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Abstract

Clinical psychologists, who work with adults with learning disabilities, regularly use standardised assessments. One assessment commonly used by clinical psychologists is the Weschler Adult Intelligence Scales – version three (WAIS-III), to obtain intelligence quotient (IQ) scores. For someone with a learning disability these scores have significant consequences for service access and provision, as well as having a major impact upon social and financial dimensions to the person’s life. Such consequences can vary widely even if the IQ score varies only by a few points. The researcher was interested in exploring ways that these scores may be affected within the assessment situation and in particular, how the interviewer may impact upon the interviewee’s performance. A review of the literature revealed that most research had been conducted from a realist epistemological stance and had focused upon how to improve the standardised administration of assessments. Limited research from the social constructionist literature, had investigated how assessment interaction is constructed through the talk of the participants, but there had been no such research conducted on the WAIS-III.

This study set out to investigate the interactions between clinical psychologists and adults with a learning disability, when assessed using the WAIS-III. Talk between the participants was analysed using conversation analysis, to see how the interaction was constructed and managed through the talk. The analysis focused upon the use by the interviewees of ‘don’t know’, ‘I don’t know’ and ‘dunno’ in response to requests for information. From the analysis it was heard that they were made as statements of competence, although how these statements were oriented to and managed within the structure of the interaction was heard to vary. The implications of this for the use of the WAIS-III with adults with learning disabilities and for clinical psychology are discussed. There is also a critique of the present study and discussion of potential areas for future research.
1 Introduction

1.1 Chapter Overview

This study will investigate how clinical psychologists manage responses to questions on the WAIS-III standardised assessment when interviewing a person with a learning disability. The analysis will be conducted using a conversation analytic methodology. The focus of analysis will be upon how the interviewer and interviewee use language to construct the interaction, with consideration to the actions that the language performs within the interaction.

To begin with, standardised assessments will be discussed, they will be defined and there will be consideration of their realist epistemological underpinnings before turning to consider critical aspects of such assessments and their consideration from a constructionist perspective. The chapter will then move to a more focussed discussion about the clinical issues that arise from the use of standardised assessments with people with learning disabilities. There will then be a description of the WAIS-III and its use will be considered in relation to assessing people with a learning disability. This consideration will draw upon the issues discussed in the previous sections and in line with the epistemological position of the present study, such use will be critically evaluated from a constructionist perspective.

In the second part of this chapter there will be a description of the conversation analytic methodology and this will include discussion about the interactive nature of standardised interviews from the constructionist epistemological position. In other words, how the interaction is constructed through the talk of the participants. There will be an overview of where conversation analysis has been utilised to investigate standardised assessments before then taking a more focused consideration about where conversation analysis has been used to investigate issues relating to people with learning disabilities. As part of this discussion, the interactive role of the interviewer and more specifically the clinical psychologist will be considered.

The rationale for the present study is then presented and finally, the aims of this study are presented within the context of the preceding literature review and methodological discussions.
1.2 Standardised Assessments

1.2.1 What are they?
There have long been political, economic and social drives within society for ways to assess people’s abilities and traits (Cronbach, 1990). Within the health services such information can be used to guide clinical intervention by ensuring that any therapy or treatment is pitched as effectively as possible. It can also be used to determine the kinds of services that an individual may be allowed to access such as day services, accommodation, benefits, support networks, clinical input and so on. While these can be seen as positive uses of assessment results it is also easy to see that the same results could run contrary to the interests of the individual. The individual may be prevented from accessing certain services or treatments, may be denied benefits or may become stigmatised and suffer from social exclusion (Fernando, 1989).

Standardised assessments are particular types of assessment that derive scores that can be compared to normative scores obtained during the process of test construction. An individual score can be compared to a large population to see where that person’s score lies relative to others. They are used to assess a wide range of phenomena such as personality, quality of life, adaptive behaviour and perhaps most commonly intelligence. Standardisation means that the test should be administered in the same ‘standard’ way on each and every occasion so that it is acceptable to compare different scores on the basis that the test was being administered in the same way to each person. It is also argued that by standardising the assessment various confounding variables such as interviewer effects, location effects can be minimised (Houtkoop-Steenstra, 1996).

1.2.2 Epistemological underpinnings of standardised assessment
Epistemological positions can be described as sitting on a positivist - constructionist continuum (Bryman, 1988). At one end of this continuum is the positivist or realist perspective held by traditional or mainstream science. This holds to the idea that there is one true and valid way of understanding the world and this truth exists independently of people (Woolgar, 2000). The realist approach assumes that this truth needs to be discovered to enable complete understanding and that it will be found if the correct tools and methods are used (Burr, 2000). Once found these truths can then
be labelled, for example ‘intelligence’. From this perspective intelligence would be defined as something that exists in its own right, a characteristic that everyone has to varying degrees and that when we have the right tool then intelligence can be properly measured. It also assumes the existence of cognitive processes, such as thinking and reasoning, involved in understanding the physical world and that these are also measurable (Woolgar, 2000). Because there is a common, underlying truth it follows that by virtue of this the knowledge we discover about one person or situation can be generalised to others (Silverman, 1994). In the same way, an individual’s performance and abilities as described by assessments can be compared with other individuals and with normative data.

1.2.3 Epistemological Difficulties with Standardised Assessments

The rationale behind the development and use of standardised assessments is very much reliant upon its underlying realist epistemology. When considered from a more constructionist perspective a number of difficulties become apparent. These difficulties will now be discussed with particular reference to individuals with learning disabilities, but before doing so a brief overview of the constructionist position will be given.

The constructionist perspective is rooted in social psychology, anthropology and the writings of philosophers such as Wittgenstein and Foucault. It is perhaps most commonly associated with the writings of Harvey Sacks in the 1960’s (see Silverman, 1998). The constructionist perspective says that there is no absolute reality or truth that we simply need to uncover or discover (Burr, 2000). It rejects the idea of cognitive processes such as thinking, reasoning and the attempts made to measure these processes. Instead, it suggests that what people are thinking can never be known but that we can only know what they communicate (Silverman, 1998) and that people construct their understanding and knowledge of the world through their use of language (Burr, 2000). It rejects ideas of global concepts such as intelligence and would argue that each person’s construction of intelligence is different but that each is equally valid. The constructionist perspective suggests that knowledge and understanding change over time and that they are influenced by the societal and cultural understandings we are exposed to and that we learn as part of that culture. With regard to assessment they can only assess what is constructed during the
assessment interview and therefore the findings are not inherently generalisable but should instead be considered within the context of the assessment process.

A more detailed account of the constructionist perspective will be provided in the methodology chapter and the descriptions given here are merely overviews of each perspective. It also needs to be noted that the above are purist descriptions of each perspective and that clinicians or researchers are likely to fall somewhere between the two perspectives.

1.2.4 Practical Concerns with Standardised Assessments

Thus, it is possible to question the rationale behind standardised assessments. There are a number of potential sources of bias or difficulty that might occur when assessing someone and these will now be considered.

The first relates to the construct that the test is assessing. From a constructionist perspective everyone is likely to construct differing descriptions of what, for example, intelligence actually is. The individuals involved in developing the test will bring with them their own social understandings and experiences about the construct in question (Sternberg & Detterman, 1986, cited in Marlaire & Maynard, 1990). This obviously then raises the question of how can we measure intelligence if no-one knows exactly what it is.

Further bias may also result from the items used within the test. Some item formats may be more familiar to individuals from one social group than another. Equally, the information being sought through questioning may be more familiar to members of particular social groups.

As already mentioned, standardised tests use sets of normative data to aid interpretation of assessment findings. The argument for collecting norms for different social groups is that it enables different cutoff scores to be developed and used (Sandoval, et al 1998). However, this is grounded in realist thinking and makes an assumption that the assessment tool can be used across social groups. As this chapter has already begun to argue, assessment tests show bias against social groups that differ from those where the test was developed. This has to begin to question the
usefulness of having norms for an assessment that is producing biased, and therefore inaccurate, outcomes.

Bias may also result from the characteristics of the interviewer such as gender, social class or behaviour (Fernando, 1989). However, it is unclear from within the literature which characteristics are referred to and how they may affect outcomes. This issue is being tackled from a realist position with studies attempting to find universal characteristics, such as gender, rather than considering individual test situations (Cronbach, 1990). The context of the interview has also been found to impact upon performance. Labov (1970, cited in Cronbach, 1990) collected speech samples from children he was assessing and found them to be generally one-word responses to prompts. However, when he tried conducting the interviews sat on the floor with the child and using language that was more familiar to the child, he found that the children who would have been rated initially as having immature speech began to talk elaborately and expansively. These findings suggest that how the interviewer and interviewee interact can impact upon the assessment results.

After the assessment has been completed, when interpreting the findings, the interviewer may introduce further bias. The theoretical adherence of the interviewer may affect how the test scores are interpreted and understood (Cunningham, 1998). For example, a study by Payette and Clarizio (1994, cited in Cunningham, 1998) reviewed assessment data and they suggested that white males were less likely to be diagnosed as having a learning disability when compared to other individuals, despite falling within the diagnostic criteria.

Other sources listed by Cunningham (1998) include: inability to correctly use statistical analyses; over confidence in own judgments; underestimation of performance variability.

Cronbach (1990) suggests that the interviewers beliefs about the consequences of assessments may also affect their performance. For example, Horne and Garty (1981, cited in Cronbach, 1990) found that teachers whose futures depended upon good performance would assist their children in illegitimate ways to perform better. Also, testers with social conscience may help someone from a minority group to perform
better and so on (Cronbach, 1990). This may occur through the mechanics of scoring the assessment but it may also occur through the way that the assessment is administered.

Within the conversation analysis literature, there have been a number of studies where the language and the nature of the interaction taking place have been investigated and have been shown to influence the responses of the interviewee and so affect the scores from the assessment (e.g. Houtkoop-Steenstra, 2000; Antaki, 1999). This work forms the theoretical backbone of the present study so it will be discussed in greater detail later in this chapter and the author feels that at this stage it is sufficient for the reader to know that this literature, albeit a small literature, does exist.

The above issues relating to standardized assessment are clearly applicable across social and cultural groups and could be applied to any number of standardised assessment tools to a greater or lesser extent. However, the focus of this chapter will now turn to consider one particular social group: people with learning disabilities. There will now be a brief discussion about issues relating to the use of standardised assessment tools with people with learning disabilities. This discussion will draw upon literature mentioned previously but will also add to this with additional findings.

1.3 Standardised Assessment within Learning Disabilities

Within the field of learning disabilities standardised assessments are used for a variety of purposes. Assessment can be of the person’s quality of life, their behavioural repertoire, their language or perhaps most commonly their level of cognitive or intellectual functioning. Outcomes may be used to determine how to plan and implement a package of care, how effectively the package of care is being provided or to determine whether the person actually has a learning disability (Marzillier & Hall, 1992). Current practice suggests that such a diagnosis should take into account the individual’s level of cognitive functioning as well as their adaptive behavioural functioning. In this way, the clinician is able to demonstrate how the individual functions on a daily basis within their environment as well as their ability to understand and make sense of their environment, to learn new skills and to negotiate situations. The Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders – Fourth
Edition (DSM-IV) (American Psychiatric Association, 1994) states that for a diagnosis of learning disability a number of criteria must be satisfied. Firstly, the person must obtain an intelligence quotient (IQ) score of below 70. They must also demonstrate significant adaptive impairment of behaviour in two of a number of areas, including communication, interpersonal skills, self-help, work, leisure, health and safety, social skills, self-direction. It is stated that a low IQ score on its own is not sufficient to warrant a diagnosis of learning disability. However, in clinical reality it may often be the case that a person's IQ score will carry significant influence in the planning and provision of that person's care with lesser emphasis upon their adaptive functioning. Marzillier and Hall (1992) note that it is a common misconception within society that mental age (or IQ score) equates to the person's abilities. They describe an example that a woman with a mental age of 7 years may be treated just like a seven year old girl, despite having a chronological age of 30 years and so having the physical, emotional and sexual needs of a 30 year old. These aspects of the person would be overlooked if the focus were upon IQ alone.

In terms of adaptive behaviour assessment the measures currently available will require information to be collected from individuals who know the person well, for example carers. This information may be collected through interview or via respondent completion of a questionnaire.

In terms of intellectual functioning the available assessment tools tend to require the individual concerned to be interviewed rather than a third party. This can be through direct verbal interview or by being asked to engage in tasks. There are a number of assessment tools available but the most widely used are the Weschler Adult Intelligence Scales that are an integral part of the diagnostic process (Slate, Jones, Murray & Coulter, 1993). Currently, these scales are in their third revision (WAIS-III) (Weschler, 1998). As discussed earlier, assessments can play a crucial role in determining service provision, resource allocation and indeed may have life changing effects. It is therefore important that the scores obtained on an assessment such as the WAIS-III that lead to a clinical diagnosis are accurate.

Before opening a discussion about the use of the WAIS-III in the assessment of people with learning disabilities a brief description and summary of the WAIS-III will
first be given. This will inform the reader of the nature of the assessment tool and will also enable understanding about the discussion to follow.

1.4 The Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scales – version III (WAIS-III)

1.4.1 Description of the WAIS-III

The WAIS-III is comprised of 14 subtests. Each subtest is designed to test the interviewee's abilities in particular areas, for example, mental arithmetic, language comprehension or visuo-spatial skills. The subtests are divided into two categories: Verbal subtests and Performance subtests, based upon the function of the test. When completed the interviewer is able to derive summary scores for Verbal IQ and Performance IQ and these allow the generation of a Full Scale IQ score. The WAIS-III also allows further investigation of particular subtest scores to investigate other areas of ability. Once the scores are obtained they are compared on tables of normative scores to determine, using the full scale IQ score, where the interviewee is placed in relation to other individuals of similar age. The average score is 100.

In terms of administration of the tests, the interviewer is guided through the administration procedure with directions on the exact wording to use. The interviewer is told how to respond to answers and how to offer prompts. Many of the subtests contain closed coded questions, which means that a specific response is required for a specific question or task. For example, in the Information subtest, the question 'How many months are there in a year' the specific answer is ‘12’ and this is the only response that would merit any points. However, other subtests contain open coded questions. For example, in the Comprehension subtest, the question ‘Tell me some reasons why many foods need to be cooked’ the interviewee has more scope when answering. Here, the scoring key ranges from 0-2 points with better responses gaining more points. In these subtests the interviewer is given guidance on what are more or less acceptable responses but the final decision falls to the interviewer. A further feature of the WAIS-III to note is that on all subtests the interviewee is required to repeatedly fail a set number of items before the subtest is finished. This is to ensure that the person's ability level ceiling has been reached.
1.4.2 Difficulties using the WAIS-III with learning disabled people

Clearly, when using the WAIS-III with a person with a learning disability a number of
difficulties may be encountered. Perhaps the most likely to occur are difficulties of
communication. The nature of the subtests means that they rely heavily upon verbal
communication between the interviewer and interviewee. This may be a difficulty
when interviewing someone whose receptive or expressive communication is poor. A
person may appear unable to complete items on a subtest when in fact they are not
actually able to understand the item. This difficulty is not confined solely to the
WAIS-III and may apply to other verbally presented assessments. A further difficulty
may stem from the WAIS-III having been developed and standardised from a white,
western, middle-class context. Items that many people may be expected to know, as
members of mainstream society, may not be within the experiences of a person with a
learning disability.

Hishinuma (1998) considered ways of overcoming some of these difficulties. He
proposed ways that interviewers could modify the way they presented subtests on the
WAIS-R (the version preceding the WAIS-III), for example, by changing the wording
of questions, or verbally presenting the interviewee with multiple response options.
While his suggestions appear sound they do then challenge the whole rationale behind
the standardised assessment. In effect, by accepting his suggestions, the interviewer is
using a non-standardised format that theoretically could render the results less
reliable. Yet, Hishinuma (1998) would argue that by modifying the assessment the
data obtained would give a better representation of the interviewee’s skills and
abilities. A review of the literature, since this paper, shows that it stands alone
although the researcher is aware of personal reports from clinical psychology
colleagues who comment that they rarely adhere absolutely to the standardised
approach.

As discussed briefly above the issue of a sympathetic interviewer may have an
impact, especially if the interviewee is struggling to answer the items successfully.
Further difficulty may occur if the interviewee acquiesces during the interview. This
phenomenon has been documented within the literature, although more recently,
Rapley and Antaki (1996) have questioned whether this is truly the case on all
occasions. They suggest that occasions that appear to be acquiescence, may actually
be an attempt by the interviewee to avoid displaying linguistic incompetence in order to appear more normal.

1.4.3 Issues of Rapport within the WAIS-III interview

As with any interaction, the WAIS-III interview requires a degree of rapport between the interviewer and interviewee for it to function. Houtkoop-Steenstra (2000) has commented that interviews are social interactions where the interviewer needs to establish and maintain a relationship with the interviewee in order that the interaction is successful. This point is clearly stated in the WAIS-III manual (Weschler, 1998) and Kaufman and Lichtenberger (1999) note that a key to the best possible administration is ‘*a comfortable interpersonal situation*’ and they stress the importance of facilitating positive rapport during the interview. In terms of the WAIS-III interview it is important to attend to the need to establish and also to maintain rapport. This is perhaps even more crucial when interviewing a person with a learning disability who by definition is more likely to struggle with the assessment items and whose confidence and self-esteem are likely to be lower.

The suggestions discussed in the previous sub section (for example: Hishinuma, 1998) can be seen as strategies for ensuring that the assessment is completed. However, they can also be seen as ways to maintain rapport with the interviewee. Kaufman and Lichtenberger (1999) offer recommendations about how to manage rapport within the WAIS-III interview. They advocate that where necessary the administration of the tests should be modified to accommodate the interviewee’s difficulties. For example, they suggest that the interviewer may deviate from the standardisation to accommodate a person’s special needs but they warn against deviating significantly from the standard procedure as this could, they suggest, affect the scores or invalidate the use of norms. However, amongst their suggestions for maintaining rapport they stress that the examiner must ‘*use precise wording of questions and directions*’ and that ‘*only the mildest of paraphrasing is acceptable occasionally*’. Most of their guidance is geared either towards the periods of time between subtests where they advocate the use of small talk and ensuring smooth transitions between tests, or practically how the examiner can ensure that the assessment runs more smoothly, for example by preparing well before the interview. Kaufman and Lichtenberger (1999) fail to clarify what they mean by ‘*significantly*’ or ‘*occasionally*’ and this is left to
individual clinicians to define. They do advocate that any deviation from the standardised procedure is clearly documented.

While the above comes at the issue of rapport from a realist epistemological position, within the constructionist literature rapport has also been investigated. Using extracts of talk from interview transcripts, Houtkoop-Steenstra (2000) has been able to take the non-tangible construction of ‘rapport’ and has been able to show interviewers and interviewee’s ‘doing rapport’ within interview interactions. From a review of the literature and from her own work she argues that strategies for ‘doing rapport’ or ‘doing being personal’ as she sometimes suggests, can be considered in two ways. Firstly, there are ways that the interviewer will respond to the interviewee’s talk. For example, if the wrong answer is given or if the person is struggling within the interview. Secondly, there are ways that the interviewer may anticipate difficulties or seek to prevent problems. For example, positively rephrasing neutral questions or reshaping the response options to a question in order to facilitate the correct response.

Unfortunately, at this stage space limitations prevent the more detailed explanation and demonstration of the numerous strategies that interviewers may employ. However, they will be touched upon within the following subsections of this chapter when the constructionist literature around standardised interviews is discussed and they will also be referred to within the results section as part of the analysis of various extracts of talk. For a detailed account the reader is directed to Houtkoop-Steenstra (2000).

From the above discussions it can be seen that there is a tension in existence for the interviewer between maintaining rapport with the interviewee and the various that this could be done both practically and linguistically, and ensuring that the standardised procedure is maintained.

Within the conversation analysis literature there is a small but growing body of research where the language used within standardised interviews has been investigated. This literature will now be presented within the next part of this chapter.
1.5 The Conversation Analysis of Standardised Interviews

Before considering the literature around standardised assessments a brief description of conversation analysis will be given. It should be noted that a much more detailed discussion of conversation analysis will be presented later in the methodology chapter.

1.5.1 Overview of Conversation Analysis

Conversation analysis is an analytic approach for the investigation and explanation of talk-in-interaction (Hutchby & Wooffitt, 1999). The researcher makes use of transcribed recordings of talk and uses the transcriptions as the basis for analysing the interaction. Conversation analysis is not merely interested in the language that the participants use in their interaction. It is also interested in the ways that the interaction is being constructed by the participants, how the interaction is accomplished and how the interaction is ordered (Hutchby & Wooffitt, 1999). It is concerned with the orderliness that any interaction may hold and seeks to explain the interactional orderliness within the context in which it was produced (Psathas, 1995). Conversation analysis is grounded in the constructionist epistemology and so it doesn’t seek to uncover the organisation of the talk but sets out to empirically explain how the talk was constructed during the interaction. As already mentioned, this account is brief and a fuller account is given within the methodology chapter. However, the above should be sufficient to allow the reader to understand the discussion of the conversation analytic literature presented below.

1.5.2 The Standardised Interview as Interaction

Within a standardised interview situation there is more occurring than simply a question being asked and then an answer being given back. From the conversation analyst’s perspective, within the interview situation the participants are constructing and managing an interaction (Antaki & Rapley, 1996). Research within the conversation analysis field has sought to explain how the orderliness of standardised interviews may differ from other forms of talk-in-interaction such as everyday conversations or medical consultations. This section will now review the research in this field.
Houtkoop-Steenstra (2000) has described the standardised interview as a ‘complex interactive framework’. Her research has focused primarily upon standardised survey interviews. She describes two types of text within the assessment: the scripted questions and the coded responses. During the assessment the interviewer is constantly shifting between these texts in addition to managing the verbal responses from the interviewee. From her extensive analysis of survey interviews she has found that interactive conventions may be different within these situations as compared to everyday conversation. For example, conversationally acceptable responses may be rejected if they do not fit with the coded responses on the questionnaire. Also, the interviewer may be seen to switch between interactional styles. Commonly seen is when the interviewee fails to fully understand the question being asked or does not understand the structure to the subtest (Houtkoop-Steenstra, 2000). The interviewer is then required to step out of being a passive provider of the question or a passive recipient of the response and he/she needs to clarify, explain or offer prompts to the interviewee.

Marlaire and Maynard (1990) analysed the use of various school based IQ assessment tools with children and in their paper they presented an outline of how a standardised assessment interview with a child was seen to be ordered. At the beginning of testing, they saw how the interviewer and the child co-orientated to the structure of the subtest through the initial practice and rehearsal items. Marlaire and Maynard (1990) describe each subtest as having an interactional substrate and they suggest that through the initial rehearsal, the orderliness of the interaction is co-constructed to the point where the child understands that interactional order. They also commented on how the child is able to attend to verbal and non-verbal cues from the interviewer about the nature of a response. They found this in cases where the child would offer a tentative response and the clinician would then seek clarification, indicating to the child how close they were to the correct response. Maynard and Marlaire (1992) found that rather than being the passive receptacle for responses, as suggested by realist proponents of standardised assessments, the interviewers actually varied their responses according to the performance of the child. This results in the test scores being collaborative productions resulting from the interaction (Marlaire & Maynard, 1990).
Having considered how the standardised interview is more than merely a stimulus – response relationship (Maynard & Marlaire, 1992) this chapter will now consider where conversation analysis has been used to investigate the standardised assessment of people with learning disabilities.

1.6 Conversation analytic studies of the standardised assessment of people with learning disabilities

A review of the conversation analysis literature shows that there has been little research investigating the use of standardised assessment of people with learning disabilities. The studies that have been completed are not confined to one particular aspect of this area but have been exploratory and innovative investigations of the phenomena constructed within the interactions. Yearley and Brewer (1989) were amongst the first to use conversation analysis to investigate the talk-in-interaction of people with learning disabilities. They concluded that it was appropriate to do so because they found that people with a learning disability still used conversational devices found in everyday conversation.

1.6.1 The role of the interviewer within the standardised interview

Within standardised assessments, when considered from a realist epistemological position, the role of a clinical psychologist, or any other interviewer, is to act as a passive conduit for administering the questions and then recording the responses. This epistemological position suggests that the interviewer has little impact upon the assessment process. However, from a constructionist perspective, the interviewer is considered to have a more integrated role within the assessment interaction and more importantly, the assessment interview can be considered to be an interaction that is constructed by both participants. While administering the assessment, the interviewer is being expected, by the assessment designers and the administration guidance, to function as a passive conduit within the assessment and to follow the standardised administration. Yet, by virtue of being embedded within the interaction they are also presented with the need to construct and manage the interaction through clarifying, prompting or managing difficulties that arise.
When considering the interaction that takes place between the interviewer and the person with a learning disability it has been found that within the talk, both participants are indeed constructing the answers, as suggested earlier by Marlaine and Maynard (1990). Antaki and Rapley (1996) in a study of quality of life interviews upon people with learning disabilities found that within such interviews two types of difficulty tended to occur. These were issues around question administration and issues around the answers given. In terms of how the questions were asked they noted that often the interviewer would reword the question for a number of reasons: to negotiate a complex item, to pursue an answer or to provide alternative responses. Antaki (1999) also found that interviewers would deviate from the standardised interview script and that they would often reword the questions in such a way that they were more likely to action a particular response and so, effect a higher score. Antaki (1999) has argued that the high number of rewordings and deviations from the script was in line with claims by Houtkoop-Steenstra (1996) that interviewers are constantly managing a tension between administering the assessment in the standardised way and administering the assessment in a way that is sensitive to the interaction. As suggested earlier in this chapter, this strategy can be seen as the interviewer working to maintain the interactional rapport within the assessment. The interviewer is working to avoid an uncomfortable situation where the interviewee fails repeatedly and so he/she 'assists' the person to succeed (Houtkoop-Steenstra & Antaki, 1998).

The present study would argue that the tension referred to by Houtkoop-Steenstra (1996) and authors since then, is comparable to the realist concepts of being a scientist (i.e. following the standardised protocol) and being a clinician (i.e. using interactionally sensitive strategies for managing interactions), or indeed the scientist-practitioner model that currently exists within the clinical psychology profession. This model is concerned with the role of the clinical psychologist. It advocates that clinical psychologists should be trained as scientist – practitioners so that on the one hand they are skilled in being able to access, interpret and implement psychological research. Yet, on the other hand they are skilled at being practitioners and being able to work therapeutically using a range of subtle interpersonal and therapeutic skills (Marzillier & Hall, 1992). However, this model is still debated within the profession and opinion is divided about it’s utility. Shapiro (2002) notes that many clinicians and
clinical psychology trainees hold reservations about the practicality of such a role, when much psychological research is considered to be inapplicable to clinical practice and where clinical skills are gained through practical experience rather than from scientific research (Marzillier & Hall, 1992). Due to space constraints there is no scope for discussing these concepts or debates further. However, it is acknowledged that from a constructionist perspective these terms are socially constructed. They are widely used terms within clinical psychology and so they have been raised here because they may be usefully referred to in later chapters to provide a frame of reference for the purposes of discussing the clinical implications of the results. For an in-depth account of the scientist-practitioner debate the reader is directed to Pilgrim and Treacher (1992) or more recently Shapiro (2002).

In terms of the answers being given, Antaki and Rapley (1996) have noted that often these are reworded by the interviewer and they found that often the interviewer would deviate from the standard script in a way that they describe as being ‘helpful’ to the interviewee. They reported that as with previous findings (e.g. Antaki, 1999; Antaki et al, 2002) the interviewer occasionally deviates from the neutral administration of the assessment. Again, these can be seen as strategies being employed to maintain the interaction and the interviewer can be heard to be ‘doing maintaining rapport’. However, Antaki (1999) notes that the interviewers then fail to take account of this when writing their assessment report. As suggested by Kaufman and Lichtenberger (1999) this obviously will have implications for the apparent validity of the assessment where the report of the assessment is failing to accurately reflect the assessment interaction.

Taking a broader perspective, there have been studies where the nature of the responses given by someone with a learning disability have been investigated using a conversation analysis methodology. The pioneering work of Yearley and Brewer (1989) found that individuals with a learning disability varied their conversational mechanisms when talking to their peers as compared to when being interviewed. They found that the interviewee would use a reduced repertoire of conversational skills when being interviewed. They suggested that this could be explained by the account of stigma given by Goffman (1968), who suggested that a stigmatised person requires ‘two faces’: one for interacting with other stigmatised individuals and one for
interacting with non-stigmatised individuals. Yearley and Brewer (1989) argue that the person with a learning disability is attempting to pass themselves off as being a non-stigmatised person. They are changing interactional style to minimise the potential for showing their linguistic or interaction incompetence. This work was built upon by the study by Antaki et al (2002) mentioned earlier. These findings also fit with the work by authors such as Houtkoop-Steenstra and Antaki (1996) who talk about the interviewer struggling with a tension between using a standardised approach and a more sensitive approach. Here, it may be that the interviewer is orienting to the concerns of the interviewee within the talk and so is seeking to assist and support them.

Following on from this, Rapley, Kiernan and Antaki, (1998) demonstrated that within quality of life interviews, people with learning disabilities could be seen to demonstrate clear understanding of their constructed identity and the interactional and social realities of having a learning disability, but that they could be seen to be working to pass themselves off as being ordinary by ‘doing being ordinary’ within the talk.

In the above section there has been a discussion of the small body of conversation analytic literature that has considered the assessment of people with learning disabilities. So far, the introduction has presented an overview of standardised assessment followed by a discussion focusing more specifically upon the WAIS-III. From there the discussion turned to consider the use of conversation analysis when investigating the application of standardised assessments and then more specifically for considering the application of standardised assessments to people with learning disabilities. Having provided this discussion, this chapter will now present the rationale and the aims for the present study.

1.7 Rationale for the present study

From the research literature presented above, in relation to assessment and people with learning disabilities, it can be seen that most of the research has focused upon issues around the standardisation and the administration of standardised assessments from a realist perspective. In other words, from the position that there is a true
construct that the assessment is seeking to uncover and that the tests are flawed in ways that affect their ability to accurately detect and measure this construct. However, there is also a body of constructionist literature, in particular a number of studies where conversation analysis has been used to investigate the assessment of people with learning disabilities.

From this body of literature it is noticeable that the research has tended to focus upon the use of quality of life measures (e.g. Antaki, 1999). As discussed above, IQ can be a powerful determinant of care provision for persons with a learning disability, yet the WAIS-III has yet to be subjected to any form of conversation analytic investigation. Such research, as has been seen with quality of life measures, would help to develop a better understanding about the interaction taking place during a WAIS-III interview and how the participants are constructing the interaction. This in turn would inform clinical practice about the administration of the WAIS-III with people with learning disabilities. It seems appropriate that an assessment that can have such an impact upon people's lives, and their social identity, should be further investigated to help deepen understanding about the interaction taking place and its effect upon the outcomes.

Therefore, it is this specific gap in the literature that has informed the focus for investigation and has prompted the present study. Namely, how is the interaction during a WAIS-III assessment interview managed by the participants, when one of them has a learning disability?

1.8 Aims of the present study

Building upon that rationale, the present study aims to use a conversation analysis methodology in order to investigate and to explain how the interaction between a clinical psychologist and a person with a learning disability is managed. As with any form of talk-in-interaction the order to the interaction is managed and produced by both participants and is specific to the context where it is being constructed. Rather than taking a global perspective of the interaction, the nature of the conversation analytic method will result in the analysis focusing upon an interactional phenomenon in detail. The phenomenon for consideration will emerge during the analysis phase of this study rather than being an *a priori* subject for investigation.
The present study is setting out with four aims:

- Firstly, once an interactional phenomenon is chosen, it will seek to investigate how this aspect of the WAIS-III assessment interaction is constructed and managed by the participants during the assessment interview. Using conversation analysis the study will seek to explain the mechanics of the talk-in-interaction rather than seeking to uncover any particular truth behind the utterances. The analysis will focus upon explaining how the interviewer and interviewee orient to the phenomena, how they manage it and the action being performed within the interaction.

- Secondly, there will be consideration of ways that this understanding can be used to inform the assessment of people with learning disabilities, to inform clinical psychology practice and to inform the wider profession of psychology.

- A third aim is that the findings will generate further areas for research and they will also provide a platform for future investigations to build upon. The findings from this study will also add to the growing conversation analytic literature.

- Finally, the researcher is hoping that as a potential clinician working with people with learning disabilities this research will allow opportunities for personal and professional development and will result in understanding, knowledge and skills that he can take beyond the research into his future clinical practice.
2 Methodology

2.1 Chapter Overview

This section will consider the methodology employed in this research. The ultimate aim of this section is to provide a clear and accurate account of how this research was conducted. To do this, the methodology section will be divided into four main parts: Theoretical context, Research design of the present study, Data management and Ensuring data quality. Each of these parts will now be considered.

Theoretical context. In the first part there will be discussion about constructionist research, what it is and its place within psychological research. This will be built upon by discussion around epistemological issues, before discussing in much greater detail the conversation analytic methodology being employed for this study. Within this there will be a full discussion of the methodology itself, the mechanics of conversation analysis, a critique and finally why it has been chosen for this study.

Research design of the present study. This section will present a detailed description of the design for the current study. It will consider the research design, issues the researcher brings to the research, participants involved, the procedure used and the ethical issues relating to this research.

Data management. This section will discuss how the data was managed by the researcher and there will be discussion about the transcription, and other procedures, used as well as issues this presented during the course of the research.

Ensuring data quality. Finally, there will be a discussion about issues relating to Data quality and how this can provided for within this research. There will be a discussion of how these issues where applied to this piece of research to ensure that the findings can be considered to be of value.

2.2 Theoretical Context

2.2.1 Constructionist Epistemology

Initially, it is necessary to discuss the epistemological underpinning to the present study before proceeding to consider the methodology chosen. For this study a
constructionist epistemological position was held by the researcher. By its very nature, this poses some difficulties. To offer a definition could be considered to be anti-constructionist and would imply that it is a neutrally, objectively describable construct. However, Shotter and Gergen (1989) have summarised that constructionism is interested in how people's experiences and knowledge are constructed through interaction and more specifically through language.

Potter and Weatherall (1992) would advocate that rather than trying to define constructionism it is better to consider the various approaches calling themselves constructionist. However, that would not be appropriate for this chapter. While it is difficult to offer a definition of constructionism, Burr (2000) has suggested four basic assumptions for a constructionist science.

Firstly, constructionism requires a critical stance towards any understanding of the world that is 'taken-for-granted'. It runs against the idea that objects hold a true, underlying nature that is waiting to be revealed. This clashes with the realist epistemological position that would suggest that actually there are underlying truths that it is possible to discover. Rather, a constructionist approach suggests that objects are socially constructed and Burr (2000) suggests that people should be constantly suspicious of assumptions about how the world appears to be. This idea is certainly more readily applicable to non-tangible concepts and constructs. For example, psychological phenomena such as intelligence are constructed between people and are done so through the use of language. Potter (1996) suggests that psychology should be concerned with how these constructs are generated and utilised linguistically through the use of language.

Secondly, building upon the previous paragraph, constructionism argues that the understanding of the world is constructed between people. Versions of knowledge are constructed through interaction and the practices of interaction are the ways that knowledge is constructed (Burr, 2000). From a constructionist perspective language should not be considered as a passive mechanism for conveying knowledge but instead, it should be seen as a form of social action where people construct their understanding between them (Gergen, 1985).
Thirdly, interactions that lead to a constructed understanding of the world are historically and culturally specific. For example, the notion of childhood will vary between cultural groups, and within British society it has varied over the past century. This, argues Burr (2000), means that not only are ways of understanding specific to particular cultures, and periods of history but they are also constructed by those cultures and within those historical contexts. Forms of knowledge are therefore social artefacts (Gergen, 1985).

Finally, Burr (2000) notes that from a constructionist perspective, knowledge and social action go together. A constructed understanding or form of knowledge will invite particular social action but may also exclude other forms of social action and each different construction of the world may invite different actions. A useful example presented by Burr (2000) is the social construction of alcoholism which used to be viewed as a behaviour that the person was responsible for, so resulting in a social action of punishment. More recently it is constructed as an addiction and so a different action is invited in the form of treatment.

As already mentioned, there is a range of constructionist approaches that to a greater or lesser extent follow the above assumptions. It is difficult to identify any single commonality between the various approaches and Potter (1996) refers to them having a ‘family resemblance’. These include such approaches as discourse analysis, conversation analysis, ethnomethodology and ethogenics. Common aspects to this ‘family’ of approaches are that they tend to oppose the realist assumptions of more traditional social sciences. Also, they share a view that mind and action are fluid essences that are constructed from the symbolic resources of a culture. Further more, Potter (1996) states that, most commonly, this ‘family’ of approaches treat language as being fundamental to the construction of knowledge and understanding.

2.2.2 Conversation Analysis
An empirical, constructionist methodology commonly used to analyse talk-in-interaction is Conversation Analysis. This is an approach that stems from the work of Harvey Sacks in the 1960’s and has been added to and developed since then by various authors (e.g. Emanuel Schegloff; Gail Jefferson). Conversation Analysis can
best be described as the study of talk-in-interaction (Psathas, 1995) and it is concerned primarily with the turn-taking within conversation (Hutchby & Wooffitt, 1999).

A key notion of conversation analysis is that turn taking within conversations and interactions is sequentially ordered and conversation analysis is used to discover those orderings. Conversation analysis serves to investigate how the speaker uses the 'next turn' in a conversation to show how they are understanding and orienting to the prior turn's completion. Conversation analysis also serves to analyse how speakers use their 'next turn' to orient to the content of the previous turn and so provide the action it has been designed to do. For example, the extract below shows a simple exchange between two people.

**Extract 2.1**

1. Bob: hello
2. John: hello

In extract 2.1 the interaction begins in line 1 where Bob says 'hello'. This is immediately followed by John saying 'hello' (line 2). Line 2 can be seen to be the 'next turn' being discussed above. Here, John's statement in line 2 shows him to be oriented to Bob's statement in line 1 as a greeting. John is responding to Bob and is demonstrating the interactional rules around greetings by giving an acceptable reply. However, Bob's greeting is serving to generate an action from John (i.e. an appropriate response) and so John's reply shows that this was successful and that an appropriate response was generated. John's response is considered successful because if he gave an inappropriate response this would have caused difficulties in the interaction.

In addition to turn-taking accomplishment, conversation analysis is also interested in what the participants in the interaction are *actually doing* in the interaction. In other words, as mentioned previously, the actions that are being achieved within the interaction by the talk. Psathas (1995) presents seven basic assumptions that he argues are fundamental to conversation analysis and which relate back to the earlier discussion about constructionist epistemology. Psathas (1995) suggests:

- Order is a produced orderliness within the interaction.
• Order is produced by the parties *in situ*.

• The parties in the interaction will orient to that order themselves while constructing the interaction. The analyst observes this order within the talk rather than conceptualising it based upon preformed theoretical assumptions.

• Order is repeatable and recurrent.

• It is the analyst who must discover and describe the conversational order within the talk.

• The focus of analysis is upon describing the structures, procedures and mechanics of the talk-in-interaction that produce the order, rather than the frequency of their occurrence.

• Once discovered, these structures of social action, resulting from the talk-in-interaction (see Burr, 2000 earlier) can then be described in formal terms. These can include consistent, structural, organisational or logical terms.

While attending to the turn structure and the functions of the talk within the interaction, the researcher investigates the linguistic sequences within the talk and seeks to understand how they are produced, how they function and how they are managed within the conversation. Within talk there are a number of commonly occurring conversational structures. These will now be briefly discussed for the benefit of the reader. These are structures that, within the corpus of literature, have been repeatedly encountered and demonstrated across studies of interactional talk and are currently accepted as conversational conventions within everyday talk.

2.2.2.1 Adjacency Pairs

Adjacency pairs are paired turns of talk that conventionally come together (Hutchby & Wooffitt, 1999), although not always. For example question and answer, greeting and counter greeting. Harvey Sacks noted that the first part of the pairing will then require that the second part occurs. In order to ensure that the talk is able to function effectively, adjacency pairs must be ordered so that each part is clearly different from the other in it's function and that the first part requires the second part to occur (Silverman, 1998). Without adjacency pairings a conversation would quickly deteriorate into a monologue or a disorganised mess with all speakers talking over
each other. Adjacency pairs serve the function of allowing the speakers involved to manage the interaction so that it is effective.

Extract 2.2

1. A: Can I have a tea please
2. B: Yes

Extract 2.2 begins with participant A: who says 'can I have a tea please'. At the end of A:'s statement the intonation rises at the beginning of the word 'please'. This turn of talk is followed by participant B: who says 'yes'. The rising intonation at the end of A:'s statement could indicate an enquiry and indeed B:'s response shows that B: is orienting to A:'s statement as a question. Therefore, B: is completing this adjacency pairing with a response. Linguistically, A’s question in line 1 carries a clear request for a cup of tea. However, the issuing of the question also makes a requirement upon B to give an answer. For the interaction to be successful, B must orient to A’s statement as a question and by doing so must offer the requested second part to the pair (i.e. an answer). Here, there is no attempt being made to determine whether A:'s statement truly was a question but the concern is with how B: oriented to A:'s statement. This issue is picked up later in this sub-section.

Ordinarily adjacency pairs should occur sequentially in the talk. However, sometimes they do not and turns of talk will occur between the paired statements. These turns are called insertion sequences because they have been inserted into the conversation, and within a pairing, by one or more of the participants.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A:</th>
<th>Can I have a bottle of Mich?</th>
<th>Q1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>B:</td>
<td>Are you over twenty-one?</td>
<td>insertion 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>A:</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>insertion 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>B:</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>A1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In extract 2.3, the sequence of talk begins with participant A: who says 'can I have a bottle of Mich?'. This statement is followed by participant B: who says 'are you over twenty-one?'. In line 3, A: then says 'no' and B: then says 'no' in line 4. The rising intonation indicated by the question mark in line 1 suggests the first turn of a
question-answer pairing but it is responded to by B: with a question which is indicated by the rising intonation and by A:'s response of ‘no’ which shows A: to be orienting to it as a question. B: then makes a response to A:'s initial statement in line 1 and is orienting to it as a question. In this extract B:'s question in line 2 is not the response that might be expected to the initial question but A: accepts the insertion by responding to it in line 3 rather than restating the initial question. Once this inserted question answer pairing has been completed it can be seen that the initial question is responded to and so this pairing is completed. This shows that the conventions of interaction allow pairings to be delayed but it is likely that if the pairing had not been completed then difficulty would have arisen and the question may have been reissued to seek the required response.

2.2.2.2 Repair
Another important aspect to talk-in-interaction is how the participants manage situations where difficulty is encountered within the interaction. The term used within conversation analysis is ‘repair’. This can apply to a range of phenomena including errors in turn taking and corrections made by a speaker (Hutchby & Wooffitt, 1999). Repair may be initiated by the speaker or by another person and the person making the repair can direct it at themselves or at another. Repair can occur immediately within a turn of talk or later within the interaction. The function of repair is to ensure that the talk, and ultimately the interaction, is able to continue. Failure to repair difficulties may result in the interaction breaking down or struggling to continue successfully.

Extract 2.4 [GTS, 1, 37] cited in Schegloff (1992) (original transcription codes)

Dan: Well that's a little different from last week.
Louise: heh heh heh Yeah. We were in hysterics last week.
Dan: No, I mean Al.
Louise: Oh. He......


1 A: .h >Well< >you've< actually wro(t)- rung the wrong
2 number

Extract 2.4 shows an interaction between two individuals that demonstrates one type of repair. After Dan's initial statement Louise orients to it as a request for information
and she offers an account. However, Dan orients to Louise's statement as being incorrect by stating 'No' and then going on to explain 'I mean Al'. Here, Dan is repairing the interaction after Louise incorrectly oriented to Dan's initial statement. This extract demonstrates what Schegloff (1992) refers to as third position repair, because it occurs in the third turn within the sequence of talk, and in this case is repaired by the initial speaker. In this particular extract Louise's initial statement is referred to as the 'next turn repair initiator' (Hutchby & Wooffitt, 1999) because it initiates the need for repair within the interaction. In extract 2.5 the speaker A: can be seen to make self-repair within the turn of talk having begun to say 'wro' this is then corrected to 'rung'. The potential examples of repair structures are too numerous to provide examples of them all here but it is hoped that the above two extracts help to clarify this repair phenomena for the reader.

2.2.2.3 Turn Construction Units

Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson (1974) have presented a turn taking model of conversation. They noted that conversation involves: turn taking, one speaker talking at a time and turns being taken with minimal gap. The model suggests that turns are managed in various ways. Turns in talk are typically made up from 'turn construction units' (TCU's). Hutchby and Wooffitt (1999) state that a turn construction unit roughly corresponds to a statement or utterance but that ultimately they can only be defined by the speaker themselves when produced during the talk. They note that TCU's have two features: *projectibility* and *transition-relevance places*. Projectibility is defined as being the ability of the speaker to project to the recipient what sort of unit the construction unit is and also when it is likely to end. Transition-relevance places are points at the ends of turns of talk where it is possible and acceptable for another speaker to begin a new turn of talk. These enable to the flow of an interactional conversation to occur and this demonstrated in the extract below.


<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Rose: Why don't you come and see me sometimes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Bea: [I would</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>like to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Rose: I would like you to</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Here, the first statement by Rose is an invitation to Bea to visit and Bea recognises this before Rose finishes her statement. She acts to respond to the request and does so with her statement ‘I would like to’. This statement begins while Rose is still talking and there is a clear overlap in speech. Neither participant indicates that this overlap is at all problematic. In her statement in line 1, Rose has projected to Bea that the transition-relevance place will occur after the word ‘sometimes’ and Bea orients to this and initiates her turn of talk accordingly. On occasions where the recipient misunderstands the next projected transition-relevance place then this can present difficulty within the conversation and this will then need to be repaired (as discussed earlier) to maintain the interaction.

2.2.3 Conversation Analysis: practical applications

Conversation Analysis continues to evolve as an interdisciplinary field of investigation within the social sciences (Hutchby & Wooffitt, 1999). The practical applications can be said to extend to any area of social activity where individuals are interacting. Wherever talk-in-interaction needs to be investigated, conversation analysis can be used to yield a better understanding about how that interaction operates and how the participants manage the interaction. The outcomes can then be used for supporting the development of different and potentially better ways of interacting and managing situations where interactions take place.

Within clinical settings there have been many applications of conversation analysis. For example, Gardner (1997) utilised conversation analysis to study interactions between children with speech difficulties, their mothers and their speech therapists. Houtkoop-Steenstra (2000) has written extensively about her investigations into the use of standardised survey interviews with clinical and non-clinical populations. Further to this work, Antaki (1999) has explored the use of quality of life questionnaires with adults with learning disabilities (as already discussed in the Introduction section).

2.2.4 Criticisms of Conversation Analysis

As with any methodological approach aimed at investigating social phenomena, a number of criticisms have been levelled at conversation analysis.
Gill (2000) suggests that a potential criticism of conversation analysis is that these studies do not produce broad generalisations from the results and so question it's utility, for example, the findings cannot be generalised to a whole clinical population. However, supporters of conversation analysis, and indeed other constructionist approaches, would argue that this criticism is misplaced. The underlying constructionist epistemology requires that any analysis results in information and understanding that is by it’s very nature, specific and current to the interactive situation, rather than being generalisable. Further, as already discussed earlier in this section, the constructionist epistemology clashes with the idea that findings from a piece of research are reporting an underlying truth and so can be generalised to a greater population.

Criticism is also directed at the relatively small samples of data often used within conversation analysis. Critics suggest that this makes the data used for conversation analysis less representative of more global populations. Certainly, it would be appropriate for a conversation analytic study to utilise a single instance of an interview and the analysis would be focused upon that particular interview. Traditional realist approaches would require large pools of data that have been agreed through various forms of power analysis to ensure that the data can be considered to be representative. However, such a criticism again seems to misunderstand the constructionist epistemology behind conversation analysis (Gill, 2000). The constructionist approach is not concerned with the pursuit of uncovering an underlying truth. Neither is it concerned with developing an all-encompassing theory that has been grounded in and developed from the data. Rather, the epistemological position of conversation analysts supports the detailed analysis of discrete examples of talk for the purposes of understanding and describing that particular interaction. This is done with a view to building a description about how the interaction is constructed and managed through the talk in that given case rather than building a global theory about interactions. Once such a description has been it then contributes to a wealth of knowledge and ideas about interaction. However, the findings are not assumed to be a generalisable theory to account for all interactions. Any claims about generalisability must be demonstrated within the talk and by drawing upon the literature for supporting data.
Critics of conversation analysis may also question the amount of effort required to undertake the analysis. While data collection may be brief, the transcription and analysis of the transcripts can be extremely time consuming. Conversation analysis is by its very nature labor intensive during the analysis stage. However, proponents of the approach (e.g. Edwards & Potter, 1992) would argue that the benefits to be gained from the findings outweigh the methodological intensity.

Criticism could also be levelled at the fact that within an interaction such as a WAIS-III interview conversation analysis will only consider the talk that occurs. Yet, within human interaction non-verbal communication plays a fundamental part in how the interaction is managed. By its very nature, conversation analysis is concerned with the conversations between individuals but difficulty arises when attempting to record non-verbal communication for the purposes of analysis. One answer may be to video the interactions. However, the video camera will only record one perspective on the interaction and for an interview between two individuals there would need to be at least two cameras. It would then need to be ensured that all of the non-verbal gestures were recorded and analysed clearly. The complexities of undertaking such research could almost be prohibitive. Within the conversation analytic literature there has been little work investigating non-verbal communication. However, an interesting paper by Goodwin (2000) investigated the use of pointing as a form of non-verbal communication by a man with aphasia. Goodwin transcribed an interview with the man and included diagrammatic representations of his pointing within the text. While this work is crucially innovative, in terms of non-verbal communication it forms only the tip of the iceberg. Pointing is only one of a whole range of non-verbal communicative strategies that people use within interactions. A clear consideration to be made about non-verbal communication is that it ultimately becomes oriented to within the conversation by the participants and so it becomes verbal. As yet, there is no clear or agreed method for recording and analysing non-verbal communication although as demonstrated by Goodwin (2000) attempts are being made in this area. This current inability to take account of non-verbal communication is accepted as a potential criticism of conversation analysis.
2.2.5 *Why Conversation Analysis for this study?*

This study was concerned with investigating the interaction that takes place during a standardised assessment interview between a clinical psychologist and a person with a learning disability. More specifically, how the clinical psychologist managed this interaction. This was driven by the researchers previous experience of working with people with a learning disability and having administered standardised assessments during that work. The researcher also was interested in determining if clinical psychologists could be better informed about administering standardised assessments within such a client group. The researcher was interested in looking at the psychological mechanics of these interactions. He considered that more contextualist or interpretative methodologies such as grounded theory, would be focusing too much upon themes within the interaction, rather than the mechanics of the talk itself. Other qualitative methodologies were also considered but again, it was felt that they would attend to the data with the purpose of grounding it in order to generate a generalisable theory that could then be used to make predictions. This did not sit with the researchers constructionist epistemological position.

As outlined in the introduction chapter, the constructionist position holds the interaction between the participants as being the talk. The interaction is constructed and managed in the talk and the understanding and knowledge of the participants is constructed between them within the talk-in-interaction. It is the talk that brings about social action within the interaction. Therefore, to investigate the interaction between clinical psychologist and a person with a learning disability, the researcher chose conversation analysis. As described earlier in this chapter, conversation analysis is primarily concerned with describing the interaction between the participants as constructed through talk. This methodology was chosen because it would allow the researcher to effectively investigate and describe the interaction between the interviewer and interviewee during a standardised assessment interview. It would also allow the exploration of aspects of these interactions that are rarely considered but that may have significant impacts upon the outcomes of these assessments and more importantly the lives of the interviewees.

An outline of the procedure employed for this particular study will now be presented. During this a detailed account of the conversation analysis methodology will be given.
This will then be followed by a discussion about ensuring the quality of the data and the results obtained.

2.3 Research Design of The Present Study

2.3.1 Research design
For this study a conversation analysis approach was used and as already discussed, this was considered to be the most appropriate methodology. The interview transcripts were analysed using conversation analysis based upon the work of authors such as Potter and Wetherall (1992), Hutchby and Wooffitt (1999). In addition, advice was sought from members of the Discourse and Rhetoric Group based at Loughborough University. However, the author did also draw upon a variety of other texts for guidance on how to conduct the analysis, including regional and national workshops and training events.

2.3.2 The researcher
The researcher was a final year trainee clinical psychologist training at Leicester university. He had over four years of clinical experience as an assistant psychologist before beginning clinical training and most of his experience was in the field of learning disabilities. His clinical style follows systemic and person centred approaches. He would describe his epistemological position to be constructionist although not orientated to the more radical position adopted by some (e.g. Ian Parker).

Aside from the above, the researcher brings an interest in standardised assessment that stems from concerns about the current use of standardised assessments, particularly with learning disabled people. He is also concerned about how standardised assessments are developed and the realist epistemology underlying their construction and application. His interests are in seeking to ensure that such assessments are employed more constructively, and are used to enable clinicians to be more aware of factors that may impact upon the interviewee’s performance. Therefore, the researcher is hoping that this study will enable some explanation about this particular type of interaction that can be taken into consideration when considering the effect of the interaction between interviewer and interviewee on these assessments.
2.3.3 Participants
The participants in this study were qualified clinical psychologists (n=3) and service users who were being assessed by the clinical psychologists (n=3). The clinical psychologists were based within a Learning Disabilities service in the UK. The service users were all individuals who were over the age of 18 years, who were considered to have learning difficulties and who had been referred to the psychology department with a request that a formal assessment of their cognitive functioning be conducted.

2.3.4 Materials
- SONY TCM-40DV Cassette-Corder
- SONY ECM-F9 table top microphone
- SANYO Transcription machine
- TDK IEC1/TYP1 FE90 cassettes
- MAXELL IEC/TYP1 UR120 cassettes

2.3.5 Procedure
This section will discuss the recruitment of participants, the collection of the interview data used for analysis and the procedure for analysis itself. It will also discuss issues relating to the validity and reliability of the analysis and will discuss various ways that this has been assured. Following this, there will be discussion about the ethical issues encountered in relation to planning and conducting this study.

2.3.5.1 Recruitment
The recruitment of service users began in November 2002. All of the service users interviewed were selected by the clinical psychologists during department referral allocation meetings. Allocation meetings were monthly meetings where referrals to the service were discussed by the psychology team. The discussion would focus upon whether the referral was appropriate, what the work might involve, who would be best suited to providing the work and so on. It is within this meeting that any referral requesting a cognitive assessment was considered by the team. The team would decide whether there was a genuine clinical need to conduct such an assessment and they would decide whether there was a need to conduct a WAIS-III interview as part
of such an assessment. A clinician would then agree to accept the referral and would contact the referrer. It was at this stage that there would also be discussion about whether this service user could be a potential participant in the study, based upon the information they currently held about the service user.

Following this process, any referral that satisfied these criteria where the clinician was also willing to take part in being interviewed, was then considered to be appropriate for the clinician to approach for inclusion in the study. It is important to stress that the researcher was not involved in participant selection in any way except for having provided initial guidance to the department. The reason for this was that the researcher was aiming to capture the realities of typical and naturally occurring assessment situations in this particular department.

2.3.5.2 Exclusion criteria
The desire to capture typical assessment situations resulted in very few exclusion criteria being applied to the selection of service users for inclusion in the study. It was agreed that participants would be individuals who had been referred to the service for a cognitive assessment and that this assessment should include the administration of the Weschler Adult Intelligence Scales Third edition (WAIS-III). Potential participants were to be excluded if it was considered by the clinical psychologist conducting the assessment that they were no longer suitable for assessment using the WAIS-III. Also, potential participants were to be excluded if English was not their first language or if there was a need to have an interpreter present during the assessment. This was done on the grounds that it could present difficulties for the analysis of the interview conversation as the interviewer and interviewee would be interacting with the interpreter and not orienting to each other’s exact turns of talk. All other WAIS-III interviews, complete or incomplete, were considered acceptable.

2.3.5.3 Obtaining consent
Once a potential participant was identified the clinical psychologist would introduce the study to the client. This was supported by the use of ‘clinician’ and ‘client’ information sheets (see appendices 2 & 3). The ‘client information sheet’ had been adapted to incorporate clearer text and pictures to enhance communication. The client was encouraged to ask questions of the clinician and the clinician was encouraged to
contact the researcher if they wished to ask any questions themselves. Then, consent would be obtained from both the participant and the clinical psychologist for the tape recording of the WAIS-III assessment interview(s). This was done using written consent forms to be signed (see appendices 4 & 5). Where a client was unable to sign their own name it was agreed that a third person would witness verbal consent being given and then would sign the form to that effect.

2.3.5.4 Data collection

The interviews were tape-recorded using a cassette recorder and table top microphone that was operated by the clinical psychologist during the interview(s). Once the interviews were completed the cassettes were stored in a locked cabinet within the psychology department to await collection by the researcher.

