TITLE: Konusma Analizi

AUTHORS: Halit Keskin,Tuba Etlioglu Basaran

Original Article / Orijinal Makale

Conversation Analysis

Konuşma Analizi

Halit KESKİN⬛, Hatice Tuba ETLİOĞLU BAŞARAN⬛

Department of Business Administration, Yıldız Technical University, İstanbul, Türkiye

Yıldız Teknik Üniversitesi, İşletme Bölümü, İstanbul, Türkiye

ABSTRACT

Analyzing naturally occurring conversation in social contexts can help us understand the dynamics of social life, how individuals perceive and sustain their relationships with one other, and how institutions are maintained through daily routines. This is only achievable with a systematic research approach that is very strong both methodologically and theoretically, concentrates on empirical data, and is able to incorporate into the analysis all the micro details of the conversation and its context without introducing the researchers' subjective presumptions. Conversation Analysis, that is the research method incorporating all of these, can generally be described as the scientific examination of people's conversations and verbal communication. It is a set of methods and an approach in social sciences that aims to describe, analyze and understand talk as the basis of people's social life (Sidnell, 2010). The aim of this study is to provide an insight for conversation analysis. Based on this, the background and development of conversational analysis is provided, main structural characteristics of talk-in-interaction, which are turn-taking, adjacency pairs and sequence organization, and repair are discussed, the method of data collection and transcription is explained, and finally, conversation analysis in management research is addressed.

Cite this article as: Keskin H, & Etlioğlu Başaran H. T. (2023). Conversation Analysis. *Yıldız Social Science Review, 9*(2), 55–63.

ÖZ

Sosyal bağlamlarda doğal olarak gerçekleşen konuşmaları analiz etmek, sosyal yaşamın dinamiklerini, bireylerin birbirleriyle ilişkilerini nasıl algılayıp sürdürdüklerini ve kurumların günlük rutinler aracılığıyla nasıl sürdürüldüğünü anlamamıza yardımcı olabilir. Bu ancak, metodolojik ve teorik olarak çok güçlü, ampirik verilere odaklanan ve araştırmacıların öznel varsayımlarını devreye sokmadan görüşmenin ve bağlamının tüm mikro ayrıntılarını analize dahil edebilen sistematik bir araştırma yaklaşımıyla başarılabilir. Tüm bunları bünyesinde barındıran bir araştırma yöntemi olan Konuşma Analizi, genel olarak insanların konuşmalarının ve sözlü iletişimlerinin bilimsel olarak incelenmesi olarak tanımlanabilir. Sosyal bilimlerde konuşma analizi, insanların sosyal yaşamının temeli olan konuşmayı tanımlamayı, analiz etmeyi ve anlamayı amaçlayan bir dizi yöntem ve yaklaşımdır (Sidnell, 2010). Bu çalışmanın

* Sorumlu yazar / Corresponding author
*E-mail address: tubaetlioglu@gmail.com

amacı, konuşma analizine ışık tutmaktır. Buna dayanarak, bu çalışmada, konuşma analizinin arka planı ve gelişimine ilişkin literatür taraması sunulmakta, kişilerarası etkileşimde konuşmanın temel yapısal özellikleri tartışılmakta, konuşma analizinde kullanılan veri toplama ve transkripsiyon yöntemi açıklanmakta ve son olarak yönetim alanında konuşma analizinin yerine değinilmektedir.

1. INTRODUCTION

People socialize, build, and maintain their relationships with one another through conversation. There is a linguistic communication going on when individuals are conversing, but there is much more going on in a conversation than just the usage of a linguistic code. In addition to verbal language, additional factors such as body language, silences, and the atmosphere in which the discussion is created play a significant role in conversation. In contrast to strictly focused linguistic explanations of language, Goffman (1964) maintained that the study of talking involved interaction, which had its own set of laws and structures that were not inherently linguistic in nature. As a result, the study of language from a linguistic perspective alone could not effectively explain the nature of language-in-use (Wilkinson & Kitzinger, 2014).

The foundation of conversation analysis (herein, after CA) is a sociological understanding of the fundamentally social aspect of language use in interpersonal communication. But as the area of CA work has grown, it has become really multidisciplinary. The main sociological finding of CA is that we carry out the routine—and sometimes the extraordinary—features of our lives through talk. Talking to one another involves more than just exchanging ideas, facts, and expertise. Whether we speak face-to-face or over the phone, our talks create, manifest, sustain, and manage our connections and our sense of ourselves to one another. According to Drew & Curl (2008), people "construct, establish, reproduce and negotiate their identities, roles and relationships in conversational interaction" (p.22).

