Framing in interactive academic talk

A conversation-analytic perspective

Yun Pan
Shanghai Maritime University

Framing involves how language users conceptualize what is happening in interaction for situated interpretation of roles, purposes, expectations, and sequences of action, thus show significant conceptual relevance to the analysis of routinized institutional communication. Having established a working definition of *framing* based on an intensive review of previous research, this study investigates university students' and tutors' framing behaviors in interactive small group talk. Two types of framing-in-interaction, -*alternate framing* of a single situation and *co-framing* within/beyond speaker role boundary-, are identified, examined, and characterized from a conversation-analytic perspective. The findings suggest that alternate framings co-occur with traceable interactional devices for sequential organization when the single situation at talk takes on divergent meaning potentials to be accessed. Co-framings happen when at least one (group) of participants is highly goal-oriented, showing conditional relevance to the prior courses of action and more explicit negotiation of epistemic stances. Framing, therefore, can be arguably taken as a global organization resource to characterize contextualization in institutional communication.

Keywords: frame, framing, contextualization, Conversation Analysis, academic talk, institutional communication

1. Introduction

Socio-interactional research in recent decades has been passionately devoted to mechanisms of verbal communication in institutional exchanges. Researchers in Conversation Analysis (CA) have found that the infrastructure which is universally applicable to informal, ordinary conversations do not always hold in specific institutional contexts (Kendrick et al. 2020). When the institutional framework is invoked by professionals (Nielsen et al. 2012), a global dimension for discursive organization applies beyond the immediate turns and sequences. With meaning

Published online: 23 July 2021 *Pragmatics* 32:1 (2022), pp. 131–157.
ISSN 1018-2101 | E-ISSN 2406-4238

constructed (Heritage 2005) based upon mutual expectations, procedural limits, and situated expertise (Dall and Sarangi 2018), the evidence of interactive framing shows (O'Malley 2009).

Framing captures "what people think they are doing when they talk to each other" (Tannen 1993a, 6) and has been conceptualized at the interface between human cognition and interaction (Goffman 1983; Gordon 2008, 2009, 2015; Ribeiro and Hoyle 2009; Stubbs 2001; Tannen 1993a, 1993b; Tannen and Wallat 1993; Kern and Selting 2013). Framing for professional meaning negotiation is particularly manifest in institutional exchanges (e.g. classroom talk) where epistemic asymmetry is either maintained or challenged (Jacknick 2011; van Dijk 2012) and social relationships are jointly accomplished (Tannen 2005; Stivers et al. 2011). Epistemic state and status navigate ways of approaching topics and situations (Heritage 2012, 2013; Heritage and Clayman 2010) and relationships define roles and responsibilities (Dörnyei and Murphey 2003; Stivers et al. 2011) in the "context-bound process" of conversational inferences (Gumperz 1982, 153). Following is an example.

Excerpt 1. The overcompensated generator

```
1  <$ 1>  It ((the temperature)) ↓will(.) become too ↓high
2  <$ 2>  ↓Yep
3  <$ 1>  Right
4  <$ 2>  Eventually
5  <$ 1>  =So do we almost have to O:VER-(1.6) °what's the ↑word°
6  <$ 2>  Overcom-
7  <$ 1>  ↑ YEAH(.)Overcompen↑ sate
```

In Excerpt 1, two participants jointly attend to the concept of "overcompensate" at a student project meeting. The shared knowledge provides the cognitive basis upon which the interaction proceeds. $ 1 initiates a clarification from $ 2 after failing to come up with the full term. $ 1's verbal prosody -a stretched sound and an increased volume of the incomplete utterance of "overcompensate" (Line 5)- indicates a trouble source by claiming his insufficient knowledge (Sert and Walsh 2012). The knowledge of the concept, however, is supposed to be equally accessible to both of them, revealed from the lower volume of $ 1's question (Line 5). The second component part of "overcompensate" uttered by $ 2 (Line 6), although unfinished, performs an effective repair that triggers $ 1's confirmative response and the latter's articulation of the full term (Line 7).

The example demonstrates that a cognitive workload and an awareness of situated interpretation are essential for interlocutors to be engaged in meaningful interaction. The sequential organization is not only motivated by particular knowledge structures associated with specific disciplinary concepts but also attributed to how interlocutors' state of knowing can be accordingly aligned and adjusted (Heritage 2012). Such alignment and adjustment constitute framing in

the courses of action at talk. Therefore, an exclusive focus on the locally managed turns and sequences, as shown in numerous existing CA studies, might not be conceptually and methodologically sufficient to address the complexity in institutional exchanges. Although analysts following the tradition of CA have undoubtedly "developed a truly linguistic understanding of framing" (Gordon 2001, 327), the analysis of talk-in-interaction needs to make the connection between structural linguistic elements (e.g. "contextualization cues" conceptualized by Gumperz 1982) and framing more manifest and interpretable at the operational level of analysis, while the research field is still in need of expansion.

Utilizing a CA approach, this study is aimed to build on the ongoing research by investigating framing in university small group talk. The focus is on the relationship between framing and institutional routines, in particular, how framing operates to integrate the cognitive relations (Goffman 1983) and contextual inferences (Gumperz 1982) between participants for collaborative meaning construction and negotiation. Having established a working definition of *framing* based on an intensive review of previous research, this study identifies, examines, and characterizes two types of framing: *alternate framing* of a single situation and *co-framing* within/beyond speaker role boundary. The analyses demonstrate that patterns of framing and goal-oriented courses of action shape each other at different stages of talk. The findings suggest that framing can be arguably taken as a global organization resource to interpret interlocutors' specific linguistic choices in institutional verbal communication.

2. Frame and framing in social interaction

Frame is one of the key concepts in social interaction research. The notion of *frame* was introduced into the field of ethnography and ecological studies of society in the 1970s. Tracing back to anthropologist Gregory Bateson (1987), frames as psychological sense-making behaviors are re-interpreted for an approach towards contextual discourse analysis of human social interaction and experience (Tannen 1993a, 1993b). Goffman (1974) proposed the concept of *frame* based on the earlier work on the ethnography of communication (see Hymes 1968) to analyze the organization of human experience in moment-to-moment interaction. Frames are conceptualized by Goffman (1974) as consisting of "principles of organizations which govern events – at least social ones – and our subjective involvement in them" (p. 10). When speakers create or apply frames in their talk, they construct alignments between one another as well as what is said (Gordon 2015, 326). Frames are "reflexive and fluctuating" so that interlocutors can manage any change "from one frame to another" (Drew and Heritage 1992, 8).

Sociolinguistic research has subsequently seen the definition of *frame* refined as "structures of expectations", "organized knowledge in form of expectations (Tannen 1993b, 16–21), and "a sense of what activity is being engaged in, how speakers mean what they say" which is "constituted by verbal and non-verbal interaction" (Tannen and Wallat 1993, 60). Discourse analysts typically take frames as to what incorporate behaviors and processes of how interlocutors establish "definitions of situation" (Goffman 1974, 10) and how they correspondingly make sense of social experience. The analysis of frames in social interaction, according to Ribeiro and Hoyle (2009), is "a way of studying the organization of experience", "an approach to cognition and interaction that focuses on the construction, conveying and interpretation of meanings" (p. 74). Frames are believed to be "not innate but acquired through socialization as constructed out of experience", thus are highly "culturally dependent" (Bednarek 2005, 690; also see Tannen 1993a, 1993b), and cultural dependency contributes to establishing norms of socialization (Tannen 1993b). Frames are, therefore, expected to be "conventionalized and capture the prototypical features of a situation" (Bednarek 2005, 690) in social interaction.

Typical characteristics of frames identified from the socio-interactional perspective help researchers divide them into categories, some of which see overlaps with what is portrayed by linguists following a cognitive path.[1] For example, (Fillmore 2006) uses *interactional frames* to describe how people conceptualize what is going on in actual communicative contexts, concerning interlocutors' expectations to define the roles, purposes, and conventionalized sequences of language-in-action associated with certain knowledge. Tannen and Wallat (1993) portray *interactive frames* of interpretation, referring to "a sense of what activity being engaged in, how speakers mean what they say" in interaction (Tannen and Wallat 1993, 59–60). Based upon the categorization, Tannen and Wallat (1993) demonstrate how concepts are interconnected (for example, through switching

1. There is no unified frame theory and a terminological confusion is sometimes inevitable (Bednarek 2005, 688). Scholars following distinct research traditions may be reluctant to accept an unmarked use of *frame* to refer to different (though related) phenomena in a single research project, for example, a "mental knowledge structure" from a cognitive perspective (see Minsky 1974; Barsalou 1992; Fillmore 1982) or a "sense of activity system" from a socio-interactional perspective (see Goffman 1974, 1983; Tannen and Wallat 1993). This study shares the theoretical and methodological concerns of Conversation Analysis (Sacks et al. 1974) to examine *framing* in interaction. This preference, however, does not mean that the cognitive dimension of framing is irrelevant or peripheral to the data analysis. Scholars following the socio-interactional path have never failed to highlight the significance of interactants' "cognitive relation" (Goffman 1983, 4) and mental connection between present things and past experience (Tannen 1993a, 15) in their analysis of social interaction.

and adjusting different frames), extending Goffman's observation that "social life is layered as experience is recast and transformed" through language use (Gordon 2015, 327).