2.3.5.5 Feedback of results

In terms of providing feedback to those involved the researcher was keen to offer service users and the psychologists the option of having a copy of the audio-taped interview they participated in as a personal copy to keep. They were also offered the option of having a copy of the transcription from their interview, although they were advised that due to the complexity of the transcription coding this might make it difficult to understand. One service user requested a copy of their audio-taped interview.

The researcher also presented the option for psychologists and service users to request a meeting with the researcher to discuss the study further. This was taken up by one service user who requested a meeting after having had their interview audio-taped and this meeting was provided.

In terms of feeding back the results of this study a number of routes have been agreed. Firstly, it has already been arranged that following submission of this research, the researcher will be returning to the psychology department to present back the findings that have been submitted. The researcher has also agreed to meet with the clinical director of the learning disabilities service to present the findings back to her. In terms of feeding the results back to the service users the researcher has made no specific plans to do so due to the aim of remaining distant from the participants themselves.
Instead, the clinical psychologists will be invited to provide feedback to those they interviewed at their discretion. The researcher will also be happy to meet with any of the participants to discuss the results should they request such a meeting.

2.3.6 Ethical issues

Ethical approval for this study was granted by the Leicestershire Research Ethics Committee on 1st March 2002 (see appendix 1). When planning and submitting the proposal for the study a number of ethical issues were considered. Firstly, the nature of the study is such that the data is formed from authentic clinical assessment interviews. These are assessments that would be conducted regardless of whether the study was taking place. Therefore, it was considered important to make sure that the protocol for data collection presented as little disruption to the assessment process as possible. Discussion with the clinicians involved led to the decision that they would take the lead in seeking consent, operating the recording equipment and that the researcher would remain as detached as possible from the clinical environment.

A second ethical issue that was considered was the nature of the individuals being interviewed. There was an ever present risk that the service users may agree to their interview being recorded for reasons other than simply wanting to take part in the study. For example, it was possible that the service users may misunderstand that any clinical help would be dependant upon taking part or wanting to please the clinicians. Issues around understanding the nature of the research and the conditions around giving consent are highlighted by Arscott, Dagnan and Stenfert Kroese (1998). In an effort to minimise such risks it was emphasised on the information sheets that any clinical support was not contingent in any way upon participation in the study. The clinical psychologists were encouraged to actively emphasise this and it was made clear to them that if they held any doubt about the participants motivations for taking part in the study then they should err on the side of caution and exclude the person. During the research process, one of the clinical psychologists raised the issue that it could be difficult to exclude someone on those grounds if they had already consented to take part as it could be damaging to their self-esteem. It was agreed that in these cases the clinician would need to advocate in the best interests of their client by ensuring that their ability to perform effectively in the assessment situation wasn’t affected by either being withdrawn or included in the study.
A further ethical issue related to the participant's ability to understand the purpose of the study (Arscott et al., 1998). Again, efforts were made to ensure that this was clearly explained both verbally and in visual form. While the study would be in no way harmful to someone who didn't understand its purpose, the clinical psychologists were asked to make a clinical judgement about whether the service user should be excluded from the study, taking into account the issues raised earlier.

Upon reflection, the researcher was happy that any potential ethical concerns were addressed within the research protocol and through discussion with the clinical psychologists prior to and during the course of the study. This belief was confirmed by ethical approval being obtained from the Leicestershire Research Ethics Committee.

2.4 Data Management Procedures

2.4.1 Transcription

When conducting this type of research the audiotaped interviews need to be converted into a manageable medium. Potter and Wetherall (1992) stress that the importance and difficulty of transcription is usually underestimated. A good transcription is fundamental to the analysis in two ways. Firstly, it provides the basis for the analysis of the talk to take place. Secondly, the process of transcription itself constitutes a distinctive stage in the data analysis (Hutchby & Wooffitt, 1999). However, Hutchby and Wooffitt (1999) also note that the transcripts are not 'the data' but merely a way of managing the data that is the audio taped records.

A major feature of transcription is the length of time it can take. This is dependent upon the detail that the researcher wishes to use and this will be driven to some extent by the methodology being employed. For example, grounded theory may require less detailed transcription than conversation analysis where timed pauses, intonation and other aspects to the talk, beyond the words themselves, are sources of information used in the analysis.

For conversation analysis, Hutchby and Wooffitt (1999) note that the researcher should aim to encapsulate two features in their transcripts. Firstly, they must
endeavour to capture the dynamics of the turn taking. This would be the pauses, words used, ends and beginnings of the turns of talk, breaths. Secondly, the researcher should seek to capture the speech delivery with these being the speed, intonation, and pitch of the speech. It can be seen that there are likely to be numerous ways that a piece of talk could be transcribed and that it will not be possible to capture every aspect of the conversation. It is for this reason that there can never be a truly neutral transcription system (Hutchby & Wooffitt, 1999). Different researchers will attend to different aspects of a piece of talk when transcribing it. Ochs (1979, cited in Hutchby & Wooffitt, 1999) states that transcription is ‘a selective process reflecting theoretical goals and definitions’.

Within the field of conversation analysis there is a generally agreed system for coding phenomena within the talk. This is a series of symbols and codes devised by Gail Jefferson (Sacks, Schegloff & Jefferson, 1974). This study will use the Jeffersonian transcription codes for the interview data. Within the conversation analysis literature there doesn’t appear to be one universally agreed transcription system in use, however, in the interests of working towards a degree of consistency, the Jeffersonian system has been used for this study, as it is the most commonly used within the conversation analysis literature. A full transcription key is provided in appendix six. The extracts of data drawn from the literature will be reproduced as they appear in the literature and in some cases those authors may have used different codes or symbols. Where necessary, these codes and symbols will be clarified within the text accompanying the extract.

2.4.1.1 The Transcription Process

For this study the transcription of the interview data was carried out in three stages by the author. For the benefit of the reader a sample extract from one of the interviews will be used to demonstrate the three stages of transcription that were undertaken in order to eventually arrive at the completed transcripts.

Initially, the audio-tapes were listened to and the words were transcribed as spoken. The words were written turn by turn, so that a new line was started when a new speaker began talking or when a new piece of talk was started. Where there were noticeable or even lengthy pauses, or where there were other features on the tape such
as external sounds then these were placed on a new line. In addition, real names were changed for the purposes of confidentiality. To maintain information about the gender of the speaker and to retain the flow and structure of the talk, names were replaced with gender appropriate names of the same number of syllables. So, for example David would have been replaced with Peter, or Harriet with Stephanie. Extract 2.7 below is a sample of text from an interview and it is presented in the format it would have been transcribed initially.

Extract 2.7 [1A / PC / Oct 2002 / Dec 2002]

578 Phil: ehm designate
579 Steven: disinate desi
580 Phil: de-designate
581 Steven: dunno what that means dizzy
582 Phil: dizzy
583 Steven: does it mean dizzy
584 Phil: eh-
585 Phil: do you know what reluctant means
586 Phil: no and do you know what a colony is
587 Steven: no

After this stage the tape was listened to again and the pauses and silences were timed using a stopwatch. Convention varies about timings and signifying the lengths of pauses. In this study, pauses and silences were timed down to 0.2 of a second. The distinction of 0.2 seconds was decided upon following Hutchby and Wooffitt (1999) who make reference to transcription timings generally being taken to 0.2 of one second as it is difficult to accurately time any shorter periods of time without sophisticated computer packages. In addition, reading of transcription in the literature repeatedly showing usage of 0.2 second timings. Pauses or silences that were noticeable but shorter than 0.2 of a second were indicated by a full stop within brackets. Also, other aspects of the speed of speech were added such as where speech was quicker than the surrounding talk or where sounds were lengthened noticeably.

Extract 2.8 below shows the same talk presented in extract 2.7 but with the timings and pauses included. The timings are presented in brackets and as mentioned above, brief silences are indicated by (.) as in line 581. Faster speech is indicated by the use of > < markers as in line 581. Where sounds were lengthened then this is shown by
the use of one or more colons after the letter with multiple colons indicating longer sounds. The sound being lengthened is underscored along with the colons as seen with the word ‘ehm:’ in line 578.

Extract 2.8 [1A / PC / Oct 2002 / Dec 2002]

578 Phil: ehm: (1.0) designate
579 Steven: disinate desi
580 Phil: de- designate
581 Steven: >dunno what that means< (. ) dizzy
582 Phil: dizzy
583 Steven: does it mean dizzy
584 (1.0)
585 Phil: eh-
586 (2.2)
587 Phil: do you know what reluctant means
588 (2.4)
589 Phil: no (1.2) and (1.0) do you know what a colony is
590 Steven: no

Finally, notation regarding the pitch, intonation and volume were then added. This was to give much more colour and depth to the text. It would also make it easier to determine how words or sections of talk were being used. For example, being able to see how a word sounds and to determine whether it has rising intonation at the end, which may suggest an enquiry, or whether the word is being whispered or shouted. Extract 2.9 shows the same section of interview as in extract 2.8 but now with the notations added.

Extract 2.9 [1A / PC / Oct 2002 / Dec 2002]

578 Phil: ehm: (1.0) designate
579 Steven: disinate desi
580 Phil: de- designate
581 Steven: >dunno what that means< (. ) dizzy
582 Phil: dizzy
583 Steven: does it mean dizzy
584 (1.0)
585 Phil: eh-
586 (2.2)
It can be seen in extract 2.9 that the text itself becomes more difficult to read, with words and sentences being split by notational symbols. However, in this third extract the structural aspects of the speech are clearer and the conversation in extract 2.9 is more detailed and clearly different than extract 2.7 where it would be possible to read the lines of text in different ways and to see them carrying different meanings. There is less ambiguity about the structure and flow of the conversation in extract 2.9.

The above process was applied to three complete WAIS-III interviews totalling over five hours of audio-tape. This took the researcher over 100 hours to fully transcribe.

2.4.2 Analysis of the transcripts

This part of the methodology section will now outline the analysis that took place within this study. It will lead the reader through the analysis process from transcription. Following this discussion there will then be discussion about how the researcher sought to ensure the quality of the data and the findings drawn from the data. This will be presented in light of the analytic procedure that was undertaken.

Authors within the field of conversation analysis (e.g. Potter & Wetherall, 1992) are keen to stress that there is not a prescriptive ‘manual’ of how to do conversation analysis. Rather, Schenkein (1978, cited in Hutchby & Wooffitt, 1999), talks about having a ‘conversation analytic mentality’ and Psathas (1995) talks about ‘unmotivated looking’. The researcher must aim to approach the transcripts with an open mind about what might be interesting about the data. However, the researcher is also likely to be aware of the conversation analytic literature and the commonly reported structures and phenomena within that literature. Ten Have (2000) notes that while viewing the transcripts openly, the researcher is also able to access the literature to draw upon work that may help to explain or normatively describe the phenomenon being explored.
In this study the researcher has drawn heavily from the conversation analysis literature, as already mentioned, in order to guide the analytic process. In particular the work of Hutchby and Wooffitt (1999) and Potter and Weatherall (1992) have been consulted.

2.4.2.1 Building a collection of the phenomenon for analysis
During the transcription stage the researcher began reading the completed transcripts for any phenomena that appeared to be of interest. At this stage, the researcher made notes within his research log to keep a record of these phenomena. While doing this, the researcher actively worked to return to the text in the spirit of unmotivated looking. This method continued through the entire transcription phase. Once the final interview had been transcribed the researcher reviewed his notes and began reading through the completed interview transcripts, again allowing interest to develop in any sequences, turns or other items of the talk. Hutchby and Wooffitt (1999) talk about various ways that conversation analysis can be conducted upon data. They suggest that a researcher may build a collection of a recurring phenomenon or the researcher may choose to focus upon a single example of a phenomenon in the data.

During the transcription phase in the present study, the researcher became interested in responses to questions and more particularly in the occasions where the interviewee responded to a question with ‘don’t know’. From initial reading of the transcripts it appeared that such a response could be problematic within the talk and could have different outcomes. For example, it may have been difficult to code within the WAIS-III scoring criteria, or it may introduce failure within the interaction. A collection of the ‘don’t know’ responses was assembled and, in total, fourteen instances were found.

The researcher soon became aware that twelve of these extracts came from one of the three WAIS-III interviews and one interview had yielded no ‘don’t know’ statements. At this point the decision was taken to include the responses of ‘I don’t know’ and ‘dunno’. When reading the transcripts the response of ‘I don’t know’ was seen to be linguistically the same as ‘don’t know’ but with the personal pronoun ‘I’ preceding it. Therefore, these responses were included into the data set. In terms of the ‘dunno’ responses, within the literature, Scheibman (2000) in a study of American-english
conversations suggested that 'dunno' is a reduction of 'don't know'. In addition, when reading the transcripts the 'dunno' responses appeared to be linguistically similar to responses of 'don't know'.

Despite the reasons offered for including the 'dunno' and 'I don't know' responses, the researcher was aware that part of the data analysis would require him to account for how the different responses are used within the interaction and the actions they perform. In relation to the work by Schreibman (2000) this work was conducted using American-English conversation whereas the current study will be using British-English talk. Therefore, it is not acceptable to merely assume that her findings will carry to the talk in this study. Instead, the suggestion that 'dunno' is a reduction of 'don't know' will need to be demonstrated within the talk. Including the 7 'I don't know' instances and the 6 'dunno' instances the collection then comprised of 27 extracts of talk drawn from all three interviews. As with the 'don't know' statements the researcher was interested in how these responses are oriented to with the talk due to their potentially problematic impact upon the interaction. In addition, how these responses may be similar or different in their actions within the talk.

Each example of talk was extracted from the transcripts along with the surrounding turns of talk. This was done by locating the statement and then tracking back to where the previous sequence of talk ended. The researcher then also tracked forward from the statement to where the sequence of talk appeared to end and a new sequence was introduced by one of the participants. Due to the volume of data being analysed the extracts were grouped into three sets based upon the wording of the statement: 'don't know', 'I don't know', 'dunno'. This was done to make the data easier to manage before the detailed analysis began and this is explained in more detail in the results chapter.

2.4.2.2 Examining the turns of talk

Each extract was then analysed individually. The researcher took each extract and began investigating and explaining the turns of talk and their sequential significance within the talk-in-interaction. The aim was to explain the conversation structures and conventions within the interaction, and more specifically, to explain each turn of talk by determining it's function within the interaction and to explain how the participants
oriented to it. To do this, the researcher needed to employ the ‘next turn proof procedure’ as described by Hutchby and Wooffitt (1999) and originally discussed by Harvey Sacks (Silverman, 1998). This technique was fundamental to this stage of the analysis. The ‘next turn proof procedure’ will be discussed in greater detail in section 2.5.2 when issues of quality are discussed. However, briefly, it involves the researcher discussing and describing a turn of talk and then testing any claims about a piece of talk by looking to the next turn of talk to see how the participant orients to the turn under discussion. It also enables the researcher to avoid making assumptions about the turns of talk based upon misunderstandings about the talk or being influenced by his/her own assumptions about the interaction (Hutchby & Wooffitt, 1999).

Finally, having described each extract in this way and summarised the actions occurring within the interaction and how this was being managed, the researcher considered where commonalities existed between extracts either in the structure of the talk or in the action being performed. The researcher was interested in exploring how these responses were managed differently and sought to understand why these differences occurred. The researcher was also interested in exploring the actions that such responses would generate within the interaction. In addition, he was interested in exploring where difficulties arose within the interaction as a result of these responses and how both participants managed this in order that the interview interaction could be maintained.

In summary, the above outlined analysis procedure was applied to the transcripts in this study and the outcome of such analysis is provided in the following results section. Before proceeding to that section it is important that the issues of validity and reliability are considered. To do so, after a brief discussion about validity and reliability a number of mechanisms for ensuring this will be presented.

2.5 Ensuring Data Quality

2.5.1 Quality Issues

Over recent years within social science research, there have been increasing discussions about how to evaluate the reliability and validity of research not falling within more traditional realist epistemological positions (e.g. Henwood & Pidgeon,
1992). Any form of research must be able to account for the quality of its outcomes and findings but Madill, Jordan and Shirley (2000) note that for conversation analysis the concepts of reliability and validity must be understood differently than from the realist position. Within the conversation analytic literature various ways of ensuring the quality of research findings are presented. This study has drawn heavily upon the strategies outlined by Hutchby and Wooffitt (1999), amongst others, and how data quality was ensured within the present study will now be discussed.

2.5.2 Next turn proof procedure

One of the aims of conversation analysis is to focus upon the production and interpretation of talk within interaction as an orderly accomplishment that involves the participants orienting to the turns of talk within the interaction (Hutchby & Wooffitt, 1999). Therefore, the analysis of talk-in-interaction must be concerned with the actual turns of the interaction and should not be concerned with the researchers assumptions about the interaction (Potter & Weatherall, 1992). As mentioned earlier, the 'next turn proof procedure', as described by Hutchby and Wooffitt (1999) is an analytic tool for explaining and making sense of a speaker's utterance by the ways that other participants in the interaction orient to it. This involves considering the turn of talk that follows. This procedure is fundamental to the analysis in this study so it will be explained by use of an example of transcript. The extract used for this explanation is reproduced from Hutchby and Wooffitt (1999) in their account of the 'next turn proof procedure' as it very neatly makes the procedure clear.


<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Mother:</td>
<td>Do you know who's going to that meeting?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Russ:</td>
<td>Who?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Mother:</td>
<td>I don't know!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Russ:</td>
<td>Oh probably Mr Murphy and Dad and Mrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>Timpte an' some of the teachers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In line 1 in the above statement by Mother, it would be possible to read the statement in two ways. It could be seen as a genuine request for information or it could be seen as a pre-information statement (Hutchby & Wooffitt, 1999). Both understandings about the functions of the statement are different and would be based in the assumptions and speculations of the person reading the statement. The nature of the
actions that the statement would be expected to perform would require different responses from other participants in the interaction. A genuine question would action for Russ to provide information about who is actually going to the meeting whereas a pre-information statement would action for Russ to enquire about who is going (Hutchby & Wooffitt, 1999).

The ‘next turn proof procedure’ would now require that the next turn of talk be considered. This would allow the researcher to understand how the participant oriented to the statement and not how the speaker might have intended the statement to be heard. As already discussed, the focus of conversation analysis needs to be upon how the participants in the interaction orient to the turns of talk and not the suspected meaning behind a turn of talk. In this extract the next turn of talk, in line 2, shows Russ to be making the utterance ‘who?’. This shows him to be orienting to Mother’s statement as a pre-information statement. However, to test this the researcher would then proceed to the next turn of talk which in this case, in line 3, shows Mother to be saying ‘I don’t know!’. Here, she is demonstrating that Russ misunderstood her initial statement. This turn of talk is then followed, in line 4, by Russ providing a list of people who may be attending the meeting. By making this statement Russ is now orienting to Mother’s second statement as difficulty in the interaction and he is making an attempt to repair the interaction by providing the second part of the originally intended adjacency pairing begun in line 1.

This extract demonstrates the utility of the ‘next turn proof procedure’ in understanding how the participants in the interaction are orienting to the turns of talk without the need for the researcher to make assumptions.

2.5.3 Internal Coherence

This is concerned with ensuring that the argument being made by the researcher is a coherent and consistent one (Smith, 2000). So, for example are all the loose ends within the data accommodated within the researchers argument? Smith (2000) notes that while contradictions within the data may be of value, the researcher should seek to manage them in a coherent way by clearly explaining them. This can be assisted by clear and total presentation of evidence to support the argument. In the case of conversation analysis the researcher should present extracts from the transcripts to
support the claims being made about the actions being performed within the talk. The reader should be given the opportunity to interact with the data themselves in order to fully understand the researchers argument and conclusions. Validation by the reader is a strategy recommended by Potter (1996). Considering the above suggestions Drew (1995) notes that conversation analysis already requires the researcher to adopt such strategies and so it can be argued that conversation analysis has good validity.

2.5.4 Deviant case analysis
A deviant case is defined as being an extract of data or findings from an interaction that fails to fit with an emerging explanation of how a feature of interaction is performed. A deviant case, for example, may be that during a sequence of talk, a question is typically followed by a response, yet, in a deviant case a question is followed by a change in the topic of talk. This case could then be used constructively to explore the mechanisms within the emerging pattern of interaction as well as contributing to an alternative explanation of how questions may be oriented to. Ten Have (2000) notes that deviant cases may be used by researchers to challenge their emerging theory in order to ensure that the account is able to explain exceptions.

2.5.5 Transparency
Potter (1996) has suggested that one effective way to evaluate the quality of a conversation analytic study is through evaluation by the reader. For this to happen effectively, the reader must be able to fully understand all aspects of the study. Therefore, the researcher must be clear and open about how the study was conducted. The researcher must allow the reader to know all aspects of the research design, process and findings. In terms of the results of a study, the reader must be able to follow the researchers line of discussion and to understand the researchers explanations for phenomena.

2.5.6 Generalisability
Within quantitative methodology generalisability is common, with research findings being generalised to wider populations. In fact, generalisability is typically a requirement. However, this is not necessarily the case for conversation analytic research. Lincoln and Guba (1985) advocate talking in terms of ‘transferability’ instead. Within conversation analysis, the researcher should present research findings
as being an empirical account of their analysis but with the aim of adding to the body of conversation analytic literature. Other researchers should then take those findings and attempt to apply them in different contexts without an assumption that they will unquestionably be generalisable. In other words, the researcher can make a claim that their theory about interaction within one setting might be true of another setting but any more firm claims should be supported by evidence within the talk or from literature. This links with the earlier comments about transparency and maintaining clear and detailed records of the research process.

To summarise validity and reliability, they need to be considered differently within conversation analysis and the issues can crudely be summarised as the researcher needing to clearly record and make available all aspects of the study so that it can be openly scrutinised by the reader. When reading conversation analytic studies it needs to be reinforced that constructionist research seeks to explain phenomena, not predict them (Madill, 2000).

2.5.7 Reflexivity

Reflexivity is described by King (2000) as being a complex concept that is integrally linked with conversation analytic research methodology. It was described by Mead (1934, cited in King, 2000) as being 'the turning back of the experience of the individual upon her- himself' (p134). Pels (2000) describes it as the way that texts take into account 'their own manufacturing conditions' (p 6). He goes on to suggest that when a researcher writes a paper or report they are also writing something about themselves. From the above account, writing a paper can be seen as a complex series of social interactions between the researcher, the data and the reader and these interactions are being constructed on the page. In this way, the text is subject to the same aspects of social construction and social action as talk-in-interaction, as discussed during the introduction chapter.

Pels (2000) has suggested that the circular nature of reflexivity and how the process is potentially endless. This aspect to reflexivity has led to the criticism that constructionist researchers may become too self indulgent (Silverman, 1998). Indeed, the idea of reflexivity being a circular process then begs the question of when to stop when working within the practical constraints of conducting research. Potter and
Wetherall (1992) suggest that, “the most practical way of dealing with this issue is to simply get on with it, and not to get paralysed by or caught up in the infinite regresses possible” (p182).

Within a research study, such as the present study, a reflexive approach requires that the researcher closely examine their assumptions, values and past experiences and that they consider how they may be impacting upon the research process. In other words the researcher needs to ensure that the analysis is concerned with the discourse itself rather than issues or values being imposed by the researcher (Potter, 1991).

Within this study, reflexivity has been considered as an ongoing process with the researcher being aware about his influences on the whole research process, from the conception of the research idea through to the analysis and the discussion of the results. One way that this was facilitated was through the use of a research journal. The researcher recorded ideas, comments, observations, concerns and other issues that arose during the research as well as ideas about the data and other aspects of the analysis. Initial interests in how the questions were being answered within subtests then shifted to consider when correct or incorrect responses were given and the interactional difficulties that arose. As the researcher proceeded his focus of interest moved towards occasions where the interviewee was unable to offer what the interviewer considered to be an acceptable response and how these were managed. Ultimately, this became an interest in the phenomenon of where the interviewee responded with 'don't know', 'I don't know' and 'dunno'. Throughout the present study the researcher sought to be reflexive and this was facilitated by use of the log book but also through peer and research supervision where he was encouraged to explore values and beliefs he might be bringing to the analysis through his interaction with the data.
3 Results

3.1 Chapter Overview

This results section will begin by briefly outlining the phenomenon chosen for analysis. It will then proceed to present each and every example of this phenomenon existing within the transcripts. Each extract will be considered individually and will be analysed using the conversation analysis methodology as outlined earlier in the methodology section. The location of the phenomenon within the text will be discussed along with its relationship to the surrounding turns of talk. How the participants within the interaction orient to each other's turns of talk will also be considered and these observations will be used to explore how the phenomenon is managed within the standardised WAIS-III assessment situation. The literature will be drawn upon to demonstrate and support the claims being made. Also, as the results section progresses there will be occasions where it is appropriate to draw attention to similarities between particular extracts.

3.2 Phenomenon for analysis

As discussed in the methodology section, the researcher has chosen to analyse occasions where the interviewee uses the statements: 'don't know', 'I don't know' and 'dunno' in response to questions during the WAIS-III interview. As already outlined in the methodology section, these phenomena were selected as being interesting aspects of the talk and reasons for their selection where given in sub-section 2.4.2.1. Structurally, all three types of response appeared to be the same and might indeed be considered to be the same utterance, yet from the initial reading of the transcripts they could be seen to be oriented to in differing ways within the talk and as already discussed in the methodology chapter, all three statements were not used by the three interviewees. Having experience of administering standardised assessments including the WAIS-III the researcher was also aware that statements such as 'don't know', 'I don't know' or 'dunno' could sometimes introduce difficulty into the interaction for the interviewer who may not always know how best to manage such an utterance.

The results section will now consider each occasion where 'don't know', 'I don't know' and 'dunno' is used by the interviewee. To provide a degree of structure to the results section the extracts will be considered within three subsections and these
subsections will be further sub-divided where necessary. However, these groupings are in some ways arbitrary and there are also similarities between extracts in different groups, as will become apparent.

The researcher also acknowledges that due to the volume of data, the results section is large and somewhat cumbersome to read. However, the current format of the results section was deemed to be the most accessible for the presentation and description of the data.

3.3 Occasions where ‘don’t know’ is used

Once the ‘don’t know’ statements were identified and collected from the transcripts a collection of 14 such instances were identified. Each instance of ‘don’t know’ was extracted from the transcript within the context of the turns of talk occurring before and after it. These extracts have been grouped into five collections: ‘When don’t know leads to a new question being asked’, ‘When don’t know is followed by changes in the way that information is requested’ and ‘When don’t know is explicitly receipted’.

3.3.1 When Don’t Know leads to a new question being asked


110 Paula: on what continent is Brazil
111 (4.4)
112 → Catherine: don’t know
113 (4.0)
114 Paula: who was Martin Luther King
115 (1.8)


471 Paula: okay (0.2) why should people pay taxes
472 (7.2)
473 → Catherine: mm: (1.2) don’t know
474 (6.2)
475 Paula: can you tell me some reasons it’s important to study
476 history

Extract 3.3 [2A / PC / Nov 2002 / Jan 2003]

273 Paula: ehm: () what does compassion () mean
274 (5.4)
275 → Catherine: don’t know
To begin with extract 3.1, this sequence of talk starts with Paula making the statement ‘on what continent is Brazil’ (line 110). This statement is followed by a silence for 4.4 seconds (line 111) and there is then an utterance from Catherine of ‘don’t know’ (line 112). Catherine’s response of ‘don’t know’ suggests that she has oriented to Paula’s statement as a request for information and she is responding by indicating that she doesn’t know. At this stage it is not possible to determine the function of Catherine’s response. It maybe that Catherine does indeed not know the answer or it maybe that Catherine is doing something else within the interaction. This section of interaction forms an adjacency pairing as described by Schegloff and Sacks (1973). An adjacency pairing is a commonly occurring feature of interaction. To briefly remind the reader, these pairings are described by Schegloff and Sacks (1973) as being turns of talk where one turn of talk actions a paired turn of talk. For example, a question will action a response from the other participant in the interaction and difficulty occurs when the pairing isn’t completed. Extract 3.4 presented below shows such a pairing.


H: What time will you be finished
X: Lecture finishes at about quarter past twelve

In the above the second line given by X is a presentation of information that is being given in response to the initial request issued by participant H. It has been argued by Tsui (1994) that this interaction represents an adjacency pairing of an information seeking question with a response. This is shown by X orienting to H’s statement as an information seeking question by providing information.

Returning to extract 3.1, Catherine’s statement in line 112 is followed by a silence for 4.0 seconds following Catherine’s response. Then Paula issues a new statement ‘who was Martin Luther King’. This statement begins with ‘who’ and can be seen as a new request for information. As already mentioned, lines 110 to 112 demonstrate a
question-answer adjacency pair as described by Schegloff and Sacks (1973). The interesting aspect to this sequence is the lack of a third turn receipt by Paula in line 114. Instead she issues a new request for information. Heritage (1984) notes that often answers to questions are receipted in order that a given function can be achieved. Different receipt tokens will serve different functions but Houtkoop-Steenstra (2000) comments that within standardised assessment settings the receipt will ideally be neutral such as ‘okay’ or ‘I see’ as this avoids a judgement being offered to the interviewee. A receipt will take the third turn of talk and it can then indicate the closing of the prior sequence and the initiation of another (Ten Have, 2000). In place of a receipt the interviewer may keep silent or use a continuer. Both of these can be interpreted as suggesting that the answer given was not clear, incomplete or inappropriate and serve the function of eliciting additional information.

It is noticeable that Catherine does not add any additional information to her answer. Here, Paula is orienting to the silence as a device for closing the sequence of talk and this is supported when she makes the statement ‘who was Martin Luther King’ (line 114) as the beginning of a new sequence of talk. The silence (line 113) and the new sequence of talk demonstrate how Paula is orienting to the ‘don’t know’ within the interaction. It is only possible to comment that Paula is orienting to Catherine’s ‘don’t know’ statement as an answer to the request for information. This is interesting when the raising intonation at the end of Catherine’s statement is considered. Rising intonation at the end of a sentence is typically seen in questions (Ten Have, 2000) yet Paula doesn’t orient to it as such. Here, Paula has oriented to ‘don’t know’ as an acceptable answer to the question.

In extract 3.2 this sequence begins with Paula’s statement in line 471. She begins with ‘okay’ which after a brief silence is then followed by ‘why should people pay taxes’ (line 471). There is a silence for 7.2 seconds and then Catherine takes the next turn of talk with the statement ‘mm (1.2) don’t know’ (line 473). Here, Catherine is orienting to Paula’s statement as a request for information. Paula initially is preparing Catherine for the presentation of a new turn of talk with her ‘okay’ in line 471 and then the question is issued. This question - answer adjacency pairing is similar to that seen in extract 3.1. Catherine’s ‘don’t know’ response is preceded by ‘mm’. This could be seen as Catherine orienting to the role of interviewee and so demonstrating to Paula that she is thinking about her response before making it. However, from the
surrounding turns of talk it is not possible to prove this suggestion. What can be seen is that Catherine’s statement of ‘mm (1.2) don’t know’ is followed by a silence for 6.2 seconds before Paula then makes a statement in lines 475 & 476. Here, Paula is issuing a new request for information. This shows her to be orienting to Catherine’s statement as an acceptable response to her question. It may be that she is also orienting to Catherine’s ‘mm’ as indicating her having attempted to give the required response. Yet, the above adjacency pairing is similar to that seen in extract 3.1 where ‘don’t know’ is a stand-alone response.

At this stage it is worth commenting on the pauses within this and the previous extract. In naturally occurring conversation the usual time between turns of talk is about 1.0 seconds (Jefferson, 1989, cited in Ten Have, 2000). However, Houtkoop-Steenstra (2000) comments that this does not apply to interview situations. She has reported that silences could be of much greater than 1.0 second and that they serve various functions within the interview interaction. The following extract is taken from Houtkoop-Steenstra (2000) and it demonstrates a number of these strategies.


(Original transcription codes)
1  R:  Jacks (.) Refrigeration
2   →  (5.2) ((typing))
3  I:  .hh what kind of business or industry is this?
4  (0.6)
5  R:  uh:::'s a refrigeration (.) company
6  (1.6)
7  I:  :hh would that be for retail sale wholesale or manufacturing?
8  (0.8)
9  R:  uh::: retail
10  →  (4.0) ((typing))
11  I:  and (.) what particular products do they sell would that be a refrigerator?
12  R:  uh: n- air conditioning (.) uh
13  (1.5)
14  and refrigeration
15  (0.7)
16  repair products
17  →  (13.5) ((typing))
18  I:  .hh alright and your believe you said
The above extract is useful in demonstrating the point to be made. In the extract, there are a number of lengthy silences as indicated by arrows in the margin. During these silences the interviewer is sometimes typing, as indicated in brackets but at other times the interviewer is waiting for the interviewee to provide further information and there is no audible activity during the silence. This highlights the importance of ensuring that as much detail is included within the transcription as possible to enable a full analysis of the turns of talk to be conducted.

As in the above extract, there are occasions when a lengthy silence accompanies the interviewer actively waiting for further information, the silence is serving the same function as a continuer in that the answer given is considered to be inadequate and the third turn of talk has been with-held. Schegloff (1992) refers to this use of silences as a non-repair way of dealing with trouble. However, in relation to extracts 3.1 and 3.2 lengthy silences have been noted to be followed by a new sequence of talk. This could suggest that the interviewer is writing down the response that had been given. It could also show silence to be acting as a closure at the end of the question answer sequence. It is not possible to comment on the interviewers non-hearable actions in those extracts. Therefore, from the text it must be concluded that silences following a response are serving as receipts and as closures of the sequence of talk. There may also be an element of that time being used to record the response given although it is not possible to determine this from the transcriptions. A further suggestion may be that the interviewer is aiming to allow the interviewee some extra time to change their answer or some thinking time to consider the required response. However, the interviewee's have already offered a response by then, and the transcription data will not enable any further testing of this suggestion.

In extract 3.3 this sequence begins with Paula making a statement. She starts with 'ehm' and then after a short silence continues 'what does (.) compassion (.) mean'
(line 273). This is followed by a silence for 5.4 seconds before Catherine then makes the statement 'don't know' (line 275). As with previous extracts presented, this shows Catherine orienting to Paula’s statement as a request for information and lines 273 to 275 form a question - answer adjacency pairing. In Paula’s statement there are two silences within the actual question being made and this could serve the function of highlighting to Catherine the word that is requiring explanation. Catherine’s response is followed by a silence of 5.2 seconds before there is the sound of a page turning. This sound is followed by a further silence for 2.2 seconds before Steph1, who is a member of staff sitting in the room with Catherine and Paula, clears her throat. There is a brief silence before Paula then takes the next turn of talk and issues a fresh request for information. By issuing a new question, Paula can be seen to be accepting Catherine’s response as an acceptable answer following her initial question in line 273. Again, silence here is being oriented to as a receipt following the response.

So far, it has been shown that the structure of the turns of talk in extract 3.3 is similar to those shown in extracts 3.1 and 3.2. Paula makes no comment about Catherine’s responses and the sequence can be described as being: question is asked, answer is offered, next question is asked.

Extract 3.6 [2A/PC/Nov 2002/Jan 2003]

222 Paula:  what does (. ) repair mean
223 (0.8)
224 Catherine:  when something’s got a snag which is- (0.2)  fix it
225 tryna fix it
226 (13.8)
227 Paula:  what does (. ) assemble (. ) mean
228 (7.2)
229 Catherine:  don’t know
230 (7.0)
231 (( sound of page turning ))
232 (5.2)
233 Steph1:  gghhh (. ) gghhh (( clearing of throat ))
234 (2.2)
235 Paula:  ehm: (0.4)  what does (. ) yesterday (. ) mean

In extract 3.6 this sequence begins with Paula’s statement ‘what does (. ) repair mean’ (line 222). This is followed after a silence of 0.8 seconds by Catherine’s turn of talk.
She begins with 'when something's got a snag which is' she then takes a small pause before continuing with 'mending it' and then finally saying 'tryna fix (.) it' (lines 224 & 225). Here, Catherine is orienting to Paula's statement as a request for information and within her response she makes three attempts to provide an answer by offering three pieces of information separated by pauses. There is then a lengthy silence of 13.8 seconds (line 226) before Paula then makes a statement. Her statement is 'what does (.) assemble (.) mean' (line 227). This is followed by a silence for 7.2 seconds and then Catherine takes the turn of talk and utters 'don't know'. Her utterance shows her to be orienting to Paula's statement as a request for information and she is stating that she doesn't know. This answer is followed by a silence for 7.0 seconds before the sound of a page turning is heard and after a silence of 5.2 seconds there is the sound of Steph1 clearing her throat. After a further silence of 2.2 seconds Paula begins a new sequence of talk.

In extract 3.6 above, there are two question - answer adjacency pairings. The first pairing is lines 222 to 225 where Paula asks a question and Catherine offers an answer. Paula orients to this answer as being acceptable by the way that she then begins a second adjacency pairing in line 227 that runs to line 229. A number of points can be noted within this extract. The extract is taken from the same subtest as extract 3.3. This subtest requires the interviewee to define various words presented by the interviewer. When Paula offers these words in lines 222 and 227 she noticeably pauses before the word is spoken. She can be seen here to be using a pause after 'what does' as a cue to Catherine that the word to be defined is about to be spoken. This was also seen in extract 3.3.

The structure of both question - answer pairings appears similar in the above extract. However, the amount of silence after Paula's initial question (line 222) where Catherine attempted to answer the question, is much shorter than has been seen in this and previous extracts when Catherine offers a 'don't know' response. Catherine is unable to answer the question and so after a lengthy silence, which is oriented to as an acceptable aspect of the assessment context, she makes a statement about her competence by stating 'don't know'. With both question - answer pairings Paula orients to Catherine's responses in similar ways by withholding third turn receipt and taking the next turn to begin a new sequence of talk. Here, as in previous extracts,
Paula is accepting Catherine's responses and can be seen to orient to a 'don’t know' statement in the same way as an attempted response.

3.3.2 When Don’t Know is followed by changes in the way that information is requested

Extract 3.7 [2A / PC / Nov 2002 / Jan 2003]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Paula:</th>
<th>Catherine:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>256</td>
<td>what does (.) confide (.) mean</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>257</td>
<td>(4.2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>258</td>
<td>I’m not sure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>259</td>
<td>(4.0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>260</td>
<td>what about remorse</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261</td>
<td>(4.8)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>262</td>
<td>don’t know</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>264</td>
<td>don’t know</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>266</td>
<td>haven’t heard of that</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Paula:</th>
<th>Catherine:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>499</td>
<td>why do some people who are born deaf (0.2) have trouble learning to talk 'when'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>501</td>
<td>(5.8)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>504</td>
<td>and if you were lost in the forest (1.2) &gt; in the woods* in the&lt; day time (0.8) how would you go about finding you're way out</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In extract 3.7 the sequence begins with Paula making the first statement in the sequence ‘what does (.) confide (.) mean’ (line 256). This is followed by a silence for 4.2 seconds and Catherine then utters ‘I’m not sure’ (line 258). Catherine’s response shows her to be orienting to Paula’s initial statement as a request for information. By saying ‘I’m not sure’ Catherine is commenting upon her ability to provide the information and following a silence of 4.0 seconds Paula then begins a new turn of talk with the comment ‘what about remorse’ (line 260). This shows Paula orienting to Catherine’s answer as being acceptable. After a silence of 4.8 seconds Catherine then makes the statement ‘don’t know’ (line 262). Here, she is orienting to Paula having issued a second question in line 260 and again she is indicating not knowing the
answer. This answer is followed by a silence for 4.0 seconds and then Paula says ‘ponder’ (line 264). After a silence of 2.8 seconds Catherine then states ‘I haven’t heard of that’.

In this extract there are three question - answer adjacency pairings at lines 256 to 258, 260 to 262 and 264 to 266. While the pairing of most relevance to this study is the second in lines 260 – 262, where the interviewee makes the statement ‘don’t know’, this statement is presented within it’s wider context for a valid reason. To give some context to the reader, this sequence occurs within the assessment during a subtest where the interviewee is required to define words verbally presented to them by the interviewer. The style of presentation can be seen to change through the sequence of talk as for each request for information Catherine is unable to provide a definition or attempted definition. Following the first request, the second is clearly brief and carries a more informal tone and the third question (line 264) is presented merely as the word to be defined. Within standardised interview situations it has been seen that the interaction will become more informal as a way of managing difficulty that occurs (Houtkoop-Steenstra, 2000). This informality makes the interaction more relaxed and so helps to maintain rapport that could otherwise be eroded away. This can be important in ensuring that the interaction is maintained and so that the assessment can continue.

This sequence can be seen to indicate difficulty within the interaction where Catherine is stating that she is unable to provide the information being requested. Difficulty in the interaction is also suggested through Catherine’s responses. Her initial response of ‘I’m not sure’ suggests uncertainty about her competence to answer the question, yet she then upgrades her response to ‘don’t know’ (line 262) as a more certain comment about her competence. Her final response of ‘haven’t heard of that’ (line 266) is worded to suggest that she can’t answer the question not through lack of ability but because she hasn’t heard of the word. Catherine can be seen to be deflecting negative evaluation away from herself. One strategy for managing difficulties in the interaction, as suggested by Pomerantz (1978, cited in Houtkoop-Stenstra, 2000) is for either or both participants in the talk to shift the referent of the difficulty outside of the interaction itself. In this extract, Catherine is deflecting the focus of difficulty away from her abilities. This comes in a sequence of interaction where Catherine is
making repeated comments about her inability to answer Paula’s questions and as a result difficulty is being experienced within the interaction and is being maintained.

Extract 3.8 begins with Paula making the statement ‘why do some people who are born deaf have trouble learning to talk’ and interestingly she then tags ‘when’ onto the end of this statement but spoken in a soft tone. There is a silence for 5.8 seconds and then Catherine utters ‘don’t know’ (line 502). This is followed by a silence for 4.2 seconds. Here, Catherine’s statement in line 502 shows her orienting to Paula’s statement as a request for information. Paula then begins her turn of talk with ‘and’ before then continuing ‘if you were lost in the forest’ (line 504). At this point there is then a silence for 1.2 seconds before Paula then says ‘in the woods in the day time’ which is spoken more quickly than the surrounding talk. It is also heard that she says ‘in the woods’ in a soft tone. Following a further silence of 0.8 seconds Paula then says ‘how would you go about finding your way out’ (line 505 & 506).

Heritage and Sorjonen (1994) have noted that prefacing a question with ‘and’ acts to imply that the immediately prior response was not problematic. They describe it as being a strategic way of normalising a difficulty in the interaction. Having done this Paula then proceeds to ask the question. However, she then offers a clarification within the question to Catherine by offering an alternative to ‘in the forest’ by saying ‘in the woods’. This is inserted into the question in softer and quicker speech before the question is then continued. This can be seen as a way to manage difficulty within the interaction that is initially arising from Catherine’s ‘don’t know’ statement in line 502. Here, Paula may be seeking to assist Catherine’s understanding of the question and so manage the oriented to difficulty resulting from Catherine’s statement of competence. The softer speech could also be accounted for by the interviewer being aware that this is a breach of the standardised administration and so indicate the interviewers tension between following the standardised administration and managing difficulty within the interaction. While there is no way of proving this from the transcriptions this may be an interesting area for future investigation.

To summarise this extract, Catherine’s ‘don’t know’ response is hearable as giving rise to difficulty within the interaction and Paula is orienting to this in two ways.
Firstly, by attempting to normalise Catherine’s inability to answer the question and then by attempting to help Catherine to successfully answer the question.

### 3.3.3 When Don’t Know is explicitly receipted

**Extract 3.9 [3B / PC / Nov 2002 / Jan 2003]**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Utterance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>461</td>
<td>Pamela</td>
<td>three nine two four eight seven</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>462</td>
<td>Pamela</td>
<td>(13.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>463</td>
<td>Jonathan</td>
<td>don’t know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>464</td>
<td>Pamela</td>
<td>(1.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>465</td>
<td>Pamela</td>
<td>okay don’t worry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>466</td>
<td>Pamela</td>
<td>(1.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>467</td>
<td>Jonathan</td>
<td>ehh ehh: (in breath followed by outbreath)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>468</td>
<td>Pamela</td>
<td>fine (2.0) right (3.0) /NO\W (0.2) I’m going to say some more numbers (1.2) but this time when I stop \W want you to say them back\Wards</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Extract 3.10. [3B / PC / Nov 2002 / Jan 2003]**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Utterance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>421</td>
<td>Pamela</td>
<td>five eight two</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>422</td>
<td>Jonathan</td>
<td>&gt;five eight two&lt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>423</td>
<td>Pamela</td>
<td>(1.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>424</td>
<td>Pamela</td>
<td>six nine four</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>425</td>
<td>Pamela</td>
<td>(7.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>426</td>
<td>Jonathan</td>
<td>six nine four</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>427</td>
<td>Pamela</td>
<td>thank you</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>428</td>
<td>Pamela</td>
<td>(2.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>429</td>
<td>Pamela</td>
<td>six four three nine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>430</td>
<td>Jonathan</td>
<td>six four three nine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>431</td>
<td>Pamela</td>
<td>thank you</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extract 3.9 is set within the context of a subtest of the WAIS-III where Jonathan is presented with a sequence of numbers and he is then required to repeated those numbers back to Pamela in the same order as given. This sequence of talk begins with Pamela making a statement *(line 461)* that is a list of numbers. The nature of this subtest is such that the interviewee is required to listen to and then repeat back a list of numbers that are presented verbally by the interviewer. After a silence of 13.2 seconds Jonathan makes the utterance ‘*don’t know*’ *(line 463)*. This shows him to be orienting to Pamela’s previous turn of talk as a request for information and he is orienting to it as a request that he repeat the list of numbers. Extract 3.10 is taken from earlier in this subtest and opens with Pamela making the statement ‘*five eight (.) two*’ *(line 421)*.
Jonathan immediately take the next turn and utters ‘five eight two’. Here, he has oriented to Pamela’s statement as a list of numbers that he is required to repeat back to her. Within this extract there are a further two such pairings in lines 424-426 and lines 429-430 where Pamela gives a list of numbers and Jonathan orients to these as lists to be repeated back and does so. This extract occurs prior to the text shown in extract 3.9 and demonstrates that Jonathan was already orienting to the nature of the subtest.

As mentioned previously, Ten Have (2000) has noted that questions typically finish with rising intonation. However, at the end of Pamela’s statement in line 461, there is dropping intonation with the word ‘seven’. Therefore, while Pamela’s statement may be heard as a statement, it is being oriented to by Jonathan as a request. This is due to his awareness of the interactional rules governing this subtest as demonstrated.

After a silence for 1.0 seconds Pamela then states ‘okay don’t worry’ (line 465). This statement is spoken softly and here, Pamela is receipting Jonathan’s ‘don’t know’ response when she says ‘okay’. Within the literature statements such as ‘okay’ are acknowledged as neutral receipts within conversation (Houtkoop-Steenstra, 2000) and extract 3.11 demonstrates ‘okay’ being used as a neutral receipt.


(Original transcription codes)

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I: how many people ((pause)) live in this house.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>R: three.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>I: three.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>okay, ((continues))</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Here, participant I: has asked for some information which participant R: then provides (line 2). In line 3, I: then repeats R:’s response back and follows this with ‘okay’. This lets R: know that the response has been accepted. However, it can be seen that the receipt doesn’t give an indication of whether the response is the required or correct response, merely that the response has been accepted as a response.

Returning to extract 3.9, Pamela then goes on to offer reassurance when she says ‘don’t worry’ (line 465). This statement is followed by a silence for 1.2 seconds and
then Jonathan takes an audible in breath and long out breath (line 467). Pamela immediately takes the next turn and begins by stating 'fine'. After a silence of 2.0 seconds she states 'right' in a softly spoken tone and then after a further silence of 3.0 seconds she opens a new sequence of talk with 'Now' which is spoken loudly (line 468). After a brief silence Pamela then says 'I'm going to say some more numbers'. There is silence for 1.2 seconds before Pamela then continues 'but this time when I stop I want you to say them backwards' (lines 469 & 470). In the previous two pieces of talk Pamela is introducing the next part of the subtest and has introduced a new topic of talk following her 'Now' utterance.

Houtkoop-Steenstra (2000) notes that interviewers will sometimes seek to repair a troubled interview interaction by normalising problematic responses. In this extract trouble arises within the interaction. In line 465 where Pamela receipts Jonathan's response with 'okay' her follow on statement of 'don't worry' shows Pamela to be orienting to the difficulty by seeking to normalise Jonathan's statement about his competence and she is seeking to maintain rapport by doing this. Pamela orients to Jonathan's sigh, in line 467, as an indication that the rapport in the interview is under threat and she immediately makes the statement 'fine'. Here, she is making a positive assessment and evaluation of the interaction so seeking to manage the difficulty that is present. Goodwin and Goodwin (1987, cited in Houtkoop-Steenstra, 2000) note that assessments tend to contain contrast terms. These are terms that can be paired for example good/bad, right/wrong. They argue that assessments are found within interactions where there is a need to establish or maintain rapport and typically within interview situations (Houtkoop-Steenstra, 2000). However, as the reader will already be aware from the introduction, the WAIS-III standardised instructions advocate the use of neutral receipts to answers. Therefore, in this extract, Pamela can be seen to be deviating from the standardised instructions.

Pamela's next statement of 'right' is closing that previous sequence of talk and Jonathan is orienting to it as such by not taking a turn of talk during the 3.0 second silence that follows. Having successfully closed that sequence of talk Pamela then introduces the next sequence of talk with 'Now'. In this extract Pamela is managing the difficulty that has arisen within the interaction. She is working to maintain the rapport within the interview by orienting to the difficulty, but at the same time she is
also looking to keep within the interview structure. She skilfully moves the interaction on from the difficulty to a new sequence of talk while maintaining rapport with Jonathan, so successfully enabling the interview to continue.


1119 Pamela: twfav does the Estate require people in some professions to obtain licences before offering services to the public

1123 Jonathan: don't know

1126 Jonathan: shouldn't been on tape in the first place

1129 Jonathan: shoulda put my dad on here

1131 Jonathan: he's know all of em

1132 Pamela: do you

1134 Jonathan: he's got all the answers every single answer

1136 Pamela: oh well that's helpful at least somebody has that's good I don't think I've got all the answers half the time

1139 Jonathan: [ehh hh hh

1140 Pamela: don't honestly right lets leave it there cos

1141 I think we- we've done enough of that assessment thank you

1142 (( sound of tape being stopped ))
In extract 3.12, the sequence begins with Pamela’s statement in lines 1119 to 1121. This is followed by a silence for 20.2 seconds before Jonathan then utters ‘don’t know’ (line 1123). This utterance shows Jonathan to be orienting to Pamela’s initial statement as a request for information. As with previous extracts from these interviews it can be seen to form a question – answer adjacency pair. There is a silence for 3.0 seconds and then Pamela takes the third turn to receipt Jonathan’s reply with ‘okay’ (line 1125). Here, she is suggesting that Jonathan’s response has been accepted although she is not making any comment about whether it is the response she was seeking. However, Jonathan then takes the next turn of talk and begins talking over Pamela’s receipt with ‘shoulda asked all my dad these questions he shoulda been on tape in the first place’ (lines 1126 & 1127). Here, Jonathan is making a statement about who would have been able to answer the question correctly and so who could have provided Pamela with the information she was requesting.

By making this statement Jonathan is displaying a concern that he has been unable to provide the required response and he is orienting to this as a source of trouble in the interaction. Therefore, he is seeking to repair the interaction by trying to let Pamela know who could provide the information she requested. Here, Jonathan is ‘doing competency’. Pamela immediately responds with ‘sorry’. The word itself could be heard as either a question or as an apology, but the intonation can be seen to rise at the end of this word. This suggests that she is requesting further information from Jonathan. Indeed, in this case Jonathan has oriented to her statement as a request for him to repeat or clarify what he had said and so he does this in line 1129 by stating ‘shoulda put my dad on here’. This forms another question – answer pairing.

Following this statement Pamela laughs. Jonathan takes the next turn of talk and overlaps with Pamela’s laughter by stating ‘he knows all of em’ (line 1131). Here, Jonathan is continuing to make comment about his dad’s competence to answer the questions. Pamela makes a statement overlapping with Jonathan ‘you reckon he’s got all the answers do you’. Jonathan orientes to this as a question in his response where he
states 'he's got all the answers every single answer' (line 1134). Again, a further question – answer sequence has occurred.

At this stage it is worth noting the style of interaction. Unlike previous extracts where each turn of talk is followed by a clear period of silence, in this extract the turn taking style changes at line 1124 and there are no longer regular silences at the end of each turn. Instead, it can be seen that the turns of talk are changing around transition marker points. As already described earlier in the methodology section, within everyday conversation the turn taking is managed through the use of markers that indicate when another participant may take the next turn of talk so that the conversation flows with few if any silences. This is demonstrated in extract 3.14 below.

(original transcription codes)

1    I: your opinion is is important indeed because
2    we want to form as clear as we can a picture
3    of the Dutch consumer.
4    R:  ye:s.=
5    I:  =.hh we'd like to know for instance which
6    programs you watch, and which not,
7    .h u:h also of course why not.
8    R:  hm[mm
9    I:  [mm.hh the interview will take about
10    a quarter of an hour . . .

In extract 3.14 the reader will notice how the turns of talk flow from one to the next. Here, the participants are attending to transition-relevance places, as discussed in the methodology chapter, in order to manage the interaction and to know when to begin their own turn of talk. Zimmerman and Boden (1993) have commented that the informal turn-taking style of everyday and ordinary conversation will always operate as a ‘default’ setting to the participants involved in an interaction, regardless of the conventions specific to a give interaction such as standardised assessment. However, in this study so far, it has been demonstrated that the interview context has constrained this flowing style to a more formal question – answer style. Indeed, Houtkoop-Steenstra (2000) notes that within interview situations turns of talk are typically question – answer pairings and there are clear and sometimes lengthy
silences between each turn of talk, as have been seen in the earlier extracts. However, in response to the difficulty that is occurring within the interaction, both participants can be seen to be defaulting to a more informal conversational style through their adoption of a turn-taking style similar to everyday conversation.

Schegloff (1989) has suggested that during standardised interviews the interviewer will switch between styles of interaction. The question may be asked in a formal interview style but the response may then be receipted or managed in a more informal conversational style. Houtkoop-Steenstra (2000) offers the idea that this may cause difficulty for the respondent and this issue will be raised in the discussion section in relation to the interviewees involved in this study.

Therefore, it is possible to see in extract 3.12 that the interactional style has moved to a more informal style. Jonathan initiates this informal style in line 1126 when he overlaps Pamela's receipt, yet Pamela then engages in this less formal style also. Here, both participants are orienting to a difficulty related to the interview context and to manage this difficulty there is a shift to a more informal interaction. Jonathan is orienting to potential difficulty arising from not providing the requested information and Pamela is orienting to difficulty in the interaction in the form of potential loss of rapport with Jonathan. Pamela is orienting to the difficulty in the interaction through her use of laughter in line 1130. It needs noting that Jonathan doesn't reciprocate Pamela's laughter. Instead, he attempts to qualify his statement about his dad's competence. Silverman (1998) has reported that one function of laughter within an interaction is as a device to manage difficulty by making the interaction less formal. This claim is supported by the work of DuPre (1998, cited in Coupland, 2000) who has suggested that within doctor-patient relationships laughter changes the tone of the conversation in order to manage interactional difficulties.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Provider</th>
<th>Need your arm outta your right sleeve</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Patient</td>
<td>Sorry, I'm just standin' here waitin' for mother ta tell me what to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>do/ ((laughter))</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above extract is taken from transcribed interactions between women attending a breast care centre and their doctors. Here, the provider has given the patient an
instruction and the patient then responds with a light-hearted statement, as demonstrated by the laughter at the end of the statement. The patient’s light-hearted response shows her to be orienting to the request as a potential source of difficulty. Here, the laughter is geared towards managing the difficulty by relaxing the tone of the interaction.

Returning to extract 3.12, Pamela follows Jonathan’s answer in line 1135 with ‘has he’ that overlaps his talk and is made in response to his statement. She then says ‘oh well that’s helpful’. Here, she is making a positive assessment about his dad’s competence in response to his statement and she then follows this with a brief silence before commenting ‘at least somebody has’. This can be seen as an attempt to maintain rapport with Jonathan by offering a positive evaluation of his statement. After a silence of 0.2 seconds she then says ‘that’s good’ and finally comments after a further silence of 0.6 seconds ‘I don’t think I’ve got all the answers half the time’ (line 1137 & 1138). In this turn of talk Pamela has begun with her positive assessment of Jonathan’s dad’s competence to answer the questions.

