

**Participation frameworks and features of social order  
in specially approved home (Swe: Särskilda  
Ungdomshem) meetings.**

**Karin Osvaldsson Cromdal and Jakob Cromdal**

## **Abstract**

This paper aims to analyze and discuss conference interaction routinely glossed as institutional. The analyses draw on two sets of data, so called hand over meetings and network meetings. In the hand over meetings only teachers and treatment cwants participate while the network meetings include both the young person her/himself, family, social workers from the municipal social services and staff from the specially approved home. Drawing on ethnomethodology and conversation analysis, the analysis features how meeting norms surface in interaction but also how deviations from expected order result in extended negotiations, including elaborate accounting practices. Previous studies of institutional interaction have often stressed formality and its following discursive constraints. The study at hand also highlights some formalizing devices which attune the interaction towards organizational goals. But more importantly, we have identified a systematic production of informalizing interactional devices. An interesting feature of these events is that they are routinely introduced by staff. The findings are discussed in terms of both institutionality as an observable-reportable feature of talk but also in terms of collegiality, especially when turns are received as expected versus non-expected by the fellow participants.

## INTRODUCTION

Previous studies on ‘talk at work’ have highlighted the goal-oriented nature of meetings, often focusing on the accomplishment of actions and exchanges of a recognizably formal character (e.g., Atkinson, 1992; Atkinson and Drew, 1979; Boden, 1994; Clayman, 1992), but also pointing to more mundane and informal procedures through which institutional work is accomplished (Osvaldsson, 2002). This paper aims to approach meeting interaction from a similar perspective, examining how the participants produce and orient to their specific institutional participation. Specifically, we wish to demonstrate how specific actions are produced and managed by themselves. We are especially interested in actions that seem both to formalize and informalize the meeting interaction and how professional collegiality may be built and demonstrated in interaction. In order to demonstrate a variety of actions we have examples taken from ‘professionals only’ meetings, but also meetings where family and students participated.

All analyses draw on recordings of assessment conferences and hand over meetings at specially approved homes ([Swe: Särskilda Ungdomshem]). The issue of institutionality has earlier often been taken for granted or at best been studied in a simplistic way: a description of a setting as medical, for example, has been seen as sufficient for describing and framing an institutional context (see Agar, 1985 or Mishler 1984). But when institutionality instead is studied as a situated accomplishment, other patterns may emerge. For instance, institutional constraints on talk may be violated (as will be shown in the analysis) and this will only become visible through detailed analysis of interaction. The analysis of such *deviant cases* to social order may in fact extend and elaborate our understanding of the institutional conduct as such.

The second reason is that *probabilities* for structural constraints on discourse can never serve as *explanations* for the selfsame constraints (Keat and Urry, 1975, p. 13).

The job for the analyst, is therefore to demonstrate how notions of power, asymmetry and institutionality are grounded analytically in the participants’ conduct as an observable-reportable product of their interactional work. The need to be careful about claims grounded in observations towards which the participants *do not demonstrably*

*orient* is argued for by Linell and Luckmann (1991) when discussing various ways of approaching ‘asymmetries’ in dialogue.

As noted by Drew and Heritage (1992), getting a rudimentary sense of a setting as institutional at just a glance is often rather easy. On a very general level, ‘talk in institutional settings’ certainly seems to hold certain common characteristics. They include: ‘(a) *orientations to institutional tasks and functions*; (b) *restrictions on the kinds of talk that are, or can be, made*; and (c) *distinctive features of interactional inferences*’ (Drew and Heritage, 1992, p. 25). However, analyzing what this institutionality is comprised of is another and much more delicate matter. Still, this is the enterprise we need to embark on if we wish to study, rather than merely assume, an institutional context.

This implies a view of context as both a resource for and a result of the participants’ interactional work. This line of research has for some time been promoted by several conversation/interaction analysts. Arminen (2005) Schegloff (1987, 1991, 1997), Drew and Heritage (1992), Peräkylä (1995), and Hutchby (1999) to name but a few have all presented analyses compatible with a members’ perspective on the institutional order and explicated the methods participants employ to accomplish ‘institutionality’ in talk.

In these studies, participant’s orientation to issues of sequence, topic and membership are given paramount status. In a similar vein, Cromdal et al. (2018), Psathas (1999) and Watson (1997; 2000) argue for an analysis of Membership Categories that is always grounded in the sequential unfolding of talk.

We wish to demonstrate how the interactional accomplishment of institutionality may take on many different forms over and above the formalizing and constraining nature of such talk. Note that here, concepts such as formality and informality are used as very local achievements and should not be confounded with Drew and Heritage’s (1992) division of institutional settings into formal (such as court proceedings where turn allocation is strictly distributed) and non-formal (where the turn taking itself may very well have rather ‘mundane’ conversational features) or informal, as Peräkylä (1995) labelled the counseling situations in his study.

## DATA AND PROCEDURE

The examples of meeting talk presented here are drawn from a material of 18 audio recorded multiparty meetings and 7 handover meetings from four different specially approved homes. The meetings lasted between 20-120 minutes, which makes about 23 hours of recorded material. The meetings were recorded in relation to two different projects, both who were also approved by the local ethics board<sup>1</sup>. Participation in the project was voluntary and could be terminated at any time. One of the authors was present at all meetings, and careful field notes were taken together with the recordings. During the assessment procedure, many meetings and interviews took place. Among these were two meetings large multiparty events (so-called network conferences).

A network conference normally involved involved family members as well as the young person her/himself, their relatives and members of the institutional network. That is a series of participants representing three different types of parties: (i) the young person her/himself, and normally one or several family members, (ii) referring social services staff, and (iii) home staff including various expert(s) such as social workers and teachers. A chairperson, the director or some other senior official of the home led the conferences. During the conference, the Detention Home staff; in collaboration with the referring staff, engaged in 'referral talk', trying to arrive at several provisional joint problem formulations: Why is the young person referred to the home and what needs to be altered?