Framing, from diverse but related epistemic perspectives, is understood as a speaker's applying a (collection of) knowledge structure(s) to a communicative situation for specific purposes, involving "contextualizing or situating events in the broadest sense possible" concerning established patterns of linguistically constructed knowledge (Fillmore 1982: 391). Framing is a "collaborative, multiparty" communicative process (Kendon 1992, 324) and "a filtering process through which societal-level values and principles of conduct are transformed and refocused so as to apply to the situation at hand" (Gumperz 2003, 3). Pragmatics is, therefore, fundamental to framing in that speakers not only depend on the shared perception of frames but also strive towards framing in creative ways to achieve communicative goals (see Nerlich and Clarke 2000; Hamawand 2016).

Different functions of framing-in-interaction have been identified, examined, and characterized in a broad variety of social scenes. Some framings are investigated at a relatively macro level of discourse analysis, such as narrative framing (Goodwin 1984), ironic framing (Clift 1999), argumentative framing (Goodwin 1996), negotiating framing (Gordon 2009), quotative framing (Tannen 2007; Betz 2013), institutional framing (Hutchby 1999), work and play framings (Gordon 2008), and quotidian framing (Matsumoto 2011, 2015). Some framings seem to be locally emergent and lanimated (Gordon 2015) concerning the structuredness of conversational moves, such as framing for repairs (Lerner and Kitzinger 2007), framing for openings (Hutchby 1999), overlapped framings (Gordon 2003), embodied framings (Goodwin 1996), reframing (Tannen 2006; Matsumoto 2011), shifted framings (Goodwin 1996), nested framings (Campbell 2003), embedded framings (Gordon 2002, 2009), and blended framings (Gordon 2008, 2009). The latter category is closely related to the sequential organization and transformation of interaction, demonstrating that framing is "often a complex, multi-layered activity" (Gordon 2008: 343) with a high level of sensitivity to and dependency of context.

In his discussion on the analysis of frames in talk, Goffman (1974) proposed three points concerning how language use functions as framing devices in human interaction. First, the role of words can be a source of both framing and misframing in a conversation for their recipient. The speaker can break frames just as he/she can create and utilize frames through the way he/she manages the production of lexical items.

Second, frames are "institutionalized in various ways" (Goffman 1974, 63). Unlike informal talk at each juncture of which "a whole range of actions seems available to the individual" (Goffman 1974, 501), institutional talk usually allows

limited choices of language resources and heightened use of procedures which would narrow the range of available actions. A single context compromises its own interactional order (Goffman 1983) in institutional talk and a frame contains its own "logic", "motives", "meanings", and "activities" (Goffman 1981b, 63) to manifest contextual specifics. Institutional exchanges involve "a single, pre-established agenda with elaborate differentiation of parts to be played" (Goffman 1974, 498). A close observation of such goal-orientedness may contribute to revealing how interlocutors, with "idiosyncratic motives and interpretations", "gear" each other into "what is available by way of standard doings and standard reasons for doing these things" (Goffman 1981b, 63).

Third, ways of framing can be idiosyncratic concerning how interlocutors choose to "replay" a scene to each other (Goffman 1974, 504). This involves the speaker's evaluation of the moment-to-moment interaction as well as his/her intention to conceptualize the talk to his/her listener(s) so that the latter can "empathetically insert themselves into" the talk (Goffman 1974, 504). This concerns a higher level of shared intentionality in interaction and more complex forms of cooperation, through which interlocutors represent and coordinate their agendas according to the overall goal of the communication.

While the theories of framing are far from being unified, it has been widely accepted that framing is closely related to what language users know and the way of knowing (Heritage 2012). To investigate the sequential transformation (Gordon 2008) of framing in interaction, the concept of *contextualization cues* (Gumperz 1992a) is of particular relevance and usefulness. Contextualization cues are linguistic and para-linguistic devices that "when processed in co-occurrence with other cues and grammatical and lexical signs, construct the contextual ground for situated interpretation and thereby affect how particular messages are understood" (Gumperz 2003, 220). They are used by interlocutors to signal and interpret talk-in-interaction (Gordon 2008, 322), including but not limited to intonation, rhythm, loudness, pitch, lexical, phonetic and syntactic choices (Tovares 2016, 557). There is "a significant convergence between the linguistic concept of *contextualization cues* and the sociological concept of *frame*" (Drew and Heritage 1992, 8). Framing is, therefore, characterized as a global level of contextualization that signals interlocutors' expectations, interpretations, and negotiations through "cues and markers" (Goffman 1981a, 157). Contextualization[2] at this level contributes to making predictions about what is in focus (e.g. topics and viewpoints) and the subsequent sequential organization (e.g. identification of legitimate speaker change).

---

2. Gumperz (1992a) uses *contextualization* to refer to "speakers and listeners' use of verbal and nonverbal signs to relate what is said at any one time and in any one place to knowledge acquired through past experience" (p. 230).

In this study, a working definition of *framing* is established: framing-in-interaction is the process of how interlocutors apply particular knowledge structures to interaction and how they negotiate meanings through the use of contextualization cues to enclose each other's alignments and expectations. The following sections introduce the data and methods used in this study, followed by a detailed analysis and subsequent discussion. The conclusion and implication of the findings are also provided.

3. The study: Data and methods

This study focuses on interlocutors' framing behaviors in a particular kind of social communication – university small group talk. The aim of data analysis is to determine if, and how the participants' management of turns and sequences at talk would have any impact upon ways of framing-in-interaction for meaning negotiation following specific institutional routines. University small group talk is selected to be examined not only due to a lack of prior research on framing patterns in interactive small group talk at the higher educational level, but aimed to explain the structural uniqueness of the talk genre from a fresh, more global perspective of contextualization. University small group talk does not resemble mundane conversations in that it shows a heightened use of procedures. On the other hand, it differentiates itself from traditional classroom interaction in that it features a relatively equal participation and more emergent turn-taking patterns with pedagogical orientations less relevant or salient. The shifting participatory mode, nevertheless, does not override the asymmetrical power distribution across different speaker roles. Epistemic divergences between interlocutors are, therefore, found to be more strategically deployed to take advantage of communicative resources bound by rights and obligations.

The main data set used in this study is a specialized corpus of spoken academic English (NUCASE, Walsh 2014). The corpus comprises 47 small group talk sessions (roughly 63 hours) which were audio-and video-recorded at a UK university from 2010 to 2016. The data cover a broad range of speech events, including seminars, tutorials, Ph.D. supervision meetings, staff-student consultations, and students' project meetings. Students at both undergraduate and postgraduate levels are involved. The number of participants for each session ranges from 4 to 12 (Walsh and Knight 2016), and the time duration of a single session ranges from 15 minutes to 5 hours. All participants included in data analysis are native speakers of English.

All participant speech is broadly transcribed and speaker-coded. Multiple listenings of the recordings contribute to identifying target talk sequences which

are further transcribed following the conventions developed by Jefferson (2004). Transcribing at this stage ensures that all excerpts genuinely represent naturally occurring talk which is not produced following any external instructions or recording scripts (Schegloff 1987, 102). Labels[3] in capitalized italics are assigned to different frames which are activated in the sequential organization of the participants' talk. A conversation-analytic approach (Sacks et al. 1974) is adopted to examine how the corresponding framing patterns are fitted to specific turn-taking structures and communicative needs (Betz 2013). The following section reports the main research findings and subsequently provides a focused discussion.

4. Findings and discussion

4.1 Alternate framings of a single situation

This section focuses on the talk sequences which involve *alternate framings* of a single situation. The formulation is based on empirical observations which show that the same 'fact' can be presented within different framings thus are made out as different 'facts' (Fillmore 2006, 386). Alternate framings show how deviant people's experiential schematizations can be when they are encountered with the same situation. The single situation can make different people invoke different expectations and subsequent actions (as alternatives) for meaning construction and negotiation.

In Excerpt 2 alternate framings are invoked by a single speaker rather than proposed by the interlocutors. In this excerpt, a tutor (\$ 1) and two student-teachers (\$ 5 and \$ 7) are talking about student-teachers in the workplace.

