PARAMETERS OF
INSTITUTIONAL DISCOURSE[*]

Jan Anward

In: Britt-Louise Gunnarsson, Per Linell & Bengt Nordberg (eds): *The Construction of Professional Discourse*. Longmans 1997. 127-150.

This paper has as its point of departure the following problem: Every utterance entails a context. Sounds or gestures or lines emerge as utterances only as figures against a contextual ground. However, structural resources for utterance construction are very rarely designed relative to particular contexts, but are provided by design features internal to linguistic systems. Nevertheless, utterances constructed from such structural resources are typically well-designed in particular contexts, often in fine detail. How is this possible? How does structure make contact with function?

In my view, the best answer to the question of how structure makes contact with function is an answer along Darwinian lines: language systems are both products of independent laws and selected by various arenas of use (Hurford 1987: 15-35). Humans, unlike all other species, have the capacity to acquire systems of syntactically structured symbols, but the potential lexical and structural resources of such systems are crucially adapted to expressive spaces made available by significant arenas of use.

1. Divisions of saying

Starting with Anward (1983), a study of how classroom interaction might influence students' language development, I have been exploring a line of inquiry where expressive spaces, the 'environments' to which language systems adapt, are shaped by the 'divisions of saying' operating within significant social activities. Consider, for example, the following sequence from a lesson in 5th grade:

(1) **Classroom interaction, 5th grade**[1]

T1:	Är det nån som vet vilken	Is there anyone who knows which
	planet som åker runt	planet goes around
	närmast solen	closest to the sun
	Arne	Arne
A1:	Saturnus	Saturn
T2:	Nä	No
	Benny	Benny
B1:	Markillus eller nåt sånt heter den	Marcilly or something like that is it called
	T3: Merkurius ja	Mercury yes

What is said in this sequence can also be said as (2), by a single speaker.

(2)   Den planet som åker runt närmast   The planet that goes around closest
      solen heter Merkurius   to the sun is called Mercury

That what is said is (1) and not (2) reflects the division of saying in this variety of teaching, where things are normally said through the classical three-part sequence of teacher question, student response, and teacher evaluation. A similar pattern prevails in writing as well, where textbook exercise and textbook solution to exercise substitute for teacher question and teacher evaluation, respectively:

(3) **Grammatical drill** (Bratt et al. 1974: 157)

Exemplen nedan består vart och ett av flera meningar. Gör om varje meningsserie till en enda mening genom att byta ut det kursiverade ledet mot *ett* relativpronomen. Ibland måste du då också göra andra ändringar av texten. Skriv på ett löst blad.

a) Hon gillade bara violinisten. Hon bad *honom* spela en känslosam melodi.

The examples below each consist of several sentences. Make a single sentence out of each sentence series by substituting *one* relative pronoun for the italicized expression. Sometimes you must change other things in the text. Write on a separate sheet.

a) She only liked the violin player. She asked *him* to play a sentimental tune.

---

[1]I am using a transcription notation without much detail. Utterances, i.e. stretches of talk bounded by a single contour, are introduced by capital letters. Nonverbal turns are in italics. (p) marks pauses. Simultaneous utterances are underlined.

(4) **Solution to grammatical drill in (3)** (Bratt et al. 1974: 167)

> a) … *vilken/som* hon bad spela en känslosam melodi.

> a) **…** *who/that* she asked to play a sentimental tune.

This division of saying has definite consequences for student contributions to teaching. Of the students' turns in the cited lesson, 54% consist of at most one syntactic phrase, and 87% consist of at most one simplex clause (Anward 1983: 120). Simplifying drastically, we can say that the student role in this variety of teaching selects language systems, versions of linguistic competence, which do not include subordinate clauses. This, in turn, creates a curious tension between the competence projected by language drills such as (3) and the arena in which students are meant to acquire this competence. Put bluntly, we could say that in the context of language drills students are often taught language resources that can not be used in that very context.

In this paper, I develop the environmental side of this line of inquiry. I isolate three functionally distinct strata of talk in social activities: activity talk, topic talk, and text talk, and describe which divisions of saying are operating in these strata in three types of social activities, which all give rise to institutional discourse (Agar 1985): teaching, interrogation / interview, and therapy. In this way, I arrive at a 'parameterized' notion of institutional discourse, where the patterns of division of linguistic labour in activity talk, topic talk and text talk can be used to classify concrete discourses into subtypes of institutional discourse. I argue that these patterns of division of linguistic labour express the points of the social activities involved, and can thus establish a link between social activity types, expressive spaces available to participants in particular activites, and language resources selected by these expressive spaces.

2. The functional stratification of talk

To take something as an utterance means placing it in a context. This context normally involves two situations: a situation in which the utterance occurs, C, and another situation, a described situation, D, which is linked to C through the meaning of the utterance. In C, the utterance is furthermore embedded in a speech event: it is being uttered by a Speaker to an Addressee about a Topic in a Language within a social Activity.[2]

Following a respectable tradition in functional linguistics (Bühler 1934, Jakobson 1960, Hymes 1974, Silverstein 1985, and others), we can derive a functional stratification of talk from the relation of an utterance to the components of its context. To begin with, we can make a distinction between **indexical** function and **topic** function of talk. In its indexical function, talk serves to record the dynamics of the speech event, by indexing continuity and change in the identity of its components, their properties and their relations to each other. Identity of Speaker and Activity, property of Speaker, relation between Speaker and Addressee, and relation between Addressee and Topic are just a few examples of indexical information signalled by talk (for a comprehensive overview, see Saville-Troike 1985). A crucial property of indexical information is that it can not be denied, except by a metacomment (Levinson 1979, Anward 1986). For example, if someone asks you (5a) in Swedish, you can not use a simple *nej* (no), as in (5b), to deny that the social relation indexed by the second person singular pronoun *du* (thou) holds between you and that person, but have to use a metacomment such as (5c). In other words, (5b), as an answer to (5a), can never mean the same as (5c).

