on this yeah on this >it was our attempt< it seemed
to me that classically what Elizabeth did was come up with
a Resonance from family life () you know
Vince mm
Harry [yeah
Nicholas [ you know that BING:::: (.) that went off over there
Harry and that rang off me
Robert and Robert did the same thing in terms of his work (.)
in terms of lexical studies (.) an exact ‘bong::’ off to that
Harry yeah I-I
Nicholas yeah?
and you did the same thing (.) in terms of your work
Harry right
Nicholas and I wasn’t thinking- I was thinking much more things
like (0.4) well (.) and you’ve heard me say this in a
different context "I think" (.) this made me think of a
certain reference to some of Lawrence Young’s stuff which
I think is connected to this
Vince Mmmmm,
Nicholas but it wasn’t a Resonance for me in that sort of sense ()
erm (.) I tell you another thing (.) okay I’m committed
now (.) >another thing it made me think is that< (0.8)
okay but now I’m talking about this (.) I’m not
Resonating from my ()
Elizabeth mmmm mmmm
Nicholas I am >going to say something< which is evaluative of
this (.) and about this and
Elizabeth “that’s right”
Nicholas which at the moment< I don’t want to so I’m not going
to (.) but that’s
Harry (0.6) fine
Nicholas that would a difference between a Resonance and (0.2)=
[ ]
Elizabeth: this is a topic based SEEion

Nicholas: (2.2)...hhh=-

Vince: I can I just put on record that I’d got no idea

Nicholas: hha haaa haaa

Vince: [ I- I didn’t have one () so if I’d probably if -

I could have said the same thing () at that point () I could

have said “well” I don’t have any particular Resonance’ but

I just like picked up a phrase () and just (1.2) and-and I

suppose talked myself into some kind of Resonance

but I didn’t have one () when I first started

Harry: cos you didn’t want to sit there

Vince: [ no there’s a slot () there’s an expectation

isn’t there? () that everyone’s going to have a

Resonance and I didn’t have one today and () that’s why

I was interested to check with you because (0.4)

Nicholas: [mmm] [mmm]

Vince: I sometimes do () ‘there’s still an expectation that you’ll

come up with some Resonance’ an-and “I stumbled into

one today”

Nicholas: err just in terms of what we’re about I mean I’ve seen

this as as err () as a GD session for Harry to work on

these ideas not a topic session which

Elizabeth: right okay

Nicholas: yeah so that I me-

Elizabeth: but to me: () because it was uhmm a whole new topic

(3.2) I’m still digesting () all the information

Vince: mm

Elizabeth: (0.6) erm okay I had one query about this (0.8) but then

the Resonance that went BING was a personal one

and I would like to spend more time thinking about it

and asking you about it () what are the other small things

small things and > all that kind of thing< to get the bigger

picture because I think it’s REALLY interesting

Nicholas: mm

Robert: it’s not like Sti- Harry telling us that err I actually like

Stilton cheese and I like Hogseradish sauce on it and so

forth

Every: ((laughter 6.6 seconds))

Robert: what he is presenting has a certain grabbing power ()

right () and you can- you can Refl re- Reflect the

Stilton and the () quite adequately

Harry: haaa rePFAT yeah

Robert: but it’s not easy to Reflect OH () HA ha ha () because

because you’re learning and responding ()

Elizabeth: mm

Nicholas: [MMmm

Robert: to it

Nicholas: MMMmm but- and AGAIN I’ve taken the mood of

this () of this session to be that we do have those

reactions to different things that we present and

areas that lead us into () and the asking the questions

and the commenting and the evaluating and the ()

eh asking for - is what we’ll do later () some other

time.

Harry: ummm

Vince: if-if you said you

Elizabeth: [could we not do it?

Harry: mm
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1298  Elizabeth  yeah?  sorry
1299  Nicholas  mmm
1300  Vince  if you’d said I’m reminded of this Lawrence Young thing
1301  Nicholas  yeah
1302  Vince  would that not be a Resonance for you? (0.4) that’s
1303  what I’m interested in ( ) you-you’ve said that
1304  it came from the personal life and outside there’s
1305  almost a sense of because it’s an outside thing
1306  it’s a Resonance but if I’d said I’m reminded of this
1307  Lawrence Young thing then that wouldn’t be a
1308  Resonance ( ) or you didn’t feel at that particular
1309  time that it
1310  Nicholas  that’s right ( ) I don’t think I wanna argue a hard
1311  line here (0.6) but I did feel that Elizabeth’s was a
1312  Resonance in terms of family life and experiences
1313  Robert’s was a Resonance in terms of umm (0.2)
1314  his own work and ideas he’s struggling with and
1315  trying to formulate in his own work=> I was being
1316  polite about you:: ( ) you were clearly making
1317  yours up as you went along<
1318  Robert  [ arrrrh ha ha
1319  Harry  [ ha ha ha
1320  Nicholas  but its ( ) ha ha ha
1321  Harry  [ absolutely
1322  Nicholas  it’s disgusting
1323  but that thought about Lawrence Young was
1324  for me much too close to “Oh yes so and so’s
1325  written about this’ and errr
1326  Vince  mmm.
1327  Nicholas  and it wasn’t something coming out of me
1328  it made me think of my work ( ) there
1329  wasn’t even a three way connection ( ) if I might
1330  have thought “oh there’s that” (0.6) oh Lawrence
1331  wrote that thing about ( ) and what does that mean
to me ( ) I could have bounced it maybe ( ) but it
1332  didn’t bounce either (0.6) so yeah! I didn’t feel there
1333  was anything that was Resonating in me ( ) there
1334  was lots of intellectual work going on ( ) lots
1335  of interest and lots of all that sort of stuff but
1336  (9.0) Harry ( ) “back to you”
1337  Robert  yeah thank you ( ) that’s interesting ( ) ( ) so I’ll respond
1338  ( ) as far as I can respond but first of all Elizabeth-Gen-gen-
1339  genuine Resonance first=
1340  Nicholas  [ha ha ha
1341  Vince  [ha ha
1342  Robert  cos that really bounced off me actually ( ) that family
1343  thing and again I hadn’t thought of it and not sure how
1344  ( )
1345  Elizabeth  [( )
1346  Harry  but I was telling Nicholas about it at the weekend ( ) and it’s
1347  put it in a whole new perspective ( ) I’ve got to tell the
1348  story again cos it–it does connect with this ( ) and it
1349  Actually connects cos my Resonance generally was that
1350  which was interesting was that you know that ( ) Robert’s
1351  talking about his work and Vince was coming back on
1352  this ( ) the idea of surface beneath the surface ( ) thing
1353  it’s obviously a BJG metaphor for important things but it
does intellectually it has all sorts of connotations as all over the
place so MAYbe even if I don’t bring it to the forefront maybe it’s worth leaving there in the background cos it clearly IS there anyway not just here but in lexical studies in text, the analysis of text so there’s all sorts of things that so that’s if I worry away at that I’m just worrying away at what other people are worrying away at and that can’t be bad can it? so that’s good that Resonance for me was that I feel better about that you know that doesn’t seem such a big thing in some ways hhhh Elizabeth’s Resonance was lovely because at the weekend Alicia came home and err she’d already showed it to me this school trip to Holland two hundred and eighty quid and err something NOW of course I want her to go to Holland you know > I mean err she’s going on a school trip this term and it’s not an issue really but (0.6) but the way in which it was presented was sort of oh you know how about this you know I’m going to Holland > sort of iss she didn’t actually say that and I thought ‘well NO bugger it’ you know I’ve got a right to sit back and maybe not make a decision on the spgt so I said “well” I don’t know about that lets have a look before we make a decision and you know both she and Ethel smiled with this sort of ‘oh it’s just a thing’ and when I saw this smile I thought no hang on a minute you know < you harden your line and I thought NO NO (.)=

Robert
[All ha ha ha ha

Harry = and I went and took her through this text showing >you know < oh wait a sec it says things like

Robert I told this to Nicholas they get the chance to EXpose you to a GERman derived language I said “CO:ME o:sm” you know they’re learning German in school but they’re not learning Dutch

Robert HA HA ha= Harry =exactly

Robert German derived! ha ha ha

Harry [and I said “well” you can count that one out

Nicholas [ that would have gone down well in Amsterdam=

Harry =yeah they’ll love that one!=

Nicholas =yes=

Harry = ha ha ha (0.8) and then other things like they’ll get to an art gallery it’ll be GOOD fun, it they do art they’ll go to Anne Frank’s house all of which I could pick holes in which I did err it caused a bit of upset with Alicia and my point really was (.) I’ll cut a long story short because I could go on and but I took the thing apart and said ”no” they’re all sorts of things we’d have to ask about this before we say yes’ you know < and I sat on it deliberately and err and so Monday morning you know of course we said yes I said yes but not til and it took a long time to get across to Alicia that who’d argued against it that it fact the issue was one of assumptions that she would be going which she never normally does (0.6) but her argument was I knew you’d want me to go because you always have (.) she was working at the deeper level of well I know he will because I know him and I was working on the surface level of (.) there are certain moves you have to make and
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Robert: [nice] [that’s nice]
Harry: and of course that’s exactly what you’re talking about
when you’re just operating at different levels and refusing
to go into the other one (.) whereas normally when we
interact it’s the [c-] the relationship between the two
Elizabeth: [yeah]
Harry: which is what this is about and that’s about
Robert: [it’s called]
Harry: taking me for granted=
Robert: well that’s exactly what it is () I wanted hgr and it
wasn’t until she actually used those words on Monday
night that it was resolved (0.4) she said- I said ‘have
you got it yet?’ and she said ‘yes. I shouldn’t have made
assumptions’
Robert: ahhhhhh
Harry: but >you know< () but that’s an interesting ( )
as soon as you said it I went BOING so there’s a ding dong
ding dong there (.) the other thing was just to finish off
with your non-Resonance cos I’m gonna get back to that (.)
now (.) I’m gonna respond to you non-Resonance (.) it was
very interesting because what worried me about this
was I thought (.) that is why I spent some time thinking
about what is my big question? () because what I didn’t want
to do () because I know this is not about presenting your research
just talk through my research and this is what I’ve done cos
then I’m just talking coherently through
my research and so what (.) I can tell you about it
in the corridor (.) I really wanted to: >you know< to try and bring
up something in the research that was not a block but was actually
causing me problems (.) which I have done (.) and as
a result I think I’ve got a clearer picture (.) thanks to the
responses (.) and I don’t mean advice but the responses
I’ve got a clearer picture of some of the worries and where
they’re coming from and what I can- what I should be
aware of (0.6) >to some extent< I don’t want to be arrogant
about it and what I can afford to just leave on the
back burner (.) and that’s helped me (.) I think I’m
more in balance about the way that I’m going to go
about this now and I was very very conscious though
through it all that I shouldn’t GET just academic because
ALL I would- anyone would be left with would be
questions such as yours (.) but inevitably (.) those
questions because of the nature of way I talked
((tape ends))
Transcript 7

After Elizabeth

GDFM17.11.98
Those extracts which are played on the tape recorder are in bold.

001 Nicholas  erm okay () so () first of all I've cut out Elizabeth's
002 introduction () topics plans and purposes () what I'd like to
003 do is to play that again then I'd like to make some
004 comments on it myself () then I'd like to rewind it and play
005 it again and then I'd like to ask for your comments () okay? ()
006 so this is it () so this is how we started
007 ((Extract Elizabeth played on tape-recorder))
008 Elizabeth I only thought about this for ten minutes last night at about
009 midnight () so I haven't kind of prepared and my first feeling
010 was when I thought oops it's Tuesday tomorrow was this is
011 the first session that we've actually done which has been
012 base on a specific sort of research topic so I wasn't quite
013 sure how to do it () so I thought I would () (trying to put
014 down chair) doesn't go down any further does it
015 Robert no
016 Elizabeth I would hahaha ha mmmm () I'd like to go through very
017 quickly and speed me up if I'm too slow () a kind of
018 chronological process of where I started at () with the
019 landmarks and turning points along the way () just to bring
020 you into the flow of things and the excitement () mainly
021 ups but <you know> a few downs of what I've been trying
022 to do () ummm and there've been about three turning points in
023 the last six months or so ummm and I'd like to vaguely
024 outline those and then ummm ask you whether you think or
025 just how you feel about what do you think a way ahead
026 would be () I've got three pieces of data to show you () not
027 to actually analyse but just to put you into the picture of
028 what I've been doing and one actual piece of data which I've
029 had Tom's feedback on but I'd really like your feedback on
030 as well () is that okay () (end of taped extract)
031 Nicholas so that's I- where we started and in terms of the work we're
032 trying to do in this group that's where I think I let Elizabeth
033 down () by not giving her a chance to talk about it before ()
034 because what I think you are presenting there is a regular
035 seminar
036 (1.5)
037 Nicholas  erm () and >you know< we couldn't respond to it ()'in those
038 terms< that's to say () that the point that occurred to me as
039 I listened back again () erm () >first of all you sounded so
040 nervous< () I thought () the sound of the voice when I
041 listened () but I don't know whether that's true or not () I
042 didn't think it at the time () erm in terms of a distinction
043 that () Vince's given us () what I do want to be as Speaker is
044 not- is prepared not planned () and I think that's the most
045 powerful way for the Speaker to be ready to speak () erm () I
046 don't think it makes any difference if the topic is a research
047 topic or any other sort of a topic () myself () I don't think it
048 matters () erm but I think what we did here was a seminar
049 discussion plan () erm where () >first of all< () we can't speed
050 you up () it's out of the rules () it's not something we can
051 do for you () we can't speed the Speaker up () I think it is
052 possible to () for me to develop by going back into the
053 history of something and reviewing it () I think there are
054 certain techniques I could follow () to get development out
055 of that () by focusing on a particular decision I made perhaps
056 and then speculating () what would it have been like if I'd
057 made a different decision () I think if one took that sort of an
058 approach () you can take a historical reviw and work on
personal development from it (but it is quite difficult for) (for us to help the Speaker develop I think (when what the Speaker is doing is a background (to something (not impossible but difficult (erm (3.0)
in seminar discussion >yeah< we could give feedback and respond and make suggestions to what the Speaker had got to say (but it's not what we're trying to do here (3.0) (erm
(4.0)
and I think it seems to me that what I need to do as Speaker in this kind of situation is to give what background is necessary but to do that as quickly as possible and to move as quickly as possible to what I consider to be a difficult relevant critical point in my thinking now and then be working on it (and be working on it here and now (4.0)
so those are all the- I think that’s the conversation if you and I had earlier on (but I simply wasn’t here (and came here from the airport if you remember and that didn’t happen (shall I play it again?
Nicholas (104)
(5.0)
or is that not necessary?
Vince [I'm not sure it's necessary
Elizabeth [it's not necessary
Nicholas okay any comments on that then? I'd got rather a lot to say on that bit
Harry [yeah I (I d-ermmm
106 yeah (it's an interesting <thing to talk about cos>
(1.5)
hhhh err my response to that (I didn't pick it up at the time (but obviously when you highlight something you listen in a different way I guess (that you talked about as nervousness (but I:: was aware there (and I'm gonna speculate here (I was aware there that erm:: (there's was a lot of hedging >for a start< and a lot of setting up of what you were going to do (erm and comments about the fact that you hadn't really prepared for it because you hadn't had time (and I remember doing exactly the same thing (we can check back (I thought about this on the train (I tried to get somewhere but I couldn't (and I wonder (and this is where the speculation comes in (and I wonder whether the Speaker role is more difficult than it appears at the start (because it's not something that we're used to
Nicholas yeah
Harry [ you know >what we're used to doing< is either() if we're a Speaker being prepared in a different way
Nicholas yeah
Harry it goes back to Vince's point really (you know (but nevertheless knowing what is expected of you is an important part of what we do as Speakers and one of the things about this of course is you know you are expected to provide something (which as you said here (which will provide a focus for moving you forward (and sometimes of course (you don't know where that located (you don't know where the crunch really is=
Nicholas =that's right (you can't to some extent=
Harry =exactly
Nicholas: you certainly can't know where it's going -
Harry: = no (.) you can't know where it's going (.) but - but you
really - I felt quite a pressure on me somewhere to come up
with something that might be you know digable with <you
know> this would be < something that I could put on the
table that we'd also wrestle with> and would help me
forward (.) and in a sense even getting to that point is going
a bit further than you should go because to get that point
you're already starting to work out where it might go from
there
Nicholas: yes
Elizabeth: [ mmm
Harry: cos you have an idea of how it might be useful (.) so I think
part of the problem is that while we've concentrated a lot on
the responder because that it is a difficult thing to do in fact
the Speaker is under tremendous pressures that don't seem to
have been recognised (.)
Elizabeth: mmm
Harry: I mean that's my: (.)
Nicholas: I think this is quite right (.) yeah (.) that - that the
focus is so much on the understanding because of the
obvious differences in what we are being asked to do (.) but
the pressure is most certainly on the Speaker because the
Speaker's the person who is working on their own
development
Harry: yes
Nicholas: and it's again (.) not been said often enough I guess (.) or
worked on
Harry: [ I think not
(.) and there is an interesting (.) you know because this is a
discussion ( ) there's an interesting line > and I could dig it
up if you want to have a look < (.) it's on interview techniques
and someone made the point very powerfully that that this
idea of an open-ended interview (.) that the worst thing you
could possibly do in an interview however open-ended is just
to go into someone and say well talk generally about your
job (.) because people are not set up to do that sort of
thing (.) they need some
Robert: " it's an obvious thing this talking"
Harry: [ that's it (.) they need some sort
of sense of what the other person wants from them and how
they might be able to provide it and I - somewhere - (.) that can
make it difficult for interviewees < (.) and somewhere I think the
problem we have as a Speaker is knowing just where to
position ourselves (.) and that is > I guess < is something we could
work on isn't it?
Elizabeth: mmm
Nicholas: [ yeah and (.) it is to my thinking not different (.) from:: the work
we do with our own participants > all the time < about finding a
focus for their action research projects (.) finding a focus for:: (.)
getting themselves to a position where they're going to
investigate something (.) it's the same issue and we know
it's one of the major difficulties of getting going
Harry: yes (.) it may well be: (.) and hear I speculate even more (.)
erm (.) it may well be that actually finding a focus is
important in all sorts of ways that haven't been recognised (.)
that- that interactionally (.) in this sort of interaction (.) and in
that sort of academic interaction (.) and in ordinary sort of
interaction (.) finding a focus that you know "could be quite important* and this brings it out (.) doesn’t it? (.) it really highlights it (.)

Elizabeth but is the Speaker finding the focus or is the focus kind of cropping up from responders- (.) from listeners errm, attempts to understand? (.)

Vince .hh I think in- in- where it works best (.) it would be in chemistry of- of those two things coming together (.) and that’s- that’s my feeling (.) is that where it becomes the most powerful way of us working together is where it- the things that the responder says (.) makes- makes the person review what they were going to- not review what they were going to say (.) that’s completely wrong (.) because the person doesn’t necessarily know where its going to go (.)

Harry mmm

Elizabeth [mmm

Vince and I th-I’d just like to pick up on something that Harry said there that that maybe we haven’t thought about- enough (.) we haven’t talked enough about the ways in which we can use the sessions as Speakers (.) errm because I picked up that- (.) I can only do what Harry does here (.) and give you an example< (.) I used to play space invaders (.) when I was about 20 at university (.) used to waste hours and hours and the only reason that I gave up was cos I used to take me half an hour to get to get to the critical point where I was actually pitting my wits against the machine

Nicholas mmm

Vince and I just couldn’t stand the wasting of that half an hour in order to get to=

Harry [yeah

Vince156 =the point (.) so I think (.) I think there’s a balance between sort of< like< reviewing the topic and putting the Understanders in a position to be able to understand what you are saying=

Elizabeth [mmmm

Vince =and actually being at the cutting edge of your current level of=

Harry [mmm

Vince =your current=

Nicholas =yes yeah

Vince level of understanding on that topic

Elizabeth yeah

Nicholas and we are so used to:: (.) telling people about what we’ve done (.) as opposed to sort of being there (1.0)

trying to move it along with them and in front of them

Vince166 yeah (.) it’s certainly not something that when you’re with the in-house- the on-campus group (.) I tend to fall back on the routines (.) things that I’ve said before (.) things that I’m comfortable with (.) I mean that would not be a forum for >kind of< trusting to- (.) trusting to your ability to really explore things in a feeling of trust that the other people are not gonna judge you if you don’t come up with anything (.) in the way that an on-campus group for example would say well this guy doesn’t seem to particularly prepared (.) planned

Harry yes yeah I have a strong memory of that errm *where* t-I mean taking er I-I think you’ve hit on it there (.) I mean Donald used to do sessions like that (.) I think in retrospect they were very good sessions (.) he wouldn’t- he would let the focus come from the group (.) he’d have a topic and in the
I wasn’t there at the time but erm the group sort of challenged him at the beginning of a lecture and said look we’re sick to death of you:: letting us you give us something you and I wish I’d been there. cos apparently Donald said “okay if that’s what you want” and delivered a lecture straight >you know< 

Nicholas ha haa haa=

Harry =absolutely thing () you know it is was the:: >play Cherokee< ()
I can do that thing.

Nicholas yeah yeah

Harry it was having the courage to do it in situations where it’s alien to people () and I wasn’t in a dumb group I mean they were:: they were sharp and I think it’s a big leap isn’t it () it’s almost an act of faith to be >prepared to try something like that< () and get lost.

Nicholas can I try and find something else taken out of sequence ermm=

Elizabeth =can i- can I just say=

Nicholas [yeah

Elizabeth =one reflection on Harry and on ummm (2.0)

err::

(5.0)

I::- ()when I was kind of thinking about it in the ten minutes that I said I’d spent thinking about it I’d very much had the feeling that Nicholas would say about being Columbus and letting it freewheel ()

Vince mmm

Elizabeth right () so I mean I hadn’t- in the planning time () where I kind of wrote some stuff () I was thinking all the time () I don’t want to go into the academic side of this I’m not into trying to put across definitions of whatever () I’m just trying to get a taste of what’s happened () so we can get to the cutting edge quickly () but I took far too long getting to it () AND I realise now () I reverted into seminar mode by saying I want to find out you know what you feel about this () that was more of a kind of seminar mode thing () hhh ermmm (2.0)

but Vince’s just said there’s a difficult to get the balance between clarifying sort of background () giving enough background so that erm people will then know what are you taking about haa right=

Nicholas =yeah which has got to be

Elizabeth [ when you’ve spent two years doing

something

Harry “yeah”

Elizabeth and actually reaching the cutting edge () now I had vainly hoped that that would only take me about ten minutes to do () but in fact it took me forty minutes to do () right?