Excerpt 2. Student-teachers at work

```
1   <$ 1>   So e= I ↑gues (.) in a way(0.5)for a= for a= se:nior
2           teacher to come into your lesson >as you say first of all
3           you think< "oh my word↓ that's (0.6) you know (.) bit
4           [↑worrying"]
5   <$ 7>   [Yeah      ]
6   <$ 1>   (.)but then ↑actually >the fact that< he gave: you: the
7           ↑respect to say ["well      ]
8   <$ 5>                   [Mm (.) Yeah]
9   <$ 1>   what= what <do you:: want me to [do?"]>
```

3. Labeling of interactive frames in this study largely depends on the identification of and judgment on the principles and organizations that govern the small group talk events, or how the participants establish "definitions of a situation" (Goffman 1974, 10). The labeling approach proves to serve the research purpose well, while scholars favoring a cognitive approach to framing may prefer a more technically rigorous way of labeling frames based on the identification and categorization of specific lexical concepts in pre-established semantic domains (see Ruppenhofer et al. 2006; Rayson 2008).

```
10 <$ 5>                                  [Yeah]
11 <$ 7>                                  [Mhm ]
12 <$ 1>   =given that we've (.)There's obviously >an incident<
13         going on here =There's ↑always gonna be incidents(1.0)
14         but rather than just saying "oh you ↑°silly°
15         [student teacher]
16 <$ 5>   [Yeah           ]
17 <$ 7>   [Yeah           ]
18 <$ 1>   =and >you know< I'll sort ↑this out for you"
```

The talk is based on a shared acknowledgment that there is a tension between student-teachers at work and other institutional actors (e.g. senior teachers) concerning how the former is viewed and treated by the latter. The single situation is "a student-teacher's lesson is under the observation of a senior teacher". An*INSPECT* frame underlying student-teachers' worrying sentiments against senior teachers is invoked by the tutor and confirmed by $ 7 (*yeah*, Line 5). $ 1, however, immediately proposes the other way of interpreting the situation by invoking an *ASSISTANCE* frame to show that "being observed by a senior teacher" can be something positive since the student-teachers are in fact helped rather than criticized. The word *silly* stages an external voice that has been pragmatically revised with a rising intonation but in a lower volume (Line 14). It performs as a counterfactual marker, indicating that the situation being discussed is strategically contrasted. Traceable prosodic features in $ 1's turn at Line 14–15 (e.g. intonation, volume, stress) contribute to signaling a meaning shift and contrast as "constitutive of the interactional characteristics of the encounter" (Gumperz 1992b, 43), thus manage to highlight the *ASSISTANCE* frame as what is to be expected by student teachers in the workplace.

Excerpt 3 shows how alternate framings are applied by different speakers who share a particular identity that is institutionally defined. Two tutors ($ 1 and $ 2) and a student-teacher ($ 4) are reflecting upon a scenario recalled by the student-teacher from her prior teaching experience. An orientation of $ 4 can be identified to building up her professional identity of being a teacher based upon students' emotional feedback.

Excerpt 3. The teacher-student emotional bond

```
1  <$ 4>   I ↑want to get to the stage where the kids they're sad(.) that
2          I'm not gonna be teaching them °anymore° ((laughing))
3  <$ 2>   [They >probably< sure they were sad when you. left (.)
4  <$ 1>   [I'm sure they al= they al= they [↑ ALREADY WERE        ]
5  <$ 4>                                    [↑Yes some of them WERE]
6          (0.5) I was really pleased (0.5) and I was like= "ah yeah(.)my
7          lesson must be quite good (.) if they [think= if they really
8          said that"
9  <$ 2>                                        [Yeah(.) But-
10 <$ 1>                                        [Yeah(.) Well=
11         that's what Roger and ↑ I ho:pe (.) ↑isn't it(.) >That at the
12         end of the year< you think- "aw: I'm gonna miss them"
```

It is right after $ 4's turn where alternate framings can be identified carried out by the two tutors. The overlapping talk (Line 3–4) shows their immediate responses to $ 4's utterance. $ 2 talks about the possibility (*probably*, Line 3) of the kids being sad on the kids' part, while $ 1 emphasizes the certainty (*sure, already*, Line 4) of the kids being sad from her perspective. $ 2 invokes the *EVALUATE* frame to objectively examine the teacher-student relationship; whereas $ 1 invokes the *EMPATHY* frame to recall the emotional bond between the teacher and her students. $ 1's comment seems more proactive and encouraging, indicated by $ 4's acknowledgement (Line 5) which relates the kids' reaction to positive self-evaluation (Line 6–8). $ 2 orients to maintaining his framing by trying to give a different comment after a short acknowledgment (*yeah*, Line 9). The act is projected by the word *but* (Line 9) which indicates that $ 2's following talk may be contrasting with $ 4's prior talk (Line 5–8). This move, however, is interrupted by $ 1 when she may have realized that what $ 2 is going to say would probably discourage $ 4. She then deliberately applies a series of discursive strategies to "save the talk", such as building solidarity (*that's what Roger and I hope*, Line 11), using a tag question *(isn't it?*, Line 11) to invite affiliation (see Gass et al. 2005), and directing the talk into a sympathetic realm (*Aw, I'm gonna miss them*, Line 11).

The overlap in Line 9 and 10 shows individual efforts made to maintain their framings which have been constructed in the prior talk: $ 1 orients to maintaining her framing with $ 4 while $ 2 orients to regaining the focus on his framing but fails to do so when $ 1 manages to take the floor (Line 11). The overlap happens before $ 4's turn has come to the end, offering initial clues as to the action implemented in next turn (Rühlemann 2019, 142) when $ 1 and $ 2 compete in the transition space for the speakership. The overlap is correlated with the sequential environment of assessment when $ 4 emphasizes *good* (Line 7) as a self-evaluation of her lesson and $ 1 and $ 2 agree with her assessment (Pomerantz 1984, 69; see also Vatanen 2018). The acknowledgment tokens *yeah*s at the initial positions of both $ 1's and $ 2's turns (Line 9 and 10) are associated with a display of passive recipiency which exhibits "a preparedness to shift from recipiency to speakership" (Jefferson 1983). The finding adds to the evidence of structural representation of cognitive divergence involved in alternate framings (Fillmore 2006). The divergence shown in the overlap is "intimately connected to the predictive work expended by recipients trying to anticipate the current turn as a whole" (Rühlemann 2019, 145; see also Levinson and Torreira 2015, 13).

Excerpt 4 shows that alternate framings of a single situation can be associated with different speakers' orientations shaped by distinct institutional values. Such orientations show how participants position themselves in relation to the macro (e.g. institutional) and micro (speech event) contexts and how they conceptualize their corresponding rights and obligations in communication. In this excerpt, a

student research team ($ 2 and $ 4) and a company delegation ($ 1 and $ 3) are talking about their concerns of a software design.

Excerpt 4. Software development cycle

```
1   <$ 1>   ↑Well(.) so another requirements gathering meeting (.) Is
2           there anything(.) er(.) you need to know ahead of your (.)
3           submission (.) of the initial(.) design this evening
4   <$ 2>   We're Just looking for clarification on what it was (.) with
5           regards to the documentation that you actually wanted (.)
6           Like- obviously the aims of each(.) er (.) proposal and
7           also(.) which tools we're going to use ((a female's
8           coughing)) and why we're going to use them(.) Is that mainly
9           what you're ↑after
10  <$ 3>   (4.0) Design documentation and er: I guess (1.0) have you
11          looked it up on ↑Google(2.3) The software development life
12          cycle (.) Do you know what design documentation will look
13          like(.) I think do you ↑KNOW(.) Well I hope you do because
14          I'm paying you enough(.) about the software development life
15          cycle(.) You have one at least= one computer scientist on
16          your team
17  <$ 2>   Yeah (2.3) Okay-
16  <$ 1>   =So there are standards(.) for design documentation (.) [(a
19          male's coughing))and I think what we'd like to see(.)
20          is (0.5) ↓ documentation that conforms to those standards
21  <$ 2>   Okay(4.8) >That was the only question I really came in
22          with<= I ↑mean(.) the re3t of it is just getting on(.) with
23          the work flow= so-
24  <$ 1>   Right
25  <$ 4>   Yeah(.) it's pretty much(.) the same(.) as yesterday we
26          found
27  <$ M>   Mm-mm
26  <$ 3>   So what a= a company would be looking for is some evidence
29          that there is some rationale from(.) because we all put our
30          contracts-
```

The two parties are found to frame differently a single situation of "a software design is to be presented in documentation". The research team tends to highlight the contextualized factors (e.g. aims, tools, rationale) which are taken specifically relevant and significant to their design (a *BOTTOM-UP* frame). By contrast, the company delegation prefers a reference to a standardized model of software development life cycle which will specify and rationalize the order of stages for the software design (a *TOP-DOWN* frame). Conceptualization of "expertise" is represented from different perspectives concerning what should be the common practice in software design and development.