Then followed a four-week period during which different staff members, such as teachers, social workers, psychologists and others, together with the young person worked with the assessment questions. During the second network conference, these results as well as future recommendations for the young persons were reported and discussed. In the analysis at hand, examples are taken from both kinds of conferences. A third corpus of meetings consist of handover meetings between teachers and care workers from the wards. During these meetings, the teacher reported to the care worker about the school day for each of the students. At these meetings, no students or parents were present, only staff.

The meetings were transcribed according to a transcription scheme, which is a slightly modified version of the system developed by Jefferson (see appendix A). English translations in italics are presented below the Swedish originals. Names were

fictionalized and minor omissions or changes inconsequential for the present analysis were made in the transcripts to protect the participants' identities. Transcripts and audio tapes were used simultaneously in the analytical procedure. The analysis was conducted using the Swedish originals.

## ANALYSIS

The analysis focuses upon situated practices and participant's own orientations to their mutually coordinated actions. The four examples are chosen to represent both routine and unusual interaction to demonstrate the methods the parties use to conduct the local social order and further on, collegiality. In the first example we focus on the rationality of casual, or informal talk, as part of an ambition to construct rapport between different parties at a meeting. Then we continue to analyze some interactional procedures which allow for the meeting talk to be explicitly formalized. We then proceed to discuss a deviant case, in which the chair's unstated yet taken-for-granted right to control the meeting's activities is challenged by one of the lay participants. Finally, in the last example, among professionals only, allusions and half said categorizations of youth are used and seem to establish a mutual understanding between the participants that we argue could be one of the building blocks for collegiality in these kinds of settings.

### *Coffee talk, announcements and being routinely casual*

We have already mentioned that the intake meetings at the homes bring together a variety of professionals and relevant lay persons to discuss some important features of the assessment of the youth. Issues raised by the social services during preliminary investigation may need clarifying, new information concerning the youth's situation may be brought into the case, and the terms of the assessment may need to be settled. Previous studies on 'talk at work' have highlighted the goal-oriented nature of meetings, often focusing on the accomplishment of actions and exchanges of a recognizably formal character (e.g., Atkinson, 1992; Atkinson & Drew, 1979 and Boden, 1994), but also pointing to more mundane and informal procedures through which institutional work is accomplished (Osvaldsson, 2002).

Our analysis begins by considering an episode taking place during an initial phase of an intake meeting. The example begins as the participants have completed the customary round of introductions, which include presentation of themselves as well as their relation to the youth and/or the case. This was accomplished over coffee and cake prepared – according to local tradition at the home – by the admitted youth her/himself.

Example 1 /SA10117/ Present parties (abbreviations used in the examples within brackets): Youth [Sofia], relatives [mom, dad, sis], schoolteacher [teach]. Referral staff: social worker [soc], family therapist, [fam], apprentice social worker, [appr1]. Home staff: chairperson [chair], psychologists, [psy1, psy2], Sofia's care worker, [cw], an apprentice social worker, [appr2]. The researcher's discursive contributions are marked as [res].

---17.50---

- 01 chair        men ja tänkte vi kan väl ta lite mer  
but I thought why don't we have some more
- 02               e: ja ska nog inte ta mer e: kaka ifall  
eh I think I won't have any more e:h cake if
- 03               ja ska kunna prata merhehhe  
I'm to do any more talkingheh
- 04               >men ni< andra (.) kanske vill ha?  
but you lot (.) perhaps want some
- 05               fyll↓på innan >vi ska< (.) bö:rja me  
fill up before we will begin with
- 06               frågeställningarna och så.  
the inquiries and all
- 07               (.45)
- 08 fam        °Eva (.) ta mer fika°  
Eva (.) have some more coffee
- 09               ((looks at Sofia's mom))
- 10               (.85)
- 11 mom        j↑a:  
yea
- 12 chair        e saften ↑slut eller? (.) °nä det fanns i°  
are we out of lemonade no there's still some in
- 13               °°den där röda°°  
that red one
- 14               (1.9)
- 15 chair        det h↓är va en jä:ttego kaka  
this was a really good cake
- 16 appr1        ((waving for coffeepot))
- 17 appr2        vis[st (var det)  
wasn't it
- 18 (dad)        ä-ä[hn  
eeh

19 res [hrmhrm] mjölk också? ((till appr1))  
milk too? ((to appr1))

20 cw [>(ska) ] man ta< en kaka till?  
should I have another cake?

21 [((pouring ))]

22 teach [°kommer här°) ](.) goda kakor Sofia!  
coming here delicious cakes Sofia

23 Sofia va?  
what

24 teach mycket goda kakor.  
very good cakes

25 psy1 ja den var jättegö! hardu sma:kat >på den<  
yes that one's real good did you try it

26 själv? ((skiftar ögonkontakt från psy1 till Sofia))  
yourself ((gaze shifts from teach to Sofia))

27 Sofia ((shakes her head))

28 psy1 du har änte de? du vågar änte?  
you didn't don't dare do you

29 mom >ska du< ha mer kaffe? ((to dad))  
do you want some more coffee

---18.30---

30 Sofia nä >ja vill änte ha<.  
no I don't want any

31 mom varför ↑änte då?  
why not then

32 Sofia [°naeh°  
no

33 dad [hon vet redan smaken.  
she already knows what it tastes like

34 appr2 desto mer till[(gruppen)  
all the more for the group

35 unison [hehehehheehhe

36 mom det kan ju hända att man blir (mätt).=  
well there's the risk you might get full

37 =NÄ! den e tung den ((termos))  
no it's heavy that one ((thermos))

38 fam Mats ((dad)) har du kaffe då?  
Mats ((dad)) you alright for coffee

39 dad tack >ja står< över tack.  
thanks I'll pass thanks

40 fam de gör du?  
is that right

41 dad ja  
yes



42 fam            varför det?  
                  why is that

42 dad            här ä änte mer  
                  there's no more in this one

44 several        [heheheihéh

45 fam            [HAHAHAHAH  
---19.00---

46 cw            [( X ) klagomål framfört)  
                  complaint delivered