Vince mmm

Harry mmmm (2.0)

Harry yes it is difficult isn’t it cos “that analogy’s a really good one”

Elizabeth and I think you’re quite right saying you know () I wasn’t wasn’t nervous I was ermmm: () how shall say it? () I was () worried about, () errrrrrr () I was worried about slipping back into academic mode () I wasn’t nervous about the role of Speaker because I knew I had masses to talk about () it was just keeping it short enough to reach what I think was where I wanted to get to
Nicholas: mm what I'm-
Elizabeth: (1.5)
so up- so I felt that I had like an agenda for the first five, ten
minutes () for the reaching of the- then after that it was () I
had this freewhegely feel about it () I mean I don't know
where it's going to go after that ()
Nicholas: right
Elizabeth: and that's what=
Nicholas: =right=
Elizabeth: that's what stopped me being nervous () cos I mean
waaa I don't know whether I would have been nervous or
not () but I mean I was all the time thinking I'm not sure about
these two modes
Robert: .hh ermmm () hhhh there's something that's dawning in my
mind () and that is: that the topics that we take are somehow
fundamentally different and lead into that kind of thing ()
ermmm Harry's topic as I remember it and I think Emma's
topic, possibly Nicholas's was one that you could state in
very few words () and then you unfolded it from the centre
out () there's another kind of topic that I think Elizabeth was
tackling which was a long series and
Elizabeth: [yeah] [ah need it have been though?]
Robert: ah that's another point () I think this extremely vgluable () I think
it's altogether valuable () if one's going to discover this () yeah? ()
you were simply following a line of thought and then and then
and then () as opposed to starting out the problem () adding
it () we're talking about Russian dolls () at one stage () now
that is an entirely different development () you don't have to
listen to the whole lot to know what it's about=
Vince: =I think what you said there about [then and then and then]
Elizabeth: [that's different] [between research and ]
Harry: personal topic isn't it
Vince: yeah
thinking about what you said then () I have a real memory
that that it was chronological () that it wasn't it wasn't primarily
conceptual () it was primarily chronological with the
staging of the concepts into [the chronological ]
Robert: [it wasn't a seed ]
growing as it were
Vince: yeah I'm not
Robert: [it was layered]
Vince: (1.0)
so can you go over that- that () could you give us that
comparison again () cos I understand what you were saying
about Elizabeth's=,
Robert: =if-if Emma says that she's concerned about
the clash between work and family or something like that ()
which was very similar to: () to Harry then we know what he's
talking about right? () and then he would explore and simply
made that one thing more visible () he'd put more colour on
the same object () put the object on the table and started
painting it () yeah and we were saying 'you sure you mean
that colour' () or 'what=
Harry: [yeah the object changed]
Robert: ['colour more here']
Vince: s~ so the aim in that one is I got a simple problem or >=not so
simple problem< but it's simply stated () and the purpose of
this is to explore solutions to that problem ()
I've got a complex canvas here () I'll try to make you see
it (,) right (,) but that’s quite a different thing from something
that is ordered and sequential
and those are two different ways of
approaching an issue (,) I don’t see the difference as being
one between (,) a family topic and an academic research topic (,) in
as much >it seems to me< that Emma could have said ‘well (,)
when Carlos and I first got married (,) and we used to’ and she
could have built up to having a child and how things d- and she
decided not to
[no but
yeah
in the same way Elizabeth could have potentially said (,) I’ve
this issue around four item chunks and how can I make them
seem like idioms=
=hhaaaaa
ermmm,
(1.5)
and there’s some of that we’d have understood and some not
that’s right
in the same way (,) that there’s some of what Emma was
saying about private life and work life that we understand (,)
but we don’t understand what Emma’s saying about it (,)
just understand what we think about it (,) >I mean< we’ve got to
listen just as carefully to what she’s saying about her family
that’s how we discovered that as far as she was concerned that
having her mother look after her child is (,) is what was the
expression? she used a particular expression which you would
categorise as meaning something else (,) I thought there
was a real FLASH of something that happened in that session
[yeah I remember that
that we discovered what the technical term meant
well actually discussed that (,) my perspective as a
Grandfather=
yeah that was very ppowerful=
so there was a technical term issue that could have just as
much been a research issue it seems to me that I don’t see
that distinction as- at the moment
whar-
[I see it the dist)ection quite clearly still (,) but I also see
possibilities for starting (,) slap in the middle and then perhaps
unfolding outwards petal by petal
“yes”
rather than (,) going through chronologically
mmm
I see that as a possibility=
=and tell you what I’m feeling really excited about at the
moment (,) errmm and ever so comfortable and that might be
because of what I’m doing at the moment and not working
here full time like you are (,) errm
(1.0)
here =
=hha haaaaa
too LATE (,) too late
time to listen to the radio in the morning
hhaa haaa ha
is that (,) it seems really good to me that we’re turning our focus to
the Speaker (,) I don’t feel that we haven’t talked about this
enough (,) I actually feel >and I feel it on the tapes< that we
have talked about this before but we never felt it til
now::: (. .).

413 dagny! there's a problem with this as well (. .) i think it's been a
topic before (. .) but now i think we're digging deep enough to
actually experience that (. .) and have to- yeah (. .) resolve it for
ourselves and (. .) although my normal personality failing is

to think "oh" my god we hadn't done that yet' i actually feel
that the timing is good (. .) and we're facing that

420 Robert
it's discovery

421 Nicholas280 yeah

422 (4.0)

423 can i jump right- (. .) in fact now< i've missed- missed you
424 know (. .) but there were different moments but there was a moment
425 a while back when elizabeth asked about (. .) does the speaker have
to bring the focus or does the focus arise (. .) and "vinc said he
426 thought" that at its BEST its when it turns up in the work together
427 and (. .) i think they're both aspects of what we're doing (. .)
428 think >as i say< (. .) perhaps the quicker the speaker can get us to
429 what they perceive as a focused moment (. .) a focus area to work
430 on (. .) the better (. .) but then what focuses will come from
431 that (. .) are necessarily unpredictable (. .) and i don't know if
432 this is the right number on the tape (. .) if it's exactly right i
433 don't know< (. .) but this is the one moment (. .) i did want to play
"to you" (. .) before we finish (. .) let's try and get it in now
((attempt to play extract from tape re-winds to find extract
below in bold))

438 Nicholas this one coming up now is the last one (. .) where:

439 (3.0)

440 without wanting to make too big a thing out of it (. .) and it's
441 up to elizabeth to say what she felt mostly (. .) and clearly
442 this was not a focus or a topic that the speaker brought but
443 it seems to me that we do have "on tape" one example of the
444 entire process that we've been talking about all this time (. .)
445 when vinc intervenes (. .) to pull back something the speaker's
446 said before and offer it as a potential focus and this is what
447 happened

448 Extract: 075
"i was just interested ... see vol1 793-822 for full
extract

450 Nicholas begins the say the following while pressing the pause button)

452 Nicholas i think at that point you can hear the speaker trying out (. .)
<all i know is that > you get the metacomment 's all the
mental activities going on (. .) i think (. .) it-it's- you're one
alley tried out and then the speaker comes back from that
((Nicholas presses play button))

456 Extract
"...done (.) yes i hadn't thought of that"

458 ((extract ends))

460 Nicholas330 i don't know how significant it is (.) but it does seem to me
461 that we saw a microcosm of the whole process=

462 Elizabeth =mmm

463 Nicholas 'and i think could be done' (.) 'we've got the lists', (.) 'we have
the data' (.) 'if someone took the lists' (.) 'checked the data' (.)
'saw the intonation patterns' (.) in fact there's a whole research
project there which wasn't there before

466 Elizabeth mmmm

468 Robert there seems to me to be a distinction coming to my mind
469 between understanding a person on the one hand and
470 understanding a topic (.) on the other and what we're engaged
471 in- what it seems to me we're engaged in the understanding
472 of people (.) and if the focus shifts to the topic (.) one has
moved into a different ball game (:) with a different way of
doing it (:) and that question seemed to me to be eh
somewhere between the two but moving towards the topic
(2.0)
as if it- if we’re all trying to help each other understand
topic (:) it’s not at all the same thing
Nicholas erm hh each Speaker’s had a topic (:) I still don’t see the distinction
to be honest
Robert well the di-
Nicholas and- and we are certainly trying to understand people
Robert >>yeah yeah< well I mean that is what I take as absolute (:) that
we’re trying to understand people (:) but it seems to me that
at certain stages in our discussions the focus shifts towards
understanding the topic and not towards my understanding of
the topic
Harry .hhhhffffff
Robert347 now I don’t know whether that’s err valid or not (:)
Harry I think there’s something (:) hh now I’m just you know trying
to a handle on this (:) I think that obviously there’s two
positions there (:) that are different (:) and I just wonder
whether it’s again something that-that that needs looking at
because (:) maybe err I don’t know Robert just check that I’ve
got this right (:) maybe when you say people responding to
people (:) you- are you talking about things like responding
to feelings, (:) emotions: (:) or that sort of thing (:) whereas this
is not responding to anything like that but responding to::
errm
(1.5)
a gap in the representation of something (:) which opens
up the possibility of concentrating on the something *and not on*
the person*
Robert a gap in the representation
Harry [and I don’t see those two as contradictory
but you could immed- you could easily come away with a
picture of the two different things are going on
Nicholas I think there are- there are various categorisations that one
could do here (:) but I’m not convinced by any of them and I
think they could get in our way
Harry yeah that’s why I say I’m standing in the middle of that=
Elizabeth =yeah=
Harry =cos obviously (:) whether they’re getting in our way or not
we do have two different positions and that means they’ve
got in the way (:) in a sense< (:) do you see what I mean? (:) I-I-the very fact that that’s there means that maybe it’s something we
should think about (:) I have no steps forward (:) I’m just (:) you
know (:) sitting in the middle *and trying*
Nicholas I’m trying to und- this instance I’m trying to:: (:) ‘understand’
Elizabeth’s thinking on this topic and that’s- makes the dual
demand on me to understand the topic as Elizabeth sees it (:
or Elizabeth expressing the topic (:) but I’m doing that in the
same way as I was trying to do with Emma (:) or Harry (:) or
maybe when they were the Speakers
Robert but if there’s too many angles on the topic in order to
constitute a topic (:) one has to visit many many areas of the topic
rather than the understanding of the topic (:) or does that not
make sense?
Nicholas well to me the topic is defined by the Speaker that’s where I
was starting=
Robert [sure
Nicholas: off understanding the person=
Robert: [yeah
Nicholas: and therefore what is visited ( ) has its coherence through
the person
Robert: "yes"
Nicholas: and that’s what I’m trying to link into
Robert: but if there are too many aspects of the thing which you call
the topic
Nicholas: mmm
Robert: ermm its more difficult to see any picture
Nicholas: yes ( ) and again in the same way ( ) that ( ) as we say to people in
their assignments you know it stayed too superficial because
you tried to cover too many things and the Speaker can do
that ( ) it’s not ( ) you don’t feel you’ve made any particular
progress in a particular direction ( ) you might think ‘on the
other hand I opened one or two things that I can go away and
think about’ but you wont see any particular push through
because too many points have been visited
Robert: this-this
Nicholas: this is what I- this sums up my feeling quite well yes ( ) I
mean that’s not a good or a bad thing=
Robert: it’s got nothing to do with that
Nicholas: [no no no those are facilities ( ) yes
Robert: [for me a clarifying thing
Nicholas: yes yes
Vince: hhh
(1.0)
it’s interesting to hear that again ( ) at the time I felt quite
negative about that understanding move ( ) I felt that it was
right on the edge of what was acceptable
Harry: hmmm
Vince: because I was saying >‘you’ve talked about these two things
pretty clearly but you’ve mentioned this other thing that you
don’t seem to have said anything about’< and I was conscious-
you can hear the rephrasing it ( ) there’s a negative polarity in
that ( ) which I’m trying to just stay on board and not fall over
the edge so I- I hedge it and bring it back ( ) but actually ( ) when
you hear Elizabeth’s response ( ) then it -it just about gets
away with it
Nicholas: yeah I think you’re dead right=
Vince: whereas I think=
Elizabeth: [yeah yeah
Vince: I’ve done things before ( ) and there’s a classic example on
Robert’s tape ( ) where I reflect back absolutely perfectly but
it’s absolutely useless in terms of its use for Robert cos
Robert: says yes well done you’ve y- you understand exactly
what I’m saying ( ) so it serves no purpose ( ) it doesn’t take
the speaker any further forward ( ) now what I think is
interesting about this is that maybe sometimes you have to
go to the critical edge of what’s an acceptable move in order
to bring in things to say ‘you’ve got this this and this how
do you feel about that when I put them together hah a’=
Nicholas: I don’t think you can dismiss reflection the way you just said
because it doesn’t ( )
Vince: NO ( ) I’m not dismissing it = sometimes when you make a
classic reflective move it does no good=
Harry: [ah no ( ) but you don’t know=
Vince: =sometimes it doesn’t
Nicholas can't do that it's dismissing it ( ) that's the thing you

Vince it's not it's not it's not stating a fact

Harry can I just put a word in there

Vince I'm saying that sometimes

Harry [can I put a word in there ( ) it does no immediate good=

Elizabeth (° of the topic"

Harry does no immediate good ( ) not does no good because it's helped you to understand ( ) it's clarified that you've understood and if you haven't understood ( ) and if you haven't understood you can't get to the edge ( ) so it has done a lot of good ( ) but it's done no immediate good

Vince [well it's exaggerated

Harry =yes=

Vince =but it does n't it doesn't take the Speaker any further

Harry no but it takes the Understander further

Elizabeth and it might take the Speaker further in terms of errm feeling confident that they can move on=

Robert =yes I think that at=

Nicholas =it makes the Speaker feel good about the fact ' "damn he was listening" errm you know

Robert =this is my feeling at the time

Nicholas =that is interesting and can be very genuine in the building of empathy among the group ( ) but=

Vince =yes

Elizabeth =there were some early Reflections from you and Emma on my talk that I thought "gosh I wish I could remember the way they said that ( ) they put it really nicely and differently=

Robert =that's right

Elizabeth =from the way I put it ' but ' good I shall look forward to hearing that on the tape again because that was a nice way of putting it ' ( ) maybe more succinct or something

Robert yeah at least two people last when I spoke said things that I wish I could ( ) record

Elizabeth I didn't feel it wasn't worth it at all ( ) I can understand what you're saying about it not pushing it further ahead

Nicholas =yes so there's that aspect=

Elizabeth =but there are two different f-functions

Nicholas [=that the two will also work ( ) they're be no argument about that

Vince NO and a good Reflective move always has those things of being- making making someone feel that they're being listened to ( ) and some Reflective moves do even more than that in that they: ( ) somebody hears it Reflective back and the way ( ) as Elizabeth said ( ) the way that they put it seems particularly powerful and takes them forward

Nicholas =I think the counterbalance to what you just said about what you just said about 'being on the edge of what we do here" mmm is to remind ourselves also that the Speaker always has the right to say 'yeah I don't really want to get into that'

Vince mmmmm

Nicholas when Elizabeth - Elizabeth's I haven't done any research in that could have gone the other way

Elizabeth mmmmm

Nicholas she could have said ( ) 'I haven't done any research in that so can we get back to,' ( ) and that's always okay ( ) all the Understander can do is to say there is this as well did you
want to say any more about that

Nicholas or not (.) and this instance it seems to me that we really did
get a little view of that whole process taking place

Elizabeth [mmmm

Nicholas (8.0)

Elizabeth ermm

(2.0)

but when Vince talked about it being on the brink (.) do you

mean? on the brink of academic discourse

Vince [ no (.) [ I meant

Elizabeth question or on the brink of a co-operative development
discourse question?

Vince I meant it being on the brink of a co-operative development
move (.) as one of the moves in the- in Nicholas’s book that

I was trying to think (.) well what it is? maybe it’s a thematising
thing? (.) you’ve got that that and that (.) and can we bring
them together somehow (.) I don’t know which move it

would be

Nicholas I’d put it (.) I’d put it (.) for me it was you offering a: a focus
but-but working with the Speaker’s ideas (.) you didn’t come
in and say “well” (.) you know my interest in this is so and

so would you like to say something about that (.) you did
actually pick up something the Speaker had already
introduced and brought it back

(3.0)

errm

(3.0)

are we good? (.) we alright?

Elizabeth mmm

Robert ? mmm

Elizabeth [that was really useful for me

Robert yeahheh very

Nicholas [cos ch (.) we-I’m having this strong feeling now (.) we all
know this is difficult but it is worth it

Robert oh yeah this is

Nicholas [and (.) and

Robert [another step forward=

Nicholas yeah

Robert [oh yeah absolutely

Nicholas there’s

(3.0) if we shoot back then to early (.) what I put down as

number two are (.) maybe a couple of the Reflects that

Elizabeth’s just referring to (.) that did come up at the

beginning (.) errm where ((rewinds tape))

(19.0)

((repeated sound of stop button on tape player))

((plays the following extract))

Extract Vol 2 page 30 line 30 ‘umm but idioms is a good word

...absolutely

((end of extract))

Nicholas I did hear that as a potential focus (.) you might want to
make a point of wanting to Reflect that bit because of what
you were saying there

((click of stop button as Nicholas locates the next extract
and plays)) Extract: page 30 line 167

there’s also from a research point of view ...

can I come onto that

((sound of stop button - end of extract))

Elizabeth it’s interesting because I stopped there (.) because that

seemed to be more taking it onto (.) academic (.) onto an
Nicholas: academic plane () onto a seminar type of plane (1.0)
that's what it felt like to me () does it sound like that to you (1.0)
Robert: but I can imagine that it might () on the other gnd ()"yes"
Nicholas: but then I came onto it anyway so ha ha ha
Elizabeth: which have been checking and setting up on potential
Nicholas: maybe the contrast is more stark because they were so
Harry: clearly () strongly
Nicholas: yeah
Elizabeth: but in a different context the degree to which that stuck out
Harry: as it were would not been so obvious () it was obvious there
because of the context in which it occurred
Elizabeth: now interestingly I hadn't understood the potential of a
Reflect for a focus () in terms of this type of discourse () so
Harry: when people were Reflecting () it was helpful () I was pleased
but I didn't see () I didn't see- I wasn't interpreting those
as invitations to focus
Nicholas: yeah () >nor does it need to be< I know I just said that=
Harry: but
Nicholas: =nor does it need to be
Elizabeth: [ now ] now I can see that I could () after a Reflect
think () is it=
Nicholas: =how important is that=
Elizabeth: =how important is that () do I want to stop there and go off
Harry: on that () as a potential or do () as a potential point
whether I accepted and I thought yeah it was really nicely
put errm and then we went on because I didn't see them as
possible focus points
Harry: yeah that's interesting that because you've got a huge
difference between the Speaker and the hearer () a real
fundamental difference
Elizabeth: [ because [from what I've read about it a
Reflect is a Reflect it's not an invitation to focus () is it?=]
Harry: [yeah
Nicholas: =yeah but that's the point () you've- that's the fundamental
difference because () from the Speaker's point of view () you can
take them any way you like and if you take them as an
invitation to focus that makes them particularly powerful ()
from the () correct me if I'm wrong here () but from the
hearer's point of view () if the motivation for the Reflect is
to produce a focus then that motivation is not the sort of
motivation that ought to be there=
Nicholas: =that's right
Harry: the motivation ought to be to make sure I've
understand what has so far happened () sometimes it would
seem that if that-that can serve WOnderfully to provide a
focus for the Speaker () but whereas Robert’s that may
genuinely have come from a desire to understand () if you see
what I mean the form of it may have been inappropriate or
may not have been () it doesn’t matter () the desire might
have been there () erm ultimately what makes the
difference () we can get it wrong in how we express it () but
ultimately if the what the () again correct me if I’m wrong ()
if the desire is to move things on () whether you frame it as
a pure Reflect or whether you frame it as a question () the
motivation is wrng and sooner or later the whole thing will
go skewwhiff () the urge has got to be simply to
understand () from the Understander’s perspective () from the
Speaker’s perspective you can take anything anyway you
like () is that not () you have a fundamental division there=

Elizabeth

is if () if the person focusing hadn’t Reflect- () sorry if the person
Reflecting hadn’t Reflect what the person had been intending
to mean () then there’s an invitation to refocus isn’t there?
there’s an invitation to: () you know if it hadn’t been what I’d
wanted to say=

Nicholas

= yes

Harry    [yes

Elizabeth  if the interpretation had been squiffy () I would have taken it
as an invitation to say () ‘oh no’ what I meant was,

Harry    yeah

Nicholas  I’ll correct that yes () or it might be that () that in the Reflection ()
you realise that () yeah that was what I said () but erm

Elizabeth  I didn’t mean it

Nicholas  but yeah

Elizabeth  or it’s less important than I thought

Nicholas  yeah that’s right

Harry    [yeah

Nicholas  or in fact I can do better than that () you might take it that
way () and I think there’s- what you were just saying Harry is
a very clear statement of what I understand to be a Roggrian
position and that in the way that I’ve used some of these
ideas () I do in fact let the Understander get a bit more pushy than
that () in the sense of what Vince was doing when he bought
back the intonation issue and said there was this as well do
you want to talk about it () there is this idea of offering
focuses=

Harry    = it’s just that

Nicholas  [ the demand that remains though out of the position that
you’ve just described is that the Understander doesn’t do that
in order to try to: manipulate the direction of the Speaker in
some ways which fit the Understander’s desires () that I want
want you to talk about this or that I think this is what you
really ought to be giving some thought to () it is always
trying to work with the Speaker’s ideas with that honesty of
saying that- this is one of the points you bought up () did you want
to say any more about that

Robert  I thought Harry’s formulation a few minutes ago was very
close to mine

Nicholas  yes yes

Robert  “I found that a very good perspective* but you may remgnber that
during Elizabeth’s session I did manifest a certain amount of
anguish at one or two stages=

Harry = haaaaaaahaaaaaa

Robert  ermm by referring to notion of err capgelmeister or callmeister=
Nicholas: yes that's right which I wasn't doing=
Robert: which you weren't doing and I felt at sea to a certain extent
because I wasn't sure whether we were >in fact< going into seminar mode topic mode or what
Nicholas: yeah I think we started off wrong () and then some of the things we did got us back on track and some went off
Robert: I was certainly - I was certainly confused () I take your point just made absolutely but it wasn't exactly malicious it was=
Nicholas: =NO you were all ()
Robert: [*trying to grope my way along*
Nicholas: that was the point of my apology in the first place () I was not sufficiently present in my presence ermm () and now what I'm trying to do with these extracts () is: () to treat the session as though it were the kind of session that we would want to have and then pick out the bits of data out of that I think are on borderlines and are interesting for us to work on the discourse ()
Robert: yes yes
Nicholas: you see the next point () you feature strongly in the next extract
Robert: I can imagine I do yes
Nicholas20: because this to me is an interesting issue in terms of specialist topic () where () clearly if
(2.0)
Vince and I () if Vince's the Speaker and Vince's speaking about a particular area or even a paper that I'm familiar with () and other people aren't then () with the best will in the world for me to check my understanding of Vince I may move more into that terminology than is generally available () to the rest of the group () but it remains honestly specialist checking () and the borderline then >we have to watch out for< () is when does specialist checking
Elizabeth: mmm
Nicholas: slip over into=
Elizabeth: =this is when I started to get really
Nicholas: [other you know back into the debate the dis- the discussion () the well have you thought of]
Robert: yeah yeah yeah=
Nicholas: and and you tell me because I can't tell here () when you bring up ermm canonical and non-canonical
Robert: yeah yeah yeah
(Nicholas bends to put off the tape)
Transcript 8

Example interview (INT1-EL)

Interview 1 with Elizabeth
Interviewer with a something of a blank book (.) you know <

Elizabeth [hh khh ha I haven't even got a book

haha ha ha (.) me without a pen and a paper=

Interviewer [ ]

Elizabeth [ ]

Interviewer hhh ha

Elizabeth that’s pretty good

(0.8)

Interviewer thanks for coming

Elizabeth s; alright= Interviewer = been enjoyable (.) er:mm (0.6) th- the purpose

of the interview is- is largely exploratory

in that I haven’t got (.) a real agenda or- or:: a
definite set of questions=

Elizabeth yeah=

Interviewer = that will pop up (.) so: (.) I’m really just interested

in what’s prominent for you in the experience and how

it’s been for you. (.) and erm (.) I’ll act largely as a

kind of Reflecter-Understander in a kind of CD Mode

[ ]

okay try me

Elizabeth yeah

Interviewer er:mm but not exclusively and erm there may be- there

may be a couple of times where I’ll think “oh” that’s a

good opportunity to get into that area cos there are some

sort of broad areas (.) for example like the future

> you know < how do you see this thing going?=

Elizabeth [mmmm=

Interviewer = and the future is something that I want to try and get

everybody’s’ ideas on (.) but out of the sort of- I’ll build

a framework from these interviews and from the data

and if- if it works out (.) I’d like to have a second

interview sometime in the future where some of the

things that you say in this interview and maybe some

of the contributions that you’ve made in meetings

to try and do a kind of critical incident analysis

Elizabeth uh huh

Interviewer and actually give you- it’s be much more data led

(.) discussion (.) but this one’s a bit freer really and a bit

more exploratory.