A number of fields including linguistics (Mazeland, 2006), applied linguistics, (Seedhouse, 2004; Kasper & Wagner, 2014), education (Watson, 1992; Koole, 2013), communication (Beach, 2012), anthropology (Zeitlyn, 2004; Clemente, 2012), sociology (Heritage & Stivers, 2012), and psychology (Potter & Edwards, 2012) are influenced by CA. It is commonly employed in many domains as a research methodology, frequently as a critical voice against more interpretive approaches and methodologies that have a propensity to utilize exogenous ideas like gender, power, or culture as justifications for human behavior (Brandt & Mortensen, 2016).

CA, which deals with social interaction, is positioned as an "inductive, micro-analytic, and predominantly qualitative method" for language study. It sees language as

resource for social action and focuses on conversation naturally occurs in a context. It provides a progressive means for describing conversational interaction and empirically proving the analysis (Hoey & Kendrick, 2017, p.152). As an approach for social action, conversation research provides an insight for the behaviors and pursuits that constitute social life. As a result, it is largely a strategy for social action (Drew & Curl, 2008; p. 23). It has been useful in many ways to understand both the mechanics of social interaction in daily life and the nature of professional interaction.

CA, an inductive study area, examines how social contact develops in real-world, non-experimental circumstances. In this context, the term "inductive" refers to the general theoretical rule of refraining from any theorizing that does not derive from an empirical investigation of the available evidence. The purpose is to demonstrate how participants prompt sense-making behaviors for social action, that is, to assess how participants utilized their spoken, auditory, and bodily cues to show that they understood the interaction's progression in real time. (Brandt & Mortensen, 2016).

In the almost half-century that have passed since Sacks's groundbreaking research, a substantial amount of empirical research has uncover the essential structural elements of talk-in-interaction that underpin all social interaction. These include of how participants take turns speaking, how activities are arranged in a certain order, and how speakers and listeners handle difficulties pronouncing, hearing, or comprehending what is being said (Wilkinson & Kitzinger, 2014).

The purpose of this study is to provide an insight for CA. Based on this, a literature view on the background and development of CA is presented. Then, the main structural elements of CA are discussed. The method of data collection and transcription of CA is explained. Finally, the place of CA in management research is argued.

2. THE BACKGROUND AND DEVELOPMENT OF CONVERSATION ANALYSIS

Harvey Sacks, along with Emanuel Schegloff and Gail Jefferson who are his colleagues, articulated CA in the 1960s and 1970s. Sacks passed away in a car accident in 1975, leaving his colleagues, students, and collaborators to carry out the majority of the development of CA in its wake.

His seminal work is still available in written form, mostly as lectures given to University of California undergraduate students. Jefferson's original tape records were transcribed, and Schegloff provided a thorough introduction before the work was published (Sacks 1995).

CA became a unique approach to sociology mostly due to Erving Goffman's and Harold Garfinkel's influence (Goodwin & Heritage, 1990). Face-to-face interaction was a completely new area of sociological study that Goffman (1967) first identified. Sacks and Schegloff gained an understanding of interaction as a site of social organization whereas Harold Garfinkel developed ethnomethodology, a fresh look at daily activities contradicting established theories of social order (Hoey & Kendrick, 2017).

CA, born out of ethnomethodology, is still deeply rooted in sociology (Brandt & Mortensen, 2016) because it was a sociological approach to using daily common sense as the foundation for human activity. In the sociological discipline of ethnomethodology, it is investigated how individuals within a society create and recognize things, events, and actions that are mutually understandable. Studies in ethnomethodology (Garfinkel, 1967), which laid the groundwork for the approach, contains these key concepts. The primary focus of ethnomethodology is on small-scale social order as viewed through members of society's shared social knowledge of the factors that affect how people understand the circumstances and messages they come across in their social environment. In actuality, a conversation analyzed, for example, an interview or classroom role play, may occur regardless of the desire of the researcher to investigate (Liddicoat, 2021).

From a methodological standpoint, CA looks for common behaviors, patterns, and ways that people execute and understand social activity. Two sociological thought streams gave rise to CA. The first is primarily derived from the studies of Goffman (1967) who contends that social interaction is a unique institutional order made up of normative duties and rights that govern interaction and operate largely independently of an individual's psychological, social, and motivational traits. The second approach is Garfinkel 's ethnomethodology (1967), which emphasizes the socially constructed and contingent nature of action and action perception as well as the significance of shared methods in the creation, acknowledgment, and comprehension of cooperative activities. By combining these two viewpoints, CA was able to appreciate how the "Goffmanian interaction order structures the production, recognition, and analysis of action" as it occurs in real time by utilizing common techniques or procedures. Because each person in the interaction displays their understanding of the other's behavior instinctively with each new input, this process (and its analysis) is made feasible. (Drew & Curl, 2008, p.23).

