TOWARDS A DISCURSIVE MODEL OF PERSONAL FAITH AND AN
EMPIRICAL STUDY OF CONVERSATIONAL ACHIEVEMENT

Caroline Shepherd

Heythrop College, London University

PhD THESIS

I confirm that the work presented in this thesis is my own

93,179 words

October 2011
The study explores personal faith at the level of conversational exchange and not reduced to or causally determined by personal intentionality or psychological orientation. It responds to Gergen (1985) and a social construction epistemology and to Day (1993) and the narrative turn that he suggests. It assumes a non-referential and social action function for language (Wittgenstein 1953). The study’s conceptual perspective is one of Discursive Psychology (Edwards and Potter, 1992) understanding faith as an account constructed by two people in dialogue, or talk-in-interaction. Its empirical study employs a Conversation Analysis informed Discourse Analysis as method but uses one-to-one unstructured interviews for the research sessions rather than mundane conversation often used in similar projects. Consequently, the analysis focuses on the long turns from one speaker (the research participant or interviewee) to identify patterns in the speech and to ask, ‘why does the speaker say this here?’ The study identifies passages of ‘story’ and ‘non-story’ in its research data and compares the structural/functional, social cognitive and discursive perspectives of narrative to discuss these. It concludes that these passages are action orientated to achieve shared knowledge and agreement and ultimately effect a faith attribution during the course of the talk. In contrast to classic and conversational attribution theory (Hilton, 1990, 1991, and Kelly, 1967), the study explores how speakers work-up their accounts so as to reach agreement of an appropriate faith attribution from within their own descriptions of it. The thesis discusses the various discursive resources, externalising devices and formulations available to participants for this achievement, including: doing being ordinary (Sacks, 1984); just X when Y (Wooffitt, 1992); reported speech (Clift,
2006); *out-there-ness* (Potter, 2004); *script formulations* (Edwards, 1994); and a *rhetoric-of-argumentation* (Antaki and Leudar 1990); *of-justification* (Billig, 2002); and *of-fact* (Latour, 1987 and Latour and Woolgar, 1986). The thesis notes how speakers achieve a faith attribution and make this psychologically relevant and available to them in the moment of speech. The thesis also considers interview as *topic* and notes the tensions arising from two different forms of talk *genre* - informal interview and friendly chat.

The thesis assesses the constructionist epistemology for the project and of the Discursive Psychology perspective and of the method used for its empirical study. It concludes that this is flexible and systematic and entirely appropriate for the methodological ‘kit-bag’ for the researcher in the psychology of religion. It suggests four themes this approach allows: the concepts of *responsiveness*, *openness to the other* and *plurality* in faith, and of the *behavioural opportunity* for change, in talk.
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Chapter 1

Psychological Perspectives in the study of Faith: The case for a Discursive and Constructionist view.

1.0 Introduction

The purpose of this thesis is to explore from a psychological perspective, personal religious or spiritual faith in adults and in particular the characteristics of different kinds of faith. What would such different faiths look like; how would we recognise these in ourselves and in others and warrant an attribution of them? Within academic psychology, the sub-discipline of psychology of religion addresses questions of this sort by locating them within an existing conceptual model from mainstream psychology to see how this might inform a perspective on religious faith and provide a framework for its study. The present thesis begins with a review of two such projects. Gordon Allport locates his discussion of immature and mature faith within the framework of extrinsic and intrinsic motivation of the personality. James Fowler grounds his Faith Development Theory (FDT) in Erik Eriksson’s socio-psychological model for the development of the psyche and on Kegan’s model of identity and self-development. Sections 1.1 and 1.2 below give a short overview of this research. The discussion of the present chapter then moves away from the realist models adopted in these studies, to discuss an alternative approach: James Day considers the narrative turn in the social sciences and explores a constructionist view of religious faith, locating it within the performative features of mundane speech. Section 1.4 below, reviews his paper, Speaking of Belief: Language, Performance, and Narrative in the Psychology of Religion (1993). This examines so-called grammars of belief and relational and functional
aspects of narrative behaviour. The conceptual perspective that embraces Day’s approach is *social construction*. To contextualise the discussion of his paper, Section 1.3 considers the social construction perspective as Kenneth Gergen discusses it in ‘*The Social Constructionist Movement in Modern Psychology*’ delivered to the American Psychological Association in 1985. His paper explains the key points of the social construction perspective, how it differs from a realist one and the implications of this for psychological research.

1.1 A review of Gordon Allport’s model for mature and immature faith operationalised as 'intrinsic' and 'extrinsic' religious motivation respectively.

1.1.1 The first of the two classical approaches summarised here is that of Gordon Allport’s understanding of religious maturity described in his book *The Individual and his Religion* (1950). In this work, Allport describes the meaning and purpose of religious faith as an integrating and generative process within all humanity. His distinction of mature versus immature religion began a positive and fruitful discussion of religion within psychology, which continues today, in some guise, at least 50 years on. At the time, the discussion of religious behaviour in psychology (where it occurred) was set against a backdrop of behaviourism, psychoanalysis (or depth psychology) and a humanistic perspective of human behaviour. Behaviourism describes a person’s response to early learning and social and parental conditioning. This view considers religious behaviour a response to the external interest of parents and peer or other referent groups, and is a learned, ritualistic behaviour. Alternatively, classical Freudian psychoanalysis reduces a person’s conscious, rational and religious behaviour to the dominion of unconscious urges and drives of biogenic origin that serve unconscious needs. Religious behaviour in this
context is neurotic action, which would wither away as a person comes to understand more about her own unconscious self. In contrast to these approaches, Allport saw the individual as proactive, reaching out into her environment in order to understand more about the world and herself. He uses words like striving and intention to describe a person’s active and purposeful efforts to relate to the exterior world. Allport stresses the idea of ‘agency’ - the individual’s conscious efforts to take responsibility for her actions. In contrast to psychoanalysis, he proposed an explanation of religious behaviour which, where it once may have had a biogenic origin, has developed onwards from this, becoming independent from the initial urges and growing to serve the individual’s psychogenic needs – that is, ones relating to spiritual needs and values. This he called ‘functional autonomy’. For Allport, a religious orientation had ‘propriate function’ - purposeful behaviour directed towards self-awareness. A mature religious sentiment, for Allport, was the supreme unifying philosophy for a person’s life, superior to any other principle or passion including the broadest possible scope of ideas comprehensible to man. He defined it as a ‘disposition, built up through experience, to respond favourably and in certain habitual ways, to conceptual objects and principles that the individual regards as of ultimate importance in his own life, and as having to do with what he regards as permanent or central in the nature of things’ (Allport, 1950 p.64). He characterised religious maturity in five ways. Firstly, it is ‘differentiated’, that is, rich, complex, personal and subtle. Secondly, it is ‘derivative yet dynamic’ - a motivating force in its own right having outgrown its organic origins of internal needs and drives. It is ‘consistently directive’ - able to transform character by the consistency of its moral values and its persistent steady influence to the personality. It is ‘comprehensive’, able to harmonise all the facts of science
- of the natural world, or of humanity - of emotions and values and of ‘man’s strange
propensity to seek his own perfection’ (p.78). Lastly, it is ‘integrative’ - it creates a
‘homogenous pattern’, like a tapestry with all the threads woven together in the right
manner. To fashion this integral pattern, writes Allport, ‘is the task of a lifetime - and more’
(p.79).

1.1.2 Allport described a mature religious sentiment as dynamic and purposeful towards a
superior goal, but an immature religious sentiment, by contrast, he saw as more fixed, rigid
in form, and limited in scope. It is the opposite of mature religion. It is early behaviour not
grown or developed past ways adequately described by contemporary theories of social
learning and psychoanalysis: ‘Instead of dealing with psychogenic values it serves ... a
wish fulfilling... function for the self-centred interest...it remains unreflective, failing to
provide a context of meaning in which the individual can locate himself... It is not really
unifying in its effect upon the personality...and even when fanatic in intensity, it is but
partially integrative of the personality’ (Allport, 1950 p.61-62). The 1950 work is more
descriptive of religious growth than explanation - it does not attempt to define or
demonstrate any underlying causal links, directing subsequent human behaviour.
Nevertheless, in this work, Allport describes his understanding of the meaning of spiritual
endeavour within the context of personality and motivation psychology, presumably from
his own experience. The level of interest that the book received and the huge amount of
subsequent research it generated reveals the importance of this work, not least, one
supposes, for Allport himself. As a psychologist, influenced by European humanist thought
and as a practising Christian, he would surely find the contemporary discussion of religious faith and behaviour, unsatisfying.

1.1.3 To operationalise the concepts of im/maturity described in the earlier work, Allport (1959) adopted the terms ‘extrinsic’ and ‘intrinsic’ orientation to the personality; that is, one that motivates a person towards external, means driven goals on the one hand, or to behaviour leading to generative and integrative growth of the personality on the other. These are, for some commentators (including the present author) a narrowing of the earlier concepts, which are much broader than the terms extrinsic and intrinsic orientation allow. This work and much of the subsequent research into mature or immature religion now took a somewhat different turn to the thrust of the earlier book. At the time, it was a noted empirical result that religion, far from fostering a tolerant, inclusive, and a flexible or a ‘love thy neighbour’ attitude, could show the reverse – exclusivity even cruelty, dogmatism and prejudice. For example, Abraham Franzblau (1934) found a negative relation between religious belief and honesty; Murray Ross (1950) reported that from those associated with the YMCA and who responded to a questionnaire, agnostics and atheists were more likely than the deeply religious to express willingness to help the needy and to support radical reform. Allport (1954) himself noted, ‘The role of religion is paradoxical. It makes prejudice and it unmakes prejudice.... Some people say the only cure for prejudice is more religion; some say the only cure is to abolish religion’ (p.444). If a religious orientation is a boon to the developing and maturing individual, offering the most unifying principle to an understanding of the self, why should religious behaviour be associated with any non-sociable attitude or behaviour? Yet this link is consistently found. For example, Ronald
Smith and his associates (1975) found that religious college students were no less likely to cheat in a multiple-choice questionnaire and no more likely to volunteer to help with mentally disabled children, than were non-religious students. Indeed, Middleton and Putney (1962) found a higher frequency of cheating with religious, over non-religious respondents. In another study, Ferguson (1944) found no relation between religiousness and ‘humanitarianism’ (as measured via a variety of scales) and in others, Kirkpatrick (1949) and DeFronzo (1972) found a negative one. In a laboratory experiment, Lawrence Annis (1976) found that none of his measures of religiousness could predict which of his subjects would help a ‘lady in distress’. Ralph McKenna (1976) found that when a supposedly stranded lady motorist claimed to have misdialled trying to get help, clergymen were no more willing than control subjects to put in a call to the emergency services for her. A raft of studies has repeatedly shown a link between religiousness as measured in a variety of ways, for example, church attendance, doctrinal orthodoxy, affiliation etc. and all kinds of negative attitudes, such as prejudice, ethnocentrism, dogmatism, racial intolerance (see Dittes 1969; Batson and Burris 1974; Gorsuch and Aleshire 1974; Gorsuch 1988; Batson et al. 1993; Hunsberger 1995). Finally, in a classic study of the authoritarian personality, Theodor Adorno and others (1950) noted that the conventionally religious - those disposed ‘to view religion as a means instead of an end’ (p.733) and to attend church to be classed with normal or even privileged people, show ethnocentric attitudes. By contrast, those that took religion ‘seriously’, for whom religion is ‘a system of more internalised, genuine experiences and values’ (p.310) are likely to oppose ethnocentrism. Could it be that antisocial attitudes are associated with Gordon Allport’s notion of an extrinsic religious orientation, that is, immature religion, stuck in a self-serving and utilitarian base; and that
the reported association of religion with anti-social behaviour relates only to a religious belief stuck in immaturity? Allport’s work offered a possible answer to the ‘anti-social religion’ conundrum.

1.1.4 Thus, the basis of Allport’s 1967 research with his colleague Michael Ross was to test the above assumption, by devising a scale of religious orientation, defined as extrinsic through to intrinsic, administered via a 21-point questionnaire. Feagin (1964) using an early version of this scale, found a correlation between southern USA Baptists and anti-black prejudice. However, with factor analysis, his results did not confirm Allport and Ross’s hypothesis that the religious orientation so measured was the two extremes of one dimension. Instead, he found two separate dimensions of extrinsic and intrinsic orientation. There have been many studies since, using a slightly amended Religious Orientation Scale (ROS) that have reported a statistical link between various forms of anti-social behaviour (as measured via the appropriate questionnaire) and an extrinsic religious orientation. For example - with prejudice, Brannon (1970); Hoge and Carroll (1973); Matlock (1973); Morris et al. (1989); Ponton and Gorsuch (1988) - with dogmatism, Strickland and Weddell (1972); Hoge and Carroll (1973); Thompson (1974); Kahoe and Dunn (1975) - with authoritarianism, Kahoe (1974, 1975) - with ethnocentrism, Dicker (1977). In contrast, Bernt (1989) found that a high score on the intrinsic scale correlated positively with volunteering to help others.

1.1.5 So it would appear that Allport had discovered something rather remarkable to do with human religious and social behaviour - firstly through his ideas expressed in 1950, and
then as he was able to measure these via his ROS questionnaire in 1967. Other researchers agreed with him. By 1985, researchers had used the ROS as a measure of human religious orientation in over 70 separate published research studies. M. J. Donahue (1985b: 400) remarked ‘no approach to religiousness has had greater impact on the empirical psychology of religion’. So too Daniel Helminiak (2006 p.199) in his critique of much psychology of religion as being ‘merely descriptive’, argued that the research on intrinsic and extrinsic religious orientation was ‘the richest vein... in the psychology of religion’. So why has Allport’s work received this level of interest? It offers an alternative understanding of religious faith, rooted in the personality. It purports to show different ways of being religious - an early and underdeveloped religion, giving way to a mature, internalised and integrated faith. Furthermore, Allport and Ross had operationalised these ideas into a remarkable methodological tool - the Religious Orientation Scale, which offered statistical and replicable measurement of an ideological belief. It offers a way to explore experimentally what a mature faith, as opposed to an immature or undeveloped one might look like in practice. It appears the obvious place to begin any study of developed, religious maturity.

1.1.6 Unfortunately, the ROS was fraught with empirical, psychometric and conceptual critique from the start. If the ROS were truly measuring an extrinsic versus intrinsic religious orientation, Allport, in his 1967 research, predicted they would show negative correlation. However, the evidence is overwhelmingly against this. Studies have consistently shown little or no correlation at all and high or low scores on one orientation have occurred with high and low on the other (e.g. Allport and Ross 1967). Factor and
content analysis particularly of the extrinsic scale, have shown multi-dimensionality to this scale, indicating two or more clusters of behaviour, not one (Kirkpatrick, 1989), and low inter-item correlation and cohesion (see King and Hunt 1972; Donahue, 1985a; Altemeyer 1988; Gorsuch and McPherson, 1989; Genia, 1993). In their review of these studies, Hoge and Carroll (1973) conclude: the extrinsic scale ‘...lacks a clear definition of what is being measured; we know only that it is not tapping extrinsic religious motivation’ (p 189). Other studies have thrown up an unexpected result for the intrinsic scale, for example David Bock (1973) in a repeat of Stanley Milgram’s famous electric shock study, found intrinsic, rather than extrinsically religious subjects, obeying the command to administer electric shocks (as they thought) to other participants in the study. A range of studies shows the intrinsic scale relating to closed, rigid or unquestioning thinking, for example, high intrinsic scores correlating positively with a tendency to see the world in terms of absolute or rigid categories (King and Hunt, 1979); correlating negatively with a measure of open-mindedness in pursuing religious questions (Kahoe, 1974); positively with some aspects of authoritarianism (Kahoe, 1997); and either positively associated with prejudice (Hoge and Carroll 1973) or neutral, rather than negatively correlated, as predicted (Donahue 1985b). The intrinsic scale does appear to measure (perhaps only too well) what has been called a master versus slave motif, that is, where a single passion predominates with all others subdued into submission; but is that the extent of a mature religious orientation? Allport did view a mature orientation one where religion controlled, integrated and unified all secondary drives and needs into one over-riding motivating force, only religion being able to offer the individual a view on every conceivable thing. However, in his original work, he wrote that a mature religious sentiment demands to keep ‘pace with the intake of relevant
experience’ (Allport, 1950, p. 59). Maturity in religion is characterised by growth and the capacity to consider, not reject, differences in others’ behaviour or opinions; it is complex, not single-faceted. Allport saw maturity as heuristic in character - where one maintains belief tentatively, not dogmatically, until, through its help, we can discover a more valid belief. Mature religious individuals could act whole-heartedly even (or particularly when) in the absence of certainty. In the light of considerable ROS research, the ‘using’ religion versus ‘living it’ distinction appears substantially to narrow Allport’s original immature/mature distinction, especially in regard to the intrinsic scale. Leak and Fish (1999) conclude: ‘We regret that Allport... eschewed some aspects of his earlier work on mature religion. [He] may have excised too much in his efforts to operationalise a complex, meaningful but elusive construct...’ (p.84-5). So, whilst the intrinsic scale may be a measure of a sincerely held and strong commitment to one’s religion, the present review concludes (in company with Leak and Fish and many others) that it fails conceptually and empirically as a measure of mature faith. Whatever else the ROS measures in its extrinsic and intrinsic scales, it is not the single dimension of religious immaturity moving through to maturity as described by Allport in his original work of 1950. However, the notion of plurality in faith and that we may hold beliefs and express them in different ways is pertinent; and the systematic study of different, yet sincerely held beliefs and of different yet coherent faith behaviour, remains as an objective of the present research.

1.2 A review of James Fowler’s Faith Development Theory (1981) and a structural model for the discussion of faith.

1.2.1 James Fowler’s Faith Development Theory (FDT) in 1981 offers a second approach to the question ‘what do we mean by religious or spiritual growth?’ Fowler’s approach
differs from Allport’s work in a number of ways. Allport viewed religious orientation as a motivating aspect of the personality. Fowler takes this further, defining religious growth as a discrete psychological process dependant on a complex of eight underlying intra-psychic dimensions. Thus, his model seeks to explain, faith development rather than (as was the case with research based on Gordon Allport’s work) looking to explain the different kinds of religious behaviour we may daily observe. His model is broad and detailed, based on a selective sweep of psychological and theological perspectives. Fowler’s work (1981) started with his reading of H. Richard Niebuhr, a Christian Protestant theologian, who understood faith as a human universal. Therefore, whilst the model must allow for some individual variation, the scope of FDT is to describe a basic human impulse and is universal in scope. Fowler takes a very broad definition of faith, but a more specific view of its development. Incorporated into the underlying structure of FDT, into the interpretative framework, is the work of Erik Erikson (1982) and his views on the developing person, affected both by psychogenic needs and by the socialising effects of culture and society; and of Robert Kegan’s model of self-development (1982). As Erikson did before him (see Erikson, 1950, 1982) Fowler basis his notion of development on the appearance of six stages or steps (Erikson has eight) in an invariant, hierarchical sequence. Each new stage arises out of the successful resolution of internal conflict and provides the individual with a new skill or strength working together in balance. These intra-psychic resources or strengths (Erikson called them virtues) are specific to each stage but, conversely, if the individual remains conflicted for any reason at any stage, then a corresponding danger or deficiency (or vice - Erikson) in the personality will develop instead. The strengths gained at each stage continue to inform and influence the individual as she continues further along
her developmental path. Fowler acknowledged the importance of Erikson’s work to his understanding of human development. It touched him, he wrote, ‘at convictional depths’ (Fowler 1981 p. 110).

1.2.2 Just as in Erikson’s model, personal identity matures through becoming complex, re-evaluating Self with Other and finally achieving integration of its diverse skills and world experiences, for Fowler, personal faith matures in a structurally similar way. In FDT, Fowler defines the developing faith as ‘knowing’ and as ‘relational’ (Reich 1992 p.159). Faith is knowing, because it is ‘our way of discerning and committing ourselves to centres of value and power that exert ordering force in our lives. Faith... grasps the ultimate conditions of our existence...’ (Fowler 1981 pp. 24-25, and see Paloutzian 1996 p.117). Faith is relational as revealed in the mutual binding of self to others, by the two-way loyalty of each to the other and by their joint loyalty to a ‘centre of superordinate value’.

Furthermore, Fowler defined a stage as, ‘typical patterns of construal that we have come to understand as deriving from systematically integrated operations of knowing, value and meaning construction’ (Fowler 1987 p.57). These two definitions - of faith and of a stage - reveal a second formative influence on Fowler’s model, that of the cognitive development work of Jean Piaget (e.g. 1983). However, logic development (as described by Piaget) is only one of eight dimensions Fowler believed to be at the root of faith development. The other seven dimensions are - role taking (Selman 1980); the development of moral judgement (Kohlberg, 1981); bounds of social awareness; locus of authority; form of world coherence; symbolic functioning and development of self-identity (Kegan, 1982). FDT is a model profoundly based on a cognitive input to faith, but is distinct from other cognitive
models in its inter-disciplinary approach and its inclusion of a selection of psychological research perspectives as the eight dimensions show. Consequently, FDT’s conceptual base is complex. The research variable - generic faith - is very broad, broader than, for example, ‘religious thinking’ (e.g. Goldman 1964), ‘the capacity for ethical judgement’ (e.g. Kohlberg 1969) or ‘the representation of the God image’ (e.g. Rizzuto 1991) although it contains an element of all these. Fowler includes all forms of faith, including non-religious faith and he describes faith generically, not in the language of a particular tradition. In FDT, faith follows one developmental path whether it is identifiably from one religion, or from none. FDT has been widely applied in practice, particularly by those interested in faith education and the teaching of religion to the young. However, Fowler’s work has suffered criticism concerning the model’s lack of empirical grounding, the lack of unequivocal replication studies and its conceptual base. What, for example, is the empirical evidence for six distinct stages - why not five or seven? Erikson’s model of the developing personality has eight stages and Abraham Maslow’s (1970) famous ‘hierarchy of needs’ has five. A-M Rizzuto (1979) another influential writer and clinician in this field, has a developmental model with ten stages. Unfortunately, Fowler’s own published results do not settle this point. His results do show clear stage progression, with age, for his stages 1 and 2 (‘intuitive projective’ faith and the ‘impulsive’ self at age approximately 3-7 years; and stage 2 -‘mythic-literal’ faith and the ‘imperial self’ at approximately 7-11yrs.) In his study, over 90% of 6 year olds and younger were at stage 1; and over 80% of 7-12 year olds were at stage 2 (Fowler 1981 p.320). However, the relationship with age and stage beyond this is very unclear: respondents from age 12 years and up were rather evenly distributed amongst

---

1 Maslow’s needs hierarchy is not a development sequence, rather it denotes a temporal sequence by which needs may be expressed.
stages 3-5, and (in the 1981 research) there was only one respondent allocated to stage six. Fowler’s data appear to support the idea of stage development in the young, when other aspects, notably cognitive capabilities are developing in a structured way; but not as the individual moves into adulthood. A review of the research literature caused Spilka and his colleagues to conclude, ‘The research literature is both unclear and contradictory regarding religion in middle and later life’ (Spilka, Hood, Jr., & Gorsuch 1985 p.111. See also Reich 1992 p.176).

1.2.3 The defining characteristic of FDT is its assumption of the invariant, sequential and hierarchical progression of the stages\(^2\). Each stage has characteristics appropriate to it with no systematic bearing to that of an earlier stage. Each stage informs the next in sequence and meaning resides in the context of the whole. A physical example is that of the oak tree - it is an acorn when tiny, a seedling when young, a sapling when adolescent, and a huge sturdy tree when several decades old. All oak trees grow from acorns and none of them misses out the sapling stage. Each stage develops out of the previous one and the stages progress in one direction only. Given certain environmental conditions - air, soil, nutrients and water, we can predict with complete accuracy, what the oak tree will be like at any given year of its life. In locating faith within the psyche in this way, Fowler specifically excludes the possibility that faith development is socially contingent (the assumption of cross-cultural universalism was a critique of Erikson’s original work). That is to say, whilst social factors may affect the way that a particular psyche unfolds for good or ill in a single subject, they do not allow any systematic variation from the staged development for any

\(^2\) Derived from its reference to the structuralism inherent in Piaget’s model of cognitive development in children. For a discussion of FDT’s dependency on Piaget’s structuralism see Heywood (2008) www.davidheywood.org
non species-specific reason. Just as all oak trees develop from acorns and move through a seedling stage before they can become mature oaks, so, in Fowler’s model, faith matures from the lower to the higher stages in developing human individuals. However, the evidence for universalism across gender, religion and culture in FDT’s stages is not empirically clear (for a full review of the literature see Shepherd 2006). Studies have shown some evidence for Fowler’s description of the contents of the relevant stage of the FDT model, but most conclude that there are further possible content and structural characteristics. For example, stage four might be not one stage but two - ‘young adult’ and ‘adult’ (Parks 1980, 1986). Alternatively, within stages three and four, there might be a range of types or styles of faith designated ‘disoriented’, ‘set’, ‘critical’, ‘idealistic’, ‘collapsed’ or ‘embraced’ (Mischey 1976). Again, the definition of faith might be broadened to include the unifying activity of the imagination (Parks as above). In a study of older subjects, Howlett (1989) researched the transition between stages five and six. The study concluded that there were further influences or triggers for the transition, namely, openness to spiritual experience, motivation to transcend, choice of teacher and a path, and the practice of detachment and solitude. Slee reviews the results between the FDT stages of faith and gender and concludes these to be ‘mixed’ (1996 p.82). Whilst many studies do support FDT’s prediction of no significant difference between the sexes, others have found (for example, Bradley, 1983; Bassett, 1985; White, 1985) that female subjects score at lower stages than do males. This has lead to a critique of FDT as containing a gender bias. Further, correlation studies have not shown the developing faith to be independent of a variety of other variables (as FDT would predict). For example, Snarey (1991) found some evidence for a relationship between religious affiliation and faith stage; and others that
those with an atheistic stance or with less strong affiliations to a religious group may score at higher stages (White 1985; Snarey 1991). However, Snarey did conclude from his study (of Jewish, non-theist kibbutz leaders) that ‘Fowler’s model ... is able to capture the thinking of persons whose religious orientation and background is quite different from those of his original sample’ (Snarey p. 310 quoted in Slee p. 88). Other studies have shown a relationship between socio-economic status or level of education and faith stage (Gorman 1977; Shulik 1979; Sweitzer 1984); and between the faith stage of the individual and her pattern of social interaction (for example Hunt 1978; Vanden Heuvel 1985). A further study of Furushima (1983) reviews the relationship of FDT across both culture and religion, specifically Hawaiian Buddhists. This concludes that whilst the study offers support to the notion of stages and for their content it also evidenced the strong, ‘structuring power of content and cultural context upon faith’ (quoted from Slee p.87). Furthermore, Furishma’s subjects could score at the highest level, level six, without, apparently, acquiring the orientation described at earlier levels. This finding queries the sequential nature of the stages.

1.2.4 There is clearly some uncertainty with the empirical grounding for the FDT model, particularly with the lack of unambiguous support for development in invariant, sequential and hierarchical stages. Additionally, the goal or purpose of the faith developmental sequence is obscure - how would we know when we had achieved this? For various religions, this could be self-actualisation; sanctification; resurrection after death; release from re-birth; or enlightenment. In Fowler’s published work, he identified very few subjects at his highest level. He describes this as ‘universalising faith - a transformed
relation to the environment, a de-centration from and emptying of self and an all consuming commitment to justice and to love’ and many adults were rated as not proceeding past stage three (out of six). This is very problematic - what is the meaning of a developmental step in a human maturational process where virtually no individual from the species attains full maturity? Finally, the language of the stages is inherently judgemental: early stages are ‘immature’, ‘lower’, applicable to ‘children’ and from which one must progress away. Later stages are ‘higher’, ‘upward’, ‘mature’ and appropriate to ‘adults’. Stasis is ‘stagnation’ and a level lower than that deemed appropriate for one’s age, ‘regression’. Yet faith can seem at its most pure in the mouth of babes and the Gospels adjure us to be childlike in faith.

1.2.5 This review of FDT leads to two questions: ‘If religion is grounded in intra-psychic organisation, must its development be sequential?’ Secondly, ‘what is the internal logic of psychic reality implied by this development? Addressing the question of sequential development, Ana-Maria Rizzuto agreed Fowler’s stages of faith development to be invariant, sequential and hierarchical ‘in principle’ (2001 p. 203). She bases her opinion not on ‘faith development as such but with development in general’. Stage progression is characteristic, she writes (with some individual variation) in all living creatures: one stage conditions the next and an in-built mechanism triggers this progress. Within the biological organism, the trigger for change is the enzymatic system; likewise, within intra-psychic and social human behaviour, including religious behaviour, the trigger mechanisms are, ‘concrete, psychic, social, interpersonal and historical events that facilitate, disturb, or interrupt a sequential development’. Religious behaviour may be dependent on many
factors, but all of these develop in a pattern of sequential and hierarchical progress. Thus it would appear that an organic (that is structural) model for maturing faith implies sequential, staged growth, invariant across the species for which, as far as FDT goes, there is no strong empirical evidence; and the term ‘development’ is a one-word paradigm that describes this progress within organic structures and psychological realities understood as such. In this case, the FDT’s structural approach to the understanding of maturity in religious faith is an obstacle when there appears little empirical evidence for its characteristically staged growth. Helmut Reich, writes: ‘...development in psychology implies a progressive maturation, an unfolding...a restructuring of the psyche and its organisation...the concept of development would seem applicable to religion only if religiousness is based on some psychological meaningful reality’ (Reich 1992 p. 148). Conceptually, the underlying psychic reality to the staged development of faith is both the trigger for change given certain circumstances and the content at each stage. According to Fowler, the stages of faith arise out of an amalgam of the FDT’s eight underlying dimensions and of these, Fowler asserts, it is that of self-identity that is the psychic trigger and the motivating mechanism for change. However, Reich points out that these ‘self stages are not convincing because there is no underlying psychic reality to them, unique to each stage’ (Reich 1992 p. 162). Can we understand Fowler as saying that the eight dimensions combine into a unified psychic reality? He implies this in his definition of a stage, given above. However, whilst this diversity adds depth and broadens the scope and appeal of the model considerably, it leads Helmut Reich to note that, ‘from a psychological perspective, it is conceptually not evident that the various dimensions all develop synchronistically’ (1991, p. 161). How might the eight dimensions meld together to create a unified psychological reality capable
of triggering the emergence of the next stage, each with an intra-psychic organisation
discriminably different from the previous one? Alternatively, does each dimension develop
in its own way to motivate religious change? If this is the case, and they each develop at
differing rates, then there must be a considerable element of interpretation in the scoring of
the interview transcripts, with a resultant softening to the proposed stages. In either way,
the case that progress in faith - behaviour and attitudes - originates as the observable
phenomenon of an underlying psychic reality of a number of dimensions specific to
religion, as described by the FDT, looks extremely problematic.

Conclusions

Despite the richness of insight of both James Fowler and Gordon Allport’s models, and of
their basis in a robust theoretical framework, as a model for faith both of these approaches
suffer conceptual and empirical difficulty. In the ROS studies, the empirically measured
intrinsic orientation is a significant diminution from Allport’s original mature faith. In
FDT, there are individual, gender and cultural outcomes, incompatible with the assumption
of universalism and its empirical basis is weak. In both cases, the relation of a
discriminable intra-psychic organisation with religious behaviours is particularly difficult.
It is not clear that the motivational orientation of the personality that the ROS purports to
measure, or the various stages of self-identity claimed by Fowler’s semi-structured
interviews, is one of religiosity or faith. With regard to FDT, David Heywood (2008) has
called for ‘paradigm shift’ in the thinking of maturation in faith and a new framework for
its study. What might such a framework for faith be, what insights might this offer and
could this deliver a research model for study?
In his paper, ‘Speaking of Belief: Language, Performance and Narrative in the Psychology of Religion, (1993), James Day locates faith, not within the intra-psychic environment but socially, within human interactivity specifically as performed in language. Faith, in this perspective is a phenomenon of culture and the medium in which it is situated is mundane human conversation. This is a radical departure from the two models reviewed above and has the potential to provide the alternative framework for faith for which Heywood calls. The conceptual perspective that embraces this approach is social construction, which describes how human social activity in language constructs ‘what passes for reality’ - that which we take to be real and true and in which human meaning making and understanding is contingent. This is the framework for Day’s study and to explore this epistemological perspective, Section 1.3 below, considers this as Kenneth Gergen discusses it, in ‘The Social Constructionist Movement in Modern Psychology’ delivered to the American Psychological Association in 1985. The review of Day’s paper follows in section 1.d.

1.3  A discussion of the social constructionist challenge to the psychology of religion for a social faith understood as an artefact of social exchange

1.3.1  This section discusses Gergen’s 1985 paper, The Social Constructionist Movement in Modern Psychology and takes this as the framework for a discussion of a social faith in Day’s paper and the present thesis. In his paper, Gergen discusses five foundational principles to social construction:
i) What does social constructionism (SC) tell us of the ‘facts’ behind people’s assertions of the real world and of themselves and their faith - how is it that people ‘know’ the truth of their assertions and why should we understand these as being objectively true? Firstly the SC view is that the ‘world as it is’ does not objectively determine our knowledge of it, nor warrant the assertions of knowledge that we may make. We do not come to understand the world by the putting up and testing of hypotheses or by independent observation, because the world does not contain static objects of truth, pre-existing our independent discovery of them. Facts neither speak for themselves nor become items of data that we possess. A strong constructionist view leads to radical doubt of the understanding and basis of all conventional knowledge. A softer view in the sociology of knowledge (such as that of Berger and Luckman, 1966) distinguishes between ‘common sense’ knowledge - that which passes as everyday knowledge, and certain other specialised knowledge domains, such as mathematics and other technically bounded disciplines. In principle, social constructionism questions the empirical positivism of modernist science as the (only) basis for knowledge claims, particularly for the ‘common sense’ assertions we make everyday. The debate from the 1950s expressed this as whether ‘scientists qua scientists add value’ (see for example Rudner 1953), and in the 1960s and since, that knowledge researchers corral their ‘facts’ into useful and appropriate paradigms (or stories) for their interpretation as much as explanation (Kuhn, 1962). Social construction asks us to make explicit the hidden assumptions present in knowledge claims and to suspend belief in a ‘taken for granted’ view of the world, particularly when dealing with the subjective truths of human identity and social behaviour. It is therefore less a model of the world than a conceptual
methodology and as such can provide a basis to explore questions of, ‘what do we mean by faith’ and ‘how would we know if it were maturing?’

ii) If knowledge claims are not made because of the world ‘as it is’, then how do we derive and warrant them? SC understands the world in terms of social artefacts, as historically situated exchanges between people. It is through the co-operative behaviour of social exchange that assertions to knowledge of these artefacts become possible. SC privileges the social over the individual; the whole span of culture, history, and the local community embrace personal interpreted experience: One is not alone in the subjective construction of knowledge. In this view, our assertions of the world and the behaviour that follows from them form in a layer of organisation and complexity above that of the individual agent. SC allows for the study of the historical and cultural bases of human behaviour of all kinds since it recognises the situated-ness of humanity. It does not therefore concentrate on an individual actor, motivated and guided by internal goals. It looks first to understand an individual’s behaviour as social and part of a community, either really present in any communal setting or vicariously so through a shared language, culture and history.

iii) A SC perspective recognises the role of ongoing social process in the maintenance of knowledge over time. Facts understood as static data, remain so and repeated observation of them upholds their validity. However, social construction holds that we do not give empirical validity to facts through observation or measurement alone, but in dialogue including conversation, negotiation, confrontation and rhetoric. We may uphold a
knowledge claim in the absence of empirical evidence, even, sometimes, in the teeth of apparent evidence to the contrary. SC asserts that we maintain or change our views of the world through relationships as they proceed and change over time. In this way, knowledge is located within social relationship. What then counts for truth - he who has power and voice through access to conversational platforms where he more than others is listened to? This is not the necessary conclusion of the social construction argument, but it is a comment on what we mean by knowledge, the processes whereby we acquire it and the validity of our knowledge claims. As its name describes, this is a social, not empirical, epistemology.

---

3 Complexity Theory
The following is a discussion of emergence theory as a parallel argument to some of the points addressed above: Put succinctly, this states that the ‘sum is greater than the parts’. Emergentism (which flourished in the first part of the last century and which grew from discussions within theoretical chemistry) notes that in complex organisations, phenomena emerge at particular layers of increasing complexity that are neither explained nor inferred by characteristics at the constituent level. An original example is that of the transparency of water, which, arguably, the properties of the hydrogen and oxygen molecule that constitute it do not predict. Another example is the gaseousness of hydrogen. A single atom of hydrogen is just that, but it acquires the property of gaseousness only collectively with other atoms. The argument continues into the phenomena the philosophers call ‘qualia’, why water, beyond the atomic level, ‘feels wet’, or why light, refracting through particles in the air around the curvature of the earth at sunset, looks beautiful. It seems impossible to analyse, that is, reduce to objective physical terms, the subjective character of these phenomena (see Nagel, 1974). There are three implications from this, relevant to the present study:

i) It is necessary to study complex phenomena at the layer where they emerge, that is, to follow a synthetic study in addition to an analytic one. If the human phenomenon of a claim to faith occurs at a social and dialogic level, then it is right to study it at that level.

ii) Emergent properties make causality between layers problematic; rather, we can say phenomena are epiphenomenal with constituent layers. If faith is epiphenomenal with intra-psyhic activity, then it is neither necessary nor sufficient to ‘explain’ it in terms of an a priori human intentionality (see also discussion in the Archive for the Psychology of Religion (31) 3, 2009 regarding different kinds of causality.) This links to a similar argument Gergen proposes in his reply to Day’s 1993 paper. Abandoning the assumption of cause and effect, he suggests, allows for alternative relationships - perhaps Y follows X not out of causal necessity but social convention, what he calls, ‘pragmatics-as-pattern’ (1993, p. 233-4). This enables a broader interpretation over and above that of causality, in the (faith) conversations between Day’s study participants, one that explores the unfolding relationship between speakers, as they speak.
iv) A further insight from social construction is its understanding of the relationship between knowledge assertions and behaviour. Forms of social knowledge inform activity of all kinds, including those of value and power in society. Individuals do not normally behave arbitrarily or unpredictably, but act appropriately concerning the knowledge they claim of the world and of themselves. Therefore, whilst individuals might certainly act according to inner needs, motivations or goals as they see them, social construction discusses individual’s actions linked to our understanding of the world and so to the categories that define us. When asked to describe ourselves, we might make a claim as to our working life - ‘I am a doctor or an academic’, for example; or our home life - ‘I am a mother or a carer’; or social or value status - ‘I am only a girl, or a victim, or ill or I am a Christian’. In each case, we would act appropriately to these self-ascribed identities. The claim from social construction is that the knowledge process and consequent behaviours involved in making these identity statements is rhetorical and dialectical. We first make a knowledge assertion within a social relationship, where we debate, nuance and maintain it. This may lead, naturally, to other behaviours and other assertions about the real world. Ultimately, we would see ourselves behaving in accordance with these facts, these ‘pieces of the world’ as we have received them. However, if we forget this link to a social origin or deny it, then this identity category may become reified and take on the form of objective
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iii) It is reductive to consider phenomena as ‘nothing but’ the properties of constituent layers, as in, ‘we are nothing but our genes’ if that analysis excludes the explanation of emergent properties at higher levels (see Poole 2007). On the other hand, the analysis of human social phenomena does not of itself entail its reduction to ‘nothing but’ these processes.

Emergence theory distinguishes between methodological, epistemological and ontological reduction. Methodological reductionism results in the knowledge, ‘how’ - how a thing works, how it is put together and this has lead to huge progress in technical, scientific and medical advancements of all kinds. However, emergence theory provides an argument to limit a reductionist chain that might otherwise lead to unacceptable or extreme outcomes and from methodological to ontological assertions of knowledge.
fact over which we apparently have no control or involvement. This distorts our understanding, leading to the notion of ‘false consciousness’, which impairs our development and impedes progress and change. It is because of this that many social and political groups, wishing to alter power and identity relationships in society, look first at ‘consciousness raising’ efforts to restore the taken for granted understanding to its social and interpersonal base.

v) The fifth basis of social construction, as set out in Gergen’s paper, is the non-representational understanding of language. This is a key point; both Wittgenstein (1953) and Vygotsky, (1962) before him, note that the use of mental predicates within language is convention bound. This rejects the sometime-called ‘common sense’ understanding of language, that in use, language points away from itself to other external and independent objects of reality. In the alternative view, language hardly ever, if at all, names things, be they material objects, logical or abstract truths, or our own inner thoughts or intentions. Language is not constitutive of reality, but through language, individuals engage with the world. In this view, an individual mind does not ‘originate’ meaning or ‘discover’ the real world, but meanings develop cooperatively in social exchange with others. Language takes its use from its appearance in relationships and not from internal, mental representations. Writers frequently refer to this view of language as ‘performative or functional’, but this can lead to an over emphasis on an individual actor as against the social milieu in which he lives (see discussion in Day’s paper below).
1.3.2 **Theoretical and practical implications of a constructionist perspective**

A clear conclusion of the SC perspective is the loss of objective knowledge. The claim of a social epistemology blurs the distinction between objective and subjective understanding and denies an external and independent validation for truth and knowledge. However, whilst SC critiques the process for gaining knowledge, it provides no clear alternative. It seems that SC cannot contribute to knowledge as conventionally defined; what it does provide, however, is an alternative definition. In social construction, reality is ‘that which passes for reality’ and knowledge becomes a process in which we engage rather than facts we possess. In particular, it distinguishes between the knowledge ‘how’ and the ‘what’ or the ‘why’. There is the view (see Gergen, 1985; Kvale, 1992) that psychology has a particular difficulty with this because of the nature of the discipline itself. Experimental psychology is a modernist project, basing its assertions of knowledge in the scientific method and aligning itself with the natural sciences. Its experimental methodology is designed to exclude or strip out the very subjectivities that psychology wishes to study. It is oriented towards an inherently exogenic view (Gergen, 1992) of knowledge, where truth statements are able in principle to map or mirror in an exact representation, the characteristics of an external, real world. This obscures a view of the world as cognised, that is, as an agent individually or socially, represents, understands, perceives and uses it.

This view is the domain of the contrasting endogenic perspective of knowledge, of phenomenology and of the first cognitive turn within psychology. However, as Gergen argues (1985), it is not the aim of social construction to replace an exogenic view of the world for an endogenic one, since this is neither desirable nor even possible. A wholly endogenic perspective must proceed inevitably into solipsism - an unacceptable position for...
(mostly) everyone; and in the hands of empirical psychology, an account of the cognitive processes assumed to underlie behaviour inevitably constructs as an exogenic account. What social construction seeks to do is firstly to point this dilemma out, and in light of this, critically examine knowledge assertions as they are made; and secondly, to attempt to overcome the dilemma by describing an alternative to empiricist epistemology and methodology. This approach mounts a fundamental critique to knowledge as mental representation both as thoughts and as embodied in spoken language. Instead, SC considers knowledge, not a possession of a single mind, but rather an activity that people do together. This is knowledge ‘to do’ something, to assume or to assert or ascribe, for example, and its study is the analysis of the words that individuals choose to speak of it. The object of such analysis is not therefore a description (or representation) of the characteristics and organisation of an interior psychological or mental state - in the present case an ascribed state of faith, but of the discourse and social activities relevant to its realisation.

1.4 A review of a social and linguistic model for faith and of a narrative methodology for its study, as discussed in Speaking of Belief: Language, Performance and Narrative in the Psychology of Religion (1993) - James Day

1.4.1 This section now reviews a constructionist approach to the study of faith in James Day’s 1993 paper. In this paper, Day explores ‘the performative features of religious language, especially grammars of belief’ and argues that ‘belief is best understood in terms of the words and other signs that people use to perform it’ (p.213). He presents the data from two conversations in which people spontaneously discuss their faith. Day sets out four propositions as the basis of his approach before reporting the conversational data. These are summarised below:
i) **Religious language, like all language, is as much performative as it is informative.**

Here Day expounds a non-representational view of language as principally discussed by J.L. Austin (1962) and L. Wittgenstein (1953) and others. Austin discusses that for a broad range of language (if not all) speech is not a description of things done but is the performance of the action in itself. If I say ‘I apologise’ I do not describe an act of apology, or an assumed internal state of regret, but I perform an apology - I am apologising to you. Indeed, if I do not actually say the words then I have not apologised at all. Wittgenstein discusses that words do not point away from themselves, at the real world assumed to lie beyond them, or at thoughts supposedly existing independently of and prior to these words, in mental processes. Day refers to Goffman (1959) who had stressed that the functions performed in language relate to various strategies, themselves social and inherently performative. In this way, the whole of what we do is enacted behaviour.

ii) **Language consists of sets of signs enacted to establish, maintain, shape and conclude relationships.**

Day bases his primary thesis on the post-structuralist proposition that language is fundamentally social, designed to promote relationships through social interaction. He writes, ‘language ...is interpersonally formulated and remains forever so constituted, has as its purpose the making and maintenance of place sufficient for continued conversation, without which the life of the speaker could not go on’ (p.215). This a precise statement of an extraordinarily radical view of language - that it is social in design and function and that conversation is foundational and prior to individual thought and reasoning carried on privately in our own heads. In this view, speech cannot reveal interior states, intentionality, personality and so on, but instead may tell us about the communities to which a speaker
belongs and how we ascribe or attribute to ourselves our understanding of the world, of others in it and of our own identities. Day’s phrase is particularly intriguing in its suggestion that the role of interpersonal language, of speaking with others, is to create and maintain ‘space’ in which individual life can flourish. This very insightful idea is potentially generative of a number of different implications of speech acts and of the faith expressed through them.

iii) To speak means both to be spoken into being and to transform what it is that being and speaking can mean. Both interlocution and appropriation mark our speech acts. With this statement, Day stresses that linguistic behaviour is *dialectical* - we both shape and are shaped by it. Language is a living process, organised, systematic and constantly changing. In this, linguistic behaviour is not fixed and static, but is the mechanism for change, growth and personal development. We use it as we would use a tool but it is more than a tool because in giving voice through language, we give voice, that is, identity, to ourselves. Again, this very provocative idea draws our attention away from assumptions and models about what may be happening intra-psychically and towards what is actually happening in the speech of our study subjects. The object of study is evidentially available for analysis, within the spoken words of the conversational data.

iv) The genre of narrative provides an intellectual and methodological opportunity for psychologists of religion

Like very many others researching and practicing across all branches of the social sciences, Day notes the extent that life (including religious life) is ‘storied’. We make-up and tell stories for all sorts of reasons and purposes: They provide *act forms* (Cupitt, 1991) through
which we may make a place for ourselves in the world, work out strategies for dealing with
the world and with others, imagine other possible worlds and situations, or explain, account
and warrant features of the world. We also tell stories for fun, to raise emotions of
sympathy, awe, fear, excitement and to resolve confusion (Harvey, 1981). Day notes (p.
218) Bruner (1986, 1990) observing that ‘narrative has been underestimated as a topic for
serious study by psychologists’ (however Day acknowledges those, such as Sarbin, who
have contributed in this domain). In his own work, Day (1991) has detailed the functioning
of a ‘moral audience’ - the salient others to whom one tells a story, and therefore observes
that ‘moral action [and so too] belief, because of its narrative components, is a function of
the audience to whom it is played’ (pp.218, 225). Day expands this point in the introduction
to his paper, stressing that social context is a determining factor in the interpretation of
conversation. Day (typically in this field, see Riessman, 2008) does not give a definition of
story (or narrative) however his purpose is both to suggest the narrative content of much
social and intra-psychic life and a suitable methodology for the analysis of linguistic data.

**Data interpretation**

1.4.2 Day reports two relatively short conversations with people discussing their religious
beliefs and behaviours in a natural setting. He does not provide the original speech but
reports this, from notes taken at the time of the conversations, which are, consequently,
‘once removed’, from the data, mediated by the intentionality of the author (an implication
of his methodology that Day acknowledges p. 226). He introduces his first set of data of a
conversation between himself and two friends returning home in a cab with, ‘the story
begins...’ (219) and he notes his friends’ speech writing it as direct ‘quotes’. He continues
later, ‘Because Will and I were friends, I asked if I could take notes’ (p. 220). Day presents the subsequent dialogue as direct speech presumably re-created from these notes. There is no mention of recorded data. For a second data set, Day writes that he ‘gathered material during conversations...’ (p.221) between a man and a woman who each wanted to discuss their faith with Day. He says, ‘I report from their responses to my question, “Could you tell me what belief does mean to you” ’. In both data sets, the noted speech is relatively short - a few minutes. Day describes himself as the ‘Interviewer’ in each case and the sessions appear as unstructured interviews.

1.4.3 The lack of original data for this study is of immediate concern. The reported interviews written up from memory, even if the original notes were extremely detailed, is not, as Day’s own epistemology tells him, the same thing as the original data. It begs the question what is the study data - his friends’ conversation or his own interpretation of them? With this point in doubt, from where does Day obtain the empirical warrant for his interpretation? In terms of the various methods for the analysis of discourse (discussed below), Day’s approach is a thematic Narrative Analysis (NA) the interpretation of content described as narratively structured. Day’s thesis is that his subjects’ stories reveal both what they mean by their faith and how this may inform their behaviour in relationship. However, without the original speech data, we cannot, with confidence, relate Day’s interpretation of the reported stories back to the speech as it was spoken and to understand it as located there, generated from and within these words, as Day’s conceptual framework suggests.
Day interprets the data with an assumption of agency. This together with two aspects of his treatment of language leads him to the critical realist conclusions he ultimately draws. The first of these is his concentration on language as performance and the second, the rhetorical consequences of this language use. Firstly then, Day tends to privilege (over other considerations) the speaker as ‘a purposeful performer’, that is, as an individual agent with desires, goals and intentions for outcomes in the speech. Day describes four functions of narrative: ‘imagining, explaining evaluating and accrediting’, which he associates with his speakers who use narrative as a convenient and effective tool with which to perform these activities, ‘it is ...plain that narrative is employed as an explanatory device’ (224), Day writes. The result of this perspective is that it is the speaker’s desired outcome, assumed as the goal of intra-psychic motivation rather than that of the activity of the speaking itself, that becomes the main concern of the analysis. The conversational setting, in this case, in contrast to the radical constructionist perspective outlined in the introduction to the paper, now becomes the context against which a single speaker tells his story, and achieves a desired goal. Thus, Day: ‘when one says, “Yes brother, I believe” one points...to what one wants to accomplish with that brother’ (p.214-5); and again, speakers may ‘violate with purpose...the rules of speech...in order to accomplish our desired ends’ (p.217); and thirdly, ‘it is not that we sometimes speak to convince but that we always do’ (p.227). This approach leads Day towards a position (as Gergen notes in his response to this paper, 1993 p. 233) where although beliefs are assumed to have no mental referents within an individual psyche, wants, intentions and desires seemingly do, and there is the danger that it is to these wants, that faith is ultimately reduced. If Day is suggesting an intra-psychic motivational origin for faith, this diminishes
the scope and influence of what it means both for language in general and for religious
language in particular. It appears to describe a conversationalist as an ‘autonomous actor ...
a con artist or huckster attempting to use, convince or manipulate others for private
purposes’ (Gergen’s critique p. 233). Faith becomes the performances of saying and
signing, of efforts to persuade...’ (p.225). If this implies strategic behaviour for personal
psychological profit, then whatever else this may be, this is as narrow a view of faith as
Allport’s extrinsic faith discussed above. The second aspect of Day’s analysis is his own
language rhetoric, such as ‘performances of saying and signing’ quoted above and that
‘language consists of a set of signs...’ (proposition ii) above). To describe language as
‘signing’ appears to give it a referential function, signing or pointing away from itself, like
a milepost to some other aspect of the world, which is the important, essential, or real
determinant of the linguistic performance. In Day’s analysis, this appears to point ‘the
spoken-of faith’ to the psychological referents discussed above. Additionally, when
discussing the implications of understanding one’s faith lived in social relationships in
language, Day notes, ‘to recognise one’s belief as a pose...while pledging loyalty to the
supposedly ultimate truths it embodies could be difficult to reconcile’ (p.218-9). The terms
‘pose’ and ‘reconcile’ suggest a gloss or a take on real life, like a role that an actor may
take on over and above his real identity beneath. This, suggests Day, would cause believers
(of superordinate Truth) to feel tension. In the first of Day’s presented dialogues (p.220)
one speaker (Will) does have to justify his personal faith in the light of his friend’s (Nate)
more orthodox view of what religion ‘means’. However, in the conversation as presented,
there appears no evidence that Will suffers tension because of this; he seems entirely
comfortable with his faith. If anything, it is his friend who ‘frowns’. Here in lies the
problem inherent in a socially constructed faith expressed as a ‘pose’, as an orientation away from something else, more meaningful or truthful either because the ‘something else’ is ultimate truth to which one aspires, but does not achieve, or because it is an intentional, psychological state, which potentially reduces religious faith to a psychologism.

1.4.5 Sebastian Murken, a second respondent to Day’s paper queries Day’s claim that the performative function of language is unique. It seems, to Murken, that when Day’s conversationalists speak the words ‘I believe’ this could indeed reference an element of the mental apparatus - ‘a feeling, an image, a memory, a sense of knowing, all referring to some kind of transcendence’ (p. 238). It is not that spoken words reference an interior state that troubles Murken, but the kind of state that Day claims for it - one of persuading and influencing for one’s own motives. Murken suggests other candidates for the interior referent for faith, including exploring the relational aspects of a person’s religious life, as Day stresses, through the application of object-relations theory\(^4\), as an alternative. Thus while both respondents to Day’s paper welcome the narrative turn of his approach, Murken suggests alternative interior states as the psychological referent of the narrated faith, however Gergen queries the necessity to reduce the ‘spoken-of-faith’ to an interior state at all.

1.5 Conclusions

The review of the structural models for faith that Allport and Fowler adopt, discussed in sections 1.1 and 1.2 above, concludes that the reduction or association of religious faith to a

\(^4\) Today, he might have included the extensive work by Kirkpatrick (2004) and others relating faith to an attachment system as part of an evolutionary theory for religious faith, which likewise addresses inter-relational aspects.
discriminable, intentional, or intra-psychic state remains problematic on both conceptual and empirical grounds. James Day’s narrative analysis is an alternative approach - a paradigm shift - from these realist models. It considers faith located entirely at a social and linguistic level, realised in discourse and in human social relationships. Section 1.3 above discusses the social constructionist perspective that informs this approach and notes the serious engagement it makes with the non-representational view of language and with the ‘linguistic turn’ in the social sciences. To follow such an approach in an empirical study of faith is to take up the challenge that Gergen makes to psychology of religion to realise constructionist epistemology in its study methods. Here lies a significant problem, one that, the present author suggests, Day’s paper does not satisfactorily resolve. Day’s paper begs the questions - ‘what methodologies are available to explore faith on non-realist terms?’, ‘what constitutes linguistic ‘data’?’, and, ‘what is the systematic analysis that would do justice to them and with the rigour demanded for academic study?’ The present study is an attempt at this project. It follows the radical constructionist perspective with which James Day opens his paper, and emphasises dialogue, rather than individual speech. The immediate objective is to find a research method that includes a robust examination of the linguistic data of conversational exchange and one with rather more rigour than that of Day’s study. This is not a trivial task for two reasons. Firstly, it is not obvious what kind of methodology is appropriate at all for a constructionist epistemology; and secondly, there is a variety of analytic methods for the study of oral speech, each with its own conceptual framework of assumptions and presuppositions. Nevertheless, this is the object of the present research - to explore faith as an account, socially constructed by two people in dialogue and locating its analytical observations in empirical study.
In his paper, James Day emphasises the ‘significance of speech as the thing of which believing consists’ and argues for a ‘narrative’ treatment (p. 227) for its study. He asserts that narrative is ‘essential to talk of belief’ and stresses the ‘consequences [of this approach] for the discipline [of psychology of religion]’ (p. 226). His final words are ‘I look forward to the next instalment’ (p. 227). The present study is an attempt to do this.

Chapter 2 presents a typology of qualitative research methodologies appropriate to a non-realist perspective and reviews a number of analytic methods appropriate for the study of oral speech. It explains the perspective adopted by the present study - that of discursive psychology (Edwards and Potter 1992b), together with the study aim’s, objectives and specific research questions.
Chapter 2

Methodological Frameworks for the non-realist Analysis of Spoken Discourse

2.0 Introduction

Chapter 1 reviewed four research papers and programmes from the psychology of religion and noted:

- the plurality of faith - that there may be different kinds of sincerely held beliefs (from Allport);
- the emphasis on faith development - or transformation, movement or change (from Fowler);
- Kenneth Gergen’s proposal of social construction (SC) for social psychology (and by extension psychology of religion) on its own merits and as a critique of positivism; and
- James Day’s emphasis on the linguistic turn in psychology, a non-representational and functional view of language and a narrative methodology.

Allport and Fowler’s programmes and Day’s paper, have received critique of the relationship between the proposed intra-psychic environment for faith and its spoken-of ‘expression’; and also of their various empirical approaches. This poses a challenge to find the methodological framework appropriate for the empirical exploration of the faith issues these scholars discuss: How does one operationalise the concept of a plural faith? What methodology combines the exo- and endogenic (the external/internal or object/subjective) perspective as Gergen suggests? How does one analyse data restricted to the social sphere, without a relationship to prior intra-psychic motivation; and what does this data represent?
James Day recommends a narrative approach to the study of discourse, but does not detail the methodological framework for such an approach. To address these issues, the present chapter discusses the various kinds of qualitative research approaches that might satisfy the kind of constructionist research Day and Gergen suggest. Firstly, it offers a typological framework for qualitative methodologies appropriate to a non-realist epistemology and the research interest of transformation or change and variability in faith. Secondly, it gives an overview of three different analytic approaches to the empirical study of spoken discourse. Finally, it describes the perspective adopted by the present study - one of discursive psychology (DP). Chapter 3 specifies the research questions and details the method, procedures and the selection of research participants, for the present study with this perspective.

2.1 Qualitative research methods

2.1.1 David Silverman (2001) opens a chapter in his book on qualitative research methods with the quip,

‘Since the 1960s a story has got about that no good sociologist should dirty their hands with numbers’ (p.11).

Silverman goes onto observe that ‘the story has been better on critique than on the development of positive, [qualitative] strategies’. There is significant discussion in the academic literature on the range, value and empirical warrant of qualitative methods, placing these in a contrast with quantitative methods. Researchers express a variety of reasons for preferring qualitative methods to quantitative, often citing a desire for rich, meaningful data, not stripped of the contextual or individual features that convey meaning, as non-parametrical statistical evaluation or other positivistic research measurement
methods require. Table 1 below is a typological framework and is informed by Roulston: *Considering quality in qualitative interviewing*, Qualitative Research (QR) vol. 10 no. 2 April 2010, which explores the qualitative/quantitative divide in research interviewing. Roulston notes, that in constructing such a typology there is the risk of ‘over-simplifying complex ideas’ (p. 203) however, the purpose of the framework given below is to bring various qualitative methodologies together with the epistemological assumptions on which they rely and the practical issues that result. Roulston further notes that a tabular form suggests clear demarcations between the different approaches she lists but which she has found in her reading of the literature not to be the case. Thus Table 1 systematises certain theoretical and methodological conceptions which cohere together in logical groups in qualitative research, but is not intended to be prescriptive. Five different epistemologies are offered with appropriate methodologies as being of potential relevance to the present study. These are: *neo-positivist/empiricist* (used as a comparator); *romantic/emotional; constructionist; postmodern; transformative*5:

---

5 Roulston’s paper includes a sixth perspective - *decolonization*, not included here.
2.1.2

Table 1 - Qualitative methodologies

Table 1a Neo-positivist, Empiricist, or Realist approach

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perspective/Research question</th>
<th>Theoretical assumptions</th>
<th>Methodological issues</th>
<th>Critiques of this approach</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neo-positivist/Empiricist/Realist (Alvesson 2003)</td>
<td>-IE is able to access interior and exterior states and describe these accurately in language, which is representative or descriptive of objective reality, <em>the real world.</em></td>
<td>-IR takes neutral role in I/V; does not express an opinion or take a stance.</td>
<td>-IE’s language may not describe ‘accurately’; IEs may lie, mislead, or forget: ‘memory is notoriously fallible’.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-IR and IE share <em>consensual cognition</em> - a common understanding of the research topic and of the questions.</td>
<td>-IR minimizes <em>bias</em> or influence via <em>open</em> and <em>non-leading</em> questions.</td>
<td>-The IR may bias the data through the sequencing and formulation of the questions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Contextual influences on the generated data are controllable through experimental design.</td>
<td>-IR asks <em>good</em>, questions, that is, those that generate <em>valid</em> and <em>reliable</em> data, in reply.</td>
<td>-Ignores role of IR in co-construction of data and the non-representational or functional view of language.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-It is possible in principle to minimize influencing IEs’ answers to research questions and so create an unproblematic S-R experimental design.</td>
<td>-IR relies on research I/Ving <em>skills.</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The neo-positive approach is the classic approach of modernist psychological study. It typically does not address the ‘linguistic turn’ in the human sciences and does not focus on the constructing role of the researcher or the functional purposes of language. It adopts a realist understanding of psychological phenomena. Its qualitative methods include social

---

6 In all of the tables, the following abbreviations are used, IE = interviewee; IR= interviewer; IV = interview; Rr = researcher.
7 Cited in Roulston p. 205.
surveying via questionnaire and the research interview, which may be formal and pre-tested through to relatively unstructured and open. Both Allport and Fowler’s Faith Development Theory (FDT) research, discussed in section 1.2 in Chapter 1, is located in this area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perspective/Research question</th>
<th>Theoretical assumptions</th>
<th>Methodological issues</th>
<th>Criticisms of this approach for the I/V</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Romantic (Alvesson 2003(^8)) or Emotional (Silverman 2001(^3))</td>
<td>-IE is able to filter contextual and other variables to access interior and exterior states and describe these in language.</td>
<td>-IR must develop genuine rapport demonstrated by a trusting and caring relationship with IE.</td>
<td>-Conversational technique hides asymmetry of power of IR-IE relationship within I/V structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are respondents’ beliefs, opinions, attitudes or experiences with respect to the research topic?</td>
<td>-Despite contextual and other influences, IR obtains detailed understanding of IE’s perspective of the research topic and of the research questions. The IR ‘gets under the skin’ of the IE.</td>
<td>-IR responds to IE’s answers, is ‘open and honest’.</td>
<td>-Friendly conversation may elicit confessional detail from the IE not relevant to the research topic and which could be used inappropriately by Rr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-IR asks ‘good’ questions, that is, those that generate self-disclosure from both IR and IE.</td>
<td>-IR relies on conversational I/Ving technique, is ‘perceptive’ has ‘good listening skills’.</td>
<td>-It may not be possible to access the IE’s supposed ‘inner authentic self’, as assumed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Day’s critical realist stance might put him in this area. His focus on the functionality, rather than the action of talk, and on J. L. Austin (How to do Things with Words, 1975) and to Speech Act Theory links the performance in speech to prior intentionality of the speaker. This may view discursive practices as a ‘disturbance’ or ‘filter’ through which a researcher

\(^8\) Cited in Roulston pp. 208, 217.
has to get past in order to observe psychological phenomena lying beneath. It addresses the language turn from the perspective of a single speaker (or research respondent) and whilst recognising its role and importance, it may underplay the interactivity of dialogue and so the constructing role of the researcher in the research interview. Methodology based in this perspective may struggle to show *evidentially*, that the researcher has ‘got under the skin’ of her respondent and that the researcher’s interpretation of events is that of the interviewee. This gives rise to an ethical concern of the imposition of the researcher’s interpretation onto the interview and of the potential use to which this interpretation is subsequently made.
Table 1c Constructionist or non-Realist (Relativist) Approach

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perspective/Research question</th>
<th>Theoretical assumptions</th>
<th>Methodological issues</th>
<th>Criticisms of this approach for the I/V</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Constructionist</strong> (Silverman 2001)</td>
<td>- Both IE and IR construct I/V data. I/V an ‘interactional object’.</td>
<td>- Very detailed audio/video transcription of I/V for close examination of features used in construction.</td>
<td>- Analytic focus too narrow.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- How are I/V accounts organised and constructed?</td>
<td>- This data represents a situated account of the research topic and do not provide a means of accessing interior or exterior states, or participants’ ‘authentic inner selves’.</td>
<td>- ‘How’ data are constructed becomes the research focus, which informs analysis of ‘what’ is discussed.</td>
<td>- Analytic findings ‘trivial’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- What conversational resources are available and used to account for research topic?</td>
<td>- Accepts a non-representational or non-descriptive view of language (the linguistic turn).</td>
<td>- Analysis of action performed in speech, including accounting for cultural knowledge.</td>
<td>- Difficulty of reconciling the ‘how’ of construction with the ‘what’ of the research topic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- What are participants (IR as well as IE) achieving in the I/V using these resources?</td>
<td>- Functional analysis of data includes construction of sense, personal narratives, or different ways of considering the topic -‘culture in action’.</td>
<td>- IR and IE rely on ordinary conversational skills.</td>
<td>- What does the data represent?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Focus on detailed transcription may lead to a ‘positivist’ research position and a ‘full’ and ‘final’ representation of the data.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Constructionism does not deny the intra-psychic self, rather the assumption that an interviewee’s words directly reveal, or represent it. The research question therefore changes to one of how interviewees use words to achieve objectives in speech and thereby, potentially, psychological phenomena, rather than the what of the supposedly real phenomena expressed by them. How interviewees reply informs the researcher’s
understanding of the ‘what’ of her study, which is situated in the conversation where it is discussed. For example, the researcher may study how the speakers orientate themselves to *categories* inherent to the research topic or implied by the research questions. This exposes the participants’ understanding of the interview topic, including shared cultural beliefs and normative expectations underlying it. However, the relationship of the ‘what’ to the ‘how’ in this approach remains difficult - in Day’s interviews for example, are the conversationalists talking ‘about their faith’, or constructing ‘a faith identity’ or building an argument about faith with which they hope to ‘convince’ their collocutor; or are they doing something else appropriate to their interactivity in speech and entirely unconnected to a faith (objectively conceived)?

Table 1d below shows ‘data’ with *ironising* marks throughout as there are multiple meanings for what these data represent and mean. Whilst Gergen’s 1988 paper talks of social constructionism, in other places particularly in *The Saturated Self* (1991) the postmodernist position as described in Table 1d might equally well describe his approach. This embraces the notion of multiple selves and fluid and unfinished subject positions that demonstrate great variability in the attempt to capture and observe them. Gergen may be comfortable here epistemologically (or rather, he is uncomfortable!) but the methodological issues of this approach are considerable. The methodology consists of multiple approaches to empirical study, each informing an aspect of the phenomenon under review and which are reconciled only into multiple, fluid and changing positions:

<p>| Table 1d | Data with ironising marks throughout as there are multiple meanings for what these data represent and mean. Whilst Gergen’s 1988 paper talks of social constructionism, in other places particularly in <em>The Saturated Self</em> (1991) the postmodernist position as described in Table 1d might equally well describe his approach. This embraces the notion of multiple selves and fluid and unfinished subject positions that demonstrate great variability in the attempt to capture and observe them. Gergen may be comfortable here epistemologically (or rather, he is uncomfortable!) but the methodological issues of this approach are considerable. The methodology consists of multiple approaches to empirical study, each informing an aspect of the phenomenon under review and which are reconciled only into multiple, fluid and changing positions. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perspective/Research question</th>
<th>Theoretical assumptions</th>
<th>Methodological issues</th>
<th>Criticisms of this approach for the I/V</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Postmodern</strong> (Fontana and Prokos, 2007⁹)</td>
<td>-I/V ‘data’ are situated performances of selves co-constructed by IE and IR together. -‘Data’ represents partial and fragmented aspects of non-unified selves. -Both IE and IR’s part in I/V are subject to analysis and representation. May draw on critical and autoethnographic work.</td>
<td>-Adopts non-representational view of language and research I/Vs cannot fully represent and categorize ‘data’. -Reliance on multiple I/V approaches including conversational, semi-structured, open-ended, life-history, online and interactive I/V techniques. -Creative analysis including fiction, drama, art and poetry may be used to represent ‘data’.</td>
<td>-Approach is not evidenced-based, replicable, objective or generalizable. -Results in ‘narcissistic’ and subjective reports. -Impossibility of achieving consensus as to what results mean.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1e below has a focus on transformation. In the present study it might address a research question framed as, ‘how might change in faith be managed through dialogue’, or ‘how might the interviewer and the interviewee together engineer a particular response to faith’; or to challenge and provoke a change in the interviewee’s (and the interviewer’s) attitude or faith behaviour. Meaning and interpretation of the ‘data’ might be particularly problematic in this area if the researcher’s view is inappropriately imposed, leading to issues with the validity of research claims and to ethical concerns, particularly in a therapeutic context:

⁹ Cited in Roulston pp. 210, 219.
### Table 1e Transformative approach

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perspective/Research question</th>
<th>Theoretical assumptions</th>
<th>Methodological issues</th>
<th>Criticisms of this approach for the I/V</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transformative</strong> (Wogemuth and Donohue 2006&lt;sup&gt;10&lt;/sup&gt;)</td>
<td>- The IR intentionally aims to challenge or change the IE’s understandings of research topic/daily life.</td>
<td>- IR and IE may work collaboratively in design and conduct of research.</td>
<td>- If differences of view reveal underlying power asymmetries, the IE’s perspective may be ignored or resolved in Rr’s favour, as, e.g. ‘false consciousness’ on IE’s part.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- How might IR and IE challenge their beliefs and assumptions about the research topic: an 'inquiry of discomfort'?</td>
<td>- Research has emancipatory or social justice aims as well as to generate research data.</td>
<td>- IR ‘dialogues’ with IE to develop transformed or enlightened understandings.</td>
<td>- Difference between therapeutic or research I/V blurred.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- How do participants engage critically and reflectively about aspects of their daily lives?</td>
<td>- Two strands: <em>Therapeutic</em>: focus on healing the ‘patient’ <em>Critical</em>: focuses on transformative dialogue.</td>
<td>- Interpretation of ‘data’ produces critical readings of cultural discourses that challenge normative discourses</td>
<td>- Is authentic transformation evidentially confirmed?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Conclusions from Table 1

The conclusions from this table are, firstly, to note the direct relationship between the epistemological basis and theoretical assumptions underlying a research study and the methodological framework used for its exploration and discussion. The variety of method(s) chosen to inform the research question and gather data is an extension of this relationship. This is not one-to-one, some methods overlap across methodologies and perspectives; the research interview, for example, is ubiquitous in social science research across all disciplines and topics (see Potter and Hepburn 2005, p. 3) and theoretical

---

<sup>10</sup> Cited in Roulston pp. 211, 220.
assumptions overlap, particularly in the real/relative dimension. The task is to find a ‘best fit’ through the various positions appropriate to the research in hand. Secondly, the different methodological perspectives constrain the research question it is possible for that perspective to address and thereby the kind of critique appropriate of its conclusions. A constructionist study does not address the ‘what’ of its phenomena of study in the manner of a positivist or critical realist study. Therefore, a critique originating from a realist theoretical position would not be coherent on this basis alone. Thirdly, the theoretical basis assumed in a particular study informs the practical issues the study methods must address (and those which they can ignore) for the research conclusions to be valid. For example, research to study the effects of different intervening activities on memory recall assumes the principle that recitations from memory are capable of reflecting the real world accurately, whereas a discursive psychology study asks what the memory talk is doing, not whether it is accurate. The first study method must include controls to nullify any co-varying or extraneous influences to the study data in a way that the second study would not; and the second should address the constructing influence of the interviewer, which the first may bracket because it is not a concern of its theoretical base. Finally, the method chosen must be capable of informing the research question, or, to put it the other way round, a relevant question is one which a given method is capable of answering.

2.1.3 In Roulston’s paper, her focus is the ‘quality in qualitative interviewing’ (p.201). She notes that in the literature, there is ‘no consistency in the terms used’, in the assessment of quality. For example, how might it demonstrate the classic four ‘Rs’, that is, be ‘representative, reactive, reliable, replicable’, as Katz (1983) and Mishler, (1986) suggest
that it should. Alternatively, is quality found where the methods are ‘credible’ or ‘thorough’ (Rubin and Rubin 2005); or ‘valid’ (Kvale, 1996, all quoted from Roulston p. 201); or ‘truthful’, (Potter and Hepburn, 2005, Roulston p. 203). The present discussion suggests that the research method and the analysis of the data it gathers must reflect the theoretical assumptions of the study perspective and the challenges of its methodology; whether these are lined-up appropriately constitutes a test for quality in a qualitative study.

For example, if this assumes, that a conversation between two people is an interactional event then so too is the interview that gathers the data and engages with its analysis; the same considerations of the object of study apply to the very method used to observe it. This throws up serious practical issues. Potter and Hepburn (2005) discuss the methodological problems (p. 5) contingent upon an assumption of the interview as dialogic interaction. They list four issues which together might demonstrate (lack of) quality in a research study with this perspective: (1) the exclusion of the interviewer; (2) the lack of interactional detail in the representation of the data (the interview transcript); (3) the generality of analytic observations; and (4) the exclusion of the pre-interview set-up. Antaki et al (2002) also address shortcomings in the analysis of a spate of talk. Their list includes: (1) under-analysis through summary; (2) under-analysis through taking sides; (3) under-analysis through over quotation or isolated quotation; (4) the circular identification of discourses and mental constructs; (5) false survey; and (6) analysis that consists in simply spotting features. With these writers’ views and the conclusions from Table 1 in mind, Table 2 below takes the four non-positivist approaches from Table 1 and summarises the steps their chosen method might take to ensure a best fit between the theory and the methodology and to avoid the contingent pitfalls and thereby to claim ‘quality’ in the research findings:
### Table 2 - Steps ensuring the quality of non-positivistic methodologies

#### Table 2a Romantic or Emotional approach

- R/r may use multiple methods of data collection, including observational data, i/vs and naturally occurring data to gain multiple viewpoints and to check data.
- R/r may have multiple i/vs with the participant to establish rapport and to demonstrate longevity of fieldwork.
- R/r demonstrates reflexivity by being consciously aware of her own subjectivity and motivation in relation to the research question. May include a personal statement and self-account of R/r relationship to participants and motivation to the research topic. I/R’s comments in the i/v may be included in the final report.
- R/r may have participant checking of transcriptions, statements and any research claims to ensure the participant’s own voice is heard. Any disagreements between I/R, R/r and I/E may be included in the research findings.
- The method used will demonstrate that the I/R is aware of sequencing effects of formal i/v questions.
- R/r is aware of ethical concerns of sensitive topics discussed at i/v. The method will take steps to ensure that the research process is fully transparent and accessible to the I/E so that the participant’s consent to participate is adequately informed.
- R/r may check the final report is credible and plausible to the participant, that it represents her viewpoint.
Table 2b Constructionist Approach

- The I/V transcript is not considered a *full and final representation* of the research data, but rather a *theoretical construct*. Therefore the un-transcribed data in the form of the original audio or video recording may be made available in the final report.

- To the extent that any research claims are made on the basis of the transcription, then as much information as possible may be captured here - including the contributions from the I/R and all audible (in)/articulations, breathing and pauses and descriptions of gestural/body posture.

- To be sensitive to the I/V as *interactional object*, the transcription notes all responses on a new numbered line to enable the *close* or micro-analysis of the text. All subsequent claims for the data are explicitly linked to this numbered line.

- The interview set-up is specified (just as in a positivistic study although with different concerns). This includes: a description of the practical arrangements, the basis for the selection of participants; the nature of the interview questions or the task undertaken.

- The I/R is considered an active participant in the I/V. Her words are analysed exactly as are the I/E’s, with no distinction made. The subjective *self-positioning* of the I/V and her manipulations of *stake* and *interest* are considered as much as with the I/E.

- Because of problems with the above, *naturalistic* data may be preferred to the I/V format where discussions as they naturally occur are analysed (such as court sessions, doctor/patient or teacher/pupil sessions etc. group or family social occasions, or telephone calls).

- With both I/V and naturally occurring data, the ethical concerns of Table 2a apply.

- Conclusions of the ‘*how*’ aspect of constructions relate to the detail of the transcriptions. The ‘*what*’ aspects are sensitive to the participant’s *voice* and researcher *reflexivity*, in the I/V setting, as in Table 2a.
Table 2c Postmodern approach

- The I/V may be seen as a ‘vehicle for producing a performance’ (Denzin 2001:24\(^{11}\)) rather than a method for data gathering at all. The i/v elicits the performance to promote thought and action.
- The R/r engages with the participant (as co-participant or as audience) and the research setting is broadened such that all possible interactions - contextual, cultural, or historical, are relevant. Multiple methods of ‘data’ collection are used, not to check the data (as in Table 2a) but for thoroughness.
- Multiple representations of the ‘data’ may be included - spoken, written, behavioural, creative, artistic and personal histories or life circumstances of the participant. These are considered deconstructive, fragmentary and open-ended/unfinished or as complicating the participant’s understandings of the research topic.
- The analytic focus may be to challenge a normative view or to provoke a change in attitude or belief, prior to rebuilding an alternative. It may ‘bring people together to criticize the world’ or ‘to make suggestions for change’ (Denzin 2003:24). This may be difficult or uncomfortable in practice, issues of voice and ethical considerations are considerable.
- The method demonstrates an awareness of researcher reflexivity and sensitivity to the variety of subject matter that may occur during the exchanges.
- The method does not make research claims or conclusions based on an epistemological or empirical basis in the modernist/positivistic way, nor relate these directly to the ‘data’ collected via the method.