Pamela then proceeds to make attempts to manage the interactional difficulty that has arisen by shifting the referent of the difficulty away from Jonathan. First, she comments that ‘at least somebody has’ which can be heard as suggesting that while most people don’t have the answers at least somebody does. Here, she is attempting to normalise the experience of not being able to answer the question. It can be heard as a suggestion that not being able to answer is where the majority of people would be. The ‘that’s good’ can be taken as a positive assessment of the previous statement and is aimed at reinforcing the previous comment. Pamela then follows this with an attempt to share the difficulty by including herself as someone who doesn’t always have the answers to questions. Houtkoop-Steenstra (2000) notes that ‘sharing the problem’ is a powerful way of maintaining rapport within interview situations where difficulty is encountered between the participants. In extract 3.13, participant I: begins by requesting information from participant R: about whether they use a calculator (lines 1 & 2). After a brief pause I: states ‘you don’t use a pocket calculator no’ which R: overlaps with ‘I never use one’. Here, R: is responding to I:’s request. I: then states a further request ‘would you be able to’. This is met with a silence of 1.4 seconds and then I: makes the comment ‘neither could I, by the w(h)ay’. Here, difficulty has arisen
in the interaction where R: has not responded to I:’s question so I: attempts to manage the difficulty by then making a comment designed to share the problem with the respondent (line 10).

Pamela’s statement (lines 1136 to 1138) is then followed by overlapping laughter from Jonathan. Pamela orients to this laughter as disbelief or a challenge to her attempts to share the difficulty and makes the statement ‘I don’t honestly’ (line 1140). She then holds the turn of talk and states ‘right let’s lets leave it there’. Here, Pamela is attempting to close the sequence of talk and she goes on after a silence of 0.4 seconds to qualify this by stating ‘I think we- we’ve done enough of that assessment’. Pamela then continues to hold the turn of talk and after a silence of 0.4 seconds she states ‘okay’. Within the turn of talk this can be seen as a marker that the sequence of talk will be ending and Pamela then goes on to end the taping of the session.

In this extract difficulty initially stems from Jonathan’s inability to answer the question asked. It is Jonathan who orients to the difficulty in line 1126 and then Pamela can be seen to be working at managing this difficulty in the interaction. She skilfully employs a number of linguistic devises in an effort to maintain rapport with Jonathan by initially seeking to make the interaction more informal and then proceeding to focus upon the source of difficulty, in other words his competence to answer the question. Jonathan can also be seen to be engaging in attempts to make the interaction less formal and so manage the difficulty. Pamela makes efforts to normalise his experience in order to maintain the relationship and towards the end of this extract it is noticeable that Pamela makes greater efforts to hold the turn of talk. In her latter two turns she is chaining various comments and utterances together without allowing Jonathan to take a turn. The conversation can be seen to shift from a question – answer format to a more directive and controlled style on Pamela’s part that ultimately she draws to a close.

### 3.3.4 When Don’t Know results from being prompted for further information


- **248** Paula:  `↑what about ↓sentence`  
- **249** (1.0)  
- **250** Catherine: `right ( . ) we use those for writing = we put a full stop at the ↓end`  
- **251** (34.6)
In extract 3.16, the context of this particular subtest is that the interviewee is asked to explain the meanings of words presented by the interviewer. The sequence begins with Paula stating ‘what about sentence’ (line 248). This is followed by a 1.0 second silence and then Catherine says ‘right’. She then follows that after a brief pause with ‘we use those for writing = we put a full stop at the end’ (line 250). Here, Catherine is orienting to Paula’s statement as a request for information. The text shows that she has used ‘right’ as a marker to introduce her turn of talk and she is indicating to Paula that she is about to respond to her statement. After the initial marker, Catherine then offers a statement aimed at providing the requested information. She can be seen to offer two pieces of information. The first being ‘we use those for writing’ and she then provides a second piece ‘we put a full stop at the end’ which is tagged immediately onto the first. This may indicate that she thought the initial information was insufficient on its own and so she wanted to demonstrate her competence by making an additional statement. There is then a lengthy silence for 34.6 seconds during which neither party makes any audible sounds or interactions. This would suggest that Catherine doesn’t feel the need to add any further qualifications to her answer and that she is not orienting to Paula’s silence as an indication that her response was inadequate. At this stage, the interaction has comprised a question – answer pairing as seen in previous extracts. Paula then makes a further statement saying ‘can you tell me a little bit more about what sentence means’ (line 252). After a silence for 8.6 seconds, Catherine then utters ‘don’t know’ (line 254). Here, Catherine is orienting to Paula’s statement as a request for information and from the wording used Paula is requesting additional information in response to her original request made in line 248. It is interesting to note the wording that Paula uses for her request in line 252. Here, Paula has moved from asking an open-coded question in line 248 to a closed-coded question in line 252. As previously mentioned, open coding involves the
interviewer having a rough framework of required information that should be included within the response but depending upon the extent and detail mentioned the response would be awarded a higher or lower score. A closed coded question has a specific answer.

Within the conversation analytic literature it has been noted by some authors (e.g. Houtkoop-Steenstra, 1996) that where an inadequate response has been offered to a question, the interviewer may seek further information by asking a further question that will direct the interviewee to provide a more closed response, typically ‘yes’, ‘no’, ‘don’t know’.

Besides becoming a closed-coded question, Paula’s statement in line 252 can be heard as no longer directly seeking a definition of ‘what sentence means’. She is now making an enquiry of Catherine about her competence to answer the question. In this situation Catherine provides a closed answer in the form of ‘don’t know’. This response could be considered as a response to Paula’s enquiry about her competence as this is the second part of the adjacency pairing, however, there is insufficient evidence in the content of Catherine’s response to allow any more than speculation about whether she is orienting to the initial question of the probing question. After her response, there is a silence of 7.0 seconds and then Paula states ‘what does (.) confide (.) mean’ (line 256). It is worth noting the hearable silences either side of the word ‘confide’. This linguistic style has been seen in previous extracts where words are being offered for definition. By making this statement, Paula has oriented to Catherine’s earlier ‘don’t know’ as an acceptable response. She has closed the previous sequence of talk, has begun a new question-answer pairing and is now requesting new information. This is demonstrated by Catherine’s response in line 258 where she is orienting to Paula’s new statement as a question.

In extract 3.16 Paula has asked a question and has received an initial answer. However, she has not considered the answer to be satisfactory and so she then asks a follow-up question to investigate Catherine’s competence to answer the question. Catherine then states that she doesn’t know and Paula accepts this as a genuine response and moves to the next question.

Paula: can you tell me some reasons why many foods need to be cooked

Catherine: because they’re frozen

Paula: *mmhm*

Catherine: and they’ll be too hard

Paula: *mmhm* yes* (0.4) can you tell me some more reasons why foods need to be cooked

Catherine: ehm:

Paula: *mmhm*

Catherine: don’t know

Steph: *hghh* hghh

Paula: *okay* in what way are work and play alike


Paula: okay in what way are work and play alike

Catherine: ehm:

Catherine: you do em both out side

Paula: *mmhm* (.) tell me a bit more

Catherine: don’t know

Steph: *hghh* hghh

Paula: *okay* in what way is steam and fog alike

Extract 3.17 begins with Paula making the statement ‘can you tell me some reasons why many foods need to be cooked’ (lines 407 & 408). This is followed by a silence for 4.2 seconds and then Catherine’s turn of talk is ‘because they’re frozen’. Here, Catherine is orienting to Paula’s statement as a request for information and is providing a response. It is worth noting that this question begins with the words ‘can you...’ but her response shows that unlike in extract 3.16, here Catherine is orienting to the request as being about the reasons rather than about her competence. This is seen by the content of her answer being directly related to food. There is a silence for
2.2 seconds and then Paula takes the next turn of talk uttering ‘mmhm’ (line 413). This is followed by a silence of 2.6 seconds and then Catherine’s next utterance is ‘and they’ll be too hard’. In these lines, Paula’s statement could be serving the action of receipting Catherine’s initial response in line 413. However, the ‘mmhm’ statement is spoken softly and has falling intonation followed by raising intonation that is indicative of a question or request, as described by Ten Have (2000) earlier. Further, Catherine’s next turn of talk is a statement to clarify her initial response and this shows her to be orienting to Paula’s utterance in line 413 as a request for further information. Here, she is explaining why frozen foods would need to be cooked. Catherine is orienting to Paula’s ‘mmhm’ as suggesting that her answer wasn’t necessarily incorrect but that it needed clarifying.

Following a further silence of 6.0 seconds Paula begins her next turn of talk with ‘mmhm yes’ (line 417). This is also spoken softly but the intonation is different from line 413. Here, there is rising intonation on ‘mmhm’ and then falling intonation on ‘yes’. This suggests that the statement is designed to close the preceding sequence of talk. This action is confirmed after a silence of 0.4 seconds when Paula states ‘can you tell me some more reasons why foods need to be cooked’ (lines 417 & 418). This utterance varies from the opening statement in line 407 in two interesting ways. Firstly, Paula includes the word ‘more’ before ‘reasons’ and she has then omitted the word ‘many’ before ‘foods’. This makes a difference to the request being made. Here, Paula is orienting to Catherine’s initial response as acceptable but she is then asking her to provide further reasons. This would suggest that Catherine has already provided some or at least one. Also, Paula has made the statement slightly less linguistically complex. By changing ‘why many foods’ to simply ‘why foods’ the statement has become more global and so Catherine isn’t required to firstly determine which foods would have been included under the many before then deciding why they need to be cooked. Paula’s statement is then followed by a silence of 3.4 seconds before Catherine states ‘ehm’. There is then a further silence of 4.2 seconds before she then says ‘don’t know’ (line 422). Here, Catherine has oriented to Paula’s statement as a request for information and is indicating that she doesn’t know the response. Her pause between ‘ehm’ and ‘don’t know’ may indicate that she is thinking about the response she can offer. As discussed earlier with extract 3.2 it is difficult to prove this suggestion but Catherine clearly holds the turn of talk and by not taking the turn of
talk Paula can be seen to be orienting to Catherine as preparing to offer a response. After a lengthy silence of 17.2 seconds Paula then begins a new sequence of talk by requesting some new information.

In this extract Catherine provided a response to a request for information and also responded to a probing utterance from Paula when the response was oriented to as being insufficient. Paula is seen to request further information in a number of ways: in an explicit way (lines 417 & 418) and also in a more subtle way (line 413). Catherine oriented to both statements as requests but her 'don't know' response was oriented to by Paula as an acceptable response and the sequence of talk was then terminated at that point.

In extract 3.18, the sequence begins with Paula saying 'okay' and then continuing with 'in what way are work and play alike' (line 446). Here, 'okay' is acting as an opener to the turn of talk before Paula begins her statement. Catherine orients to this statement as a request for information by immediately taking the next turn with 'ehm' (line 447). There is a silence for 4.8 seconds before she then adds a further statement saying 'you do em both outside' (line 449). Here, Catherine has offered a response to the request but the raising intonation at the end of 'outside' suggests uncertainty on Catherine's part. Schaeffer, Maynard and Cradock (1993, cited in Houtkoop-Steenstra, 2000) have reported that rising intonation within a response to a question is a commonly used marker for uncertainty within interview settings. This is shown in the extract below.


(Original transcription codes)

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I: how often have you been to a museum with your class in primary school?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>R: we:ll (1.8) I think about once, twice, yah (2.1) twic perh'aps three t'imes=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>I: =<em>twice</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>R: yah.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Here, I: has made a statement in lines 1 & 2 that R: then orients to as a question by seeking to offer information in reply. To begin with R: indicates that the response is
uncertain by the use of 'I think' and 'about' which suggests further uncertainty about the information to follow. Then, in line 4, R: states 'yah (2.1) twice perhaps three times'. 'Perhaps' is used to indicate further uncertainty and rising intonation can be heard within 'perhaps' and 'times' indicating uncertainty about the information.

There is a silence of 11.8 seconds and then Paula utters 'mmhm (.) tell me a bit more' (line 451). Here, Paula is initially receipting Catherine’s response but the raising intonation then suggests that she is requesting further information and she then states this more explicitly by asking for a 'bit more'. After a silence of 13.0 seconds Catherine responds to this request with 'don't know' (line 453). This is followed by a silence of 3.2 seconds and then Stephl, who is a member of staff in the room, clears her throat. After a lengthy silence of 21.0 seconds Paula then states 'okay' before going on to say 'in what way are steam and fog alike'. Here, Paula is receipting Catherine’s response and is indicating the closure of that sequence of talk and the introduction of a new sequence of talk which in this case is a new request for information. Paula’s ‘okay’ is spoken softly which suggests that she is orienting to a difficulty in the interaction by making the tone of her speech less confrontational. This difficulty may have arisen initially with Catherine’s response in line 449 which Paula then probed to encourage Catherine to provide extra information. By asking a probing question, Paula is indicating that she doesn’t consider the initial response to be acceptable. However, Catherine was unable to provide further information and this would then mean that the answer remains unacceptable. Catherine is aware of this and Paula is seeking to maintain rapport by gently closing that sequence of talk and moving to a fresh sequence with a new request.

3.3.5 When Don’t Know is followed by another question


96 (( sound of pages turning ))
97 (7.2)
98 → Catherine: *don’t know*
99 (1.2)
100 Paula: I have a good look cos they get more difficult as they go along
101
102 (12.6)
103 Paula: do you need me to have the table a bit nearer to you
104 Catherine: s’alright [there
Extract 3.20 begins with the sound of pages being turned and this is followed by a silence for 7.2 seconds (line 97). Catherine then makes a softly spoken utterance of ‘don’t know’ (line 98). This sequence can be seen as a question – answer pairing. The nature of the particular subtest that this extract is drawn from is that the interviewee is shown a picture and is asked to provide information about the picture. Here, Catherine is orienting to the sound of the picture being presented and the accompanying presentation of a picture as the first part of a question – answer adjacency pairing.

This claim is supported by extract 3.21. This extract shows a sequence of talk from earlier in this subtest. Here, the sequence opens with the sound of pages turning and then Paula makes the statement ‘let’s try that one’ (line 84). This is spoken softly and after a silence for 1.4 seconds Catherine makes the utterance ‘the water coming out’. Here, Catherine is orienting to Paula’s previous statement as a prompt to consider the presented picture and to provide information. Having made a statement Paula then immediately receipts Catherine’s response with ‘okay’ (line 87). There is then a silence for 7.0 seconds before the audible sound of pages being turned and then after a further silence of 4.6 seconds Catherine makes the statement ‘the screw is’ (line 91) and Paula takes the next turn of talk with ‘yeh’. Here, the sound of the pages turning
and Catherine's following statement indicate that a new picture has been presented. It also demonstrates Catherine to be orienting to the presentation of a new picture as a prompt for her to provide information about what may be missing from the picture.

Therefore, Catherine is showing that she is orienting to the sound of the pages turning and the accompanying presentation of a new picture is functioning as the first part of an adjacency pairing which is then requiring her to provide a response. It is possible to argue that in the initial pairing in this extract, both of Paula's statements are softly spoken and this may be due to Paula orienting to Catherine now responding to the picture rather than her verbal prompts, with the verbal prompting also a unnecessary interference. However, Houtkoop-Steenstra (1986) noted that interviewers in standardised interviews often lower the volume of their speech when issuing continuer statements. In this extract, Paula's statement is supplemental to the presentation of the picture and is working as a continuer within the interaction.

Returning to extract 3.20, Catherine's response is followed by a silence for 1.2 seconds and then Paula makes a statement saying 'have a good look cos they get more difficult as they go along' (lines 100 & 101). Here, Paula is prompting Catherine to reconsider her answer by saying 'have a good look'. This shows her to be orienting to Catherine's response as inadequate and she is also making a comment about how well Catherine initially looked at the picture. Paula goes on to qualify her statement by offering a reason why Catherine needs to 'have a good look'. By indicating that the picture is more difficult she is offering an explanation about why Catherine may not be able to provide the information. Here, Paula is orienting to the 'don't know' as a source of difficulty in the interaction and she is seeking to maintain rapport in the interaction by shifting the referent of the current difficulty (i.e. not being able to provide an answer) from Catherine's competence to the nature of the subtest. Shifting the referent of difficulty is an interactional strategy for maintaining the interaction, that has been noted within interview situations (Houtkoop-Steenstra, 2000). This is demonstrated in extract 3.22 below.
Extract 3.22. [Literacy survey (Kea, closed part)] cited in Houtkoop-Steenstra (2000)

(original transcription codes)

1 I: and those programs on uh t.v.,
2 on politics, and and talk shows,
3 and the social items,
4 ( )
5 hh do you ever watch those?
6 those programs?
7 R: I do watch now and again,
8 but I'm not always able to follow it.
9 (1.0)
10 I: "hm mm."
11 R: and because I can't follow it, then I-
12 there's this moment when I start doing this
13 and then I completely lose interest. =
14 I: "yes"
15 (0.8)
16 so in fact it just is- it's uh the
17 language that they use, [and
18 R:]
19 (0.9)
20 I: the information they give is so limited,
21 [and that one that one can't follow it.
22 R: "yes. That's what I think. [it is just that
23 I [myself find it hard to follow.
24 I: "yes.
25 R: [and politics as well.]
26 I: [and do you find it important?]

Extract 3.22 is lengthy but for the purposes of this report the line of most interest is line 20. Following the previous turns of talk it can be seen that participant I: makes a statement (lines 5 & 6). Participant R: then orients to this statement as a request for information by taking the next turn and offering information in response. In line 10, I: states 'hm mm' which R: orients to as a request for further information by the provision of further information in line 11. In line 14, I: then states 'yes' and then after a silence of 0.8 seconds continues the turn of talk with a statement about the language that the people on the programmes use. This is acknowledged by R: (line 18) and I: then continues with this discussion in line 20 stating 'the information they give is so limited and that one that one can't follow it' (lines 20 & 21). This sequence demonstrates how I: shifted R:’s initial, very personal reference to difficulty away to the people involved in the programme instead. As already mentioned earlier in this
section, this is commonly seen to occur within interview situations where difficulty is experienced within the interaction and the interviewer attempts to repair the difficulty to maintain rapport and ultimately to maintain the interaction.

Returning to extract 3.20, Paula’s statement in lines 100-101 is followed by a lengthy silence of 12.6 seconds which shows Catherine to be orienting to Paula’s second statement as being directive rather than a direct request for information. Paula then orients to this silence as indicating difficulty in the interaction by taking the next turn of talk. Her next statement is ‘do you need me to have the table a bit nearer to you’ (line 103). Catherine’s utterance of ‘s’alright there’ (line 104) shows her to be orienting to the statement as a question. Paula’s question can be seen as an action to restart the interaction having tried to prompt Catherine in line 100-101, but failing to elicit an acceptable response to the initial picture presentation in line 96. However, Paula’s question is focused not on the information being sought but instead on Catherine’s ability to provide the information. Here, Paula is making an enquiry about whether there are external factors affecting Catherine’s ability to provide the information (i.e. the table being too far away). She is working to maintain interactional rapport by referring to the source of any difficulty that Catherine is experiencing as being external to her. When Catherine makes an immediate response Paula orients to difficulty by taking an overlapping turn to say ‘no (0.6) okay’ (line 105).

There is then a silence for 3.2 seconds before the sound of pages turning and Paula then issues a prompt for Catherine to ‘look at that one’ (line 108). In line 105, Paula is orienting to Catherine’s quick response as an indication of further difficulty in the interaction. This difficulty is stemming from Paula’s probing questioning in line 103 where she is exploring Catherine’s inability to provide an acceptable response and by issuing a question she is requiring Catherine to engage in the interaction that she may no longer wish to engage in. Paula initially reinterprets and repeats Catherine’s response given in line 104 and she is showing to Catherine that her response was heard to ensure that this difficulty is managed. After a brief silence, Paula says ‘okay’ which is acting as a mechanism for closing that sequence of talk. This is evidenced by the next audible sound being the turning of a page to introduce the next picture.
In this extract, Paula has oriented to Catherine’s ‘don’t know’ response as being an inadequate response. She has then sought to prompt Catherine to provide an acceptable response but Catherine made no further response. Paula then made an enquiry about Catherine’s ability to provide an acceptable response to the initial request. Catherine’s answer was accepted by Paula and the turn of talk was then closed. Paula can be seen to be exploring possible reasons why Catherine provided an inadequate response in line 98. In both cases Paula does this in a way to maintain the interaction by ensuring that in each case the referent of the difficulty is defined as being external to Catherine.


916 Paula: the price of \( \underline{\text{shirts}} \) is \( \underline{\text{two}} \) for thirty one \( \underline{\text{pounds}} \) (0.4)
917 \( \text{how much u- no-} \) \( \text{what is the price of one dozen \( \underline{\text{shirts}} \)} \)
918 (1.8)
919 \( \rightarrow \) Catherine: don’t know
920 (14.2)
921 Paula: do you know what \( \text{dozen means} \)
922 (2.0)
923 Catherine: it’s twelve
924 (1.0)
925 Paula: just checkin you knew
926 Catherine: yeh
927 Paula: °okay ehm:°
928 (8.2)
929 Paula: all right that’s the last one

Extract 3.23 begins with Paula making the statement ‘the price of shirts is two (.) for thirty one pounds’ (line 916). This is then followed by ‘how much u- no- (.) what is the price of one dozen shirts’ (line 917). After a silence for 14.2 seconds Catherine then takes the next turn of talk with ‘don’t know’ (line 919). In this first sequence of talk Catherine can be seen to be orienting to Paula’s turn of talk as a request for information and so she provides a response to the request. Paula’s request is comprised of two parts. First, she gives a piece of information about the price of shirts. She then proceeds to make the request for information having provided the information necessary to arrive at the required answer. It can be seen that Paula begins the request with ‘how much’ before stopping herself to self-repair the statement and she reissues the repaired request using different wording. Here, Paula is rewording the
question so that it fits with the standardised wording stated in the WAIS-III administration manual (Weschler, 1998).

Following Catherine’s response of ‘don’t know’ (line 919), there is a silence for 1.8 seconds and then Paula says ‘do you know what dozen means’ (line 921). This is followed by a silence for 2.0 seconds before Catherine then utters ‘it’s twelve’. Here, Paula is orienting to Catherine’s initial response as an indication of having been prevented from being able to answer the question by a lack of sufficient background knowledge required to arrive at the answer. Here, Catherine is making a statement about her competency to answer the question. In this case Paula is then asking a probing question to ascertain Catherine’s understanding of what ‘dozen’ means. She is seeking to test this by checking whether Catherine has sufficient knowledge to be able to answer the question and Catherine subsequently demonstrates that she does. There is a further silence for 1.0 seconds and Paula then states ‘just checkin you knew’ (line 925). Here, Paula is orienting to Catherine’s correct response as a potential source of difficulty. This sequence of talk highlights that Catherine’s inadequate response to the initial question in line 917 may be due to her inability to calculate and provide an acceptable answer, rather than her being prevented from doing so by other factors.

Paula’s third turn of talk is interestingly phrased. The wording conveys the message that she was already aware that Catherine would know what dozen meant but only wanted to check. By starting the sentence with ‘just’ she is down grading the importance of the enquiry with the aim of minimising the likelihood of her question being taken as a negative evaluation of Catherine’s competence. This can be seen as a strategy to maintain the interaction. Catherine immediately follows this turn with ‘yeh’. Here, Catherine is orienting to Paula’s statement as a light enquiry and is agreeing with the suggestion that she already knew and that the question wasn’t a comment on her competence. Paula then says ‘okay ehm’ and this is followed by a silence for 8.2 seconds before she then continues her turn of talk saying ‘alright that’s the last one’ (line 929). Here, Paula is using ‘okay’ to close the turn of talk and she then uses ‘ehm’ as a continuer to hold the turn of talk and to indicate that she will wish to continue her turn. This can be seen by the lengthy silence where Catherine doesn’t take a turn but instead remains silent.
In this extract, Catherine’s ‘don’t know’ response is being oriented to by Paula as a comment about not being able to answer the question due to reasons other than competence. By exploring this Paula initially causes difficulty in the interaction that is then quickly resolved by both parties and the sequence of talk is then quickly terminated.

In extract 3.24 the sequence of interaction opens with Paula saying ‘how many weeks are there in a year’ which Catherine orients to as a request for information in her turn of talk where she makes the comment ‘don’t know’ (line 91). This follows a silence that is noticeably shorter than seen in previous extracts, where a request for information is typically followed by a much more pronounced silence. It is also worth noting that Catherine’s utterance is spoken softly, as compared to the surrounding talk. There is then a lengthy silence of 6.0 seconds before Catherine makes a clearer statement of ‘don’t know’ (line 93). It is not clear from the text whether Catherine’s initial utterance in line 91 is perhaps a comment made to herself while she is contemplating possible answers or whether line 91 represents her intended initial response and when it is not acknowledged or receipted by Paula she reaffirms this response in line 93. However, Paula orients to the second ‘don’t know’ statement after a brief silence of 0.8 seconds by initially reflecting back Catherine’s utterance saying ‘don’t know’ in a soft tone to indicate that she has heard the response. However,
regardless of how Catherine intended both utterances to be heard, Paula can be seen to be orienting to Catherine’s second response as a reaffirmation of the initial utterance in line 91. The implication here is that the initial response wasn’t acknowledged and this is causing difficulty in the interaction. Therefore, Catherine is reissuing the response in order to action a receipt from Paula. After repeating back the ‘don’t know’ response to show that it had been heard and receipted, there is a silence for 0.8 seconds before Paula then says ‘okay’ and this is followed after 0.2 seconds by ‘have a guess’ (line 95). Here, Paula, having receipted the initial response is closing that sequence of talk and she is introducing a new sequence of talk with her ‘okay’ statement before then proceeding with the new statement. After a silence for 2.0 seconds Paula then takes the next turn of talk. She makes the statement ‘how many weeks in a year’ (line 97). This is spoken softly and the statement can be heard as being spoken in a more informal style. It is also worth noting that Paula has changed the wording from the initial request issued in line 89. She has removed the words ‘are there’. This has the effect of making the statement less linguistically complex. Antaki (2000), as mentioned earlier, found that interviewers ‘redesign questions sensitively in ways that lower the social and personal criteria for a high score’ (p437). He goes on to comment that while this may appear generous it actually shows the interviewer to be constructing the interviewee as being impaired.

After a silence of 3.2 seconds Paula’s statement is followed by Catherine’s turn of talk where she says ‘about fifty’ (line 99). By taking this turn of talk Catherine is performing a number of interactions. She is orienting to Paula’s statement as a request for information and is giving a response. Also, she is orienting to her earlier response of ‘don’t know’ as being unacceptable and so is offering an alternative. In addition, it is possible that she is orienting to Paula’s introduction of informality into the interaction as an indication that it would be less problematic if an offered response were wrong. Therefore, Catherine offers a response despite having initially stated ‘don’t know’. Following this response there is a silence for 1.0 seconds and then Paula says ‘okay’ with which she is orienting to Catherine’s response as an acceptable answer and she is closing that sequence of talk. This is evident in line 103 where Paula takes the next turn of talk and issues a fresh request for information with the statement ‘who wrote Hamlet’.
3.4 Occasions where ‘I don’t know’ is used

As with the ‘don’t know’ statements, the occasions where the interviewee used the utterance ‘I don’t know’ were identified within the talk. A total of 6 extracts were found and these were drawn from all three interviews. For clarity of presentation these have been grouped into three sub categories that are similar to those used for ‘don’t know’ statements: ‘When I don’t know is followed by a new question’, ‘When I don’t know is followed by a request for further question’ and ‘When I don’t know is followed by attempts by the interviewer to offer reassurance’.

3.4.1 When I don’t know is followed by a new question.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Paula:</th>
<th>What about terminate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>238</td>
<td></td>
<td>(3.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>239</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>240</td>
<td>Catherine:</td>
<td>I don’t know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(2.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>242</td>
<td>Paula:</td>
<td>okay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(2.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>244</td>
<td>Paula:</td>
<td>What does consume mean</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extract 3.25 begins with Paula’s statement ‘What about terminate’ (line 238). This followed by a silence for 3.0 seconds before Catherine makes the statement ‘I don’t know’. This shows Catherine to be orienting to Paula’s statement as a request and Catherine is stating that she does not know. Catherine’s utterance is followed by a silence of 2.2 seconds after which Paula softly states ‘okay’. Paula then issues a new request for information in line 242. Paula can be heard to receipt Catherine’s response and by receipting in a soft tone she is orienting to a potential source of difficulty within the interaction (i.e. that Catherine is having to admit that she is not able to answer the question). Here, Paula is managing the difficulty and is then beginning a new sequence of talk in line 244. At this point it is worth noting that this extract can be seen to be similar to extracts 3.1, 3.2 and 3.3 where the interviewees responded with ‘don’t know’. In those extracts the response was receipted with silence rather than an explicit receipt, yet the turn of talk was closed and a new sequence of talk was initiated.
Extract 3.26 begins with Pamela making the statement ‘what does winter mean’ (line 373). After a silence Jonathan states ‘winter’. This is followed by a silence for 1.2 seconds and before he then says ‘it’s oh winter winter winter w’ (line 377). This is
followed by a silence of 9.2 seconds. Jonathan’s statement in line 375 can be heard as him thinking aloud to himself, as Pamela doesn’t orient to it as a request for clarification or help. In line 377 he can be heard to be holding the turn of talk and showing that he is able to provide the required answer. This suggestion is supported by the silence of 9.2 seconds that follows where Pamela can be heard to allow him to hold the turn of talk and provide a response. Jonathan then states ‘windy ain it’ (line 379). This is followed by a silence for 3.8 seconds and then Pamela makes her statement in line 381. Here, Pamela is orienting to Jonathan’s statement as a response to the question. However, his utterance in line 379 ends on raised intonation and can also be seen as an enquiry about the validity of his answer. This forms the first part of a question answer adjacency pairing as evidenced by Pamela’s ‘y::e::h’ (line 381). Here, Pamela has receipted Jonathan’s statement but then proceeds to prompt him for further information. This can be seen by Jonathan’s overlapping statement in line 383 where he orients to this prompt with a response. This is followed by a silence of 2.0 seconds before Jonathan utters ‘er::’. Here, Pamela’s lack of talk shows Jonathan to be using this utterance as a way to hold the turn of talk. Jonathan makes a further statement ‘it’s like (.) oh winter that’s where (0.2) is it where all the leaves come off the trees’ (line 386). This is followed by a silence for 4.0 seconds and then Pamela makes the statement ‘okay’ (line 389) which can be heard as a receipt. Jonathan makes two attempts to begin an answer before finally offering ‘is it where all the leaves come off the trees’ (line 387). However, it needs to be noted that while this statement is phrased as a question Pamela doesn’t orient to it as such. Instead, the silence is followed by a neutral receipt. Here, she is orienting to Jonathan’s response as an answer. It is also worth noting that Pamela’s receipt is softly spoken which suggests she is orienting to difficulty within the interaction as also seen in extract 3.10. As Pamela offers the receipt Jonathan makes an overlapping statement and this is followed immediately by Pamela saying ‘mmm’ (line 391). Here, Jonathan is offering further information to support his response and Pamela is receipting this information. Her receipt is followed by a silence for 1.2 seconds and Jonathan then takes the next turn of talk stating ‘and er::’ (line 393). This is followed by a further silence and he then states ‘and it’s cold’. These lines showing him orienting to Pamela’s receipt in line 391 as an enquiry about whether he has any further information to offer. He holds the turn of talk in line 393 and then offers further information. After a brief silence Pamela states ‘yep’ which can be heard as a positive
evaluation of his response and shows her to be orienting to his statement as a further part of his response to the question. Pamela then makes a further statement ‘er:: (0.8) what else is there’ (line 399). The initial ‘er::’ is spoken softly suggesting that she is orienting to potential difficulty within the interaction. This difficulty may stem from Jonathan’s unsuccessful attempts to provide an answer to the question.

After a pause of 3.0 seconds Jonathan quickly states ‘that’s all I can say’ and this is followed by a sigh. He then makes an inaudible utterance before ending it with ‘but nothing else’. This is followed by a short pause of 1.4 seconds and then Pamela states ‘okay can you explain that any more=or’. Jonathan takes the next turn after a brief silence with ‘NAH I don’t know anything else’. Here, Jonathan is making a statement about his ability to provide a response and he is stating that he is not able to provide any further information. Pamela receipts that statement with ‘okay’ (line 404) and then asks whether he can explain his answer any further. Jonathan orients to Pamela’s statement as a question by initially stating ‘NAH’ and he then reaffirms his inability to provide any further information. Pamela overlaps with ‘okay thank you’ and then immediately opens a new sequence of talk with a new question in line 408. Pamela’s overlapping talk indicates that she is orienting to Jonathan’s loud ‘NAH’ as indicating difficulty within the interaction and she is acting to close the turn of talk.

### 3.4.2 When I don’t know is followed by a request for further information.

**Extract 3.27 [IA / PC / Nov 2002 / Jan 2003]**

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>184</td>
<td>Phil:</td>
<td>how about ↑that ↓one number ↓nine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>185</td>
<td></td>
<td>(7.2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>186</td>
<td>Simon:</td>
<td>right something missing (0.4) “but I don’t know what”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>187</td>
<td>Phil:</td>
<td>you don’t know ↑what (2.2) ha[ve a guess</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>188</td>
<td>Simon:</td>
<td>↓[screw</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>189</td>
<td></td>
<td>(3.0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>190</td>
<td>Simon:</td>
<td>a ↑screws ↓missing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>191</td>
<td>Phil:</td>
<td>↑what would happen if the screw wa- wasn’t ↓there</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>192</td>
<td>Simon:</td>
<td>break</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>193</td>
<td>Phil:</td>
<td>yeh they’d &gt;fall in alf ↓wouldn’t they&lt; (.) thh hh</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>194</td>
<td></td>
<td>(4.0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>195</td>
<td>Phil:</td>
<td>I ↑said they’d get a bit harder as they go along=</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>196</td>
<td>Simon:</td>
<td>=yeh</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>197</td>
<td>Phil:</td>
<td>wha- what do ya think to that ↓one</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

92
This extract begins with Phil making the statement ‘how about that one number nine (line 184). This is followed by a pause of 7.2 seconds before Simon then utters ‘right something missing (0.4) but I don’t know what’ (line 186). In this statement Simon is orienting to Phil’s statement as a request for information. In this particular extract, the subtest requires the interviewee to consider a picture and to describe the important aspect of the picture that is missing. Simon indicates that he is aware that something is missing, showing that he is orienting to the rules of the interaction, but he then states that he doesn’t know what. The second part of his statement is spoken softly and this could either suggest that he is thinking aloud or it may be an admission to the interviewer that he doesn’t know what the answer is.

Following this statement, Phil immediately utters ‘you don’t know what’ (line 187). Here, Phil is echoing Simon’s statement and is orienting to it as a response. By echoing it he is receipting that he has heard it. However, after a pause Phil continues by stating ‘have a guess’ (line 187). As this is spoken Simon overlaps with ‘sa screw’. This overlap could be heard as Simon has orienting to the first part of Phil’s statement and the following pause as a prompt to provide an answer. However, when Phil utters ‘have a guess’ this is heard to serve a number of actions. He is indicating that Simon’s initial response is not acceptable. He is also seeking to minimise the importance of giving a correct answer and is indicating to Simon that he wouldn’t be judged for giving a wrong answer. This suggestion is supported by Simon’s subsequent response of ‘sa screw’. Such a strategy was seen previously in extract 3.24 where an attempted response also resulted from a prompt to ‘have a guess’.

There is a 3.0 second pause and Simon then states ‘a screws missing’. Phil immediately follows this with ‘what would happen if the screw wa- wasn’t there’ (line 191) and Simon then states ‘break’ (line 192). Phil then takes the next turn with ‘yeh they’d fall in alf wouldn’t they (. ) thh hh’. Here, Simon has provided a response to Phil’s request for information. In line 191, Phil is heard to be requesting information from Simon about his understanding of the response he has made. Simon demonstrates his competence by offering an immediate response. Phil then proceeds to offer an explanation to Simon that confirms his response and it can also be heard to draw that sequence of conversation to a close.
After a pause of 4.0 seconds Phil takes the next turn of talk with 'I said they'd get a bit harder as they go along=' (line 195) which Simon immediately follows with '=yeh'. Here, Phil can be heard to be orienting to difficulty within the interaction by shifting the referent of the difficulty away from Simon and placing it within the test items. This interactional strategy was discussed earlier (e.g Pamela in extract 3.12) as being a recognised way to maintain rapport within the interaction.


424 Paula: ↑tell me some ↓reasons (0.2) ↑why we have a parole system (6.2)
426 → Catherine: I don't know
427 Paula: ↑right
428 Catherine: I've got no idea
429 Paula: do you know what a parole system is
430 Catherine: ↑to I've [never heard ↓of ↓it]
431 Paula: [hh hh
432 Paula: ↑difficult to ↓answer that one then ↑isn't ↓it eh eh
433 Catherine: it's got me puzzled e- (0.2) EY UP THERE'S SOMEbody COMIN AhhT ME he he ehh ehh ehh
435 (1.6)
436 Paula: ↑ok ↓kay (0.2) ↑can you ↓tell me ↓why: people wash ↓clothes
437 ^=why do people wash clothes<

In extract 3.28 the talk begins with Paula stating 'tell me some reasons (0.2) why we have a parole system' (line 424). This is followed by a pause for 6.2 seconds and then Catherine states 'I don't know' (line 426). Here, Catherine is heard to orient to Paula's statement as a request for information. This is followed immediately by Paula's utterance of 'right' (line 427), which is spoken softly and can be heard to receipt Catherine’s response. However, Catherine immediately makes the statement 'I've got no idea' (line 428) and is heard to be orienting to Paula’s statement in line 427 not as a receipt but as an indication that her response was not acceptable. Therefore, she is providing an alternative response while still commenting upon her inability to provide the answer.
Paula follows this statement with ‘do you know what a parole system is’ (line 429). Catherine takes the next turn of talk immediately with ‘no I’ve never heard of it’ (line 430) and Paula overlaps with laughter. Here, Paula is orienting to Catherine’s previous responses as being statements about her ability to answer the initial question. Her statement in line 429 shows her to be testing whether Catherine’s poor competence is a result of not having sufficient background knowledge to provide a correct response. Catherine’s response in line 430 shows her orienting to Paula’s statement as a request for information. Paula’s laughter can be heard as her orienting to difficulty in the interaction by attempting to lighten the tone of the interaction. This is supported by Paula’s statement ‘difficult to answer that one then isn’t it eheh’ (line 432). Here, Paula is cleverly providing a reason why Catherine could not answer the initial request. She is heard to be shifting the focus for this inability away from being a negative evaluation about Catherine’s competence while still acknowledging that Catherine couldn’t provide an answer. Catherine follows this with ‘it’s got me puzzled’ (line 433) and she then changes the topic of her talk where she says ‘EY UP THERE’S SOMEBhhODy COMIN AhhT ME he he ehh ehh ehh’. After a pause Paula then says ‘okay’ before stating ‘can you tell me why people wash clothes >why do people wash clothes<’. Initially, Catherine is heard to acknowledge Paula’s comment about her competence, but then Catherine is heard to shift the focus of conversation away from her competence and instead talks about someone coming at her. This may be her attempt to shift the focus of interactional difficulty away from herself. Indeed, Paula follows this with ‘okay’ (line 436). Here, she can be heard to orient to interactional difficulty by receipting Catherine’s statement but then closing that sequence of talk before opening a new topic of talk.

3.4.3 When I don’t know is followed by attempts from the interviewer to offer reassurance.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pamela:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>667</td>
<td>can you name a prime minister of great britain during the second world war</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>668</td>
<td></td>
<td>(18.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>669</td>
<td>Jonathan:</td>
<td>aint got a clue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>670</td>
<td></td>
<td>(2.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>671</td>
<td>Jonathan:</td>
<td>not so sure if it’s Tony Blair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>672</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Extract 3.29 begins with Pamela making the statement ‘can you name a prime minister of Great Britain during the second world war’ (line 667). This is followed by a silence of 18.4 seconds before Jonathan makes the utterance ‘aint got a clue’ (line 670). Here, Jonathan is orienting to Pamela’s opening statement as a request for information. This is supported by the lengthy silence that follows where Pamela can be heard to withhold from taking the next turn of talk. As seen in previous extracts, this constitutes a question-answer adjacency pairing.

This turn is followed by a silence for 2.8 seconds and then Jonathan makes a further statement ‘not so sure if it’s tony blair’ (line 672). He follows this with a further silence for 2.6 seconds before making the statement ‘can’t remember that sohh shhure (0.4) I know I watch a war films but=’ (lines 674 and 675). Pamela follows with the next turn where she states ‘m mm’.

From line 670 Jonathan can be heard to be attempting to provide the request information. His first response in line 670 can be heard as a statement about his competence but he orients to the following silence as an indication that his response is not acceptable. Therefore, he then makes a further statement of competence in line 672. Here, he is stating what he does know. However, he orients to the silence that follows as indicating that this statement is also not acceptable so he makes a further statement about his competence. Brief laughter can be heard when he says ‘sohh shhure’ (line 674) which could indicate an attempt to lighten the interaction as a way of managing difficulty, as has been seen in previous extracts. This is followed by a further statement of competence where he states what he does know (i.e that he does watch war films).
Following Pamela’s statement in line 676 Jonathan immediately makes the utterance ‘there isn’t (.) I don’t know th- who he is’ (line 677) and Pamela takes the next turn of talk with ‘you’ve been watching (.) you’ve watched war films though’ (line 678). Here, interestingly, Pamela can be heard to comment not upon Jonathan’s ability to provide the answer but instead upon the fact that he has been watching war films. By doing so, Pamela is orienting to Jonathan’s stated inability to provide the answer as a source of difficulty within the interaction. Jonathan overlaps with ‘yeh’ (line 679) indicating that he is orienting to Pamela’s statement as focusing upon a positive area of his competence. In other words what Pamela is saying could be heard as ‘well you can’t provide the answer but you have been watching war films which is good’. Pamela is working to bring a positive aspect to the interaction which is oriented to by Jonathan in line 679 and also by Pamela stating ‘yeh’ (line 680). There is a silence for 2.6 seconds and this is followed by the introduction of a new turn of talk. As with previous extracts it can be seen that the interactional style shifts after line 674 from a formal interview style to a more informal conversational style. As has been demonstrated in previous extracts, this is a recognised strategy for managing interactional difficulty.

In the above extract, Jonathan is making repeated statements about his inability to provide a response to the question and as the interaction progresses Pamela can be seen to be orienting to emerging difficulty and working to manage that difficulty. Once Jonathan states ‘I don’t know’ Pamela can be seen to be focusing upon a positive statement that he had made and so is working to maintain the rapport in the interaction by drawing the sequence of talk to a positive conclusion. It could be argued that when Jonathan states ‘not knowing’ he is actioning the closure of the sequence of talk, yet, it could also be argued that such closure is the result of an accumulation of statements about his inability to respond. This latter suggestion is supported by previously seen extracts, where a clear statement of not knowing has not always brought the interaction to a close.

Extract 3.30 [IC / PC / Nov 2002 / Jan 2003]

533 Phil:  how can you remember the name (0.8) of a (.) prime minister
534 (.) in England that was around in the war
535 Simon: right
536 (4.0)
537 Simon: I weren't born then
538 (7.2)
539 Phil: no you weren't born then
540 (3.2)
541 Phil: have you any idea
542 Simon: he was smoking
543 Phil: he smoked a cigar yeh
544 Simon: yeh cigar
545 (1.8)
546 Phil: can you remember this name
547 Simon: it's THICK (2.2) I saw it on Kelly
548 Phil: mm
549 Simon: I thought it was quite big
550 (2.2)
551 Simon: saw it yesterday (.) on black and white talked
552 (1.8)
553 Phil: can you remember what this name was
554 Simon: hat
555 Phil: yeh
556 (1.8)
557 Simon: he had a hat when I saw him
558 (2.6)
559 Simon: ehm (0.2) I don't know this name know
560 Phil: hh hh
561 Simon: his name gone (.) that's strange
562 (2.0)
563 Phil: shall I tell you his first name
564 Simon: yeh
565 Phil: it was Winston
566 Simon: *Winston*
567 Phil: do you know what this second name was
568 Simon: I seen it on telly (.) yesterday
569 (1.2)
570 Simon: it was the same man (0.2) difficult
571 Phil: okay next question then

Extract 3.30 begins with Phil stating 'can you remember the name (0.8) of a (.) prime minister (.) in England that was around in the war' (lines 533 & 534). This is followed by a silence for 4.0 seconds and then Simon takes the next turn of talk with
'right'. Here, he can be seen to be orienting to Phil’s statement as a request for information and so his response forms an adjacency pairing. Simon then takes the next turn of talk with 'I weren't born then' (line 538). Phil immediately follows with 'no you weren't born then no' and then there is a further silence for 3.2 seconds. Here, Simon can be heard to have offered a reason for not providing the required answer and Phil has then receipted that response immediately. Within the interaction Simon can be heard to have oriented to the receipt as meaning his response was acceptable. This claim is supported by Phil’s further statement where he is heard to prompt Simon for further information about his ability to answer, with 'have you any idea' (line 541). Simon orients to this as a prompt by taking the next turn with 'he was smoking' (line 542). Phil treats this as a response by stating 'he was smoking a cigar yeh' before Simon then follows with 'yeh cigar' (line 544). Here, it is interesting that Phil, in line 543 is heard to rephrase Simon’s response by including the word 'cigar'. Such rephrasing of responses has been reported within the literature (e.g. Antaki, 1999).

Phil then follows a silence of 1.8 seconds with the statement 'can you remember his name' (line 546). Simon follows with 'it's THICK (2.2) I saw it on telly' and Phil follows with 'mmmm' (line 548). Here, there is what appears to be a further question—answer adjacency pairing and this is then receipted by Phil in line 548. However, within the talk, while Simon is heard to be responding to a request, the content of his talk shows that he is qualifying his previous response by now commenting on the size of the cigar. Simon can be heard to orient to Phil’s request in line 546 as an indication that his previous response was unacceptable and so he is attempting to add to it, to make it acceptable.

A silence for 2.2 seconds follows and then Simon takes a further turn of talk with 'saw it yesterday on black an white telly' (line 551). There is a further silence for 1.8 seconds and then Phil states 'can you remember what his name was'. Here, Simon can be heard to make efforts to demonstrate that he knows the person being discussed despite not being able to give a name. In other words, he is attempting to compensate for his inability to provide the requested information (i.e. the name) by displaying his competence to know who is being talked about.
Simon then states 'hat' (line 554) which shows him orienting to Phil's statement as a further request for information and Phil follows with the utterance 'yeh'. Here, Phil is heard to positively evaluate Simon's statement and after a silence for 1.8 seconds, Simon takes the next turn of talk with 'he had a hat on when I saw him' (line 557). Here, Simon can again be heard to be attempting to demonstrate competence to provide the correct answer. His statement is followed by a silence for 2.6 seconds before he then states 'I don't know his name now' (line 559). This shows him to be orienting to the preceding silence as indicating that his response was unacceptable as compared to previous responses that have been receipted.

Phil follows Simon's statement with laughter in line 560 and Simon then states 'his names gone (.) that's strange' and a further silence of 2.0 seconds follows. Here, Phil's laughter can be heard as an attempt to manage potential difficulty by lightening the tone of interaction and playing down the significance of Simon's admission of not knowing. This suggested difficulty is confirmed by Simon's following statement where he can be heard to suggest that he did know the name but it has now gone. Here, Simon is attempting to display competence by attributing his inability to answer to having had the information but not being able to recall it at present. It is not possible to determine from the talk whether this is actually the case or whether he is covering for not being able to answer.

After the silence Phil states 'shall I tell you his first name' (line 563) and Simon follows with 'yeh'. Phil then follows with 'it was Winston' (line 565) and Simon softly repeats this. Phil then states 'dyu know what his second name was' (line 567). This turn is immediately followed by Simon saying 'I seen it on telly (.) yesterday'. This statement shows Simon to be orienting to Phil's statement as a request for information. Following a silence for 1.2 seconds, Simon then states 'it was the same man (0.2) difficult' (line 570). Again, as with previous parts of this extract, Simon can be heard to be working at demonstrating his ability to provide the requested information. Phil then closes the sequence of talk with 'okay' and introduces a new sequence of talk. As with previous extracts, the interactional style in this extract can be heard to shift towards a more conversational style in an effort to manage interactional difficulty arising from Simon's statements about his competence.
3.5 Occasions where ‘dunno’ is used

As with the ‘don’t know’ and ‘I don’t know’ statements, the occasions where the interviewee used the utterance ‘dunno’ were identified within the talk. A total of 7 extracts were found and these came from two of the three interviews: interviews One and Two. As with previous sets of extracts, for clarity of presentation these have been grouped into three sub categories similar to those used for the ‘don’t know’ and the ‘I don’t know’ statements: ‘When dunno is followed by a receipt and closure of the sequence of talk’, ‘When dunno is followed by a question’ and ‘When dunno is followed by an attempt by the interviewer to offer positive evaluation’.

It needs noting that some of the ‘dunno’ statements are made as standalone utterances yet others are prefixed with ‘I’. However, unlike with the ‘don’t know’ and ‘I don’t know’ statements it wasn’t considered to be worth subdividing these statements due to the small number of extracts that had been found.

3.5.1 When dunno is followed by a receipt and closure of the sequence of talk

Extract 3.31 [IC / PC / Nov 2002 / Jan 2003]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Phil:</th>
<th>Simon:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>922</td>
<td>d’ya know what (0.2) d’ya know what a parole system</td>
<td>Phil: have you ever heard the word (1.8) we talk about (0.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>923</td>
<td>system is</td>
<td>someone being on parole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>924</td>
<td>(5.2)</td>
<td>(1.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>926</td>
<td><em>wha-</em></td>
<td>Simon: do you know what the word parole means</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>927</td>
<td>Phil:</td>
<td>Simon: dunno what it means</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>928</td>
<td>do you know what the word parole means</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>929</td>
<td>go to a job</td>
<td>(1.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>930</td>
<td>(4.2)</td>
<td>can you think of any reasons why we have</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>931</td>
<td>Phil:</td>
<td>when children can go to work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>932</td>
<td>ehm:</td>
<td>(0.4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extract 3.31 starts with Phil saying ‘d’ya know what (0.2) d’ya know what a parole system is have you ever heard the word (1.8) we talk about (0.6) someone being on parole’ (lines 922 to 924). This is followed by a silence for 5.2 seconds and Simon then utters ‘wha’. Here, Simon is orienting to Phil’s opening statement as a request for information. The structure of Phil’s request is interesting in that it begins with the request ‘d’ya know what a parole system is’ but then he continues to make a linguistically different request ‘have you ever heard the word’. Here, Phil is
requesting different two separate pieces of information: namely a definition of a parole system and also a yes/no indication of whether Simon has heard of the word parole. After this, Phil then concludes his statement by offering an example of how the word might be used ‘we talk about (0.6) someone being on parole’. This shows a clear deviation from the standardised wording within the WAIS-III manual.

Phil immediately follows Simon’s statement of ‘wha’ with ‘do you know what the word parole means’ (line 927). Here, Phil can be heard to orient to Simon’s statement as a request for clarification. This may stem in part from Phil making two differing requests in his initial statement, although there is no evidence for this within the talk. Simon immediately takes the next turn of talk by saying ‘dunno what it means’ and Phil then states ‘no okay’ (line 929). This is followed by a silence for 4.2 seconds before Phil then utters ‘ehm (1.8) can you think of any reasons why we have laws about when children can go to work’ (line 931 and 932).

In line 928, Simon can be heard to be orienting to Phil’s preceding statement as a request for information and Simon is stating that he doesn’t know what the word parole means. Phil then reframes Simon’s response into ‘no’ and receipts this with ‘okay’. After a silence he then holds the turn of talk with ‘erm’ and introduces a new sequences of talk.

Within the talk there is indication of some interactional difficulty arising. This can be seen to stem from line 926 where Simon is demonstrating his inability to understand the request. The talk then becomes more informal in style with flowing turns of talk. Indeed, in line 928, Simon is heard to speak quickly, indicating a desire for the information to be considered less important. Here, Simon is making a statement about his competence but is making light of it by talking quickly. This is a strategy that has been seen in previous extracts and within the literature. Phil follows immediately with his response and the sequence is then closed which suggests that difficulty is being managed by the closure of the sequence of talk.

289 Pamela: thank you
290 (9.4)
Extract 3.32 opens at the end of a previous sequence of talk with Pamela making the statement ‘thank you’ and this is followed by a silence for 9.4 seconds. Jonathan then states ‘anything else or do you want me to carry on’ (line 291). Pamela follows with ‘yes we just carry on have a look at that one’ (line 292) and Jonathan overlaps with ‘yeh okay’. Here, it could be suggested that Pamela had been closing the sequence of talk yet Jonathan oriented to the silence with uncertainty about whether the sequence had closed. He can be heard to enquire about this and Pamela orients to this by then explaining ‘we just carry on’ and opening a new sequence of talk with ‘have a look at that one’. After a brief silence Pamela states ‘there are quite a few of these so just carry on an’ (line 295). There follows a pause for 6.2 seconds before Jonathan then states ‘I dunno what you call them but it’s number three’ (line 297). Pamela takes the next turn with ‘that’s lovely that’s fine’ (line 298).

To provide context to this piece of talk, the subtest presented above involves the interviewee considering sequence of patterns where one in the sequence is missing and they must choose from a selection the one that would fit into the missing space. Therefore, in line 297 Jonathan in indicating that number three is his preferred answer.

Returning to the extract, Jonathan can be heard to indicate not being able to name something but he then goes on to indicate the number of his choice. Here, Jonathan is doing a number of things. Firstly, he is orienting to Pamela’s statement of ‘so just carry on’ (line 295) and the following silence as a request to provide some information. In his statement he is also making a statement about his competence to
name the object but then proceeds to demonstrate competence about his ability to identify what he believes to be the correct response. This statement is receipted by Pamela who is heard to be offering a positive evaluation of Jonathan’s answer rather than a neutral receipt. This is similar to previous instances of positive evaluation (for example extract 3.12). After a silence for 3.8 seconds Pamela then states ‘right’ which can be heard as an indicator that a new sequence of talk is about to be introduced and then she continues with ‘which one of those pictures (0.2) do you think fits in there’ (line 300). Pamela is now opening a new sequence of talk with a new request for information.

Unlike in previous extracts, there is no evident difficulty within the interaction despite the statement ‘I dunno’ (line 297). This could be accounted for in a number of ways. Firstly, while the statement ‘I dunno’ is the focus for analysis it is important to remember that in this extract Jonathan did offer a response to the request for information in the form of ‘it’s number three’. Therefore, ‘I dunno’ is not being offered a true response to the question but an additional comment on his ability to provide additional or alternative information. Secondly, the nature of the subtest means that Jonathan has multiple options for giving his response and therefore is still able to give a response to the request without being able to name or describe what pattern number three is. This is supported by evidence from previous extracts, for example extract 3.29, where Simon’s options to respond were limited to being verbal in the form of the name of the Prime Ministers. He was heard to be attempting to demonstrate that he knew the prime minister being talked about but was unable to recall his name. In that case, the name was the crucial information being sought and Simon was left with no acceptable alternative way to convey the requested information. However, in extract 3.32, Jonathan is simply required to indicate his choice of answer and this could be done by pattern number, by pattern description or by non-verbal indication. Jonathan’s statement about not knowing didn’t introduce difficulty into the interaction because it was of no consequence to him being able to provide the requested information. It is important to remember that a lack of interactional difficulty may not be due to a correct response being given. At this point that there is no way of knowing from the talk whether Jonathan’s response was correct although while Pamela offers a positive evaluation of his response this is far from conclusive.
Extract 3.33 begins with Phil stating ‘do you know how many weeks there are in a year’ (line 475). After a silence for 1.8 seconds Simon utters ‘how many weeks’. Simon’s statement can be heard as a request for clarification or as a comment to himself as he is preparing a response. Phil follows with ‘mmm (.) altogether’ (line 478) which shows him to be orienting to Simon’s response as a request for clarification about the information being requested. Simon then follows immediately with ‘thirty days thirty one days (1.0) an (( syll syll )) days’. Here, Simon is heard to be orienting to Phil’s statement in line 478 as a clarification of the request and he is offering responses to that request. He offers two responses and then after a silence he offers a further response.

Phil then takes the next turn with ‘that’s how many days there are in a month isn’t it’ (line 480) and Simon follows with ‘yeh’. Here, Simon is orienting to Phil’s statement...
as an indication that his responses were unacceptable and Phil is explaining why this is so. Interestingly, Simon’s statement of ‘yeh’ shows him to be orienting to Phil’s statement in line 480 as a question. Phil’s question is closed and it allows Simon the opportunity to demonstrate his competence.

Phil then takes the next turn of talk and states ‘so do you know how many weeks there are in a year’ (line 482). This is followed by a silence for 3.0 seconds before Simon then states ‘lots’. Here, Simon can be heard to be orienting to Phil’s statement as a request and he is completing the question-answer adjacency pairing with a response. Phil can be heard to begin his question with ‘so’ and this can be heard as a strategy for managing potential difficulty. Having allowed Simon to correctly answer his question given in line 480, Phil is heard to use the prefix ‘so’ to allow him to reissue the same request as stated in line 475, but in a way that allows it to be heard as a follow-on question rather than a direct repeat of the initial question.

