

# Analyzing Race Talk

Multidisciplinary Approaches  
to the Interview

Edited by Harry van den Berg  
Margaret Wetherell and  
Hanneke Houtkoop-Steenstra

CAMBRIDGE

This page intentionally left blank

# Analyzing Race Talk

## Multidisciplinary Perspectives on the Research Interview

The interview is one of the most important sources of social scientific data yet there has been relatively little exploration of the way interviews are conducted and interpreted. By asking internationally respected scholars from a range of traditions in discourse studies including conversation analysis, discursive psychology, and sociolinguistics to respond to the same material, this exciting new book sheds light on some key differences in methodology and theoretical perspective. Key topics are addressed such as the forms of knowledge produced in interviews, the interview as social interaction and the foundations for the study of talk and texts in qualitative research. The use of interviews exploring issues of race and racism further broadens the scope of the book, enabling the contributors to explore sensitive questions around the construction and interpretation of interviews on controversial topics.

HARRY VAN DEN BERG is an Associate Professor at the Vrije Universiteit, Amsterdam. He is the author or editor of fifteen books on different topics and has published numerous articles and book chapters. He is a member of the Committee of Quality Inspection of the MOA (The Dutch Market Research Association).

MARGARET S. WETHERELL was appointed to a Personal Chair at the Open University in 2000. She is the author or editor of twelve books and has published over sixty articles and book chapters. She is one of the most widely cited psychologists in the UK with over 1,000 citations of her single and joint authored research as measured by the SSCI. Currently she is co-editor of the *British Journal of Social Psychology*.

HANNEKE HOUTKOOP-STEENSTRA was an Associate Professor at the University of Utrecht. She authored or edited five books and published numerous articles and book chapters. She played an outstanding role in the development and application of methods of conversation analysis especially in the field of interview discourse. She died in December, 2002 just after the completion of this book at the age of fifty-two.



# Analyzing Race Talk

*Multidisciplinary Perspectives on the  
Research Interview*

---

Harry van den Berg

*Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam*

Margaret Wetherell

*The Open University*

Hanneke Houtkoop-Steenstra



**CAMBRIDGE**  
UNIVERSITY PRESS

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS

Cambridge, New York, Melbourne, Madrid, Cape Town, Singapore, São Paulo

Cambridge University Press

The Edinburgh Building, Cambridge CB2 2RU, UK

Published in the United States of America by Cambridge University Press, New York

[www.cambridge.org](http://www.cambridge.org)

Information on this title: [www.cambridge.org/9780521821186](http://www.cambridge.org/9780521821186)

© Cambridge University Press 2003

This publication is in copyright. Subject to statutory exception and to the provision of relevant collective licensing agreements, no reproduction of any part may take place without the written permission of Cambridge University Press.

First published in print format 2004

ISBN-13 978-0-511-16240-4 eBook (Adobe Reader)

ISBN-10 0-511-16240-5 eBook (Adobe Reader)

ISBN-13 978-0-521-82118-6 hardback

ISBN-10 0-521-82118-5 hardback

ISBN-13 978-0-521-52802-3 paperback

ISBN-10 0-521-52802-X paperback

Cambridge University Press has no responsibility for the persistence or accuracy of URLs for external or third-party internet websites referred to in this publication, and does not guarantee that any content on such websites is, or will remain, accurate or appropriate.

Dedicated to the memory of  
Hanneke Houtkoop-Steenstra





# Contents

---

<i>List of contributors</i>	<i>page</i> ix
<i>Preface</i>	xiii
<i>Acknowledgments</i>	xiv
<i>Transcription symbols</i>	xv
 Introduction	 1
HARRY VAN DEN BERG, MARGARET WETHERELL, AND HANNEKE HOUTKOOP-STEENSTRA	
1 Racism and the analysis of cultural resources in interviews	11
MARGARET WETHERELL	
2 Analyzing racial discourse: the discursive psychology of mind–world relationships	31
DEREK EDWARDS	
3 Constructivist processes in discourse: a cognitive linguistics perspective	49
DAVID A. LEE	
4 Institutional, professional, and lifeworld frames in interview talk	64
SRIKANT SARANGI	
5 The uses of absurdity	85
CHARLES ANTAKI	
6 Multiple voices in talking race: Pakeha reported speech in the discursive construction of the racial other	103
RICHARD BUTTNY	
7 Contradictions in interview discourse	119
HARRY VAN DEN BERG	

8	Racism, happiness, and ideology MAYKEL VERKUYTEN	138
9	The frame analysis of research interviews: social categorization and footing in interview discourse TITUS ENSINK	156
10	Affiliation and detachment in interviewer answer receipts TOM KOOLE	178
11	Interviewer laughter as an unspecified request for clarification TONY HAK	200
12	Perspectives and frameworks in interviewers' queries ANITA POMERANTZ AND ALAN ZEMEL	215
	<i>Appendix: Interview transcripts</i>	232
	<i>Index</i>	309

## Contributors

---

CHARLES ANTAKI, Ph.D., is Reader in Language and Social Psychology at the Loughborough University, England. He is a member of the Discourse and Rhetoric Group in the Department of Social Sciences, an active circle of academics and students who study spoken and written discourse from a variety of perspectives. His research interests are in conversation analysis.

RICHARD BUTTNY, Ph.D., is Professor of Speech Communication at Syracuse University. His publications include *Talking Problems: Studies in Discursive Construction* (2003) and *Social Accountability in Communication* (1993). His scholarly interests pertain to accounts and social accountability, reported speech, talk in institutional settings, discursive constructions of race matters, and environmental communication.