Since the 1960s, the main contribution of CA has been the description of the systematic utilization of verbal and vocal resources to achieve locally ordered turns at discourse. From the standpoint of CA, the social behavior of interaction participants is a public demonstration of how they comprehend one another and collectively construct meaning as they conduct their social affairs. Many social science scholar have long placed a high priority on understanding and misunderstanding. However, CA takes a rather unusual stance in this situation because comprehension is viewed as a praxeological issue that individuals exhibit in and via their social behaviors (Brandt & Mortensen, 2016). While a large amount of conversation analysis research has focused on casual conversation in ordinary social environments, a growing corpus of work has also used the same theoretical and methodological techniques to study discourse in institutional settings (Heritage, 1997; Drew & Heritage; 1992; Antaki, 2011).

CA has evolved as a result of empirical research concentrating on certain, observable events. Therefore, CA is not a theoretical endeavor but rather a very concrete empirical one. However, a body of theoretical information regarding the structure of conversation has been developed through empirical studies, in an inductive manner. Methods for analyzing social interaction and social interaction theory are extremely closely related in conversation analysis (Peräkylä, 2004).

3. THEORETICAL AND METHODOLOGICAL ASSUMPTIONS OF CONVERSATION ANALYSIS

Gardner (2004) demonstrates how CA took the three fundamental ideas of responsibility, reflexivity, and indexicality (or context-boundedness) from ethnomethodology. For the aim of effective engagement, speakers are accountable, reflexive, and indexical in addition to being grammatically correct and suitable. Accountability pertains to the ways in which members choose to make their acts public and reportable to other members; in other words, accountability relates to ways in which members carry out routine tasks. It is assumed that these behaviors are structured, observable, typical, aimed toward, logical, and comprehensible. Accounts are made feasible by the fact that social behaviors, such as talking, have practices that may be taught and replicated, for instance by very young people or outsiders. The belief that this kind of responsibility reflects the talk in all of its facets—the realm of action, the environments, the talk practices, and the acts and activities of a social interaction—is known as reflexivity. The social activities themselves are reflected in the members' reports of everyday social interactions. Indexicality is the idea that a language's meaning depends on the context in which it is employed. This goes beyond the linguistic concept of deixis to assert that all language is indexical, or, in a less extreme sense, that all utterances are sufficient only if they are appropriate for the context in which they are being used. As such, it dismisses as insufficient and unrealistic a context-free description of language (or of situated activity). One way to look at the ethnomethodological aspect of CA is as an attempt to pose the question of how actors in

their social field generate sufficient meaning and context. Instead of trying to interpret talk from the outside in, this approach is inside-out (Gardner, 2004; Seedhouse, 2004).

The majority of the early CA research were based on casual phone conversations between friends and acquaintances. The underlying premise was that social order originated from everyday talk, a fundamental mode of structure that sociologists had hitherto disregarded. But soon after, CA researchers started focusing on more specialized settings, like offices, courts, clinics, and doctor's offices. Studies on communication in particular circumstances have multiplied significantly in recent years, surpassing the amount of studies on the general mechanics of everyday speech. An initial analysis of these professional or institutional environments reveals that the fundamental mechanisms that underpin everyday communication are still in place. Individuals must trade turns, create action sequences with conditional relevance, open, close, and shift between sequences, fix trouble spots, and so on. Nonetheless, a lot of behaviors that are highly erratic and locally controlled in casual discourse seem ritualized, extremely predictable, and restricted in these settings. These interactional characteristics, given in table 1 below, are related to particular institutional goals that members actively pursue and orient toward by acting in certain ways or not acting at all (Palotti, 2007).

Most studies on conversation analysis rely on essential components of conversational organization. These include turn-taking (Sacks et al., 1978), sequences of action (Schegloff, 1995), and repair (Schegloff et al., 1977; Schegloff, 1992).

3.1. Turn Taking

Talk in interaction requires turn-taking to be organized, hence knowing how turn-taking operates is a necessary precondition for CA study. Turn-taking has enormously important interactional ramifications, despite the fact that it is occasionally considered a merely technical phenomena. It is crucial for analysts to comprehend how turn-taking typically functions in conversation because co-conversationalists use it as a way to pass the conversational floor in an orderly manner and participants can manipulate this normative system to achieve specific interactional effects, such as demonstrations of power, (non-) cooperation, or empathy (Wilkinson & Kitzinger, 2014).

The practice of taking turns in conversations is one of the key elements that create order. It provides an analytical instrument to explain how people regulate conversational flow when they communicate in groups of two or more and how they can swap turns in a smooth manner without many overlaps, conflicts, or protracted pause. Through deliberate selection of an interlocutor, such as when a teacher chooses a student to answer a question, turn-taking can be managed. In institutional encounters, cases like this are very typical, but they are exceptional in casual discussion, when turn allocation is typically less apparent. Most of the time, when someone talks after another, they choose to do so. In actuality, an analyzed interview or classroom role play would have occurred regardless of the conversational analyst's desire to research them (Pallotti, 2007).