(0.4)

Interviewer ermm (.) okay (.) so how’s it been for you?=

Elizabeth = ha ha ha hhhhh

Interviewer [ > I mean < what- what- what- what strikes

you about the whole experience looking back?

(0.4)

Elizabeth erm I want to start off with something really present

because one thing that really excites me is (.) one

very small aspect (.) is the aspect of metaphor

Interviewer yeah

Elizabeth as metaphors keep cropping up

Interviewer yeah

Elizabeth and when I listened to the- I didn’t attend

the Elizabeth Sunderland one because I was away

but when I listened to the GD tape (.) the metaphor

of the carousel (.) was really strong and that really sparked

off a huge lot of thought in me (.) [Interviewer: yeah]

about how if I’d been there I could have said

this (.) I could have [Interviewer: yeah] (.) there were things
that I wanted to: ( .) hhh experience within that metaphor

cos I think it- ( .) as people were trying > to sort < of

hang onto the carousel ( .) and place things on the carousel

and with [Interviewer: mmm] the text in the middle ( .) hhh and

hhhh looking back on the other times when:

have used particular metaphors ( .) of vases with light

shining on them ( .) and [Interviewer: yeah yeah] these kind

of different things ( .) errrm sometimes they’ve worked

better than others ( .) but I’ve found that really [Interviewer:

mmm] ( .) that’s something that has really errrm

been interesting

(0.4)

Interviewer so it’s interesting and there’s also a sense that

it’s something that makes you want to say more

than you might normally want to say =

Elizabeth = yeah ( .) it structures a different way of looking at things

[Interviewer: mmm] and so it opens up facets of (0.4) of ( .)

hmm facets? > maybe not ( .) > maybe it opens up

angles on the discourse [Interviewer: mmm] that ( .) by looking

at the way the carousel works or the way the vase

reflects the light ( .) you’re then searching ( .) it’s a kind

of errrm ( .) [Interviewer: yeah] mental preoccupation with

trying to flesh that metaphor out and get as much

out of it as possible [Interviewer: yeah] and I think that actually

helps with the development of the ideas [Interviewer: yeah]

and the whole discourse [Interviewer: yeah] you know the content

of the discourse ( .)

Interviewer yeah there’ve been quite a lot of=

Elizabeth = yeah=

Interviewer = examples that I think where a metaphor’s really sort

of taken a hold [Elizabeth: yeah] and everyone’s tried to

work with it ( .)

Elizabeth yeah and sometimes at the end you might

actually think that doesn’t actually work ( .) but

it was a good exploration even if it didn’t work

Interviewer yeah

Elizabeth or maybe we haven’t got that far ( .) I mean it would be

an interesting study to actually tape all the metaphors

and explore whether they do work ( .) with hindsight

or come back and have a session on the metaphors

and see whether we can get at them

so I’m going into the future first right [Interviewer: yeah]

but that was just something I wanted to say

Interviewer [something recent

Elizabeth cos you’ve listened to the tape

[ yeah that’s right it really

sparked me off ( .) yes that was my yesterday’s > sort of <

you know I was listening to the tape as I was driving

and [Interviewer: yeah] it was really interesting [Interviewer: yeah]

are there any other things that you found interesting it ( .)

about the process

Elizabeth ermm (1.2) yeah so I think my reaction to:: a couple of early

sessions was frustration ( .) because there were things

that I wanted to say ( .) I mean this came out in earlier

meetings ( .) so you probably know about this

Interviewer mmm

Elizabeth ermmm (0.8) but that we’re not onto the problem solving

lark because you know ( .) that’s > you know < that’s

(0.6) that’s [Interviewer: mmm] a different kind of discourse

errm
Interviewer: so what was the frustration out of

Elizabeth: I don’t know. Why don’t you ask me.

Interviewer: can you remember it?

Elizabeth: er:mm (0.6) just occasionally knowing

---

Interviewer: yeah yeah yeah

Elizabeth: which is my normal tutorial mode [Interviewer: yeah]

---

Interviewer: =so that’s-

Elizabeth: [so it’s really learning the rules () I think Robert’s-

Interviewer: = just not being able to share==

Elizabeth: = i- it’s sticking to the rules of- yes [Interviewer: yeah]

Interviewer: yeah [Interviewer: yeah] () erm (0.8)

Interviewer: and when::: the::: it

Interviewer: and there-

Elizabeth: [ but then it’s self control isn’t it? Because that could

---

Interviewer: = yeah

---

Elizabeth: but then when the exciting things come up you realise

Interviewer: yeah

Elizabeth: so you need >I think< you need to go through both
these feelings really to get the ( ) to
Interviewer mmm
Elizabeth understand the potential
(0.4)
Interviewer so definitely- definitely a feeling of- of frustration
and one of maybe constraint as well ( ) although
that later on- or maybe just after that you felt that
( ) there were benefits there ( ) in=
Elizabeth =yeah=
Interviewer establishing those rules and that self-control
but- ( ) but that it still felt like a frustration
it felt like a constraint
Elizabeth [ mmm ( ) mmm= Interviewer =mmm
Elizabeth but only on a couple of the topics ( ) only on
one or two topics
Interviewer yeah ( ) yeah
(4.2)
Elizabeth another thing I’ve felt was [Interviewer; yeah]
real errm (1.2) real privilege at being exposed
to what people did feel ( ) like I remember
listening to Harry’s session early on
where he was talking ( ) exploring the
relationship with the CELU and LES and how
he was ( ) wondering how to cope with the "sort of"
power relations ( ) I can’t remember [Interviewer: mmm]
exactly the content now [Interviewer: mmm]
but feeling “gosh” this is really
good because this- ( ) this helps
ms understand the situation which we’re all working
[Interviewer: mmm] and the pressures on Harry and
knowing what each member of the team actually does
is really important ( )
Interviewer mmm
Elizabeth and I think ( ) we don’t have enough time for that
kind of exploratory talk ( ) exploratory thought
Interviewer [Interviewer: mmm] very often
Interviewer so there’s a sense that that space does create
an opportunity that wasn’t there before- or wasn’t there
enough ( ) for seeing the way other people view ( ) a
particular topic
Elizabeth mmm
Interviewer and that ( ) sometimes at least ( ) that’s ( )[Elizabeth: mmm]
there’s a real sense of being ( ) being privileged or being
umm (0.6) that- that opportunity isn’t normally available
to see in that=
[ ]
Elizabeth >that’s right<
Interviewer =that’s right<
[ ]
Elizabeth [ detail and in that complexity
Interviewer [ ]
Elizabeth because it can never be an item=
( ) thinking about your three kinds of meetings [Interviewer: yeah]
right ( )[Interviewer: yeah yeah] it can never be an item on
a staff ( ) meeting agenda ( ) neither is it something
that’s urgent ( ) so it wouldn’t get talked about
mmm ( ) because we- we’re here so rarely all
together ( ) that it’s very difficult to actually ( ) you
very rarely talk about something that’s not absolutely on
the board at the moment ( )
Interviewer yeah ( ) yeah
(0.4)
so I think the topic: mmm (0.4) and well that particular topic that Harry chose, I thought he was really generous to share it but also it made me understand how the department worked better which was so it had a professional spin off as well as a personal spin on maybe a [Interviewer: yeah yeah] really I don’t like the word team-building [Interviewer: yeah] but I think that that kind of thing can be because then you realise and I’ve always known that Harry goes to lots of meetings and sort of we talk about the actual meetings but actually looking at the relationships and exploring them and how he felt about them

so=

=that to me was quite an eye-opener=

=so there’s team-building in two senses maybe that-one that- that because there’s space you see things for one of the team a little bit a bit more closely in detail than you might normally do but that sometimes also the topics and the understanding of that viewpoint gives you a better sense of the things that are going on anyway so there’s almost a double whammy*

[yeah and also-]

and also just occasionally he’s said something that I’ve often felt about the rest of the department but it hasn’t been urgent enough to say or I’ve felt that I shouldn’t say that if it’s highly unprofessional or:: I shouldn’t really think like that really but here he was sort of putting all the things out into the open [Interviewer: yeah yeah] and I felt i- it relieved me as well because “oh gosh” someone else has been thinking that but its not there isn’t any other occasion within the unit that we would actually say that unless we went off to the pub every other night and drank you know that’s the kind of thing that comes out in social social chit chat [Interviewer: yeah yeah] and since we don’t seem to have lunch hours ha ha any more ha ha and people go off home afterwards okay there is some socialising but very little socialising

yeah (0.4) yeah (0.8)
si think it’s valuable to slightly formalise it and play it open to everybody that’s good [yeah good (0.4) and there’s this sense that that in the other kind of meeting that we only have time for urgent things=

mmm mmm

= and those things are action points and things that need to be done=

[ yeah that’s right yeah = and they’re not necessarily things that are perceptions]

yeah (0.4) yeah mmm
Elizabeth: hhhh another thing that: (.) errrr (2.2) yeah okay two things (.) which one shall I say first? [Interviewer: mmm] (.) erm (6.6) I regret that right at the beginning of the this is like going back into the past chronologically [Interviewer: mmmmm] (.) right at the very beginning of the group development sessions (.) I can't remember whether I was away (.) I think it was a term when I was away a lot [Interviewer: mmm] and I wasn't here for the first two or three [Interviewer: yeah] (.) and for the next one or two (.) because I'd been away I was so hassled (.) that I didn't come (.) I'd totally forgotten about them and (.) because I hadn't been part of it when they'd started off (.) cost I'd been away (.) I can't remember what it was now (.) but I was unable to come for the first two or three (.) and then I forgot a couple or I was too hassled (.) I had stuff I just had to get done (.) [Interviewer: yeah] it was a particularly bad term for me that when GD started off (.) [Interviewer: yeah] it was one of the terms when I r-nearly gave up ((sniffs)) erm mm Interviewer: what gave up the GD? Elizabeth: no give up the job ha ha ha ha haaa he he
[Interviewer: give up the job]
just sort of [in fact I thought right that's it we're going onto half time at the end (.) I'm not going to have another term like this (.)
Elizabeth: erm (.) and so I regret not being in at the start because one thing- (.) my very initial th-going back even further about oh gosh when Nicholas first started writing about co-operative development (.) he and I co-incided on a British Council run course in Poland Interviewer: before Norton. Elizabeth: oh WAY before Norton (.) oh I dunno (.) it must have been (.) I think it was before his book actually came out (.) I can't remember (.) but he did some sessions to the whole group (.) on co-operative development and we practiced the first three stages I think in y- we practiced Understanding, we practiced Reflecting and we practiced- what's the next one? that he has Interviewer: Focusing? (.) Thematizing?
Elizabeth: can't remember the order they came in (.) hhh and then he took- and then his rest of the workshop was with half the group who went on and finished (.) finished them all and practiced (.) and then mine was something else so I'd started off with the whole group and with Nicholas (.) hhh and::: my experiences on that workshop were::: (.) very ambivalent because erm for some of the Polish teachers (.) that I was paired with (.) that I happened to be partnered to (.) [Interviewer: mmm] during the Understanding and Reflecting (.) we found it incredibly embarrassing (.) incredibly difficult (.) and they didn't- >I mean< and I- because I like Nicholas (.) and because I really wanted it to work I tried really really hard (.) to understand what he was getting at [Interviewer: yeah yeah] an- and and Interviewer: what Nicholas was getting at or your pair?
Elizabeth: no (...) what Nicholas was trying to help us to do (...) right
Interviewer: yeah yeah
Elizabeth: and frustrated because I wasn’t sure how the pair felt about it (...) and in some cases we ended up in giggles (...) I mean a lot of people ended up just in giggles (...) and some of the things we had to think about weren’t things (...) we didn’t know what to talk about (...)
Interviewer: yeah
Elizabeth: there was this problem of what to talk about [Interviewer: yeah] and it [Interviewer: yeah] was really really difficult and he said "well" if you don’t know what to talk about look at this shape and say what you think (...) you know (...) [Interviewer: yeah] an- and we didn’t want to look at this shape
Interviewer: that was the Medulla?
Elizabeth: that was the Medulla yeah (...) that’s right but(...) I was really keen on it and I wanted it to work (...) [Interviewer: yeah] and so I thought “oh okay” well I’ll reflect in my conversations with teachers around the course (...) [Interviewer: yeah] and it had disastrous effects (...) because:: it gave the wrong message to people (...) Interviewer: yeah (...) what sort of message do you think it gave?
Elizabeth: [[ ]]
[This extract from 386 has been removed because Elizabeth was not happy about its inclusion. It contained potentially embarrassing comments about a third person...]

A155

Interviewer
Elizabeth
Interviewer
Elizabeth
Interviewer
Elizabeth

Interviewer: okay
Elizabeth: you don’t carry it over into your normal lives
Interviewer: yeah (...) yeah as a technique
Elizabeth: it- it’s a technique (...) and I talked to Nicholas about it afterwards (...) not on the course because er- w::: there were too many things happening (...) but I did talk about it to Nicholas afterwards (...) when I joined Norton and .hhh (0.4) you know it needs to be::: when you’re teaching it you should definitely put a health warning on it (...) Interviewer: yeah (...) yeah=
Elizabeth: =right (...) that it is exciting but there are times and places for it (...)
Interviewer: yeah (.4) yeah (.4) okay (.4) so .hh you came
to the meetings with some ambivalence based on that
Elizabeth: so then (.4) so I came to the meetings=
=with a degree of excitement and a degree of wanting
it to work errm and I’d also talked for c- (.4) that’s right
and then my other pre- (.4) this is what I brought to
the meeting if you like (.4) the other thing I brought
to the meetings was (.4) I developed a kind of (0.6) you
know how when you go to conferences you see the
same people every year (.4) and you’ve never seen
them in-between (.4) well there’s one guy from Spain
that used to come to IATEFL (.4) and he was a social-
he was trained in social sciences and social work (.4)
so he knew the counseling moves (.4) he knew
the Understanding Reflecting and so on (.4)
and he’d actually been privy to some kind of
cerr (.4) no that’s right (.4) I think he’d read Nicholas’s
book (.4)
Interviewer: mmm
Elizabeth: and he asked me about it and how it was going
and he was desperately worried (.4) because social
workers are trained for years to deal with what
comes out of those (.4) with what comes out of
that situation (.4)
Interviewer: mmm (.4) mmm
Elizabeth: right? (.4) the way to react and the way to handle
it (.4) it’s not just giving back (.4) it’s not er-
if you’re going to go through the whole (.4)
if you’re going to understand all the moves (.4)
then you need to be trained to
well he reckoned (.4) very strongly (.4) that you need
to be trained to deal with what comes up (.4)
and in a couple of cases when I’ve watched
teachers using it (.4) or teachers have used it
>teachers have written assignments on it
they’ve used it< (.4) they sometimes have been faced
with situations (.4) they couldn’t cope with as
a result of using it (.4) so he felt (.4) he felt
the lack of: (.4) (0.4) that psy- >you know< psych
(0.4) psychiatric (.4) no its not psychiatric
Interviewer: psychotherapeutic
Elizabeth: psychotherapeutic (.4) the lack of (0.4) that actually
doing it on a learn it in one hour basis (.4) and
try it out (.4) could actually be quite dangerous
Interviewer: yeah
Elizabeth: so I came with (.4) that warning bell as well
so I wasn’t totally sceptical (.4) because I did
know it could help (.4) and I really wanted it
to work (.4) but I came with those two rather:
negative feels I think
Interviewer: yeah (.4) yeah
Elizabeth: I mean I was positive for Nicholas (.4) I was
positive for the: [Interviewer: yeah] (.4) I could see how
it could work (.4) and I had seen it working well
in some cases (.4) but it was a question of how
it was going to work for us (.4) and whether
we’d be able to cope with what came out of it
and so I had that little niggle
Interviewer: .hhh do you think that- that looking back over the sessions
that-there’s any moments for you where (0.6) in
gny of the sessions (0.6) where you would say that that
sort of erm sort of pre- that worry about the danger
and the fact that we’re not trained to do it ()
all the way through () do you feel that that’s an issue
looking back on it=
Elizabeth  
=[no
Interviewer is it- so is it the difference between a group and a 1 to 1?
Elizabeth  
[ ] [ ] [ ]
Interviewer . hhh but I think it’s partly- I think it’s partly because we:::
Elizabeth (0.4) know each other well in a group () and we would
Interviewer: yeah] and I think we know each other well enough
Elizabeth recognise if any of us was getting in really deep water
to be able to rescue each other if that happened but
Interviewer I don’t think it has ever cropped up here maybe because
Elizabeth of this kind of things that we’ve talked about ()
Interviewer "I don’t know"
Elizabeth but there’s a sense that that maybe >you know<
Interviewer that maybe if there were things that were on the
Elizabeth psychotherapeutic dangerous element that they would
Interviewer: mmm be say maybe very personal things or:: (0.4) is that
Elizabeth the sort of thing y- you mean when you talk about
Interviewer having to pull someone out?
Elizabeth (0.4)
Interviewer . hhh yeah that you c==
Interviewer [ like in a state?
Elizabeth =well wha- what this< guy said was when
Interviewer you’re helping people explore () sometimes you
Elizabeth they- they open up and it- basically things come out
Interviewer: mmm that () the audience or that they can’t cope with
Elizabeth and the audience isn’t trained to cope with [Interviewer: mmm]
Interviewer the kind of soul baring side ()
Elizabeth yeah
Interviewer but we’re not into the soul bearing here () we’re into
Elizabeth exploring () we’re into exploring a- an issue of some
Interviewer kind
Interviewer yeah () well I mean
Interviewer: mmm it’s come up really ()
Interviewer well it’s an interesting issue () I’m going to step out
Interviewer of Reflecting mode for second
Interviewer mmm
Interviewer in that- in that it’s something that Nicholas
Interviewer makes a big thing about saying this is not
Interviewer psychotherapy () it’s not counseling
Interviewer mmm
Interviewer and yet people do see it as counseling because
Interviewer they’re very similar moves
Interviewer mmm mmm
Interviewer and while I don’t think that we’ve ever got
Interviewer into any dangerous situations=
Elizabeth [no I don’t think we have
Interviewer [=but there
Interviewer have been sessions where- where people have
Interviewer revealed very personal=
Elizabeth =yeah=
Interviewer =sides of themselves () erm (1.8) but I’m not sure
Interviewer personally whether whether if we had a sort of group
Interviewer development meeting and we had a very different
Interviewer format () and we () brought the honest and empathy
that we bring together as colleagues then some
of those things might have come up if we'd given
people the space to say talk about their family or their
career or whatever

Elizabeth yeah
Interviewer but I'd agree with you that I don't think it's been
a problem but it's a very interesting area
this thing because obviously people do perceive
it like that=

Elizabeth [mmm
Interviewer =and they do perceive it as a danger so you have to-
you have to deal with it[Elizabeth: mmm] in some way

Elizabeth .hhh well I was thinking more for ermm if you're
going out to somewhere else and people says what about
group development you know how can you do it? and

Interviewer yeah yeah
Elizabeth then it's something that you well you'd need to be
aware of how Nicholas puts it across that it's not
psychotherapy [Interviewer: yeah] it's a way of [Interviewer: yeah]
of exploring an issue [Interviewer: yeah] initially and so on

Interviewer so do you think that those things have been answered
Elizabeth I mean in the sense that your experience has- has come
on from there I mean really you know
one thing that I didn't say is that this interview sort
of like confidential in the sense that I won't include
any of this without checking it with you so I don't if
you feel that there are things about it that you've not
enjoyed it sounds like it's been maybe
as positive as you though it might be but I'm y-

Elizabeth once once I got past that ermm that dreadful
once I got over the real hassle tgrm I can't
remember it was all fine [Interviewer: yeah]
and then listening to the tapes when I couldn't make it
when I was away and I've enjoyed listening to the
tapes ermm and I've always ended up wishing I'd been
there you know ha ha ha [Interviewer: yeah] so that must be
a positive sign mustn't it?

Interviewer yeah yeah
Elizabeth ermm and excitement from the issues raised and just
a worry that I can't remember all the gems and
I know I can remember saying to Nicholas [Interviewer: yeah]
look rather than just rather than just go through
the discourse [Interviewer: mmm] things [Interviewer: yeah]
I'd really like to recap on the gems and if you're writing
your book again you should have picture frames
every three or four pages with exciting ideas that
have been that have arisen as a result of a professional
group development session because there are gems<
there are certainly gems [Interviewer: yeah]
ermm they are not only metaphoric the metaphors
have nearly always been what I would call a gem
even if they haven't worked right through ermm
but there have been other things as well
either ideas that we've explored like early on there was the difference between planning and
preparation came up wasn't there

Interviewer yeah yeah
Elizabeth you see that was useful that stayed with me

[Interviewer: yeah] I remember that it stayed with me
but there were quite a lot of ( ) to actually have a
page in his book ( ) or for us to actually:
where it’s said ( ) we started off talking about this
and from this discussion ( ) came out the
distinction between this and this and this has been
useful to the team every since ( ) Interviewer: yeah]
and I would like to have captured more of those
moments ( ) because I’ve now forgotten a lot of
them ( ) Interviewer: yeah] so this is a little niggly
frustration ( )’s only cos my memories so gawful<
[ Interviewer: yeah] and because you know you come out
and y- and so we don’t a summary of each s- we
don’t have a summary of the gems from each session
( ) Interviewer: yeah] when we go over it ( ) we only
go over it from point of view of ( ) discourse discourse
things

Interviewer yeah ( ) yeah yeah that’s interesting so-
Elizabeth [ so that’s something

Interviewer I feel has been missing

Interviewer yeah ( ) some kind of capturing or recording

Elizabeth of some of the concrete outcomes that have developed from=

[ ]

Elizabeth some of the really good moments

Interviewer =the discourse

Elizabeth [ yeah some of the really ( ) AHHA >you know<

Interviewer Robert would call it an Aha moment ( ) where we all thought

Interviewer ah yeah ( ) that’s a really strong concept ( )

Interviewer yeah yeah

Interviewer (2.2)

Interviewer yeah

Interviewer (1.4)

Elizabeth and see how m- often they are to do with a metaphor

Interviewer ( ) I don’t know ( ) I can remember quite a few that are
to do with metaphors ( ) maybe the metaphors just
help you remember them ( ) although the planning
and preparation one wasn’t a metaphor one was it?