DEREK EDWARDS, Ph.D., is Professor of Psychology in the Department of Social Sciences, Loughborough University. His interests are in the analysis of language and social interaction in everyday and institutional settings. His books include *Common Knowledge* with Neil Mercer (1987), *Ideological Dilemmas* with Michael Billig and others (1988), *Discursive Psychology* with Jonathan Potter (1992), and *Discourse and Cognition* (1997).

TITUS ENSINK, Ph.D., is Associate Professor of Discourse Studies and Rhetoric in the Faculty of Arts at the Groningen University, the Netherlands. His research interests include political rhetoric in relation to commemorations and the frame analysis of texts and media messages.

TONY HAK, Ph.D., is Senior Lecturer in Research Methodology at the Faculteit Bedrijfskunde/Rotterdam School of Management, Erasmus University, Rotterdam, the Netherlands. He has published on discourse analysis, ethnomethodology, doctor-patient communication, and the social research interview. In 2002 he received an ASA/NSF fellowship for research within the US Census Bureau on the response process in business surveys.

HANNEKE HOUTKOOP-STEENSTRA, Ph.D., was Associate Professor at the Utrecht Institute of Linguistics (UIL-OTS) and the Institute for Dutch Language and Culture at Utrecht University. Her research focused on the development and application of methods of conversation analysis, especially in the field of interview discourse. Her books include *Interaction and the Standardized Survey Interview: the Living Questionnaire* (2000).

TOM KOOLE, Ph.D., is Researcher at the Utrecht Institute of Linguistics (UIL-OTS) and Lecturer at the Institute for Dutch Language and Culture at Utrecht University. His research has focused on interactions in intercultural and interethnic contexts, and his present concern is with student participation in multi-ethnic and multi-lingual classrooms.

DAVID LEE, Ph.D., is Associate Professor in Linguistics in the School of English at the University of Queensland. He teaches and researches in cognitive linguistics and discourse analysis. He has written numerous articles and books, including *Competing Discourses* (1992) and *Cognitive Linguistics: an Introduction* (2001).

ANITA POMERANTZ, Ph.D., is Associate Professor in the Communication Department at the University at Albany, SUNY. She has published articles on strategies of seeking information, methods of negotiating responsibility, practices for giving feedback, and interaction in medical settings. She serves on the editorial boards of *Communication Monographs*, *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, *Language in Society*, and *Discourse Studies*.

SRIKANT SARANGI, Ph.D., is Professor and Director of the Health Communication Research Centre at Cardiff University. His research interests are in discourse analysis and applied linguistics, language and identity in public life, and institutional/professional discourse. His recent book-length publications include *Discourse and Social Life* with Malcolm Coulthard (2000) and *Sociolinguistics and Social Theory* with Nik Coupland and Chris Candlin (2001).

HARRY VAN DEN BERG, Ph.D., is Associate Professor in the Department of Social Research Methodology at the Vrije Universiteit. His current research focuses on the quality of public opinion research and on a variety of methodological issues concerning research interviews, including questionnaire design, the social interaction between interviewer and interviewee, and discourse analysis of qualitative interviews. His books include *Opinie-maken of Opinie-meten: De rol van Stellingvragen in Markt- en Opinieonderzoek* [Opinion Making or Opinion Measuring:

The Role of Assertions in Public Opinion Research] with Hanneke Houtkoop-Steenstra and others (2002).

MAYKEL VERKUYTEN, Ph.D., is Associate Professor in the Faculty of Social Science at Utrecht University. He is also Senior Researcher at the European Research Center on Migration and Ethnic Relations (ERCOMER) at the same university. His research interests include ethnic identity and inter-ethnic relations. With Jessica ter Wal, he edited the collection *Comparative Perspectives on Racism* (2000).

MARGARET WETHERELL, Ph.D., is Professor of Social Psychology at the Open University, UK, and co-editor of the British Journal of Social Psychology. Her books include *Discourse and Social Psychology* with Jonathan Potter (1987) and *Discourse Theory and Practice* and *Discourse as Data*, both with Stephanie Taylor and Simeon Yates (2001). Her empirical research on discourse includes work on racism, masculinities, and the governance and forms of identity.

ALAN ZEMEL is a Post-Doctoral Fellow at Southern Illinois University School of Medicine. He received his Ph.D. from Temple University in 2002, and he is trained as a conversation analyst. His research focuses on medical education.



## Preface

---

During the very last phase of our work on this book, we received the devastating news that our co-editor, Hanneke Houtkoop-Steenstra had died. We knew that she was severely ill but her sudden death was unexpected. We mourn her passing and miss her greatly.

Hanneke studied linguistics at the University of Amsterdam. After finishing her Ph.D. thesis in 1987 on the analysis of proposal-acceptance sequences, she was appointed to a position at the Utrecht Institute of Linguistics (UIL-OTS) and the Institute for Dutch Language and Culture at Utrecht University. She was a dynamic and wholehearted researcher fascinated by the structure and organization of ordinary conversation and conversation within an institutional context. Hanneke's contributions are numerous. She had a particular interest in the interaction between interviewer and interviewee in research interviews and is, of course, well known for this work. Hanneke liked to transgress conventional disciplinary and institutional borders, and she demonstrated, for example, the relevance of conversation analysis for critical reflection on traditional survey methodology. She played a crucial role in the design and editing of this book and was inspirational in pushing forward our scheme of encouraging researchers from many different perspectives to analyze the same data set. Her comments on all our work were marked by a delightful combination of professional rigor, straightforwardness and disarming humour. We only wish that she could have been here to share our pleasure in its publication.

To honor her contribution to the field of conversation analysis as well as to the field of the methodology of research interviews, we dedicate this book to her memory.

HARRY VAN DEN BERG AND MARGARET WETHERELL

## Acknowledgments

---

We want to thank all those who contributed to this book and pay tribute to their willingness to play the game proposed to them. It is not easy to work on shared data to analyze texts produced in very unfamiliar contexts. The result, however, has proven well worth the effort.