47 fam            men då ä änte vårt bekymmer då ju  
                  but that's none of our concerns is it

48 cw            nä:        (.) ja >håller me< dej  
                  right        I agree with you

49 psy1            .hhhh

50                (2.9)((coffee cups clinking))

51 fam            a ja tänkte ja tar,  
                  well I figured I'll have some

52                för ja ska >änte va< utan  
                  cause I won't be left without any

53 (cw)            nä  
                  right

54 psy1            ehhehehehe

55 soc            nä (x)  
                  right

About 18 minutes into the meeting, the chair encourages the group to have some more refreshments (line 1), then declaring that she will not have any more of the cake for fear of not being able to “do any more talking” (lines 2-3). She then turns directly to the group, offering more of the cake (line 4) and encouraging them to fill up their drinks before they turn to the business of the meeting: ‘before we begin with the inquiries and all’.

These actions serve as a pre-closing (Schegloff & Sacks, 1973) of the current activity; they announce an incipient change of business, as well as and provide some characteristics of that same business. Clearly, there will be ‘talking’ involved, but it is hearably a different type of ‘talking’ that what has been conducted so far. It will crucially involve the chair doing talking (which provides for her account for not having more cake), it will involve dealing with ‘inquiries’ and it will specifically *not* involve the serving of refreshments. Chair’s announcement thus dissociates the current activity

from what is soon to come. Conversely, the chair's announcement also makes it clear for the participants that the transition has not yet occurred, and her encouragement for the participants to help themselves to more refreshments points to the nature of the current activity.

In the interaction that follows, the participants act upon the chair's instruction to have another round of refreshments: there is coffee and lemonade being offered, requested and passed around (lines 8-9; 12-13; 16; 19; 22; 29-30; 37-38), and there is a series of positive assessments of the cake (lines 15; 17; 22; 24-26). Note that Sofia, who has baked the cake, does not respond to the chair's assessment in line 15. The following second assessment by the teacher orients to this absence by directly allocating the praise at Sofia: 'delicious cakes Sofia' (line 22). The teacher treats Sofia's minimal response 'what' as a token of non-hearing, and repeats his praise, now upgrading the force of the evaluation lexically as well as through prosodic stress ('very good cakes', line 24). This does not engender a reply from the youth but one of the psychologists tags on, producing yet another positive assessment turn in lines 25-26, and pursuing a response by asking whether Sofia has tasted her own cake. At this, Sofia merely shakes her head, and we can see the psychologist persisting in engaging Sofia in the talk through a display of surprise and a jocular challenge that Sofia dare not taste her own cake (line 28). Sofia does not acknowledge the humorous delivery of the challenge and replies curtly that she does not 'want any'. Sofia's mother questions this choice ('why not', line 31), but rather than producing a full account, Sofia merely whispers 'no'.

However, an account is still due for Sofia's refusal to eat the cake, and her father supplies a jocular explanation that she already knows what it tastes like, which generates some laughter from the other participants (see also Osvaldsson, 2004).

Elsewhere, Osvaldsson (2002) discusses Sofia's minimal participation in the talk in terms of her displayed non-cooperativeness with the institutionally sanctioned project of carefree socializing before the group turns to discuss a range of matters of direct relevance for her future. Our current concern is with the way that several participants treat Sofia's lack of engagement in the event – her not having had any cake and failing to meet the local expectations on how to receive the praise – as socially uncooperative. Clearly, not taking part of the refreshments offered is an accountable matter and we may note in passing that the father's declining of another cup of coffee is also subjected to

questions and remarks. We are not suggesting, of course, that everyone has to eat cake at the meeting, but it is worth pointing out that the refreshments serve as interactional artefacts – they supply the natural topics for casual talk.

Consider for instance the humorous exchange following upon the father's passing on the offer to some more coffee. When questioned, he accounts for his action by pointing out in line 42 that there is no more coffee in the thermos offered by the family therapist. This generates a round of laughter, and Sofia's care worker volunteers a jocular formulation of the father's action as an official complaint having been delivered (line 46), hence humorously alluding to the formal setting of this exchange. Building on the institutional context invoked by Sofia's care worker, the family therapist then continues the joke, concluding that this particular problem is none one of 'our concerns'. The 'our' here should be understood as the referring social services who, considering that the meeting is hosted by the youth home, have no culpability in the apparently insufficient provision of beverages. Hence, what is being invoked here for purposes of humour are the institutional identities of the individual participants, as well as the official responsibilities tied to those identities, and the exchange between the family therapist and Sofia's care worker trades on their cross-institutional identities, which they invoke to humorously perform a bit of formal negotiation concerning the insufficient amount of coffee served. Clearly, whatever else is being accomplished here – in terms of, for instance, enjoying each other's company and wit – this brief exchange demonstrates the participants' orientation to the underlying formal conditions of this gathering.

We argue that there is an order of interaction operating in example 1, which involves as one of its normative features the production of casual talk – talk that specifically lacks any obvious relevance to the case (Sofia) that forms the very reason for the meeting. Arguably, the refreshments have an important role in the ongoing production of that order. They allow participants to accomplish 'being casual' by offering, accepting, maneuvering, and indeed discussing various aspects of the drinks and cakes available on the table in front of them. Moreover, the refreshments provide the means for some of the participants to comment on the official formal nature of the meeting without directly violating the social order; Sofia's care worker and the family therapist are observably being casual about their professional responsibilities.

Further evidence of this order may be found in the way that Sofia's non-cooperativeness is dealt with. In particular, the participants' efforts to engage Sofia in the informal socializing testifies to their orientation to the normative, yet arguably veiled, features of this interactional project.