Interviewer no ( ) I mean it seems like ( ) there are:: you mentioned

Interviewer some there ( ) there’s- there’s those sort of more general
representations of an experience or an aspect of our lives

Interviewer like Harry’s ( ) there’s the- the metaphors ( )

Interviewer I mean I remember that one about Harry’s hot pipe

Interviewer ( ) do you remember that one where he talked about

Interviewer holding onto a hot pipe in -in Disneyland ( ) it was

Interviewer about how- how the discourse sometimes allows you

Interviewer because you give more space ( ) this kind of co-operative

Interviewer development ( ) that you’ve got this idea and this idea

Interviewer and you’ve got this idea and this idea ( ) and your
initial reaction ( ) like there’s these pipes in Disneyland

Interviewer where (0.8) when you put your hand on them ( ) you

Interviewer think they’re burning you ( ) because one’s slightly warm

Interviewer and one’s slightly cold ( ) and if you touch them individually

Interviewer they don’t feel anything at all but it’s just some trick of

Interviewer human senses that when you hold ( ) a slightly warm and

Interviewer slightly cold bar simultaneously ( ) the body’s confused and

Interviewer thinks it is being byrned ( ) so your natural reaction is

Interviewer arrahhhh ( ) and he was s- he was just explaining that

Interviewer sometimes ( >you know that< , someone will represnt an

Interviewer idea ( ) and another idea and you’re first reaction would be

Interviewer urgh they don’t go together at all ( ) but when you give the

extra space that we give=
Elizabeth: [yes] yeah yeah
Interviewer: to actually say Reflect >well< you say that idea and that
idea [Elizabeth: mmm] can you () can you tell us again why
you think there’s a connection there () and when you
give the space for the Speaker to come back () you can
can sometimes () that extra of holding on to=
Elizabeth =yes okay=
Interviewer =to the pipes () and that was a metaphor for me
which you know [Elizabeth: yeah] stuck with me () so I think
there are those general representations that you’ve brought
out () there’s the metaphors () and there’s also () I don’t
know how you’d describe those sort of () either (1.4)
they’re classifications I suppose aren’t they erm
the one for me was active proactive and reactive () there
sort of ways of () diving things up () which
Elizabeth: [yes] [yes] [yes] [yes] (0.4)
Interviewer: and maybe you could call those classifications >or
something like that< y- th- you have those >sort of<
outcomes=
Elizabeth: =what you mean the insight for you was active pro-active?= Interviewer =yeah that’s just- that’s
Elizabeth: [ from that session () that was a gem for you
Interviewer: that was a gem yeah
Elizabeth: [okay yeah
Interviewer: [in your terms=
Elizabeth: [okay yes
Interviewer: =I’m just trying to sort of () again
sort of classify them in different ways () from
what things that you’ve said and that-
Elizabeth: [well for me
gems are ideas that have become () err vgrbalised
and () articulated () that have then taken off
because then you can take them further
Interviewer yeah
Elizabeth: not just exploratory () you’ve actually got something
as a result of it
Interviewer: [yeah () yeah ()
Elizabeth: I mean exploring’s fine=
Interviewer: [some outcomes
Elizabeth: =but there is an outcome
Interviewer yeah
Elizabeth: and an outcome that you can ac-
that actually helps you [Interviewer: mmm] work on
whatever it is you’re think [Interviewer: mmm] >you know<
an outcome that comes to mind and is helpful afterwards
Interviewer yeah
(0.6)
Elizabeth: so those are what I mean by the gems () they keep
twinkling () everytime you kind of come back to
A315: something () they () you remember ()
Interviewer yeah yeah
(1.6)
Interviewer: can I just take you back erm () t- to make
it- (1.0) you said at one point that () that
it’s good that we’ve got this space to do it
and- and that () that we don’t socialise very
much and if we did () if we were in the pub
is it your perception that we could do the same
sort of thing? if we went to the pub and had
a few drinks () that really (0.6) I suppose what
I’m getting at is that- that would say that really
not so much the special nature of the discourse
it's the fact that you just get together (4.2)
and talk

Elizabeth no () it's different () but there are things ()
erm for example () Harry talking about ()
the relationship between CELU and LES ()
mmm () that's the kind of () he might have
said 'oh' come and have a drink I've got something
to think about I've something to () you know
I've just got to work something out () and
occasionally when- when () I don't know
a couple of years ago when Emma was having
a tough time () we'd go and have lunch because
she needed to talk () and it was a Emma's agenda
lunch

Interviewer yeah yeah
Elizabeth right? () and she'd basically explore and I'd-
but then that was () I suppose then in those
situations () you're not just helping explore
you're also kind of two penn- you know=

Interviewer =yeah=
Elizabeth =your twopenny worth
Interviewer so it'd be like=
Elizabeth [] so it's different
Interviewer =a mixture?=
Elizabeth but we don't have- but we don't have time to::: ()
but I think there's room for both ()

Interviewer yeah
Elizabeth but we have too little of the socialising () and that's
why the group development is really () is really useful
Interviewer it's filled a gap
Elizabeth yeah () cos the other things have been fairly priority
anyway () you know [Interviewer: yeah] Harry was obviously
starting his term () his new term () it was when he was
finishing off his Ph.D. wasn't it () and he was starting off
so that for him was priority () then you talk about things
which were priority () that've been bugging you or
worrying you () or whatever
Interviewer do you think () and this is extending that point slightly
() in that we don't have many opportunities for social
talk as a group () I mean () there are sometimes occasions
when people get together outside () do you have a sense
that there have been any benefits in this group development
into staff meetings or Away Days or anything like that? or:::
Elizabeth well I think so
Interviewer yeah? () hard to probably () hard to pick out particular
instances () I think it's a lunch thing

(3.4)
Elizabeth I think we're sometimes better at listening to each other
Interviewer mmmm
Elizabeth errm

(4.2)
Elizabeth and just the fact that we've all said these things () you
know we've all talked about these issues () [Interviewer: yeah]
gives us a much better background () so it's a stronger
background to build on for Away Days () but I'm not sure
I could actually put my finger on it and say () that or that or
that
Interviewer no () but there is maybe a feeling that maybe it's::: it's helped
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Elizabeth: I tell you where it’s helped a lot for me is in err... supervisions in tutorials (.) in helping people to come to terms with what they want to do themselves (.) rather than me saying well you could do this or this or this (.) [Interviewer: mm] so helping people explore (.) it’s certainly errrr and I used ‘so what you’re saying is’ (.) as a phrase ‘tell me if I’m wrong’

A360: I’m just- what I’m doing- and- I’m >I- I sometimes say well look- I’m just trying to reflect what you’ve said to me to see if I’ve understood (.) [Interviewer: yeah] so I do that a lot with students (.)

Interviewer: yeah yeah (.) so there’s a sense that (.) two things there (.) that one that you’re more likely to use that kind of reflective behaviour =

Elizabeth: =to help them explore

Interviewer: pedagogic

Elizabeth: whatever they want to do for their (.)

Interviewer: =yeah and that you’re also aware that when you do that you tend to mark it with (.) with a fairly explicit chunk =

Elizabeth: =I mark it (.) I mark it very explicitly (.)

Interviewer: yeah (.) and do you think that’s a a a sort of sense that >you know< linking back to what you said =

Elizabeth: [yes][yes]

Interviewer: =before if you’re going to use it you’ve got to be very - (.) very clear about it =

Elizabeth: >you’ve got to mark it yeah<

Interviewer: =or it might be misunderstood

Elizabeth: =yes yes

Interviewer: yeah

Elizabeth: I don’t think it would be misunderstood in a supervision (.) I just think it’s just good supervision to help someone rather than give someone answers (.) is to help someone explore [Interviewer: yeah] (.) and then at the end of that session (.) you could say (.) well okay what you’ve talked about then (.) and what we’ve come up with are these possibilities and you’d like to consider there’s a couple more that stuck me as you were talking (.)

Interviewer: mmm mmm mmm

Elizabeth: and quite often they’ve come up with things that I was going to say to them anyway (.) so it’s much better if it’s there ideas (.) if they’ve actually expressed them [Interviewer: yeah] because it comes from them (.) if you wait long enough it comes from them very often (.) [Interviewer: yeah] so I though “ah” good that was a good tactic to take then

Interviewer: yeah yeah

Elizabeth: so it’s definitely improved the way I handle (0.6) well especially your dozy students who don’t really know what they want (.) to do (.) they’ve got to come to some sort of decision [Interviewer: yeah] that’s got to be there decision I mean not only dozy (.) but even- no it’s helped right across the range I think (.) no I used that with Pauline the other day (.) [Interviewer: mmm] who’s changed her mind about six times (.) about what to do for dissertation (.)

Interviewer: [really]

Elizabeth: helping her explore why an- and thinking what she could do an-

Interviewer: yeah yeah (.) I think Pauline would probably be someone
that would react particularly well to that.

Interviewer: yeah

(4.0)

Interviewer: ermm

(3.2)

Elizabeth: one other thing I- I can remember feeling- when you suggested your three types of meeting and I thought oh good topic meetings because one reason which stopped me from being Speaker earlier was because I thought “Christ” what the hell can I talk about and occasionally things came up that would have been like- just very occasionally something like that came up and I thought I could do that at a GD meeting but there wasn’t a chance and by the time that three weeks was up it was gone. [Interviewer: yeah] you know I didn’t need- it wasn’t something that I needed to explore anymore. [Interviewer: mm] so occasional things came to mind that I could talk about but then I was thinking I was pleased when you suggested the topic ones and what I’m not sure about and what I wasn’t sure about cos I couldn’t get hold of Nicholas before I did mine. [Interviewer: yeah] and watching listening to Elizabeth Sunderland yesterday was interesting. [Interviewer: mm] the group development was how the topic ones can be run in an exploratory way rather than doing a little presentation first cos I went way off. [Interviewer: mm] I spent far too long. [Interviewer: mm] sort of presenting stuff. [Interviewer: mm] cos I wanted people to understand the background and the excitement I got from it.

before going into the exploratory part. And Elizabeth Bolton actually spent quite a long time structuring hgs. Robert spent- although we’d talked about not doing it not presenting there seems to be this you’ve got to have a certain amount of common ground before the group can be helpful to you because Elizabeth did quite a long presentation of her column. (.)) I didn’t have the handout so I don’t know what some of the columns were about but the columns. [Interviewer: yeah] and the things like that. [Interviewer: yeah] but then the subsequent Reflecting and Understanding and Focusing was very strong. mmm so it’s difficult to work with a topic one I mean I think they’re really valuable. [Interviewer: mm] difficult with an outsider who’s work you don’t know at all. [Interviewer: yeah] (0.4) and who hadn’t talked about it in the morning on purpose.

Interviewer: yeah yeah

Elizabeth: she’d avoided it so then she had to sort of (0.4) home you into what what it was she wanted to talk about and that is a presentation basically.

Interviewer: yeah yeah

(2.0)

Elizabeth: cos Robert had quite a clear structure in his head when he was doing his hierarchy thing he had this hierarchy of can’t remember what it was new but you had to finish the hierarchy before you could start (.)) before he could then start exploring the angles because you had to understand that it worked like this [Interviewer: mm] t- hhhh so I’m I’m mmm not confused but I’m:

. hhff (.)) we talked about in one session didn’t we?
Interviewer: well I mean, the issue of the nature of whether
one sort of=
Elizabeth: with a special subject:::
 Interviewer: [topic:] drives it into different areas
Elizabeth: it has come up yeah
Interviewer: yeah and there is the possibility of calling thin-
it- it hasn’t happened yet erm but then maybe
Elizabeth: >possibility of what the things?
Interviewer: of calling it a different name that if you feel
that it’s more- that it’s more likely to be:: to have
Elizabeth: to have a lengthier lead in to get people into
Interviewer: mmm into the topic
Elizabeth: hhhh Elizabeth’s- it was quite interesting Elizabeth’s
Interviewer: [become more important
Elizabeth: throwaway line “well” this is what I’d do as
Interviewer: a workshop really
Elizabeth: yeah yeah
Interviewer: right was indicative of that little you’re
not quite sure where to go from here
Interviewer: yeah
Elizabeth: it’s not a workshop but I want you to help me
Interviewer: yeah yeah
Elizabeth: I want you to help me explore
Interviewer: yeah
Elizabeth: and I think it would be different for everyone that comes
Interviewer: I think
Elizabeth: yeah
Interviewer: cos Lawrence’s was did Lawrence’s grow out of his
morning session? Yes it did much more
than Elizabeth’s
Interviewer: well it was an extension of it wasn’t it
Elizabeth: [it was an extension
Interviewer: of the morning session so there wasn’t quite
so much a far as I remember I don’t know
Elizabeth: I may be wrong there wasn’t quite kind of so much
presenty there was he did have to present
Interviewer: a little bit he had to say how his books were
changing and that seemed to get exploratory
Elizabeth: quicker I dunno [Interviewer: mmm] can’t remember
now
Interviewer: but there’s definitely an issue for you in this area of
some sessions are different from others and
some of them are more topic focused and that
Elizabeth: yeah totally different things came out of them which
was interesting
Interviewer: yeah yeah and is there a sense that we
haven’t- we haven’t understood that enough
or previously that we hadn’t understood that
and that we know that more now that- that
the thing’s gone in different directions from where
we thought it might- that-
Elizabeth: well I’m not sure if I’ve ever know where the
topic where the topic I was really relieved
to have a topic to have a topic the idea
of a topic based session right? because
Interviewer: for you?
Elizabeth: = for me because it solves the problem of
970 oh I can’t think of anything to talk about
971 I mean okay this isn’t (.) you know the things
972 I thought were pff become so peripheral that
973 it wasn’t worth spending a lot of time (.)
974 wasting everyone’s time talking about them
975 to be quite honest (.)
976 Interviewer: yeah
977 Elizabeth: .hhhh mmmm=
978 Interviewer: = so d-
979 Elizabeth: [so the idea of a topic was I thought really strong
980 and it certainly (.) it seems I mean I’ve really enjoyed
981 listening and I enjoyed listening to Elizabeth yesterday
982 but I was frustrated because I didn’t have the handout
983 fff ermm (.)
984 (3.4)
985 Elizabeth: and thinking back to the teachers like working
986 with co-operative development in Turkey (.)
987 I don’t know whether you’d met any of them
988 when you went out [Interviewer: mmm] but that was for
989 A488 them an issue of you’ve got to have something (.) to
990 co-operative development- to co-operatively develop with (.)
991 or about
992 Interviewer: yeah (.) I mean this is bringing us back to
993 the- the P gland experience isn’t it (.)
994 Elizabeth: yes (.) what do you talk about
995 okay
996 Interviewer: if you haven’t got something to talk about
997 (.) it seems rather artificial
998 Elizabeth: yes, it was like role-play (.) yes
999 Interviewer: the ingredients are that you know somebody
1000 well the ideal ingredients are that you know
1001 somebody and there’s some trust and empathy
1002 anyway=
1003 Elizabeth: [mmm mmm
1004 Interviewer: [= and that- that there’s ermm t- people
1005 actually want to say something about something
1006 they have a real need=
1007 Elizabeth: =yes I see what you mean
1008 Interviewer: [to explore a topic
1009 Elizabeth: [yes yes yes
1010 Interviewer: and then maybe there’s a third th- thing
1011 of understanding the discourse [Elizabeth: yes]
1012 rules [Elizabeth: yes (.) and that you can maybe
1013 do without one of those things (.) t- to get
1014 people into it but to do without two (.) to deal
1015 without a knowledge of the discourse rules (.)
1016 or to deal without all three=
1017 Elizabeth: = yes- no what are the three then?=
1018 Interviewer: [it’s unnecessary
1019 Elizabeth: discourse rules, topic and::;
1020 Interviewer: [ well I’m just exploring this (.) yeah
1021 I mean fr- from what you said really
1022 that you’ve got the discourse rules (.) the
1023 sort of (.) the techniques (.) how do you do
1024 it (.) you’ve got the need of the Speaker to
1025 say something (.) then- then having wanting to
1026 say something
1027 Elizabeth: right
1028 Interviewer: and you’ve got the shared group empathy an-=
181
Elizabeth: right okay =
Interviewer: and the sort of relationship
Elizabeth: yes () yes () yes () yes
Interviewer: that- for it to work at its best
Elizabeth: mmm
Interviewer: and maybe in some of our sessions it has worked
Elizabeth: like that () we have all those three ingredients
Interviewer: but when you introduce it to people=
Elizabeth: =that's interesting () yeah
Interviewer: [ you don't necessarily have any of those things
Elizabeth: [ you might not have any
Interviewer: of them to start with
Elizabeth: so () I mean < one of the big things for me is
Interviewer: how do you- how do you introduce this to people
Elizabeth: () errm how do you either recreate those
Interviewer: three conditions in some way::: or how do
Elizabeth: you compensate for them () or::: () do you
Interviewer: get them to do it at all at first? () is there
Elizabeth: another alternative? For example li::ke just
Interviewer: letting them genter (0.4) our world
Interviewer: er- or- or- some- () people who've been doing
Interviewer: it for a while () that it's like with
Interviewer: anything that () with Tai Chi or anything like that
Interviewer: to start off with complete beginners and not show
Interviewer: them a few moves being ()
Elizabeth: that's right () yes yes
Interviewer: [you know practiced by a competent
Interviewer: professional
Elizabeth: [yes
Interviewer: it's getting that balance between
Elizabeth: [ yeah they don't know what
Interviewer: their aiming at () they don't know what they're
doing ()
Interviewer: no
Elizabeth: they've got no idea why:: or how:: () or anything
Interviewer: () they don't know what the finished product-
Interviewer: [Interviewer: no] what a possible finished product
Interviewer: could look like or fe::: I like or:::=
Interviewer: so you have to take it too much on trust
Elizabeth: [Elizabeth: yeah] that it can do something
Interviewer: for you
Elizabeth: yeah
Interviewer: I mean I >you know< coincidentally () maybe
Interviewer: it was the same tour:: () had some friends
Interviewer: in Eastern Europe () in Hungary that went
Interviewer: to a session and they didn't respond to it very well
Interviewer: at all
Elizabeth: no
Interviewer: errm () maybe it's not the sort of thing that
Interviewer: translates in an out-of-the-blue workshop type
Interviewer: environment () where you sort of say here's
Interviewer: something you can use () maybe () you know
Interviewer: because of the things that we've been talking about
Interviewer: it just doesn't translate very well= [Elizabeth: mmm]
Interviewer: to that () that workshoppy envoirment () errmm
Interviewer: (0.4)
Elizabeth: and maybe it was something that () cos I know
Interviewer: a lot of students in Turkey who trie- () they were
Interviewer: really keen () and I was keen [Interviewer: mmm] and I was sort
Interviewer: of [Interviewer: mmm] (0.8) errm (2.4) but there was three
Interviewer: or four projects in Turkey over two years I think
(.) where the leader (.:) who was the person writing
the dissertation (.:) had to go through with it
because they were writing a dissertation on it
erm (.:) an- in two >I can’t remember< in two or three cases
they felt that there needed to have been something
they were trying to achieve through it

Interviewer yes (.:) yes
Elizabeth not just applying the discourse
Interviewer no (.:) no that’s interesting isn’t it?
Elizabeth and so:. (.:) one of the most successful projects
which was really badly written up
Elizabeth was from one of the Turks from that era
actually (.:) the dissertation came through
this year (.:) where she’s introduced
task based learning (.:) and she had training
sessions and she had group development
sessions and she made them different (.:)

Interviewer mmm mmm
Elizabeth so she had (.:) introducing task based learning
through group development (.:) [Interviewer: mmm]
so they were basically told how to do the
task based learning in a training session
(.) and then they’d have group development
sessions on various things about
how they felt- their feelings towards it

Interviewer yeah (.:) yeah
Elizabeth and that seemed to have worked really well
so it was- it was a sort of- >you know<
there were two things (.:) [Interviewer yeah] there
as the theme [Interviewer: yeah] that they were developing
that they were trying to develop in their
teaching practice (.:) [Interviewer: yeah] and trying
to develop better conditions for learning (.)
by doing this: (.:) and then they were exploring
their feelings towards it all (.:) in the
group development (.:) [Interviewer: yeah] and
although it was extremely badly written up=

Interviewer =but- but the actual=
Elizabeth the actual:!::
Interviewer [ feeling that- that s-
Elizabeth [=impetus (.:) and it was
Elizabeth a really successful project=:
Interviewer =mmm=
Elizabeth =who said “gosh” it was really good (.:) so
I mean it’s not just- hhh (.:) yes so you like
you met people from a Hungarian workshop
A575 who sort of felt
((tape ends at this point))
B000 ((start of side B))
Interviewer sorry you saying the idea of:::=
Elizabeth =the three strands
Interviewer yeah (.:) yeah
Elizabeth and the empathy being the third one
sort of what to develop for:. (.:) what to
develop through doing (.:) [Interviewer: mmm] so
if it’s a teacher project in the College >or
something like that< (.:) there needs to
be something that they come together to do