(5)   a.   Har du en tändsticka?   Have thou got a match?
      b.   Nej   No
      c.   Vi är inte du med varandra   We are not thou with each other

To use Wittgenstein's distinction between what is said and what is shown (Wittgenstein 1921), indexical information is always shown, never said.

---

[2]Although a context of this general form is necessarily invoked when something is taken as an utterance, we need not assume that all its components are active in all cases. There are well-known genres, where one or more of these components are not focussed, not identified or even suppressed. In public signs ("No right turn", for example), in recipes, and in instruction manuals, the sender is neither focussed nor identified. In poetry, the addressee is not identified. And in formal language instruction, a described situation is neither focussed nor identified (Anward 1990). These components are not missing, though, since it is always possible to refocus them. We might for example link the example sentences of a thesis to a described situation and so derive an illuminating roman de clef.

The topic function of talk can then conveniently be linked to what is said by talk. While in its indexical function, talk serves to show non-deniable aspects of the speech event, in its topic function, talk serves to say deniable things about a situation, which need not be the situation in which the speech event occurs. The situation which a stretch of talk says something about, the **topic** of that stretch of talk, may be the speech event in which that stretch of talk occurs, the situation in which that speech event is embedded (C), or another situation (D).

In ordinary conversation, as Bergmann (1990) shows, talk about C can always interrupt talk about D, and neither the transition from D to C nor the transition from C to D requires an overt display of topic shift. Ordinary conversation is **locally sensitive**, in Bergmann's terms. This suggests that the idea that talk has just one topic at a time might be wrong. Instead, we might think of ordinary conversation as always operating with three active and linked topics: the speech event, the situation C, and the situation D. Shoshana Blum-Kulka has even suggested (p.c.) that there may be several D situations active in a single conversation. For example, in the family dinners analysed by her, talk about the food, talk about table manners, talk about 'my day', and talk about political affairs may alternate. If there are no marked transitions between these topics, then we may well draw the conclusion that they are simultaneously active.

Let us adopt this multi-topic notion of talk. Talk occurs as part of a speech event (e) in a situation (C), which is linked to one or more situations distinct from it (D, D', D'', ...). Talk provides information about all these components of the context, by indexing aspects of the speech event (e), and by treating the speech event (e), the situation in which it is embedded (C), and the other situations (D, D', D'', ...), as simultaneously active topics. This means that aspects of the speech event can be both indexed and talked about, which opens up the possibility for an indexed aspect of the speech event to be denied through talk which takes the speech event as topic, as in (5c).

3. Activity talk

A consequence of this multi-topic nature of talk is that a stretch of talk, without ceremony, may be heard as talk which indexes and describes the very social activity in which it occurs. Consider the following example, the opening of the lesson from which (2) was extracted:

(6) **Classroom interaction, 5th grade**

T1:	Vi ska börja i OÄ idag	We'll start in OÄ today
	me lite historia	with some history
	Å de ska vi hålla på till jul	And we'll keep on with that until Christmas
	Dom här två veckorna som	These two weeks that
	e kvar	are left
	Å då ska vi tänka oss lite	And then we'll move a little
	grann ut ifrån jorden	bit away from Earth
C1:	Ska vi ut i rymden	Are we going out into space
T2:	Lite grann kanske	A little maybe

This part of the lesson serves to identify and phase the current activity. In the first utterance of T1, the current activity is glossed as *OÄ* (*orienteringsämne*, i.e. 'orientation subject', a cover term for natural and social science subjects) and *historia* (history). Since history is only one of the various subjects covered in OÄ, the glossing of the current activity as history can be taken as a partitioning of OÄ, an interpretation which is further strengthened by the second and the third utterance of T1, where this partitioning is provided with a temporal frame, establishing the current activity as a distinct phase of OÄ. In the fourth utterance of T1, and further in C1 and T2, the topic of that phase is then identified.

The teacher's utterances in (6) are all performative (Austin 1962), in that they change the activity they are embedded in, not merely describe it. Thus, the next phase of her OÄ teaching, which the teacher introduces in T1, is created and defined through the very sequence T1-C1-T2. Talk like this, which serves to change, through showing or through saying, the very activity in which it is embedded, I will call **activity talk**. In more detail, activity talk serves to identify the current activity, its current and next phases, its current and next topics, and the current and next alignments[3] of its participants. In (6), we saw examples of how activity talk establishes current activity, next phase, and next topic. In (7), the continuation of (6), there is an example (indicated by −>) of how activity talk changes alignment, by identifying a next speaker.

---

[3]In the sense of Goffman (1981), who decomposes the notions of Speaker and Hearer into the more primitive notions of Animator, Author, Principal, Addressee and Recipient, which can combine to yield a number of distinct **participant statuses**.

(7) **Classroom interaction, 5th grade**

C1:	Ska vi ut i rymden	Are we going out into space
T2:	Lite grann kanske	A little maybe
D1:	Ååh de e skoj	Wow that's fun
T3:	Vad vet ni om rymden	What do you know about space
	Hur tror ni världen ser ut	How do you think the world looks like
E1:	*brings a chair*	
F1 and other students: *raise their hands*		
T4:	Tack	Thanks
–>	Fredrik	Fredrik
F2:	De e svart	It is black
T5:	De e svart	It is black

The unit which is instrumental in establishing such **activity facts** is typically not a single utterance, but a sequence of verbal and non-verbal turns, which combine to bring about an activity fact. Such a sequence is fundamentally an interactive unit, since activity facts must attain intersubjectivity. This means that cases such as the first utterance of (6) and the indicated utterance in (7), where an activity fact is established by a single utterance and without overt contributions from other participants, are not typical, but require special contexts of use, which automatically supply what is normally achieved through sequence and interaction in ordinary conversation.