As Garfinkel ([1984]1967) demonstrated, ordinary social conduct is marked by a prevailing preference for interactional cooperation. Delivering the expected interactional work (be it 'understanding', 'filling in', or otherwise engaging in 'documentary procedures of interpretation') is for ordinary members in society a matter of moral conduct. The present setting imposes some further concerns upon the participants' conduct, concerns that crystalize when the expected order of affairs is threatened. Crucially, the initial phase of an intake meeting offers an opportunity to establish rapport between the present parties. Given the fact that important matters are at stake during these meetings, establishing rapport between its participants seems a rational concern. Sofia's displayed reluctance to partake in the casual talk poses a threat to this local order, and the participants' ways of dealing with her reluctance offer some insight into the institutional rationality of such informal proceedings during the intake meetings.

### ***Working the meeting through formalised turn-taking procedures***

The previous section showed how the chair's announcement of a forestalling meeting agenda served as a pre-closure to a seemingly informal exchange between the participants to the meeting. By pointing to the institutional rationality of such casual interaction early in the meeting and by highlighting the participants' orientations to the normative features of this mode of interaction, we have made the point that some of the institutional goals of the intake meeting may be attained through informal interaction, and that provisions for this to occur constitute a built-in feature of such meetings.

The next extract, which follows directly on our previous example, shows the transition from the normatively informal exchange into the officially case-oriented phase of the meeting.

Example 2 /SA10117/ Present parties (abbreviations used in the examples within brackets): Youth [Sofia], relatives [mom, dad, sis], schoolteacher [teach]. Referral staff: social worker [soc], family counselor, [fam], apprentice social worker, [appr1]. Home staff: chairperson [chair], psychologists, [psy1, psy2], Sofia's care worker, [cw], an apprentice social worker, [appr2]. The researcher's discursive contributions are marked as [res].

56 chair        mm (.) o:↑kej >då ska vi< lyfta fram  
                  mm ok let us then highlight the

57                frå:geställningar some::h  
                  inquiries that

58                (.45)

59 chair        ni vill att >vi ska<  
                  you want        us to

60                ↑jobba me nu under utredningstiden,  
                  work with now during the assessment period

61                (.8)

62                å då vänder jamej först till Noa ((soc))=  
                  an so I turn first to Noa ((soc))

63 soc           =mm  
                  uhuh

64                (1.1)

65                ((stirring coffee for 1.2 sec))

66                e::h  
                  eh

67                ((stirring coffee for 1.6 sec))

68                vi har delat upp i tre områden  
                  we have split this into three domains

As the laughter following upon the family therapist's humorous remark (Example 1, lines 50-51) drifts off, the chairperson takes the floor by producing in line 56 a hearable closure of the informal exchange: 'mm ok', immediately followed by an actualization of the agenda: 'let us then highlight the inquiries'. These two moves accomplish the transition from the previous exchange into the case-oriented business of the meeting. Sequential proof of this accomplishment may be found in the turns that follow: although the chair's talk is interspersed with pauses (lines 58 and 61) and hesitations (line 57) we can see that none of the other participants makes any move to begin talking, until the chair explicitly gives the word to one of the participants.

Let us consider two further aspects of the chair's turn. First, it is interesting to observe that the chair's presentation of the agenda for this phase of the meeting accomplishes more than simply presenting the business at hand, to deal with 'inquiries'.

It also identifies a minimum of two parties to these dealings: the party or parties producing and delivering the inquiries (identified by the collective pronoun “you”) and the party responsible for ‘work with’ the inquiries (identified by another collective pronoun ‘us’) during the forestalling assessment of the detainee. There are several interesting observations to be made about the chair’s construction of the agenda<sup>2</sup>, but it will suffice for our current purposes simply to conclude that there is a division of labour and a distribution of institutional responsibilities involved in the handling of a youth assessment case, both of which are roughly glossed in the chair’s turn. However rough, this glossary instates the business of the meeting *as* a formal institutional concern for the parties involved. Unlike the previous episode, where the business of socializing, establishing rapport and generally getting to know one another was not explicitly spelt out, the work of the meeting during this phase is specifically formulated *as an official task*.

The second aspect of the chair’s turn to which we wish to draw attention, may be found in her allocation of speaking rights to the social worker in line 62. Our first observation is that – in contrast to the interaction shown in Example 1 – speaking rights are now being allocated. Furthermore, the allocation of the turn to the social worker is accomplished through a direct performative speech act (cf. Austin, 1971), ‘an so I turn first to Noa’. Arguably, this action accomplishes more than the routine job of slating the social worker as next speaker. Put bluntly, the participants are being instructed how to make sense of the action they are currently observing. The floor is being handed over to the social worker as a matter of demonstration. Furthermore, the implication of the chair’s turning *first* to Noa is that she will be turning to other individuals during the course of the meeting. What seems to be at stake then, is the enforcement of a new speech exchange system – one that differs significantly from that of the previous interaction in Example 1 – and the chair’s turn in line 62 serves to instruct the participants in some central features of its formal organization relevant comparison of questioning practices in ordinary conversation vs. formal non-dyadic interviews).

Let us now consider the social worker’s actions considering this reading of the chair’s turn. In line 63, the social worker immediately latches on to the chair’s turn allocation, producing a minimal receipt token ‘uhuh’. Having thus secured the turn space, he pauses for a second, then proceeds to stir his coffee, produces a start-up token

(‘eh’) and returns to stirring his coffee, before beginning to present the social services’ inquiries concerning Sofia. Clearly, this delayed onset of talk differs significantly from the exchange in Example 1, and we wish to propose that in postponing his presentation of the inquiries, the social worker displays an orientation to the new speech exchange system instated by the chair. More specifically, having been slated as the first speaker to deliver the inquiries of his organization, the social worker is treating this sequential slot as exclusively *his* slot, without risking have his turn taken over by any other participant.