Interviewer mmm mmm
Elizabeth so I don’t know hhh (.:) that might have bee:::n
1151 (.) cos one of the topics that I’ve thought
1152 I might talk about (.) was errrm (0.4) how
1153 I felt about writing (.) and all the >you know<
1154 sort of pr- going through all the procrastinations
1155 you do and then [Interviewer: yeah] when you
1156 really get [Interviewer: yeah] down to it you do it
1157 Interviewer yeah well that’ll probably be one of the ones
1158 where someone like me (.) would think “well”
1159 that’s interesting (.)
1160 Elizabeth yeah:: (.) so I mean that- that was one of the things
1161 and then once I’d got to the point when I could have
1162 done it (.) I just thought I don’t want to talk about
1163 that anymore (.)Interviewer: no I’ve finished that particular bit
1164 now (.) so it’s- it’s done
1165 Interviewer yeah- I’ll come back to that because you said at one
1166 point that (.) and maybe we can link this into the
1167 >sort of< what do we do with this in the future
1168 conversation (.) there seemed to be a sense
1169 that you were saying that (.) that we need to be
1170 a little bit more flexible (.) or- or to create something
1171 some (0.4) some wary in which (.) when-
1172 when something- someone’s buzzing with something
1173 (.) that it’s an issue for them then at that particular
1174 time (.) that they need to talk about it at that particular
1175 time (.) that it’s no good >sort of< timetabling it
1176 for two months later (.)Elizabeth: mmm because then
1177 that need (.) which is one of those three things
1178 we just [Elizabeth: mmm] outlined (.) isn’t there anymore (.)
1179 [Elizabeth: mmm] so it won’t be [Elizabeth: mmm] so it won’t
1180 be necessarily such a strong session.
1181 Elizabeth mmm
1182 (0.8)
1183 Interviewer do you think there’s actually anything we can do
1184 with that? (.) and I want to put that together with another
1185 point that I sense (.) or that I’ve picked up from (.) from
1186 at least one (.) possibly two other people (.)
1187 that (.) that it really places quite a demand on us anyway
1188 to have a weekly (.) session (.)
1189 Elizabeth that was something that we have talked about with
1190 Emma:: (.) that- (.) I wonder whether a weekly session (.)
1191 (.) during- is it just during term times? (.) it is isn’t it (.)
1192 [ ] [ ] [ ]
1193 Interviewer .hhh well it’s
1194 kind of during term times but not necessarily every week
1195 Elizabeth I have sometimes felt (.) ‘gosh’ it’s come round again
1196 and I’m not ready for it (.) but then I always enjoy the
1197 sessions (.) but then I stay until 8 o’clock at night
1198 catching up you know [Interviewer: yeah] errrm ha and miss
1199 supper and go to my Ti Chi class ha .hhh
1200 Interviewer yeah
1201 Elizabeth so I mean there is- there is- there are times
1202 when I really (.) unless I was really really
1203 kggn I wouldn’t come (.) or I’ve just felt I just
1204 can’t do it today (.) and I mean Emma’s definitely felt that
1205 way as well (.) but she didn’t want to say
1206 because she was going off on maternity leave
1207 anyway ha ha and she felt
1208 Interviewer [ yes that’s something that Emma shared
1209 yesterday (.) I mean it’s not surprising in
1210 a sense (.) that- >I mean< (.) it’s interesting that on
1211 the one hand you would feel=
Elizabeth: That maybe that- >you know< you haven't got
time to do this today (.) but then when you get into the
>when you do it it's always good<
Interviewer: you actually en- enjoy it
Elizabeth: it's always good yeah
Interviewer: it's just (.) you have to stay la- later (.) errm
and I suppose this is the big question we have now
people going part-time (.) and people coming in
on part-time basis (.) you know what can (.) what
can we do with it (.) will it work?
Elizabeth: .hhrh yeah (.) you see
I think it's really valuable (.) and I'd really like
everyone part-time to come (.) because I think
that's one of the ways that part-timers can
keep in with what's happening (.) and I think
Mark would have actually got a hell of a lot
although he might not admit it himself
Interviewer: probably the most out of it (.) I mean it could have=
Elizabeth: [yeah cos I mean
Interviewer: =changed his life (.) I mean th- the last bit
of this work here=
Elizabeth: =yes yey=
Interviewer: =I think so=
Elizabeth: =I'm sure it would have been really good
Interviewer: [I think if he could
(.) for someone like Mark (.) it would actually
give a framework in which his- side (.) his good
side is- which is there
Elizabeth: [yeah I've really regretted that Mark hasn't wanted
to cgoe and the same with=
Interviewer: [yeah so do I
Elizabeth: =Donald as well (.) because they're both really
rich in:: [Interviewer: yeah] >I mean< in kind
of insightful thinking and I think- I mean
Mark would have given a lot I think
.hhrh so I regretted
Interviewer: [yeah it would have been really good to have
got Mark (.) maybe we could get him in as an Outside
Speaker
(0.8)
Elizabeth: yeah that's a good idea (.) no the other thing for the future
I- I just remembered I wanted to say was (.) I don't know
whether this happened at the beginning because I missed
the first few sessions (.) hhhh but was there ever
a time when Nicholas (.) too:K everyone through
all the moves?
(1.0)
are we actually- we're Understanding (.) we're Reflecting
we're helping Focus and I can't remember the other four
off the top of my head
[ . ]
Interviewer: .hhrh well it may be
because they don't make sense?
[ . ]
Elizabeth: I mean are we?
Interviewer: I mean it
Elizabeth: [but are we- but
(0.8)
Elizabeth: I wouldn’t mind going back to:: [Interviewer: mmm]

or >I mean< I’d quite like a session where
Nicholas actually took up all- you know the other
moves as well

Interviewer: mmm

(1.8)

Elizabeth: A to help us use them

[ ]

Interviewer: You mean that- that the slightly more advanced ones?

or:

Elizabeth: yes () or I don’t know what they were () I can’t remember
what they were [Interviewer: yeah] I’ve got his book
but I haven’t looked at it for ages ()

Interviewer: so which ones make sense to you at the moment=

Elizabeth: I have the feeling that

Elizabeth: = well just the ones that we’ve been using
because I’ve been practicing those and () and
like the::: Understanding Reflecting Focusing

B044 [Interviewer: yeah] you see I can’t remember what the
others are called even () so we may have been doing
them without even realising+

Interviewer: = well that’s what I’m wondering () I wonder
whether () whether

Elizabeth: [so I’d like Nicholas to come back
and put his framework over what I’ve been doing

Interviewer: yeah () yeah

Elizabeth: to say () in the original- in the original
erm framework for err co-operative development
we had seven moves () and err I mean- I fee:::l
>because this may have been something that
happened at the beginning< () that I wasn’t
priy to () that you went through all of them
and you decided right you were just going to stick
with [Interviewer: mmm] Speaking () Understanding

Interviewer: [yeah I don’t think
we ever got as far as the more complicated ones

Elizabeth: well is ther- okay let’s explore whether there’s

a value in those () I would like to do that

Interviewer: as sort of pedagogic training concepts for newcomers

Elizabeth: [just to take the
discourse further () would it- would it enable our

discourse to develop more deeply or more in an exploratory

fashion? If we had the other moves as well () and are
they moves that you do- like you always start Reflecting
and then you might thematise and- [Interviewer: mmm] () or:::
do you jump in and do this and then this and then this ()
or could you jump in and do this this and this as appropriate

Interviewer: yeah () yeah

Elizabeth: so I’d like to explore the potential of knowing more

about the other moves in the discourse () so if they’re

in Nicholas’s book () he must have at one time thought
they were important () and you see I’d like to know

if he’s still writing about them () so I’d like Nicholas
to come and do an update on how he now feels
about having those moves () and help- and how far

they help discourse () and whether he’s found them

in our discourses () whether we’re aware of them or not

Interviewer: yeah () no it might be a very interesting thing for me
to look at as well () to try and get into () revalue that

Elizabeth: yeah
Interviewer: those categories
Elizabeth: yes (.) yes because I think the one’s we’re using are
valuable (.) so why not be more explicit about
the others
Interviewer: mmm mmm
Elizabeth: do you see what I mean?
Interviewer: I do: see what you mean (.) erm (0.8) and when
you started making that point (.) I have a sense that
you were talking about introducing new people
to the ->you know< to part-timers (.) but in fact
by the end it was just as much about- extending
[ ]
Elizabeth: no no that was a separate
>it was a separate thing<
[ ] [ ]
Interviewer: was it yeah
Elizabeth: there were two separate- quite separate points
the first was that it would be really
good for part-timers to be in on it
(0.6)
Interviewer: but in the sense of
Elizabeth: because of the shared experience
and team building (.) and understanding
Interviewer: [ ] working with that framework
Elizabeth: and then erm no totally separate
ermm I was just aware I've got to
go in a minute so (.) erm (.) I wanted
to say it before I’ve forgotten (.) about
exploring the rest of the discourse moves
[Interviewer: yeah] (.) exploring their potential
have we been using them without knowing
it [Interviewer: mmm] (0.4) erm (.) or would- as
we:: (.) came to an understanding of the
constraints (.) and (.) rules and (.) potential
of using the other mgyes .hhh (.) then could
we do the same for the others? [Interviewer: mmm]
would Nicholas think there was "as:: broadening
out possibility"*
Interviewer: good (.) okay (.) so finish off by just a
summary of the future (.) you would like to
carry on::: (.) from what you said you obviously
feel that- (.) that there have been worthwhile things
out of it (.) but you’re here for the six months
but you might (.) you might like- well there
are two possibilities (.) one is that as a group
we decided to cut down the number (.) of- of
sessions or made them optional (.) which-
do you have a sense of which one of those
two (.) would be your preferred (.) outcome
(3.2)
Interviewer: well there is a third one of course (.) and that's
to leave it (.) more or less
Elizabeth: [no I would certainly come
for the six months I was actually here
since I’m not going to be living in Newchester
there’s no way I’m going to come down from
Layton on a Tuesday afternoon (.)
Interviewer: [ no for the six months of
the year
Elizabeth: [so six months I’m not here () I would expect Nora to come () but I would like to be privy to what has happened () or in the sense of gems and insights that people have gained.]

Interviewer: mmm

Elizabeth: explorations () explorations () like a little diary of explorations attempted and insights gained ()

Interviewer: yeah

(0.4)

Elizabeth: and then I wouldn’t feel comin- >I mean< this is a personal selfish thing >I mean< I wouldn’t then feel that if I’d been out of it -> you know < if I’d been out of it for six months () that’d I’d missed out all that much () certainly >I mean< I could quite easily listen to the tapes () and would like to listen to the tapes () erm () and they are getting much more listen t- >I m< the first ones were much more difficult to hear () because Harry boomed so much- () but I think we’ve got that sorted out now better () havn’t we? I mean the actually recording is better.

Interviewer: I think so yeah

Elizabeth: cos the first ones were just- almost impossible you had to take your ear plug- [Interviewer: yeah] ear phones out for Harry and put them back in for everyone else.

Interviewer: [yeah these are good ((looking at the Coomber tape recorder))]

Elizabeth: yeah

Interviewer: okay=

Elizabeth: =so no () I think - I mean if we () maybe the thing to do would be to do it during term () but not do it when there was an Away Day building up or something ()

Interviewer: mmm

Elizabeth: and then if we are really pressured and if we don’t cme () we don’t cme () we usually get two topics every month only () cos it’s ten weeks () we get five topics [Interviewer: mmm]

so if there were eight ten of us doing it I mean I know there never are () we’d speak once a term [Interviewer: yeah] it’s not very much really.

Interviewer: no

(4.2)

Interviewer: no () and there’s the other choice of course is the balance between analysis and () Speaking and a couple of people have said that it’s time we did more Speaking.

Elizabeth: mmm

Interviewer: and less analysis

Elizabeth: yeah () I think that maybe unless- yeah unless we go on and broaden out the discourse () unless we go on to focus more on the discourse yeah

[ ]

Interviewer: in the way you just described

Elizabeth: yes=

Interviewer: =yeah
Interviewer: yeah well maybe there's a sense that we've kind of-

apart from running out of categories that

we've got a shared understanding of what it's doing

[ ]

Elizabeth: yes

Interviewer: and how to do it [Elizabeth: yes] that the thing

now is to do more of it mmm

Elizabeth: yes yea::h

Interviewer: OKAY anything else to

Elizabeth: maybe have a recap session

(Interviewer gestures to a student waiting outside the room))

Elizabeth: oh yes I knew she would be errrm maybe have

a recap session like could you have two recap

sessions in one?

(0.4)

Elizabeth: so that you have three Speakers two

Speakers and then a recap session

Interviewer: yeah yeah well maybe

Elizabeth: if we have this idea of erm outcomes

Elizabeth: collecting the gems

Interviewer: we just need to have some sort of system

for you know sharing that round either

that the individual Speaker would sort of

have some sort of outcomes for them

(sound of door opening as Interviewer stands to open))

Elizabeth: jolly good

Interviewer: thanks very much Elizabeth

Elizabeth: right

(sound of door closing as Elizabeth exits))
Transcript 9

Example of notes derived from a first interview and used as the basis of the second interview.

Notes for Robert
Robert 1\textsuperscript{st} interview notes used as the basis for the 2\textsuperscript{nd} interview

Thursday 24\textsuperscript{th} June 1999

Robert’s Questions

Introduction

When you are the Speaker what do you think is the balance between:

- articulation (creating awareness in real time)
- the reporting of awarenesses (ideas) that you have been thinking about for some time previously.

Do you think you are malleable person?

\textbf{Extract 1}

\begin{tabular}{ll}
342 & A034 \hspace{1em} it is that I am malleable material (.) >some  \\
343 & \hspace{1em} people are more malleable than others< (.)  \\
344 & \hspace{1em} and when I get into a group I am \textit{malleated}
\end{tabular}

In what ways do you feel you’ve been recalibrated?

\textbf{Extract 2}

\begin{tabular}{ll}
426 & Robert \hspace{1em} in fact it has just occurred to me that one could  \\
427 & A087 \hspace{1em} () look at our sessions and ( ) calibration  \\
428 & Interviewer \hspace{1em} yah (.) mmm  \\
429 & Robert \hspace{1em} I reckon I have been (.) or one of ‘me’s (.) one the  \\
430 & \hspace{1em} many Bakhtinian me’s has been recalibrated  \\
431 & Interviewer \hspace{1em} yes  \\
432 & Robert \hspace{1em} err (.) and this I found (.) find very positive
\end{tabular}

You have been aware of this recalibration – did it sustain itself? Is it indeed the recalibration of one particular Bakhtinian self or the creation of a new one? Did it manifest itself outside the GD session?

\textbf{Extract 3}

\begin{tabular}{ll}
448 & Robert \hspace{1em} okay that was my calibration (.) then I found we were  \\
449 & \hspace{1em} playing these games (.) certain things were in (.) certain  \\
450 & \hspace{1em} things were out (.) and you had to concentrate on that  \\
451 & \hspace{1em} (.) and I had certain difficulty (.) in adjusting and learning  \\
452 & \hspace{1em} (.) I could conceive it notionally (.) but not match my  \\
453 & \hspace{1em} language to the conception (1.2) after a while I learned  \\
454 & \hspace{1em} better and better (.) became more and more sensitive  \\
455 & \hspace{1em} and I saw how what I would have accepted as good  \\
456 & \hspace{1em} sound principle (.) but could not convert it into speech  \\
457 & \hspace{1em} because my speech hadn’t- (.) because of the way  \\
458 & \hspace{1em} I was calibrated (.) right? (.) so I recalibrated  \\
459 & \hspace{1em} (.) how far that calibration extends we’ve also  \\
460 & \hspace{1em} touched on (.) in that it extends to my students
\end{tabular}
Ideas and terms

I'd like to consider the following statement in connection with articulating your way (as a Speaker) into a better understanding of 'terms':

Extract 4

678 Robert = in all meaningful discourse and debates (.) before
679 you get beyond the trivial (.) you have to negotiate
680 A246 terms (.) that is what we've been doing
681 Interviewer mmm
682 Robert right? (.) to a large extent (.) the sooner we
683 get beyond the daily routine

Sometimes in GD terms are used as placeholders (they do not mean until they come to mean through articulation and clarification).

When we talked last time, you expressed doubts about my use of the term 'idea'.

In connection with this and with something that Elizabeth expresses I would like to use the second interview to talk over your reference to the Wittgenstein's disservice in the formation of the concept of 'idea' and Elizabeth's prominence for 'gems':

Extract 5

584 Elizabeth errm (.) and excitement from the issues raised (.) and just
585 a worry that (.) I can't remember all the gems (.) and
586 I know I can remember saying to Nicholas [Interviewer: yeah]
587 look (.) rather than just (.) rather than just go through
588 the discourse [Interviewer: mmm] (.) things [Interviewer: yeah]
589 I'd really like to recap on the gems (.) and if you're writing
590 your book again (.) you should have picture frames
591 every three or four pages (.) with exciting ideas that
592 have been - that have arisen as a result of a professional
593 group development session (.) because there are gems<
594 there are certainly gems (.) [Interviewer: yeah]

How does this relate to this statement:

Extract 6

698 Robert yeah (0.4) that I think is is- is the crucial- crucial
699 our scientific method means cut it out (.) put it onto
700 A258 your laboratory desk (.) yeah?
701 Interviewer yeah
702 Robert and it is no longer (.) it was the Bakhtian notion of language
703 (.) being like the volcano (.) this hot and red fire yeah? (.)
704 Interviewer mmm
705 Robert a:nd (.) we can't ca- capture it yeah (.) all we can do is
706 get a bit that's cooled and carve it up at the back of the
707 laboratory
708 Interviewer mmm

Social Engineering and artificiality

You use the term social engineering – obviously there are number of times when
You feel some sort of artificiality and the constraint of rules and games and
what we are allowed to do.
There are expressions of doubt about the need for the ‘rules’:

Extract 7
724 Robert are they:: discourse rules or are they social rules? (0.4)
725 are they realised in text or realised on some different plane?
726 A340 () how are they perceived? (0.4) that’s one aspect
727 err () another aspect is you could put in your title
728 social engineering (1.0) cos that’s what it is

At another point you talk about the changes in discourse rules as ‘playing a game’:

Extract 8
448 Robert okay that was my calibration () then I found we were
449 playing these games () certain things were in () certain
450 things were out () and you had to concentrate on that

There is an ambivalence perhaps in ‘for me the discourse failed to be central theme at an earlyish stage’ but on the other hand ‘you need a key to unlock the door’

744 () it is an artificial () constraint () the rules of
745 Reflection (0.6) but that is not to say there’s a
746 better way of doing it ()

Metaphor

Your language is hugely metaphorical. Are you aware of this concentration – is that a result of a basic distrust of lexical items - words as ‘slippery etc’?

Introducing this to new groups

And how do we introduce this to new people or new groups? How do we get the balance between practicing the moves (labels and facilitating understanding) or as Robert says ‘give the experience’ and then import the labels.

Extract 9
766 Interviewer there’s also the pedagogic description ()
767 the training description () to what extent
768 can you add labels which facilitate the
769 understanding and give people a conceptual
770 framework for feeling their way into it
771 Robert yeah you can’t give old wine in new skins
772 () you can’t give new frames through lexis
773 which is attached to other experiences () you
774 can only I think give the experience and then
775 import labels

Self as contextually constituted

We then talked about selves. Robert draws a parallel between a word which is contextually constituted and the self which is dependent on context too:

Extract 10
Robert then goes onto make clear that he feels we are multi-valent. This is a question of how you relate to the group. Using an example of a card game played in Germany Robert makes the point that familiar address forms are acceptable with people you wouldn’t even address on the street. “The chemistry is determined by the context.”

Extract 11

342  Robert  it is that I am malleable material (.) >some
343  people are more malleable than others< (.)
344  and when I get into a group I am malleated
345  A034  (.) hammered in other words (.) become
346  part of that group (.) and that is the only
347  part of me that exists (.) right

This idea of how the individual self has a reflexive relation with the group is explored:

Extract 12

353  Robert  I become part of that group (.) and that
354  A44  is the only part of me that exists (.)
355  right?
356  Interviewer  yes
357  Robert  so thi- thi- thing- (.) it’s a continuum
358  a continuum with vortices (.) central
359  focal points which are socially (.)
360  socially determined

Robert feels that part of describing the complexity of this relationship between individual, group and context is the inability of “western science” to
Robert feels that the difficulty in accounting for this complexity is that the search instruments are calibrated in such a way as to make the task impossible:

Extract 14

| 381 | Robert | our search instruments are calibrated in such a |
| 382 | Robert | A062 such a way that they will only perceive things |
| 383 | Robert | which are calibrated on those scales () and we |
| 384 | Robert | cannot see:: the other things because our vision |
| 385 | Robert | doesn’t- doesn’t- () like colour colours beyond |
| 386 | Robert | the spectrum () the colours are there () but we |
| 387 | Robert | can’t see them () but if you put on these ultra-violet |
| 388 | Robert | glasses () or heat glasses >or something like that< () |
| 389 | Robert | you suddenly see:: (0.6) but it’s no use trying to |
| 390 | Robert | explain these things to a linear binary philosophic |
| 391 | Robert | mode person () Euclidean () playing geometry () |
| 392 | Robert | one needs to move into the realm of Romanian |
| 393 | Robert | geometry () multiple-dimensions () “oh” that’s just |
| 394 | Robert | nonsense >you know< () |

The difficulty is further explored:

Extract 15

| 397 | Robert | It’s like the man who sets out to find God () or in the |
| 398 | Robert | Chinese- the- the- truth err () or Siddarta () or |
| 399 | Robert | something like that () you are only going to find |
| 400 | Robert | that which your calibration will perceive |
| 401 | Interviewer | mmm |
| 402 | Robert | therefore you are creating whatever truth or God it is |
| 403 | Interviewer | in your own image and likeness () |
| 404 | Interviewer | yeah |
| 405 | Robert | and big deal huh () that is why () it’s not just a case |
| 406 | Robert | of trying harder () trying harder is not going to get it |
| 407 | Robert | you’ve got to try different |

Perhaps this is evidence of a real time awareness:

Extract 16

| 426 | Robert | in fact it has just occurred to me that one could |
| 427 | Robert | look at our sessions in terms of recalibration |
| 428 | Interviewer | yeah () mmm |
| 429 | Robert | I reckon I have been () or one of ‘me’s () one the |
| 430 | Robert | many Bakhtinian me’s has been recalibrated |
| 431 | Interviewer | yes |
| 432 | Robert | err () and this I found () find very positive |

Robert expresses examples of ways in which this recalibration has happened, This has been an enriching experience firstly because of the experience of the calibration and also the perception of the calibration. These two aspects have both been enriching. Interviewer asked for a clarification on these two aspects:

Extract 17

| 445 | Robert | I was a year ago () pre-calibrated to respond in the way that |
| 446 | Robert | I talking about at the beginning of the interview () |
Robert extends the point about calibration to the effect GD has had on the way he then perceives the actual calibration itself:

Extract 18

Robert when you moved into metacomment (.) I was saying to myself (.) what’s going on here? (.)
what is the significance of this? (.) it’s obviously not at my level (.) it’s at us level
Interviewer mmm
Robert now that is a meta-statement (.) and that is a realisation of the impact and the implications of the recalibration (.) what is being recalibrated is not just me it’s the group

The recalibration brings problems for others to get in:

Extract 19

Robert now this brings in the question (.) how does somebody else get in? (.) who hasn’t been recalibrated? (.)

Robert thinks the feelings that lie behind the moves are the key elements (the personal and not the technical?)