\(^{11}\) Cited in Roulston, p. 219.
Table 2d Transformative approach

- R/r intentionally means to challenge the participant into change through dialogue, for social, justice or health reasons.
- Research is collaborative and may be participant driven rather than R/r lead. The method demonstrates sensitivity to participants’ understandings of the research topic – what is relevant or meaningful to them.
- The research setting may be broad as in 2c above; equally, for a therapeutic I/V, it may have a more focussed setting (a clinical or home environment, for example).
- The R/r is self-consciously aware of her own subjectivities in relation to the research topic and of her participation in the I/V process (for example, in the process of transference). Both I/E and I/R are transformed through the I/V. The post-IV actions or changes and the responses of the I/R, R/r and wider communities are evidence of quality in the I/V.
- The method may demonstrate the epistemological and empirical basis for any claims to transformation and relate these directly to the data collected via the method.
- The R/r is sensitive to the ethical issues involved as before.

2.1.4 Discussion

The various methods in qualitative research and the issues they address, overlap. When studies with different research perspectives embrace a range of possible methods from which to gather their data, even if assumptions of what these data represent differ, all must address, for example, similar ethical considerations that the collection of this data throws up. Additionally, the issue of researcher reflexivity may always arise in non-positivistic research, whether or not it is the prime theoretical perspective. The overriding concern is to find a study method that enables the collection of data with the capacity to inform the research question(s), which allows the theoretical assumptions inherent in the methodology to warrant valid claims to knowledge and lastly (and certainly not in the least) which take due consideration of the significant practical issues the method will inevitably involve.
The discussion so far has been of the epistemological and methodological choices involved in a qualitative study; in addition, there are a number of different ways to analyse the data gathered by these methods. The following section is a discussion of three different methods for the analysis of discursive data. It explores the characteristics and focus for each, together with their potential strengths and limitations. In particular, it notes the warrant, textual or theoretical, for conclusions drawn from these study methods.

2.2 A review of three methods for the analysis of speech data, detailing the individual focus in each case and areas of overlap. It notes the strengths and limitations for each.

2.2.1 A focus on the ‘linguistic’ turn in the social sciences or a ‘performative’ perspective of language does not alone distinguish between the different methods available as candidates for the analysis. This is because the language turn in psychology is three-fold, as van den Berg et al. note (2003, Introduction p.1). It is firstly a consideration of discursive practices in social life; secondly, a reconceptualisation of theory in the study of psychological phenomena; and thirdly, the recognition that social research is itself a discursive practice. All of the methods reviewed below for studying speech in social exchange understand language as an irreducible aspect of social process, however as Potter et al. (1993) note, quite different strands of research may describe themselves as ‘discourse analysis’, such as: speech act oriented studies of conversational coherence (e.g. Coulthard & Montgomery, 1981); discourse processes work on story grammars (e.g. van Dijk & Kintch, 1983); ‘Continental discourse analysis’ (for example, Foucault, 1971), and developments within the sociology of scientific knowledge (for example Gilbert and
Mulkay, 1984, all references cited in Potter et al. p. 383). Additionally, they take a differing view as to whether speech involves a *discursive performance* or construction on the one hand, or an *historical set of social structures* on the other; and there is a distinction of narrow or broad text-based or theoretical warrant. Research data are not neutral, they are themselves constructed, and not only within a specific theoretical paradigm, but also within research practice and culture. Table 3 below\(^\text{12}\) summarises three different methods for the analysis of linguistic data which between them demonstrate (some of) these differing aspects of the linguistic turn. These are, Discourse Analysis (DA), Conversation Analysis (CA) and Narrative Analysis (NA). The three methods are broad; there are variations within each one, as defined, and areas of overlap between them. Nevertheless, Table 3 broadly identifies the main distinguishing features of each of the three and locates them in their place in the overview framework. A discussion of the resulting strengths and limitations of these three approaches follows.

\(^{12}\) This Table is not exhaustive. Other analytic methods not included in this summary are for example: Critical Discourse Analysis, Membership Category Analysis, Interpretative Phenomenology Analysis (IPA), Positioning Theory and various approaches from socio-linguistics.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Table 3 - Overview of Three Discourse Analytic Methods</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Discourse (DA)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Origins:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Focus:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intentionality/agency:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Empirical warrant:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Data analysis:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Purposes:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Discourse Analysis (DA)**

2.2.2 Gilbert and Mulkay (1984) term their analysis of the sociology of scientific knowledge, ‘discourse analysis’ and by discourse they mean an *account*, either *rhetorical* or *empiricist* within scientific talk. Their study includes a critique of positivist empirical perspectives and enables a move away from realist accounts of objective knowledge and towards linguistically variable, social accounts. It addresses the blurred endo/exogenic warrant to knowledge assertions, as Gergen suggests, previously discussed. As a methodology, DA is a radical alternative to those studies that rely on the representational view of language. A DA study recognises that language use is immensely variable, flexible and nuanced; that there is no one, ‘correct’ way of accounting for anything. The words we may actually use in any given account or description, are contingent upon the conversation in which we speak them and the rhetorical purposes to which we put them. A DA account therefore, necessarily puts a great emphasis on the linguistic context in which a spate of (often naturally occurring) talk occurs. DA does not confine its study to the linguistic text however; it includes the institutional context of the spate of talk and the rhetorical purposes of the speaker as an intentional agent, herself understood as situated within a personal and historical context. DA has moved from its origins as one description of scientific discourse in the sociology of scientific knowledge into a wider critique of sociology and psychology, understanding the intra-psychic state as rhetorical, that is, social practice located in the relationship between everyday discourse and social activity. DA may now apply to a rather wide range of analytical research all, broadly, analysing speech, yet from different and contrasting perspectives. It is proposed as a general methodology (Wood and Kroger, 2000); alternatively, as theory and critique allied to social constructionism (Gergen, 1994; Harré and Gillett, 1994; Potter, 1996, all cited in Edwards, 2005 p. 257). Or it may move to
social critique via forms of critical discourse analysis (CDA). Many authors note that the term discourse is itself used in different ways. Furthermore, DA may embrace a variety of analytic methods including linguistics - a grammatical and structural analysis of textual (and invented) materials; to CA - analysis of the spoken word via a detailed transcription of naturally occurring conversations; to a broadly thematic analysis of social structures and ideologies. A principle that all DA study shares however, is the understanding of talk as constructive and as action. Talk as a medium for social action is contrasted with talk as a code for representing events, or thoughts and ideas, or as descriptive of the intra-psychic state (as realist psychology might understand it); or as a grammatical system designed to work up and communicate semantic units, (as linguists would generally conceive it); or as a support to historically situated elements of society (as critical theory might view it). From the perspective of communication studies, Craig has argued that it is seen as a practical rather than a scientific activity. A limitation of DA, particularly one located in a specific linguistic context, may be that it is rather narrow, interested only in a discrete and single text and hardly addressing the pressing concerns of a theoretically informed social analysis; indeed some have accused it of triviality (although that is arguably even more pertinent to a CA critique). Some have noted DA to be, analytically, little more than description since its empirical warrant is neither social theory, nor (necessarily) a forensic analysis of the text. DA can address the important issues within sociological/psychological analysis, but it does so from a specific vantage point - the critical, non-representational view of language.

15 This is particularly important for those researching Language and Social Interaction (LSI) where a goal is to study how production (techne) side of communication is married to its moral and political (praxis) aspects.
Conversation Analysis (CA)

2.2.3 The conceptual basis for CA is *ethnomethodology* - the *study of methods*. This is the project of Garfinkel (1967), a sociologist, as informed by the phenomenological philosophy of Schütz, (1962) and by the sociology of Irving Goffman (1959). Language is central to ethnomethodology. Through it, speakers reveal their methods for producing orderly and accountable social activities, ‘*visibly-rational-and-reportable-for-all-practicable-purposes*’ Garfinkel (1967: vii). Schegloff (1996) notes talk as ‘*the primordial scene of social life...through which the work of the constitutive institutions gets done*’. The aim of CA is the study of the systematic basis of social activity as it appears in conversational exchange - of social action grounded in the ‘*details of actual events*’, (Sacks, 1984). It involves the extremely close and detailed observation of dialogue describing the unit of activity found naturalistically there. This unit of activity is the *turn-at-talk*, a paired sequence of utterances where a speaker (A) makes a part-1 statement of a 2 part pair; and speaker (B) replies with the second part. Adjacent pairs follow each other in a particular spate of talk and the resultant sequence is known as *talk-in-interaction*. CA is rigorously empirical, basing its analysis *from the first* in the close study of the text. The transcription of dialogue is very detailed and contains as much of the aural information as is possible to transcribe, including prosodic features (changes in pitch, volume and tempo) slips, repairs, mistakes and all the ‘messiness’ of ordinary speech. Transcribers time pauses typically to within 1/10 of a second and note overlapping speech, interruptions and voiced in-articulations of all kinds. This takes a considerable amount of time. CA may to be said to be a positivist or empiricist methodology since it warrants its analysis on what it claims to be evidentially clear and available to observation and not as located in prior theoretical explication of social and political practice; its very detailed transcription is a full and final
representation of the data. It claims to be ‘a-theoretical’ and ‘agnostic’ (or neutral) to human intentionality through the policy of *ethnomethodological indifference* or *bracketing* (Garfinkel and Sacks, 1970). CA would understand an assertion to a faith identity, through its indexical orientation to its linguistic context and note it as an *oriented-to* production or an *accomplishment* within the interaction. Thus, Schegloff:

> ‘Showing that some orientation to context is demonstrably relevant to the participants is important...in order to ensure that what informs the analysis is what is relevant to the participants in its target event, and not what is relevant in the first instance to its academic analysts by virtue of the set of analytic and theoretical commitments which they bring to their work’ (1992 p.192, italics in the original).

Thus, the ‘problem of relevance’ for CA means that analysts must attend to what is demonstrably relevant to participants and note the consequences of that talk for the speakers. Schegloff, (1991) argues that where *a priori* categories (of gender, identity, ethnicity, power asymmetries and the like) are brought to the data, as they are in Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA), these may *obscure* what is actually happening, and may impose the analyst’s theoretical and political agenda onto the text. CA is able to capture a (faith) identity as a shifting self, contingent on the talk’s sequential environment and the other participants in it - the audience to whom it is told, (as Day asserts) and understands it as a an accomplishment of the talk in hand.

Therefore, CA has an empirical warrant not available to those methods that do not ground their claims in the detailed analysis of the text, but it does not avail itself of the theoretical understanding stressed by, for example, CDA. CA’s focus of analysis, more so than in other approaches, is the *dyad* in talk-in-interaction. The researcher bases her observations of speaker (A) in the actions of speaker (B), evidentially on display and which gives the
proof-procedure to warrant the analyst’s observations. The analyst does not resort to, what Schegloff calls, ‘speculation’ about interior states and motivations. CA’s purpose is to understand social interactivity as it is located in speech. This is both a strength and a limitation, since it is open to the charge of triviality, as noted above. CA’s focus on social achievement and effect is located and bounded by the conversation where it occurs and not in the broad sweep of culture and historical activity. A central CA observation is that paired adjacencies typically follow each other with extreme efficiency; one speaker follows the next with no pause or delay or often with a very slight overlap. A key focus of CA then, is how speakers manage this: How do speakers know when it is their turn to speak; how can they manipulate turn conventions to control access to the floor; and how does a recipient anticipate a reply appropriate to the social action that the first speaker has initiated. In studying this, CA does discuss a power dynamic, although one not as extensive as might be observed in a wider, CDA, study. Finally, in observing patterns in conversationalists’ orientations to the dialogue - how they respond to each other in acceptable and appropriate ways (to themselves and to the other speaker) CA addresses participants’ orientation to the normative underpinning of dialogic practice. CA examines the departures from established patterns and repairs and in so doing, can describe the significance participants make of these departures and the inferences they consequently take. A CA study is not necessarily a constructionist one (see for discussion Hester and Francis, 2007) - it emphasises that and how identity, or an account, is achieved in speech (see for example, Hall, 2000 p.27; Wilkinson and Kitzinger, 2003) rather than any ontological or essentialist claim. Thus, whatever else faith, or a faith identity may be, it may be realised as an accomplishment in speech and analysed accordingly.
Narrative Analysis (NA)

2.2.4 James Day locates his study within the broad category of Narrative Analysis (NA). Very many researchers across the social sciences have noted the extent to which life - both social activity and religious life, appear ‘storied’ - that is, structured in a way that we recognise and call story (see for example, Denzin, 2000). The definition of this structure may be general or specific - researchers typically describe it as extending in a sequence over time and having a clearly defined ‘beginning, middle, and end’\(^\text{16}\). As its name implies, NA has its roots in literary theory and psychologists may understand ‘story’ as a root metaphor for life. It is a constructionist understanding of discourse, the stories we tell being constitutive of reality. An individual tells a story, constructs it and edits it, and positions the finished product - often an understanding of the self - within the intentionality of its teller (see, for example, Georgakopoulou, 2002; Gergen, 1988; Gergen & Gergen, 1987; Sarbin, 1986). Thus, there are links between NA and Positioning Theory where speakers position an identity or account construction, between the teller and the audience or against subjective positions derived from master narratives - discourses of cultural significance to the teller and available as a resource in the story telling (see for example, Davies and Harré, 1990; Harré and van Langenhove, 1991, 1999; Bamberg, 2004). Researchers choose NA in a wide range of research contexts, with structural, functional or thematic purposes, adopting various methods to do so. These will normally involve textual analysis of linguistic data but not, typically, with the empirical rigour of, certainly, a CA study. In some cases, particularly in studies that extend over a lengthy period, researchers do not supply the original talk, as data, referring to it only in excerpted passages (as did Day). Occasionally

\(^{16}\) This phrase, ‘beginning, middle and end’ is ubiquitous in NA research. Everyone uses it to the extent that in the present author’s opinion, it has become a metaphor (or reified discourse) in its own right - a complete account summing up in ‘meaning’ the concept of ‘story’. Note that it is a list-of-three (Jefferson 1990).
researchers take these from notes made at the time, although most NA researchers do stress the importance of recorded talk. Some NA research becomes hermeneutical and introspective as researchers explore their own reactions to their subject of study, understanding their study experience as germane to its analysis and interpretation. In this case, they may refer to themselves by borrowing a phrase from social anthropology (Geertz, 1995) - ‘the researcher-in-the-midst’ - meaning that analysts cannot treat the observer and the observed as independent. Most NA studies assume psychological intentionality and agency; often it is the very focus of study (as in therapeutic storytelling). A strength of NA is the very generality and ubiquity of the storied structure (as is the turn in CA). It is used in a wide range of contexts, including the study of personal and group identity, therapeutic story telling, the construction of personal meaning, to make a point and of course for fun and entertainment. It suffers similar critique to other methods discussed here, of lack of theoretical warrant, particularly telling when a rigorous empirical engagement with the linguistic data is also lacking.

2.3 Discursive Psychology

2.3.1 The present study locates its research within the constructionist perspective as outlined in Table 1c above. It studies participants’ talk (about their faith) without privileging an aspect of the intra-psychic state as prior and theoretical explanation for it. It makes no comment on the intra-psychic environment understood as an independent or objectively ‘real’ state, precursive to speech behaviour seen as an expression or description of the mind. It follows the Wittgensteinian notion that language is social and functional and not descriptive of either the external real world, or the intra-psychic state. It makes the
theoretical assumption that the research ‘data’ gathered represent an account (of participants’ faith) and a rhetorical version of it, situated within the spate-of-talk at hand and within the research context. It notes the conceptual argument about the nature of ‘descriptions’, that stresses the indefiniteness or open-endedness of any description, the various ways in which scenes and events are formulated, and the impossibility of producing a single definitive version, free of interests or perspective (for example, see Kuhn, 1970; Popper, 1959; Wittgenstein, 1953, all cited in Potter et al. 1993 p. 385). It therefore queries the epistemological privileging of cognitivist versions of reality based on individuals’ (or academic psychologists’) descriptions (or versions) of events. The study attempts to understand the implications of these conceptual principles as they play out practically, in actual speech.

2.3.2 The research perspective that pursues the conceptual and theoretical interests outlined above, is one of discursive psychology (DP). Edwards and Potter have defined this as: ‘[D]iscourse ... taken to be talk and text of any kind ... through which people live their lives and conduct their every day business. [Discursive psychology] is the application of principles and methods from discourse and conversation analysis to psychological themes’ (Edwards 2005, p. 258, see also Potter and Wetherell, 1987; Edwards and Potter, 1992; Edwards and Potter 2005, p. 241; Edwards, 2006b). DP’s focus is on the inconsistent and varying versions of events that analysts find typical of talk in research interviews and naturalistic conversation, which psychologists traditionally regard as ‘noise’. Rather than dismissing this variability, Potter, Edwards, Wetherell, and other DP researchers focus on

---

17 The author wishes to stress any description. There is no intention here to make a claim specific to an account of faith.
talk as situated in its dialogic context. When analysed functionally and indexically, discourse displays a different kind of order, one that is coherent and systematic and not the inconsequential ‘mess’ with which mundane conversation is typically viewed.

The overriding perspective of DP is that of talk as action and a discursive practice, and a framework for its study is the Discourse Action Model (DAM) of Edwards and Potter, (1992b). Table 4 summarises this below:

**Table 4 - Discursive Action Model**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The research focus is on <em>action</em> rather than cognition or behaviour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. As action is predominantly, and most clearly, performed through discourse, traditional psychological concepts (memory attribution, categorization etc.) are reconceptualized in discursive terms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Actions done in discourse are overwhelmingly situated in broader <em>activity sequences</em> of various kinds.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fact and Interest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. In the case of many actions, there is a dilemma of stake and interest, which is often managed by doing attribution via factual reports and descriptions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Reports and descriptions are therefore constituted/displayed as factual by a variety of discursive devices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Factual versions are rhetorically organised to undermine alternatives.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accountability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7. Factual versions attend to agency and accountability in the report events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Factual versions attend to agency and accountability in the current speakers actions, including those done in the reporting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Concerns 7 and 8 are often related, such that 7 is deployed for 8 and 8 is deployed for 7.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The DAM is not a process model in the standard way that psychology might understand such things but rather a framework to highlight the three key points to DP - action, fact and interest, and accountability:

(i) *Action.* DP takes psychological phenomena such as memories and attributions, which cognitivist psychology conceptualises as mental constructs, representations or processes and recasts them as things people do in discourse. A memory or an attribution becomes not something one possesses but something achieved, worked up with another for whatever reason in ordinary speech. Memory work might be achieved in the giving of an account of ‘what went on’ for example and the attribution might be the upshot or conclusion achieved in that account.

(ii) *Fact and interest.* Central to the view of the variability of descriptions is that this is exactly how people themselves experience and understand them. In everyday life, as people discuss events, or give opinions or make claims to knowledge, they treat other people quite naturally as having desires, motivations, biases, or allegiances, which they display in the accounts that they offer and the inferences of attribution they may make. People treat each other as *people* and not as philosophers of logic or as scientists which explains the variations of their descriptions - they are not independent of their own differences and preferences. This gives rise to the so-called dilemma of ‘stake and interest’. To be believed as true or rational, an account must defend itself from a challenge of interest and be based

---

18 As Edwards and Potter rather whimsically point out, p. 155.
19 Scientists treat each other as people too and not as ‘scientists’, as Gilbert and Mulkay discovered.
on events external to the speaker. Alternatively, the best way to undermine another’s version, is to suggest personal interest\textsuperscript{20}.

(iii) \textit{Accountability}. Accountability is the management of the attribution of responsibility, both as an inference of the reported-on events and the actors within it, and of the speaker herself, in working up the account in the version she does.

Speakers in this perspective, through public accountability of their descriptions of events, memories, attitudes and so on, make certain psychological phenomena available and thereby demonstrate that a particular description (in contrast to alternatives) is psychologically relevant \textit{to the speaker}. Edwards and Potter term this \textit{epistemic constructionism} (2005, p. 243) in contrast to a \textit{constructivist} model, where the faithful mind is itself understood to be \textit{actualised} or \textit{realised} in speech\textsuperscript{21}.

\begin{flushleft}
2.3.3 With this perspective, these authors identify three distinct strands to DP: Firstly, as re-specification\textsuperscript{22} and critique of standard psychological themes; secondly, the common sense usage of lay or folk psychological themes, as ordinary people purposefully and meaningfully employ them (Potter and Edwards both call this the ‘psychological thesaurus’); thirdly, as these themes are managed and handled in what Edwards calls the management of psychological business (2005, p. 267). DP looks at the various psychological phenomena of academic psychology such as, identity and personality and of
\end{flushleft}

\textsuperscript{20} As in the famous comment - well he would say that wouldn’t he?’
\textsuperscript{21} This is a developmental-psychological approach where actual minds, real minds, are produced and shaped through language and action see Bruner, 1986.
\textsuperscript{22} Edwards, 1991 citing Button notes ‘re-specification’ as a term borrowed from ethnomethodology.
the central theoretical notions within cognitivism of motivation, causal attribution, attitudes, memory, and categorization, seeing these as discursive practices, worked up in speech, by participants for interactional purposes. For its analysis, DP studies talk, situated in whatever kind of talk-in-interaction, whether telephone calls, research or broadcast interviews, or group or individual conversation. Its focus is the detailed sequence of conversation following the principles of CA rather than the categories of research interest brought to the talk from critical or social theory and might be described as a conversation analysis informed discourse analysis. It warrants its assumptions therefore on the detailed transcription of actual talk and how participants themselves orientate to speech behaviour in this context.

Conclusions:
A DP perspective sits very well with the discussion in Kenneth Gergen’s paper (in section 1.3 in Chapter 1) of social construction for psychology, and of individual’s every day assertions and (common sense) knowledge claims as they achieve these in practice in speech. It also follows Day’s four foundational principles with which he opened his 1993 paper, particularly the second, and his words, (p.215), ‘language …is interpersonally formulated and remains forever so constituted, has as its purpose the making and maintenance of place sufficient for continued conversation, without which the life of the speaker could not go on’ are understood as compatible with a discursive psychological understanding to the study of human faith.
2.4 The use of the research interview or naturalistic data as method in discursive psychology.

2.4.1 Before the discussion of the research method chosen for the present study, there is a further issue in qualitative research - that of the use of the interview itself. This reflects the third aspect of the linguistic turn referred to above, that of the reflexive exploration of social research itself. This recognises the interviewer/participant’s talk that both describes the phenomenon under review and constitutes it through describing it (Burr 1995). The problem is a practical and theoretical one, that if all knowledge is discursively produced, then discourse research itself is subject to this and should be treated accordingly. Table 2 above discusses the differing ways for qualitative methodology to demonstrate quality in the research interview; it does not question the interview as the research instrument, which some researchers, notably Potter and Hepburn (2005) do. These writers critique the epistemological and methodological value of the overarching use of the research interview in psychological qualitative study and suggest a greater emphasis on naturally occurring (or naturalistic) data for much qualitative research. Potter and Hepburn note (p.3) that the research interview is invariably used across studies with very different research perspectives from ethnography, phenomenology, psychoanalysis, narrative psychology, grounded theory and discourse analysis as well as discursive psychology. They conclude that the interview is over-used and that its choice is taken-for-granted.

2.4.2 The debate regarding the research interview is not new - at its heart is the (un-resolvable) subjective versus objective polemic in epistemology. Despite this, Hester and Francis note ‘the chronic inability of sociology to resolve the problem of interview reliability/validity... the business of interviewing goes on.... the fact that ... differences
remain unresolved does not seem to present any effective obstacle to the continued and widespread use of the interview in actual research’ (1994, p. 678). However, the debate materially affects the research question the interview can inform, the way it is conducted in practice and the kind of knowledge claimed of it as a result of its use. As a research instrument, the interview is designed to collect data. Positivists care about the characteristics of the technical interview to generate reliable data, that is, replicable data that represent the real phenomenon of the research lying beyond the interview and independent of it. At the other end of the scale, interpretivists want valid, personalised data. They, equally, demand a technically creative interview, but in this case, characterised by the establishment of rapport, openness to context and to the participatory interaction of the interviewer. The phrases, ‘in-depth’ or ‘open’ interview, or ‘data collection’, may betray a rhetorical placement of the interview with the realist principle that it is possible to get to ‘real’ data once the ‘contamination’ of the interviewer has been neutralized or where the interviewer has been able to get ‘under the skin’ (see Holstein and Gubrium 1995). These phrases display opposing epistemologies but their methods are consistent within the theoretical position adopted since each accepts that the value or meaning of the interview data, whether as independent fact or as contextualised interpretative practice, is able, in principle, to transcend the interview of itself. However, for those (such as Potter and Hepburn) who hold the view that the interview is a locally managed and discursive interactive event, then any claim on the interview, whether formally structured or open, to

23 The following is a reprise of the argument found in Hester and Francis 1994
24 This is Hester and Francis’s term for those pursing qualitative, rich data, not stripped of contextual and personal meaning. In the present paper, those following the emotional or romantic programme would fall into this category.
provide research data, whether reliable or valid, becomes problematic. Hester and Francis cite Cicourel (1964, 1968, cited p. 693) an early exponent of this view.

2.4.3 Potter and Hepburn’s concern is with the uncritical and wholesale adoption of the research interview in research methodology. In addition to the problems contingent upon the interview as an interactive object (the present paper discusses these in Table 2b as problems of method) which, as they say, might be ‘relatively easily fixed, or at least attended to’ (p. 5), they note, four further problems necessary to a consideration of the interview, as instrument, from a conversation analytic and discursive psychological theoretical perspective: These are (1) the flooding of the interview with a social science agenda and categories; (2) the interviewer’s and the interviewee’s footing, (3) their management of stake and interest; and (4) reproduction of cognitivism. Issues 2 and 3 are integral to the discursive understanding of conversational exchange and are not in principle, ‘fixable’ in the sense that they must be attended to in their own right within the research interview as discursive practice; the first issue is a concern of the manner in which the research is carried out. Potter and Hepburn suggest that these necessary problems highlight issues for the design and conduct of interviews, such as the interview introductions, questions and so forth, which would repay systematic study as a topic in its own right. This is part of the debate in the literature of the research interview as instrument versus topic (see van den Berg et al. 2003 p. 4) and the concept of the research interview itself as situated, that is, a local production constituting a specific category of institutionalized talk to be studied in and of itself (van den Berg et al. cite, Briggs, 1986; Pomerantz, 1988; Heritage and Greatbatch, 1991; Houtkoop-Streenstra 1996, 1997, 2000 and Baker, 1997 in this discussion). The emphasis on the contextualization of the interview begs the question
what the linguistic data represent - Potter and Hepburn’s concern is where they are treated for and on behalf of the researcher for her sole use and consumption as research data, and in so doing underplay the dialogicality of the exchange. An integral concept of ethnomethodology is its indifference\(^{25}\) to the value of social research to inform the object of study, (that is the interview as a research instrument) understanding it simply as an instance of practical social action. Thus the interview as topic must be given systematic study, not least because of its ubiquity in social research and because of its disputed position there.

2.4.4  As an alternative to the interview, Potter and Hepburn suggest working with so-called naturalistic data. The definition of naturalistic data is debated (Potter and Hepburn cite contributions from Lynch, 2002; Potter, 2002; Speer 2002a, b; ten Have, 2002 in this discussion p. 21). However, the principle of naturalistic data is that, unlike the contrived exchange of the interview, it involves a recording of an activity that would have happened, as it happened, in any event. Any recorded session can only proceed when the participants have given their informed consent to it. As a minimum, the researcher will have explained the purpose behind a particular research study, how she proposes to ‘collect the data’ and store them, and who has access to them, and that the session is recorded. The problem for naturally occurring data is one of participants’ reactivity to this knowledge. Hence the term naturalistic - data that approaches a naturally occurring situation but cannot fully represent it. The research interview is a highly circumscribed and specific discursive event\(^{26}\), but so

\(^{25}\) The concept of ethnomethodological indifference: the research phenomenon is investigated ‘while abstaining from all judgements of their adequacy, value, importance, necessity, practicality, success, or consequentiality’, Garfinkel and Sacks, 1986: 166 as cited in Hester and Francis, p. 677.

\(^{26}\) Rapley (2001, p. 311) notes both from academic research and from personal anecdote that whilst questioning and answering is a highly regular and visible phenomenon of mundane discourse, it is rare when it is consistently only one speaker who poses questions and the other who answers. Conversationalists may regard this as ‘strange’.
too are mundane encounters within their context. Telephone calls, for example, may exhibit
systematic variation from face-to-face encounters, as might group discussions over dyadic
exchanges, in for example, the negotiation of speaking rights. There is extensive
discussion over this issue in the academic literature (see, for example, Griffin 2007; Lee
and Roth, 2004; Potter and Hepburn 2007; Rapley, 2001; Smith et al. Commentaries on
Potter and Hepburn 2005 pp. 309-325; van den Berg et al. 2003; Widdicombe and
Wooffitt, 1995).

2.4.5 The present study is oriented to the constructionist’s critique of those positivist
methods that exclude and strip away the context of the research situation from analysis. The
researcher was particularly struck by Geertz’s approach of the ‘researcher-in-the-midst’
that understands both subject and researcher of an ethnographic or social anthropological
study as situated. A research interest therefore is to recognise, and not to shy away from, an
understanding of the observer/researcher as participant. Therefore, the study was set up as
a conversation between the researcher and a single collocutor. The researcher called these
conversations ‘unstructured interviews’ and herself the ‘interviewer’ and for all of the
sessions, the researcher’s roles of observer, interviewer, participant and report writer are
conflated (as are the interviewees’ of research subject, co-conversationalist and friend of
the researcher). The research data is not therefore naturalistic and the interviews and their
analysis are subject to the pressures discussed earlier in this chapter; this is not optimal for
the reasons already noted. The reason for this choice of research interview was, firstly,
pragmatic. As one of the participants in the study says, people do not often (at least in this

---
27 Harvey Sack’s (Lecture 1, 1992) original CA work was with telephone calls, and Sacks, H., Schegloff, E.A., and Jefferson, G. (1974) discuss the negotiation of speaking rights.
country) speak of their personal faith. To be able to record a spontaneous discussion might take a long time to set up. The research could have observed a prayer or Bible study group, or other group gathered at a seasonal time in the Church’s calendar or possibly a private conversation between a person of Christian faith and their spiritual director.

However, in the researcher’s view, this would have yielded rather more theologically and religiously informed speech than the kind of personal and transformative faith talk that the researcher was primarily interested in. The researcher thought a one-on-one session to be appropriate to elicit a discussion of private and personal faith matters. Secondly, the interview as topic is a study interest; it is the research instrument of choice for much psychological study. Potter and Hepburn do not suggest restricting its use only on theoretical grounds but due to the methodological and practical concerns of inappropriate and over use and of poor execution in practice. For the present study, the researcher was concerned to explore the implications of a constructionist approach on methodology. It asks, ‘How does one conduct and analyse a research interview considered an interactive object?’ The practical issues this approach throws up (of the kind discussed in Table 2b above) are considered as they occur during the course of the study.

2.4.6 The present researcher, following Day, initially planned the study as a narrative analysis and there is discussion in the literature of the kind of interview appropriate for

28 Sebastian Murken, (1993) in his reply to Day notes the ‘different attitudes about the place of religion and religious “talk” in the United States and in Europe’. He says of Days ‘reported conversation [with his friends] in the taxi could never have taken place in Germany without serious concern for the speaker’s sanity. Talking about one’s religion and belief in Europe is probably more private than talking about sex’. Would it be very different in the UK in 2011?

29 The lack of opportunity for a personal discussion of faith might be borne out by the fact that, not infrequently, individuals volunteered to be participants in the study. These people wanted to be able to talk about themselves and their faith in a way perhaps not usually available to them.

30 As the study progressed however, the researcher preferred to pursue a DP analysis, as discussed.
Mishler (1986) recommends that in research interviewing, a participant be left as free as possible to reply as she likes and in her own time and manner. This enables her words to flow freely and unhindered, as she constructs her faith accounts, experiences, or identity, naturally, in narrative form. This informed the interview process in the present study and the interviews consequentially are not structurally symmetrical. Even as a co-participant, the interviewer tends to pose questions and to encourage her collocutor to be expansive in her turn at the conversational floor with a series of ‘continuers’ (such ‘mm’ ohuh’ the simple ‘yes’). These are designed to ‘pass up’ an opportunity to speak and allow the interviewee more of the floor time than the interviewer. The sessions, as a consequence are very one-sided. There is variety in the sessions, there are passages of the rapid ‘quick-fire’ or turn-by-turn talk (TBT) typical to conversation, but the interviews typically exhibit a style of active interviewing (Gubrium and Holstein, 1995), story telling, or even a form akin to therapeutic interviewing yet which can include passages of interviewer self-revelation. On other occasions they fall into a more formally recognisable question and answer pattern. Questions and answers occur in mundane chat of course, however, it would be very unusual for all the questions to come from one speaker and all the answers to come from the other as is the case in the present sessions. As conversations therefore, they must be regarded as ‘strange’. The consequences and implications for this are discussed in Chapter 9.

The study understands a talked-of-faith as an account, socially generated between two people in conversation, just as discursive psychology maintains and not as the external expression of an intra-psychic state. The emphasis from the first is the dyad in conversation and not an individual storyteller. In this way, the study takes up the challenge from Kenneth
Gergen to pursue the implications of a social construction approach for the study of faith in psychology and with an emphasis, following Day, on its empirical study. The research explores social exchange as the location for what passes to be real and true about faith via a DP perspective of psychological phenomena. Its two-fold research question is:

1. How do research participants give assessments and evaluations of their faith in conversation such that an attribution of faith is possible and warranted? How do they share this and reach agreement with the interviewer?

2. What are the practical limitations and difficulties with the use of interviews as opposed to naturalistic data?

Chapters 4-9 present the analysis from the interview transcripts and address issues raised in the exploration of research question 1. Chapter 8 discusses the ‘chat’ before the interview proper begins and Chapter 9 looks at the asking of the research question itself, to consider Question 2. Chapter 10 concludes with an assessment of the study.
Chapter 3
The study participants, procedure, interview question and the interview set-up arrangements

3.0 This chapter details the arrangements and procedures followed in the empirical study.

3.1 Participants
The study participants are individuals known to the interviewer through their membership of two different Christian prayer groups in which the interviewer is also a member. One group is a contemplative group, meeting for silent meditation rather like a Quaker Meeting. This is a relatively uncommon form of prayer and individuals who come to such sessions frequently arrive at this kind of practice after a long and varied faith journey. The assumption is that such individuals would be likely to describe themselves as having a fairly lengthy or changeable faith history, understood by them as potentially maturing or falling away, certainly changing - and this is an interest of the present research. Four participants are from this group and the fifth, Sally, is a participant in a traditional prayer group based at the school that she and the interviewer’s sons both attended. The study presents the transcribed interviews for these five individuals - four women and one man known by their pseudonyms as Sally, Margaret, Joyce, Cathy and John. Sally, Cathy, (and the interviewer) were aged between 50-55 years at the time of the interviews, John was slightly younger, Margaret was 70 years old, and Joyce was 79. Cathy and John are married to each other; Margaret is a retired Church of England curate, and Joyce was married to a Church of England vicar, but she later converted to Roman Catholicism. As in Day’s study, the research participants are personal acquaintances of the interviewer. Unlike with Day,
they are not long-term friends and the interviewer did not know their personal histories prior to the research sessions. The participants were aware that the interviewer was undertaking an academic research project, and the researcher asked them if they would like to participate. None of them had any formal involvement in it and none were familiar with the academic discussion of social construction or discursive psychology. Formally then, the category membership of the research participants is ‘acquaintances known by the researcher to pursue an aspect of (unspecified) religious faith via prayer in some form’. One of the theoretical considerations of the study is that a dialogue affords an opportunity for construction. If opportunities to discuss one’s faith are relatively rare, or if faith is an important or valued construction, then the research participants may view an opportunity to construct as gift. The researcher met with other individuals who volunteered to be interviewees and who were very keen to speak of their faith. This may be how some of the research participants viewed it, at least some of the time - all the interviewees thanked the interviewer for the session as much as the interviewer thanked them and John says, (see transcript John in the Appendix, line 1788): ‘it was a privilege to be able to waffle on about oneself’.

3.2 Procedure

The sessions took place either in the participants’ or researcher’s own home, or in Joyce’s case, in the prayer group meeting room just after a prayer meeting. In each case, the researcher recorded the interview onto a laptop computer and each session lasted about one-and-a-half hours. The sessions began with general chat and drinking coffee. Some topics were discussed that were not connected, or only loosely so, with the subsequent

31 But he puts himself into the impersonal third person in order to say this.
interview. Sally and the interviewer walked over to the interviewer’s home after a prayer session at the school. They discussed the interviewer’s son who had helped with the computing arrangements. With Margaret, the interviewer was late, for which she apologised and Margaret mentioned the kind of things - finding her glasses and doing her ironing - which she had been able to do as a result. With Joyce, the interviewer discussed her own family, the smallholding in Wales they managed and their attitude to rural living, farming and food generally. With Cathy and John, they and the researcher started the session with fifteen minutes of silent prayer (not recorded!). Cathy’s interview followed John’s directly, on the same morning. Thus with the exception of Margaret, the interviews followed a time of prayer in which the interviewer had joined in with the participant. There was no effort made to standardise the immediate interview context, nor the interview question. Thus, the sessions are located in a period of naturalistic spontaneous chat and for all but one, a period of prayer.

The researcher transcribed the complete dialogue from these sessions, which gives a huge amount of linguistic data (over 85,500 words). To make the transcriptions, the researcher used Dragon Naturally Speaking voice recognition software and spoke the aural recording back into the laptop to convert to text, resulting in a text version with something like 75% accuracy of the original aural recording. The researcher then repeatedly played back the aural interview until the text was complete and correct and with as much of the original data transcribed into text as possible. To fully capture the detail, particularly of prosodic variation, the researcher slowed the recording speed. The original aural data are stored at www.faithnarratives.com and are available for inspection there. The original aural data of
specified passages presented as Text Boxes in Chapters 4-10 are included as an audio CD. The researcher used a set of transcription marking conventions based on the scheme proposed by Gail Jefferson. This and the full written texts are included in the Appendix.

3.3 Interview Question

The sessions, as discussed, are unstructured interviews. There is only one question: ‘How would you reply, if you met somebody at a party or in the pub, or wherever, and he unexpectedly turns to you and says, “Oh, do you have a faith, are you religious, do you pray?” What would you say?’ This is a fluent rendition of the question, in practice the researcher asks it in completely different ways across and within interviews. The differences in the way the research question is given and in the ‘chat’ that precedes the interview proper are an integral part of the study and are the topic of Chapters 9 and 8 respectively. These chapters consider the implications and consequences of the interview talk each set in its own conversational and discursive context. A second aspect of this question is that the researcher puts it into the mouth of an impersonal third person, referred to throughout as the hypothetical enquirer and of whom the research participant has no knowledge, prior expectations or assumptions other than his immediate words - does this person sympathise with faith or is he sceptical? This distinguishes him from the interviewer about whom the participants will hold an inference of support for their faith. This makes the interviewer’s footing (Goffman, 1981) explicit; she is at a distance from the research question - the animator not the composer of the question and the hypothetical enquirer is the origin for the question and un-addressed recipient of the reply. The research question was posed in this way firstly to highlight and not lose sight of the issue of footing as integral to any research interview, and secondly, to make a specific contextualised start to
respondents’ subsequent talk. The participants’ account or description of their faith is in
response to a remark that provokes it. Therefore, the analysis begins with this remark in
each case. The researcher took the view that people do not discuss their personal faith
openly or very frequently. The hypothetical enquirer device is an attempt to stimulate a
conversational reaction from the research participants to a relatively unusual topic of
conversation but in a social situation, rather than as a considered ‘answer’ posed to them in
a ‘research interview’.

The hypothetical enquirer device may throw up additional conversational complexity
arising from the functionalism paradigm of some Critical Discourse Analysis.
Functionalism is the view that the function of discursive (therefore social) action is to
uphold the structural elements (typically of power and value) integral to the social system at
hand. Conversationalists, in this view, work together to maintain the relationships between
them and to achieve strategic goals relevant to the social system they share. In addition to
institutional goals however, conversationalists orientate to personal goals and where these
are different or at odds, then a communicative dilemma arises (van den Berg 2003). This
can account for the considerable variability observed in discourse (see for example Van
Berg p. 122). The present study does not make an assumption of functionalism as a general
principle in its analysis, however it does assume that conversationalists orientate to their
understanding of interactional or conversational norms underlying the talk. How the
participants deal with the hypothetical enquirer and their specific version of his question
therefore is essential to the analysis in the present study.
3.4 **Talk-in-interaction**

The resultant *talk-in-interaction* of the interviews presented here has characteristics of both lengthy replies and ‘quick-fire’ dialogue; of monologic story telling and conversation; and of ‘formal question and answer’ and ‘chat’. Mazeland and ten Have (1996 p. 91) call those exchanges that are one-sided, where one person - the interviewee - speaks more often and for longer than does the interviewer, and which result in passages of monologue, or extended turns, a *discourse unit* (DU) interview. Whereas the ‘quick-fire’ dialogue they call a *turn-by-turn* (TBT) interview\(^{32}\). DA/CA discuss that the dialogue ‘turn shape’ reveals whether participants orientate themselves to an expectation of unequal access to the conversational floor or towards a more equitable sharing of this vital resource and this is noted and discussed as it occurs.

3.5 Heythrop College’s ethics committee approved the study before any interviews took place and the researcher explained the nature and purpose of the interviews to the interviewees prior to each session. The interviewees have given their permission for the discussion of their interview transcripts, including their publication in the present thesis and on the Internet. They have signed a participant consent form, included in the Appendix.

\(^{32}\) In a ‘quick-fire’ or turn-by-turn exchange, the time distance between one constructional turn unit and the next is small; see Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson, 1974.
Chapter 4

Story telling: Answering the hypothetical enquirer with a story - a discussion of the structural/functional, social cognitive and discursive perspectives of narrative.

4.0 SUMMARY

The present chapter presents data from the research interviews and notes the incidence of a structure that appears to be a ‘story’ within the relatively long passage of Sally’s fourth reply to the enquirer’s question of her faith. In recognition of Day’s recommendation for narrative analysis, the present chapter asks, ‘what makes this form a story, why did Sally tell it and what does she achieve with its telling?’ The chapter considers Labov and Waletzky’s (1967) structural/functional model for story as a stand alone unit for analysis but concludes that stories cannot be analysed independently from the discursive situation in which speakers produce them. It offers a discourse analysis (DA) of the story sequence in Sally’s speech and concludes with a discursive psychology (DP) perspective for this passage. This shows the speaker effecting an attribution of faith, making it psychologically relevant to her, in the course of her speech.

4.1 INTRODUCTION

James Day observes that ‘one of the most striking features of religious life is the degree to which it is storied’ (1993, p. 217). Narrative structures prevail in religious life as much as they do in all human experience. Narrative and linguistic analysis explore the story structure and purposes of oral story telling; literary criticism and textual criticism discuss this as it appears in writing. Discourse and conversation analysis also note sequences of story telling, as conversationalists speak these back and forth in turn-taking speech. In the present study, in a fourth attempt at answering the hypothetical enquirer’s question about
her faith, Sally makes the following short speech set out in Text Box 4.1 below. This is a turn of twelve lines of transcription, without interruption or comment from the interviewer. The speech seems recognisably in story form; is this passage a story and if so, what makes it so and why does Sally tell it here?

Text Box 4.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I:</th>
<th>[and I wondered if you’d had any incident like that ↑that =</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>S:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>(↓1.5) both ↓Welsh .hh my father both from (.) very, very poor I mean real poor backgrounds .hh my mother's father was a miner she was one of six .hh and they</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>wer. lived ↓you know there was no running water there was ↑no ↓thing we were ↓rea·dily poor .hh my ↑fath·er's family were er also hill farmers in (.) South Wales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>↓hh so they were brought up in real poverty my ↑father was a communist (↓.75) erm because of the ↑poverty he’d seen. hh erm my mother was they were both brought</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>up chapel (↓.75) which is you know (.) six hours on a Sunday enough to put anybody</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>off religion especially a child↓ .hh ↑so (.) we ↑did go to church (↓1.0) as a family (↓)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>erm ↑but I don’t think (.) we ever really thought about it and ↑I was a Sunday school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>teacher for ye:ars in my teens (↓1.5) you know every Sunday [I used to teach (↓)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>↓hhhh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S:</td>
<td>Sunday school .hh and =</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>S:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I:</td>
<td>sort of in the back ground</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>S:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I:</td>
<td>all part of (↓) life =</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>S:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I:</td>
<td>↑just generally there =</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 124 | S:  | = just in the background and of course I went to schools which had .hh (↓1.5)

Present research Sally: Ref S/1/103-124/4.1

DATA ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

4.2 The interest in story (or narrative) crosses the academic disciplines. Mishler discusses the ubiquity of story and that researchers across the social sciences regard it as a fundamental human activity. Thus Rayfield, (1972, p. 1085) an anthropologist, writes,

33 The numbered lines in the margin refer to the original transcript. See Appendix.
“the assumption that there exists universally in the human mind the concept [of] a certain structure … we call a story” and [deep structures of grammar are] ‘built into the human mind’ and ‘the story is… a natural psychological unit’.

Similarly, Gee (1985, p. 11) a linguist:

‘one of the primary ways - probably the primary way - human beings make sense of their experience is by casting it in a narrative form... This is an ability that develops early and rapidly in children, without explicit training and instruction’.

Dan McAdams a clinical psychologist, proposes the ‘story metaphor’ as a theoretical construct for the study of identity development and that the ubiquity of story,

‘...is so pervasively true that many scholars have suggested that the human mind is first and foremost a vehicle for storytelling’ (1993, p. 28).

Similarly, Alasdair MacIntyre, philosopher, observes,

‘It is because... we understand our own lives in terms of the narratives we live out that the form of narratives is appropriate for understanding the actions of others’ (1981).

In addition, Cohler (1982, p.207) writing from the perspective of psychoanalysis maintains:

‘the personal narrative which is recounted at any point in the course of life represent the most internally consistent interpretation of past, experienced present, and anticipated future at that time’.

Daiute and Lightfoot (2004: xi) argue that in the area of human, social and linguistic development,

‘…narrative discourse organises life social relations, interpretations of the past and plans for the future’.

The ubiquity of story and the story form, seemingly apparent in Sally’s excerpt in Text Box 4.1, leads to the view that this structure expresses the essence of human cognition itself.

Thus, Sarbin (1983, p.8) proposes narrative as the ‘root metaphor’ for psychology because:
‘human beings think, perceive, imagine, and make moral choices according to narrative structures’.

The implication of these authors’ words is that the essence of story, as we find it displayed in oral speech, is fundamental to the interpretation and understanding of that speech. So what, therefore, is a story\(^{34}\)? The study of story is narratology, and researchers in this field have traditionally focussed on the internal structures of story to study the different component parts and how these cohere together. In a linguistic analysis, the structures of discourse are, classically: morpheme, word, phrase, clause, and sentence with long passages treated as several sentences strung together. Today, analysts recognise ‘\textit{story}’ as a discriminable unit of organised discourse beyond the level of sentence and when this deals with personal events of the story teller this unit is known as ‘\textit{life story}’ (Linde, 1993). This perspective treats personal vignettes, which Sally’s speech here appears to be, as a type within the general class of ‘narrative’.

\textbf{4.2.1} The focus of narrative research may be on the identification of abstract universal elements of the narrative, or on the performance of story telling (for example see Brockmeier and Carbaugh, 2001 as cited in Benwell and Stokoe, 2006 p. 131); or on the distinctions between story and non-story. An early pioneer of narrative structure is Vladimir Propp (1968), who analysed the plot lines of Russian fairy tales and claimed they contained particular plot elements occurring systematically in sequence. Northrop Frye (1957) devised a grammar of narrative \textit{genres}, where he claimed four basic categories capture all story plot lines of literature: comedy, tragedy, romance and satire. The historian

---

\(^{34}\) See Benwell and Stokoe, 2006 Chapter 4, for an overview of story and the construction of identity and Edwards, 1997, Chapter 10, fact construction.
Hayden White (1973) applied these categories to his study of historical narratives. Kenneth Gergen (1994, pp.189-90 as discussed in Edwards 1997, p. 273) outlines a typology for story following earlier and similar typologies from Burke (1945) and Bruner (1990, both cited in Edwards, 1997, p. 272). A well-formed narrative in his view has (1) a valued end-point, goal or ‘point’; (2) an ordering of events, not necessarily told in the order in which they occur (flashbacks, insertions etc.); (3) stable identities for the main characters, which may develop; (4) causal links and explained outcomes; (5) demarcation signs (in conversation) marking stories’ beginnings and ends. Gergen notes of these typologies, that it is difficult to seek ‘a definitive account [for narrative structure]…there is a virtual infinity of possible story forms…’ (1994, p.195, cited in Edwards 1997, p. 274). Alternatively, analysts may study the purpose of story telling using a variety of differing theoretical approaches - looking at the events as narrated, to ask ‘what happened’ and is the story a true account? Or to study people’s perception of the events to ask, ‘what is their understanding, mental picture, or ‘view’?

4.2.2 A socio-linguistics perspective for narrative coding is articulated in Labov (1972) and Labov and Waletzky’s (1967/2003) study of American oral narratives. This work began as a way of comparing verbal skills across socio-linguistic categories. Labov subsequently based his model for story and its analysis on the ‘personal experience life story’ and defines story as, ‘one method of recapitulating past experience by matching a verbal sequence of clauses to the sequence of events which (it is inferred) actually occurred’ (Labov, 1972, p. 359; see also Linde, 1993, p. 68). This definition, therefore, takes story to be a sequence of actual occurrences represented in or by a sequence of
The sequence of events as the storyteller relates them need not follow the actual sequence - plots in a story may include flashbacks and other out of order events for the purpose of the drama of the telling. The *presumed* order within the narrative must mirror reality however, since the contiguous sequence of events determines the sense of the story through the inference of causality. The story may not necessarily be ‘true’ nor the storyteller give an accurate account of detail. Labov argued that for a stretch of talk to be a narrative, it must contain at least two clauses that are temporally ordered. Under this definition, the most basic of stories is a very simple sequence of clauses, such as:

**Example 1**

‘well this person had a little too much to drink and he attacked me and the friend came in and she stopped it’.


**4.2.3** The participant gave this story, in Labov and Waletzky’s study, in reply to an interview question as to whether the speaker had ‘ever been in danger of death’. Linde asserts this brief story form to be extremely rare. She believes such a minimal story to be an artefact of the interview situation that occurs when the speaker tells a narrative that is unpleasant or painful to relate; and she refers to it, consequently, as ‘*aberrant*’. Linde further maintains that respondents in research interviews give shortened stories, because they feel obliged to give ‘answers’ to the direct ‘questions’ the researcher poses to them as ‘subjects’ and suggests, that ‘the minimal narrative may... exist in spontaneous conversation functioning as a bid for permission to tell the full narrative’ (p. 69).

---

35 It is therefore, a realist definition, one that understands language in conversation in principle able to describe real events happening beyond, or within, the subjectivity of the speaker.
4.2.4 The present study has passages of talk that look very much like Example 1 and Text Box 4.2 below gives three such passages from the beginning of the present study interviews with Sally, Joyce and Cathy. Sally and Joyce’s story are in response to the original interview question - ‘how would you reply to a person suddenly asking you if you had a faith?’ and Cathy’s to ‘what changed, what happened next?’ Sally and Cathy’s stories are remarkably concise, their story structure very similar to that in Example 1 above. Joyce’s story is just two or three lines, concluding as she says, ‘she would just stop’:

Text Box 4.2

**Sally: 1**

S: ↑yes ↑erm (2.5) I’ve ↑had people I’ve ↑had people say to me do you believe in ↓God
and in the past I’ve said ↓no (.75) although I used to when I was younger and then I went through a phase when I decided I didn’t .hh and then I’ve come back to it .hh

**Joyce: 2**

I: and (1.0) h.has anybody recently asked you this? or ev. have you ever had to (.) stand up and explain to somebody (.) has someone or (0.5) just sort of in passing in conversation have you ever (1.0) have you ever been asked this? or
J: no not [really
100 I: [no not really
I: but it wouldn’t cause you any difficulty or bother (.) you would just say yes?
102 J: but I wouldn’t get involved in arguing about it I mean I wouldn’t want to pursue it
I: no
104 J: I mean I’m not I mean er (.) I would say yes I have a faith I’m a Roman catholic and that would be that and I wouldn’t wish to discuss any more
106 I: you wouldn’t say ‘I’m a Christian’?
J: well if you’re a Ro. if you’re a Roman catholic you are [a Christian
108 I: [mm
I: yes yes yeah
110 J: I would say I am a Christian catholic a Roman Catholic
I: mm (1.0) now [I know
112 J: [good afternoon and I I just would [stop
I: [yes

**Cathy: 3**

266 I: and then you what happened next what happened
C: erm >what happened then< erm .hh yes kept going to sort of evangelical Anglican
church then did midwifery (0.75) back in ((place)) and then there was a Baptist church [around I went to (.) and went out with a Baptist minister for a while
270 I: [mm
I: mm
272 C: so I was very drawn to that particular church

Source: present research Sally ref S/91-93/4.2; Joyce ref 1A/96-113/4.2; Cathy ref C/266-272/4.2
4.2.5 The purpose of presenting excerpts from the present study is not to settle a disputed point of story form, but to note that immediately into the present discussion we are asking - and speculating - why do speakers tell their the stories in the form it is, and when it is? Do respondents feel ‘obliged’, and are they feeling discomfort at telling a painful or difficult story? If the so-called minimal narrative does exist as a bid for permission to tell a full story as Linde asserts, is that what the participants in the three passages above are doing? It seems that the interviewer gives Joyce many opportunities to expand her account, but still her story is very brief - is there no more to her faith journey than this? The structural analysis of story as a stand-alone unit does not provide a basis for the interpretation of the discourse without a further understanding of what the participants are doing with that discourse; a functional analysis is needed in addition.

4.2.6 Labov and Waletzky (1967/2003) offer such an analysis in their model by noting the separate component parts of a story and relating these to a functional purpose. Labov describes it:

‘a fully formed narrative begins with an orientation, proceeds to the complicating action, is suspended at the focus of evaluation before the resolution, concludes with the resolution, and returns the listener to the present time with the coda’. (1972, p. 369).

Table 4.1 below shows their model together with Sally’s words from Text Box 4.1 (lines 104-114). The passage appears to fit the model well:
Table 4.1: Structural-Functional Components of Narrative

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Structural Component</th>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Sally from Box 3.1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*Abstract</td>
<td>An introductory element, a brief summary, indicating that a narrative is about to be told</td>
<td>‘oh yes I do believe’ (104)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orientation</td>
<td>The setting, or background for the narrative</td>
<td>‘you know it started off when I was younger’ (105)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complicating Action</td>
<td>The events of the narrative’s plot, often told in simple past tense</td>
<td>lines (105-113)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolution</td>
<td>The outcome of the narrative, the ending</td>
<td>‘so (.) we did go to church (.) as a family’ (113)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Coda</td>
<td>A final segment that leads the narrative back to the present interaction</td>
<td>‘but I don’t think () we ever really thought about it’ (114)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Evaluation</td>
<td>An assessment of the narrative events</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Labov (1972:369) as adapted in Wennerstrom (2001b).

*The abstract and the coda are optional and the evaluation – a key function of story – can occur throughout the story’s telling not only at the end.

Within this model, Sally’s opening statement, ‘oh yes I do believe’ (104) functions as an abstract or summary for the personal story she is about to tell. The abstract is considered optional; Wald (1978, pp. 128-40, cited in Linde, 1993, p. 69) terms it an announcement and Sacks (1971, cited in Linde, p. 69) and Goodwin (1984) the preface. Linde discusses the abstract may serve to summarise the narrative, or offer an evaluation of the story to come; Benwell and Stokoe (op. cit. p. 133) call it the ‘point’. It typically (but not necessarily) comes at the start. Sally follows the abstract, with a setting or orientation of the story, ‘when I was younger’, answering the question ‘when?’. The orientation may additionally address ‘who’, ‘what’ or ‘where’. The model allows that the orientation clauses may not necessarily come at the beginning of the story and Linde suggests that skilful placing of the orientation distinguishes good storytellers from poor. The bulk of Sally’s
story (105-113) is a series of clauses in the simple past tense given in the presumed order of the actual events. She describes, in some detail, various events of her and her parents’ life and answers the question, ‘what happened next’. She brings the details together, ‘resolving’ them (a component Linde excludes) by declaring that her family went together to church. Labov describes this as ‘what finally happened’. An optional coda signals ‘the end’.

Finally, Sally gives an assessment or evaluation of her story that ‘she never really thought about it’ (114) - church was something that she just did. The evaluation is a key component to stories, without it the passage is not a story. Evaluation may occur at any point throughout the story and any of the structural components just discussed may be evaluating. Labov describes the evaluation as explaining why the narrator tells the story and what her point of view\textsuperscript{36} on events is. There are different kinds of evaluation - ‘so what?’ perhaps, or, ‘why is this story reportable and tellable?’ (Polyani, 1979).

4.2.7 With this model, a listener presumes to understand the origin of Sally’s faith and certain features of it and may attribute an evaluating motivation to Sally as she tells it. However, this analysis treats the passage as a stand-alone story, internally organised and context free appearing as a story waiting to be told, fitting ready-made into the conversation. It does not expound on the motive for telling the story - we cannot know why Sally tells this story in the way she does, unless we speculate on its origins in the psychology of the individual - in intentions, personal experiences and memories. Why does she cite her parents? What relevance do they have to Sally’s faith? We may ask the same

\textsuperscript{36}The phrase, ‘point of view’ here is cognitivist - this is the framework of Labov and Waletzky’s model and is a key point distinguishing it from DP, discussed further throughout the present thesis.
questions of this story as we did earlier, of the ‘minimal story’ supposedly elicited in research interviews.

In Linde’s (1993) discussion of Labov and Waletzky’s model, she gives examples of stories to show their structural components, but includes the conversational setting where they occur. In this manner, her analysis moves Labov and Waletzky’s account into a more discursive direction than did Labov himself.

4.2.8 Abstract component

Discussing the abstract component, Linde gives the following two conversational excerpts:

Example 2

ANN:     Well – ((throat clear)) (0.4) We could use a liddle, 
marijuana. tih get through the weekend.
BETH:   What h[appened? 
ANN:     [Karen has this new hou;se . . .


Abstracts occur at the boundaries, therefore Linde notes, they may be specifically useful in serving an interactive function. In the above excerpt, Ann offers an abstract, which Goodwin calls ‘a preface offering to tell the story’ and Beth ‘accepts the offer’ by requesting the story be told (what happened?). This makes this sequence appear as a negotiation. Alternatively, the story telling may be a co-production, as in the example below:
Example 3

BILL: I heard secondhand or whatever that you got robbed.
SUSAN: Yeah.
BILL: That’s distressing. What happened?
SUSAN: We were parked down at the hill . . .


In this excerpt, it is the other speaker (Bill), not the storyteller, who provides the abstract; it is only when we hear the speech as a spate-of-talk that this story component is realised and without his words, Susan’s story misses the abstract component. Furthermore Bill contributes to the story before hearing it, that it is ‘distressing’. Text Box 4.3 below has two excerpts from the present study with the abstract separated from the story in this way. In the first passage, the arrowed lines show the abstract as preface and the listener asking for the story to be told (as in Example 2 above); and in passage two, the arrows show the first speaker giving the abstract but the second speaker telling the story, (as in Example 3):

Text Box 4.3

1: Margaret
546 → M: which ↑wasn’t very comfortable at the time
and I didn’t tell my husband for a::g↓es =
548 I: = it ↑was↑n’t com↓fortable
M: ↓no
550 I: wh. wh. why =
M: = I didn’t like ↓it
552 → I: ↑why wasn’t it comfort[↓able
M: [it just didn’t feel. you kn. it felt it was asking a bit (0.75)
d↓much ((laughs))

2: Sally
→ I: ↓right (.) but then it ↓changed =
142 S: = yes =
144 I: = something happened so tell me [that story what
S: [erm
I: ↑what (.) [what↓ changed
146 → S: [↑we↓ll I went ↑to. I went away to uni↓versity (0.5) er I went to Oxford (.75)
continues

Source: present research Margaret ref M/546-553/4.3; and Sally ref S/141-146/4.3
4.2.9 Evaluation component

The evaluation component of Labov and Waletzky’s structural model, Linde discusses, is considerably more varied and hard to classify. She suggests, ‘we went home to my house’ is a simple narrative statement, but ‘we finally went home...’ is evaluative. Further, she says, ‘even simple repetition can have evaluative force, as in, “He looked and he looked and he looked for her”... is clearly more evaluative than the sentence, “He looked for her” ’⁴⁷. Linde continues that the evaluative functions include - contrast in linguistic forms, (for example switching from indirect to direct speech) indicating a heightening of action; paralinguistic features such as pitch or tone of voice, and by non-linguistic features such as gesture and facial expression (see Wolfson, 1982, for discussion of the paralinguistic features in performed narrative). With this understanding of evaluation, it would seem that the so-called minimal story discussed above is not a story since (as presented in Example 1) it contains no evaluation.

4.2.10 Linde suggests that the evaluation construct of the Labov and Waletzky model is not a stand-alone structural/functional component, but rather speaker and listener achieve an evaluation through negotiation between them. Not only must the storyteller build evaluation into her account, she must do this in such a way and provide suitable cues so that the listener can understand; and the listener must provide acknowledgment, accepting, rejecting or nuancing, the speaker’s proposition. Goodwin and Goodwin (1987) provide examples of successful and unsuccessful negotiations, as do the texts of the present research:

⁴⁷ In this example, Linde uses a ‘three-part-list’ - the three ‘he lookeds (Jefferson 1990). CA/DA discusses that a three-part-list is not only evaluative, but generalising and making universally true.
Example 4

EILEEN: This beautiful, (o.2) Irish setter
DEBBIE: Ah : : :
EILEEN: Came tearin up in ta the first gree(h)n an tried to steal Pau(h)l's go(h)lf ball. · hh


Text Box 4.4

| 1106 C: | = in the whole of my life but for some reason it seems to have been (o.25) erm (o.5)
| 1108 | it ↑seems to have been a sort of catalyst that allows the water to flow ↑in and I
| 1110 | I: → mm (o.25) I'm reading it [now
| 1112 | C: → [and ↑are ↑you
| 1114 C: | [aah
| 1116 I: | → m↑↓m
| 1118 C: | and (.) I mean I just found that book so amazing

Source: Present research Cathy: Ref C/1/1106-1117/4.4

In Example 4, the first speaker, Eileen, sets up an evaluation (‘this beautiful’) that the second speaker, Debbie, (‘Ah:::’) accepts, matching and joining in the affect display contained in the assessment. The passage in Text Box 4.4 is similar with co-evaluation continuing over six lines of transcription. Cathy sets up the evaluation of the book ‘The Teacher Within’ (1110). The interviewer joins in (line 1111), which Cathy notes with approval (the upward stress on ‘are you’ and ‘aah’) .The interviewer continues the positive

38 The Goodwins give the transcription marking for an extended vowel - a series of colons - after the word, Ah::: The present study places it within the sound, A:::h, or with a double a - aah - as at line 1114 in Text Box4.4.
evaluation (with the augmented stress ‘\(m \uparrow \downarrow m\)\(^{39}\)) and Cathy concludes by stating her approval explicitly. All the lines marked with an arrow contribute to this construction. This talk is not only evaluative, but is something that is responded to, participated in, and co-constructed.

4.2.11 In the two sequences below, the second speaker does not support the evaluative comment the first speaker suggests. In Example 5, the second speaker withholds his agreement to the first, through silence, and then acknowledges, but not necessarily assents to it, with a nod.

**Example 5**

CURT: *This guy had, a beautiful thirty two O:lds*  

CURT: Original  
MIKE: ((Nod))


Goodwin and Goodwin discuss that agreements in talk are not automatic (that is, triggered by specific cognitive stimuli) but are an achievement within it. Curt supplies specific additional information to Mike to encourage him not only to make a response at all, but one contributing positively to the assessment Curt has set up. But Mike’s nod does not do this; it is a relevant reply, acknowledging that it is his turn to speak, but it withholds agreement\(^{40}\).

---

\(^{39}\) This is an instance of the so-called minimal reply token being anything other than minimal, due to its prosodic stress - it co-constructs the present evaluation.  
\(^{40}\) Although, of course, what the text does not show is that Mike could be nodding extremely vigorously to indicate full agreement - there may have been any number of reasons why he did not speak!
In Text Box 4.5 below, from the present research, the interviewer responds twice, with ‘ah’ ironised through laughter, and then after prompting, explicitly rejects it:

Text Box 4.5

| 420 S: | er colloquial way you know I don't you know when (name) prays for example or the vicar or you you say you have the right (.) exactly the right words and I just (0.5) I just | chat really |
| 422 I: | → £ah£ (laughing word) | |
| 424 S: | its not really | £ah£ (laughing word) |
| 426 I: | → do you know what I [MEAN | ggh ggh |
| 428 S: | it's not me ↑ei↓ther for [heavens sake | |
| 429 I: | → [o::h its is tho you do = | Source: Present research Sally: Ref S/1/420-429/4.5 |

Sally makes an evaluation of the interviewer and others’ ability with prayer. The interviewer responds three times with an equivocal reply (the first three arrowed lines). These lines indicate a dispreferred sequence (Pomerantz 1984). Sally sets her assertion up for the interviewer to agree but the interviewer delays doing this as it would confer a self-compliment (that she is skilful in saying public prayers). Additionally, laughter (either outright, or as here ‘laughter particles’ at lines 423 and 425) is associated with trouble, either of personal stress (as in therapeutic or depth psychology interviews) or interactional trouble within the conversation (Potter and Hepburn, 2010). When the interviewer finally disagrees overtly (428) she includes an idiomatic phrase, ‘for heaven’s sake’ which generalises her disagreement and makes it less personal. This enables Sally to continue (429) her words prefaced with an ‘oh’ marker which several studies have shown speakers using when asserting and sharing knowledge statements (for example, see Clift, 2006; Heritage, 1984 a and b, 2005; Heritage and Greatbach, 1991; Heritage and Raymond,
This negotiation has continued over several lines of transcription due to the interviewer’s delays and enable Sally to have a second chance to make her claim (with which she finally wins the argument).

In Linde’s discussion of the story structure, she privileges for analysis the discursive environment where speakers tell them. Constructing and agreeing an evaluation is subtle and embedded within the actions of the talk-in-interaction for the two participants. When there is an audience of more than one, then clearly the dynamics for group negotiation can become complex. In a further move away from story as a stand alone model, Linde notes two aspects of constructing and negotiating evaluations in speech which, she asserts, cannot be divorced from the situatedness of the story at hand; the first is the reportability or ‘newsworthiness’ of the *story content* and the second, the construction of the *moral character* of the speaker.

4.2.12 Newsworthiness

An event, if it happens every day is not newsworthy. To become told as a story, Labov suggests (1972 p. 390) it must either be unusual in some way, or run counter to expectations or norms. In the present research, one respondent, Joyce, tells a whole series of interesting, unusual and supernatural stories to support her claim for Divine intervention in the world. The passage in Text Box 4.6 below is typical:
Joyce presents her conclusion to the interviewer for her to accept with raised pitch at the end of ‘it worked’ and ‘coming’ (319/320) and with the low volume on ‘he became a Christian’ (321). Her co-conversationalist acknowledges the story explicitly and in her matching of Joyce’s low volume (322). This Joyce in her turn immediately accepts. Labov claims this passage as a story (it has reportability) because the event it describes is unusual; and the interviewer here explicitly agrees. Listeners appear to recognise passages of talk as story - because of story’s newsworthiness - and also, as is the case in the present passage, due to the spoken delivery of the words. Joyce’s turn here contains direct reported speech and a great deal of prosodic dynamic change; it sounds like it is a performance of story telling, or ‘doing stories’. How stories exhibit design in their unusual content is the topic of Section 6.2 in Chapter 6.
4.2.13 ‘How things are’ - making worlds, making self

If narratives involve a negotiation between speaker and listener about how they are to understand the events of the story, then storytellers may need to include certain expectations of values or ‘the ways things are’ in the negotiation if speakers are to have any chance of agreeing. Particularly if the evaluation contains a strong assertion, or something unlikely or unbelievable, the negotiation may include an assessment of the speaker’s actions - such as ‘I did what any other competent, good, or faithful person would have done’, or a discussion of ‘how the world works’. Further, if the narrative includes a claim to knowledge, then the speaker may need to show that the claim does not rest on any subjective or psychological motivation of the speaker. Linde’s second argument is that almost inevitably, therefore, narratives include a presentation of the moral character of the speaker.

The passage in Text Box 4.5 discussed above, comes just after Sally has told an eventful story where she claims she had faith as a young girl, she loses it at university, but much later re-gains it, un-dramatically, during a funeral service. There may be many reasons why Sally claims to have regained her faith but she presents this as a genuine faith response and not just an emotional reaction felt in the moment of the church service. Some time later, a friend asks her to become a member of a prayer group, something even when she had faith as a girl she would not have done; but now Sally goes along. In Text Box 4.5, Sally presents herself as a person ‘who does not know how to pray’ by contrasting herself with others, including the vicar and her current collocutor, who, she presumes, do know how to
pray. The fact of her praying therefore is evidence for her changed faith status and makes her faith claim appear more reasonable.

In Margaret’s interview, she and the interviewer have been discussing Margaret’s faith, which she calls a kind of experiential knowing of God’s love and which she claims always to have had. The passage in Text Box 4.7 below comes after a discussion whether the fact of evil in the world must throw the existence of a loving and providential God into doubt; can it be rational to hold such a belief? :

**Text Box 4.7**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M: →</th>
<th>erm (1.0) I (0.25) I ↑ have ex↓erenced erm (0.75) well ↑ for ↑ instance ↓ now as I’m</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>182</td>
<td>getting o↑ld↓er</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I:</td>
<td>mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>184</td>
<td>M: → ↑ much ↓ older I mean ↑ I’m 75 ↓ now I was [75 last week]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I:</td>
<td>[mm]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>186</td>
<td>I: ↑ m↓m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M:</td>
<td>erm (.) and the news is so appall↓ing and sometimes I think (.) and I say to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>188</td>
<td>((husband’s name)) ↑ oh for God’s sake let’s turn it off↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I:</td>
<td>mm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the middle of telling a story about the existence of evil in the world, Margaret interrupts herself to mention that she has just had a birthday. She constructs herself as experienced - her age is evidence of her experience of the world - to ward off the challenge that she is naïve in believing in a loving God (this is further discussed in paragraph 7.4 in Chapter 7).

In a passage in John’s interview, he constructs the nature of other people (who have faith) and himself, in order to support his claim that there can be no God:
John observes other people including his own father who hold irrational (as John maintains) faith beliefs. He constructs them as highly intelligent (arrows 1, 2 and 3 at lines 135-7), therefore an alternative explanation than that they are just unthinking is required to explain their faith. He then presents them as ‘needy’ (140-2) and that they ‘have to believe’ for some unspecified intra-subjective reason (arrows 4-6). This, supports John’s earlier assertion that their professed faith is not independent of the subjectivity of the believer, but is a projection of the psyche (arrows 7 and 8, 133/4). He finally, constructs himself (arrow
9, 144) as exhibiting faith behaviour when he was younger, for the same, extrinsic reasons.
(This passage is discussed further in Section 5.5 in Chapter 5.)

4.2.14 The present discussion began by noting the good fit of the Labov and Waletzky functional/structural model for the ‘story’ as Sally tells in Text Box 4.1. It then moved to consider the model in discursive conversation and finally discussed two further aspects - the content of the story as reportable, and the construction of the moral character of the actors within it. There are two further concerns with the structural/functional model considered as stand alone and independent of the discursive context which houses it. Firstly, it is not evidentially clear which of the phrases in the opening passage in Text Box 4.1 necessarily reflects the particular component suggested for it. The present analysis puts the evaluation component at the end (at line 114) because that seemed a good fit, in which case, the point of the story is that Sally grew up with her faith in the background rather than daily ‘in mind’. But Labov’s classic structure has the resolution as the final component - ‘what finally happens’ before the coda returns the speaker to the conversational moment. Therefore, Sally’s phrase ‘so we did go to church as a family’ (113) might be the evaluation. In this case, is the unusual and resolving point of the story that Sally’s family went to church when chapel might have been expected, or that, surprisingly, her family, including her communist father went to church together? In this case, ‘I don’t think we ever really thought about it’ is the coda and it does indeed lead Sally back to a small dialogue with the interviewer on this point (lines 118-124). But here again lies a difficulty - when is the dialogue a return to the conversation and when is it a component of the stand alone story discursively negotiated - a co-production - along the lines seen in the examples
above? Bell (1983, cited in Mishler, p. 100) makes a very similar point. She points out that the model does not make clear a story’s boundary from beginning to end nor how episodes tie-in and relate to each other.

**4.2.15** This leads to the second concern: It may be that the flexibility of interpretation of the different component parts is a strength of this model, allowing it to fit most spoken passages that seem clearly to be stories. If this were the case, one might expect many relatively lengthy turns able to demonstrate this story form (particularly across interviews of over an hour in length); but this is not the case with the present data. Very shortly after the passage in Text Box 4.1 the interviewer asks of Sally, ‘*something happened so tell me that story*’ (143) and Text Box 4.9 below has Sally’s reply. When invited to tell a story, Sally does so, but it is hard to fit her words unequivocally into the component structure of the Labov and Waletzky model as in the earlier passage in Text Box 4.1:
Present research Sally: Ref S/1/138-161/4.9

There is an orienting sequence in this passage - Sally goes away to university (146), answering the question, ‘where?’ but the abstract is given by the interviewer (as discussed in paragraph 4.2.8 above). The orientation contrasts Sally’s home life with university in some detail and it includes the word ‘talking’ said three times (149) - a three-part-list (Jefferson, 1990) There is no complicating action at all - a point which the interviewer explicitly queries in her turn, ‘was there any...’ (156). Sally makes an assertion in this passage of ‘all the usual things that people think’ (152) and it is only this general claim of ‘other people’ and the detail of the orientation that moves Sally’s talk to its clear resolution - Sally had been a very religious little girl and teenager and wanted to serve God (another list of three items) but now she becomes ‘quite aggressively against the idea of God’ (155).
This is a surprising conclusion given Sally’s earlier strong faith, yet the interviewer appears to accept this just as happily as she had Sally’s account of her younger faith. Thus, in this passage, which was solicited to be told as a story, the complicating action component of the Labov and Waletzky model is entirely missing and consequently it does not explain why the story, if it is a story, should be successful.

4.2.16 The Labov and Waletzky model does not address the action of completing a successful negotiation in oral storytelling in conversation because the methodological assumptions underlying the original study specifically exclude this. When Labov and Waletzky asked individuals to tell their stories, they noted that there may be many ‘biases’ to their respondents’ replies, such as the so called ‘observer paradox’ where individuals self-consciously ‘correct’ their speech, if they make a slip or what they take to be an inarticulation or lack of suitable formality. To counteract this, Labov and Waletzky asked their storytellers to tell of an exciting story, ‘where you nearly died’. Speakers would become so involved in the story, they assumed, that they would forget they were being observed. In this manner, their speech would be of and for itself and explicitly not in response to any reaction from the listener. This treats the social engagement between researcher and respondent unproblematically as a stimulus and response (S-R) exchange. Every respondent receives (it is presumed) the same stimulus (the research question) and with biases removed, any pattern or variation in the responses must be due to the research variable, in this case the ‘pure’ story form. Mishler (1986) strongly queries the notion that research questions are the same across different interviews. He gives examples of research questions asked by himself and another researcher in a survey project. In social surveys,
researchers typically give the research questions to interviewers in written form and advise them to stick to this wording, since to deviate from it might prejudice the survey data\textsuperscript{42}. However Mishler could show tiny differences between his and the other researcher’s interview words (despite their being highly skilled and experienced survey researchers) and argued that these differences vitiate the assumption of identity in the stimulus question. (Chapter 9 of the present study explores the effect and significance of differences in interview questioning, in discursive interviews.)