We gratefully acknowledge the continuing support for this project by the editor at Cambridge University Press, Sarah Caro.

We are grateful to the Faculty of Social Sciences of the Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam for offering the opportunity to organize and pursue the project by a grant.

We would like to thank Barbara Fehr and Marjon Vos van der Born for the very precise and careful retranscription of the audiotapes of the interviews.

Last but not least we would like to thank Kate Henning for her major contribution to the administration and management of the editing process.



# Transcriptions symbols

---

I	= interviewer
R	= respondent
D	= respondent's daughter (in Interview 44)
[xxx]	overlapping talk
[yyy]	
word=	latched utterances; no interval
=Word	
(1.0)	timed silence in seconds
(.)	micropause (less than 0.3 sec)
word.	falling intonation
word,	continuing intonation
word?	rising or questioning intonation
word!	exclamation like prosody
wor-	abrupt cutoff
↑word	higher pitch
↓word	lower pitch
wor:d	stretched sound
w <u>o</u> rd	emphasis
WORD	louder talk
°word°	quieter talk
>word<	faster talk
<word>	slower talk
wo(h)rd	laughingly spoken
.hhh	inbreath
hhh	outbreath
((note))	transcriptionist's note and comment
(word)	transcriptionist's uncertain understanding
[ . . . ]	lines omitted



# Introduction

---

*Harry van den Berg, Margaret Wetherell, and  
Hanneke Houtkoop-Steenstra*

Discourse analysis is a rapidly expanding field of research and theorizing. The growing interest in this field of research reflects a threefold linguistic turn in the social sciences. First, there has been a developing appreciation among social scientists of the central role of discursive practices in social life. The conception of language as a mere technical means of communication has been superseded. Language has been re-conceptualized as social activity. As a consequence, the traditional boundaries between linguistics and the social sciences have become blurred. To fully understand contemporary social life, researchers have had to turn their attention to a diverse range of new phenomena. These include, for instance, the large-scale discursive practices that make up postmodern reflexive culture and the small-scale organization of talk in the call centers of the new service economies, the formulation of social policy and the detail of social interaction. The study of discourse is inseparable from the study of society.

Second and more generally, the concept of discourse has produced new and fruitful angles on the old themes of the social sciences such as the nature of power and the construction of social identities. Many recent theoretical debates and controversies within the social sciences are concerned with the way the notion of discourse is used, and its potentialities and limits. Third, there has been a growing recognition that social research is itself a discursive practice. Scientists' discourse emerged as a research topic for discourse analysts at the beginning of the 1980s. Nigel Gilbert and Michael Mulkey (1984), for example, in one of the first studies of this kind, explored the variability of the accounts biochemists used in different situations for their research practice. Along with these studies of the accounting devices used in scientists' discourse, it has become apparent that even the so-called "hard facts" of social research are discursive in nature. The empirical data of social research are predominantly products of specific discursive practices.

All three of these moments of the linguistic turn (discourse as topic, as theory/epistemology, and as reflexive exploration) are illustrated in this book. The book itself is the product of an unusual collaboration

coordinated by Harry van den Berg and Hanneke Houtkoop-Steenstra. A group of discourse scholars from a range of different perspectives and geographical locations (North America, Australia, the United Kingdom, and the Netherlands) were brought together and asked to focus their attention on a common set of materials. All agreed to study three interviews independently and then to report their findings. The interviews (conducted by Margaret Wetherell) came from a large-scale project on racist discourse and were relatively informal and open-ended in nature. (They are reproduced for the reader in the appendix.)

The range of perspectives shared by the group included conversation analysis and ethnomethodology, cognitive linguistics, Goffman's frame analysis, critical sociolinguistics, discursive psychology, and Foucauldian-influenced styles of critical discourse analysis. In working with the interviews, our contributors became interested in a huge range of phenomena. These included reported voices, the formulation of the mind/world relationship in talk, absurdity and laughter, and the cultural resources comprising "common sense." Contributors looked at contradictions and their functions and effects, the development of categories and representations of agency, the interviewer's actions and the kinds of frames these created for those being interviewed, along with the subtle coordination of talk.

The chapters in this volume illustrate some of the key methods and approaches available in social science and linguistics for investigating discursive practices. The shared empirical ground allows the reader to compare different theoretical perspectives and methodological approaches and to evaluate the process of making inferences. It has been a fascinating exercise to see how each discourse scholar has dealt with these interviews. Research data are not neutral, and empirical data are always constructed within a specific research practice. Our contributors had to work with material that was not their own, but in each case they good humoredly set about locating it and defining it as the kind of object they could analyze. In the process they demonstrated their typical working assumptions, preferred research questions, and procedures for producing knowledge. The empirical material in this respect proved to be both negotiable and non-negotiable. It metamorphosed into a different kind of data with exposure to each new act of scrutiny, yet it also remained "relatively autonomous," and thus dialogue and communication became possible between different theoretical and methodological positions.

The contributors report a number of new empirical findings on the rhetorical organization of discourse about issues of race, and, more generally, on the organization of talk on "controversial issues" and interaction in interviews. They also discuss some current live theoretical debates.

Should, for instance, discourse be understood as social action and/or as a product or expression of the (individual or collective) mind? Should discourse analysis be “emic” or “etic” in approach? Should discourse analysts, in other words, restrict themselves to the categories used by the participants, or should analysts also use theoretical categories to understand the discourse in question? How relevant is the wider social and institutional context? Is it relevant at all? Where do discourses end and the rest of “the social” begin? Should discourse analysts take a critical stance? Should discourse analysis, for example, be primarily oriented to the production of knowledge, or should it take into account political goals, such as supporting groups in their struggle for liberation and social equality?