Clearly then, the transition from one phase of the meeting into another, brought about by chair’s extended turn in lines 56 through 62, has some immensely observable procedural consequences (Schegloff, 1987) for the organization of interaction in this part of the meeting. What this episode illustrates then, is that social order is a continuous accomplishment in talk. Although speakership may be pre-formalized through announcements and procedural instructions, various contingencies, problems and other local issues will crop up in the course of interaction that ambiguate the operation or applicability of the seemingly preestablished order. This allows us to conclude, on the basis of the above analysis, that social order, however formalized through institutional routines, inevitably remains a situated achievement (cf. Garfinkel, 1967). To the extent that ‘institutional interaction’ may be seen as an ‘orderly transformation[...] of the base structures of talk’s mundane organization’ (Boden, 1994, p. 290), then the above analysis has pointed to the continuously ongoing, collaborative and ever local accomplishment of this transformation.

### ***The speech exchange system challenged***

Occasionally, the institutionalized order of assessment meetings is contested in more direct ways, as our next example vividly illustrates. As such, it comprises a deviant case that offers us a glimpse of the normative background features of this social setting (Garfinkel, 1967). It shows, in a sense, the fragility of local orders, but also an important feature of their stability: the procedures deployed by the participants to handle the unexpected event towards a soon restoration of the order. The example is drawn from a post-assessment meeting, just after the chair and the other representatives from the home have finished presenting each of their respective parts of the assessment.

Example 3 /ALI6210/ Present (abbreviations used in the examples within brackets): Linda, her parents [mom, dad], Referral staff: (social worker, [soc], Detention Home Staff: the chairperson [chair], Linda's care worker, [cw]. The researcher's discursive contributions are marked as [res].

092 (4.2)

093 chair ((looking down at paper)) då var de (.4) °avdelningen°  
that's that dormitory

094 (.9)

095 chair °skolan°  
school

(.65)

096 chair °psykolog°  
psychologist

---37.30---

097 [ (6.25) ]  
[((coffee cups clinking))]

098 då kan vi övergå till ↑e::h (.)  
then let's move on to eh

099 rekommenda↓tionerna.  
the recommendations

100 dad nu tar vi rø:gpaus.  
it's time for a smoke break

101 chair >vasa?<  
sorry

102 dad nu tar vi rø:gpaus.  
it's time for a smoke break

103 (.35)

104 chair innan-?  
before

105 (.3)

106 dad nu tar vi RØ:GPAUS sa ja  
I said it's time for a smoke break

107 chair jaa: [ja-]  
yeah I

108 dad [du] du har- du ha:r (.) snu:s  
you you've you've got snuff

109 i munnen ((pointing at chair))  
in your mouth

110 du har snu:s i mu[nnen ((points at cw))  
you got snuff in your mouth

111 cw [tihieheh

112 dad då har vi raett å gå ud å røke två minuter  
so we've got the right to go out for a smoke for two minutes

113 chair °de har ni°



you do

114 ( ) hehe [hh

115 ( ) [heheh

116 dad de har rykt de vet ja  
you've been a smoker I know that

---38.00---

117 men RÄTT ska va RÄTT!  
but what's right is right

118 unison HEHEHEHhehehe

119 chair Ejag heh kan heh ta ut minheh?  
I could take mine out

120 dad nu har vi vart inne hos dej två ↑ganger.(.)  
we've been seeing you twice now

121 en och en halv ti:me varje gang,  
one and a half hour each time

122 å du bare tar snusen  
and you just take the snuff

123 så in i munnen,  
into your mouth it goes

124 ( ) hohohoh

125 du tänker inte på: >vi andra<  
you don't think about the rest of us

126 ( ) heheheh

127 chair °nä, de har du rät[t i°  
no you're right there

128 dad >är det inte< raett?  
isn't that right

129 chair jo de e rät[t.  
yes that's right

130 cw [de e helt riktigt.  
that's absolutely correct

131 ( ) [hihihihi

132 dad nu tar vi rökpaus.  
let's take a smoke break

133 (4.3) ((people rising to leave))

134 chair nu tar vi en paus.  
let's have a break

The chairperson is looking down at his checklist, going through the different paragraphs that have been covered in the presentation of the results of the assessment. We should point out that the choice of organizing the assessment around these three paragraphs is not arbitrary: “dormitory”, “school” and “psychologist” all refer to major aspects of the

young person's life during the assessment period – they comprise places, activities and people with which s/he has been in continuous engagement during the past ten weeks.

After a lengthy pause, the chair announces that they will now move on to the next point on the agenda, 'the recommendations' (lines 098-099). The methodic, almost monotonous, character of the chair's actions – his displayed moving through the list of assessment topics, the completion of the list, and the following announcement of a new activity as a matter of course – suggests that they are dealing with a routine transition of organized, predictable, institutional activities. Furthermore, the chair's actions hearably tie the 'recommendations' with the 'assessment' in ordered ways; his announcement – without further comment or introduction – casts the delivery of recommendations as a natural consequence of the results of the assessment, which have just been presented to the meeting.

The two consequential aspects of this are that: (i) recommendations are grounded in the results of the assessment, and hence follow (directly) upon their presentation; (ii) the recommendations may be naturally delivered by the same party or parties who are responsible for the assessment. Thus, the chair's actions cast the upcoming delivery of recommendations as a category-bound activity, specifically tied to those who have been involved in carrying out the assessment. Indeed, producing recommendations for treatment of youth *is* the very business of the assessment home (Watson, 1986), and the chair's conduct makes it *accountably so* in the current exchange.

It is against this backdrop that we need to consider the father's action in line 100, and the ways in which the upshots of that action are dealt with in the subsequent talk. Due to space constraints, we offer only a rudimentary account of the exchange, focusing in more depth on a few select features of the interaction. Let us first note that the father's demand for a smoke break in line 100 is packaged as a declarative (the verbatim translation of the Scandinavian<sup>3</sup> utterance “nu tar vi rø:gpaus.” is ‘it's time for a smoke break’). In the current sequential position, where the chairperson has just announced a new activity, the father's turn is hearable as a counter-announcement, as a claim for an alternative agenda. The chair's immediate response ‘sorry’ – although audibly perplexed – is ostensibly treated by the father as a request for repetition, with which he complies in line 102, producing an identical version of his previous turn. Chair's next turn however (“before?”, line 104), locates the trouble source more explicitly to the

propositional upshot of the father's action, questioning the idea of breaking up before the recommendations.