Extract 20

Robert and those are the principles that you stated earlier (.) about trust, (.) mutual respect and t-
(.) you can say those things in a few words kyyyyyyy huh “oh yes I love the whole world yeah” (.) urgha haha

The full section where we talk about ideas

Interviewer asks Robert to comment on how ideas seem to be created through the GD sessions but Robert is not sure whether ‘ideas’ is a useful term. This exchange can best be understood by looking at a section later. Here Robert’s low tolerance of ambiguity in the way words are used as placeholders

Extract 21

Robert, could you look over the following transcript and see if anything strikes
it depends on what kind of ideas

Yeah well ideas is the sixty million dollar word (.) cos for me (.) can I just throw a distinction to you (.) there is the group feeling (.) the camaraderie the group collegiality (.) the co-operation the feeling of goodwill (.) and the there’s the process (.) but there’s also the idea of outcomes of product (.) and I don’t- I’m not belittling or minimising (.) the idea of collegiality and the good feeling that we build up in those sessions (.) which maybe spins off to make other professional talk more rewarding and more chance of having outcomes but I have this sense also of product (.) of ideas being generated that weren’t there before (.) maybe concepts or slants on things (.) and I’m interested in that and err (.) just wanted to s- share your view

well I don’t think I can give you the answer you want but I can- ha ha

when you say ideas (.) that implies for me not the idea (.) but the formulation in language of the idea (.)
yeah
right? (.). hhh on the one hand there’s an abstract reality which is a thing that we’re eng- that we’re pleased about (.). the devil is in the detail (.). the devil is in actual putting that into words (.) because as soon as it is put into words it is no longer the idea (.)

no
it is a means for one of two things (.) one is reminding me (.) and us of an experience that we have shared (.) which we label in that way (.) the other is telling somebody else that this is an experience which you hadn’t had (.) get out of the words what it is you can mmm

now no words that you can formulate what we’re talking about (.) is going to do that (.) which is back to how you ( .) somebody interpersonally mmm

and my intuitive feeling was don’t tell ‘em too much about it

right
demonstrate it (.) so it depends on what you mean by ideas right

well (.) let me bring something that you said there back into it (.) that if ideas (.) have a reciprocal relationships with the words we choose; (.) to describe them (.) to articulate them (.) and that in the describing of them (.) in the drive to articulation of those ideas (.) then the nature of the idea will change (.) what I’m interested in (.) is do you have a sense that in the group development meetings (.) that we have created a space where that reciprocal relationship has more chance of getting somewhere? (.) have you had feelings that “mmm that’s- that’s happened for me today” you mean between language (.) and experience?

I think there’s a- there’s an intermediate holding room
Robert: of something which is ( ) in the mind as a conceptual=
(0.4)
Interviewer: file=
Robert: an awareness ( )
Interviewer: an awareness ( ) maybe it’s slightly more than=
Robert: [yes]
Interviewer: = the sens- sensory engram that spins around one word ( ) it’s
somehow an amalgam- amalgam of those things ( ) which
because of the space and the camaraderie ( ) I think ( ) we
may have more space for the perception of that amalgam
Robert: we’re talking about awarenesses right?
(0.8)
Robert: and as so long as you don’t start naming and labeling these
awarenesses ( ) because I would quarrel with you on the
labeling ( )
Interviewer: yes
Robert: whereas I might agree on the awareness ( ) now
we have already ( ) in order to have this discussion ( )
we had to share awarenesses ( ) otherwise we’re talking
at cross purposes
Interviewer: mmm
Robert: so those things clearly exist and this is what we’ve
been talking about all along (0.6) we haven’t been
talking about words ( ) we have been talking a little
bit about procedures ( ) but we’ve been talking about
far more than that ( ) is abstract awarenesses ( ) of
those experiences we’ve been having ( ) the different
aspects ( ) of those ( ) you know there was sensitivity
( ) the ouch feeling ( ) the togetherness ( ) the magic
thing that happens in the Tuesday meetings ( ) error-
I mean those are things that are there ( ) yeah? ( )
if we came to label them ( ) we might disagree
but we know ( ) we have an awareness of
those things ( ) and those things ( ) in that sense
exist ( )
Interviewer: mmm
Robert: they exist historically and they exist by projection
Interviewer: can I ask you then to think a little bit about
about ( ) about your concept of awarenesses ( ) and
is there any way of breaking down those down into
different sorts of awarenesses ( ) and maybe one thing
is c- can we explore ( ) for you ( ) your perception of
idea ( ) in terms of awareness ( )
Robert: I get the feeling that ( ) you are using what I’ve been
calling scientific method ( ) in order to pin things down
in a way that I don’t think can be pinned down ( ) they can’t
be localised in other words ( ) because they are dependent
on so many little different ingredients ( ) and they are very
fluid ( ) as soon as you label them down as this idea as
opposed to that idea as opposed to that idea ( ) you betray
what these ideas are ( ) because they all run into err
one another ( ) and I certainly don’t think one can do
"well today’s session is about sensitivity" ( ) and tomorrows
session is going to be about some other label ( ) now in
order to marry these learning experiences to these ideas ( )
you have in some sense to organise them ( ) but also to
label them ( )
Interviewer: so then we’re talking about- ideas in those terms would
be things like sensitivity, empathy,
Robert: group responsibility:::
Interviewer: yeah ( )
Robert: mutual respec::ct, co-productivity::=
okay then I see a distinction then between
the exploration of those ideas (1.0) which you may
set out as having (.) let's explore this global idea
and what I'm talking about maybe (.) which
is slightly different and happens in real-time
where- where the ideas are not prescribed
(.) but they happen in the space
that's right
now what I'd like to s- t- to know is (.)
although I take the point about method (.)
is that for you: (.) I'm looking for your
sensory engram of- of idea (.) the generation
of ideas (.) not the exploration of ideas in that
a priori sense (.) but the creation of space
for these awarenesses, ideas, (.) the emerging
of concepts (.) recalibrations
ah
that's the kind of area that I'm interested in
your
yeah (.) I mean
Wittgenstein in the Tractatus had a long time
on the word idea (.) "idea" (.) right? (.) and I
think he in certain senses has done us a great
deal of disservice about trying to isolate this
from- it's like taking an utterance and trying to
isolate from context
yes
I'm much more interested in the context
in which it is used (.) if you look at the living
thing (.) and you point out features of the living
thing (.) which cannot exist independent of the global
thing (.) the event
no
it's a social event (.)
and jumping the gun (.) I'm going to be looking
at the way those ideas emerge from the context
and the way that they are generated through turns
and collaboratively managed (.) I think this is my
focus- working focus at the moment (.) my sense
of idea is a long way from the idea and you know
the talk we're having here is a classic example of
how you can make distinctions in real time (.) if
you're prepared to work with the other person
to find out what the other person sees (.) when they
use a word
Transcript 10
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Example of a CELU Unit Meeting
Harry I'm off (.) erm I've got to put this down
actually (.) Nicholas went to Spain didn't he?
instead of erm (.) Emma
Rachel "uh hu"
Nicholas I'm sorry I've not the report on that
Harry no
Nicholas I'll just put something round (.) just to
mark it
Harry okay
((Nancy and Rachel are talking in the background
in lines 007-008))
Nancy Emma's got Portugal=
Rachel =that's what we meant to ask you
Harry [now the one I wanted to-
the one I wanted to get was the >19< to the 22< of February
Portugal< Coimbra erm and we've actually got it down
as a visit that's going to be mar:de (0.4) Annie has offered
to do that (.) erm (.) if necessary (0.4) erm (.) I'm not
sure of the best way of playing this (.) so I thought
I'd just mention it and see (.) Emma's also down for UK
which she can do (.) the next one is November which
shouldn't be an issue (0.6) so I guess it's just Portugal
really (.) erm (.) what are the feelings on that? (.) I mean<
errm (.)
(0.4)
Harry there are two things we could do (.) anyone who doesn't
mind Portugal cou- (.) there may be a conference (.) could
offer to swap with Emma (.) erm=
Elizabeth =sorry (.) when is- when is Portugal
Harry it's the 19< to 22< of February (.) anyone who fancies it
could offer to swap with Emma for a trip later in the year (.)
and I would ask her to do that (.) or- and or (.) I'll phone
Emma and just confirm that she doesn't want it cos she might

The following section (034-058) has been removed as one of the participants preferred the section to be removed.

Elizabeth I'm in- I'm actually in Turkey
Harry that weekend
so you're out (.) we’ve got R- Robert in France (.) in October
and that's all we've got actually (.) Robert you don't want to
swap France for Portugal?
Robert not enthusiastically (.) no
Harry well in that case (.) if it's okay with everyone (.) I just
wanted to check (.) could we note it down and I'll
approach Annie (.) and ask her if she's prepared to do
that trip (.) yeah (.) April the se- I'm hoping that she'll
do that=
Nicholas =yeah
Harry I would be disappointed if she didn't do it (.) there's a
weekend UK weekend Emma and Robert in the UK
and I will talk with Emma about that as soon as she
024 comes back (.) and unless there are really serious reasons
I shall indicate that we really hope that she will be there
>you know< I wouldn't like to ask anyone else to do it
to be honest (.) I think she won't be too far on in her
pregnancy to define a foreign thing
Elizabeth: and it's not involving air travel
Several: no no
Harry: I might- you know suggest that she sets that up.
  "that's not too much really to ask."
  (0.4)
Right: jolly good so I'll get in touch with
Emma: (spoken looking at Rachel)) (0.4) hhh it's a month's
  time so I think really I ought to do it now (I ought to
get in touch with Annie and then I'll get in touch
and ask Annie to get in touch with Emma or I'll get
in touch (I'll get in touch with her and see how Annie
and she how she'd like to play it (whether she'd like
ME to get in touch (whether she'd like to- or whatever
err and what she thinks about- one way or another
>can you remind me< to do it this week (jolly good)
DONE it (err duty days)
Elizabeth: can I just say that I'm supposed to be going Spain and
Portugal in October (is that down in your list?
Harry: no (have you got a list?
Elizabeth: well I've got this written in my diary
Harry: Elizabeth c- 15th to 18th of October I have
Elizabeth: yeah you have okay oh that's alright sorry
Harry: do you want to run through just to check we've got-
ju- the next one is you err Elizabeth to Turkey (on 17th
February then there's Portugal then in March I'm going to
March on the 5th of March to Japan I'm going to Greece
on the 18th March and so is Donald (or thereabouts ()
Rachel: conference visits coming back aren't they?
Harry: oh right (yes sorry (you've got it
these are visits these are weekend visits (err
and then I'll give you conference visits (err
Emma and Robert in UK 17th of April (Vince France
on the 22nd April then you're into October well a
couple of conferences there (I'm also doing a conference
in Greece and Elizabeth is doing one in Spain on the 14th April
and France on the 23rd of April (they're conference
they're not weekends ()
Elizabeth: and then also you haven't got Robert and me down
for a 19th to 27th March trip to Mexico ()
Harry: I certainly haven't (although that's not (that's
a different trip- but I'll put it in (see what I mean<
(0.4) it's a- it's a- it's not a weekend=
Robert: [ ( ) students
Harry: =when is it? Mar- March::?
Elizabeth: =March the nineteth until the 27th (inclusive
Harry: okay nineteth to the 27th
Elizabeth: Mexico
Rachel: we haven't been able to get any faxes through (anywhere
in Mexico
Nancy: "no"
Harry: even with the new numbers
Rachel: no (and even to the University of Crizana (I posted it
last week but I've still (we can't get faxes through
anywhere
Harry: ((talking with mouth full)) ohhgh
Rachel: we've tried five numbers for various things (haven't had
any of them get through (and they're all
collect numbers
Harry: nothing else we can do;:
Harry can you let me know tomorrow if we still havn’t seen any mail from them

Elizabeth have yo- maybe we should try ringing?

Harry to see if they’ve changed their fax system or something=

Elizabeth (0.8) so what- have they had those dates by e-mail?

Rachel no (.) no they all went in the past last week

Harry give them some time then (.) keep faxing them until it gets through (.) okay so th

Elizabeth [ is IATEFL conference down as well (.) or is that just overseas you’ve got there

Harry no you can have a conference (.) when’s your IATEFL

Elizabeth IATEFL is 28th March to 31st of March

(2.2)

Harry yeah

Nicholas I think both Elizabeth and I are doing the international House (-) teacher education conference (.) February 5th to the 7th (-) in London

Elizabeth oh yeah I’d forgotten (.) well no I hadn’t forgotten it’s in diary=

Rachel =hh ha ha

Nicholas [just having one my panics

Nicholas =I’m doing the TESOL conference

(1.2)

Robert Elizabeth’s also down for a visit to Germany July 19th

Harry oh really?

Elizabeth [oh yes go- I’d completely forgotten about that (.) yes

Robert and (.) ther==

Elizabeth =19th 20th Potsdam

Robert there’s an urgent request (.) for Elizabeth’s services on the day before the we==

Elizabeth =on the 18th?

Robert the weekend before

Elizabeth oh no:

Robert not from Potsdam but as visit to the German group

Elizabeth I’ve got friends over from France that weekend

(1.6)

Harry actually (.) no (.) is that okay?

(1.0)

Harry cos we agreed the other wasNEGmanny to be arranged

Robert no no (.) Nicholas is going on the 13th of October I hope you know that is

Harry [is that ( )? ( )?

Nicholas no (0.8) it is to be arranged and they’ve indicated a preference for that weekend

Harry right

Elizabeth okay (.) let me get back to my French friends and see if they can come

Robert if you could (.) it’s just too good an opportunity
it’s daft isn’t really
it will be (,) the we- they were keen you know
I said I couldn’t confirm anybody’s visits “without checking
with them”
the trouble is you see (,) there’s no flights out on the Saturday
night (,) I’d have to go on the Friday (,) and that’s a whole
weekend gone (,) like if I wanted to do a Sunday I couldn’t
do it by going on a Sunday (,) I’d have to go on the Friday
so that’s like
urum urum there’s quite a lot of business that you could do
over the weekend (,) arising out the wider issue
although Nicholas’s just do that for me in Spain
(1.4)
what’s this (,) this a complete
nonsense for me(,) (,)
this is what’s come through from the Exeter bookshop
tell them that they’ve got it completely wrong
you know this is absolute codswallop (,) absolute
codswallop (,) how the hell they got that on there I don’t
understand (,) really (,) I mean tell them not to send
that out (,)
that’s coming out on the agenda isn’t it?
yeah
the old- (,)
nothing to do with (,)
okay DUny days (,) the only duty days (,) >thanks for
doing those< (,) duty days (,) we’ve just to review
where we are (,) an- and- if we’re asked about this
I mean (,) and Emma isn’t here (,) but we’ve just
to leave Emma to slot in when she comes back
I’m sure she won’t mind if people take the days they
want and she slots in (,) given that people have been
covering her (,) so I’d like to just revise duty days
not change them necessarily but check which duty days
people want (,) erm it’s obviously Monday, Tuesday
Wednesday, Thursday, Friday (,) Tuesday all of us
are here (,) and I think what we could do: is (,) at the moment
while Emma is not here (,) obviously if each person
could take separate day (,) BUT if each person could take
a separate day (,) but if any one of you has a preference
for another day (,) you know to double up with someone
we could do that and leave a slot for Emma to fill
do you see what I mean

The following section (244-256) has been removed as one of the participants preferred the section to be removed.

((a few asides between various including joke))
who’s got Monday? Robert (,) right okay
Wednesday?
Elizabeth
me
Thursday?
I’ve been doing Thursday (,) erm (,) I sent
an e-mail a while back saying I’d prefer to
shift to Friday to cover Vince’s Friday
when he goes off (,) on sabbatical
Harry: yes
Nicholas: if that’s okay?
Harry: that’s absolutely fine
Nicholas: so if I stay with Thursday for as long as
Vince’s here (.) when Vince goes on sabbatical
Harry: I shift to the Friday (.) is that okay?
Harry: yeah that’s absolutely fine (.) so >the thing< that’s why
Nicholas: that’s what I was trying to say and making a complete
message of it
Nicholas: no (.) not at all
Nancy +1: hah hha
Harry: you should be able to shift
Nicholas: erm

The following section (280-314) has been removed as one of the participants preferred the section to be removed.

Harry: GOOD (.) Summer School (.)
Nicholas: just to let you know what last week
Harry: if I hadn’t mentioned it (.) that last week
Nicholas: at the school board (.) sorry if I’m repeating
Harry: myself (.) the school board agreed that we
could have three weeks summer school
Nicholas: but the really good thing was that in the discussion
Harry: and it was a long discussion (.) on this (.) Quality
Nicholas: and Standards (.) as I said to you Quality and Standards
Harry: reviewed our Master’s courses in ’97 (.) I had to
Nicholas: write a report responding to that (.) which I did
Harry: in ’98 (.) all the points have been covered
Nicholas: but one thing (.) the only point that wasn’t covered
Harry: was the work pressure (.) and I pointed out
Nicholas: that’s got larger (.) it’s got heavier (.) I explained why
Nicholas: I gave examples (.) as a result Quality and Standards
Nicholas: are worried about the workload that we have
Nicholas: erm (.) so
Nicholas: it doesn’t keep them awake at night or anything like that
Rachel: hahhhahah
Nicholas: hahahah
Harry: it’s nice to have it on record (.) so: when the discussion
came up about the three weeks (.) this was mentioned (.)
and I put it in the context that we’ve put it in explained (.)
that the reason that colleagues had accepted it (.)
enthusiastically (.) was that we intended to change of our style
of working (.) that up to now we have worked 12 months
effectively without a break (.) and we feel that that wasn’t
good for us: it wasn’t good for participants (.) and what we
intended to use this three week summer school for (.) if we
hold it (.) not saying that we will (.) will be to mark
the end of our academic year (.) and then take
two months afterwards (.) with duty cover spread out
that to take two months (.) and erm that two months to be
research and development and to take our holidays (.) and
that was the condition of the three weeks being passed
was that we take those two months
Robert: a condition that they stipulated?
Harry: that we stipulated
Robert: ha ha ha:

Harry: ( )

Robert: oh I

Harry: so we've got a situation where those two months
are not things we are taking ( ) we are obliged to have
( ) we will cover

Elizabeth: so student's wanting to do dissertations and wanting to
get feedback won't get any

Harry: no ( ) but they know that and they're just got to be ready in
July ( ) I mean we'll be really BUZZING in July

July's going to be our buzzing month for you know
dealing with them and setting them up for the summer
and all the wonderful things that we'll do: ( ) and then August
and September we will effectively

Robert: [yeah but with
the modular of course that pressures not going
to happen

Nancy: that's the old course yeah

Harry: safe in the knowledge ( ) if a real emergency crops up
there's always someone here to answer a question ( ) and
we'll just decide who's gonna take August or July

Elizabeth: [and they should direct
it to the office rather than to each person

Harry: exactly ( ) who will make sure

Elizabeth: [ rather than to that person's
e-mail cos that won't be read until they get back
so it needs to be filtered through obviously

Harry: that's it ( ) we will make that very clear ( ) do
not write to individuals ( ) write to ( ) a name
and address ( ) and

Nicholas: ca- I'm sorry ( ) this is me just not being up to speed
it's one of those questions ( ) errm what is this three
week summer school? that we ta->where did it come from?

Elizabeth: [yes that's right are we [is it
Nicholas: and what is it?

Elizabeth: is it a Ph.D. summer school?

Harry: no

Elizabeth: or an MSc summer school

Harry: no it was the Taiwan thing ( ) remember I talked about
this group in Taiwan who wanted to come for three weeks

Nicholas: only sort of ( ) yeah but

Elizabeth: ( ) summer school

Harry: what it was- was that they wanted what they couldn't
have ( ) which was ten weeks ( ) and I went through
all the grizzly details of sorting it out ( ) but