Simon’s response of ‘lots’ is immediately receipted by Phil with ‘lots yeh’ (line 485). After a silence for 2.2 seconds Phil states ‘any idea of a number’ (line 487). Here, Phil is orienting to the silence as suggesting that Simon is orienting to his last response as acceptable. Therefore, he takes the next turn of talk to request further information from Simon who responds with ‘over (0.2) over a hundred’ (line 488). Phil then utters ‘over a hundred’. Here, Phil can be heard to be gradually prompting Simon to answer the initial question offered.

After a silence for 3.8 seconds Phil then says ‘okay’. This is spoken softly and he can be heard to be orienting to difficulty within the interaction arising from an unacceptable response given by Simon in line 488. By speaking softly, he can be heard to be gently drawing the sequence of talk to a close. This is followed by a silence for 1.8 seconds and then Phil states ‘do you know (.) who wrote (.) Hamlet’ (line 493). Here, Phil can be heard to have closed the sequence of talk with ‘okay’ in line 491 and is opening a new sequence of talk.

Interestingly, after a silence for 3.0 seconds Simon the states ‘er (0.8) eighty six (1.8) sorry I don’t (0.6) dunno (.) DUNNO THE answer really’ (line 495 and 496). Phil follows this turn of talk with ‘okay (1.6) do you know who wrote Hamlet’. Simon can
be heard to attempting to offer a response to Phil’s question. In this case, he is orienting to difficulty in the interaction relating to Phil’s closure of the sequence of talk and the introduction of a new sequence as an indication that Simon’s his response in line 488 demonstrated his inability to provide the correct response. Simon is making a further attempt to provide the response but after a silence of 1.8 seconds he then states that he ‘dunno’. Simon may have oriented to the silence of 1.8 seconds as indicating that his response of eighty six was also unacceptable and so he is making a statement about his competence to attempt any further responses. However, Simon takes three attempts to make this statement. Firstly, he quietly utters ‘sorry I don’t’ before then quietly saying ‘dunno’ and finally he loudly says ‘DUNNO THE answer really’. Phil then again closes that sequence of talk and introduces a new one. Here, Simon is orienting to the difficulty of admitting that he is not able to provide the correct response having made several attempts and Phil is managing this potential difficulty by closing the sequence in order to introduce a new sequence of talk. 

In this extract, Simon can be seen to be orienting to difficulty within the interaction and continues to orient to it despite the sequence of talk being closed. This suggests that the closure of the talk is a strategy by Phil to manage interactional difficulty but Simon is orienting to it as a comment about his competence. Simon eventually indicates not having the competence to provide the requested answer.

3.5.2 When dunno is followed by a question

Extract 3.34 [3A / PC / Nov 2002 / Jan 2003]

497 Pamela:  
498 does (0.2) what does yesterday mean (1.8) yes yesterday
499 Jonathan:  
500 →
501 dunno what yesterday means< (.) eh heh
502 Pamela:  
503 can you explain it to me
504 Jonathan:  
505 (18.2)
506 Jonathan:  
507 Pamela:  
508 (9.4)
509 Jonathan:  

107
In this extract, Pamela begins with the statement ‘okay (0.2) we'll move on and do a few more =what does (0.2) what does yesterday mean (1.8) yesterday’ (lines 497 and 498). This is followed by a silence for 4.8 seconds before Jonathan then says ‘you go like that (0.2) an a went out yesterday (0.2)>oh I dunno what yesterday means< (.) eh hhh’ (lines 500 and 501). Pamela's statement begins with ‘okay’ which can be heard as a marker that a new sequence of talk will be introduced and she then confirms this by stating ‘we'll move on and do a few more’. However, Pamela follows straight on with the request for information that Jonathan is orienting to. In this case, a definition of ‘yesterday’. Jonathan begins his turn of talk by offering an explanation of ‘yesterday’ but he then follows it with ‘>oh I dunno what yesterday means<’ spoken quickly. This can be heard as an attempt by Jonathan to inoculate himself against negative evaluation. Here, Jonathan has made a response but to guard against his competence being questioned if the response is incorrect he is then indicating that he doesn't know and so suggests that the offered response is only a guess. Further to this, Jonathan is then heard to sigh at the end of his statement. This would suggest that difficulty has occurred within the interaction as a result of the initial request.

Pamela immediately takes the next turn of talk with ‘can you explain it to me’ (line 502). Here, she is indicating that Jonathan’s attempted response was unacceptable. This is followed by a silence for 1.6 seconds and then Jonathan utters ‘erm’. There is a further lengthy silence of 18.2 seconds before Jonathan states ‘no I can’t (0.2) as’ (line 506). Here, Jonathan is initially holding the turn of talk in line 504 but then after a silence he completes the question-answer adjacency pairing with his statement of competence in line 506. Pamela immediately issues the statement ‘>want to have a guess<’ in quick speech. After a silence for 9.4 seconds Jonathan then states ‘nah (.) don’t know what it means’ and a silence for 3.0 seconds follows. In line 506 Jonathan has made a more definite statement about his competence to answer the question but this is followed by a further prompt to ‘have a guess’. He can be heard to orient to this
as an invitation to guess by initially stating 'nah' and then restating that he doesn't know what the word means.

After the following silence Jonathan then takes the next turn of talk with 'wish me (0.2) well me (.) me dad knows (0.8) he knows all of em ehh heh heh' (line 511). After a silence for 3.2 seconds Pamela states 'okay (.) what does terminate mean'. Here, Jonathan can be heard seeking to demonstrate his ability to know who would be able to provide Pamela with the information requested. Interestingly, this strategy was used by Jonathan earlier in extract 3.12). Here, it can be seen to be an attempt to manage the interactional difficulty following his previous statement about his competence.

This extract is interesting in that it contains both of the statements 'I dunno' and 'don't know'. Within the extract, it can be seen that 'I dunno' is followed by further attempts to gain the information, yet 'don't know' is not followed by any further attempts to gather the information. This may be due to Jonathan’s statement in line 511 and so the sequence is closed in order to manage the interactional difficulty. It may also be that 'don't know' is a more successful way of actioning the closure of the sequence of talk. In addition, it might be that 'I dunno' is considered a less definite statement about competence. Or, it may be simply that by line 509 Jonathan had already made two previous statements about his competence to provide the response and that the actual wording of a third such statement is less important. From the transcription it is not possible to determine any of the above. Although, drawing upon earlier results, it can be suggested that within the talk the interviewer orients to both statements as being statements about competence. However, they are bringing about different actions within the interaction and this may be a reflection of the wider interactional context and it's impact upon the interaction itself.

Extract 3.35 [1A / PC / Nov 2002 / Jan 2003]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>577</th>
<th>Phil:</th>
<th>ehm: (1.0) designate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>578</td>
<td>Simon:</td>
<td>disinate desi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>579</td>
<td>Phil:</td>
<td>de: ↑designate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>580</td>
<td>Simon:</td>
<td>&gt;dunno what that ↑means&lt; (.) ↑di\text{ dizzy}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>581</td>
<td>Phil:</td>
<td>di\text{ dizzy}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>582</td>
<td>Simon:</td>
<td>does it mean ↑di\text{ dizzy}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Extract 3.35 begins with Phil stating ‘ehm (1.0) designate’ and this is followed immediately by Simon saying ‘disinate desi’ (line 579). Phil takes the next turn with ‘de- designate’ and then Simon makes the utterance ‘dunno what that means (.) dizzy’ (line 581). Here, Simon is heard to be orienting to Phil’s opening statement as a request for information. This subtest requires the interviewee to explain the meaning of a word. Simon can be heard to be orienting to the rules of the subtest by offering a response to Phil’s statement. To support Simon, Phil is heard to be cueing Simon that a new will be coming by stating ‘ehm’ and then allowing a short silence before issuing the word. Simon’s response shows him to be orienting to Phil’s request but he can be heard to be uncertain about the word itself. Phil’s request is heard as a source of difficulty for the interaction because Simon needs to demonstrate his inability to understand the word ‘designate’. Once clarification is offered, Simon then follows with a response to the original request made in line 578. As discussed previously in the methodology section (see extract 2.3), within this extract of talk there are two adjacency pairings at work: those being lines 578 and 581, and lines 579 and 580 as an insertion sequence into the first pairing.

In line 581 Simon begins with a comment about his competence to provide the requested information by stating ‘dunno what that means’ and this is spoken quickly. Here, Simon can be heard to be making a difficult admission about his competence and by speaking quickly is seeking to reduce the importance of the comment. Simon then goes on to make an attempt to demonstrate competence by saying ‘dizzy’. This can be heard to be an attempt to offer a response, having already professed not to know what the word means and so perhaps soften any perception that he is not competent to answer the question.

Phil states ‘dizzy’ (line 582) and this is followed immediately by ‘does it mean dizzy’ from Simon. After a silence for 1.0 seconds, Phil then states ‘eh’ before a further silence for 2.2 seconds. Phil then takes the next turn of talk and states ‘do you know
what reluctant means'. Here, Phil has oriented to Simon’s utterance of ‘dizzy’ as a response by repeating it to show that he has heard it as such, however, he has not receipted it or offered an evaluation and can be heard to be orienting to difficulty within the interaction in relation to Simon’s ability to provide a response. Simon then seeks to ascertain whether his response is correct. This is heard in line 585 by Phil taking the next turn of talk. His utterance of ‘eh’ can be heard to have rising intonation and could be heard as an enquiry. However, the next turn doesn’t offer any evidence to support this. An alternative explanation could be that here, Phil is managing the interactional difficulty by avoiding any further opportunity for Simon’s competence to be questioned. Phil can be heard to be holding the turn of talk until he is able to open a new sequence of talk in line 587 with a fresh request for information.

3.5.3 When dunno is followed by an attempt by the interviewer to offer reassurance

Extract 3.36 [IB / PC / Nov 2002 / Jan 2003]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Transcript</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>394</td>
<td>Phil: 'lets try one more (0.4) see how you get on with this one'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>395</td>
<td>Simon: 'I think I’ll get on with this one alright now'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>396</td>
<td>(9.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>397</td>
<td>Simon: ‘I think I’ll get on with this one alright now’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>398</td>
<td>(6.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>399</td>
<td>Simon: ‘that’s alright (1.2) done that one (.) there you go</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400</td>
<td>Phil: ‘well done yeh’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>401</td>
<td>Simon: ‘that’s alright (1.6) it’s and’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>402</td>
<td>Phil: ‘what do you think (0.2) what made it (.)’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>403</td>
<td>(1.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>404</td>
<td>(0.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>405</td>
<td>Simon: ‘dunno I know it’s (.) there (.) there (.) there (.) there</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>406</td>
<td>Phil: ‘you know it’s’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>407</td>
<td>Simon: ‘yeh’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>408</td>
<td>Phil: ‘how to cut the picture up into four’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>409</td>
<td>Simon: ‘into four’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>410</td>
<td>Phil: ‘okay’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Phil makes the statement ‘lets try one more (0.4) see how you get on with this one’ (line 394). Simon then immediately takes the next turn with ‘I think I’ll get on with this one alright now’ (line 395). After a silence for 9.0 seconds Simon repeats the
same statement but in a softly spoken tone. Again, this is then followed by a silence of 6.2 seconds.

To provide some context to the talk, this subtest involves the interviewee being presented with a picture of a pattern made from four red and white blocks. They are required to use four blocks to copy the pattern shown in the picture. In this extract, Simon is heard to orient to Phil’s statement in a number of ways. Firstly, he is orienting to it as a prompt to consider the next picture and to proceed with copying the pattern. This is evidenced by his statement in line 395 and the following silence. His statement in line 397 is heard to be quietly spoken as though being said while concentrating on the task and this is followed by a further noticeable silence. Secondly, Simon can be heard to be orienting to it as a speculative comment about his competence to complete the task. Therefore, he is responding to Phil’s query about his abilities.

Simon then states ‘that’s alright now (1.2) done that one (.) there you go’ (line 399) and this is followed by Phil stating ‘well done yeh’ and Simon follows with ‘that’s right (1.6) it’s ard ey’ (line 401). Here, Simon is indicating that he has finished the task and that he has provided the requested information for Phil in saying ‘there you go’. Indeed, Phil orients to this statement as such by positively evaluating Simon’s comment. Simon can then be heard to reaffirm that he has completed it and makes a comment about how difficult the task was. With the rising intonation on ‘ey’ at the end of line 401, Simon is asking Phil to confirm how hard it was. However, Phil takes the next turn with ‘what do you think helped (0.2) what made it easier that time’ (line 402). After a silence for 0.8 seconds Simon then states ‘dunno I know it’s that there that there that there’ (line 405). Here, Simon is orienting to Phil’s statement as a request for further information about his abilities and begins with ‘dunno’, however, he moves straight to state ‘I know...’ and then demonstrates competence to Phil. Phil follows this with ‘you know it’s four’ (line 406) and Simon states ‘yeh’. Here, Phil has reformulated Simon’s response to his question and Simon then acknowledges the reformulation to be correct.

Phil then goes on to say ‘>how to cut the picture up into< four’ and Simon follows with ‘into four’ before Phil then says ‘okay’ to close the sequence of talk down. In the
above turns of talk, Phil can be heard to be clarifying his reformulation into an account of how Simon knows to divide the picture into four. Simon orients to this as a further request for comment about his abilities by then responding with 'into four'.

In the above extract, the utterance 'dunno' is seen in a different interactional context than previous extracts. Here, the initial request for information has been successfully satisfied with the completion of the task. However, Phil then proceeds to explore Simon’s competence by investigating how he was able to provide the correct response. Here, Simon can then be heard to make a statement of competence using 'dunno' before then proceeding to demonstrate competence. The subsequent turns of talk can be heard as the participants managing the difficulty that has arisen from Phil’s question and Simon’s admission of not knowing. This is heard through Phil’s positive reformulations of Simon’s statement in line 405 and the sequence of talk is then closed down.

Extract 3.37 [IC / PC / Nov 2002 / Jan 2003]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Phil:</th>
<th>Simon:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1057</td>
<td>how if you got lost in the forest (.) in the day</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1058</td>
<td>I do get lost</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1059</td>
<td>(0.4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1060</td>
<td>Phil: not in forests though</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1061</td>
<td>Simon: I did</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1062</td>
<td>Phil: did you</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1063</td>
<td>Simon: yeh</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1064</td>
<td>Phil: turn round (.) turn around to see the way you came (0.2) the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1065</td>
<td>way behind you</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1068</td>
<td>(3.2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1070</td>
<td>Simon: get direction from a junction (.) or-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1071</td>
<td>(2.2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1072</td>
<td>Simon: in a little while right</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1073</td>
<td>(1.2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1074</td>
<td>Simon: ((sounds like these boys I was following these boys I got lost ))</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1075</td>
<td>I asked a gentleman to give me a way out =</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1076</td>
<td>Phil: so you could ask someone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1077</td>
<td>Simon: yeh (.) ask somebody</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1078</td>
<td>(2.2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1079</td>
<td>Phil: how about if there was no-one else around (0.6) how</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Simon: oh: (0.2) can't think what it is that's hard (.) sorry
(1.8)
Simon: go on (.) come out there go down there > go down
there<
(2.0)
Phil: h- (.) how would you know which direction you were going in
(0.2) if it was a big forest (1.6) how do you think you'd find
your way out
Simon: (3.8) *yeh (0.6) hard *ehm:
Phil: tis hard *yeh
(1.6)
Phil: how big-=
Simon: =t'd find my way out some how
Phil: o*ahy hh hh
(2.8)
Simon: dunno ho-w
Phil: hh hh hh (0.4) just wander around until (( syll ))
Simon: yeh wander round til I find
(1.0)
Phil: o*ah
(2.2)
Phil: how were those

Extract 3.37 begins with Phil making the statement 'if you got lost in the forest (.) in the day' (line 1057) and Simon immediately comments 'I do get lost'. After a brief pause of 0.4 seconds Phil states 'not in forests though' and Simon takes the next turn of talk with 'I did'. Phil then takes the next turn with 'did you' and Simon utters 'yeh'. Here, Phil appears to be issuing a new request for information yet Simon can be heard to comment back that he does get lost. Phil can then be heard to make a comment about Simon's competence by suggesting that he doesn't get lost in forests but Simon orients to that as being incorrect and corrects Phil in line 1061. Phil can then be heard to seek clarification and this is confirmed by Simon orienting to Phil's statement as a question by giving a response 'yeh'.

Phil then states 'okay then well you can do this (0.2) think about it (.) if you got lost in a forest in the day (1.6) how do yo- how would you find your way out' (lines 1064 to 1066). This is immediately followed by Simon's statement 'turn around (.) turn
around to see the way you came (0.2) the way behind you’ (lines 1067 and 1068).

Here, Simon can be heard to be orienting to Phil’s statement as a request for information. When considering Phil’s statement, it can be seen in four parts. Firstly, he closes the previous sequence of talk with ‘okay then well you can do this’. Aside from closing the talk he is making a positive evaluation of Simon’s abilities to answer the question. He then makes a statement to instruct Simon to attend to what is to follow. Then he offers the first part of the request for information before a pause for 1.6 seconds and the makes the request. Simon immediately offers a response. The above lines of talk allow for the initial lines 1057 to 1063 to be heard as difficulty within the interaction. Here, the difficulty is being managed by Phil who makes attempts to close the sequence of talk. This is seen in line 1060 but Simon’s following statement shows this to have been unsuccessful. Phil then cleverly uses a question-answer adjacency pairing to bring the talk to the point where he can then receipt Simon’s response and while holding the turn of talk he can redirect the focus back to the original question.

Returning to extract 3.37, Simon’s statement in lines 1067 to 1068 is followed by a silence for 3.2 seconds before he takes the next turn with ‘get direction from a junction (.) or’ (line 1070). There follows a further silence for 2.2 seconds before Simon takes the next turn with ‘in a little while right’. This statement is followed by a silence for 1.2 seconds and Simon then takes the next turn. The first part of his statement is not clear but then he states ‘I asked a gentleman to give me a way out’ (line 1075). This statement is followed immediately by Phil saying ‘=so you could ask someone’ and Simon then states ‘yeh (.) ask somebody’. In the above turns of talk, Simon can be heard to make repeated attempts to provide a response Phil’s question. These attempts can be heard in lines 1067 to 1068, 1070 and 1072. After each statement there is a noticeable silence and Simon can be heard to be orienting to these as indications that his response is not acceptable, by offering a further response. Phil’s statement in line 1076 shows him orienting to difficulty in the interaction. His talk flows seamlessly from the end of Simon’s statement and here Phil can be heard to be reformulating Simon’s statement. In line 1077 Simon is heard to be orienting to Phil’s reformulation as being given as a question and so he confirms the formulation.
After a silence for 2.2 seconds Phil then states ‘how about if there was no-one else around (0.6) how would you get yo- how would you find your way out’ (lines 1079 to 1080). Simon takes the next turn of talk with ‘oh (0.2) can’t think what it is (.) that’s hard (.) sorry’. This is followed by a silence for 1.8 seconds before Simon continues with ‘go on () come out there go down there >go down there<’ (line 1083). Here, Phil can be heard to reissue the question taking into account the response given by Simon. Simon is orienting to Phil’s statement in this way in line 1081 and makes a statement about his ability to answer the question before shifting the referent of his inability away from himself and towards the question by stating ‘that’s hard’. Simon is managing the interactional difficulty. After a silence he offers a further attempt to respond to the question. Here, he can be heard to be orienting to the silence as indicating that his statement in line 1081 was not an acceptable response.

In line 1085 there is a silence for 2.0 seconds before Phil then states ‘h- (.) how would you know which direction you were going in (0.2) if it was a big forest (1.6) how do you think you’d find your way out’. Simon can be heard to orient to this as a further question by commenting ‘it’s hard (3.8) yeh yeh (0.6) hard ehm’. In Phil’s statement it is interesting to note that he is actually asking two questions within one. The first runs ‘how would you know which direction you were going in (0.2) if it was a big forest’ and then the second is ‘how do you think you’d find your way out’. Phil takes the next turn with ‘tis hard yeh’ where he can be heard to receipt and confirm Simon’s suggestion that the question is hard and that this explains his inability to provide an acceptable response.

After a silence for 1.6 seconds Phil utters ‘how big=’ and Simon follows from that with ‘=I’d find my way out somehow’. Here, Simon can be heard to be orienting to Phil’s statement in line 1092 as the beginnings of a further question and so Simon attempts to close the sequence of talk by making a statement about his ability to find his way out. Phil orients to the interactional difficulty at this point by stating ‘okahhy hh hh hh’. In this statement he is heard to receipt Simon’s response but his ‘okay’ contains and is followed by laughter in order to manage the interactional difficulty. After a silence for 2.8 seconds Simon then states ‘dunno how’. This is followed by Phil stating ‘hh hh hh (0.4) just wander around until’ and Simon overlaps with ‘yeh wander around til I find it’. There is a pause for 1.0 second before Phil then says
'okay'. In the above turns of talk Simon’s comment in line 1096 can be heard as an attempt to inoculate himself against negative evaluation. Such inoculation statements have been discussed in earlier extracts (e.g. extract 3.34) and have already been demonstrated to guard against the person’s competence being negatively judged. This shows Simon orienting to difficulty in the interaction and Phil then begins the next turn of talk with laughter before offering a reformulation of Simon’s statement given in line 1093. Simon orients to this as a positive reformulation and receipts it with ‘yeh’ before repeating it. Phil then closes the sequence of talk in line 1101.
4 Discussion

4.1 Chapter overview
This chapter will open with a review of the literature relevant to the phenomena under investigation. It will then proceed to consider the results of the study. Initially, it will discuss the results looking at the 'don’t know', 'I don’t know' and 'dunno' statements within the interactions from a structural and then from a functional perspective. There will then be a discussion about the implications of the results for clinical psychology. This will be followed by the researchers reflections about conducting this piece of research and there is then a critique of the study. Finally, there is a discussion about areas for future research to build upon the work in this study.

4.2 Review of relevant literature
Within the conversation analysis and discourse psychology literature there have been a small number of studies investigating the statements ‘don’t know’, ‘I don’t know’ and ‘dunno’. These will now be discussed before there is then a discussion of the results of this study with this literature as a backdrop.

Tsui (1991) has suggested that within everyday conversation, there are a number of pragmatic functions for the phrase ‘I don’t know’. She has suggested that respondents may use ‘I don’t know’ to avoid assessment by indicating that they do not have the information to provide a response. It may also be used when the person wishes to make a negative assessment but prefaces the assessment with ‘I don’t know’ so that it is less threatening to the interaction. This is achieved by the speaker initially claiming no opinion or knowledge before then making a statement of opinion. This mechanism enables the speaker to make a negative assessment but to still maintain the interaction. Linked to this, Tsui (1991) notes that ‘I don’t know’ may occur where there is disagreement in the interaction and rather than explicitly disagreeing with the participant, ‘I don’t know’ allows a more subtle disagreement that can also be less threatening to the interaction. A further function that Tsui (1991) reports is where ‘I don’t know’ can serve to avoid commitment. For example, if a request is made the person may avoid complying with or rejecting the request by stating ‘I don’t know’. Finally, Tsui (1991) notes that ‘I don’t know’ may be used to indicate uncertainty about the information being provided and so will preface the information. The
differences between these identified functions are relatively subtle and she suggests that they all carry a unifying message to the participant in the interaction, that is, a message of having insufficient knowledge.

When considering stand-alone statements of 'I don't know', Drew (1992) examined court-room transcripts and found that such a statement may be used when a speaker wishes to show that an event or piece of information was of little importance or consequence to inoculate against negative judgement. Potter (1996) has also considered the interactional work being achieved by the statement 'I don't know'. As with the work of Tsui (1991) he has noted that 'I don't know' may be tagged on to the end of an utterance to bring about 'stake inoculation'. By this, Potter (1996) means that the speaker is able to protect themselves against direct judgement about their statement, in a similar way to prefacing disagreements as described by Tsui (1991).

Hutchby (2002) has suggested that it is important to consider not only the cognitive aspect to the statement 'I don't know' (i.e. that the speaker has insufficient knowledge) but also to consider the interactional work that such a statement is doing during the interaction. The differences between these authors can be seen when considering where they sit in relation to the idea of attending to the cognitive aspect of the utterance. While Potter (1996) holds much more with the view that the interactional work rather than the cognitive function should be attended to, Tsui (1991), Drew (1992) and Hutchby (2002) take a more collective approach and draw upon both aspects.

In his investigations of transcribed counselling sessions with a 6 year old child, Hutchby (2002) considered utterances of 'don't know'. He found that this particular child repeatedly used 'don't know' in response to questions and that interactionally it worked very effectively as a resistance strategy for blocking lines of questioning that the child didn’t wish to follow. Hutchby (2002) suggests that this use of 'don't know' is a manifestation of the child’s competence in avoidance and that this is a demonstration of how 'don't know' is being used non-cognitively as an interactional strategy. This avoidance is reflected in the repeated attempts of the counsellor to engage the line of questioning and Hutchby (2002) acknowledges that eventually the counsellor is skilfully able to side-step this resistance tactic.
As referred to earlier in chapter two, Scheibman (2000) investigated the usage of the utterance 'dunno' in American-English conversation. She concluded that this was often used as a reduction of 'don't know'. She further argued that in most cases 'dunno' was actually a reduction of 'I don't know'. She suggested that within discourse, both statements actually performed the same actions and so could be used interchangeably within the interaction. Of course, caution would need to be exercised when transferring this argument beyond America-English conversation where there may be specific cultural issues underpinning this usage. However, in a similar vein to Scheibman (2000), Hutchby (2002) used the statements 'I don't know' and 'don't know' interchangeably in his paper, so treating them as being the same statements.

It should be noted that only a small number of papers were found relating to the use of the statements 'I don't know', 'don't know' and 'dunno' and none of these have investigated such statements during standardised assessment interactions. While there is some suggestion in the literature that these statements may be performing the same functions in conversation (e.g. Scheibman, 2000; Hutchby, 2002) from a constructionist perspective it would need to be proven in the talk each time such a claim were made. This issue will be considered during the discussion of the results that follows.

4.3 Structural aspects of 'don't know', 'I don't know' and 'dunno'

This section will now consider how these statements appeared within the talk from a structural perspective. In other words, the practical placing of the statements within the talk, how they are organised and their general occurrence within the talk. This will then be followed by a discussion about the functional aspects of these statements within the talk.

Within the talk used for this study it was seen by use of the 'next turn proof procedure' that in all instances, the statement of 'don't know', 'I don't know', 'dunno' was made in response to a request for information.
Structurally, within the individual extracts of talk it could be seen that the three types of statement were used in differing ways. The statement ‘don’t know’ was seen to occur as a stand alone utterance and it always constituted a turn of talk on its own (for example: extract 3.1). In terms of the ‘dunno’ statements, these always occurred as a part of a larger turn of talk and didn’t appear as a stand alone statement, regardless of whether prefixed by ‘I’ or not. They could be seen to be used in a structurally very different way from the ‘don’t know’ statements. As regards the ‘I don’t know’ statements, these were less clearly used. From the extracts it could be seen that sometimes they were used as stand alone statements (for example: extract 3.25) yet at other times ‘I don’t know’ was given within a larger turn of talk (for example: extract 3.26). It can be suggested from the above discussion that there is an overlap in usage between ‘don’t know’ and ‘I don’t know’, and between ‘dunno’ and ‘I don’t know’. However, the statements ‘don’t know’ and ‘dunno’ were used in clearly different ways within the talk.

It is also interesting to note that within the completed transcriptions the above statements only occurred in a total of 27 instances. From reading through the transcripts it can be seen that in response to questions, other responses are given that are clearly not the requested information. Linguistically they could be read as being further statements of ability or competence but this could not be proven without analysing those extracts of talk and there was not scope within this study for such analysis.

Of further interest is the nature of the subtests where the responses of ‘don’t know’, ‘I don’t know’ and ‘dunno’ occurred. All of the examples except three occurred during verbal subtests. These involved the interviewee being asked a question and needing to respond verbally. The three remaining responses were heard when the person was attempting to provide information on a performance subtest. For example, looking at a picture and identifying the missing part of that picture. However, one of those extracts showed the individual provided a response and it was only a follow-up question about how they knew the answer that resulted in the utterance of ‘I don’t know’. It maybe that with performance subtests individuals were more likely to use other ways of indicating their competence to provide the response or it maybe that the performance
subtests were found to be easier and so the interviewees had no need to indicate poor competence. To answer this would require further investigation into the data.

4.4 Functional aspects of ‘don’t know’, I don’t know’ and ‘dunno’.
Having looked at the structural aspects of the statements, this section will now consider the interactional functions of these statements within the talk.

4.4.1 ‘don’t know’, ‘I don’t know’, ‘dunno’ oriented to as acceptable responses
In a number of extracts the interviewer oriented to the responses of ‘don’t know’, ‘I don’t know’ and ‘dunno’ as an acceptable response to the question rather than as the correct or required response. The interviewer would indicate acceptance of the response either through a verbal receipt, such as ‘okay’ or by silence before moving to the next question. The use of silence was heard as an indication of acceptance due to a new sequence of talk beginning with the next turn of talk (for example: extract 3.1). This orientation to the response was also heard to occur in sequences of talk where the interviewee had already attempted a response and this had been oriented to by the interviewer as being inadequate or unacceptable (for example: extract 3.16). On these occasions, the interviewer can be heard to orient to the interviewee’s response as being a genuine statement about their ability to provide the required information.

4.4.2 ‘don’t know’, ‘I don’t know’, ‘dunno’ as sources of interactional difficulty
Within the extracts there are occasions where difficulty arises within the interaction following interviewee response of ‘don’t know’, ‘I don’t know’ or ‘dunno’. Here, these responses can be heard as sources of interactional difficulty, resulting from the interviewee’s statement of competence to provide the requested information.

Within the extracts, the interactional difficulty can be seen to occur in broadly one of two ways. Firstly, where the response of ‘don’t know’, ‘I don’t know’ or ‘dunno’ is made, this is oriented to by the interviewer as being an unacceptable response and the sequence of talk is continued (for example: extract 3.28). Where the interviewee had made a statement indicating their lack of competence to provide the requested information, the interviewer was then creating a further need for the interviewee to restate their lack of competence by requesting further information. For the interviewee
with a learning disability who may desperately wish to demonstrate competence, a requirement to demonstrate a further lack of competence is certain to create difficulty within the interaction. This suggestion is supported by other studies within the literature (e.g. Yearley & Brewer, 1989; Rapley & Antaki, 1996). With difficulty arising within the interaction, the interviewer would then make attempts to repair the difficulty, and to maintain the interaction. These strategies for maintaining rapport have been referred to in earlier chapters but they include shifting the referent of the difficulty away from the interviewee, rewording questions to support the interviewee in answering the question, rephrasing responses, providing positive evaluations to responses. In this study, the results show the interviewers using such conversational strategies to maintain the interaction before then closing the sequence of talk.

Secondly, in some extracts the difficulty was raised in the talk by the interviewee. This sometimes occurred where their response had been oriented to as being acceptable but the interviewee then demonstrated awareness that their response was unacceptable (for example: extract 3.12). It could be argued that here, the interviewee is seeking to be seen as competent by demonstrating an ability to identify an incorrect response. As with the previous paragraph, this may indicate the desire of the interviewee to be seen to be competent. They may be indicating to the interviewer that while they don’t know the requested information they do know other things (i.e. that the response was inadequate, or, who could provide the information). This relates to the work of Yearley and Brewer (1989) who indicated that people with a learning disability seek to pass as being competent within interview situations. In such sequences of talk, the interviewer then needed to manage the difficulty using strategies to shift the referent of the difficulty away from the interviewee in an effort to manage the interaction and so maintain rapport. The interviewers showed themselves to be skilled at doing this in order to maintain the interview interaction.

However, on other occasions, it could be seen that the interviewee would offer a response but would then use ‘I don’t know’ or ‘dunno’ to inoculate themselves against negative judgement before the interviewer had been able to offer a response or evaluation (for example: extract 3.27). In these cases, the interviewee can be heard attempting to display competence by offering a response but is then also attempting to show that they have awareness of their response possibly not being correct. Here, it
could be argued that they are ‘hedging their bets’ and are seeking to display competence in more than one way within the same turn of talk.

4.4.3 Return to ‘don’t know’, ‘I don’t know’, ‘dunno’ as acceptable responses
Having considered those occasions where difficulty is oriented to within the talk, it is worth reconsidering occasions where the interviewee’s response is oriented to as being acceptable. Here, it could be suggested that the interviewee is also making a statement about their own competence but that the interviewer is orienting to such a statement as a source of interactional difficulty and this difficulty is being managed by the interviewer through the closure of the sequence of talk. Unfortunately, it was not possible to test this hypothesis due to the absence of any evidence within the talk.

4.4.4 Summary of ‘don’t know’, ‘I don’t know’, ‘dunno’ within the talk
From the detailed analysis presented in the results chapter and from the above summary discussion it can be seen that the statements of ‘don’t know’, ‘I don’t know’ and ‘dunno’ are being used by the interviewee within the talk to make a statement about their competence to answer the question being asked. Typically, they are used as a direct comment about the interviewee’s competence although on a small number of occasions, as discussed earlier, they will also be used following an attempted response in order to deflect negative evaluation and so here they are still making a statement about their competence, albeit more indirectly. While being used consistently in this way by the interviewees it can be seen that the interviewers responded to these statements in varying ways. Therefore, the action that these statements created within the talk varied between extracts.

The structural aspects of the statements are also worth considering. Taking the differences highlighted in sub-section 4.3 it could be argued that these statements are essentially ‘don’t know’ statements, but within the talk they are sometimes given ‘I’ as a prefix and sometimes reduced to ‘dunno’ depending upon their occurrence within the flow of the talk in order to make linguistic sense. This suggestion is supported by them all conveying the same information about the interviewee’s competence to provide the requested information.
4.5 Implications for Clinical Psychology

The above results allow for a number of issues to be considered in relation to the use of the WAIS-III, and other standardised assessments by clinical psychologists. It is hoped that consideration of these issues will provoke discussion amongst clinicians about their role within such assessments.

4.5.1 Assessing adults with learning disabilities using the WAIS-III

It has been demonstrated that the responses of ‘don’t know’, ‘I don’t know’ and ‘dunno’ are conveying the same meaning within the interactions, yet, it can be seen that they tend to be oriented to in different ways by the interviewers. How a response of ‘don’t know’ is oriented to in the talk will have varying consequences for the interaction and ultimately for the individual’s performance and their outcome measure. Clearly then, clinical psychologists need be attentive to how they are managing such responses. It was noticeable that when a statement of not knowing was followed by further sequences of talk, this was seen as a source of interactional trouble, whereas trouble was usually less evident when the statement was receipted and the turn of talk closed. It was clear that interactional difficulty, and in turn the interactional rapport, was being skilfully managed in various ways. These strategies have been referred to previously, but they included the rewording of questions and the reformulating of responses.

As discussed in previous chapters, authors such as Hishinuma (1998) have advocated the modification of the standardised format in order to obtain ‘better data’ about the person’s abilities. However, others such as Kaufman and Lichtenberger (1999) advocate adherence to the standardised approach although have been vague about defining when the standardised approach becomes non-standardised. This study, and previous literature (e.g. Antaki, 1999) would argue that in standardised assessments when used with people with learning disabilities it is not uncommon for questions to be reworded or responses to be reformulated or even shaped by the interviewer. Therefore, rather than feeling that they must appear to be following the standardised interview format, there is a strong need for clinicians to be aware of how they are managing the interaction and to then acknowledge this when summarising the assessment outcomes, as advocated by Kaufman and Lichtenberger (1999). In that
way it is possible to present an accurate and transparent report of the individuals performance and the interactional context within which this took place.

In this study it is not possible to suggest whether clinicians were deviating significantly from the standardised format and this is perhaps not important. What needs to be attended to is that on occasions clinicians will deviate from the standardised wording of questions to a greater or lesser extent and that they will also manage the response they are given in varying ways as evidenced by this study and others within the literature. How this is dealt with is more important and this study argues that such practices are not 'right or wrong' but that they should be openly acknowledged as assessment strategies. In terms of appropriately determining someone’s needs and abilities it could be argued that there may never be a truly perfect method for doing so. However, this study is not questioning the current use of the concept of IQ or the WAIS-III as a tool for assessment. Rather, it is seeking to describe how the WAIS-III could be utilised more effectively to the benefit of the interviewee and clinician’s awareness can be raised about their very active role within the interaction.

Clinically, this awareness could be taken beyond assessment contexts. Clinicians could develop their understanding and awareness of how turns of talk are oriented to between a clinician and a person with a learning disability. For example, in psychodynamic work where the therapist may reword the clients statements when reflecting them back, or, in cognitive work where the therapist and client may co-construct an understanding of cognition. Taking this further, the findings of this study may begin to suggest potential for conversation analysis to be of use when investigating manifestations of the internal processes involved in such therapeutic work. These ideas may be of particular relevance to people with learning disabilities whose use of language may be limited, or unorthodox, but where the therapist is attempting to use a verbal therapeutic approach. This certainly highlights a substantial area for future research.

4.5.2 Role of the Clinical Psychologist
The ‘scientist-practitioner’ issue was discussed in the introduction. In this study, the clinical psychologists appear to switch between interactional styles within assessment
interviews. On some occasions they may be working to follow the standardised assessment protocol but at the same time they can be heard working to manage difficulties by using a more sensitive interactional style in order to maintain the interaction and the rapport, as eluded to in the previous subsection. In the introduction chapter these styles were labelled, with a caveat, as being comparable to scientist and clinician. So, where these different interactional styles are heard in the talk, it could be suggested that the clinical psychologist is ‘doing being a scientist’ or ‘doing being a clinician’. It could also be suggested that the clinical psychologists are seeking to complete the assessment by switching between styles in order to successfully manage it. However, an alternative hypothesis could be that the way the interaction is being managed represents the clinical psychologists ‘doing a WAIS-III assessment’, or in other words, they are using one interactional style that is suited to standardised assessment contexts. This would be supported by other authors (e.g. Houtkoop-Steenstra, 2000) who have also discussed interactional styles.

These styles of interaction were not the analytic focus of this study and so are being discussed here without supporting extracts from the literature. Indeed, upon reflection, the above ideas and discussion may be driven in part by the author’s current position within clinical psychology (i.e. at the end of training) where the role of the clinical psychologist, and indeed the author’s own identity as a clinical psychologist are fluid and a source of anxiety. However, this may be an area worthy of future research and certainly for future debate.

4.5.3 Professional training of clinical psychologists
Following from the above issues, it can be seen that there could be training implications for trainee clinical psychologists on clinical training courses. This could be done in two ways. Firstly, by exploring with the trainees the interactional aspects of a standardised assessment, for example, considering how the interaction is managed and the potential consequences of such management. Secondly, by encouraging trainees to analyse their own performance whilst on placements to investigate their own interactional style when administering assessments. Both strategies would benefit clinical psychology’s understanding of the interactional processes operating within standardised assessment interviews. They would also enable trainees to develop clearer understanding about their role within the assessment
interaction and the extent to which they are an active participant rather than a passive recipient information. In addition, where significant deviations from the standardised format are evident the individuals can be supported, through analysis of their transcripts, to administer the assessment in the more standardised way.

4.6 Researcher’s Reflections on Conducting the Present Study

The issue of assessment with people with learning disabilities was an area of interest of mine before setting out on this dissertation. As acknowledged earlier this was a guiding influence upon my choice of research topic. The most enlightening stage of the research process was the transcription of the interviews where the construction and management of the talk-in-interaction became noticeable beyond the realist emphasis within the WAIS-III. This process led to my re-evaluation of my own understanding of standardised assessment interaction and how I engage in completing assessment interviews. For example, it raised my awareness of how easy it can be to deviate from the standardisation during an assessment and this has impacted upon my awareness of how I may reword questions that the interviewee doesn’t understand or ask prompts.

My awareness about interpreting and explaining the outcomes of standardised assessments was also influenced with much more consideration being paid to the interview interaction as an accompaniment to the assessment scores. Beyond assessment it has raised my awareness about interactions within clinical and non-clinical settings, how action is being achieved through the talk and how participants orient to this action.

Having done this research I believe that I will take away a better understanding about how individuals interact and how they construct and manage interactions. Also, a clearer understanding about the complexities of standardised assessment that go beyond just the mechanics of administration but right to the fundamentals of the interaction and my role within the interaction. As a potential clinical psychologist I feel that this will form an invaluable aspect of my future clinical work.
4.7 Critique of the present study

4.7.1 Generalisability of the findings

The constructionist epistemology of the present study emphasises that knowledge and understanding are constructed within the talk-in-interaction. This leads to the findings being specific to the interactions. Therefore, as with any other study conducted from a constructionist position the present study may be criticised for providing results that are not generalisable beyond the specific context within which the interactions occurred. However, where constructionists differ from realists is that the constructionist will seek to generalise findings beyond the data with an awareness of the uniqueness of the interactions upon which the findings are based. The realist position would make assumptions about underlying truths and so once a phenomenon is discovered on one occasion it is acceptable to assume that it will be true in other situations. In the present study the results are being offered as theoretically transferable beyond the specific WAIS-III interviews used in the study but with a caveat that their generalisability ought to be investigated and proven rather than just accepted.

4.7.2 Quality of the data

The present study may be criticised in relation to the validity and reliability of the findings being presented. It could be argued that the data is not a valid or reliable account of how WAIS-III interactions are generally managed. However, from the constructionist perspective the concepts of validity and reliability are understood differently. They are concerned with ensuring that the findings of the study are open to scrutiny by the reader. This is achieved by making all aspects of the study as transparent as possible. Within this study a number of strategies, including presentation of extracts, the ‘next turn proof procedure’, reflexivity and seeking internal coherence were employed to ensure the quality of the findings and these were outlined in detail in the methodology chapter.

4.7.3 Replicability

The present study may be criticised for not being replicable. From a realist position it is important that any research can be repeated in order to test the validity and reliability of the findings. However, this is not a concern from the constructionist
perspective. As mentioned in the methodology chapter, the emphasis in this study is upon ensuring the quality of the findings through open scrutiny by the reader. The epistemology behind studies such as this one is that the interaction is a unique event and that it will never be possible to entirely replicate the talk-in-interaction that occurs. Therefore, there is no need to ensure replication, rather, the reader must be able to clearly follow how the findings were obtained so that they can compare different studies within the wider literature.

4.7.4 Unused data
As already suggested, the number of extracts used for analysis is a very small proportion of the total amount of available transcription. This has resulted in a large amount of unused data. It could be argued that in terms of investigating standardised assessment interactions much more detailed or much richer findings could be obtained through use of more data. However, while this may be applicable to perhaps a PhD the time constraints placed upon this study were such that this was not possible. Such large amounts of redundant data are also an artefact of the conversation analytic methodology although the disregard of such much information about the interview interaction and the focusing upon specific aspects of the talk could be considered a potential failing of the methodology and a hindrance to making generalisable comments from the findings.

4.7.5 Non-verbal communication
As referred to in the methodology chapter, the conversation analytic methodology is concerned with talk and so non-verbal communication tends to be overlooked for reasons of not being able to accurately record and analyse it. This can be held as a criticism of the present study. It can be argued that the results and the discussion of the results are based on only one part of the interaction (i.e. the talk). The author acknowledges that aspects of the interaction have indeed been overlooked in terms of analysing the interaction. However, within this study it was not possible to record or analyse the non-verbal communication although it was certainly referred to within the results chapter on a number of occasions when debating the action of a lengthy silence within the talk. This ‘lost communication’ is clearly a difficulty with the methodology of choice and needs to be considered when reviewing the findings of this study,
although it must be stressed that within the terms of the methodology used, the results of this study are still a richly detailed account of the interaction taking place.

4.8 Areas for Future Research

There are a number of areas for future research that are suggested by the current study. This study has demonstrated how conversation analysis can be usefully applied to the WAIS-III standardised assessment, and the findings of this study can be considered a useful addition to the literature base. This study has considered a particular aspect of WAIS-III interviews and within such a lengthy and complex assessment tool the scope for investigating interactional phenomena is almost endless.

- Future work could extend beyond this study to investigate other occasions where interviewees are not able to provide the expected or required response and how statements of competence are made other than by using 'don't know', 'I don't know', 'dunno'. It would be interesting to see whether they share common features with the results of this study.

- Linked to the issues around competence, it would be important to investigate how the clinical psychologist manages the closing of a subtest, given that this requires the interviewee to repeatedly fail items and the implications for managing rapport, repeatedly negotiating difficulty and then acknowledging any stated concerns about competence.

- There could also be scope for further investigation into how the clinical psychologist manages the tensions between interactional styles (i.e. being a scientist and being a clinician). While this study discussed this issue it wasn't the primary focus of the analysis and was only raised as a speculative suggestion.

In summary, with the small literature base and with the WAIS-III being such a fundamental assessment tool that can have life changing effects upon the people it is administered, the scope for conversation analytic or indeed qualitative research is broad and an important addition to the established empirical literature.
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Clinician Information sheet
Clinician Information Sheet

"The analysis of discourse within WAIS-III interviews involving adults referred to a learning disabilities service for cognitive assessment"

Who is conducting the study?

- Peter Corr, who is a trainee clinical psychologist at Leicester University, is conducting the study.
- This research will be submitted in part fulfilment of the requirements for the Doctorate in Clinical Psychology.

Why have I been asked to help with the study?

- All qualified clinical psychologists working within your psychology department have been invited to take part in the study.

What is the purpose of the study?

- The study will be investigating how understanding as communicated between the client and the clinical psychologist during a WIAS-III interview.

A detailed protocol is attached.

Will the information from the study be treated as confidential?

- Yes
- You will be given a code number so that only the lead researcher and yourself will know whom the information relates to.
- Within your transcripts your name will be changed to disguise your identity.

What will happen if I agree to take part in this study?

If you agree to take part in this study this is what will happen:

- When meeting with a client who you believe it would be appropriate to assess using the WAIS-III, you would explain to them about the study and invite them to consider whether they would be willing to have their assessment audio taped. You would also offer them opportunity to ask questions about the study.
• When the person returns for the assessment appointment you would again explain the study and ask whether they are willing to take part in the study. Again you would offer an opportunity to ask questions.

• If the client would like to meet with the lead researcher to ask further questions this could be arranged. However, the priority must be the clinical assessment and this must not be disrupted by the study in any way. If you are in any doubt about the client’s capacity to consent to take part in the study then withdraw the option to take part.

• If the client were willing to take part in the study you would ask them to sign a consent form. If the client were unable to give written consent then a third party would be needed as a witness to verbal consent being given.

• Consent will need to be obtained for the interview to be audio taped and for WAIS-III record form to be copied to the researcher. You must also give consent for this to happen by signing the Clinician Consent Form.

• You would then quickly test the cassette recorder and then proceed with the assessment interview.

• At the end of the assessment you would need to check that the client is still happy for the audiotape and the WAIS-III record form to be used as part of the study. Also you would check whether the client wishes to receive a copy of the cassette.

• You would then need to number the interview and forward the cassette and a copy of the record form to the lead researcher by recorded delivery.

Further information can be found in the attached protocol.

What will happen if I decide not to take part in the study?

• The lead researcher would not contact you again.

What will happen if I am harmed by the study?

• Medical research is covered for mishaps in the same way, as for patients undergoing treatment in the NHS i.e. compensation is only available if negligence occurs.

Am I allowed to change my mind about taking part in the study?

• Yes you may change your mind at any time.

• If you do not wish to take part in the study or if you wish to change your mind and withdraw from the study you may do so at any time.

• You do not need to explain why you have changed your mind and the lead researcher will not contact you again.
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Client Information Sheet

"The analysis of discourse within WAIS-III interviews involving adults referred to a learning disabilities service for cognitive assessment"

Who is doing the study?
This study is being done by Peter Corr. He is a trainee clinical psychologist at Leicester University. He is doing this study as part of his training.

What is the study for?
- The study will see how people talk to each other during an assessment.

- The study will look at helpful and unhelpful ways of talking. It will also see how people understand each other when talking.

- This study will help Clinical Psychologists be better at assessing people.

- This study WILL NOT look to see when people are saying the wrong things.
Why have I been asked to help with this study?
You have been asked because you have come for an assessment and Peter Corr is interested in learning what happens during assessments.

Will the information from the study be private?
Yes. Only Peter Corr will listen to the tapes. This means that only he and the clinical psychologist who you meet with will know what you said during the assessment.

When Peter Corr writes his study report he will change your name so no one else knows what you said. Then he will destroy the tapes and the typed words so that no one else can know what was said.

What will happen if I agree to take part in the study?
If you agree to take part in the study this is what will happen:

1. You will meet with the Clinical Psychologist for your assessment as agreed. This meeting will be tape-recorded.

2. Sometimes assessments may need more than one meeting. The Clinical Psychologist will tell you if they need to meet with you again. They will tell you whether that next meeting will need to be tape-recorded as well.
3. During an assessment the Clinical Psychologist will ask you questions or ask you to do simple tasks and he/she will write down your answers and how well you do. If you agree to take part in this study a copy of these answers will be sent to Peter Corr with the tape.

4. You may ask the Clinical Psychologist to send you a copy of the tape recording to keep if you wish.

5. Peter Corr will listen to the tapes and type out all of the words being said.

6. He will then keep the tapes and the typed words in a safe place.

7. When he has written the report he will destroy the tapes and the typed words so that no-one else can know what was said.

8. Peter Corr will not arrange to meet you at any time. This will help to keep your information more confidential. If you would like to meet with him to ask questions about the study, the Clinical Psychologist can arrange this for you.
What will happen if I decide to not take part in the study?
It is okay if you decide to not take part in the study.

You will still meet with the Clinical Psychologist for your assessment as arranged and this will not be affected.

What will happen if I am harmed by the study?
• "Medical research is covered for mishaps in the same way as for patients undergoing treatment in the NHS i.e. compensation is only available if negligence occurs".

This means that if you are harmed by taking part in the study then you will be allowed to ask for compensation to make up for being harmed.

Am I allowed to change my mind about taking part in the study?
• Yes, you can decide that you don’t want to take part even after the assessment has finished.

If you change your mind you do not need to say why.

If you change your mind you can still meet with the Clinical Psychologist.
Appendix 4

Clinician Consent form
Clinician Consent Form

“The analysis of discourse with WAIS-III interviews adults refers to a learning disabilities service for cognitive assessment”

Investigator: Peter Corr

You should read this form as well as the Clinician Information Sheet.

• I agree to take part in the study as it is explained in the Clinician Information Sheet.
• I understand that the information on the audiotapes and the WAIS-III record sheet will be treated as confidential.
• I understand that I am allowed to change my mind about taking part in this study at any time.
• I understand that medical research is covered for mishaps in the same way as for patients having treatment in the NHS.
• I confirm that I have explained the nature and details of this study as described in the Client Information Sheet to the client in ways most suited to their ability to understand.
• I confirm that I understand the nature and purpose of this study and that I am willing to consent to having this clinical interview audio taped and a copy of the WAIS-III record from being provided to Peter Corr.

Signature of Clinical Psychologist: .........................................................Date:........................................

(Name in BLOCK LETTERS):...........................................................................

*With Leicester City Council, Leicestershire County Council and Rutland County Council to provide mental health and learning disability services
Trust Headquarters: George Hine House, Gipsy Lane, Leicester LE5 0TD Tel: 0116 225 6000
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Client Consent form

"The Analysis of discourse within WAIS-III interviews involving adults referred to a learning disabilities service for cognitive assessment"

Investigator: Peter Corr

You should read this form as well as the Client Information Sheet.

• I agree to take part in the study that has been explained to me from the information sheet.

• I know that what is said on the tape recordings and the answer sheet will be kept secret so that other people will not know what was said or what my answers were.

• I know that it is okay for me to change my mind at any time without having to explain why.

• I know that whether or not I change my mind this won’t affect any support from the Clinical Psychologist or other NHS support.

• I understand that this study is covered for mishaps in the same way as for patients having treatment in the NHS.

• I have been told what the study is for. I have been allowed to ask questions about the study. I understand what will happen if I take part in the study.

Working with Leicester City Council, Leicestershire County Council and Rutland County Council to provide mental health and learning disability services

Trust Headquarters: George Hine House, Gipsy Lane, Leicester LE5 0TD Tel: 0116 225 6000
Signature of client........................................Date........................................

(Name in BLOCK LETTERS).................................................................

If the client is only able to give verbal consent obtain the signature of a third party.

Signature of Witness........................................Date........................................

(Name in BLOCK LETTERS).................................................................
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Transcription Codes
Transcription codes

(0.4) The number in brackets indicates a time gap in the talk and is presented in tenths of seconds.

(.) A dot enclosed in brackets indicates a gap in the talk that is less than two tenths of a second in length.

:A colon indicates that the speaker has stretched the preceding word or sound; the more colons the longer the stretch.

- A dash indicates a sharp cut-off of the preceding word or sound by the speaker.

(( )) A description is given within double brackets and will be written in italic text. This may describe the preceding sound or it may describe a non-verbal sound on the tape.

( syll ) Where speech isn’t clear it is represented by the number of syllables.

(guess ) Where the transcriber takes a guess at an unclear word this will be presented in single brackets rather than being indicated as syllables.

↑↓ Arrows indicate a change of intonation and the arrow indicates the direction of change.

underline Where underline follows an arrow it indicates the duration of the rising intonation. Where underline follows a colon it indicates the preceding sound being stretched. Underline without a preceding symbol indicates a stressed sound.

.hh A dot preceding a ‘h’ indicates an in-breath and this will be described by the transcriber in brackets following the utterance. The number of h’s indicates the length of the breath.

hh An ‘h’ or series of h’s indicate an out-breath and this will be described by the transcriber following the utterance. The number of h’s indicates the length of the out-breath.
hah, heh, huh Where laughter occurs, it’s sound is reproduced as accurately as possible. Where necessary the transcriber will indicate that it is laughter in brackets afterwards.

laugh(hh)ter Where the speaker laughs while talking this is indicated within the word in brackets.

> < The ‘more than’ and ‘less than’ symbols indicate that the speech between them is noticeably quicker than the surrounding speech.

= The ‘equals’ sign indicates where one turn of talk begins immediately as the preceding turn is ending without gap or pause. For example:

Bob: So you were saying that he went=
Dave: =yeah he just left

[ ] Square brackets indicate where more than one speaker is talking at the same time. For example:

Bob: he told me [he was going
Dave: ]oh did he really

CAPITALS Except for proper nouns, capital letters indicate speech that is noticeably louder than the surrounding talk.

Additional sounds not accounted for in the above coding system are recorded in the transcripts and then described by the transcriber in brackets following the utterance.

A more detailed description of these and other transcription symbols not used within this study can be found in:

The management of 'Don’t Know' responses on the WAIS-III: a conversation analytic study
Addendum

Peter Corr
B.Sc. (Hons), M.Sc.

December 2003

Addendum to the doctoral thesis of the same title submitted in part fulfilment of the coursework requirements for the degree of Doctorate in Clinical Psychology at the University of Leicester.
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Transcript 3A 145
Transcript 3B 178
Introductory statement

Transcriptions

This volume contains the complete transcripts for the three WAIS-III interviews that were conducted upon adults with learning disabilities by qualified clinical psychologists. These transcripts represent the entire field of data used for analysis in the above project and represent in excess of 100 hours of transcription time.

Each complete WAIS-III was conducted over more than one session so each session was transcribed separately. Therefore, each WAIS-III interview consists of at least two transcripts. As described in the main body of this study, the transcription codes used were from the Jeffersonian transcription system and this is presented on the next page.
Transcription Codes

(0.4) The number in brackets indicates a time gap in the talk and is presented in tenths of seconds.

(.) A dot enclosed in brackets indicates a gap in the talk that is less than two tenths of a second in length.

: A colon indicates that the speaker has stretched the preceding word or sound; the more colons the longer the stretch.

- A dash indicates a sharp cut-off of the preceding word or sound by the speaker.

((( ))) A description is given within double brackets and will be written in italic text. This may describe the preceding sound or it may describe a non-verbal sound on the tape.

(syll) Where speech isn’t clear it is represented by the number of syllables.

(guess) Where the transcriber takes a guess at an unclear word this will be presented in single brackets rather than being indicated as syllables.

↑↓ Arrows indicate a change of intonation and the arrow indicates the direction of change.

underline Where underline follows an arrow it indicates the duration of the rising intonation. Where underline follows a colon it indicates the preceding sound being stretched. Underline without a preceding symbol indicates a stressed sound.

.hh A dot preceding a ‘h’ indicates an in-breath and this will be described by the transcriber in brackets following the utterance. The number of h’s indicates the length of the breath.
An 'h' or series of h's indicate an out-breath and this will be described by the transcriber following the utterance. The number of h's indicates the length of the out-breath.