As it turned out, this collaborative exercise has perhaps revealed most about the third twist of the linguistic turn noted above – the application of discourse theory and method to understand the discursive practices of social science itself. What interested many of the contributors were not the topics but the organization of the interviews as a research activity. (Indeed, it is difficult to comment on content with such a small sample and where the context was unfamiliar.) This focus is valuable. It has been estimated that over 90% of social research is based on interview data (Brenner 1981). Social research, whatever discipline or approach taken, relies heavily on interviewing people about their experiences, opinions, hopes, fears, reactions, and expectations. The research interview is a discursive act. It is jointly produced by the participants, and the interviewer is as involved in this production as the interviewees. It is highly appropriate, therefore, that the methods and theories of discourse analysis are applied to this practice. In the remainder of this introduction, we want to comment more generally on this central theme before introducing the structure and organization of the book as a whole.

### **The research interview: instrument or topic?**

Many social scientists treat the research interview as an instrument for developing the empirical foundations of social scientific knowledge. Opinion polls based on survey interviews are often presented as windows onto the world of what people believe and want. In the field of qualitative research, terms such as “in-depth interview” and “open interview” suggest that it is possible to go beyond the superficial style of standardized survey interviews to unravel a deeper or more essential reality. Indeed, a crucial assumption of much qualitative as well as quantitative research practice is that it is possible to make inferences from the information produced in interviews that go beyond the specific context of those interviews. This assumption is very often taken for granted.

As a consequence it is common to find that qualitative researchers, just like their quantitative colleagues, neglect the constructed nature of their data. Interviewees' answers are interpreted without taking into account their local construction or the ways in which they are produced by the joint effort of the interviewer and interviewee within a highly specific context. Although there is an awareness of the active role of the interviewer, often presented as the problem of "reactivity of measurement," in mainstream methodological texts on interviewing, the presupposition remains that the ultimate ideal for interviewing is to obtain answers that are not "disturbed" by the interviewer's behavior. The misleading metaphor of "data collection" is still dominant, in other words, in the way the interview process is framed.

The interviewee is approached as a vessel of pre-given data, and interviewing strategies or styles are conceptualized as ways to open the vessel to "collect" the data without transforming them (cf. Holstein and Gubrium 1995). This metaphor provides some common ground for mainstream qualitative and mainstream quantitative research, although these approaches differ substantially in their views on how to "open up" the interviewee. Standardizing the behavior of the interviewer, neutrality, and detachment are the central methodological guidelines for survey interviewing, while flexibility of interviewer-behavior, empathy, and openness are the central methodological guidelines for qualitative interviewing (cf. Rubin and Rubin 1995). Notwithstanding these differences, in both cases, the "logic in use" (Kaplan 1964) of interviewing promises an entrance to the "real" experiences, attitudes, opinions, and emotions of the interviewee.

This view of the interview as an instrument for empirical research is a contested one. Scholars working within related research traditions such as ethnomethodology, sociolinguistics, conversation analysis, and discursive psychology have demonstrated the constructed nature of interview data (for example: Cicourel 1964; Briggs 1986; Pomerantz 1988; Heritage and Greatbatch 1991; Houtkoop-Steenstra 1996, 1997, 2000; Baker 1997). From this approach comes the notion that a research interview has to be understood as a specific social context (defined and redefined during the interaction between interviewer and interviewee) within which answers are locally constructed. Answers should be analyzed as the product of a joint effort of interviewer and interviewee. Research interviews are thus viewed as an interesting research topic in their own right because they constitute a specific category of institutional talk that can be studied in itself.

This recognition of the discursive character of the empirical data produced in social research has far-reaching implications for the traditional

“logic in use” found in survey research, as well as in qualitative social research. Both strands of social research neglect and underestimate the effect of context, for example. Interviewees typically articulate opinions that do not necessarily correspond with those articulated in other conversational situations, such as in conversations with friends or neighbors and conversations in the workplace. This variability, which is such a problem for the instrumental view of interviewing, is grist to the mill for those who study interviews as discursive acts.

The research community in which interviews are viewed and used as a more-or-less reliable and valid research instrument, and the research community in which interviews are regarded as a research topic have up until now formed two different cultures. There has been very little debate between these research communities. Very often their positions are presented as incompatible and opposing alternatives. Nevertheless, there are initiatives oriented toward bridging the gap. There have been attempts to use the knowledge produced by research on interviews as social events for social research based on interviews as a method of data collection. Hammersley and Atkinson (1995) have developed an ethnographic approach, for example, with reflexivity as a cornerstone, that doesn’t fall into the trap of naturalism or positivism. This approach recognizes the ways in which the researcher is part of the social world he/she wants to investigate and the necessity of taking into account the role the researcher plays in producing the outcome of ethnographic research.

Reflections on the implications of the constructed character of interview data have produced profound insights into the interview as a social practice. In qualitative research, Holstein and Gubrium (1995) have advocated the concept of the “active interview” to underline their perspective on the research interview as a process in which both the interviewer and the interviewee play a creative role. Within the tradition of standardized survey interviews, authors like Schuman (1982) have argued for an approach in which reactivity is not viewed as a methodological problem but as an opportunity. It is not seen as something that needs to be solved in order to avoid a supposed “bias of measurement”; instead it is viewed as relevant information about the context dependency of an interviewee’s behavior. The common denominator here is the methodological conviction that social research should avoid the trap of decontextualizing the interviewee’s discourse, which is still characteristic of the “logic in use” of much mainstream qualitative and quantitative research. This methodological conviction stresses the importance of studying interview discourse as a social activity, thereby creating common ground to discuss the potential applications of discourse analysis to the interviewing practice of social research. One of the principal contributions of this book is

to further open up this possibility. The contributors have extended the systematic study of the research interview in ways that can only be helpful for researchers collecting data through this method.