Evidence can be found that both sides may be reluctant to align with each other's framing, which is revealed by three remarkably long gaps. One of them emerges in the transition space (Sacks et al. 1974; Jefferson 1996; Schegloff 1996a, 1996b) for speaker change (Line 10). The other two emerge within the research team's turns (Line 17, 21). The three gaps, however, show different ways the talk is sequentially framed. For the first gap, the company delegation expands the transition space by not providing talk which has been projected by prior talk (Liddicoat 2007). An alternate framing is provided by the company delegation right after the gap. The second gap after $ 2's acknowledgment (*yeah*, Line 17), along with

another acknowledgment token (*okay*, Line 17), is perceived by $ 1 as a transition relevance place where any participant can legitimately take the floor. The silence is attributive to $ 2's not speaking and showing his failure to maintain his original framing. The company delegation, on the other hand, manages to stay in the frame they have applied to the talk earlier (line 18–20; 28–30). The third gap which is also after $ 2's acknowledgment (*okay*, Line 21) sequentially creates another prolonged transition space for possible speaker change. The transition space, however, develops into an "intra-turn silence" (Liddicoat 2007, 81) with $ 2 packing-up his utterance (cut-off *so*, Line 23) and tending to abandon his original framing in readiness for a closure of the topic (Hougaard 2008; see also Beach 1993).

Alternate framings are also identified when a single situation simultaneously emerges from talk sequences due to a conceptual mismatch between the prior speaker and the current speaker. The conceptual mismatch can be explained by the prior speaker's particular lexical choices at the point where speaker change is relevant and imminent. This makes the current speaker think that the following talk is projected into a path for a contrastive interpretation. In Excerpt 5 two students are talking about the consequence of an over-compensated generator.

Excerpt 5. The generator getting too hot

```
1   <$ 4>   =So do we almost have to O:VER-(1.6) °what's the ↑word°
2   <$ 2>   Overcom=
3   <$ 4>   ↑YEAH(.) Overcompen↑ sate
4   <$ 2>   Well the o= the only problem with that is (0.5) um(0.5)
5           obviously at rated torque is the moat efficient (.) You
6           know at the what- the rating of the generator determines
7           the (most) efficient-
8   <$ 4>   =Right so you want it working at its pea:k
9   <$ 2>   You w= you want it working at its peak(.) but obviously-
10  <$ 4>   [You've got a heat problem
11  <$ 2>   [=you have cooling systems-
12  <$ 4>   =Yeah(.) ↑AH ↓RIGHT(.) Okay
13  <$ 2>   You ↑know
14  <$ 4>   Mm
```

The talk progresses around a single situation: "the generator is getting too hot" with $ 2 and $ 4 collaboratively retrieving the term *overcompensate* (Line 3). *But* uttered by $ 2 at the end of his turn (Line 9) pragmatically operates to display a possible action completion for 'contrasting' what has been already constructed in his prior talk (Hata 2016, 139). The contrast sequentially projects a stepwise move from $ 4's point of view, encouraging him to go back to the situation in their earlier talk. Following the hint, $ 4 invokes a *PROBLEM* frame, focusing on the contrast between the preferred working status of a generator (*working at its peak*, Line 8) and its dis-preferred consequence (*You've got a heat problem*, Line 10). $ 2, on the other hand, invokes a *SOLUTION* frame, focusing on the contrast between the problem and the solution (*You have a cooling system*, Line 11). $ 4's follow-up

turn with *Ah right* (Line 12) as a reception marker (Fuller 2003) indicates that he is informed of what $ 2 means. This marks a change in the "locally current state of knowledge of awareness" between interlocutors (Drew and Heritage 1992, 41) and makes their alternate framings mutually accessible with attendance to the ongoing interactional concerns (McCarthy 2003).

The observation suggests that alternate framings of a single situation can be the result of sequential manipulation of interaction at the action level. $ 2 and $ 4's overlapping talk reveals how information is gathered, interpreted, and conveyed from different viewpoints even when they have similar pragmatic orientations (e.g. to express contrast). The overlapping talk cannot be simply taken as something that $ 4 entering the talk does to $ 2 who currently has the floor thus makes the interaction problematic. On the contrary, the overlapping talk as an interactional phenomenon has an interpretive consequence for alternate framings around a particular situation emerging from the progressive talk.

4.2 Co-framings within/beyond speaker role boundary

In this section, the focus is on how the participants collaboratively frame the talk to make it progress in a certain direction. I shall call such framings *co-framings* which are motivated by a shared goal and represented by mutual assistance in meaning negotiation. Different from alternate framings, co-framings show a closer association with speaker roles which are either assigned in the task script or naturally emerging throughout talk sequences (see Dörnyei and Murphey 2003). A role implies the relationship between one's actual behavior and the shared expectations from relevant group members. In this study, speaker roles are either assigned within an institution (e.g. tutors vs. students), across institutions (e.g. research students vs. company delegations), or by task specifics (e.g. chair, spokesperson). The role assignment ensures that each participant in a group has got "something specific to do", which is essential for task completion. On the other hand, the establishment of emerging roles is a powerful component of group interaction which can reveal the contextual relevance of co-framings both within and beyond the role boundary.

In Excerpt 6 co-framings are carried out by participants with a shared orientation to a specific task. The two participants are talking about how to draft their project report on the calculation of wave loading.

Excerpt 6. Reporting wave loading calculation

```
1   <$ 2>   =Well for me- well- the way when I pitch it if I have to
2           talk about the stuff I ↓do(.) I will tell them(.) what I
3           ↑had
4   <$ 1>   Yeah
5   <$ 2>   What I had to deve↑lop
```

```
6   <$ 1>   Yeah
7   <$ 2>   To work, out the results
8   <$ 1>   Yes
9   <$ 2>   What I did have is the= a class report
10  <$ 1>   Yeah
11  <$ 2>   With the: significant wave height
12  <$ 1>   Yeah
13  <$ 2>   Then I ha:d to look, for ↑formulas-
14  <$ 1>   Yeah
15  <$ 2>   =to find the wave ↑length-
16  <$ 1>   Yeah
17  <$ 2>   =and the wave- eh(.) whatever characteristics of the ↑wave-
18  <$ 1>   Yeah(.) yeah
19  <$ 2>   =and use Morison's equation-
20  <$ 1>   Yeah
21  <$ 2>   =to develop the= the= the wave ↓loading
22  <$ 1>   Yeah
23  <$ 2>   The current loading the wind loading u= works on about the
24          same ↑principle-
25  <$ 1>   Yeah
26  <$ 2>   =used the Atlas and so on and so forth
27  <$ 1>   Yeah
```

The two participants pay a *joint attention* (Goffman 1963; see also Kidwell and Zimmerman 2007) to reproduce the procedure of the report by highlighting the transactional dimension of the report. $ 2 is the person who is responsible for reporting the calculation of wave loading, thus invokes a *REPORT* frame. $ 1 is expected to facilitate $ 2's reporting by simultaneously monitoring the process to check the accuracy of the information and the logic of inquiry thus is expected to main the *REPORT* frame invoked by $ 2. The roles assigned to the task results in the linear talk sequences are of particular interactional relevance. The turn-takings are quite rapid and compact with $ 1 using the response token *yeah* 12 times (*yes* for once, Line 8). Schegloff (1982) observes the multi-functioning of the response token *yeah*: it not only marks acknowledgment and confirmation but also expresses agreement, "signaling an enthusiastic or encouraging response" (McCarthy 2003, 40).

A reasonable interpretation of the repetitive use of *yeah* in this excerpt, however, requires an analysis of the token along with other contextual resources to explicate its affective (McCarthy 2003) or affiliative (Stivers et al. 2011) consequences for the co-framing. *Yeah* as a response token is "more retrospective than prospective" (Gardner 2007) and reveals more involvement and more speakership incipiency (Jefferson 1984). It functions, as shown in numerous existing studies on conversations, as *backchannels* to indicate "non-turn-claiming-talk" (Rühlemann 2017, 212; see also Levinson and Torreira 2015), "vocalizing understanding" of the recipient thus encourage the speaker to proceed (Gardner 1998, 220). I shall argue that, in Excerpt 6, $ 1's repeated uses of *yeah* indicate a combination of both affective attendance and communicative economy. $ 1 uses the *yeah*s as continuers (Schegloff 1982) to construct his concurrent talk (Goodwin 2007), frequently informative about his analysis of what is being said by $ 2 and

his stance towards it (Jefferson 1983, 1984). $ 1's responses are both supportive (Holmes and Stubbe 2015) and engaging (O'Keeffe and Adolphs 2008) thus strengthen the shared orientation to co-framing the talk.

On the other hand, $ 1's right to take turns is to a large extent constrained anyway (see Houtkoop and Mazeland 1985; Schegloff 1982) when $ 2 is engaged in an extended report which is tightly bound by the task procedure. $ 1 says *yeah* repeatedly, but within "quick and close sequences" (Tottie 1991, 261), which indicates that encouraging $ 2 to go on talking is possibly due to the consideration of the communicative economy. $ 1 intends to make the discussion as concise and efficient as possible by holding $ 2 back from further extending his turns. This corresponds to Peters and Wong's (2015) observation that the speaker and the listener will co-monitor and co-control the intervals before and after *yeah* to make subsequent courses of action stick to the communicative agenda.