errm ( ) the upshot was that I saw no harm in since
they wanted it and since it might be a powerful
recruiting option ( ) getting permission if wanted to
to have a 2-3 week summer school ( ) it's the thing that we talked
about it the past ( ) that you know< the idea of- of offering
something in July when they can come across and
accommodation is available ( ) and the idea is not that
we would necessarily do it ( ) but that now if we want
to do it ( ) we now have clearance for doing it ( ) that's
what we now need to discuss not today because we've
got so much on the agenda ( ) is to sit down ( ) between
now and Easter and talk about 'a' whether we want it
I'm still negotiating with these Taiwanese individuals
and I'm not going to get back to them before we've
decided that ( ) they’re interested ( ) they reckon they
can get a group of ten teachers who can come across
Robert but this will overlap with potential Master’s research
and a doctoral summer school for a fortnight
Nicholas yeah but only-
Elizabeth I remember everybody HATING that Turkish summer
school when it came ( ) not just because the first year
it was disastrous because they weren’t prepared and it
all went wrong initially but ( ) because of ( ) I mean
it took ages setting up ( ) absolutely ages making sure
everyone was here and doing it ( )
Robert Elizabeth I think one of the reasons why we all hated it I think
because it was eight weeks long
Rose yeah it’s a long time
Elizabeth ah but then it went down to four weeks
Robert it went down to six
Elizabeth it went down to six
Harry but
Elizabeth it went down to four
Harry the idea of this would be that we would not give them
accommodation ( ) they would simply have to arrange
that themselves ( ) for the accommodation < we would
simply ( ) be available for three weeks ( ) there would
be sessions
Elizabeth but they’ll have to be a timetable won’t there and all that
Nicholas there’s all the stuff that we were just saying ( ) about
people needing their: dissertations being set up and
all the extra questions they’d have because we’d be
closing down for two weeks ( ) that’s all true ( ) July
will be very busy ( ) for those reasons ( ) and
strategically the last idea I remember before I went
away was that we weren’t going to offer to be taking
up any extra teaching until our numbers were falling
to the extent that it became necessary for us to do
something for us to be able to keep our numbers up
Harry well that’s now on the agenda
Nicholas [that’s not our situation
Harry = but we’ve got this research Masters
and that’s going to involve us in- that’s
Robert going to have a residential thing ( ) that’s
Nicholas got an element in it ( ) which we said would
Robert I mean Robert’s draft originally included that in
Nicholas it didn’t it? ( )
Robert it’s always in it
Vince .huh I think as far as today’s meeting’s concerned
we ( ) we ( ) it’s- Harry’s reporting that we have
this option ( ) we’re not making any decision=
Harry [that’s it
Vince = about that and I think the discussion of whether
we actually do that needs to wait for a later meeting
but at this point we’re all clear that we haven’t agreed
to doing this three week summer school on any basis
yet
Harry no ( ) I mean we can put it on the agenda
for next week
Vince but I think the agendas far too long for us to discuss
the full implications
Nicholas [ yeah yeah
Harry [yeah I agree ( ) I agree
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if we put it on next weeks and have a real thrash out
get individuals on it ( ) arriving at different times wanting
different things ( ) its not going to be like a set of Turkish
students who all want the same thing=
[ not it isn't ] oh [ are we
( ) degree certificates we get ( )
Harry no I don't think so necessarily ( ) I think- I mean-
I really don't think so ( ) I think I had a different idea
than that ( ) I had an idea of something that was over and
people drift in and drift out ( ) but we can talk about that
next week and how it would look ( ) what we would do
and whether we want to do it ( ) so if you put that
first one next week ( ) I just wanted you know that we
can do it and that two months is tied in with it ( ) we can
have the two months anyway ( ) but the idea of it is
and how long is it going to be for:::?
Harry two or three weeks ( ) depends I m- >sort of thing<
(Harry's lines have a mumbled quality = closing down)
Harry okay ( ) new date for marketing meeting ( ) we need a
new date for the marketing meeting as well because
we haven't done that yet ( ) I guess err ( ) looking ahead
Vince .hhhh ( ) is it true ( ) is it the case that the brochure hasn't-
isn't
Harry hasn't been updated
Vince [ hasn't been updated
Elizabeth and the leaflets still-
Vince cos I was surprised to find that
out because I though the brochure
I knew that we waiting for the supplier
Harry Martha sent it down ( ) Martha sent it down
we'll have a reprint if happens
Rachel didn't you say it'd have to have
the new regulations?
Harry we've got the new regulations coming
through which I haven't gone through on the
modular thing and how that works ( ) do you
know the idea that we're going to a different
credit system ( )
Vince oh right
Harry and we need to get that in ( ) but it's still
got to go through > you know < quality and
standards=
Elizabeth =but we haven't even seen the text of the whole
200 thing put together yet
Harry no we haven't
Elizabeth with perhaps little holes for the numbers for
the credits
Harry yeah
Elizabeth I mean I think wha-
Harry [okay we'll ask- can you ask Rose
if we can get the text that we've got ( ) did we
save the text
Elizabeth [ that we'll okay the whole thing and the little
leaflet ( ) that we've all sent feedback on
Harry yeah ( ) yeah
Elizabeth cos that is really ( ) cos I'd like that for Turkey
Harry yeah ( ) can Martha produce what she's got
on the basis of what we've already given her ( ) then
when we get that we use that we use that as
as trigger for all the other things we need to look
at such as the agent’s pack and the whatnot shall
we pick a date then that we know we’ve got to hit for
that? And then if you could send us ( )
by e-mail Rachel err okay ( ) what’ve we got?
err ( )
Elizabeth next week’s the 26th and the week after that’s the 2nd
Harry *well I think we’ll need at least a couple of weeks*
( ) shall we make it the 2nd of February ( ) that’s not
too late is it?
Elizabeth well would it be possible from the 2nd of February to
get a quick printout ( ) even if it’s just ETEd of a small
leaflet that I can take with me to Turkey
Harry should be shouldn’t it? ( ) and then you’ve got
Elizabeth if I leave on the 17th
Rachel should be able to get it for the 2nd
Harry 2nd then ( ) okay ( ) okay second of February
Elizabeth if we could have ( ) if we could have a txt of the
brochures before hand so we don’t have to sit in
the meeting and read them
Harry yes ( ) we need a text for the brochure
Elizabeth [ we need a full text
Harry the agent thing perhaps I can resend again
the thing we agreed on the Away Day
Elizabeth [ can we set a date to get the full text
sent to us?
Harry right okay ( ) Martha ( ) can you chase that up
[ i.e. not the Monday
because we might not be in the Monday
Harry [ no
Harry well no ( ) I think we need a bit more time
Elizabeth sometime the week before
Harry yeah if she can get it to us ( ) if we said the
28th ( ) Thursday the 28th ( ) Thursday the 28th
that gives
Robert [”January”
Harry yeah January ( ) that gives her lots of time doesn’t it? ( )
Elizabeth so that’s brochure plus leaflet then
Harry yeah and can you remind me to send round the agenda
and can we check through the minutes of the away
day for any changes ( )? I’m not sure on that
(( to Rachel )) the papers cos we discussed it
Rachel that’s right yeah
Harry oh right Nancy the away day
Nancy oh yeah the last bits ( ) you did them all
Rachel [ I’ve done some more
Harry oh on Robert’s stuff ( ) the summer school stuff
did we not do the away day?
(0.6)
Harry can’t remember ( ) agent’s pack ( ) it was in the afternoon
we’ll have a look
Nancy I’ve got my notes anyway
Harry actually if you can ( ) I’d like to have a ganders
and see what’s what
Elizabeth could you pass the water again
Harry cos I’m not sure whether I ( ) I probably put
my stuff with your stuff
Rachel *kikkkkkk he’ll blame me now*
Nancy hhrrrhh ha ha
Harry that’s a good idea ( ) right okay
Robert could I just make a note ( ) in connection with the brochure
erm when I was performing on Saturday and talking to the err- the Head of the Foreign Relations and so forth I noticed that in the leaflet it said that Germany had a centre in Frankfurt and no mention of Potsdam at all the only active centre is Potsdam (,) and we just have to consider the political

Harry well that's because of it being dated (,) but that's exactly the kind of thing we need to change (,) and get updated (,) yeah

Rachel it's all the stickers that are going in now (,) covering last year's fees (,) so 2nd of February is a good time cos it will be on time for Elizabeth (,) and we can push it through (,) okay did the books get to centers? "EBC versus Southwold"

(0.4)

Vince oh yeah (,) this is just this thing (,) linked to earlier point about the Exeter Book Centre (,) they're not doing the things that we've asked them to do (,) and I phoned them up a week ago to talk to Frank and said that we're not particularly happy at the moment about their response rate=

Rachel [mmm = to some of the things that we've asked them to do particularly to rewrite the Foundation Module order form AND come up with all the module order forms

Rachel that's what that one is

Vince so I haven't seen this today (,) but the question- two questions one is are they doing a good enough job? and the second related questions- is is it worth looking at Southwold?

Harry I think it's well worth looking at Southwold

Nicholas [me too

Vince see if we can get the same deal with them

Robert I think it's worth doing

Harry yeah (,) investigating interaction in context I have conversational analysis (,) which should be conversation anyway second language vocabulary acquisition > which certainly not on my list < (,) vocabulary semantics and language education

Elizabeth [isn't that on Lexical Studies?

Harry yeah (,) and corpus concordance and collocation and there is nothing for Lexical Studies

Rose ughh

Robert ah but those

Elizabeth he's just left out Lexical Studies

Robert [those are Lexical Studies

Elizabeth he's left out the heading Lexical Studies

Harry fine but then I've only got conversation analysis

Robert so it's a mistake anyway (,) he's just missed out a chunk of the list

Harry yeah (,) I mean well that doesn't- (,) what we need to do is to investigate alternatives

Elizabeth well the books did get to Turkey (,) once the- you know the whole set of books arrived in Turkey a fortnight after we:: a fortnight after the first reminder (,) you know where they didn't go

Nancy [yeah yeah

Elizabeth what we didn't do (,) he didn't tell us that he hadn't been able to send the complete order

Rachel no (,) he hasn't to any of them
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Nancy: yeah
Harry: that's what we need to know!
Elizabeth: well he didn't tell me I didn't know
that a couple of the books were reprinting
and hadn't been sent out and whether
they have been sent subsequently is another
matter & we don't know
Rachel: "I don't think they've all gone yet"
Elizabeth: did he tell you they were reprinting?
did he tell anyone here?
[no no but Mary phoned up
Nancy: didn't she?
Rachel: "yeah"
Elizabeth: cos she checked the invoice
you see that's the sort of thing that
we need to know because we expect
people to read these things and then they
can't get them or don't get them
Harry: yeah
Vince: but they're not sent documentation about
what's been sent out to who they just
worked with our original lists and hadn't
communicated back
Nancy: =yeah that's it
Rachel: but we're having trouble with ( ) as well
at the moment
Harry: =well shall we look at Southwold?
Elizabeth: =but they must have sent an invoice to say
what's been sent out to whom
Rachel: they have sent an invoice
Robert: that that's the feedback don't they?
Nancy: mmm
Rachel: well that's what Mary checked them against
wasn't it?
Nicholas: yeah that's sensible
Vince: that's sensible
Elizabeth: yeah if they sent us an invoice=
Nicholas: =we don't expect a longhand letter
do we
(Rachel, Harry and Elizabeth start to say something)
Harry: =we don't have to go through [the individual lists]
[A list]
Elizabeth: of- we want a list of when they are going to send
the books that are reprinting
Harry: hsh so what's the feeling then do we stick with
them a bit longer and see if they're coming good
or do we explore options 'Southwold and see if they
give a better deal'
Elizabeth: [well I think we need to do ( ) I think we
need to look at it from their point of view
as well ( ) but I mean they haven't been that
good have they?

Harry no

Nicholas *have we:: got? o

Elizabeth [how much of its their fault I don’t know

Nicholas [ anywhere a- a clear

statement of our relationship with them (.) what

we’re expecting from them (.) it’s been piecemeal

adding up hasn’t it?

Harry I think it has

Nicholas if could articulate a clear statement of what we

expect them to be doing:: (.) that would >at one and

the same time< be a way of checking our relationship

with them and also s- a document we can take to someone

glse and say “hey” can you do this

Elizabeth [ cos the same thing might happen with

them

Nicholas what can you give us how much would it be worth

Harry okay

Nicholas but we don’t have:

Harry I’ll ask around (.) yea-

Elizabeth = >I think that’s better<cos you know when we want

all the books to be sent (.) you know all the books all

the- sorry all the foundation books (.) that was a quick

decision (.) and we made it quickly (.) so they were just

told please send all Foundation books to all centres (.) hh

so if they didn’t have any:: (.) warning

Nicholas mmm

Nancy yeah (.) that’s true

Rachel *yeah that’s true*

Elizabeth and we didn’t say and if there are any books you can’t send

please let us know and please give us a date when you can

send them (.)

Nicholas that’s why I was wondering if we had a list

of:: trying to articulate all this stuff

Rachel [ but they still haven’t come back and said

Elizabeth [they should have come back

and said these aren’t available we’ll be sending them so and so=

Harry =right what we need to do::

Rachel [( )weeks off

Harry could you- sorry could you come up with a ( )

Elizabeth it’s basically just the pair of them

Rachel but it’s always put in writing for them though

with the original lists

Harry [ have you got the-

Rachel I’ve got the letter=

Harry =could you bring the letter to me and then

I’ll and then we’ll go round and check with

everyone that we understand what we’re asking

them to do (.) I’ll draft the letter and we’ll send

it to him and crm we’ll say >you know< can you guarantee that

you will do these things and if you can (.) then

Nicholas that’s we formalise this whole thing as much as we can

Harry yeah (.) cos we clearly want to

Rachel well I think it is formalised apart from these=

Nicholas [ right okay

Rachel that aren’t available

Harry >that’s it<

Rachel mmm
Nicholas okay and we know what happens if our participants write to them
Rachel but I mean we haven’t had any feedback saying yes we definitely had these books or no we h- we know that- well
we take it on trust that’s he sent what we’ve asked him to do=
Elizabeth [ well each tutor (.) each tutor
Rachel =apart from those that weren’t available
Elizabeth [presumably each tutor’s
Vince yeah or Japan is
Nicholas [ a large box of books has arrived in Paris
I don’t know yet exactly which (.) but I assume they’ll match up to the invoice (.) but that’s where are at the moment=
Elizabeth =yeah
Rachel yeah
Harry okay we’ll sit down > and look at a couple of things< but you can you get in touch with them straight away and say can they check their list because there are titles that are missing.
Rachel yeah
Harry so clearly somethings wrong there,
okay thank you for that and we will get together
and we will draft something and we’ll put it round before a staff meeting just to confirm that that’s the case=
Elizabeth = even if we got it and the systems sorted (.) I think we should have a statement on paper which they accept
or reject (.) you know even if we’ve got a system we confirm the system (.) we add anything to it that we want
Nicholas and if we ask them to estimate what they think their turnaround times ARE
Nancy yeah
Elizabeth [yeah
Nicholas if one of our participants writes to them for a book (.) how long does it take to be posted?
Rachel course it
Vince [the- the turnaround time=
Nicholas [then
Vince =the turnaround time as far as individuals are concerned
Nicholas that the feedback is quite good
Nicholas good
Elizabeth thi-
Nicholas [if they hadn’t got it does the participant get a little note saying sorry that’s reprinting
Elizabeth yeah erm::
Rachel but this happens with Dobson’s like that book that you got before
Harry [right > that’s a pain in the arse<
Elizabeth I’ve only had one complaint=
Nicholas [yeah
Elizabeth =and that was when the guy didn’t send the money=
Rachel [they just [havn’t come to back to you at all- the bookshop the one that came back to you (.) you’ve got to keep ringing=
Elizabeth =you just need to check back (.) and when you pay they come=
Rachel =them on a daily basis
((at this point Rachel and Elizabeth had been talking to the group but Rachel is now direct her comment to Harry and Elizabeth to Nicholas))
Elizabeth = through to you okay
Nicholas yeah
Elizabeth and he didn’t get them and I said ( )
Rachel [it’s only a bookshop]
Elizabeth and he rang up () and I explained
Harry [yeah] [huh I’ve had
Vince ( ) if it carries on like that
Vince the only other thing to throw in is that Southwold have=
Rachel can we not ( )
Vince a searchable website now () for books and - and Exeter
do n’t
Robert well that was precisely the thought that was in my mind
Vince () when is someone going to come along and switch it
Harry all on
Vince well they have () they’ve just come up with it
Vince well that is-
Vince [Southwold have been working on it with Rochester
Harry with Jeff Henderson
Vince right
Vince so that’s - that’s a big ()
Harry plus
Vince plus () I mean I’m sure Exeter will have to follow with that ()
but at the moment th - that’s nice if you’re sitting in
ning and you want to order some books and you can work
through their 7000 book catalogue and do searches and stuff
Elizabeth and then at the TBL conference () erm Dawn Trotter was
Vince saying they use Amazon bookshop on the internet for
Harry 330 anything that is published in Britain that they can’t get
in the States and it’s very good as long as you don’t order
Vince () their express service which is very expensive
Harry yeah
Elizabeth if you order their ordinary service you get quite a lot off
Vince yeah
Elizabeth you end up paying y - it works out the same as going
to a shop li-
Vince well () we’ve already - we’ve already told the students
Elizabeth about Amazon and we’ve already told them about Southwold
Harry so they know those resources are there on the web=
Vince () so we stick with Exeter yeah
Vince the question is - is whether we have this relationship
with one bookshop only and whether () they’re doing=
Nicholas mmm
Vince = enough good ()
Harry I think what we do
Vince [good enough job at the moment
Harry to justify that special relationship
Vince yeah I think what we do is we simply say that
Harry err we - we have no preference () we give them the
alternatives Southwold and Amazon () but for their
Harry conveniences we have also arranged with a bookshop
Nicholas that they can if they wish us this service
Rachel as an option
Harry they choose what they want
Vince mmm
Harry do you see what I mean () then we don’t ally ourselves
Nicholas to the bookshop
Harry and to Nigel Dobson we have to say “look” we’re also
looking at these alternatives I mean i- in how good shape
Harry can you get
Harry [yes yes
Elizabeth: maybe they’re better to tell you what we- ought to be saying
that we’re having our annual review of the group of students
Harry: yes oh yea::h () that’s what we plan to do*
Elizabeth: and we’d like to clarify these points
Harry: yeah
Elizabeth: you know whether we continue with the system or not
maybe he ought to realise that it is
Harry: what can you offer us (:) this is the system that we
Elizabeth: that it is doubtful that we are
Nicholas: mmm (:) are the-
Rachel: [there’s a bloke in Switzerland we’ve had
we’ve had a package back empty (: ) so the books
have obviously gone mad
Nancy: [so the books have gone missing
Vince: that’s not- that can happen but you can’t put that down=
Rachel: [but we don’t know which books
Vince: =at their fault can you
Rachel: [which ones (:) cos we haven’t sent them (:) we
don’t know which goes
Nancy: no we did send these recently
Rachel: [oh we did send those didn’t we?
Harry: we’ve got to catch that
Nancy: yes
Rachel: yeah
Nancy: *(::)*
Harry: okay we’ll do that then <I’ll draft a letter I’ll pass it round
I will tell them this is an alternative> if they do say they
>they can come up trnmps we’ll carry on with them<
if not we’ll pull out
Vince: right
Harry: is that okay
Nicholas: yeah
Vince: those booklists need to be checked don’t they
Harry: [they certainly do
Vince: against the original lists
Harry: so go through (:) get in touch cos they’ve obviously
made a mistake and ask them to retranscribe the things=
Elizabeth: =but- did you give it to them on disk?
Rachel: no
Nancy: no
Rachel: we gave it to them on hard copy
Harry: so can you check that against and see where the mistakes are
Elizabeth: my- well we could send it on disk as well and then they
could transfer it straight on
Rachel: I haven’t got it on disk I don’t know who’s got it
Harry: okay now
Elizabeth: [but have you not got it on e-mail (: ) it went round on
e-mail
Harry: [I’ve had it on disk anyway we’ll check it later.
Nancy: ["there’s only one (:)"
Harry: pastoral update (:) Vince
Vince: just to say that erm this system is- has kicked in now
so I want t- to::
Harry: right
Vince: hand these out there’s Karen and Ildiana they’re both
Hungary aren’t they?
Elizabeth: mmm
Vince: so:: (: ) Donald’s not here so I can’t
give him that one (:) erm I’ll see erm- there
are give students at the moment on the pastoral list
and they should have this red file in the front of their
folder ( ) and there should be an initial statement of of
what the problem is ( )
((Vince looks for the right document among a number in
front of him))
(2,2) got one here somewhere
Elizabeth do you mean we write an initial statement
of what the problem is
Vince yeah so I’ll see Elizabeth and Donald about that- that
just so that if we have any- any more students
going on that list – that- every piece of
correspondence once they’re on the- on the
list ( ) goes in this red folder – it’s documented
on the front so that- so that everything’s thre
and can be picked out so that particularly if I’m
going on sabbatical and- and someone’s taking up
a couple of my students they know where that is
Harry yeah
Vince so that’s system is there at the moment and if you
have any ideas of- if there are any other students
that need to be added to that list then ( ) please see me
Nicholas the list of which students do have red files?
Elizabeth what about Kona?
Vince well that- I mean if you’re interested in that list
it’s Kona, erm =
Nicholas = no all I was thinking was if some communication
comes to me from some student I might not know
they are a red pile person ( ) but
Vince no ( ) well that list has gone round before
Nicholas right okay
Vince I can recirculate that list of the five students who are
on the pastoral:: ( ) presumably when we have
quarterly meeting we’ll review that
Nicholas yeah
Vince I mean do- how often is it worth me:
Nicholas I’m sorry I f- if you’ve sent that to me
Vince sending round the message
Nicholas I must have thrown it away
Harry erm ( ) that’s a point really ( ) the best thing to do
perhaps is without a title ( ) you know on the notice
board
Nancy mmm
Harry the best thing to do is- if you can just produce one
that ( ) and err- we will have it untitled
erm ( ) w- erm ( ) I think perhaps we’ll call it
we’ll just call it projects ( ) projects is the title
cos that could mean anything and then h-
Elizabeth [put Vince’s put Vince’s
Harry yeah but then- that bce- >I mean< projects is the sort of
thing that you might::
Robert anybody can use that
Harry yeah we just put the names of the projects
and then they are special cases and then
we can just pop in there and check
that’s the easiest thing isn’t it
Nancy yeah
Vince okay
Harry is that okay Vince
Vince yeah that’s fine
Harry: then there’s always physical evidence on it.
Vince: I’d like some feedback on how it seems to fill
in the initial statement, I’ll give you that form.
Elizabeth: "okay" hhh
Vince: later and I’ll talk to Donald when I see him
Harry: yeah:: ( ) who’s Donald’s which one?
Nancy: Tati
Antoinette: Tati
Harry: I don’t know that name:: ( ) cos technically that’s
Emma’s now isn’t it?
Nancy: no it’s erm:: ( ) oh yeah she’s gone over to
modular:: ( ) the old group
Harry: ohh:
Nancy: the old group Elizabeth has:: ( ) the new modular
Emma has
Vince: I think Donald might be the right person to write
the initial statement
Harry: [oh yeah
Nancy: [yeah he’s had a lot to do with her
Elizabeth: I think I’ve got her now:: ( ) cos I replied a couple
of things to her:: ( ) not recently
Nancy: we had all the file out if you remember she had the-
we couldn’t find the Doctor’s note:: ( ) you remember
she couldn’t do the exam<
Elizabeth: >and then we did find it<
Nancy: and then found it in::
Vince: okay
Nancy: yeah
Elizabeth: turned up somewhere
Harry: right grades and transfers to modular system
Vince: this is it
Harry: this is a biggy
Vince: a potentially biggy one:: ( ) it’s just that if we- at what point
do we decide whether someone is graded on all their pieces
of work on the old system or do- when they transfer
do the two modules that they did on the old system
do they get regraded:: ( ) to the new system:: ( ) so I’m
thinking of down the line:: ( ) what happens with their
end up transcripts and we havn’t really
discussed that issue yet errm
Nicholas: I thought we had
Harry: I couldn’t recall it
Vince: [well we couldn’t recall it
Harry: I couldn’t recall it
Nicholas: well what about:: ( ) we:: ( ) the default position
421: is we transfer:: ( ) old grades to new grades
59: when they transfer to the new system and if
60: any participant out there especially wants to have
61: you know an E+ on their transcript
Rachel: .hh hhhhh haana
Nancy: hhh hhaaaaaaaag
Nicholas: they can do that:: ( ) the default position we tell them
Harry: [that’s the
difficulty:: ( ) we talked about this earlier with Vince
Elizabeth: [I mean everyone
Harry: will want to go modular
[that’s:: can I::
Nancy: [yeah:::
Harry: al- also the problem with that if you talk with Emma which
you can’t () she would say you can’t do that they don’t
transfer across as easily as that () cos I had a response similar
to that from Emma on exams on that issue
Robert .hhh but .hhh w- hhh
Harry yeah
Robert w- ha () well I thought this=
Harry [if we decide
Robert =was the only possible way forward that you can
go is what Nicholas has just said
Harry well there’s two things you can do: () erm actually
n- () there are alternatives () there are two alternatives
() you can do that () you can have two sets of grades
"the old and the new" an- I think the disadvantage of thgt
is that >I’ve just put this in special features< the
disadvantage of that is erm that of course it looks
very odd to have a transcript of grades
and two different explanations
Robert [yeah absolutely () complete poppycock
Harry as- said the options () I mean I’m not coming down
on () the third option is to decide that for anyone who’s
transferring with just say:: >and there are many of them<
with just say one assignment
Nancy mmm
Harry that assignment could be regraded onto the new system
cos it’s relatively little effort () we can always say
we’ve looked at it again even if we hgvn’t >you know
>slight fibs< err:: but anyone beyond that will just stay
on the old system and we just mark it on the old system
put old grades () the disadvantage of THAT is that if we’re
not careful () w- we’ll forget that someone has been marked
on the old system and we’ll mark them on the new system
if you see what I mean
Robert oh that’s right=
Harry =so there are potential problems with all areas
Robert I- could we
Harry [there you have it
Robert the potential problem with first one?
Harry the potential problem I think is the position that Emma
presented which was that >you know< w- we- that- that-
that we’re having a new set of criteria:: () we’re marking
on a whole new system () we know the criteria for
the new system and the old system doesn’t map onto that
() what we could do of course () erm opening ourselves
up to possible objections:: () from E:: if not Emma then
someone in Emma’s position is to say we will simply declare
what they’re worth () which we did roughly anyway
and work to that and transfer everything
((tape ends on Side A)
Harry mine was a little fib () you’re talking about some
whoppers now
Nicholas [ha ha ha
Harry you’ve progressed to whoppers () so yeah::
Nancy .hhh ha ha
Nicholas if they go onto- they go onto either scheme
they go onto the new grade () system () we transfer
the marks into the new grade system () if challenged
I will testify that I myself re-read those assignments
and regraded them
Nancy oh oooohh
Harry and I would say: add at this point (,) you can pay me
for the tape now or we'll do this
((general laughter – all))
Robert ha ha ha aa:::
Nicholas I don"- I rea:illy don't
Harry no (,) oh we do have an equivalence don't we?
we do somewhere have an equivalence in the grades
[we do ]
Robert [of course] there's a problem with this but it isn't
anything compared to the problem with the other
ones
Harry right okay (,) no I'm open to it I just want to reach a
decision what we're going to do (,) I'm not (,) w-
Vince the problem th- the one th- the problem there are
problems with both of them (,) but we have situations
with six (,) completed six mo- six modules on the old
system they're transferring to modular (,) their friend
has done six on the old system (,) they may finish at
the same time (,) they're gonna get completely different
transcripts (,)
Nicholas there will be these small anomalies yeah
Vince yeah (,) well I don't think it's a small anomaly-
anomaly to those people that are going to be=
Robert [but they will
Nicholas have different legend
Vince [=left with their 'E's and those who are going to=
Robert [they'll have a different
Vince [=to be upgraded to C's
Nicholas I mean that is the historical situation (,) you can't
tell people that they're a victim of history (,)
but that is the historical situation they find themselves
in (,) that (,) yeah we will have different explana-
Robert [we're not going
to be able to avoid that problem because in the future
because in the future (,) in a couple of years time (,)
two people are going to apply for a job (,) they're
going to present their transcripts from Aston
>and one's gonna have one lot and one going to have
the other lot anyway<
Elizabeth one's going to say modular even if=
Harry [ I:: thii:::mk,
Elizabeth =they've only done two modular units
Harry [ the best thing to do:::
Nicholas yes=
Harry =yes >the best thing to do::: <is that anyone who's done
that (,) anyone who's transferred (,) Nancy we need to
identify every single person who's transferred
we need to go back (,) we need to do it as quickly
as we can cos- before any more come in
so we'll have to sit down
Nancy [ okay
Elizabeth [we need (,) they need to call them transfer
students or something like that
Harry [and I'm going to (,) yeah what I'm going
to suggest is that where they are identified they are
really flagged up strongly on the thing and when we
produce their transcripts of grades () there will be
a statement on the transcript to that effect that
a new modular course was introduced
Nicholas yeah
Harry and this student elected to transfer to the modular
and therefore all their grades () their previous
grades were transferred to the new modular grading
system () which is described below
Nicholas yes
Harry and therefore () on the statements they will see
err () you know () and I could even state () you know
the old system was A – E () the new system is >you know<
whatever. ()
Nancy [yeah
Harry do you see what I mean Vince? so that
Elizabeth the new system is A to F too but with out the E
Harry yeah you’re right it’s A B ()
Elizabeth you have to say it very carefully
Harry I have thought of this yeah
Robert D E F and F
Harry [the new systems A B C E
Elizabeth err and I’ll actually STATE that
Harry so they can see
Nancy mmm
Harry do you see what I mean
Nicholas >that’s just what we do for them isn’t it?<
Vince yeah () it’s just erm I thought
Harry nothing’s perfect () you’re right
Vince nothing’s perfect and it’s a bit of a shame for those
poor sods that have soldiered on on the old system=
Elizabeth [yes
Vince =and the ones that have >you know< not made the grade
and have taken a bit longer and- an- maybe been a bit
flabby on hitting deadlines are the ones that get
rewarded with the better transcripts
Elizabeth [if everyone does assignments rather than exams
Vince >you know< if that’s a sad but-
Robert that is arguing for the more we do the transfer for the better
Vince yeah well maybe that’s () as tutor then- then if that
becomes the position then I’ll feel more likely to say
Harry [ I:::
Vince ‘well if I was you I’d switch to modular’
Harry there is an alternative which is to leave it as it is and
we actually record the transfer on the i- i- it creates
slight problems but a minimum- a number
Vince a small number of them sorry () if when we produce
the transcript we actually produce you know the list
Nancy mmm
Harry but for the ones where they’ve done both two lists
old and new
Robert you know if I were an employer faced with a certificate
like that I’d say to the guy what’s all this? ()”you know.
Harry yeah there is that
Vince if we- if we make the cut off point the end of February
then every student that isn’t finished by the end of February
we’ll put them all on modular
Robert yes
Vince that would make sense because then at least there won’t be
Harry that’s true
Robert that I think best yeah
Vince so if we advise everybody who’s not going to finish by the end of February to go to modular
Harry can we do it at the exam boards? Can we say-
Elizabeth they can still do the exam if they want
Harry can we discuss with the external examiner explain the situation () explain the conclusion that we’ve reached that we want from a particular date () all transcripts to be on the new system () we can then transfer across=
Robert but this system =this simply means that up for- preparing for the external examiner () when Nancy prepares these mark sheets they are all new system
Harry yeah
Nancy oh yeah
Robert irrespective
Harry from- from- from th- not- not- from this ex-
this board will be the last board on the old system and at this board with the agreement of the external examiner () we’re going to do it formally then ()
Robert that’s
Harry [we will agree:: () a transfer equivalence excepting that it’s not perfect () n- these things aren’t >but that’s it’s acceptable< () and that from all exam boards henceforth will be on the new system so that we know
Robert [that makes sense anyway
Harry and all marks will be transferred across
Nicholas yes excellent
Harry we’ve got a response () that I like
Nancy [ha ha ha
Robert [ha ha
Harry cos that’s okay cos if there’s anyone in your Japan situation will automatically be put on the new system=
Nancy [ the scales () yeah
Harry =unless they elect to stay on the old
Elizabeth and February is the end of the two year ( ) isn’t it
Harry [and no one will be- and if someone says hang on these are better=
Nancy [end of February
Harry = so >if someone< says well I graduated a year earlier when you had the old system which you can check
Vince [yeah
Nancy [yeah
Harry nice one () that’s good
Robert [when does that go in the newsletter?
Harry err::m
Robert in mine? Or do we wait?
Elizabeth we wait
Vince: we wait until we get rid of the ones=
Nancy: [yeah
Vince = that go in February
Robert: [ha ha ha
Elizabeth: we wait we wait
Vince: it only goes to those students
who- who are transferred I there's no
point in rubbing their noses in it
Harry: no no we wait until these ones that
are off
Nancy: are off
Harry: I think in fact I what we will do
(yes) we will do individual letters
after this board to those concerned
and then >leave it at that< I think we'll
do it on an individual basis rather than
in a newsletter
Robert: yes this is good because we've got
quite a few dissertations going through
the system right now and we want=
Elizabeth: [ Nicholas have you put an inch in
the ( ) something in
Robert: [them to wind up
Harry: yes
Vince: there's one other quickie when somebody
in the old system did DME it was a full
module wasn't it?
Harry: [yes
Vince: and presumably that will stay as a full module=
Harry: =if they've done it if they've done it
Vince: yes so if they ha-
Harry: [if they haven't done it it's a half module
Nancy: that's true
Nicholas: [the new one is? yeah
Harry: yeah
Vince: yeah that those people that who did DME and who
have transferred to modular would be credited as
having 10 credits but will we put it on as DME
or will we put it on as GE?
Harry: I think we'll put it on as DME because of the transfer
Elizabeth: [it has to be
Elizabeth: ( ) it has to be put in as a transfer
Vince: [so those will need to be put be special
Harry: [what it will then appear
to be is as if there was a course which was
running then and is not running now
Elizabeth: yes that's right ( ) yes yes
Nicholas: [that all those who move
across will also be the case
Harry: yeah yeah
Robert: that's right
Elizabeth: so ( )
Vince: yeah that's me done
Harry: yeah nice point though Vince we've got some things
so JUST when we though we were ( ) in the woods
B127 Nancy we're back in with avengeance
Nicholas: I'm sorry no that where I c- it's just really germane to
this
Harry: no it's important
Nicholas: so if there's someone out there at the moment
1370 elected to stay on the old scheme and planning
1371 to do DME will there be a DME?
1372 Harry yeah there have to- yeah th- they
1373 Nancy last year isn’t it
1374 Harry they have to do the old course and then finish it
1375 Nicholas [ right [ right
1376 got it
1377 Harry we’ve offered them that they must do that
1378 we have an obligation to
1379 Nicholas [ that’s what I thought
1380 Elizabeth [ ( )
1381 [ )
1382 Nancy G:-----
1383 Rachel [G:-----:
1384 Robert ah yeah well that’s DME
1385 Nicholas no one’s a full module and one’s a half
1386 module they’re completely different courses
1387 Elizabeth [ yeah but DM-
1388 Robert [ oh yeah completely they’ve
1389 got different names and diff-
1390 Nicholas = sure
1391 (( the next six seconds are impossible to
1392 transcribe there are several people talking
1393 at the same time Nicholas, Elizabeth, Robert, Harry
1394
1395
1396 Harry anyone who registers t-
1397 Nancy [ well exactly
1398 Harry on- on- the original course
1399 Elizabeth [ yeah DE is isn’t
1400 Harry [ we offered them DME they
1401 Harry must be able to do it and they have
1402 Nicholas [ yes
1403 Harry we’ll give them the old file
1404 Martin will mark the exam
1405 Nicholas yeah
1406 Harry oh no we honour our commitments
1407 to everyone who registered on the old system that we
1408 must do we’re just talking about a few
1409 dozen cases here
1410 Vince [ yeah
1411 Nancy mmm it’s not like
1412 Nicholas [ yeah
1413 Elizabeth [ can I also put in a plea
1414 for very special care to be taken over the transfer
1415 ( ) that it ought to be checked and double checked
1416 and triple checked
1417 Harry [ oh good yeah
1418 Elizabeth because that kind of it’s brainless stuff
1419 and it’s so easy to make mistakes
1420 Harry well the first thing we’ve got to do:
1421 I think Nancy: I think all transfers have to go
1422 Nancy [ go through
1423 Harry through everything everyone is a transfer
1424 we-
1425 Nancy [ well it should be on the database it’s
1426 a little box that says trans-
1427 Harry = transfer and a tick can you put into the database
1428 print out all transfers can you print them all out
1429 then can you send them to course tutors
who can just check against their centres
( ) you know that this is their understanding