In an interaction, talk is arranged methodically such that, for the most part, one speaker talks at a time and speaker transition occurs as seamlessly as feasible to prevent protracted turn overlap or lengthy gaps in between turns. Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson (1974) presented this discovery in their groundbreaking study on the systematic structure of turn-taking in everyday discourse. According to Sacks et al. (1974), taking turns is a fundamental aspect of all interactional events since it allows for the sequential organizing of interaction. As a result, it may be said to have a context-free quality. The ability to be locally adjusted to a

Table 1. Interactional characteristics of CA

Interaction area	Features
Turn-taking arrangement	-who gets to speak first -how turns are passed, and what order is followed
General structure of the engagement	- whether it is broken up into several stages or portions, who introduces them, how, and how the transitions between them are handled
Sequence organization	- how several parties participate to and manage the opening, continuation, and closure of courses of activity
Turn design	- the process of creating turns syntactically, lexically, morphologically, and prosodically to accomplish specific interactional objectives when carrying out specific activities
Lexical choice	- word choices that demonstrate, generate, and uphold roles and identities, giving the interaction a certain direction
Asymmetry	- how participants› roles, positions, rights, and obligations may vary

Kaynak: Heritage (1997); Palotti (2007). CA: Conversation analysis

range of formal and informal interactional situations and their variable participant configurations makes turn-taking context-sensitive. Interactants adapt to this dual nature of the turn-taking structure and make use of it to accomplish their institutional, social, and cultural duties (Sacks et al., 1974; Seedhouse 2004).

Even while the study of Sacks and his colleagues (1974) specifically addresses turn-taking, its broader approach highlights issues that are still relevant to conversation analysis research today. The study of everyday conversation as a means of interpersonal social action looks at utterances as things that people do with one another. The highly patterned character of these linguistic exchanges in interaction is examined using CA. It looks for patterns of recurrent contact and analyzes their characteristics. Ultimately, the aim is to pinpoint the normative anticipations that support action sequences. Some characteristics of paired action sequences, like question-answer or invitation-response sequences, were covered by Sacks et al. (1974) in their examination of turn-taking.

3.2. Adjacency Pairs and Sequence Organization

The practical acts that make up the core of social life are meticulously planned and ordered according to the CA perspective. The actors must orient themselves to the structures and regulations that only allow them to accomplish their aims. The relationships between activities are the main focus of these structures and regulations. One-off acts are components of more complex, structurally constructed things. Sequences are another name for these things (Schegloff, 1995).

The most prevalent aspect of interaction is the adjacency pair, which is made up of a first-pair and a second-pair component (Hutchby & Wooffit, 1998; ten Have, 1999; Schegloff, 2007). Adjacency pair is the most fundamental and significant sequence (Schegloff & Sacks, 1973). It is a series of two actions where one interactant performs the first action (the "first pair part"), inviting another interactant to conduct a certain kind of second action (the "second pair part"). Frequently, adjacent pairings act as a foundation upon which even longer sequences are constructed (Schegloff, 1995). Typically, an action sequence is started by the first-pair portion, and it is finished by the second-pair portion in response (Schegloff, 2007). First- and second-pair components can combine to generate other pair types, such as greeting-greeting, question-answer, and invitation-accept/reject action pairs. Put it differently, every initial action establishes standards for a certain type of response activity that is made conditionally significant, making its conspicuous absence an issue of responsibility (Schegloff, 2007; Hutchby & Wooffit, 1998; Heritage, 1984).

Action sequences in pairs serve to highlight three ideas: 1) They are made up of distinct activities carried out by the corresponding turns. 2) They display recurring characteristics, such as the sequence in which turns are given: responses typically follow queries rather than the other way

around; invitations are accepted or declined rather than greeted, and so on. 3) Since they are influenced by normative expectations, the first pair producer may attempt to pursue the absence of the second part, while the second part producer may attempt to explain its absence (Wooffitt, 2005).

This mechanism is based on the reflexivity principle of ethnometodology (Seedhouse, 2004). The order in which the acts in talk are performed constitutes a second level of orderliness in talk organization. This addresses the obvious on one level: an offer is usually met with an acceptance or rejection, a question with an answer, and so on. The idea of adjacency pairs originated from this fundamental coupling of conversational activities. Schegloff and Sacks (1973) developed the fundamental guidelines for the creation of adjacency pairs. When a first pair part is produced in a recognizable manner, the speaker should stop as soon as feasible, and the next speaker should begin and generate a second pair part of the same pair type. Speakers orient to each other when they are positioned adjacently. Adjacency pairs are made up of two turns by separate speakers. Questions, requests, offers, invites, counsel, and informings are examples of common first pair parts. Answers, acceptances, declines, rejections, agreements, and disagreements are examples of typical second pair pieces. These pairs are limited, so requests are either granted or denied, queries are answered, and greetings are returned. Saying that a first pair component is sequentially implicative of a second pair part is one method to describe these limitations. When a speaker pronounces the first pair component without the second, it is apparent and frequently brought out by other speakers. In other words, the second pair portion becomes formally nonexistent (Schegloff, 1990; Gardner, 2004).