The variety of teaching exemplified in (2), (6), and (7) is such a special context. What reduces sequence and interaction in this kind of social activity is a division of saying, which confines the establishing of activity facts to one participant only, the teacher. Whatever the teacher says or shows about the activity of teaching becomes a fact, while whatever a student says or shows about that same activity attains only the status of a proposal, which must be ratified by the teacher to become a fact. This means that an activity fact can be established by a teacher utterance alone, as exemplified by the first utterance of T1 in (6), by a sequence of teacher utterances, as exemplified by the second and third utterances of T1, or by any sequence of teacher utterances and student proposals which ends with a teacher utterance, as exemplified by the fourth utterance of T1, C1, and T2.

This division of saying also accounts for turn-taking in this variety of teaching. Consider Sacks, Schegloff & Jefferson's (1974) ordered options for next speaker selection: 1. Current speaker selects other; 2. Other self-selects; 3. Current speaker self-selects. Since identity of next speaker is an activity fact, it can only be established by the teacher. This means that the teacher freely can select next speaker, both as current speaker and as other. A student selection, though, attains at most the force of a proposal, which must be ratified by the teacher to become a fact. A successful student selection consequently has two components to it: a student proposal and a teacher

ratification. Other-selection by students is rare, as are attempts by students to keep the floor. Self-selection by students, according to the second option, is in contrast a recurring pattern, where the two components of a student selection are conventionalized as bidding and nomination (Sinclair & Coulthard 1975). This is exemplified in (7), where the bidding is in F1 and the nomination is the indicated utterance in T4.

   The variety of teaching exemplified in (2), (6), and (7) is fundamentally different from conversations among peers, where activity facts are interactively established, with possible participation of all ratified participants. As a consequence, activity talk is much less frequent in conversation, where topic selection and turn-taking are seldom regulated through talk, but just done. Furthermore, there are conventionalized forms of activity talk in teaching, such as bidding and nomination, which are completely absent from conversation.

4. Topic talk

A stretch of talk within a social activity may also be heard as **topic talk**, talk about a topic that is the current object of that activity. Such talk may alternate with talk about a topic that is somehow 'outside' the social activity in question. The latter kind of talk must of course also be understood as topic talk, but within another activity. Note that it is completely in accord with the model developed so far that an activity may involve several simultaneous topics. It is also to be expected that one and the same stretch of talk may be heard both as activity talk and topic talk, since a stretch of talk can perfectly well both say things about a topic and show things about the activity in which the topic is embedded.

Just as activity talk is used to establish facts, topic talk is used to establish **truths** about the current topic of an activity. By 'truth', I do not mean truth in any absolute sense, but only 'truth for all practical purposes', something which is held to be true by participants during further talk about that topic.

The lesson, whose opening has been shown in (6) and (7), switches into topic talk at T3:

(8) **Classroom interaction, 5th grade**

T3:	Vad vet ni om rymden	What do you know about space
	Hur tror ni världen ser ut	How do you think the world looks like
E1:	*brings a chair*	
F1 and other students: *raise their hands*		
T4:	Tack	Thanks
	Fredrik	Fredrik
F2:	De e svart	It is black
T5:	De e svart	It is black
F3:	Fullt me prickar	Full of dots
T6:	Me prickar	Of dots
	E de stjärnorna ja	Is that the stars yes
	David	David

In (8), two truths are established. The first truth is 'It is dark in space', which is established by the sequence T3 - F2 - T5, a classical three-part sequence of teacher question (T3), student response (F2), and teacher evaluation (T5). In this case, the teacher evaluation accepts the student response, by repeating it. The second truth is 'Space is full of stars', which is established by the sequence T3 - F3 - T6, a classical three-part sequence augmented with an other-initiated other-repair (the second utterance in T6).

Truth-establishing sequences in teaching are not always classical three-part sequences. The simplest formats of such sequences are:

    a. Teacher assertion
    b. Teacher question - Student response - Teacher evaluation
    c. Student question - Teacher response
    d. Student assertion - Teacher evaluation

A teacher turn can also include a repair or formulation of a preceding student turn, as in the second utterance in T6. And, finally, we get more complex sequences, combinations of the simple sequences above. (2), where the truth expressed in (3): 'The planet which goes around closest to the sun is called Mercury' is established through a combination of teacher question, student response, negative teacher evaluation, another student response, teacher repair of that response, and a positive teacher evaluation, is a good example.

As is evident from the simple formats a - d, truth-establishing sequences in teaching always end with a teacher turn. Just as the teacher is the only participant to establish activity facts, the teacher is the only participant to establish truths about the topics dealt with in teaching.