Where laughter occurs, it's sound is reproduced as accurately as possible. Where necessary the transcriber will indicate that it is laughter in brackets afterwards.

Where the speaker laughs while talking this is indicated within the word in brackets.

The 'more than' and 'less than' symbols indicate that the speech between them is noticeably quicker than the surrounding speech.

The 'equals' sign indicates where one turn of talk begins immediately as the preceding turn is ending without gap or pause. For example:

    Bob: So you were saying that he went=
    Dave: =yeah he just left

Square brackets indicate where more than one speaker is talking at the same time. For example:

    Bob: he told me [he was going
    Dave: [oh did he really

 Except for proper nouns, capital letters indicate speech that is noticeably louder than the surrounding talk.

Additional sounds not accounted for in the above coding system are recorded in the transcripts and then described by the transcriber in brackets following the utterance.

A more detailed description of these and other transcription symbols not used within this study can be found in:

Interview One
Transcription: 1A
Phil: Right I'll start talking (2.4) properly (.) I'll leave the tape recorder here.
Simon: .ehhhh
Phil: ehm:: right like like a said befor (0.2) ehm: (0.6) I've asked you to do these tests because ehm: (0.6) they're part of the assessment I'm doing and (0.4) they're to test what kind of things you underst and=
Simon: =hm=
Phil: =and what kind of things (.) you struggle with (0.2) [so what you]
Simon: [°hm°
Phil: °what your good at< and what you (.) [not so good at
Simon: °yeh°
Phil: °does that make sense
Simon: °yeh°
(1.4)
Phil: ehh ((in breath)) ehm: so (0.8) >the tests ask you to do< (0.6) lots of different things=
Simon: °yeh°
Phil: tch (.) ehm: some o them are kina word problems
Simon: °problems (.) yeh°
Phil: [and some o them are to do with numbers
Simon: °numbe[r°
Phil: [ehm: but >some other things as we'll< like jigsaws (0.8) allsorts (0.4) tch .ehhh (( in breath )) ehm (0.4) >you’ll find some o them< quite easy
Simon: °yeh°
Phil: the- they start off easy and they usually get harder as they go along
Simon: °they’re easy and [aint ard°
Phil: [So don’t worry if you get a bit stuck with
Simon: °yeh°
(1.6)

Phil: (( sniff)) ehm: (5.0) y- yeah it just says at the end (0.8) that
   ehm: (1.0) just do do-} just do your best< on all ↓of them and
   ehm: don't {don't worry about ↓them really{=

Simon: =°do your best don't worry°

Phil: ehm: (0.6) ↑and if you want to stop at any point (.) or you get
   tired then just say so and °we can stop {okay°

Simon: °okay °

Phil: .ehhh (( in breath )) ehm: (.) we ↑wont get them all done to↓day so
   ehm: (.) °>what time is it now it's about five o’clock< now° so if
   you ↑have a go for about half an ↓hour

Simon: °right°

Phil: ehm:

Simon: did you say half past ↑five

Phil: til about half past ↑five=

Simon: =°yeh°

Phil: is that ↑alright

(2.0)

Phil: is that all↑right

Simon: yeh (.) somethin (( syll ))

Phil: heh heh heh well if you ↑want to ↓stop just say so

Simon: aye=

Phil: =but ↑your not (.) ehm: (0.6) clare’s not gonna (0.8) come over
   to cook ↓til about six is she so=

Simon: =ye:h

Phil: e|hm

Simon: [she’ll come and (( syll syll ))

Phil: okay (.) well if you ↑want to stop just say [so

Simon: [yeh

(1.2)

Phil: ehm is there ↑anything you want to ask before we st↓art

Simon: yeh (2.4) what are you going to do

Phil: what am I going to ↑d↓o

Simon: yeh

Phil: .ehhh (( in breath )) (.) I’ll tell you at the beginning of each ↓one=

8
Simon: =yeh
Phil: o[kay
Simon: [yeh (.) right
(2.0) ((shuffling of paper)) (2.4)
Phil: o[kay (.) we’ll start with the ↓first one
(2.2)
Phil: I’m ↑gonna show you some ↓pictures=
Simon: =yeh I can see ((syll syll syll))
Phil: ehm: (0.8) >and in ↑each ↓picture< there’s an important bit
Phil: that’s ↓missing (.) >so there’s a little bit that’s [missing in each
Phil: one<
Simon: [°I know° (.) I
Phil: [can see it
Phil: =o[kay
(2.0)
Phil: so y- you get what you got to ↑do=
Simon: =I know (.) l- look at the picture
Phil: [look at each picture tell me what’s missing
Phil: okay what’s ↑the ↓first one
Simon: jus ↑the↓re
Phil: yeh what d’ya know what you call [that
Phil: [chain thing
Simon: that’s ↑a° ↓comb
Phil: =°I see°
Phil: >and it’s that< little: (0.4) prong that’s missing=
Simon: =°yeh it’s missing yeh°
(4.0)
((noise of turning picture card))
Phil: o[kay (0.8) number two
Simon: (0.6) o[ah (0.6) just ↑there (.) it’s it’s led- le- ↑lev g [missing
Phil: [leg
(5.4)
((sound of card turning))
Phil: number three
Simon: ↑nose ↓missing
Phil: >the nose yes hh hh<
Phil: number four

Simon: [ah

Simon: (1.0) "that one"

Phil: yei[h

Simon: [do you see

Phil: do you know what you call it

Simon: (0.8) handle

Phil: "yei[h

Simon: =lock

Phil: >a lock yeh< that's right

(8.0)

Phil: now that one’s a bit tougher

(4.2)

Simon: I know what missing it's the windows (0.4) just there

Phil: the windows on the engine

Simon: yeh

(3.2)

Simon: they’re not there

Phil: anything else

(2.0)

Phil: anything else

(3.4)

Simon: it’s hard heh=

Phil: =>tis a bit hard< yeh

Simon: hh heh hard yeh (0.8) ehm:

(6.0)

Simon: (sounds like ‘sixty are eh’) oh I know (.) rail track

Phil: yeh another rail track yeh

(5.6)

Simon: another

(3.0)

Phil: okay (.) this is (0.4) the sixth one

(2.0)

Simon: door an- (0.2) handle missing there
Phil: >yep< door handle

Simon: I know that one

((sound of paper turning))

Phil: how about there

(6.0)

Simon: uh-

(2.2)

Simon: it's hard to say now innit ehm:

Phil: I see

(6.4)

Simon: not easy to see what's missin

(9.0)

Simon: oeh::m°

(2.4)

Simon: well I think it's () it's hard

Phil: hh heh heh tis hard yeh

Simon: [heh heh (0.4) yeh

Phil: it's alright if you can't see anything

Simon: eh- his eyeballs [eyebows

Phil: [eyeballs

Simon: missing

Phil: o'kay

(4.4)

Phil: next one

(5.2)

Simon: that pours innit out out the water (0.6) there's a man missing

Phil: a man missing

Simon: or a lady (0.8) whatever

Phil: so somebody holding the jug=

Simon: =yeh

Phil: ehm: (1.0) have a look at just what's there:re (1.0) and just tell me if you see there's a th- som- anything else (0.6) that should be there

Simon: ehm a hand

Phil: a hand okay°
Simon: (3.2)
Simon: something else there (0.4) about who I said (. ) that ri:ght
Phil: >ye:yh yeh< there's a- there's- (0.6) there's a jug floating in
mid air so that makes sense
Simon: yeh
Phil: hh hh
(4.4)
Phil: how about that one number nine
(7.2)
Simon: right something missing (0.4) but I don't know what
Phil: you don't know what have a guess
Simon: [sa screw ?
(3.0)
Simon: a screws missing
Phil: what would happen if the screw wasn't there
Simon: break
Phil: yeh they'd >fall in alf wouldn't they< (.) thh hh
(4.0)
Phil: I said they'd get a bit harder as they go along=
Simon: =yeh
Phil: what do ya think to that one
(4.4)
Simon: leaf
Phil: yeh that's a leaf (0.4) can you see anything about it that's
missing
(13.0)
Simon: hgh hgh ((cough)) (. ) hgh hgh ((cough )) (0.4) what there's
something missing there that's a tre:e
Phil: okay the tree
(8.2)
Simon: bowl missing there
Phil: a bowl
Simon: there's a funny crust to it
Phil: a bowl to put the
Simon: yeh=
Phil: =put the pie in
Simon: and the \spoons

Phil: and the \spoon

(4.4)

Simon: \tha about ri\ght I think°

Phil: \okay (.) ehm°

(2.2)

Simon: \bit harder now°

Phil: they \are getting a bit \harder yeh (.) yeh°

(3.4)

Simon: footprints mis\sin there

Phil: [welldone yeh footprints

(5.0)

Phil: >\tha's quite a hard one actually°<

Simon: yeh°

(3.6)

Simon: is a \funny one eh

Phil: heh heh heh

Simon: ehm: somethin miss\in cause it’s not gotta piece with it (0.4)

there’s a fire going up with smoke \comin out and it’s a (.)

\build\ing that needs something here

(1.0)

Phil: so you think there’s a- (.) the \buil\dings \miss\ng= 

Simon: =ye:lh

Phil: [around it

Simon: [the buil\ding yeh

Phil: [o\kay

(1.0)

Phil: is anything \else

(2.6)

Phil: \wh- \wh-

(1.0)

Simon: smo\kc=

Phil: =smoke

(5.0)

(( sound of page turning ))

(2.4)
Phil: have a look at that ↓one see if you see anything that’s ↓missing°
(3.0)

Phil: °yeh°

Simon: cone

Phil: cone
(4.8)

((sound of page turning))
(3.0)

Simon: what about ↑that ↓one ↑there (0.6) °bit missing there°

Phil: yeh so a bit of the ehm (0.4) a bit of the chair

Simon: yeh
(4.2)

((sound of page turning))
(1.0)

Phil: look carefully at ↓that one (%) and see what you think

(4.0)

Simon: about somethin with the la:dy isn’t gotta a lady an her hands

not there

Phil: there’s no la:dy

Simon: >nono<no< there’s no la:dy

Phil: ["hmmm°

(2.4)

((sound of page turning))

(5.2)

Simon: right he’s ↑spreading the bread no ↑butter↓er there

Phil: no butter
(1.0)

Simon: no ↑plate ↓there

(2.4)

Phil: o↑kay
(1.4)

((sound of page turning))

Phil: look a- (%) look at that ↓one
(2.2)

Simon: oh ↑that bit missin there (0.6) °like that°
Phil: so one of the boards that goes across the boat
Simon: the boat yeh

Phil: (10.0)
Simon: I see harder now [oh that missin there
Phil: [mmm
Simon: yeh [hhhh
Phil: [huh huh [huh
Simon: [it goes there
Phil: it wasn't that difficult then was [it
Simon: he heh he (.) quite easy (.) that was=
Phil: =hh
(9.0)

Phil: have a look at that [one
Simon: (0.4) missin there (.) clo- it's a clothes missin
Phil: a wh[at=
Simon: =coat hanger missin
Phil: a coat hanger
Simon: yeh
Phil: to put clothes [around
(1.0)
Phil: [Okay
(4.6)
Phil: look carefully at [that one and see if you can see anything that
should be there
(2.0)
Simon: I can't recognise anything° (2.6) a h that's different (0.4)
that's different [too
Phil: hm: their diferent but do you know: (.) is anything miss[ing
(12.4)
Simon: yeh just there
Phil: °okay° [one of those little vents (.) in the=
Simon: =y[eh
Phil: [in the door
(3.2)
(( sound of page turning ))
Phil: one more to do

Simon: "one more to do hhhh"

Simon: "ehm: bit harder now they are"

Simon: it's not moving is it it goes in there (0.6) "it's not (0.2) ah that bit

Phil: the bit of his... of

Simon: yeh=

Phil: =yep
((bang noise on tape))

Simon: ehhh ((syll syll))

Phil: [heh heh heh]

Phil: >have look at that one<

Simon: a:h (1.0) there (.). missing there

Phil: "right"

Simon: nothin there it should be there

Phil: >what like a< stripe on the side=

Simon: =stripe on side ye:h (. that's right

Simon: that's gonna make it a bit harder now

Phil: hm mm they are getting harder

Simon: "that's a little bit harder"

Simon: agh (0.6) harder

Phil: [it is hard yeh (. have a guess at it if you (0.4)

Simon: "get stuck"

Simon: ah the mans not walking there now (0.4) it's not there (. the man's not there

Phil: the man's not there
Simon: yeh the boy or whatever [the kid [last one
Phil: (7.4)
Simon: °yeh°
Phil: (2.4)
Simon: e:hm (2.0) snowed up
Phil: tis ↓snowed up y[eh
Simon: [oh a missin door ↓there the- it’s the ↑door
Phil: ↓there (.) it must be ◊door there◊
Simon: °okay° >so there’s a< door ↓missin
Phil: eh eh sfence
Simon: ok very >something at the end of that< ↑building
Phil: (1.0)
Simon: °isn’t there◊
Phil: °okay° ↑fair e↓nough it’s the hardest ↓one
Simon: there’s something here (.) oh trees (.) it’s (.) no- ↑isn’t there
Phil: cl↓ouds
Simon: no clouds in the ↓sky
Phil: ehhhhh (( out breath )) well ↑done (0.4) to all of ↑those
Phil: what did you think about those ↓then
Simon: alri:ght thank you
Phil: °okay° not too ↑bad
Simon: °yes:°
Phil: (( shuffling of paper ))
Simon: (( shuffling of paper ))
Phil: okay go onto the next one
Phil: ↑i:ght
Phil: >yeh I’m fi<- (.) I’m- I’m fine
Simon: you ar↑i:ght
Phil: (1.8)
Simon: is it on tape
Phil: yeh- it’s on tape
Simon: uhh
Phil: hh hh hh
(1.0)
Phil: ehm right we’re going to do something different in this one=
Simon: =yeh
Phil: ehm: (0.4) what you want you to do is tell me the meanings
of some words (1.2) so if you listen carefully
Simon: =yeh=
Phil: =ehm= an tell me what each word that I say means
(2.0)
Phil: ready
Simon: yeh hgh hgh hgh
Phil: okay
Simon: hghh (cough)
Phil: tch .ehhh what we (syll syll) (spoken too softly)
(1.0)
Simon: (syll syll syll syll) (spoken too softly to hear clearly)
(1.4)
Phil: can you tell me what winter means
(1.2)
Simon: (( sound of hands being rubbed together and breathing onto
hands for 3.0 ))
Phil: co;ld hh hh hh
(1.2)
Simon: swinter now innit
Phil: it’s nearly winter now
Simon: part of the year yeh part of it
Phil: yeh yeh its-s-
Phil: leaves have started to fall
Simon: yeh (0.8) leaf fall yeh-
Phil: s- whatst
Simon: yeh I can see that yeh
Phil: hh heh heh=
Simon: =leaves fall
Phil: what else would you say apart from cold if it was someone (0.4) if you were tryin to tell someone what winter

Simon: freeze

Phil: freezing

(3.2)

Phil: tch.ehhh (( in breath )) what does breakfast mean

(2.0)

Simon: eating the breakfast

(1.4)

Phil: °eating°

(2.0)

Phil: anything °else°

(0.8)

Simon: porridge (. hot warm porridge

Phil: °porridge°

(2.4)

Phil: °when would you say breakfast is

Simon: in the morning

Phil: °in the morning yeh°

(4.2)

Phil: do you know what repair means

(1.0)

Simon: you use a tool (. wood °or like that° been broken

Phil: °if somethings been broken°

Simon: yeh

Phil: so °what do ya do if it's broken (0.4) °if you repair°

Simon: [mend it

Phil: mend it yeh

(6.2)

Phil: how about the word assemble (0.4) do ya know what

assemble (1.4)

Simon: °what it means can you tell me (. what it means°

(1.0)
Phil: >ya- what you want me< to tell you
Simon: °yeh°
Phil: °dya mean° (1.0) a- a- are you ↑sure you don’t know
Simon: it means leave it alone
Phil: tch ↓ahh (2.0) tch °erm°
Simon: it means ↑leave (.) ↑good ha↓vor (0.6) ↑good (0.2) ha↓vor
Phil: good be↑viour=
Simon: =yeh
Phil: assemble (0.4) >so if you< (.) if ↑someone assembles
something >do you know what that ↓meant<
Simon: [yeh
Phil: >dyant to tell ↓you<
Simon: went °(( syll ))°
Phil: e- assemble ↓usually means if you put something together
Simon: °ye:h°
Phil: °so like if you build a model or something°=
Simon: =°model yeh°
Phil: °right° ehm: (0.4) what does ↑yesterday mean
Simon: yesterday means ↓gone
Phil: >the day that’s ↓gone<
Simon: °yeh°
Phil: have you ever heard the word ↑terminate (0.6) °do you know
what terminate means°
Simon: it means (0.8) when you move onto the next one °an you don’t
want to do something about it°
Phil: when you (.) move onto the next ↓one
Simon: °hmm°
Phil: so if you are moving onto the next one of something
what’s been terminated

Simon: the terminate means you turn an you stand there and you don’t do anything

Phil: >you stand there and not do anything<

Phil: o.kay and do you know what consumer means

Simon: no

Phil: ehm do you know what sentence means

Simon: no

Phil: sentence

Simon: prison (2.4) ehm () do you know what confide means

Phil: °to confide°

Simon: right ehm: (2.4) confide or means

Phil: >let me give you a clue< () if you confide in someone

Simon: confide in someone yeh

Phil: °dya know what that means°

Simon: find somebody that you needed to see em

Phil: find someone that you need too=

Simon: =yeh see

Phil: that you need to see and what would you do then (0.6)

Simon: talk at her () °talk at her°

Phil: [talk to someone

Simon: like when friends talk to them to

Phil: like a friend °yeh° °yeh°

Phil: do you know what the word remorse means

Simon: °no°

Phil: remorse
534      (5.2)
535  Simon:  "no"
536  Phil:  no (.) "okay" (0.4) like I said in the last test "the-" (0.2) these
537  get a bit harder as they go along "so" (0.2) don't worry if you (.)
538  "some of them you've not heard of (1.0) ehm: (.) d'you know
539  what "ponder" means
540  (4.0)
541  Phil:  "it's quite an old fashioned word [actually<
542  Simon:  [old fashioned yeh
543  (2.2)
544  Simon:  old clothes "an that
545  Phil:  old clothes heh heh
546  Simon:  old fashioned clothes that are out of date
547  Phil:  yeh "it's quite an "old fashioned word< you don't hear it very
548  "often usually these days but (.) ehm: (1.0) do you know what
549  "compassion means
550  (1.0)
551  Simon:  compassion usually (0.4) when you know that someone that
552  you like (.) when you see somebody
553  Phil:  when you see someone that you "like"
554  (8.0)
555  Phil:  "tranquil" >have you ever heard that word< before
556  Simon:  "tranquiliser"
557  Phil:  "it's like "tranquiliser yeh ["yeh"
558  Simon:  [an tablets
559  Phil:  "okay"
560  (3.2)
561  Phil:  so do you know what "tranquil" means
562  Simon:  it's means your "sleep"
563  Phil:  "when you sleep yeh yeh< (.) "okay"
564  (4.0)
565  Simon:  your on a "tranquiliser an your on tablet make you sleep (0.2)
566  [relax ya
567  Phil:  [yeh
568  Phil:  yeh an "tranquil comes from the same (.) word doesn't it
means ehm *quiet or*

Simon: *quiet<

Phil: *yeh* (2.4) ehm: (0.2) {{sane}} that have you ever heard that word before (5.4)

Simon: never heard it {{all}}

Phil: no . at that’s *quite* an old fashioned word as we:ll=

Simon: =yeh (3.0)

Phil: ehm: (1.0) designate<

Simon: designate desi

Phil: de- {{designate}}

Simon: >dunno what that {{means}}< (.) {{di}}zzzy

Phil: {{di}}zzzy

Simon: does it mean {{di}}zzzy (1.0)

Phil: {{eh}}-

(2.2)

Phil: do you know what re{{luc}}tant means (2.4)

Phil: *no* (1.2) and (1.0) do you know what a colony is

Simon: *no*

Phil: what colony means

Simon: not {{sure}} (1.2)

Phil: >have a {{guess}}<

Simon: ehm: (1.0) its: is it helping other {{people}}

Phil: helping other people

Simon: yeh (6.4)

Phil: ehm: (1.0) {{do}} you know what generate means

Simon: generate means you- you- (0.2) torch an (.) battery an it but to- (.) put the things (.) it (.) generates it (.) in to- it’s a (0.4) it’s equipment

Phil: it’s equipment yeh (.) do you know what it {{makes}}
Simon: (2.0) generator
605 Simon: it charges it up
606 Phil: wha- how does it- what does it- (0.6) what does it make
607 Simon: make ehm: () metal
608 Phil: >made of metal< (2.0) and what does it charge up
609 Simon: charges up the things that you use (0.8) battery charger
610 Phil: right >ah- yeh< the battery charger’s like a generator
611 (4.2)
612 Phil: ehm: do you know what the word battery means
613 (2.4)
614 Simon: "ballad means"
615 Phil: ballad
616 (5.0)
617 Simon: hitting something
618 Phil: >hitting something<
619 (4.0)
620 Phil: ehm:
621 (4.0)
622 Phil: okay (0.2) do you know what pout means
623 Simon: pout
624 (2.4)
625 Simon: good friends
626 Phil: friends
627 Simon: good friends might shake hands (0.4) [shake hands
628 Phil: ["good handshake that
629 Simon: was fine"
630 (1.0)
631 Simon: when they’re being sensible
632 (1.2)
633 Phil: ehm: right one more (1.0) do you know what plagerise
634 means (2.4) "it’s quite a tough one"
635 Simon: plagerise y’know when you’re talking to someone
636 Phil: when you’re talking to someone (1.0) "okay"
637 (4.0)
Simon: do that next time

Phil: >yeh-kay nothats< all of those so- (.) we won’t go to the end

Simon: =°na:h°

Phil: (2.2)

Simon: those o↑kay

Phil: yeh (1.2) ss things that got me somethings I ↑did

Phil: yeh yeh that’s ↑true (0.4) well like a said they get (.) they get harder as they go along ↓don’t they

Simon: °yeh°

Phil: but you did ↑all↓right ↓with them

Phil: (2.2)

Phil: ehm: (0.6) ↑have we got time to do ↓one more dya think (.)

Phil: would you rather finish ↓now (.) it’s up to you (4.0)

Simon: e- ehm:

Phil: y- wll- I’ll tell you what it’ll take (.) abou: (.) ehm:; (1.0) th:ree minutes=

Simon: =°three minutes°

Phil: so dya want to do this one or do you want to (.) leave it til next time

Simon: we’ll do it ↑now

Phil: >okay (.) do it ↓now<

Simon: °yeh ple:ase do it now° (0.4) °three minutes right°

(( sound of pages being turned ))

Phil: e::h (1.8) turn me pages o↑yer

Simon: is it ↑num↓bers (1.0) is it [numbers you want

Phil: [you can see all the answ↑ers ↓in

Phil: there

Simon: answers

Phil: hh hh

Phil: (2.6)

Phil: o↑kay ↑when we started the ↓tests (.) I said we were going to do all sorts ↓of things (1.0) in ↑this ↓one I’m going to ask you to copy some sym↓bols (0.4) o↑kay
Phil: I'll show you what that means.

Phil: If you look at these little boxes, you can see each number has got a little symbol underneath it = yeh.

Phil: Like a special mark underneath it. Yeh.

Phil: That's right. Yeh. Different shapes. And if you see each number has got a different special mark, okay so all these (0.2) all these are different, there's one mark for each number.

Simon: Yeh.

Phil: Now if you look down here, (1.0) yeh.

Phil: You see that these squares have got numbers in them. But that the squares, the little boxes underneath where the symbols go are empty.

Phil: So can you guess what you have to do?

Simon: [Yeh]

Phil: Yes. So have a practice and see how you do.

Simon: [Yeh that's right]

Phil: In each of these boxes here, you write you put the right symbol with the right number. So if I give you something to lean on, (1.0) if I give you that'll do. (1.8) You just do these first ones upto that black line there. (1.2) See if you get the hang of it. (1.0) If you do nothing to it.

Simon: These symbols.

Phil: That's right. Yeh. So have a practice and see how you do.
Simon: (4.2) is that right

Phil: (1.0) that’s right yeh (0.4) and do the same for the rest of them

Phil: (26.0) well done (0.8) all done

Phil: (1.2) now ehm: (.) what I’m going to do is set this clock going (.)

Phil: ehm= (that was my first practice that was

Phil: those are practice ones up to that line yeh (0.4) ehm: (0.8)

Phil: all I want you to do is carry on (0.4) going along there (0.2)

Phil: and then that line (.) like that (0.4) ehm: (0.6) go as quickly

Phil: as you can (.) but (.) get them right [and ehm:

Simon: [yeh
do them one at a time

Simon: quickly

Phil: [ehm and I’ll tell you when to stop (.) okay

Phil: so go (.) from there

(27.0)

Phil: mm o

Phil: o kay (.) change it

(37.0)

Phil: o kay (1.0) carry on to the next line o

(72.0)

Phil: stop (.) now

(2.2)

Simon: nearly there o

(4.8)

Phil: well done

(4.2)

Simon: see that I wasn’t meant to that say that

Phil: yeh okay (.) change wha- change that one to (.) what you

Phil: thought (1.2) were those those kay

Simon: yeh
Phil: yeh (.) good (.) ehm: (0.4) well it didn’t take us took us about
three minutes didn’t it
Simon: ye:l[h
Phil: [that’s good
(2.0)
Phil: right ehm: (1.0) if we finish them there today(0.4) ehm:
Simon: [yeh
Phil: we can carry on with them next week=
Simon: =yes aye
Phil: like a said (.) and ehm (0.4) just to le- just to let you know
ehm: (2.8) there’s some word puzzles next time
Simon: next time°
Phil: ehm: (1.0) and there’s a test where we look at (0.8) making
blocks into shapes (. ) copying patterns
Simon: yeh°
Phil: er (0.4) what else (0.8) there’s some (0.6) sums to do
Simon: sums
Phil: and there’s er (.) some pictures (.) of (.) shapes (.) trying to
find the odd one out<
Simon: yeh°
Phil: so those kind of things (0.6) is that okay
Simon: yeh (0.2) don’t forget the tape is working
Phil: yep I’ll turn the tape recorder off now and then we’ll talk back
on for the next one
Simon: next one° (. ) yeh°
((tape switched off))
Interview One

Transcription: 1B
Phil: °okay° the \up{tape recorders} \down{working again}=

Simon: =yeh

Phil: °okay° (0.2) put it down \down{there}

Simon: °right°

(2.0)

Phil: \up{ehm}: (2.2) \down{right} \down{remember last week we did some} (0.4)

[\down{tests}

Simon: [yes yes

Phil: and (0.4) \ehm: (0.2) they were \up{different kinds of} \down{things} (0.2)

\ehm: (3.0) \up{this is carrying on doing the same ones} and we’ll

do (.) I should think (.) about another \up{five} \down{today} cos we’ve

got about half an hour (2.4) \ehm: the \up{first one’s} another

\down{word} (0.6) \down{word} \down{test} (0.4) so (.) \up{in this} \down{one} \ehm: I’m going

to re- \up{read} \down{two words} \down{to you}

Simon: yeh

Phil: and I want you to tell me how they’re (0.2) how they’re like

\down{each} other (0.4) how- how they’re the \down{same} (0.6) so \up{give}

you an \down{example}

Simon: °right°

Phil: \ehm: (2.0) \up{can you} \down{tell me how} (0.4) a fork an a spoon (1.0)

are alike

Simon: \up{forks} when you eat \down{dinner} and a spoon eat your puddin

Phil: \up{yeh} (-.) so you can eat food \down{with} them both (0.6) °yeh°

(6.2)

Phil: \up{how about} \down{socks} and \up{shoes} (0.4) how- (-.) how- how are

\down{they the same}

Simon: ye- \keep (0.4) \up{pull em \up{up} and they keep you} \down{warm} shoes

(0.2) \up{put em on the} \down{ground}

Phil: so wha- so what do you do with both (-.) socks and \down{shoes}

Simon: you put em \down{on}

(2.8)

Phil: \up{where} do you put them \down{on}

Simon: on your \down{feet}
Phil: yeh hh hh (0.4) not on your [hands
Simon: [yeh heh heh (1.0) °feet°
(4.4)
Phil: ↓how about ↓yellow and ↓green (0.2) ↓what are they both
Simon: colour
Phil: yeh (.) colours
(3.2)
Phil: and (0.2) ↓dog and a ↓lion
Simon: dog and a lion
Phil: what are ↓they both
Simon: animals
Phil: *animals yeh°
(4.0)
Phil: ↓how about ↓coat and a ↓suit
Simon: very (0.2) easy (0.2) blazers a ↓suit is a blazer
Phil: ↓mm↑huh
Simon: coat its ss ss ↓suit ↓is a ↑coat
Phil: so ↑what are they ↓both
Simon: warm (0.2) keep you warm
Phil: they keep you ↓warm ↑yeh (.) wha-what can we call them
↓though (2.0) a- a; suit and a ↓coat wha- wha- what are they
both (.) kinds ↓of=
Simon: =(( syll syll )) them in ↑there
(1.4)
Phil: ↑what the- what are they both< kinds ↓of
Simon: one’s (.) one’s with a ↓suit (0.4) the other (0.2) (( sounds like:
‘puts it on’ ))
Phil: see the- they ↑both keep you ↓warm
(1.2)
Phil: yeh
Simon: but i- i- if you were ↑talking to someone who didn’t know what
a coat or a suit wh- re (0.2) what would you say they both
we re (0.6) they’re both kinds of=
Simon: types of clo^hes
Phil: ↑clothes yeh ↓well done (2.0) so do you ↑think you’ve got the
Phil: okay the next one is a piano and a drum

Simon: what are they equipment ones equipment and one's a toy

Phil: e- they're equipment wha- what are they pianos and drums wha- what are they kinds of

Simon: names

Phil: an names what do you do with them

Simon: play um

Phil: yeh play them

Simon: instruments

Phil: instruments well done yeh

Phil: an orange and a banana

Simon: an oranges you peel and a banana that you eat fruit

Phil: both fruit yeh well done

Phil: how about an eye and an ear how are they both

Simon: you can hear with ear=

Phil: =mm

Simon: and an eye you can watch

Phil: you can hear with your ear and watch with your eyes

Simon: yeh
Phil: can you think of a way they’re both the same (0.2)
they’re both like each other (0.2)

Simon: [when
you’re outside and you’re listening to traffic and that you can
hear all the traffic (0.6) an when you’re looking in the cars so that they don’t hit ya
looking in the cars so that they don’t hit ya

Phil: right so they’re both ways of keeping yourself safe

Simon: [safe yeh
Phil: right good that’s a good okay

Phil: how about a boat and a car (0.6) how would they both be like each other

Simon: boat can go to Brittany (0.4)

Phil: mm
Simon: and a car that you drive
Phil: so what do what can you do in both of them

Phil: what can you do in a boat and car that’s the same

Simon: drive the boat ((syl syll syl syll ))

Phil: mm huh (0.4) you can drive them both

Simon: ugh

Phil: how about the table and a chair (0.2) what are they both (1.0) kinds of

Simon: wood
Phil: they’re both wood yeh

Simon: you sit on them

Phil: you can sit on them both

(0.8)
Simon: and eat your dinner on a table

Phil: you wouldn't eat your dinner on a chair would you

Simon: no on a table

Phil: so so what are a table and a chair both kinds of

Simon: table and a stool you put the food on you sit on

Phil: okay

Simon: that's what the right answer must be

Phil: okay

Simon: how about work and play what are the same how are they both the same actually working you'd use some teaching stuff or when you're working in town and play making friends make new friends and play with them

Phil: so what's the same about work and play how are they like each other is there something that makes them both the same

Simon: yeh

Phil: you just you be kicking a ball and an playing with somebody

Phil: how about steam and fog how are they both the same

Simon: ehm (in breath for 0.8) steam is when it's hot

Phil: where'd you get steam

Simon: when the sun shines

Phil: when the sun's shining
Simon: yeh (0.4) an (0.4) in the- in the hot weather
Phil: yeh so ↑when do you get ↑fo↓g
Simon: frog
Phil: fog
Simon: ↑fog<
Phil: no- not the ↓animal[s
Simon: ↑[when you get ↑co↓ld
Phil: when you get cold yeh (0.4) so- so that’s how they’re ↑diffe↓rent steam is hot and [fog is cold
Simon: ↑yeh
Phil: but how are they both (0.4) ↑like ↓each other (?) can you think of a way they’re both the sa↓me
(5.0)
Simon: yeh but it’s (?) differ↓ent (0.4) one’s a- (0.2) get co↓ld
Phil: yeh (?) ↑one’s ↓cold
Simon: one’s warm
Phil: o↓kay
(5.2)
Phil: ↑last ↓one (0.4) ↑how about (?) an egg and a se↓ed (1.0) egg and se↓ed (?) can you ↑think how they’re the sa↓me or ↑what they’re both kinds ↓of
Simon: well (0.2) ↑willing to ↓tell you now (0.2) ↑that seed there (0.4)
Simon: ↑plant ↓it
Phil: yeh
Simon: it grows (?) the flower
Phil: ↑how about ↑eggs ↓then ↑how are they ↓the same
Simon: eggs come the ↑b↓ird (0.2) an sitting on the b- sitting on the bird (0.2) lay egg un- und- un- the b↓ird
Phil: ↑what happens to them ↑then
Simon: bro:ke (0.2) it ↑that↓ches out an ↑br↓oke
Phil: so they ↑both ↓grow int-
Simon: yeh (1.0) that ↑right ↓though ↑dun↓nit
Phil: good
Simon: that’s ↑it
(2.2)
209 Simon: I'm doin’ well then

210 Phil: yeh (.) yeh (.) ((↓syl↓sy↓ll ↑syl↓ll))

211 (5.0)

212 Simon: next ↑one

213 (2.8)

214 Phil: this one’s quite different

215 Simon: °different°

216 (1.4)

217 Phil: and I’m going to use the case (0.6) as a table ↓here

218 Simon: yeh

219 Phil: so (.) as ↑long as you can ↓reach it o↓kay

220 (3.0)

221 Simon: is that what we got to ↑do

222 Phil: ↑m↓mm (0.2) that’s what we got to ↓do

223 (2.2)

224 Phil: right ↑where’s the little ↓box gone

225 (3.6)

226 Simon: they’re ↑bu↓sy (0.6) they’re ↑bu↓sy out ↑there

227 (3.4)

228 Phil: they’re busy out↑s↓ide

229 Simon: yeh that’s right they’re busy out↑s↓ide

230 (6.2)

231 Phil: now (0.6) if you ↑look at these ↓blocks

232 Simon: yeh

233 Phil: they’re ↑all the ↓same (.) ↑each one of them’s the ↓same (0.2)

234 each one’s got ↑two ↓red sides (1.0) and ↑two ↓white sides

235 (0.8) and ↑two sides that are (0.8) half an ↓half

236 Simon: °right°

237 Phil: ↑yeh and they’re ↑all the ↓same

238 Simon: like ↑this (0.6) ↓we’re goin’ ↑to do

239 Phil: >↑this is what we’re going to ↓do< and I’ll show ↓you

240 (2.0)

241 Phil: I’m ↑going to put these (0.6) these two ↓blocks together (0.4)

242 to make a ↓pattern (0.2) make a design (0.4) we’re ↑only

243 looking at the ↓tops ↓of them
Simon: yeh=
Phil: =It doesn’t matter about the \downarrow{sides} (1.0) \uparrow{just looking at the}
\downarrow{tops} there
Simon: now these tops
Phil: \uparrow{that’s} \downarrow{right}
(2.0)
Phil: now \uparrow{what I want} \downarrow{you} to do (3.0) is to just \downarrow{make}
\downarrow{those} two the same as those (.) \uparrow{quickly} as you \downarrow{can}
(2.4)
Simon: just like \uparrow{that}
Phil: well \uparrow{done}
(9.2)
Phil: \uparrow{okay}
(3.0)
Phil: we’re going to do the \uparrow{same} \downarrow{thing} (4.0) let me \uparrow{jumble} them
\downarrow{up} \uparrow{again}
(4.0)
Phil: like a \downarrow{said} we’re \uparrow{just looking at the} tops \downarrow{the}re
Simon: \uparrow{yeh}
Phil: so if you can \uparrow{do} the same thing \downarrow{again}
(5.4)
Phil: \downarrow{well} \uparrow{done}
(7.0)
Phil: right \downarrow{the} next ones a \uparrow{little} bit \downarrow{harder}
(2.2)
Phil: \uparrow{we’re gonna have to use for}
(24.4)
Phil: \uparrow{good}
Simon: about \uparrow{seventeen} \downarrow{minutes} wasn’t that \uparrow{eh}
Phil: seventeen sec\downarrow{onds}
Simon: ah (0.2) seconds
Phil: b- (.) a \uparrow{bit} quicker than seventeen min\downarrow{utes}
(2.8)
Phil: right (0.2) we’ll do \uparrow{one} \downarrow{more}
(0.4)
Simon: yeh
(15.0)
Phil: just jumble them \(\downarrow\)up (0.8) o\(\uparrow\)kay (0.6) go-
(9.2)
Simon: d\(\downarrow\)nit
(1.0)
Phil: well done
(17.8)
Phil: right (4.0) next \(\downarrow\)one
(29.0)
Simon: "not quite"
(1.0)
Phil: y\(\downarrow\) (0.4) o\(\uparrow\)kay
(9.0)
((sound of page turning for 6.0 ))
Phil: \(\downarrow\)now (.) for the \(\uparrow\)next \(\downarrow\)one
(3.2)
Phil: I'm gonna show you a \(\uparrow\)picture (0.2) rather (.) than putting the
blocks out \(\uparrow\)for \(\downarrow\)you
Simon: yeh
(7.6)
Phil: \(\uparrow\)let me jumble them up \(\downarrow\)again
(2.6)
Simon: to \(\uparrow\)copy that \(\downarrow\)one
Phil: \(\uparrow\)see if you can copy \(\uparrow\)that one (0.2) remember we're \(\uparrow\)just
looking at the \(\downarrow\)tops of the \(\downarrow\)blocks
(17.2)
Phil: think you've got the hang \(\downarrow\)of these now
Simon: ye:h
Phil: e:r (.) I'm \(\uparrow\)going to do some \(\downarrow\)more (0.2) and (.) \(\uparrow\)like all the
\(\downarrow\)tests \(\uparrow\)in \(\downarrow\)this they \(\uparrow\)get a bit harder as they go a\(\downarrow\)lo:ng=
Simon: =yeh
Phil: so (0.4) \(\uparrow\)don't worry if you s (.) \(\downarrow\)they start to get (.) seem
quite \(\downarrow\)ha:rd
(1.4)
Simon: ri:ght
but they're just the same I'll show you a card with the picture
right is a practice again
yeh those were good practice ones just so you get into the swing of it
(2.2)
right now I'm here I can't do:
[heh heh heh]
look at the next one
(1.2)
got to think about this one
(7.0)
I can't think of this one
it's not a big rush just take your time with them
(2.2)
no ehm tch can't think
see a (( syll syll syll )) ehm:
(4.0)
ah having some luck
(1.2)
okay you've got the right number of blocks
(3.8)
that there that there hh hh hh
hh hh
foreach that was a bit hard that was (2.0) that
was two that one
bit hard that was (0.2) that was a bit hard there (0.4)
was harder
okay let me s- you got that one right there look
(1.2) didn't you (1.0) what do you think goes there (0.4)
in that top corner
(3.4)
Simon: in the middle
Phil: your happy with that one aren't you? That one looks right.
Simon: yeh.
Phil: now look at the top bit there. What might the top bit do?
Simon: yep.
Phil: what goes underneath it?
Simon: ah.
Phil: so have a go at the other side there. See if you can:
Simon: hgh hgh.
Phil: do you want some water?
Simon: no.
Phil: does that look the same:
Simon: tone is missing there.
Phil: so what should be in that corner to make it red?
Simon: put that side.
Phil: is that the same?
Simon: yes.
Phil: =yeh. Well done.
Simon: right.
Phil: okay.
Simon: I got it now.
Phil: hh hh.
Simon: \( \downarrow \) we'll it \( \uparrow \) takes a little \( \uparrow \) while it worked out \( \uparrow \) all \( \downarrow \) right

Phil: [well yeh they're]

Simon: \( \uparrow \) quite \( \downarrow \) hard aren't they

Simon: \( \uparrow \) hard \( \downarrow \) that was \( \uparrow \) eh hh hh hh

Simon: \( \downarrow \) hard \( \downarrow \) that was \( \uparrow \) eh hh hh hh

Simon: \( \downarrow \) that's alright \( \uparrow \) now (1.2) done that one (.) \( \uparrow \) there you \( \downarrow \) go

Simon: \( \uparrow \) that's alright \( \uparrow \) now (1.2) done that one . . \( \uparrow \) there you \( \downarrow \) go

Phil: \( \downarrow \) lets try one \( \downarrow \) more (0.4) see how you get on with \( \downarrow \) this one

Phil: \( \uparrow \) I think I'll get on with this one \( \uparrow \) right \( \downarrow \) now

Phil: \( \uparrow \) I think I'll get on with this one \( \uparrow \) right \( \downarrow \) now

Simon: \( \uparrow \) I think I’ll get on with this one alright now\(^o\)

Simon: \( \uparrow \) that’s alright \( \uparrow \) now (1.2) done that one (.) \( \uparrow \) there you \( \downarrow \) go

Simon: \( \uparrow \) that’s alright \( \uparrow \) now (1.2) done that one (. . \( \uparrow \) there you \( \downarrow \) go

Phil: \( \uparrow \) I think I’ll get on with this one \( \uparrow \) right \( \downarrow \) now

Phil: \( \uparrow \) I think I’ll get on with this one \( \uparrow \) right \( \downarrow \) now

Phil: \( \uparrow \) that’s \( \uparrow \) right (1.6) it’s ard \( \uparrow \) ey &

Phil: \( \uparrow \) that’s \( \uparrow \) right (1.6) it’s ard \( \uparrow \) ey &

Phil: \( \uparrow \) that’s \( \uparrow \) right (1.6) it’s ard \( \uparrow \) ey &

Phil: \( \uparrow \) that’s \( \uparrow \) right (1.6) it’s ard \( \uparrow \) ey &

Phil: \( \uparrow \) that’s \( \uparrow \) right (1.6) it’s ard \( \uparrow \) ey &

Phil: \( \uparrow \) that’s \( \uparrow \) right (1.6) it’s ard \( \uparrow \) ey &

Phil: \( \uparrow \) that’s \( \uparrow \) right (1.6) it’s ard \( \uparrow \) ey &

Phil: \( \uparrow \) that’s \( \uparrow \) right (1.6) it’s ard \( \uparrow \) ey &
Simon: I think I got that.
Phil: mmhm.
Simon: I was thinking about that.
Phil: you did. you did well.
Simon: gets harder.
Phil: I know, they're getting a bit harder.
Simon: be careful.
Phil: okay.
Simon: I'm working out the maths. I can do a good job.
Simon: that's the work done for me.
Phil: carry on until you think you've got it right.
Simon: "I don't think I'm going to do this."
Simon: I think that’s all to that ( ( syll syll ))
(2.4)
Simon: it’s that ↓ one ↑ there
Phil:  o↑kay
Simon: I ↑ think it’s ↓ right
Phil:  o↑kay
(6.4)
Simon: ↑ done twenty ↑ minutes (0.4) it’s took me a while to work ↑ it
 Phil:  out ain’↑ put (1.2) it’s ↓ took me a long while to work ↑ it out aint
Simon: °yeh°
Phil:  you’re ↑ quick ↓ at these
(1.0)
Simon: °very good°
Phil:  hh hh ↑ hh
(0.8)
Phil:  now I’m gonna jumble them ↑ all up ↓ again (.) hh hh
Simon: (( °syll syll° ))
(6.8)
Simon: (( sigh ))
Phil:  you o↑kay (1.0) bit stiff (1.2) heh heh
(2.2)
Phil:  ↑ tell me if you ↓ want to stop
(5.2)
Phil:  you ↑ ready for one ↓ more
Simon: yeh
(5.2)
Simon: right ↓ :
Phil:  [right
(2.2)
Simon: this is ↑ hard
Phil:  hh hh hh hh hu ↑ hh
Simon: I’m gonna have to ↑ think ↓ about this ↑ one
(9.0)
Simon: °that’s right now°
(17.0)
Simon: °yes:°
Phil: °it’s ↑not ↓quite th ere°
(0.6)
Simon: °↑now it ↓is° (0.8) li ke ↑that
Phil: ↓mm ↑hm
Simon: right I’ve gotta do ↑another ↓one (1.2) one (.) two (0.2) two
↑thr↓ee (0.4) ↑thr↓ee
(26.0)
Simon: right (.) ↑dun↓nit ↓no:w (1.2) ↑dun↓nit
Phil: well ↑done
(5.2)
Phil: you’re quite ↑good ↓at th ese
(7.2)
Phil: ↑there’s ↓only three more ↑left (.) ↓I wonder if you can ↑do
them [hh hh hh
Simon: [ye:: eh huh huh
Phil: ↓lets ↑see (0.2) ↓lets see this one ↑through ↓and see if you
can finish ↑them all
(5.0)
Phil: ↑next ↓one (2.0) bit ↓har↑der
Simon: these a bit har↑der
Phil: ↑y↓eh
(7.2)
Simon: agh: (0.2) ↑that’s ↓ri↑ght ((syll syll syll))
Phil: hh hh hh
Simon: eh: (0.8) it ↑cou↓ld be: ↓that (0.2) ↓one eh
(8.2)
Simon: ↑A↓H
(4.2)
Simon: °that goes that side yeh°
(1.6)
Simon: °yes (0.2) harder°
Simon: I ↑think it’s ↓much ↑har↓der ↑he-
526 Phil: heh (.) it does get harder yeh
527 (1.0)
528 Simon: right (0.2) put some thing white one there white
529 one there
530 (8.0)
531 Simon: eh
532 (5.2)
533 Simon: is: (0.4) is thats all come to me (.) is that bit there (0.4)
534 the:re
535 (8.4)
536 Simon: is that bit there
537 (2.8)
538 Simon: not quite (2.0) eh: now
539 (2.0)
540 Simon: an there
541 Phil: well done
542 (3.2)
543 Phil: you've done this before
544 Simon: >I haven't done this before< (.) this is the first time=
545 Phil: no I was saying it's the same time you took to do the
546 last one
547 (1.6)
548 Phil: which is go:od I mean this is (.) this is the harder puzzle
549 Simon: may I have the next one please
550 (17.4)
551 Simon: ooh
552 Phil: hh hh hh (.) huuh
553 Simon: does that match up with
554 (5.2)
555 Simon: box
556 (62.6)
557 Simon: (( syll syll > syll syll< ))
558 (1.2)
559 Simon: ri:ght
560 Phil: mmm
561 Simon:  \text{\upshape ri\downshape ght} (0.8) \text{\upshape yeh°}
562 Phil:  \text{\upshape o\downshape kay°}
563 (1.0)
564 Simon:  \text{\upshape du\downshape nnit}
565 Phil:  \text{\upshape fas\downshape ter}
566 (0.6)
567 Simon:  \text{\upshape I were} \text{\upshape quick} \text{\downshape then}
568 Phil:  \text{\upshape you \upshape we:re} \text{\downshape quicker} \text{\upshape yeh}
569 Simon:  \text{\upshape hmm} \text{\upshape ten} \text{\upshape minutes} \text{\upshape quicker} \text{\upshape at \upshape least}
570 (1.2)
571 Simon:  \text{\upshape that’s \upshape e\upshape r}
572 (4.2)
573 Phil:  \text{\downshape mm\upshape hm}
574 (2.2)
575 Simon:  \text{\downshape last \upshape one}
576 (1.0)
577 Simon:  \text{\upshape then} \text{\upshape that’s \upshape it} (0.2) \text{\upshape hgh hgh hgh}
578 (8.2)
579 Phil:  \text{\upshape now} \text{\upshape this} \text{\upshape is} \text{\upshape the} \text{\upshape hardest} \text{\upshape one} \text{\upshape of \upshape a\downshape ll}
580 (1.2)
581 Simon:  \text{\upshape we’re \upshape working \downshape hard} \text{\upshape this} \text{\downshape afternoon°} (0.8) \text{\upshape ri\downshape ght°}
582 (2.2)
583 Phil:  \text{\upshape see} \text{\upshape what} \text{\upshape you} \text{\upshape make} \text{\downshape of \upshape th\upshape a\downshape t}
584 (1.6)
585 Simon:  \text{\upshape it’s quite \upshape um°}
586 (12.4)
587 Simon:  \text{\upshape ri\downshape ght°}
588 (9.0)
589 Simon:  \text{\upshape it’s \upshape quite \downshape trickey} \text{\upshape this} \text{\upshape one°}
590 Phil:  \text{\upshape \upshape m\downshape mmm°}
591 (31.8)
592 Simon:  ((( \text{\upshape syll} \text{\downshape syll} \text{\downshape syll} )))
593 (12.2)
594 Simon:  \text{\upshape ugh°}
595 (1.6)
Simon: it's arid to find hh hh up heh heeh

Phil: hh hh hh hh

Simon: \( \downarrow \text{how (( syll syll \uparrow \text{syll syll ))) \downarrow \text{now (2.2) thirty \downarrow \text{eight}} \)

(2.2)

Simon: \( \uparrow \text{one goes \downarrow \text{there (0.8) \^\text{wa- \uparrow \text{one goes \downarrow \text{there (0.4) \^\text{wa \uparrow \text{one}}}} \)

(3.2)

Simon: \( \circ \text{one in the middle} \)

(1.2)

Phil: \( \circ \downarrow \text{mm \uparrow \text{lm}} \)

(2.0)

Simon: \( \uparrow \text{the \uparrow \text{square \downarrow \text{box: (0.2) goes \downarrow \text{there}} \)

(2.0)

Phil: \( \circ \downarrow \text{mm \uparrow \text{lm}} \)

Simon: \( \circ \text{the \uparrow \text{square box} \circ \downarrow \text{there} \)

(1.4)

Phil: \( \circ \downarrow \text{mm \uparrow \text{lm}} \)

Simon: \( \circ \text{that's it} \)

(3.2)

Simon: \( \circ \downarrow \text{how \uparrow \text{did I do alri: \downarrow \text{ght}} \)

(3.2)

Simon: \( \circ \text{done} \circ \text{AL \uparrow \text{RI \downarrow \text{ght}} \)

(1.2)

Phil: a \uparrow \text{quick \downarrow \text{lo: ok}

(1.6)

Simon: close

(2.2)

Simon: need to take \( \downarrow \text{them out \uparrow \text{ri:ght (0.2) it's done \uparrow \text{it ri:ght >\downarrow \text{that}}}

(2.2)

Simon: \( \circ \text{right} \circ \text{(0.4) \downarrow \text{that's \uparrow \text{ri:ght}} \)

(3.2)

Phil: \( \uparrow \text{sure-}
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Simon: yeh=

Phil: =Yep okay
(0.6)

Simon: right
(0.8)

Phil: well done

Simon: took me a little while
(1.4)

Phil: er... (0.4) (("syl"" )) (0.2) (("syl"" )) (0.2) that one° (0.4)
that one°

Simon: it took a long while teh (0.2) it taken me a long while to
sort that out teh
(1.2)

Simon: it's hh hard work wantit

Phil: you did do it right

Simon: it were hard (0.2) is that all right

Phil: well done that i- that is a very hard puzzle

Simon: think so yeh
(4.2)

Phil: really hard that

Simon: dunnit again
(8.0)

Phil: have you got time to do one more before I go (0.4) or
wou- would you need to get back over

Simon: it's lunch time now

Phil: is it (.) would you like to stop now

Simon: what you think

Phil: ehm: (0.2) I think the next one will take about five or
ten minutes (0.2) so it's up to you
(1.4)

Simon: what it means
(0.8)

Phil: ehm (.) the next one's a ma- is maths

Simon: maths

Phil: do- doing adding up (0.4) taking away
Simon: can we do it next time
Phil: we can do it next time, yeh
Simon: yeh
Phil: okay, well we’ll stop here then and I’ll turn the tape off
Simon: yeh
Phil: okay
(( sound of tape being turned off ))
Interview One

Transcription: 1C
Phil: ehm
(7.4)

Phil: ↑okay (.) this is (0.2) ehm (0.2) ↑the ↓maths test (0.4) we
said we’d do first

Simon: °mm°
(1.4)

Phil: ehm (0.2) ↑this one’s I’m ↓just gonna ask you to solve some
(0.4) arith↓metic problems

Simon: °yeh°
(1.2)

Phil: ehm: (1.0) ↑like all ↑the ↓other tests that we did (0.2) they get
harder as they go a↓long

Simon: °yeh°

Phil: so (0.8) ↑don’t ↓worry (.) if they start to get difficult (0.4) cos
they will
(1.6)

Phil: ehm: (2.2) ↑first of ↓all (2.4) I’m ↑just gonna put these little
↓blocks out
(3.2)

Phil: re↑mem↓ber these
(9.0)

Phil: how many of ↑those are there
(1.6)

Simon: three
(2.0)

Phil: °well done°
(17.0)

Phil: how many are there there ↑now
(4.2)

Simon: ↑se↓ven
(1.8)

Phil: ↓good↑to:
(5.4)
so if you got seven and you take two away how many are left

five

right

lets get rid of those

the rest of the questions I want you to do in your head a bit more difficult

ehm lets see how you do

o kay

if you had three books and you gave one of them away how many would you have left

two

how much is four pounds and five pounds
eighteen

how much is four pounds plus five pounds

oh seven

nine pounds

if you had a car right and you bought six pounds worth of petrol you gave them (0.2) a ten pound note how much change do you think you'd get back

er a pound

a pound
Phil: okay if you buy cans of pop (0.4) in packs of six (.), so you get six together.

Simon: yes

Phil: yeh

Phil: and you wanted thirty cans altogether (1.8) how many packs do you think you would have to buy?

Simon: one hundred in each.

Phil: let me ask you again (0.6) if you buy them in sixes (0.4) so you get six cans together (1.8) you

Simon: yeh right.

Phil: how many packets of six would you need to get thirty (2.0)?

Phil: have a guess if you can’t get it stuck (9.0)

Simon: a lot of money.

Phil: it’s a lot (0.2) have a guess (0.2) how many would make thirty (4.0)

Simon: tenner (0.4) only a tenner (6.2)

Phil: ehm:

Phil: okay chewing gum (0.8) the chewing gum costs twenty five pence.