3.3. Repair

Adjacency pairs can result in repairs. Afterwards, they form a very specific type of pair that is utilized to address issues related to talk comprehension, production, or hearing. The astonishment of talk lies in its odd disintegration. While complete comprehension is not the standard in discourse, it does mean that, in general, the structures, organization, and coherence of talk are preserved and that, in the event that orderliness is in danger of collapsing, the threat is mostly addressed fairly quickly, allowing orderliness to be restored (Gardner, 2004). This is a system of conversational techniques and other behavior that helps participants deal with issues related to speaking, hearing, or comprehending the conversation. Using this organizing principle and a metric made up of turns at talk, it appears that almost all attempts to address such issues in the talk, such as issues with shared understanding, are either started by the speaker of the trouble source in the next turn or in the turn in which the issue or potential issue arises in the next turn by another participant—what we can call third position repair (Schegloff, 1991).

The repair mechanism, which really forms the foundation for all other forms of intersubjective understanding, is concerned with the speaker's comprehension of the turn that came before. Every turn of talk is generated in the context that the turn before it formed, and it also reveals the speaker's comprehension of that turn (Atkinson & Drew, 1979).

Interactants can use the organization of repair as an inbuilt interactional resource to help them with speaking, hearing, and understanding issues. Additionally, it is the interactional resource that interactants use to demonstrate and develop mutual knowledge of what is happening at a certain point in the interaction as well as to resolve any potential problems. Thus, interlocutors fundamentally organize repair through sequentially structured turns-of-action as a way to attain and protect intersubjectivity (Heritage, 1984; Schegloff, 1992). Interactants are aware of the normative character of repair and its preferred implications when working toward intersubjectivity (Schegloff et al., 1977). Interactants observe how repairs are made and how activities relating to repairs are planned in order to preserve social cohesion amongst them (Heritage, 1984; Goffman, 1981).

4. DATA COLLECTION AND TRANSCRIPTION IN CONVERSATION ANALYSIS

CA has studied interactions of an institutional nature since its early years. Sacks' early lectures addressed phone calls to a San Francisco suicide prevention center, and many of his subsequent lectures addressed group therapy encounters (Heritage, 2004). Two elements from the original Sacks data set continue to be crucial to CA work today. First, rather than being created by researchers, the data are real. Sacks examined the helpline calls itself rather than speaking with suicidal persons about their experiences dialing the helpline. Instead of analyzing a retroactive account of social life, he examined an actual aspect of it. This indicated that rather than responding to research questions, the hotline callers were pursuing actions in their own lives and resolving their own concerns. Today's CA still relies on the examination of real-world examples of talk-in-interaction rather than imagined, hypothetical, or retrospective self-reports produced by researchers through interviews or focus groups. Secondly, data are captured, enabling repeated playback for analysis. This was made possible for Sacks by the development of the tape recorder since recordings could now be examined in much more depth than was previously conceivable. Sacks discovered that interactional participants are more focused on such fine-grained features of talk-in-interaction and that these are particularly crucial for how an interaction develops (as opposed to imagined or hypothetical examples or retrospective self-reports generated by researchers via interviews). Video or audio recordings are used in modern CA. For the study of face-to-face interactions, video is essential because it allows for the investigation of interactional elements such gesture, body deployment, and gaze (Wilkinson & Kitzinger, 2014).

CA deals with interactional life in real time, using audio and video recordings as data sources (Antaki, 2008). Naturalistic data, or interactions that happen without the need for the researcher to record and analyze them, are the foundation of CA research. In order to notice certain conversational features, conversation analysts do not collect their data by establishing experimental methods, communication tasks, role plays, or interviews. This is not to suggest that conversation analysts are uninterested in these more fabricated contexts, as they too are part of the range of talk interactions that really occur in society. In actuality, whether or not conversation analysts were interested in examining them, an interview or classroom role play would have taken place (Pallotti, 2007).