if it's confirmed back to you: back to me

across to Rachel ( )

Nicholas this is where Doreen raises her head
Nancy ha:

Harry do what?
Nicholas >sorry< we were talk- the one- we had one

this morning ( ) yes it's not altogether clear
to me what she's doing

Harry there's always a ( ) but we'll get- ( ) as we can
Nancy we'll get there

The following section (1442-1518) has been removed as one of the participants preferred the section to be removed.

Elizabeth can we h-
Nicholas [he's got an A for it hasn't he
Elizabeth well this is the other prblem

is that I don't write ( ) I don't type the
grade on it ( ) on computer until it's agreed

so I don't
Harry [ but it was an A wasn't it
Elizabeth well I c- I couldn't remember if it was
A a B+ or an A question mark
Harry ah:
Elizabeth I was probably ( ) I sent it to Emma

B+/A question mark ( ) because a lot of it

was on materials and when I re-read this 'really

sincerely' this morning ( ) I reckon I was being really
clever and disguising the gaps ( ) and saying

no you could have done a bit of that ( ) it wasn't
negative at all ( ) but that looks to me more

like a B+ Feedback sheet ( )
Harry right
Elizabeth so I mean I can't remember ( ) I don't know
whether Emma would have given in an A=
Harry [ what I
Elizabeth = having re-read that now
Harry [ well the third option

is to put a grade on it and say look this has
only been first marked cos we have lost it

and if you feel you would like it to be first=
Elizabeth [ this is a provisional
Harry marked with the possibility that it would be
changed
Elizabeth [ yeah this is a provisional
Nicholas [ send us ( )
Harry yeah send us another copy and we'll do it

you see that's the third that sits between
the two
Robert coming up clean I think is
Harry [ I think we tell 'em
Elizabeth I think it probably is better
Harry (1.4)

rather than ask them to send it back
say you know< look this- this grade
er: ( ) my own instinct actually is

that if it's borderline we go up
rather than down (,) not just because
we've lost it (,) I mean that would be
my instinct anyway (,) in fairness
in- in terms of natural justice ()
ermm to give him a grade (,) and say
look if you're not happy with this grade
we are happy to see- have it second marked
and confirmed ( )
Robert we do have a technical weakness and that
is if the external wants to call for it
Harry yes well that's the other thing (,) we can-
I think we should be open (,) with the
external
Elizabeth I mean if we're going to ask him
to send it anyway why don't
we just ask him to send it and we'll
cover costs of postage and packing
Robert yes surely but it's just a matter of
time he wants his feedback (,) and I
think he should get it
Harry yeah (,) I've got no strong feelings
I'm just trying to put the options
Vince [huh] [huh]
Vince it reads like B+
Elizabeth mmm it does (,) I mean when I read
it this morning (,) I thought no
that's not an 'A' because there's
> this and this and this<
Harry [ah:] right okay
well in that case
Robert well all marks are provisional
why don't we give him a provisional
B+ (,) and if the external examiner
wants to up it to an A that's okay
too
Elizabeth (,) if you desperately want it
second marked
Nicholas .huh I don't know about leaving
that up (,) I don't think it's his decision
about whether this work's going to be
second marked
Harry "okay"
Nicholas is it?
Harry well- we normally offer it to them as an example
of fair marking (,) that we second mark
Nicholas yeah that's what we do
Robert [ah but I'm pretty sure we wouldn't
want to lower it aren't we?
Harry yeah
Elizabeth I mean it was definitely good enough for a
B+
Robert and he would never object to it going up
() now why don't we just send him that
and say I'm sorry the external examiner
may need a copy and () we err we've made a
mistake about ( , ) can you send
another copy in case the external examiner
wants it () and THEN we can have somebody
do it ()
Elizabeth and then you could second mark it and if
someone else thinks it is an A

Harry [yes]

Elizabeth I mean Annie could have a look at
t it as part of doing Emma’s job (.) if she
thinks it’s an A

Robert he’s not going to object

Elizabeth we can give it to the external examiner

Nicholas it comes back to me (.) it’s my patch yeah

Elizabeth alright yeah (.)

Nicholas yeah

Elizabeth so you could (.) oh yeah s- sorry

I thought

Nicholas it was only Emma because Emma was covering

for me on sabbatical

Nancy yeah that’s right

Harry [ Emma was doing France

Elizabeth oh France (.) sorry Nicholas

Nicholas [no no

Elizabeth I was thinking he was Spain

Robert well I mean it it’s

Nicholas why that’s why we’re pursuing it

Elizabeth quite so ha ha haa::: yea::s

Nancy ha ha ha

Robert it’s quite understandable in the changeover

B203 this kind of thing does happen

Elizabeth ((yawns)) so your decision Nicholas

Nicholas so::: I’ll get in touch with guy send him

the first marker (.) say that hhhh I’ll give

a version of the situation without

Elizabeth [ I think that sounds like a good idea

The following section (1653-1684) has been removed as one of the participants preferred the section to be removed.
Elizabeth = how many have we lost in the past?
Harry = one
Vince = it's just one of those things
Harry = just the one
Elizabeth = I mean
Nancy = just the one
Elizabeth = it seems an awful lot of=
Harry = fine
Elizabeth = to insist on
Robert = it's nearly happened fifty or so times
Harry = hah ha

The following section (1721-1782) has been removed as one of the participants preferred the section to be removed.

Nicholas on a very basic () count em all in count 'em all
out () system () so it's MET at the end of the
marking period () you got the ones that list which
ones came in () feedback should have gone out in
three weeks () if it hasn't we've already not
kept to the contract
(0.6)
Harry yeah () wh- I mean- IIC I tend () occasionally
I intend to follow it through anyway () I wouldn't
mind I'd certainly be happy to do that
Elizabeth so we all keep=
Harry [ cos we-
Elizabeth =a list on lined paper () we write the name
Nancy = you know the list
Elizabeth we write the date
Harry well what I do actually () I don't even bother
with that () cos what I do () is I do I do a::: () I
do it on the computer () and I always keep them in a file
errm and each () and what I've done is to develop a separate
file for each intake () and so each- each >you know< quarter
() and at the end I open it up=
Nancy = read this
Harry = and look at the names and then you know I've
Elizabeth = yeah but
Harry = I've got files as well which is how I found this () but
Elizabeth = I haven't when we've agree- I haven't- I don't open
Harry = up that file again when we agree a grade
Elizabeth = but I- that's what I do () I open it up and
Harry = you know that- the ones that "haven't got it"
Elizabeth = it seems to me that the contract
involves we make sure feedback is dispatched within
that three week marking period () and each module
tutor needs to go to Nancy and say have these ones
gone off
Harry = yes
Robert = I have a horrible feeling
Elizabeth = but that's the tutor
Harry = isn't it? () the country tutor=
Harry = no
Elizabeth = the modules
Harry = it's the module
Nancy = module yeah
Elizabeth = right okay fine ()
Harry: cos what- cos what=
Elizabeth: [we need to know whose it is
Harry: =I tend to do
is I actually get the envelope ready (.) I either
do it myself (.) I either send it off myself
and give Nancy the thing (.) or I get the
( ) I gave you the
envelope and tape and everything
Elizabeth: so we have different systems and Nancy has to cope
Harry: [ yeah I- I do it myself ()
Elizabeth: I actually follow it through (.) cos
for that reason
Elizabeth: well that's not going to be a good idea
Harry: yeah (.) but I don't think we should
Nancy: >I cope at the moment<
Harry: [ but it's the same principle
I've always followed it through like that
Nancy: they're very small numbers aren't they?
really (.) I mean they all come in
Elizabeth: well Nancy's handling three or four
different systems then
Nancy: mm
Harry: yeah (.) so we'll all have the same system
cos mine is different from yours (.) is different
from yours is different from (.) so lets
all have the same? (.) well we put a thing
on standing orders (.) and if we're not doing
it then we need to re-agree standing orders
Robert: well yeah
Nancy: yeah
Harry: yeah
Nancy: cos it was Nicholas's way that was agreed on
wasn't it (.) the way that you were doing
Nicholas: that's the one I put around
the school and I thought we'd agreed it=
Harry: =I- I just took it a stage further and
actually sort them out but I mean
if that's- if that's going to cause problems
then I'll
Nancy: [well that's up-
Nicholas: [I don't know if it does or not
Harry: well it's just a version of what you do
as opposed to actually doing it at
the end (.) I make- I see the envelope (.) I put
the envelope in the thing and tick it
272: off on my . hhh =
Nancy: [yeah
Harry: = which instead of doing it
at the end of the three week (.) I do
it at the end of like one week for
this one and two week for the next
Robert: this all raises a horrible fear
that maybe five or six weeks ago
Nancy: I read a (.) dissertation ()
Nicholas: =that's right
Robert: and said Nancy will be getting in touch
with you (.)
Harry: yeah ( ) I've done- I did
the same
Robert: I mean I just don’t know
Elizabeth: [I can’t remember ( ) ]
Robert: it’s just
Vince: raised the thought in my mind
Elizabeth: [Annie’s got seven or eight=
Vince: =dissertations and she’s - she’s
marked three of them () and they’re
in your pigeon holes () now () the ones
that have been done () there are about four
more to do () which will probably take
another week
Harry: mm
Vince: but one of yours is there
Robert: right
Harry: okay .hhh
Robert: that’s okay then
Harry: on this system then shall we just
put on sta- to check reiterate this
standing orders () that it is
the responsibility of the-
just to say it is the responsibility of
Elizabeth: the subject tutor to-
Harry: [the subject tutor to ensure
at the end of the three week period
that all pieces of work first marked by
him or her:: have been sent out () no
more specific than that
Robert: subject tutors stroke supervisor
Harry: stroke supervisor yeah () >stroke supervisor<
no more specific than that
(0.8)
Robert: “err guilty”
Rachel: ha ha ha
Harry: yeah well it’s easy o ( )
Nicholas: yeah:: I haven’t done it
Harry: oh I haven’t done it as supervisor
I do pass on- tend to leave it for
course centre tutor
Nancy: mmm
Harry: anyway () okay we got that one
sorted () and the system is now a simple
statement () that we all know () okay
Nicholas: Nicholas’s () inquiry
Nicholas: did everyone else get this e-mail from Judith
about errm workloads and () oh God don’t tell
me she was sending to me
Robert: it’s not from Judith
Vince: was it outside the university
Elizabeth: [ oh I don’t know I haven’t seen my e-mails yet
Harry: [OH I’ve done that () no
it was passed on () it was passed on by the
person who was filling in for Judith who’s gone
from Bognor University
Vince: from Bognor yeah
Harry: straight in the trash
Robert: trash
Vince: it didn’t apply to us because it was on about terms
and lecturing
Harry: >straight in the trash mate<
1947 Robert trash it
1948 Nicholas good that was easy
1949 Harry these two'll only take a second
1950 office and machines (.) just to remind you
1951 that if you are staying late (.) can you check
1952 can we check that we know who's staying
1953 late because sometimes the office lights and
1954 machines are left on (.) an; so if you are
1955 going can you check that there's no one=
1956 Elizabeth [mm]
1957 Harry =else in and that you switch >everything off
1958 again< just a reminder and a
1959 Elizabeth [now the big printer doesn't
1960 turn off does it?
1961 Robert it- at weekends it does
1962 Nancy at weekends
1963 Harry we're not supposed to turn it off?
1964 Elizabeth [ no during the week
1965 Harry I've been turning it off
1966 Nancy not til Friday
1967 Elizabeth during the week- during the week the big printer doesn't
1968 turn off=
1969 Harry =oh doesn't it?
1970 Elizabeth so when I've come in
1971 Nancy [not til Friday
1972 Vince oh right (.) I've been turning it off
1973 Harry I've been turning it off
1974 Elizabeth Tuesday Wednesday Thursday when I'm
1975 last I don't turn it off
1976 Rachel that's why it keeps breaking
1977 Nancy right
1978 Harry sorry I won't turn it off a:gain
1979 Nicholas and he's been coming in again following mornings
1980 and saying * look at that Elizabeth Willis=
1981 Elizabeth [it's broken
1982 Nicholas she hasn't turned it off again and he's turned it off
1983 just for spite (.)
1984 Robert HA HA HA haa:::
1985 Nancy [ha ha ha haaa
1986 Elizabeth [ or he's been coming in and saying why isn't this
1987 printer printing
1988 Nicholas [no he's coming in he's got all lights on the printer's on
1989 all the machines on you know the works- ahhh
1990 Elizabeth and a little budy on the floor asleep
1991 Harry that it (.) or in the corridor this ( )
1992 exhausted
1993 Nancy [ ha ha
1994 Elizabeth [ ha ha ha aha::: ha ha ha
1995 Harry a trail of ink down the page (.) that's what I like to see
((end of tape))