Again this is in marked contrast to conversation among peers. Consider the following excerpt from a conversation among four physicians. One of them, A, has just discovered a funny-looking map on the wall:

(9) **Conversation: Four physicians** (Talsyntax 1974)

A1:	De där e minsann till å me	That is even
	sionistisk propaganda	sionistic propaganda
B1:	Den där	That
C1:	Va	What
B2:	Jaså	Is it [4]
	De e inte turistartat	It is not 'touristic'
A2:	Näej absolut inte	No certainly not
B3:	De e de inte	It is not
	Nähä	≈OK≈
A3:	Undrar var i all sin dar han fått	Wonder where on earth he got
	tag i den	hold of that

---

[4] The Swedish response items *jaså* (in B2), *näej* (in A2), and *nähä* (in B3) are hard to translate. Roughly, *jaså* is a news receipt token, in the sense of Heritage (1984), i.e. *jaså* weakens *ja* (yes) from an indication of acceptance to an indication of uptake, without further commitment. The partial reduplication in *näej* makes *nä* (no) more emphatic, while the stylized partial reduplication in *nähä* (and *jaha*) marks the matter reacted to as already settled.

The truth established in this sequence is the proposition expressed by A1: 'That (i.e. the map on the wall) is sionistic propaganda'. Unlike the truths in (2) and (8), this truth is interactively established. B2 reacts to A1 with a non-committing *jaså* and presents a tentative alternative interpretation, in the form of a negative declarative with the force of a question. This alternative interpretation is then rejected by A2, and B3 accepts this rejection. With this, both A and B have subscribed to the truth of the proposition expressed by A1, and the truth is established. A3 can then proceed to further talk about the map. In contrast to teaching, conversation among peers involves a division of saying where truths are established by all ratified participants together.

This does not mean, of course, that all participants necessarily take part in the establishing of each truth. Although all participants should have their say in each truth-establishing sequence, factors such as competence, motivation, and responsibility effectively limit participation, producing sometimes fairly asymmetric dialogues in what is, in principle, egalitarian activities (cf Linell 1990b). In (9), for example, two of the physicians involved in the conversation are inactive. Nevertheless, they accept the truth, as is shown by the further development of the topic. The way their silence (or near-silence) is interpreted is suggested by the Swedish proverb *Den som tiger samtycker* (The one who is silent assents).

5. Text talk

Not all truths established about a topic within an activity are worth saving as results of that activity. This makes it desirable for participants to mark certain truths established within a round of an activity as results of that round. Together, these truths constitute what I will call the **text** produced in that round of the activity. A single truth belonging to the text will be called a **text segment**, and talk used to establish the text of the current round of an activity will be called **text talk**.

The lesson, which has been unfolding in (6), (7), and (8), continues in this way:

(10) **Classroom interaction, 5th grade**

T6:	Me prickar	Of dots
	E de stjärnorna ja	Is that the stars yes
	David	David
D2:	Dom som åker ut i rymden å tittar ner på jorden ser de ut som en boll med massa gropar å sånt	Those who go out into space and look down at the Earth it looks like a ball with a lot of holes and things
T7:	Så jorden e en boll	So the Earth is a ball
D3:	Ja	Yes
T8:	Ha	≈OK≈
	Så du tror alltså att jorden e rund	So you think the Earth is round
D4:	Ja	Yes
T9:	Eller vet du säkert	Or do you know for certain
D5:	Ja	Yes
T10:	Ja de vet du säkert Fredrik	Yes you know for certain Fredrik
F4:	Förr i tiden trodde dom den va platt å när dom åkte till jordens ände ramla dom ner	In the past they thought it was flat and when they went to the end of the Earth they fell down
T11:	Ha	≈OK≈
	Vi ska titta på de lite	We'll look at that a little
	Men först ska vi se va vi vet om jorden nu	But first we'll see what we know about the Earth now
	Vi vet att jorden e rund	We know that the Earth is round
G1:	Ja	Yes
T12:	_Då ritar vi en liten jord här då_	Then we draw a little Earth here then
	draws a circle on the blackboard	
	Va vet vi mer	What do we know more

In (10), there is an elaborate sequence, starting with D2 and ending with T12, in which 'The Earth is round' is established both as truth and as text segment. The teacher formulates D2 in T7, and then leads D through two successive versions of 'The Earth is round', as belief and as certain knowledge. Then there is an attempt by F to introduce a new proposition. However, this proposition is deferred until later, and the teacher returns to 'The Earth is round', re-establishes it as truth, in T11, and, so to speak, puts it

on the blackboard, in T12. This is the start of a phase of the lesson, where the teacher and the students successively identify the Moon, the Sun, and the planets. These are drawn on the blackboard, to form, eventually, a complete picture of the Sun and the planets. Then, the teacher moves on to other topics (the medieval picture of the world, Copernicus, Galilei, and Bruno). Finally, the students are told to work individually on an exercise in their workbooks. In this exercise, there is another picture of the Sun and the planets, and the students' task is to fill in the names of the Sun, the Moon, and the planets (including the Earth).

There is thus a recurrent pattern in this lesson. Certain truths are established through talk and put on the blackboard in an early phase of the lesson. These truths are then the very truths that the students are required to reproduce in the final phase of the lesson. In my analysis, these truths are part of the text of that lesson, what is to be learnt from that lesson.

Unlike the other text segments, which are established once in talk, and once on the blackboard, the first text segment established in the lesson, 'The Earth is round', is established three times: twice in talk, and once on the blackboard. By separating the establishing of 'The Earth is round', in T11, from the drawing of a round Earth on the blackboard, the teacher can show to the students that the current phase of the lesson is one where text segments end up on the blackboard. This 'rule' can then serve as an interpretive frame for the remainder of the phase.

Text segments, like truths, are established by one participant only in the variety of teaching we are looking at, the teacher. In this respect, too, teaching contrasts with conversation among peers, where text segments are established interactively by all ratified participants. Consider, for example, the complete sequence spent on the map on the wall in the conversation sampled in (9).