4.2.17 A second problem with Labov and Waletzky’s method is an unexpressed presupposition behind it. Schegloff (2003) notes an inconsistency of the research method in that the performance of the telling that gives rise to the story is assumed to obscure its structure, but that the story topic (\textit{a near death encounter}) is assumed to be independent of it. Schegloff critiques the Labov and Waletzky’s interview method in similar terms to Mishler (1986) and as Gilbert and Mulkay (1984) interpret scientists’ accounts of their work. Schegloff asserts that Labov and Waletzky’s focus on the ‘pure form’ of story does not explore nor acknowledge the relevance of the discursive context. When the analysis retains this and does not strip it out, either the performance of the telling or its topic, researchers note many differences to the story structure of Labov and Waletzky’s model. For example, the evaluation component may be entirely oriented to the \textit{manner} of the listener’s enquiry, as some of the examples given in the present chapter have explored. When stories come up naturally in speech, Schegloff maintains, the evaluation is often missing. This is the case in \textit{Sally 1} and in \textit{Joyce 2} in Text Box 4.2 above (but not \textit{Cathy 3}).

\textsuperscript{42} As indeed it would given the theoretical underpinning of this kind of realist research. See discussion in Chapter 2 and Table 1a.
Jefferson (1978) found that when evaluations do occur, they are not unproblematically accepted by the enquirer and may become themselves the object of the discussion, as is the case with Sally and the interviewer in the passage in Text Box 4.5 above. She further found distinctive patterns in speech behaviour to be topic dependent (Jefferson & Lee 1981, Wooffitt 1992) as does the present study (discussed below at Section 6.2 in Chapter 6). Other differences can occur when a story is solicited by an enquirer as a response to a query, rather than elicited by the speaker from other motives; the differences in Sally’s turn in Text Box 4.1 and in Text Box 4.2 may show this and also, very clearly, in the passage in Text Box 4.7, just discussed. If story recipients contest the initial premises of a story’s telling, this will substantially shape the outcome (Goodwin, 1986) as do other kinds of listener interpretations (see Jefferson, 1978; Lerner, 1992; Schegloff, 1992; Mandelbaum, 1993).

4.2.18 There are clearly very different kinds of speech exchange undertaken in different contexts and for different reasons and where participants’ share or disagree the underlying normative expectations. One such is the very formal story telling session of Labov and Waletzky’s study, another, the unstructured (or narrative) interviews of the present research. The present chapter has discussed the structural/functional model for story in conversation and notes:

(i) The research literature and data from the present study show that the individual components from the Labov and Waletzky model may only appear in dialogic rather than
monologic speech - the component structures from abstract to evaluation, may arise only as the analyst considers the co-conversationalist along with the storyteller.

(ii) Even when asked to tell a ‘story’ the resultant speech may miss out elements of the model (specifically, the complicating action) and yet the passage of talk still appears to function within its conversational setting very well.

(iii) The content of the story - whether it is unbelievable for instance - and speakers’ purposes for telling a story, are relevant to the participants of the story telling as it appears in conversation and therefore to its analysis as discourse.

(iv) Both speakers in discourse, the story teller and the listener, participate in the story, to agree it, share it, and negotiate evaluations, assessments and conclusions, and therefore an analyst cannot meaningfully remove ‘the story’ from the conversation that constructs it.

4.3 Rather than understand a story as reflective of an independent cognitive structure, the present discussion suggests that this form is due to the combined efforts of collocutors in dialogue; nevertheless, passages of written text can seem to be recognizably stories. A discursive perspective treats these as it does any passage of talk and asks, ‘how do speakers construct these apparent forms in dialogue, why do speakers say these when they do, and what do they achieve in the conversation through them?’ To address these questions, the present discussion returns to the passage from Sally’s interview in Text Box 4.1, with
which the chapter opened, to discuss this sequence in light of the discursive perspective just outlined.

4.3.1 Sally speaks this sequence after a few minutes from the start of the interview in reply to the hypothetical enquirer who has asked her four times of her faith. Up until this reply, Sally has had trouble framing a satisfactory answer and the conversation has not been fluent, with turn constructions completed efficiently and quickly (see discussion at section 8.2 in Chapter 8). Eventually, Sally dismisses the enquirer and makes a clear statement of belief (104). She says this assertively, stressing ‘do’ with leaned on emphasis and ending on a downwards pitch accent on ‘believe’ and beginning with an ‘oh’ particle. As a claim to knowledge and of priority over the listener(s) in that knowledge, Sally’s words could hardly be stronger:
Text Box 4.10

| I:  | [and I wondered if you’d had any incident like that ↑that = |
| S:  | = no I ↑can’t. don’t think I have (.) but if I did have I’d say oh yes I do ↓believe |
|     | (.75) erm (.25) ↓you know it ↑started off when I was younger (.) my ↑parents were |
|     | (1.5) both ↓Welsh .hh my father both from (.) very, very poor I mean real poor |
|     | backgrounds .hh my mother’s father was a miner she was one of six .hh and they |
|     | ↓really poor .hh my ↑father’s family were er also hill farmers in (.) South Wales |
|     | .hh so they were brought up in real poverty my ↑father was a communist (.75) erm |
|     | because of the ↑poverty he’d seen. hh erm my mother was they were both brought |
|     | ↑up chapel (.75) which is you know (.) six hours on a Sunday enough to put anybody |
|     | off religion especially a child↑ .hh ↑so (.) we ↑did go to church (.) as a family (1.0) |
|     | erm ↑but I don’t think (.) we ever really thought about it and ↑I was a Sunday school |
|     | teacher for ye:ars in my teens (1.5) you know every Sunday [I used to teach (.) |
| I:  | [.hhhhh |
| S:  | Sunday school .hh and = |
| S:  | = it I never really ↑thought ↓about it it was just, (0.5) |
| I:  | sort of in the back ground |
| S:  | ↑yea↓h |
| I:  | all part of (.) life = |
| S:  | = that’s [↑right |
| I:  | ↓just generally there = |
| S:  | = just in the background and of course I went to schools which had .hh (1.5) |

Present research Sally: Ref S/1/103-124/4.10

There is a great deal of research interest in the phenomenon of evidentiality in talk - the indexing of the source of information on which a speaker basis a knowledge claim and of the reliability of that claim (see Clift, 2006). In some languages, the status of evidentiality is a grammatical category. In English, there are non-grammatical means to index the point of origin of a speaker’s knowledge and their rights in claiming it, and first person reported speech and the ‘oh’ particle are two such means. A series of research studies on ‘oh’ particles (Heritage 1984b) has shown it displaying a change of knowledge state or understanding - Sally exhibits a new self awareness and declares it to the interviewer (see also Heritage, 1985; Heritage and Greatbach 1991; Heritage and Raymond, 2005). Sally is due epistemic priority over the interviewer by producing her evaluation first. Sally claims
epistemic authority with the ‘oh’ marker, positioning herself as informing her listener. Her mode of reported speech is forced on her by the interviewer’s use of the hypothetical enquirer; nevertheless Sally does not shrink from replying in like form ‘I [woul]d say...’ This decontextualises her reply - it is what she would say to anyone in any circumstances and supports her epistemic stance. Had Sally wished to downgrade her epistemic stance vis-à-vis the interviewer, she could have replied - ‘well, I might say something like...’ See also, Du Bois, 2002; Fox, 2001; Haddington, 2004; Kärkkäinen, 2003a, all cited in Clift 2006, p. 571. Sally’s positioning works both on herself and the listener; as she claims priority, she constructs the interviewer as being epistemically subordinate. Sally does not ask for the interviewer’s collaboration in the tricky question of faith, rather the interviewer is to be informed; and therefore Sally continues in her long turn while the interviewer listens. Rather than ‘oh yes, I do believe’ therefore being the ‘abstract’ for an independent and out of context and ready made story, this is Sally’s assertion to faith, made in public to both her addressed and hypothetical audiences. Her subsequent story is the warrant to this claim.

4.3.2 Sally’s next phrase, ‘it started off when’ (105) in appearing to be the first line of a story alerts the interviewer that Sally has elected to continue speaking and to hold the floor for a while. In this sense, it does the work of the story preface (discussed in paragraph 4.2.6 in relation to the abstract). Sacks (1992, Vol. 2 pp. 222-68) notes that stories usually take more than one turn construction unit to tell, that is, Transition Relevance Places (TRPs) may occur during the telling, but the story teller will want to keep the floor to finish the ‘point’ of her story. This story opener works to prepare the interviewer for her role as listener. This is particularly important in the present passage as the interviewer has not
colluded with Sally, requesting that the story be told as often happens in story telling in conversation (as in the passages in paragraph 4.2.8). A second point about this story opener is that it confirms when the story starts. Riessman notes that ‘where one chooses to begin... a narrative, can profoundly alter its shape and meaning’ (Riessman 1993, p. 18) and Edwards observes that where a speaker places the story’s start to be ‘rhetorically potent’ - a way of ‘managing causality and accountability’ in talk (1997, p. 277). In Sally’s case then, she grounds her faith claim in her family’s activities and way of life before she was born and as she goes on to discuss how her faith life plays out, her description will reveal how this starting point is rhetorically relevant to it. A third function of Sally’s opener is that it alerts the interviewer as to the kind of discourse in which Sally will warrant her faith - life story. Sally is not going to make a legalistic apology for her faith, nor expound doctrine, but she is going to talk of her life circumstances. This prepares the interviewer as to the kind of response she will ultimately make in reply (see discussion of the interviewer’s reply below and at paragraph 5.2.3 in Chapter 5).

4.3.3 Sally continues with seven more lines rich in narrative detail. She uses the words ‘poor’ or ‘poverty’ five times in six lines of transcription, all except the last preceded by one or two adjectives, the first a repeated ‘very’ (line 106). Then, we know ‘there was no running water’ (line 108) and that her ‘father was a communist’ (line 110). Researchers have shown (for example see Atkinson, 1990; Bruner, 1991,) that it is the inclusion of detail such as this that constructs verisimilitude or a sense of authority on the part of the speaker. We believe what these speakers say and we take their stories as true.  

43 Note Mark’s Gospel: The author writes in the story of the feeding of the five thousand, of the grass as green, which in Galilee only occurs for a few weeks in March/April. This detail is missing from Matthew and...
Furthermore, Sally says that chapel took up six hours on a Sunday (112) - not five say, or ‘most of the day’. This precision constructs Sally’s remark as a fact and not simply Sally’s rhetorical understanding, or her parents’ potentially coloured memory of those times. Note too that Sally slips in the impersonal phrase ‘you know’ before her claim of six hours. ‘You know’ is an impersonal discourse marker associated with the management of epistemic stance (see for example, Edwards, 1997). This is a moment of rhetorical design, bringing in the interviewer to share in impersonal knowledge - the interviewer knows, as Sally knows and as anyone would know the picture Sally paints with her story. There are five words with an augmented pitch accent: ‘↑parents’, ‘↑father’s’, ‘↑really’, ‘↑nothing’, ‘↑poverty’. Each one adds another aspect to the picture Sally is describing, another ‘brick in the wall’ constructing this reply in as detailed a way as possible. (Linde’s comment on the use of prosody in constructing evaluations was noted earlier at paragraph 4.2.9.) Prosodic variety heightens the drama in storytelling making it seem more immediate and relevant to the talk in hand. Immediately after this detail, Sally makes three statements explaining what kind of faith this is - she went to church with her family, she didn’t really think about it, and she was a Sunday school teacher for years.

4.3.4 Sally presents her faith attribution as leading from the family story she has described using two conversational forms. Firstly, Sally says the whole of the passage from, ‘my mother’s father...’ to ‘especially a child’ (lines 107-113) at slightly lower pitch and volume to the surrounding talk (transcribed with┌...┐). She resets her pitch at the start of, ‘so we did go to church’ (113). ‘So’ is a continuation-of marker (see Heritage and

Luke’s version but appears in John as ‘plenty of grass’. This little detail confers authenticity on the text, we believe the author to have been, or to have spoken with, an eyewitness to the events described.
Sorjonen, 1994). As Sally shifts to a new topic ‘so’ marks this out as a natural move - a
continuation of the first part of her turn into the second. So Sally distinguishes the two
essential parts of her turn with prosody but links them as contiguous; and the story format,
as Labov and Waletzky note, is effective precisely because it enables inferences and
attributions of causality and reason across component structures (or plot events). This then
is Sally’s faith discourse - its assertion and warrant - that she constructs with the floor time
given her by the interviewer for the purpose.

4.3.5 How linguistic texts create realism is a central concern of post-structural literary
criticism, classically discussed by Roland Barthes (1974). In his study of Balzac’s short
story, Sarasine, Barthes painstakingly describes the various tropes and devices, some
consisting of only a few words and even the largest only a few sentences long, noting five
different categories through which the author creates the sense of realism. (No doubt he
chose Sarasine for study since it is hailed as a classic of literary realism.) In so doing,
Barthes challenges the notion that literary texts acquire veracity through a faithful
representation of reality: rather ‘realism’ is a worked-up construction (see Potter, 2004,
p.162). In the passage from Sally’s interview, the detail of her parents’ life in Wales
appears to be doing just this. Rhetoricians note a stylistic device in speech they term
hypotyposis. This is a highly graphic introduction that provides a contextual warrant for
subsequent assertions. We may believe a speaker’s version of an event to be true when he
provides so much incidental detail (see for example, Edwards’ and Potter’s discussion,
1992, a and b, of the row surrounding journalists’ take on a brief by the then UK
Chancellor, Nigel Lawson,). However, there is more to be said about the detail in the present passage - why does Sally give these particulars and not others?

4.3.6 Potter observes (op. cit., p. 163) narrative detail to be a ‘contrasting’ category - the kind of detail one speaker gives of a particular subject in certain circumstances is different to that given by another from an alternative perspective. Potter suggests the narratological concept of *focalization* as developed by Genette (1980) and Bal (1985) to be relevant here. Focalization is the point of view, or perspective, that the narrative presents. In Sally’s case, she presents what Genette calls *zero* focalization, which is the omniscient, all knowing narrator who describes both the scene and claims knowledge of individual thoughts or motivations. Sally claims here that the poverty she describes is influential to her father’s notion of care for others and that he turns to communism in consequence. She also hints that her parents, and any one, might be put-off by the kind of institutional religion they practised. This shows the power of narrative (in addition to that of zero focalisation) - the speaker controls the content (Potter and Hepburn, 2008, p. 22). This focalization addresses two constructing concerns: Firstly, in being all knowing and non-particular, Sally’s account appears as the empiricist rhetoric of impartiality and thereby, true. Secondly, it appears to give Sally witness status - she gives her account as though she were there herself.\(^4^4\)

Atkinson (1990) suggests that the careful build up of narrative detail together with the rhetorical positioning of the speaker as ‘present’, constructs both the sense of reality or veracity and inclines the listener to view the account from the perspective of the speaker/narrator. A listener takes this (subjective) perspective as her own.

\(^4^4\) The author can confirm the effectiveness of Sally’s account on this point. As she was transcribing the interview, the author had to contact Sally to ask if she were brought up in Wales, so convinced as she was that Sally had been describing a personal experience!
4.3.7 It is the case that speakers recognise certain kinds of speech as storied and orientate to this in discourse. Whatever else stories may be or do, speakers find them useful to help describe and thereby understand how lives are lived, identities formed, and relationships with the world and with others managed. *Narrative psychology* understands story as an essential feature of so-called ‘folk’ psychology and the cognitive perspective within this understands that Sally gives her fourth reply to the hypothetical enquirer in storied form because it conveys understanding and meaning. There is a long debate within the academy of distinguishing between two kinds of knowledge, the result of two different cognitive processes\(^\text{45}\). These are the *paradigmatic* mode and the *narrative* or *intuitive* mode (Bruner 1986 and see discussion in Edwards, 1997, p. 286). Paradigmatic thought is the propositional, logical, Cartesian rationality of philosophy and science which results in *facts*. Narrative thinking, on the other hand is, at its broadest, everything else. It involves inference, the ability to sense connections or implications and to make interpretations, predictions or conclusions from minimal ‘data’. It confers meaning. Narratives work in this view, by describing intuitive truth and common sense that individuals experience as giving meaning to their lives because they are an expression of the psyche, itself structured in storied form. They work because stories are temporal extensions, forming connections between seemingly disparate events over time, with a common plot line, just as the psyche is ordered and lives are experienced. The present thesis, as *post-cognitive*, does not pursue the two-cognition approach. Research in the sociology of scientific knowledge (for example, Gilbert and Mulkay, 1984) and in DP has shown that there is no clear distinction

\(^{45}\) This is the Interacting Cognitive Subsystems (ICS) Model which is a comprehensive systemic model of the organisation and function of the resources underlying human cognition. The model proposes nine interacting cognitive subsystems, each specialised for handling a specific type of information and of these, the propositional and the implicational, are two systems for the encoding of meaning making.
between these two modes of thought when scientists describe their own work. The current chapter therefore views narrative passages not as an expression of a particular mode of cognitive functioning but rather as an interaction and an oriented-to production, in a discourse unit embedded within the conversation where it arises. The storied form works therefore, for discursive and rhetorical purposes in conversation as any descriptive form might, because speakers design it to do so.

4.3.8 Recipients of the story are not only oriented to the story as a story, but what is being done in it (Schegloff and Sacks, 1973) and they respond appropriately in the moment of the story’s telling (Goodwin, 1984 and Goodwin and Goodwin, 1987). Therefore, from his close analysis of conversational turns, Sacks notes, ‘projects that are implemented in the telling of a story inform the design and construction features and details of the telling’ (Sacks, 1978). Thus, who the recipient is and how many and what presuppositions and assumptions participants may hold of each other, all shape the subsequent story (Goodwin 1981, 1986). In this perspective, storytelling is a co-construction and an interactional achievement just as is any long turn in talk-in-interaction. A DP perspective therefore understands Sally’s apparent story in the passage in Text Box 4.1, due, not to a pre-existing and independent story form, nor to an expression of a mode of cognitive functioning, but to the exigencies of the conversation and in the context of the previous turns. In one of Sacks’ lectures (1992, vol. 1:113) he gives a sample of recorded talk of a man (B) calling a help line:
Example 6

1 B: ...Well, she ((the wife of B)) stepped between me and the child,
2 I got up to walk out the door. When she stepped between me
3 and got the child, I went to mover her out of the way. And then
4 about that time her sister had called the police, I don’t know
5 how she..: what she...
6 A: Didn’t you smack her one?
7 B: No.
8 → A: You’re not telling me the story, Mr B.
9 B: Well, you see when you say smack you mean hit.
10 A: Yeah, you shoved her. Is that it?
11 B: Yeah, I shoved her.


The line relevant to the present argument is line 8. It seems that participants recognise the category of action, ‘telling a story’ as much as the story format and that this possesses the criteria for adequacy for turn evaluation. In the example above, A finds something hearably wrong with B’s account and ‘not telling the story’ is A’s conventional way of expressing this. In like manner, therefore in the present study, the interviewer’s phrase ‘tell me that story’ in Text Box 4.9 above, and given again as Text Box 4.11 below, is in response to Sally, who has made her account that her faith was ‘all there in the background’ (138) challengeable by adding the phrase ‘not as a child or a teenager’ (140) and the interviewer asks her to account for this by asking that she tell ‘that story’ (143):

---

46 The reverse is true when speakers believe they have given a good account of themselves as in ‘he tells a good story’ shortened even further perhaps to ‘he talks the talk’, a form of tautology noted by Billig, 1996, as a particularly potent rhetorical device.
With this in mind, note the complexity of Sally’s construction, ‘you know’ slipped in just before her claim that her parents attended chapel for six hours (112, Text box 4.8). On the one hand this detail confers credibility through its precision, but on the other, it makes Sally’s account challengeable if proved incorrect. Sally’s ‘you know’ strengthens the account against the likelihood of challenge by appealing in advance to shared knowledge, and the adequacy of Sally’s turn as a description of real events. Another instance of the adequacy of story as a description is the interviewer’s line ‘that’s a wonderful story’ (322-3) in response to Joyce, and of Joyce’s reply in Text Box 4.6. With this the interviewer expresses her appreciation of Joyce’s account and of what she achieves by it, in this case the evidentiality of divine purposes in the world and Joyce acknowledges this.

4.3.9 The discursive psychology (DP) perspective on Sally’s faith construction in the opening passage to this chapter, is to view Sally’s words, not as an out of context and ready made story unit, but rather a purposive act designed to elaborate and justify Sally’s faith confession for which the interviewer is waiting. Additionally, it is not a description of, nor does it express, the cognitive realities involved in the attribution of faithfulness within her
mental self. Rather, in describing her early faith in the way that she does, Sally makes *this* version psychologically relevant and available *for* her self. This is the practical implication of Wittgenstein’s theoretical treatment of language as a performative act in a complex language ‘game’ (1953). Mills expresses this point beautifully when he says, ‘the different reasons [or various descriptive versions of events] men give for their actions are not themselves without reasons’ (1940: 904 cited in Edwards and Potter, 1992b p. 141). This is the converse of classic attribution theory which notes that a move to make a trait attribution is made from within a moral universe - it is dependent on the social context in which it is situated. However, attribution theorists look to disentangle the (real) situatedness that results in a (real) attribution; DP looks at it both ways round at once, at the (constructed) situatedness (the event description) that both warrants the (made available) evaluation, *and* reflexively performs it in the moment of the describing. Rather than mental operations directing speech in its efficient (or otherwise) indexing of independent reality, including intra-psychic reality, speech constructs versions of the world precisely to allow particular inferences about mental life to become allowable and made useful to the actors in the discourse. Whether or not Sally’s father were a communist and her family grew up with no running water is not to the point in this perspective. It is appropriate to Sally to associate her faith in this family story, which locates it in a sense of concern for others (the Golden Rule of ‘*do unto others as you would towards yourself*’) and part of the normalcy of everyday living and not within the institutional religion of church worship, for example, or any other kind of spiritual practice. As she tells this story, Sally makes *this* faith relevant to her as psychological reality.
4.3.10 The chapter has discussed how Sally constructs and warrants her faith avowal, ‘oh yes I do believe’ using narrative and other rhetorical and discursive devices, including very fine detail and constructing apparently unrelated episodes (before she was born) contiguous to it; also why she does this - to achieve a faith attribution with particular characteristics and to make this psychologically available to her. The final point in the present discussion is to ask if this faith attribution were successful and if so, does Sally complete this feat single handedly or in negotiation with the interviewer. Text Box 4.12 below repeats lines 113-124 from Text Box 4.10:

Text Box 4.12

```
. hh ↑ so (.) we ↑ did go to church (.) as a family (1.0)
114 erm ↑ but I don't think (.) we ever really thought about it and ↑ I was a Sunday school
   teacher for ye:ars in my teens (1.5) you know every Sunday [I used to teach (.)
116 I: [.hhhhh
   S: Sunday school .hh and =
118 S: = it I never really ↑ thought ↓ about it it was just, (0.5)
   I: sort of in the back ground
120 S: ↑ yea↓h
   I: all part of (.) life =
122 S: = that's [↑ri↓ght
   I: [just generally there =
124 S: = just in the background and of course I went to schools which had .hh (1.5)
```

Extended turns, whether told as stories or in any long turn, require closure and there are conventional ways for suggesting this. One such is to sum-up. Sally can begin to suggest a completion to her account but she cannot really guarantee transition (Schegloff 1984). After the first (113) and third (115) of her three faith statements, Sally pauses - she has made no clear completion signals and does not make any obvious plays to manipulate the TRP to enable her to continue speaking (such as the ‘rush-through’, Schegloff, 1982.) There are a number of signals Sally can employ to encourage transition. Duncan (1972)
identified six categories associated with TRP: completion signals (intonational, syntactic
and also gestural); decrease in loudness; ‘drawl’ on the final stressed syllables and lexical
discourse markers. He found none that individually guarantee transition; however transition
is more likely to occur when there are more of these cues present. As a group therefore,
they constitute the canonical cues for turn transition. In turn taking (as in story telling) a
speaker can indicate the end by describing a suitable terminating incident or can make an
appropriate physical gesture. Sally uses none of these in her speech here; the interviewer
has no reason therefore to believe Sally is ready to hand over to her. Thus a one-and-a-half
second pause follows Sally’s final remark and she picks up the turn again. On this occasion,
unlike at the beginning when Sally uses her floor time to elaborate on her earlier faith
confession, she simply repeats herself, without a delay or filler, both about teaching Sunday
school and that she never really thought about her faith. Sally introduces the repetition with
the discourse marker ‘you know’ again inviting the interviewer to comment
knowledgeably on her faith statement as anyone would. The inference is that this is an item
of public not personal knowledge that Sally and the interviewer now hold in common.

4.3.12 As Sally continues, the interviewer makes a lengthy, voiced out-breath overlapping
Sally’s words. To speak at this point would be an interruption as it is not a TRP. She
waits for the next opportunity when Sally makes a second pause at the end of line
118 to make her turn. Sally’s ‘just’ limits her account, restricting it to nothing more than
something to do with the events that she has so carefully described. Her voice intonation
remains at the same level at this point (transcribed as a comma after the final word ‘just’)

47 Sally does this at line 394 by clicking her fingers; and Margaret does so by bringing out her spectacles
which she and the interviewer were discussing at the time (line 32, Text Box 8.2, Section 8.3 in Chapter 8).
where a lowered intonation typically occurs at completed utterances. Her comment is left hanging and the interviewer completes it. Schegloff (op. cit. p. 42) discusses that for the listener to complete the speaker’s sentence is one way to indicate her view that the speaker has finished and that she understands what she has been saying. If she finishes the sentence ‘correctly’ that is, if her view and that of the speaker’s coincide, then the conversation can carry on, if not, then the first speaker will instigate a repair. Sally does accept the interviewer’s completion of her turn with the emphasised prosody on ‘yeah’ (120) and the interviewer repeats her ‘correct’ assessment again. Sally’s second response at line 122, ‘that’s right’ is not an agreement, but a confirmation. Sally maintains epistemic authority despite being in a position of response to the interviewer, positioning herself as holding a knowledge position prior to and independent of her collocutor (Clift, 2006: 578; Heritage and Raymond, 2005: 23) Sally regains her ‘first speaker rights’ which the interviewer had subverted by her earlier jumping in and the interviewer must now respond to Sally. She does this and Sally completes her original remark (118) but uses the interviewer’s word, ‘background’ (124).

There is clearly strong agreement here - the speakers latch their turns onto each other, with no gaps, as though in one voice. This smooth turn-taking looks very much like the easy and affiliatory chat that Sally and the interviewer enjoyed at the beginning of the session, before the interviewer poses the tricky interview question (see lines 4-52 and the discussion at Section 8.2 in Chapter 8). As Sally has presented her faith account in this passage, the interviewer completely accepts it, with no queries, to the extent that she ‘co-authors’ the account’s conclusion with Sally in the ‘quick-fire’ dialogue at the end. This affiliation
continues with Sally’s continuation-of marker ‘and’. This is discussed in the next chapter, at paragraph 4.2.4).

4.4 CONCLUSION

4.4.1 This chapter began by considering the stand-alone story form as an expression essential to human cognition. Mishler’s argument in his analysis of the interview as a research method, is that storied responses in research interviewing will always be more revealing than interviewee responses, shoe-horned into ‘answering’ direct ‘questions’. This is because this allows respondents floor time to construct their turns in a manner that reflects how they organise and store-up life-experiences and possibly their very mode of thinking. He suggests, following Labov and Fanshel (1977, p.105) that when interviews take the form of open-ended questions and allow interviewees time to speak beyond the limits of their usual turn, their turns will flow from story to story. Joyce’s interview transcript shows exactly this as she tells very many stories each one eliciting the next. In this case, Labov further suggests, in a research interview, the interviewer becomes an audience to whom the respondent speaks in a particular light. He suggests that stories often go unrecognised as interviewers interrupt respondents. Gradually respondents’ replies become shorter and shorter as a result. Like Linde, with the minimal story, Mishler regards a short reply an artefact of standard procedures for conducting, describing and analysing interviews. Whilst agreeing that this may very well occur in research interviewing in practice, the present study queries the emphasis on the stand-alone story form, not least because the definition of story is not clear. Stein (1982) asserts that it is not possible to
specify a unique set of features or attributes that can be used to identify a story. The data excerpts discussed above indicate that the story form transcends individual speaker turn boundaries and that structure alone cannot be meaningful of any utterance without a discursive analysis of what the respondent is doing within the linguistic context of turn-by-turn exchange. The present thesis goes further and suggests that rather the storied form being normative and obscured and truncated through ‘interruption’ by another speaker, the reverse is the case - that turn-taking dialogue is the fundamental platform for speech and that storytelling in monologue is a derivative form. In talk, a speaker makes propositions, assessments and evaluations of the real world and puts them to the other in conversation, for their acknowledgement and acceptance. If the other declines to speak, for whatever reason, the first speaker may construct her enforced monologue, not by reference to a universal story template, but to these dialogic forms. The passage from Sally’s speech, whilst seemingly in classic story form, is amenable to interpretation as an extended turn oriented to the demands of the conversational context. Sally uses this, in collaboration with the interviewer, to good effect - to make and warrant an avowal of faith and in so doing, make this faith psychologically meaningful and available to her.

4.4.2 As a final point, the present discussion opened by referring to researchers who claim the story structure to be a human universal and that children develop an understanding and skill with story without explicit training or instruction. However, children are equally familiar with dialogic forms. The following is a passage of a talk between a little girl (age not given) and her mother:
Example 7

Child: Have to cut these mummy
(1.3)
Child: Won’t we mummy
(1.5)
Child: Won’t we
Mother: Yes


Heritage discusses that this shows the little girl displaying the normative expectation of conversation to turn taking. A turn that is part-one of a paired adjacency expects a part-two in acknowledgement. Had the child believed that her mother had not heard her query, she might have repeated it louder. Instead, she repeats her query but with less information. She continues in her expectation that her talk demands an appropriate second part of the turn sequence and that its absence is a breach of conversational norms. The story form is universally recognised, and from a young age, as narrative psychologists maintain; but so too is the manipulation of the turn-at-talk, prevalent everywhere in the speech of adults and children alike and used as a resource for the achievement of interactional goals, as the above passage demonstrates.
Chapter 5

Conversational monologues: how speakers achieve interactional, discursive and rhetorical goals, in long turns, by design.

5.0 SUMMARY

The present chapter considers passages of long turns within the research interviews and notes the incidence of ‘non-story’ structures. These are forms that do not conform to the model for story described in the previous chapter. Specifically, passages that appear as ‘lists’ are discussed, that is, turns structured as a series of statements and clauses, often without an apparent thematic theme or focus and without the narrative detail characteristic to story. Linde (1993) identifies this as ‘chronicle’ and a contrasting discourse unit to the storied form. Continuing with a discursive rather than a structural/functional perspective, the chapter notes four activities that the present research participants pursue within long turns of dialogue, using lists: (i) Achieving shared knowledge; (ii) justifying particular events as commonplace and normal; (iii) achieving agreement, and (iv) achieving out-there-ness (Potter, 2004, p.150) or objective reality. The chapter offers a discourse analysis of these passages and concludes from a discursive psychology (DP) perspective that the opposition of ‘story’ with ‘chronicle’ is usefully reconsidered as a ‘category of action’, that of ‘accounting for oneself or justifying assertions’, which speakers engage in using a variety of devices and resources of speech.

5.1 INTRODUCTION

The previous chapter discusses story from a number of different perspectives - narrative, socio-linguistic and cognitive, and concludes with a discursive psychology (DP) perspective noting what the speaker achieves with her words. It examines particular features of story, including the preface, narrative detail and prosodic variation, and considers how Sally uses these features to warrant her faith assertion, how she agrees this with the interviewer, and in so doing effects a personal faith as a psychological entity. The present chapter continues with an exploration of non-story forms - the minimal or aberrant story and sequences or lists of items placed one after the other with no apparent further structure. In the present study, the research sessions are interviews, not the mundane
conversation typical to DA/CA studies. Interviews (particularly narrative interviews of the present study) tend to be asymmetrical where one speaker (the interviewer) asks questions and listens to the replies; and her collocutor (the interviewee) responds and holds the floor with longer turns. The interviewer encourages the interviewee to continue to hold the floor by providing ‘continuers’ such as ‘mm’, ‘uhuh’ and a simple ‘yes’ with no further comment. These are a relevant reply - they indicate at a possible TRP, ‘yes its fine I’ve heard you I’m responding, but please continue to speak if you wish’. However, the resultant talk tends towards a series of long turns from one speaker, which is not typical of everyday conversation. CA studies mundane conversation because the short turns-at-talk enable a discussion of what happens around the transition relevance place (TRP). This is the proof procedure in CA because it shows how the participants themselves understand each other in dialogue as they orientate their turns to underlying norms of discourse. Since long turns curtail the opportunity for the proof procedure of the turn, an issue for the present research is the systematic analysis within these longer passages. Story is only one of a number of ways for a speaker to design a long turn and the present chapter now explores other ‘non-story’ forms and discusses how speakers achieve their interactional, discursive and rhetorical aims with these as much as with ‘story’ discussed in the previous chapter.

The forms discussed here are grounded in the regular patterns that the analyst observes occurring in long-turns. They are not analytical categories, brought to the conversation by the analyst to further its explication and discussion, but discourse resources that speakers themselves create throughout their conversation in order to achieve their aims. The kinds of social actions that speakers may pursue in their talk are those that Edwards and Potter address in the DAM model including: warranting, explaining, excuseing etc., and those of
accountability and responsibility. In the present study sessions, the hypothetical enquirer calls participants to account for themselves when he asks them of their faith and the present chapter addresses how speakers manage this within the interview context. It considers how speakers ‘work up’ their descriptions to achieve shared knowledge between conversationalists, to support their accounts and protect them from the possibility of challenge. Additionally, it explores issues of evidentiality and epistemic stance. Mundane epistemics is the study of knowledge and understanding as things that are practical and interactional. Garfinkel (1967) and Schegloff (1991b) both observe that shared knowledge can be treated as something procedural (Potter and Hepburn, 2008 p. 22). The present chapter explores how participants achieve and manage knowledge statements in the long turns of the present study interviews.

DATA ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

5.2 Achieving shared knowledge with a script formulation.

5.2.1 Immediately after the strong endorsement of her faith assertion discussed in the previous chapter, Sally begins another relatively lengthy turn to explicate her faith for a second time. This second sequence takes the same form as before - ‘quick-fire’ dialogue follows a relatively long turn and supports the claims made there. However, in the present passage, Sally’s language has changed. In the earlier passage, in Text Boxes 4.1 and 4.10, Sally tells a story using very detailed narrative description, as discussed. In Text Box 5.1 below, Sally’s words (124-130) look like the minimal story form\textsuperscript{48} - a sequence of clauses strung together beginning and ending with the conclusion from the earlier passage, ‘in the background’. It appears to have no particular structure other than a ‘list’ with which Sally

\textsuperscript{48} Discussed at paragraph 4.2.2 in Chapter 4.
informs the interviewer and reinforces her already agreed faith assertion. The passage in Text Box 5.1 below follows straight on from the end of Text Box 4.10 from Chapter 4:

Text Box 5.1

I: [just generally there =  
124 S: → = just in the background and of course I went to schools which had .hh ( 1.5) e::r
   → religious s:services and (,) you know private schools and then I went to a grammar
126 → school which also had (0.5) erm you know a religious background so .hh it was just
   → you know you knew the words of the communion service .hh I was confirmed (0.5)
128 erm (0.5) ↑all of these things I used to read in church (1.0) we were quite heavily
   ↑volv↓ed in the local church when I was a teenager .hh so it was ↑al↓ways there in
130 the backg[round
I: ↑yeah
132 I: → sounds really similar to m. ggh (,) to myself in a way
S: yeah
134 I: it was just there
S: yes
136 I: you didn’t have to think about it (( ))
S: it was just there
138 I: ↑erm but you ↑say (2.0) it was all there in the background so you ↑can’t (,) really
   remember a time when you would say you were not ↓religious
140 S: not as a child or a teenager
I: ↓right (,) but then it ↓changed =
142 S: = yes =
I: = something happened so tell me [that story what
144 S: ↑erm

Present research Sally: Ref S/1/123-144/5.1

In their socio-linguistic analysis of talk, Linde (1993 pp. 85-89) and White (1973, 1987) identify chronicle as a contrasting discourse unit to that of ‘story’. A chronicle is a list such as, ‘all the things I did at school today’. At the end of the period the list stops, there is no summing-up or evaluating component or any thematic focus. Thus for Linde, chronicle ‘consists of a recounting of a sequence of events that does not have a single unifying evaluative point’ (p. 85). Stories conclude whereas chronicles just stop⁴⁹. Linde observes that a chronicle does not build and make an argument but may provide a list of instances, perhaps in support of an argument already agreed. In White’s view, written chronicles

⁴⁹ Notice the ‘just’ - a limiting phrase, which claims chronicle to be restricted due to its apparent deficiency in an evaluative function.
provide un-evaluated raw material for an historian to shape. He further suggests that in ordinary conversation, we may find chronicles where the speaker needs to fill in temporally organised information that is unknown to the addressee (White, 1987, as cited in Linde, p. 86, italics present author’s). This definition assumes un-storied sequences, without the evaluation critical to story, as non-constructive, that is, doing no discursive work and rhetorically neutral. Whilst lines 124-130 in the passage above fit the pattern for chronicle, is it the case that this passage does no discursive or rhetorical work? It could hardly be more different in form to the narrative passage discussed in the last chapter and yet it results in the same strong endorsement of Sally’s faith claim by the interviewer.

5.2.2 Sally uses the words ‘you know’ three times in seven lines of transcription (125, 126, 127) and ‘you knew’ (127) and ‘of course’ at line 124. ‘You know’ is impersonal; with this, Sally refers to an ‘everyman’ listener inviting the interviewer to endorse her faith claim as any one would (Edwards, 1997; Potter and Hepburn, 2008). Sally’s ‘you knew’ refers to herself and with this, she constructs herself with the same category entitlement to this common knowledge. It is not the details in Sally’s speech that the interviewer is presumed to hold in common with Sally (why should she know in advance these things?) and similarly, why should Sally refer to herself in the impersonal over items she clearly does know? Rather, Sally constructs herself and the interviewer holding in common the point of Sally’s speech - what kind of belief practice her made-available-faith is. Sally refers to this ‘commonplace’ knowledge (see Billig, 1991,1997) explicitly at the beginning of her talk using the interviewer’s original word ‘background’ and continuing, ‘of course’ (124). ‘Of course’ cannot refer to the details Sally goes on to supply, there is no ‘of course
about these; but the detail warrants Sally’s authority to make the claim she does in the manner discussed before. Sally takes her particular faith avowal, already agreed, and secures it as generally true and common knowledge for herself and the interviewer. Her speech in this passage is as precise, albeit very different but just as purposeful, as her earlier detailed story, and with it she achieves shared knowledge (Edwards, 1997). When she makes her faith assertion ‘oh yes I do believe’ (104), at the start of her first long turn, Sally claims epistemic authority and accountability for her faith account - she makes a knowledge assertion with which she informs the interviewer. Now, during the present passage, she subverts this authority, sharing the knowledge of what kind of belief this is with the interviewer claiming it in common with her.

5.2.3 A second feature of this passage is that its structure looks like a script (Edwards, 1994, 1995, 1997; Potter, 2004). In her talk, Sally refers to knowledge that she and the interviewer both hold, not because of particular information that Sally imparts in the course of the session, but because both participants have access to, or share in, cultural or social experience - that of schools and church liturgy. In cognitive theory, ‘script theory’ (Mandler, 1984; Schank and Abelson, 1977) describes how shared knowledge is achieved - how assumptions of ‘how the world works’ derived from concrete experience, become publicly shareable as an abstraction from that experienced reality (Nelson, 1986:8). Script theory discusses that certain social events and activities, such as visits to the doctor, or to a restaurant, or school experiences, are frequently ordered and predictable. Socially competent individuals taking part in these activities perceive their regularity and learn from exceptions, and so update a ‘script’ of the activity, held as a mental representation. If we all know what typically occurs in certain places or times, then we need only refer to this,
briefly, (indeed its discussion as a story would not be newsworthy) and speed on to the point of the discussion - the exception or breach of the script perhaps, which makes the event interesting to relate.

5.2.4 DP recognises scripted descriptions, but theorises them differently. In DP the scripted description is a *formulation*, not perceptual, mental or real, but discursive. Just as Sally’s earlier ‘story’ was not held to be an expression or embodiment of a story template contained within the cognitive *schema* and used to ‘convey’ understanding, so Sally’s present ‘non-story’ is, similarly, a worked-up construction for rhetorical ends. Sally’s speech in this passage is *designed* as scripted, that is, as following a normative and expected order. At line 124, Sally begins her turn saying she ‘went to schools’, and her first ‘you know’ (125) comes just before a slipped-in phrase, ‘private schools’. This constructs her particular faith background by reference to the generalised experience of the British public school - a script, to hold in common. Then Sally tells of a second (grammar) school with additional, yet equally predictable experience (the second ‘you know’, 126). Sally gives no details of what kind of religious experience her schooling in point of fact was, because, with access to the script, she does not need to. She links both of these constructions to the next with the continuation-of marker ‘so’ and sums up her early experience with the third ‘you know’ (127). She includes ‘it was just’ which limits her experience to nothing particular beyond that evoked by the script. She uses generalised language - ‘all of these things’ whilst describing few particulars. This last phrase, additionally, looks like an extreme case formulation\(^50\); Sally generalises her faith experience to include *all* things which is convincing and completing. She finally sums up

\(^{50}\) Pomerantz, 1986. See further discussion of extreme case formulations (ECF) below at paragraph 5.5.4.
her argument by repeating the initial assertion that her faith was ‘in the background’. When first stated (124) her faith was limited to this - ‘just (in the background’) but now, with her case made, it is determining - ‘always there (in the background’, 129). In understanding a scripted description discursively rather than cognitively, DP addresses the socio-psychological business that a speaker achieves through the description and for this we consider how the interviewer receives Sally’s claim.

5.2.5 Sacks notes (1992) that a relevant reply to a story can be another story. Second stories given in response may be put together to, ‘achieve similarity …that B produced this story in such a way that its similarity to A’s will be seeable’ (1992, vol. 2:4, ‘achieve similarity’ in italics in the original). Sacks was referring to turns taking the story form, however the interviewer achieves the same outcome here with her brief reply. She acknowledges Sally’s turn, ‘yeah’ and upgrades it with, ‘it sounds really similar to…myself…’ (132). Speakers give responses to accomplish relevance - to make an appropriate turn fit for the purposes of the talk-in-interaction at hand. Whilst not relating a story of her own, the interviewer replies to Sally in the same genre - life-story⁵¹ - her words suggest a story, which achieves agreement as the desired result. Perhaps her short reply here is a consequence of the session as interview rather than as mundane conversation. Whatever else the interviewer’s words here imply, they are a device for signalling strong agreement (Pomerantz, 1984, p. 64). As before, in previous passages, we cannot know if these words are factually true about the interviewer’s experience, nor, without speculation, understand that the interviewer means this or believes them to be true. However, we can see

⁵¹ See comment at paragraph 4.3.3 Chapter 4, the interviewer is alerted to the genre of discourse by the first line of Sally’s story - ‘it started off when …’ (line 105, Text Box 4.10) See also discussion in John’s interview, paragraph 5.5.5 below.
their practical effect in achieving complete agreement with Sally, and endorsing and co-
constructing her speech\(^{52}\) (134-137).

5.2.6 Sally constructs her faith claim in such a way that she and the interviewer can ‘be of
one and the same mind’ - her initial story and subsequent remarks are designed to convince
that is, elicit agreement. This is the rhetorical business at hand that Sally achieves with her
discourse and rhetorical perspective is that conversationalists make their descriptions or
accounts in speech, as one version positioned against possible alternatives. Any account is,
in principle, challengeable. The view is that speakers say what they say when they say it
because they react to the particular occasion each time. CA notes this as ‘occasioned
utterances’ and Clark (1996), a socio-linguist observes that just as tennis players, dancers or
those negotiating a contract coordinate their movements moment by moment, so do
conservationalists in dialogue - this is converse. Sally describes her faith as typical to her
generation and to her upbringing, completely ordinary and non-newsworthy and within
areas of knowledge which she constructs the interviewer and herself as sharing. This gives
the interviewer every reason to agree Sally’s claim and little opportunity to challenge it. It
is important to emphasize that Sally’s rhetorical manoeuvring is not to coerce the
interviewer round to her own view, which she possesses prior to the conversation taking
place. DP critiques the notion that descriptions of events, opinions or personal dispositions,
refer to mental representations held in the mind independently of the discursive context

\(^{52}\) We might even say the interviewer’s words endorse Sally’s speech even if the interviewer’s upbringing
were known to depart from that of Sally in points of detail, because discursive analysis does not attend to
these as real events. A problem for classic, cognitive script theory is the difficulty it has with dealing with
particulars - a generalised formulation cannot embrace all eventualities without becoming so inclusive of
detail it loses its value as a generalisation.
where speakers produce them. Rather, with this faith version agreed, Sally’s description reflexively performs it and makes it available to Sally as psychological reality.

5.2.7 With shared knowledge achieved, the interviewer begins a new topic. She raises her pitch (Wennerstrom, 2001b), pauses, and begins, ‘but as you say’ (138). This quite explicitly places her upcoming remark in light of what Sally has just said. Moreover, she begins with the counterpositional continuation-of marker ‘but’ which positions it as naturally following on, but a challenge. Challenging arguments is what conversation is for. One speaker puts her version of events into play for others to dispute or confirm. In the present case, Sally and the interviewer between them achieve *consensual cognition* as to what they are talking of - Sally’s faith and the kind of faith it is, now they can go onto discuss it - its implications and ramifications for Sally.

Linde’s chronicle is limited. In having no thematic focus - no point or conclusion it has little to achieve as social action in discourse. Similarly, in contrast to White’s view, the present discussion is of a list of event descriptions precisely worked up to share knowledge rather than offer it where it does not exist. DP argues that speakers may make systematic use of a variety of forms and structures in a longer turn to achieve discursive ends; and the next section shows this with the most ubiquitous list of all - one constructed into three parts.

5.3 Justifying particular events as commonplace and normal with a three-part-list.

5.3.1 When speakers describe events, justify assertions or account for themselves in any way, they may construct their turn into three parts. This idea might seem whimsical, but the three-part-list occurs very frequently (note the sentence above). Listeners in conversation
recognise the convention of *three* items in the list since they do not attempt to make their turn before the third item, even if a speaker gives plenty of opportunity to do so. Very often, a speaker may add a ‘generalised list completer’, such as ‘*etcetera*’ or ‘*and so on*’ to two named items to ensure the three parts, giving *three* items normative or conventional status. The discussion in Text Box 4.9 (paragraph 4.2.15 in Chapter 4,) noted of that passage that it does not resemble the story structure, but contains instead two lists of three items. Sally has made a faith declaration (104) and now the interviewer asserts that this has changed (141). We noted (at paragraph 4.3.9 in Chapter 4) that ‘*tell me that story*’ (143) is conventional language for ‘*account for yourself*’. Sally uses her long turn consequently, to this end. The passage is shown again below as Text Box 5.2:

**Text Box 5.2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I:</th>
<th>↓right (.) but then it ↓changed =</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S:</td>
<td>= yes =</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I:</td>
<td>= something happened so tell me [that story what</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S:</td>
<td>[erm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I:</td>
<td>↑what (.) [what ↓changed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S:</td>
<td>[↑we↓ll I went ↑to. I went away to uni↓ersity (0.5) or I went to Oxford (.75)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>where of course there was a lot of (,) you know I I realise I I was from an in↑credibly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>→ (,) you know there’s all these new people and everybody talking, talking, talking the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>whole time and .hh (,) and ↑it was just ↑wonderful really but it did (,) make me (,)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>question (,) the sheer ↑existence of ↑God ↓.hh and you know ✽ how can there be a god</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>when all these terrible things happen and so on all the usual things that (,) people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>→ ↑think (,) .hh and I suppose (,) from being quite a (,) er↑m ↑religious ↓little girl and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>↓religious teenager .hh and erm (,) wanting to serve God (,) I really went the other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>w↓ay and became quite aggressively (0.5) a↑gain↓st (.25) the ↓idea of God</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>156</td>
<td>I:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[↑was ↑there ↑any (,)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>did you have a friend or anything that that you teamed up with that was (,) anti =</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| | 158 | or .hh did any (((did any thing happen )))
| S: | [↑n↓o most of my friends were ↑Christ↓ians actually = |
| I: | [right |

Present research Sally: Ref S/1/141-161/5.2

---

53 See Jefferson, 1990 for an examination of the three-part-list as a conversational task and resource, to speakers in turn-by-turn dialogue.

54 Computers using Microsoft Word software also recognise the list of three. When quoting another’s speech, the present author may miss out a word or so of the original quote if these are syntactically inappropriate to the present text. A row of dots indicates these missed out words. The Spell Checker function notes these as a spelling mistake and underlines them in red if the number of dots is two, or four, but not three: *Three* dots is the encoded character.
Sally’s first three-part-list conveys the university atmosphere and Sally’s experience of it, very succinctly ‘everybody talking, talking, talking the whole time’ (149). In the second list, (153-4) Sally sums up her earlier religious life as a ‘religious little girl and ‘religious teenager’ who serve[d] God’, in order to make a dramatic contrast between this and university life. Clark’s (1985:183) notion of ‘common ground’ is that which participants in interaction ‘mutually know, believe and suppose’ and ‘grounding’ is the process by which participants reach this mutual belief. For linguists, there are devices in language, such as *deixis*, which contribute to this process; also information structures (Halliday, 1967) that may be either ‘given’, that is already held in common by participants, or ‘new’. However, discourse analysts understand *all* words in principle as indexical and creating meaning from within the conversational context, indexicality being a feature of talk; and for information to be new or mutually shared, speakers must construct as such. Gail Jefferson (1990) writes that a three-part list is one such constructing structure, indicating completeness or totality by summarising a general class of thing. Edwards and Potter (1992b) and Potter (1997) both note of the three-part-list that it is a device to construct any particular activity or event as commonplace or normal. Speakers use the three-part list to position their *particular* assertions as generalised, or a given. In this manner, it can function like the script formulation discussed above.

5.3.2 In the present passage, Sally constructs the significance of Oxford life as already held in common (147) and requiring no detailed description: whatever ‘there was a lot of”, is ‘of course’, and the interviewer is impersonally aware, ‘you know’ (149) of people talking the ‘whole time’ (150) another extreme case formulation. Sally comes to ‘realise’

---

55 Deictic words are those that depend on context for meaning (as are *here, there, now, then* and personal pronouns). Clark (1992) discusses that the actual physical environment and the ‘real’ linguistic (rather than discursive) environment provide this context for conversing participants.
(147, the present tense constructs ‘immediacy’ and factuality) the nature of her childhood upbringing, of which the interviewer is again constructed as aware, ‘you know’ (147). Sandwiched between the two three-part-lists, Sally places a particular argument - that of, the presence of evil in the world (151) which makes faith in God problematic, but impersonalises it with the phrase ‘all the usual things that people think’ (152-3). This phrase ‘distances’ Sally the speaker from the opinion, since she cannot be held responsible for what other people hold true. The rhetorical thrust of Sally’s argument therefore is the juxtaposition of Sally’s home and university life generalised in the two three-part-lists, which directly lead to Sally’s rejection of faith. Sally’s lists are discursively conventional and rhetorically designed to make her claim robust and hard to resist through being general and through constructing common ground. She gives no particular, subjective or creedal faith knowledge in her account that could potentially open it up to a specific challenge. Thus, as with the passage in Text Box 5.1, a long turn with simple lists may be as constructing as one with an elaborate story. Various studies across a range of different discourse genres have shown that turns designed as three-part-lists are rhetorically important, from political speeches (see Atkinson, 1984; Grady and Potter, 1985; Heritage and Greatbach 1986), courtroom dialogue (Drew, 1990), as well as mundane talk (Jefferson, 1990, all cited in Edwards and Potter 1992b). The interviewer does not at once accept Sally’s account, but asks for further elaboration and Sally’s phraseology appears to acknowledge that there may be yet more to account for, ‘strange, strange thing’ (160). In her next turn, Sally gives a second explanation to justify her loss of faith using another kind of list and this is discussed in the next section.
5.4 Achieving agreement with a check list in a ‘rhetoric-of-fact’.

5.4.1 Speakers may orientate their turn to an underlying expectation to be seen as speaking reasonably, in which case they may introduce what Smith (1978) has called a rhetoric-of-fact and what Shotter (1993) calls the ‘normal’ or ‘basic’ discourse. Smith suggests a checklist that speakers may employ to assert their claims as true. Simply introducing a list to show that one has checked one’s facts is enough in itself as it infers the logical proofs to the standards of scientists or philosophers. The passage in Text Box 5.3 below follows straight on from Text Box 5.2 above. With this turn, Sally gives a second account for ‘what changed?’:

Text Box 5.3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I:</th>
<th>right</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>162</td>
<td>mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S:</td>
<td>it’s just I just (.) logically looked at the world and thought well there cannot ↓be ↓a god (0.5) ↓if this happens↑ can’t be a loving god anyway (.25) ↑and I read um Bertrand Russell why I am not a Christ↑ian .hh and I read ↑oh I read quite a lot of (0.5) anti-religious stuff .hh and I can see my son doing it now my own my own children now beginning to go through that phase .hh and I wonder if they ↑will come back to it like ↑I did (.) but it took me years to come back to it</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Present research Sally: Ref S/1/161-168/5.3

Smith’s checklist includes: showing that the claim is i) permitted by or grounded in circumstances; ii) independent of one’s wishes; iii) potentially the same for everyone; iv) dependent on practicable experience and that the checking procedures are v) teachable vi) applied correctly vii) have taken local contingencies into effect (discussed in Shotter, 1993 p. 93). In Sally’s case here, she introduces just this kind of check. She refers to the discourse of the problem of evil to a providential and loving God and this is the context or circumstance against which she makes her claim, (i). It is part of the ‘objective’ world,
given in the form of ‘the things people say’ rhetorically positioned as independent of Sally’s subjective opinion (ii). She localises this into her specifically Christian experience, explicating the discourse as one particularly concerned with a *loving God* (164) (iv) and at the same time locating it in response to the specific linguistic context of the present conversation. She brings in, not just what people say, but expert people - how could one disagree with a person of the stature of Bertrand Russell and other authors of his ilk? Finally, she notes her own children are following a similar path (iii) - why should they not, as rational individuals? Sally’s checking shows her claim to be potentially the same for anyone and thereby, sound. Finally, Smith adds that a speaker making a claim and offering a checklist must provide an opportunity for the listener to challenge. This is potentially available in any turn-by-turn dialogue, when the collocutor takes over.

### 5.4.2

With this second turn, Sally explicates the particular argument relevant to her loss of faith - the problem of evil in the world, which before she had stated as common knowledge, what ‘everyone thinks’. The checklist supports her argument but in specifying it, may provide an opening for challenge. The passage below shows the interviewer’s response to Sally. Text Box 5.4 carries straight on from Text Box 5.3:
Unlike her response to Sally’s first turn, not only does the interviewer acknowledge Sally’s assertion, she upgrades it with, ‘so that’s really, really interesting’ (169) said with sustained down intonation. Sally’s ‘list’ has been successful. The interviewer sums up Sally’s turn with an assertion of her own - that Sally has ‘lost her faith’, which she embeds within her question, ‘were you conscious of...’ (170). This is the interviewer taking her turn to respond to Sally as Smith allows and her reply is as constructing as Sally’s account. For a listener to sum up or present a gist of what the first speaker has said indicates their understanding. CA understands gist within the notion of formulations (see for example Heritage and Watson, 1979, 1980). Typically, these are not neutral, but are discursively designed for the specific purposes of the turn. Here, the interviewer designs her question to include her assumption of Sally’s ‘lost’ faith, which Sally appears to completely accept, ‘yes I did yes’ (172) she says. However, this is not the last word; she continues with, ‘and yet’, a discourse marker introducing a dispreferred reply (Pomerantz, 1984). Sally has not lost her faith; she must have retained ‘something’ (174) as she goes onto say. CA studies
have shown the dispreferred turn to be a regular feature of dialogue, where respondents first introduce a disagreement with agreement in order to ‘soften’ it. It is a ‘considerate’ reply, enabling conversation to carry seamlessly on even when respondents want to disagree. This device contributes to DA’s account for the variability of speech, the characteristic feature of turn-by-turn dialogue that it is never finished - there is always potentially another turn, another assertion, another challenge. Even as Sally designs her account as reasonable and an accurate depiction of events and memories, when located in its conversational and sequential context, Sally’s turn shows her account changing. She introduces her dispreferred turn with ‘you see’ (173) which works rather like the ‘you know’ formulation already discussed. She continues with ‘I mean’, a mental state avowal which, however, rather than describing a cognitive state works to down play the evidentiality of her following knowledge assertion (Billig, 2002). Sally has made a good case that she has lost her faith, now she reverses this to claim that there is an enduring part of humanity that orientates to the divine and she uses another three-part list to do so (the three ‘believes’, 176-7).

5.5 Achieving out-there-ness reality, with a rhetoric-of-argumentation

5.5.1 The previous chapter discusses a passage from John’s interview (paragraph 4.2.13 Text Box 4.8) where he constructs himself and others so as to warrant his account of subjectivity in faith avowals. The earlier discussion noted that John pursues this project and the present discussion is of how he achieves this. The passage is given again as Text Box 5.5 below. John’s talk in this passage is not in story mode, it is more like the passages just discussed - a series or list of statements. If John is not ‘describing facts’ but creating a to-be-agreed ‘version’ of the world, how does he achieve this with this list?
J: and I'll I'll so to make it easier [if I go if I tell you where =
I: [↑ggh
J: ↑please ↑d↓ o
I: = I'm coming from on the word faith an' if you want to structure it ((( )))
J: [no, no that's fine I would have I would have asked
I: yes
J: would have suggested that yeah
I: 1→ er (0.50) ↑when ↑I think about myself I think that its .hh (0.25) its very difficult to.
J: to dis-associate (0.75) your religious beliefs, your ↑faith, your approach to the
2→ world, your psychology (1.75) because I think essentially (0.50) all religion (0.75)
3→ is (0.75) a projection of our (. ) our own longings, aspirations (0.75) onto the
4→ my own ↑faith↓er very bright ↓man (1.25) and ↑yet their re↑li↓gion (. ) the way they
express themselves religiously is very simplistic (0.75) and very (0.75) out of tune
with their oth. the ↑rest of their approach to life (0.50) they never talk about
↑politics like that they'd question it much more (0.50) they need (. ) to ↓believe
5→ they need that (0.25) and even in the face of (0.25) ↑huge evidence to the
↑contrary they have to (. ) believe in ↓God or love of ↓God or ↓religion ↓and ↓so
6→ ↓on (0.75) .hh and that's very ↑interesting to me because I might think that I
↑all↓so passed through a period of my life when I had to (0.50) and I'm now in a
period when I ↑don't ↓have ↓to and its ↑quite (. ) sort of scary and exciting to be
(0.50) just cast off
I: well can we go back over that just a little bit perhaps erm you you were ↑brought up
J: a. as a Roman Catholic
J: ↑brought up as a Roman Catholic continues...

Present research John: Ref J/1/123-149/5.5

process of modalisation, for example:

X is possible
I guess that X
I think that X
I hypothesize that X
I believe that X
I claim that X
I know that X
X is a fact
X

This process takes a speaker through a range of positions starting with those contingent on his own desires and motivations and ending where the ‘fact’ is so commonplace it goes without saying. Table 5.1 below shows John systematically ordering his speech from Text Box 5.5 in such a way:

**Table 5.1: Modalised Components within John’s Faith Account, lines 131-146**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>when</th>
<th>I think about myself I think that its .hh (0.25) its very difficult to. to dis-associate (0.75) your religious beliefs, your faith, your approach to the world, your psychology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>because</td>
<td>I think essentially (0.50) all religion (0.75) is (0.75) a projection of our (.) our own longings, aspirations (0.75) onto the world (1.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and</td>
<td>(1.25) sometimes when I. I see people who are highly intelligent (0.50) for example (. ) scientists I know highly, highly intelligent er, or people like my own father very bright man (1.25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and</td>
<td>yet their religion (.) the way they express themselves religiously is very simplistic (0.75) and very (0.75) out of tune with their oth. the rest of their approach to life (0.50) they never talk about...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>they need</td>
<td>(. ) to believe they need that (0.25) and even in the face of (0.25) huge evidence to the contrary they have to (. ) believe in God or love of God or religion and so on (0.75) poltics like that they’d question it much more (0.50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and that’s very interesting to me because I might think that I</td>
<td>al so passed etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Present research John: Ref J/1/131-146/

The first statement (1) is an orientation, answering the question *when* and prefaced with a general mental state avowal ‘I think’ and is in the second person impersonal voice ( the four ‘your’s. Statement (2) is also an ‘I think’ avowal and is the base assertion but in the first person plural impersonal (‘our own longings’). A second orientation, (3) is prefaced with the more specific, ‘I see’ and introduces a named category - intelligent people; the second assertion (4) is a contrast to (3) and ‘complicates’ it. The first conclusion (5) resolves the
contrast for the category group, and the second (6) resolves it for the speaker and is in first
person voice and in simple past and present tense. Each statement (apart from number five)
links to the next via a continuation-of marker which shows these statements naturally
continuing from one to the next. The exception, statement five, is the resolution of
statements three and four. John’s language has moved, in stages, from the impersonal to
direct speech and from the generalised and specific other, until ending with the speaker
himself.

5.5.3 The notion inherent to chronicle is that the list of events is unsystematic, that is, that
they could be in any order. The notion of modalisation by contrast, suggests design towards
an end point. Woolgar (1980, 1988) writes in his study of scientific discourse that scientists
establish the objectivity of their ‘discoveries’ by describing the trail or path that leads the
scientist in the right direction towards them. For example:

‘The trail which ultimately led to the first pulsar’
From Woolgar, 1980:253

In the account of the discovery of the pulsar, this scientist uses the metaphor of ‘the trail’. Its
purpose is to construct a fact with pre-existing objectivity. Woolgar notes that in the
construction of factual accounts, people use ‘externalising devices... to provide for the
reading that the phenomenon described has an existence by virtue of actions beyond the
realm of human agency’ (1988). In this example, the metaphor of ‘the trail’ is one such
externalising device. Thus, just as the objectivity or out-there-ness (Potter, 2004) of
scientific truth is worked up; and as reality in life stories is achieved via narrative methods,
such as descriptive detail and the like, so too the structure evident in John’s list of
statements in the present passage is not arbitrary but achieves the discursive construction of
the psychological state he now professes. John’s list functions as the externalizing device of a *rhetoric-of-argumentation* (see Antaki and Leudar, 1990; Potter and Wetherell, 1988 cited in Edwards and Potter, 1992b p. 135). Through this device, John presents his conclusion as warranted by the impersonal operations of logic rather than as a motivated inference from his own subjectivity. Exactly as argued before in the case of narrative detail, whether John’s claim is true (due to the abstract workings of logic) is not to the point in this perspective. It is rather that John finds it appropriate to locate his assertions in this form and through this his (non)-faith attribution becomes available as a psychological resource for his use. John’s speech moves from the impersonal and the general, about the world and other people to his making a personal trait attribution, not one of faith, John maintains, but one that recognises the intra-psychic need that motivated his earlier, so-called faith behaviour.

**5.5.4** In addition to his modalised list, John’s rhetoric-of-argumentation includes another externalizing device - that of ‘extreme case formulations’ (ECF, Pomerantz, 1986). John does not just think of religion but he thinks of ‘all’ religion, in ‘essence’ (133) and he contrasts ‘highly, highly intelligent people’ (136) with religion that is ‘very simplistic’ and observes these people ‘never talk about…’ and ‘huge evidence to the contrary’. Through using extreme rhetoric there is no ‘half-way’ position - it is non-negotiable from his final conclusion, which John constructs as logically and impersonally true.

**5.5.5** A final point to note of this passage is that John asks permission to give this account and he implies that it is structured it in a particular way (see lines 123-130). He says that it will ‘*make it easier*’ if he tells ‘*where he’s coming from*’ a metaphor or cliché for his choice
of ‘start’\(^{56}\). In specifying this, John controls the rhetorical thrust of his argument. He seems about to offer the interviewer the right to structure it under her terms but the interviewer interrupts, not only to waive this (dismiss it in fact with her repeated ‘no, no’, 127\(^{57}\)) but to upgrade her position to one of prior ownership to John’s structuring, whatever it is, ‘...I would have asked...’ John asks to tell his account - his non-story - in exactly the manner that speakers request to tell their stories, as discussed in the previous chapter. This suggests that the distinction between story and non-story is not so useful from a DP perspective, ‘story’ and ‘non-story’ both being a ‘category of action’, that is, of accounting for oneself. Speakers construct their remarks to meet the objectives of the turn, using the various categories, devices and formulations at hand as they choose. Additionally, this sequence shows the speakers orienting themselves to the category of interviewer/interviewee - John to defer to the interviewer \textit{qua} interviewer; and the interviewer to defer to John \textit{qua} owner of his account narrative\(^{58}\). Having asked and received permission, John’s turn achieves relevancy through providing the permitted account.

At its conclusion, the interviewer acknowledges John’s turn (147-8) but does she agree? She begins her turn with the counter-positional ‘well’. She begins a process of review of John’s account, which, as noted before under Smith’s rhetoric-of-fact, is central to discursive argument. It is interesting that in order to ‘go back over’ John’s account as she

\(^{56}\) Note comment paragraph 4.3.3, Chapter 4 regarding the discursive and rhetorical importance of the start of a story.

\(^{57}\) Komter, cited in Mazeland, 1991, p. 98, notes that speakers repeat themselves, such as the interviewer’s ‘no, no’ here, to indicate there is no need for the other speaker to say any more - the argument is made or she has enough information to make an immediate reply. See further instance of this at paragraph 6.3.4 in Chapter 6.

\(^{58}\) The interviews were planned at the outset of this research as narrative interviews, that is, ones where the interviewer speaks as little as possible, except to encourage her collocutor to be open and to speak as much and in the manner if his choosing.
claims (147) she changes the discourse from the modalised rhetoric-of-argumentation John uses, into that of life-story.

5.5.6 From a DP perspective, John’s speech here is not an expression of the cognitive processes by which he arrives, logically and correctly, at his conclusion, but is an accomplishment of speech in the rhetoric-of-fact. John’s modalised sequence is designed to achieve his purpose, to accomplish accountability for his faith assertions and attributions and in so doing make available a version of faith as a psychological entity. This psychological reality is available for John now, at the moment of its telling, fresh and fit for purpose one might say - in fact John does say, ‘its very interesting ... and sort of scary and exciting (143,145). The faith attribution that John abandons here, that ‘all religion is a projection of our own longings and aspirations onto the world’, is recognizable as Allport’s extrinsic faith (see discussion at paragraph 1.1 in Chapter 1). This is faith that believers follow sincerely, but which meets particular and individual psychological goals and needs, external to and not contributing towards, a cohesive and unified psyche. John here works up the very faith orientation about which Allport theorised (as immature) but could not show conclusively as a ‘real’ phenomenon of the intra-psychic environment, when operationalised as an extrinsic motivation of the personality and measured via the Religious Orientation Scale. However, it becomes observable as a discursive phenomenon of the psyche, through the close observation of John’s speech. John’s speech here is not ‘mere description’ of an historical set of situated contingencies, nor of the rational process by which logical relationships are expressed, but is constructive. His speech is designed in the moment of its telling to become constitutive of the psyche, discursively viewed.
5.6 CONCLUSION

This chapter has addressed a particular feature of the present study interview data, that of the long turns of relatively one-sided and asymmetrical talk. It notes the pattern of a simple list, of items or statements not displaying an evaluative component or other structure that might otherwise mark the pattern as a story that speakers often tell in the longer turns of their speech. Researchers have noted such ‘lists’ and have contrasted them with the story form. However, whatever kind of pattern occurs in speech, these, as a category of action contribute to its discursive purpose. Sally works up her account to create a script, a generalised version of her religious experience at school, constructing it as typical. The preference is for her collocutor to agree and share in Sally’s faith assertions, which she does, whether or not this were factually true about the interviewer’s own schooling. Sally uses three-part lists in a similar manner to create her particular experiences as generally true and commonplace. Additionally, she uses a check list as a rhetoric-of-fact to construct it as particularly true. John’s rhetoric-of-argumentation is similar. This is quasi-scientific speech designed to make his resultant faith attribution rational, one arrived at through the impersonal rubric of logic. This ‘realises’ John’s faith as a psychological entity and as a public discursive phenomenon and not the private possession of internal cognition. The DP perspective is one that understands the detailed language both of the monologues of extended turns in discourse, as well as the quick-fire exchanges of the dialogue of CA scrutiny, able in principle to make particular versions of events of the external and internal worlds factual and in so doing reifying them, making them available as a resource to the speaker, for his or her active use.
Chapter 6

Realising discursive faith: Achieving a personal faith attribution or disposition and agreeing this in dialogue.

6.0 SUMMARY

The present chapter presents several passages of conversational monologue appearing as the long turns of the present study and notes participants using these to make an attribution of personal faith, or express an attitude towards it. Classical attribution theorists in social psychology (for example, Kelly, 1967) and exponents of the ‘conversational model’ (for example Lalljee, 1981 and Hilton, 1990, 1991) explore the ‘calculus’ that individuals perform in making an attribution either of external causality or of a character trait, or of any other ‘explanation’ of an event. This research investigates intentional processes of perception and cognition following an input of discursive material that describes an event or situation, treating the event and the presented description of it as equivalent - as one and the same thing. In contrast, the present chapter takes a discursive perspective and explores how study participants make a personal faith attribution from within their own description and account of it. It considers how speakers work-up their descriptions so that their accounts are ready-positioned to reach agreement of an appropriate attribution. It further notes how participants argue, rhetorically, from their own attitude or position to create a robust account, one that can resist actual and potential challenge. An attitude or a disposition to faith is not, in this view, an individual private cognition but a public position, rhetorically worked-up in discourse and in the process made available to the speaker and psychologically relevant.

6.1 INTRODUCTION

The previous two chapters took as their starting point patterns apparent in long turns in interviews that are recognisable as ‘story’ and ‘non-story’ or ‘chronicle’ respectively. The discussion was that rather than being neutral descriptions and expressions of prior mental states, these patterns are externalising devices or formulations that speakers use for discursive and interactional purposes. The chapters show how study participants work up
descriptions of events and personal memories and secure these as shared knowledge with the interviewer and thereby factually or reasonably true. The present chapter continues the analysis of long turns and explores the various ways in which the study participants work up and warrant their accounts so that they may make an attribution of personal faith. Social psychologists\(^59\) have studied how individuals come to understand the world and social activity within it, by making attributions of external causality or of personal intention. In making sense of everyday events, individuals must work out whether an aspect of the nature of the world or a prior intentionality or a character trait disposes a person to act in a particular way. Theorists have discussed how people perform an ‘attribution calculation’ using quasi-scientific and common sense reasoning. The calculus includes the information variables of consensus, distinctiveness and consistency: If there are several people who react in a similar way or if an event stands out as a ‘one-off’, then external causality might be attributed. On the other hand, if a person always or typically behaves in a particular way, then a personal trait attribution is likely to be preferred. Alternatively, respondents may infer causation through regular association. Researchers have, classically, studied the attribution calculus using short, written or oral vignettes and descriptions, and by varying one or more of the information variables can show how this affects the attributional reasoning each time. This research investigates intentional processes of perception and cognition following an input of discursive material. It treats the vignettes as neutral, that is, the description of the event it describes and the event itself are taken as equivalent, to be viewed as one and the same thing. Furthermore, the analyst presents the descriptions to the research subjects without context and with the original assumed speaker or author’s

motivation for, and interest in the text removed and in this way excludes the action orientation of ordinary talk. The resultant calculus therefore, is theoretical or experimental, showing how subjects may arrive at an attribution assertion in the absence of its natural situation.

The present chapter explores how study participants make a personal faith attribution from within their own description and account of it. It explores how speakers work up their particular account and through this perform the attributional calculus, in the process of the telling. It looks at this as a two-stage process - how speakers first work up their accounts to be neutral as though they were ‘description-as-event’ which then determines a subsequent faith attribution as an impartial and warranted conclusion. Speakers, in this perspective, do neutrality (Clayman, 1992) and ‘mere description’ is their achievement in speech. Through the close analysis of actual talk, the present chapter shows research participants ‘doing’ the attributional calculus, not ‘describing’ it and furthermore, using not the analytical categories of theoretical research brought externally to the study, but their own motivations, their own psychological stake or interest in the account. The detailed way in which participants rhetorically design their accounts to be robust and to offset challenge, reveals the attributional calculus of cognitive analysis as a discursive practice and the account as description-as-attribution. Through the reflexivity of language, this realises personal faith as psychological reality and makes it available to a speaker for his or her use.
DATA ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

6.2 ‘I heard a voice say’: Faith in response to a description-as-external causality

6.2.1 The following is from Joyce’s interview where she describes one of several supernatural experiences that she takes to be instances of Divine intervention. Text Box 6.1 below is the preamble or setting for Joyce’s story and the event itself follows in Text Box 6.3. As Joyce tells her story she creates interest and excitement in her ‘unbelievable story’ using great variety in prosody, and her words show an intricate pattern of rhetorical design:

Text Box 6.1

| J: and I really (.) ooh my goodness I really did have to work terribly terribly hard | 756 |
| especically in the with this sixth form girl you know preparing her stuff it was really I was really quite exhausted at the weekends any way er... mother | 758 |
| has died and about a fort night later there came a ring I was playing my piano I used to relax playing my piano when I’d done my work at night and I could hear my father speaking and then I heard this voice and it was our young curate we’d got a young curate you know he’d just arrived well he’d been there about a fortnight and the vicar said to him he’d better go out and see those (name) you know their mother’s just you know died and I thought oh its the curate and I went on playing and playing and he didn’t seem to be going an I thought hhhooor (.) have to go and see him | 762 |
| I: and the rest as [they say is history | 764 |
| J: [so very regretfully no bu. this is another of those experiences = ...To Text Box 6.3 | 766 |

Joyce describes her life in detail at the time of the extraordinary event she is about to tell - she was working hard as a school teacher preparing a particular girl for her exams. She begins her story several days or weeks (?) before the day of the event itself. She describes herself exhausted at ‘weekends’ (757) - not on this particular weekend but weekends generally. Joyce sets a context of herself as busy and tired, preoccupied only with her work.
not thinking of anything else. With the discourse marker (or rather *misplacement* marker, Schegloff, 1984) ‘*anyway*’ (757) she moves on from this context, what she says next is not a continuation-of this first theme and does not follow directly from the context, in which case, why does Joyce tell it? She gives a second context, the death of her mother, but even here her phraseology ‘*mother has died*’ (758) is rather distancing. Joyce does not say that her mother had ‘just died’ or ‘died recently’ and although she does orientate her story specifically in time, ‘*about a fortnight later*’ (758) she gives no hint that she might be emotionally upset. Rather, her phrase ‘*I used to relax…*’ (759) emphasises her general routine and not anything special or particular about this time. For accounts to be true, or at least reasonable, the attributional calculus suggests that speakers must construct them as objectively so; if accounts seem to derive from within the intentionality of the speaker, they lose their force as a credible account (see for example, Eagly and Chaiken, 1993). Within the scientific discourse, scientists go to great lengths to remove a subjective interpretation or ‘contamination’ of the research variable (see Gilbert and Mulkay, 1984). Joyce’s opening words seem specifically to serve this purpose, orienting her story away from any inference of subjective interest in it, particularly perhaps, if an inference that she was upset at her mother’s death were likely. The purpose of Joyce’s preamble therefore is to turn a *personal account* of the unbelievable event that follows, into a *neutral* or *objective description* of it, and when she finally tells the story, it comes already positioned as such. Joyce describes the event itself by relating exactly what she was doing at the time\(^{60}\), playing her piano, a typical pastime. This locates Joyce in her every day setting, distancing herself from any claim to uniqueness or speciality of any kind, simply ‘being ordinary’ (Jefferson, 1984b). She says she hears ‘*this voice*’ (760) which rather nicely sets up a

\(^{60}\) Just as John does in the passage in Text Box 6.16 at paragraph 6.4.8 below.
contrast with ‘the voice’ (or technically, the *loquation*) Joyce is going to claim to hear. Joyce uses direct speech, supposedly reporting the vicar’s actual words in his own voice, which creates immediacy supporting the ‘ordinariness’ that Joyce has described. Wooffitt (1992) describes this as ‘active voicing’ and the brought-in voice as constructed by the speaker ‘as if it were said at the time’ (1992 p.161). This perspective understands the direct speech as discursive and a constitutive element in the speaker’s constructed account. There are three ‘you know’ formulations in this sequence (761/762/763). The first constructs as shared between the interviewer and Joyce, the understanding of what curates typically do when first appointed - visit parishioners. The other ‘you know’s are said by the vicar, positioning him actively contributing to shared knowledge about visits to families in bereavement and constructing this sequence as typical in every way. Furthermore, his phrase, ‘you’d better go out’ (762) includes the curate not just as recently arrived and who should make visits, but as the one who has the interest in so doing. Finally, Joyce describes herself as turning away from her piano practice ‘regretfully’ (767) and she went on ‘playing and playing’ (763) delaying having to leave it. She ‘sighs’ at having to interrupt her piano playing and is compelled, ‘have to go’ (764) to answer the door. All of this speech is designed to remove a charge of subjective interest or motivation in the fateful meeting to come. Joyce relates virtually the whole of her preamble from ‘playing my piano...see him’ with sustained low volume. This contrasts with her story, which she tells with significantly heightened pitch. This marks out this passage as separate to the account proper - a contrasting preamble to it.
6.2.2  Sacks (1984b) describes the pattern speakers use to discuss unusual events identifying the format, ‘At first I thought... but then I realised’. The following is a report of a witness in a plane hi-jack:

‘I was walking up towards the front of the airplane and I saw by the cabin, the stewardess standing facing the cabin, and a fellow standing with a gun in her back. And my first thought was he’s showing her the gun, and then I realized that couldn’t be, and then it turned out he was hi-jacking the plane’. (Sacks, 1984b:419)

Jefferson describes this device as one of ‘people being ordinary’. They include their first incorrect thought - of a man showing-off his gun - to demonstrate their own normality (sic) that is, they would normally orientate to the world in a non-exceptional way. The following is a passage from Sally’s interview where she describes herself recovering her faith in rather unusual circumstances - at the funeral of a young teenage girl, a school friend of her daughters. The passage is given in Text Box 6.2 and it shows Sally constructing herself as ordinary in just the manner described:

Text Box 6.2

| 480 | S: but it was a [one-off it was ↑totally unex↑pected |
| 482 | I: [yes |
| 484 | I: [right |
| 486 | I: [yes |
| 488 | S: out feeling r:rally ↑an↓ery |
| 490 | S: but I ↑did↑n’t I came out thinking well all right she had a horrible (. . ) journey to |
| 492 | I: [mm |
| 494 | S: and she’s all right |
| 496 | I: [mm |

Present Research Sally: Ref S/1/480-493/6.2
Sally constructs herself as expecting to react to the girl’s tragic death in an entirely understandable way, with distress or anger. So when instead she reacts with a return to faith in a personal God, the explanation for this is not seen to reside with Sally’s personal motivation, which would weaken her assertion. Wooffitt (1992) also notes this form of ‘being ordinary’ when people make claims of paranormal experience. He describes it as, *I was just doing X ...when Y*. He concludes from his study that this device is typical when speakers describe unusual events. Speakers first begin with an ‘X’ statement, constructing an ordinary event even if (or particularly when) they were engaged in some out of the ordinary activity at the time (Heritage and Watson 1979). This distances themselves from the unbelievable ‘Y’ statement that follows. This device orientates itself to an understanding that accounts are more believable if they are seen as coming from people whose general assumptions, perceptions and activities in the world are not themselves unbelievable or unusual. As Joyce tells it, her ‘X’ preamble precedes her ‘Y’ story in just this way. She was just playing her piano when…

Text Box 6.3

...From Text Box 6.1

766 I: and the ↑rest as [they say is history

J: [so very regretfully no bu. this is anothe↑er of ↓those experiences =

768 I: yes

J: = no this is a experience this is the one that I I am now pondering ↑so ↓deeply about (.)