Simon: yeh (4.2)

Phil: how much would it cost to buy six (3.4)

Simon: pound (0.8) over a pound (0.8).
Phil: "over a pound"

Simon: "mmm"

Phil: "how much over a pound=

Simon: "one twenty five"

Phil: "one twenty five"

(5.8)

Phil: "one more"

(5.2)

Phil: "how many (0.2) how many hours do you think it would take a man to walk (0.4) twenty four miles (0.8) if he walks at three miles an hour"

(1.6)

Simon: "long way"

Phil: "hh hh (1.8) but how long"

(9.6)

Simon: "twenty four miles (.) that's a long walk"

(1.2)

Phil: "he walks at three miles an hour how long do you think it would take"

(3.6)

Phil: "good"

(7.0)

((sound of pages being turned for 2.2))

Phil: "right this is more of a picturey one"

((sound of pages being turned for 2.8))

Simon: "it's harder now (.) now I'll have to think about it"

(1.4)

Simon: "getting easier"

Phil: "[well it's got a bit harder as they went along didn’t they]"

(5.6)

Simon: "[yeh yeh yeh"

Phil: "but (0.2) the other tests did too"

(5.6)
Phil: let me find the right pictures
(6.2)
Phil: okay on this test I'm gonna show you some pictures
Simon: yeh
Phil: and for each picture there's a bit missing
(0.6)
Simon: bit missing yeh
(1.0)
Phil: so I want you to at all the bits of the picture carefully
(3.0)
Phil: choose the missing bit from the choices at the bottom
(2.2) okay
(4.2)
Phil: so can you tell me on this one
(1.2)
Simon: (sounds like 'arrow')
Phil: which of these five is the missing bit
Simon: that one
(0.8)
Phil: number two well done
(7.2)
Simon: 'harder'
Phil: it does get harder which of these pictures do you think is the missing one there
Simon: that one
(5.2)
Phil: lets have one more practice one those are the ones we're looking at so which one of these is the one that
Simon: which bits that one
Phil: 'missing'
(2.2)
Phil: 'good'
(12.4)
Phil: ready to carry on
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174 (0.4)
175 (( sound of pages turning ))
176 Simon: getting a bit harder into it
177 (0.6)
178 Simon: I know which one is (0.8) that one
179 Phil: yep number three
180 (2.2)
181 (( sound of pages turning ))
182 (3.2)
183 Simon: that one
184 Phil: number three
185 (3.8)
186 (( sound of pages turning ))
187 (2.2)
188 Simon: that one number three
189 Phil: number two
190 (4.0)
191 Simon: right
192 Simon: probably (( syll syll syll ))
193 Phil: hh hh hh
194 Simon: that one in there
195 Phil: yep number two
196 (3.0)
197 (( sound of pages turning ))
198 (2.2)
199 Simon: right (0.2) it's that one
200 Phil: brilliant
201 (1.8)
202 (( sound of pages turning ))
203 (3.6)
204 Simon: ee arh (0.4) that one there
205 Phil: number one
206 (1.2)
207 (( sound of pages turning ))
208 (2.0)
209 Simon: getting harder
Phil: "hh hh hh"

Simon: "can’t read that one I’d better pick that one"

Phil: "take your time with them"

(1.2)

Phil: "number five"

(8.0)

Simon: "(0.6) gotta think about that one (0.4) that one"

Phil: "number four"

(3.0)

((sound of pages turning))

(2.8)

Simon: "now (.) that’s really hard"

hh hh hh

(1.8)

Simon: "fully there’s one missing the re"

Phil: "get harder yes (.) th- th- those are the ones we’re looking at (1.2) an then you’ve got to choose one of these"

(0.2) goes in there

(8.0)

Simon: "right (2.2) well I’m thinking about that one (1.4) what about them (() syll syll ( )) there (2.6) I (.) think (0.6) I think that it’s that one at the moment there (0.8) I think that it’s that one"

(3.8)

Simon: "it’s hard eh"

(3.0)

Phil: "how are you going to work it out"

(4.2)

Phil: "yep"

(3.6)

Simon: "ergh: (.) how do you work that out"

(5.6)

Simon: "down piece there that goes there"

Phil: "mmmmm"

Simon: "un there un there"
Phil:  ↓mm↑hmm
246  (0.8)
247  Phil:  so wh- wha- wha- < (0.2) so ↑what would be ↓next
248  (7.8)
249  Simon:  hard ↓one that ↑is
250  Phil:  tis a- yeh they do get ↓harder
251  (4.0)
252  Phil:  °can you ↑look at° ↓that one
253  (5.2)
254  Simon:  °↓that° ↑one
255  Phil:  number ↓fi:ve
256  (3.0)
257  (( sound of pages turning ))
258  (3.2)
259  Simon:  ↑se↓en that ↑one ↓be↑fore (1.4) ↑that’s ↓getting ↑har↓der
260  Phil:  °hh hh°
261  Simon:  ri:ght
262  (8.2)
263  Simon:  I wonder if it ↑does say (.) ↓there’s (( syll syll )) there
264  (0.8)
265  Simon:  (( sounds like ‘one nots in there’ ))
266  (1.2)
267  Simon:  what you ↑think (0.6) ↓anyone will do
268  Phil:  °hh hh° ↑an↓one’ll do
269  (1.0)
270  Simon:  hard ↑gh
271  Phil:  ↑tis ↓hard ↑yeh (.) yeh ↑don’t ↓worry about that jus- if you
272  ↑get ↓stuck then just have a guess
273  (7.4)
274  Simon:  °that° (0.2) °one°
275  Phil:  ↑number ↓fi:ve
276  (6.0)
277  (( sound of pages turning ))
278  (1.6)
279  Phil:  ↓have a lgo on that one
Simon: [↑right]

(3.0)

Simon: (0.4) [↑it's harder ↑now]

(2.0)

Simon: (0.6) I think (0.2) I'm sure it's (0.4) ((syll syll ↑syll))

(3.6)

Phil: number ↑five

Simon: yeh

(2.2)

Phil: well ↓done

(2.8)

Simon: ↑theys ↓hard ↑ehs

(0.4)

Phil: ↑yeh (0.2) but you ↑knew ↓that one didn't ↑you

Simon: yeh:: I knew [that one

Phil: [hh hh hh

Phil: they're ↑meant ↓to be

(1.8)

Phil: ↓there'd be no ↑test ↓if you got them all ↑right

Simon: [meant to get hard

(0.8)

((sound of pages turning for 6.0 ))

(1.2)

Phil: ↑okay () ↑in ↓this test I'm ↑gonna ↓say some numbers out loud (1.8) and I ↑want you ↑to listen ↓carefully (0.8) and

Simon: yeh

Phil: ↓okay (0.2) so ↑you just say what ↓I've said

(7.2)

Phil: say if I say ↑one () ↓seven

(1.4)

Simon: that's eight

Phil: ↑just say the numbers ↓back to me jus- ↑don't have to add

them ↓up (0.4) just () ↑remember the ↓numbers they're one seven (0.2) straight back
Simon: °seven°

Phil: ↑what did I ↓just say

Simon: °say it back°

Phil: ↑one (.) ↓seven

(0.4)

Simon: eight

Phil: do- ↑don’t add them ↓up (0.2) just ↑say the numbers ↓back

(0.4)

Simon: one ↓seven

Phil: that’s it (.) well done

(3.2)

Phil: ↑six ↓three

Simon: ↑six (.) ↓three

(2.6)

Phil: ↑five (.) ↓eight (.) ↓two

Simon: ↑five ↓eight ↓two

(4.8)

Phil: ↑six (.) ↓nine (.) ↓four

Simon: ↑six ↓nine ↓four

(4.2)

Phil: ↑six (.) ↓four (.) ↑three (.) ↓nine

Simon: ↑six (.) ↓four (.) three (0.2) ↓nine

(0.4)

Phil: ↑seven (.) ↓two (.) eight (.) ↑six

(0.4)

Simon: ↑seven ↓two eight (0.2) °six°

(1.2)

Phil: ↑four (.) ↓two (.) ↑seven (.) ↓three (.) ↓one

Simon: seven (0.4) seven ↓four (.) ↓two (.) ↓three (.) ↓one

(1.4)

Phil: ↑last ↓one

(0.8)

Phil: ↑seven (.) ↓five (.) ↑eight (.) ↓three (.) ↓six

Simon: seven ↓six three (3.4) °three° (1.2) °↑four°
Phil: 
°>↑well ↓done<°
(3.8)
Simon: it’s ↑hard ↓aint if I ↑am ↓tried it I am
Phil: [yeh yeh well
Phil: so all these (.) ↑all these ↓tests (0.2) they get ↑tougher as they
go a↓long
(0.6)
Simon: °tougher as they go along°
Phil: now the ↑second bit of ↓this one (0.4) I’m going to say some
↑more ↓numbers
Simon: yeh
(1.0)
Phil: but ↑this ↓time when I stop (0.6) I ↑want you to say them
back↓wards
Simon: ↑back↓wards
Phil: so it’s a ↑little bit ↓tougher (1.6) so for example if ↑I said
↓seven one ↓ni:ne (0.4) ↑what would ↓you say
Simon: seven (.) nine (.) ↓one
(1.4)
Phil: ↑seven (.) ↓one (.) ↓ni:ne (0.4) ↑what’s that back to ↓front
Simon: one (.) seven (.) ↓nine
(1.0)
Phil: nine (.) °one° (.) °seven°
(1.2)
Simon: °nine° (.) °seven°
(4.4)
Phil: ↑lets try a↓gain (0.6) if ↑I said ↓three four ↓eight
Simon: ↑eight (.) ↓four (.) ↓three
Phil: ↓got it (.) yeh (0.2) well done
(3.4)
Phil: so ↑we’ll do the same thing a↓gain (.) as when ↑I say some
downed you just ↑turn them a↓round and say them back
Simon: yeh
Phil: ↑two ↓four
Simon: ↑four ↓two
(2.8)

Phil: ↑five ↓seven
(0.6)

Simon: ↑seven ↓five
(3.6)

Phil: ↑six (.) ↓two (.) ↓nine

Simon: ↑nine ↓two six
(3.0)

Phil: ↑four (.) ↓one (.) ↓five
(0.8)

Simon: ↑five ↓one (2.6) ↓four
(4.0)

Phil: ↑three (.) ↓two (.) ↑seven (.) ↓nine
(1.0)

Simon: ↑nine (.) ↓three (.) two (1.6) se↓ven
(3.0)

Phil: ↑four (.) ↓nine (.) ↑six (.) ↓eight
(0.8)

Simon: ↑eight ↓six four (4.2) et
(3.6)

Phil: °↑go ↓o:n°
(1.4)

Simon: ↑fo↓ur
(0.8)

Phil: ↓o↑kay
(7.2)

Phil: ↑whizzing ↓through them

Simon: ⁰hh hh whizzing through [hh°

Phil: [hh hh
(1.6)

Simon: yeh (.) ↑I’m ↓doin alr↑t::ght

Phil: ↑m↓mm

Simon: ↓gonna do alr↑t:ght eh

Phil: ↑you are ↓doing alr↑t:ght ↑yeh
Simon: dawn tooke be pleased at the end

Phil: [heh hh hh hh] will she

be pleased hh hh hh

(1.8)

Phil: ehm: (.) okay this one I've just got to ask you some questions (1.2) and I want you to tell me if you know the answers (1.0) okay

(6.4)

Phil: are you ready

(5.2)

Phil: ?

((cough))

(8.2)

Phil: what's the day that comes after Saturday

Phil: what's the day that comes after Saturday

Simon: Saturday

Simon: Saturday

Phil: okay

Phil: what's the shape of a ball

Phil: rotund

(1.2)

Phil: *yeh*

(4.0)

Phil: last practise one

(2.0)

Phil: how many months are there in a year

(2.0)

Phil: *all together*

(1.2)

Simon: twelve

(10.0)
Phil: øKay (0.2) do you know what a thermometer is
(3.2)
Simon: something used to check the temperature
Phil: check the temperature
(6.6)
Phil: this one's a bit harder (0.8) do you know what
direction the sun comes up in the morning
(4.2)
Simon: night-night time in the morning
Phil: night time in the morning (0.6) do you know what direction
it comes up in (.) which
Simon: now it's side now
Phil: oKay
(3.0)
Simon: goes up you can see it right across there
Phil: yeh it moves across in the day
(2.0)
Phil: do you know how many weeks there are in a year
(1.8)
Simon: how many weeks
Phil: mmmm (.) altogether
Simon: thirty days thirty one days (1.0) an (syll) days
Phil: that's how many days there are in a month isn't it=
Simon: yeh
Phil: do you know how many weeks there are in a year
(3.0)
Simon: lots=
Phil: lots yeh
(2.2)
Phil: any idea (0.6) of a number
Simon: over (0.2) over a hundred
Phil: over a hundred
(3.8)
Phil: °oKay°

(1.8)

Phil: ↑do you ↓know (.) ↑who wrote (.) ↑Ham↓let

(3.0)

Simon: ↑er: (0.8) ↑eighty six: (1.8) °sorry I don’t° (0.6) °dunno° (.)

↑DUNNO THE ans↓er re:ally

Phil: ↑oKay (1.6) ↑do you know who wrote Ham↓let

Simon: ↑Ham↓let

Phil: Ham↓let

hammered

(2.0)

Phil: ↑not- not ↓hammering (0.8) ↑Ha- ↓Hamlet (.) it’s- it’s a pla↓y

Simon: play=

Phil: =do you ↑know who wrote ↓it

(1.4)

Phil: °no okay°

(5.2)

Phil: ↑do you know where Brazil ↓is (0.6) ↑what continent it’s on

(1.8)

Simon: °is in° (0.2) °↓town°

Phil: °town°

Simon: °yeh°

Phil: ↑do you know (0.4) Brazil the coun↓try

Simon: °coun↓try° (.) °↑Brazil the coun↓try°

Phil: ↑where- j- where dya think that ↓is

(0.8)

Simon: ↑in- in another coun↓try

(1.0)

Phil: do you ↑know where it’s ne↓ar

(1.8)

Simon: °no°

Phil: °oKay°

(5.6)

Phil: ↑have you ever heard of a man called ↑Martin ↑Luther King

(1.2)
Simon: no I've never heard of him (0.6) don't know why.
Phil: \(\uparrow\)dya know do you know who he \(\downarrow\)was (\.) or what he \(\uparrow\)did
Simon: played music
Phil: \(\uparrow\)played music
Simon:
(3.4)
Phil: \(\uparrow\)can you re^member the name (0.8) of a (\.) \(\uparrow\)prime \(\downarrow\)minister (\.) \(\uparrow\)in \(\downarrow\)England that was a\(\uparrow\)round in the w\(\downarrow\)ar
Simon: \(\uparrow\)right\(\uparrow\)
(7.2)
Simon: \(\uparrow\)I weren't born then\(\uparrow\)
Phil: no you \(\uparrow\)weren't \(\downarrow\)born then \(\uparrow\)no\(\uparrow\):
(3.2)
Phil: \(\downarrow\)have you \(\uparrow\)any id\(\downarrow\)ea
Simon: he was \(\uparrow\)smok\(\downarrow\)king
Phil: he smoked a ci\(\uparrow\)gar \(\uparrow\)yeh\(\uparrow\)
Simon: yeh cigar
(1.8)
Phil: can you remember \(\uparrow\)his n\(\downarrow\)ame
Simon: \(\uparrow\)it's THICK (2.2) I \(\downarrow\)saw it on \(\downarrow\)telly
Phil: \(\uparrow\)mm\(\downarrow\)mm
Simon: I \(\downarrow\)thought it was qu\(\uparrow\)ite b\(\downarrow\)ig
(2.2)
Simon: saw it \(\uparrow\)yester\(\downarrow\)day (\.) on black an white \(\uparrow\)tel\(\downarrow\)ly
(1.8)
Phil: can you \(\uparrow\)remember what \(\uparrow\)his name \(\downarrow\)was
Simon: hat
Phil: yeh
(1.8)
Simon: he had a \(\uparrow\)hat \(\downarrow\)on when I saw \(\uparrow\)him
(2.6)
Simon: ehm: (0.2) I don't know \(\uparrow\)his name \(\downarrow\)now
Phil: hh hh
Simon: his names gone (.) that's strange
(2.0)
Phil: shall I tell you his first name
Simon: yeh
Phil: it was Winston
Simon: "Winston"
Phil: do you know what his second name was
Simon: I seen it on tv yesterday"
(1.2)
Simon: "it was the same man" (0.2) "difficult"
Phil: kay next question then
(2.2)
Phil: do you know who Cleopatra was (0.6) "have you ever heard of her"
Simon: in the war
(3.8)
Phil: in the war< not in the war
Simon: no:
(0.6)
Phil: okay fair enough<
(3.6)
Phil: ehm:
(4.8)
Simon: "not heard of her before no"
Phil: do you know what the capital city of Italy is
(0.6)
Simon: Britain
(4.2)
((sound of pages turning ))
Simon: I know that one (.) it's easy
(3.2)
Phil: one more
Phil: Do you know what the book of Genesis is?
Simon: Book of Genesis.
Phil: It's a two-man.
Simon: Yeh.
Phil: Where.
Simon: In the Bible.
Phil: Yeh (.) that's right. Do you know what it's about?
Simon: No.
Phil: Okay (.) just thought I'd ask.
Simon: Okay. Aye wanna have a go at that.
Phil: Putting pictures into stories.
Simon: Pictures into stories.
Phil: Dya wanna have a go at that?
Simon: Yeh.
Phil: (.)
Simon: Nes-sa's coming today. To get some to get my pictures sorted out.
Simon: Pictures of stories now.
Phil: Yeh (0.8) now. I'll- I'll turn this around again.
Simon: °yeh°
Phil: so that we can use it as a bit of a desk
Simon: yeh
((sounds of pages turning and boxes being opened 5.0 ))
(3.6)
Simon: °gets ↑hard as it ↓goes along°
Phil: hh hh hh (0.4) >gets ↑hard as it ↓goes along yeh< (0.8) ↓they ↑all ↓do
(1.2)
Phil: °okav° (2.2) are you ↑comfortable enough there
Simon: ah (0.4) it ↑hurts
Phil: ↑you hurting
Simon: yeh
(1.2)
Phil: ↑will you be alright=
Simon: =yeh
(2.8)
Simon: °I'll ↑put this ↓down°
(4.8)
Phil: right
(2.0)
Phil: I'm ↑gonna put ↑these ↓out for ↑you
Simon: °yep°
(6.8)
Phil: now can you ↑see that ↓these (0.8) these pictures make a- (.)
Simon: ↑can be turned into a story
(1.2)
Simon: °mm°
Phil: ↑do you think you can put them in the right order ↑so that they make ↑sense
(2.4)
Simon: that ↑does (1.6) ↓that ↑bit
(1.0)
Phil: what's happening in there
Simon: he's
Simon: he’s sticking up the (.) the brick done the bricks now

Phil:ummhmm

Simon: stickin them up there (0.8) he’s building a house and he’s
dunnit

Phil: yeh (.) building a house (0.4) well done

Phil: ?you did that enough

Simon: just ghhotta get sohhme exertchhise

Phil: say if you want to stop (.) we can always stop

Phil: see what you make of that one

Simon: there’s a woman in the water (1.0)ght

Phil: well done

Phil: good at these

Phil: lets try an other one with the same number (0.2) of cards

Phil: oh no (((sylly)))

Phil: do that one

Simon: okay then (1.0) he’s comin there

Phil: ummhmm

Simon: tries to open the door and he’s pull i:t
Phil: yeh
Simon: it's hard to get it open and the lady he's spotted her
while he's pulling it
(1.6)
Simon: an he's (( syll syll syll ))
(2.8)
Phil: well done
(1.6)
Phil: @good on those as well°
Simon: @hmm
(8.2)
Phil: let's try another one
(10.0)
Phil: @two°
(3.4)
Phil: @four five°
Simon: gonna be a long time with all those
(1.6)
Simon: it's a long while I've done it for
(2.0)
Simon: thinking he're (.) but I'll see what I can do
(3.0)
Simon: right
(28.8)
Simon: (( syll )) goes through the window cats are there
(0.4)
bark (.) and then e goes home the kennel (0.8)
(8.4)
Simon: (( syll syll syll )) an e goes there for his tea (( syll
(0.4)
(3.2)
Phil: @easy peasy°
(21.4)
Simon: picnic (.) supper there for his yeh
(32.6)
Simon: ((°syll°)) (0.6) ((°syll syll°))
(3.2)
Simon: ((°syll syll°)) (0.4) ((°syll°))
Phil: ↑yep
Simon: °he’s watchin° ((°syll°))
(5.4)
Simon: °and he tryin° ((°syll°))
(6.2)
Phil: °and you’ve ↑done° four ↓of them
Simon: ↑mm (.) dunnit (.) it [rather a long ↑time ↓that was
Phil: [hh hh hh
Simon: ↑sitting ↑he ↓re
(1.8)
Simon: sitting here a ↑long time ((↓syll syll syll ↑syll))
Phil: ↑yeh ↓well I ↑put some other pictures didn’t I (.) as well
Simon: °yeh°
Phil: yeh
(7.8)
Phil: that’s a ↓shorter one (.) gets a bit har ↓der
(2.2)
Simon: °right°
(31.2)
Simon: ↑right ↓then
(1.8)
Simon: ((°syll ↓syll syll ↓syll:°)) (0.4) ((↓syll ↑syll°))
Phil: ↓mm ↑hmm
Simon: ((°syll syll°)) (1.6) °he’s rushin up there and then° ((°↑syll°))
(0.8) ((↓syll syll syll syll°))
(3.8)
Phil: °↓o ↑kay°
(22.2)
Phil: °two°
(1.6)
Phil: °three°
Phil: °four °five °six °all a bit squashed °in
(3.0)
(4.8)
(52.8)
(2.2)
Simon: right
(1.2)
Simon: takin takin the lady ((syll syll syll))
(0.8)
(1.8)
(2.2)
Simon: in the taxi °goin in the taxi °it looks like °and the lady () went away
(0.6)
(0.4)
(1.0)
(2.0)
(2.0)
Simon: it's a dummy
(1.6)
(27.0)
Phil: °al ri ght
(6.2)
Phil: nearly °one two three °four five<br>
(5.2)
Simon: °right
(46.4)
Simon: °yeh that's okay<br>
(4.6)
Simon: °e's telling him °er (( °syll syll syll syll °syll °))
(0.2)
(0.6)
Phil: °o kay °al right °
(27.0)
Simon: °e's got a °gun °think °
(1.2)
(1.2)
(0.6)
Phil: °mm °hmm °
Simon: °and then turns °back °again °he's gotta °drink °
(1.2)
(1.2)
(0.6)
(0.6)
(0.6)
(0.6)
Phil: °took it °off °an e's got a gun °out °that °
Simon: °what e °syll syll syll °
(1.2)
(1.2)
Phil: yep
Simon: that’s ready to shoot him (0.8) don’t know what’s happenin
down the re () the police might come as well°
Phil: police might come yeh
(1.8)
Phil: well played
(10.0)
Phil: °o° kay°
(3.2)
Simon: a:: h:
Phil: °one° °two° °three° °four° °five° (1.2) and with
those
Simon: yeh (0.6) (( sounds like: °I °know numbers ))
(2.2)
Simon: I remember them
(6.2)
Simon: °lets see°
(6.2)
Simon: (( °syll syll syll ° (0.2) °syll syll syll ° ))
(13.0)
Simon: right (1.6) checkin out there
Phil: yep
Simon: and e’s () goin in there () to drink
(2.8)
Simon: (( °syll syll syll syll ° )) (0.6) missed () part the re
Phil: yep
Simon: and I’m checkin them out until it’s finished
Phil: °o° kay°
(21.2)
Phil: °THINK () if we do °one °more test now () we’ve pretty
much got them finished<
Simon: yeh°
Phil: and we’ve got ten minutes too (0.8) right°
Simon: alr°ight
(2.8)
841 Simon: ((SYLL SYLL ))
842 (15.0)
843 Phil: in this (SYLL) I'm just going to ask you to tell me some
844 answers=
845 Simon: =yeh=
846 Phil: =to just (0.6) every day problems
847 Simon: >problems yeh<
848 Phil: problems that you'll see day to day
849 (3.6)
850 Phil: let me put the suitcase down (.) we don't need it any more
851 (9.4)
852 Simon: doin good
853 (1.8)
854 Phil: right like on the other ones they get a bit harder as they
855 go a long
856 Simon: [yeh
857 Simon: yeh
858 (2.2)
859 Phil: the first one is (0.4) eh:: (0.2) what do people use
860 money for
861 (2.6)
862 Simon: (0.8) saving in the bank
863 Phil: saving in the bank<
864 (2.0)
865 Simon: get clothes
866 (3.2)
867 Phil: how do you mean get them
868 Simon: food
869 Phil: how do you mean put money in the bank
870 Simon: save up for food and clothes put money in the bank
871 (2.0)
872 Phil: mmm
873 Phil: so what do you do with money when you get clothes
874 (2.0)
Phil: ↑how ↓can you use it
(1.4)

Simon: sp↑end ↓it=

Phil: ↓spend it
(3.6)

Phil: tch (0.8) ↑why ↓do people wear ↑watches
(1.8)

Simon: ↑to ↓tell the ↑time

Phil: ↑yep

Simon: ↑can't ↓tell the ↑time ↓without a watch
(4.2)

Phil: ↑why ↓do people wash clothes
(1.0)

Simon: ↑keep em ↓clean
(3.6)

Simon: ↑keep em clean (.) and heal↑thy (.) ↑make sure they're not

sme-° (.) ↑nice an clean they ↓don't smell

Phil: ↑so they don't ↓smell

Simon: °↓yeh°
(0.8)

Simon: °↓clean° ↑clean ↓ones over ↑there °they smell°
(3.2)

Phil: ↑what's the ↓thing ↑to ↓do (.) if you find an ↑envelope ↑in the
↓street (.) and it's ↑sealed ↓up (0.4) and it's addr- it's ↑got an
add↓ress on the front (.) and there's a ↑stamp ↓on it
(1.4)

Simon: put it in the ↑post
(0.2)

Phil: ↑yep (0.2) ↓in the post
(9.0)

Phil: ↑can you tell me some ↓reasons why ↑food ↑gets cooked (.)
or ↑needs ↓to be cooked
(1.2)

Simon: cos of (0.8) ↑poison (.) food needs to be cooked cos you
could be ↑poor↓ly
Phil: you’d be poorly yeh (.) yeh
(1.0)
Simon: sick
(1.4)
Simon: tummy ache
(2.2)
Phil: can you think of any other reasons why we cook food
Simon: it’s salmonella
Phil: yeh salmonella
(4.2)
Phil: is that the only reason you cook food (.) to stop getting poorly=
Simon: something else (0.2) blood poison
Phil: yeh okay
(2.6)
Phil: d’ya know what (0.2) do you know what a parole system is
have you ever heard the word (1.8) we talk about (0.6)
someone being on parole
(5.2)
Simon: what is parole
Phil: do you know what the word parole means
Simon: dunno what it means=
Phil: no okay
(4.2)
Phil: can you think of any reasons why we have (.) lack of children (0.4) can go to work
(1.6)
Simon: yes (1.4) ehm... (0.2) cos they want to work
(0.8)
Phil: be cause
Simon: yeh (.) they want to yeh
Phil: cos they want to work
(3.2)
Phil: and what might be the rules for children who want to be able to work<
Simon: \(\uparrow\text{school}\)

Phil: because of \(\uparrow\text{school}\)

Simon: \(\circ \downarrow \text{yeah}\)

Phil: learn (0.2) \text{learn} \\

Phil: \(\uparrow\text{o\-kay}\)

Simon: \(\uparrow\text{grow} \downarrow\text{up} \uparrow\text{and they get} \uparrow\text{ol}\text{-der}\)

Phil: is \(\uparrow\text{there any o\-ther reason why (.) you need- (.) we need}\text{ rules if children (.) work when they’re young (1.6) \text{why we need laws a\-bout it}\text{.}}\)

Phil: \(\circ \downarrow \text{o\-kay}\text{.} \uparrow\text{next} \downarrow\text{one}\)

Phil: \(\uparrow\text{can you think of \downarrow\text{reasons why the government (.) ehm: (.) make (0.4) some pr}	ext{ofessional people (0.2) >people who do \downarrow\text{jobs like me<}}\text{.}\)

Simon: yeh

Phil: do you \(\uparrow\text{think} \downarrow\text{ehm; (2.2) do you \uparrow\text{think \downarrow\text{there are reasons why we need a li\text{cense or we need to pass exams (0.2) \text{why we need laws a\text{bout it} before we can do what we \downarrow\text{do<}}\text{.}}\text{.}}\text{.}\)

Simon: you need to pass \(\text{exams cos \text{Ter}; (0.6) it’s im\text{portant for your job}\text{.}}\)

Phil: \(\downarrow\text{y\text{-ehh (0.8) why is it im\text{portant}}\text{.}}\)

Simon: ehm: (.) cos you \(\uparrow\text{learn} \downarrow\text{a bit more}\text{.}\)
Phil: °φοτκαφοη=
Simon: =°and:°(.)°than°at°at°school°
Phil: and°why°is°it°important°for°the°people°that°we°work°with
Simon: [at°school]
Simon: ◁skills°(1.2)°help°others
(2.8)
Simon: maybe°(.)°they°got°problems°them°shelf
(1.8)
Phil: ◁oφκαφ
(6.6)
Phil: ◁why°do°people°pay°taxes
(2.0)
Simon: ◁taxes°(0.6)°cos°ehn;°taxes°(0.2)°paying°taxes°(.)°they
Phil: ◁need°to°be°paid
(1.0)
Simon: ◁cos°we°need°too
(1.2)
Phil: how°(.)°how°do°you°mean°we°need°to
(3.6)
Phil: wh-why°do°we°need°to
Simon: cos°er:(.)°it's°the°law
Phil: ◁it's°the°law
(2.2)
Phil: an-°(0.6)°do°you°know°that°money°goes°(.)°where°the
money°goes°to
Simon: goes°on°the°community°like°the°police°and°((°syr°syl)
Phil: ◁anything°like°that
(0.4)
Phil: ◁ye[h°
Simon: ◁hospital°
(0.4)
Simon: ◁can't°remember°now
(2.6)
Phil: ◁oφκαφ
(2.4)
Phil: ehm: (2.0) can you think of any reasons why it’s important
(0.6) to (0.2) study history (0.4) things that went on in the
past
Phil: long while ago
Simon: hmm long while ago
Phil: hmmm long while ago
Simon: ehm: (1.2) get history from it (0.6) get everyone to learn a bit
more about it (0.4) history
Phil: why is it important do you think as a subject
Simon: er.: (.) you learn bit more (.) it’ll help you
(3.0)
Simon: learn a bit more about it
Phil: okay (.) how does it help do you think (0.4)
how— how would it help if you knew about history
(8.4)
Simon: learn bit more about it
Phil: okay (.) how does it help you think
Simon: would it help if you knew about history
(2.0)
Phil: this one (.) have a think about this one
(1.8)
Phil: why do people who are born deaf (0.2) so their deaf (.) their
deaf as soon as their born (0.2) why do they have (.)
trouble learning to speak
Simon: like (( syll ) (syl)) ehm: (0.2) like (( sounds like Ronnan ))
Simon: he’s deaf (.) he can’t hear (.) can’t speak
Phil: do why-
Simon: he was born like that=
Phil: why does he have trouble learning to talk then if he’s
deaf=
Simon: he was born (0.4) like that
(2.0)
Phil: how does the fact that you can’t hear (1.8) make it hard
for users to talk
Simon: have to sign too
Phil: right°
Simon: like a language (0.6) harder°
Phil: right last question
Simon: yeh
Phil: then we’re done
Phil: if you got lost in the forest in the day
Simon: I do get lost
Phil: not in forests though
Simon: I did
Phil: did you
Simon: yeh
Phil: okay then you can do this° think about it if
you got lost in a forest in the day how do you how
would you find your way out
Simon: turn round turn around to see the way you came the
way behind you
Simon: get direction from a junction or-
in a little while right
Simon: (sounds like these boys I was following them boys I got lost)
Simon: I asked a gentleman to give me a way out=
Phil: so you could ask someone
Simon: yeh ask somebody
Phil: how about if there was no-one else around how
would you get yo how would you find your way out
Simon: oh can’t think what it is that's hard sorry
Simon: go on (. ) come out there go down there > go down

Phil: how would you know which direction you were going in

Simon: it's hard (3.8) yeh yeh yeh (0.6) hard ehm:

Phil: tis hard yeh

Phil: how big=

Simon: I'd find my way out some how

Phil: o kahhy hh hh hh

Phil: dunno how

Simon: t just wander around until ( syll)

Simon: yeh wander round til I find

Phil: it

Simon: al right

Phil: how where the questions (0.2) was it al right

Simon: yeh

Phil: o kay that's the last one of those ( . ) today

Phil: ehm: (1.2) so we've done ( . ) e leven ( . ) tests alto gether=

Phil: yeh (0.2) to day and last week and the week before=

Phil: =yeh

Phil: ehm: (0.8) there's three left actually that we don't nec ed to
do (0.4) but I'll ask you next time I come to see if you want
to do them
Simon: °yeh°

Phil: but you don’t have to do them if you don’t want to

Simon: right

Phil: you’ve done all the important ones

Simon: °portant ones yeh°

Phil: ehm: (3.2) °SO (.) I’LL TURN THE TAPE OFF NOW COS

WE’VE FINISHED DOING THE TESTS [okay

Simon: [yes:

(( sound of tape being stopped ))}
Interview Two
Transcription: 2A
Paula: ehm: (2.2) you name is

Catherine: my name is Catherine (4.2)

Paula: ehm: (0.6) and how old are you Catherine

Catherine: twenty one

Paula: twenty one

Steph: twenty two

Catherine: twenty two

Paula: twenty two

Catherine: hh hh hh

Paula: okay (2.6)

Paula: was it your birthday or something yesterday (15.6)

Paula: the work that I'm gonna do with you today or we'll start today (0.4) ehm: (0.2) is something we use with everyone (0.2) and ehm: it's lots of different things

Catherine: yeh ((bang))

Paula: eh: (most) people find some bits of it easier than others

Catherine: yeh

Paula: okay HH HEH

Catherine: [yeh hh hh]

Paula: so you'll probably find some of it okay and some of it a little bit difficult

Catherine: -yeh yeh

Paula: but everybody says that

Catherine: okay

Paula: okay (0.6)

Paula: I have to read (0.4) from this book so I have to read out of the book

Catherine: right
Paula: ehm: (0.4) "it"o tells me what to v say
Catherine: "mmm°
Paula: "okkay°
(3.2)
Paula: "it says° ™I'll be ™asking you ™to do a number of ™things today
(0.2) like ™giving some ™word definitions and solving some
™problems (0.2) uh ™with ™numbers
Catherine: "right°
Paula: ™you'1 ™find ™some of these ™easy but ™others more diff™icult
(0.4)
Paula: ™most people don't ™answer every ™question ™right
(( bang ))
Catherine: "mm™hm°
Paula: okay (0.2) and ™most people don't ™finish (0.4) erm: (.) but
™just have a- have a ™go
Catherine: yeh
Paula: and ™do your ™best
Catherine: "mm™hm
Paula: ™any question™ions
Catherine: "m™mmm
Paula: "okhhay hh hh°
(1.4)
Paula: "right°
(4.2)
Paula: ™do you need glas™ses Catherine
Catherine: no
Paula: "okay°
(6.2)
Paula: the ™first ™o™ne
(8.0)
Steph1: hghh hghh
(2.2)
Paula: I'm ™gonna show you some ™pictures in which there's an
™portant part ™missing
Catherine: right
Paula: I want you to look at each picture and tell me what’s missing and if you don’t know what it’s called you can point at it. Okay.

Catherine: A HANdle

Paula: handle okay.

Catherine: dun they do the big le (.) tters an

Paula: yeh

Catherine: the water coming out

Paula: okay.

Catherine: the screw is

Paula: yeh

Catherine: it is quite long

Paula: mmmmm

Catherine: don’t know

Paula: have a good look cos they get more difficult as they go along

Paula: do you need me to have the table a bit nearer to you
Catherine: s'alright [there
Paula: [no: (0.6) ↑ok
Paula: (3.2)
(( sound of pages turning ))
Paula: "↑look at that ↓one"
Paula: hghh hghh
Catherine: [(( syll syll )) the ↓holes (0.2) in
(5.8)
(( sound of shuffling ))
Paula: sorry (0.2) heh ↑heh
(1.6)
Catherine: ↑the ladies foot prints
Paula: ↑right
(4.2)
(( sound of pages turning ))
Catherine: the (0.8) ↑steam ↓coming out (.) from the chimney
Paula: wh[a-
Catherine: [could be smoke (.) coming out (.) from the chimney
(3.8)
Paula: "there you go"
(4.6)
Catherine: ↑the cat
(5.0)
Paula: ok
(3.2)
(( sound of page turning ))
Paula: (( syll syll syll syll ))
(9.0)
Paula: hghh hghh (( coughing ))
(4.0)
Catherine: ↑the leaves ↑miss sin
(( sound of bell begins ringing in background ))
Paula: ↑there aren't ↓any leaves (.) but ↑is there anything ↑else
↑that's missing
Catherine: can't see

Paula: "okay"

Catherine: (( bell stops ringing ))

Paula: (1.4)

(( sound of page turning ))

Paula: (6.8)

Catherine: ↑the hand↓dle ( . ) ↑back

Paula: ↑the handle ↓where ↑sorry

Catherine: no ↑the handle that goes on the bo::ard

(( sound of page turning ))

Paula: ↑and >what ↓about that ↑one<

(8.8)

Catherine: wooden se:ats

Paula: the what ( . ) ↑se↓ats

Catherine: ↓ya know ↑seats what go across

(4.2)

Paula: ehm: (0.6) >↑what about that ↓one<

(5.8)

Catherine: can't see

(2.2)

Paula: ↓o↑kay

(4.2)

(( sound of page turning ))

Paula: hghh ( . ) hghh (( coughing ))

(4.2)

Paula: >↓thank↑you<

(3.4)

Paula: ↑ok↓ay

(2.0)

(( sound of box being moved / banged ))

(1.8)
Paula: okay (.) ehm: (0.2) this time we’re gonna try something different

Catherine: yeh

Paula: in this section I want you to (0.4) tell me the meanings of some words (0.8) okay (.) so just tell me what some words mean

Catherine: okay

Paula: ehm: (0.2) listen carefully and tell me what each word I say means

(1.8)

Paula: you ready

(2.8)

Catherine: yeh

(2.8)

Paula: ((sound of page turning))

lets start with the word winter (0.2) can you tell me what winter means

(1.0)

Catherine: when the weather gets cold

(2.2)

Catherine: an you get snow or rain

(3.2)

Paula: ye:h like today

(2.2)

Catherine: hh [hh (.) hh hh

(2.2)

Paula: hh hh hh

(2.2)

Paula: I don’t know about the snow but [anyway it’s raining at the moment

(4.0)

((sound of page turning))

(3.6)

Paula: can you tell me a little bit more about what winter means

(2.8)

Catherine: the leaves falling off the trees

(8.2)
Paula: "o.ravel° (1.2)

Paula: ↑can you tell me what break↑fast means (3.0)

Catherine: it means that you have your first meal of the day (.) when you’re desperate (3.2)

Paula: "o.desperate° (6.8)

Paula: ↓o ↑kay (6.8)

Paula: ↑what does (.) re↑pair mean (0.8)

Catherine: when something’s got a snag which is- (0.2) ↑men↑ding it tryna ↑fix (.) ↓it (13.8)

Paula: ↑what does (.) as↑semble (.) mean (7.2)

Catherine: don’t ↑know (7.0)

((sound of page turning)) (5.2)

Steph: hghh (.) hghh ((coughing)) (2.2)

Paula: ehm: (0.4) ↑what does (.) ↓yesterday (.) mean (6.0)

Catherine: the day before today (3.0)

Paula: ↑what about ↓terminate (2.2)

Catherine: I don’t know (2.2)

Paula: "o.ravel° (2.6)

Paula: ↑what does (.) ↓consume (.) mean (3.8)

Catherine: I’m not sure (7.2)
Paula: what about sentence
(1.0)
Catherine: right we use those for writing put a full stop at the end (34.6)
Paula: can you tell me a little bit more about what sentence means (8.6)
Catherine: don’t know (7.0)
Paula: what does confidence mean (4.2)
Catherine: I’m not sure (4.0)
Paula: what about remorse (4.8)
Catherine: don’t know (4.0)
Paula: ponder (2.8)
Catherine: haven’t heard of that
Paula: no (1.2)
Paula: they get harder don’t they (1.2)
Catherine: I know yeh HH HH HH HH
Paula: that’s what this one does but they’re all a bit like that (1.2)
Paula: ehm what does compassion mean (5.4)
Catherine: don’t know (5.2)
Paula: (( sound of page turning )) (2.2)
Steph: hghh hgh ((coughing)) (0.6)
Paula: what about tranquil (2.2)
Catherine: no idea
Paula: (3.0)
Paula: \( \uparrow \) and sanc\( \downarrow \)uary

Catherine: (4.2)
Catherine: °I’m not sure°

Paula: (3.8)
Paula: \( \downarrow \)\( \uparrow \) kay (0.4) are \( \uparrow \)those all words (.) that you’ve not heard \( \downarrow \)of

Catherine: no
Catherine: (4.2)

Paula: right

Steph1: hghhh (.) hgh (\( ( \text{coughing} \) )

\( ( \text{16.0 during which occasional shuffling of paper} \) )

Paula: o\( \uparrow \) kay \( \downarrow \) here’s something diffe\( \downarrow \)rent

Paula: (\( \text{bang} \) )

Paula: right (0.2) I’ll have to use this

Paula: (8.2)

Paula: ehm. (.) in \( \uparrow \)this \( \downarrow \) section I’m gonna \( \uparrow \)\( \text{ask} \) \( \downarrow \) you to copy some

\( \uparrow \)\( \text{sym} \) \( \downarrow \)\( \text{bols} \) (\( ( \text{syll syll} \) ) some special \( \downarrow \) marks

Catherine: °right°

Paula: °okay°

Paula: (3.0)

Paula: if you \( \uparrow \) look at these \( \downarrow \) boxes at the \( \uparrow \) top \( \downarrow \) here

Catherine: yeh

Catherine: (1.0)

Paula: notice that \( \uparrow \) each one’s got a \( \downarrow \) number in the \( \uparrow \)\( \text{top} \) (.) \( \uparrow \) in the

other half of the \( \downarrow \) box

Catherine: \( \downarrow \) yeh

Paula: and in the \( \uparrow \)\( \text{bot} \)\( \downarrow \) tom it’s got like a \( \uparrow \)\( \text{special mark} \)

Catherine: °right°

Paula: and it’s different for each num\( \downarrow \)ber

Paula: (3.2)

Paula: if you \( \uparrow \) look down \( \downarrow \) here (0.2) \( \uparrow \) those \( \downarrow \) boxes (0.4) the squares

have got \( \uparrow \)\( \text{numbers} \) in the \( \uparrow \)\( \text{top} \) but they’re empty at the

\( \uparrow \)\( \text{bot} \)\( \downarrow \) tom

Catherine: right

(0.6)
Paula: and each of these empty squares you need to put the mark that should go there so=

Catherine: =mm

Steph1: hghh () hgh=

Paula: =in this one (4.2)

Paula: it's that one there°

Catherine: yeh

(6.0)

Paula: if you have a go: up to the thick line (27.4)

(( sound of chair creaking ))

Paula: that's great ( ( BANG ) ) okay

Catherine: ( ( syll syll syll syll syll syll syll: ))

Paula: hh hh hhh ( ) ehm:

(1.6)

Paula: now you know how to do them when I ask you ts- to start (0.2) I want you to do the rest of them okay you won't: you won't finish it I'm quite sure nobody does° (1.2)

ehm: if you start ( ) from this line and go along the line

Catherine: right

Paula: and then that one ( ) [and that one

Catherine: [right°

Paula: as much as you can do ( ) in the time until I ask you to stop

Catherine: right

Paula: okay

(1.4)

Paula: oh an do them in order so then I can see if you've skipped anything

Catherine: yeh

Paula: else

Catherine: yeh

Paula: °okay°

(142.6)
Paula: (( bang ))

Paula: ↑how did you ↓find that

(0.8)

Catherine: ↓al ↑right

Paula: yeh (.) ↑great hh hh hh

(( sound of paper shuffling ))

(6.0)

Paula: I’ve ↑never actually ↓known anyone get down ↓there:

Catherine: .chh (( in breath )) hh [hh hh

Paula: [↑1 ↓don’t know if they ever do

(6.0)

Catherine: oh right

(3.2)

Paula: ↑well we’ve ↓got some questions now this ↑time

(6.2)

Paula: ↓on ↑on (0.2) carry ↓on (0.6) ↑are you alright to ↑go- (.) you

(6.2)

Catherine: [y ↑e ↓h

(2.4)

Paula: (.) in ↑this next ↓section I’m going to ↑read two ↓words

Paula: in ↑what ↓way (0.4) in ↑what way are a pi↓ano and

(5.0)

Paula: >just bear with me a sec I’ve gotta< write down what you say

(1.4)

Steph: hghh (.) hgh (( coughing ))

(4.0)

(( sound of pages turning ))

(3.2)

Paula: in ↑what way are an ↓orange and a ba↑na↓na alike

Catherine: they’re both fru↓it
Paula: an eye and an ear

Catherine: they’re both in the head

Paula: can you tell me a bit more

Catherine: er both round

Paula: mm hm

Paula: in what way are a boat and a car alike

Catherine: you can travel in both

Paula: yeh in a boat and a car alike

Catherine: they both have four legs

Catherine: can I put that there’s a drink there for you

Catherine: thank you

Steph2: that’s your appetiser

Paula: hh hh

Catherine: heh heh

Steph2: do you want a drink while=

Paula: =no you’re alright thank you

Steph2: are you alright=

Catherine: =you’re lady this evening eh

Paula: hh hh

Steph2: very useful

Catherine: ye heh heh

(6.2)

Paula: they have four legs they do have four legs can you
tell me a little bit more about how they’re alike
Paula: a ta- sorry table and chair

Catherine: they're both furniture ((syll syll))

Paula: up\(\uparrow\)eh

Catherine: they're both flat

Paula: y\(\uparrow\)eh

((loud howling noise outside of the room))

Catherine: I'm not sure

Paula: hh hh hh

Catherine: I THOUGHT THAT WAS SOMEBODY DYHHING HHNOHHW

Paula: hh hh (0.4) quite loud though hh hh (0.4) okay° (0.2) \(\uparrow\)what

Paula: okay in \(\uparrow\)what way are \(\downarrow\)work and play (\(\downarrow\)) \(\downarrow\)alike

Catherine: ehm:

Paula: mm\(\uparrow\)hm (\(\downarrow\)) tell me a bit \(\uparrow\)more

Catherine: don't know

Steph1: hghh (\(\downarrow\)) hgh ((coughing))

Paula: okay° in \(\uparrow\)what way is steam \(\downarrow\)and fog \(\downarrow\)alike

Catherine: both clouds of ehm:

Paula: \(\uparrow\)what about egg \(\downarrow\)and seed
Catherine: °no°
Paula: ↑no
(0.8)
Paula: can you think of any way they're alike:
(1.8)
Catherine: both (. ) round
(5.4)
Paula: °↓mm↑hm°
(2.2)
Paula: in ↑what way are ↓democracy and ↑monarchy (. ) alike
(2.8)
Catherine: mmm (0.2) no ↑deva
Paula: have you ↑heard ↓ of those be↑fore
Catherine: no
Paula: °no°
Catherine: heh ↑hh (. ) ↓not heard of those at ↑ALL [hh hh hh hh
Paula: [hh hh hh
(1.2)
Paula: ↑what about a ↓poem and a stan↓ue (1.2) how are ↓they alike
Catherine: °a poem°
(6.0)
Catherine: there's no↑thing
(3.2)
Paula: °right° (0.8) °↓okay that's fine°
(4.8)
Steph1: I wondered whether you tried to frighten ↑us (. ) oh ↑no hh [hh
heh heh
Paula: [hh hh hh (. ) I'll be ↑testing you ↓later on all these you know
Catherine: ye:h (. ) ↑hh [hh hh
Steph1: [hh hh hh
Catherine: they'll test me so later (( syll syll syll syll syll ) ) ↑yeh
soh[hooho:]
Paula: [hh [hh hh
Paula: and what way are praise and punishment alike

Catherine: the difference if somebody's done somat right and if somebody's done wrong

Paula: yeh tell me a bit more

Catherine: praise them means that you say thank you instead of being angry with them

Paula: hehm

Catherine: still okay to carry on

Paula: hh hh

Catherine: mh hh

Paula: right

Catherine: I'm alright when I've gotta cup of tea HH HH

Paula: hh hh

Steph1: hghh hgh

Paula: keeps you going

Catherine: YEH CUP O TEA KEEPS ME GOING IF I HADN'T GOT ME CUP O TEA I MIGHT NOT BE TO CARRY OHHN

Paula: HEH HEH HEH

Paula: hh hh hh

Paula: right we'll remember that then

Catherine: YEH HH HH

Paula: okay

Catherine: oh you're gonna time me (.) now h hh hh hh
Paula: don't worry too much about that then

Catherine: heh heh

Paula: °okay°

Catherine: °right°

(( bang ))

Paula: seen anything like this before

Catherine: yeh

Paula: >have you<

Catherine: yeh

Paula: have you done this sort of test before

Catherine: no: not that I know of

Paula: oh that's fine sometimes people do it if you go somewhere else=

Catherine: =oh n:

Steph1: hghh hgh

Paula: okay I'm gonna ask you to make some designs with some pictures

Catherine: right

Paula: you see these blocks

Catherine: ye

Paula: well on some sides their all red

Catherine: °yeh°

Paula: and on some sides their all white

Catherine: right

Paula: and the other ones their both (0.2) [they're red and white]

Catherine: [they're half 'n half hh hh

Paula: and they're all exactly the same
((sound of blocks on the table top))

(3.8)

Paula: I'm gonna put some (0.8) blocks together to make a design

((sound of blocks on the table top))

Paula: no I'm (.) got to do it first

(0.4)

Catherine: "right"

Paula: hh hh hh

Catherine: oh right

Paula: okay

(4.2)

Paula: I'm going to put one together to look like that

Catherine: right

(4.0)

Paula: there we are

(1.0)

Catherine: oh right (.) heh heh

Paula: they're if you look like this (0.2) look

(3.2)

Paula: me getting it wrong tin it

(7.0)

Steph1: hghh (.) hgh ((coughing))

((sound of bricks on table top for 16.0))

Paula: o'Kay

Catherine: right

(2.2)

Paula: now (.) I want you to make one just like that

((sound of blocks on table top))

Paula: I'm gonna mix the blocks up

Steph1: hghh (.) hgh ((coughing))

(2.0)

Paula: can you copy that

(5.2)

Paula: and tell me when you've finished

(9.0)

Catherine: "I've done it"
Paula: (0.8) 
606 Paula: 

(2.8)

608 Catherine: we could have eight blocks instead of eight

(0.2) eight

610 (2.2)

611 Paula: right. this time we’re going to put them together to look like a picture

613 Catherine: oh hh hh hh

614 Paula: that’s what I was trying to do last time. I got it wrong.

615 wrong<

616 (4.2)

617 Paula: if I try it first

618 (0.8)

619 Steph1: hghh hgh ((coughing))

620 (sound of blocks on the table top for 2.2))

621 Paula: do you see the picture when I put the blocks together

622 (7.0)

623 Paula: yeh can you see the picture is the same as the

624 picture

625 Catherine: yeh

626 Paula: you DON’T have to worry about the ones around the

627 outside (0.2) at all

628 Catherine: right

629 Paula: it’s just the ones on top

630 (0.8)

631 Paula: okay

632 (sound of blocks on the table top))

633 Paula: now you try it now it should just look like that

634 picture

635 Catherine: okay

636 (12.0)

637 Catherine: mm hmm

638 Paula: that was fast

639 Catherine: yeh hh hh hh (1.0) don’t take me long does it Maisy tyeh hh hh

640 hh
Steph1:  
[oh yes

Catherine:  
yeh

(1.4)

Steph1:  
\text{hghh (.) hgh ((coughing))}

(1.0)

Catherine:  
I say a really like puzzle heh heh [heh heh

Paula:  
[hh hh hh

(1.2)

Steph1:  
yeh

(2.0)

Paula:  
\text{can you get that one then}

(28.0) (\text{((almost continuous sound of blocks on the table tops))}

Steph1:  
\text{hghh (.) hgh ((coughing))}

(1.0)

Catherine:  
\text{\up{yes} \down{h}}

Paula:  
you get that one

(46.0) (\text{((almost continuous sounds of blocks on the table top))}

Paula:  
\text{re\up{member to \down{tell me when you've \down{finished}}}

Catherine:  
yeh

Paula:  
\text{\textdegree okay\textdegree}

(1.2)

Paula:  
\text{\textdegree great\textdegree}

(1.4)

Paula:  
\text{\down{now: (.) \up{that \down{one}}<}

Steph1:  
\text{hghh (.) hgh ((coughing))}

(30.6) (\text{((almost continuous sounds of blocks on the table top))}

Catherine:  
\text{finished}

Paula:  
\text{\down{o\up{kay}}}

(6.0)

Paula:  
\text{\up{o\down{kay}} \down{and that \down{one (0.4) ooh \up{hang\down{on we may- oh need more \down{blocks \down{for that one

Catherine:  
(([syll syll]))}

(0.8)

Catherine:  
\text{won't be able to \up{do it if we \down{aint got all the \down{bricks [hh hh hh

hh
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Paula: (sound of bricks dropping onto the table)
Paula: that's not fair if I don't give them to you
Catherine: no
Paula: okhhahhy this one's got nine blocks
(almost continuous sounds of blocks on the table top)
Steph1: hghh hgh (coughing)
(7.0) (almost continuous sounds of blocks on the table top)
Catherine: this is difficult
(26.4) (almost continuous sounds of blocks on the table top)
Catherine: nearly there
Paula: ok kay well done
((sound of bricks being dropped on the table top))
Steph1: hghh hgh hgh (coughing)
(54.0)
Catherine: there you go
((sound of bricks on the table top))
Paula: well done
Catherine: heh hh hh hh
Paula: heh hh hh hh
Catherine: hey
Steph1: (sound of bricks being dropped on the table top)
(2.2)
Paula: try that one
Catherine: ooh wha- heh heh heh
Paula: hh hh hh
Paula: okay
Steph1: hghh hgh hgh (coughing)
(0.4)
Catherine: try that one
Paula: okay
Steph1: hghh hgh hgh (coughing)
Catherine: I go and do all that and she goes an mixes it up oh hh hh
Paula:  

Catherine:  

Paula:  

Catherine:  

Paula:  

Paula:  

Catherine:  

Paula:  

Stephl:  

Catherine:  

Paula:  

Stephl:  

Catherine:  

Paula:  

Paula:  

Catherine:  

Paula:  

Catherine:  

Paula:  

Catherine:  

Paula:  

Paula:  

Paula:  

Catherine:  

Paula:  

Catherine:  

Paula:  

Catherine:  

Paula:  

Paula:  

Catherine:  

Paula:  

Paula:  

Catherine:  

Paula:  

Paula:  

Paula:  

Catherine:  

Paula:  

Catherine:  

Paula:  

Stephl:  

Catherine:  

Paula:  

Stephl:  

Catherine:  

Paula:  

Paula:  

Paula:  

Catherine:  

Paula:  

Paula:  

Catherine:  

Paula:  

Catherine:  

Paula:  

Paula:  

Catherine:  

Paula:  

Paula:  

Catherine:  

Paula:  

Paula:  

Catherine:  

Paula:  

Paula:  

Catherine:  

Paula:  

Paula:  

Catherine:  

Paula:  

Paula:  

Catherine:  

Paula:  

Paula:  

Catherine:  

Paula:  

Paula:  

Catherine:  

Paula:  

Paula:  

Catherine:  

Paula:  

Paula:  

Catherine:  

Paula:  

Paula:  

Catherine:  

Paula:  

Paula:  

Catherine:  

Paula:  

Paula:  

Catherine:  

Paula:  

Paula:  

Catherine:  

Paula:  

Paula:  

Catherine:  

Paula:  

Paula:  

Catherine:  

Paula:  

Paula:  

Catherine:  

Paula:  

Paula:  

Catherine:  

Paula:  

Paula:  

Catherine:  

Paula:  

Paula:  

Catherine:  

Paula:  

Paula:  

Catherine:  

Paula:  

Paula:  

Catherine:  

Paula:  

Paula:  

Catherine:  

Paula:  

Paula:  

Catherine:  

Paula:  

Paula:  

Catherine:  

Paula:  

Paula:  

Catherine:  

Paula:  

Paula:  

Catherine:  

Paula:  

Paula:  

Catherine:  

Paula:  

Paula:  

Catherine:  

Paula:  

Paula:  

Catherine:  

Paula:  

Paula:  

Catherine:  

Paula:  

Paula:  

Catherine:  

Paula:  

Paula:  

Catherine:  

Paula:  

Paula:  

Catherine:  

Paula:  

Paula:  

Catherine:  

Paula:  

Paula:  

Catherine:  

Paula:  

Paula:  

Catherine:  

Paula:  

Paula:  

Catherine:  

Paula:  

Paula:  

Catherine:  

Paula:  

Paula:  

Catherine:  

Paula:  

Paula:  

Catherine:  

Paula:  

Paula:  

Catherine:  

Paula:  

Paula:  

Catherine:  

Paula:  

Paula:  

Catherine:  

Paula:  

Paula:  

Catherine:  

Paula:  

Paula:  

Catherine:  

Paula:  

Paula:  

Catherine:  

Paula:  

Paula:  

Catherine:  

Paula:  

Paula:  

Catherine:  

Paula:  

Paula:  

Catherine:  

Paula:  

Paula:  

Catherine:  

Paula:  

Paula:  

Catherine:  

Paula:  

Paula:  

Catherine:  

Paula:  

Paula:  

Catherine:  

Paula:  

Paula:  

Catherine:  

Paula:  

Paula:  

Catherine:  

Paula:  

Paula:  

Catherine:  

Paula:  

Paula:  

Catherine:  

Paula:  

Paula:  

Catherine:  

Paula:  

Paula:  

Catherine:  

Paula:  

Paula:  

Catherine:  

Paula:  

Paula:  

Catherine:  

Paula:  

Paula:  

Catherine:  

Paula:  

Paula:  

Paula: and that one was right
(0.8)
Catherine: those three there were right
Paula: it's confusing because the points are different way
Catherine: and was it that one
Paula: yeh
(2.8)
Catherine: yeh
(3.6)
Paula: yeh
(4.2)
Steph1: hghh hgh (coughing)
(4.8)
Catherine: no
(20.0)
Paula: pretty that one isn't yeh
(0.2) it's not square
Steph1: I'll get the last one up
((sound of blocks dropping onto the table top))
(3.3) ((sound of blocks on the table top))
Steph1: hghh hgh (coughing)
(78.4) ((sound of blocks on the table top))
Catherine: (( sound of blocks on the table top ))

(22.4)

(°syll°)

(1.2)

Paula: \(\text{hmm}\)

Catherine: °is it that°

(1.8)

Paula: °does it \(\text{look}\) \(\text{like it}\°

Catherine: °yeh°

(13.0)

Steph1: hghh (.) hgh (( coughing ))

(7.2)

Catherine: I got no idea to be honest

Paula: it’s hard isn’t it

Catherine: yehhh

(0.8)

Catherine: (( °syll syll syll syll syll syll syll °))

(2.2)

Paula: (( syll syll syll )) blocks (0.8) it’s \(\text{cos}\) there’s \(\text{no outline}\)

Steph1: hghh (.) hgh (( coughing ))

Catherine: °right°

Paula: there’s no kind of (.) box round \(\text{it}\)

Catherine: °no:°

Paula: shall I \(\text{show}\) \(\text{you}\)

Catherine: yes please

Paula: yeh hh hh [hh hh hh

Catherine: [yeh hh hh

(( sound of blocks on the table top ))

(3.2)

Paula: °right° (.) \(\text{ehm}\) (0.2) right \(\text{now}\)

(5.2)

Paula: °ehm:°

(3.2)

Paula: oh (0.2) \(\text{stuck}\) \(\text{on this}\) \(\text{one}\)

Catherine: yehheh

(1.8)

Paula: put a \(\text{white one in the}\) \(\text{middle}\)
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Paula: (5.4)
Paula: ch:
Catherine: oh right (.) yeh
Paula: (9.0)
Paula: okay but well done on that
Catherine: rhh:ght
Paula: (3.2)
Paula: I'll take these blocks away°
Catherine: (0.6)
Steph1: hghh (.) hgh (.) hgh ((coughing))
Paula: (7.2)
Paula: how you doing°
Catherine: alright°
Paula: °okay°
Catherine: °alright°
Paula: °go° kay°
Paula: (2.0)
Paula: you were good at that
Catherine: (13.6)
Paula: °how's your maths
Paula: (sound of pages turning ))
Paula: (5.6)
Paula: we're gonu ehm: (0.4) do something e- diff rent again now
Paula: (1.8)
Paula: okay this section I'm going to ask you (.) to solve some
Paula: maths problems
Catherine: right
Catherine: (4.2)
Steph1: hghh (.) hgh ((coughing)) (0.2) °getting tired of that°
Paula: yehh hh hh (0.2) °how much is four pounds plus five
Pounds
Catherine: nine pounds
Paula: (0.4)
Paula: I didn't have a chance to turn it [on hh hh hh
Paula: If you buy six pounds worth of petrol and pay for it with a ten pound note, how much would you get back?