(11) **Conversation: Four physicians** (Talsyntax 1974)

A1:	De där e minsann till å me	That is even
	sionistisk propaganda	sionistic propaganda
B1:	Den där	That
C1:	Va	What
B2:	Jaså	Is it
	De e inte turistartat	It is not 'touristic'
A2:	Näej absolut inte	No certainly not
B3:	De e de inte	It is not
	Nähä	≈OK≈
A3:	Undrar var i all sin dar han fått	Wonder where on earth he got
	tag i den	hold of that
D1:	Titta där	Look

	De e liksom slag	It's like battles
A4:	Hela faderullan	The whole thing
D2:	Israel air-strikes	
C2:	Jaha	≈OK≈
D3:	De e luftslage va	It's the air-battle isn't it
A5:	De va katten	I say
	De e tydligen från israeliska propagandaministeriet	It's apparently from the Israeli ministry of propaganda
	Å sen e där en lampa bak som lyser precis överallt <u>där</u>	And then there's a lamp behind it which lights up in every place <u>where</u>
C3:	<u>Ja</u>	<u>Yes</u>
A5:	israelerna slogs	the Israeli fought
B4:	De va ju som sjutton	That's really something
D4:	Va var har vi hamnat riktit	Where are we really
C4:	Ja	Yes
A6:	Ja just de	Yes right
	Ja e oskyldig	I'm innocent
D5:	Okej vi tror dej	OK we believe you

There are two truths established in this sequence: 'The map is Israeli propaganda' and 'The map shows the air battle [between Israel and the Arab nations in 1967]'. These truths are established by A and B (A1 through B3), and by D and A (D1 through the first utterance of A5), respectively. Then in A5, A proceeds to formulate these truths and proposes to establish them once more, which all other participants agree to do (B4 through C4). In the sequence A5 - C4, then, two truths are established, for the second time, by all participants. This sets this sequence off from the two sequences preceding it, in each of which one truth is established, for the first time, by only two of the four participants. This contrast is, in my view, best interpreted as a contrast between topic talk (A1 through the first utterance of A5) and text talk (the second utterance of A5 through C4).

It might be thought that text talk is primarily a phenomenon of formal, institutional contexts. In such contexts, the text of a round of an activity is quite often actually codified as a written text, and measures may be taken to ensure that the written text adequately reflects what was arrived at through talk. At a formal meeting, for example, what is going into the minutes and what is not is often explicitly stated, and there are routines for selecting who will take the minutes and who will verify them. However, the example of text talk in conversation in (11) suggests a rather different picture, namely that text talk is primarily a conversational phenomenon. Surely, the functional motivation for text talk, to mark what has been achieved through talk, is not lacking in conversation. Formalization of text talk as controlled representations in more permanent media would then be a secondary development, shaped and selected by various institutional contexts.

6. Further divisions of saying

So far, I have only contrasted the polar opposites of conversation and teaching. In conversation, all participants together establish activity facts, truths, and text segments; in teaching, there is only one participant, cast in the professional role of teacher, who establishes activity facts, truths, and text segments. The 'lay' persons in teaching, the students, do none of these things.

I will now turn to activities where the establishing of truths and text segments follow a different pattern from those found in teaching and conversation. My first example comes from a study of police interrogations by Linda Jönsson (Jönsson 1988, Jönsson & Linell 1991). Consider the following extract from an interrogation:

(12) **Police interrogation** (Jönsson 1988: 113):

A1:	Vem monterade bort bandspelaren	Who disconnected the tape recorder
B1:	Ja vi höll väl på båda två Han va ju lös om ja säjer De va ju bara de att vi tog bort kablarna å sen	Well, we were at it both of us It was loose if I say It was just that we disconnected the cables and then
A2:	Den va inte fastmonterad alltså	It wasn't mounted then
B2:	Nä De va bara kablarna	No It was just the cables
A3:	Kommer du ihåg vem som gjorde de då	Do you remember who did it then
B3:	Ja tror vi drog i'n båda två	I think we pulled at it both of us
A4:	Jaha	≈OK≈
B4:	Vi satt i var sitt säte	We sat in separate seats
A5:	Mm	Mhm
B5:	där fram	in the front seat
A6:	Man kan säja att ni hjälptes åt att ta bort den där	One could say that you helped each other to disconnect that one
B6:	Ja i stort sett	Yes more or less

There are two truths established in this sequence: 'The tape recorder was not mounted' and 'B and his accomplice, C, removed the tape recorder together'. These truths also appear in the policeman's written report, in the following formulation:

(13) **Interrogation report** (Jönsson 1988: 115)

Stereon låg lös i bilen och kamraterna hjälptes åt att ta bort sladdarna

The stereo lay loose in the car and the mates removed the cables together

The history of 'The tape recorder was not mounted' is this: assertion by B1 - formulation proposed by A2 - formulation accepted by B2 - formulation in A:s written report. The history of 'B and C removed the tape recorder together' is this: question by A1 - answer by B1 - question by A3 - answer by B3 - formulation proposed by A6 - formulation accepted by B6 - formulation in A:s written report. In both cases, the proposition involved is first established as a truth by the layperson, and then established as a text segment through a formulation by the professional which is accepted by the layperson.