Co-framings are applied by participants who share the labor of playing a specific role in an institution. Excerpt 7 shows how two tutors ($ 1 and $ 2) are collaboratively explaining what schools expect of student-teachers.

Excerpt 7. What to expect of student-teachers

```
1   <$ 1>   ↑Well and also I think >a lot of them< ↑appreciate how much
2           tou: qher: it is (.) You know (.) what the expectations are on
3           student-teachers
4   <$ 5>   Mm(.) Yeah
5   <$ 1>   (1.5)Um and I we= I think ↑we forget (.)actually(.) about-
6           [what= what=   <the SYETEM now EXPECTE of you>]
7   <$ 2>   [°The pressure in schools has increased°      ](.) Yeah
8   <$ 1>   (.)mean- when even three ↑years ago(.) we >didn't have to
9           Use< the Ofsted um(.) [criteria for-
10  <$ 2>                         [That's right (.) Mm
11  <$ 1>   =satisfactory good and outstanding at student-teacher
12          level
```

Co-framings are performed in an *EXPECTATION* frame when the two tutors deal with the overlapping talk (Line 6–7). $ 1's overlapping talk indicates that what she is concerned about is the gap between the existing evaluative systems and what to expect of student-teachers in reality. The overlap may be perceived by $ 2 as something problematic when he realizes that $ 1 and himself would probably push the following talk into different conceptual realms. He chooses to close his turn after a short pause with an acknowledgment token (*yeah*, Line 7). $ 1 takes the floor to build upon her prior talk by making it clearer (*I mean*, Line 8), pointing out that the explicitly laid-out criteria in a standard evaluative system may not be more useful or reliable than what schools did before the system was introduced. Her idea receives a confirmation from $ 2 (*That's right*, Line 10) which is uttered in an overlapping way again. The shortened transition space here, however, can be seen as attributive to $ 1's short pause (Line 9) which seems to create a place for legiti-

mate speaker change. Finding that $ 1 orients to holding the floor after her pause, $ 2 again chooses to close his turn to make the talk progress.

The observation reveals that at a particular moment of an interaction a leading role may naturally emerge to frame the talk while the co-participants can choose to accept or challenge the legitimacy of projected co-framing moves. In Excerpt 7, $ 2's co-framing practice with $ 1 is represented by his following and building upon the latter's talk, even though the contextual relevance of taking over her leading role is made pragmatically salient to him. While $ 1 tends to produce extended turns within her frame, $ 2 manages to make his turns short and brief to maintain the progressivity of the talk. This demonstrates how co-framings are carried out not only at the cognitive but the action level.

Excerpt 8 is another example to show how co-framings can be applied at the action level. In this excerpt, an expert in biology ($ 7) and a member of a student research team ($ 8) are talking about what to find in drug targeting.

Excerpt 8. What to find in drug targeting

```
1   <$ 8>   Yeah(.) But that's why we in the first one we're looking for
2           variants and this one we're just looking for(.) erm(.)
3           alignments-
4   <$ 7>   Right
5   <$ 3>   =To see(.) what level of alignment we've ↑got(.) Erm(.) but
6           also when i- said characterise in the first one= We was
7           characterising for (.) basically location and accessibility-
8   <$ 7>   Mm-mm (.) Sounds good
9   <$ 8>   =And this one(.) we're looking for metabolic function
10  <$ M>   Mm-mm
11  <$ 7>   Right
12  <$ 3>   So-
13  <$ 7>   =Nope(.) That sounds like a= a reasonable approach(.) ↑Yeah
```

A *SUPERVISION* frame is invoked based upon the mutual expectation that the expert gives comments on the student research team's proposal. $ 8's extended turns (Line 1–3; 5–7; 9) receive brief acknowledgment and short comments from $ 7 (Line 4, 8, and 11). The two *right*s used by $ 7 as response tokens can be understood as epistemic dependency markers which reveal her recognition of the relationship between what is currently under discussion and something that had been said earlier (Gardner 2007, 325). It is in Line 12 that $ 8 orients to extending his talk by initiating a new turn (*so*, Line 12). Because his turn is interrupted by $ 7 right after his utterance of *so*, his following action is open to multiple predictions. He may orient to introducing the result of approaching the project in the way he has just mentioned, clarifying the motivation for adopting the proposed approach, or providing an evaluation of its rationale. His framing is constrained from further expansion with $ 7 entering the interaction.

The word *nope* (Line 13) is quite curious considering what $ 7 says following: *That sounds like a reasonable approach* (Line 13). A conceptual conflict can be identified that she negates what the prior speaker said and shows an affirmative

attitude right after the negation. The hidden psychological process becomes traceable and interpretable when one goes back to examine the prior talk sequences. One possible interpretation is that what $ 7 negates is not what $ 8 said but her next move to give comments. That $ 8's talk is interrupted indicates that he prefers another extended turn over comments from $ 7, while $ 7 might be ready to comment from the moment $ 8 began his talk but decides not to do so. This could partially explain why $ 7's replies are quite brief – she may have been considering $ 8's proposal and does not want to suspend her train of thought by stopping to give longer comments. This is also revealed by $ 7's use of the word *nope* but not the less emphatic *no*, by which she may have no intention to change the truth condition (see Fuller 2003) of $ 8's talk but still uses the negation marker to show her agreement in a relatively relaxed manner. *Yeah* with a rising intonation at the end of $ 7's turn (Line 13) suggests that an acknowledging action in response to the prior other's action is embedded as a cognitive consequence. $ 7's "holding-herself-back" action

The observation shows that a conjunctional (e.g. *so*) can be vulnerable to another speaker's turn initiation (Jefferson 1983) in framing-in-interaction since its semantic potential can be pragmatically rich thus leads to multiple interpretations of what is going to happen next. The next speaker would possibly see it as a legitimate transition relevance place (TRP) for speaker change and reduce the transition space accordingly to express his/her interpretation. Co-framings can, as a result, be challenged if the next speaker's interpretation happens to be divergent from the current speaker's agenda. This would have been the case if $ 7's follow-up agreement was missing since a reduced transition space and a salient negation marker (*nope*) are commonly seen in cases of disagreement with or rejection of the agenda in the prior talk (Liddicoat 2007, 86). However, the co-framings are not necessarily successfully achieved but one possible effect of co-framings has been realized.

Co-framings to make sense of complex concepts can be challenging. In Excerpt 9 two tutors ($ 2 and $ 4) and a student ($ 1) are collaboratively analyzing an audio-recorded teacher-student interaction in a foreign language classroom. The participants' analytic focus is on a question-answer adjacency pair in the recording:

Teacher: *"If you have a bad conscience, how do you feel?"*
Student: *"Bad (with laughter)."*

Excerpt 9. Bad conscience

1	<$ 2>	Let's Just step out of the data for a second and ask
2		ourselves that question(.) If you have a bad conscience(.)
3		how do you ↓feel (.) [Do you feel-
4	<$ 4>	[It's almost like a rhetorical question
5	<$ 2>	=do= do you fee:l bad or good ↓though

```
6   <$ 4>   It's like a silly question
7           Well I don't know= I'm asking gen= a genuine question(.)
8   <$ 2>   do you feel bad or good if you had a bad con↑science
9   <$ 4>   Well to me that sounds like a rhetorical question
10  <$ 2>   Can you answer it for us=
11          [cos I am asking as a genuine question
12  <$ 4>   [Sounds like a silly question(.) How DO I feel if I have a
13          bad conscience ((laughter))
14          I wouldn't say yes uh- bad or good
15  <$ 2>   Well I mean if [you've done something BAD-
16  <$ 4>                  [I feel- probably feel bad if I've got a
17          bad conscience
18  <$ 2>   =if you've= if you've= done something BAD(.) and you don't
19          feel bad about it (.) does that mean you've got a good
20          conscience or a bad conscience
21  <$ 4>   If I feel bad I'd probably feel pretty bad
22  <$ 2>   No no that's not what I'm asking(.) If you've= if you've=
23          done something that you know is wrong-
24  <$ 1>   Ah I understand
25  <$ 2>   =↑Okay(.) You've= you've= you've hurt somebody ↑right
26  <$ 1>   Mm-hm
27  <$ 2>   And (1.0) should you feel good or bad ↑about it(.) and then
28          if you feel good do you have a good conscience if you feel
29          bad do you have a bad- it's not as straight↑ forward as
30          that(.) You would say somebody had a bad conscience in
31          that example (.) if they (.) felt bad
```

The goal of the participants is to analyze the teacher's question "If you have a bad conscience, how do you feel?" by collectively invoking a *SENSE-MAKING* frame. The talk to examine the rationality of this question is initially co-framed by the two tutors when both of them choose to focus on the function of the question. $ 4 claims that the question is like a rhetorical one since it seems to be asked to produce an effect (e.g. to draw attention/elicit interest, to provoke thinking, etc.) or to make a point (e.g. someone should feel good/bad if they have a bad conscience, etc.). The pragmatics of the question, therefore, is to motivate or persuade rather than to pursue an answer. The question, however, is not well formulated as perceived by $ 4, to meet the purpose since it sounds like a *silly* (Line 6) one with no further contextual information provided. By contrast, $ 2 tends to take the question as a *genuine* (Line 7) one and invites $ 2 to re-examine its answerability. Having failed to give an articulate answer, $ 2 reiterates that the question is *silly* (Line 12), whereas $ 1 enters into the talk (Line 14) by implying that the question might not be answered straightforwardly.