When doing a conversation analysis, the investigator first records audio or video of real-world dialogue. These recordings have been meticulously transcribed using precise guidelines that Gail Jefferson first established. The CA transcription notation is made to give information that aids in the structuring and comprehension of talk. Prosodic elements and turn location should be preserved in the transcription. Researchers can evaluate the types of language use that were available to the participants in the recorded encounter itself by combining the transcription with the original tape. A CA transcript can still be understood without significant specialized knowledge. The etic approach that is typical of phonetics is not represented in the transcript, which is not talk creation at the level of its mechanical reproducibility. Instead, the transcription offers an emic approach-based empirically accurate approximation of the interpretative assemblies that discourse participants are using. A transcription is the end product of the transcriber's interpretive labor as a skilled member of the culture being studied and their careful listening to how and where utterances are created (Mazeland, 2006).

5. CONVERSATION ANALYSIS IN MANAGEMENT AND ORGANIZATION RESEARCH

The success of many management tasks, such as planning, merchandising, interviewing, leading meetings, negotiating, and representing, depends heavily on communication. In spite of this, organizational discussion has received comparatively little attention in the literature on management and organization research. But recently, a number of academics have started to think about how different methods for analyzing talk—developed across a variety of disciplines—can be utilized to provide unique and significant insights into the execution and coordination of management tasks (Greatbatch & Clark, 2012). The use of broader social and organizational contexts and identities to explain interactional discourse traits is severely constrained by CA. Talk-in-interaction participants may be precisely

classified according to a wide range of social identifiers, such as age, sex, race, social class, occupation, and organizational level. (Sacks, 1992).

In the context of management research, a disadvantage of CA is that it uncovers organizational tasks that are not largely completed through talk-in-interaction. Nonetheless, a variety of workplace studies of interaction in natural settings have surfaced recently. These studies take a broader approach by examining the role that different artifacts—such as tools, texts, and technologies—play in the accomplishment and coordination of organizational tasks. The workplaces where these studies have been conducted include offices (Suchman, 1987; 1992), airport operation rooms (Goodwin & Goodwi,n 1996), city trading rooms and urban transport control rooms (Heath et al., 2004), and emergency dispatch centers (Whalen, 1995). These studies, in contrast to mainstream CA research, frequently depend on data from qualitative interviews and non-participant observation. This has proven vital since video analysis alone is frequently insufficient to identify or comprehend interaction patterns and activity organization in complicated organizational environments. (Greatbatch & Clark, 2012).

The use of CA to analyze interactions where participants carry out role-based or organizational tasks has increased over years. Therefore, interactions in classroom settings (Gardner, 2012), emergency call centers (Kevoe-Feldman, 2019), business meetings (Nielsen, 2009), divorce mediation sessions (Greatbatch & Dingwall, 1997), medical consultations (Peräkylä, 1997), broadcast interviews (Clayman, 2012), small claims courts (Atkinson & Drew, 1979), and psychiatric intake interviews (Roca-Cuberes, 2014) have all been the subject of CA studies. These studies examine how participants use speech to orient to social institutions and the identities that accompany them, and how this might serve as a tool or a hindrance to completing the tasks at hand. CA might potentially contributes significantly to the theoretical advancement of many management research topics and literatures.

6. DISCUSSION AND THEORETICAL IMPLICATIONS

CA, which is the study of talk-in-interaction, is a novel theoretical and methodological approach to comprehending social activity. It is currently an interdisciplinary field that includes communication studies, linguistics, psychology, and sociology in particular. It was initially articulated in American sociology in the late 1960s and early 1970s by Harvey Sacks and his associates Gail Jefferson and Emanuel Schegloff (Wilkinson & Kitzinger, 2014).

A CA viewpoint considers the social behavior of individuals interacting as a public demonstration of how they comprehend one another and collaboratively generate meaning while engaging in social interactions (Brandth & Mortensen, 2016). One technique for examining the composition and dynamics of human social interaction is conversation analysis. Conversation analysis studies use audio or video recordings of naturally occurring interactions—that is, interactions that would occur even in the absence of data collection—as their source of data. Empirical research centered on distinct, observable events has given rise to CA. First and foremost, then, CA is an extremely empirically grounded endeavor rather than a theoretical one. However, a corpus of theoretical information regarding the structure of conversation has been gathered through empirical investigations conducted in an "inductive" manner. The real "techniques" of performing CA can only be comprehended and valued in light of of these fundamental CA theoretical presumptions (Peräkylä, 2004).

The field of CA has grown to be an empirical discipline that focuses on a variety of interactional conduct domains, such as turn-taking ("the distribution of speaking opportunities among participants"), sequence organization ("internal structuring of turns at talk and the formation of actions"), organization of repair ("addressing difficulties in speaking, hearing, and understanding talk"), narrative and story-telling, phonetic and prosodic aspects of talk, body behavior, and so forth (Drew & Curl, 2008, p.4).