Catherine: I think four pounds

Paula: Soft drinks are sold six cans to a pack if you want thirty cans how many packs must you buy?

Catherine: How much is a pack

Paula: six cans to a pack and you want thirty thirty cans all together

Catherine: we'll (( syll syll ))

Paula: Are you doing these

Catherine: hh hh [hh

Paula: [hh hh loo:k

Paula: Chewing gum costs twenty five pence a pack how much would it cost to buy six packs

Catherine: One pound fifty

Paula: How many hours will it take a person to walk twenty four miles at the rate of three miles an hour

Catherine: Eight

Steph: Hghh (( coughing ))

Paula: If you buy seven twenty pence mints and give the
Catherine: four pounds sixty

Paula: four pounds sixty

Paula: oke

Paula: if you have eighteen pounds and you spend seven pounds and fifty pence how much will you have left

Catherine: eleven pounds fifty

Paula: right

Paula: Jesse bought six pieces of chocolate for one pound sixty and an additional twenty pence vat was added to the price how much did he pay for each chocolate including the vat

Catherine: two pounds forty

Steph: hghh (coughing)

Paula: the price of shirts is twenty for thirty one pounds what is the price of one dozen shirts

Catherine: don't know

Paula: do you know what dozen means

Catherine: it's twelve

Paula: just checkin you knew

Catherine: yeh
Paula: °okay ehm:°
(8.2)
Paula: all right that's the last one
Catherine: heh heh hh
(2.2)
Paula: okay (0.6) there's some more pictures this time
(3.6)
Steph: hghh () hgh ((coughing))
Paula: I'm gonna show you some pictures
(2.2)
Paula: and for each picture there's a part missing
Catherine: right
(0.4)
Paula: ehm: () I want you to look at all of the ((syl syl syl))
picture carefully okay and choose the missing one from the
bottom (0.2) there's a choice of five at the bottom but the-
these are just examples () so if you look at that: () this
is the picture=
Catherine: yeh another ones missing
Paula: okay
(1.2)
Paula: can you tell me what number
Catherine: number two
Paula: number two right°
(2.2)
Paula: another one
(1.8)
Catherine: number four
(1.0)
Paula: mm hm
(2.6)
Paula: and that one
(3.6)
Catherine: number four
(1.2)
Paula: °okay°
Paula: can you tell me the number
Catherine: number two
Paula: okay
Catherine: number three
Paula: okay
Catherine: number one
Paula: okay
Paula: what about that one
Catherine: ehm:
Catherine: is it number one
Paula: okay
(( sound of page turning ))
Paula: now (( syll syll )) that one
(( sound of page turning ))
Catherine: number four
(5.0)
Paula: and that one
(6.0)
Steph1: hghh (.) hgh ((coughing))
(7.2)
Catherine: number three
(6.2)
Paula: can you tell me that one°
(24.0)
Catherine: number one
(1.6)
Paula: ↓o↑kay
(4.8)
Steph1: hghh (.) hgh ((coughing))
(0.8)
Paula: and that one°
(26.8)
Catherine: number four
(1.4)
Paula: ↓o↑kay
(15.2)
Catherine: number three
(2.0)
Paula: ↓mm↑hm
(20.6)
Catherine: number three
(16.4)
Catherine: number two
(1.6)
Paula: ↓mmmm↑hm
(20.0)
Catherine: number one
(1.8)
Paula: ↓mm↑hm
(11.8)
1035  Catherine: that's hard
1036
1037  Catherine: (( syll syll syll syll syll ))
1038  Paula: hehh hh
1039
1040  Catherine: number five
1041
1042  Paula: /oʊ/kaɪ
1043
1044  Catherine: number one
1045
1046  Steph1: hghh () hgh ((coughing))
1047
1048  Catherine: number four
1049
1050  Paula: /oʊ/kaɪ
1051
1052  Catherine: number three
1053
1054  Paula: /m/ɪhm
1055
1056  Catherine: number four
1057
1058  Paula: /m/ɪhm
1059
1060  Catherine: number two
1061
1062  Steph1: hghh () hgh ((coughing))
1063
1064  Catherine: number three
1065
1066  Paula: /m/ɪhm
1067
1068  Catherine: number four
1069
1070  Paula: /m/ɪhm
Catherine: number three
Paula:  
(22.8)
(1.4)
Paula:  
(3.6)
Paula:  
(2.0)
Paula:  
Stephl:  
(2.0)
Paula:  
Stephl:  
(3.6)
Paula:  
Stephl:  
(3.2)
Paula:  
(2.0)
Paula:  
(1.8)
Stephl:  
(1.2)
Stephl:  
(0.2)
Stephl:  
(0.4) uh: ( ) hh hh

Catherine: 
Paula:  
(0.4) how you doing
(0.4)
Catherine: 
Stephl:  
(3.6)
Paula:  
(3.2)
Paula:  
(1.2)
Paula:  
(1.2)
Paula:  
(1.2)
Paula:  
(1.2)
Paula:  

hghh ( ) h[gh (( coughing ))

[a little bit ( ) alright]
Paula: I tell you what we'll do the last one til about five then
(0.6) yeh (0.4) ahhnd then I'll come back and finish the
others

Catherine: hh hh

Paula: cos the next one isn't re- it doesn't take a long time<br>
(2.2)

Paula: I'm gonna say numbers

Steph: [hgh ([coughing])

Paula: I say
(3.2)

Paula: one seven

Catherine: one seven
(2.2)

Paula: six three

Catherine: six three
(2.6)

Paula: five eight two::

Catherine: five eight two::
(3.0)

Paula: six nine four

Catherine: six nine four
(2.4)

Paula: six four three nine

Catherine: six four three nine
(2.0)

Paula: seven two eight six
1142 Catherine: seven two eight six
1143 (3.0)
1144 Paula: ↑four (0.4) ↓two (0.6) ↑seven (0.4) three (0.4) ↓one
1145 (3.8)
1146 Catherine: for↑ur: ↓seven (1.2) two: three: ↓one
1147 (3.2)
1148 Paula: ↑seven (0.4) ↓five (0.4) ↑eight (0.4) three (0.6) ↓six
1149 Catherine: ↑seven ↓five eight three ↓six
1150 (16.2)
1151 Steph1: hghh (.) hghh ((coughing))
1152 (2.8)
1153 Paula: right (0.2) so (0.4) ↑six (0.2) ↓one (0.2) nine (0.4) four (0.4)
1154 seven (0.4) ↓three
1155 (3.2)
1156 Catherine: six (2.8) four (1.8) one (0.8) three (3.0) four and se↓ven
1157 (1.6)
1158 Paula: °okay°
1159 (3.2)
1160 Paula: ↑three (0.4) ↓nine (0.4) two (0.2) ↑four (0.4) eight (0.4) ↓seven
1161 (1.8)
1162 Catherine: ↑three (0.6) ↓nine (0.6) ↑two four eight ↓seven
1163 (2.0)
1164 Paula: ↓okay
1165 (3.2)
1166 Paula: ↑five (0.4) ↓nine (0.4) one (0.6) seven (0.6) four (0.6) two (0.4)
1167 ↓eight
1168 (2.2)
1169 Catherine: ↑five (0.2) ↓nine (0.6) seven (0.6) two (2.4) eight
1170 (3.0)
1171 Paula: okay
1172 (2.0)
1173 Paula: ↑four (0.4) ↓one (0.4) seven (0.4) nine
1174 (tape ended on master copy)
1175 (tape starts on side two of master copy)
1176 (1.2)
1177 Paula: okay
Paula: all right
Catherine: I am:
Paula: °good°
(2.0)
Paula: now I’m gonna say some more numbers (0.4) but this
(0.8) so for example if I said seven one nine
that’s right (0.4) well done (0.2) OK
quickly
(2.2)
Paula: okay (.) so I’ll start (0.4) two four
(0.4)
Catherine: four two
(2.4)
Paula: five seven
(1.4)
Catherine: six two nine
(1.8)
Pau
a: four one five
(1.2)
Catherine: three two seven nine
(2.2)
Steph: hghh hghh (coughing)
(1.2)
Paula: four nine six eight
(1.6)
Catherine: eight six nine four
(3.6)
Paula: °otkay°

(1.8)
P

Paula: ↑one (0.4) ↓five (0.6) two (0.4) eight (0.4) ↓six

(0.8)
P

Catherine: six (0.2) eight (0.2) two five and ↓one

(3.2)
P

Paula: ↑six (0.4) ↓one (0.4) eight (0.4) four (0.4) ↓three

(2.8)
P

Catherine: ↑three: ↓four eight six an ↓two

(2.6)
P

Paula: o↑kav↓y

(2.8)
P

Paula: ↑five (0.4) ↓three (0.6) nine (0.4) four (0.4) ↓one (0.4) ↑eight

(1.6)
P

Catherine: eight (0.2) o:ne four ni:ne fi:ve

(2.8)
P

Catherine: °otkay°

(3.2)
P

Catherine: right we’ll ↑finish ↓there today

(2.6)
P

Steph1: hghh (. .) hgh ( "coughing")

(1.4)
P

Paula: ↑to↑kay (.) ↑thank ↓you

(3.2)
P

Paula: ↑what did you think of ↓that

(0.2)
P

Catherine: alright

(2.6)
P

Paula: y↑e:h

(1.4)
P

Catherine: YE↑f:H

(2.8)
P

Paula: [haven’t done TOO ↓BAD

(2.6)
P

Catherine: NO

(0.2)
P

Paula: We’ve got a few ↓more to do

(2.6)
P

Catherine: y↑eh=

(2.6)
P

Paula: =we’ve got o:ne (0.4) two (.) ↓three (2.6) °four°
(2.2)

Paula: °yeh° (0.2) °just do those next °time°
Catherine: right
(4.2)
Paula: you like puzzles °don’t °you
Catherine: yehhe|hheh
Paula: °okay°
Catherine: I’m °feeling really puzzled aren’t °I hh hh
Paula: hh hh hh
Catherine: you can °tell I °like puzzles cos Barry °lent me °some
puzzhllhhes
(1.4)
Catherine: mind you °often °feel puzzled when you got a brain like Barry
Paula: tchawhh hh
Catherine: ye:::s (0.2) she’s °always °keeping you puzzled °aren’t you
Rachhhel hh
Catherine: °hehh heh°
Paula: eh hh hh hh hh he he he;
(4.8)
(( sound of boxes being put away in test case ))
(3.6) (( sound of girl shouting in the background ))
Catherine: oh well a=
Steph1: =hghh () hgh (( coughing )) =
Catherine: =can tell Lou°rise °is °here can’t °ya
(3.2) (( sound of a girl shouting in the background ))
Paula: is she the °noisy one °oh lets just turn this°<
(( sound of tape being switched off ))
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Interview Two

Transcription: 2B
((sound of tape being turned on))

(1.6)

Paula: right (.) ↑put ↓that on the ↓floor

((sound of microphone being moved))

Paula: AND WE'LL START AGAIN this week ↑won't ↓we

(2.2)

Paula: you ↑did very well ↓last week

Catherine: ↑yes

Paula: ↑yeh°

Catherine: °alright°

(5.2)

Steph1: HGH

(4.2)

Paula: °right° (.) °just get my form out from last ↓time°

(2.0)

Paula: you got here be↑fore ↓me this time ↑then

Catherine: ye:h hh [hh hh

Paula: [eh hh hh

(0.2)

Paula: I was a bit late I'm ↓sorry about that

Catherine: that's alright

(0.4)

(1.0) ((sound of pages turning))

(1.6)

Paula: there we go

(10.0)

Paula: you did a ↑lot ↓didn't you: (0.2) I'll just ↑check hold ↓on one ↓sec

(5.0) ((sound of pages turning))

(3.2)

Paula: you ↑okay ↓today

Catherine: yes thank you
35 Paula: °yeh goo̲d°
36 (2.2)
37 Paula: do you remember I had read stuff out of this book (. ) I have
to look what the words are
38 Catherine: [yes
39 Paula: °yeh°
40 (2.6)
41 Paula: °the right section°
42 (8.2)
43 Paula: °okay°
44 Catherine: so you doing ↑puzzles so I’m feelin puzzley-
45 Paula: heh hh hh hh
46 Catherine: [behehehe feelin quite puzzley- todhhahhy he he he
47 Paula: ↑what me ↓or ↑you
48 Catherine: YOU EH HH [HH
49 Paula: [right a::h
50 Catherine: °heh°
51 (3.0)
52 Paula: ↓feels late ↑to↓day
53 Catherine: yeh
54 Paula: ↓nearly there (. ) this is the right ↑one
55 Catherine: °ehh°
56 Paula: so I’ve got some ↑ques↓tions to ask you ↑first
57 (2.6)
58 Paula: ehm:
59 (4.0)
60 Paula: ↑ok kay yeh (. ) says (. ) I’m ↑going to ask you some ↓questions
(0.2) and I would ↑like you to tell me the ↓answers=
62 Catherine: =yes
63 Paula: o↑kay
64 Catherine: that’s ↑fine
65 Paula: °right°
66 (0.4)
67 Paula: ↑what is a ther↓mometer
68 (2.2)
Catherine: well (0.2) it (.) tells you (.) what the temperature is (3.2) if it's seer- (.) if (.) put thermometer in drinks or (.) in food to see if it's the right temperature of heat (6.2) \\
Paula: remember I have to write down what you say as well (0.8) \\
Catherine: yhhehh heh [heh (9.0) it takes me a little while (0.8) \\
Catherine: ye::h (9.0) \\
Paula: yeh (.) in what direction does the sun rise (1.2) \\
Catherine: ehm:: (2.6) \\
Catherine: the east (1.8) \\
Paula: o to kay (4.0) \\
Paula: how many weeks are there in a year (1.2) \\
Catherine: don't know (6.0) \\
Catherine: don't know (0.8) \\
Paula: don't know (0.8) kay (0.2) have a guess (2.0) \\
Paula: how many weeks in a year (3.2) \\
Catherine: about fifty (1.0) \\
Paula: o kay (0.6) \\
Paula: who wrote Hamlet (2.0) \\
Catherine: no id tea
Paula: °ohkhay°
(1.6)
Catherine: hehhh
(1.4)
Paula: on what continent is Brazil
(4.4)
Catherine: um: don’t know
(4.0)
Paula: who was Martin Luther King
(1.8)
Catherine: ehm: (°syl syl syl syl°)
(2.2)
Paula: °hehh°
(3.0)
Catherine: ehm:
(1.8)
Paula: can you name the prime minister of Great Britain during the second world war
(5.2)
Catherine: no (0.6) sorry
(9.6)
Paula: and (.) who was Cleopatra
(4.2)
Catherine: not heard of her
(0.6)
Paula: not heard of her
Catherine: no
Paula: that’s fine
(7.2)
Catherine: ((sound of pages turning))
Paula: ((°syl syl syl°))
Catherine: yeh
Paula: I need to just ask you one question=
Catherine: =yeh=
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Paula: =again (0.4) cos (0.2) it was ↑me that got it ↓wrong last time
Catherine: whatever
Paula: not you (.) don’t worry
(4.2)
Paula: you ↑know that I was ↓asking about ↓words and what they ↓meant
Catherine: yeh
Paula: chm: (0.2) I missed (.) I ↑missed a ↓couple of questions ↓out
Catherine: riːght
(3.2)
Paula: unfair to (( syll syll syll syll ))
Catherine: (( syll syll (.) syll syll ))
Paula: hh hh hh hh
Catherine: I have to hh hh
(1.8)
Paula: ↑okay (.) ↑so: (1.6) I ↑just need to ↓read you the stuff out from the beginn↓ing again (0.4) I ↑want you to tell me the ↓meanings of some ↓words (0.4) so ↑listen ↓carefully and when I- (.) and ↑tell me what each ↓word I say ↑means (.)
Catherine: that’s ↑great (1.6) ↑what does ↓penny mean
(2.2)
Paula: ↑yeh
(2.0)
Paula: o↑okay (.) ↓that’s ↑great (0.4) and chm: ↑what does ↓ship mean
(0.6)
Catherine: it means you have some money an (0.2) you- you’ve got a (.) brown coin that’s a penny: (0.4) and a gold one is a (.) pound an- silver is twenty p or ten p or fiːve
Paula: ↑yeh
(16.2)
Catherine: it’s something that if you (0.2) eh: travel on across the waːter
(16.2)
(( sound of shouting outside of the room ))
Catherine: it sounds like riːght fun out there doesn’t lːiːT hh [hh heh heh
Paula: hh hh hh
(3.2)
Paula: ↑okay ↓that’s ↑great (0.4) >we’ll go back to where we were
Catherine: before now<

179  Catherine: eh (.) whahhh hh hh

180  (4.2)

181  Catherine: don’t know if you’re goin ↑backwards or ↓forwards hehhh

182  (3.2)

183  (( sound of rummaging in the WAIS case ))

184  (3.8)

185  Paula: °alright then°

186  (7.0)

187  Paula: °find the right bit again°

188  (6.2)

189  Paula: °okay°

190  (3.6)

191  Paula: right in ↑this ↓section (0.6) I’m gonna ↑give you: (.) ↓a ↑group

192  of ↓cards (.) that are ↑in the wrong or ↓der

193  Catherine: right

194  Paula: and I want you to ↑put them together so they ca- ↑they tell a

195  story (.) that makes some sense

196  Catherine: °right° (1.2) °okay°

197  (2.2)

198  Paula: so I’ll ↑show you some (.) an example to ↓start first

199  (3.0)

200  Paula: °must remember to get them out° (.) °right°

201  (2.6)

202  Paula: °ehm:°

203  (2.0)

204  Catherine: if you’ve learned the right words hh hh (.) right (( ↑syll syll ))

205  Paula: heh heh (0.2) yeh [hh hh

206  Catherine: [ya more like to say forwards to backwards

207  not backwards to forwards hh hh

208  (0.4)

209  Paula: °hh hh [hh°

210  Catherine: °ri:ght°

211  (0.2)

212  Paula: I’m ↑starting ↓here
Catherine: *right*

Paula: *right* (0.4) so *these pictures tell a story about a *worker* built a *house* that *go* in the wrong *order*

Catherine: *ahah*

Paula: I want you to put them together (.) in the right *order* so they tell a story that *makes sense*

(9.0)

Catherine: *there*

(3.2)

Paula: *okay*

(6.2)

Paula: as you’ll *guess* (.) *I’ve* now got some more *for you* (.) to do

Catherine: more more hh hh hh

(8.6)

Catherine: now I know why I’ve been feeling quite puzzled (.) eh hh hh hh hh (.) he:

Paula: *okay* (1.0) *so* I’ll just read this out *I’ve* got some *more*

sets of *pictures* for you to *arrange*

Catherine: *right*

Paula: in *each* *case* they’re mixed up and you are to *put* them in *the right* *order* *so* they make the most sensible *story*

Catherine: yeh

Paula: *okay* *right*

(1.2)

Paula: ehm *work* as quickly as you *can* and *tell me* when you’ve *finished*

Catherine: *right*

(14.4)

Paula: you *don’t* *wear glasses* *do* you

Catherine: *no:

Paula: *that’s alright*

(2.2)

Paula: *okay*

(25.2)
248  Paula: finished
249  Catherine: °yeh°
250  Paula: °oyeay° (0.4) remember to tell me when you’ve finshed
251  Catherine: °oh yeh° (.) heh°
252  (20.8)
253  Paula: °mmm°
254  (52.4)
255  Catherine: finished
256  Paula: hmm
257  (14.4)
258  Catherine: ooooh no no (0.2) oh dear (0.2) eh heh [heh heh
259  ] hh hh hh
260  (2.0)
261  Paula: you know that I’m not allowed to tell you how you’re doing
262  Catherine: yeh (0.2) I know
263  (10.2)
264  Catherine: I’m just keeping my fingers crossed that I’m going to be right
265  (.) ooooh help me he hehe (.) heh
266  (12.2)
267  Paula: oookay
268  (31.0)
269  Catherine: there
270  (30.4)
271  Paula: to do with these
272  Catherine: eh hehh
273  (2.2)
274  Catherine: uh ooh
275  (1.0)
276  Catherine: ooooh dear help eh heh heh
277  (1.2)
278  Paula: you’re doing fine
279  (6.2)
280  Paula: oookay
281  (23.2)
282  Catherine: finished
283  Paula: oh (0.2) eh heh heh (0.6) that was fast
Catherine: oh (0.2) eh heh heh
(12.2)
Catherine: uh oh (0.4) check you do this right don't wanna do eh heh heh
Paula: o\kay
Catherine: am getting it right
(1.0)
Catherine: uh oh (0.2) oh de ar eh heh heh heh
Paula: you're doin fine
Catherine: if I'm not getting them right I'll just say well it's our
Rachel (.) really (.) eh he he (0.4) me an Dawn just go an
swap over on our Rachel (.) shall when hh
Paula: [hh hh now Rachel's not even in the room this week hh hh hh
Catherine: yeh (.) heh heh heh
Paula: o\ka\v (0.2) that's the next one
(58.2)
Catherine: ((syl))
Paula: finished
(19.2)
Paula: okay
(12.6)
Paula: are you o\ka\v
Catherine: yeh
Paula: great
(3.2)
Catherine: apart from feeling really quite puzzled EH HEH HIEH
Paula: [hh
(1.2)
Paula: right
(45.0)
Catherine: there you go
(39.6)
Paula: can I just check with you in this one
(3.0)
Paula: I'm not sure did (.) did you (1.4) which or der did you do
them in (2.2) "I am getting them up in the right order"

(4.0)

Catherine: "ehm:"

(2.6)

Catherine: "that one"

Paula: sorry do you want me to do it again

Catherine: "hm"

(4.4)

Paula: okay (.) that was the order was it

Catherine: yeh

(5.0)

Paula: and where does the story start

Catherine: it starts from (( sounds like tattoo for me ))

Paula: it starts they're

Catherine: yeh

(15.0)

Paula: "hm" (( syll syll (.). syll syll syll syll syll syll))

(4.0)

Paula: it's warm in here today I didn't (( syll syll syll syll ))

Catherine: "no"

(8.2)

o kay

(25.8)

Catherine: there you go

Paula: "hmm"

(1.4)

(2.8) (( loud shriek / giggle from outside of the room ))

(0.8)

Catherine: they're havin a party out there (.) aren't they heh heh (.) heh

he he he

Paula: they having a party

Catherine: ooh hh heh heh heh ehhhh (.) o:h

(53.0)

Catherine: "is it that"

(1.4)
Catherine: EH HEH HEH
Paula: that's fast
(1.0)
Catherine: yeh heh
(2.8)
Catherine: ((sung)) we're gettin' quicker yeh eh
Paula: are you
Catherine: heh heh heh
(26.4)
Paula: *okay* (0.6) can you do these ones then
(4.2)
Catherine: okay
(2.8)
Catherine: ehm:
(21.4)
Catherine: there
(31.0)
Paula: and the last one
(6.2)
Paula: o*kay*
(22.2)
Catherine: there
(24.0)
Paula: *okay that's great*
(3.0)
Paula: something different now
(1.6)
Paula: just find the lid for that box
((sound of rummaging around in the WAIS case for 7.2))
(2.4)
Paula: *right*
(1.2)
Paula: *now I'm gonna ask you* (.) to tell me some solutions to
everyday problems
Catherine: right
Paula: in other words tell me what you think you should do
(10.2)
Paula: what is the thing to do: if you find an envelope in the street that's sealed addressed and has got a new stamp on it
(3.0)
Catherine: take it to the post office
(7.2)
Paula: mmhm
Catherine: eh heh that's all
Paula: what
Catherine: [eh heh
Paula: d'ya wa-
Catherine: no: mmhm
Paula: can't hold too many things at one
((sound of page turning))
Paula: can you tell me some reasons why many foods need to be cooked
(4.2)
Catherine: because they're frozen
(2.2)
Paula: mmhm
Catherine: and they'll be too hard
(6.0)
Paula: mmhm yes (0.4) can you tell me some more reasons why foods need to be cooked
(3.4)
Catherine: ehm:
(4.2)
Catherine: don't know
(17.2)
Paula: tell me some reasons (0.2) why we have a role system
(6.2)
Catherine: I don't know
Paula: "right"

Catherine: I've got no idea

Paula: do you know what a parole system is

Catherine: n’t I’ve never heard of it

Paula: hh hh

Catherine: difficult to answer that one then isn’t it eeh

Paula: o kay (0.2) can you tell me (.) why: people wash clothes

Catherine: why do people wash clothes?

Paula: (0.2) can you tell me (.) why: people wash clothes

Catherine: to keep em clean (0.2) else they get all smelly

Paula: o kay

Catherine: ("syll syll syll")

Paula: tell me some reasons why child employment laws (.) are needed

Catherine: I’ve no idea

Paula: why does the government require people in some professions (0.6) to obtain licenses before offering services to the public

Catherine: to make it (0.2) to make sure they’re alright (0.2)

Paula: I missed the last bit to make sure they’re alright

Catherine: for other pe- (. ) for the other people ( . ) to do it

Paula: tell me a bit more
Catherine: ehm.

(6.0)

Catherine: in each well it (0.2) they don't get hurt

(2.4)

Catherine: if they have to hit things or (sounds like pull ander)

(18.2)

Paula: "okay"

(25.6)

Paula: upray (0.2) why should downy pay up taxes

(7.2)

Catherine: mm: (1.2) don't know

(6.2)

Paula: ucan you tell me some downy reasons it's important to up study

history

(3.6)

Catherine: "history" (0.8) to say (0.4) that you can (tell (0.4) if you go

for a job and (0.8) the boss asks you a question (.) you know

what the (0.4) words (0.2) mean if they ask you a different (0.4)

word that (0.8) difficult word (3.2) like (0.6) if they ask what

cy clopedia means

(2.2)

Paula: hehh (0.4) I've got to write that down and SPELL it now

haven't down ch hh hh hh

(1.2)

Catherine: up: down: (2.0) up: down: (1.8) up: (1.2) down: (1.2) up: down: (0.8) up: (1.2) up: (1.8)

i: a:

(0.8)

Steph: "hh hh hh" right

(3.2)

Paula: there you go.

(1.4)

Paula: good job you're here

(2.8)
Paula: Why do some people who are born deaf have trouble learning to talk when()

Catherine: don't know

Paula: and if you were lost in the forest in the day time how would you go about finding your way out

Catherine: ehm:

Paula: right

Catherine: just keep walking around

Paula: what shall we do next

Catherine: mm

Paula: right then

Catherine: (( sound of pages turning ))

Paula: (( syll syll syll ))

Paula: can I put that on that

Catherine: right

Paula: can I just shift the table

Catherine: right

Paula: can you put your name at the top for me please

Catherine: thank you
Paula: Okay

Paula: In this next task (. . .) I want you to look at two target shapes and then see if you can find either one of them in the group of shapes next to them (okay so there's (( syll syll))) at the top (if you look over here) at these two notice the two shapes on the left hand side

Catherine: "yeh"

Paula: and there's a group of shapes on this side

Catherine: right

Paula: you're to mark the yes box (either of those) two shapes (.) is the same as any of those

Catherine: right

Catherine: right

Paula: so for example in this guide there's (.) that (.) one = yes

Catherine: same as that:

Paula: excellent so if it's the same

Catherine: [so

Catherine: you'd

Catherine: [so

Paula: [yeh

Catherine: that would be round a yes

Paula: that's great

Catherine: "so (. . .) there's more now (. . .) there's a square"
Paula: *mm*hm°

(3.4)

Catherine: an (0.8) no there isn’t (.) in that one

Paula: \( \downarrow \)okay (2.0) so (.) \( \uparrow \)when I \( \downarrow \)tell you to \( \uparrow \)start

(2.2)

(\*noise near microphone\*)

Paula: don’t know \( \uparrow \)what’s happened \( \downarrow \)to this table can’t get it \( \uparrow \)right

(.) ehm:=

Catherine: =hehh

(1.2) (\*noise of table continues\*)

Paula: got it

(2.8)

Paula: I \( \uparrow \)want you to do the \( \downarrow \)same (0.2) to all \( \downarrow \)these (0.2) the same

\( \downarrow \)way \( \uparrow \)yeh

Catherine: right

Paula: if you start on this \( \downarrow \)page

(2.8)

Paula: \( \uparrow \)I want you to \( \uparrow \)begin- \( \uparrow \)begin \( \downarrow \)here (1.0) and do as \( \uparrow \)many as

you \( \downarrow \)can (1.2) and when you’ve \( \uparrow \)finished \( \downarrow \)this page (.) move

on to that \( \downarrow \)one

Catherine: right

Paula: but I mean (0.2) people do (.) don’t finish all \( \downarrow \)of them there’s

\( \uparrow \)loads \( \downarrow \)of pages so \( \uparrow \)do as many as you \( \downarrow \)can

Catherine: right (0.2) ehm:=

Paula: \( \uparrow \)most people don’t do \( \downarrow \)all of them=work as \( \uparrow \)quickly as you

\( \downarrow \)can

Catherine: [I’ll have to cos puzzled [heh heh heh heh

Paula: [hh hh hh hh

Paula: \( \uparrow \)keep you \( \downarrow \)busy now shall I=

Catherine: =eh heh heh ri::ght

Paula: \( \uparrow \)don’t skip \( \downarrow \)any of them

Catherine: no:
Paula: and ^don't stop until I ^tell you to ^okay cos you've got a
      ^certain amount of time to do it
Catherine: ^okay
Paula: ^right
Catherine: ^ohh hh hh ^nohh hh oo::h heh () help me he he he
Paula: ^okay
Paula: ^so::() be^gin
(77.4)
Catherine: (( ^syll:: ))
(54.0)
Paula: ^okay^ stop
(3.2)
Paula: ^that's great^
Catherine: ^right
(11.4)
Paula: what we on now ^it's the sixth ^isn't it
Catherine: ^yes I think^
(4.2)
Paula: ^are you left ^handed or ^right ^handed
Catherine: left
(5.2)
Catherine: I'm one o- left handed pe:rs^ons (1.2) eh heh
(2.8)
Paula: ^nothing wrong with that is there^=
Catherine: ^yeh () take after me dad he's a left handed pe:rs:on
Paula: ^do ^you
Catherine: ^yeh
Paula: ^he's left handed as ^well
Catherine: ^yeh
Paula: ^oh right^
(1.6)
Paula: ^okay
(1.4)
Paula: right this is the ^last ^one of these ^tests
Catherine: ^okay
I'm going to say a group of numbers and letters. After I say them, I want you to tell me the numbers first in order starting with the lowest number, and then tell me the letters in alphabetical order. So for example if I said bee seven, your answer should be: seven bee. If I said nine see there, it's nine three see. You need to do the numbers in order so there's a three and a nine. That's right, yeh. Good. Okay. So, if I said six eff, it's eff: six. Numbers first and then the letters.
Paula: ↑gee; ↓four
(1.8)

Catherine: four gee
(2.2)

Paula: ↑three ↓doubleu five
(2.4)

Catherine: ↑three ↓five doubleu

Paula: o↓kay
(2.0)

Paula: ↑tee ↓seven ↓ell
(3.2)

Catherine: ↑seven ↓tee ell
(1.8)

Paula: make sure ↑the letters in ↓alphabetical ↓order (1.2) >↑tee ↓seven ell<
(0.8)

Catherine: it's (0.6) seven ell tee
(2.2)

Paula: ↑that's ↓right (0.2) so the ↑letters ↓are in order as well
(0.8)

Catherine: right
(2.0)

Catherine: ↑oo[oooh::

Paula: ↑↑are you gettin ↓that bit
(2.2)

Catherine: I'm getting all ↑puzz↓led () eh ↑heh ↓heh heh
(0.8)

Paula: ↑it's a puzz↓ling puzzle this one
(2.2)

Catherine: ah right eh he he he
(0.8)

Paula: so () ↑one ↓jay av
(0.8)

Catherine: ↑one (0.2) ↓jay jay
(2.2)

Paula: okay (_) right (0.6) so you ↑got the i↓dea
(2.2)

Catherine: yeh
(2.2)

Paula: then we'll ↓start

Catherine: "okay"
(2.2)

Paula: ↑ell ↓2
Catherine: 2 \downarrow \text{ell}

Paula: \uparrow \text{six} (\cdot) \downarrow \text{pee}

Catherine: \uparrow \text{pee} (\cdot) \downarrow \text{six}

Paula: \uparrow \text{bee} \downarrow \text{five}

Catherine: \uparrow \text{five} \downarrow \text{bee}

Paula: \uparrow \text{eff} \downarrow \text{seven ell}

Catherine: \uparrow \text{eff} \downarrow \text{ell} \text{ seven}

Paula: \uparrow \text{arr} \downarrow \text{four dee}

Catherine: \uparrow \text{dee} \text{ arr} \downarrow \text{four}

Paula: \uparrow \text{haych} \downarrow \text{one eight}

Catherine: \uparrow \text{one} \downarrow \text{eight aych}

Paula: \circ \downarrow \text{mm} \uparrow \text{hm}^\circ

Paula: \uparrow \text{tee} (\cdot) \downarrow \text{nine} (\cdot) \text{ ay} (\cdot) \downarrow \text{three}

Catherine: \uparrow \text{ay}: (1.0) \downarrow \text{tee}: (4.2) \text{ eight} \downarrow \text{nine}

Paula: \uparrow \text{vee} (\cdot) \downarrow \text{one} (\cdot) \text{ jay} (\cdot) \downarrow \text{five}

Catherine: \uparrow \text{one} \downarrow \text{fi} \uparrow \text{vee} (1.4) \downarrow \text{jay} \text{ vee}

Paula: \circ \downarrow \text{mm} \uparrow \text{hm}^\circ

Catherine: \uparrow \text{one} \downarrow \text{fi} \uparrow \text{vee} (1.4) \downarrow \text{jay} \text{ vee}
Paula: \( \text{seven} \downarrow \text{en} \downarrow \text{four} \downarrow \text{ell} \)  
(3.0)

Catherine: \( \text{four} \downarrow \text{seven} \) \( \text{Jay} \)  
(5.2)

Paula: °okay°  
(2.2)

Paula: \( \text{eight} \downarrow \text{dee} \downarrow \text{six} \downarrow \text{gee} \) \( \text{one} \)  
(2.0)

Catherine: \( \text{gee}: \) \( \text{dee}: \) \( \text{seven} \) \( \text{eff} \)  
(4.2)

Paula: °okay°  
(1.2)

Paula: \( \text{kay} \downarrow \text{two} \uparrow \text{see} \downarrow \text{seven} \) \( \text{eff} \)  
(9.8)

Catherine: \( \text{dee} \downarrow \text{ess} \) \( \text{one} \downarrow \text{seven} \)  
(2.0)

Paula: °\text{mm} \uparrow \text{hm}°  
(0.8)

Paula: \( \text{five} \downarrow \text{pee} \downarrow \text{three} \downarrow \text{wy} \downarrow \text{nine} \)  
(8.6)

Catherine: fi- \( \text{three} \downarrow \text{fi} \uparrow \text{ve} \) \( \text{nine}(2.0) \) \( \text{pee} \uparrow \text{v} \)  
(2.2)

Paula: °\text{o} \uparrow \text{kay}°  
(1.2)

Paula: \( \text{em} \downarrow \text{four} \downarrow \text{ee} \downarrow \text{seven} \downarrow \text{cyu} \downarrow \text{two} \)  
(9.0)

Catherine: \( \text{four} \text{seven}(3.8) \) \( \text{pee}(1.0) \) \( \text{cyu} \)  
(2.8)

Paula: \( \text{doubleu} \downarrow \text{eight} \downarrow \text{aych} \downarrow \text{five} \downarrow \text{eff} \downarrow \text{three} \)  
(4.0)

Catherine: \( \text{eff}(0.8) \) \( \text{aych} \downarrow \text{doubleu}(3.6) \) \( \text{three}(0.4) \) \( \text{five} \) \( \text{eight} \)  
(2.8)

Paula: °\text{o} \downarrow \text{kay}°  
(2.8)

Paula: \( \text{six} \downarrow \text{gee} \downarrow \text{nine} \downarrow \text{ay} \downarrow \text{two} \downarrow \text{ess} \)  
(7.0)
Catherine: two six nine (3.0) ay (2.0) haych ess

Paula: o:ka:vy

(2.2)

Paula: ri:ght (0.8) well done = you finished those

(0.8)

Catherine: ohh

(2.0)

Paula: what did you think

Catherine: alright

Paula: ri:ght

(4.2)

Paula: I've got another one to do (0.4) looking at some words (0.4) okay but this isn't jus- it's not to do with the tape (. )

[so (.) I'll turn that off now (0.2) all right

Catherine: no

(3.6)

((noise of someone touching the microphone ))

Paula: oops

(1.2)

((tape switched off)))
Interview Three
Transcription: 3A
1 Pamela: hhm
2 Jonathan: anything you like (.) your name (0.4) ehh[hh HEH HEH
3 Pamela: [hhh hhh
4 Jonathan: oh it's William (. ) ehh heh heh
5 Pamela: right okay that's fine
6 (0.8)
7 ((sound of tape being switched off))
8 (1.6)
9 ((sound of tape being switched on))
10 Pamela: right go (0.2) I'll just leave it (.) running now (0.2)
11 (reco:rding (. ) right=)
12 Jonathan: =mmm
13 Pamela: but it sounds like it's picking up to me so I don't think that's
14 a problem
15 (0.8)
16 Jonathan: well it did pick up then
17 Pamela: it didn't (.) right=
18 Jonathan: =BRILLIANT
19 Pamela: eh yehhehh
20 Jonathan: heh heh
21 (0.8)
22 Pamela: quite good actually isn't it
23 Jonathan: [used to be (.) used to be on tape (. ) ehm (. ) at police
24 station
25 (0.6)
26 Pamela: did you
27 Jonathan: yeh
28 Pamela: right
29 Jonathan: they put me on tape about questions about erm (2.2) about
30 ooh the- (. ) oh (.) the:: (.) trouble I've been (0.2) had
31 Pamela: right (0.2) oka::ly
32 Jonathan: [I remember it was all on tape
33 Pamela: well I think the police do do that
Jonathan: [well ]three [tapes
Pamela: but >this (. ) this is different this is for Peter’s research that we’ve talked about
Jonathan: [hmm
Pamela: [oka[v
Jonathan: yeh
Pamela: ehm:
(2.4)
Jonathan: mhehh
(1.6)
Pamela: oh [right (. ) can I ask you put your name [on the top of\nthis [form (0.4) up [the [re
(2.0)
Pamela: thank you Jonathan
(6.4)
Jonathan: anything [else
(1.6)
Pamela: EH::M (0.4) can you put your [age (0.4) in that
(0.6)
Jonathan: sure
Pamela: [er: (0.2) thank you
(1.8)
Jonathan: won’t believe [tieve how am (0.2) how old [am I (0.2) ] won’t believe it
Pamela: [hm\n
(1.8)
Pamela: [and today's [date (0.2) if you can: remember
(1.8)
Jonathan: paper I’ll look to [copy it
Pamela: I put it a [way: it was the (( sounds like [top of a [other number))
Jonathan: [AH NO
Jonathan: ah it’s alright I’m quicker I’ll get it (0.8) (( sounds like sowerall dies ))
(2.2)
Jonathan: two ay (. ) slash (0.2) (( sniff )) (0.2) er: when’s [it
Pamela: No\text{ember}  
Jonathan: November\textsuperscript{o} (0.2) so it’s e\textsuperscript{L}ven  
Pamela: yes  
Jonathan: gotcha  
Pamela: \text{ehm}::  
Jonathan: \text{ehm}::  
Pamela: two thousand and two  
Jonathan: \text{I just put} (0.2) cos there’s \text{no more room}  
Pamela: that’s lovely  
Jonathan: just put (0.2) cos there’s \text{no more room}  
Pamela: thank you very \text{much}  
Jonathan: should a put another< \text{line the re}  
Pamela: yes it’s \text{not very well designed} \text{it}  
Jonathan: diculous (0.2) ehh [heh heh]  
Pamela: [hehh \text{heh}]  
Pamela: they don’t even have room for us to write (.) do they  
Jonathan: no (0.8) they haven’t printed them out rubbish  
Pamela: okay\textsuperscript{o} (.) let’s see how we get on though shall we  
Pamela: ehm:  
[ knock knock on the table ]  
Pamela: Jonathan (0.8) I’ll be asking you to do a number of things today (.) like giving some word definitions and solving a few number problems  
Jonathan: o\text{Kay}  
Pamela: you’ll find some of these tasks \text{easy} (.) whereas \text{others}  
Jonathan: may be more \text{difficult}  
Pamela: \text{o\text{Kay}}
Pamela: o\textup{kay}  
Jonathan: yeh  
Pamela: also (0.2) most people don't answer every question correctly (0.2) or finish every item  
Jonathan: mmhm  
Pamela: but please (.) give your best effort on all the items  
(0.8)  
Jonathan: kay  
Pamela: do you have any questions  
(1.4)  
Jonathan: ehm (0.2) if the hard or not (1.0) either easy or hard  
(1.6)  
Pamela: well (.) they start easy and then they get harder  
(0.4)  
Jonathan: know what I used to do at college (.) done maths  
Pamela: probably some of it's a bit like that but not all of it  
Jonathan: urrh (.) it's difficult  
Pamela: it's certainly not all to do with maths  
Jonathan: yeh I used to do maths at college (0.8) I done well at it  
Pamela: were you good at it  
Jonathan: yeh  
Pamela: o\textup{ght}  
Jonathan: I get the erm (.) stimulate Monday  
(1.2)  
Pamela: for maths (0.2) \textup{ght}  
Jonathan: all the work I've done  
Pamela: o\textup{h}  
(0.6)  
Jonathan: cos it- (.) cos the teacher put (.) very good (0.4) decent mark  
Pamela: g\textup{ood} (0.2) \textup{kay}  
Jonathan: extremely good  
(2.0)  
Pamela: \textup{ght}  
(2.2)
139 Pamela: so the first thing we’re going to start with is I’m going to show you some pictures in which there’s an important part missing could you look at the pictures and tell me what’s missing that’s the first one could I just move that thank you okay what’s missing from there

146 Jonathan: A BIT TO THE COMB

147 Pamela: right fine

148 Jonathan: one of them

149 Pamela: yes just turn over the page turn over to the next one

151 Pamela: thank you what’s the most important part missing from that picture

155 Jonathan: another leg to the table

156 Pamela: go on

160 Jonathan: no wonder he can’t smell now there’s no nose

166 Jonathan: I’m enjoying this

168 Jonathan: anything else

169 Pamela: yes we’ll just move on

171 Jonathan: oh another clip just there

172 Pamela: mm hmm

173 Pamela: mm hmm (0.8) thank you
Jonathan: (3.4)

Jonathan: some more windows (0.6) missing just there

Pamela: what's the most important part missing

(5.2)

Jonathan: a bit of the track

Pamela: mm hm

(2.0)

Jonathan: that's missing

(9.6)

Jonathan: oh the knob (0.6) the door handle

Pamela: okay

Jonathan: that's missing

(8.2)

Jonathan: the middle bit (0.2) to your glasses

Pamela: good

Jonathan: like what you've got

(0.8)

Pamela: okay

Jonathan: YEH

(10.6)

Jonathan: can't tell

(3.2)

Jonathan: can't tell on that one

(0.4)

Pamela: can't (.) you can't tell

Jonathan: no

Pamela: okay

Jonathan: shall we miss that one:

(2.2)

Pamela: anything you can see missing:

(3.0)

Jonathan: just- (0.8) bit just there

(2.0)

Jonathan: just to the glass (0.8) that's missing

Pamela: oh right okay (0.4) thank you
Jonathan: it's pliers but there's nothing missing off it

Pamela: nothing missing

Jonathan: well yeh there used to be whatcha call it's just the re it's like spring pliers

Pamela: to:h right yep

Jonathan: ye- they're missing o- or the bolt that's missing

Pamela: where would that be

Jonathan: that'd be in the middle

Pamela: right o'kay

Jonathan: oh half o the lines are missing on the leaf

Pamela: mmh thank you

Jonathan: one o the squares are missing on the pie

Pamela: thank you

Jonathan: can't tell

Jonathan: pass=

Pamela: can you see anything missing from there

Jonathan: the sun

Pamela: ehh (0.2) okay thank you

Jonathan: that's missing

(14.8)

Jonathan: the top aint up

(2.0)

Pamela: right can you explain that a bit more

(16.6)

Jonathan: no
Pamela: no oh okay (.) thank you
Jonathan: nah
(2.0)
Pamela: thank you
Jonathan: perhaps getting a bit ar
d
Pamela: mmm (0.2) hehehehehe
Jonathan: oh[ well
Pamela: just try a few more and see how you get on
(2.4)
Jonathan: a:h (.) those are missin from there
(3.2)
Pamela: can you just point to that (.) where you-
Jonathan: it's a chair
(3.8)
Pamela: oh right (0.2) the front two legs
Jonathan: yeh (0.2) if you were sittin on the chair you'd be
falling backwards
(0.4)
Jonathan: ehhh
Pamela: mmm
(13.2)
Jonathan: oh somethin that spikes somethin on
Pamela: okay can you point to where
Jonathan: those
Pamela: mmm
Jonathan: what prick ya (1.2) no- not on there
Pamela: right
Jonathan: on that one
Pamela: o kay
(5.2)
Jonathan: oh some o the teeth are missin on the knife
(2.2)
Jonathan: to cut the bread
Pamela: 4mm ühm
Jonathan: they're ümissing
(1.0)
Pamela: thank üyou
(12.8)
Jonathan: oh üwhatcha down it's missin (.) where you put the üerm: (1.4)
Jonathan: I don't know what you call em (0.4) üpeüdals (.) oh I don't
know what you call them (1.4) I don't know what you Ücall Üthem
Pamela: üokay (.) üthanks
(18.4)
Jonathan: üokay üsome of them üare missin
(2.0)
Jonathan: from the basüket
Pamela: 4mm ühm (0.6) thank üyou
(5.8)
Pamela: they're stuck togetüher
Jonathan: (( sounds like your ways ))
Pamela: ehh ehh (0.4) thank you
(11.2)
Jonathan: oh the two clips on that
(3.6)
Jonathan: where you put your üclothes üup
Pamela: 4mm ühm
Jonathan: üthey're ümissin
Pamela: right (.) thank üyou
(19.2)
Jonathan: (( intake of breath for 1.2 )) I can't tell (( syll syll syll ))
Pamela: üright üit's a diffücult one isn't it it isn't it
Jonathan: ücan ünot tell
Jonathan: yeh (0.4) it is
(8.2)
Jonathan: üdoes cows ühave ühorns
(2.0)
Jonathan: I'm not so sure if that's a bull or a cow (0.6) cos it has horns

Pamela: mm

Jonathan: I don't think there's nothing missin off that (0.6) oh  
yeh there is

Pamela: right

Jonathan: oh one of the things are missin

Pamela: mm hm

Jonathan: from that trainer

Pamela: thank you

Jonathan: hgh hgh ((coughing))

Pamela: sorta c-

Jonathan: there should be another tree there shouldn't there (0.8)

Pamela: see's one two three (0.6) should be four (1.2) cos I can't

tell what's missin off this picture

Jonathan: what's the most important part missing do you think

Pamela: what's the most important part missing do you think

Jonathan: sun

Pamela: okay thank you

Jonathan: nearly finished

Pamela: yeh (0.4) think there's only (1.6) it's the last one actually

Jonathan: mm hmm
Jonathan: can’t tell

Pamela: okay don’t worry that’s they’re very difficult those last one’s aren’t they

Jonathan: mmm

(1.8)

Pamela: thank you Jonathan: if you give me that book back

(3.4)

Jonathan: oh wow look at those shapes

Pamela: we’ll look at those later

Jonathan: ehh hh hh hh

Pamela: more excitement to come t-hhey

(3.0)

Jonathan: don’t run out of tape then ehh

Pamela: is it going around alright

Jonathan: YEH IT’S DOIN FINE

Pamela: good (.). okay we’ll just leave it then

Jonathan: [It’s done half (0.6) quarter of it already]

(1.8)

Pamela: right now we’re going to do something different in this section I want you to tell me the meanings of some words now listen carefully and tell me what each word I say means

Jonathan: okay kay

Pamela: okay ready

Jonathan: yeh

Pamela: what does winter mean

(1.4)

Jonathan: winter

(1.2)

Jonathan: it’s: oh >winter winter winter< w-

(9.2)

Jonathan: win-dy ain it

(3.8)

Pamela: can you ex-plain that a bit more or not=

Jonathan: =wind
Jonathan: er:

it's like (.) oh winter that's where (0.2) that is where all the leaves come off the trees.

Jonathan: it's like (.) oh winter that's where all the leaves come off the trees.

Jonathan: it's like (.) oh winter that's where all the leaves come off the trees.

Pamela: oof kay

Jonathan: it's like (.) oh winter that's where all the leaves come off the trees.

Pamela: mm

Jonathan: and er:

Pamela: yep

Jonathan: an it's cold

Jonathan: >that's all I can say< hehh (.) em (( syll syll syll )) but nothing else<

Pamela: okay can you explain that any more= or

Jonathan: >that's all I can say< hehh (.) er: >(( syll syll syll )) but nothing else<

Pamela: okay thank you

Pamela: what does breakfast mean

Jonathan: breakfast

Jonathan: oh >that's when you get up in the morning (.) that's when you have your cereals

Pamela: mm hm

Jonathan: and c:rm:

Jonathan: (( °syll° )) °food°
Jonathan: when people finish school they have their lunch or sommat (0.4) dinner or sommat (2.0)

Jonathan: that's all I can think of (1.6) about breakfast (2.2)

Jonathan: hum (.) I can only say (1.2) >when you get up in the morning you have your cereals< (0.2) that (.) that's fine (0.6)

Pamela: °yep yeh cos that's all° (0.6)

Pamela: thank you (10.8)

Pamela: °what does penny mean (0.6)

Jonathan: °penny° (0.6)

Pamela: °explain what a penny is to me° (3.2)

Jonathan: °MONEY° (0.6)

Pamela: °o kay fi ne° (0.2)

Pamela: °and ship° (0.6)

Jonathan: SHIP (0.6)

Pamela: °yeh° (0.4) can you explain (0.6) what that means (2.2)

Jonathan: °ship what's °that's °what you go °on° (0.6) °what you go °on° (1.8)

Jonathan: °on a ship° (0.2)

Pamela: y can you explain a little bit more° (0.2)

Jonathan: oh pe- (1.6) fish people go on it (1.8) to catch fish from
Pamela: °ship° (0.6) ↑ships ↓have got ↑guns
Jonathan: (0.4)
Jonathan: and sails (.) °↓van all that° (0.2) ↑an flags (0.2) an you got
↑sail↓lors
(3.8)
Jonathan: an it goes ↑on watr↓er (0.4) go[es on the seas
Pamela: ↑right (0.8) ↑thank ↓you
(7.2)
Pamela: ↑can you tell me what (.) re↓pair means
(2.2)
Jonathan: ↑oh repair that’s ↓where you erm repair (0.8) things like
↑ste↓reos and (1.2) tele↑vis↓ions and all that
Pamela: ↓m mh↓m:
Jonathan: and videos (0.6) if your (.) ↑vid↓eos (. ) knackered you ↑repair
↓it (0.4) you take it to ↑a repair ↓shop (0.2) [and they’ll fix it
Pamela: [yeh
(1.4)
Jonathan: the- they’ll they’ll charge ↓ya
Pamela: ↓argghh (.) ↓right
(1.8)
Jonathan: is ↑it rain↓in out there or sommat
Pamela: cr[m::
Jonathan: [cos I can ↑here ↓it eh heh
(2.2)
Pamela: °↑not sure ↓actual↑ly° (( °s yll↓syll° ))
(1.0)
Pamela: ↑o↓kay thank ↑you
(2.4)
Pamela: ↑a↓semble
(1.4)
Jonathan: ↑OH ↓MY ↑god (0.2) say
Pamela: ↑what does a↓semble mean
(3.2)
Jonathan: I haven’t got a clue what that means.

Pamela: okay don’t worry.

Jonathan: I don’t know if you know it (eh huh).

Pamela: ah it’s a bit easy for me cos I’ve got the answers in front of me and I’m not cheating.

Jonathan: yeh that’s right.

Pamela: to day we’ll move on and do a few more what does yesterday mean.

Jonathan: you go like that and went out yesterday (oh). eh hehh.

Pamela: can you explain it to me.

Jonathan: erm.

Pamela: want to have a guess.

Jonathan: nah don’t know what it means.

Pamela: sentence.

Jonathan: wish me- well me- me dad knows he knows all of cm ehh heh heh.

Pamela: to k a y. what does terminate mean.

Jonathan: I ain’t got clue.

Pamela: a ha (sigh for 0.6) consume what does consume mean.

Jonathan: intake of breath for 1.2) ain’t got clhuhe (sigh for 0.6).

Pamela: okay.

Pamela: sentence.