### **The materials for analysis**

As noted earlier, an unusual and unique feature of the collaborative exercise underpinning this book is that every contributor was invited to analyze the same textual data. Every author received transcripts of three research interviews. These interviews had been re-transcribed in fine detail to make them suitable for as diverse a range of styles of analysis as possible. The interviews were part of a large-scale research project conducted by Margaret Wetherell in the mid-1980s on racism and race relations in New Zealand. (The project and the main findings are summarized in detail in Wetherell and Potter 1992.) Although racism and race relations was the main focus, the interviews covered other matters such as economic relations with Australia, and New Zealand's relation with Britain as the former colonial power still linked through the Commonwealth of Nations.

In line with the focus on racism and race relations, the interviews covered three main controversial issues in New Zealand in the 1980s. First, the events and protest around the South African (Springbok) rugby tours of New Zealand in the 1970s and early 1980s were targeted. These tours defined relations between New Zealand and the then apartheid government of South Africa and were a recent source of major social upheaval and civil disturbance. Second, the interviews focused on relations between the two main ethnic groups in New Zealand – the indigenous minority, the Maori people, and the majority group, white New Zealanders of European descent (frequently described as Pakeha New Zealanders). Specific themes here included the government's multicultural policy and emphasis on New Zealand as “one nation, one people,” and recent Maori campaigns over land rights, language issues, and affirmative action policies. Finally, the interviews usually also focused on immigration issues, in relation particularly to migrants from the Polynesian Islands. From a corpus of over eighty interviews, three of the “most memorable” interviews were selected for our contributors to examine. More detail on the interviewing strategy and approach can be found in the chapter from Margaret Wetherell that follows this introduction.

The choice of interviews on race relations for the collaborative exercise was not accidental. Open-ended interviews on sensitive and controversial topics such as prejudice, ethnocentrism, ethnic categorization, and stereotyping are difficult to interpret. These interviews very often produce



many ambiguous statements. Traditional (qualitative as well as quantitative) research on the fields of ethnicity, racism and nationalism, and gender and sexism has encountered severe difficulties in coping with the ambiguities and contradictions within interview discourse on these topics. The turn to discourse, in contrast, opens up ways of analyzing these ambiguities and contradictions in terms of the situational dependencies of discourse, giving full attention to the flexibility of accounting practices. For example, discourse analysis draws attention to the possibility that the interviewee may switch between different ways of framing the question topic, and may use different interpretative repertoires in answering questions about a topic considered to be controversial. Ambiguities may be due to changes in the way the interview situation, the relation between interviewer and interviewee, and the general research goal are framed during the course of the interview (Van den Berg 1996). The outcome of these framing activities can be crucial for the unfolding discourse between interviewer and interviewee and the strategies used by each. The analysis of such interviews is seldom straightforward in other words, and presented a considerable test or challenge to our contributors and their methodology.

The complete transcripts are included in the appendix. An important function of this appendix is to give readers the opportunity to “check” the interpretations developed by the authors and to facilitate the comparison of different approaches to discourse analysis. It is possible, for example, for the reader to reanalyze the fragments selected by the authors within the context of the transcribed interview as a whole and to compare the selected fragments with other parts of the interview. Note, however, that readers should seek permission (see details given in the appendix) before making any other use of the interview material.

### **The structure of the book**

In the first chapter, Margaret Wetherell sketches the broader background to the research interviews used in this exercise. She describes the general research aims of her project and the discourse analytic procedures used in analyzing the interviews. Attention is especially focused on the general methodological/theoretical aspects of the relationship between discourse and context. Following the discussion a few years ago in *Discourse and Society*, Wetherell outlines her approach, perhaps best described as “critical discursive social psychology” (Wetherell 1998; Schegloff 1997, 1998, 1999a, 1999b; Billig 1999a, 1999b).

In chapters 2 and 3, two further general theoretical/methodological positions are presented and illustrated by exemplary analysis of the selected

interviews. In chapter 2, a discursive psychological perspective strongly influenced by conversation analysis is outlined by Derek Edwards. Edwards takes a more fine-grained approach to discursive psychology and examines the ways in which the participants in the interviews constructed and used various versions of mind/world relationships. In chapter 3, David Lee presents a view from cognitive linguistics on how categorizations and agency are constructed in interview discourse. In chapter 4, the critical sociolinguist, Srikant Sarangi, approaches the interviews as a specific form of talk, which he characterizes as “hybrid.” He demonstrates that, in addition to the institutional frames normally guiding interviewer- and interviewee-role identities, other frames are used, such as professional frames and life-world frames.

Chapters 5 and 6 primarily focus on some of the specific devices used by the interviewees in presenting their accounts of race relations and ethnicity. In chapter 5, Charles Antaki analyzes the function of absurdity in interviewees’ discourse. Why did those interviewed produce such colorful descriptions at certain points of the interview? What functions does this “color” serve? In addition to the use of absurdity in expressing views, attention is also given to the use of caricature in descriptions of “others” and some of its possible effects. In chapter 6, Richard Buttny focuses on the use of “voice” in discourse on race. He examines the use of reported speech in constructing the (racialized) other as deficient and ascribing unreasonable political positions to this “other.”

Chapters 7, 8, and 9 take up further substantive aspects of the discourse, focusing on the (ethnic/racial) categorization and stereotyping (co)produced in the course of the interview. In chapter 7, Harry van den Berg analyzes different types of contradictions in interviewee’s discourse and looks at how these inconsistencies are constructed. In chapter 8, Maykel Verkuyten analyzes how the notion of happiness features in interviewees’ discourse and the ideological functions these constructions fulfill. His emphasis, as in Chapter 1, is on the interpretative or cultural resources participants draw upon to construct their versions of events. In Chapter 9, Titus Ensink illustrates the value of concepts taken from Goffman’s work. He explores the “footing” of the interview participants in particular and how they categorize themselves and the world they live in.