Whether the trouble indicated by this turn has to do with breaking up the sequence of events (recommendations following directly upon presentations of results of assessment), or with the current bracketing of the local distribution of rights-responsibilities across the participants to the meeting, or indeed both, is impossible to say. It does seem clear, however, that the chair is not about to proceed along the line of action initiated out by the father.

Let us pause to consider the exchange in more depth. The vocal delivery of the fathers turns in lines 100 and 102 makes his action hearable as an official demand, as an unhedged claim for a different agenda. This type of action stands in discriminative relation (Sacks, 1992, Vol. 2, p. 521) to what comes next – it makes relevant a very definite set of actions, such as compliance or refusal (e.g., Sacks, et al., 1974, on conditional relevance). However, the chair's responsive turns accomplish none of these actions. Rather, their sequential design is to initiate subordinate sequences (e.g., Jefferson, 1972), which, whatever other interactional functions they might serve, would at least postpone the response to the father's action. The father's next move then, should be seen in light of the failure of his previous attempts to solicit a relevant response to his action (cf. Auer, 1984, on "non-first firsts").

His third demand for a smoke break (line 106) is unmistakably upgraded: he packages his turn as a self-quote through the turn-final tag<sup>4</sup> and he virtually yells out the word (one word in Danish/Swedish) 'smoke break'. The chair produces a prolonged yes in reply to this, but through the father's actions in line 108 it is evident that this yes does not suffice for him, as he changes his demand in to a declarations of his observations of staff members snuff habits (108-109).

What are we to make of this? The upgrading of the demand makes it evident that from the father's point of view, the chair has not complied with the father's demand. In more conversational terms, the chair refuses to supply the relevant response, hence not recognizing conversational rules of sequence and relevance. He is dismissing these rights at relevant is the current context. The chair is imposing a different conversational order, one in which such discriminative relationships are reduced/restricted to the

formalized order of turn taking, thereby also revealing an institutional agenda where smoke breaks are not a part.

Perhaps this series of requests entails a misunderstanding between the father and the chair? Clearly, as the request is not immediately granted, perhaps even questioned, the father points out that certain individuals in the group are using snuff as they speak (108-109). They are allegedly already engaged in a non-institutional practice, in the sense that using snuff is not a goal-oriented activity of this meeting where the upcoming part of the agenda is to present recommendations (098-099). But here the father engages in a sort of moral reasoning that is essentially non-institutional and involves the idea that all participants have a right to their habits.

His declarations in lines 108-110 are met by giggle from the care worker, whereupon he reformulates his moral case as a direct request in line 112, which is met by collective laughter (114-115). The laughter indicates that the present are orienting towards the father's request as a violation of an unspoken norm. In line 117, the father's presentation of his moral case is gaining intensity, in that he explicitly spells out the injustice taking place. Moreover, he seems to hold the chairperson directly accountable for this injustice, pointing out that the chairperson himself is recurrently engaging in non-institutional activities by snuffing. Through this action, he is implicitly accusing the chairperson of being ignorant to other participants' needs, while looking after his own habits. In sum, he is not merely delivering moral justifications for a cigarette break. He is in fact criticizing the chairperson's way of conducting the organization's work.

And the chairperson, who was the target of the accusation, 'pleads guilty' (line 127) by producing a half-mumbled admission that the father is right. At this point, however, this no longer satisfies the father, and he demands a more convincing admission by asking whether his reasoning is not correct (128). Granted this, Linda's father rests his case in line 132, suggesting that they take that break now – 'let's take a smoke break'.

We might finally note that the chairperson wraps up this phase of the meeting by announcing a recess, possibly implying that the task of dismissing the group is, after all, the chairperson's and not the father's work (line 134). In a sense then, he is restoring the institutional order. Indeed this seems to be what Garfinkel (1984[1967]) would call a breaching episode: an instance that reveals and elaborates the 'seen but unnoticed' social order. The rest of the participants orientation towards the breaching episode, the

laughter and the lack of immediate support for the father's request also tells us that they are aligning with their chair and colleague. Recess, as it seems, is not for students and family to initiate during the conference meetings. It is the chairperson's work.

### ***Doing Collegiality in hand over meetings***

In the last example we would like to linger a bit more on how a concept such as *collegiality* could be analyzed. The hand over meetings, have an agenda just like the bigger assessment and network meetings. It is made relevant but seldom explicitly mentioned. In line with our earlier discussions on formalizing and in-formalizing discussions, what could an analysis of collegiality look like when analyzed in the same manner. The last example is taken from a meeting when the care workers are coming to get the students from school and guide them back to their dorms. Before leaving, a short discussion of each student's day always takes place. No students are present during the meeting.

Example 4 / Present (abbreviations used in the examples within brackets): teachers [tea1, tea2], case workers [cw1, cw2], The researcher's discursive contributions are marked as [res

281	(3.0)
282 tea1	.hh Ö:::H vem börjar vi då me? <i>who do we start with then</i>
283	(.8)
284 tea2	sam kanske? <i>sam perhaps</i>
285	[ (1.9) ]
286 cw1	[((turning pages in the notebook)) ]
287 tea2	eller? <i>or</i>
288 tea1	MM:: <i>uhuh</i>
289	(.5)
290 tea2	h.↑ja[:::↓ (.) ]om vi jämför me ↑förra måndan? <i>well if we compare to last monday</i>
291 tea1	[((coughing))]
292	(.6)
293 tea2	>så var han ett< nö:j[e <i>he was a pleasure</i>
294 cw2	[>så har han vatt

*he has been*

295 lju[vl[ig<  
*an absolute delight*

296 tea1 [mh[emhehme

297 res [hehehe

298 cw2 [hähähähähä häh.