Jonathan: when you puttin words into a sentence I mean if
you asking questions you have to put em in a sentence

Jonathan: that's what you wanna know ehh hh hh

Pamela: that sounds fine

(14.2)

Pamela: what does confide mean

(0.8)

Jonathan: confide

(1.0)

Pamela: confide

Jonathan: confide

Pamela: confide

Jonathan: I can't say that word hehh hh hh hh

Pamela: I'm not being clear I think confide

(0.8)

Jonathan: oh (1.2) oh god (.) erm (1.0) oophh erm

(8.2)

Jonathan: I haven't got a clue

(1.8)

Pamela: okay

(1.0)

Pamela: remorse (0.6) what does remorse mean

(9.8)

Pamela: want to guess

(3.2)

Jonathan: no I ain't got a (0.2) I ain't got a clue (2.0) looks hard to me
ehh hehh

Pamela: okay (0.6) just try a few more (0.8) what does ponder

mean

(1.0)

Jonathan: ponder

Pamela: ponder

Jonathan: ponder (0.6) ooh god

(6.2)

Jonathan: oh let me think of this
Jonathan: haven't got a clue

Pamela: no okay don’t worry (.) they’re quite difficult aren’t they

Jonathan: mmhm they a:-re

Pamela: ^com-passion (0.8) ^have you heard of ^that

(7.8)

Jonathan: no (.) I ain’t got a clue

(1.2)

Pamela: ^tran-quil

(15.2)

Jonathan: no

Pamela: o’kay (0.6) ^a:-nd (0.2) ^sanctuary (.) ^you heard of ^that

Jonathan: tceeh eh ^hh ^hh hh ehh (0.2) century

Pamela: ^sanctuary

Jonathan: ^sanctu:-ary (1.4) oh god (0.2) ^sanctuary

(3.2)

Jonathan: ^who’s that ^giving you ^all these ^questions (0.8) nah I ain’t got a [clue

Pamela: [no

Pamela: o’kay then well ^we all fi:ished that there

(2.2)

Pamela: thank you for ^trying hard on that cos they’re (0.4) they’re ^not always that ^easy are they

Jonathan: n[o

Pamela: [you’ve ^done ^okay ^though

Jonathan: ^y^eh^o

(2.2)

Jonathan: (( ^syll ^syll )) quarter tape al^rea^dy

(2.8)

Pamela: ^you’re right (0.2) well ^we’ve had a^bout half an hour (.) haven’t we so (0.6) ^you okay to plod on a bit ^longer and to see how [you get on

Jonathan: [yeh

(0.4)

Pamela: okay thank ^you
Pamela: °we'll move on to the next one°

(2.4)

Pamela: °just need to find something°

(9.6)

((sound of something dropping on to the table ))

Pamela: that's for you (1.2) o.kay (0.2) when we started today (0.2)

(4.2)

I said you'll be doing all sorts of things (0.4) in this section I'm going to ask you to copy some symbols

(2.0)

Jonathan: oh wick-ed hehh hh hh hh

Pamela: °can I just move that thank you°

(1.8)

Pamela: right (0.6) if you look at these boxes

(1.0)

Jonathan: hmm

Pamela: you'll notice that each box (0.8) has a number in the upper part (1.4) an a mark in the lower part (1.0) an each number has it's own mark

(2.6)

Pamela: now if you look down here (1.4) where the squares have numbers in the top

(0.8)

Jonathan: yeh

(2.2)

Pamela: but the squares in the bottom are empty

(1.0)

Jonathan: yeh see heh heh

Pamela: right in each of the empty squares

(0.8)

Jonathan: yeh=

Pamela: =you put a mark that should go there like this (1.2)

right so here's a two

(6.8)

Pamela: and two has this mark

(2.2)
Pamela: so \(\uparrow\) put \(\downarrow\) that into the empty square \(\uparrow\) re

(1.8)

Pamela: there's a \(\uparrow\) one (1.4) it has that mark so \(\downarrow\) I put that into the empty square \(\uparrow\) re

(3.6)

Pamela: that \(\uparrow\) here: (2.0) that mark \(\downarrow\) so \(\downarrow\) I put that into the square \(\uparrow\) re (0.8)

\(\uparrow\) can you \(\downarrow\) go along an (0.6) complete those up to that thick line \(\uparrow\) and then \(\downarrow\) stop there

Pamela: \(\uparrow\) in you

(2.8)

Pamela: right \(\downarrow\) that looks good to \(\uparrow\) me

(3.4)

Pamela: \(\uparrow\) now you know how to \(\downarrow\) do them \(\uparrow\) when I tell you to \(\downarrow\) start

(0.2) \(\uparrow\) if you do the \(\downarrow\) rest of them

Jonathan: \(\uparrow\) mm

Pamela: be\(\uparrow\) gin \(\downarrow\) here (.) and fill in as \(\uparrow\) many squares as you \(\downarrow\) can=

Jonathan: \(\uparrow\) mm=

Pamela: \(\uparrow\) one after the \(\downarrow\) other with\(\uparrow\) out \(\downarrow\) skipping any

Jonathan: \(\uparrow\) mm

Pamela: keep \(\uparrow\) working til I tell you to \(\downarrow\) stop (0.2) and work as \(\uparrow\) quickly as you \(\downarrow\) can without making any mistakes (0.6) o\(\uparrow\) kay (.) so if you \(\uparrow\) go a\(\downarrow\) head

(42.6)

Pamela: okay if you could carry on

(78.2)

Pamela: \(\uparrow\) okay can you \(\downarrow\) stop \(\downarrow\) please

(5.2)

Pamela: thank \(\downarrow\) you (.) \(\uparrow\) how'd \(\downarrow\) you find that

Jonathan: alright

Pamela: \(\uparrow\) yeh fine good well \(\downarrow\) done

(3.4)

Pamela: right (0.8) \(\downarrow\) can I have \(\uparrow\) the (1.8) \(\downarrow\) thank \(\uparrow\) you (0.6) put these away
Jonathan: °right° (1.6) love\textsuperscript{LY} yeihhh

Pamela: ((sound of pages turning ))

Jonathan: ehhh

Pamela: yep (.) think \textit{we’ve got time just to do a bit more (.) this afternoon an}

(0.8)

Jonathan: hmm

Pamela: then we’ll have to arrange when we can meet again (1.4) to finish it (2.6) °oh rats°

((sound of pages turning ))

(9.2)

Pamela: o\textup{kay} \textit{lets go} on (0.4) \textit{in this section I’m going to read two words to you and I want you to tell me how they are}

(1.2)

Jonathan: okay

Pamela: alright

Jonathan: kay

Pamela: so: (.) in \textit{what way are a fork and a spoon alike}

(3.0)

Jonathan: well \textit{fork} \textit{er (.) wha- \textit{knife an fo\textup{rk}}

Pamela: \textit{a} \textit{fork and a spoon (.) \textit{what way are they a\textup{like}}

(1.8)

Jonathan: \textit{s} \textit{poon you can use em for \textit{cere\textsuperscript{als} (1.2} an a fork you use for \textit{dinner}

(2.8)

Pamela: \textup{right}

(2.4)

Pamela: ehh::m

(2.6)

Pamela: \textup{kay they’re BOTH things that you eat (.) with

(6.2)
Pamela: alright

Jonathan: yeh (0.4) hh [hh

(2.2)

Pamela: socks and shoes

(2.0)

Jonathan: socks (.) you put on your feet shoes you put on (.) top of your socks (1.2) and they're both to wear

(0.8)

Pamela: that's right

(3.4)

Pamela: good

(2.2)

Pamela: so you wear them both

(0.4)

Jonathan: correct

(0.6)

Pamela: good

(2.0)

Pamela: o kay

(1.2)

Pamela: yellow and green

(2.8)

Pamela: in what way are they alike

(1.0)

Jonathan: yellow you erm (0.4) draw the sun wi- if you erm (0.8) dr- draw it (0.6) yeh you could draw the sun (.) ss-- the sun shine (.) on pa- piece 737 of paper (1.0) ther- (.) erm: hot stuff

(2.8)

Jonathan: you use (0.6) did you say blue (0.8) or green=

Pamela: no I said yellow and in what way are they a like

[oh yellow and green

(1.4)

Jonathan: oh erm (2.6) to draw with (1.6) to colour

(1.2)
Jonathan: you can hear stuff and you can see stuff

Pamela: can you tell me a bit more about that in what way are they alike

Jonathan: just your eye is if you’re fallin asleep ya- ya- your eye

Pamela: the top of your eye goes down an your ear

Jonathan: you can put your earphones on your ears like

Pamela: o-kay

Jonathan: in what way are they alike

Pamela: boat goes on the water car goes on the road you drive a boat (0.6) no ya throwin a boat (0.2) and you drive a car (1.2) ya use em

Pamela: you use them

Jonathan: [i- its vehicles]

Pamela: RI GHT

Jonathan: thank you table an chair

Pamela: you sit on a chair an puttin in n- n- an move the chair to the table

Jonathan: you just sit on em an move the chair to the table >you use a table cloth<

Pamela: right

Jonathan: sounds like instead of the floor)
Jonathan: work and play. In what way are they alike?

Jonathan: oh well, you gotta work to do stuff (1.4) and play you erm.

Jonathan: just play outside (0.2) for sommat.

Jonathan: cos that's all I can work (0.2) can work with.

Jonathan: there's nothing else I can say about that (.) eh huh.

Pamela: right kay.

Jonathan: oh you play er play on er (0.2) play play play play play.

Jonathan: >oh well< you gotta work to do stuff (1.4) and play you er.

Jonathan: degree you gotta work to do stuff (1.4) and play.

Jonathan: just play outside (0.2) for sommat.

Jonathan: cos that's all I can work (0.2) can work with.

Jonathan: there's nothing else I can say about that (.) eh huh.

Pamela: kay.

Jonathan: ST E AM.

Pamela: and fog.

Jonathan: fog (.) you can't see owt (0.8) when you just erm.

Jonathan: when your car's (0.2) and the fog lights you have to use the from your car (0.2) to see (0.2) where.

Jonathan: you're going (0.6) and steam is er (.) when you're cooking.

Pamela: mmh.

Jonathan: an steam comes out.

Pamela: in what way are they alike (.) though.

Jonathan: steam's hot (1.0) fog's cold (1.2) it's absolutely freezin.

Jonathan: it's like a
Pamela: [any°

Jonathan: erm: ice cube out s- (0.4) out there eh huh

Pamela: hh hh

Jonathan: hehh heh heh

Pamela: ↑egg and ↓seed ↑in what way are ↓they alike

Jonathan: egg an ↑seed

Pamela: mmhhmm

(1.6)

Jonathan: ↑seed you put in a ↓gar↑den (0.8) egg you put in a fryin pan

(2.0)

Jonathan: you eat

(1.0)

Pamela: ↓o↑kay

(2.8)

Jonathan: cos ↑dya have seeds in toma↓to's or in ↑spuds (0.2) >well

spuds ↑I ↓don't know if you ↑have ↓seeds in a ↑spud<

(2.2)

Jonathan: or seed un (0.2) put in a ↑plant (0.6) an jus- (.) an it ↑grows

(2.6)

Jonathan: hghh ( (cough ))

(4.2)

Pamela: o↑kay ↓ri↑ght thank ↑you

(11.4)

Pamela: thank ↑you is it still going ↓round all↑right

Jonathan: alf quarter ta- ta- ↑tape

(1.2)

Pamela: ↑ri↑ght°

(20.6)

Jonathan: oo:ph:::::

Pamela: ah they ↑do go ↓on a bit but we'll do something a bit differe↑rent

(3.2)

Jonathan: umhhhh

(7.0)

Pamela: ↑jus°

(1.0)

Pamela: tu- tu- (.) tu- tu- tu-
((sound of tape being switched off))

(0.8)

Pamela: right it's going now

(2.2)

Pamela: okay

(1.8)

Pamela: now I'm going to ask you to make some signs

(3.4)

Pamela: and you see these blocks

Jonathan: yeh ((syll syll))

Pamela: they're all alike

Pamela: and on some sides they're all red

Pamela: and on some they're all white (0.2) white (0.6) and on some

they're red and white

Jonathan: mmm

Pamela: half red and half white

(1.2)

Jonathan: yeh

(5.8)

((sound of blocks on the table top))

Pamela: okay

(5.2)

Pamela: I'm going to put these blocks together to make a
design if you just watch me

(16.2) ((sounds of blocks on the table throughout))

Pamela: now (0.4) can you make one just like this and tell me when

you've finished

(6.2)

Pamela: right goodness

Jonathan: eh hh hh hh hh hh

Pamela: w that's good isn't it

(0.4)

Jonathan: goo- good I- I- I'm quick when I ((syll syll))
Pamela: (4.0)
Jonathan: eh hh hh hh hh
Pamela: this toime
(0.4)
Jonathan: oh:
(1.2)
Pamela: you’re going to put these blocks together to make them look like this picture but watch me first
((sound of blocks dropping onto the table))
(2.2)
Jonathan: let see who gets quicker
Pamela: ehh heh heh
Jonathan: hh hh hh
Pamela: right (.) okay
Jonathan: hh hh hh
(1.8)
Pamela: (())
Jonathan: ye:
(5.2)
Pamela: ooh:
(1.2)
Jonathan: ehh (in breath) () heh () heh
(1.6)
Pamela: does that look right
(2.8)
Jonathan: let’s have a look (0.4) yes it does=
Pamela: =o kay
(1.4)
Pamela: o kay
(4.2) ((sound of blocks being moved on the table))
Pamela: now (0.6) look at the picture and make one just like it with these blocks and tell me when you’ve finished
(2.0)
Pamela: ^right°
Jonathan: eh HAH HAH HAH HAH HAH hah hah
Pamela: hehh
(1.2)
Pamela: ohkha-v (0.2) hh [HH
Jonathan: [I'll say dad can I come here
Pamela: a\gain
Pamela: hehh hehh [hehh
Jonathan: [eh huh huh huh huh huh
(3.2)
Pamela: \right (0.4) okay let me just
(2.4)
Jonathan: should put on a \timer see who (( sounds like beats worse ))
Jonathan: [HA HA HA HA
Pamela: [we'll think I'll have to in a minute
(1.2)
Jonathan: °I love \doin°
Pamela: [hold on hold on
(6.2)
Pamela: okay (1.2) can you make one just like this (0.4) and try to
work as \quickly as you can and again tell me when you've
\finished
(( sound of blocks on the table ))
Jonathan: right
Pamela: thank you
(19.4) (( sounds of blocks on the table throughout ))
Jonathan: hmph (0.4) heh heh heh heh
(0.4)
Pamela: great (0.2) thank you
Jonathan: eh heh hh hh
Pamela: mm\hm°
(5.2)
Jonathan: °I just love it°
(1.0)
Pamela: ehh hh hh he\hh hh
Jonathan: it’s like a bow eh heh
Pamela: it is a bit you’re right

(3.2) (sound of blocks on the table)
Jonathan: there she goes m'm'up
Pamela: okay you can start now
Jonathan: yeh I’m startin

(8.6) (sound of blocks on the table throughout)
Jonathan: oh god

(13.2) (sound of blocks on the table throughout)
Jonathan: right

(19.4) (sound of blocks on the table throughout)
Jonathan: right

(2.2) (sound of blocks on the table throughout)
Jonathan: wrong

(2.0)
Jonathan: oh no does it wrong

(9.6) (sound of blocks on the table throughout)
Jonathan: HEHHH (sounds like can’t enjoy it)

(26.4) (sound of blocks on the table throughout)
Pamela: shall we leave that one want to leave that one

(1.2)
Pamela: hell no:

(3.8)
Jonathan: ain’t gotta white in it huh

(0.6)
Pamela: mmm

(3.0)
Jonathan: still exactly the same

(2.2)
Jonathan: arh’s ard

(1.0)
Pamela: they do get harder don’t they

(2.8)
Jonathan: actually I don’t look hard to me it looks easy

(0.8)
Jonathan: you need to do a triangle don’t ya beaten me
Pamela: I can't help you with it. Jonathan: I'm sorry. Let's just try another one.

Jonathan: Okay.

Pamela: Have a look at that one. Thanks.
Pamela: do you want to give up
(0.8)
Jonathan: eh- (0.4) yeh
Pamela: okay don’t worry
(3.2)
Jonathan: I can do the next one
(1.2)
Pamela: have a look at the next one
Jonathan: look at the next one
Pamela: just turn over the page
(1.6)
Jonathan: oh that one’s easy
Pamela: okey (0.6) have a go at that one then for me (1.2) thank you
Jonathan: yeh okay
(78.8) (sound of blocks on the table throughout)
Pamela: do you want to give up
Jonathan: ssehh
Pamela: okay don’t worry
(3.6)
Pamela: let’s just try one more cos ey- (0.6) they are getting quite difficult
(4.4)
Jonathan: no problem
(98.2) (sound of blocks on the table throughout)
Jonathan: gah
(0.8)
Pamela: hehh hh hh ohkhay ehh (0.2) do you want to give that
one up
(0.6)
Jonathan: yeh
(2.2)
Pamela: okay I think we’ll stop that there Jonathan: (1.8) okay cos they actually more ha- (0.4) difficult not easier I’m afraid
(2.6)
Pamela: alright just put those blocks away
Pamela: right

Pamela: thank you

Pamela: think we'll finish there for today okay so

I'll switch the tape recorder off now and we can decide again

Pamela: let me just erm stop it

(( sound of tape being switched off ))
Interview Three
Transcription: 3B
Pamela: moving and this [is (0.2) tape two
Jonathan: |eh heh heh heh
Pamela: isn’t it this is the se|cond session
Jonathan: |yeh
Jonathan: ↑I ↓don’t know what to ↑say
Pamela: oh right ↑don’t ↓worry (0.4) let’s jus-
( (sound of tape being switched off))
(0.6)
Pamela: ↑I think ↓that’s fine I’m sure I’m sure that’s recording
Jonathan: [mike was on at]rea↓dy
Pamela: ri↓ght (0.4) okay
(1.4)
Pamela: just check it’s working and everything cos that’s quite difficult=
Jonathan: =yeh I’ll bring my ↓next one in (0.2) ↑next ↑time
(0.4)
Pamela: ↑oh ↓right yeh yeh ↑bring me ↓another transformer to show
me that’d be ↑go↓od
Jonathan: er well (0.2) I’ve got erm (1.8) ↑ot↓er
Pamela: ↑oh that↓d be nice
Jonathan: he’s got a ( ) curly ↓tail
(0.4)
Jonathan: ↑YOu EVER SEEN erm (0.6) ↓wildlife it was on last ↓ni:ght
Pamela: I ↑didn’t see ↓that last night but I know it’s ( ) it’s ↑good ↓isn’t
it
Jonathan: [it’s ↑absolutely ↓brilli|ant
Pamela: [es- ↑you enjoyed ↓it
Jonathan: with David Att↓enbah ( ) is in it
Pamela: [yeh
Pamela: ri↓ght=
Jonathan: =when e s↓: ( ) all ↑them bats ↓man (0.4) ↑oh ↓my ↑go↓d
Pamela: ey heh heh heh heh
Jonathan: the bat just ( ) ↑got ↓the spider straight off it’s ↓web
Pamela: mmm
Jonathan: absolu- (.) the programme's absolutely wicked it's on tonight again
Pamela: tch (.) tgo: od
Jonathan: I'm gonna have a look (0.2) in the pa: per (0.2) if it is:
Pamela: I'm pleased you en: joyed it (.) [erm:
Jonathan: [↓↑↓ did an all I just layed on me ↑bed an just ↑watched ↓it
Pamela: ↑Jonathan we- we've a↑greed to try ↓an (.) carry on with the assess↓ment
Jonathan: ye[h
Pamela: [o↑Kay
Pamela: if ↑that sounds al↓right (1.4) erm: (0.2) ↑so if I just intro↓duce it a↑gain
Jonathan: ehh (( in breath )) (0.2) hehh
Pamela: right (0.4) I'll be ↑asking you to do a number of ↓things today like giving some ↓word definitions (0.2) and solving a few num↓ber problems
(0.6)
Jonathan: yeh
Pamela: you'll find ↑some of these tasks ↓easy whereas others may be more ↓difficult (0.2) also ↑most people don't answer every ↓question correctly or finish every ↓item
Jonathan: mmm
Pamela: but ↑please give your ↑best ↓effort on all the ↓items (1.0)
Jonathan: yeh (.) yeh [okay
Pamela: ↑↑have you got any ques↓tions
(0.8)
Jonathan: nah (.) aint got ↓no "questions"
Pamela: right lets ↑see where we'll start to↓day then (1.0)
Pamela: crm:
(2.2)
(2.6) (( noises from outside of the room ))
Pamela: it's a bit noisy out there isn't it
(0.8)
Jonathan: what they doing out there
(1.2)
Pamela: well they do all the deliveries back there that's the
trouble (0.6) erm: just trying to find my place just now
Jonathan: really need a new (0.2) place to park
(2.2)
Pamela: you
Jonathan: could park (. ) just near the side
(5.2)
Jonathan: phff::::
Pamela: we're going to start with some arithmetic problems
today (0.8) and I'm going to ask you to solve some arithmetic
problems
Jonathan: ooh ooh<
Pamela: th the height=
Jonathan: =a know yeh=
Pamela: = ooh kay (0.2) just see how you get on
Jonathan: o kay (0.4) go on then
Pamela: erm:
the first one is (. ) how much is four pounds plus five
pounds
(13.4)
Jonathan: well five pounds jest is: (0.2) is the erm five (0.6) cos
four is the em (0.8) oh god (0.4) OH TH- TH- hh any
money
Pamela: o kay (0.6) ha- but how much is four pounds (. ) plus (. )
five pounds
(0.8)
Jonathan: how much is four pounds
Pamela: plus five pounds
(plus five pounds
Pamela: yeh
(16.6)
104 Jonathan: that's like a sum
105 Pamela: yes ehhh
106 Jonathan: eh hh hh hh =
107 Pamela: yes (0.6) do you want to have a go at it or=
108 Jonathan: I'll try
(2.2)
109 Jonathan: so it's (1.4) four add five
110 Pamela: yep
111 Jonathan: okay
112 Pamela: (0.6) thank you
(4.8)
113 Jonathan: if you got me a piece of paper I could write some sums
114 Pamela: we- we can't do it that way for this [I'm afraid
115 Jonathan: [mmm
116 Pamela: erm:
117 Jonathan: I'll just have to get them using my mind
(2.0)
118 Pamela: okay
119 Jonathan: three take away one (1.4) three (0.4) take a (0.8) TWO
120 Pamela: well done (1.8) okay
(2.2)
121 Jonathan: it's alright I'm goin back to college tomorrow I'm gonna do
122 all these sums
123 Pamela: right [are you (0.4) okay
124 Jonathan: [hh hh hh hh hh ehh (( in breath ))
(4.0)
125 Pamela: well you've been doing some of this at college haven't
126 you

182
139 Jonathan:  yeh
140 Pamela:  (28.2) (( sounds of blocks being arranged on the table top ))
141 Pamela:  o\^kay (0.4) \^if you have- (3.2) \^if you have \^seven \^blocks and
142 Jonathan:  take () \^two blocks \^away
143 Pamela:  (( sounds of blocks being slid across the table top ))
144 Pamela:  \^how many do you have \^left
145 Jonathan:  five
146 Pamela:  well done
147 Jonathan:  (0.8)
148 Jonathan:  you can see em in a \^line
149 Pamela:  yeh
150 Jonathan:  herhh hh hh hh
151 Pamela:  \^it's easier \^when they're there in front \^of you \^isn't \^it
152 Jonathan:  still do it on \^your \^ands
153 Pamela:  \^we'll that's \^true
154 Jonathan:  (1.6)
155 Pamela:  well done thank \^you
156 Jonathan:  no (0.4) \^oops (0.2) \^no \^problem
157 Jonathan:  (2.8)
158 Pamela:  \^that's \^good
159 Pamela:  \^thanks\^e
160 Pamela:  (14.6)
161 Pamela:  right (1.6) \^try \^something \^different (0.6) ehm: () \^if you \^buy
162 Pamela:  (0.2) \^six \^pounds worth of \^petrol (1.2) and \^pay \^for it with
163 Pamela:  a ten pound \^note (0.6) \^how much \^change () should you
164 Jonathan:  get \^back
165 Jonathan:  (4.0)
166 Jonathan:  oh \^god
167 Jonathan:  (5.6)
168 Pamela:  \^this is a sum \^aint it
169 Jonathan:  (2.2)
170 Pamela:  \^ack- \^I can't \^give you any \^more help \^really
171 Jonathan:  \^hehh \^heh heh heh heh
172 Pamela:  if you buy \^six \^pounds worth of petrol (0.4) and \^pay for it
183
174 with a ten pound note (0.4) how much change should you get back (17.6)
177 Jonathan: not two pound something is it (3.2)
179 Pamela: okay that's fine (3.8)
180 Pamela: thank you (3.6)
182 Pamela: ehm:
184 Pamela: soft drinks (0.2) are sold six cans to a package (1.8)
187 Jonathan: right
188 Pamela: if you want thirty cans (0.2) how many packages must you buy (15.8)
189 Jonathan: haven't gotta clue
192 Pamela: okay don't worry (3.8)
193 Pamela: can we try just one more (0.8) thanks (4.0)
196 Pamela: chewing gum costs twenty five pee per pack (0.4) how much would it cost to buy six packs (16.4)
199 Jonathan: haven't gotta clue
200 Pamela: okay don't worry (1.4) bit difficult aren't they
201 Jonathan: they are
202 Pamela: yeh
203 Jonathan: especially when you got somethin like that buyin stuff like that
204 Pamela: mmm (0.2) you did really well though when you had the blocks in front of you and you could just see it in front of you
207 Jonathan: [mmm
208 Pamela: erm: (2.2) okay
Jonathan: they've got a job cos they must stuff off or sommat

Pamela: yes it's quite noisy back there isn't it

Jonathan: mmm

Pamela: right we're going to erm

(11.2)

Pamela: I'm going to show you now

(12.2)

Pamela: right (1.2) I'm going to show you some pictures

(2.2)

Jonathan: mm hm=

Pamela: = for each picture there's a part missing

(1.0)

Pamela: if you could look at all aspects of each picture carefully and choose the missing part from the five choices

(2.8)

Pamela: right (.) for example (0.6) tell me which of these pictures

(2.4)

Pamela: should go here

(2.0)

Pamela: make sure you look (.) carefully at the picture at the top

[ya'm yeh I a- I am looking

(2.6)

Pamela: and at the response choices (0.6) before making your selection (0.4) if you think there's more than one correct answer to the problem (.) choose the best one (0.6) remember you are to choose the one that best completes the pattern

(3.6)

Jonathan: number two

Pamela: well done (0.8) oka'y

(1.8)
Jonathan: next \( \uparrow \) page
Pamela: \( \uparrow \) NEXT \( \uparrow \) PAGE (.) [yep (.) I’ll just get that \( \downarrow \) down
Jonathan: [hehh hh hh hh hh hh
Pamela: °you did that° (.) °ri:ght° (.) °that’s o\( \uparrow \) kay°
(1.2)
Pamela: \( \uparrow \) no\( \downarrow \) w \( \uparrow \) tell me which of \( \downarrow \) these pictures
(1.2)
Pamela: o\( \uparrow \) kay (.) \( \downarrow \) should go \( \downarrow \) he\( \uparrow \) re (0.6) an again make sure you
look\( \uparrow \) carefully at the picture \( \downarrow \) on the top and the pictures
be\( \downarrow \) low (0.8) before you choose your \( \downarrow \) answer (0.4) and if you
\( \uparrow \) think (.) there is more than one correct \( \downarrow \) answer to the
problem choose the best \( \downarrow \) one
(2.0)
Jonathan: number five (1.2) it goes there
(0.4)
Pamela: o\( \uparrow \) kay good (0.8) \( \downarrow \) well \( \uparrow \) done (0.4) \( \uparrow \) can you just explain to
me \( \downarrow \) why you thought it was number \( \downarrow \) five
(1.0)
Jonathan: cos it’s y- (.) it’s (0.2) ye- (.) it’s a- (.) yell\( \downarrow \) a an it goes \( \uparrow \) there
Pamela: ri:ght fine (0.2) o\( \uparrow \) k\( \downarrow \) a\( \downarrow \) y \( \uparrow \) let’s move onto the \( \downarrow \) next one
Jonathan: [hehh hh hh
(0.4)
Pamela: now \( \uparrow \) tell me which of these \( \downarrow \) pictures (1.4) should go (1.6)
\( \downarrow \) here
(1.2)
Pamela: all the pictures (1.0) °right s’alright°
(4.2)
Jonathan: number \( \downarrow \) four
(0.8)
Pamela: \( \downarrow \) goo\( \downarrow \) d
(0.8)
Jonathan: [goes in there=
Pamela: \( \uparrow \) can you explain \( \downarrow \) that to me
Jonathan: it’s a \( \uparrow \) small cir\( \downarrow \) cle
Pamela: good
Jonathan: an it goes in there

Pamela: lovely (0.4) okay fine (0.4) got the idea [that's what I think]

Jonathan: [yehh hh hh hh

Pamela:

Jonathan: the red star number three (0.4) goes here

Pamela: thank you

Jonathan: anything else (0.4) or do you want me to carry on

Pamela: yes we just carry on, I have a look at that one

Jonathan: [yeh okay

Pamela: there are quite a few of these so just carry on

Jonathan: I dunno what you call them but it's number three

Pamela: that's lovely, that's fine

Pamela: *right* which one of those pictures (0.2) do you think fits in

Jonathan: number two

Pamela: the book is stuck heh heh heh

Jonathan: definitely number two can't be number four (0.4) cos they all go the opposite

Pamela: okay

(7.0)
Jonathan: ahh that’s what you use on saws it’s when you cut
wood with
(2.0)
Pamela: can you tell me which of these pictures down here would
fit in there which would go there
(1.8)
Jonathan: number three
Pamela: okay thank you
(7.8)
Jonathan: number one
(1.8)
Pamela: thank you
(11.6)
Jonathan: definitely number five it’s gotta be
(1.0)
Pamela: thank you
(12.0)
Jonathan: number four
(2.2)
Pamela: thank you
(4.8)
Jonathan: turn the page over
((sound of page being turned))
Pamela: right just don’t em that’s it
(33.2)
Jonathan: it can’t be number five
(4.4)
Jonathan: ((sounds like she’ll avus off sign))
(3.2)
Pamela: which one did you think it might be
(2.0)
Pamela: just have a try
(4.0)
Jonathan: number three
(0.6)
Pamela: okay we’re going on thank you
Jonathan: The number is five.

Pamela: Thank you.

Jonathan: No; I don't know.

Pamela: Heh heh (1.2) getting a bit more difficult isn't it.

Jonathan: You cannot tell (0.4) cos it's (0.2) it's either two three or four.

Pamela: Mmm

Jonathan: I'll say:

Pamela: All we leave those there

Jonathan: I do-

Jonathan: Yeh

Pamela: But they do get more difficult so thanks very much.

Jonathan: Some of them were a lot o them.

Pamela: They (.) they do get hard.

Jonathan: You can't tell a lot o them.

Jonathan: They're all exactly the same.

Pamela: Mmm

Jonathan: [Three an four five]

Pamela: Well they get harder.
Pamela: you know a sai- I said at the beginning that they all start off easy and they get harder don't they [like the questions

Jonathan: [↓mmm

Pamela: erm; (.) but no you've done well the re (0.6) that's fine

thank you

(0.4)

(( sound of page turning ))

Pamela: let's just see (0.4) ahh

(3.8)

Pamela: I'm going to say some numbers (0.8) listen carefully and when I'm through I want you to say them (.) right after me (. ) just- just say what (.) what say<

Jonathan: o kay

Pamela: one seven

(3.6)

Jonathan: er:

Pamela: just say what I've said

Jonathan: one seven

Pamela: that's it THAT'S IT that's all it is

Jonathan: or you could put seven one

(1.0)

Pamela: just say exactly what I say this time

Jonathan: yeh [okay

Pamela: [o kay

Jonathan: yeh

Pamela: thank you

(1.6)

Pamela: six three

(1.8)

Jonathan: six three

Pamela: thank you

(1.2)
Pamela: five eight two
Jonathan: >five eight two<

(1.8)

Pamela: six nine four
Jonathan: six nine four

(7.2)

Jonathan: six nine four
Pamela: thank you

(2.8)

Pamela: six four nine
Jonathan: six nine four

(1.0)

Pamela: seven two eight six
Jonathan: seven eight two (0.8) one ou:t

(1.6)

Pamela: don’t worry that’s fine (0.6) thank you

(1.6)

Pamela: four two seven one
Jonathan: four seven two one (0.6) or is that right

(4.2)

Jonathan: seven three two one (0.6) or is that right
well I don’t know (0.4) could be right phehh hh hh

(2.2)

Pamela: don’t worry that’s fine thank you

(4.8)

Pamela: seven five eight three six
Jonathan: seven five eight three six

(0.6)

Pamela: well good thank you

(0.4)

Jonathan: excellent

(1.8)

Pamela: six one nine four seven three
Jonathan: eight nine

(1.2)

Jonathan: eight nine

(5.4)
Jonathan: I think it's six seven

(4.0)

Jonathan: no

(3.4)

Pamela: three, nine, two, four, eight, seven

(13.2)

Jonathan: don't know

(1.0)

Pamela: okay don't worry

(1.2)

Jonathan: heh (( in breath )) heh:::

(4.0)

Pamela: fine, right, NO, W

(3.4)

I'm going to say some more numbers

(1.2)

but this time when I stop I want you to say them backwards

(0.4)

Jonathan: ask me that question again

(2.0)

Pamela: I'm going to say some more numbers=

(7.4)

Jonathan: mm

(0.4)

Pamela: but this time when I stop I want you to say them backwards

(0.4)

Jonathan: yeh

(2.0)

Pamela: for example if I say seven, nine, what would you say

(2.0)

nine seven, one

(1.6)

Pamela: what's seven one nine backwards

(4.4)

Pamela: you would say

(2.0)

Jonathan: ninety seven

(3.2)
Jonathan: or is it's (.) ↑no ↓seventy nine

(2.0)

Pamela: ↑seven ↓one nine

(1.6)

Jonathan: oh [seven ↓one (.) se↑ven one nine

Pamela: [backwards

Pamela: you would ↓say (0.2) ↑nine one (.) se↓ven

(0.6)

Jonathan: yeh

(4.8)

Jonathan: ↓ohh ↑right ↓o

(2.8)

Pamela: "right"° (0.4) ↑I said ↓seven one nine °ne (0.2) [so

(0.8)

Jonathan: [I say nine °nine

(0.6)

seven one

Pamela: [so to

↑say

(0.8)

Jonathan: or ↑nine one se↓ven

(1.4)

Pamela: "right"° (2.2) ↑can you just (0.2) just lis↓en to

(0.6)

Jonathan: ↑veh I'm listen[ing

Pamela: [I'll try an explain it alright

Jonathan: it's cos I'm not quick ↓enough (0.6) I'm not fast enough to

understand it

Pamela: [well ↑it's

↑quite hard ↓to explain as well ↓though

Jonathan: mmm

Pamela: okay

(1.0)

Pamela: ↑I've ↓said seven one ↓nine (0.4) so to ↑say it ↓backwards

(0.2) you would say nine (.) one (.) se↓ven

(12.2)

Pamela: ↑can we just try another ↓er one

Jonathan: mmm (0.4) ↓that looks ard
Pamela: (0.4)
Jonathan: iht ihhs iht loohhks ard
Pamela: °right° (1.6) well ↑just- just try ↓this one ↑try ↓these numbers
(1.0) re↑member to ↓say them backwards (0.4) ↑three ↓four (.)
↑eight

(2.8)
Jonathan: ↑eight ↓four three
Pamela: ↑go↓od (0.2) ↑that’s ri↓ght
Jonathan: hehh [hh hh cos ↑I didn’t ↓do the ↑other ↓one
Pamela: ↑↑that’s ri↓ght ↓we-

Pamela: well
Jonathan: ↑hah ↓hah hah
Pamela: good (0.2) ↑okay (0.2) well let’s try ↓these
(1.2)
Pamela: ↑two ↓four
(3.0)
Jonathan: four two
Pamela: °good° (0.4) ↑that’s it
Jonathan: ↑when you said the ↓other one’s li:ke (0.2) s:: seven nine one
↓or som↑mat (0.8) you said one (.) seven ni↓ne (0.2) I woulda
said (0.2) ↑nine seven one (1.0) an that’s (.) back↓wards ain
↑it (0.6) ↓or ↑is it for↓wards
(3.4)
Pamela: well jus- ↑just try ↓these and try to remember to say them
↓backwards
Jonathan: mmm
Pamela: right (.) ↑the next one’s ↓five (.) se↓ven
(1.2)
Jonathan: seven fi:ve
Pamela: good (0.6) ↑six ↓two ↓nine
(6.8)
Jonathan: nine six::::: (0.4) ↑is it a five
Pamela: o↑kay (0.6) thank ↑you
(1.8)
Pamela: four one five

(7.6)

Jonathan: one four five

(2.2)

Pamela: right thank you

(4.2)

Pamela: okay that's fine

(1.6)

Jonathan: I found them brilliant heh HH HH HH

Jonathan: [they are]

Pamela: it's quite difficult that backwards [cos you've got to=

Jonathan: well I couldn't it words an all if you're spellin

words backwards well ard

Pamela: mmm (0.2) it is isn't it

Jonathan: spellin Li- (0.2) like Liverpool or Leicester backwards or (0.2)

then can't do it (0.2) LE ON it's easy that's jus en

(2.4)

Jonathan: ehhh

(2.8)

Jonathan: en owe ee ell

(2.0)

Jonathan: ell ee owe en

(2.0)

Pamela: right

Jonathan: so that's (0.2) backwards

Pamela: that's easier is it

Jonathan: mmm

Pamela: okay well thanks for trying cos I think they are quite difficult

(0.4)

Jonathan: well I done ma best

(0.8)

Pamela: that's the main thing isn't it

Jonathan: that's the main thing that's it exactly (1.0) so thank you
Jonathan:

(2.2)

Pamela: chm: ↑we’ll do something ↓different now (0.2) [hehh (. ) heh

heh

Jonathan: [oh ↑that’s

↓all ↑right

Pamela: ↑I’m going to ask you some ↓questions and I’d ↑like you (0.2)
to ( . ) ↓tell me ( . ) the ↓answers (2.4) ri↑ght ↑the first ↓one we’ll
try is

[okay

Jonathan:

(0.4)

Pamela: ↑what is a ther↓mometer

(3.8)

Jonathan: you ↑put in your mouth

(1.8)

Pamela: yeh

Jonathan: [to see what your temper↓ature is ( . ) see what you erm: (0.2)

if you’re ↑bad ↓or not

Pamela: right

(2.0)

Pamela: o↑kay thank ↑you

(4.8)

Jonathan: ↑we ↓did these last ↓time (2.2) and we done ↑brilli↓vant

(1.8)

Pamela: ↑we did ↓something slightly ↓different last time didn’t ↑we ( .)

↑haven’t ↓done these before

Jonathan: no we did the erm: (0.8) ↑what ↓dy↓a call it one

Pamela: I asked you the ↓meaning of some words

Jonathan: yeh

Pamela: yep ↑o↑kay (0.2) ↑this is ↓slightly different ↓though

(2.8)

Pamela: ↑erm: (0.4) ↑in what ↓direction does the sun ↓rise

(7.0)

Jonathan: ↓e↑fast

(0.6)
Pamela: good (2.6) thank you

(( sound of pages turning ))

Pamela: how many weeks are there in a year

(12.2)

Jonathan: it's not twenty four is it

(3.2)

Pamela: okay (2.2) I'll take twenty four as your answer is that

(1.0)

Jonathan: I think or is it twelve I'm not so sure (0.8) I don't

know about the years hehh hehh

Pamela: YOU DON'T KNOW ABOUT YEARS hehh

Jonathan: no

Pamela: okay try this one who wrote Hamlet

(9.4)

Jonathan: I can't got a clue

(1.0)

Pamela: o'kay try this one (0.8) who wrote Hamlet

(7.6)

Pamela: on what continent is Brazil

(12.2)

Jonathan: I can't got a clue

(4.8)

Pamela: just try a few more

(1.2)

Pamela: who was Martin Luther King

(8.6)

Jonathan: he's a man in the

(2.2)

Pamela: ehm: (1.2) can you tell me a bit more

(11.0)

Jonathan: I can't got a clue

(2.0)

Jonathan: "ehm:"

(4.6)

Pamela: can you name a prime minister of great britain during the
second world ↓war

(18.4)

Jonathan: aint got a clue

(2.8)

Jonathan: not so sure if it’s Tony ↑Blair

(2.6)

Jonathan: can’t remember that sohh ↑shhure (0.4) I know I ↓watch a war

films but=

(2.6)

Pamela: ↑m↓mm

Jonathan: there isn’t (.) I don’t know th- who he ↑is

Pamela: you’ve ↓been watching (.) you’ve watched ↓war films [though

Jonathan: ↑yeh

Pamela: yeh

(2.6)

Pamela: ↑one ↓last one then I think (0.2) ↑who was Cle↓opatra

(4.0)

Jonathan: prime ↑mini↓ster

(0.6)

Pamela: o↑kay

(2.4)

Pamela: thank ↑you (1.0) quite ↓hard questions ↑aren’t ↓they

Jonathan: >YEH YEH THEY ↓ARE but it doesn’t bother me ↓we’re havin

↓the hard questions< hehh hh hh (0.4) ↑I’m ↓gettin the ↑ang ↓of

um

(1.8)

Pamela: ↑well thanks ↓for try↑ing (0.2) that’s (.) ↓really help↓ful thank

↑you

(3.2)

Pamela: that’s go↑od (0.4) erm::

(3.4)

Pamela: ↑right↑ (2.0) got some more [pictures ↓to show you

Jonathan: [scuse me

(4.8)

Pamela: ↑let me↑ just get them all ↓out

(6.2)
Pamela: "that"

Jonathan: well I ain't done these before

Pamela: no; (. ) I don't think you have

Jonathan: we did the others

Pamela: they were different weren't they

Jonathan: yeh=

Pamela: =last week

(2.6)

Pamela: "okay"

(1.4)

Pamela: in this section I'm going to give you a group of cards that are in the wrong order I'm going to ask you to put them together so they tell a story that makes sense

(4.0)

(8.2) (( sound of cards being placed on the table ))

(4.6)

Pamela: right these pictures tell a story about a worker building a house but they are in the wrong order can you put them in the right order so they tell a story that makes sense

(5.2)

Pamela: lovely can you explain it

Jonathan: [starts it]

(1.2)

Jonathan: and (. ) fix the roof fix these sides

Pamela: mm hm

Jonathan: an ee starts the windas and there's your house

Pamela: lovely

(1.0)

Jonathan: that's what you call a building site hehh hh hh

Pamela: [hhhh

(3.4)

Pamela: quite true actually

(1.2)
Jonathan: cos you ↑can’t ↓put the opposite ↓way cos if you ↑do it ↑that way then won’t get the ↑answer=

Pamela: =yeh ↓cos it doesn’t make ↑sense ↓does it that way

Jonathan: ↑it’s not gonna be not gonna be< ↑done ↓else

Jonathan: nah

Pamela: thank you very ↑much

(1.8)

Pamela: ↑okay so we got (0.6) we gotta ↑few ↓more

(8.2)

((sound of page turning ))

Pamela: ↑I’ve got some more ↓sets of pictures for you to arrange (0.2)

in ↑each ↓case the- they’re mixed ↓up (1.4) and you are to put them in the ↑right ↓order so they make the most sensible ↓story

Jonathan: okay

Pamela: if you work as ↑quickly as you ↓can (0.2) and ↑tell me when you’ve ↓finished

(4.2)

Pamela: thank you

(28.2)

((sound of a card dropping on the table ))

Pamela: okay ↓is ↑that it

Jonathan: yeh

Pamela: love↑ly

Jonathan: makes (0.2) ↑makes ↓it

Pamela: mm↑hm

Jonathan: ↑tosses ↓it

Pamela: mm↑hm

Jonathan: ↑sticks up the ↓ceiling and lands on ↓ead

Pamela: right o↑Kay love↓ly

Jonathan: [hehhhh heh [heh

Pamela: [hehh hh hh ↑quite a good ↓one

that as well

Jonathan: looks ↑like me ↓doin cookin up ↑home
Pamela: (↓is ↓it (. ) heh heh ↑heh heh .hehh)
Jonathan: (↑I ↓do ↑I ↓do ↑[piz ↗za base an- an- ↑pan↓cakes)
Pamela: (they don’t stick to the ↑ceiling I’m su↓re)
Jonathan: (1.0)
Pamela: can ↑you do ↓pancakes
Jonathan: yeh they’re easy just milk and erm:
Pamela: (2.2)
Jonathan: er.: ↑milk (1.2) an it’s er.: ↑flo↓ur
Pamela: mm↑hm
Jonathan: (1.0)
Pamela: an ↑just put it in a ↓pan (. ) an [let it ↑cook
Jonathan: ↑toss up in a ↓frying pan (0.2) an ↑that’s what my ↓did ↑dad
tossed up on the cei↓ling<
Pamela: dihhd ↑hhehh [heh heh heh heh heh heh
Jonathan: (stuck up ↑cei↓lin
Pamela: ↑oh: ↓de:ar I like that (. ) that’s great
(3.8)
Pamela: a↓s long as you gotta ↑piz↓za base ↑an ↓you
Jonathan: [an that ↑an that ↓was large
Pamela: e↑h (0.2) you ↑can’t eat ↓it then
Jonathan: no you can’t ↓while it’s stuck up ceiling
Pamela: ↑n↓o:
(1.2)
Jonathan: I’ve done about twelve ↓of them (0.4) with jam in the mid↓dle
(8.2)
Pamela: right ↑can you have a look at ↓those and put those into the
right or↓der
Jonathan: o↓kay
(27.2)
Jonathan: (wait a minute)
(22.6)
Jonathan: nah I ↑can’t ↓on this
Pamela: oh dear ↑dya want to have a ↓go:
Jonathan: that's "might be (( syll syll )) (1.2) I'll try
(( sound of card dropping on the table ))

Pamela: "o-kay

Jonathan: "yes she walks in try an strike the door (0.8) the do- the
do- the door she ta- she's "tying the knot=

Pamela: "mmmm=

Jonathan: "but the door knob won't "udge (0.6) so ch-ch- "hen she
opens the door a friend "omes in (0.8) and "hen a friend
walks "out

Pamela: okay "so where does your story sta"rt

(2.0)

Jonathan: well "my "ory

Pamela: "where does it sta"rt (.) which is the first "icture

(6.2)

Jonathan: that "one

Pamela: right "o-kay

Jonathan: that's your first "one (.) them (0.4) wait "in there

(0.4)

Pamela: oh "don't (.) don't look at the "ack ehhh heh heh (0.2)

Jonathan: alright c- "ould you give those "ack to me (1.0) chm::

(2.2)

Jonathan: want play the other "one really heh heh

Pamela: par"on

Jonathan: "uild "ing site (1.2) when build the "ouse "up "hat's "a
good story

(0.4)

Pamela: "you did "at really well

Jonathan: yeh (0.8) "ut that "one's "rd

(1.0)

Pamela: it i:;:

(8.2)

Pamela: that's "good "ough

(1.8)
Jonathan: °mmm°

Pamela: you ↑found that one quite hard ↓did you
Jonathan: mmm

Jonathan: I know I↑know ↓I'm not supposed to be ↑looking ↓at the back then am I (0.2) hehhh

Pamela: well ↑the things on the ↓back are for me to ↓use for ↑lots of ↓things
Jonathan: yeh

Pamela: ↑have a look at ↓these

Pamela: and ↑could I ask you to start the story over this ↓side
Jonathan: yeh I will
Pamela: okay ↑this will be the first ↓card in the story (.) when you’ve ↓looked at them obviously

Pamela: thank you

Pamela: o↑kay ↓that’s ↑it

Jonathan: do- ↑the dog erm: (0.4) e walks in- near the ↓fence
Pamela: mmm
Jonathan: the ↑dog ↓barks at im ↓the dog tries to go out
Pamela: [mmm

Jonathan: erm a- ↑ave ↓im or sommat
Pamela: right
Jonathan: cos the ↑dog's bitin the erm ↓fence
Pamela: ↓yeh

Jonathan: an ee’s ↑climbin over and ↓then ↑two minutes ↓later e walks (.) e walks (.) e sees the dog be in the ↓shop (.) and then (0.4)

°exactly the same but opposite way° (0.4) °wait a minute° (.)
°that’s right° (0.8) an then erm: (0.8) e \looks at the dog (0.6)
dog’s not doin \noffin an then e (. ) just \walks there (0.2) \c
just \stands there an dogs u- \near the shop an then \two
minutes \later he waves to the \dog
Pamela: \right o\okay thank \you
Jonathan: I’\m not so sure about the (( syll ))
Pamela: \not \so sure
(8.0) (( sound of cards being taken off the table ))
(9.2)
Pamela: \right thank \you
(2.2)
Jonathan: I come ere again \though \somethin- d- do sommat di-
\diffe\rent ehh heh heh heh
Pamela: yeh \next \time we meet \we’ll \finish this \assessment but I
think we’re \gonna have to (0.2) decide what to do \after that
Jonathan: mmm
Pamela: but ( . ) \just have a look at \these for now
(5.0) (( sound of card being placed on the table ))
Pamela: this \is where the story
Jonathan: ((( syll syll syll syll syll syll syll )))
(0.6)
Pamela: if \you could start your story \that end of the table thank you
(23.8)
Jonathan: yeh that’s al\right
(0.8)
Pamela: o\okay
(1.2)
Jonathan: \comes \in (0.6) with a bo- ba- er:: basket full of wash\in
Pamela: mm\hm
Jonathan: then he goes into the laun\dry
Pamela: right
Jonathan: an then e folds \it (0.2) an then e sticks it in the:: er:: washin
machine and then \after \that e sticks it in the dri\er
Pamela: \right ( . ) o\okay thank \you
(6.2)
Jonathan: **Oh** it's eleven o'clock

Pamela: I know time's moving on isn't it

Jonathan: mm

(9.0)

Pamela: we've got another half an hour though so we're kay

Jonathan: o k e'll be up ome then ehh ehh ehh

(2.2)

Pamela: he'll be at home will he

Jonathan: yeh (0.2) h e'll be

Pamela: has he got a lot to do:

Jonathan: yeh

(1.6)

Jonathan: sorta like doin some stuff out

Pamela: right

Jonathan: he's already done (0.8) grand kids

(4.2)

Pamela: right have a look at these then

Jonathan: o kay

(7.2)

Pamela: thank you

Jonathan: you want em sorted out

Pamela: yeh

Jonathan: kay=

Pamela: that's fine

(3.2)

Pamela: so it makes the most sensible story

(25.4)

Pamela: right=

Jonathan: bloke standin there (1.2) the woman's in the erm:

ba- I don't know what to call it it's like a (( sounds like lim)) or sommat

(1.2)

Jonathan: take clothes off (0.4) e's hidin behind the tree

Pamela: mmhm

Jonathan: see if she's not lookin (0.2) right (0.4) s- if he'll nick
Jonathan: her clothes tan he has look at that (0.2) like an idiot
(2.2)
Jonathan: he took her clothes - he's took her clothes
Pamela: mmm
(1.8)
Jonathan: an then he erm: (0.8) he's got a number on is erm: (0.2)
Jonathan: then they're looking for him
Pamela: mmm
Jonathan: and then (1.8) well actually yeh (0.2) cos look
(4.0)
Jonathan: the coppers erm::
(3.2)
Jonathan: are after him
Pamela: mmm
Jonathan: cos he nicked her clothes
(0.8)
Pamela: right () okay thank you
(2.2)
Jonathan: "that's two s- three stories" 
Pamela: mmhm
(6.0)
Jonathan: it can't be getting dark already () please
(4.2)
Jonathan: cos last time it got dark last time () didn't it
Pamela: didn't we see each other in the afternoon on (1.2) was it an
afternoon appointment
Jonathan: yeh
Pamela: I think it was yeh it gets dark around about four at
the moment doesn’t it
Jonathan: I got college tomorrow
(2.2)
Pamela: right I think we’ll leave those there h mhh mhhh (( clearing
throat ))
Jonathan: [yeh
Pamela: thank you very much for trying
(2.8)
Jonathan: okay
(1.2)
Pamela: erm
(19.0)
Pamela: put those away°
(4.2)
Jonathan: I bet that's good you know
(1.2)
Pamela: you enjoyed that
Jonathan: mmm
Pamela: good (0.2) good
(3.2)
Pamela: right now I'm going to ask you to tell me some solutions to everyday problems or social concerns
(10)
Jonathan: hehh
Pamela: ehh hh hh hh
(1.0)
Pamela: right
(5.4)
Jonathan: go on
Pamela: you up for it
(2.2)
Pamela: what is the thing to do: if you find an envelope in the street (0.2) that is sealed addressed and has a new stamp on it
(2.2)
Jonathan: put in pillar box
Pamela: good
(2.8)
Pamela: thank you
Jonathan: ehh hh hh hh
(16.2)
Pamela: tell me some reasons why many foods need to be cooked
(8.6)
Jonathan: what cooked
1020 Pamela: cooked (1.4) cooked
1021 Jonathan: oh ↑COOKed
1022  (1.0)
1023 Pamela: ↑tell me why (0.2) ↓sorry ↑tell me some ↓reasons why ↑many foods need to be ↓cooked
1024  (4.0)
1025 Jonathan: ↑some ↓are meat (.) some ↑don’t
1026  (1.4)
1028 Pamela: ↓ri↑ght
1029  (1.6)
1030 Jonathan: er:::
1031  (7.8)
1032 Jonathan: oh I don’t ↑know this one now (0.8) ↑I’ve lost ↓it
1033 Pamela: o↑kay
1034  (3.0)
1035 Jonathan: ↑I know I do ↓have food up home
1036 Pamela: well ↓you do ↑lots ↓of cooking ↑don’t ↓you
1037 Jonathan: yeh
1038 Pamela: yeh
1039 Jonathan: eh ↑hh hh ↓hh
1040  (6.8)
1041 Pamela: erm:: (.) ↑why do ↓people wash ↓clothes
1042  (3.8)
1043 Jonathan: cos you got (.) cos if you wear dirty ↑clothes ↓you have to ↓change your ↑clothes and ↓you have to (( syll syll syll syll ))
1044 Pamela: right (.) but (.) but ↑why (.) why do ↓people wash clothes
1045  (5.2)
1046 Jonathan: cos they li- cos they ↑like ↓too (1.4) gives em sommat to ↑do
1047  (5.6)
1048 Pamela: o↑kay
1049  (2.2)
1050 Pamela: thank ↑you
1051  (11.2)
1052 Pamela: erm:: (0.6) ↑why do ↓people wear wat↓ches
1053  (1.8)
Jonathan: so you can tell the time
Pamela: good
Jonathan: I remember one now
Pamela: you’ve gotta lovely watch haven’t you
Jonathan: yeh
Pamela: what do people use money for
Jonathan: to buy food
Pamela: mmmhm
Jonathan: or erm
Pamela: mmhm
Jonathan: or erm
Pamela: mmhm
Jonathan: jewellery stuff an all that an that
Pamela: mmmhm
Jonathan: or Christmas presents
Pamela: Christmas presents
Jonathan: yeh you could buy them
Pamela: yeh
Jonathan: if you order it
Pamela: alright
(2.6)
Pamela: okay fine
(4.8)
Pamela: can you tell me some reasons that we have a parole system
(2.0)
Jonathan: please tell me what that is
(1.4)
Pamela: right
Jonathan: I ain’t got a clue what that is
Pamela: yeh \textup{you haven't heard of a parole system}

Jonathan: no

Pamela: [no \textup{okay}]

(8.0)

Pamela: \textup{don't worry about it we'll try another question I think}

Jonathan: yeh (0.6) \textup{cos I aint got a clue what that is}

Pamela: no okay

Jonathan: \textup{parole system}

(7.2)

Pamela: \textup{tell me some reasons why child employment laws are needed}

(15.6)

Jonathan: \textup{aint got a clue}

(4.4)

Jonathan: bad \textup{behaviour or sommat}

Pamela: par\textup{don}

Jonathan: bad \textup{behaviour}

Pamela: \textup{bad behaviour}

Jonathan: swearin \textup{an all that} (0.8) \textup{tantrums an all that} (.) \textup{touchin stuff}

up (.) \textup{touchin women up touchin girls up or sommat like that}

(1.0) \textup{sommat like that} (2.2) \textup{I haven't gotta clue} (0.8) I just aint

(5.0)

Pamela: right

Jonathan: be that were ups \textup{well hard}

Pamela: that's a hard question is it

Jonathan: yeh hehh hh hh hh

Pamela: [\textup{okay}]

(2.0)

Pamela: \textup{why does the state require people in some professions to obtain licences before offering services to the public}

(20.2)

Jonathan: \textup{don't know}

(3.0)
1125 Pamela: o\[\]kay
1126 Jonathan: [shoulda asked all \[my \uparrow dad \downarrow these questions \uparrow he
1127 \downarrow shoulda been on tape in the \uparrow first \downarrow place
1128 Pamela: so\[\]trry
1129 Jonathan: shoulda put \uparrow my dad \downarrow on here
1130 Pamela: ehh \[heh \[heh
1131 Jonathan: [he's know [all \downarrow of em
1132 Pamela: [you \[reckon he's got all the an\[swers
1133 \downarrow do you
1134 Jonathan: he's got all the answers \[\uparrow every \downarrow single answer
1135 Pamela: \[\uparrow has \downarrow he
1136 Pamela: oh well \[that's \downarrow helpful (. ) at \[least some \downarrow body has (. 2) that's
1137 \downarrow good (. 6) I \[don't think I've \downarrow got all the answers half [the
1138 time
1139 Jonathan: \[ehh hh hh
1140 Pamela: \[I don't \[honestly (. 6) right \[lets lets leave it \downarrow there (. 4) cos
1141 \[I think we- we've done \[enough \downarrow of that assess\[ment (. 4)
1142 \[ok \[let's just stop that (. ) tape recorder (. 4) thank
1143 \[you
1144 (( sound of tape being stopped ))