Its popularity in the realm of management and organization has increased over years. However, the scope of research using CA is till restricted to organizational contexts, such as classrooms, emergency call centers, business meetings, divorce mediation sessions, medical consultations, broadcast interviews, small claims courts, and psychiatric intake interviews. Organizational researchers might find fruitful to use CA in their studies, extending the array of research on organizational roles or tasks performed in those institutional settings.

7. CONCLUSION

CA is an interdisciplinary field that studies talk-in-interaction, focusing on how individuals understand and generate meaning through social interactions. Initially created in the late 1960s and early 1970s, CA examines the composition and dynamics of human social interaction using audio or video recordings of naturally occurring interactions. CA is empirically grounded, focusing on various interactional conduct domains such as turn-taking, sequence organization, and organization of repair. While its popularity in management and organization has increased, its scope of research is limited to organizational contexts, such as court laws, emergency centers, and business meetings. Organizational researchers can more rely on CA in their studies to expand their understanding of organizational roles and tasks in different institutional contexts.

Disclosure Statement: The author reports there are no competing interests to declare.

REFERENCES

Antaki, C. (2008). Discourse analysis and conversation analysis. *The Sage Handbook of Social Research Methods* (pp. 431-446). Sage Publication.

Antaki, C. (2011). Six kinds of applied conversation analysis. In *Applied conversation analysis: Intervention and change in institutional talk* (pp. 1-14). Palgrave Macmillan UK.

Atkinson, J. M., & Drew, P. (1979). *Order in court*. Springer.

Beach, W. A. *(2012). Conversation analysis and communication.* The handbook of Conversation Analysis (pp. 674-687). Wiley.

Brandt, A., & Mortensen, K. (2016). Conversation analysis. In Z. Hua (Ed.), *Research methods in intercultural communication: A practical guide* (pp. 297-310). Wiley.

Clayman, S. E. (2012). Conversation analysis in the news interview. In: J. Sidnell, & T. Stivers (Eds.), *The handbook of conversation analysis*, (pp. 630-656). Blackwell Publishing Ltd.

Clemente, I. (2012). Conversation analysis and anthropology. *The handbook of conversation analysis*, 688-700.

Drew, P., & Curl, T. (2008). Conversation analysis: Overview and new directions. In J. Sidnell & T. Stivers (Eds.), *Advances in discourse studies,* (pp. 32-45). Blackwell-Wiley.

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

Gardner, R. (2004). Conversation analysis. In A. Davies, & C. Elder (Eds.), *The handbook of applied linguistics*, (pp. 262-284). Wiley.

Gardner, R. (2012). Conversation analysis in the classroom. In J. Sidnell, & T. Stivers, (Eds.), *The handbook of conversation analysis*, (pp. 593-611). Blackwell Publishing Ltd.

Garfinkel, H. (1967). *Studies in ethnomethodology*. Englewood Cliffs.

Goffman, E. (1964). The Neglected Situation. In J. J. Gumperz, & D. Hymes (Eds.), *The Ethnography of Communication.* American Anthropologist.

Goffman, E. (1967). *Interaction ritual: Essays in face to face behavior.* Doubleday.

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

Goodwin, C., & Goodwin, M. (1996). Seeing as a situated activity: formulating planes. In Y. Engestrom and D. Middleton (eds.) *Cognition and Communication at Work* (pp. 61-95). Cambridge University Press.

Goodwin, C., & Heritage, J. (1990). Conversation analysis. *Annual Review of Anthropology, 19*(1), 283-307.

Greatbatch, D., & Clark, T. (2012). Conversation analysis in management research. In G. Symon, & C. Cassell (Eds.), *Qualitative organizational research: core methods and current challenges,* (pp. 451-472). Sage.

Greatbatch, D., & Dingwall, R. (1997). Argumentative talk in divorce mediation sessions. *American Sociological Review,* 151-170.

Heath, C., Luff, P., & Knoblauch, H. (2004). Tools, technologies and Organizational Interaction: The Emergence of Workplace Studies. In D. Grant, C. Hardy, C. Oswick & L. Putnam (Eds.), *Organizational Discourse,* (pp. 337-358). Sage.

Heritage, J. (1985). A change-of-state token and aspects of its sequential placement. *Structures of Social Action,* 299-345.

Heritage, J. (1997). Conversation analysis and institutional talk: Analysing data. In D. Silverman (Ed.), *Qualitative research: Theory, method and practice.* Sage

Heritage, J. (2004). Conversation Analysis and Institutional Talk. In *Handbook of language and social interaction* (pp. 103-147). Psychology Press.

Heritage, J., & Stivers, T. (2012). Conversation analysis and sociology. In J. Sidnell, & T. Stivers (Eds.), *The handbook of conversation analysis* (pp. 657-673). Wiley.

Hoey, E. M., & Kendrick, K. H. (2017). Conversation analysis. In A. M. B. De Groot, & P. Hagoort (Eds.), *Research methods in psycholinguistics: A practical guide,* (pp. 151-173). Wiley.