Following this emphasis on more substantive aspects, chapters 10, 11, and 12 turn back again to one of the main themes of this book: the characteristics of the interaction between interviewers and interviewees. These chapters focus on the role of the interviewer. In chapter 10, Tom Koole develops a fine-grained analysis of the tightrope walk interviewers take between conflicting interactional goals such as affiliation and detachment.

The analysis focuses on the different types of answer receipts used by the interviewer and their functions in relation to these broader goals. In chapter 11, Tony Hak focuses on interviewer laughter in the context of instances of racist talk produced by the interviewee. Why does the interviewer laugh at these points? What might it signify for the general process of interviewing? In the last chapter, Anita Pomerantz and Alan Zemel conclude the book through their examination of the ways in which perspectives and frameworks are constructed in interviewer's queries. They look at how adjustments are made when there are different perspectives between interviewer and interviewee and draw attention to the implications of their study for the practice of researchers who use the interview as an instrument or research tool.

Here then is a fascinating range of attempts to analyze the interview as a discursive practice. The chapters in this book showcase different styles of discourse analysis, and we believe that they offer considerable insight into the social situation of the interview.

## References

- Baker, C. 1997. Membership categorization and interview accounts. In *Qualitative research; Theory, method and practice*, edited by D. Silverman. London: Sage. 130–143.
- Billig, M. 1999a. Whose terms? Whose ordinariness? Rhetoric and ideology in conversation analysis. *Discourse and Society* 10, 4: 543–547.
- 1999b. Conversation analysis and the claims of naïvite. *Discourse and Society* 10, 4: 543–547.
- Brenner, M. 1981. Patterns of social structure in the research interview. In *Social method and social life*, edited by M. Brenner. New York: Academic Press. 115–158.
- Briggs, C. L. 1986. *Learning how to ask; a sociolinguistic appraisal of the role of the interview in social science research*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cicourel, A. V. 1964. *Method and measurement in sociology*. New York: Free Press.
- Gilbert, G. N. and Mulkey, M. 1984. *Opening Pandora's box: a sociological analysis of scientists' discourse*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hammersley, M. and Atkinson, P. 1995. *Ethnography; principles in practice*. London: Routledge.
- Heritage, J. and Greatbatch, D. 1991. On the institutional character of institutional talk: the case of news interviews. In *Talk and social structure*, edited by D. Boden and D. Zimmerman. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Holstein, J. A. and Gubrium, J. F. 1995. *The active interview*. London: Sage.
- Houtkoop-Steenstra, H. 1996. Probing behavior of interviewers in the standardized semi-open research interview. *Quality and Quantity* 30: 205–230.
1997. Being friendly in survey interviews. *Journal of Pragmatics* 28: 591–623.
2000. *Interaction and the standardized interview. The living questionnaire*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Kaplan, A. 1964. *The conduct of inquiry*. Scranton, PA: Chandler Publishing Company.
- Pomerantz, A. 1988. Offering a candidate answer: an information seeking strategy. *Communications Monographs* 55, December: 360–373.
- Rubin, H. J. and Rubin, I. S. 1995. *Qualitative interviewing; the art of hearing data*. London: Sage.
- Schegloff, E. A. 1997. Whose text? Whose context? *Discourse and Society* 8, 2: 165–188.
1998. Reply to Wetherell. *Discourse and Society* 9, 3: 413–416.
- 1999a. “Schegloff’s texts” as “Billig’s data”: a critical reply. *Discourse and Society* 10, 4: 558–571.
- 1999b. Naivete vs sophistication or discipline vs self-indulgence. *Discourse and Society* 10, 4: 577–582.
- Schuman, H. 1982. Artifacts are in the mind of the beholder. *American Sociologist* 17, 1: 21–28.
- Van den Berg, H. 1996. Frame analysis of open interviews on interethnic relations. *Bulletin de Methodologie Sociologique* 53: 5–32.
- Wetherell, M. 1998. Positioning and interpretative repertoires: Conversation analysis and post-structuralism in dialogue. *Discourse and Society* 9, 3: 387–412.
- Wetherell, M. and Potter, J. 1992. *Mapping the language of racism*. New York: Harvester Wheatsheaf.

# 1 Racism and the analysis of cultural resources in interviews

---

*Margaret Wetherell*

My goal in this chapter is to illustrate a style of discourse analysis focusing on the cultural resources constituting racist ideological practices. I am interested in the way people tell stories: how they organize their versions of events, and how they build identities for themselves and others as they speak. I am also interested in how powerful majority groups are constructed in discourse, how the members of those groups justify their position, and how they make sense of their history and current actions in relation to their constructions of disadvantaged minority groups. In more general terms, my focus is on what Rosie Braidotti has called “the traffic jam of meanings . . . which create that form of pollution known as common sense” (1994, 16). Meaning coagulates in a culture and becomes temporarily stuck or jammed. The study of ideological practices involves investigating what these sticking points look like and how they occur, along with the social and political consequences.

As noted in the Introduction, the chapters in this volume have a common focus: transcripts from three interviews that I conducted in the 1980s that form part of a larger corpus of over 80 interviews with white New Zealanders (Wetherell and Potter 1992). As I conducted these interviews, I have a different relationship to the data than the other contributors to this volume, who have come to the re-transcribed interviews fresh. I will return to the advantages and pitfalls of this “insider” knowledge in the last section of the chapter, but one difference is that in illustrating my approach to the analysis of discourse I can draw on the history of the project and the data corpus as a whole.