The co-framing initiation of $ 4 receives a preferable response from one student instead of the other tutor ($ 1, Line 24). Nevertheless, it may not be fair to say that $ 2 does not respond to $ 4's co-framing initiation. His lexical choices to evaluate the question show subtle evidence of a focus shift. Taking the question as rhetorical he suggests that the answerability of the question is irrelevant since its function is not to elicit an answer; while he immediately portraits the question as something silly, which implies that the question is almost unanswerable. $ 2's responses show that his original framing tends to remain though the participants

negotiate on the spot to achieve conversational cooperation (Gumperz 1982). The "resilience of schemas (frames)" (Tannen and Wallat 1986, 306) as such triggers $ 4's repetition of his question and further elaboration.

In the following talk, $ 4 tries to maintain the *sense-making* frame by suggesting that the answerability of the question depends on how one would possibly fill the linguistically expressive gap, specifically, how to understand the meaning of *bad*. A conceptual process to make sense of *bad* can be identified from $ 4's successive lexical choices: *if you've done something bad* (Line 15) – *if you've done something that you know is wrong* (Line 23) – *if you've hurt somebody* (Line 25). The lexical choices contribute to creating discursive relevance by intensifying the degree of "being bad": *bad* as a gradable adjective towards the negative polar, *wrong* as a non-gradable adjective, *hurt* as a verb with a very strong negative prosody. The conceptualization becomes accessible to $ 1 (*Ah I understand*, Line 24), while $ 2 does not show whether he gets the point too.

The observation suggests that the co-framings applied by the two tutors are insufficient, if not unsuccessful, throughout the talk sequences even though they have a shared orientation to the task. While $ 4 keeps eliciting co-framing moves from $ 2, the latter fails to meet the expectation. When another participant who is not the selected co-framer makes the next co-framing move ($ 1), the original framer would probably create a new co-framing relationship with him/her by giving positive acknowledgment responses (e.g. ↑*Okay*, Line 25) and strengthening mutual understanding (e.g. *Mm-hm*, Line 26; *it's not straightforward as that*, Line 29–30). The co-framings, as shown above, are closely related to the concept of *evidentiality* which refers to the speaker's expressed attitudes towards the "reliability" of certain knowledge and "the adequacy of its linguistic expression" (Biber and Finegan 1988, 93–94). The assessments of the "bad-conscience question" are expressively explicit in the participants' framing behaviors which constantly negotiate their *epistemic stances* (Heritage 2012, 6) concerning how the question can induce dramatically different interpretations.

5. Concluding remarks

This study examines university students' and tutors' framing behaviors for meaning construction and negotiation in interactive small group talk. University small group talk manifests complexity in framing (Tovares 2016). First, framing in university small group talk is found to be more straightforward than what is identified in everyday interaction (see Gordon 2009). Both alternate framings and co-framings are built on what occurs as meaning shared and projected by participants' prior disciplinary knowledge (Tannen 2005), thus are more explicitly

marked and procedurally operated. Second, participants' situated interpretations are partial representations of relevant knowledge structures (see Coulson 2001) and interactive framings do not usually happen on a large scale but quite incrementally in the on-going talk (see Gordon 2008, 2015). Participants, therefore, tend to stay longer within certain frames than what they may do in everyday interaction (see Gordon 2009) to produce and orient to the institutional regularities (Heritage and Atkinson 1984). Third, both alternate framings and co-framings are approached from an operational rather than a categorical perspective in this study. The labeling of different interactive frames contributes to highlighting how framing at the action level correspond to distinct conversational patterns (see Betz 2013).

Alternate framings of a single situation recurs in the general discussion stage of small group talk where different conceptualizations of a particular topic are tolerated or even encouraged for information exchange and meaning representations. Different ways of framing a single situation can be a result of contrasting actions, different viewpoints, distinct institutional values, conceptual mismatches, and management of framing mutability. Alternate framings co-occur with traceable interactional devices for the sequential organization, including prosody, backchannels in overlap, discourse markers, self-selecting overlaps to initiate new turns, and a shift of assessment tokens. The alternate framings identified in this study demonstrate how a single situation under discussion evolves at talk and how it takes on different meanings when participants align with the group to make meanings emerge and converge. Alternate framing shares features with Tannen's (2006) *reframing* in terms of "changing what the discussion is about", but the former differs from the latter in that what has been changed is not the topic itself but how the topic is to be interpreted.

By contrast, co-framings show a closer association with speaker roles which are either previously assigned or naturally emergent at talk. Co-framings usually happen when at least one (group) of participants is highly goal-oriented, for example, to give instructions, to explicate working procedures, to produce extended explanations, to provide evaluative comments, etc. On the other hand, co-framings beyond the role boundary are identified to be applied, with individual framing moves showing conditional relevance to the prior courses of action and negotiation of epistemic stance showing reverence for more powerful social groups. More complex structures are expected to be associated with co-framings when the listener's interpretation needs to be adjusted to the change of element(s) in the speaker's framing. Co-framings can be challenged thus risk failure in situations where a selected co-framer does not align him/herself with the co-framing initiator or refuses to adjust his/her interpretation when the former changes his/her representation of certain elements of framing. The sequential projection of

possible contrasting actions or simply the complexity of a topic can override co-framing initiations and navigate individual framings into different layers of conceptualization. This corresponds to Goffman's (1981a) observation that framing can be laminated when interlocutors' alignments are fully (or partially, as shown in this study) enclosed within one another (Gordon 2002, 2008).

This study sketches out and illustrates the research opportunity offered by taking framing as a global organization resource to characterize contextualization in routinized, interactive academic talk. The analysis represents an extension of a growing body of research on the action formation in institutional communication. While the universal infrastructure in ordinary social interaction does hold in institutional exchanges (Kendrick et al. 2020), a conceptual merger of interactive framing and sequential analysis with CA concerns sheds light on how participants select and develop specific formats (Pallotti 2009) so that institutions are "talked into being" (Heritage 1984, 290). The findings also contribute to the ongoing debate on the identification and explication of the cognitive dimension in the analysis of talk-in-interaction (see Potter and te Molder 2005; Oakley and Hougaard 2008; Deppermann 2012; Pan 2020).

References

Barsalou, Lawrence W. 1992. "Frames, Concepts and Conceptual Fields." In *Frames, Fields, and Contrasts: New Essays in Semantic and Lexical Organizations*, eds. by Adrienne Lehrer, and Kittay Eva Feder, 21–74. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Bateson, Gregory. 1987. *Steps to an Ecology of Mind: Collected Essays in Anthropology, Psychiatry, Evolution, and Epistemology*. New York: Ballantine Books.

Beach, Wayne A. 1993. "Transitional Regularities for Casual "Okay" Usages." *Journal of Pragmatics* 19: 325–352. https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166(93)90092-4

Bednarek, Monika. 2005. "Frames Revisited – the Coherence-inducing Function of Frames." *Journal of Pragmatics* 37(5): 685–705. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2004.09.007

Betz, Emma. 2013. "Quote-unquote in One Variety of German: Two Interactional Functions of Pivot Constructions Used as Frames for Quotation in Siebenbürger Sächsisch." *Journal of Pragmatics* 54: 16–34. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2013.02.001

Biber, Douglas, and Edward Finegan. 1988. "Adverbial Stance Types in English." *Discourse Processes* 11: 1–34. https://doi.org/10.1080/01638538809544689

Campbell, J. Edward. 2003. "Always Use a Modem: Analyzing Frames of Erotic Play, Performance, and Power in Cyberspace." *Electronic Journal of Communication* 13.

Clift, Rebecca. 1999. "Irony in Conversation." *Language in Society* 28(4): 523–553. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404599004029

Coulson, Seana. 2001. *Semantic Leaps: Frame-shifting and Conceptual Blending in Meaning Construction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511551352

Dall, Tanja, and Srikant Sarangi. 2018. "Ways of 'Appealing to the Institution' in Interprofessional Rehabilitation Team Decision-Making." *Journal of Pragmatics* 129: 102–119. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2018.03.012

Deppermann, Arnulf. 2012. "How Does 'Cognition' Matter to the Analysis of Talk-in-Interaction?" *Language Sciences* 34(6): 746–767. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.langsci.2012.04.013

Dörnyei, Zoltán, and Tim Murphey. 2003. *Group Dynamics in the Language Classroom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511667138

Drew, Paul, and John Heritage. 1992. "Analyzing Talk at Work: An Introduction." In *Talk at Work: Interaction in Institutional Settings*, eds. by Paul Drew, and John Heritage, 3–65. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Fillmore, Charles. J. 1982. "Frame Semantics." In *Linguistics in the Morning Calm*, ed. by In-Seok Yang, 111–137. Soeul: Hanshin.