Hutchby, I., & Wooffitt, R. (1998). *Conversation analysis: Principles, practices and applications.* Polity Press.

Kasper, G., & Wagner, J. (2014). Conversation analysis in applied linguistics. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 34,* 171-212.

Kevoe-Feldman, H. (2019). Inside the emergency service call-center: Reviewing thirty years of language and social interaction research. *Research on Language and Social Interaction, 52*(3), 227-240.

Koole, T. (2013). Conversation analysis and education. *The encyclopedia of Applied Linguistics*, 977-982.

Liddicoat, A. J. (2021). *An introduction to conversation analysis*. Bloomsbury Publishing.

Mazeland, H. (2006). Conversation analysis. *Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics, 3*, 153-162.

Nielsen, M. F. (2009). Interpretative management in business meetings: Understanding managers' interactional strategies through conversation analysis. *The Journal of Business Communication, 46*(1), 23-56.

Pallotti, G. (2007). *Conversation analysis: Methodology, machinery and application to specific settings. Conversation analysis and language for specific purposes.* Peter Lang.

Peräkylä, A. (1997). Conversation analysis: a new model of research in doctor–patient communication. *Journal of the Royal society of Medicine, 90*(4), 205-208.

Peräkylä, A. (2004). Conversation analysis. In C. Seale, D. Silverman, J. Gubrium, & G. Gobo, (Eds.), *Qualitative Research Practice* (pp. 165-179). Sage.

Potter, J., & Edwards, D. (2012). Conversation analysis and psychology. In: J. Sidnell, & T. Stivers (Eds.), *The handbook of conversation analysis* (pp. 701-725). Wiley.

Roca-Cuberes, C. (2014). Conversation analysis and the study of social institutions: methodological, socio-cultural and epistemic considerations. *Athenea Digital, 14*(1), 303-331.

Sacks, H. (1992). *Lectures on conversation:* Vol. I. Blackwell.

Sacks, H., Schegloff, E. A., & Jefferson, G. (1974). Linguistic society of America. *Language, 50*(1), 696-735.

Sacks, H., Schegloff, E. A., & Jefferson, G. (1978). A simplest systematics for the organization of turn taking for conversation. In J. Schenkein, (Ed.), *Studies in the organization of conversational interaction* (pp. 7-55). Academic Press

Schegloff, E. A. (1990). On the organization of sequences as a source of "coherence" in talk-in-interaction. *Conversational Organization and its Development, 38,* 51-77.

Schegloff, E. A. (1991). Conversation analysis and socially shared cognition. In L. B. Resnick, J. M. Levine, & S. D. Teasley (Eds.), *Perspectives on socially shared cognition* (pp. 150–171). American Psychological Association.

Schegloff, E. A. (1992). Repair after next turn: The last structurally provided defense of intersubjectivity in conversation. *American Journal of Sociology, 97*(5), 1295-1345.

Schegloff, E. A. (1995). Discourse as an interactional achievement III: The omnirelevance of action. *Research on Language and Social Interaction, 28*(3), 185-211.

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

Schegloff, E. A., & Sacks, H. (1973). Opening up Closings. *Semiotica, 8*(4), 289-327.

Schegloff, E. A., Jefferson, G., & Sacks, H. (1977). The preference for self-correction in the organization of repair in conversation. *Language, 53*(2), 361-382.

Seedhouse, P. (2004). The interactional architecture of the language classroom: A conversation analysis perspective. *Language Learning, 54*(Suppl 1), 10–14.

Sidnell, J. (2010). *Conversation analysis: An introduction.* John Wiley & Sons.

Suchman, L. (1987). *Plans and situated actions.* Cambridge University Press

Suchman, L. (1992). Technologies of accountability: On lizards and aeroplanes. In Button, G. (Ed.), *Technology in working order* (pp.113-126). Routledge.

Ten Have, P. (1999*). Doing Conversation Analysis - A Practical Guide.* Sage.

Watson, D. R. (1992). Ethnomethodology, conversation analysis and education: An overview. *International Review of Education, 38,* 257-274.

Whalen, J. (1995). A technology of order production: computer aided dispatch in public safety communications'. In P. Ten Have, & G. Psthas (Eds.), *Situated Order: Studies in the Social organization of Talk and Embodied activities* (pp.187-230). University Press America.

Wilkinson, S., & Kitzinger, C. (2014). Conversation analysis in language and gender studies. In S. Ehrlich, M. Meyerhoff, & J. Holmes (Eds.), *The handbook of language, gender, and sexuality* (pp. 141-160). Wiley.

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

Zeitlyn, D. (2004). The gift of the gab. Anthropology and conversation analysis. *Anthropos, 99,* 451-468.