770 I ↑opened the ↓doo↑r (. and I heard a.a. voice say ↑good ↓even↑ning (. it was him (. and I ↑looked towards him but ↓do you think I could ↓see ↑him↓↑ (. ↑ no .hh ↑all ↑

772 ↓saw was ↑ligh↑ts (. sort of (. ↑rays ↑of ↑light coming I ↑couldn’t see him at ↓all (. I could look at him (. and talk with him (. and ↑then ↑I had a. (. ↓well (. the only ↑

774 person I’ve ↑ever told this to is dead now he was my spiritual director and ↑I (. I tal. talk to you because (. this is the ma. this is where I am in ↑life ↓now

776 I: mm

J: ↑suddenly (. heard a ↑voice ↓sa↑y (. and I’ve ↑thought about this ↓voi↑ce it was very

778 (. quiet but it was authoritative and it ↑said ↓this (. ↑there ↑is your↓↑ husband and↑ you are to be the wife of (. °a ↓priest° (. .hh to Text Box 6.4

Present research Joyce: Ref J/2/766-779/6.3
6.2.3 Joyce tells the story of her meeting the man she is to marry. Her future husband is a significant figure in her faith account and Joyce sets up her introduction of him referring to this first meeting as an ‘experience’ with leaned on emphasis (767-8). She tells her story with great dynamic variation of prosody; in the present study, the assumption throughout is that this is an important rhetorical tool for construction in conversation. The passage in Text Box 6.3 tells of two supernatural events. The first begins at line 771, said with raised pitch accents across the whole phrase and offered to the interviewer for her opinion, ‘do you think…?’ Joyce’s subsequent intonation is assertive - the downwards pitch on ‘all’, (another extreme case formulation, 771) as she states her first claim that she was unable to see her husband (presumably his face) and she contrasts this with her ability to look at him and talk with him. She links the first event to the second with the deictic continuation-of marker ‘and then’ (773) stressed with heightened pitch. The second event begins, (after an inserted phrase), ‘I suddenly...’ (776); Joyce constructs this as without warning. This distances Joyce from responsibility for these unexpected events - she is as unprepared or uninvolved as is the listener. The voice Joyce hears is ‘authoritative’ (777) and Joyce introduces it with downwards pitch for finality, ‘said this’; the words of the ‘voice’ are given with great dynamic variety. Joyce has made her difficult-to-believe claims with assurance and confidence.

6.2.4 With both difficult-to-believe claims, Joyce inserts a preamble to support her account. Firstly she states that she is ‘pondering so deeply’ (769) rhetorically constructing herself, not as gullible, but thoughtful. Secondly, before making the second claim she states
she has told only one other person of this story - her ‘spiritual director’ (774) 61. This positions her subsequent claim not only as something important to do with spiritual matters, but also that Joyce is not a gossip, she speaks only on important matters with appropriate people and to this end she includes the interviewer, constructing her as similarly suitable to consider her account (775). Finally, before telling what the voice says, she positions it as ‘quiet’ and ‘authoritative’, both attributes having Christian religious overtones, and Joyce repeats that she has ‘thought about it’ (777). Joyce tends to give less prosodic variation to her words in the preamble than in the story proper. A narrative analysis of this passage might note the heightened prosodic variation as characteristic of oral storytelling; speakers use this to create dramatic tension and to draw the listener in, to experience the events of the story for themselves, so far as possible. The present study suggests the difference in dynamic range between the commentary and the story might relate to the amount of rhetorical work; the preamble to the discourse positions the story ready for its reception, but the story has to account for itself: Joyce’s great dynamic variation and heightened pitch appears exhortatory, challenging the interviewer to accept her story and to agree.

Joyce designs her turn with precision. She supplements the unbelievable account with a reasonable preamble spoken with level intonation and which acts as commentary and context. She constructs herself and the interviewer as responsible, thoughtful people and distances herself as uninvolved. In distancing herself from the events she describes, Joyce weakens a challenge of intentionality - that she is psychologically prepared or motivated towards these events. It is important to emphasize that it is not that Joyce does have agency,

61 A Spiritual Director is appointed by a member of the senior local clergy in Catholic and Anglo-catholic faith communities, Lay or Religious, as a personal guide, supporter or teacher, to an individual for their personal faith progress.
which she must conceal to be believed, but that agency itself is a rhetorical and worked-up construction in speech.

6.2.5 Joyce says the whole of this passage without comment from the interviewer - it is a monologue, but at line 771, she asks the interviewer a direct question; why should she do this here? Joyce places her question immediately at the end of the preamble and just before she tells of the first supernatural activity. CA and CA informed DA note the significance of the sequential placement of the words in talk. It may be that having set up her account to be a neutral description, Joyce invites the interviewer to perform the attributional calculus. Realist conceptualisations of causality or personal trait attribution, for example, Au, 1986, theorise a linguistic over a pragmatic framework. Some researchers associate certain kinds of verbs with a more implicational form of causality than a direct attribution of it. With verbs of ‘experience’, such as ‘looking at…’, Au’s study respondents consistently attribute the cause of that experience beyond the agent (the Experiencer) and place it with the stimulus or the situation. In Joyce’s case, this would infer that the cause of the light hiding the curate’s face derives from him and not from Joyce. The present study notes, in line with the action perspective of discursive speech, that speakers may use the linguistic components of talk as an externalising formulation much as any other. With this perspective, Joyce’s ‘I looked towards him’ is a contextualising construction for her following question. This is prefaced with the counter-positional ‘but’ oriented to an answer in the negative. Joyce’s account works therefore by limiting the number of inferences it

---

62 See Antaki (1994) for a discussion of classical attribution.
might be reasonable for the listener to make. Her question might be re-phrased as, ‘there, I’ve removed all other possible explanations, please make the only inference left to you of what I’m now going to say’. Joyce does not provide the interviewer the opportunity to comment and she declares the answer herself, with raised pitch. Down intonation is associated for the last word; up intonation implies there is more to come, which there is, but Joyce leaves the listener to make the final implication of (both) supernatural events for herself. She does provide a coda to her story however, shown in Text Box 6.3 below:

Text Box 6.4

| J:                                                                 | (.).hh so I↑ go to ↓school↑ the next day |
| and I get my best friend who teaches geography I said ↑(name) (...) I’ve↑ met the man |
| I’m going to marry (...) she said o↑↓oh (...) what’s he look like↓Joyce↑↑ I said don’t |
| ↑↑know←γ(...) and I could ↑not↓see (...) ↓well be↑lieve ↑↑it or ↓not (...) he kept coming ↑up (...) |
| I’ve ↑↑told ↓you and I [was continues... |

Present research Joyce: Ref J/2/779-784/6.4

6.2.6 Joyce takes a breath and continues her turn with a continuation-of marker, ‘so’ (779) - her next words are a continuation of the events she has just related. She speaks to her best friend providing detail (that she taught geography). She speaks in the conversational historical present tense (CHP), ‘I go to school...’ and ‘I get my best friend...’ who ‘asks’ exactly the right question for Joyce to repeat, or rather suggest, her claim. There is considerable research interest in reported speech across the disciplines of discourse and narrative analysis (see for example Holt and Clift, 2007). Within story

---

63 Wooffitt (1992:2) makes a similar observation for accounts of ‘the unexpected’- speakers are concerned to ‘influence the range of inferences an overhearing jury will arrive at’.

64 Story tellers regularly describe past events using the present tense which creates immediacy and impact. See for example Wolfson, 1982.
telling, many researchers note that quotations are demonstrations (see Clarke and Gerrig, 1990: 764), or that they provide evidence and ‘lend an air of objectivity to an account’ (Holt, 1996: 241 both references cited in Clift 2006: 572). Wooffitt suggests the reported voice is ‘active’ in the construction of difficult-to-believe claims, as noted above. Clift notes that in its grammaticalized form, reported speech acts as a marker for evidentiality, that is, as relating to the source of information on which a speaker bases an assertion, or the reliability of speaker’s knowledge (see Willett, 1988:55). In her CA informed study, Clift (2006) shows how reported speech achieves evidentiality and indexes epistemic stance in turn-by-turn dialogue. In the present study, the current passage of ‘conversational monologue’ is a hybrid of story telling and dialogue and makes no comparable claim to that of Clift for first person direct speech for stance construction. However, Clift notes in her study (p. 573), that co-occurrence of ‘assessments’ with ‘I said’ are very common in English conversation and she predicates her analysis on the sequential position of first person direct speech after an assessment. In the present passage, Joyce’s first person reported speech - ‘I said don’t know and I could not see’ comes, similarly, after her claims of supernatural activity; it displays\[65\] Joyce’s epistemic stance to a neutral witness at the original time. Having taken her stance Joyce immediately follows with the purpose of this passage, ‘well believe it or not’ (782). Joyce is not explicit about what attribution she wants the interviewer to make; she notes that the curate kept coming to see her - why should he not? The inference that Joyce invites her listener to draw is that the curate is smitten and that he continues to visit Joyce with a desire for marriage, just as the voice foretells. This creates the voice as the ‘voice of prophecy’ and Joyce’s faith not a personal trait attribution

\[65\] That is, displays epistemic stance in contrast to constructs it, as it Clift’s study. For the difference between displaying and constructing, see Drew, 1992:485 and Sacks, 1992, vol. 2:113-4.
but a reasonable response to an experience of an event whose cause is external to her. Thus Joyce works up her account to create the attributional variable of distinctiveness; also out-there-ness, that is, discourse-as-description, so as to limit the potential inferences and attributions of her story to that of Divine activity in the world.

Joyce does not make a faith declaration at this point, but she does so at various places throughout her interviews\(^{66}\). The present thesis offers her various stories and accounts as ‘typical’, which she gives, the thesis proposes, to make various points including her faith attribution. The following in Text Box 6.5 below is one such story. This passage comes after that in Text Box 4.6 noted in Chapter 4 and refers to it in the first line, ‘that sort of experience’:

**Text Box 6.5**

---

J: and I’ve got an other one to add to that sort of experience in ((place)) I was a friend .hh of ((name)) and her brother her brother was a famous professor ((name)) who had a lot to do with the computer .hh you mention the word ((name)) in ((place)) physics .hh and he’s ↑large he’s ↑dead now(.) well after he retired (0.25) he went to live in er in ((place)) in the ↑country↑side in a little .hh and ((name)) told me (0.5) one day he(.) just ambled into the↑church(,) and looked around I ↑don’t know what it was this is the fascinating thing .hh but ↑after ↑that he thought well I. I’ll go and see what goes ↑on ↑here and he ↑did (,) and it’s jus. another ((name)) ↓story (,) he ↑sat at the back of the ↓church ↓so his sister told ↑me (,) and he ↑just kept on, he ↑didn’t actually take part in the ↓service (,) but he ↑al. un↑til he ↓did↑ed he went every Sunday and sat at the back of the church in the service ↓what do you make of ↓that↓

I: (1.5) ↑why I what do ↑you make of it

J: ↑we’ll I’m a bel↑ie↑ver ↑aren’t ↓I I mean (0.25) well we are ↑talking ↓now... ...

---

Present research Joyce: Ref J/1A/325-338/6.5

---

\(^{66}\) Joyce had two long interviews resulting in a serious of many stories and anecdotes. For reasons of personal privacy, these are not included in the Appendix.
Faith-as-response to the evidence of Divine activity in the world is, of course, an entirely orthodox understanding of (Christian) faith and a traditional reading of Biblical texts. Joyce builds her account, in the moment of its telling, to allow for an interpretation of an experience of supernatural activity resulting in an entirely appropriate faith response.

6.3 ‘I’m back’: Faith as description-as-personal-trait-attribution

6.3.1 In previous chapters, we learnt how Sally had faith as a young girl and lost it at university. In the present passages, she describes how she recovers her faith at the funeral of one of her daughters’ school friends. She uses many of the features discussed so far to create out-there-ness, immediacy and factuality and through this, her account as description-as-event and her subsequent personal faith attribution, reasonable (see Text Box 6.2 above). The passages in the Text Boxes that follow below show, like Joyce’s speech, extremely rich rhetorical design in the moment of their telling:
378 S: and then (2.0):mm ((girl's name)) died who was erm a friend of the twins
I: mm
380 S: here
I: this was the girl that you've mentioned at school [before now
S: yeah .hh I didn't know her very we'll um
384 I: so this was what about
S: this was three years ago
386 I: [three years ago yeah ok
S: .hh and erm (2.0) <I:I came to her:r> (1.0) funereal here
388 I: mm
S: and (2.0) oit was probably more than three or four years now (.hh um
390 and the previous headmaster ((name))
I: mm
392 S: stood up (.) in (0.5) erm (.) the (.) you know to preach at the serv. at her funeral
 .hhhh and (.) he. >you can imagine can't you he was faced<> with (.hh a full
394 (.). chapel of grieving teenagers who are all thinking <<how can there be a god
↓ when this happens>> .hh and >you know quite a lot of parents as well
396 thinking that too< an he stood. and he made the most wonderful <> .hhhh u
ser>mon (.) and it absolutely shattered me >> (.) and that was =
398 = the [turning point for me =
[(((clicks fingers))]
400 I: = really
S: yeah (.) he stood up >and I'll never forget it< he said (.) <> ↑↓know ((girl's
402 name)) is now in heaven (0.5) ↑I know that hh>> (2.0) and I looked ↑at ↑him
and I thought ↑yea↑h↑ (1.0) an. and that's that's [when I came back
404 I: ((( )))
S: I know and that's when I came back ...continues Box 6.6

Firstly, before saying any thing else, Sally constructs herself as ‘not knowing the girl [who
died] well’ (383). This distances her from a close, personal and emotional involvement.
Then, after giving an orientation of when this event occurred, she interrupts herself to
reconsider (385-389). Vagueness can be as rhetorically important as detail; it is hard to
challenge an account if a speaker acknowledges, in advance, some details to be inexact.
Furthermore, her hesitancy over the date constructs Sally as unconcerned and personally
remote (as well she might be over the death of a relative stranger). The headmaster (who is
also the chaplain) ‘stood up to preach’ (392) but Sally interrupts herself again to add a
commentary that the chapel was full of ‘grieving teenagers’ (394) and this is the start of a sequence of complex rhetorical design. She prefaces her remark with ‘you can imagine can’t you’ (393) and she speeds up to ensure that she holds the floor long enough to include this phrase before continuing (a rush through, Schegloff, 1982). Sally works up a script formulation with these words, by inviting the interviewer to construct the event as typical of its kind and how the interviewer might herself describe it. This creates the ordinariness of the situation and of Sally as a participant in it. The inverted subject/verb (393) ‘can’t you’ is a negative interrogative, indexing epistemic stance (Clift, 2006, p. 576; Heritage and Raymond, 2005). Sally turns her assertion round, from informing the interviewer of this event, into a question, asking the interviewer to share in its construction. This subverts Sally’s epistemic authority as the first person to speak and creates shared knowledge with the interviewer. Then Sally positions the awfulness of the situation as a challenge, not for the girl’s family and friends, or for herself, but for the preacher, ‘he was faced’ (393).

There are two ECF formulations, the ‘full’ chapel (393) and the claim of what ‘all’ the teenagers are thinking (394). Sally slows down the pace of her talk when she asserts that the teenagers are thinking of the problem of evil to a good God (394-5) - the very discourse that Sally had mentioned before that had contributed to her own loss of faith (see Section 5.3, Chapter 5). This positions this phrase as germane to Sally’s turn and requiring no rush-through to retain the floor. This detail of reported thought (just as with reported speech) helps construct the immediacy of the situation and consensus of it and is a form of the ‘active voicing’ noted before; it creates all the people in the chapel potential allies to Sally’s subsequent faith claim. Sally constructs the full chapel as being all of one voice (so to speak) and the teenagers’ thoughts as emblematic, that is, the kind of thing they would be
thinking, and the kind of thing they would be saying, if they were to speak. Then Sally speeds up again for a second rush-through to claim that ‘quite a lot of parents’ are thinking the same thing (395). This is rhetorically clever; Sally uses an ECF for the teenagers’ thoughts, but generalised detail for the parents. She does not want to over claim and it is sufficient for her case that a good number of mature minds are added to those of the pupils. Furthermore the detail adds facticity to Sally’s account and yet is robust through its relative vagueness. Note, in addition, Sally’s focalization (see discussion at paragraph 4.3.7, Chapter 4); Sally describes the scene with herself and the interviewer (through her imagination) as the ‘omniscient narrator’, knowing people’s thoughts and giving the description the status of empiricist rhetoric and therefore impartially true. Next Sally describes the headmaster’s sermon with a three-part-list, each item emphasised with a raised pitch accent, ‘he stoo(d)’, ‘he made’, ‘the most wonderful…’ (396). She slows to finish with ‘sermon’ given after a pause for a lengthy in-breath and said with lowered intonation for impact and finality (397).

6.3.2 Sally’s repetition, that the preacher ‘stood’ to make his sermon, forms a closing bracket with her opening words - the headmaster ‘stood up’ (392) and the words in between are a ‘self-initiated-self-repair’ (Schegloff et al., 1977; Sally’s earlier ‘he stood up in ...’ 392, is unfinished.) Repair is a general term for a range of specific actions in talk-in-interaction that speakers regularly employ to ward of interactional trouble and to make ‘changes’. The phrase, ‘he stood up’ is not rhetorically neutral, all preachers stand to preach. Here, the inserted ‘repair’ gives the rhetorical detail, to support and justify, in advance, Sally’s about-to-be-made faith claim. Just as with Joyce’s account above, Sally’s
claim, when she finally makes it, comes ready-positioned. Immediately after the repair, Sally makes the assertion that the sermon ‘shattered’ her and that it was a ‘turning point’ (397-8) which as a cliché, is inferentially rich through being detail poor. She indicates this is the end of her story by physically clicking her fingers to which the interviewer immediately responds. Her reply, said with emphatic prosody is an affirming continuer, ‘really’ (400) and consequently Sally takes the floor again to make a second faith affirmation said with great dynamic variation. She repeats a third time, ‘he stood up’ and quotes directly the preacher’s words and concludes the attributional calculus, ‘I looked at him and I thought yeah’. As with Joyce, ‘looking’ creates the inference that the causal stimulus is external to the agent, in Sally’s case, the preacher. Sally has given the greater part of this passage to contextualise the chaplain’s words preparing the listener to make an attributional inference of his faith, and this is made explicit in the next passage.

6.3.3 As before with Joyce in the passage above and with Sally in her opening account discussed in Chapters 4 and 5, Sally gives a second explication of her faith affirmation:

**Text Box 6.7**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S:</th>
<th>I know and that’s when I came back and I looked up to the &lt;&lt; chapel (.) the window</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>406</td>
<td>(1.0) and I saw the (.) image of God and Christ&gt;&gt; and everyth↑ ing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.) and I thought ©↓ yeah (1.5) I’m ↓ back ©</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>408</td>
<td>I: °he was a good man wasn’t he°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S:</td>
<td>rmm↑ (.) but to stand up it was so courageous you know to say I ↑ know how you’re</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>410</td>
<td>all feel↓ ing .hh I know you’re feeling (.) .hh sad and I know you’re feeling angry' he</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>said but I KNOW ↑ she’s ↓ in ↓ heaven↑ (.) and what a comfort for her parents (.) and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>412</td>
<td>you see he was so respected (1.0) ↓ this ↓ headmaster he was so respected by the pupils</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.hh and loved but he could be strict you know .hh um (.) but they all listened it was</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>magical it was magical an .hh and from then on (0.5) I I felt I was (0.5) and then</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>((name of friend)) said to me do you want to come to prayer group she’s always</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>414</td>
<td>saying would I like to go and I used to say its not really me .hh (0.5) ‘cos I’ve ↑ never</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>↓ done anything like our ↑ prayer group before ...continues...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Present research Sally: Ref S/1/405 -417/6.7
Sally repeats her assertion expanding it with another three-part-list ‘the image of God and Christ and everything’ (406) which specifies her claim as Christian. She repeats ‘I’m back’ for a third time (407). The interviewer has acknowledged both of Sally’s first two claims, but she contributes to the third with an upgraded agreement, the substantive comment, ‘he was a good man, wasn’t he’ (408). The interviewer matches her low pitch to that of Sally; Brazil (1986 p. 86) has argued that this creates concord or agreement across the turn. The negative interrogative subverts first speaker rights as discussed above, this time the interviewer invites Sally to share in her knowledge claim. The interviewer’s assertion is of the chaplain, making a personal attribution of goodness to him. However, Sally’s response is in the form of the dispreferred reply (Pomerantz, 1984) - to what can she be disagreeing? Sally predicates her return to faith on her construction of the headmaster - on his ability to claim that the dead girl is in heaven. The interviewer’s construction is of the headmaster as a ‘good man’ not a ‘faith-filled’ man. A good man might say anything if it comforts people in their distress, but this might not be a reason for accepting faith. Sally explains: ‘but to stand up it was so courageous you know to say...’ (409) and this makes the rhetorical design of Sally’s earlier repair evidentially clear. Sally has designed her argument specifically to construct the headmaster as a man of courage. The headmaster is courageous because in the face of everyone’s grief and despite the ‘fact’ that every one is thinking that a good God is incompatible with a terrible death, he ‘stands up’ to this opposition. The headmaster has the courage for this because of his faith that the dead girl is now with God (constructed with another list-of-three ‘I knows’ - ‘sad’, ‘angry’, ‘but ...she’s in heaven’,

---

67 Many CA and sociolinguistics scholars note a relation between tone pitch and coherence across turns. Tone concord is where the pitch level at the termination of the first speaker is met by the same relative pitch level from the second speaker and is described as supportive. Sacks (in Jefferson, 1995) cites Günter (1966) in noting contrasting pitch accents used to ‘tie’ utterances together, as does Schegloff, 1998a; 248 who notes ‘nuclear stress’ used to highlight contrast and distinguish items within a turn. See also Selting, 1996.
410-11). It is because Sally’s claim to recovery of faith rests on the description of the headmaster displaying *his* faith that she repairs the interviewer’s, ‘incorrect’ attribution of goodness. Sally ‘corrects’ the interviewer’s contribution with the counterpositional continuation-of marker ‘*but*’ (409), now she acknowledges the interviewer via the continuation-of marker ‘*and*’ (411) detailing the headmaster as a ‘*comfort to the parents*’ (411-413), repeating that he was ‘*so respected*’, adding the semantically redundant repetition of his name -‘*this headmaster*’ (asserted with down intonation) and that he was ‘*loved*’. She notes the seemingly irrelevant, ‘*he was strict*’, but he was ‘*listened to*’. Sally makes a personal attribution of faith because of the ‘evidence’ of another person clearly displaying *his* faith, an inference that she makes via her own description of it.

6.3.4 In the sequence in Text Box 6.8 below, Sally creates a script formulation ‘*you know*’ (604) of how a Methodist minister might typically preach:
She makes another ECF claim (of the omniscient narrator) that all the people in the chapel were affected by the chaplain’s words (607). This might be a claim too far as it prompts the interviewer to ask if others had a similar faith experience (608). Sally immediately responds in the negative three times (609) and her vehement down intonation and smart interjection (her words latch on to those of the interviewer’s before she finishes) appear dismissive; is the interviewer’s question so unreasonable? As noted above⁶⁸ a repeated ‘no’ (or ‘yes’) may indicate that the speaker has enough to go on, that they need no more information from

---

⁶⁸ At paragraph 5.5.5 in Chapter 5, note 10.
the collocutor in order to make a relevant reply. In the present passage, Sally changes the subject away from the events in the chapel to what happened next, using a counter-positional deictic marker, ‘but then’ (611) and moves from the importance of the chapel experience to talk of her going to a prayer group as a direct consequence of her changed faith. The interviewer’s turn (608) is constructed, with an affirmation ‘wow’ and continuation-of marker, ‘so’, then a delay ‘ggh’ and finally with a self-initiated-self-repair (she was about to say something beginning with ‘d’) that she prefices with ‘just out of interest’. This marks the interviewer’s question as a dispreferred reply, not immediately relevant to Sally’s turn - it responds to the interviewer’s interest⁶⁹. Furthermore, it responds to Sally’s account as description-as-historical-fact. Sally constructs facticity all too well and therefore the interviewer suggests others in the chapel may have responded as Sally did. However, Sally’s speech is a discursive action designed to justify her personal faith attribution in the telling of it; whatever others may or may not have felt at the time of the funeral is not to the point. Furthermore, discourse is challengeable by realist detail (as John is to do in his interview, see below). Therefore Sally dismisses the interviewer’s words and moves on, to change the topic and make a second justification for her faith through them.

6.3.5 As a final discussion of Sally’s faith account, Text Box 6.8 shows another instance of Sally’s rich construction in discourse. She discusses the importance to her of the chapel building, and the interviewer asks if that is because she had recovered her faith there (584-6). Sally first replies positively, ‘yeah’ with affirming prosody (587) only to add a rider: ‘she hadn’t really thought about it’ (591). This seems strange if, as she had claimed earlier,

⁶⁹ The phrase ‘just out of instance’ (608) might be though of as a ‘noticing’, pointing up a remark in order to make it relevant. See note 37 in section 8.3.2 and discussion at 8.4.4 in Chapter 8.
that she would ‘never forget’ (line 401, Text Box 6.6). Sally’s present vagueness keeps the actual moment of her faith recovery disconnected from any psychological involvement in it. This is a form of ‘stake inoculation’ (Potter, 2004) since the sequence is designed to protect an account from challenge before it may be made and based on categories pertinent to the speaker - her stake or interest in it. A dissimulation to interest in the moment of her faith recovery whilst describing it in so much detail supports and strengthens the attributional calculus and the inference of non-intra-psychic motivation and origin. Protecting assertions from challenge is the topic of the next section.

6.4 ‘I couldn’t, couldn’t believe’: Personal faith as description-as-mental-state

6.4.1 The previous sections contrast description-as-event with description-as-attribution - discursive accounts designed to achieve ‘mere’ description and so enable (in section 6.2) an assertion of external causality and (in section 6.3) a personal trait attribution. In conversation, a speaker may make a mental state avowal referring to cognitive activity of the internal world such as, I think; or a state of mind, I understand; or an attitude, I prefer, or a faith disposition, I’m a believer conventionally treating these as reified mental states. CA/DA research shows the action orientation of ordinary talk and that people do not passively wait their turn to speak and simply place their communication or ‘thoughts’ ready made into the conversation, but actively anticipate when their turn is due and what

---

70 This is particularly pertinent since Sally’s life at some point after the funeral service becomes filled with trauma and difficulty. Sally’s account counters the view that she turns to God in the face of her own stress, that is, for extrinsic, intra- psychic goals, without it being raised.

71 Although, one difference between CA and DP, is that CA may take an ‘objectivist’ view of talk-in-interaction, understanding it ‘in its own right’ and structurally distinguishable from the intra-psychic cognitive environment (Sacks 1992, vol. 2:169). DP, in contrast, is ‘post-cognitive’- the radical re-specification of cognition itself.
kind of a response the other speaker may expect as set up by the shape of their turn.

Michael Billig (1996) argues that assertions in speech are *positioned rhetorical versions* to which there is always the possibility of challenge. The implication of this is that from the first, a speaker’s talk is not only a statement or reply positioned in its conversational, discursive and institutional context but also in a *rhetorical* one\(^\text{72}\). In discourse, speakers *engage in the business* of posing assertions and negotiating them, and any assertion (of faith or otherwise) is potentially available for re-specification in the moment of its telling. Rhetoric in this perspective does not imply conversation as ‘mere argument’, or ‘persuasive communication’, but rather, as a function of *all* ordinary talk, discourse has the purpose to enable understanding and agreement. Its function and practice is to establish a relation between speakers, their interaction with each other; with their internal mental worlds and the external real world around them. It allows us to achieve agreement of the mental state avowals we make. DP privileges discourse as the construction of the mental state - how speakers work up a particular intentional state and how they orientate to it in the process of construction. This is ‘description-as-mental-state’. These are *constructed* positions of discourse and *constitutive* of intentionality, rather than descriptive of mental states as independent facts of objective reality. An *attitude* or a *disposition* is not, in this view, a private cognition, but a public position, rhetorically worked-up in discourse. Speakers develop these attitudes in speech and in so doing, acquire and hold them (see also Billig 1991, 1997, 2002).

\(^{72}\) This distinction of rhetorical psychology, that words are rhetorically placed as well as discursively placed in sequential talk-in-interaction is at the heart of the debate between Billig and Schegloff in the journal *Discourse Studies* in 1997-9 (see References).
6.4.2 Text Box 9.2 in section 9.3 of Chapter 9 shows the hypothetical enquirer asking John of his faith. He puts his question argumentatively and sceptically as that section discusses (see Text Box 9.2). The passage in Text Box 6.9 below follows straight on from Text Box 9.2 and is John’s first reply to the enquirer:

Text Box 6.9

| J: (2.5) ↑erm hhh (1.5) I think the words are are very loaded I mean (. ) faith |
| I: mm |
| J: and re↑li↓gious |
| I: mm |
| J: erm (2.25) I, I (. ) I ↑think you have to have (. ) I feel you have to have an approach to ↓life (. ) that helps me to (1.0) under↑stand, cope ↑with, deal ↑with, (1.0) the mystery of ↑li↓fe |
| I: mm |
| J: erm I ↑think that the best approach is to have as little faith as poss↓ible (1.0) because faith in what I mean faith is often defined as (. ) believing in something (1.0) that you cannot see or under↑sta↓nd (1.0) and I I believe ↓in ↓thin↑gs but I f. I find faith (. ) I define faith more as ((coughs)) how you would have faith in your ↑par↓ner or your friend (0.5) you believe in that = |
| I: .hhh |
| J: = what that person has (. ) shown you that they’re ↑li↓ke (0.75) so for example don’t believe in God (0.75) I mean there is no God (0.75) °I mean I think it’s (0.25) almost (0.25) I mean it sounds ↑insul↓ting but I couldnt, ↑could↓nt believe in God cos the way my life has been (0.75) ° and erm although I ↑used to (.) until my twenties° very ↑strongly believed in God (0.75) I was brought up as a (. ) Roman Catholic° |
| I: ↑righ↓t |
| J: erm and (0.25) so ↑faith to me is more (0.50) faith in a ↑practice, a (. ) er (. ) |

Present research John: Ref J/1/35-57/6.9

John begins an answer only after a long pause (two-and-a-half seconds), a delay (the emphasised filler ‘erm’), a sigh and a second pause of one-and-a-half seconds (35). He does not immediately answer the enquirer, which would lead him, one way or the other, into a justification. Instead, John queries the words, ‘faith’ and ‘religious’ and their referents, and notes the indexical inference to scepticism, ‘loaded’. He suggests alternatives (39), his words littered with difficulty - the delay, ‘erm’ long pause and repeated ‘I’. Thus, John
outlines his own position before going onto answer the enquirer and to reject faith (43). He justifies this rejection ‘because...’ (44) based on the queried definition, and carries on to make a re-specification, again with delay (the repeated ‘I f. find....I define’, 45). He makes a clear rejection of faith in God (51) as a continuation from his opening words via the marker, ‘so’ (50) and as an ‘example’ (50) of the way he defines and uses his words. The first part of the turn, therefore, is an account that informs the faith attitude in the second half. John uses strong terms to make this rejection, the repeated ‘coudn’t’ with emphatic prosody, (52) an extreme case formulation. He prepares the ECF by recognising it as such, ‘it sounds insulting’ (52), and he lowers his volume for the entire phrase, ‘I mean … has been’ (51-53). This ‘softens’ the ECF, and is ‘considerate’ to other, differing views. Billig (2002) discusses that speakers may use an ECF precisely because they do recognise there are alternatives. John positions his view in light of these other possibilities using the ECF device to do so, and with it, John turns his comment from a ‘description’ of his faith attitude, into a rhetorical argument for it. The interviewer acknowledges and accepts John’s turn (via the prosodic emphasis on ‘right’, 56). Finally, having made his lack of faith declaration, John begins to explicate an alternative view of faith based in mundane practice, ‘and so faith to me’ (57); the continuation-of marker ‘and so’ connects John’s about-to-be-expressed faith statement with his non-faith assertion just made. His phrase ‘to me’ implies that for John and ‘for you’ to hold alternative opinions is justifiable.

6.4.3 Throughout this sequence, John makes fourteen personal mental state avowals - ‘I think’ (35, 39, 43, 51), ‘I feel’ (39); ‘I mean’ (44, 52); ‘I believe’ (45); ‘I define’ (47); ‘don’t believe’ (51); ‘I mean I think’ (51); ‘I couldn’t, couldn’t believe’ (52); ‘I used to ...
believed’ (53) and one impersonal one, ‘faith is ... defined as believing’ (44). John makes this turn in reply to the hypothetical enquirer, but his speech may be understood as an opening ‘salvo’ in the negotiation of his faith position. The enquirer appears sceptical and the interviewer, John knows, has a faith. Furthermore there is the ‘footing’ (Goffman, 1979) of the interviewer as a representative of the academic community, so John must debate with at least three other positions and not just present the single anti-logoi of the collocutor; he must construct his speech to be acceptable to all hearers. The rhetoricians Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca (1971), refer to this as the ‘universal audience’, where a speaker’s words could be understood as rational by any reasonable person, and Bakhtin (1986, both cited in Billig 2002, p. 141), writing from a theoretical perspective, calls this the ‘super-addressee’ or ‘mythical universal audience’. In this view, John does not speak to engage with the enquirer or the interviewer alone but with any critical interlocutor. So here, having first pointed out the semantic ‘fuzziness’ of religious words, John suggests an approach introduced with ‘I think...’ (39) that helps him ‘to understand...’ (40) and uses a three-part-list, ‘to understand, cope with, deal with...’ This is the discourse of multi-subjectivity suggesting John’s account as one amongst many and the three-part list attempts to de-particularise it and make it a general commonplace with which the interviewer can share73. Clift (2006) notes the substantial body of (socio-linguistic) research on epistemic stance74 within interactive speech, observing that words such as ‘think’, ‘seems’, ‘find’, ‘often’, downgrade first speaker epistemic authority. So in the present passage, with his

73 This discussion understands a rhetorical context beyond the sequential situation of John’s words in their conversational location; and to speakers’ orientation to a universal or cultural audience over and above that of the words of the collocutor’s previous turn. See discussion of the Billig/Schegloff debate in Chapter 9.
stream of mental state avowals, John does not yet claim authority for his position. He continues to argue his case giving evidence in support - ‘because’ (44). This is an argument now of inter-subjectivity as John, recognising that various positions and faith definitions are available, develops his argument as rationally superior based on the grounding he provides. Now his speech becomes more assertive - ‘don’t believe’, ‘is no God’. This is consistent with empirical DA research (for example, see Schiffrin, 1984, Billig, 1991 and cited in Billig, 2001b p. 141) which has shown that speakers argue from their own attitudinal positions - from their particular stance amongst the many.

6.4.4 Classically, cognitive social psychology would seek to understand John’s position - his attitude, opinion, or in this case, his faith (or lack of it) as the referent or object of his words, as they describe his internal mental state. However, given the plethora of state avowals John makes in the present passage, it would be a puzzle to disentangle these and to give a coherent account of John’s faith stance as a construct or process of the intra-psychic environment. The one statement that is very clear is his denial of a belief in God (52) yet how can a lack of faith be adequately represented as a mental referent? As he tries to respecify the faith concept, John includes: a ‘life-approach’ including an ability to ‘understand’ and to ‘cope’ with life, a ‘belief system’ with either a transcendental ‘object’ that one can neither ‘grasp’ nor ‘see’, or a personal object of one’s experience, but not both. On the other hand he says that his lack of faith in God is due to mundane reasons - the way his ‘life has been’ (53). Furthermore, he tells us, his current lack of faith contrasts sharply with a strong belief he held when younger. What has caused this belief to disappear so completely? Psychological models have been suggested for these individual elements of
John’s faith\textsuperscript{75}, nevertheless, a key difficulty for realist psychological theorists\textsuperscript{76}, is to operationalise such a concept as complex as this as a coherent construct of the internal psyche, one that changes over time and may show great variability within and between different conversations of it. Allport’s attempt was ultimately regarded as being too narrow, his ‘intrinsic’ faith unable to capture the full implications of his earlier concept of ‘mature’ faith; whereas Fowler’s FDT was too broad. In trying to do justice to just the kind of expressions that John has given here, it failed as a coherent psychological complex. However, when John’s talk is taken in its immediate discursive and rhetorical context, a simpler explanatory paradigm is that his remarks are to justify and to explain himself against the extremely challenging manner of the hypothetical enquirer. DA studies have shown the rhetorical nature of opinion giving, and show that this is hardly ever (if at all) offered as a report on an internal state (for example see Billig, 1991, Edwards and Potter, 1992, Potter, 1996, Edwards, 1997, Wetherell, et al. 2001). Billig, in particular stresses the positional nature of (so-called) attitude statements, that is, that statements do not become labelled as attitudes until and unless they are challenged. Once an assertion is open to doubt and to challenge, then that issue becomes one on which an individual can ‘take a position’ (McGuire, 1964 as cited in Billig 1997, p. 214; Billig, 1991:143; Billig 1996). In the present case, John does not immediately claim a state of (lack of) faith until he has first commented on his enquirer’s words and only subsequently does he place his faith assertion in light of this.

\textsuperscript{75} For example, Kirkpatrick (2005) Evolutionary Psychological and Attachment perspective; Granqvist (2006), Granqvist and Kirkpatrick (2008) and Attachment Theory; Pargament (1997) and the psychology of Religion and Coping; Watts and Williams (1988) - religious knowing; and theories based on Object Relations Theory.

\textsuperscript{17} There is the similar difficulty for classic attribution and script theorists.
6.4.5 From a DP perspective, researchers analyse how a speaker positions a description in order to undermine alternative positions and claims (see Dillon, 1991). Some researchers discuss this in military terms:

‘In the ordinary use of discourse - for example, in a discussion between two friends - the interlocutors use any available ammunition, changing [language] games from one utterance to the next: questions, requests, assertions, and narratives are launched pell-mell into battle. The war is not without rules but the rules allow and encourage the greatest possibility of flexibility of utterance’.


In the present author’s opinion, the military terminology is not helpful. However it does emphasise that the same discursive passage can argue both for its own position and at the same time, oppose countering views. John’s ECF, for example, (52) denies a half-way position from John’s stance even as he presents it.

6.4.6 Text Box 6.9 below shows the kind of faith John’s beliefs are ‘to him’, the passage carries straight on from Text Box 6.8:
John further describes his concept of faith (57-59) including here the notions of a
‘practice’; ‘teachings’; ‘approach’ (as before at line 39) and ‘ultimately my self’. He down
plays his faith concept with laughter, which is associated with interactional trouble
(Jefferson, 1984, 1985; Jefferson et al., 1987), or with other discursive concerns (Potter and
Hepburn, 2010 and see Glen, 2002 for review). In the present case, it seems that John has
trouble with the word faith itself and in what it may convey and notes that this is not the
answer he would give in the pub to the enquirers (64). The interviewer interjects a turn to
ask what John would he say in the pub and John repeats the interviewer’s words back to
her, with raised intonation suggesting this is not the last word (66). Repetitions may work
as a means of instigating some sort of repair, for example, to request more information
from the other speaker (Schegloff, 1984). In the present case, the effect of John’s repetition
is to delay his substantive reply, which itself contains more delayers (‘er’ and the extended
‘ha.have’, 65). Here, changing the context of the discussion from the present interview
back to ‘the pub’ implies a change to the rhetorical construct of faith that John develops. In
John’s next formulation of his concept of faith, John discusses that it is something *useful*, to ‘anchor you’ (67). John uses the second person impersonal to imply a generalised concept of faith, able to anchor *anyone*, and not specific to John. Placing an argument into the impersonal is very common in everyday talk as it strengthens the justification by removing the implication of personal motivation. Furthermore, John frames his answer as a three-part-list - three ‘to haves’: ‘anchor’, ‘practice’ and ‘a set of friends’ (67-8). As discussed before, an account structured into three parts appears as (one of) the conventional ways that speakers may use to position their particular assertions and descriptions as non-particular, common to both participants and to which therefore the collocutor can agree. Billig talks of this as a rhetorical commonplace and argues that this is part of the process of the dialectic of justification. He identifies maxims and clichés in this category, where, because speakers claim these in common they do not need justification. In the present case, who would argue against something that ‘anchored’, gave ‘a practice’ with a ‘set of friends’ sharing a ‘spiritual journey’? John’s phrase, ‘spiritual journey’ (69) is, additionally, a cliché and participates in Billig’s commonplace categorisation. Having established his account of faith as ‘normal’, John now goes on to personalise it - ‘I just find that helpful’ (69). The personal ‘I’ works to support the justified argument, by being a concrete consequence of it. ‘Just’ limits John’s assertion - he does not want to over claim. Despite John’s saying that he would not have described his faith as he did in the pub, this second formulation is very similar - including a repetition of the phrase, ‘mystery of life’. Additionally, John’s manner

---

77 It is of course the acceptable way for academic and scientific writing and also for newspaper headlines because it removes the agent from the data or event reported on - a process known as ‘nominalization’. See Billig 2008 for a discussion of its use in critical discourse analysis, where he argues for a limit in its practice.

78 for example, 2002, p. 141.

79 Theorists of rhetoric (such as Eagleton 1991) claim that the process of making a contingent claim into something natural or commonplace is one of the characteristic functions of ideology See discussion in Billig 2001 p.142.
is similar. In both cases, he offers a three-part-list and he gives no technical or creedal
terms, nor suggests any particular faith. Perhaps John means that telling anybody of his
faith would be complicated - something that the interviewer now goes on to explore:

**Text Box 6.11**

| 72 | have you ↑th:thought ↓about this much I mean do you sometimes find yourself thinking what am I doing how ↑would I answer these questions is it something that you find difficult to [answer your↑self |
| 74 | J: ↑no, no because I ↑don’t real↓ly get asked asked the ↓questions |
| 76 | I think that .hh (1.0)↑people, (1.75) the ↑people I have religious discussions with are the people who know (0.50) where I ↓stand [in the groups I’m ↑in |
| 78 | I: [mm |
| 80 | J: I think people out↑side, people at ↑work, people ↑meet (0.75) may be (.↑) ↑they have more discussions about what sort of ↑person you are and how you beh↑ave and what you ↑do (0.25) ↓in life |

Present research John: Ref J/1/72-81/6.11

**6.4.7** The interviewer responds to John’s turn not to agree or reject it but to ask about
John’s motivation when tackling this topic about which John has replied so fulsomely -
does he spend time thinking of these things, does he find it ‘difficult’, (74)? This John
rejects with a repeated ‘no’ (75). John dismisses the interviewer’s question rather than
answer it. The ‘people’ he has ‘religious discussions’ with are ‘people who know where
[he] stand[s]’ (76-7). The implication is that to give an account of one’s opinions is only
difficult when the speaker has to justify his views in a context where these are not already
known. In other words, the so called description of the opinion does not in point of fact
‘simply describe’ at all but performs rhetorical work. The more unknown or at odds
alternative versions are, the more difficult this is. This is exactly the theoretical position of
rhetorical psychology. Billig (1996) discusses that ‘statements of fact’ that must be
carefully worked up in opposition to alternative views, is precisely what the rhetoricians of antiquity understood so well and which modernist, positivist science ignores. John continues with two three-part-lists - the three groups of people ‘outside… at work… I meet’, (79) and what sort of person John is ‘person you are...you behave...what you do’ (80/1). The first list is in the first person voice, the second all in the impersonal third. The lists achieve what they are designed to achieve, to construct and sum up, so that the floor is handed over to the next speaker.

6.4.8 With this positioning complete, John gives another account of his faith:

---

80 The very people the interviewer had ‘in mind’ for the hypothetical enquirer, not surprisingly, since this is a generalised list.
81 The lines in Text Box 6.11 follow those of Text Box 6.10 with a short break of 15 lines of transcription (see full transcript in the agenda).
### Text Box 6.12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Transcription</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>J: ↑well ↑religion ↑is ↑just ↑another (0.25) conceptualisation of ↓things &quot;I ↓think&quot; .hh and it’s ↑so loaded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>I: mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>J: it’s so ↓loaded ed I mean I’m in a. (0.75) a. ↑poetry group and we write (( )) and I mentioned the word God ↑not (0.75) in a ↑kind of slightly ↓ironic way actually in a poem&lt; and (0.50) the whole critique from the ↑group centred on that ↑word</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>I: mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>J: because it was such an emotive [word for people and =</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>I:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>J: &gt;and in my final writing of the poem I took that word&lt; out =</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>I: = oh you ↑did I mean don’t you think that (.) for people to discuss it and have all these different views is part of the [(1.0) ↑benefit of it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>J: (((())) yeah but they’re not talking about ↑God they’re talking about (0.25) they’re talking about erm the way that ((coughs)) they’ve been (0.75) controlled (.) socially during their ↑upbringing usually .hh (1.50) when people talk about God they’re often talking about the church or (0.75) the social milieu, or the functionalist religious (.) (((()))) controlling them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>I: [people come to as↑associate certain things with that word (.) because of what they’ve experienced, n people they’ve met an =</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>I: = (.0) good and [bad experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>J: [yes well so do ↑I really</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>I: [yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Present research John: Ref J/1/96-122/6.12

John reasserts that a religious view is one amongst many (96-9) and that religious terms are put to rhetorical purposes. He introduces his view with the counterpositional ‘well’ - whatever else faith may be, here is John’s view, in contrast. He justifies this assertion with prosodic emphasis: The stream of raised pitch accents, the leaned on emphasis of ‘so loaded’ and its repetition, and the assertive downward pitch at the end (‘things’, 96) as if to say, ‘there, I’ve made my point’. John continues with a second justification, this time using a story format. It is possible to formulate John’s words (lines 97-115) using Labov and

---

82 Edwards (2006) has the felicitous phrase - ‘prosody is a detail of rhetoric’.
Waletzky’s functional/structural model for story, as discussed in Chapter 4, and Table 6.1 below shows this:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Structural Component</th>
<th>Function</th>
<th>John from Text Box 5.5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*Abstract</td>
<td>An introductory element, a brief summary,</td>
<td>‘it’s so loaded’ (97)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orientation</td>
<td>indicating that a narrative is about to be</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>told</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complicating Action</td>
<td>The events of the narrative’s plot, often</td>
<td>‘I mentioned... the critique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>told in</td>
<td>centred ... there was anger... they</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>simple past tense</td>
<td>didn’t see... they just saw...’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolution</td>
<td>The outcome of the narrative, the ending</td>
<td>‘I took that word out’ (108)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Coda</td>
<td>A final segment that leads the narrative</td>
<td>‘but they’re not talking about</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>back to the present interaction</td>
<td>God... (111-115)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Evaluation</td>
<td>An assessment of the narrative events</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Labov (1972:369) as adapted in Wennerstrom (2001)

*The abstract and the coda are optional and the evaluation – a key function of story – can occur throughout the story’s telling not only at the end.

A first point to note is that this structure ignores the fact that the evaluation beginning, ‘yeah but they’re not talking about God...’ (111) occurs only after an interjection by the interviewer which elicits this response. Who knows what John may have said as an evaluation without the interviewer’s prompt, which begs its value as a component of a given, pre-formed story structure. Secondly, we cannot know John’s motive for telling this story without an understanding of its place in the sequence of discourse, particularly if the evaluation is not a ‘given’. Finally, its analysis into these component parts does not add to
the discussion at hand. The action may complicate the abstract - ‘it's so loaded’ - but why is that significant? Rather than understanding this sequence as an independent story, we can see this passage as having a recognizable storied form through which it performs a justifying function within its current rhetorical context. From this perspective, the story comes after John’s opening claim, given to support his original faith assertion, and introduced with the mental state avowal, ‘I mean’ (99). This supports an argument which he makes without a presumption of epistemic authority. In this light, it appears as a justification of John’s claim, supporting his offered or suggested premise regarding his lack of faith exactly as was Sally’s story (for her assertion of faith, Text Box 4.1). For John, ‘religion’ is a personal term with no objective meaning and as such he must argue his case, not assert it. John uses his story as description-as-event explicating the flexible use of religious language in practice: John could not even use the word, ‘God’, in his own poem because of the way his readers hijacked it to put to rhetorical purposes of their own. The story works as a justification for the reasons discussed in Chapter 4; it is interesting and the resolution surprising. The interviewer gives an intoned ‘oh’ receipt on hearing it (109) marking a change in her epistemic stance vis à vis John to one of shared knowledge with him as she receives this news. It enables her to make an assertion of her own (109-110). John’s reply to this is a classic dispreferred phrase - ‘yeah but’ (110) the weak agreement introducing disagreement. The interviewer takes the story at face value, that is, a factual account of an historic event but John’s rhetorical use of his storied turn is to justify his claim. In this rhetorical context, the interviewer’s reply is not relevant and John moves on from it. In this storied sequence, John uses the direct language of story in the simple past and present tense and first person voice, in contrast to the impersonal second and third

83 As she had done with Sally’s account of the other adults in the school chapel, at section 6.3.4 above.
person voice he uses in his rhetoric-of-argumentation earlier (paragraph 5.5.2 in Chapter 5). He uses the conversational historical present to heighten the immediacy of the story, ‘they’re (not) talking’ (110) and takes the zero focalization of the omniscient narrator and so claims it as empirical fact. John constructs his description as a specific and particular instance of a wider and general truth. As John continues however, he softens his claim with ‘usually’ (113) and ‘often’ (114) which weakens his authority to make this claim (Clift, 2006, as before). John continues after this passage with the second justification of his faith discussed earlier\(^*\) as a *rhetoric-of-argumentation*. His argument is the same but he uses two different rhetorical devices to support it: the storied form offers detail and direct language to infer an evaluative conclusion from the particular to the general; the non-storied, modalised series of statements (in Text Box 5.5, in Chapter 5) which argues as though in logical steps, from the general to the particular.

The mental state avowal ‘*I mean*’ (99) with which John introduces his story in the present chapter therefore, is seen not to ‘describe’ a ‘mental state’ but to locate John’s explanation. It may serve to reduce evidentiality for John’s subsequent assertions and, more generally, it functions as ‘*I intend by this*’, that is ‘*I have a purpose towards you and I in this conversation*’ in relating John himself, the topic under consideration and the wider world in the context of the possible alternative positions of the interviewer, the hypothetical enquirer and the wider audience.

\(^*\)Section 5.5 in Chapter 5.
6.4.9 In a later sequence, John employs yet another formulation - a *rhetoric-of-fact*. This is a powerful device in the warranting of accounts which speakers frequently use to *dismiss* accounts, as John does here:

**Text Box 6.13**

| 796 | J: so I can rem[ember] gggh I can remember where I was in my school corridor = |
| 798 | I: ("laughs"); |
| 800 | J: = at the age of fourteen when I knew it was ab[sur]d that there was a there must be a resurrection the priest was talking to me hh and I said Father the. there can be no resurrection of the bo[dy] its stu[pid] idea (1.0) and he said well what do you mean ("John's surname") ("(laughs)""); |
| 802 | I: ("(laughs)"), |
| 806 | J: (((coughs))) and I knew it couldn't happen it was all dis[per] all our atoms and molecules disperse and the bits of carbon in me ([become] tree[s] or recycled into = |
| 808 | I: yes |
| 810 | J: = other things how can that get altogether again and any way once the body's not there how are you a human be[ing] because the spirit and the mind are intimately part of the body I mean (.) with no body there could be no spirit no mind I mean the whole thing is one |
| 811 | I: mm |
| 812 | J: and I sort of knew that at that age ...continues... |

Present research John: Ref J/1/796-811/6.13

John discusses a time when he claims to know that there is and can be, no Christian God (798). He bases his claim on the single fact that a material body, when dead, cannot be physically resurrected as orthodox Christianity maintains. The Christian creed contains a series of detailed, factual claims and John in rejecting one of these, rejects the conclusion on which the Christian rhetoric-of-fact (may) warrant itself. Any truth claim warranted on a rhetoric-of-fact leaves itself vulnerable to just this challenge. John secures his argument with further construction work. He mentions *exactly* where he was at the time this realisation came to him - *‘in the school corridor’* (796) aged *‘fourteen’* (798). This detail creates verisimilitude because of its ordinariness and immediacy, as discussed in Joyce’s
interview above. Furthermore, John quotes as active voicing the first person reported speech he claims to have had with an ordained priest at the time. John gives the priest’s words to be a witness, to respond to John and to ask for elaboration, ‘what do you mean’ (801). This enables John to display in the present interview his earlier knowledge. (803-811). John brings in the priest as a member of the category ‘someone who would know’ religious truths by way of his faith, as a foil to John who now rationally knows by way of his reason. John laughs at this point, which the interviewer shares (801/2) showing support. John’s language is rhetorically precise. He gives many ECFs - he ‘knew’ (said with leaned on emphasis) the notion of resurrection was ‘absurd’, there ‘must be’ no resurrection (798); it was ‘stupid’ (800) and he knew it ‘couldn’t happen’ (803). However, the interesting point of note to this present turn-at-talk, is that whilst John’s rhetoric is robust, he says elsewhere (see Appendix), that at the time when he was fourteen years of age up until his late twenties he was very devout, practicing his Roman Catholic faith every day and attending spiritual retreats. Clearly the relationship between speech, practices, memory, historical circumstances and intra-psychic intentionality is complex, just as is the psychological concept of personal faith. To locate the one within the other via an uncritical understanding of ‘language-as-description’ seems fraught with problem and difficulty.

6.5 CONCLUSION

The present chapter has argued that when asked to account for themselves in conversation, individuals will do just that. The language they use is much more than a simple reflection of external or historic reality with the assessment for veridicality and accuracy its only test.
Indeed, the perspective of the present study is that when turning to the intra-psychic ‘environment’ itself, speakers design purposeful and intricate accounts in such a way as to specify subjective states, achieving them or realising them in speech where their meaning and practical advantage becomes available in quotidian discourse. These motivations and interests are accessible both to the individuals who construct them and to psychologists who study them. Furthermore, the intra-psychic objects realised as discursive phenomena are those of the participants’ own immediate concern and not those created for or imposed on them by the analyst. Joyce constructs her description of supernatural activity with precision to justify an attribution of external causality to it. She uses externalising devices to construct herself as normal, or ordinary in everyway. She prefaces her description of unbelievable events with utterly typical and normal ones thus creating the attributional variable of distinctiveness and invites the interviewer to make an attributional calculus based on this. Her account of faith (in the present interviews at least) is that it is a human response to an experience of the Divine. With this perspective, she may ‘see’, or ‘construct’ many such instances and she describes several of these in her account during the present study. Sally, in contrast, constructs faith as a human orientation to the divine, ‘something’ which continues within the individual whatever their outward protestations or activities may suggest. She constructs with exquisite detail the occasion of a school girl’s funeral with the attributional variables consensus (on the part of the ‘full chapel’) and of consistency (on the part of the chaplain in the face of challenge) to justify an attribution of the chaplain’s faithfulness. This (constructed) event enables Sally to reconnect with her own ‘spiritual element’ inside. Her regular prayer practice alters as a consequence and she describes herself as ‘back’, that is, returned to faith. John uses a number of different
arguments throughout his talk to warrant his faith account - ‘story’, a rhetoric-of-argumentation and a rhetoric-of-fact. He uses each purposefully within the interview to achieve his discursive aims. After the modalised sequence discussed in the previous chapter, John makes a personal attribution of (non)-faith (or extrinsic faith). In the present chapter, John’s various formulations appear as positioned rhetorical versions which he argues from his own perspective and in so doing creates a ‘position’ for himself or an ‘attitude of mind’. This John holds in contrast to the alternative versions either of the hypothetical enquirer or of his real collocutor or other audiences who may hold different views to that which is now ‘his own’.
Chapter 7

Doing, ‘accounting for faith’: A discursive psychology perspective of Margaret’s faith

7.0 SUMMARY

This chapter is a presentation of Margaret’s faith analysed from a discursive psychology perspective. The passages below are a sequence of continuous long turns from the beginning of Margaret’s interview, as the interviewer passes the ‘floor’ to Margaret to account for herself and explain her faith in her own words. The discussion notes Margaret using a variety of discourse devices and formulations including extreme case formulations, contrast structures, a rhetoric-of-justification and direct speech, which it discusses as evidence of design within an interview context. The chapter discusses that the speaker designs her talk for interactive, discursive and rhetorical ends. It contrasts faith talk as ‘mere description’ of an internal mental state with the constructed realisation of it in discourse. As a phenomenon of talk, Margaret realises a faith recognizable as Allport’s ‘mature faith’ which Allport could not reveal unproblematically as an objective orientation of the personality, via the Religious Orientation Scale. As a discursive phenomenon, Margaret makes this faith available to her as psychological reality and a resource for everyday life.

‘well certainly I would say that I do’: a discursive attribution of an intrinsic or mature faith

7.1 DATA ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

7.1.1 In reply to the hypothetical enquirer (see discussion of the posing of the question at 7.2.2 below), Margaret gives two contrasts. The first is between a rational belief which requires intellectual rigour to grasp, as opposed to experiential knowing, which is a kind of feeling (117-8). Margaret asserts her faith as the latter:
Margaret constructs herself as a rational thinker - she ‘always’ questions ‘everything’ (118) and with the most ‘rigorous rationality’ (119). She stresses the ‘doing’ of the questioning and the ‘everything’ with leaned on emphasis and ‘rigorous’ with upward pitch. This description offsets a potential counter argument that belief in God and to make a knowledge claim of Him, requires suspension of normal rational processes of engagement with fact based evidence, before the interviewer can raise it. Margaret’s language here is typical to that of extreme case formulations. Margaret deflates criticism of naïve incredulity since she is a person who always questions everything, and the ECF works because it recognises the alternative argument. The close analysis of this passage shows that what seems like a description of a mental state (Margaret’s rigorous rationality) functions as a rhetorical device to underpin a rhetoric-of-justification. To observe Margaret for a time to see if there
were a single instance when she did not question something rigorously, would be entirely to miss the point of why she makes this perfectly reasonable, if extreme, statement. It shows design in Margaret’s speech. This is not ‘sales talk’, the kind of persuasion that Day’s critics accused him of imposing on his subjects\textsuperscript{85}, but the positioning in discourse of an argument that recognises possible alternative versions. Furthermore, the ECF constructs Margaret in a particular way. Depicting herself as rigorously rational, constitutes grounds for her faith claim.

7.1.2 Margaret describes her faith, twice, as ‘deep’ (120) and that she ‘always’ (120) possessed it, (echoing her, ‘always believed’, 115). This is another ECF. If Margaret has always had her faith, and ‘can’t remember a time’ without it (112) then it is hard to trouble this claim by relating it to a specific instance, or event, when she was young and immature, or to any motivated goal of her own subjectivity. This is another positioning in support of her faith claim and Margaret recognises that this is something rather special. She says she is ‘fortunate’ and is about to say that it is a great - what? - blessing? (121) and settles on it is ‘something that’s gifted’ to her (123). Speakers often make small self-instigated-self-repairs of this sort and they may reveal something of the speaker’s intentions. Here, we cannot know what Margaret was going to say, ‘blessing’ would fit. However, from the change of syntax we can see that the repair manages a change to Margaret’s positioning. In the first formulation, Margaret is the subject, fortunate to be in possession of a great (unknown) object. In the second, Margaret is the recipient of a faith gifted to her. This tiny change and from an unspoken word, dramatically distances Margaret from the source of her faith and removes a potential charge of motivated subjectivity towards it. Furthermore, the word,  

\textsuperscript{85} ‘Con-artist’ and ‘huckster’ were the terms used, see discussion at Section 1.4.4 in Chapter 1.
‘gifted’ itself is constructing. It is a one-word metaphor with both secular and religious inferential connotations. A gift is the responsibility of the giver and consequently Margaret, in using this word, rejects the notion that she is responsible for her faith - that she has to work hard at it or that it is under her control; for her, it is a gift. As a gift, Margaret is ‘very fortunate’ (121) to receive it. Fortune is providential luck - according to Margaret her intentionality contributes nothing to her faith. Furthermore, the notion of the free gift of grace (faith) is an essential principle of Christian doctrine. This word is not a neutral description of Margaret’s state of belief, but is highly constructive of Margaret’s self-positioning and therefore works, reflexively, to support her faith assertion. Margaret does not only assert her claim to a gift, she offers an empiricist-rhetoric for it; she has talked to ‘lots of people’ and concludes that genuine faith experiences may validly take different forms (123/4). The interviewer not only accepts Margaret’s claim, she confirms it, ‘that’s right’ (127) levelling epistemic stance vis-a-vis Margaret. Margaret’s negotiation has been successful and her assertion is now held in common by both participants. Given this, Margaret ventures a further endorsement to her faith. Her next turn begins ‘but it is’(128) the ‘but’ dismisses a potential foray into rationalistic knowledge to repeat that faith ‘knowledge’ is different to mundane rationality.

7.1.2 Margaret continues with another continuation-of marker, ‘but having said that’ (131) positioning her next remark as despite her earlier one:
Text Box 7.2

M: but (.) having said that as I’ve grown up =
I: [mm]
M: = in the Christian faith [I do find .hh this is the faith =
I: [mm]
M: = that [I was brought [in to
I: [mm] [yes
M: I mean if I’d been born a Muslim I might find that equally satisfying =
I: mm
M: = I don’t know (.) but I was born and brought up in (.) the Christian faith
I: mm
M: as [most [people [we’re [of my generation
I: [mm]
M: [erm (0.5) and I have (0.25) had all of the intellectual doubts that I think it’s possible to have
I: mm
M: (0.5) and yet [nothing (0.5) has ever happened even the most serious things in life
I: mm
M: that has [actually shaken that (0.25) that a ware ness that there is (0.25) a deep love and a deep purpose at the root of things
I: mm
I: (.)[hh] yes
M: (.) [but that’s the =
M: = that’s the only way .hh I [wouldn’t have described it like that as a child
I: no (.) no .hh no .hh continues...

Present Research: Margaret Ref: M/1/131-154/ 7.2

Margaret claims that she is a Christian because she was born in a Christian country and in a generation where Christian faith is the norm. She queries her categorical status - if she were a Christian only due to an accident of birth, might she find the different creeds and practices of other religions ‘equally satisfying’ (137)? This is an extremely sensitive sequence of rhetorical work beginning at the end of the passage in Text Box 7.1 and continuing over thirteen lines to line 141 in the present passage. Margaret’s claim to faith does not rest on a rhetoric-of-fact. As discussed in John’s interview, factual claims are vulnerable to challenge; a single disputed fact can unravel an account (as it does for John). Margaret quite explicitly distances her account from this danger. But in the present sequence Margaret looks as though she may be poised to make an assertion, specific to
Christian faith, and warranted by the very rational processes she has just distanced herself from ‘but having said that…I do find…’ (131/3). The phrase ‘I do find’ is a reduced first person epistemic claim (Clift, 2006); however, Margaret does not complete this construction. In another self-repair, she begins a new topic suggesting instead that her culture may inform her faith experience (137). She prefaces this with ‘I mean’ - another mental state avowal reducing evidentiality. She concludes this and removes herself from any claim of rational knowledge with ‘I don’t know’ (139). Speakers use the ‘I don’t know/I dunno’ formulation\textsuperscript{86} to distance themselves from specific category entitlements or identities when making assertions. Margaret’s disinterest in the significance of Christian or Muslim creeds and practices removes her faith account from any challenge on this score to the point that she can repeat her earlier claim that her faith is not shaken despite all intellectual doubt possible. She concludes with another ECF (143) and even upgrades it with prosodic emphasis, ‘all’ is heavily leaned-on, and ‘the intellectual doubts’ take downward or assertive stress. She concludes further doubts are not even ‘possible’ and even ‘the most serious things in life have not dislodged her faith’ (146). Margaret is an Anglican priest yet she makes no claim as to the superiority of the Christian creed to represent and describe her faith, nor to any categorical expertise due to herself as an ordained minister. These categories are available to her to warrant her faith, but she declines them. Margaret has removed herself from the category ‘most faith people’ but has not used any another to warrant her claim. Instead she relies on the fact that as a rational person she can examine her faith and compare it to (lots of) others’ and come to a conclusion based on the observation that her faith-as-knowledge-feeling endures. Margaret’s ‘I don’t know’ is in

\textsuperscript{86} Potter (1997 and 1998) demonstrates the constructing work of ‘I dunno/ don’t know’ in his analysis of the television interview between Diana, Princess of Wales and the journalist Martin Bashir. Widdicombe and Wooffitt (1995) also note this form in their study of identity. See discussion at section 8.2.2 in Chapter 8.
direct contrast with her earlier, strongly asserted ‘I do know’ (123) that she makes on this very point. This is a robust account precisely because it makes no particular claims for Margaret’s Christian faith or of herself as entitled to knowledge of it. She speaks as anyone would who had had her experiences and discussions with ‘lots of people’.

7.1.3 Margaret now adds descriptive detail that was hitherto missing in her faith account - that it contains the notion of providential love and purpose (148). As soon as speakers offer a specific detail, or claim a category entitlement to describe or warrant an assertion, this can provide an opportunity to undermine it. Margaret’s faith is now open to a challenge of theodicy - why a loving God allows evil in the world, but Margaret does not engage with this argument and continues to assert her faith and that this is the only way as an adult, she can describe it. Margaret endorses the notion that whilst her faith-as-feeling has always remained the same, her description of it would change according to circumstances. This statement, the interviewer not only fulsomely accepts, (154) she does so with four repeated ‘no’s that dismiss any alternative out of hand; Margaret’s faith account appears unassailable.

7.1.4 Margaret grounds her faith claim in that it does not change with her life experiences - it is independent of everything. The interviewer now queries this, as it is the heart of Margaret’s claim:
It is ‘obvious’, the interviewer says (168) that Margaret’s mundane knowledge would change as she grows up. She asks of Margaret’s faith knowledge in light of this assertion, linking it with the continuation-of marker, ‘but’ (170) which Margaret acknowledges with her exact placement of the continuer ‘mm’ (171). Margaret does not answer at first but repeats the interviewer’s question back to her (with the deictic ‘that’ changed to ‘it’, 173).

If the repetition is a request for more information, the interviewer does not supply this, but simply bats the question back to Margaret, this time with reverse phraseology and with down, and finalising intonation. If the repeat has not elicited new information, it has provided a delay before Margaret’s answer. She begins with the filler ‘erm’ and a pause. The delay gives Margaret time to give a considered reply, which she eventually puts into

---

87 It is fundamental to CA that any single turn elicits an appropriate response - answers follow questions for instance in an adjacency pair. A response to a part 1 with another part 1 suggests therefore that the repetition is doing work in anticipation of the expected part 2.
the conversation for joint consideration by both speakers with the reduced epistemic claim of ‘I think’: ‘I think its pretty much like a ground base...’ (175).

7.1.5 The interviewer has four attempts to get her question right (170/172). She substitutes ‘kno.’, the start of ‘knowledge’ for ‘experience’. This is not an incorrect description of Margaret’s faith - she uses it herself, but it is potentially ambiguous. The interviewer changes this to ‘belief’, but this is not right either. She speaks two and a half words, at low pitch, ‘not this be.[lief]’ before finally settling on ‘feeling’ said with leaned on emphasis. With the low intoned phrase, rejecting the word ‘belief’ the interviewer corrects herself, according to her understanding of Margaret’s argument. It is another self-initiated-self-repair (see Schegloff et al. 1977). Repairs are a general category of CA, referring not so much to factual ‘corrections’ but to the various conversational disorders that may occur during the turn-taking process. There are many occasions in the present conversations where a speaker, often at the beginning of a new turn, has a false start before articulating a perfectly correct, or appropriate word. In the present case, we cannot say without speculation that the interviewer feels that belief is an incorrect description for Margaret’s faith, however, the present author, suggests that her repair addresses interpersonal and discursive concerns just as Margaret’s two self repairs discussed above at lines 121 and 133. Of the three words, belief is explicitly negated ‘not this’ in a phrase hearably separated from the rest of the speech, with low pitch. The socio-linguistics perspective on prosody may refer to an inserted phrase, all at low pitch, as ‘a parenthetical’ or ‘O Contour (for Outside) Class’ (Bing 1985). Bing understands the O Contour Class as

---

88 Schegloff, (1979a as cited in Hutchby and Wooffitt, 1998, p. 60) notes that when this happens, speakers usually get it right by the third attempt - that number three again!
covering a wide variety of different speech forms and semantically it is material that ‘does not seem to contribute to the truth value of the sentence’ (p. 21 quoted in Wennerstrom, 2001 p. 104). In his study of parentheticals, Local (1992) found speakers using lowered pitch to interrupt themselves in naturally occurring talk, resetting their pitch when taking up the thread of their argument, as here. Wennerstrom discusses that the purpose of the low intoned phrase indicates to listeners that this speech is not connected or even relevant to the main talk. In the present case, whilst ‘belief’ might be incorrect, it is certainly not irrelevant, and it is rhetorically important to Margaret’s faith account as the foil against which she predicates her faith as a kind of knowledge. The interviewer has corrected herself so that Margaret does not have to do so, and shown that she understands what Margaret’s claim to faith is, by contrasting it with what it is not. This positions the interviewer in a category of shared knowledge with Margaret and the variation in pitch emphasises this. This repair, highlighted with low pitch indicates to Margaret that the interviewer is aware of her argument and orientates to it and to herself as co-participant in the dialogue.

7.1.6 This discussion of Text Box 7.4 ends by noting that Margaret re-asserts her main contention that her faith ‘feeling’ is ‘always there’ (179). Then, as she continues, she makes another self-initiated-self-repair:

---

89 Much of this data is either of constructed text, or, as in the case Wennerstrom cites here, non-dialogic - a classroom presentation.
Margaret was about to say something of her experience and instead (using the counterpositional ‘well’) she mentions her age and that she had just had a birthday. This is relevant because it constructs Margaret with category entitlement to knowledge of the ways of the world and events in it, because of her 75 years experience of it. Margaret includes
this before bringing in her discussion of her experience as support for her faith claim. She introduces her husband and uses direct speech in the first person voice, her words marked with lowered pitch and volume. First and third person reported speech often occurs in story telling passages but rather less often in account building, such as Margaret’s here; nevertheless it has been shown to do interactional work in these ‘fleeting passages’ as Clift (2006, and see Heritage and Raymond, 2005) calls them. She argues that reported speech in assessments indicates epistemic stance. In naturalistic conversations, she notes that direct speech is a ‘powerful evidential display of having reached an assessment first’ (p. 578) that is, it displays the claim to epistemic priority over the collocutor. In Clift’s study, speakers turn to direct speech after already establishing stance via other means (the negative interrogative for example) and in response to other interactional events of the talk-in-interaction at hand. It seems that Margaret’s passage of direct talk in the present case, is not just an example of Margaret’s acquaintance with mundane matters but is part of her claim to authority over the interviewer in respect to the assessments and claims she makes. It was noted earlier that Margaret had introduced a claim that her faith feeling was one of a ‘deep love and... purpose at the root of things’ (148-9) and that this claim is challengeable by direct evidence to the contrary - by the presence of evil in the world. Before the interviewer asks of it, Margaret acknowledges this argument with an ECF, ‘the news is so appalling’ and displays her prior orientation to it with her comment to her husband; she acknowledges it, ‘that side of things’ and finally accounts for it, ‘but it doesn’t alter’ (192). Margaret claims epistemic authority due to first speaker rights, (Heritage and Raymond 2005) and (according to Clift’s analysis) displays it with her first person speech to her husband to turn the television off. Furthermore, the present sequence constructs Margaret as ‘being
ordinary’, responding with horror to the evils of the world exactly as any one else would. Margaret introduces the vignette explicitly, ‘for instance’ (181) as an example of this and as she brings her husband into her account as a ‘witness’. Next Margaret says it is hard to explain to suffering people (194) why there should be grief in the world, which sounds rather like a concession - Margaret admits to the only argument available to challenge her account so far. However, the concession is not a concession at all because Margaret does not detract from any of her account, ‘but it does not alter’ (192) and it ‘stay[s] pretty much the same’ (207), she says. Rather, she uses her admission and experience of evil in the world to bolster her account - her faith endures despite it. In Antaki and Wetherell’s (1999) study, ‘Show Concessions’, these authors discuss speakers doing exactly this in interactive conversation as they use ‘concession-like’ talk to build accounts and make claims, strengthened by the recognition of the alternative view.

This passage has been one long turn from Margaret who uses the floor time given her by the interviewer with her stream of continuer markings. Margaret beautifully builds her account, which shows design and structure and uses a series of rhetorical devices including direct speech, category entitlement and concession-like talk, and with manipulation of prosody throughout.

7.1.7 Margaret has repeated her assertion to her faith in a loving God and that it is a ‘gift in life’ (218). She returns to the one argument that can still challenge this, the problem of evil:
but I don’t think I’m as optimistic as I was about the outcome

because I think facing up to what’s happening in the world and the [environment

and yet (0.25) I can also (.) use my brain and rationalise and say well (.) human

beings are no (.) the total full of God’s (.) er

providence, God’s: s (0.5) erm creation

just checking it still going° ((checks laptop))

→ .hh erm (.) and you really can’t remember a ↑ti↑me (.) when you haven’t (.) had this

→ (1.0) er (.) feeling =

no (0.25) ↓ I can’t .hh and think that I I think that’s ↑possibly quite

un↑us↑ual (0.75) ↑EVEN when my son was very ill [erm

[mm

and I ↑ couldn’t (.) erm (1.25) I couldn’t bear what was happening and it was so ↓ painful

erm (0.25) and I ↓ couldn’t pray, (0.75) but it didn’t seem to me that it was contrary

to the will of God

[mm

[that he:e. that even if he was lost from ↑us he would be lost

(0.75) for↑ever you kn[o↑w

yes

you you could (0.25) in some fundamental way accept what was happening even

though it was so awful

(1.5) I ↑ don’t ↑ know whether accept is the r: right word I didn’t have to accept [it

because he got better

but erm (0.75) the pain I think would have gone on

erm the pai. at a perfectly human [level

but it didn’t make me feel (.) erm (2.25) “how could (.) a loving” [God =

(0.5) er permit this to happen =

[permit this

[mm

w: what people ↑ do ↓ feel =

so I’m I’m I’m speaking [I ↑ think

continues...
Margaret does not concede anything from her faith, but instead, reappraises what a providential outcome might be. Rationally speaking, she cannot ignore the presence of evil in the world, and so, ‘using my brain and rationalise’ she accommodates it into her account, ‘and yet’, The interviewer’s reply is to query, for the third time, how enduring Margaret’s faith in a loving God is and uses the word ‘feeling’ to describe Margaret’s faith experience. There is no hiding from this last challenge - ‘really’ is associated with ECF, which as discussed, implies the presence of alternative versions. It is as though the interviewer were saying, ‘so given all that you have said and despite your recognition of alternative views, you still claim that your personal experience of a loving God has never wavered?’ Margaret answers immediately with downward pitch emphasis, ‘no, no I can’t’; the double ‘no’ with a pause between, is a repeat. Margaret gives a new piece of evidence, conspicuous by its absence earlier when Margaret talked of appalling events in the world. She says that her faith held not only when she saw evil happening elsewhere but when her own son was ‘very ill’. This might have been a very telling argument in the discussion before now, alternatively, it could have introduced an undermining ‘Panglossian’ element. It might have stretched Margaret’s credibility too far to suggest that Margaret’s faith could survive such a test. In any event, Margaret refers to her son now only after the rest of her argument has been made. She concludes with ‘lost for ever you know’ said unassertively with upward intonation. ‘You know’ asks for the interviewer’s support to confirm that this is a fact of knowledge - that what is ‘known’ is what the participants agree is ‘known’ in the course of the talk. The interviewer, at first, gives a minimal acceptance - the double ‘yes’ but then upgrades it by giving a summary of what she has just heard and puts it back to
Margaret for her agreement and with this summary, she accepts Margaret’s argument (Schegloff, 1984).