Fillmore, Charles. J. 2006. "Frame Semantics." In *Cognitive Linguistics: Basic Readings*, ed. by Geeraerts Dirk, 373–400. Berlin: Monton de Gruyter. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110199901.373

Fuller, Janet M. 2003. "The Influence of Speaker Roles on Discourse Marker Use." *Journal of Pragmatics* 35: 23–45. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166(02)00065-6

Gardner, Rod. 1998. "Between Speaking and Listening: The Vocalisation of Understandings." *Applied Linguistics* 19(2): 204–224. https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/19.2.204

Gardner, Rod. 2007. "The *Right* Connections: Acknowledging Epistemic Progression in Talk." *Language in Society* 36: 319–341. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404507070169

Gass, Susan, Alison Mackey and Lauren Ross-Feldman. 2005. "Task-Based Interactions in Classroom and Laboratory Settings." *Language Learning* 55(4): 575–611. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0023-8333.2005.00318.x

Goffman, Erving. 1963. *Behavior in Public Places*. New York: The Free Press.

Goffman, Erving. 1974. *Frame Analysis: An Essay on the Organization of Experience*. New York: Harper Colophon Books.

Goffman, Erving. 1981a. *Forms of Talk*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Goffman, Erving. 1981b. "A Reply to Denzin and Keller." *Contemporary Sociology* 10 (1): 60–68. https://doi.org/10.2307/2067804

Goffman, Erving. 1983. "The Interaction Order." *American Sociological Review* 48 (1): 1–17. https://doi.org/10.2307/2095141

Goodwin, Charles. 1984. "Notes on Story Structure and the Organization of Participation." In *Structures of Social Action: Studies in Conversation Analysis*, eds. by J. Maxwell Atkinson and John Heritage, 225–246. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Goodwin, Charles. 2007. "Interactive Footing." In *Reporting Talk: Reported Speech in Interaction*, eds. by Elizabeth Holt, and Rebecca Clift, 16–46. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Goodwin, Marjorie Harness. 1996. "Shifting Frame." In *Social Interaction, Social Context, and Language: Essays in Honor of Susan Ervin-Tripp*, eds. by Dan Isaac Slobin, Julie Gerhardt, Amy Kryatzis, and Jiansheng Guo, 71–82. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Gordon, Cynthia. 2001. "Framing and Positioning." In *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis*, eds. by Deborah Tannen, Heidi E. Hamilton, and Deborah Schiffrin, 324–345. Oxford: Wiley Blackwell.

Gordon, Cynthia. 2002. "I'm Mommy and You're Natalie': Role-Reversal and Embedded Frames in Mother–Child Discourse." *Language in Society* 31: 679–720. https://doi.org/10.1017/S004740450231501X

Gordon, Cynthia. 2003. "Intertextuality in Family Discourse: Shared Prior Text as a Resource for Framing." Dissertation, Georgetown University.
Gordon, Cynthia. 2008. "A(p)parent Play: Blending Frames and Reframing in Family Talk." *Language in Society* 37: 319–49. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404508080536
Gordon, Cynthia. 2009. *Making Meanings, Creating Family: Intertextuality and Framing in Family Interaction*. New York: Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780195373820.001.0001
Gordon, Cynthia. 2015. "Framing and Positioning." In *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis*, eds. by Deborah Tannen, Heidi E. Hamilton, and Deborah Schiffrin, 324–345. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
Gumperz, John. J. 1982. *Discourse Strategies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511611834
Gumperz, John. J. 1992a. "Contextualization and Understanding." In *Rethinking Context: Language as an Interactive Phenomenon*, eds. by Alessandro Duranti, and Charles Goodwin, 229–252. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Gumperz, John. J. 1992b. "Contextualization Revisited." In *The Contextualization of Language*, eds. by Peter Auer, and Aldo Di Luzio, 39–53. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/pbns.22.04gum
Gumperz, John J. 2003. "Interactional Sociolinguistics: A Personal Perspective." In *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis*, eds. by Deborah Tannen, Heidi E. Hamilton, and Deborah Schiffrin, 215–228. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
Hamawand, Zeki. 2016. *Semantics: A Cognitive Account of Linguistic Meaning*. United Kingdom: Equinox Publishing.
Hata, Kazuki. 2016. "Contrast-Terminal: The Sequential Placement of Trailoff *but* in Extensive Courses of Action." *Journal of Pragmatics* 101: 138–154. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2016.06.006
Heritage, John. 1984. *Garfinkel and Ethnomethodology*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
Heritage, John. 2005. "Conversation Analysis and Institutional Talk." In *Handbook of Language and Social Interaction*, eds. by Kristine L. Fitch, and Robert E. Sanders, 103–147. New York: Routledge.
Heritage, John. 2012. "Epistemics in Action: Action Formation and Territories of Knowledge." *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 45(1): 1–29. https://doi.org/10.1080/08351813.2012.646684
Heritage, John. 2013. "Action Formation and Its Epistemic (and Other) Backgrounds." *Discourse Studies* 15(5): 551–578. https://doi.org/10.1177/1461445613501449
Heritage, John, and Maxwell Atkinson. 1984. *Structures of Social Action: Studies in Conversation Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Heritage, John, and Steven Clayman. 2010. *Talk in Action: Interactions, Identities and Institutions*. Oxford: Blackwell-Wiley. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781444318135
Holmes, Janet, and Maria Stubbe. 2015. *Power and Politeness in the Workplace: A Sociolinguistic Analysis of Talk at Work*. London: Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315750231
Hougaard, Anders. 2008. "Compression in Interaction." In *Mental Spaces in Discourse and Interaction*, eds. by Todd Oakley, and Anders Hougaard, 179–208. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company. https://doi.org/10.1075/pbns.170.07hou

Houtkoop, Hanneke, and Harrie Mazeland. 1985. "Turns and Discourse Units in Everyday Conversation." *Journal of Pragmatics* 9: 595–619. https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166(85)90055-4

Hutchby, Ian. 1999. "Frame Attunement and Footing in the Organisation of Talk Radio Openings." *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 3(1): 41–63. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9481.00062

Hymes, Dell. 1968. "The Ethnography of Speaking." In *Readings in the Sociology of Language*, ed. by Joshua A. Fishman, 99–138. The Hague: Mouton. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110805376.99

Jacknick, Christine M. 2011. "Breaking in is Hard to Do: How Students Negotiate Classroom Activity Shifts." *Classroom Discourse* 2(1): 20–38. https://doi.org/10.1080/19463014.2011.562656

Jefferson, Gail. 1983. "On a Failed Hypothesis: 'Conjunctionals' as Overlap Vulnerable." *Tilburg Papers Lang. Lit* 28: 29–33.

Jefferson, Gail. 1984. "Notes on a Systematic Deployment of the Acknowledgement Tokens 'Yeah' and 'Mm hm'." *Papers in Linguistics* 17: 197–216. https://doi.org/10.1080/08351818409389201

Jefferson, Gail. 1996. "A Case of Transcriptional Stereotyping." *Journal of Pragmatics* 26: 159–170. https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166(96)00010-0

Jefferson, Gail. 2004. "Glossary of Transcript Symbols with an Introduction." In *Conversation Analysis: Studies from the First Generation*, ed. by Gene H. Lerner, 13–31. Amsterdam, Netherlands: John Benjamins Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1075/pbns.125.02jef

Kendon, Adam. 1992. "The Negotiation of Context in Face-to-Face Interaction." In *Rethinking Context: Language as an Interactive Phenomenon*, eds. by Alessandro Duranti, and Charles Goodwin, 323–334. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kendrick, Kobin H., Penelope Brown, Mark Dingemanse, Simeon Floyd, Sonja Gipper, Kaoru Hayano, Elliott Hoey, Gertie Hoymann, Elizabeth Manrique, Giovanni Rossi, and Stephen C. Levinson. 2020. "Sequence Organization: A Universal Infrastructure for Social Action." *Journal of Pragmatics* 168: 119–138. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2020.06.009

Kern, Friederike and Selting, Margret. 2013. "Conversation Analysis and Interactional Linguistics." *The Encyclopaedia of Applied Linguistics*. 1-5.

Kidwell, Mardi, and Don H. Zimmerman. 2007. "Joint Attention as Action." *Journal of Pragmatics* 39: 592–611. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2006.07.012

Levinson, Stephen C., and Francisco Torreira. 2015. "Timing in Turn-Taking and Its Implications for Processing Models of Language." *Frontiers in Psychology* 6: 1–17. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2015.00731

Lerner, Gene H. and Celia Kitzinger. 2007. "Extraction and Aggregation in the Repair of Individual and Collective Self-Reference." *Discourse Studies*, 9: 526–57. https://doi.org/10.1177/1461445607079165

Liddicoat, Anthony J. 2007. *An Introduction to Conversation Analysis*. London: Continuum.