299 (.5)

300 tea2 >har han< (.3) de har inte vatt  
*he has it has not been*

301 mycke:: >tjafs men< †han e ju som  
*a lot of fuss but he is the way*

302 han †e[:  
*he is*

303 cw2 [†ja:  
*yes*

304 tea2 .hh menä de gick <bra> mhan satt å  
*but eh it went well he sat and*

305 jobba jätteflitigt på:öh >moronen  
*worked very well in the morning*

---4.30---

306 då< (.) >fick mycke gjort< i matten  
*and got a lot done in maths*

307 å sen >gick vi på< bibliotek†et  
*and then we went to the library*

308 (1.1)

309 ††å:öhm (.3) uppträdde bra >tycke ja<  
*and behaved well I thought*

310 (.) †mEN (.4) .hsen eftermiddan  
*but then the afternoon*

311 gick inte så bra me †carina  
*did not go too well with carina*

312 (1)

313 >de va de här< hämta schackbrädet  
*it was this like get the chessboard*

314 kärringjäväl=  
*fucking hag*

315 cw1 =†å:hh.= ((sighing))  
*uhh*

316 tea2 = åså \*smooch\*((sound, hump and touch groin move))  
*and then*

318 >den d[är< stilen hela tiden]  
*like that all the time*

319 cw2 [°ja° de v†a:rdags ]språk

*well that is everyday language*

320            för °han°=  
              *for him*

321 tea2        =j↑a:]                    [ja e >på dom<  
                              *well I am on to them*

320 cw1                    [°tyvärr°]  
                              *unfortunately*

321 tea2        [he:la tiden >när ja hör< sånt=  
                              *all the time when I hear things like that*

322 tea1        [↓ja ve:t inte alltså om hane:h=  
                              *I don't know really if he*

323 tea2        =här.]  
                              *here*

324 tea1        =ä:::]:: .h[h  
                              *is*

325 cw2                                [>>ja tror inte han  
  *I don't think he*

326            fattar va han säger<<  
                              *understands what he is saying*

327 tea1        näjh. >>å ja tror (.) inte<<  
                              *no and I think not*

328            >han menar så (så) illa< heller  
                              *he means all that bad either*

329            utan de e- öh de bara bubblar  
                              *it's just eh it just keeps bubbling*

330            ur [honom.  
                              *out of him*

331 tea2                    [han e så ↓van vid å pr[ata=  
  *he is so used to talking*

---5.00---

332 cw2    [↓ja:=  
  *yes*

333 tea2        =så (här)  
                              *like this*

334 cw2        =:: vem var de mer vi hade  
                              *who else did we have*

335            som: (.5) e::hm  
                              *who*

336            (2.9)

337            vem hade vi här som [pratade  
                              *who did we have here who was talking*

The 'proper hand over' starts some four minutes into the meeting. Before this, the staff have been discussing other general reflections from the day. The change to handover proper is also visible through the three seconds pause that introduces the

example (line 281). The teachers then negotiate the reporting order for the students (282-287) and agree to start with Sam. Teacher 2 starts her report with an allusion towards his behaviour last week. Care worker 2 catches up on the allusion, exaggerating how lovely he has been during the day, and teacher 2 latches on to him being 'a pleasure' (292) by exaggerating even more. He has been an 'absolute delight' (293), an expression which causes several participants to laugh (in overlap) as a receipt of the descriptions. So far, alluded but not overtly expressed is that Sam has been good this day, compared to the experience they all have of how he can be.

The allusions and humorous expressions tells us that this is a group of people who orient towards each other as knowledgeable concerning their workplace and their students. A half-spoken comparison seems enough to set the scene and the character of Sam. The way of characterizing Sam through the relatively uncomplicated recent school day is once again contrasted with a gloss 'he is the way he is' (301-302), an unspoken personality disposition, which is confirmed by care worker 2 (yes, line 303). Teacher 2 then continues to describe Sam's conduct during the day and his studying achievements. But this is set in contrast to the afternoon when Sam had another teacher. She gives a vague yet explicit description; 'did not go too well with carina' (line 311), which is animated through reported speech/quoting; 'get the chess board fucking hag and imitation of movements (lines 313-318). The description is followed by a sigh from care worker 1 and an expression that this is mere routine language for Sam from care worker 2. Through this they are both aligning with the teacher's description of Sam displaying a mutual understanding of the young person and his problems.

*Analysis to be continued with the further descriptions of Sam and of it being more a matter of impulse control than being aggressive as such. Constructed as a habit of his (which also makes is changeable, habits may be broken). Conclude analysis with how the characterizations of Sam are also descriptions of a working team- and of collegiality (a collegiality that is not pre-established but set in place turn by turn in interaction)*



## CONCLUDING DISCUSSION

To sum up, what we have wanted to demonstrate in this paper is how participation frameworks and social order build the institutional interaction as just institutional. The first two examples illustrated very routine activities; the initial coffee drinking and cake or sandwich eating took place during every recorded meeting. The same for the transition into assessment meeting ‘proper’, and the jokes and overlapping speech among staff. In contrast, a request for a break from non-staff occurred only once. But all examples reveal a range of practices we may relevantly gloss as institutional. And we would like to argue that the extensive work required for the father to reach his smoke pause goal is in fact proof of a non-spoken but deeply rooted institutional order that is taken for granted by the staff at the home. This order may be expressed through both formalizing and in-formalizing practices but needs to be initiated by staff. It is not for parents or students to initiate the organization’s work.