7.1.8 As she has before, Margaret contrasts her faith with that of others and bases her assessment on the empirical evidence of talking with others:

Text Box 7.6

| 268 | I: | [mm | M: from my knowledge of other people |
| 270 | I: | mm | M: I think I have something (0.25) that is a little unusual in that sense |
| 272 | I: | ↑yes [so you you find in your experience = | M: | ↑you know |
| 274 | I: | = when talking to people = | I: | = that perhaps other people don’t have this kind of strong |
| 276 | M: | ↓some ↓people ↓have ↓it [but I think, | well I think (.) I I think |
| 278 | I: | ↓yes | M: (. ) I think most people = |
| 280 | M: | ↓don’t you know ↓thing much more thoughtful | I: | ↓yes (.) yes |
| 282 | M: | ↓whereas ↓I feel ↓I’ve been gifted ↓with ↓it | yes |
| 284 | I: | ↓yes | .hh I mean good Christian people say (.) religious people (0.75) you might say |
| 286 | M: | but they don’t have this kind of base = | well I don’t think it was quite as easy (.) shall I say that = |
| 288 | I: | ↓yes (.) mm | ↓feeling (.) .hhh |
| 290 | M: | ↓so hhh (1.0) in if you can’t remember a time when you didn’t have this feeling (. ) .hhh |
| 292 | M: | no I wouldn’t call it ↓feeling = | I: | = or [or |
| 294 | M: | [I would call it just knowledge | knowledge then rather knowledge ok yes I’m sorry |
| 296 | M: | [mm | continues ... |

Present research Margaret: Ref M/1/268-296/7.6
Margaret makes two contrasts between herself, who has the kind of faith as she has described, and most other people (275-80) who do not; and that other people’s faith involves rational thought, ‘much more thoughtful’ whereas hers, is a gift (280-283). Within the DP perspective, for an argument to be treated as factually true, a speaker cannot simply assert her account, the logical truth of which is somehow recognised or grasped. Rather speakers ‘set this up’ or ‘make it so’ in participative discourse. Dorothy Smith’s study ‘K is mentally ill’ (1978, and cited in Potter, 2004 p. 194) notes the use of ‘contrast structures’. In Smith’s study, she describes that what passes for normality in mental health is indexical; therefore abnormality is ‘constructed’ in normal discourse by being positioned in contrast to it. In Margaret’s case, if she can show that her faith is different in some specific way, then the arguments that would challenge what normally passes for faith might not be appropriate for hers. It would serve to warrant her account. Making contrasts to construct identity is widely noted within the literature. In self-categorization theory (Turner et al., 1987) the contrast results in a self-perception understood as a cognitive component of the intra-psychic environment and part of the information-processing system. The present discussion understands contrasts in discourse to be a flexible conversational resource employed as part of the work at hand (see for example, Hester, 1988). Margaret had initially contrasted her faith as a ‘sort of knowing’ (117) with faith as a ‘rational belief’ (116). This locates Margaret’s faith as beyond her intentional rationality (128-9, Text Box, 7.1), it is not something she has worked out for herself. Margaret and the interviewer, in the present passage, discuss that other people do not have this ‘kind of (faith)’ (275) which provides a comparison between Margaret and a group ‘other people’.

---

90 For example, see Dickerson 2000.
7.1.9  Foucault (1972) notes that dichotomy is a mode of objectification through which individuals arrive at their sense of identity. This may give a ‘finalising’ sense to Margaret’s faith self - it is no longer ‘under construction’ but finished and complete. However, in Dickerson’s (2000) analysis locating identity construction in its talk-in-interaction context, he notes that speakers orientate contrasting activity to the current discussion as much as to any prior reified construct, or ideology and this is the case with the present data. In Margaret’s interview, it is the interviewer who first makes the identity contrast, not Margaret. She does so in a turn with herself at the very beginning of the interview where she asserts that whilst the question of faith is hard for others to answer, in Margaret’s case it will be different (92). The passage in text box 7.7 below is discussed in Chapter 9, which compares the different ways in which the interviewer sets up the hypothetical enquirer’s question across the interviews. The passage shows the interviewer positioning her interview question in the context of its being ‘wonderful’ (89) and ‘just so interesting’ (90). She gives a second context - it is an ‘up front’ question (91) giving a little out-breath laugh as she says this. This troubles the question in some way. Potter and Hepburn (2010) describe a little laugh as packaging trouble, that might be expounded at length, into a short hearable prosodic feature within the word to which the trouble relates - in the present case, ‘question’ The interviewer elaborates her question in a commentary spoken at a faster speed than the surrounding words (91-93) to keep the floor. She makes an assertion, ‘sometimes quite hard’ (92), and comments on it to contrast ‘people’ in general with Margaret in particular, ‘but I think in your case...’ (92-93) and without offering a TRP, carries on to the next assertion, ‘because its this...’ (93) the deictic said with up intonation to foreground the question to come:
The reference to ‘people’ who might find the question ‘hard’ and the contrast with Margaret, sets up an inference that Margaret is in a category who would not find the question hard. That is, Margaret has entitlement to knowledge based on her membership of this category, whatever the basis for this may be. The notion of category entitlement is a central concept of CA; Harvey Sacks was particularly interested in entitlement through experience. In this case, a person who witnesses an event, for example a fatal car crash, is entitled to feel the horror of that experience in a way that the person to whom they tell it, in a later phone call for example, would not be:
‘If you call up a friend...who is unaffiliated with the event... then if they become as disturbed as you ... something peculiar is going on, and you might even feel wronged - though that might seem to be an odd thing to feel’.

7.1.10 In addition to experience, Margaret perhaps has a category entitlement to theological knowledge. Whalen and Zimmerman (1990) studied the ways in which speakers link knowledge to categories of actors in a variety of normative and cultural ways. So just as nuclear scientists do not find physics hard, or doctors medicine in the way that the rest of us would, Margaret, because of her theological training would find the research question manageable. Alternatively, Margaret may be in a category having the social skill to deal with an unexpected and ‘tricky’ question⁹¹, or as priest, Margaret may be due the respect of her cloth and she might not receive the question in a challenging manner but one of support and interest instead⁹². For whatever reason, the interviewer has made this inference to an entitlement to ease of answering - hence her laughter on the word ‘question’, and Margaret will surely respond⁹³. The way to building-up category entitlements is usually varied and subtle (see discussion in Potter, 2004, chapter 5), in the present case, the interviewer explicitly asserts this, in her speeded-up section. It follows a turn-shape that resembles the ‘backdowns’ or ‘reversals’ that Pomerantz notes in her study of dispreferred turn shapes (1984, p. 76). She describes where a speaker (A) might make an assertion and speaker (B) may respond with silence, in which case (A) rejoins with either a qualification of her assertion or a reversal, with disagreement. This parallels the shape of the interviewer’s turn

---

⁹¹ The interviewer experiences Margaret putting her at her ease because of her lateness for the interview. This is discussed in Chapter 8.
⁹² Again, see discussion in Chapter 9. That chapter discusses how the hypothetical enquirer puts his question to John and Cathy in a manner that appears challenging.
⁹³ Sports psychologists and motivation psychologists sometimes engage in the manipulation of category entitlement. Individuals are encouraged to set themselves up as people entitled to win the cup, or answer questions at a job interview as though they were already an employee, for example. This is a resource to help them perform well in the required winning or professional manner.
at lines 91-3. The interviewer introduces an idea into the conversation - ‘up front question’, then immediately comments on her own words - *in your case it might be different*, her speeded-up tempo preventing the other speaker from jumping in. Thus, there is ‘silence’ from the other speaker - the interviewer pre-empts and draws back from a potential objection from Margaret that her case is different, *before Margaret can even say it*. In this manner, she prevents possible future disagreement. She nuances her own assertion on Margaret’s behalf and so avoids a potential dispreferred reply. This turn shape prevents future disagreement perhaps even encourages agreement (that Margaret’s case is different). By this means the interviewer ‘constructs’ Margaret as a person who would find questions of faith easy, even as she describes her as such. This is exactly as it turns out, for Margaret echoes this very point in the passage in Text Box 7.6; the consequence for the ‘other people’ who do not have her faith, is that it is ‘not quite as easy’ (287). As much as contrasting herself with others then, Margaret is agreeing with the interviewer’s rhetorical positioning of her, which she does at the outset of the interview.

7.1.11 Returning to the passage in Text Box 7.6, the interviewer again challenges Margaret’s claim for the stability and endurance of her faith, this time to note the potential implications, ‘…*if you can’t remember…*’ (290). The interviewer refers as she has done before, to Margaret’s faith as a ‘feeling’ (291). She takes an in breath to continue but Margaret jumps in to reject this word (292). Her intonation is assertive; she does not end her turn with up intonation to indicate a suggestion for the interviewer to consider. She closes with downwards pitch - this is final - whatever else Margaret might call her faith she would not call it a feeling. The interviewer responds immediately, her words ‘latch on’ to
Margaret’s (transcribed with =) with no discernible gap between speakers. As the interviewer attempts to rephrase her remark, Margaret jumps in again, ‘I would call it just knowledge’ (294). This is an instance of ‘other-initiated-other-repair’ and seems like a ‘correction’ without any softening such as a discourse marker or delayer. The interviewer responds, twice, acknowledging Margaret’s preferred word and apologising, ‘ok yes I’m sorry’ (295). This kind of repair is immediate, the ‘error’ is pointed out, the ‘correct’ word offered, acknowledged, and the speakers move on. It is designed to prevent any potential misunderstanding developing into disagreement. This is also another contrast -‘feeling’ versus ‘knowledge’ which Margaret refers to with the limiting, ‘just knowledge’. Also, the modal ‘would call’ infers permanence; this is what Margaret would always term her faith.

The interviewer has caused a breach in conversational norms that elicits Margaret’s un-softened repair, so she apologises (295). However, why should Margaret be so concerned to correct the word feeling here when the interviewer used it in her self-repaired question earlier (170/2, Text Box 7.3) and again just a few seconds before (232, Text Box 7.5)? This is an instance of the variability of accounts and is a feature of discourse. The close analysis of actual conversations shows that speakers’ ‘descriptions’ of events - in this case, Margaret’s intra-subjective faith experience which she claims to have never been without - show differences and variations between and within conversations of them. The treatment and understanding of this variation is a core difference between a discursive and cognitivist perspective. If the function of language is, in principle, to refer beyond itself to objective reality lying beyond and independent of it, then the variability of description is problematic. However, the DP perspective is that speakers make descriptions of external and internal reality relevant in the moment of the telling and located within their conversational and
rhetorical context. The interviewer’s use of ‘feeling’ just above was at a crunch point in the argument. She had challenged Margaret’s claim for the endurance of her faith experience - central to its credibility. Now the interviewer asks of the implications in light of Margaret’s now agreed faith. Therefore its status as knowledge, is important. ‘Feeling’ will not do.

7.2 CONCLUSION

This chapter has presented Margaret’s own account of her faith and has discussed that her speech, rather than a neutral description of the intra-psychic state is a systematic construction. Her talk constructs her faith as an enduring and stable phenomenon of subjective experience beyond conscious rationality. The passages show Margaret using a variety of discourse devices including contrast structures, shared knowledge formulations and direct speech, as evidence of this design. Notable in Margaret’s account is her lack of detailed assertion, or a rhetoric-of-fact, which makes it hard to challenge. At the outset, Margaret constructs herself as rational, which functions to offset a potential challenge of incredulity or naivety and turns her ‘description’ of her faith experience into a rhetoric-of-justification for it. This rhetoric positions the account against competing alternatives, so that Margaret can reach agreement of it with the interviewer in the course of the session. This is the constructionist perspective, that reality is what passes for reality, what conversationalists can agree is reality in the moment of its telling. Margaret’s faith, by her account, becomes directly observable as a phenomenon of discourse. Turning personal faith outward from an objective, intra-psychic state into a social phenomenon of speech, realises faith and makes it available as a psychological entity and as a personal resource for human
action and fulfilment, as the interviewer and Margaret discuss in the passage in Text Box 7.8 below:

Text Box 7.8

I: ↑erm (0.75) would you say in your faith (0.75) is it w:would it be a corr↑ect
des↑crip↓tion then to ↑talk about (0.25) progress or maturing of your ↑fai↓th
because perhaps it's [always been like this
M: [no it probably wouldn't
I: ↑right
M: it probably wouldn't ↑I ↑think there are ggh ↑chan↓ges en↑or↓mous changes
I: ↑m↓m
M: about what erm what feeds, and erm what satisfies, what a holds .hh for instance
coming to to med[it↑a↓tion in these er later [years has =
I: [mm [mm [mm
M = been (0.5) erm (0.5) enormously (. ) helpful because I have f:found the older I've
M: got the less I’ve needed erm (1.0) needed ↑voice, ↑words
I: mm =
M: = those sorts of things
I: [m↓m
M: but I ↑do re I’m able to recognise that for other people
I: m↓m
M: erm (1.0) those things continue to be extremely important
I: so th so the style the way you’ve ex↑pressed ↓your ↓faith may [have changed
M: [↑m↓m mm
I: ( . ) but your faith itself (0.75) as such =
M: = I think I think that that’s right I think that it hasn’t changed so very much ↑n↓o =
I: ↑so ggh (1.0) ↑when we read in the ↑B↑↓ble when we dis↑cuss things .hh er it may
talk about ( . ) ↑strength↓ening our ↑faith or ↑deep↓ening our ↑faith (. ) or (0.75)
walking with ↑Christ in ↓some way
M: ↓mm
I: ggh
M: hh oh y↓es [[[ )
I: [in ↑your case what would that ↑me↓an
M: oh I think it’s been erm an enormous learning curve that still going on about .hh
about how (0.25) we ↓walk ↓with ↓Christ =
I: mm
M: = a how we .hh how we erm we put ourselves .hh erm in the way (. ) of (0.75) erm
communicating and and growing
I: ggh growing in in what way [then
M: [in disc↓ipleship I would say yes (. ) y. in di[sc
I: [and what
M: = well the way in our (0.25) life our experience our relationships that (0.5) << we
continues...
With Margaret’s faith account, as she has developed and agreed it, the interviewer suggests that faith ‘development’ is not a relevant concept for Margaret; and Margaret agrees (298-300). However, Margaret’s response to her faith experience/account is one that she can attend to, manage and nurture. Margaret can intentionally choose, can ‘put ourselves in the \textit{way...}’ as she describes it (331) to grow in \textit{discipleship}, in \textit{life experiences}, in \textit{communicating} and in \textit{relationships} (332-337) because of the faith account which she has produced in discourse. This is the reality of her faith - recognizable as Gordon Allport’s mature faith, which he characterised using words such as \textit{striving} and \textit{intention} to describe a person’s active and purposeful efforts to relate to the exterior world. Allport stressed the idea of ‘agency’, as does Margaret - the individual’s conscious efforts to take responsibility for her actions which realises her spiritual/psychogenic needs and values. However, as discussed in Chapter 1, Allport’s Intrinsic ROS scale ultimately failed in its attempt to
operationalise this faith which as a construct of the internal psyche remained, ‘complex and meaningful but elusive’ (Leak and Fish (1999, p.84-5) yet in the present conversation, it is revealed as a meaningful phenomena of discourse.
Chapter 8

Social action in talk: Managing subjective positioning collaboratively in the pre-interview conversation

8.0 SUMMARY

The present chapter presents data from the pre-interview chat before the interview sessions proper begin, to contrast with and to contextualise the subsequent interview talk. Interviews contain long turns and one-sided question-and-answer passages but the pre-interview data is of the quick fire dialogue typical to mundane speech. The interviewer’s footing is as a participant in her own right and not as a receiver of answers on behalf of a non-present recipient. Analysis of this talk shows participants orienting to interactional concerns of affiliation and of rhetorical argumentation. This sets up a difference of contextualisation for the various interviews and the chapter discusses the implications for this for discursive and positivist research alike.

8.1 INTRODUCTION

The present chapter discusses the pre-interview ‘chat’ of three participants - Sally, Margaret and John immediately before their interview proper begins. CA informed DA understands talk as located in its immediate talk-in-interaction and through the management of this talk, participants ‘contextualise’ the kind of talk it is to be. Participants in talk are knowledgeable social agents who actively display to each other their orientation to the relevant context, which they manage using the conversational practices and resources available to them in their particular discursive situation. The present analysis allows a comparison between two different talk-in-interaction institutionalised settings - everyday conversation and the unstructured or narrative research interview, and the manner in which participants orientate to these. Mundane talk is talk that would have happened, as it
happened whether recorded by an analyst or not, which is clearly not the case for the interviews but potentially so for the earlier talk. The primary difference for the pre-interview chat is the footing of the interviewer who in these sessions is a participant in her own right rather than a ‘poser of questions’ on behalf of an extra-conversational audience. The sessions may show a difference in form therefore as both ‘interviewer’ and respondent orientate to these positions and the interviewer may more frequently take her turn at the TRP rather than passing the floor with ‘continuers’. Therefore, the passages are likely to be more of the quick-fire dialogue typical to conversation rather than the one-sided sessions with long turns, noted so far. Furthermore, as there are no ‘questions’ to ‘answer’, the talk may orientate itself to different discursive and interactional issues, including the agreement of what kind of session the up-coming interview is to be and what part the participants will play in it.

DATA ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

8.2 Doing, ‘getting prepared for the interview’

Text Box 8.1 below is the transcript of the chat between Sally and the interviewer before the interview proper begins:
I: yeah are we are we doing something here do you think how do I know if I'm doing it (0.1) I think we're doing something.

S: Dunn I don't understand computer I:

yeah I think we're doing something. Hh [see that's the brilliant thing Al ex is =]

I: = doing all this for me.

S: oh [he's such a little star isn't he)

I: [[(coughs)]

S: Dunn

I: well what I'm hoping to do is record the tape. Hh so it'll be in my computer in voice.

S: yes

I: then I'm going to then I've got to transcribe it all which it [normally that's]

I: the bit that takes hours and hours and hours

S: yeah

S: yeah

I: so what I'm going to do is get some software that recognises my voice

S: Haa

I: hh and then going to train it train it

S: repeat

I: then I shall repeat it. I'll sit with headphones repeat it all

S: aah

I: so then I'll have it all in and then of course there'll be loads of editing [(oh that takes)]

S: yeah

I: but then what Al is going to do he's going to write me a little thing. Hh so I can then merge in the same file the your the vocal bit with the written bit

S: wow

I: so then people can actually put the head phones on hear the stories and read the text at the same time.

S: wow

I: so but Al is doing that for me (0.5) I could n't do it

S: no I wouldn't know (.) so is that now tapping

I: yeah (.) if that's ok

S: it must be very um sensitive (.) 'cos we're not speaking loudly are we

I: tried it out last night

S: and [it worked]

I: [hhhaa laughing out of breath] [it was]

S: I'm impressed

I: erm well I didn't want it to be sort of obtrusive (.) are you happy with that

S: yeah quite happy [with that]

I: [erm 1.0] what I'll have to do is I'll just take a copy before we go and I'll keep one and you'll keep one

S: ok

I: and that's my crib sheet (.) erm

S: the questions

I: yeah it isn't really questions th:the idea is we sort of get into it but that's if we (.) that's just to sort of erm keep us going as it were

S: yes

I: and erm (2.0) Hh so first of all I should say (1.0)
The interviewer has two tasks relevant to formal research to complete: setting up the laptop to record the conversation, and making sure that the interviewee knows this and gives her consent, and that she is fully informed about the process as a whole. As she fiddles with the laptop, the interviewer asks if it is working properly (4):

‘Are we doing something here do you think?’

8.2.1 Sally takes the interviewer’s remark as a question addressed to her, and replies, ‘dunno’ (6) with prosodic emphasis\(^94\), and then explicitly denies any expertise in computers. The interviewer completes this sequence, ‘yeah’ and repeats her last words.

Formally, this is an adjacency pair\(^95\) where a speaker A makes the first part of a two-part turn and speaker B replies with the second part. This is an ordered sequence and question-answer is a typical example. The ‘pair’ does not imply that answers must follow questions but that after a first utterance, a subsequent one is interpreted in light of the expectation that the first remark was the first of a pair. The ‘turn’ is the proof-procedure in CA because two utterances can display what a single remark (a long turn) cannot - how speakers ‘orient’ to each other and indicate mutual understanding of what each is trying to accomplish through their words (Schegloff and Sacks 1973, p. 296). Very often, the speaker who asks the question completes it with an answer receipt, which is what the interviewer does here, ‘yeah I think…’ (7) indicating her footing here as recipient\(^96\). Whilst this exchange may be

---

\(^94\) The raised and immediately lowered intonation indicated by ↑↓ and the extended vowel, transcribed with a colon ‘ːːː’. Prosody is extensively discussed in the socio-linguistics, phonetics and the CA literature. Frameworks for the functional analysis of prosody in speech are given in Halliday, 1967; Pierrehumbert 1980; Pierrehumbert and Hirschberg, 1990. A discussion of these and the use of prosody from different analytic perspectives are found in Wennerstrom, 2001b.


\(^96\) When a first speaker gives an answer receipt, this shows her to be the recipient of the answer. Heritage and Greatbach, 1991, note that a special feature of (British) news interviews is that the interviewer does not give
a simple question and answer, DA/CA analyse it for the discursive work it achieves and the orientation of both speakers this work. The interviewer subtly alters her subjective positioning even within her first comment. She asks of Sally, ‘are we doing something do you think’ and then of herself, ‘how do I know’ and finally answers, ‘I think we’re doing something’. Positioning, as footing, (Goffman 1981) may be quite explicit, as when ‘stating something ourselves [as opposed to] reporting what someone else said’ (Goffman, 1981, p.151). A politician giving a speech written by a speechwriter and an interviewer posing pre-designed research questions are clear examples. However, in the present sequence, it is more fine-grained than this. Matoesian writes of it, ‘our social identities are not static or structurally determined, but [are] contextually situated and interactionally emergent’ (1999, p. 494 as sited in Lee and Roth, 2004, [17]). In her first words, the interviewer includes Sally with herself as responsible for the laptop recording properly, both in the activity of it and via her opinion (‘we are doing…’, ‘do you think…’). Then she takes the recording responsibility back to herself (how do I know if I…) and after a delay97, assumes success with Sally (‘we’re doing…’). She raises her pitch throughout her first words, until finishing her question with falling intonation, ‘doing ↓it’, and then stresses the answer, ‘↑think’ with a raised single pitch accent. Prosody can indicate alternative meanings for lexical items98 and throughout the present analysis, the author takes prosodic changes as indicative of discursive work. Furthermore, in this opening utterance, the speaker says

---

97 The numbers in brackets indicate the timed delay, in quarter seconds - here one second. CA does not consider pauses as neutral, contributing nothing to the conversation at hand. Short spaces may be needed to manage the practicalities of speaking but their position in the conversational sequence may be telling. Gail Jefferson (1989, cited in Edwards and Potter, 2005, p. 259) suggests a ‘standard maximum silence’ of one second as the cut off between a short and a longer pause.

‘think’ twice and ‘I know’. This gets straight to the heart of DP’s engagement with cognitive approaches in psychology with its contrasting understanding of mental states. Rather than seeing ‘I/you think’ as a description of the interviewer’s or Sally’s objective mental state, or referring to a rational process of information handling or problem solving at all, DP notes the complex and reflexive relationship between descriptions of the world and of mental states. Through reporting events of the real world and the issues of causality, action and accountability in those events, so at the same time speakers display their own accountability in the provision of the report. Constructions of the mind and of the real world work together as part of the description. Therefore, in the present case the interviewer’s opening ‘thinking’ words reflexively relate the interviewer and Sally with each other and to the world. The high pitch indicates there is something ‘more to be said’ - that the interviewer’s point is not finished. So here, the interviewer asks something of Sally about their relationship with each other and with the up-coming conversation, as set up in the technicalities of recording. Is it going to be Sally and the interviewer together, braving the laptop as a team, or will Sally demonstrate a disposition or skill that will distance herself from this positioning?

‘I dunno’

8.2.2 Sally’s reply is equally constructive. Potter (1997, 1998) has demonstrated the constructing work of ‘I dunno’. So just as ‘I know’ is understood as doing rhetorical

---

100 Hence its association with interrogatives - the answer completes the question.
101 The language here is cognitivist because it is a conventional expression of speech. The use of cognitive language here and elsewhere does not imply a theoretical cognitive perspective for the analysis.
102 See Margaret’s interview, paragraph 7.1.2 in Chapter 7.
work, here its opposite ‘*dunno*’ is not so much a description of Sally’s (lack of) cognitive abilities but rather Sally uses ‘I *dunno*’ to distance herself from an identity of *computer expert* and she follows this by explicitly saying so. Her remark ends on upward intonation, not down as might be expected if Sally were making an assertion - the last word. Sally’s upward intonation invites further comment. The interviewer accepts Sally’s positioning\(^{103}\) and carries seamlessly on, as conversation does, upgrading her acceptance to agreement with the inclusive ‘*we [a]re*’. The constructing effect, for the interviewer, is to respond to Sally, placing herself together with her in the membership category that Sally has proposed of ‘non-computer expert’ and at the same time, distance herself from a position of ‘expert research interviewer’ at Sally’s non-technical expense. Whether or not either of these positions is factually true is entirely beside the point for a discursive analysis, because this discusses what the participants *achieve* with their words and not the objective piece of the real world these words purportedly describe\(^{104}\). In the present case, both conversationalists achieve a levelling of the Interviewer/Subject dynamic - the interviewer by underplaying her research expertise, and Sally, by suggesting the complementary category she does.

‘*see that’s….Alex is doing all this*…’

8.2.3 The interviewer continues - ‘*see that’s*’ (7). ‘See’ is a *continuation-of* marker (Heritage and Sorjonen, 1994). As the interviewer shifts to a new topic, ‘see’ marks this out as a natural move - a continuation of the construction in the first part of her turn into the

\(^{103}\) The simple ‘*yeah*’ typically indicates the answer to be relevant or appropriate and not necessarily that the first speaker agrees, or contributes to the construction, unless further work is done - prosodic stress or an ‘upgrade’, for example, as here.

\(^{104}\) Who knows how the interviewer might have responded had Sally replied to her first question with a rather more savvy, ‘*well it’s really very straightforward you know, just ensure the computer is plugged in and hit record*’.
second. *That* is deictic - it depends on the context for its meaning. Clark\(^\text{105}\) (1992) observes of the physical context - that which is `physically co-present’ with the conversationalists, that it is available equally to participants throughout the conversation. However, this may not be the case for the *discursive* context - the words spoken in previous turns or at the start of an extended turn. A listener may be less oriented or attached to these words than is the speaker who spoke them; *‘that’* (with the emphasising rise in pitch) redresses any potential imbalance. It foregrounds a feature of the linguistic environment (the interviewer’s just spoken words) and is the linguistic equivalent to a physical gesture. In stressing this word with rising intonation, the interviewer places the responsibility for the computing arrangements with her son, Alex, (in the second half of her turn, 7-9) in light of what she has just said in the first part, and in response to the positioning there. ‘↑Al↓ex’ has the upward and immediately downward drop in pitch that the present author refers to as an ‘augmented down’. The rise before the drop in pitch (and vice versa) widens the tonal interval making the pitch change hearably distinctive\(^\text{106}\). Sally responds to the first part of the interviewer’s turn with a minimal acceptance token\(^\text{107}\) *‘ok’* (8). With this, she acknowledges the interviewer’s remark but does not comment on it although the interviewer’s talk, grammatically, is complete and the turn-construction-unit potentially at an end; in other words, this is a possible transition-relevance place (TRP) for a change of

\(^{105}\) The indexicality of language, resulting in a ‘loose-fit’ (Heritage 1984a:145) between words and their referents causes the problem, for psycholinguists, of ambiguity in speech. How do speakers know that they each understand the same referents by their words? This is not an issue for CA/DA - in their interaction in dialogue, participants exploit the flexibility of `fuzzy’ semantics, performing constructing work and achieving mutual understanding in the process. See discussion, Edwards 1997, p. 114-121.

\(^{106}\) Edwards (2006, p. 7, citing Cruttenden, 1997) notes that it is pitch *movement* rather than amplitude per se, that generally corresponds to subjectively heard rhythm and emphasis.

\(^{107}\) Such as ‘*mm*’ or ‘*uhuh*’, (see Jefferson, 1983; Clayman and Heritage, 2002).
speaker\textsuperscript{108}. Schegloff (1982: 80, cited in Hutchby and Wooffitt, p. 106) calls this minimal token a \textit{continuer} because it shows that the recipient understands the speaker as continuing and that she is happy to give up the floor. Furthermore, Sally’s ‘\textit{ok}’ is positioned at the very place that the interviewer proposes to continue. Goodwin (1986, cited in Hutchby and Wooffitt, op. cit. p. 106) has shown that speakers frequently place continuers at the bridge between the two halves of an elaborate construction and in so doing, recognise that the first speaker has not yet completed their turn. In contrast to this, when the interviewer does finish her turn (at the end of line 9) Sally takes the opportunity of the TRP to make a constructing contribution of her own.

\textit{‘oh he’s such a little star isn’t he’}

\textbf{8.2.4} Sally brackets her words (line 10) with the participle ‘\textit{oh}’ at the beginning and with the inverted subject/verb ‘\textit{isn’t he}’ at the end. DA/CA notes the seemingly small but significant items, such as Sally’s ‘\textit{oh}’ here, and discuss that these are far from trivial, that they suffuse talk-in-interaction and have rich, discursive implications. Heritage (1984, 2005, and see discussion in Potter and Hepburn 2008, p.24) studied the way that speakers use ‘\textit{oh}’ in receipts, marking a turn as \textit{news} and therefore the receiver as relatively uninformed compared with their interlocutor. Heritage and Raymond (2005, and Potter and Hepburn op. cit.) note how the ‘oh’ can build ‘epistemic authority’ with respect to another speaker. This is part of the wider discussion (Garfinkel, 1967; Schegloff, 1991) that claims

\begin{footnotesize}
\textsuperscript{108} A suitable place for turn transition is a ‘Transition-Relevance Place’ abbreviated to TRP. This is a core construct of CA; it contributes to the ‘projectability’ of conversational turns. During the course of turns-at-talk, participants project what sort of turn it is, what kind of response might be suitable in reply and when it is likely to end. The TRP conventions account for the extreme efficiency of talk - one person taking over from the other within a split second (literally) without significant overlap or gap.
\end{footnotesize}
to knowledge in conversation are practical and interactional, that is, that knowledge, rather than being treated as an object of the mental state of asserting and understanding, is something procedural - people do knowledge and achieve a ‘performance of knowledge’ together. Edwards (1997, 1999) takes this further in his observations of the cognitivist notion of ‘shared knowledge’, reworking this as something speakers achieve in the practicalities of speech and inseparable from the descriptions they use. Potter and Hepburn write of this that understanding is not something ‘floating in phenomenological space but is something structurally located with different possibilities for checking and modifying’ (2008, p. 23). In the present case, the author suggests, Sally makes a declaration of Alex’s competence to the interviewer as though informing her. She uses an idiomatic phrase ‘little star’ which, writers note109, further creates agreement through being a ‘commonplace’ that anyone would find hard to disagree with - they have a taken-for-granted-quality. However she subverts her epistemic priority over this ‘news’ (due because she makes the assertion first) by tagging the negative interrogative ‘isn’t he’ onto her remark. Sally is ‘entitled’ to her opinion of Alex in so far as his computer skills because of her own lack of them, but epistemic authority is due to the interviewer as Alex’s mother but more pertinently, since the interviewer brings Alex into the exchange not as her son but as the computer expert, as the recipient of his technical expertise. Sally’s ‘isn’t he’ converts her remark from an assertion into a question and invites the interviewer to reply as someone who would know. Furthermore, her words set up agreement in reply from the interviewer as the ‘preferred’ next turn (Pomerantz, 1984). The shared knowledge achieved in this exchange therefore, is

---

109 See in particular, Sacks, 1992:156; and Billig (1987) who both note this idiomatic form as self-sufficient, that is, since everyone already shares it, a claim to knowledge needing no further warrant. See also Drew and Holt, 1988; Edwards and Potter, 1992; Kitzinger, 2000, all cited in Hepburn and Potter, 2010, p. 35, on idiomatic speech that is hard to counter, when a recipient is making a complaint, withholding affiliation (e.g. sympathy) or resisting advice.
only obliquely of Alex’s computing skill (as a matter of objective fact) but relates more to
the positioning of Sally and the interviewer which they achieve together in the
correspondence. Sally has ‘designed’ the interviewer\textsuperscript{110} in the sense of pre-supposing her
agreement, and levelled the epistemic stance between them with the simple little words
‘oh’, ‘isn’t it’ and earlier, ‘dunno’. Apart from this achievement, this demonstrates the
exchange as a \textit{locally oriented-to, co-production}. There is interactional business achieved
by both participants as they orientate their own words to each other and to the business of
the turns-at-talk, in hand. In the present case, the interviewer has introduced her son as a
discursive device to position herself as recipient of technical expertise, for reasons relevant
to the up-coming interview and Sally has joined in with the lack-of-expertise positioning it
references.

\textit{‘well, what I’m hoping to do…’}

\textbf{8.2.5} The interviewer makes a series of nine assertions (12-34) appropriate to a research
interview, the first introduced with a delay, \textit{‘well’} and the underwhelming (and
emphasised with leaned-on prosodic stress) \textit{‘hoping’} (12). \textit{‘Well’} is a ‘counter-positional’
marker (Pomerantz, 1984:72; Sacks1992: vol. 1, 76) relating the interviewer’s up- coming
words to those just gone, but in contrast to them. The interviewer is in some difficulty since
to offer Sally her expected agreement would be to accept a self-compliment on her son’s
behalf, something speakers prefer not to do (Pomerantz, 1984). The \textit{‘well’} deflects this.
‘Hope’ is another ‘mental state’ avowal; one would think, perhaps, that any competent
researcher would expect to record the interview and plan thereby to perform the

\textsuperscript{110} Hepburn and Potter (2010) note the designing properties of tag negative-interrogatives in their study of
calls to a UK Child Protection Help Line. In their study, the tag sets up a recipient’s agreement \textit{in contrast to}
resistance indicated earlier in the call. It is thus not only designing, but \textit{coercive}. 
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transcription, as detailed. The interviewer’s ‘hope’ suggests an alternative version, one that meets her current strategic needs in the conversation. If the interviewer is hoping, then the object of the interview session is, technically speaking, outside of the interviewer’s control. In saying, ‘hoping’, the interviewer, rather than describing her ‘state of mind’, uses it discursively to confirm her subjective positioning with Sally\textsuperscript{111} as an alternative to the positioning of ‘technical skill’ that the words ‘expecting’ and ‘planning’ would imply. The interviewer explains how she will use the recording procedure to generate a transcript of the interview. To each point she makes, Sally contributes with a participating and affiliative token (lines 14, 16, 18, 19, 21, 23, 25, 27, 30, 33, 35) most of which are upgraded agreements\textsuperscript{112} continuing and contributing to the discursive work at hand. She achieves ‘demonstrating knowledge’ with her pre-emptive ‘oh that takes’ (16) and ‘repeat’ (23). Sally may not know about computers but she knows about speech transcriptions apparently. Sally’s ‘oh’ confirms that she shares the knowledge of the effort involved in transcription work, that it is held in common between them and therefore she can appreciate the interviewer’s efforts. It helps to build rapport, as do the subsequent ‘aah’ (21, 25) and ‘wow’ (30, 33). This passage is a successful negotiation: the researcher makes various claims about the recorded interview to which Sally submits supportive contributions, which both complete and corroborate the interviewer’s assertions. However, the interviewer

\textsuperscript{111} Throughout the discussion so far, the author has used the word ‘positioning’ to refer to participants’ manipulation of discursive identity. Positioning theory (Bamburg, 2004; Davies and Harré, 1990; Harré and van Langenhove, 1991; Harré and Moghaddam, 2003) refers to a theoretical approach that understands a process of discourse, where speakers offer each other ‘subject positions’ potentially available to them as ‘master narratives’ (see discussion Benwell and Stokoe 2006, p. 139). A critical point is whether these categories derive from within the particular talk-in-interaction at hand - in the present case Sally’s proposed category of ‘non-expert’, or are brought to the analysis from the analyst’s theoretical perspective.

\textsuperscript{112} Pomerantz, 1984, pp. 64-70. This sequence of short responses might be thought of as ‘backchannel’ replies, contributing only minimally to the conversation at hand (Yngve, 1970). However, what type of reply is a backchannel is debated. They appear to be individually and culturally dependent, see Berry, 1994; Duncan, 1974. The present author argues that in the present passage they are affiliatory tokens between friends, see Tannen 1984.
includes within this exchange a re-statement of her son’s role in this (28-32) and repeats her dependence on him (34) displaying the inter-subjective positioning the exchange achieves\textsuperscript{113}. The interviewer’s, ‘so then’ (26, 31) and ‘but then’ (28) work as her ‘so that’ did earlier, ‘but’ introduces the continuation-of as, ‘in light of, but in contrast to’, what has just been said. Sally, finally, in her turn, repeats her own lack of computing ability (35). The syntax of her mental state avowal explicitly supports Sally’s rhetorical work. ‘I wouldn’t know’, expresses the conditional mood and says effectively, ‘if I were (literally) in your place, I would be in the same non-technical position as you’. As it is, she can join her discursively and shows surprise at the equipment sensitivity (37)\textsuperscript{114}. Sally’s words at line 37 are themselves an assertion, negotiable in the talk-in-interaction. She uses the negative interrogative - inverting the subject and verb, ‘cos we’re not speaking loudly are we’ (as she used above at line 10). With this, as before, she presumes to include the interviewer in her assessment, positioning her as agreeing and sharing epistemic authority with her. For Sally’s negotiation to fail, the interviewer will have to expressly disagree, something conversationalists take pains to avoid. In the event, the interviewer replies with a rather subtle piece of positioning, using prosody. She owns to trying out the equipment the previous evening, which, as a responsible interviewer she might well do, but she downplays it by whispering (indicated by the ° sign). It is as if she were saying, ‘well this is a research interview and I am an efficient interviewer, but between you and me, I’m in the same boat as you when it come to this technical stuff’. It achieves both the requirement to efficient research and to the levelling of the distance between herself and her interviewee at the same


\textsuperscript{114} The laptop was placed on a chair, effectively hidden underneath the (kitchen) tabletop, attached to a thin cable and microphone only about 2 cm long and a couple millimetres wide. This lay on the table obscured by coffee cups, biscuits etc. It was not ‘heavy duty’ recording equipment.
time and she leaves it to Sally to confirm that the try-out was a success (40). The interviewer’s laughter and Sally’s overlapping speech drown out the interviewer’s subsequent talk, where she seems, consistent with her positioning, to have been presenting the try-out as a bit of fun, a laughter event (41). ‘Laughter particles’ have received a great deal of study interest as they appear both highly organised and contributive to the fine detail of the organisation of the social activity of talk. Potter and Hepburn (2010) note that these out-breath particles can occur with or without actual laughter, before or after words, or interpolated within them at precise places. For that reason, they refer to them as *interpolated particles of aspiration* or IPAs. They are discrete articulations, without propositional meaning and may be a highly targeted conversational resource. Following Potter and Hepburn, the present author suggests that the interviewer’s IPAs at line 41, mark out her phrase ‘*tried it out last night*’ (39) as both relevant and problematic at the same time. Her ‘laughter’ is not a self-repair (that is, that her words are ‘incorrect’) but indexes the difficulty the interviewer has through her need to manage both the ‘research interviewer’ and ‘peer-conversationalist’ categories at the same time. Sally does not respond to the interviewer’s IPA and instead confirms the try out as an impressive achievement (42). It is, in effect, an upgraded agreement to the interviewer’s series of assertions earlier and provides the agreement to her own, ‘*are we*’ (37/8), to which the interviewer might not wish to agree as it implies a self-compliment. The interviewer accepts Sally’s construction, after an appropriate delay, ‘*erm well*’ (43), and deflects the

---

116 This difficulty is the topic of Chapter 9.
117 Speakers manage self-compliments by withholding or delaying agreement when set up as preferred by the other speaker. Pomerantz, 1984, as before.
compliment with an account of the unobtrusiveness of the recording equipment which completes this negotiation.

‘it isn’t really questions’

8.2.6 With the positioning now established, the interviewer moves straight on, in the same turn to make two further comments relevant to the following discussion as a research interview (43-44) referring to the ethics statement and a ‘crib sheet’\(^{118}\), which Sally incorrectly assumes is a list of interview questions (49). Whatever the interviewer’s self-positioning may have achieved so far vis-à-vis Sally, Sally regards the upcoming conversation an interview of some kind, that is, a question and answer session, with her collocutor in possession of the questions. This contextualises the research session institutionally as an interview and not one of mundane conversation and sets up a dynamic of conversational power of who controls access to the conversational floor and the interview topics, although either participant may wish to manipulate this as the session proceeds\(^{119}\). However, the interviewer’s next words (49-52) demonstrate a dispreferred turn shape when offering and making assertions. Sally makes her assertion as to questions with falling intonation indicating finality or closure (49). This turn-shape is orientated to the speaker’s expectation that the interviewer in her turn will agree or support the first speaker - this is the ‘preferred’ reply. The interviewer seems at first to provide this agreement;

---

118 The research interview is unstructured; there is only one pre-set question. The interviewer had researched and planned the interview process using, predominately, the discussion on qualitative research interviewing from Silverman, 2000, 2001. The crib sheet contained notes and jottings for the interviewer to use as an aide memoir, should the conversation dry up or the interviewer need any kind of help. In the event, the researcher did not refer to it during the interview.

119 The strategic management of a research interview, whilst it is happening, and the potential tension this may cause, is the topic of Chapter 9. The sense of power here is in respect to local authority as participants ‘play this out’ within the conversation. The manipulation of power as a social element of society and culture, brought to the discussion as an ‘external’ context is the topic of Foucauldian, or post-structuralist discourse analysis.
‘yeah’ she says (50) and matches Sally’s down intonation. Her reply is in concord with the first speaker in content and in pitch\textsuperscript{120}. However, the interviewer immediately goes on to reverse her reply, ‘it isn’t…questions’ (50) softened with the filler word ‘really’. The ‘yeah’ in this case is what Pomerantz calls a ‘weak agreement’ because it is used, not to agree, but as the preface to disagreement. The function of this turn shape is to ‘soften’ the disagreement; it prepares the ground, before the delivery of a dispreferred reply. This is a ‘sensitive’ reply, oriented to a speaker’s expectations of the other. If conversation is to be the vehicle for constructions of the real world, then it must be capable of handling disagreements and differences in expectations in such a way as to keep speakers talking and listening to each other. CA researchers\textsuperscript{121} note that in ordinary conversations participants prefer to agree (why should we talk with someone with whom we disagree?) A brusque rebuttal of an assertion may not be conducive to continued, productively constructing talk. This dialogue displays the participants negotiating the form of the up-coming interaction itself, as they decide what conventional norms (of turn taking and other interactional events) will be appropriate. Sally accepts the interviewer’s version with a receipt token - the simple ‘yes’ (52) which completes the topic. However, Mazeland, (1990) notes ‘yes receipt’ as signalling not so much agreement as an acknowledgement that the answer is relevant\textsuperscript{122}. Yes can also signal a preface to disagreement, as discussed.

\textsuperscript{120} See note 9 Chapter 6 for references.  
\textsuperscript{121} Sacks, 1987; Pomerantz, 1978, 1984. Additionally, Mazeland and ten Have, 1996, p. 105 note that as a genre the research interview shares this preference to agreement with naturalistic conversation. They speculate that interviewees do not have the same intrinsic interest in the interview as does the researcher. Interviewers need to keep their collocutors motivated and interested, which open disagreement might endanger.  
\textsuperscript{122} See also Mazeland and ten Have 1996, p. 97.
8.2.7 This has been a successful negotiation by both participants in the discourse, of three constructions: the initial pair, (4-7) that agree the category of ‘no computer expertise’. The sequences at (10-35) and at (37- 43) which achieve a supportive positioning and shared knowledge within this and a levelling of the Interviewer/Interviewee dynamic; and the final lines (45-52), where the participants construct a context for the discourse ‘space’ where the upcoming interaction is to be performed. In response to Sally’s closure of this topic, the interviewer moves on to initiate a new one (to ask the interview question). Her words (53) consist of - a delayer ‘erm’ followed by short pause, repeated filler word, ‘right’ and a long pause of two seconds, then a delayer phrase with the two words, ‘first’ and ‘say’ both elongated. This all contributes to a significant delay in the posing of the question and is consistent with the interviewer’s ‘down playing’ her role as interviewer so far. This sequence has not been an asymmetrical train of questions from one side and answers from the other, as a ‘strange’ conversation might be; or a series of monologues from one speaker with minimal response tokens from the other, as an unstructured (or narrative) interview tends to be and it demonstrates the construction work typical to mundane conversation. In any research situation, the researcher selects respondents from defined categories. In positivist research, the categories are pre-defined and the researcher must find suitable respondents to fit them. In the present passage, the interviewer here prior to her interview follows a process of identity categorisation, and both participants - interviewer as well as respondent, offer suggestions. A suitable category for qualitative interviewing is one where the interviewer and interviewee can establish rapport with each other. Koole (2003, p. 192) has shown that in practice, a speaker achieves this interactationally, by

---

124 See discussion of ‘critical realist’ research interviewing in the discussion of methodology in Table 1b in Section 2.2.2 of Chapter 2.
providing joint answer constructions, and affiliative answer receipts, (rather than very minimal backchannel responses or ones of detachment\textsuperscript{125}) exactly as Sally and the interviewer have demonstrated here (particularly the sequence at lines 14-33). Sally and the interviewer have designed their utterances to create discursive identities. There are any number of ways they could do this but they have settled on one appropriate to their understanding of the engagement to come. The close analysis of the talk has shown these to be relevant identities (Schegloff, 1991) since they show how the participants propose to achieve their discursive purposes in the interaction to come. The pre-interview chat contextualises the interview that follows, by suggesting and querying the role of interviewer-lead questions within it.

Section 8.3 below now considers the sequence of talk just before the interview proper begins with Margaret. This sequence shows Margaret and the interviewer both building discursive identity and manipulating inter-subjectivity, just as Sally and the interviewer did in the passage shown in Text Box 8.1.

\textsuperscript{125} For ‘back channel’, see Yngve, (1970) as cited in Koole p. 192.
8.3 Doing, ‘being a considerate conversationalist’

With Margaret’s interview, the interviewer has the same technical and research concerns as with Sally but with the added factor that she was late for the interview and needs to apologise:

Text Box 8.2

6 I: everything’s o↓kay hh ↑yup everything’s o↓kay
M: ↑good
8 I: so I’m just gonna ↑put that over there so we’re not watching it an (1.0) hh that’s a
   bit of a crib sheet for me (0.25) so (1.0) erm thank ↓you ↓((Margaret)) and I’m
10 rea↓ly sorry [about erm
M: [↑don’t ↓worry (.)↑please don’t say another word of ↓sorry
12 I: oh okay =
M: = I’ve been doing my ironing (0.25) [I’ve been to the p↑ost
14 I: [right
16 I: and there weren’t too many people th↑ere
M: ↓real↓ly
18 I: ↑m↓m
20 M: [which was good (.)
I: [remarkable
22 M: I dro. I left my ↑gla:ss↓es in there the other day but fortunately I got them back
I: ↑did y↓ou well that that ↑was ↓good ↑y↓es
24 M: ↑mm they were on the floor too
I: ↑wo↓w
26 M: they said °yes they were found on the floor°
I: ggh in a ↑ca↓se they’re ↑not
28 M: ↑no° they were just they’d I’d ↑had ↑them in my pocket and I pulled my purse ↓out
   (0.5) and I expect the glasses fell [out
30 I: [oh
M: at [the same time
32 I: [but they’re not scratched they’re ok
M: no ↓they’re ↓fine° they’re ↓these
34 I: ↑I don’t re↓mem↑ber ↑you ↑wear↓ing ↓them you don’t ↑you don’t ↓wear ↑them
M: I ↑do for [read↓ing
36 I: [you do
I: so you [don’t wear them so much
38 M: [you don’t see me [reading much =
I: [right
40 M: = now I’d just been ironing and
I: right
42 M: I have been wearing [them  cont’d below...

126 The lateness was caused by difficulty getting the lap top to record, which the interviewer may have said, but this is not recorded.
I: [I have to take my specs off for ironing because the 
steam steams them up]
M: yeah it does
I: [((laughs))]
M: [((laughs))]
I: OPENING the oven too is another thing
M: that's a nightmare [oh wow
I: [you you go to the oven and open it up and then you can't see anyth-
ing ((laughs))]
I: well I've got to the stage ggh it started when I, when I was still doing some
sermons [and
M: [mm]
I: I had to have my glasses off for read-
ing [.]]
M: [mm]
I: but n for looking up at people
M: [people mm]
I: so you i agh its a nightmare isn't it
M: [yes
M: mm
I: (.). erm any way
M: tell me about what you want
I: right a. as you know (Margaret)) I'm do ing a PhD [it's into faith .]
M: [yes
I: progress or development [or movement
M: [development
I: or whatever augmenta-
tion
M: [don't know that I can discern much of mine but I'll answer
I: = we'll i. it's not really questions and inter view its more like a conversa-
tion its
M: [yes
I: for you to be able say in your own words
I: [.hh some of the things that that you feel are important to you =
M: [mm]
I: = in your faith
M: m
I: and () as I said it will be er its under the bona fides of
M: yea [mm
I: [London University
M: mm
I: and erm if it is discussed and it's () I hope it will be discussed at seminars and
what have you obviously .hhh then I anonymise all the names
M: [that's right I've read all
I: [yes so so I want you to feel comfy that it's all you know secure
M: mm
I: .hh erm (0.5) ggh and I've I've real I've had some wonderful conversations
with people, people's faith, I mean it's just so interesting .hhh and I usually start...
8.3.1 As she settles the laptop, unlike with Sally, the interviewer confirms to Margaret, twice, that the laptop is working properly (6) thus establishing a position that the interviewer is in control of the technical arrangements. Her prosody is assertive with downward intonation on ‘okay’. (Contrast with Sally, the interviewer’s upward pitch, line 4, Text Box 8.1.) Margaret accepts this with a news receipt -‘good’ (7). The interviewer draws attention to the laptop as she puts it out of sight, and to the crib sheet, moving immediately to a research interview position without any of the extensive levelling that she had followed with Sally. She thanks Margaret and gives a repeated apology127 for being late in the same turn. The thanks and the apology are linked to each other and to the putting away of the laptop by ‘so’ and ‘and’ (9) respectively, both continuation-of markers, which makes them appear a natural follow on from the laptop action and the reference to the crib sheet. So the interviewer’s thanks are due because Margaret has agreed to be an interviewee in a formal research session; and the apologies are due, because of this formality (one does not apologise profusely for being late for a ‘drop-in’ coffee.) This sequence immediately orientates the participants to the up coming session as a formal, not conversational interaction. Margaret accepts the apology and then tells a ‘story’ about what she had been doing.

8.3.2 In lines 13-31, Margaret ‘explains’ that she had been doing her ironing and that she had gone to the post (office) where she had retrieved her lost glasses. Later she repeats she has ‘just been ironing’ (40) which implies that she was indeed doing this before the

127 Earlier apologies are unrecorded but Margaret says, ‘don’t say another word of sorry’ (11).
interview. It is not evidentially clear however that it is factually true she had gone to the post office that morning, whilst waiting for the interviewer, but this is the story she tells and with it she constructs the notion that she used the time the interviewer had unintentionally given her, fruitfully. She mentions that the post office was un-crowded, ‘which was good’ (20). She uses this story as an account to justify the lack of requirement for an apology (11), since it almost seems that the interviewer, in being late, has done Margaret a favour instead of letting her down. Furthermore, she includes the interviewer in the sequence as co-constructor of it. As she says she has ‘been to the post’ (13) she raises her pitch at the end and waits for the interviewer to respond, ‘right’ (15). Then again, she has raised pitch at the end of ‘too many people there’ (16). Sacks and Schegloff (1979) refer to this upward intonation as ‘try-marking’, that is, an attempt to engage the respondent in mutual recognition of the turn’s relevance, which is exactly what Margaret achieves as the interviewer’s replies become more engaged with augmented intonation, (‘↑m↓m’) and upgraded responses (‘remarkable’, 21 and the turn at line 23). The interviewer finally makes a contributing comment of her own - that Margaret’s glasses are undamaged (27, 32) with a form of words that look like a ‘my side telling’ (Pomerantz 1980). Pomerantz notes that when people ask questions they may do so indirectly - the interviewer checks if the glasses were in a case before asking outright if they were undamaged. The indirect first part of a ‘my side telling’ alerts the other speaker before the question is actually posed and does not put them immediately in a position to reply, as a direct question would. The point

---

128 See Davidson, 1984; Drew, 1984, both cited in Edwards, 1994, p. 225, for accounts used to justify refusals to offers and to invitations.

129 The interviewer (I) begins the construction that the glasses are un-damaged with a ‘fishing’ statement - the glasses were not ‘in a case’ (27), M confirms that the glasses were unprotected. I’s overlapping talk (32) positioned with a marker, ‘but’ directly asserts that the glasses are ‘unscratched’ and M completes the construction, ‘no’ (33).
of Margaret’s story would be entirely vitiated if the glasses turn out to be damaged and the ‘my side telling’ gives Margaret an opportunity to ‘hedge’ if necessary. As it is, her reply orientates not to whether the glasses are damaged but why they should be on the floor of the post office at all and she gives an account for this. Only after this ‘positioning’, does the interviewer asks her direct question and Margaret brings out the glasses to confirm that they are unharmed and says so with finalising downward pitch and lowered volume (33). Researchers in narrative analysis (NA) note that when storytellers tell stories, they can indicate the end by describing a suitable terminating incident or can make an appropriate physical gesture. Both Margaret’s action here and her prosody not only signal ‘the end’ of her story, they conclude the co-construction why no ‘word of apology’ is necessary. So far, this negotiation, in contrast to that with Sally, has been respondent, not interviewer lead and the author suggests that with this sequence Margaret puts the interviewer at her ease (the potential discomfort caused by her lateness and problems with the laptop). Margaret is a priest, professionally trained to do this sort of thing one might think. Margaret may well be a considerate conversationalist and concerned to ensure a successful interview; the present analysis shows how she achieves ‘being a considerate conversationalist’ in the present discursive situation through the telling of her story and involving the interviewer in recognition of this.

130 Both the try-marking prosody and the interviewer’s ‘fishing’ might be though of as instances of ‘noticing’ (Schegloff, 1988) discussed further at section 8.4.4 below. This is where speaker (A) makes a comment not to describe what might be clearly obvious, but to ‘notice’ it so as to go onto make a particular point -explanation, justification or point-up trouble.
131 And Margaret uses a self-initiated-self-repair to divert her first answer from the glasses being on the floor to the explanation of how they got there - the phrase after ‘just’ (28) is not finished.
132 ‘Reader, I married him’ for instance.
133 See discussion of line 399 in Text Box 6.4 in Chapter 6.
134 Rapley makes a similar comparison (for his interviewer) between ‘being an open ended interviewer’ and ‘doing, being an open-ended interviewer’ in his study on the ‘artfulness of open-ended interviewing’, 2001.
‘opening the oven too is another thing’

8.3.3 In response to Margaret’s final gesture, the interviewer introduces (34) a related, but new topic (there is no continuation-of marker). She leads a sequence of turns with a discussion of the difficulty with glasses steaming up when doing domestic tasks (34-51), which both participants experience. The interviewer takes Margaret’s original theme of ironing, introducing it as problematic for glasses wearers (43-44), and turns it into a laughter event. Margaret is not neutral in her response, but joins in laughing with her - both participants enjoy a shared moment as members both of the category ‘glasses wearers’. Margaret takes the floor back (‘opening’, 48, is said loudly) to collude further with the interviewer, giving another instance of difficulty for glasses wearers. Margaret uses the impersonal ‘you’ (50, rather than the particular, ‘when I’, for example) and this constructs her remark as appropriate to anyone (who wears glasses) and thus constructs the interviewer and herself unproblematically into the same category. The interviewer strongly accepts Margaret’s point with an upgraded acceptance both in content ‘nightmare’ (49) and with prosodic stress (the augmented down intonation and the elongated vowel, ↑o:oh ↓wow). The interviewer begins a second sequence, (52-60) talking of the difficulty with glasses when speaking in public using notes, specifically when giving a sermon. The interviewer is a Church of England lay reader and would have experience of taking church services and giving sermons; but her purported difficulty with short sightedness when giving sermons is not to the point - her words are accountable to the inter-subjective positioning they achieve. The interviewer and Margaret have constructed themselves ‘nearer together’ because of their joint membership of three separate categories - personal, domestic and professional: spectacles wearer, housewife and preacher. The participants
have built up Margaret’s original story, across several turns of quick fire dialogue, involving each other in mutual recognition of each other’s purposes in the talk at hand.

**working ‘mms’**

8.3.4 Margaret responds to the interviewer’s positioning in this second sequence (52-60) with minimal acknowledgement tokens ‘mm’ (54, 56, 58, 61). Minimal, so-called backchannel comments may be as constructing as a full response because of what they do not say (the extreme case of silence can be devastating). In addition, their position in the sequence may inform the outcome of the next speaker’s turn (see Rapley, 2001). Here, the first of Margaret’s minimal replies (54) comes exactly at the interviewer’s bridging *continuation-of* marker, ‘and’ (53) and functions therefore as a *continuer* (as in the discussion in Sally, Text Box 8.1) showing that Margaret orientates her words towards the interviewer’s keeping the floor. The interviewer finishes the second half of her construction (‘reading’ has downward intonation) and pauses, slightly but hearably, at the end, ‘off for reading (.)’, (55). Margaret makes a second, minimal response, in this silence. It therefore *elicits* the interviewer’s next *continuation-of* marker, ‘but’ (57) as a suggestion to continue. The interviewer finalises her construction (indicated by the down intonation on ‘people’, 57) and Margaret says the interviewer’s own word, before the interviewer has finished speaking (58). It is quite common for speakers to finish their collocutor’s turn for them, their words overlapping at the TRP. This indicates, ‘*I have heard what you say and understood why you’ve said it*’. However, Margaret still declines to comment more, (the third ‘mm’); so the interviewer must carry on. The interviewer begins again with ‘so you’ which looks like a bridge to a corollary to her construction, but she does not complete this
and after a delay (the voiced, ‘*agh*) repeats her earlier word ‘nightmare’. She includes Margaret in this assertion with the negative interrogative ‘isn’t it’ (57) and ends on rising intonation. This is a direct request to Margaret to speak and to agree, subverting her place as primary epistemic authority and deferring to Margaret. Margaret’s ‘yes’ (60) overlaps the interviewer’s turn at nightmare; it is a continuer, encouraging the interviewer to speak after her delay. Margaret’s fourth ‘*mm*’ (61) said in the hearable gap between the two turns is a minimal response token. The interviewer has said nothing new from the earlier construction at lines 48-9, and Margaret’s ‘silence’ invites the listener to initiate a new topic. The interviewer responds to Margaret firstly with another hearable pause, a delayer, (the upward stressed ‘*erm*) and ends with a heavily augmented down intoned ‘*anyway*’ (62).

‘*anyway*’

8.3.5 In a socio-linguistics study, Ferrara (1997) researched the up/down tone shape for the adverb *anyway*. She explored how a listener might understand the varying role played by *anyway*, by noting its place in the phrase and by the different intonational patterns associated with it. Ferrara noted that of the two different adverbial uses of *anyway* (that is, *anyway* meaning *besides*, or *nonetheless*) the first had a flat or level intonation associated with it, and the second, a small rise in pitch followed by a gentle fall. However, *anyway* used as a discourse marker had a distinctly marked high pitch followed by a steep fall (what the present study refers to as an ‘augmented down’ and the pitch shape of the interviewer’s *anyway* at line 62 in the present passage). These pitch shapes are shown schematically below:
Three intonational versions of *anyway*:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(a) adverb: besides</th>
<th>(b) adverb: nonetheless</th>
<th>(c) as discourse marker</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>


In Ferrara’s study, the use of *anyway* in any of its forms was frequent, but *anyway* as a discourse marker was by far the most common. This study shows the augmented tone shape to be associated with a word doing discursive, as opposed to semantic work. Edwards (2006, p. 7) speaks of conversationalists displaying *subjectivity* and *stance* through the *manner* of their vocal delivery (present author’s italics). Ferrara’s study shows an instance of this via a specific prosodic variation. In the present case, the author suggests, the interviewer’s intoned *anyway* is hearably dismissive. Both participants have contributed to positioning activities, but now the interviewer has repeated herself (‘*nightmare*’, 59) and Margaret’s final minimal reply withholds the fulsome participating token both she and the interviewer had given earlier in the session.

*‘tell me about what you want’*

**8.3.6** Margaret, responds to the interviewer’s tone on ‘*anyway*’ and it she who asks for the interview to begin, ‘*tell me about what you want*’ (63). This is a version of a ‘preliminary to a preliminary’ (Schegloff, 1980). With it, Margaret acknowledges that the
first part of the interview is now complete and ‘gives permission’ to the interviewer to start the interview proper. In response, the interviewer does not at first answer her. Instead, she gives some preliminaries associated with her interview question (hence the phrase, preliminary to a preliminary). With this phrase, Margaret hands responsibility for the preliminaries over to the interviewer in recognition of her ‘role’ in a formal session as ‘holder of the questions’ and the interviewer corroborates this - ‘right’, is strongly down intoned. She accepts not only the topic shift Margaret has just offered, but also the implied orientation to the session as diverting from mundane conversation and of Margaret’s and her own role within it. She makes an assertion, ‘as you know’, again with downward pitch and includes Margaret by name. The rhetorical work of Sally’s ‘I know’ was discussed earlier (Text Box 4.1) where suitably placed apparently incidental words can be highly contributing to the work at hand. Here, ‘as you know’ seems very deliberately inclusive of Margaret in a ‘research’ category membership with the interviewer. The ‘object’ of Margaret’s asserted mental state is the interviewer doing a PhD. The interviewer uses down intonation to make her assertions and does not wait for confirmation from Margaret before continuing her turn. (Margaret’s simple acknowledgement and ‘continuer’ ‘yes’ (65) comes as the interviewer has already embarked on the next part of her turn.) This ‘dampens’ Margaret’s reply, that is, reduces an opportunity for disagreement and contributes to the interviewer’s ‘design’ of Margaret as a participant with the interviewer in her task-at-hand.

135 In Schegloff’s study, both first and second preliminary are given by the same speaker as in ‘may I ask you something’ leading ultimately to a question. The effect, in the present case is the same however, the present author suggests. It works to introduce (or obtain permission for) a relatively long turn, where a question is only asked or an assertion made after it has been positioned in a preamble. In the present case, Margaret’s word ‘about’ in ‘tell me about what you want’ presumably invites more circumlocution than the more straight forward, ‘tell me what you want’.

136 The term ‘dampens’ is taken from Potter and Hepburn (2010, p. 31) from their use of it in their discussion of ‘recipient design’. Recipient design both in Potter and Hepburn and in the present discussion means designing the recipient. In CA studies ‘recipient design’ refers to the orientation of a turn-at-talk to assumptions of mutual knowledge awareness or understanding between the speaker and the recipient.
The interviewer has introduced the category ‘academic research’ and that this is something ‘done’. The implication is that this is being done at the present moment, which positions the session as a research interview and Margaret a participant in it. However, the topic of the interview - ‘faith progress or development or movement’ (66) appears open to discussion and Margaret chooses ‘development’ (67). The interviewer does not regard Margaret’s choice as final and suggests a fourth option after ‘or whatever’ (68) which sounds as dismissive as her previous ‘anyway’ (but it does not take the same prosody). ‘Development’ is not linguistically neutral. It contains implications relevant to academic psychology and to the interviewer’s motives for the present research study. There are reasons therefore why she may prefer not to accept this term. However, that argument is a speculation, brought to the conversation and not an observation of it; however, this appears to be an attempt by the interviewer to reposition the content of the up-coming session and herself as more in charge of it. There is a ‘direct relationship between status and role [that participants take] and discursive rights and obligations’ in the conversation, Drew and Heritage (1992: 49). If, for example, one person can establish themselves as ‘expert’ then they will tend to ask questions and come to conclusions with which they inform the other (as in a doctor-patient relationship, see Maynard, 1991; Ten Have, 1991). In response, Margaret accepts a positioning for her collocutor as ‘one who asks questions’ and of herself as ‘one who answers’ (69-70). As in Sally’s session, the interviewer replies with a dispreferred turn shape. This time, she does not give a weak agreement at first (71), but her reply is typical of a dispreferred turn. She prefaces her remark with an elongated counterpositional marker,

137 Making it a very open ‘open’ interview.
138 The interviewer explicitly rejects Fowler’s Faith Development Model and considers the term development as being appropriate only for realist approaches. A discussion on the tensions due to an extra-conversational orientation in addition to attending to the local exchange follows in the next chapter.
‘we: ll’, the lengthened vowel on ‘its’ and a filler ‘really’, all used to delay the disagreement to come. She concludes with an account (again, typical to dispreferred turns) of what the session will be like and in so doing says much more to position the conversation being in Margaret’s control (74-5) than she had said with Sally and Margaret accepts this construction with an augmented down-intoned ‘mm’ at line 78 (in contrast to the earlier un-intoned continuer ‘mm’s).

‘as I said’; ‘I hope it will be discussed…’

8.3.7 The sequence ‘correcting’ the expectation to questions (69-78) has postponed the second part of the interviewer’s construction begun with the assertions at lines 64 and 66. The interviewer had to respond immediately and in an appropriate way to Margaret’s mis-statement regarding questions, therefore the point of her own assertions went unaddressed until now. She orientates her words back to the relevant turn (her words at 64/66) with ‘as I said’ (79). She had not, in point of fact, ‘said’ anything about London University earlier, but rather this phrase alludes to why it should be spoken of. An assumption of CA is that turns in the spate of conversation orientate themselves to the words around them - this is a localised production. However, this does not only mean the words just spoken in the previous turn. If a preamble, preface, or part one of a two-part pair implies a second part, then at some suitable point, participants will provide this and if necessary, flag it as oriented to an earlier first part, as here. At lines 81/3, the interviewer reinforces her earlier positioning as one in control of the topic by bringing in an non-present audience - the unnamed and un-numbered ‘others’ who might read the written transcript and final report. This reinforces the session as an academic one, and it changes the interviewer’s footing to a
receiver of Margaret’s replies on behalf of an academic audience who is the real recipient. The interviewer’s role therefore is not to respond to Margaret on her own account, but rather to elicit Margaret’s stance or opinion on behalf of this other audience, and without any bias or opinion of her own. It is after this positioning, that the interviewer goes onto ask the interview question. Margaret will ‘answer’ ‘questions’ of her faith or discuss the ‘things that are important to her’ in this light.

8.3.8 This sequence from the beginning of Margaret’s study session shows, as did Sally’s, the quick fire dialogue typical to mundane chat. Likewise, it shows construction of affiliatory and supportive shared category memberships and a preference to agree. However, it positions Margaret’s session as an academic interview in a way that Sally’s did not. Whether Margaret and the interviewer follow the implications of this, or whether they choose to subvert it using a variety of discourse strategies available to them in talk-in-interaction will be evident in the close analysis of the subsequent talk. The present study considers its research interviews as contextualised discourse, that is, participatory social action in a particular setting; whatever Margaret and the interviewer will construct there, they will construct it within the situation that they have just successfully negotiated.

8.4 Doing, ‘getting ready for argument’

John and Cathy are married - their sessions took place in their home and Cathy’s interview followed directly after John’s on the same morning. When the interviewer arrived, all three
sat for a period of fifteen minutes or so in silent meditation, or prayer\textsuperscript{139}. The interviewer and John went straight on to their interview afterwards. The interviewer set up the laptop and must have taken time over it, hence her first remark. The interviewer puts the laptop out of sight - ‘away’ (4) and apologises for the ‘palaver’ and John not only acknowledges this, he accepts the apology (6):

\begin{quote}

\textbf{Text Box 8.3}

\begin{tabular}{l}
4 & I: ‘scuse me so that’s that now I’ll put that down away so that we’re not looking at it \\
& ((pause due to erased machine noise)) sorry for all palaver \\
6 & J: that’s all ↑right \\
& I: ↑erm \\
8 & J: ((coughs)) \\
& I: right so we we ↑know what we’re doing we we I:I’ve= \\
10 & I: = described to you [what it’s all about \\
& J: ↑yeah \\
12 & I: ↑h and (.75) we’re ↑just gonna chat really I mean there’s ↑no sort of pre-set \\
& questions or (.75) there’s no sort of (. ) set agenda or anything going on it’s ↑just (. ) \\
& your, what you want to ↓say .hh but I:I ↑thought just to start us ↓off it was ↑lovely \\
& by the way starting off with prayer< wasn’t ↑↑it (. ) I mean what an appropriate way \\
& to start it \\
& J: ↑I didn’t. (. ) I ↑did↓n’t start off with prayer [(25) I started with medi↑ta↓tion \\
& 18 & I: [well I meant, \\
& J: to me that’s different \\
20 & I: ‘oh right well we’ll [better explore that then we’d better explore that= \\
& J: [huh huh huh huh((laughs)) \\
22 & I: ↑erm be↑fore we get into ↓tha↑t ((coughs)) ↑erm (. ) you know ↑↑we naturally sat \\
& around ↓there and it was fine and it felt ↑very, (. ) o↓Kay [because >you know = \\
& 24 & J: (((coughs)) \\
& I: = we were all amongst friends< we all did it we knew that \\
& 26 & J: ↑yeah \\
& I: but ↑↑1 ↑won↓dered if you were say at ↓work (.75) or wherever in the ↓pub (. ) and \\
& the conversation got round to you know these weird people who have faith (1.0) or \\
& these weird people who pray or ↓whatever (1.0) and then s. and and ↑↑somebo↓dy \\
& suddenly got the impression that you, you perhaps ↓sometimes ↓prayed or \\
& whatever (. ) and they ((↑hlooked breathed word)) at ↓you and they said ↑w:w:what \\
& \textit{eggh} do ↓you have ↑↑faith ↑↑what about ↑↑you are you ↑↑religious (. ) ↑what ↑↑do ↑↑you \\
& ↑↑call ↑↑yourself what what do ↓you have ↑↑faith (. ) and you’re >↑suddenly put on the \\
& spot and there’s ↑↑all these people looking at ↓you< what what do you ↓say \\
& 34 & J: (2.5) ↑↑erm hhh (1.5) I think.... continues
\end{tabular}
\end{quote}

Present research John: Ref J/1/4-35/8.3

\textsuperscript{139} Various religious groups and denominations, non-theist (such as Buddhist) and secular groups, all practice silent prayer (meditation or contemplation). Cathy, the interviewer and John were all active members of such groups.
‘we know’

8.4.1 With a small delay (‘erm’, ‘right’, 7/9), the interviewer moves straight to the research interview preliminaries using the inclusive ‘we’ (9) rather as she did with Sally (4-7, Text Box 8.1). She constructs her phrase, ‘we we know’ as a rhetorical question with up intonation, not the downward pitch associated with a claim to knowledge. This is as potentially constructing as in Sally’s session, but there the positioning created rapport, here it contributes to troubled talk. The interviewer suggests that she and John share knowledge about the up-coming session but delays claiming it with the repeated ‘we’ (9) and instigates a self-instigated-self-repair (Schegloff et al., 1987) from the second ‘we’ replacing it with ‘I’. The interviewer has made a cautious assertion, (that is, one with reduced evidence for it) which puts herself and John at risk of disagreement unless she offers a justification, which is what the interviewer’s repair goes on to do. She now asserts that she and John ‘know’ because the interviewer has ‘described to John what it is all about’ (10). As discussed before, it is not evidentially clear that the interviewer has explained things but we can see the need for the justification. Furthermore, the repaired ‘I’ removes the inclusive category sharing available to ‘we’. John acknowledges this, ‘yeah’ (11) said well before the interviewer has finished her turn and withholding agreement. Does he know what the interview is about in the way the interviewer asserts? And, if he does, is it the same as that of the interviewer? That question is not relevant to the analyst if it is not relevant to the participants, but in the next lines, the interviewer embarks on exactly the explanation/description she had earlier claimed. Clearly, John’s minimal ‘yeah’ was not sufficient.
‘just gonna chat really’

8.4.2 The interviewer’s relatively lengthy turn (12-16) is full of rhetorical work; it orientates to the object of John and the interviewer’s ‘knowledge’ and their (potentially different) expectations for the interview. The interviewer begins with a second assertion, with the inclusive ‘we[a]re’ (12). She positions this as an alternative version to the kind of interview John might ‘have in mind’ in order to rebut it. The effect is for the interviewer to assert her version before John speaks, which may nip potential disagreement in the bud. ‘Just’ implies ‘only’ and is limiting - the interview should not be seen as more than what the interviewer asserts of it. The interviewer’s turn is oriented to the expectation that John’s alternative version may be of an interview as a formal process to find ‘answers’; ‘just’ separates the interviewer’s version from this process and its product. The interviewer’s ‘I mean’ introduces a ‘three-part-list’ (‘no sort of pre-set questions...sort of agenda or anything’, 12-13) which has named items for the first two parts and a ‘generalised list completer’ (‘anything’) for the third (Jefferson, 1990). The interviewer’s ‘I mean’, dampens her assertion, ‘down playing’ herself and the session, rather as the interviewer had with her positioning as ‘non-technically expert’ in Sally’s interview; here, she is ‘just a person who chats’. This is an elaborate support to the interviewer’s second assertion - she thoroughly constructs her case so that she can sum up with a third statement (‘it’s just your....say’, 13/14). The ‘↑just’ with its upward pitch stress is a repetition of the earlier one, (12)

---

140 ‘Have in mind’ here is not intended as a realist description of John’s intentional state. It is conventional shorthand for, ‘The potential for John to place a countering version of the interview into play for whatever rhetorical or accountable purposes he may have.

141 ‘I mean’ and other similar mental state avowals were discussed extensively in earlier chapters, particularly in Paragraph 6.4.3 in Chapter 6. There the discussion was of the phrase as a way to subvert, or to reduce evidentiality when making an assertion in a long turn. In the present chapter, the discussion is that this epistemic subversion achieves affiliation and rapport in turn-by-turn talk. It is suggested that as the speaker downplays her own epistemic stance it has the potential to raise that of the listener, from simple receiver of the speaker’s assertion into a co-constructor of it.
reinforcing the limiting work done there. The prosody of this third, concluding statement is
assertive, more so than the previous two. It begins with raised pitch and gradually falls to
lowered pitch at the end \(^{142}\) and is entirely consistent with the notion of the interviewer
saying, ‘that’s it, my assertion’s done’.