Matsumoto, Yoshiko. 2011. "Painful to Playful: Quotidian Frames in the Conversational Discourse of Older Japanese Women." *Language in Society* 40: 591–616. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404511000698

Matsumoto, Yoshiko. 2015. "The Power of the Ordinary: Quotidian Framing as a Narrative Strategy." *Journal of Pragmatics* 86: 100–105. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2015.06.003

McCarthy, Michael. 2003. "Talking Back: "Small" Interactional Response Tokens in Everyday Conversation." *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 36(1): 33–63. https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327973RLSI3601_3

Minsky, Marvin. 1974. "A Framework for Representing Knowledge." *Artificial Intelligence* 306: 1–82.
Nielsen, Mie Femø, Søren Beck Nielsen, Gitte Gravengaard, and Brian Due. 2012. "Interactional Functions of Invoking Procedure in Institutional Settings." *Journal of Pragmatics* 44: 1457–1473. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2012.06.007
Nerlich, Brigitte and Clarke, D. David. 2000. "Semantic Fields and Frames: Historical Explorations of the Interface between Language, Action and Cognition." *Journal of Pragmatics* 32: 125–150. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166(99)00042-9
Oakley, Todd and Anders Hougaard. 2008. *Mental Spaces in Discourse and Interaction*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company. https://doi.org/10.1075/pbns.170
O'Keeffe, Anne, and Svenja Adolphs. 2008. "Response Tokens in British and Irish Discourse: Corpus, Context and Variational Pragmatics." In *Variational Pragmatics*, eds. by P. Schneider Klaus, and Anne Barron, 69–98. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/pbns.178.050k
O'Malley, Mary-Pat. 2009. "Falling between Frames: Institutional Discourse and Disability in Radio." *Journal of Pragmatics* 41: 346–356. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2008.07.008
Pallotti, Gabriele. 2009. "Conversation Analysis: Methodology, Machinery and Application to Specific Settings." In *Conversation Analysis and Language for Specific Purposes*, eds. by Hugo Bowles, and Paul Seedhouse, 37–67. Bern: Peter Lang AG.
Pan, Yun. 2020. "Meaning Construction in Interactive Academic Talk: A Conversation-Analytic Approach to Mental Spaces." *Pragmatics & Cognition* 26(2/3): 422–454.
Peters, Pam, and Deanna Wong. 2015. "Turn Management and Backchannels." In *Corpus Pragmatics: A Handbook*, eds. by Aijmer Karin, and Christoph Rühlemann, 408–429. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139057493.022
Pomerantz, Anita. 1984. "Agreeing and Disagreeing with Assessments: Some Features of Preferred/Dis-preferred Turn Shapes." In *Structures of Social Action: Studies in Conversation Analysis*, eds. by J. Maxwell Atkinson, and John Heritage, 57–101. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Potter, Jonathan, and Hedwig te Molder. 2005. *Conversation and Cognition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Rayson, Paul. 2008. "From Key Words to Key Semantic Domains." *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics* 13(4): 519–549. https://doi.org/10.1075/ijcl.13.4.06ray
Ribeiro, Branca, and Susan Hoyle. 2009. "Frame Analysis." In *Grammar, Meaning and Pragmatics*, eds. by Frank Brisard, Jan-Ola Ostman, and Jef Verschueren, 74–90. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/hoph.5.05rib
Rühlemann, Christoph. 2017. "Integrating Corpus-Linguistic and Conversation-Analytic Transcription in XML: The Case of Backchannels and Overlap in Storytelling Interaction." *Corpus Pragmatics* 1: 201–232. https://doi.org/10.1007/s41701-017-0018-7
Rühlemann, Christoph. 2019. *Corpus Linguistics for Pragmatics: A Guide for Research*. London: Routledge.
Ruppenhofer, Josef, Michael Ellsworth, Miriam R.L. Petruck, Christopher R. Johnson, and Jan Scheffczyk. 2006. "FrameNet II: Extended Theory and Practice." International Computer Science Institute, Berkeley, California.
Sacks, Harvey, Emanuel A. Schegloff, and Gail Jefferson. 1974. "A Simplest Systematics for the Organization of Turn-Taking for Conversation." *Language* 50(4): 696–735. https://doi.org/10.1353/lan.1974.0010

Schegloff, Emanuel A. 1982. "Discourse as Interactional Achievement: Some Uses of "uh huh" and Other Things That Come between Sentences." In *Analyzing Discourse, Text, and Talk*, ed. by Deborah Tannen, 71–93. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.

Schegloff, Emanuel A. 1987. "Analyzing Single Episodes of Interaction: An Exercise in Conversation Analysis." *Social Psychology Quarterly* 50(2): 101–114. https://doi.org/10.2307/2786745

Schegloff, Emanuel A. 1996a. "Confirming Allusions: Towards an Empirical Account of Action." *American Journal of Sociology* 104: 161–216. https://doi.org/10.1086/230911

Schegloff, Emanuel A. 1996b. "Turn Organization: One Intersection of Grammar and Interaction." In *Interaction and Grammar*, eds. by Elinor Ochs, Emanuel A. Schegloff, and Sandra, A. Thompson, 52–133. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511620874.002

Sert, Olcay, and Steve Walsh. 2012. "The Interactional Management of Claims of Insufficient Knowledge in English Language Classrooms." *Language and Education* 27(6): 542–565. https://doi.org/10.1080/09500782.2012.739174

Stivers, Tanya, Lorenza Mondada, and Jakob Steensig. 2011. "Knowledge, Morality and Affiliation in Social Interaction." In *The Morality of Knowledge in Conversation*, eds. by Tanya Stivers, Lorenza Mondada, and Jakob Steensig, 3–26. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511921674.002

Stubbs, Michael. 2001. "On Inference Theories and Code Theories: Corpus Evidence for Semantic Schemas." *Text* 21(3): 437–456.

Tannen, Deborah. 1993a. "Introduction." In *Framing in Discourse*, ed. by Deborah Tannen, 3–13. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Tannen, Deborah. 1993b. "What's in a Frame? Surface Evidence for Underlying Expectations." In *Framing in Discourse*, ed. by Deborah Tannen, 14–56. New York: Oxford University Press.

Tannen, Deborah. 2005. *Conversational Style: Analyzing Talk among Friends*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Tannen, Deborah. 2006. "Intertextuality in Interaction: Reframing Family Arguments in Public and Private." *Text & Talk* 26(4/5): 597–617. https://doi.org/10.1515/TEXT.2006.024

Tannen, Deborah. 2007. "Talking the Dog: Framing Pets as Interactional Resources in Family Discourse." In *Family Talk: Discourse and Identity in Four American Families*, eds. by Deborah Tannen, Shari Kendall, and Cynthia Gordon, 49–69. New York: Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780195313895.003.0003

Tannen, Deborah, and Cynthia Wallat. 1986. "Medical Professionals and Parents: A Linguistic Analysis of Communication across Contexts." *Language in Society* 15(3): 295–311. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404500011787

Tannen, Deborah, and Cynthia Wallat. 1993. "Interactive Frames and Knowledge Schemas in Interaction: Examples from a Medical Examination Interview." In *Framing in Discourse*, ed. by Deborah Tannen, 57–76. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Tottie, Gunnel. 1991. "Conversational Style in British and American English: The Case of Backchannels." In *English Corpus Linguistics: Studies in Honour of Jan Svartvik*, eds. by Karin Aijmer, and Bengt Altenberg, 254–271. New York: Longman.

Tovares, Alla V. 2016. "Going Off-Script and Reframing the Frame: The Dialogic Intertwining of the Centripetal and Centrifugal Voices in the Truth and Reconciliation Commission Hearings." *Discourse & Society* 27(5): 554–573. https://doi.org/10.1177/0957926516651365

van Dijk, Teun. 2012. "The Field of Epistemic Discourse Analysis." *Discourse Studies* 15(5): 479–499.
Vatanen, Anna. 2018. "Responding in Early Overlap: Recognitional Onsets in Assertion Sequences." *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 51(2): 107–126. https://doi.org/10.1080/08351813.2018.1413894
Walsh, Steve. 2014. *Newcastle University Corpus of Academic Spoken English (NUCASE)*. Cambridge University Press.
Walsh, Steve, and Dawn Knight. 2016. "Analyzing Spoken Discourse in University Small Group Teaching." In *Creating and Digitizing Language Corpora*, eds. by Karen P. Corrigan, and Adam Mearns, 291–319. London: Palgrave. https://doi.org/10.1057/978-1-137-38645-8_11

Publication history

Date received: 2 May 2020
Date accepted: 26 April 2021
Published online: 23 July 2021