But this is not the only pattern found in police interrogations. Consider another extract from the interrogation sampled in (12):

(14) **Police interrogation** (Jönsson 1988: 113)

B1:	Ja vet inte riktit om vi	I don't really know if we
	clears throat fick me oss	*clears throat* took it with us
	för vi (p) fick den dumma	because we (p) got the stupid
	idén att när vi väl kom in	idea that when we came inside
	så va de en bandspelare i	then there was a tape recorder in
	bilen	the car
A1:	De va samma bil de	That was the same car that
B2:	Ja	Yes
A2:	Mm	Mhm
B3:	(p) Å ja vet inte om (p)	(p) And I don't know if (p)
	Vi tog dän den i alla fall	We took it away in any case
	men ja vet inte om vi (p)	but I don't know if we (p)
	för vi har ju den inte me	because we don't have it with
	oss hem i alla fall	us home in any case
A3:	*writes*	
	(p) Nä den hittades utanför	(p) No it was found outside
B4:	Den hittades	It was found
	Mm	Mhm

Note that A3 is established as a truth by the policeman alone. The reaction in B4 marks that truth as already settled. Thus, beside truths clearly established by the layperson, there are also some truths established by the professional.

My second example comes from a medical interview:

(15) **Physician - patient interaction** (Ullabeth Sätterlund-Larsson, p.c.)

A1:	Ja hmm å tarmen sköter sej	Well ah and the bowels are doing all right
	helt å hållet	completely
B1:	Ja de gör den	Yes they do
A2:	Inga besvär me den	No troubles with them
B2:	Nää	No

I have no access to the medical record based on this interaction, but otherwise, we find the same pattern as in (12). The proposition involved in this sequence goes through the history of question by A1 - answer by B1 - formulation by A2 - acceptance of formulation by B2. In my interpretation, this proposition is, again, first established as a truth by the layperson, and then established as a text segment through a formulation by the professional which is accepted by the layperson.

As in police interrogations, though, not all truths are established by the layperson. When a physician reports a test result, for example, that report is immediately established as a truth.

Interrogations, interviews and similar activities, such as news interviews (Heritage 1985) and job interviews (Adelswärd 1988), thus have a division of saying where truths are established either by the layperson or by the professional, and text segments are formulated by the professional, accepted by the layperson, and recorded by the professional. Whether or not records are routinely signed by the layperson differs from activity to activity, as does the accessibility of records to laypersons and others.

My final example is a therapist's account of a psychotherapy session:

(16) **Psychotherapy session, therapist's account**

> Två månader in på terapin önskade X ett längre uppehåll och angav barnpassningsproblem som orsak. Hon löste situationen när hon förstod att terapin i så fall skulle upphöra. När jag tolkade detta som uttryck för rädsla och en önskan om distans till mig, svarade hon att hon i terapin ser frånstötande sidor hos sig själv och att hon också blir rädd att ingen ska tycka om henne, om hon inte är lika glad som förut.

> After two months of therapy, X wanted a longer pause, claiming problems with child care as cause. She solved the problem when she understood that the therapy would come to an end in that case. When I interpreted that as an expression of anxiety and a wish to keep the distance to me, she said that she sees ugly sides of herself in the therapy and that she becomes afraid that no one will like her, if she is not as merry as before.

Besides describing the establishing of an activity fact by the therapist ('Therapies do not admit of longer pauses'), (16) describes the following process (simplifying somewhat): X establishes 'X wants a longer pause' as a truth. This truth is then formulated by the therapist as 'X wants a longer pause, because she is afraid of therapy', and then further formulated by X, as 'X wants a longer pause, because she is afraid of the consequences of therapy'. In this case, then, we have a proposition which is first established as a truth by the layperson, and then interactively established as a text segment through successive formulations by the professional and the layperson.

This text segment is then recorded by the professional, and forms the basis of the account in (16).

   In psychotherapy sessions, at least of the psychodynamic type, we thus find a division of saying where truths are established by the layperson, and text segments are interactively established by the professional and the layperson together, and then recorded by the professional.

7. How divisions of saying relate to activities

I will now argue that the relation between a social activity and the division of saying operating there is an inner one, that a particular division of saying is a direct expression of the social activity in which it operates.

Consider first teaching. Teaching is the activity of bringing about learning with respect to something (Hirst 1973). More specifically, teaching involves one or more teachers, one or more students, some kind of subject matter (M), and something to be learnt about that subject matter (L(M)). If M is a theoretical subject matter, then L(M) is a text about M, and learning is manifested in reproduction of this text. Thus, the point of teaching is to bring about reproduction of texts about some subject matter by students.

What does it mean to say that teachers bring about text reproduction by students? I will use an extension of Goffman's notion of **principal** (Goffman 1981: 144-145, 226) to explicate this aspect of teaching. For Goffman, the principal of an utterance is the one whose position is expressed by the utterance. This means, among other things, that the principal of an utterance is answerable to the adequacy of that utterance, its truth, ethical value, correctness, appropriateness, beauty, etc. I now propose to extend this revised notion of principal of X, as the one answerable to the adequacy of X, to activities, topics, and texts. The principal of an activity is thus the one answerable to the adequacy of that activity; the principal of a topic is the one answerable to the adequacy of what is said about that topic; and the principal of a text is the one answerable to the adequacy of that text.

In teaching, the teacher is principal of activity, topic, and text. Teachers, unlike students, know which texts are to be taught and learnt. Thus, teachers naturally assume responsibility for what is happening, working to make it characterizable as teaching and learning, and for what the students are saying, working to make it characterizable as reproduction of the current text. Moreover, whoever knows the text about a topic, knows that topic, and whoever is ignorant of the text about a topic, is ignorant of that topic. This is summarized in the format below, which I will refer to as the **activity format** of teaching. To achieve maximum generality, I have substituted Professional and Layperson for Teacher and Student, respectively.