‘but I thought’

8.4.3 Without waiting for a confirmatory token from John, the interviewer takes a breath
and starts a new topic, her pitch raised at the start and running down to the end - it is a new
assertion. She starts with ‘but’, and ‘I thought’ (14) the ‘but’ indicating that the next topic
is a natural follow on, albeit in contrast to what has gone before, and the ‘I thought’ is
another mental state avowal. Sacks noted (1992:787-8 as cited in Edwards and Potter, 2005,
p. 254) that both tense and intonation are important to the factual status of the object of
‘thought’. Using the past tense, a speaker could account for a contrasting state - events turn
out not to happen as ‘thought’, or, the events may be unusual in some other way. The
interviewer’s next word, ‘just’ works as a limiting expression - the departure, whatever it is,
is only going to be for the start. In an entirely different research context, Curl and Drew
to telephone calls to remote services such as after-hours doctors, when a caller makes a
request prefaced with ‘I wonder’. They argue that it ‘displays an orientation to high
contingency over whether the request can be satisfied or low entitlement to what is
requested.’ In the present passage, the interviewer’s ‘but I thought’ might function in a

\(^{142}\) This is a canonical ‘pitch shape’ from the socio-linguistics discussion on prosody. There is a physical
aspect to prosody in that a speaker must draw breath to speak, giving rise to a natural tendency for a gradual
lowering of pitch as the pitch runs out. Thus an assertion completed in a single breath (and turn) may take
(before further ‘work’ is done) high pitch at the start gradually running to low pitch at the end, as is the case
here, twice, ‘its ↑just your what you want to ↓say’; and, ‘I ↑thought just to start us ↓off’ (lines13/14).
similar way and this would be consistent with a position of uncertainty on the interviewer’s behalf in her role of poser of questions\textsuperscript{143}. This may indicate tension due to the interviewer orienting to twin objectives - of the ‘open’ interview on the one hand, which is to be as free-flowing as possible (as NA and other qualitative interviewing recommends) and the dictates of her own research programme to ask the first (if only) formal question\textsuperscript{144}. However, the interviewer does not finish this remark; she breaks off, interrupting herself, using the ‘rush-through’ to hold the floor, exactly as she might if she were interrupting a collocutor.

\textit{‘it was lovely starting with prayer wasn’t it’}

8.4.4 The interviewer makes a fourth statement in this turn, that starting with prayer was an appropriate way to begin (14-15). Her prosody begins as an assertion (raised pitch at the beginning) but ends with raised intonation at the negative interrogative, ‘\textit{wasn’t it}’ (15) at the end. ‘\textit{Wasn’t it}’ here performs the management of stance for the interviewer \textit{vis-à-vis} John with respect to the evaluation she has just made in the manner noted before. In turn-taking talk, the person first making a claim to knowledge, places that claim into the conversation for the second person to acknowledge (Heritage and Raymond, 2005). The first speaker therefore has \textit{epistemic priority} over the second; she offers an assessment, and in so doing, informs the second speaker of it. In practice, it does not necessarily follow that a speaker offering an assessment first (or second) will claim primary (or secondary) rights. Both speakers can manipulate this stance as appropriate to the occasion (see also Clift, 2006), such as to achieve ‘shared knowledge’, (Edwards, 1997). In the present case, the

\textsuperscript{143} The interviewer states ‘I wonder’ explicitly when the interviewer finally does pose the interview question just a few seconds later (27).
\textsuperscript{144} The essential tensions caused by open research interviewing, is the topic of the next chapter.
interviewer potentially turns her assertion into a question with her ‘wasn’t it’. A relevant reply from John therefore is not acknowledgement of the interviewer’s assertion but an ‘answer’, thus informing her. By this means, the interviewer down grades her epistemic authority and passes it to John constructing John as agreeing with her; in down grading her own position, the interviewer upgrades John. A second view of this exchange therefore, is that there is now joint ‘ownership’ of the evaluation of the prayer, since the interviewer has included John with her in her evaluation. This sets up a preferred next turn for John to agree. The interviewer prefaces her suggestion with the phrase ‘by the way’ (15), which highlights her remark as unexpected in some way, perhaps it is uncoordinated with the rest of the turns-at-talk. The interviewer says it at a higher speed, setting it apart from the rest of the turn. It looks like a ‘noticing’ (Schegloff, 1988) and, with its raised pitch at the end to a my-side telling (Pomerantz, 1980). Noticings exploit a fundamental concern of CA that people’s turns-at-talk are relevant, that what they say is appropriate to whatever is going on in the talk at the time. This is an effective way of marking something in the talk. It enables a speaker to point something out either an assertion with a preference to agree, or a problem, for which an account may be needed. As it happens, in the present passage, John does not give the expected agreement.

‘I didn’t start off with prayer’

8.4.5 John rejects the interviewer’s assertion without the softening seen in passages discussed above. His first ‘I didn’t.’ (17) is brief and clipped short and after a short pause (of less than one-quarter of a second) he repeats ‘I didn’t’, made hearably different to the first with emphasising augmented down intonation. After another pause, he continues to

145 See also discussion note 37 in section 8.3.2; and note 11 and discussion in section 6.3.4 in Chapter 6.
give the expected account of his reply elicited by the interviewer’s ‘noticing’ (the
intonation on ‘meditation’ (17) mirrors the earlier inflection on ‘I didn’t’ emphasising it).
John distances himself from the interviewer’s construction by stressing that his view is
different from hers, ‘to me’ (19). The implication of the ‘to me’ is that both parties may
validly hold different views and that John places his argument into the conversation in
contrast to that of the interviewer. This elicits an explanation from the interviewer in her
turn, her ‘well’ indexes the words that follow to those just prior but counterpositional to it.
‘I meant’ seeks to clarify the trouble her words have caused but she does not finish, her
remark is left ‘hanging’ with the holding intonation after ‘meant’ (18); she stops
speaking to let John finish his turn rather than complete her explanation. This is typical of
repairs to overlapping sequences as CA research has found - the interviewer accepts the
CA convention of ‘one-speaker-at-a-time’. However, this has the effect of silencing the
interviewer who does not finish her explanation, (nor indeed, the point under dispute,
despite explicitly saying next that it should be explored, 20). When the interviewer
subsequently regains the floor, she acknowledges John’s comment, speaking quietly as
though to herself or perhaps as an indication of disengagement. Her phrase includes a
repetition of her own words, ‘we’d better explore that’ (20). Mazeland and ten Have (1996)
describe repeats as ‘not displaying any operation on the answers …they are cognitively
passive or neutral’ (p. 103). They observe that repetitions typically come in the quick fire
dialogue (or ‘turn-by-turn, TBT, interviews’) especially of short factual descriptions. They
describe that the function of the repetition is to create an interactionally shared factual
account - respondents note a fact to fix it. Once fixed, it becomes background, playing no

---

146 Transcribed with a comma. This is level intonation - neither rising nor falling and held very slightly.
147 Jefferson, 1972; 1987; Schegloff, 1979a; 1987a; 1992c; Schegloff, Jefferson and Sacks, 1977, all cited in
Hutchby and Wooffitt, 1989, p. 57.
further part in the discussion. This appears to be the case in the present passage - the repetition does not elicit any new information and neither party pursues the comment. The significance of the interviewer’s low volume may be then that she is fixing her own words as a fact for herself\(^{148}\). Whilst she says this, John makes a little laugh, (22) which the interviewer does not share. Laugh particles as IPAs were discussed in the excerpt in Text Box 8.1 above. In the present passage, John’s laugh is stand-alone, not interposed with any other words and is a turn on its own overlapping the interviewer’s turn. It is suggested that John’s laughter indexes the troubled turn just passed, and works to down play the significance of it, for John, but as the interviewer does not join him, it seems that interactionally the two participants are doing different things - John is concerned to laugh off his comment whilst the interviewer is fixing this for later use. The effect of both actions is that this topic is left un-addressed (as it turns out for the duration of the interview). The interviewer resumes her turn, she begins with a delay ‘erm’ then acknowledges John’s reply with augmented up intonation on the deictic ‘that’ (22) in the manner discussed earlier, foregrounding John’s construction and emphasising it. Then, after further delay ‘erm’ (22), she mentions the act of sitting to meditate or pray, but uses this to make a different point. In effect, she changes the subject. Her next statement (22-24) is a preamble to her asking the interview question. John’s brusque reply in this sequence looks like a preference to disagree. CA notes that in disputes, the normal preference to agree reverses and becomes a preference to disagree (Hutchby and Wooffitt, 1998). The argument from rhetorical psychology proposes that collocutors talk is designed to disagree, that is, oppose each other’s argument by putting opinions ‘into play’ to contrast with each other. In this case, John’s reply might indicate his orienting to a rather more formal interview style - almost a

\(^{148}\) See also the repeat pattern in the passage at line 64, in Text Box, 9.1 in Chapter 9.
debating session - than ‘mere’ chat, where the interviewer will call upon him to account for himself and his faith opinions. However, the present author suggests, that John’s ‘argument’ may be interpreted simply as elicited by the noticing made just prior to it. This sequence contextualises the interview ‘place’ therefore not so much as one for the positioning and counter-positioning of argument, but where one might be called to account for oneself.

8.5 CONCLUSION

The brief pre-interview chat shows differences to the passages of earlier chapters. With the exception of one long turn in John’s excerpt, the talk is typical of the quick-fire chat of mundane conversation. The analysis shows each speaker orienting to each other as participants across the turn and negotiating their relationship for the session to come. In Sally and Margaret’s excerpts, whilst one speaker might take the lead, the other speaker adds relevant contributions in her turn. The interviewer does not pass up the floor at the TRP with a stream of continuers as she does in the later session, resulting in the one-sided ‘interview’ talk. The quick-fire dialogue of mundane conversation allows an analysis of one speaker’s turn in light of the other and in its sequential position, in a way that is not possible in the long turns of an interview. The dialogue shows the interviewer responding in her own right, offering her own suggestions to which she is psychologically accountable and, in John’s case, taking a stance on prayer or meditation in distinction to his. This is in contrast to the interviewer’s footing throughout the rest of the talk, where (for the most part) she receives her collocutors’ turns on behalf of the academic audience who are the ultimate recipients. In mundane chat, both speakers contribute to the construction work
within the talk and in Sally and Margaret’s sessions, they both collaborate with the ‘interviewer’ in a joint exercise, undertaken in the moment, in the spate-of-talk, and negotiated and agreed there. The purpose of this construction is to promote a suitable discursive identity for the upcoming session whatever that turns out to be. In Sally’s discussion, she and the interviewer ‘level’ the interviewer/interviewee dynamic through their shared ‘lack of computing expertise’. Similarly, Margaret and the interviewer construct shared category entitlements. Positioning certainly occurs in the longer turns of the interviews, notably Margaret’s claim to experience through her age, (in paragraph 7.4.1 in Chapter 7), and Joyce’s construction of ‘being ordinary’ (in paragraph 6.2.1 in Chapter 6). However, there it was in support of an individual knowledge assertion and to warrant the account. Here it achieves affiliation between both participants as preparation to the following session.

All three participants orient to the research session as an interview and their replies are understood in that context; if participants are asked to account for, or justify their faith, then that is what they will construct - an account. An interview therefore is likely to be constrained in a way that mundane conversation is not. Not only will the data be organised into long turns without an extensive use of the proof procedure of the turn, it might be limited to certain kinds of content. Furthermore, there is a difference across participants of this contextualisation. Sally was gently persuaded against the idea of a formal interviewer/interviewee location, whereas in Margaret’s case, the interview explicitly establishes an academic footing. Sally’s pre-chat constructs affiliation and support, whereas John’s chat is already troubled. He is prepared, in a way that Sally and Margaret are not to
justify himself and to account for why he takes the particular stance he does, whereas Margaret will be explicitly constructed with a presumption or entitlement to her faith account. (This is shown as the questioner asks her research question and is discussed at paragraphs 7.1.9-10 in Chapter 7 and in section 9.4 in Chapter 9.) The methodological framework for the present study does not specify standardisation of the interview context (nor of the posing of the interview question itself, the topic of the next chapter).

Nevertheless, what the present data highlights is the significant contextual difference from one interview to the next that is certain to occur in just a few seconds of friendly chat entirely beyond the intentional control of the interviewer qua participant researcher. The implication of this for the discursive and positivist research interview alike is fundamental. A discourse analysis (of whatever persuasion) must include any pre-interview chat of the kind presented here alongside the interview data itself as it understands that data within this sequential and discursive context. Potter and Hepburn (2005) make this point in their critique of interviewing as opposed to mundane chat in discursive research. The positivist research interview might entirely exclude the discursive and reflexive role of the interviewer. Whilst this might be managed within the procedures of the interview itself, the importance of its discursive context might be entirely overlooked.
Chapter 9

Managing the interview: Doing, ‘posing and responding to the research question’

9.0 SUMMARY

The present chapter discusses the interview-as-topic. It presents data from the beginning of the interviews of Sally, John and Margaret, where the interviewer gives the one and only formal research question housed in the voice of the hypothetical enquirer. This question is:

‘How would you reply, if you met somebody at a party or in the pub, or wherever, and he unexpectedly turns to you and says, “Oh, do you have a faith, are you religious, do you pray?” What would you say?’

The chapter notes the tensions that arise due to the differing orientations of participants to the two genres of talk-in-interaction - research interview and mundane conversation. It notes the strategies of both questioner and respondent to deal with this. The chapter also explores the initial question-as-discourse. There are clear differences between the participants in how the question is posed in practice. Whatever the theoretical underpinning of the research interview, it is a strategic event localised within the discourse that houses it. The chapter notes these differences and discusses the implications for the subsequent talk.

9.1 INTRODUCTION

The previous chapter presents data from the chat that immediately precedes the study interviews. It notes that this chat is quick fire dialogue with rapid completion of turn constructions, typical to mundane speech, in contrast to the interviews themselves which tend towards long turns and one-sided sessions, as discussed. This enables a consideration of the two kinds of different talk-in-interaction genres. The previous chapter also noted the pre-interview chat as contextualisation for the interview to come. The present chapter continues this theme with the exploration of the posing of the interview question itself, which moves the chat into the formal session. Studies have shown that in ‘open’ interviews
tensions arise as interviewer and interviewee alike orientate to both discourses of formal interview and peer conversation at the same time. The analysis shows how participants deal with this tension.

The chapter further notes the clear differences in the way the interviewer poses the question to each of her participants. It discusses that the question is not merely a ‘stimulus’ posed to interviewees for their ‘response’ but is itself part of the discourse situation and locally oriented to participant interests. The research question and the manner in which it is posed is salient to the study participants’ replies and relevant to them in tackling the issue of accounting for their faith, in discussion.

DATA ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

Negotiating a relevant answer in interviews

9.2 Mazeland and ten Have (1996) note that participants in interviews, in contrast to naturalistic conversation\(^{149}\), have a three-fold orientation. The interviewee wants to tell of life-world experiences, beyond the context of the present interview. However, she is locally oriented to provide relevant part-two responses to the interviewer’s part-one turns. Similarly, the interviewer must locally orientate to her collocutor, offering appropriate responses in her turn, but she is also orientated to the demands of the research project. Whether or not she plans to find relevant ‘data’, categorizable into units suitable for later analysis, or if she intends an open or active interview, the interview is a strategic event,

---

\(^{149}\) Writers may use the term ‘naturalistic’ to contrast with ‘interview’ talk. All analysed speech is recorded for which participants will presumably have given their consent. It therefore can never be quite ‘natural’ but can approach this.
whether pre-designed or locally managed. In Sally’s interview we know that the interviewer has a ‘crib-sheet’, evidence of just such an extra talk-in-interaction orientation\textsuperscript{150}. Mazeland and ten Have (1996) discuss the \textit{essential tensions} that these divergent orientations will necessarily cause. Their study of open research interviews shows participants displaying these tensions particularly when negotiating the \textit{relevance} of answers and their potential for expansion (Mazeland, 1989, 1992, as cited in Mazeland and ten Have p. 94). The implications for the present study is that respondents will display these tensions in their ‘answers’, as will the interviewer as she poses her one formal interview question.

The passage in Text Box 9.1 below is the beginning of Sally’s interview and carries straight on from the pre-interview chat from Text Box 8.1 in Chapter 8:

\textsuperscript{150}See line 48 and discussion at paragraph 8.2.6 Chapter 8.
I: and erm (.) &right (2.0).hh &right so ↑first of [all I should sa:a ↑y (1.0)  
54  S: [↓right↑ght  
55  I: >it its about ↓faith obviously [you know that< so I mean =  
56  S: [yeah  
57  I: = I: I know I know the ↓answer but I should say I mean you y:you regard yourself as  
58  ↓having ↓a ↓faith or you you  
59  S: [yes (.) yes, yes  
60  I: [I mean you dhh. it’d be >pointless  
61  I: having this I((interview if you don’t actually have a<  )  
63  S: [no (.) no, no I do, I do er =  
64  S: = although (.) sometimes slightly ↓shaky (.) but I do, =  
65  I: ["sometimes slightly shaky"]  
66  S: = regard myself as [(.) having a ↓faith  
67  I: so if if ↑somebody were to ask ↓you you know (.) just, (1.0) if it cropped up  
68  S: mm  
69  I: w:what w:would you sa↓y (.) I mean would you say ↑yes ↑yes (.) hallelujah  
70  I’ma Christian or [(.) what would you say  
71  S: [I would say, erm:m, (.)  
72  S: >what do you mean if somebody said do you believe in God< or [sort of thing  
73  I: [↑ye:: ↓ah (.) if =  
74  = they jus said [you know  
75  S: [I’d say erm yes I ↓do, yes I ↓do and I have a s:spiritual (.) I have a  
76  sort of spiritual element to me .hh which (.) means (.) that =  
77  = I can ↓believe ↓in ↓God  
78  I: [you have a spiritual. element. to you  
79  S: yes  
80  I: ↓right (.)  
81  S: yeah  
82  I: ↑right erm an and ↑has that ever ↓happened has has anybody just sort of asked  
83  you out of the blue or at a party when you weren’t expecting it↑or  
84  S: ↑erm =  
85  I: = have you have you (1.0) ggh [can you re↑CALL A TIME  
86  S:  
87  I: when sudden suddenly you had had to say this in a sort of group =  
88  S: = what you mean like affirm, your faith  
89  I: ↑we↓ll or or just [at some odd moment ((    ))  
90  S: [£yes I ((yes I do£ smiling timbre))  
91  S: ↑yes ↑erm (2.5) I’ve ↑had people I’ve ↑had people say to me do you believe in ↓God  
92  and in the past I’ve said ↓no (.75) although I used to when I was younger and then I  
93  went through a phase when I decided I didn’t .hh and then I’ve come back to it .hh  
94  erm and now if somebody says to me (.) do you believe in God and I ↑don’t think it  
95  has ↓happened actually ↑people tend not to talk about it [you know  
96  I: [well that’s the point =  
97  = yes so it I just thought if somebody out of the blue if >somebody =  
98  S: [yeah  
99  I: = suddenly asks< ↓you  
100  S: [mm  
101  I: (. ) ggh you know sometimes ↑ooh wha what shall I say =  
102  S: = I [know  
103  I: [and I WONDERED if you’d had any incident like that ↑that =  
104  S: = no I ↑can’t. don’t think I have (.) but if I did have I:I’d say oh yes I do ↓believe
Question and reply 1: ‘I know the answer but…’

9.2.1 In the present passage, the interviewer begins after delays, ‘I should say’ (53) and continues to delay, firstly with pauses and then with a rushed-through insertion claiming shared knowledge because anyone would know of it, (‘obviously’, 55). She follows, not with a question but a statement, ‘I know the answer’ (56-7) and with the counterpositional and the repeated modal form that follows, ‘but I should say’ subverts epistemic authority normally due to the first speaker. The interviewer claims shared knowledge of Sally’s faith and seems to be saying, ‘I am not uniformed but I’d like to ask you questions and for you to answer as though I were’. Sally appears to answer this fulsomely - the triple ‘yes’ (59).

Mazeland and ten Have, (citing Komter, 1991 p. 98) notes of a double ‘yes’ that it is a way of a recipient to demonstrate that she has enough information, but of itself, it may be neither a relevant nor complete answer; the first speaker may need more than this to understand the turn construction as complete and may instigate a ‘repair’. Here, the interviewer makes no response to the triple ‘yes’ but continues regardless of it providing a second assertion speeding up to retain the conversational floor to do so (61). Sally replies this time with ‘no’ once more twice repeated, interrupting the interviewer’s rush-through to say this (62) adding her own rider ‘sometimes slightly shaky’ (63). A core issue for CA is that one turn constrains what can possibly come next - a speaker responds to an initial turn with an appropriate second, in reply. Repetitions to an earlier positioned turn in principle, therefore, must make at least one small change in order to indicate relevance. Here, the interviewer repeats Sally’s words (64) overlapping them and with lowered volume and this is enough to distance it from Sally’s remark. The repetition does not elicit any new information and neither party pursues the comment. The interviewer speaks the repetition

151 Clift (2006, p.574) notes that to respond with identical words and prosody may ‘warrant assumptions about one’s attention, facetiousness, or sanity’, although she cites Schegloff, (1996a) for a discussion of contexts where just such repeats are possible.
here at low volume as though she were fixing this fact for herself\textsuperscript{152}. The delays and continued talk during overlaps shows a problematic start for both interviewer (53-7) and Sally (the 59, 62) and may indicate the tensions in research interviewing to which Mazeland and ten Have refer.

**Question 2: ‘If somebody were to ask you’**

9.2.2 The interviewer asks the interview question, put into the mouth of the hypothetical enquirer. This is salient to the interviewer’s orientation to the discourse as a research interview (there is only one research question and this is it). She prefaces her question with ‘so’ (a continuation-of marker, 67-70) which positions her turn as, ‘in light of your faith affirmation, here, now, is my question’. She suggests a possible answer for Sally, ‘would you say yes yes... ’ in unambiguous, (‘hallelujah’) and specific (‘Christian’) terms. If ‘yes, yes’ does signal ‘enough information’, as discussed, then this proposed answer would indicate a complete understanding of the enquirer’s question such that Sally’s reply could be clear and unequivocal. In other words, the interviewer is suggesting that Sally would be certain. This might not be a relevant response in the immediate context of the ‘slightly shaky’ (63). Following Mazeland and ten Have, an interpretation of this passage is that Sally and the interviewer are orienting to different interactional goals. Sally responds to the interviewer with, as she sees it, a relevant answer to the question and with added information of her life-world. However, the interviewer is concerned with the entirely extra-conversational notion of the hypothetical third party enquirer. Whilst Sally sees this as the beginning of the interview and an opportunity to talk of her faith experiences, the interviewer may see it as a pre-sequence (Schegloff, 1980) preparatory only to the research question proper. Mehan (1979: 111-4, cited in Mazeland and ten Have p. 99) calls this a

\textsuperscript{152} See comment at line 20 paragraph 8.4.5 in Chapter 8.
‘getting through’ strategy. Furthermore, Sally refers to what, for her, is a real life-event, the memory of times when her faith was slightly shaky. However, the interviewer talks of a hypothetical event, a mind game\textsuperscript{153}. This demonstrates a conflict between the respondent’s and the interviewer’s interests and makes what constitutes relevance in a turn response problematic.

\textit{Reply 2: ‘what do you mean if somebody said?’}

9.2.3 Sally attempts a reply as a part two to the interviewer’s part one, ‘I would say, \textit{erm:m}’ (71) but delays answering to ask what the interviewer means and to suggest a specific question, ‘if somebody said...’ (the enquirer is still impersonal but his words are concrete, 72). She speeds up to ensure she has the floor long enough to say this. With this, Sally turns the question around into something that she can answer and she does, (75-77); this is the second answer she has given so far. She begins to answer with a delay (the lengthened ‘s’ on s:spiritual) and then makes a self-instigated-self repair changing it to ‘sort of spiritual’ Sally’s faith claim is a rather non-specific attribution of herself, which she asserts results in a specific cognition, ‘belief in God’. Sally gives no preamble or explanation or any discussion of what ‘spiritual element’ means, and the repair downgrades her first position claim to knowledge via the evidential weakening of ‘sort of’. This is not an expansive or strongly asserted claim. The interviewer responds by repeating Sally’s words back to her as Sally launches onto the second part of her turn construction (77/8) - a request for more information on Sally’s minimal faith assertion. She places strong leaned-on stress on ‘you’ (78) which might indicate an emphasis on Sally in particular, contrasting it with Sally’s ‘to me’ (76) earlier and personalising Sally’s argument. If this is the case, it

\textsuperscript{153} Mazeland and ten Have (p. 100) note that in their corpus of interviews showing a different strategic orientation, interviewers were twice as likely to use ‘categorising’ words such as ‘what sort of’ than real-life words such as ‘which one’.
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will need further justification than Sally has given so far. However, Sally gives only a minimal reply and the interviewer puts the ‘floor’ straight back to her as an opportunity for her to expand (the rising intonation on ‘right’, 80). Sally declines (81) a second time to elaborate and the interviewer must speak again. Each of the three turns (79-81) are minimal tokens indicating only an acknowledgement of the prior talk. The interviewer’s prosody at line 80 is an invitation for Sally to speak, but other than that, these turns withhold, for the interviewer, agreement, explicit understanding, or support, and for Sally, any justification for the assertion she has just made. Sally gives no further explanation as the interviewer’s repetition may be requesting, and the topic is ignored. (The speakers do not explicitly refer to this again for the whole of the interview.) The interviewer must begin all over again.

9.2.4 The interviewer asks, not of Sally’s fait h, but of the hypothetical enquirer - she is more specific and asks of an actual historical event, ‘has that ever happened’ (82). Note the limiting ‘just sort of’ and the idiomatic ‘out of the blue’ - another commonplace script formulation (Edwards 1994); the interviewer presents the hypothetical enquirer’s question here as unexpected. As Sally delays her answer (84), the interviewer asks a third time, relating the question to Sally’s life-world and personal memory, ‘can you recall a time’ (85). Sally replies with another suggestion (88) using the word, ‘affirm’, which is not linguistically neutral. Affirming one’s faith in public, witnessing to it, is a particular practice typical to certain (evangelical Protestant) Christian groups. The interviewer does not agree to Sally’s remark - her turn (89) begins with a delayer, ‘well’ (with stressed prosody), which orientates to Sally’s turn but in opposition to it and with the repeated ‘or’, seems about to suggest an alternative. However, Sally interjects, the interviewer carries on speaking, neither speaker observing the CA norm of ‘one speaker speaks at a time’, and the
interviewer’s words are inaudible. Sally speaks her repeated, ‘yes I, yes I do…yes’ (90-1) with a ‘smiley voice’ (transcribed by £ signs). The ‘smile’ in Sally’s voice is not accompanied by aspiration - there are no IPAs. Potter and Hepburn (2010) suggest IPAs perform specific interactional tasks, indexing trouble - limitation, problem, or insufficiency - in spoken descriptions. In particular they ironize a word to suggest two meanings at the same time - that the word the IPAs reference is both appropriate and problematic. This suggests a multiple orientation to Sally’s acceptance of the word ‘affirm’ at line 88, which is as it turns out. She speaks to confirm that she has had people asking her publicly of her faith and gives a definitive and relatively lengthy statement of (as it turns out) her entire faith history. However, by the time Sally gets to the end of her speech, she changes her mind, denying that she has been asked of her faith (94-5). This is an instance of the variability of discourse, and is typical to it. A speaker may entirely reverse an opinion from the beginning of a turn to the end or across different conversations, because the words may be oriented towards the achievement of different interactional or discursive aims each time.

**Question 4: ‘…wondered if you had’**

9.2.5 The interview asks, via the hypothetical enquirer for yet a fourth time - an elaborate question with four parts: ‘somebody out of the blue’; ‘suddenly asks’; ‘wha(t)’ shall I say’ and ‘wondered if you’d had…’ Sally gives a minimal acceptance token for the first two parts, replies to the third, ‘I know’ (102) and fully answers the question after the fourth part. Here she unequivocally denies an experience of the hypothetical enquirer, but begins a clear and lengthy statement of what she would say if asked, beginning with an affirmation

---

154 In Potter and Hepburn’s study (p. 6-7) they note this for a speaker’s use of the word punishment as both appropriate (this is what a local school called it), but as punishment, was being complained of at the time.
155 See for example Edwards and Potter 2000.
of faith, ‘oh yes I do believe’, (104) with stressed and down-intoned pitch, both prosodic features indicating finality and closure. She finally answers the research question at the interviewer’s (or hypothetical enquirer’s) fourth attempt. Sally’s earlier ‘I know’ (102) responds to the interviewer’s ‘you know’ slipped in before the third part of her question (101). This constructs this third part - an actively-voiced question - as one that any one might understandably ask of themselves in the circumstances described in the first two parts. Sally’s acceptance recognises this response as typical, despite the fact of her denial of an actual experience of it, ‘no I can’t’ (104) which she goes on to soften with, ‘I don’t think I have’ before directly answering. The interviewer, at the fourth attempt, has posed the enquirer’s question in direct rather than abstract terms and in an elaborate four-part construction to which Sally can finally respond.

**Posing questions**

9.2.6 Puchta and Potter (1999) in their study of focus group data, also note tensions essential to this genre of research interview. This stems from the research focus (else why would it be a focus group?) of ‘pestering the living daylights out of participants’ (p. 315) to give answers or opinions, and that of a desire for spontaneity. On the one hand, moderators need to gather categorizable data yet they want the discussion to be conversation-like. A focus group is ‘carefully planned and designed to obtain perceptions, but in a permissive atmosphere’ (Krueger, 1994:6, cited in Puchta and Potter, p. 315). Puchta and Potter suggest this creates a considerable dilemma for moderators between steering the discussion and letting it flow, between being ‘participant-controlling and participant-centred’ (p. 317); this requires skill and specialist training. Puchta and Potter note moderators balancing

---

156 Potter and Hepburn (2008, p. 21) note an instance of ‘you know’ slipped in before an actively voiced question in a ‘tale of the unexpected’ where it constructs the questioner as ‘being ordinary’.
this tension through asking two different kinds of elaborate questions. The first kind includes a candidate answer embedded in the question and is designed to help the participant with an abstract or unusual question. The second includes multiple question components, giving the participant more options to reply to, which encourages participation. In the present data, the interviewer’s opening and second question (57-8 and 69) very explicitly include an answer and are therefore of the first kind; her next two questions (82-3, 85 and 97-9, 101, 103) are of the second type. Furthermore the language of the first two questions is abstract and becomes more concrete or specific in the second two. Whether or not the interviewer in the present exchange has the same specific goals as did the moderators in Puchta and Potter’s study, this passage suggests that she balances the research interview/conversation tension via elaborate questioning in exactly the same way. The interviewer’s fourth question here, in particular, has four separate parts giving Sally the option of ‘unexpectedness’, or the ease or difficulty of a reply, or a description of an actual event, or a discussion of her faith, as a reply, at her choice. This question is successful and Sally is expansive in reply describing at length a personal story of her family upbringing.

Answering questions

9.2.7 In each of the first two occasions the interviewer asks the research question, Sally responds not with a reply, but with a statement or request. This extends the time before completion. Various writers\textsuperscript{157} note of this reply that it is a formulation, which participants employ for a variety of interactional purposes. Heritage (1985: pp. 104-108) notes three formulations: neutral prompts, summaries or restatements of the questions which are cooperative (an agreement is the preferred reply) or non-cooperative (designed to provoke or to test). Sally’s restatements (72, 88) are of the second kind because they initiate

affiliative responses from the interviewer (73-4, 89) showing a preference to agree. Furthermore, Mazeland and ten Have (1996, p. 105) note that prompts and cooperative formulations tend to lead to sequence completion exactly as they do here - Sally answers the interviewer after the affiliative token (75, 90). The affiliative formulations are a characteristic of naturalistic conversation and open research interviews, whereas the non-cooperative formulations occur in more specialist interviews, including news broadcasts. Thus, this sequence demonstrates a discourse feature that the present exchange shares with both naturalistic conversation and open interviews. At the same time, it shows the tension, causing the delay in turn completion due, the author suggests following Mazeland and ten Have, to the different and multiple orientations of the participants as research interviewer and interviewee.

9.2.8 Research interview discourse is no less ‘authentic’ than mundane or naturalistic talk but it is different. There is a different context and conversationalists orientate to this accordingly. Rapley (2001, p. 320) observes that in the conversation after an interview, when the tape has been turned off, conversationalists may offer a completely contrasting view to that they have just expressed. Interview talk is the product of a specific context, and as Heritage and Greatbach (op. cit) have studied in news broadcast interviews, these may exhibit systematic variations from other types of conversation. The passage at the beginning of Sally’s interview shows the tensions arising due to the interviewer’s need to ask a formal research question but in an affiliative and conversational manner, and to her dual footing as ‘research interviewer’ and ‘peer conversationalist’. Sally similarly balances her role as ‘interview respondent’ with ‘friendly conversationalist’. Both speakers adopt strategies to deal with this - the posing of different kinds of elaborate questions by the interviewer, and the answer formulations from Sally.
Negotiating argument in interviews

9.3 The interviewer negotiates her research question with Sally and manoeuvres it throughout four iterations. In John’s interview, she builds it up in one long turn and presents it to John. She contextualises it in the earlier prayer/meditation session\textsuperscript{158} describing it as ‘amongst friends’ (25):

Text Box 9.2

\begin{tabular}{|l|}
\hline
J: & okay [because >you know = \textcircled{((coughs))} \\
I: & we were all amongst friends< we all did it we knew that \\
26 & yeah \\
I: & but ↑1 ↑won↓dered if you were say at ↓work (.75) or wherever in the ↓pub (.) and \\
28 & the conversation got round to you know these weird people who have faith (1.0) or \\
30 & these weird people who pray or ↓whatever (1.0) and then s. and and ↑somebody \\
& suddenly got the impression that you, you perhaps ↓sometimes ↓prayed or \\
& whatever (.) and they (↑hlooked breathed word)) at ↓you and they said ↑w:what \\
& \textit{egg} do ↓you have ↑faith ↑what about ↑you are you ↑religious (.) ↑what ↑do ↑you \\
& ↑call ↑yourself what what do ↓you have ↑faith (.) and you’re >↑suddenly put on the \\
& spot and there’s ↑all these people looking at↓ you< what what do you ↓say \\
34 & J: (2.5) ↑erm hhh (1.5) I think.... continues \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Present research John: Ref J/1/23-35/9.2

9.3.1 The interviewer begins in her own voice, ‘I wondered’ (27). The personal mental state avowal here introduces her next remark not as a direct question but something more tentative and personal; additionally it positions herself as the recipient of the reply. This is the ‘wondering’ formulation referred to earlier\textsuperscript{159} and here it seems to suggest the ‘low entitlement to what is requested’ that Curl and Drew (2008) observed from their study, which is consistent with Puchta and Potter’s (1999) findings that research mediators in focus groups regularly underplay their role as formal poser of questions. The interviewer

\textsuperscript{158} See section 8.4 in Chapter 8.

\textsuperscript{159} At paragraph 8.4.3 in Chapter 8, where ‘but I thought’ was suggested as fulfilling a similar interactional concern.
appears to be levelling the dynamic between herself as interviewer and John as interviewee as she had with Sally. However, in that interview, Sally and the interviewer achieved this together, so far in John’s interview, it is the interviewer alone. It may be that the interviewer wishes simply to be more polite. Social psychological studies of the asking of questions (for example, Brown and Levinson, 1987, cited in Billig, 2001, p. 147) note that (English and American) speakers prefer to phrase their requests indirectly to avoid appearing rude. The conventions of talk-in-interaction carry a systematic code that collocutors orientate their behaviour towards and take pains not to break. For this reason, Garfinkel, (1967, cited in Billig, 2001 p. 147) claimed that the project of ethnomethodology, the study of the ‘micro-processes of life’, was an investigation of ‘practical morality’.

9.3.2 The interviewer continues with a three-part-list (27). The generalised completer comes in this case as item number two, not at the end. However, the effect is the same as discussed before - the interviewer paints a generalised scene, not one of a particular event or specific occasion. She poses the research question to John (31-34), distancing herself, using the voice of the ‘hypothetical enquirer’, and with a great deal of prosodic emphasis. With the stream of up intonations, the phrase is entirely oriented to John for his reply. It seems challenging in its opening-up to John, a sense of over to you now; and two further prosodic features reinforce this. Firstly, the two downward intonations on ‘you’ (32, 33) are emphasising - John is to answer, no one else. Secondly, the interviewer speaks the raised-pitch ‘looked at you’ (31) with an audible out breath - it contains an IPA. This emphasises and troubles ‘looked’ in some way and gives a physical quality to the ‘looking’, bringing the enquirers almost physically into the conversation making them more real and less abstract. The question is an elaborate one with several parts, giving John the option of faith,
prayer, religion or his faith identity in reply, but as much as an answer opportunity for John as it was with Sally, each is a challenge and is not neutral in its orientation to any faith statement John may be about to make. The enquirer describes the people who hold faith views, twice, as ‘weird’ (28, 29) and this contrasts to the preamble, which referred to John, Cathy and the interviewer sitting to meditate or pray earlier that morning and being amongst ‘friends’ (25)\textsuperscript{160}. Additionally, the enquirer gets the ‘impression’ (30) that John might have faith, which implies that the hypothetical conversation was not a planned discussion but that the speakers were talking about something else at the time. A final straw is that apparently there is more than one enquirer, ‘all these people’ (34) now looking at John for his reply, and the ‘all’ as an ECF has no half way position. Finally, the interviewer’s phrase, ‘put on the spot’ (33/4) is a commonplace metaphor requiring John to account for himself, to justify why on earth he might behave so oddly as to claim a faith. This context sets up an expectation that John should find a very robust argument in reply.

9.3.3 The understanding of an account in conversation as one where a speaker explains herself in response to a question posed of her is not a recent understanding within the literature on attribution theory; it is not consequential to Discursive Psychology or of Edwards and Potter’s Discursive Action Model. Rather the conversational model of attribution theory specifically addresses\textsuperscript{161} the shortcomings (as it saw it) of the limited ‘language game’ of explanation. This is where accounts as explanations are analysed only as externally causative on the one hand or of an internal disposition on the other. These researchers also note the lack of the conversational context. Hilton, (1990, 1991) notes the

\textsuperscript{160} Billig discusses (2001b, 2002) that when English speakers first learn how to be polite in language, they learn how to be rude at the same time. Parents teach this out of children at an early age and we learn to repress these forms. It may be the case that the interviewer was not able to be as challenging or rude in her own voice as she comes across here, without the device of the third person enquirer.

‘restatement’ of respondent’s task away from simple explanation of causation, via the identification of contrast or ‘counterfactuals’ set in conversation. In this view, a person explains or accounts for herself with a version of events that highlights the difference between one version of events (that of the respondent) and that of the questioner, implicit within the specific question asked and within its discursive and linguistic context. In the present case, the earlier discussion of John’s reply discussed a rhetoric-of-argumentation, where speakers position an assertion in conversation in recognition of and to debate with, competing alternatives (Billig, 1996). It appears the interviewer places her question to John in similar vein. She constructs the challenging hypothetical enquirers as a foil to John’s view. One could speculate why the interviewer poses her question in such a challenging manner - she poses it similarly to Cathy (but with yet more differences, see Appendix), but not to Sally, Joyce or Margaret. However, Section 8.4 in Chapter 8 discusses that the pre-interview chat just a few seconds before the present passage, contextualises John’s interview as one for the positioning and counter positioning of accounts, in which case, the interviewer’s question is itself a response to this positioning.

9.4 Achieving category entitlement to ease of answering

The analysis of Sally’s interview shows the tensions arising from asking a formal interview question but in a conversational context, and in John’s session, the challenging way it may be asked when actively voiced by a third person. In contrast, the passage in Text Box 9.3 below shows how the interviewer poses the same research question to Margaret, this time constructing a category entitlement to ease of answering:

---

162 at section 6.4 in Chapter 6.
163 See discussion at paragraphs 7.1.9-10 in Chapter 7.
Text Box 9.3

I: .hh erm (0.5) ggh and I’ve I’ve ↑ real↓ly I have had some ↑ wonderful ↓ conversations with people, people’s faith, I mean it’s ↑ just so inter↓esting .hhh and I ↑ usually start out (.) by asking a ↑ quite up front quest (h) ion ((laughing word)) ↑ which is some↓times quite hard for people to a↑ nsw↓ er but I ↑ think in your case it ↑ might ↑ not ↑ be ↑ the ↑ sa↓ me because< .hhh it’s ↑ this it’s (.) that (.) it’s really how ↑ you would describe your faith (1.0) if someone > that you didn’t know perhaps you met at a < ↓ par↑ ty > [and they =
M: yeah
I: = didn’t know ↑ who you were< .hh and they ↑ suddenly said out of the ↓ blue ↑ ↑ oh (0.25) ↑ do ↓ you have a ↓ faith ↑ then or are [ you religious =
M: [mm
I: = or [> whatevel↑ er and I just wondered<
M: [mm
I: (.) .hh what would you sa:a↓ y if they [i:if =
I: = if they suddenly said ↑ well ↑ you ↓ kno↑ w ↑ what ↑ about ↑ you ↓ then
M: mm
I: if we’d maybe they’re discussing terroists n ↑ Mus↓ limbs and things
M: mm
I: and they would suddenly turned round [and said
M: ↑ [y↑ es
I: well well .hh↑ how ↑ would ↑ you describe your↑ self ↓ then
M: [y.. yes
I: ↑ what ↑ what would you ↑ sa:a↓ y
M: well certainly I would say that I do and that I can’t remember a time when I didn’t have .hhh erm
I: ggh [yes

Present research Margaret: Ref M/1/89-114/9.3

9.4.1 This passage was discussed in Chapter 7 which noted the interviewer constructing Margaret to an entitlement of ease of reply to the research question. In addition to the points made there the present discussion notes the interviewer including the words, ‘they didn’t know who you were’ (97) which do not appear in any of the other interviews. This implies that identity and entitlements inform the manner in which individuals construct assertions and questions in speech. The interviewer returns to her own voice to say ‘I just wondered’ (100) using the same mental state avowal as she had with John. As discussed there, this is more polite than ‘asking’. However, with Margaret, the interviewer adds ‘just’ which is missing from John’s interview. ‘Just’ limits the interviewer’s question not only to one of personal pondering, but personal pondering only. Margaret’s questioner has been
considerably less challenging than she was with John and actively supportive. The interviewer completes her question with downward intonation and lengthening of the vowel on ‘sa:ay’; these are two of the canonical cues for turn final (Duncan 1972). However, without pause the interviewer begins again and asks the question a second time, in the enquirer’s voice. As she did with John, the interviewer refers to the enquirer in the singular, as somebody but in the third person plural, ‘they’. This reinforces the impersonal and generalised nature of the enquirer. Unlike with John, she adds a context for the discussion (‘terrorists n Muslims and things’ - a generalised three-part list, 105) and that Margaret and the interviewer might have been a part of this discussion (although the interviewer makes a change of footing as she says this - ‘we’d’ and ‘they’re’, 105). The context gives a reason why the question is genuinely difficult removing the personal challenge that the hypothetical enquirer makes to John; however, the notion of unexpectedness is retained - ‘suddenly turned round’ (‘suddenly’, used three times - 97, 103, 107). Again the earlier conversational model of attribution theory includes the notion that accounts-as-explanation are called for when something is unexpected or unusual (Lalljee, 1981). If the hypothetical enquirer seems surprised at Margaret’s faith, then Margaret must account for herself to explain this ‘difference’. In this case, justifying one’s position in contrast to another is understood as foundational, and the attribution of causality or a personal disposition secondary, or a special case.

As the earlier discussion of this passage notes, the interviewer’s words in posing the question in the way she does (particularly the turn with herself, 91-3) not only wards of potential disagreement with Margaret (that she will find the question tricky) but promotes agreement through constructing Margaret as one who is in a position to reply. She politely
asks her research question and distances it from the personal challenge that it is for John. This informs Margaret’s subsequent interview throughout.

9.5 CONCLUSION

The present chapter addresses two concerns: Interview as topic, the place where participants manage the research question and negotiate an answer; and secondly the contextualisation this has within the subsequent research session. There are clear differences between the various interviews in how the question is posed and how participants orientate to these differences. The handling of the research question is as much a part of the discursive process as is the pre-interview chat, discussed in the previous chapter. Whatever theoretical framework underlies the interview process, it is a strategic event that participants manage, meeting their interactional, discursive and rhetorical aims. The present chapter has discussed how participants achieve this in different ways. The interviewer and Sally respond to two discourse talk-in-interaction genres at the same time, formal interview and friendly chat. The interviewer manages this by asking elaborate questions and Sally through making formulaic replies, both constructing affiliatory and supportive responses with a preference to agree. The tension continues until Sally finally makes her faith assertion and begins the series of long turns systematically designed often, although not always, in storied from through which she warrants this assertion. In John’s case, both participants orientate to a rhetoric-of argumentation where any assertion, including the research question, is placed into the conversation in recognition of the need to account for oneself. The interviewer initially achieves this through the stratagem of the hypothetical enquirer, which enables her to pit a robust challenge to John that she may not have managed in her own voice. John orientates to the multiple recipients of his faith
account, designing his long turns in modal and storied forms, in a dialect-of-justification for his stance. Margaret’s interview session is different again. In the very placing of her question, the interviewer constructs Margaret with an entitlement towards it and Margaret responds to create contrast structures of her own, supporting the interviewer’s initial assertion and warranting her mature faith account. However, the notion that she must account for her own version of events in contrast to other alternatives is retained, due to the hypothetical enquirer’s apparent ‘surprise’ at Margaret’s faith, which appears, seemingly, as unexpected.
Chapter 10

An assessment of the discursive psychology perspective for faith and its empirical study

10.1  Overview and setting

The thesis began with two classic accounts for the understanding of faith from within the perspective of the psychology of religion. In each case, faith is understood as a discrete and real aspect of the intra-psychic environment. Gordon Allport located immature and mature faith within an extrinsic and intrinsic motivation of the personality; and James Fowler considered faith an organisation of the intra-psychic complex that moves from one discriminably different stage to another as the psyche/faith develops. For both accounts, the present thesis has argued there are conceptual and psychometric concerns. The psychological account of personal religious faith is complex, diffuse and variable and its identification as a unique phenomenon of the intra-psychic environment is difficult. Moreover, classically, the measurement of this faith, either via a written questionnaire or semi-structured interview is dependent on a referential view of language, which ignores the functional (Austin, 1975) and social action (Wittgenstein, 1953) purposes of speech. The thesis has argued the relevance of the ‘turn to language’ in the study of faith and following Kenneth Gergen, a theoretical perspective of social construction to inform its study. The thesis discusses a paper of James Day (1993) who has argued that ‘belief is best understood in terms of the words and other signs that people use to perform it’ and he advocates a constructionist view that ‘to speak means both to be spoken into being and to transform what it is that being and speaking can mean’. He calls for a narrative approach to the study
of faith as it provides ‘an intellectual and methodological opportunity for psychologists of religion’. However, the present thesis has discussed that Day’s position in this study is rather one of critical realism than the radical constructionism he proposes. Furthermore there are concerns with the rigour of his data analysis as he does not capture the speech data within its original discursive context.

10.2  A discussion of three conceptual ‘benefits’ of a social construction perspective to the study of faith

10.2.1  The present study has attempted a constructionist perspective for its empirical study of personal faith and a first advantage of this approach is that it avoids the problem referred to above, of definition of the psychological constituents of faith, whether social or cognitive, required of an essentialist or realist perspective. Across the disciplines, debate is joined regarding the meaning or features of the categories that define various psycho-social phenomena and the sheer variability of this defies both consensus and measurement. SC avoids this because reality in this perspective is what passes for reality, what social agents construe it to be. In this account, the features that define membership to the identity category, ‘a person of faith’ are in the first instance that member’s own concern and to ‘work-up’ an account with a personal attribution to the category of ‘having faith’ is to treat a person as having faith and to orientate one’s speech to this to the purposes of the spate of talk at hand. The non-essentialist approach allows consideration of the various ‘definitions’ for faith offered by the participants of the present study. For Sally, this is a ‘spiritual element’ which continues whether or not a person expresses a faith belief, and which is visible in mundane human action and behaviour. For John, it is variously an extrinsic faith and a way to understand, cope with, or deal with life, a systematic practice, teachings or an
approach and ultimately to do with his self. For Margaret it is a kind of intuitive knowledge of which she has never consciously been without; an intrinsic faith with a purpose of growing and developing herself as a complete person. Finally, for Joyce it is the fact of divine providential activity on earth which anyone can observe and respond to as they choose. No single definition for faith could capture this conceptual range. There are radical implications of this understanding of ‘non-definition’. Some argue (Schegloff, 1997) that to define the object of study prior to research is to restrict that research to confirm (or reject) only that concept, that research can only inform the researcher of what she already believes to be the case. This could be a basis for some critique of Fowler’s FDT, that he finds the faith stages that he does only because he has predetermined to find them. The constructionist perspective in contrast is that what participants themselves make relevant is relevant and the problem of definition is resolved.

10.2.2 A second benefit is that it locates the psychological phenomenon of faith within an understanding of psychological consciousness and selfhood as social process, with roots going back through William James’s stream of consciousness to the ‘forensic self’ of John Lock (see discussion in Middleton and Brown, 2005). This is the understanding of memory as the process whereby an individual connects themselves to a continuity through time. A person exercises choice and selects those items for recollection from personal experience that are best fitted to current and ongoing concerns and activities. In this manner, memory is not primarily about collecting and storing mental representations of the real world but is a ‘practical use of [the] intellect… [where] forgetting is as important a function as recollecting’ (William James, 1950: 679, quoted in Middleton and Brown, p. 13).
Middleton and Brown observe that to approach memory as a social concern is to ‘knock at an open door’ and ‘a truism’ (p.13). William Bartlett (1932) followed this approach in a now classic understanding of memory, \textit{Remembering}^{164}: \textit{A Study in Experimental and Social Psychology}. For Bartlett, the purpose of memory is ‘\textit{communicative action}’ which takes precedence over notions of reproductive accuracy. Memories that take reproductions of everyday life are ‘\textit{by the way and incidental to our main occupations}’. We discuss, says Bartlett,

\begin{quote}
‘\textit{with other people what we have seen...that they may value or criticise our impressions with theirs. There is normally no directed and laborious effort to secure accuracy. We might mingle interpretation with description, interpolate things not originally present, transform without effort and without knowledge}’.
\end{quote}


This is not a social construction nor discursive psychology perspective, but it does highlight the functional process of memory, to connect an individual with the real world and with others in it and for psychological purposes. Furthermore it removes it from intentional cognition as traditionally understood - this is a social and public process. This perspective could well inform the understanding of the first data passage presented in the present study (Text Box 4.1 in Chapter 4). Sally begins her faith account recollecting a family story that must have salience to her enterprise, else why tell it? Furthermore, this account, located in specifically chosen details of her family’s experience in Wales - the poverty, the hardship, the looking out for others - is successful in accounting for her faith in a way that her earlier answers to the interviewer’s questions were not. Bartlett queries the result of the remembering process as an organised mental representation designated with (his own) term ‘\textit{schema}’. In a move similar to that discussed in Chapter 5, of the present thesis where

\footnote{164 Note the term for the process of memory: re-member-ing.}
‘scripts’ as mental representations are re-specified as discursive ‘formulations’, Bartlett rejects ‘schema’ and favours ‘organised setting’:

‘I strongly dislike the term ‘schema’...it does not indicate what is very essential to the whole notion, that the organised mass results of past changes of position and posture are actively doing something all the time; are so to speak carried along with us, complete, through developing, from moment to moment. It would probably be best to speak of ‘actively developing patterns’; but the word ‘pattern’... has its own difficulties; and it like ‘schema’ suggests a greater articulation of detail than is normally found. I think ‘organised setting’ approximates most closely and clearly to the notion required.’

Bartlett (1932: 201) quoted in Middleton and Brown, 2005 p. 17 (‘doing’ in italics in the original).

It seems Bartlett has concerns with ‘schema’ similar to those the present thesis discusses in Chapter 1 for the ‘stages’ in Fowler’s (FDT) theory for a developing faith. In the FDT the emphasis is on *stasis*, the development of one recognised and discrete pattern or intra-psychic stage into another and the achievement thereby of the resources or strengths (or ‘virtues’) characteristic to that level. What Bartlett seems to stress in ‘organised setting’ is that the complex of cognition and affect are located within and dependent on the particularities of the local, historic and cultural environment. Since our relations with this are in constant change, so too are the attitudes and psychological interests represented in them. The emphasis is on the ‘doing’ of transformation.

10.2.3 The third benefit of the present study’s conceptual perspective is that it gives an opportunity to engage with the implications of the non-referential theoretical perspective to language, in practice. It is an attempt to explore, with the rigour of empirical study, the implications of Wittgenstein’s ‘language game’ in natural speech and thereby the intentions
of the turn-to-language of the first cognitive turn in psychology. Edwards and Potter take memory as a social process that ‘does things’ as the starting point for their study of ‘Chancellor Lawson’s memory’ (1992). However, in contrast to Bartlett and more specifically Neisser, (1978, and the extended arguments of perceptual-cognitivism) they take the notion further. Rather than regarding memory as the unique process for the relation of self with culture set against realist events, the whole of cognition is re-specified. Via the mundane activity of quotidian talk this approach enables a reconceptualisation of many of the fundamental concerns of traditional psychology, realising psychological entities and processes as discursive phenomena. This is the project of discursive psychology and the prospect it allows is the understanding of what participants do with the various concerns of their psychological intentionality, what purposes they serve, why they are relevant and how speakers achieve and practice them. The language game is the arena where this is played out.

The first issue for the present study is how to conduct empirical research set within this perspective and this is the topic of the next section.

10.3 A discussion of methodology for an empirical study of discursive psychology

10.3.1 Methodological concerns for a constructionist study arise on two counts. Firstly, the academic discussion that describes social construction (SC) as a philosophical position does not explain how to go about its study in practice. It offers, in some detail, a critique of modernist empirical methods but does not supply an alternative. The post-modernist framework that embraces SC (and this is the second reason) may deny the privileging of the
scientific method itself as the way to knowledge and to truth statements of the real world.

This, the analytic philosopher Paul Boghossian terms, the doctrine of equal validity defined as:

‘There are many radically different, yet “equally valid” ways of knowing the world, with science being just one of them’ (Boghossian, 2006 p. 2).

Thus, Roger Anyon, a British archaeologist commenting on the difference between the Zuni people’s understanding of the world and that of the western world observes:

Science is just one of many ways of knowing the world. [The Zunis’ world view] is just as valid as the archaeological view point of what prehistory is about’ (quoted in Boghossian, op. cit. p. 2).

And Boghossian quotes Larry Zimmerman, also an archaeologist observing:

‘I personally do reject science as a privileged way of seeing the world’ (p. 2).

The philosopher, Paul Feyerabend makes the problem explicit in his work entitled ‘Against Method’:

‘First-world science is one science among many’ (Feyerabend 1993 quoted in Boghossian p.3)

Kathleen Lennon, a philosopher interested in mind/body and gender theory writes:

Feminist epistemologists, in common with many other strands of contemporary epistemology, no longer regard knowledge as a neutral transparent reflection of an independent existing reality, with truth and falsity established by transcendent procedures of rational assessment’ (Lennon, 1997, quoted in Boghossian p. 6).

Finally, Barnes and Bloor, writing on relativism from the perspective of the sociology of knowledge observe:
‘For the relativist there is no sense attached to the idea that some standards of beliefs are really rational as distinct from merely locally accepted as such. Because he thinks that there are no cultural free or super-cultural norms of rationality he does not see rationally and irrationally held beliefs as making up two distinct and qualitatively different classes of thing’ (Barnes and Bloor, 1982, 21-47).

If post-modernism denies rational and irrational thinking as separate and distinct categories and that there is no one transcendent procedure for establishing knowledge - science being only one method among many, then ‘anything goes’ and the problem of methodology within an empirical science such as psychology, is made starkly clear.

10.3.2 The present study has pursued an approach that looks for knowledge defined as the ‘process of achieving knowledge’ and knowledge in this account is found through observation of how speakers work up their versions of the world and the truths and realities of it, and agree this with another in public discourse. This is an epistemic constructionist perspective and its discourse method is to show not how ‘anything goes’ but how a particular assertion goes and how it is achieved, warranted and agreed within a specific, localised setting of conversation. Whilst there may indeed be many versions of these assertions, the thesis argues for the significance and relevance of the particular version agreed. This is not any version, but the account in which a speaker has stake and interest and for which (s)he is psychologically accountable. In this manner, the thesis claims, the speech between conversationalists in dialogue achieves or makes available the very psychological phenomena relevant to it. This is a re-specification of personal knowledge away from knowledge-as-fact that a speaker possesses after ‘empirical’ study, to knowledge-as-process. It is a movement away from intra-psychic knowledge from its ‘internal’ location, part of the private intentionality and cognitive processes and constructs
of the individual, reforming it as discursive knowledge, locally situated and publicly available to both speaker and academic psychologist alike. Therefore, the present thesis is indifferent to what may be called a ‘rational’ or ‘irrational’ basis for a faith belief, in the sense that these are not terms relevant to its account, or embraced within its rhetoric, and a critique on this basis is not coherent with its theoretical position. This is the same argument as that for the fallibility of memory (discussed at paragraph 2.2.1 in Chapter 2) - the realist critique that to ask individuals for their personal life-stories is to rely on memories understood as facts that are either ‘true’, or more often than not, entirely ‘wrong’.

Constructionists privilege the view that events of the external world, or accounts of our intra-psychic reality are contingent upon our practical interests and social involvement, over one of correspondence to the world ‘as it is for and of itself’. This understanding recognises that while there may be different accounts for the same thing they are held for ‘rational’, but different ‘reasons’ (using these terms within their own rhetoric) by different individuals and groups at different places and times. Boghossian expresses this that for SC, ‘the rationality of a given belief is never solely a function of the evidence that there may be for it’ (op. cit. p. 24) which however is a realist rhetoric. A discursive account is to say ‘the different reasons men give for their actions are not themselves without reasons’ (Mills, 1940: 904 quoted earlier in Chapter 3); and CA: ‘accounts of truth and reality are an oriented-to production occasioned and fit-for-purpose within the talk-in-interaction to hand’. This is a different kind of reality and the claims to knowledge reflect a different understanding of what constitutes knowledge and reality itself. It is not an ontological claim; it does not address issues of the world ‘as it is and of itself’ - the knowledge of or that, but more practical - the knowledge how. In a sense, participants in talk ‘mould’ their
own realities to fit the work required of it at the time. The present study is of how participants in conversation derive and construct their knowledge claims and the implications of this for academic study.

10.3.3 The philosophical account of social construction does not provide the systematic analysis as to how individuals ‘do’ construction work; however this is the focus of ethnomethodology. Schegloff (1988) notes of Erving Goffman (1959), ‘...in registering certain events and aspects of events as worthy of notice and available to acute and penetrating interpretation... materialised...a subject matter to study’ (p. 90). This domain was one of ‘noticing, and...knowing how to provide the first line of descriptive grasp of what [was] noticed.’ Through observation, Goffman realised the whole of ordinary social and linguistic exchange as a systematic organisation, highly structured and determining, through and in which individuals live out their lives. Thus Goffman (1967:2): ‘the proper study of interaction is not the individual and his psychology, but the syntactical relations among the acts...’. Goffman’s work was to ‘bracket for description... a unit of social activity... found naturalistically in ordinary human inter-action’ and this provides ‘one natural empirical way to study interaction of all kinds’ (1967:20). This is the systematic ‘doing’ of social activity in conversational exchange. Harvey Sacks’ subsequent interest in conversation was not due to a theoretical paradigm for talk but to its place as the arena for social activity and the quantities of research data immediately and constantly available:

‘It was not from any large interest or from some theoretical formulation of what should be studied that I started from tape recorded conversation, but simply because I could get my hands on it and I could study it again and again, and also consequentially, because others could look at what I had studied and make of it what they could, if, for example, they wanted to disagree with me’.

Sacks 1984: 26
The complexity of mundane speech is immediately apparent from its close analysis; talk-in-interaction is detailed, systematic and organised with a complexity that is not random or irrelevant. DA/CA locates its analytical conclusions through its observation of this organisation, evidentially on display in the talk at hand. A CA project in particular is positivistic or empiricist in this regard. The goal of CA is to explore the dynamics of interaction and to identify objective and recurrent patterns found in turn-by-turn conversation; the focus of the present study is the psychological themes that this dynamic realises. As a DP project, the present study is not one of CA but it has employed CA methods (not exclusively) in its discourse analysis and this brings CA into critical comparison with other systematic accounts of talk.

10.4. Two methodological critiques of CA

10.4.1 CA is too ‘narrow’: Because CA concentrates exclusively on the ‘here-and-now’ of the immediate spate of talk, specifically on the technical aspects of turn management, critical analysts argue that it cannot address the equally important big picture - the historical, cultural and political dynamics of human interaction, and that its analysis is uninformed by wider social and political theoretical considerations. The CA counter-argument is firstly that unless researchers ground their analysis in the conversations before them, then any ‘brought-to’ analytic categories may be imposed, not derived from the data. Schegloff (1997) observes that this could obscure what is actually relevant to the participants themselves in what they, at that moment, are doing. He argues that from the first, it is the place in its turn-taking context that determines the significance of a particular

---

spate of talk. He asserts that whilst any individual utterance taken analytically might have a multiple interpretation within an academic or wider theoretical context, within the conversation at hand it is meaningfully understood only in reference to that, in which case the participants themselves will demonstrate what the implications of the utterance are (1984, p. 34; 1997 p.178). Furthermore for Schegloff, not only is the participants’ orientation necessary, the consequences of the supposed feature must also be visible in the talk. That is, an analyst holds off making an ascription of whatever the participants appear to be doing or whatever category memberships are available, until and unless this is observed as relevant within the ongoing talk. To demonstrate his argument, Schegloff discusses an excerpt of talk where a man appears to interrupt a woman before she has finished speaking. One way to interpret this is in terms of the undoubted power and value asymmetries of gender in society. However, if this ignores that overlapping turns in conversation are common, as speakers manipulate turn change in a variety of discrete, significant and observable ways to suit a particular interactive purpose, then this activity, (in this case the making and receiving of an assertion) would be overlooked. Schegloff asks if the interpretation based on a social theory of gender misses ‘what [the conversation] was demonstrably about in the first instance - for the parties can compelling critical discourse analysis sacrifice that?’ (1997, p. 178 italics in the original). Furthermore, in the piece of talk at hand, there might be a number of different discourses other than gender, how is the analyst to know which extra-conversational discourse is motivating participants’ speech? Finally, it is precisely through the details of the interaction that ‘narrow’ CA analysis reveals the ‘wider’ categories of social discourse and this gives the empirical warrant to a researcher’s claims. A second rejoinder to the charge of narrowness therefore, is that a CA
informed DA is capable of demonstrating empirically wider social issues including those of identity and power. Antaki and Widdicombe (1998) include in their collection on identity, a series of studies which show just this. In a very detailed analysis Wooffitt and Clarke (1998) for example, demonstrate how the manipulation of mundane epistemics in dialogue can create an identity for Doris Stokes, a well known and rather successful spiritual medium. These researchers ground their analysis in the close analysis of overlapping talk during a theatre performance and show how Doris Stokes makes slight but strategically important manipulations to her replies to her listeners’ assertions/answers. By this means, the authors can demonstrate how Doris Stokes makes a stance of prior knowledge to the information given her during the show, which supports her claim that she was speaking to a spiritual informer prior to the performance and that as a consequence, she is what she claims to be.

10.4.2 CA is not a-theoretical, ideologically neutral and ‘participant lead’ but has an implicit theoretical bias: Michael Billig (1999 a, b) contests CA’s claim that it is a-theoretical, explicating the data on participants’ own terms without prior theorising. He argues that CA, in rejecting social theories of disparity of power to warrant its conclusions, implicitly assumes one of equality, that interactions in talk are between two equal participants of potentially equal status and access to the conversational floor. CA’s own rhetoric of ‘participant’, ‘member’ and the nomenclature of the transcription itself, reinforces this. As a result, CA is overly optimistic, ‘politically naïve’ and potentially ‘seriously awry’ (1999a p.555). Billig argues that researchers do not adopt a participant lead analysis in practice since they describe speakers’ talk as consisting of ‘adjacency pairs’
or ‘preference structures’ and so on, yet this is clearly utterly alien to how speakers actually regard their speech. Billig argues (1991:16-18) from the perspective of rhetorical psychology that CA is theoretically unprepared to discuss the issues (including those of social inequalities, political disadvantage or religious faith) that people actually talk about. This is because discourse (in the view of rhetorical psychology) is primarily one of rhetorical argument, of the placing and opposing of ideological ‘positions’ that informs all talk and to which CA’s own ideology and formal rhetoric cause it to disattend, whatever else may be going on in the mechanics of interaction.

Schegloff’s rebuttal of the first critique is to cite from the foundational paper on the basics of turn-taking in CA - Sachs et al. (1974), to show that CA explicitly does not presume equality but it does allow for it (1999 p. 564). CA’s practices are not rules that individuals slavishly follow but conventions, designed to be flexible to allow for differences in biases, preferences (as participants’ concerns) and access to the all important conversational floor. Data from the present study illustrate this point:

From Text Box 4.1

104 S: = no I ↑can’t. don’t think I have (?) but if I did have I: I’d say oh yes I do ↓believe (.75) erm (.25) ↓you know it ↑started off when I was younger...

Present research Sally: Ref S/1/104-5/4.1

The discussion of the above excerpt (at section 4.3.2 in Chapter 4) notes that Sally’s line ‘you know it started off when I was younger’ (105) is Sally’s ‘bid for the floor’. She essays for a longer turn, even several turns, to finish her construction. This is a negotiation of the turn taking process, precisely to manage the differing expectations of speakers’ rights
underlying the talk. In various ways, the participants create an expectation that there will be differences in floor time for the participants and this is evidentially on display in the ensuing conversations, both in the amount of time and of the one-sidedness of the resultant talks. As Goodwin and Heritage (1990) note, forms of ‘talk-in-interaction’ allow for instances of ‘specialised communicative contexts analysable as ‘embodying systematic variations from conversational procedures’’ (p. 289). Furthermore CA study has shown that the very identity that one speaker has to speak or to defer to the other in talk (for example to ascribe expert or professional status) is one which is itself worked-up by speakers in the conversation. Turn taking is a context-free principle for conversation. Speakers undertake conversation in a variety of genres and institutions and therefore any structure or apparatus used to support this must be context free. The ‘general abstractedness of the turn’ gives local particularisation potential’ (Sacks et. al.1974 p. 700); the paired adjacencies in turns in conversation are thus both context-free yet utterly context sensitive. One speaker will speak and a second speaker will demonstrate his understanding of what speaker A was doing or saying in his turn and what is expected of him as an appropriate response. What speaker B actually replies depends upon his understanding of the situation and his reply will demonstrate this. This allows for the huge variation of turn taking behaviour that we see in actual speech - it is utterly dependent on the local conversation and participants concerned. This gives it enormous potential both for the local construction of otherwise ‘brought-to’ discourses and for interactional work.

Schegloff dismisses (1999 p. 564) the critique that CA dissembles when claiming to interpret participants’ actions in their own terms. He accepts that the terminology is not
from participants’ vocabulary, but he continues to assert that the warrant for analysts’
claims reference the ways participants display what they take to be relevant in the
interaction. This is evidentially on display in the close analysis of the talk itself, however
analysts describe it. The present author adds that Billig, as a rhetorician, will know that
speakers place any argument from within its rhetoric, including Billig’s own. This critique
then diverts the comparison of CA and rhetorical psychology into one of whichever meta-
narrative the disputants hold and that cannot resolve the argument. Rhetorical psychology
takes the view that ideology informs argumentative talk in turn-taking speech, rather than
the other way round but it does not hold from this that CA cannot handle disputes and
arguments; Wooffitt (2005, p. 166-7) reviews several CA studies which do just this.
Furthermore CA research has shown the ‘preference to agree’ in interaction designed to
handle difference not agreement as it enables participants to offer an opposing view without
hindrance to the smooth flow of conversation. Finally, the present study has offered
analysis of passages of talk (in Text Box 6.7 in Chapter 6 and in Text Box 7.7 in Chapter 7)
and has discussed that speakers are able to design their speech to counter potential
objections before they are given. The present author bases her conclusions on the detailed
observation of these passages and the talk around them. An a priori methodological
framework for argument is not a necessary condition for this analysis.

10.5 **Arguments from post-structural discourse analysis for a combined CA/DA
approach**

A nuanced critique of an exclusive CA approach is that it can overlook discourse that
is oriented to the wider picture of power and value structures in society. This is Margaret
Wetherell’s argument (1998) to include the ‘top-down’ post-structuralist discussion of
discourse as ‘texts’ alongside the CA informed ethnomethodological approach. This would allow, she suggests, the exploration of those wider discourses and how participants in dialogue orientate themselves to them, particularly in constructions and negotiations of self. This approach allows the detailed empirical rigour that CA offers to inform the discussion of ideology in society, and recognises that participants in turn-taking dialogue might orientate themselves to the manifestations of power inequalities, and other influences of culture, of gender, ethnicity, class, and so on, in addition to the immediate linguistic context (see for example, Fairclough, 1992 1995; van Dijk, 1993). This approach understands the participants in a conversation as social agents and constituted by ‘subject positions ...

constructed by diversity of discourses’ (Mouffe, 1992 p. 372):

‘The ‘identity’ of such a multiple and contradictory subject is therefore always contingent and precarious, temporarily fixed at the intersection of those subject positions and dependent on specific forms of identification... We have to approach [the social agent] as a plurality, dependent on the various subject positions through which it is constituted within various discursive formations’.


This approach allows that words are not only the representation of a person’s actions in speech, but come laden-down with the baggage of their historical use - they are meaning saturated (see, for example, Coyle, 2000, Parker 1988). Wooffitt reviews this discussion (2005 pp. 171ff) giving the discourse data from several studies. While it might appear that these wider discourses might contribute to the empirical analysis, Wooffitt concludes that many studies tend to focus on respondent’s turns as a single speech unit independent of prior turns. Yet CA research has consistently shown how prior turns (not necessarily the one immediately preceding) invariably connect to and inform subsequent turns. Wooffitt privileges participants’ speech constructions as ‘interactionally generated objects’. His
argument is essentially the same as Schegloff’s, that by attending to extra-conversational discourses, ‘the interactional circumstances in which - and for which - the utterances were originally produced’, are obscured (2005 p. 172 ‘in’ and ‘for’ in italics in the original). A relevant instance of this from the present study is the passage from Chapter 8, section 8.4.4:

From Text Box 8.3

| 12  | I: .hh and (.75) we’re ↑just gonna chat really I mean there’s ↑no sort of pre-set questions or (.75) there’s no sort of (.) set agenda or anything going on it’s ↑just (.) your, what you want to ↓say .hh but I: I ↑thought just to start us ↓off >it was ↑lovely → by the way starting off with prayer< wasn’t ↑it (.) I mean what an appropriate way to start it
| 14  | J: I didn’t. (.) I ↑did↓n’t start off with prayer [(.)25] I started with medi↑ta↓tion
| 18  | I: [well I meant, Present research John: Ref J/1/12-18/8.3

The discussion of this passage noted an interpretation of John’s account and his rhetoric-of-argumentation, in light of the interviewer’s earlier ‘noticing’ prefaced with the phrase, ‘by the way’ (15) which marks out her assertion to prayer as significant. A second example is the passage from Margaret’s speech from Chapter 9, section 9.3:

From Text Box 9.3

| 90  | I: .hh erm (0.5) ggh and I’ve I’ve ↑real↓ly I have had some ↑wonderful ↓conversations with people, people’s faith, I mean it’s ↑just so inter↓esting .hhh and I ↑usually start out (.) by asking a ↑quite up front quest (h) ion ((laughing word)) >which is ↓some↓times quite hard for people to a↑nswer but I ↑think in your case it ↑might → ↑not ↑be ↑the ↑sa↓me because< .hhh it’s ↑this it’s (.)

Present research Margaret: Ref M/1/89-93/9.3

The discussion of this passage noted that Margaret’s use of contrast structures to compare herself with others who might not find it ‘quite so easy [as herself]’ (287) is made in the
context of the interviewer’s already suggesting this to Margaret as she sets up the research question.

With Widdicombe (1995:62) Wooffitt argues that unless analysts secure their conclusions in the detail of interaction, then what appears to be analysis can be either common sense description, or ‘ascriptivism’, where the researcher imputes a discourse from their research interest to a dialogue without empirical warrant. Finally, the problem remains of which discourse is the one motivating participants’ speech. In the passage from Text Box 9.3 quoted above, and as Chapter 7 discusses, there may be many reasons why Margaret’s case should be different. However, reference to an extra-conversational discourse such as cultural attitudes to ministers of the cloth to explicate this passage, might overlook the interviewer’s earlier positioning. However, as Margaret goes on to answer the interviewer’s question (Text Box 7.1) she uses the expression that her faith is ‘gifted’ to her. Whilst Chapter 7 discusses this phrase by reference to Margaret’s turn, nevertheless it also notes the wider connotations of the concept ‘gift’ both as a one-word metaphor and within the discourse of Christian faith and is sympathetic to these wider meanings. Finally, the topic of Chapter 9 is that the dual orientation to the local interaction and to the extra-conversational requirements of the formal research interview, distract research participants. This section concludes therefore that it may be appropriate to include an extra-conversational discourse along side the interactional analysis, and that this can contribute to a full explication of the passage of talk at hand. The final issue to consider in this section is the study’s use of the research interview rather than naturalist conversation to gather its data.
10.6  A discussion of the limitations and opportunities of research interviews:

There is no doubt that the interview format of the present study restricts its capacity to exploit the power of a CA analytical framework for two reasons: the relative absence of the turns-at-talk and hence the proof-procedure for CA; and the footing of the interviewer as receiving answers from her interviewee on behalf of an un-addressed audience. This limits her capacity to engage as a participant in the talk-in-interaction. Both these are essential to a CA informed analysis since CA warrants its claims on the engagement of all participants at the turn, which simultaneously reveals how they manage the turn, what they understand of it and the consequences of the action. The sessions as interviews therefore are not ideal. However, the analytical approach of the present study has included, as well as the analysis of the turn (where possible) the identification of patterns and regularities within the longer passages of monologue and has asked, ‘why are these here in the form that they are?’ and ‘what might this talk achieve for the speaker?’ and has related this to surrounding talk from either speaker. The interview format therefore with its longer passages of ‘conversational monologue’ has aided this analysis in two specific ways. Firstly, the interview approach is of the ‘narrative’ style recommended by Mishler, where the interviewer cedes the floor to her collocutor with the stream of continuers. This design is not so as to gather ‘categorizable data’ from a study ‘respondent’ but to allow the speaker the ‘space’ to elaborate, work-up and justify her account in her own style and choosing. If a study participant is given an opportunity to account for herself just as she wishes, this gives the analyst the opportunity to observe it. Secondly, with the strategy of the hypothetical enquirer, the interviewer makes the foil against which a respondent warrants her reply, explicit. This is not any faith account, but the one made in response to and elicited by the
interview question as constructed in each particular research session. This is consistent with
the conversational model of attribution theory, which understands an assertion (explanation
or exoneration) as given in reply to an alternative ‘do you have a faith when...most
reasonable people do not believe?’ for example, or any other counterpositional or counter
factual view. The hypothetical enquirer asks participants to account for themselves and the
study has assumed that this is exactly what participants have done. The pre-interview chat
and the manner of the enquirer’s question therefore locate the subsequent analysis and the
thesis has discussed how this differs for the individual study participants.

This review of the study’s methods and approach concludes that a DP framework for
analysis, and the CA informed DA method, is flexible and adaptable for the analysis of the
construction of faith accounts understood as discursive phenomena set in the local context
of narrative interviewing. The study’s method is empirically rigorous and systematic,
capable of analysis of a complete range of interactional achievement between two people in
dialogue. Its focus is the precise observation of tropes in talk, revealing social exchange to
an extraordinary degree, locating its claims in the rigorous examination of the data to hand,
as transcribed. Of all the methodologies for studying discourse, CA/DA is the most able to
make its claims based on the warrant of detailed and systematic observation of the data.
This is an evidence-based study however we define ‘evidence’ and the ‘claim’ which it
justifies. This approach, the study concludes, particularly when broadened to include some
aspects of DA, as noted, makes it an essential method for the study of discourse and
appropriate for the methodological ‘kit-bag’ for the researcher in the psychology of
religion.
The thesis has considered human religious or spiritual faith exploring the notion that it is an account, socially constructed in conversation. The emphasis is on the social - two people, working together to agree something purposeful to both. Through the design of the account, speakers achieve discursive or interactional objectives in the talk and in the agreeing of this account over and above alternatives, the psychological phenomena relevant to it are realised. The faith account is rooted in the discursive exchange and in the interactional achievements of both individuals. This is not to say that such a faith account is any less justified than any other assertions to knowledge or beliefs. The proposition is that it emerges in the same manner as do all our assertions of the real world and our claims to knowledge of them. A social construction view of knowledge is that which is real in the world is that which passes for what is real - what people come to understand as real because it is relevant to them and most pertinently, can act appropriately because of it.