*To be continued with more descriptions and conclusion...*

## References

- Agar, M. (1985). Institutional discourse. *Text* 5(3) 147-168.
- Arminen, I. (2005). *Institutional interaction: studies of talk at work*. Aldershot, Hants, England: Ashgate Pub..
- Atkinson, J.M. & Drew, P. (1979). *Order in court: the organization of verbal interaction in judicial settings*. London: Macmillan
- Atkinson, J.M. (1992), "Displaying neutrality: formal aspects of informal court proceedings", In *Talk at Work: Interaction in Institutional Settings* (Paul Drew, John Heritage, eds.), Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, pp. 199–211.
- Auer, P. (1984), Referential Problems in Conversation, *Journal of Pragmatics*, 8(5-6) 627–648
- Austin, J.L. (1971) Performative-Constative. In: J.R. Searle (ed.) *Philosophy of language*. Oxford: Oxford University press.
- Boden, D. (1994) *The Business of Talk: Organizations in Action*, Cambridge, Polity Press.
- Cromdal, J., Danby, S., Emmison, M., Osvaldsson, K., & Cobb-More, C. (2018). "Basically it's the Usual Whole Teen Girl Thing": Stage-of-Life Categories on a Children's and Young people's Helpline. *Symbolic Interaction*, 41(1), 25-44.
- Drew, P. & Heritage J. (1992) (Eds) *Talk at Work. Interaction in institutional settings*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Drew, P. & Heritage J. (1992) Analyzing talk at work: An introduction. In P. Drew & J. Heritage (Eds): *Talk at Work. Interaction in institutional settings*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Garfinkel, H. (1984[1967]) *Studies in ethnomethodology*. London: SAGE
- Goffman, E. (1981). *Forms of talk*. Philadelphia: Univ. of Pennsylvania Press.
- Heritage, J. & Clayman, S. (2010). *Talk in action: interactions, identities, and institutions*. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Hutchby, I. (1999) Frame attunement and footing in the organisation of talk radio openings. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 3/1: 41-63.
- Hutchby, I., R. Wooffitt (1998) *Conversation analysis: Principles, practices and applications*. Oxford: Polity Press

- Jefferson, G. (1972), "Side sequences", In *Studies in Social Interaction* (David Sudnow, ed.), New York, Free Press, pp. 294–338.
- Keat, R. and Urry, J. (1975) *Social theory as science* London: Routledge
- Linell, P. & Luckmann, T. (1991) Asymmetries in dialogue. Some conceptual preliminaries. In: I. Markova' & K. Foppa, (Eds.): *Asymmetries in Dialogue*. Hemel Hempstead: Harvester Wheatsheaf
- Mishler, E.G. (1984). *The discourse of medicine: dialectics of medical interviews*. Norwood, N.J.: Ablex.
- Osvaldsson, K. (2002). Talking Trouble. Institutionalization and Identity in a Youth Detention Home. Linköping: Linköping studies in arts and science 263 (diss.)
- Osvaldsson, K. (2004) On laughter and disagreement in multiparty assessment talk. *TEXT*, 24 (4) 517-545.
- Peräkylä, A. (1995) *AIDS Counselling*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Psathas, G. (1999) 'Studying the organization in action: Membership categorization and interaction', *Human Studies* 22: 139-62
- Sacks, H. (1992) *Lectures on Conversation*. Volumes I and II, Oxford: Blackwells.
- Sacks, H., Schegloff, E.A. and Jefferson, G. (1974) A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation *Language* 50 (4) 696-735
- Schegloff, E.A (1987). Between Micro and Macro: Contexts and other connections. In J.C. Alexander et al. (eds) *The Micro-Macro Link*. University of California Press: Berkeley
- Schegloff, E. A. (1991). Reflections on talk and social structure. In D. Boden and D. H. Zimmerman (eds) *Talk and social structure. Studies in Ethnomethodology and Conversation Analysis*. Cambridge: Polity Press
- Schegloff E. A. (1997) Whose text? Whose context? *Discourse and society* 8 (2) 165-187.
- Schegloff, E.A. & Sacks, H., (1973). Opening up Closings. *Semiotica*, 8(4), 289-327.
- Watson, R. (1997). 'Some general reflections on 'Categorization' and 'Sequence' in the analysis of conversation'. In: S. Hester, & P. Eglin, (Eds.), *Culture in action: studies in membership categorization analysis*. Washington, D.C.: University Press of America: 49-76
- Watson, R. (2000). The character of 'institutional talk': A response to Hester and

Francis. *Text*, 20:377-389.

## Appendix A

### Transcription notations:

(2.65)	numbers represent pauses in seconds
(.)	micropause (shorter than .3s)
(( ))	analyst's comments
[	indicates start of simultaneous talk
]	indicates end of simultaneous talk
=	latched utterances
(x)	inaudible word
(xxx)	inaudible words
(drop dead)	best guess
→	highlights a particular feature discussed in the text
:	prolongation of preceding sound
drop <u>dead</u>	sounds marked by emphatic stress are underlined
HELLO	markedly increased amplitude
◦ ◦	markedly lower amplitude
* *	hoarse voice
~ ~	wobbly voice
£ £	smiley voice
↑ ↓	rising/falling intonation in succeeding syllable(s)
?	questioning intonation
.	conclusion intonation
-	abrupt halt
> <	embeds talk that is faster than surrounding speech
< >	embeds talk that is slower than surrounding speech
.hh	inbreath
hh.	outbreath
hi; ha; he;	varieties of laughter
---01.30---	meeting progression in minutes and seconds

---

<sup>1</sup> Dnr-nummer in, forskningsansökan Dnr in

<sup>2</sup> For instance, the chair's glossing of the activities as "working with" (as opposed to, say, providing "answers" or "solutions" to) the "inquiries" raised at the intake meeting is interesting, as it may tell us something about the nature of the business that the referring social authorities bring to the detention home.

<sup>3</sup> The father's turns at talk, while perfectly comprehensible for any native speaker of Swedish, mostly takes the form of Danish adapted to spoken Swedish.

---

<sup>4</sup> While in English these items typically preface a turn, both Danish and Swedish allow these particles to occur in either turn-initial or tag position.