Teaching

Point:	Layperson(s) reproduce a text about some subject matter
Principal of activity:	Professional
Principal of topic:	Professional
Principal of text:	Professional

   The point of interrogations and interviews is the production of a text by Professional about some topic that Layperson has privileged access to, often a segment of Layperson's life world or life story. It thus follows that Layperson is normally the principal of the topic of such activities. However, in many cases, Professional has other means of getting information about Layperson: witnesses, police investigations, medical tests, documents, etc. This information about Layperson has Professional as its principal. Thus, I suggest that interviews and interrogations typically operate with two topics: one describing Layperson from 'within', topic(i), the other describing Layperson from 'without', topic(o). The activity format of interrogations and interviews is then:

Interrogation, interview

Point:	Professional produces a text about Layperson
Principal of activity:	Professional
Principal of topic(i):	Layperson
Principal of topic(o):	Professional
Principal of text:	Professional

   The point of (psychodynamic) therapy, finally[5], might be described as a guided rewriting of Lay's life story by Layperson (White 1991). The activity format of psychotherapy is thus:

---

[5]Other types of activity formats exist too, as Bengt Nordberg (p.c.) reminds me. The study groups investigated in Anward (1990) combine a lay principal of activity and a professional principal of topic and text. Advisory activities would seem to combine a lay principal of topic(i), a professional principal of topic(o), and a lay principal of text. So does the teaching activity analyzed in Linde (1997), where the point of the activity is the reproduction of a skill, rather than the reproduction of a text. In such a case, text segments will be variations on the theme 'Layperson knows this now and is happy that (s)he does'. In other words, we have a topic which is a combination of topic(i) with a lay principal and a topic(o) with a professional principal. As a consequence, each text segment needs to be negotiated, and Linde shows that they are indeed negotiated. And further formats are certainly conceivable.

Psychotherapy

Point:	Layperson produces a text about Layperson
Principal of activity:	Professional
Principal of topic:	Layperson
Principal of text:	Professional and Layperson

Activity formats are not mechanical causes of behavior, but abductively established 'norms', which participants work to match, in so far as they share an understanding of what they are doing (for this notion of norm, see Heritage 1984, especially ch. 4). In other words, participants take the behaviors they find in an activity as indexical of that activity (Anward 1994), and may go to some length to secure such behaviors in an activity, thereby maintaining the identification of that activity as a particular kind of activity.

Consider the following extract from the lesson we have been looking at:

(17) **Classroom interaction, 5th grade**

T1:	Var tror ni jag är lättast då	Where do you think I´m lightest then
H1:	På månen	On the Moon
T2:	Upp med handen upp med handen	Hands up hands up
	På jorden eller månen	On Earth or on the Moon
	var är jag lättast	Where am I lightest
	Inge	Inge
I1:	På månen	On the Moon
T3:	Ja förståss	Yes of course

The answer in H1 is correct, as shown by the reaction to I1, and clearly audible. Yet the teacher does not accept it, but uses it instead as an occasion for rule quoting. Then she nominates another student, who produces exactly the same answer. This time it is accepted and established as a truth. I suggest that this interactive work is meant to maintain the activity format of teaching, where it is the teacher that is principal of the activity. H1 is taken as an occasion for rule quoting, and not as the correct answer that I1 shows it to be, precisely because H1 violates the activity format of teaching, by speaking without having been nominated.

It is then a small step to propose that divisions of saying are the outcomes of methods designed to establish and maintain certain activity formats. In particular, seeing to it that you are the one that establishes the relevant parts of X, i.e. that you get an independent final say about each successive part of X, is a basic method of claiming and maintaining the role of principal with respect to X. Thus, the principal of an activity will seek to establish the facts of that activity; the principal of a topic will seek to

establish the truths about that topic; and the principal of a text will seek to establish the segments of that text.

If two or more participants are principals of X, they will both seek to establish each successive part of X, which means that they must interactively negotiate a shared final say about each successive part of X, in accordance with the logic of closings, as described by Schegloff & Sacks (1973). Thus, in therapies, therapist and patient will negotiate a final say about each text segment, which, however, for the record, will count as the patient's say, since it is the patient that produces the text. In interrogations/interviews, professionals do not have to negotiate the formulations of text segments, since they are the sole principals of texts. However, if a text segment is also a truth about a topic(i), then Professional has to submit that text segment for acceptance to Layperson, since it is Layperson that has the final say on that kind of topic. In this way, we derive the contrast noted above between text-establishing sequences in interrogation/interview and therapy.

If divisions of saying are ways of maintaining activity formats, mainly through strategical use of final sayings, then it follows that a particular activity format is compatible with a considerable variation in other features of divisions of saying. Consider again the varieties of saying in teaching:

    a. Teacher assertion
    b. Teacher question - Student response - Teacher evaluation
    c. Student question - Teacher response
    d. Student assertion - Teacher evaluation

Attested teaching methods (Rasborg 1975) span the whole range from methods dominated by (a), lecturing, through methods dominated by (b), recitation, and methods dominated by (c), expert systems, to methods dominated by (d), project work. The persistence of methods dominated by (b) across all kinds of subjects (Bellack et.al. 1966, Lundgren 1972) must therefore be due to some factor beyond the teacher's role as principal of activity, topic, and text. In Anward (1983, ch. 7), I argued that teacher control, implemented through the teacher's role as principal of activity, topic, and text, can be seen as a means to restrict classroom discourse to text reproduction by the students, the very point of teaching. But it is essential that teachers exert the right amount of control. Too much teacher control eliminates student contributions altogether, while too little control is insufficient to restrict classroom discourse to text reproduction. Briefly, then, methods based on (b) are persistent because they allow

teachers to reduce classroom discourse to text reproduction without excluding student contributions.