10.7 What kind of faith is one understood as an account constructed in dialogue?

The thesis has adopted the concept of epistemic construction for its study of personal faith. This is the argument that claims of the world do not directly reflect natural or objective phenomenon, independent of our understanding of it, but that individuals construct these through various social arrangements, practices and conventions of speech. ‘Facts’ of the real world in this understanding are not pre-determined objects, existing independently of the people who ‘discover’ them and which can be stored in a memory bank as pieces of data, owned or shared, kept private or published, but a process of knowing how - how to live, how to act or how to understand ourselves and others. Facts do not speak for themselves, but are ‘spoken into being’ by people responding to others in linguistic
converse. Asking people to discuss their faith therefore, in this perspective, is to ask people of their understanding of faith as purposeful human behaviour and how they justify this understanding, and the implications for them and how they live. An aspect of this approach is that faith, as it ‘really’ exists, is never finished - it is always an open-ended discussion. It can always change; it contains within itself the possibility of the next conversation, the next interaction and a constructionist perspective is one that recognises and makes explicit this inherent movement and flow. It goes further, understanding a knowledge claim as dialectical. Assertions to knowledge inform behaviour and the way we respond to others because of the things we hold true about them. This behaviour in turn leads to further inferences about what we take to be true of our, and their, intra-psychic selves. In the process of linguistic exchange - in talk of whatever kind, the constructionist claim and the focus of the present thesis is that people make assertions that they offer to one and other, to acknowledge. As the discussion progresses, the proffered view may be nuanced, maintained or accepted or rejected outright, and however the matter is settled, the participants will subsequently act appropriately to their knowledge and understanding, as they see and agree it. People do not behave at random or act unpredictably or inconsistently; or if they do, we say they are acting out of character and demand an explanation. To be clear on this point, this is not to say (in possible distinction to Day) that the purpose of conversation is for individuals to manipulate the talk to persuade others, for personal and private motives, to agree. Since the intra-psychic environment, in this perspective, is also considered a discursive construction, there is no personal motive to persuade the other to come towards. The argument is not held privately by me, but publicly and jointly by both of us.
In noting this description of SC, Ian Hacking (1999) argues that if some fact or construction is brought into being in a natural way, as science and modernism might describe it, then as he puts it we are, generally speaking, ‘stuck with it’. However, if facts are social constructions, brought into being through intentional social activity, then they may exist in one of many guises; they may not, even, have obtained at all had we not wished them to obtain\textsuperscript{166}. This rather succinctly makes the case for the value of the SC perspective for the present study. Not only is it inherently oriented to the notion of change, it allows for liberating change and under human will. If SC can ‘unmask’ a supposedly naturally occurring, and hence inevitable fact, as a constructed one, then we can maintain, reconstruct or ignore it and orientate our own behaviour to it, as we chose. This is the same principle as ‘consciousness raising’ where beliefs and understandings of self and society, held to be givens and unchangeable, can be changed, and in the twinkling of an eye. Faith, then, understood as a natural object, is a static construction conceptually ‘handed over’ from one person to another in dialogue understood as an act of representation or persuasion. As a construct of the psyche, it may be lodged within the intra-psychic environment as a cognitive construct and part of self-identity, rather as a group endorses an ideology enshrined in its articles of incorporation and mission statements and the like. In either case, these constructs are not easily available to intentional change. Above all else, what a SC informed view of faith entails is a move from a faith as a concept we hold, or a characteristic of who we are, to something we do and a feature of how we live. A comparison is sometimes made of the faith of the Roman Empire in which early

\textsuperscript{166} We may claim to know why night follows day, but we cannot change this as a result of this knowledge. In point of fact, however, many times scientists work to discover the nature of certain facts precisely so as to be able to alter and control them. Equally, consciousness raising may not be as apparently effortless as this view depicts. However, the force of the point remains.
Christianity was formed and to make a distinction between the orthopraxy of the pagan state versus the orthodoxy of the Christian faith - that is right action versus right belief (Morgan 2008). Christian faith in this case, is a conviction that we believe in something (despite the fact, or particularly when, there is no evidence for it). Faith becomes creedal, either personal or propositional. As an alternative to ‘a right belief’, a social construction perspective of faith offers the notion of the constructed faith account as an attitude or stance. This includes the idea of making a response - choosing to orientate oneself in a particular direction or taking a stand at a particular turn of events. Responsiveness to events and to the other is the key characteristic to this faith.

A second component is that of ‘openness to the other’. In an entirely separate discussion, in a study of epistemic injustice, Fricker (2008) distinguishes between two kinds of injustice, one she calls testimonial injustice where, because of prejudice, a person is given less credibility than he might otherwise receive; and secondly, a form she terms hermeneutical. Both kinds of injustice have the same practical result; however, Fricker distinguishes hermeneutical injustice whenever a society silences a speaker because it does not have the social imagination or the conceptual ‘space’ to accommodate the speaker’s life world. It is not that the speaker has been misunderstood or that she has not communicated a propositional construct ‘correctly’, but that her hearers do not include her worldview as a resource they can turn to in understanding others in dialogue. They do not, in this case hold a prejudice against the speaker, but they have nothing for or of the speaker either. The author cites the depiction of the trial of the Negro man accused of attacking a white girl in Harper Lee’s (1960) To Kill a Mockingbird and the racial attitudes in Southern USA as an
exemplar of this view. Similarly, Carol Gilligan observes in her book *In a Different voice* (1982) that in interviews conducted by Kohlberg (1981) exploring moral development, young children, who at the beginning of the interviews were chatty, frequently became less so until their answers were monosyllabic. The study rated children as less developed in the capacity for moral thinking than adults; additionally, women tended to be rated lower than men. This finding was noted too in Fowler’s (1981) study of faith development discussed in Chapter 1. The study methodology in each case was the semi- or un-structured interview. Gilligan asks, ‘how does the (male, adult) interviewer know that the question he asks his subjects was the one that they hear, and, why does he assume that the answer he hears is the one that his subjects believe they are giving?’ Gilligan’s conclusion is that children, males and females inhabit different ‘life worlds’ and that society must find the space to include all of these, new, different and ‘other’ voices if they are to be truly included in that society. Perhaps, James Day had something of this in mind when he wrote, ‘*language ... is interpersonally formulated and remains forever so constituted, has as its purpose the making and maintenance of place sufficient for continued conversation, without which the life of the speaker could not go on*’ (p.215). In light of this, the very interviews of the present study take on a different hue. Rather than a platform on which the interviewees hand over their faith accounts, they become the vehicle by which both speakers reconsider themselves (their faith ‘lives’) in response to each other. They become what the present thesis has thought of as a ‘behavioural opportunity’ for choice, made in response and in openness, in dialogue. Sally explicitly voices this view towards the end of her interview:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1142</th>
<th>I: and because you've said a couple of times 'this isn't me this isn't me'</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S: mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1144</td>
<td>I: but now you would say that [lighting the candle [↑is you</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S: [yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[yes (.) definitely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1146</td>
<td>I: and be↑cause ↑of ↓that you feel that you've got you've moved on a [bit in your faith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S: [yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1148</td>
<td>S: yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I: right that's all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1150</td>
<td>S: it's I've never really I've never really thought about it but [now talking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I: [no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1152</td>
<td>S: about it [to you</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I: [yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1154</td>
<td>S: you know articulating [it and actually examin[ing it [that</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I: [yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[yes you don't think about it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1156</td>
<td>consciously</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S: = you ↑do↓n't</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1158</td>
<td>I: but it's something that you do,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S: yeah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1160</td>
<td>I: it sort of [happens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S: [instinctively</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Present research Sally: Ref S/1/1142-1160/10.1

Sally had described that lighting a candle to say prayer, was not part of her prayer practice as a teenager, but with her recovered faith she does this. Because it feels different - alien, she considers this evidence, not only of her recovered faith but that she is more mature, ‘moved on a bit’ (1146). She ‘realises’ this during the conversation which brings the insight to her conscious awareness (1150 ff). Similarly, Margaret observes that the interviewer has ‘wrested out’ (1478) her faith description from her in the course of the interview, which might otherwise, as with Sally, have remained below the level of her conscious attention:
All the interviewees were as effusive in their thanks to the interviewer for the interview, as she was to them and John observes that ‘it was a privilege to be able to waffle on about yourself’ (1793). It seems that while all conversation is a potential opportunity for discursive construction, we do not always take advantage of this and we may sometimes need an opportunity ‘gifted’ to us, which might be the case in the present study. John Shotter (2008) considers this distinction in terms of ‘responsive’ and ‘spontaneous’ listening and notes (p.157) Hoffman’s (2002) phrase ‘listening in order to speak’ versus ‘speaking in order to listen’. His discussion is within the context of therapeutic conversation, but he notes its general validity. He maintains that western society particularly is still searching for ‘mastery in our own terms ... rather than seeking to be sensitive and knowledgeable participants in, and beneficiaries of, processes spontaneously occurring very largely beyond our agency to control (p. 159). A first task to correct for this, suggests Shotter, is an awareness and orientation to the other and spontaneity in relations with our surroundings - a task which is not necessarily easy or straightforward.
A third component of a discursive faith account is that of *plurality* and variability. Day expresses the view that faith, ‘*because of its narrative components, may be viewed as a function of the audience to whom it is played*’ (p. 225) and this expresses the importance of the ‘other’ to acknowledge the moral components of stories, and to understand the faith account, told in speech. Gergen presses this notion further to show how any expression of belief cannot be entirely ‘*my own*’ (p. 234). I cannot within this relationship ‘*possess*’ the belief (and therefore try to persuade you) because the belief arises within the ritual of conversation - or ‘*relationship scenario*’ (Gergen & Gergen, 1988) in which ‘*your words are different after my words are spoken*’. Gergen suggests an exploration of the ‘*kind of scenario ... permitted in the unfolding dialogue between the [two conversationalists]*’; and ‘*in what sort of scenarios do assertions of religious belief function to bring people into accord, and in what relational patterns do they operate divisively*?’ (234). This is the programme of the present study, which reveals exactly the scenarios Gergen anticipates. The following is an extract from Sally’s interview where she discusses, in reported speech, the conversations that she had with a friend who had queried why Sally continued to work organising church services when ‘*she didn’t believe in God*’:
The passage contains many of the features discussed in Chapters 4-7, demonstrating the complexity of interactional work performed in speech. The talk connects to and is located in, the relationship of Sally with her present audience - the interviewer, the brought in (and constructed) audience of her sceptical friend, and the spoken of relationships (again constructed) with the vicar and the church congregation. Sally can profess a faith differently to different audiences, with sincerity, because it is through these constructed relationships that her awareness or knowledge of her faith is realised.

The parallels between a plural self-identity and a constructionist perspective with faith are not lost on contemporary theology. In his study of ‘Theology, Psychology and Plural self’ Turner, (2008) notes that theological anthropology has begun to embrace what Le Ron Schults calls ‘the philosophical turn to relationality’ and he suggests that in many ways, it has embraced this turn quicker and more profoundly than many branches of the human and social sciences. In a ranging discussion, Turner notes Alistair McFadyen’s (1990) account
of relational personhood. Amongst the claims he makes is the notion that for man to live
fully in God’s image is to maintain relations of a certain quality and these are characterised
by, ‘call and response, the gift and return of dialogue’ (p.19). He suggests that distortions
of personhood - humanity’s fallen condition - are the products of distorted ways of relating.
These are the products of manipulative or otherwise non-dialogical relationships.
Genuinely open and dialogical relationships coincide with a transformation of identity that
McFadyen would understand as responding to Christ’s call (p.117). Reformulations of
identity are the stuff of constructionism as evidenced by the ‘consciousness raising’
programmes of social and political groups of all kinds. Faith identities asserted and
discussed as an account in dialogue are, in principle, open to change every and any time
people meet to chat.

Appropriate and timely responsiveness, truly listening to the other, the notion of variance
and plurality are all features of the ‘things people do’ (or might do) that one might wish to
consider, in a study of personal faith. Faith conceived as an account socially constructed in
turn taking dialogue orientates a study to just these activities. Divesting ourselves of the
assumption that faith is a characteristic of who we are, and associated with a particular
intra-psychic state or organisation, opens up research to the notion that faith is something to
do with how we live and how we may potentially live, and to the notion of individual
choice and change. These are precisely the points that Gergen makes in his reply to Day’s
(1993) paper, as discussed in Chapter1.

And finally, is this account recognisable as faith?
‘When Jesus came to the region of Caesarea Philippi, he asked his disciples, “Who do people say the Son of Man is?” They replied, “Some say John the Baptist; others say Elijah; and still others, Jeremiah or one of the prophets.” “But what about you?” he asked. “Who do you say I am?”
Matthew 16:13-15

Faith - a life of change in response.
# List of transcription marks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mark</th>
<th>Usage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>I: quite a [while left square bracket indicates the point at which a current speaker’s talk is overlapped by another’s talk S: [yeah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>=</td>
<td>I: that I’m aware of = equal signs, one at the end of a line and another at the beginning of the next one, indicate no gap or pause between the lines S: = yes would you confirm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.5)</td>
<td>S: yes (0.5) oh yes numbers in round brackets indicate a pause estimated to 0.25s of a second</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>()</td>
<td>I: ok (.) right a dot in parentheses indicates a tiny gap, a pause less than quarter of a second</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>___</td>
<td>I: I mean underscoring indicates stress placed on the word - it is <em>leant</em> on without changing the pitch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>::</td>
<td>S: o::h colons indicate prolongation of the sound the number of colons indicates the length of the prolongation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WORD</strong></td>
<td>S: I KNOW capitals indicate louder volume relative to the surrounding talk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>°</td>
<td>I: ° give up and lose° degree sign around a word or phrase indicates softer volume relative to the surrounding talk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.hhh</td>
<td>S: I felt that .hhhh a row of .hhhs preceded by a dot indicates an in breath, without a dot an out breath</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(h)</td>
<td>M: quest (h) ion an (h) in brackets at the place of a small out breath interposed within a word - a ‘laughter particle’, or ‘interpolated article of aspiration - IPA’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hhhaa</td>
<td>I: hhhaa out breaths - ‘laughter particles’ the number of ‘h’ and ‘a’ indicating breathiness and length</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>huh huh</td>
<td>J: huh huh huh huh hearable laughter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£...£</td>
<td>I: £ah£ £ signs around a word indicate a ‘smiling’ timbre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≈...≈</td>
<td>J: it’s ≈†true†e≈ ≈ signs around a word indicate a ‘gentle’ timbre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>()</td>
<td>S: and now I go to ( ) empty brackets indicate the transcriber’s inability to hear the words said</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(( ))  I: ((laughs))  

(double parentheses indicates descriptions of actions rather than spoken words; or the transcriber's interpretation of a word said)

(( ))  S: then ((name)) died  
I: I go to ((place)) church  

(name or place in italics within double parentheses indicate a personal name that has not been transcribed)

.  S: she sai. she said  

(a single full stop indicates a stopping tone to the speech often when words are not completed or with duplicate words)

,  I: frightful, frightful disease  

(a comma denotes continuing intonation)

↑  S: oh I ↑can’t remember  

(an up arrow placed in front of the word indicates rising or high intonation on that word - an ‘Up’)

down  S: I don’t ↓know  

(a down arrow in front of a word indicates dropping or low intonation on that word - a ‘Down’)

↑↓  S: yes in↑dee↓d abso↑lute↓ly  

(.arrows placed within a word indicate the exact place of the rising or lowering intonation)

┌…┐  S: ┌…hh my mother….a child┐  

(the entire speech within the marks is said with a lower pitch than the surrounding talk)

└…┘  S: └…how can you do all┘  

(the entire speech within the marks is said with a higher pitch than the surrounding talk)

>…. <  S: >I could talk forever<  

(words placed within greater and lesser signs indicate speech at a quicker speed than the surrounding talk)

<<..>>  S: <<I ↓KNOW>>  

(words placed within double lesser and greater than signs indicate speech at a slower speed than the surrounding talk)

!  

(indicates missed out lines of transcription)

100  Margin numbers  

(original line numbers from the complete transcript)

S:  S: I:  

(indicates speaker – e.g. Sally or interviewer)
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SALLY’S STORY

First participant, first interview first field transcript

I: yeah are we are we doing something here do you think how do I know if I’m doing it (1.0) I think we’re doing something 
S: dunno I don’t understand computer users 
I: yeah I think we’re doing something .hh [see that’s the brilliant thing Alex is =
S: o[k 
I: well what I’m hoping to do is (.) record the tape .hh so it’ll be in my computer in voice
S: yes 
I: then (. ) I’m going to then I’ve got to (.) transcribe it all which it [normally that’s 
S: ((oh that takes ))
I: the bit that takes [hours and hours and hours 
S: yeah 
S: yeah 
I: so what I’m going to do is get some software that recognises my voice 
S: aah 
I: .hh and then going to train it train it 
S: [repeat 
I: then I shall repeat it I’ll sit with headphones repeat it all 
S: aah 
I: so then I’ll have it all in and then of course there’ll be loads of editing [(and )]
S: [yeah 
I: but then what Al is going to do he’s going to write me a little (.) thing .hh so I can then me:erge in the same file the (.) your the the vocal bit (.) with the [written bit 
S: [wow 
I: so then people can actually put the head phones on hear the stories and read the text at the same time 
S: wow =
I: = but Al is doing that for me (0.5) I couldn’t n’t do it 
S: no I wouldn’t know (.) so is that now tap ing 
I: yeah (. ) if that’s ok 
S: [it must be very um sensitive (.) ’cos we’re not speaking loudly are we 
S: tried it out last night 
S: and it worked 
I: ((laughing breath)) [((it was)) 
S: [I’m so impressed 
I: erm well I didn’t want it to be sort of obtrusive ( ( ) are you happy with that 
S: yeah quite happy [with that 
I: [erm what I’ll have to do is I’ll just take a (.) copy before we go and I’ll keep one and you’ll keep one 
S: ok 
I: and that’s my crib sheet (.) erm 
S: the
I: ↓yeah it ↑isn’t really ↓questions th:the idea is we sort of get into it but that’s if we (.)
that’s just to sort of erm keep us ↓going as it [were
52
S: [yes
I: and erm (. ) right (2.0) right so ↑fi:irst of all
54
S: ↓ri↑ght =
I: = I should sa:ay (1.0) it its about ↓faith obviously [you know that so I mean =
56
S: [yeah
I: = I: I know I know the ↓answer but I should say I mean you y:you regard yourself as
58 ↓having ↓a ↓faith or you you
S: [yes (. ) yes, yes
60
I: [I mean you d. it’d be pointless
I: having this (((interview if you don’t actually have a ))
62
S: [no (. ) no, no I do, I do er =
S: = although (. ) sometimes slightly shaky [ (. ) but I do =
64
I: = regard myself as [(.) having a faith
66
I: [yes
I: so if if ↑somebody were to ask ↓you, you know (. ) just, (1.0) if it cropped up
68
S: mm
I: w:wha how w:what would you say (. ) I mean would you say ↑yes, yes (. ) hallelujah I’m
70 a Christian or [(.) what would you say
S: [I would say erm:m (. )
72
S: what do you mean if somebody said ‘do you believe in God’ or [sort of thing
I: [↑ye:↓ah (. ) you know
74
S: I’d say erm yes I ↓do, yes I ↓do and I have a s:spiritual (. ) I have a sort of spiritual
element = to me .hh which (. ) means (. ) that I can [↓believe ↓in ↓God
76
I: = you have a spiritual element to you
S: yes
78
I: ri↑ght
S: yeah
80
I: ri↑ght erm an and ↑has that ever happened has has anybody just sort of asked you out
of the blue or at a party when you weren’t expecting it or
82
S: ↑erm =
I: = have you have you (1.0) ggh [can you re?call a time
84
S: [yes
I: when sudden suddenly you had had to say this in a sort of group =
86
S: = what you mean like affirm your faith
I: ↑we↓ll or or just [at some odd moment
88
S: [yes yes I do
S: ↑yes ↑erm (2.5) I’ve ↑had people I’ve ↑had people say to me ‘do you believe in ↓God?’
90 and in the past I’ve said ‘no’ (.75) although I used to when I was younger and then I
went through a phase when I decided I didn’t .hh and then I’ve come back to it .hh
92 erm and now if somebody says to me (. ) ‘do you believe in God?’ and I ↑don’t think it
has ↓happened actually ↑people tend not to talk about it =
94 I: = well that’s the point yes [so it I just thought if somebody out of the blue if somebody
S: [yeah
96
I: suddenly asks [↓you
S: [mm
98
I: ggh you know sometimes ooh wha what shall I say =
S: = I [know
100
I: [and I wondered if you’d had any incident like that =
S: = no I ↑can’t. don’t think I have but if I did have I’d say ‘oh yes I do believe’ (.75)
102 erm (.25) you know it started off when I was younger (. ) my ↑par↓ents were (1.5)
Welsh. My father was from a very, very poor background. My mother's father was a miner, she was one of six children. We lived in a place where there was no running water. My father was a communist because of the poverty he'd seen. My mother was brought up in a chapel, which is a six-hour Sunday commitment that put anybody off religion. Especially a child. We went to church as a family, but I don't think I ever really thought about it. I was a Sunday school teacher, so I read the communion service. I was confirmed at school, so it was all in the background. My friends were all religious, and I went to a grammar school with religious services. I was confirmed and became quite aggressively against the idea of God.

I: [Strange, strange thing]
S: [right]
I: [Strange, strange thing]
S: [right]
S: [Strange, strange thing]
I: mm

158 S: it's just I just (.) logically looked at the world and thought well there can't be a loving god anyway (.25) and I read um Bertrand Russell 'why I am not a Christian' .hh and I read oh I read quite a lot of (o.5) anti-religious stuff .hh and I can see my son doing it now my own my own children now beginning to go through that phase .hh and I wonder if they will come back to it like I did (.) it took me ye:ars to come back to it

164 I: so that's really, really interesting so that (1.5) were you conscious of (o.5) what it it you know were you conscious of having lost (.25) your (.25) faith did you sort of think actively yes I've [(())

S:                               

and yet (o.5) you see a. even while I'd lost (o.5) I mean I always say I had lost my faith .hh (1.0) there must have been something in me that wanted to (1.5) keep it (.) must have been because there is something in human beings that makes you want to be .hh wants you to believe in an afterlife and wants to believe in heaven .hh wants to believe in a God .hh erm and it was always there I think in the background and for ye:ars for example in our village I've I've run the ser-vice (1.0) at the time when I didn't really believe in .Gd didn't really feel I was trying to come back [trying

176 I: [so this was at university still
S: no er university finished =

178 I: = yeah

S: ok so and then (1.0) working in various schools (o.5) as a teacher (.25) some religious schools some not religious schools .hh erm never really (.25) thought about it then having been aggressively (o.25) anti-reli- gion (.25) then just (2.0) not really (.25) thinking about it (.25) in any wa- y then, (o.5) marriage then children (o.75) and in a sit. in our church in our village erm (1.0) a vicar who wasn't (.25) very good with children a very nice man but (.25) and he said 'would I help him with the ser-vices' and so for ye:ars I did six to eight services a ye:ar (0.75) I organised them =

186 I: [organised them led them
S: ye^ah

188 I: preached at them =
S: = I didn't preach no I didn't preach I did (.25) I did welcome everybody and I did (.25) organise the readings I did write the prayers .hh and even now every year I organise our village Christi- gle .hh now I don't know if that's be. I don't know if I did that because I'm a naturally organising bosy teacher ty^e .hh or because people wan Ted the church to be kept I wanted the church to be kept going cos they were talking about closing it down and I love old churches

I: this was er this was your village church =

196 S: = our village [church
I: [community parish [church

198 S: [yes

I: and ?did and did you have children at this time

200 S: yes .hh and the children were all very involved in all the [services =
I: [right

202 S: = that I ran
I: yes

204 S: so I would do =
I: = what age were they then [at this

206 S: [they started erm it started when the twins were about five

208 I: right =
S: = and they're seventeen now

210 I: yeah
S: and I’ve so I’ve done I did services for about ten years or I did six a year and I did
Mother’s Day, Harvest Festival, Christmas, and anything that the children would be in force. I would write and do the whole service and I’d say to the vicar, ‘please could you give us a sermon at this point’ but otherwise [it would all just run]
I: [to bottom]
S: oh I know
I: it sounds great did you enjoy it =
S: yes, yes I did yeah I did love it
I: [it sounds fun actually yeah
S: hh and yet my friend ((name)) who I’d spoken to about it she said ‘how can you do all this when you don’t even believe in God’ hh an I said ‘well I don’t know if I believe in God or not but if I do these things perhaps I’ll find’
I: right so the trigger to do them was the vicar asking you to do them =
S: yes and he wanted help
I: and he needed help
S: yes I was the answer to his prayer, I suppose =
I: right [so he must have recognised that]
S: he knew you’d be competent to do them
I: right
S: and erm =
I: right
S: and he recognised that you were competent and [you could do it]
S: yes
I: and we had the church full whenever there was a church service
I: right
S: it was full, we did a pet service before the Vicar of Dibley
I: ((laughs)) so I mean, we did cross this with other mums with kids or did you do it all on your own or
S: no I had a couple of other mums who used to help me, hh and I also had a lot of mothers who were very happy for their children to take part and so m, I was never short of readers
I: [what who who might not have come otherwise
S: yes who might not have come otherwise and they were very happy for their children to read the prayers I always used to get the children to write their own prayers
I: so it was a real sort of community thing =
S: absolutely yeah a real village thing
I: yeah and it brought the village together in a way that you know the church used to do and to a large extent doesn’t any more hh but then our this vicar =
I: mm
S: that I was doing these services for he left
I: mm
S: and we had a new vicar, hh who is absolutely fanatical and doesn’t need help you know doesn’t need any
I: I’ll do the Christingle
S: for him because that’s quite that’s actually just you know doing all the oranges and
everything that [takes a long time =
I: [right
S: = an I do that with the .hh (. ) older people in the village =
S: = there’s a group of older people [and we
I: [right
S: all sit round and make (. ) 200 odd [Christingles
S: = they are its a lovely service
I: [yes Christingle’s a lovely service =
S: [yeah and its famous now our [service is famous [in (name)
S: because it’s so lovely .hh and again (. ) I used to get the ↑Cubs to ↑come and write
↑ser. write prayers and parade their their colours, and the Brownies wd. you know it
was a re:al way of pulling all the groups together =
I: = so ↑you you felt (. ) you ↑felt (. ) res↑pon↓ible you [had actually ↑done
S: [oh yes
I: ↓these ↓things
S: yes [yes I did
I: [your ↑job =
I: = you had done it
S: yeah I ↑di↓d [.hh
I: [yeah
S: and and yet (. ) ggh an all the time I'm thinking (. ) ’?why I ?wonder ?why I’m doing
this’ because (.75) I don't know (. ) ggh you know
I: ggh just thought a thought that occurred to me when the ↑new vicar ↓came (0.5) is
that when it started to change because of the new vicar co↓ming (. ) you started
p’rhaps not to write so many services and to get involved [so much
S: [yes, yes because
I: he didn’t ↑need ↓me [you see
S: [he didn’t (. ) right
I: [(( ) ) no
S: [(but it also coincided with with the kids being (. ) grown [up
I: [yes and not wanting to ↓do
S: ↓it [so much
I: [yes yes
S: al↑though they still will (. ) I mean they’re still marvellous if I asked [them to do it
I: [great
S: they [will do it for me [.hh erm but, (.)
I: [yeah
I: but they were at school anyway,
S: and they see we’re at ↑chap↓el (. ) ↑he↓re
I: [yes [yes, yes
S: so we don't ↑g↓o [to the church
I: [yes
S: any [more once they started boarding
I: [yes
S: er home boarding
I: yeah
S: like they all do they had to come here
I: right =
S: = Sunday morn\(\uparrow\)nings (.) er we \(\uparrow\)still go to church Christmas and Easter in the village
I: so you were \(\uparrow\)still doing the services when they were \(\downarrow\)boarding it was only when the new vicar came that it \(\downarrow\) =
S: = yes that's right yeah
I: right and \(\uparrow\)did \(\uparrow\)it (.) ggh ok that's \(\uparrow\)great and \(\uparrow\)di. and \(\uparrow\)erm (.) I mean this sort of doctrinal stuff about not believing in God did it I mean did it (.) ever (1.0) did you think about that \(\uparrow\)much =
S: = oh I just thought it was a bit strange that I was \(\downarrow\)doing it when I \(\downarrow\)when I wasn't sure if I believed \(\downarrow\)in \(\downarrow\)God \(\downarrow\)or \(\downarrow\)not (.) .hh erm::m (1.0) but \(\uparrow\)in \(\uparrow\)ma\(\downarrow\)ny ways it was just (.) it was something I was doing for the village
I: = yes =
S: = and for the church the [fabric
I: [yes
S: of the church
I: = yes
S: you know I love the [church
I: [yes
S: I [love old mediaeval [churches
I: [yeah [yes
S: .hh and (0.5) you cn. actually I cou. I could () sep\(\downarrow\)arate them () in my mind which I know probably sounds extraordinary .hh but I didn't feel I needed to have at that time a madly deep faith in order to do the \(\uparrow\)ser\(\downarrow\)vices
I: and and and do you think you \(\uparrow\)did separate them out at the \(\downarrow\)time I mean do you think that can you remember thinking about it can you remember an event (.) .hh you know someone coming round for coffee and saying (.) you know 'what's going \(\uparrow\)on \(\downarrow\)here' can you remember discussing it at all or \(\downarrow\)not
S: I cn \(\uparrow\)yes I can with a couple of good friends wi. with whom I talked about faith (.) .hh erm and \(\uparrow\)and do you know they said 'how \(\uparrow\)why are you still \(\downarrow\)doing these services when you don't believe in \(\downarrow\)God .hh I said \(\uparrow\)well I don't \(\downarrow\)know I just feel I've \(\uparrow\)got to \(\downarrow\)do \(\downarrow\)them (.) I'm just \(\downarrow\)do\(\downarrow\)ing \(\downarrow\)them
I: how \(\uparrow\)did they \(\downarrow\)know that you didn't believe in God [I mean
S: [cos we'd discussed it
I: = yes
S: and you know say something happened in the world that was just terrible
I: yeah
S: like I dunno 9/11 or [a dis natural disaster
I: [yeah
S: or probably a natural [disaster
I: [yeah
S: cos I think natural disasters are even harder [to understand
I: [oh su\(\uparrow\) \(\downarrow\)re y\(\uparrow\)e:ah
S: erm (0.5) and you know they (.) they would they don't believe in God and they'd say 'h\(\uparrow\):how can (.) how can anybody believe in God when a:a God (.) would let this happen'
S: .hh and \(\uparrow\)and (0.5) I would say I would ag\(\uparrow\)ree with them and I'd say 'yeah I know' (.) and then I'd talk to (.) somebody you know I've got various religious friends vicars and things and I'd talk to them and say well 'how do ?you (1.0) how do you expl\(\uparrow\)ain \(\uparrow\)it what [what [how do you still =
I: [mm
S: = believe in God when this sort of thing happens' (.) and they would you know discuss
I: it it's always been in my mind\(\downarrow\) (.) wanting to discuss it
I: right (.) yeah
S: and then (2.0) m::m ((girl’s name)) ↓died who was erm a friend of the twins
I: mm
S: here
I: this was the girl that you’ve mentioned at school [before now
S: [yes
S: yeah .hh I ↑did↓n’t know her very ↑we↓ll um
S: so this was what about
S: this was three years [ago
I: [three years ago yeah ok
S: .hh and erm (2.0) I came to her (1.0) funeral here
I: mm
S: and (2.0) °it was probably mo↑re than three three or four years ↑now° (.). hh um and
S: the pre↑vious ↓headmaster (((name))
I: mm
S: stood up (. in (0.5) erm (. the (. you know to preach at the serv. at her funeral .hhhh
and (. he- you can imagine can’t you he was faced with (. .hh a fu:ll (. chapel of
S: grieving teenagers who are all thinking ↑how can there be a god when this happens’ .hh
and you know quite a lot of parents as well thinking that too an he stoo. and he
made the most ↑wonderful .hhhh um ser↑mon (. and it absolutely shattered me (. and that was the ↑turning point for me =
((((clicks fingers))
I: ↑rea↓illy
S: ↓yeah he stood up and I’ll never forget it he said ‘I ↓know ((girl’s name)) is now in
↓heaven (0.5) I know that’ .hh (2.0) °and I ↑looked ↑at ↑him and I thought ↑yea↓h°
(1.0) an. and that’s that’s [when I came back
I: (((( ))
S: I know and that’s when I came back and I looked up to the chapel (. the window (1.0)
and I saw the (. image of God and Christ and everything
I: °he was a good man wasn’t he°
S: mm (.) but to stand up it was so courageous you know to say ‘I ↑know how you’re all
feel↓ing .hh I know you’re feeling (. .hh sad and I know you’re feeling angry’ he said
but ‘I KNOW ↓she’s ↓in ↓heaven (. and what a comfort for her parents (. and you see
he was so respected (1.0) ↓this ↓headmaster he was so respected by the pupils .hh and
love↓d but he could be strict you know .hh um (. but they all listened it was magical it
was magical an .hh and from then on (0.5) I if I felt I was (0.5) and then (((name of
friend)) said to me ‘do you want to come to prayer group’ she ‘s always saying would I
like to go and I used to say its not really me .hh (0.5) ’cos I’ve ↑nev↓er ↓done anything
like our ↑pra↓yer group before (. as you can ↑s↓ee I’m not very good at formal prayer
you know I can’t find the I do it terrib[ly rl. in a ↑terr↓ib↓ly .hh (0.5)
I: [oh I
S: er colloquial way you know I don’t you know when (((name)) prays for example or the
vicar or you say you have the right (. exactly the right words and I just (0.5) I just
chat really
I: ahh (((laughing word))
S: its not really
I: ahh (((laughing word))
S: do you know what I [MEAN
I: ggh ggh
I: it’s not me ↑ei↓ther for [heaven’s sake
S: ::h its is tho’ you do =
I: = but I you know sort of (. ↑prayer ↓groups and y:you know all this sort of (. stuff
this isn’t this isn’t me either but erm
S: no its ↑not ↑me I’ve never [been into ↑any↓thing like this before (1.5)
I: it's not you isn't that interesting but it was the occasion it was the event it was the vicar.
S: mm
I: it was the chapel it was this combination.
S: yes it was it was a turning point I didn't hear voices or or =
I: [no]
S: anything like that I just looked at him with his faith so strong and I feel that in our chaplain too
I: [because you can see it]
S: yes it's the faith =
I: [yes]
S: yes it's the faith = a sort of example
I: yeah
S: and you know I'm not I don't read, erm religious books or I don't do any thing I don't study it like you do
I: [mm]
S: I don't do any thing like that I just feel it and I
I: [you seem to have a particular impression of me (laughs)]
S: ((laughs))
I: I'll have I'll have to [correct this at some time]
S: no no you are very erm you're intellectually very involved in it you know like this you know =
I: [yes]
S: you're academically involved in
I: [yes]
S: it [I'm not at all]
I: [and you're not] you wouldn't S: no
I: so is not a head thing it's a heart th.
S: [no]
S: and I don't really read the Bible I've read St Mark's Gospel from cover to cover
I: [mm]
S: many times 'cos of doing it with me for RS but I'm not I'm not I'm
I: [mm]
S: just at the moment I feel quite early stages of er an adult faith
I: hh now this this is interesting so erm you've had this event hh and its sort a sort of a one-off event
S: yes
I: = it wasn't its a bit on its own this event isn't it [I don't want to put words in your
S: [yes]
I: [mouth]
S: [no]
S: but it was a one-off it was totally unexpected
I: [yes]
S: I didn't expect to respond [like that]
I: [right]
S: I expected to go in and cry my eyes [out and come
I: [yes]
I: yes
S: but I didn’t I came out thinking well all right she had a horrible journey to that death and it is inexplicable .hh but now she is in heaven ((0.5)
I: mm
S: and she’s all right
I: mm
S: >> and I felt when my father died three years ago that also triggered two events really .hhh
I: and then your brother-in-law
S: (1.0) yes that’s right that was bad (0.5) for a year (0.5) but he was my brother in law he wasn’t my father (1.0) you know I didn’t love him (0.5) I didn’t love my brother-in-law I I you know I was very s. as you love your father or your children (.) so it’s not quite the same
I: no but it was (0.5) well anyway°
S: but it was horrible [yeah
I: [so you you went through really (2.0) so when when your father died did it did it (1.5) did it bring back this memories of this this (.)
S: yes (.) funeral
I: did it trigger this [again °<<
S: [yes (.) not so much but it made me re:ally able to seek (.)
I: [what to ask for help
S: [yeah
I: yea[h
S: yeah to ask for help .hh I went to see our vicar I went to see ((chaplain’s name)) erm and also ((name)) I went when erm our business went bust (.) tw three years ago it all happened at once my father and everything .hhhh I went to see ((name)) then
I: mm
S: just to seek for help [you know to to to get some support from .hh =
I: [mm
S: [someone who was who was (0.5) a person of God
I: mm
S: I was getting a lot of support from my friends [but
I: [mm
S: hh and also praying (1.0) which I’d never done before (1.5) all of these things are just I: praying with the vicar or no [praying by myself
I: [praying on your own
I: right
S: which I’d never done before
I: right so so tell me about that how what if you’d if that’s okay
S: no that’s fine very [I’m happy to talk about it
I: [erm so ggh you you just sit at home whenever (.) how
S: what would you do what would happen [how would you do it
I: [well I’d just (.) would just really as I do in our prayer group I’d just think about what I wanted to pray about I’d just shut my eyes and I’d just pray really hard .hhhh erm: for whatever it is for help just get me through this help me .hhhh erm help me able to support the children ((( )))
I: [so this is when your dad died
S: yes
I: so [before then
S: [and when the company went bust
right so before then you hadn't
no no not really
and did you know what to do what did you do
purely instinctive I just I suppose you remember the prayers
that you had when you were younger
mm
and I just talk very directly
mm
to God
mm
I mean did you have a set time or did you just do it
light a candle actually in the evening
mm
and I would just often then just pray in the kitchen
you know just when I got things on the Aga
yes yes
I just used to make it up yeah =
and I started coming regularly to the chapel services
mm
because that was where I first feel =
mm
you know you know I always say in prayers =
mm
I feel God is there you know when you go in and he's there with you
and I don't feel that in many of the places at the moment
is that because that's where you first recovered your faith do you think
yes (2.25)
its funny I mean its interesting to talk about it for me cos I hadn't =
mm
= really thought about it until
mm
you said you wanted to talk about =
mm
journey to faith and I was thinking about it when did and I thought =
I: [mm
S: = ‘yeah it must have been it [was that moment’
I: [mm
I: mm
S: [[[name]])
I: [mm
S: saying that ‘I know’ (0.5)
I: mm
S: and he thundered it out you know in true Methodist (.h) tradition[al style
I: [↑yes
I: yes
S: we were all trans fixed
I: wow so d ggh (.s) just out of interest do you know of anybody ?else had a simi lar
S: ↓no I ↓don’t ↓know [(.) no
I: [mm mm
S: but then I I ↑said to ((name)) I ↑will ↓come ↓to ↓prayer group (1.0)
I: mm
S: because there was quite a lot people in it [then
I: ↑yes↓s
S: because all the children have left now
I: mm
S: and erm (1.0) I wasn’t at ↑a↓ll sure I really wasn’t (1.0) .hh and (.s) but [it was↑n’t
I: ↑yes↓s
S: but then I I ↑said to ((name)) I ↑will ↓come ↓to ↓prayer group (1.0)
S: because there was quite a lot people in it [then
I: ↑yes↓s
S: because all the children have left now
S: and erm (1.0) I wasn’t at ↑a↓ll sure I really wasn’t (1.0) .hh and (.s) but [it was↑n’t
I: ↑yes↓s
S: [not sure about
what =
S: = about going [and praying with other people
I: [why why
S: well you know you always [say-
I: [but you ↑pra↓yed in in ↑church with other peo↓ple
S: yes but
I: and you had written the ↑pra↓yers
S: I know, (.s) I know it’s (( .s) ↑fun↓ny isn't it .hh erm but it’s ↑different in ↓prayer
↑group its different it's very, very intimate and its you really open up yourself don’t
you in a way .hh just reciting prayers in [church =
I: [mm mm
S: = its not the same thing at all .hh it's like going to any sort of I suppose Bible ↑study
or or anything like that which I’ve also never done
I: so you did ↑feel it was a different [1.5] [thing
S: [mm [mm
I: and you were a bit (.s) ↑cauti↓ous
S: ↑m↓m
I: so what were you cautious of it what what
S: ↑wh↓y I thought this isn’t really me and I’m not really sure I don’t ↑know (1.0) but
that its all part of my ↑quest (0.5) to (.s) erm (0.5) to get my faith (.s) really back which
I do think I have now [got back
S: ↑m↓m
I: I’ve got so many questions to ask you but I mean↑ first of all
you kept you you’d said .hh ‘its not really ↓me’
I: now ↑that’s interesting because that means that you (1.0) you think you’re something
↑el↓se
S: m↓m (0.5) just well in that I’ve never done anything like that before I mean at college
I: mm
S: and erm (.s) you know I ↑ne↓ver attended (.s) erm Christian union [groups or (.s) or =
S: = anything like that and I neve:r .hh (0 .5) but I mean (.) for example I've sent my
gi↓rls away on the Christian ↑summ↓er camps
I: ↑m↓m
S: which erm (.) they've enjoyed very ↑much
I: mm (.) see ↑I was always been dead impressed about when I when see you guys there
°cos I'm thinking .hh you're all so organised with this they come to these prayer
meetings they're really on top of it all they know what they're doing° .hh and they've
even organised their kids to go off to (. ) camps so it was the ↑camps thing that really
impressed ↑m↓e
S: ↓ye:ah
I: .hh °and I'm thinking oh if only I can get myself to get° ((name)) organised [off =
S: [yes
I: = to camp in the same ↑way I mean I was (1.0) .hh [this was =
S: = the thing [that really I =
I: = I ↑picked ↑up on ↓actua↑ly
S: = yes
I: .hh erm but anyway so it it when ↑you say it's not really me its its you mean it wasn't
something that you normally ↓did
S: no that's right never done [anything like that before
I: [yes yes
I: ↑yeah
S: = never (.) ↑nev↓er really (.) you know organising the- (.) the erm (2.0) the er ch
↑ser↓ervices in chu in the ↑vill↓age (.) erm you know I'd never ↓pray first (.) you know
help [me do the ser
I: [extempo[re
S: = yeah no never do anything [like that
I: [yes
I: is ?that because (1.0) ggh I mean did you see it is more personal in a °small prayer
group°
S: ↑yes well it (.) in a ↑small prayer group (.) its you and ↑God isn't it it and a few other
(.) indi↑vid↓uals its not a (.) big church full of people (.) erm (1.0) and you're actually
really (1.5) you're ↑rea↓lly opening your↑self ↑up aren't ↓you to (1.0) to God and to
(.) the other people in the ↑gro↓up
I: and that's a bit
S: that's to me is [quite alien
I: = a bit [scary that's
S: [yeah =
I: = a bit [alien
S: [yeah it's something I would never have done
I: right ok but but did you think it was something you'd ?like ↓to ↓do or something well
you obviously did because you came but I mean
S: yes (1.0) I I ↑came because I was seeking ↓help ( 1.5) that's why I came
I: right
S: I was in ↑des↓pair (.) ↓really I was in despair =
I: = oh ggh this was this was in the middle [of the
S: [when I first came to the group yeah
I: ↓see °
S: I was in despair and I was in on this sort of like spiritual quest to try and (1.5) you
know ↑tr↓y and make some sense of it all cos it's very difficult to make sense of life
sometimes isn't it
I: certainly
I: right =
S: = and I went to a (1.0) spiritualist and tried to get in contact with my ↑fath↓er and
[things like that
I: [really ↑wo↓w
S: .hh erm (.) I was just de ggh desperate really
I: ggh (.) right and ↓(name of chaplain) and ((name)) knew this ↓presumably
S: no ((na↑me)) didn’t erm and ((chap↑lain)) ↓didn’t when I first came (1.0) [I just =
I: [right
S: = I was just in my an’ ↑no↓body really knew I had nobody had any idea how desperate
I was
I: so you ↑hadn’t (1.0) this was (.) your (.) way of opening up
S: yes [trying to
I: [this was your way of of method like a [method of of
S: [trying to find ↓God that’s what it was
I: right
S: and I thought well ↑if ↑I ↓do ↑this (2.0) maybe (1.5)
I: so the exper↑ience with (.) with (2.0) ((name)) business and with your father this
happened ↑after ↓the (0.5) time the (.) (((girl’s name))
S: (((girl’s name)) yeah
I: so (2.0) it (.) shook (.) your faith
S: mm
I: even though you’d had that moment with
S: yes
I: with wha- erm the Reverend ([.)
S: (((name)) [before
I: ((name)) mm
S: no that’s right
I: so so you you felt that this was (1.0) erm this was this was er this was e:r a step back
for you this was a step back this was er erm an ↑iss↓ue for you rather than =
S: = ↑def↓initely, ↑de↑finitely you see I’ve ↑got .hh I’ve got (0.5) ↑chi↑ld- I suppose if
you look at the pattern I’ve got ↑child↓ood ordinary childhood adolescent faith mm
I: ↑ve↓ry devout (.) oh my ↑good↓ness .hh (1.0) and
S: ((laughs))
I: ↑then (.) you know (.) er student rebell↑ion (.) .hh and ‘cos I ↑think actually if you are
a thinker you ↑do have to question it (.) .hh and then (0.5) years of (.) not really
thinking about ↑it and then running the church services and ↑doing ↑lots of (.) you
know that you would think of religious things, (.) you know going to churches and
and so on (.).hh erm (.) and th↑en and (.) but ↑a↓ll the thinking you know I do- you
know I like all the churches and I like all this but don’t really believe in God .hh and
then ((name))’s death and this (.) thing with ((name)).hh and then my ↑fath↓er’s
↓death .hh and be↑cause I’d had this little (0.5) start ↓off (.) with ((name))’s death, (.)
when my ↓dad ↓died I was able ter (1.0) carry on down (((coughs)) carry on down that
road
I: mm =
S: = of seeking (.) a ↑rea↑lly looking for [God
I: [and did you feel that at the time
S: definitely I did I just I needed help so much and there was ↑no↓body who could ↑help
↓me (.).hh erm cos I’m always the one who helps other ↑peo↓ple (1.5) you see I am
never the one that asks for help =
I: = so ↑help in what sort of ↓wa:y [I mean
S: just make just the just so I could get out of bed in the morning you know and [not dread the [day]
I: [practical help [[( ])]
S: support like in my head you know (( )) ‘come on ((Sally)) you can do it’ .hh nobody (1.0) ggh you know you don’t tell people you feel like that because I was the one everyone was leaning↓on (0.5) which has always been the case
I: = “you’re just like my mum”
S: yeah
I: [exactly the same sort of thing exactly
S: (am I) yeah
S: and my mother lay lean. leant on me and my sister ( (husband’s name)) of course he was in a complete state of collapse (.) and all the children .hh and (.) you know you can’t burden your friend you don’t want to talk about it to your friends too much ‘cos it just, .hh
I: = "I saw it no I didn’t become depressed"
S: and I just thought somebody’s got to help me with this and I used to find coming to the chapel services (.) was the only thing =
I: = "that calmed me down"
S: = [that calmed me down
I: = "I used to sit in the back and I used to look up at that window and I still do it now .hh"
I: = "yeah"
S: and I used to think to myself .hh “help me, help me please help me” (.) and (.) it used to really give me some strength you know
I: = "mm"
S: I mean things are still bad we still are in dire straits financially with this terrible 5 million pound debt hanging over us .hh which but we hope we will sort it (.) erm but its living with (.) constant strain over a period of years
I: = "mm"
S: constant anxiety
I: = "mm"
S: and that’s what is that’s [[what (.) this faith has helped me with (.)"
I: = "mm"
S: and now I find myself (1.0) praying for other things (2.5)
I: = "right so this was this was three, two years ago"
S: the the business collapsed three years ago
I: = "right"
S: but over the past three years it is (.) things have just gone from bad to worse in terms of (.) the financial situation .hh and that is that =
I: I mean I know money isn't everything but actually it is an awful strain to think you could lose your house and.

S: = and [everything which you've built up =]

I: °for °su↓re "

S: = and [everything ]

I: [mm]

S: .hh ern oh I've quite resigned myself to [losing the house ]

I: [mm]

S: .hh ern (.:) but anyway we've hung on and ((name)) is still going to work which is very good because at one point I thought he was going to commit sui↓cide like his father had .hh (1.5) you know it was just frightful (.:) and ?who ?else ?could ?help ↓me (1.5) ↑but ↑God (2.0) ↑and ↑he ↑has I'm ↑sure its him that's [he↑:elped me

I: so (3.5) ggh wh

S: mm

I: so your ↑faith has (.:) changed ↓a ↓lot

S: I'll say

I: and (.:) is it ?still changing

S: yes (0.5) I think it's I think it's growing

I: you ↑think its growing =

S: = mm

I: why do you think it's growing

S: because the way I now pray (1.5) for all sorts of things other than (1.0) e:r help (1.0) I pray for I pray now for other people (.:) and I believe (0.5) that they will be ↑help↓ed

I: do you still pray at home, (.:) you know with a candle at home

S: I've started ↑funnily en↓ough I've started doing that again erm ggh I didn't have the candle for a bit and then I've started ter lighting it again recently I don't know quite why .hh I suppose its (.:) "big anxieties at the moment with the money" and erm (1.0)

so to me God is somebody to ↑turn ↓to and ↑rely ↓on and (.:) erm (1.0) in just to get you through life's ups and downs I ↑don't think about death or anything like that or the future .hh or the afterlife at the moment I just think get I'm just surviving .hh you know and getting the children on and erm erm (0.5) and =

S: = just getting [through]

I: [so its part [of the (( )]

S: = [and I say (.:) just saying you know hi (.:) checking in (.:) .hh and =

I: [yes]

S: = erm (1.0) then ((name)) was in something the other day a competition .hhh and now I just when he went in to do his competition I was waiting outside and I [just

I: [oh this was the LAMBDA thing

S: yeah

I: and he ↑won it [didn't he

S: [yes he did .hh and I said 'o:h please God if its if you think it's all right for him to win it (.:) please help him to win it (.:) .hh cos it you know do him so much good (.:) if you think but only if you think it's all ri↑ght' .hh and erm (.:) any↓way he came out and he ↑won it and I thought ↑oh

I: wh. he was (.:) sort of ?up for winning it was he he was sort [of [he was a finalist [last year

S: [right ok
S: erm an he sh an’ he stood a good cha\-ance but (0.5) that’s what I mean it’s more my faith now in a situation like that I’ll ask for help
I: mm
S: whereas before I’d just you know wait and just
I: so you feel sort of comfy now [when your pray\-ing]
S: yes
I: ggh [so
S: I love it [([laughs])]
I: hhh
I: ye:ah
S: I really \-like praying
I: on your own and with others
S: \-yes
I: and would you do extempore prayer in church now (.) or \-not
S: oh I don’t think so (.) don’t think I’d (.) I [don’t think
I: no
S: \-yes
I: you wouldn’t go that far
S: no
I: no
S: no
I: erm so so (2.0) your faith is chang\-ing [as =
S: \-yes
I: as as things in your life change
S: yes I suppose that’s right
I: they’re sort of going together
S: [\-its a result of (.) events that happen to me
I: \-right and how you react to those things
S: yes =
S: = and how you respond to them
I: = and then (1.0) people whom you happen to meet like (0.5) the church service
I: and that ggh all these things become connected
S: mm
I: and sorry =
S: = no sorry you carry on
I: = and and its \-still sort of going \-on
S: yes =
I: = in a \-way still and are you conscious that you’re actively (0.5) looking out for it are you actually you’ve talked a couple of times about quest [this is a quest
S: mm
I: are you (.) consciously thinking I really .hh (.) want to go down this journey I really have something to find =
S: ye: es I long I would (.) absolutely .hh (.) love to be as (.) totally secure in my (.) belief as (.) you know so many people seem to be
I: right
S: that’s what my aim is to [be,
S: = and so [how long
S: = and so when something bad happens
I: yes
S: it doesn’t wobble it
I: right (.) right and how long do you reckon that you've had this sort of longing that you
could say (.) that [you've =

S: [mm
I: = had this sort of feel (.) since since first ((name)) ?died or

S: (0.5) no ↑probab↓ly ggh really really over the ↑last ↑yea↓r =
= its been developing very [strongly

I: [right, right so you're conscious that this is what [you're =

S: [mm

I: = actually trying to [do
S: [↑ye↓s, yes

I: so what ?what is the (.) end ↑goa↓l of this quest what is the =
S: = to have a com. to have a really secure faith

I: (1.0) right a secure faith =
S: = mm a faith that .hh will ↑not be I cos you see I know ↓no↑w that say something

I: = and you would see that as a wobble in your ?faith

S: ↑yea↓h
I: you would

S: ↓yeah
I: I mean the ↑psal↓mists yell and ↑rage at ↓God ↑don’t ↓they

S: yeah they but don’t say ‘you’re not there’ ↑do ↓they
I: oh ↓yes

S: ↑yea↓h
I: oh ↓yes

S: ↑o↓h
I: from the depth of my heart I yelled at you but you weren’t th↑ere (.)↑yea↓h

S: ↓e:h
I: ↑lots of ↓them ↓do ((looks up in Bible))

I: [anyway that’s another thing
S: [yes

I: but erm so but you you would ↓see it in your own (.) thing that erm (2.5) that (.) that
↑that wasn’t part of normal ↓faith as it were

S: [mm
I: [that was that was faith sort of taking a bit of a battering

S: yes yes
I: right erm

S: so I was most impressed with that lady this ↑morn↓ping (.) who lost her husband a
↑fort↓night ago or whatever =

I: = and yet she seems but ↑that’s what she portray↓ing you don’t [know
S: [yes

I: “what’s going on do you its°
S: no you don’t but

I: but yeah [er
S: [she we she came to us because we were ther- you know (.) that’s what I

I: ↑think you know the work of ↑Go↓d
I: yeah (.) [yes

S: [we’re there to ↑help her ↓no↑w and we’ll he↑lp her (.) and and her
daugh↓ter
I: so the work [of God =
S: [that’s God
I: = is happening through
S: through our ↑ prayer ↓ group and through
I: [through the prayer group
S: =
I: through the things that (.) we [do and say ° to help her° =
S: [yeah
S: ↑ yea ↓ h
I: erm so ↑ God (1.0) is seen (. ) so ↑ your faith takes a battering when events ( .) awful
events happen (.) in other words things happen .hh and faith can be impr↓oved or
people can get ↑ hel↑ p when ↑ oth↓ er things happen it all it all (.) hinges on what
happens or [or people doing things
S: [yes
S: yes i erm I’m being brutally honest here I know it sounds ↑ aw↓ ful that but ( .) its true-
ggh thinking about it that is that is the case and ↑yet .hh I came back to God because
of a crisis ( .) so I mean I don’t know but, I don’t know if ( .) I just pray and pray that ( .)
that h: he’ll look after the children
I: yes
S: and that ( .) I won’t have to face as you know (.50) another major .hh (1.0) disaster
I: [yes
S: because ah at one point before I ↑ star↑ ted ↓ pray↑ ing (.) I used to wake up in the
morning and think ‘oh my God I’ve got to get through another day what’s going to
happen today ?what dis↓ aster is going to happen today’ .hh ‘cos at one point we were
having one disaster after another one y:y just when you thought it couldn’t get worse
it did .hh but the children were always all ↓ right (1.0) you know (1.0) but what will
happen if they ↑ are↓ n’t you know it worries me a bit
I: ° of ↑ cou↓ rse°
S: mm
I: ° of course°
900 I: .hh so (3.0) things are going to rumble on and ↑ on,
S: yeah
902 I: things go ↑ on, things are going to ↑ happen
S: yeah
904 I: it’s all going to be its all going to be fine ↑ erm .hh (3.0) w: will you ↑ think ↑ about
↑ your ↑ faith sort of ↑ generally =
906 = or do you think I wonder [what’s going to happen to↑ day or
S: [ ↑ no: ↓ o I think about it a ↑ lot I think about it a ↑ lot =
908 I: = you do th. right
S: and I s. and I I almost stand back and look at myself and say ‘now where am I ↓ now’
1000 I: right
S: what’s happening now how am how am I feeling now
1002 I: and you you stand back and you look at your ↑ fa↓ i th [as well as [your self
S: [ mm [ mm
1004 S: yes I look at like it’s a sort of
I: right
1006 S: you know plant or something
I: right like a plant ((laughing word)) [very good yes
1008 S: (((laughs))
S: and [erm
1010 I: [what sort of plant out of interest (((laughs))
S: (((laughs)) ) triffid I don’t know ((laughs))
1012 S: no it’s funny in a slightly dispasionate way I sort of observe
I: right
S: how I’m (.), feeling how, where I’m at
I: so that’s you [exploring =
S: [yes
I: and trying to sort of work [things out
S: [yes
I: and see where your faith is =
S: = and then sometimes I when I come [to chapel =
I: [give it a health check
S: = I think (.), yeah that’s right and I I think to myself right ‘°
I’m here now (.), ok (0.5)
just he- you know come and talk to me° if you I-like come and tell me something or
just you know its like I’m waiting for a sign or something .hh erm which again I think
its something that people do you know .hh I mean I’ve got a friend whose like me she’s
done the Alpha course (.), she’s done all of this all of these things and she’s
desperately trying to find a faith she wants a faith .hh and (.), and yet you know she
listens she’s done the Alpha course and all she wants to do is say ‘°that’s ru-bb-lish
how can you say °that’ and .hh (0.5) but I said to her ‘I don’t think you should do
any of these courses I think you should just (.), be (.), you and °just wait for it to
happen like it happened to me° (.), and go to church and (.), try and experience (.), you
know (1.5) °and so she’s going she’s going to try that now° (2.5) but err (.), °what
°was °I °going °to °say °something
I: its about looking at your faith
S: looking at my faith
I: °and sitting there thinking if if you’re going to say something to me (.), or °not°
S: oh I °can’t °remember °what °I °was °going °to °say °it °will °come °back °to °me
I: [it °will °come °back
S: yeah it will come back to me
I: °and °and °?how °would °you °(1.0) °sort °of °know °(0.5) °where °you °were °in °your °faith °I °mean
°how °(0.5) °do °you °know °where °you °are °(0.5) °towards °the °goal °(.) °of °this °secure °faith °do
you think you’re near to it nearer to °it °or °further °[away °from °it
S: °[much °near°er
I: °you °feel °that °=
S: = yes °yes °I °feel °.hh °I °feel °I °am °getting °nearer °to °it °and °.hh °erm (.), °you °mean °you
might °think °its °hypo°criti°cal °to °come °to °a °prayer °group °and °pray °like °mad °when
you’re not (.), you °know °ss °you °can °be °a °bit °wobb°ly °still °.hh °but °I °think °its °part °of
my °quest (.), °I °do °feel °it’s °a °°search °I °’m °on °a °search °(1.0) °a °mission °to (.), °to °be (.), °as
°totally °secure °in °my °faith °as °somebody °like °(name) °(0.5) °so °if °my °child °died °I °could
say its all right °she’s °gone °to °heaven (.), °and °I °’m °going °to °see °her °again
I: mm and and why do you think that that’s your mission
S: as a protection really I suppose
I: °because °of °the °[things °that °have °=
I: = happened °in °your °life
S: yeah from pain you know how awful it feels .hh (.), °when °you ° havn’t °got °anything
I: mm
I: so it’s °a °sort °of °opening °up °not °being °.hh °not °being °hostile
I: mm
S: °oh °that’s °what °I °was °going °to °say °you °see °I’ve °always °felt (.), °that (.), °the °Christian
°way °of °living (.), °is °the °best °way °of °living °even °if °you °don’t °believe °in °God °you °know °the
Ten °Command°ments
I: = yes
S: you °know (.), °be °nice °to °people °be °kind
I: °[yes
I: °yes
I: yes
S: care about people
I: yes
S: put yourself out for people =
I: = yes
S: hh um and I’ve ↑al↓ways ↓felt that that’s (. ) you know ggh if you s. if you des↑cribe
1072 someone as a ↑really good Christian ↓pers↑on then everybody knows what you mean
I: mm
S: even if they may not be a (. ) a believer in God
I: mm
S: hh but I’ve so I feel I’ve↑tried all my life (. ) to be a good kind person .hh and ↑now =
I: = “you are a kind person”
S: ↓aah ↓ah [you’re very sweet to say that =
I: = [you are
S: = I’m ↑not ↑alwa↓ys (. ) some days I’m very mean .hhh erm and I’m ↑no↓w I (. ) I
↑really ↑feel I’ve gone over a (. ) into the next stage of actually (1.0) being a real
S: = a good Christian person (. ) a real believer in God that God can help me (2.0) I ↑don’t know
that he does answer our ↓prayers ↑but (1.0) because why does bad things still
I: = happen but (2.0) I really feel I’m on the road
S: = but you f. you say you’ve gone over this to another stage =
I: = yeah
S: = you feel that you’re on a different sort of
I: = segment of the [road or something
S: = mm yeah
I: = so w:?what makes you feel that
S: = the fact that I now (. ) without in without erm consciously (. ) thinking it instinctively
↓pray
I: = right so it’s it’s it’s what its what the prayer practice =
S: = yes =
I: = the things that you’ve done =
S: = yes prayer [practice
I: = [the things you do =
S: = yes
I: = that
S: = yes and I light I l. I I go into the church [in
I: = [yes
S: = [[(name of church)]
I: = [yes
S: = once or twice a week
I: = yes
S: = and I stay for twenty minutes and I light a candle and [I pray
I: = [right
S: = just pop in
I: = just as and [when
S: = [yes when I’m shopping or (. ) whatever and I think think
about what I want but I always say ‘hi ↓Dad’ .hh and then I (. ) I always just pray really
I: = hard (1.0) its more for safety I’m praying for safety for the children (1.0)
S: = mm
S: = because you know we were so shattered by what’s happened you just realise how
fragile everything is (. ) you know ((name)) death and
I: = mm
S: = the business its all so ↑fra↓gile you know you think you’re safe
I: = mm
and you're on (.)

mm and I found I do get a lot of comfort from doing that .hh and wherever I go

if I can light a candle =

I feel very comfortable doing that

but now you would say that [lighting the candle] is you

[yes] definitely

and beause you've said a couple of times 'this isn't me this isn't me'

[yes]

but it's something that you do,

yeah

it sort of happens

[instinctively]

right and its(.) because you do it regularly

[yes]

right so you're still on this quest

[yes] I think I am

but you're near the goal you think

S: [yes]

so do you think it (1.0) you know is it going to change again do you think or do you [think]

I think it will just get stronger(.) that's what I think

yes and how will you know if its getting stronger what will it sort of feel like then

or what [would be a sign (.)]

erm a certainty (1.0) yeah a certainty (1.0) I mean at- (.) at the moment its

just a real(.) you know (1.0) a certainty that God I will always believe in God (1.5)

that it won't waver

so it'll be erm something that you think and

and just know mm

and know

S: mm

[er]

S: [at the moment you see I do f- I do wonder I mean I don't know( .) it might not

be the case .hh but say I had another major crisis
I: [right
1176  S: ((( ))) I mean I wonder how I would react hh
I: : right =
1178  S: = God-wise
I: yes ok, ok
1180  S: mm
I: and so all though you’ve moved on this sta ge
1182  S: mm
I: it might be possible to move back again
1184  S: yes(.) but(.) funnily enough don’t think I will
I: mm
1186  S: I feel much more secure in it
I: mm
1188  S: and I love it(.) I love feeling like that
I: mm
1190  S: it’s what I’ve wanted to feel like f. for(.) years
I: ↑m ↓m
1192  S: but it was just you know when you erm(1.5) looking at the world(1.0) you do question and you think(.) “how can this be”(.) but(.) I suppose you, you know its like that thing once a catholic you know you(.) there’s something there[that I:
1196  S: if you can just(.) give it some atention I think that’s partly it with faith hh you need to give it some time
1198  I: mm
S: you need to give it some thought
1200  I: mm [you need
S: [and everybody is so busy aren’t they
1202  I: mm
S: there’s no time [to(.) stop and stare
1204  I: ↑m ↓m
S: even on holidays now everybody’s madly climbing up mountains or kayaking down rivers or hh you know(.) people don’t stop(.) nowadays
I: mm
1208  S: and I think if you’re going to(.) have a faith you’ve got to give it some time you’ve got to think about it(.) you got to give yourself some time[so if faith is something you have to work at
1210  I: yes I think so
I: its not just something [that
1214  S: [no I think so you have to l- give yourself [a chance I:
1216  S: you have to give yourself a chance(.) you’ve to open yourself up
I: righ ↑t
1218  S: and not just be hostile and oh God you know
I: yes
1220  S: and you have to say ‘right I’m here’
I: (2.0) and then wait and see what happens
1222  S: yeah and in my case it’s happened =
I: = yes
1224  I: what what about(.) praying and prayer what what do you think happens in prayer
1226  S: well I think you get a direct link(1.5) I really do I I wo- there wouldn’t be any point unless you believed you were(1.0) going up the re(1.0) I think that(2.5) I think you just speak to God
I: mm

S: whether or not he answers though I’m not sure (1.5) but does that matter if he answers or not (.) do you wish he would answer

I: yes He couldn’t could He really cos everybody’s praying for different things (.) I wish I had a I’d love to have some sort of religious experience you know a sign or something =

I: = but you don’t think this this funeral

S: [well]
I: [was – the speech (( ))]

S: [that was it you see (( ))]
I: [yes that was it (( ))]

S: yes I think that was it that was a complete turning point
I: yes

S: for [me]
I: so there’s nothing

S: it was so strong
I: yes and and you can, you can remember that and you’ve [got it if anything happens

S: [oh yes its what you call a JFK moment you know it was a real

I: a JFK

S: yeah you know everyone knows where they were when Kennedy died =

I: = oh I see yes right

S: so it’s a sort of

I: yeah

S: sort of thing

I: yeah

I: .hh erm so (1.0) is there anything now that you can do yourself do you think to move you nearer this goal you’re on this quest

S: yeah

I: you you’re [happy with your prayer you’re

S: [yeah

I: doing all these things

S: yeah

I: is are you just sort of (.) at the whim of what’s gonna happen at the mercy of what then might then happen to you or do you [see yourself

S: [which makes me a bit uneasy yes

I: which makes you think (.) you are

S: [yes

I: a little bit at [the mercy of =

S: [yes

I: = these things =

S: yes

I: = so what is there anything that you can do do you feel there is anything you can do that can move you on yourself

S: [well =

I: push you further on

S: = I think probably just more pray and more thinking about it

I: more thinking about it =

S: yeah more giving to me to it

I: mm

S: just sitting quietly or talking to

I: mm

S: talking to somebody else [about it

I: [mm
S: which I don't do very often (1.0) talk to my vicar or (.) chaplain or (1.0) you or
I: what what why do you not do it is it
S: ↑o:o↓h I'm always too ↑busy↓y =
I: its also a bit ↑per↓sonal isn't it (.) I mean I know I said 'yes do put my name on' but
S: [((laughs))]
I: to see my name Sally on the [prayer card]
S: on the card
I: was it not ↑on before
S: = on for the first time it was and I said '↑oh ↓yes of course' =
S: = ↑information given out
I: = ↑yes
S: but when I saw my name on it .hh and ↑so many of my friends said ↑I never ↓knew
down →went →to prayer ↑group (1.0) you know its erm 'you kept that ↓quiet' and I
↑don't I ↑don't suppose I kept it ↓quiet I just never really (0.5) (.)
S: = [(( ))  information given out
I: = [(( ))] well I do know everyb↓dy
S: and I am naturally
I: mm
S: a friendly chatty sort of ↑per↓son
I: mm
S: erm (0.5) so I I mean I have always gone to the chapel services I for example if
((↑na↓me)) ↓were ↓to ↓bring ↓the ↓children ↓in .hh to school (.) erm for a chapel
service he would go an (.) read a paper in the car for 45 minutes he wouldn't come
S: = [(( ))] he re↓fused to be confirmed which was unusual in those days (.)
I: like my (↑name))
S: yeah
S: yes [[[↑na↓me]]) is completely erm (.) he's not ↓hos↓tile to religion he just (.) doesn't
get it at all .hh and we were we were ↑simi↓lar in that and yet .hh it's the ↑death of
(↑name)) (.) and the ↑death of my father really I suppose that made me
S: mm
I: = come back =
S: = did would did you ↑meet ((↑name)) at ↑Ox↓ford
I: = yes
S: ↑yes
I: yes so you went perhaps did ↑he go through a similar thing to you questioning and
querying everything or was he
S: ↑don't I ↑don't know he:e just said to him I think he decided when he was about 13 or 14 that
it was erm (.) he just didn't [bel↑ieve and that was ↑i↓t
S: he re↓fused to be confirmed which was unusual in those days (.) erm most people just
went along with it you know for the presents if for anything else and erm he did so he
↑obviously did think about it [and just rejected it
I:                                               [mm
I: ↑m↓m

S: as has my son ((name)) and ((daughter's name)) (. ((2nd daughter's name)) is more (1.0) like me

°((name)) is very like me° and she’s she’s more open to thinking about it [and

I:                                               [mm

S: °she sometimes attends ((name)) group°

I: mm

S: °and I think she might be con↑firmed° I don’t know .hh I ↑don’t have any particular I

° say to her ‘oh do be confirmed’ or anything [like that you know =

I:                                               [mm

S: I just leave it entirely [up to them

I:                                          

S: cos ↑this school its very much opting in (1.0) whereas a ↑lot of (. ) boarding schools

you opt out of being confirmed

I: yes

S: you [know

I: [yeah

S: great masses of them [getting confirmed in one go

I: [yes yes my Godson was all done like that in a mass (. ) erm

S: well that’s ↑great

S: ↓mm

S: I bet that surp↑rised you hasn’t it some of ↑that

I: ↑why do think that that I’m surprised

S: well because normally people who go to prayer groups are absolutely rock solid in

their religion religious faith

I: oh for heavens sake I I

S: don’t you ↑think

I: ggh yes (. ) I do think they would be

S: [people like ((name))

I: ↑that’s how I thought ↑you were

S: yes you see

I: well that’s ↑great

S: ↓mm

S: I mean going to an extempore °prayer group °°I mean°

S: you’re on a quest

I: oh ↓yes

S: yes

I: oh ↓yes and I mean you know this this is I mean just like you we were brought up

church was just there in the [background

S: [yeah

I: it’s what you [did you know normal part of life

S: [yes

S: yes

I: my mum was you know she’d she would call herself a Christian she would do all these

things but she would ↑never ↑dream of (. ) sort of .hh sitting n chatting to you about

you know did you have a chat to ↑God today and when did you last have a good pray

S: [no

I: or something

S:
S: yes I wonder if she would pray on her own
I: = no
S: no you see that’s di - that is what is interesting for your research [project
I: ] [yes
S: you’ve got somebody like me [who ( ]
I: [but I remember I just have to tell you this once once
when we were at my happy-clappy church in London that I ended up (.) but er I said
‘we’re going to go to this thing’ and she was there with me and she was quite happy to
go to this event to church she would always go to organised things but part of the
thing I didn’t realise and she didn’t realise was going to march down from the church
with banners [singing
S: [laughs
I: and ending up at the town hall and my mother was absolutely [horrified
S: [mortified
I: she said ‘we’ve got to walk down here singing’ and it was just
laughs
I: so I know exactly [exactly (.) what you mean
S: [yes
I: [and I think
S: ] yeah
I: its its just that’s what she was like and how I was like how I am [like
S: [mm
I: so erm (0.5) I rea. thank you so much sharing all of that I really
appreciate it [you’ve no idea
I: [oh it was it was interesting [for me to find out how I felt
S: [was it?
I: S: yeah
S: to actually examine how I felt and I was brutally honest with you
[laughs
I: [I mean well I could see that and that’s
S: [mm
I: its difficult because I want I don't want to be intrusive
S: not at all
I: its wonderful to have the opportunity to talk
S: [yes
I: yes and I am I am genuinely [interested
S: [yes
I: its not just because we’re doing this
S: [no no I can see
I: because I went through well a sort of thing a period of
S: yes
I: stress what was happening and [al.
S: [yes
I: and I just wanted to know what was going on
S: yes
I: and that’s why I started all of this
S: how interesting I think you you’ll have the most fascinating time
I: hhhh you see that’s the other thing people say that people aren’t going to church any
more and yet I’ve said to a lot of people when they say ‘oh what are you doing’ and I
say ‘I’m doing this’ and they all go ‘.hhhh how interesting’
S: yes
I: people are interested people are on quests
S: humans are spiritual beings
I: [mm
S: you can’t get away from [it and erm people either reject it or they accept it or they
I: [mm
S: say most of them are somewhere in the middle
I: mm
S: but people don’t really in my experience few people actively [rejected it] mm
I: most people haven’t thought about it or [don’t bother] no
S: and yet you see one of the reasons for keeping a church open in a village is people want to be (.) want to be buried in churches you know they want funerals
I: oh yes
S: they will turn to God in a you know
I: mm
S: in at a time of [crisis people will find themselves walking into a church]
I: [mm]
S: and [lighting a candle its that sort of thing]
I: [mm]
S: [it's still there still a faith we are spiritual beings and you know alright people have]
I: [mm]
S: turned away from (0.5) say God [traditional spirit um religion]
I: [mm]
S: but they’re looking for [other (0.5) you know]
I: [mm]
S: [other faiths or or activities]
I: [mm]
S: to try and work out this [spiritual side of them]
I: [mm mm]
S: and I’m just so pleased that I’ve been able to you know join the prayer group and not feel too self [conscious and not feel]
I: [no]
S: silly
I: mm
S: you get somebody like ((name)) who’s who’s obviously been a Christian
I: mm
S: for many many years I don’t know if she has d. I’ve never talked to her about it
I: mm
S: I don’t know her terribly well
I: you see you call her and I would you call her a Christian
S: yes
I: and yet when (.) we started right at the start of this
S: mm
I: I said you know ‘would you say you had a faith and all the rest of it you never said ‘oh
yes I would say I am a Christian’
S: (0.5) no
I: you you said ‘[oh yes I have a faith’
S: [yes]
I: [so I mean]
S: [or spiritual [fa.
I: [spiritual [its not the same thing]
S: [yes]
I: if you say I am a Christian you’re immediately put into a sort of doctrine
S: yes
I: and dogma aren’t you
S: and also you see if you look I was a mediaeval historian (.) and if you look at the history of the church
I: mm
S: you know that’s why it’s so good to just go back to what Jesus actually said cos he didn’t say a huge amount
I: mm
S: and you know on what he did it’s built this whole you know
I: mm
S: edifice the church which a lot is built by evil men really
I: mm
S: and the way it’s been twisted and manipulated and everything I think to say you have a I think faith really just comes back down to you and God
I: mm
S: you and God and all that other stuff is incidental
I: you’ve got to get rid of it
S: mm
I: throw it out
S: yeah and to purify I can see why the Puritans did what they did you know get rid of all the trappings of it its not to say I don’t feel it very much in our chapel but (2.0) I don’t know I can [see it
S: yeah
I: [trappings and trappings actually
S: yeah
I: erm (.) but the idea that you (1.0) I mean just out of interest if you are interested you might. the contemplative prayer that I now do I I’ve found my home in that
S: have you?
I: yeah its just
S: that’s you [is it?
I: [that is now me
S: uh
I: and we sit in silence there aren’t any words
S: uh
I: and erm (.) one of the things they discussed at this weekend the the person who gave it was just the most marvellous spiritual man
S: yes
I: and he said its about erm (1.5) one phrase he said once he said its about the giving up
S: mm
I: and giving up and giving up and giving up°
S: mm
I: and then you receive
S: yes you see and that makes [absolute sense to me
I: [AND THAT that he
S: [said is spiritual growth
I: [mm
S: yeah (.) that’s right
I: “you just give up and give out and give up°
S: yeah
I: “throw away and get rid and [lose°
S: [yeah
I: “and lose and [lose and lose°
S: [yeah
I: that makes so much sense to me now
I: it does to [me now but erm
S: [yeah
I: mm
I: and the other thing they said which I f. really interesting was that normal normally when we think about stuff in all walks of life
S: mm
I: you’ve got to do this you ge. you work hard you get your A levels and you know
S: mm
I: you got da de da de da [its this linear thing going out from you do this and this
S: [mm
I: [and this and then you get
S: [yes
I: you’re at the path
S: yeah
I: he said ‘faith is a circular thing’
S: mm
I: “you go out and you come back”
S: mm
I: “you go out and you come back”
S: mm
I: and its its to me that seemed.(.) and the contemplative thing’s all about actually going
S: yes (0.5) from within
I: yeah absolutely its called the prayer of the heart prayer within
S: gosh how interesting
I: I love it
S: and where do you do that?
I: er we do it at the convent opposite opposite the school
S: (. ) [oh I know
I: there’s a little convent there [number 8 next door
S: [yes
I: to the ((place name)) erm whatnot
S: yes
I: that’s just where we ______
S: yeah
I: and we’re part of this world-wide movement its massive now
S: oh
I: erm hundreds of thousands of people and that’s what I said we all could meet at the
weekend Christians and Muslims alike
S: yes
I: cos it’s not doctrinal
S: no
I: I mean IT IS CHRISTIAN
S: yes
I: the guy who runs it is a is a Benedictine monk
S: right
I: but erm (1.5) erm what you do (1.0) in prayer and in your faith and in your spiritual
quest is exactly the same as what the Muslims are doing [its just we put
S: [oh I see
I: we we we’re brought up in our [tradition and they’re brought up in theirs
S: [mm
S: yes
I: or the Quakers do or what you know
S: mm
I: anybody else does
S: mm
I: its just that when we when we talk about it we put into our tradition
S: mm of course
I: when we don’t talk about it when we just do it
S: mm
I: we’re all doing the same thing.
S: mm (1.5) mm
I: it’s all its all you know its all a journey isn’t it?
S: = you finding [what is right for you
I: [you see it. you use that often times a journey or a quest you see that
S: [don’t you? ( )
I: [I do I see it as a road.
S: mm
I: but perhaps I shouldn’t perhaps I should see it as a [coming
S: [oh no no that was
I: to see it that way
S: yeah
I: I remember when my (.) my father had a a massive stroke when I was thirteen and he
was hospitalised and he died when I was [eighteen and my mum had a nervous
S: [oh de.
I: breakdown and she was in (1.5) in a hospital and I remember when (0.5)
S: oh what a [strain
I: [I first went back to see her after I was at university and she called me up
S: I had you to come home’ I’m desperate and er I didn’t know about nobody
I: knew about depression then I didn’t realise
S: mm
I: how ill she was I didn’t I knew she was ill and in hospital but I didn’t know what for or
S: why
I: and it seems extraordinary but you don’t
S: no
I: and the first time I came home and I came home to ((place)) and I was thinking about
this and this [mm
S: [mm
I: meeting because I got off the train at ((place)) and came over the st. stairs just as I
S: did this weekend
I: and my mum was there to meet me and she said first thing she said to me like this
S: silly
I: lady whose husband has just died she said ‘of course people think I’m stupid being
S: oh’
I: and I said ‘oh well of course you are being silly mum’ as you do
S: yes
I: absolutely the wrong thing to say as I now know
S: o:h
I: burst into tears and was the whole start of it but I remember the week I spent with her
and we just sat most of the time holding hands or whatever and um (1.5) I can
remember on one time there was (1.0) we’d sat with her all morning she’d been ill and
then I could and I could suddenly sense she was relaxing a bit
S: mm
I: I was holding her hand and I was sitting next to her and I suddenly felt that we’d been
S: doing this for a week
I: and now she’s relaxing a bit
S: yes
I: and I suddenly had this sort of picture (0.5) of a little path
S: yes
I: arid stones everywhere sand desert
S: yes
I: and I was on this path looking back the way I’d come I wasn’t looking where. and in
the middle of this path was this great massive rock
S: yes
I: that we’d had to struggle over
S: yeah
I: it was almost visual it was almost like a vision
S: hhh yeah
I: and I looked back and I thought (. ) we’ve been over that rock
S: yeah
I: but we’ve done it now
S: yeah never have to do that rock again
I: yeah
S: there’ll be other rocks
I: yeah ( . ) and she was still as bad as ever I mean
S: mm
I: goodness knows what prompted me to think that because she was still horribly
S: no
I: horribly ill
S: yeah
I: but it was the path you see
S: yes
I: it’s the image of the path
S: yes
I: I think we all have it
S: how fascinating
I: mm
S: and did she get better?
I: yeah ( . ) I mean
S: with medication and
I: yes she was she was diagnosed as clinically depressed
S: yes
I: and she. and all the rest of it
S: yes
I: and she always she was always what I would say she was on the edge of the (. )
calibration I always thought of her
S: mm
I: like a radio and she went right up at the top end
S: mm mm
I: so that if anything happened then she would
S: she would go over the top
I: yeah so I was (. ) I was always you know ‘how are you today mum?’ always you know
S: yes
I: sort of
S: mm
I: careful about her (. ) and of course it meant that when she got into elderly age
S: yeah
I: she suffered more
S: yeah
I: because of it
S: very hard to see somebody you love suffer like that (.0) its very hard
I: yeah ( 1.5 ) erm ( 1.5 ) yeah
S: and is she still with you?
I: no
S: she [died
1720 I: [she she went she stayed with us for a while lived with us for a while cos it was obvious she couldn’t live on her own and er then she became very ill anxious very
1722 anxious I mean
S: a:h a:h
1724 I: and she was us she’d be in her late seventies and I mean she got. this was the period of my stress [because she got
1726 S: [I’m not surprised
1728 I: well she got to the point when she was so anxious that I (.) couldn’t leave the house I couldn’t leave the room and she she would want to sit there holding me or touching me
1730 S: oh God how awful
I: and we would have a meal and I would say ‘what you want to eat? whatever you’re eating or ‘I don’t want to eat anything’ so I’d make the meal ‘oh I’ll have what you’re eating and she’d actually want to eat it off my plate
1734 S: hhh
I: sometimes drink the water from my glass
1736 S: oh dear
I: and and I know it was this massive anxiety she just sat there [anxious ( )
1738 S: [sur. surprised they couldn’t get her something for it
1740 I: well they could she was but its its she was elderly by this time late seventies
S: yes
1742 I: she should have had I think clinical counselling
S: yes
1744 I: psychology counselling
S: mm mm
1746 I: but then. see this was in the ’60s
S: oh
1748 I: they didn’t. and she had this massive er ECT stuff
S: oh yes
1750 I: which completely collapsed her memory
S: yeah
1752 I: you wake
S: yes
1754 I: up in a hospital room not knowing where you are who you are
S: yes your short term memory just goes doesn’t it
1756 I: and erm so she knew the the worry the idea is that you forget your worries but the idea is that she woke up thinking (0.5) I’m really, really worried about something but I don’t know what it is
S: yeah
1760 I: which makes it even worse
S: yeah I don’t think it does much good that ECT
1762 I: I think it can do if it’s done with
S: it’s good for post-natal depression I think it really sorts [that out but
1764 I: [right yes
S: ((name)) father had it year in year out
1766 I: did he? oh
S: oh terrible
1768 I: frightful, frightful disease
S: frightful
1770 I: but the thing was she went into the home and I thought right this is it cos I I said I could care for her when I can but if its 24 hour care I can’t cos I have to have my sleep
S: yes
I: so she went into this lovely home really nice home Jewish really, really caring and I thought this is it erm you know she’s just going to go downhill from here now

S: mm
I: she didn’t she blossomed
S: did she
I: and you know the classic time cos my mum never slept ever the classic time was when I came in one day and I said er ‘oh you know how are you how’ve you been?’ oh yes she said ‘I’ve had a lovely time just woken up now and had my breakfast’ and I went just woken up now 9 o’clock? had your breakfast?’ yeah oh that’s great you’re sleeping so well now aren’t you you know always sleep well’ she said and I said to her ‘oh that’s good mum you don’t remember when you didn’t sleep well?’ oh was there a time when I never sleep well?