My approach to the analysis of interview transcripts and other textual material falls within the general rubric of discursive psychology (Billig 1987; Edwards 1997; Edwards and Potter 1992; Harré and Gillett 1994; Potter and Wetherell 1987; Wetherell and Potter 1992). Discursive psychology is a broad church, however (see Wetherell 2001a for a description). It encompasses work on psychological topics and issues influenced by conversation analysis and ethnomethodology, by the Bakhtin/Volosinov writings, by Wittgenstein’s language philosophy, and

by Foucault's notions of discourse, power and subjectivity, among other sources. Other chapters in this volume from discursive psychologists (see Edwards and Antaki) develop a finer-grained mode of analysis that is more attentive to the methodological prescriptions of conversation analysis. But just how attentive the analyst should be to these prescriptions is a matter of debate in the field (see Billig 1999a; Schegloff 1997, 1999a; Wetherell 1998). Like the approaches of Edwards and Antaki, my approach aims to focus on people's situated activities in talk, but I also try to locate the forms of making sense evident in talk within more global accounts of their place in the broader social and cultural context. To illustrate this approach, I will first describe in more detail the analytic assumptions and procedures behind this work. I will then outline a specimen analysis and go on to discuss some of the methodological and theoretical issues involved in combining in this way the study of "small discourse" (conversations in interviews) with conclusions about "big discourses."

### **Analytic assumptions**

What can be said about racism in a society like New Zealand from the analysis of interviews with members of the majority group white (Pakeha) New Zealanders? Conventionally, one might answer that such interviews can tell us about the cognitive states and the patterns of thought of those with racist attitudes. Such interviews might also provide us with descriptions about how things were in this society when the interviews were conducted. The political climate in New Zealand has shifted considerably since the 1980s, but perhaps the interviews might be informative nonetheless about the way things used to be, as people tell us about policy developments and discuss problem areas and points of dispute between the two main ethnic groups. These are reasonable expectations. Discourse analysis, however, explodes these comfortable assumptions of the social scientist, and particularly the social psychologist.

If they share little else, discourse analysts share their skepticism about simple reference or correspondence models of language: the notion that language neutrally describes a world of entities, whether those be external (policy developments, the state of play between groups) or internal (thoughts, attitudes, and mental states). It is argued that the state of play, policies, groups, identities, and subjectivities are instead constituted as they are formulated in discourse. The criteria for truth (what counts as correct description) are negotiated as humans make meaning within language games and epistemic regimes and, often, locally and indexically in interaction, rather than guaranteed by access to the independent properties of a single external reality.

Following this logic, racism is not first a state of mind and then a mode of description of others. It is a psychology (internal monologue/dialogues and modes of representing) that emerges in relation to public discourse and widely shared cultural resources. Similarly, inequality is not first a fact of nature and then a topic of talk. Discourse is intimately involved in the construction and maintenance of inequality. Inequality is constructed and maintained when enough discursive resources can be mobilized to make colonial practices of land acquisition, for instance, legal, natural, normal, and "the way we do things." Or, to give another example, when affirmative action policies are successfully opposed through the meritocratic reasoning that "everybody should be treated the same." Less easily for the analyst, the definition of racism becomes a discursive practice also. To say that a mode of representing is racist is to engage in an argument. It is to make an interpretation. These I think are useful arguments for social scientists to get involved in, but they are discursive acts nonetheless.

So in terms of these new formulations, characteristic of social scientific research after the "discursive turn," what can interviews tell us? I think they can tell us crucial things about a segment of a society's conversations with itself, about the ways in which the world is typically legitimated, organized, and justified. These are often efficacious forms of making sense, if simply because any policy is formed in relation to and has to take account of public opinion. Interviews tell us about the cultural resources people have available for telling their patch of the world. This is particularly so when the corpus of interviews is relatively large, there is a lot of homogeneity, and repetition and clear patterns emerge. Indeed, in the corpus of interviews from which the three studied in this volume were selected, the same kind of constructions were very frequently repeated. In this sense the social (the collective voices of culture) was not outside, but rather permeated the individual voices of the interview. The interview is a highly specific social production, but it also draws on routine and highly consensual (cultural/normative) resources that carry beyond the immediate local context, connecting local talk with discursive history. The speaker weaves the available threads and voices differently on different occasions. They are worked up as an appropriate and effective turn in a conversation according to what is going on, but speakers do not invent these resources each time. The argumentative fabric of society is continually shaping and transforming, but for recognizable periods it is the same kind of cloth. Such resources are both independent of local talk in a limited sense and need to be continually instantiated through that talk.

In effect, analysis proceeds through two related movements. One is the identification and analysis of pattern (cultural resources), while the other

is theorizing and explaining this pattern. And, in developing an explanation of the broader social organization of discourse, the analyst can draw on some familiar social scientific debates and concepts. Indeed, this kind of study of discursive practices was previously subsumed under studies of ideology and the history of ideas. The definition of ideology I have used, however, for my work is a particular one (see Wetherell and Potter 1992, chapter 3). It is a view of ideology as practical discursive action linked to power. This is a non-cognitive account (Billig et al. 1988). Ideology is not seen as defined through specific ideas or specific contents or through the categories or logic of thought. It is defined through a reading of the practical effects of the mobilization of discourse. This is also a view of ideology that does not contrast false beliefs with, for instance, scientific truth. Following Foucault (although he preferred not to use the term ideology), the interest is in how the effect of truth is created in discourse and in how certain discursive mobilizations become powerful – so powerful that they are the orthodoxy, almost entirely persuasive, beyond which we can barely think. To describe a piece of discourse as ideological, therefore, is an interpretative act; it is a claim about the power of talk and its effects. Not every piece of talk needs to be interpreted in this way.