A similar argument can be constructed for interrogations/interviews (and for therapies, but that would require a rather lengthy exposition, which I will have to refrain from here). If the essential component of professional control in interrogations/interviews is getting the final say about each text segment, then there is room for variation in other features of divisions of saying. As Linell (1990a) has shown, this kind of variation is also attested. Interrogations/interviews range from form-filling activities, where professionals ask lays very specific questions, to activities where lays present unsolicited accounts of their cases, leading up to advice-seeking questions. Since professional control is there to ensure the production of a professional text, we might expect professionals to tend towards the form-filling end of the range. This is counter-balanced, though, by great variation in relative competence and motivation among professionals and lays across the full range of interrogation/interview activities, topics, and participants, which means that there is no single optimal division of saying for interrogations/interviews. Interrogations/interviews are thus similar to conversations among peers, where asymmetric constellations of competence, responsibility, and motivation among participants may override the egalitarian nature of the activity and sustain quite asymmetric divisions of saying (Linell 1990b).

This kind of variation compatible with a single activity format might give us a clue to the origin of the activity formats I have been looking at. Asymmetric discourse in an egalitarian activity may be taken as evidence for a non-egalitarian activity format. If a certain participant is the only one to establish activity facts in an instance of an activity, for example, the activity may be perceived by new participants as an activity where the role of principal of that activity is limited to one participant only, which is, effectively, the beginning of a new activity format. When role differentiation is further reinforced by recruitment to the new role of professionals, whose selection and training often lie outside of the activity itself, and are carried out by other professionals, then the distance between an egalitarian activity and the modern activities of teaching, interviewing, and therapy is more or less covered.

References

Adelswärd, V. 1988: *Styles of success*, Linköping Studies in Arts and Science 23, Linköping

Agar, M. 1985: Institutional discourse, *Text* 5(3): 147-168

Anward, J. 1983: *Språkbruk och språkutveckling i skolan*, Liber, Lund
  - 1986: Emotive expressions, in Ö. Dahl (ed): *Papers from the Ninth Scandinavian Conference of Linguistics*, Stockholm, 39-52
  - 1990: Språkspel i språkcirklar, in U. Nettelbladt och G. Håkansson (eds): *Samtal och språkundervisning*, Linköping Studies in Arts and Science, Linköping, 147-168
  - 1994: Semiotics in educational research, in *International Encyclopedia of Educational Research*, vol 6, Pergamon Press, Oxford, 5411-5417

Austin, J. L. 1962: *How to do things with words*, Clarendon Press, Oxford

Bellack, A. A., H. M. Kliebard, R. L. Hyman & F. L. Smith 1966: *The language of the classroom*, Teachers College Press, New York

Bergmann, J. 1990: On the local sensitivity of conversation, in I. Marková & K. Foppa (eds): *The Dynamics of Dialogue*, Harvester Press, Hemel Hempstead, 201-226

Bratt, B, K. Ehnmark, K. Heidenfors, N. G. Ormaeus & Å. Pettersson 1974: *Kombi-svenska: Grundbok 3*, Utbildningsförlaget, Lund

Bühler, K. 1934: *Sprachtheorie*, Fischer, Jena

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

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

Heritage, J. 1985: Analyzing news interviews: Aspects of the production of talk for an overhearing audience, in T. A. van Dijk (ed): *Handbook of Discourse Analysis 3: Discourse and dialogue*, Academic Press, London etc, 95 - 117

Hirst, P.H. 1973: What is teaching?, in R.S. Peters (ed): *The Philosophy of Education*. Oxford University Press, London, 163 - 177

Hurford, J. 1987: *Language and number*, Blackwell, Oxford

Hymes, D. 1974: *Foundations in sociolinguistics*, University of Pennsylvania Press, Philadelphia

Jakobson, R. 1960: Concluding statement: Linguistics and poetics, in Th. Sebeok (ed): *Style in language*, MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass, 357-370

Jönsson, L. 1988: *Polisförhöret som kommunikationssituation*, SIC 23, Department of Communication Studies, University of Linköping, Linköping

Jönsson, L. & P. Linell 1991: Story generations: From dialogical interviews to written reports in police interrogations, *Text* 11: 419-440

Levinson, S. C. 1979: Pragmatics and social deixis: reclaiming the notion of conventional implicature, *BLS* 5: 206-223

Linde, Ch. 1997: Evaluation as Linguistic Structure and Social Practice, in this volume

Linell, P. 1990a: De institutionaliserade samtalens elementära former: om möten mellan professionella och lekmän, *Forskning om utbildning* 4: 18-35

Linell, P. 1990b: The power of dialogue dynamics, in I. Marková & K. Foppa (eds): *The Dynamics of Dialogue*, Harvester Press, Hemel Hempstead

Lundgren, U. P. 1972: *Frame factors and the teaching process*, Almqvist & Wiksell, Stockholm

Rasborg, F. 1975: *Undervisningsmetoder och arbetsmönster*, Aldus, Stockholm

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

Saville-Troike, M. 1985: *The Ethnography of communication*, Cambridge
University Press, Cambridge

Schegloff, E. A. & H. Sacks 1973: Opening up closings, *Semiotica* 8: 289-327

Silverstein, M. 1985: The functional stratification of language and ontogenesis, in J. V.
Wertsch (ed): *Culture, communication, and cognition: Vygotskian Perspectives*,
Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 205-235

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

Talsyntax 1974: *Läkare diskuterar eutanasi*, text E6:1, Department of Scandinavian
Languages, Lund

White, M. 1991: *Postmodernism, deconstruction, and therapy*, Dulwich Centre
Newsletter 3/1991

Wittgenstein. L. 1921: *Tractatus logico-philosophicus*, Routledge, London