### Accounts of social influence

I will try now to make this approach to analysis more concrete by introducing one example taken from the broader project. In the various analyses we conducted of our corpus of interviews, including the three that provide a common focus for this book (Potter and Wetherell 1988, 1989; Wetherell and Potter 1989, 1992), one theme was the ways in which our participants formulated various social processes. I am interested in how participants *talk about* society, rather than the veracity or validity of these accounts of society. Just as people often act as lay psychologists, they also often act as lay sociologists, and as lay social theorists. Here I am taking constructions of social life and social relations in the interviews as topics rather than as resources, following standard ethnomethodological procedure. How did people construct accounts of social processes, and why were these accounts organized in the ways they were? A particular interest was in formulations of *social influence* and *social conflict*. How did the Pakeha people interviewed make sense of Maori protest? How did they formulate the influence process? What interpretative resources did they use to present and package Maori protest movements? And then, from a broader ideological standpoint, how do those resources function to protect Pakeha interests and reflect the playing out of colonial history?

My units of analysis were patterns across the whole corpus of eighty or so interviews, rather than one interview or one section of an interview.



The general procedure was to extract material that I saw as relevant to a particular topic such as, for example, accounts or descriptions of protests and protestors. With a data file of this kind (say around sixty instances, each consisting of several turns of talk before a topic change would occur) I would then look for common and shared ways of making sense across those instances – the interpretative resources. Given the research aims, commonality or pervasiveness was an important criterion for validity. I was looking for not the novel or idiosyncratic, but the routine arguments and standard rhetoric.

To try and illustrate the analytic procedures in more detail, I want to focus now on three extracts, one from each of the three interviews used in this book. These extracts were all part of the same large original data file.

### Extract 1 (Appendix: New Zealand Interview 2: 257/258)

1. R: E:hm (0.2) I think this:- an' that's the biggest division (1.0) a:nd (0.4)  
a lot of the (.) racial (0.4) prejudice I-
3. I: [(Uh huh)]
4. R: I think is brought on you know by the Eva Rickards that a
5. I: Yes (0.4) [mm mhm]
6. R: [that stand up=I::'ve been out (.) time after time and played
7. golf at- at [[place name]]
8. I: [[place name]]
9. I: Yes yeah
10. R: And (0.2) eh playing on the golf course there I've played with Maori
11. I: Mm mhm
12. R: people and they said "Oh ya'know this the- this is the old burial- burial
13. ground,=Hi'ya Roger" ya'know an'
14. I: Yes
15. R: and'a ya'know "nobody minds you playing golf?" an' I'll say "No no no
16. (.) It's fi[ne]"
17. I: [Yes]
18. R: And it takes Eva Rickard to [c(h)ome down from somewhere else
19. I: [((laugh))]
20. I: Yeah
21. R: to ah to [stir the whole bloomin pot (1.0) [and ehm ya'know
22. I: [( )] [Mm mhm]
23. R: then the government gets in and'a
24. I: Yeah
25. R: buys the land (o:r well I don't know) they- they sorted it all
26. [out an given the- given them all a brand new ehm golf
27. I: [Yes]
28. R: course there an' [I haven't been down an' tried the new one
29. I: [((laughs)) yeah]
30. (1.0)
31. I: Yes
32. (0.2)

## Extract 2 (Appendix: New Zealand Interview 44: 297/298)

1. I: >One of the-< The other thing that (.) I'm interested is the (0.4)
2. multiculturalism and (0.6) what people think about sort of race
3. relations (0.4) scene. >Sort of-< There's been quite a change in that
4. over the six years I've been away, There's a much greater emphasis now
5. on ehm Maori culture and the use of the Maori language (1.0) an' so on.
6. (0.6) Do you think in general that's been (0.4) uh constructive or (1.4)
7. what do you feel about the way things are going (0.2) on that front?
8. (2.0)
9. R: I think they'll end up having Maori wars if they carry on
10. the way [they have I mean no it'll be a Pakeha war
11. I: [(laugh)]
12. I: Yes
13. R: U::hm (1.6) they're making New Zealand a racist cu- country uhm but
14. ya'know you usually feel (.) think that racism is uhm (1.4) putting th-
15. putting [(.) the darker people down
16. I: [Yes
17. R: [but really they're doing it (.) the other way around
18. I: [( )
19. I: A sort [of reverse [racism
20. R: [I feel [yes
21. I: Yeah
22. R: U::hm (1.4) everything (0.6) seems to be to help (0.2) the Maori people,
23. (1.0) a::nd ya'know (0.4) I think (1.4) at the moment sort of (0.6) the
24. Europeans are sort of (0.4) They're just sort of watching [and putting
25. I: [Yeah
26. R: up with it
27. I: Yeah
28. R: But (.) they'll only go so far
29. I: Right yeah
30. R: U::hm (1.0) tsk (1.0) ya'know we- we've got (.) Maori friends out he:re
31. uhm who we have into the house so yu- ya'know they're friends
32. (0.6)
33. R: U::hm (2.0) but when things happen an' they- they suddenly say "Oh
34. they're going to make (.) M- Maori language compulsory"
35. I: Yeah (.) yeah
36. R: U::hm (0.4) but that is an- antagonizing
37. I: Yeah
38. R: And- (1.4) the Maori friends that we::'ve got (1.0) they don't agree with it
39. I: Yes (.) yeah
40. R: U::hm (0.2) okay yu- you've got extremists th[ere too
41. I: [Mm mhm
42. R: the ones who feel that ya'know that everyone should learn it but u:hm
43. (2.0) I think the average Maori sort of perhaps is worried ↑too
44. I: Yeah So there's a sort of split in the Maori com[munity
45. R: [Yes
46. (0.6)
47. I: between the: yeah (.) yeah