S: aah
I: and the thing we’d been plagued all our lives
S: oh
I: with this I mean she used to wake me up at 2 o’clock in the morning and then that was it
S: o:h
I: and erm so you know
S: I’m not surprised you got stressed
I: so (1.0)
I: I don’t know why I told you all of that I think it was I don’t know why I told you all of that it just seemed to come out
S: well I’m glad you did
I: think I wanted to (0.5) say that she’d been ill (.) but how grateful I was that actually for the last three years of her life in the home where she went because she was ill she was actually as well as she’s ever been
S: yeah
I: [and probably]
S: [( ]
I: she felt safe you see
S: she felt safe
I: she did that was the point she was completely safe
S: 24 hour care (.) slightest bit. anybody. she didn’t have to worry about a thing
S: a:h
I: money
S: aah
I: it was all taken off her
S: yeah
S: coo wouldn’t it be nice to be like that?
I: actually I used to think exactly the same thing I thought I “can’t wait until I can come” here
S: ((laughs))
I: ((laughs))
S: oh God laughs roll on the Jewish home
I: there was a really. actually it wasn’t a Jewish home in in fact but a a most of the people there were Jewish and um so in recognition of that they never they never the one thing my mum said she missed was bacon
S: oh bless
I: but they had this woman who came in as a sort of person who comes into homes
S: right
I: and I was so impressed with her
S: were you
I: this Jewish thing about you care for people care for people like they’re your family
S: I think there’s a lot to be said for the Jewish faith
I: mm
1830 S: I went to a Jewish funeral recently and (.) it was marvellous it was really marvellous
    they sai. you know they all stood and said these prayers that they. people have been
    saying for thousands of years and you just felt the great surge of I dunno
    S: ((sneezes)) excuse me
1834 I: bless you have some more coffee
    S: I won't thank you I must go
1836 I: no?
    S: no I must go I'll go and pop in to see ((name))
1838 I: well we've chatted long time
    S: I know was that all right?
1840 I: it was fabulous
    S: was it?
1842 I: I'm so grateful
    S: oh don't be grateful do you know I feel grateful to you because I've never really
1844 I: we've both put our glasses on!
    S: I know
1846 S: laughs [(   )
    I: laughs [(   )
1848 I: 'end of interview put glasses on'
1850 S: yes
    I: I'm just going to switch this off
1852 S: yeah
    I: ok it says 'stop narration' so I'm going to assume that its been on
1854 I: stop!
END
JOHN'S STORY

Fourth participant, first field transcript, ref. 4:1:1:0

4 I: ‘scuse me so that’s that now I’ll put that down away so that we’re not looking at it sorry for all palaver

6 J: that’s all ↑right

I: ↑erm

8 J: ((coughs))

I: right so we we↑know what we’re doing we we I:’ve =

10 I: = described to you [what it’s all about

J: [yeah

12 I: .hh and (.75) we’re ↑just gonna chat really I mean there’s ↑no sort of pre-set questions or (.75) there’s no sort of (.) set agenda or anything going on it’s ↑just (.) your, what you want to ↓say .hh but I:↑thought just to start us ↓off ↑it was ↑lovely by the way starting off with prayer< wasn’t ↑it (.) I mean what an appropriate way to start it

16 J: I didn’t. (. ) I ↑↑didn’t start off with prayer [( .25) I started with medi↑ta↓tion

I: [well I meant,

18 J: to me that’s different

I: °oh right well we’ll [better explore that then we’d better explore that°

20 J: [huh huh huh huh ((laughs))

I: ↑fore we get into ↓tha↑t ((coughs) ↑erm (.) you know ↑we naturally sat around ↓there and it was fine and it felt ↑very, (. ) o↓Kay [because >you know =

24 J: [(((coughs))]

26 I: = we were all amongst friends< we all did it we knew that

J: yeah

28 I: but ↑I ↑wondered if you were say at ↓work (.75) or wherever in the ↓pub (.) and the conversation got round to you know these weird people who have faith (1.0) or these weird people who pray or ↓whatever (1.0) and then s. and and ↑somebody suddenly got the impression that you, you perhaps ↓sometimes ↓prayed or whatever (.) and they ((↑hlooked breathed word)) at ↓you and they said ↑w:w:what egg↑h do ↓you have ↑faith ↑what about ↑you are you ↑religious (.) ↑what ↑do ↑you ↑call ↑yourself what what do ↓you have ↑faith (.) and you’re >↑suddenly put on the spot and there’s ↑all these people looking at ↓you< what what do you ↓say

34 J: ↑erm hhh (1.5) I think the words are are very loaded I mean (.) faith

I: mm

36 J: and re↑li↓gious

I: mm

38 J: erm (2.25) I, (.) I ↑think you have to have (.) I feel you have to have an approach to ↓life (.) that helps me to (1.0) understand, cope ↑with, deal ↑with, (1.0) the mystery of ↑li↑fe

40 I: mm

42 J: erm I ↑think that the best approach is to have as little faith as poss↓ible (1.0) because faith in what I mean faith is often defined as (.) believing in something (1.0) that you cannot see or under↑sta↓nd (1.0) and I I believe ↓in ↓thin↑gs but I f. I find faith (.) I define faith more as ((coughs)) how you would have faith in your ↑part↓ner or your friend (0.5) you believe in that =

= per↓son (1.25) [because (.) of =

48 I: [hh

50 J: = what that person has (.) shown you that they’re ↑li↓ke (0.75) so for example I don’t believe in God (0.75) I mean there is no God (0.75) °I mean I think it’s (0.25) almost (0.25) I mean it sounds ↑insul√ting but I couldn’t, ↑could↓n’t believe in God cos the way my life has been (0.75) ° and erm although I ↑used to (.) until my twenties° very ↑strongly believed in God (0.75) I was brought up as a (.) Roman Catholic°
I: .hh right

J: erm and (0.25) so faith to me is more (0.50) faith in a practice, a (.1) er (.)

I: possibility of teachings although not sitting quite likely to that erm, but (0.25)
faith (0.25) in an approach and I suppose it ultimately in my self ((hh laughing
outburst))

J: ((( )))

I: that’s quite a complicated answer that’s that’s

J: it wouldn’t be the answer I’d give

I: in the pub I probably ((( )))

J: what would you give in the pub then .hh

I: the answer I’d give in the pub (.1) is that er it’s helpful sometimes to ha. have
something to anchor you to to pra. to have a practice, to have (0.75) to have a set of f
friends who are on a spiritual journey (.1) because ‘cos I just find that (0.75) help ful
(1.25) erm in ord. in living and understanding life and facing the perplexities and

I: right so there’s an awful lot in there what you’ve said but gagghh (1.50) I mean have
you thought about this much I mean do you sometimes find yourself thinking
what am I doing how would I answer these questions is it something that you find
difficult to [answer your self

J: no, no because I don’t really get asked asked the questions I think that .hh (1.0) people, (1.75) the people I have religious discussions with are the people who know (0.50) where I stand in the groups I’m in

I: mm

J: I think people out side, people at work, people I meet (.25) may be (.) they have
more discussions about what sort of person you are and how you behave and what
you do (0.25) in life

I: so you don’t find

J: [this is at a certain level after the religious part I suppose

I: [right

J: why you think that why you approach management of people for [example

I: [yes

J: [in the way

I: [yes

J: you do

I: yes yes (.1) ((coughs))

J: erm why that’s more that’s what the discussion would be

I: so you would [distinguish between perhaps say

J: (((coughs))

I: religious discussion (1.0) and the sort of discussion that you might have or how
you’d view what you (1.0) what you

J: well religion is just another (0.25) conceptualisation of things. I think .hh and it’s so loaded

I: mm

J: it’s so loaded I mean I’m in a (0.75) a poetry group and we write (( )) and

I: mentioned the word God not (0.75) in a kind of slightly ironic way actually in a poem< and (0.50) the whole critique from the group centred on that word<br>

I: mm

J: because it was such an emotive [word for people and =

I: mm

J: = there was anger and er positive (.1) responses as well around that >and they
didn’t see the poem< they just saw that word =

I: = but that’s (.1) good

J: [and in my final writing of the poem I took that word< out =
I: = oh you ↑ did I mean don’t you think that (.) for people to discuss it and have all these different views is part of the [((1.0) ↑ bene↓ fit of it]
J: [(( )) yeah but they’re not talking about ↑ God
108 they’re talking about (0.25) they’re talking about erm the way that ((coughs)) they’ve been (0.75) controlled (.) socially during their ↑ up↓ bringing usually .hh (1.50) when people talk about God they’re often talking about the church or (0.75) the social mill↑ eu, or the functionalist religious (.) [(( ))] controlling them
114 I: [pe. people come to as↑ soci↓ ate certain things with that word (.) because of what they’ve experienced, n people they’ve met an =
I: = (. ) good and [bad ex↑ periences
J: [yes well so do ↑↓ I real↑ ly
I: [yes
116 I: [↑ ggh
I: ↑ please ↑ do
120 I: = yes
J: and I’ll I’ll so to make it easier [ if I go if I tell you where =
122 I: [↑ ggh
I: ↑ do
124 J: = I’m coming from on the word faith an’ if you want to structure it [(( ))]
I: [no, no that’s fine I
126 would have I would have asked
J: yes
128 I: would have suggested that yeah
J: er (0.50) ↑ when ↑ I think about myself I think that its .hh (0.25) its very difficult to. to dis-associate (0.75) your religious beliefs, your ↑ faith, your approach to the world, your psycholo↓ gy (1.75) because I think essentially (0.50) all religion (0.75) is (0.75) a projection of our (.) our own longings, aspirations (0.75) onto the ↑ wo↓ rld (1.0) and (1.25) sometimes when I. I see people who are ↑ highly intelligent (0.50) for example (.) scientists I know ↑ highly, highly intelligent ↑ er, or people like my own↑ fath↓ er very bright ↓ man (1.25) and ↑ yet their re↑ li↓ gion (.) the way they express themselves religiously is very simplistic (0.75) and very (0.75) out of tune with their oth. the ↑ rest of their approach to life (0.50) they never talk about ↑ pol↓ itics like that they’d question it much more (0.50) they need (.) to ↓ believe they need (.) (0.25) and even in the face of (0.25) ↑ huge evidence to the ↑ contr↓ ary they have to (.) believe in ↓ God or love of ↓ God or ↓ religion ↓ and ↓ so ↓ on (0.75) .hh and that’s very ↑ inter↓ esting to me because I might think that I ↑ al↓ so passed through a period of my life when I had to (0.50) and I’m now in a period when I ↑ don’t ↓ have to and its ↑ quite (.) sort of scary and exciting to be (0.50) just cast off
144 I: well can we go back over that just a little bit perhaps erm you you were ↑ brought up a. as a Roman Catholic
146 J: ↑ brought up as a Roman Catholic and I ↑ think that there
I: in a Roman Catholic family
148 J: ↑ oh very much ↓ so ↑ yeah
I: [yeah
150 J: Irish (.) immigrant family it was i:i sort of two generations back
I: mm
152 J: although my parents were the first (0.50) kind of middle-class
I: mm
154 J: group removed from Liverpool
I: mm
156 J: “came down to the South an (.) er went to university and so on”
I: mm
158 J: “all part of it” so yeah that that was the background
I: mm
J: quite a simple
I: mm
J: folk (. ) faith if you like
I: mm
J: and then erm (. ) so that's how I was brought up (0.75) and (0.25) the church was next door
I: this was in: Liver:pool
J: no they my parents both were from they moved south ° so I was born in London so we lived there my father worked there
I: mm
J: and historically it is quite interesting because he, he was the first (0.50) person his my grandfather worked on the docks in Liverpool ( 0.50) and my father was just very bright he was and through the through the church through the Jesuits through the Jesuit education
I: mm
J: he really was singled out and and got to Ox ford
I: mm
J: not only the first person from his family who'd been to uni ver sity ever but he went to Ox ford
I: mm
J: from his faith background [.hh and in a way I think he =
I: [mm
J: = kept his sort of atavistic faith background the same as ever (0.25) even though he's socially [and
I: [atavistic you call it
J: well ye: es yeah the simple folk
I: yeah yeah
J: Irish thing
I: mm
J: non-reflective (. ) Catholicism
I: mm
J: and er
I: very creed al, doctrin al, dogma tic
J: oh ye: ah very dogmatic and doctrinal and creedal but it was a sort of yeah but it was a very (0.75) sort of healthy in a way because erm (2.0) ggh yeah I mean I even remember I rem ber going to to Mass and
I: [mm
J: [the men were all standing at the back (( )) the pubs opened after communion faith was a thing that (. ) that women were mostly interested in and religion but men came to it when it you know something serious happens in their lives like a death or a marriage or whatever .hh and they (. ) but normal ly it wasn't a very manly thing .hh
I: [anyway
J: but you were con firmed and you [were (( ))
J: oh confirmed yeah did all that and an altar boy an all that and that was very serious
I: mm
J: and the big (0.25) thing that changed my life was my when my mother died
I: ah
J: when I was 10 years old
I: ah dear
J: she was thirty seven
214
I: oh gosh
J: and (1.0) it was a very badly handled then the grief
216
I: mm
J: the grief wasn’t handled well so it was one of those very complicated
218
I: mm
J: so its really taken a long, long time for me and that has had a fundamental effect
220
on my (0.50) view of the world
I: mm
J: because (.) erm (1.50) and the first the first impact of it was I think, (0.75)
make me (0.75) erm (0.75) more religious
224
I: mm
J: in a funny sort of way hh I remember as a child saying, praying ‘oh please let her
226
live’ an all that
J: yes oh dear
228
I: and all that and of course she didn’t erm but I didn’t immediately sort of resent
God for that
230
I: mm
J: erm and I was ten [at the time
232
I: [mm
J: er (1.50) hh even as children at that stage well an’ my father used to say ‘well (0.25)
you know your mother’s looking down in heaven I’ve got [to you know
I: [mm
J: answer to her one day an treat you well and we used to think (.) even as (0.75)
children and young teenagers that was his (1.0) we used to say yes, yes, yes but we
didn’t believe it (.) not really believe it =
I: [right
J: = in that way he did or said he did hh just (0.75) so I think that my first
reaction to that was very deeply psychological I think when I became (1.50) fifteen,
238
sixteen,
I: mm
J: seventeen (1.0) I really wanted to be a monk
240
I: mm
J: and (0.75) I was really into St John of the Cross and Teresa of Avila =
= and er [re.
242
I: [did you have a Jesuit schooling
I: no no and [secu catholic catholic
244
I: [mm, mm
J: and er Thomas a Kempis
246
I: mm
J: I was reading Thomas a Kempis [at fifteen, sixteen
248
I: [mm
I: mm
J: and I dis co vered (.) through that (0.75) er quiet prayer I used to do do it probably
sixteen, seventeen onwards I’d do (2.0) sort of sit ggh quiet and
250
I: mm
J: and and contemplation try to sort of contemplation and get lots and have lots of
252
I: [mm
I: mm
J: and feel that (0.50) I was close (0.25) to God or that there was a link
I: you say you had lots of experiences so you felt something happening when you
( ) [meditated
J: [yeah
I: or prayed or [whatever you want to call it
J: [↑ye↓s I did feel a sort of floods of erm (0.50) kind of bliss or joy or
whatever yeah (0.25) I [di↓d yes
I: mm
J: erm
I: and you and you still thought of this as part of your Roman Catholic [( )
J: [oh yeah, yeah
I: this was God this [was the this was God =
J: [yes yes
I: = and the idea was to ‘seek to unify with ↑God’ but I think that for me the
psycho↑log↓cal trap was .hh erm (2.50) almost protecting myself from (0.75) the
world prote→cting myself from the vagaries [of life
I: [mm
J: because I had had (.) the ↑carpet pulled out [rudely before I was really ↑re↓dy
I: mm yes in↑deed yes
J: erm and had the ↑too↓ls to
I: yes =
J: = and because the way it had ↑not really been handled well we weren’t really allowed
to grieve fully and [so on and so forth
I: ↑mm
J: you had brothers and sisters
I: mm yes in↑deed yes
J: ↑four of us four of us and ↑I was the ↑old↓est
I: oh gosh
J: ‘cos she had four
I: mm
J: between the ages of five and ten
I: oh
J: ↑it was a big
I: mm
J: big event erm and (1.25) so I ↑think that my re↑li↓gion was almost saying well (.) the
↑world (0.25) in a ↑way it was there was a bit a bit of negativity about it I was ↑VERY
interested in as↑ceticism,
I: mm
J: and really interested in all those things
I: mm
J: and the very time of (0.50) puberty fifteen, sixteen, [seventeen
I: ↑mm
J: ↑all all almost all my energies
I: mm
J: were going into ↑Go↓d
I: mm
J: and all my e↑rot↓ic energies almost
I: mm
J: and all my psychological
I: mm, mm
J: into God
I: mm
J: and erm and this idea of monasticism [and so on and so forth
I: [mm
J: ((coughs)) and I think it was the I ↑think it was the idea of of (. ) psychologically of self pro↑tec↓tion [of
I: [mm
J: if I give everything up then I can’t ↑lose anything
I: mm ↑mm
J: and if there is some something you can hold ↑on ↓to
I: mm
J: that is ↑sol↓id (. ) in a world which had been ↑pro↓ven to me (. ) was ↑not (0.25) as it
seemed I think what happened when when you’re a child when a ↑death happens it
throws your world a↑pa↓rt “probably” although when when you’re a ↑chi↓ld and
your in a very ↑safe ↓world
I: mm
J: and the carpet is pulled out [from under that
I: [mm
J: ↑sudden↓ly a chasm opens ↑up =
I: mm
J: = and you ↑real↓ise what the world is ↑li↓ke what the universe ↑is ↓like
I: mm
J: = and (1.0) you ↑can’t (. ) can’t take that in I think [it’s
I: learning that sort of thing [isn’t it yeah
J: [yes it is
I: ]
J: so I ↑think that I was using religion in a wa:ay ggh for mortification which I was
practising the .hh (.) the er the asceticism [that I was practising =
I: [mm
J: = even at that early age =
J: = a kind of (. ) self [NEGATING
I: [so this was when you’re fifteen, [sixteen
J: sixteen, seventeen [yeah
I: [you were still
at school
J: yeah
I: did you tell your fri?ends did they know that [that you ↑did ↑this ↑sort ↑of ↑thing
J: ↑oh yeah [yeah =
I: [yes
J: = I mean in a Catholic contex t [these things are more under↑stood I suppose
I: [yes
J: and I was going on retreats to ((name)) Abbey in ((place))
I: ↑m↓m
J: and I really wanted to join the Benedictines there
I: mm
J: erm (0.75 ) then I went to university (0.50) and (. ) discovered women [(. ) ((laughs))
I: [((laughs))
J: erm and didn’t an’ I ↑think that an’ I hadn’t the two things held the two things
together a lot erm and then I worked and then I left (. ) er had a and had a year with
erm working in this The Meadows thing with Cathy and we ↓met an’
I: you met Cathy at university
J: well when I was at university I was there for after two years at university (. ) I was
getting a lot of: f psychosomatic (0.50) ↓problems eye pains and so on
I: mm
J: and I and I convinced myself to take a year ↑off I was at Oxford as well
I: ↑m↓m your father’s college
J: yeah unfortunately the same subject
I: what subject was that
J: history
I: history
J: and I shouldn't have done "I shouldn't have done (( ()" anyway well I took a year off
and I and I knew through the Catholic chaplaincy I knew (0.25) a person who
paradoxically he was a had been a ↑Bap↓tist minister in his younger days and .hh
helps to start up a ↑miss↓ion in East London called the West End Central Mission and
they had a country place and this had been developed by a very charismatic man
((name)) into a (1.0) therapeutic community for people from moving between
psychiatric hospital and living in the community
I: mm
J: and all sorts of range of disorders from schizophrenia to personality disorders
  addictions
I: mm
J: .hh Cathy was working there as a nurse
I: ↑oh ↑right =
J: = and social worker
I: ↑m↓m
J: and she she worked she worked there for ten years
I: ↑m↓m
J: and I went and they had a (.)↑stream of student volunteers and I was ↑one of them
I: mm
J: and then and went there and worked there and me[t (( ))
I: didn't go to get therapeutic [help yourself
J: ↑no, ↑no, n↓o I went as a I went to work
I: mm
J: and erm I worked there for year we took part in groups in workgroups in therapeutic
groups
I: mm
J: and of course got to ↑know people (.) we never met before in our ↑li↓fe and the
↑friend↓ships made there were very ↑strong
I: mm
J: I mean ((↑name)) you've met he wo. he worked there so (( ))
I: ↑m↓m
J: and we shared a room in fact
I: mm
J: and in the next door was Cathy ((laughs))
I: ↑hmm ((laughing word))
J: and we met and although there there's a gap in our ages of ten years =
I: mm
J: = and all sorts of things (.hh we got on really [↑we↓ll =
I: ↑m↓m
J: = and we both have the sa. understanding "I think" and so we got married
I: ↑m↓m
J: after that erm so the ↑way my faith developed ↑then (.)
I: but at ↑this time ↑would ↑you (.) would you have recognised
  = that you were ↑los↓ing (.) [your faith
J: [no I mean it was very ↑strong at The Meadows
I: right
J: 'cos it was a strong Christian (((.)↑place we had (0.25)↑communion
I: and I mean I went to communion although I was a Catholic and I wasn’t meant to and all that it seemed absurd not to join in the [communion cos I was ↑working =

J: = with them

I: mm

J: struggling [day by day with difficult people with them

I: mm

J: = head of this community

I: mm

J: and ((name)) who was the local ↑Catholic priest

I: mm

J: who became a missionary in ((place)) and still is and the two of them did the marr. did the wedding ↑joint↓ly [in a Congre↑ga↓tionalist church

I: ↑right

J and Cathy and I wrote the cer. the ceremony =

I: ↑m↓m

J: = we wrote [it

I: ↑right

J: ourselves

I: right that was

J: that was our very ↑strongly religious [together↓ness =

I: = and we ↑did pray together and so on since the beginning of our marriage

I: mm

J: but I ↑think its I ↑think what happened afterwards you’ll have to ask Cathy about her bit but (.) ↑once we’d left The Meadows once we got into being married and having children and so on and so forth I ↑think that (1.25 ) we never really (1.25) certainly for Cathy and a bit for me we never got to that ↑height again of o:of involvement the parish church wasn’t the same

I: can I ask why ↑why did you go to ↓The Meadows what, what why did you leave university to go there you could have left to do anything but you chose to go there =

J: no

I: = why did you do that

J: ↑I ↑suppose it was religious reasons ggh because (1.50) I supp↓ose (0.25) there are on different levels different levels but I think on a very, very ↑deep ↓level I wanted to understand what was going on in my head

I: and and ((noise of door opening))

J: its almost there was a psychological reason [[((laughs)) it’s haunted

I: ↑((laughs)) yes

J: all the psychological reasons [I think =

I: ↑erm

J: = I think and I ↑think I wanted to get involved with (.) a therapeutic ↑group (.) to heal my↑self to understand what ↑why (.) ↑why was I unhap↓py at university why was I ((

J: ↑whole per↑sona that I created for myself this ↑monk, this (0.50) person that used to say the Catholic ↑off↓lice every day this very disciplined

I: mm

J: this person you know had got to ↑Ox↓ford through hard work

169 Because of the door opening by itself!
I: mm
J: but why was that [((noises off)) yes why
I: [poltergeist ((laughing word))]
J: why was that person why. who created a sh. like a she'll round myself and then the shell was (swishing noise) blown up by being at university by and by
J: suddenly by reason that actually I think the question was being put to me you (1.0) are (1.0) looking to God (1.0) for security for centrality in your life because yo. and you're very almost hy per aware almost too aware (. that life is (2.0) ggh
I: you said the question was put to you, you meant you [asked yourself
J: [to myself yeah
J: I was saying to. I was I was saying to myself without saying it I was .hh realising that to do that (.5) to look to God (.5) and to be t. almost (1.0) as a student (1.0) you should (1.0) you should be more in nocent than me you should have been too
J: saw through things too fast too much (1.0) you know I should have been (.5) more (1.25) all the same things that you're into at that age and I wasn't
I: was that because I mean university is the great (.5) change in you know (.5) kids lives isn't it you've been at home and then you suddenly go to university and you meet all these people from different backgrounds, different views doing different things .hh chatting about things, staying up all night, drinking which perhaps you hadn't done before
J: m
I: erm (1.25) you know you're suddenly in this massive melting pot and so do you think this all started to (.5) you started to query [(2.0) what you were doing
J: I think I think what I'd done is is use religion to make a (0.75) to build a wall around myself to protect [myself
I: this conclusion did you [when you were at Oxford
J: yeah I think so
I: I certainly had the image in my head at that time of an egg (.5) cracking
J: I was inside the egg
I: or the the just the shell and the [little (( )) built up around you
J: [( ) and the little chicken coming out yeah exactly so (0.50) so yeah I think so an I think that what did that (.5) was, (.5) well first of all I think erm (2.50)
J: ro man tic love did that love of women [or girls =
I: yeah
J: = because I think it it just showed me that (1.25) no (.5) God isn't (.5) either he isn't there or it isn't en ough (.5) God is not en ough .hh instead of (.5)

looking like Augustinian said you know =
I: yes yes
J: = yeann and so on .hh and I saw it completely the opposite way round
I: but [the God that you had built up wasn't en ough
J: [( )
I: that's your interpretation (1.0) I was saying [(( )]
J: I mean you by going towards
I: monasticism you were explicitly (.5) exc luding romantic love but of course =
J: [(( )]
I: there are plenty of people who are religious who don't do that
J: no yeah but I because of what I was because I was saying look if ↑God is ↓God (0.75)
.hh this (0.50) and this is what the mystics all tell us (1.0) this is the highest ↑love this
is the most (0.25) amazing ↑thing this is the great ↑union (0.25) of God and the
↑soul ↑l this is what (.) prayer is a ↑bou ↓t (.) unifying the self with ↑Go ↓d (1.0) seeing
behind everything and all the shallowness and all this stuff that (.) falls away and
passes away (0.75) and (.) having ↑Go ↓d and what I then realised is (.) well what I felt
was that was a chi ↑mer ↓a and that (.) what I ↑wan ↓ted was (.) women (((laughs)) =
I: (((laughs))
J: = what I wanted was ↑lo ↓ve (.) was love of a ↑person
I: which (.) you didn’t really get =
J: [which is not
I: = from your from your, your medi ↑tations, your a ↑sceticism =
I: = you didn’t feel you [were getting this love =
J: ↑n o that’s correct
J: = ↑no and I was practising I mean we were talking about prayer and silent prayer I
was ↑doing it from the age of sixteen seventeen =
I: you didn’t feel that you would it didn’t feel like there was a personal God there with
you
I: it ↑de ↓d until I saw (1.50) wha (.) what it’s like to until I saw and felt what it’s like to
have (0.25) a personal ↑per ↓son
I: ↑m ↓m
J: that really (2.0) showed me (0.50) the ↑re ↓al because, because (0.75) ↑this is the
((psychology ↑laughing word)) of it this is where the, this is where the, I find it
interesting that thinking about it even now that the ↑per ↓son dis ↑cove ↓ring that
(1.50) forced ↓me (.) to go ↑back and say look (1.0) if ↑that’s ↓impor ↓tant if ↑that’s
↓what you need and ↓wa ↑nt (0.50) then you’re going to have to go ↑ba ↓ck
(0.50) ↑in ↓to (1.0) the mess the. the ↑ris ↓ky part of the ↑risk of ↓life (1.50) because
love is love of a persons it can ↑change it can be ↑lost
I: in ↑de ↓ed, in ↑de ↓ed
J: and er and love of God is a thing that’s permanent and always there etcetera, etcetera
and seems like (.) perfect protection from everything that it’s that there is a
difference there
I: so so ↑you could see that you were (.) challenging yourself all ↑most =
J: [[mm
I: = to gh risk lose. to say ’no I’m going to put this (0.25) sup ↑pos ↓edly [secure, =
J: (((coughs))
I: certain enduring love actually to one ↑si ↓de (.) so that I can try this ↑oth ↓er love
J: [[mm
I: but which (0.50) might come and go and your ↑experi ↓ence of it of course was that it
↑had gone ↓in ↓the ↑past cos you ↓lost your ↑moth ↓er
J: [yes
I: so you, you (0.75) you you (0.75) you ↑chose this (.) t:to ex ↑peri ↓ence a ↑different
kind of love because you wanted to experience it =
J: ↑yee ↓h I don’t know if I ↑chose I think its just that’s
the way it ↑went (0.50) it was a power. it’s a powerful thing that’s just the way it
↑we ↓nt
J: [[mm
I: but it ↑was ↑obviously in ↑contr ↑ast it was either or you couldn’t do the God thing and
normal
J: oh ↑I ↑cou ↓ld I was doing them both to ↑ge ↓ther but [I think =
I: [[mm
J: that that it’s more subtle than that of course I wasn’t saying oh that that means God’s a load of rubbi gh
I: not ↑yet ↓you ↓weren’t
J: no no at that point I was holding the two things to ↑gether
I: okay
J: but I think [psychologically]
J: yea↑h I ↑w↓a↑s I ↑think I w↓as although I did go through a period of having a girl friend and also wanting to be a monk at the same ti↓me (0.50) ↓which ↓is ↓very ↓strange but I I ↓was but I think looking back and doing the narrative and
I: okay
in ↑ter ↓preting it, it was the beginning of the shift in the re↑lig↓ious (.) side ‘cos I was investing in different psychol. psychological
I: mm
J: and be↑cause of all this, the way I’m talking you see I cannot see religion in any other way except (.) psychologically
I: mm
J: just cannot see it in any other way
I: now you can’t
J: no (0.5) and erm
I: could I just ask tho’ at this point when you’d got the two, (.) the two side-by-side =
J: [yeah (( ))
= [hh you said you had some psychosomatic issues I mean were you =
I: = were you ↑stressed did you not find this okay you weren’t happy were you (.) at this time
J: no I wasn’t happy in my early late teens and [early twenties
I: [mm
J: and at the time I was very happy at The ↓Meadows
I: [mm
J: I was there because it it was a ↑way from expectations it was away from the weight (.) of expectations [and so on
I: [expectations of what =
J: = success (.) academic success (.) to be happy to be yourself
I: you could simply go there and, and perform your [daily jobs and your chores =
J: [yeah
I: and help people and be [][](( ))
J: [yeah if y. if you go back (.) see the ↑grief ↓part
I: mm
J: is to just digress on that slightly (1.50) the way that that was handled in our family was poor
I: mm (.) you saw that at the ↑time or you was thinking [][](( ))
J: [at the ↑time it was part of (.) no
I: ( ( ))
J: I do and ↓I’ve “gone through it a lot ( ( ))” but I ↑think that it’s erm (1.0) I was forced almost to to erm (2.50 ) go t:to almost (0.50) close it down and ↓to ↓say “↓”well you know handle it “deal with it yourself
I: mm
J: don’t go to the fune. I wasn’t at the ↑funeral
I: .hh oh dear
J: I wasn’t you know it was in in a way our grief was seen as (0.25) less important ↓than ↓my father’s ( ( )) so (0.25) we wer. and it “↓was a ↓common thing that happens I think” but we were (.) therefore we weren’t really given the opportunity to do the [grief properly and (1.0) erm
I: [yeah
J: I think that that led to all sorts of self protective mechanisms and I think religion is one of them for me and I think that at university as you say because of all the differences

I: mm
J: it cracks you open a bit =

I: = and I think that then brings those things up again

J: so that probably was a reason and I know when I went to The Meadows the psychosomatic

I: [mm, mm
J: eye pains just disappeared
I: really mm

J: and never came back
I: and you never went back to university to finish your

J: oh you did

J: yeah I went back and did my degree
I: so you're a year The Meadows

J: yeah
I: and you got married (.) there

J: no I was a year at The Meadows I went back to university and then (. ) got married in the year after leaving university

I: right, right but you you did go back and you you successfully completed your degree
J: oh yeah

I: when you went back (0.25) your faith if you call it that then had changed
J: no I think not really no I was all ways ( ) no it was still there was very strong

thing faith erm no I still saw the world in terms of of erm of God and religion, and vo ca tion and so on

I: vocation in the world
J: mm

I: you saw it as
J: mm

I: from The Meadows experience
J: yeah and my Catholic experience

I: [your Catholic experience
J: [so

J: and then I went to into teaching as a semi-vocational thing I think really m m

I: you'd given up (.) the idea to be a monk
J: yes because I I wanted to get married at that point

I: [yes
J: yes so you knew you wanted to get married

J: yeah

I: so you you were teaching history or something
J: I was teaching history I was teaching history

I: yes
J: doing a bit of remedial stuff for kids that had got themselves but yeah

I: yeah hh
J: yes

I: so ggh would you say now that you have lost your faith
J: NO

I: you would stay you if someone said to you do you have faith you'd say yes I do
J: no but I. I think I wouldn’t I wouldn’t use the word lost your faith
I: no
J: because it’s (...) and I think although I think it’s a real Matthew Arnold ([experience
laughing word]) it’s the real thing you know there is an experience of loss to your
faith and I think that the reason I went into ↑Buddhism in my late twenties
I: mm
J: was a sort of replacement ↑thing a religious ↑practice immediate [to faith
I: [but you
↑woul↑dn’t say you were a Roman Catholic
J: no
I: no
J: but ((( ))
I: [when did you stop saying you were a Roman Catholic
J: ↑probably (.) some (.) probably around about ↑thirty even (0.75) fa. after my (0.25)
Buddhism ↓began (1.0) an’ I (1.0) and I went (. ) into Buddhism I think because
I: this was this ↓when you were teaching were you now
J: I was yeah I was left I was teaching for awhile for five ↑years (1.0) and then I went
into industry pharmaceutical ↓industry
I: mm
J: starting with sales and going up and I went up quite fast ° (( )) moved ° around a lot
↑hh and erm (2.0) at ↑that time I ↓was ↓into ↓Buddhism ↑yeah
I: so you how did you do that did did you meet some ↑body or did you just decide to read
a book ↑about ↑it or
J: I was reading ( .) different books =
= and I. I remember seeing somebody on tele[vision =
I: ↑yes
J: = somebody was talking about their Buddhist faith
I: right
J: saying well I can have my re↑li↑gion my practice and I don’t have to believe in ↑God
or anything that (0.75) goes against my ( .) brain [and I thought ↑oh that’s good
I: [ggh so you
J: = so you [don’t have to believe in God that sounds good
I: [right
J: so ↑what was attractive about that
J: well I ↑think that as ( .) life has deve↓loped
I: as your life has developed
J: mm as my life has developed as I’ve erm (1.50)↑thought ↓about it (0.50) and read
things and being more and more and more ↑hon↑est (0.75) with myself and why I’ve
done things
I: right
J: I’ve seen that (3.0)↑it (1.0) I’ve been trying to ↑make ↓myself ^believe in a God when I
was younger°
I: yes
J: because it because [I ↑need↓ed to
I: [you wanted to
J: ↑wan↓ted [to believe
I: [you wanted to believe be[cause
J: [yes
I: yes, yes [you wanted to have =
J: [yes
I: = that ( .) that (0.75) all that stuff that paraphernalia ( .) you wanted to have it ( .)↓all
↓that
J: .hh the security
I: the [security

J: [I wanted it to be a security

I: yeah

J: but be↑cause I then (0.25) had created my own security

I: mm

J: because I was in a good marriage

I: mm

J: and a family

I: mm

J: I was doing well in a job and I

I: mm

J: I ↑think I needed (0.75) that less and ↑less but I [↑still ↓felt I needed,

I: [mm

J: a (.)↑faith or I needed a ↑prac↓tice I needed a ↑relig↓ious ap↑proach to life (. ) it

I: seemed to be almost endemic [I mean I just =

J: = needed [it

I: [you needed it right so ggh now ↑what you think you needed it ↓for

J: .huh to ↑give a struc↓ture (. ) and meaning

I: and meaning ggh I mean you ↑have structure now [you’ve got a family, =

J: [yes

I: = you’ve got kids you’ve got working I [mean nine to five =

J: [yes

I: that’s ↑terr↑ibl↓y structured

I: yes er I ↑think I think to give a meaning to that

I: right

J: and I think meaning is is the next challenge I think that’s the next

I: now when ↑you say mean↓ing (1.75) what ↑what what did you ↓think you were

looking for

J: I ↑think I was very used to very almost wired wired into my ↓mind ↓that that it

should provide (1.75) a rationale a meaning a (0.25) not su. a rationale sounds cold it

it it

I: makes [sense of life

I: [yes

J: [sense of what’s going on [why we’re here

I: [yes

J: yeah

J: and al↑though (0.75) in my Christianity there were ↑many, many things that

obviously ↑did↓n’t make sense

I: yes

J: I was prepared to kind of put ↑up with [them because the general ↑thing =

I: [yes

J: = made sense

I: yes

J: so I can rem↑ber ggh I can remember where I ↓was in my school corridor =

I: (laughs)

J: = at the age of fourteen when I knew it was ab↑surd that there was a that there must

be a resurrection the priest was talking to me .hh and I said Father the. there can be

no resurrection of the ↑bo↓dy its ↑stu↓pid idea (1.0) and he said well what do you

mean ((John surname)) (((laughs))

I: (((laughs))

J: (((coughs)) and I ↑knew it couldn’t happen it was ↑all dis↑per. all our atoms and

molecules disperse and the bits of carbon in me [become ↑tree↓s or recycled into =

((laughs)))

I: (laughs)

J: (coughs)
J: other things how can that get altogether again and any way once the body’s not there how are you a human being because the spirit and the mind are intimately part of the body I mean (.) with no body there could be no spirit no mind I mean the whole thing is one

J: and I sort of knew that at that age I: mm

J: and yet (0.75) carry that (0.50) feeling of I could carry that cos I didn’t (.) really believe in that in that sense .hh I’ve intellectualised it and rationalised it in different ways I: mm

J: and still have a (.) the faith I: yes [yes

J: it’s like the saddlebags you put it on one side of the donkey you got plenty of other stuff on the other J: yes that’s [right I: [yeah

J: although its fundamental Christianity but that’s [another issue I: [yeah yes J: but erm I hh so, so I think in Buddhism I think I was (.) looking for another (2.0) cause of meaning and I think it did give me a lot (1.0) in that sense (.) a lot I: mm

J: a lot er because it’s very (2.0) it’s the psychology of Buddhism the (0.75) meditation practice (0.50) it’s very developed much more developed than the world (.) C (.) WCCM which is only one meditation I: mm

J: .hh it’s very developed and (0.25) over thousands of years and I think that (1.75) that (1.75) was a helpful thing (.) over (.) over many for the same reason because it was Chr:Christianity was a faith it was a faith .hh and I think what happened (1.25) positively through that at first Cathy didn’t understand that at all (0.50) she I: she wasn’t into Buddhism =

J: = no

I: she was (.) into [Christian faith J: [or or into meditation she was looking for her (()) I: [oh she was right, right okay J: and but when she found (1.0) we went to a meeting of Buddhist Christian meeting with erm where er Laurence was er (.) on a tape Laurence and the Dalai Lama talking on a tape (.) in Norwich I: [yes (.) I

J: years ago I: I must get this tape I think they’ve got a copy of it still J: yeah looks good its good it was g. very interesting .hh at that point Cathy joined up to the erm Christian mediation group that was started in the area I: righ

J: and tha. and then and then I found that we could actually meditate together although I was (.) doing my “Buddhist one and she was doing Christian one” I: [yes J: and that felt good I: yes [so you i. you could do it together J: [()
I: something to do together
  J: ((coughs)) ↑yeah, yeah
I: and it didn’t ↑matt↓er
  J: no
I: the fact that one was Buddhist and one was Christian did ↑n’t ↑matt↓er
  J: no not in this group I’m partly in her group anyway
I: I mean that didn’t (.) i:it wasn’t [relevant
  J: [mm
I: it wasn’t a relevant issue
  J: [mm
I: it wasn’t even relevant (.) it wasn’t ↑in the saddlebags
  J: .hh no (.) no because some of the insights that you gain and ↑I’ve been meditating for
twenty years or something↑ some of the insights .hh and some of the (.) Buddhist influences (0.75) er feed back into what ↑she does and so on and so forth
I: .hh ↑so ↑when, when we started this question about you know what would you say to somebody in the pub why didn’t you say you were a ↑Buddh↓ist
  J: cos I’m not
I: you’re ↑not a Buddhist you don’t see itself as a Buddhist
  J: ↑no I. I would say I followed a up to recently I suppose I would say I followed a Buddhist path
I: the Buddhist method of meditation
  J: y↑eah and and trying to ( 0.25) live (.) ↑eth↓ica↓llly
I: what [is what is a Buddhist what do you have to be to be a Buddhist
  J: [for example
I: ((coughs)) well I ↑think I think there’s a very s. you ↑have to have a meditation prac↑tice
  J: which you ↑have↑dont ↑you
I: ↑ye↑ah (.) you have to have erm er an ethical approach to (0.50) the wo↑rld, to your fellow creatures to your↑self based on:n di. n:not doing ha↑rm
I: [mm
I: so I think that’s influenced my (.) vegetarian↑ism
  J: ↑no:o I think they’re both very ↑sim↓ilar in that you could you could live that way and be a ↑Cath↓olic
I: ↑right
J: erm (0.75) I needed to get a↑way from Catholicism because of the way I’d ↑used it
  I: I’m with you I’m with ↓you I see I see
J: [If I’d been a different person and used it, (.)↑diffe↓rently
I: I see.

J: it would have been less besmirched by that and I could [possibly have used it right]

I: because [.] you

J: [in a different way]

I: you you felt that you had [.] responded to Catholicism in a particular way because of because of what you've been through

J: mm

I: and [.] you wanted to let go of that that

J: yes because now it's associated in my mind with that

I: right how awful so it wasn't because erm it is a theistic religion and Buddhism isn't that sort of debate that made you

J: ye's I mean that's part of it I suppose but erm I think what I really think is psychologically that (1.0) I would be the same probably as [.] a lot of other perfectly intelligent Western educated inheritors of the Enlightenment who still believe in God (1.0) I could probably have done that mental gymnastics if, if I had psychologically needed to because I can see that many people done (0.75) erm I

I: so you [.] yes

J: [I don't want I don't want it to sound] aggressive or or rude about it

I: you're not sounding rude

J: and much I'm trying to be honest and my honesty =

I:]

J: = is (0.75) it is rather strange in 2007 to believe in God (.) but (.) a lot of intelligent people do because they need to and I and I don't think that I'm a hh any better than them and if I (.). my re. Catholicism had been different (.) I could of (.). been like

I: right I mean you have needs to you said you wanted this thing of meaning and structure in your life it's just that your needs are different to their needs

J: yeah but you see now it's quite interesting because I I think it goes in phases and the phase I'm in now

I: mm

J: is and I don't know why, but it's to do with development, psychology it's probably to do a lot with (.) ggh now at this age fifty having really, really understood what happened to me at ten (.). years old

I: mm do you you're going back and thinking about it

J: oh I've gone through it and I've I've yeah talked about it had counselling about it gone through [bereave]

I: what recently

J: yeah a lot well fairly recently

I: [yeah]

J: and I've gone through bereavement groups [understood really understood =

I: [mm]

J: = that .hh plus thinking just thinking observing what happened in the world .hh that erm

I: and they've been helpful for you have they

J: yeah, yeah so I think now that's set me (0.50) free

I: mm

J: to (0.75) look (0.50) at the world (1.0) very, very honestly

I: mm

J: so

I: when yeah what, what why why was it not honest before

J: because I think it was as honest as I could make it but I think also a lot of it was reac
I: it was an honest reaction =
J: = yeah but ggh well it was an unaware reaction unconscious reaction
I: right
J: it was a direct reaction
I: = but you weren’t consciously in control of
J: yeah and that I was (0.50) may be even attacking Christianity, when I was
(0.50) very much in Buddhist mould attacking Christianity for negative
reactions as a reaction but I think now =
I: = but understand able ones
J: yeah well what I yes but understand able yeah what I feel now is that er (1.0) I
think I’m in a stage where (1.50) I can see some things more clearly and the first
thing I can see is that I can’t see any thing and really feel there isn’t an answer to the
mystery of life (laughing words) I really don’t understand and never will
understand (1.0) and I don’t know why we’re here (0.75) and I don’t know
what we’re doing while we here =
J: = and I don’t know what we’re doing afterwards
I: [and that’s how you feel that’s the stage you’re in now
J: yes [well I
I: we’ve talked about stages
J: but I’m happy to be in that stage
J: but I think before I wouldn’t have been
I: you’re not stressed by it
J: not at all I’m relieved by it
I: whereas before
I: you’re relieved right yes
J: also challenged by it
I: so it’s a challenge it’s it’s
J: yea I think and purpose all I can say now is we are in a universe that is (1.0) as it is
and (1.0) despite all of our efforts and my efforts as well (.) to project onto it what
we’d like it to be
I: mm
J: it will always be as it is (0.75) there isn’t in other words this this erm Plato
I: mm
J: that’s sitting behind Christianity a bit
I: mm mm
J: there’s a heaven where all your tears will be wiped away
I: mm
J: erm the Buddhist or the Buddhist idea that (.) there is an enlightenment where you
can actually (.) conquer suffering
I: mm
J: both of those to me I’m happy to say (0.25) I don’t feel that they’re right
I: I understand yes I think okay I think
J: so then I’m thrown back onto well what is there then
I: [yes
I: okay, okay and you’re a so
J: and what is there what is the and is there an answer
I: yes
J: and well and when I say what is there well what is there okay what is there first of all there is a universe which is neither positive nor negative.

I: mm

J: towards me

I: mm

J: I am part of it

I: yes

J: so why should it be positive or negative

I: mm

J: I’m like the scale of skin

I: mm

J: on my in the universe

I: mm

J: I’m not positive or negative it is part of me

I: mm

J: I’m not positive or negative it is part of me.

I: mm

J: so I’m part of the universe. hh why is why there how it happened I don’t know but it’s there

I: mm

J: it and it is as it is

I: mm

J: erm there’s no love in the universe and there’s no hate in the universe it just is

I: it just is

J: it just is there is good and there is no evil in the universe either. it is as it is things that we don’t like and there are cruel things as well

J: and there are horrible pain-ful things but there is no in ten-tion of good or evil to me anyway

I: mm

J: so it’s a fairly neutRAL place

I: mm

J: in one sense although you although that doesn’t mean it’s not a beautiful place that you can respond to

I: now this is this is the place where you are now

J: mm

I: it’s a sort of a realisation perhaps that you’ve come to so it’s a sort of a point that you’ve arrived at but it’s so a point that you can now leave to go be beyond to do a bit of exploring having having got to this sort of realisation would that be fair [or

J: [well I think the exploring has to be more how to cope with that how to not cope that’s the wrong word isn’t it how to live in that universe] [or

J: [so if if for example so if in a very simplistic psychological terms erm instead of saying well (1.25). hh I mean the universe is a place where things happen

I: mm

J: some of those things seem inexplicably cruel

I: mm

J: and some of them are wonder-ful and they are the most amazing experience you can ever have

I: right but they just happen

J: you cannot yes and they they just happen and you don’t deserve one or the other

I: right yes

J: so there so there’s no karma in the universe
I: yes
J: except what you create by your own (1.0) actions I think you can create you can create a certain karma if you like by (0.75) treating other people [(0.75) properly]
I: turns around [comes around sort of [mentality]
J: [yes] [yes you can do that]
I: yeah
J: but the universe itself isn’t like that
I: no
J: so (0.50) if ↑I get cancer tomorrow
I: mm
J: and die in a horrible way
I: mm
J: erm painful way
I: yes
J: ↑that ↑would ↑be (.) as what is there [is no meaning
I: [it has no meaning in itself]
J: it has no meaning [in it↑self
I: [in itself]
J: [right
I: [at all]
J: now (.) ↑you’ve come to this conclusion and you feel better for having ↓come ↓to ↓this ↓conclusion
I: [it feels honest]
J: = have to force my life into any ‘isms’ [(L )]
I: [which you felt you were doing before]
J: .hh yeah I think if you, yes I think I can take from all the different (0.75) religious paths but I have to find a way of (0.50) of being my↑self
I: so ↑when (.) when you were actively trying to perhaps meditate like a monk following an aesthetic path
J: back in my teens
I: back in your teens it wasn’t (0.75) it wasn’t really you doing that in a sense it was just some part of you responding in a particular way
J: ↑I ↑think it was all of me I think it was all of me I:I think it was a (0.25) person that needed (0.50)structure (1.0) in a world that had shown itself =
I: = to be cha↑t↓otic (.) [(L )]
J: [because you ↑used the ↓word it wasn’t you kept say- something ‘more honest’ now I just ↑wonder (1.50) what (.) what was the contrast what was the difference between how you reacted before and how you we are now (1.50) [because you said that now =
I: [hh well you’re comparing
J: = you or you’re more honest you say
I: you’re comparing a twenty (.) year-old (0.50) to a↑fifty year old (.) there’s a huge difference
J: so it’s [a maturation [thing (( )]) it’s a teenage immature sort of
I: [(°( ))°] [yeah I]
J: hh ( ) what I think it is (.) is is that (.) the ↑more you experience life the way you understand the way I understand myself or the more I understand (1.25) the real↓sons for many thin↑gs (2.75) the more aware I become and once you become aware (0.75) I can be more ↑hon↓est
I: ok↑ay and you you were less aware then you were responding in a (.) less aware way [sense
J: [yes probably
I: and that’s why you say you are more honest now

J: yes I wasn’t being purposefully dishonest
I: ↑no, ↓no no no it [wasn’t erm

J: [in the past I think that ↑I don’t know I don’t think I can ↑be ggh
I: ↓it was because

J: you ↑weren’t being purposefully dishonest but then you weren’t being purposefully dishonest whereas now you think you’re being purposefully honest

J: no ↑I ↑don’t I ↓don’t know really
I: (( () ) laughing word

J: I think I think if you had asked me at (o.75) sixteen or at twenty six I would have said yes I really believe in ↓God I know there is a ↓God

I: mm
J: that loves me and that I love

I: mm
J: and that () ah it’s very important to me to have quiet times every day and [experience the love of God =

I: [mm

J: = “that helps me with my life” and I’d be perfectly honest when I was saying that I: mm

J: and now at fifty I can be perfectly honest in saying () I don’t think ((laughing word)) ((coughs))

J: .hh ↑yeah ↑I ↑mean it’s (3.75) the loss () there ↑is always ↓loss I think I I always feel a sense of loss (( )) >initially when you said have you lost your faith and I I reacted against [that =

I: [mm
J: because I think actually you gain< () you gain () en↑lighten↓ment don’t you ((( ))

I: [mm
J: but I but I ↑think that (o.75) the loss would be that (o.75) it ↑gives you that that sort of faith gives you an easy (0.50) ↓community () of ↓people to be involved with I: right

J: that erm and ↑this, this is an interest. this an important ↓thing ↑when ↑I get. when my father comes () down I take him to church at ((place)) [a lovely church =

I: [mm
J: = very, very healthy thing

I: [mm
J: [you probably know all about that church ↑families [and all that

I: [mm
J: and I could easily see myself in↑olved in that

I: mm
J: you know (0.25) talking to people being involved with people the kids there ()

I: °teenagers

J: helping people out with their marriage and their deaths an° I can see myself in↑vo↓ived with that

I: mm
J: and reli↑gious religion () is necessary to a community so ↑what (1.25) and, and, and it’s a a channel

I: mm
J: .hh so there ↑is that’s a loss and I think that’s a 20th 21st century ↑thing ↓thing
I: mm

J: because, because I haven’t got ↓that () because I can’t
I: no

J: get I can’t just (. ) jettison everything and go back ( 0.75) [into that
I: now got to the place where you are (.)
I: [now
J: [that would be doing a violence to myself [ (.) spiritually
I: [right
I: you can’t hold the two togeth[her it would be impossible
J: I think in reality people [though I think I [think a lot of priests =
I: [mm
J: come to similar conclusions to [me [but stay priests
I: [mm
I: mm
J: because the human concept the human community
I: mm
J: relig. folk. religion is a folk thing it’s ingrained in us it’s a it’s a social bond
I: mm
J: erm it’s got nothing to do with what’s real
I: mm
J: except in the sense that it’s real to have relationships and communities
I: mm
J: and have families
I: mm
J: and mark births and marriages and [deaths
I: [mm
J: and that (o.75) is where that’s what I’ve lost
I: mm
J: and I (.) I have to borrow it from (.) being involved in a (.) Christian group here or a Buddhist [group [the re
I: [mm
J: but it’s not (.) something I move in easily you mean you haven’t (.) what you’ve
I: mm ggh it’s not something you move in easily you mean you haven’t (.) what you’ve
J: got instead of this ready-made community (.) doesn’t quite fit the bill or (.) isn’t quite right
J: [it’s disparate it’s kind of a post-modern thing there (( )) a lot of different
groups around [an’ =
I: [yeah
J: = it’s just me and my own relation[ships with people =
I: [yeah
J: .hh so I would be quite happy to attend (.) somebody’s wedding =
I: [yes
J: and have it at [church would have somebody’s [funeral and even speak at it you
I: [yes
J: know there wouldn’t [be a prob[lem
I: [yes, yes
J: but =
I: so you can create a little piece of community here a little piece of it there you can
J: pick up a bit of it at [that group and you can sort of mould it all together
J: [well I suppose that’s a challenge and that’s why the meditation groups are quite good hh ‘cos the meditation groups are interesting most people in meditation groups have a Catholic type of background
I: mm
J: ‘I’ve noticed it’i erm although they’re beginning to think along different li[nes
I: mm
J: from the church and I feel quite at home [in that group
I: mm
1228 J: but very often they say things to me ° (( )) ° and their belief system
I: mm
1230 J: that they’re using is very different from mine
I: so when Fr Laurence and John Maine talk about Christ talking within all that stuff
1232 J: yeah
I: you just let that float off and [and (. ) let other people think on that =
1234 J: [↑yes
I: = but you, you wouldn’t go there you wouldn’t
1236 J: ° no °
I: ° you wouldn’t go there ° . hh there is so much I could ask so much we could discuss
1238 erm ggh but there’s ↑one thing I ↑did want to ask though which is (. ) you ↑did
↑mention I think (. ) once that sort of being on a journey or questing I can’t
1240 remember the word you used and I ↑wondered do you do you (. ) do you ↑see yourself
on some sort of (. ) ↓journey do you ↑see yourself (0.50) in some sort of progression
1242 (0.75) towards some sort of ↓goal (. ) or not at all
J: . hh erm (3.75) ° there’ll be a lot of brackets here° 170 I think that erm (1.75) I see myself
in (1.75) a s. process of (2.0) trying to understand or see, see ↓things ↓more ↑clear↓ly
I: ↑yes (0.75) ↓yes ↑s
1246 J: ↑erm I don’t have a kind of linear idea of a progression
I: ↓n ↑to
1248 J: and I am a journey to what [I mean I mean =
I: [well ↑yes ↓s
1250 J: = my question is always what I mean we always talk about the journey and the inner
[ journey =
1252 J: ↑yes
1254 I: = blah, blah, but ↑where ↑are ↑you ↑go ↓ing
1256 J: ‘cos I ‘cos I’m not going anywhere I’m actually (. ) my journey throws me more and
more back to where I ↑a ↓m . hh so it means ↑here the universe as it ↑is trying to cope
with the idea that you have a lot of ↑loss you have death in ↑life you have (. ) cruelty
1258 and ↑kindness and those, those
I: but (( )) okay y:y:you can ↑have a ↓jour↑ney that that has as its centre where you
↑are where you are ↑now
J: ↑yes but why would you use the word journey
1262 I: okay okay so
1264 J: ↑erm I [really I really [I don’t know
1266 I: ↑do you ↑but
I: you ↑don’t you ↑don’t (. ) you so there’s no particular objective there’s no ↓goal there’s
↑nothing that you think that you ↑can find
J: [wisdom I suppose is a ↑goal
1268 I: and wisdom would be (. ) understanding how the world is (. ) something to do
J: understanding as much as you can [how the world is =
1270 I: ↑yes
J: = and understanding I ↑suppose ↑a ↑big ↓goal of wisdom is understanding what you
can’t understand
I: ↑yes ↑yes
1274 J: and it and one of the great things about Buddhism is wisdom is always linked with
compassion
1276 I: ↑yes

170 Refers to an earlier discussion that brackets are added to a transcript to indicate a pause, timed in quarter seconds
J: and to me (.) there’s ↑no the the danger of being me
I: mm
J: is that if you are (.) if I’m I I find the more I understand (.) probably the more
compassion I have (.) for my self ↓firm
I: mm
J: and then f:or other people (.) for we’re ↑all ↓lost we’re ↑all uncer↓tain were ↑all
un↓sure (.) es↑sentially probably were all very much like I was at ten years old
I: yes [so if you provide
J: [where if we have a world which seems to be safe and we provide safe. we
build our fam↓lies we build (.). our societies and we build our comm↑uni↓ty and what
↑happ↓ens they ↓die things ↓pass societies come and ↓go things wax and ↓wane
people lose everything. =
= people gain things change all the ti↓me [there ↑is no security
I: yes okay
J: and we’re ↑all afraid and the world ↑is (.). is a big place of change and (1.0)
down↓meaningless and we all have to try to find it to find a way ↑through ↓it
(2.25)↑and joy and love [and all the rest of it
I: [yes
J: Buddhist things really
I: so you can ↑live your life (.). with a better more ↑honest more ↑help↓ful
↓understanding ↓of ↓that one that provides compassion to people and looks out for
other people and looks out for your↑se↓If would be a [(.) would be =
J: ε((coughs)) well
I: = a good response to
J: .hh ↑ye↓ah I think that’s my response I think that the (..) people often say well if you
don’t have a religious faith
I: yes
J: then (.). why aren’t you very ↑cynical or surely not to have a religious faith means you
can do what you want (0.25) what’s constraining you you morally what you know why
don’t you just lead a hedonistic life well er you know
I: yes
J: erm why don’t you not ↑ca↓re about other people and just care about your↑self
I: mm
I: or something ↑like that some of them ↑Chris ↑tians
J: some ↑of ↑them ↑no ↓t° but erm to ↑me ↓it does ↑n’t i ↓it that the the ↑deeper, deeper, deeper understanding of () what it’s like to be a human ↑be ↓ing
I: mm
J: and and also another animal among all the ↑oth ↓er animals on the planet
I: mm
J: ↑makes me more (1.0) ↑caring of them of ↑oth ↓ers of ↑oth ↓ers
I: ↑m ↓n
J: it doesn’t make me want to (0.75) er it ↑makes me very clear that yes moral choices and moral decisions ↑a ↓re (1.25) selfish ones
I: mm
J: erm and that you don’t do things or you do, do things for reasons which are () in your own ↑self ↑inte ↓rest
I: mm
J: ↑making of ↑them ↑of ↑oth ↓ers of ↑oth ↓ers
I: mm
J: ↑m ↓lity or °something like that°
I: mm
J: but that’s true if you’re a Christian or a non-Christian or whatever whatever your belief is °I still° I still feel that my ↑ac ↓tions and the way I act are the same as if I’d had a faith. °I don’t believe there’s a lot of difference°
I: I ↑think I can I ↑think I can understand what ↓you’re ↓saying it doesn’t °strike me as°
J: mm
I: °erm (. ) you know difficult to (. ) to agree with accept understand° (. ) erm ↑would ↓you perhaps I’m sure you ↑would ↓n’t “but I don’t want to put words in your mouth°
J: ↑you say your reaction to ↓the ↓world its not a ↑faith reaction or whatever it is (. ) is more mat ↓ure (. ) than ↑it ↑was ↑when ↑you ↑were ↑younger
I: mm
J: you ↑would say you would [use the word mature
I: [I would use that word yeah °it’s bound to be more mature°
J: yeah
I: it’s more mature because ↑you are more ↓mature
J: yes
I: so it’s ↑based it ↑is it ↑is connected with you growing up (. ) psychologically
J: yes and it and it’s connected with internalising things and trusting my own response
I: as opposed to internalising other ↑people’s responses and “making them my own°
J: ↑making ↑other people’s res. [responses (. ) your own
I: [whether it’s Christian or
J: yes
I: that all those traditions that are fed in
J: [so (( )
I: [but I mean but on the other hand Caroline sorry to [interrupt =
I: ↑no it’s
J: = I really (. ) am very aware that it’s im ↑possible ↓for me (. ) to (. ) ↑think (0.50) about these things (. ) other than (1.0) as a person embedded [in a tradition and
I: [yes
J: ↑cult ↓ure
I: [yes yes
J: and that my re ↑ligi ↓ous background
I: yes
J: is [still in ↑forming
I: [is still
I: yes
J: the way I [am

425
I: [yes

1384 I: and you’re happy about that
J: well I

1386 I: you know (.).hh it doesn’t worry you
J: [it’s just

1388 J: it just is one of those things
I: [it’s one of those things yes

1390 I: erm
J: we cannot escape from our own de- from you know we cannot be totally free agents

1392 [an’
I: [no

1394 J: within [within
I: [no

1396 J: the pool of (.75) the stream of “things that are happening”
I: right okay ggh but there was some thing you said ggh something about making other
people’s responses your own
J: mm

1400 I: ggh (.75) given that you are informed by the culture that you’re in and by your own background and experiences erm would you say that your responses now (.)
are more your own
J: in so far as they ever are

1404 I: in so far as they ever are
J: yes

1406 I: you would say that they are that there’s a. there is a difference between (. the kind of way you responded (. earlier in your life to now
J: yeah ‘cos I’m more aware
I: because you’re more aware =

1410 J: = of the roots of my “response”
I: I see so are [okay
J: [and I’m more aware of the fact of the fact that I’m only responding from a repertoire of possible responses which are culturally handed down to me and I mean I’m aware [of

1414 I: [you’re in a real bind aren’t you John ((laughing phrase))
J: why
I: (0.50) I’m just saying you ca. you’re more aware that it’s all part of the cultural (.50) I didn’t mean bind in any negative sense I’m sorry perhaps that’s the wrong word I meant in a sense that you, you (. you are aware that you’re aware that you know that there’s more to be aware of [THE MORE THAT you’re =
J: aware

1420 (((laughs)))
I: = aware
J: I think that religion I think that any wisdom has to be first of all a free agent (. an awareness
of (.75) what you don’t know and what your limitations are and that we yes I feel a free agent (. but I know that I’m a free agent (. up to a point because I am programmed genetically, culturally, etcetera etcetera you know I can only =

1422 I: but you’re aware of that [. and so your awareness

1428 J: [yes
I: of it makes you feel (1.0) better in some way

1430 J: I know yes I know that it’s impossible for me if if I was talking to you at fifteen to seventeen
I: mm
J: we couldn’t have the same conversation because I might feel the same but I would

1434 have to use different language ((coughs)) I would (. I would have to use the language of theism “and have to use”
I: mm
J: the language of that ↑cult↓ure (0.75) I couldn’t ↑couldn’t talk to you as I do ↑now because I’m twenty↑first century man
I: mm
J: .hh so there are limi↑ta↓tions if I was a ↑wo↓man I might talk to you differently than I am as a man
I: yes
J: but I can’t ↑be a woman I ((can be more and more aware of my ↑feminine side laughing words)) but that’s not the same thing as being a ↑woman
I: mm
J: so I’m limi↑ted e:everyone’s limited you ↑am limited by (1.25) by by ↑that and I think Catholicism and that kind of culture at a very young age is a (1.25) fact (. ) in ↑your ↑li↓fe that
I: mm
J: it’s a fact of life
I: yes
J: no
I: it doesn’t (. ) bother you it’s not this
J: no
I: →it’s just ↑there as you say→
J: yeah
I: (1.75) so (0.75) ↑what do you think meditation is for (. ) →why do you do it←
J: (1.25) .hh
I: it’s not prayer you, you pulled me up on that one before you don’t think it’s prayer whatever [prayer is ((  )) what ↑do ↑you ↑think ↑prayer ↓is
J: ↑pulled you up← I’m sorry to pull you up
I: I mean what, what why [why
J: [WELL FOR ME prayer is reserved for erm ↓God
I: so ↑prayer ↑is reserved for ↓God
J: yeah whether it’s silent prayer or contemplative [prayer or whatever =
I: whatever
J: = kind of prayer it ↑is it’s something to do with the relationship (. ) with [God
I: [with ↓God
J: no (2.0) no () ↑no not really I don’t think so (1.25) erm ( ) what’s med ↑it ↑tion (1.75)
I: it’s a way of cultivating this a↑ware↓ness I think (0.25) ↑THINK it’s two things I mean ↑it’s a number of things right↑ but .hh ↑first of all it is a way of cultivating ↓awareness so that if you, as you settle in quiet (1.0) erm and concentrate on your breathing or your mantra or whatever you might be that kind of meditation (.) seems to be important ↑to ( ) erm (1.0) ↑just give you the training to still how to still your mind (0.75) how to quieten your mind how to approach erm the world outside afterwards in a in a more ↑it gives you a little gap< ( 0.75) in your response I ↑can’t ↑the only way I can describe it
I: [a gap in your response
J: yes the ↑way I describe the way I, the best analogy I’ve heard (0.50) is sport (.) that if you if you’re a ↓footballer “or something” .hh and an amateur you just play in the park sometimes you everything happens so fast that (.) and you react (.) if if ↑you’re a very skilled footballer y:you you have a ↑huge ↑aware↓ness you ↑know where the other people are
J: right right
I: yes
J: and you ↑know what not y:you with ↑out think↓ing about it
I: yes
J: there's a kind of gap you know what
I: yeah
J: I know what I'm going to do with [that ball
I: yes
J: and I'm going to control it and exactly how
I: yes
J: and I know exactly where I want to put it
I: yes
J: kick [and you hope for the best or
I: yes
I: and you get that through practice I mean skilled footballers don't get it over night
J: [no but] they partly practice and partly something ingrained in them =
I: I think that just a kinetic awareness of things =
J: [right]
I: [right]
J: so you don't think you get better at meditating
I: yes you do I think meditation isn't like footb. entirely like [football
J: yeah
I: because you get better at it
J: maybe there are some minds that are [better at the start but
I: yes
J: yes so I think it's that I think is trying to create a space so when something happens you don't immediately react
I: right
J: or [erm
I: right
J: or at least if you do react you're aware of your reactions
I: okay, okay
I: so is like a resource it's like a tool
J: that yes and I think also it is also a (0.50) training for the (0.75) mind
and [there's some kind of meditation
I: [right]
J: training in you in (0.75) compassionate response to things (1.0) will train you in
Awareness [of the change of things er:r so that (0.50) you can using a practice like the ((meta)) in Buddhism where you can actually thinking of (0.75) bringing up
an emotion (0.50) "loving kindness" and applying it to yourself and applying it to friends and then applying it to (.) neutral people applying it to people who are enemies or negative people you're actually training your mind to react (0.25) hh in a positive way
I: in you in (0.75) compassionately response to things (1.0) will train you in
Awareness of the change of things er:r so that (0.50) you can using a practice like the ((meta)) in Buddhism where you can actually thinking of (0.75) bringing up
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permanence as we can (0.75) so to actually train your mind to see the
impermanence s:sa counter intuitive [in a way but that’s =
impermanence s:
I: mm
J: = where the wisdom comes in
I: mm
J: so I think it’s training and also (.) quietening yourself just to see “and become
aware” and also in terms of your subconscious (.) technique
I: and where are you in all of this are you are you do you see yourself (0.50) becoming
more aware becoming more wise becoming more practised (1.50) are you nearer
J: becoming more aware I’d say
I: you are becoming more aware and are you (.) you know if you mentioned perhaps
wisdom might be a goal or being aware might be a goal are you (.) do you sense that
you are (0.75) nearer towards this goal “then you were some some time ago or do you
not see it in those terms”
J: hh ((coughs)) I try I suppose to see it in terms of a goal is (0.75) can be a bit strange
I suppose but I, I (1.75) the idea I suppose I feel (.). hh wiser than I was “yeah”
I: you feel happier than you were
J: term happiness is a thing that comes in and out I think
I: mm
J: some times if you’re wiser and more aware (0.25) for a while you’ll be less happy
I: ↑m↓m
J: ‘cos happiness (1.0) it’s easy to be happy and ded ded
I: but perhaps you could look at those states more dis-passionate↓ly and don’t get so
up↑set ↓when ↓you’re ↓unhappy
J: erm (1.0) yes I think so (.) probably (.) I think probably an’ (1.75) I think so I think
there is (0.50) an element in maybe in some kinds of religion where you shouldn’t be
sad at all you should be happy all the time .hh but I, I yeah I do I think I do (0.50) first
of all very much (0.50) I’m more aware that I am ↓unhappy (0.75) “of the situation”
I: mm
J: “than I used to be (.) and I suppose I’m more aware now and I try to get more distance
on it possibly (.) try to get more distance on it I mean happiness the same ↑way cos
happiness can (1.25) its a strange ↑thing ↑isn’t it (2.50) what is it “(2.0) sometimes I
feel oh I’m really happy a:e:everything’s “fine (1.0) the world is perf. the world is great
and others not”
I: mm
J: so it’s comes in and out
I: mm
J: so therefore I think probably happiness shouldn’t be a goal
I: mm
J: it should be part of life
I: you think looking at things which are more enduring should be
J: no because ↑nothing is enduring
I: ↑(laughs)
J: excepting death ((laughing words)) and happiness ↑also is not enduring
I: mm
J: ‘cos ↑there ↑can’t always be happy something horrible will ↑happen
I: yeah
I: and then there bound to be happy again so that’s great when
I: yes
J: what happens
I: yes that’s ↑fine that’s how ↑it ↑↓s [so what why get why get ((( ))) by it
that's the approach yes I think yeah

and to fee and to feel that you've got to be happy all the time is terribly. it's like a tyranny

so so what happens next in for you in your ggh [( )]
you were going to say journey weren't you [( laughs )]

[I wasn't I was trying to think of a word]

I: I mean what word would you use I mean it's not faith is not journey its ggh

↑it's a sort of faith isn't it Caroline is a faith in life I suppose

well

it [is a sort of faith]

the word I might use would be a sort of narrativ of life 'would be the word I would use I suppose' ( well ) where are you in that do you see yourself

what happens next

oh well

is anything gonna happen next what's going to happen next do you think about what happens next

yes

you do think about what happens next

yes I think we all do and I mean I know I do and everyone else probably does apply a narrative to their life (0.75) to make sense of it but if you are very wise you wouldn’t talk about narrative at all just see it is disparate events .hh but anyway we link it up in a narrative don’t we

yes and you you (0.75) and you can use that narrative and its useful in ([ ])

and you can change it and, and you can look at those narratives and say ‘well that worked for me then but it’s not gonna work for me now and we ?what time is it we ooh yes we’ve been an awful long time’ (0.50) it’s all getting terribly interesting

is it

i: it is

C: can I come in

i: yes of course well

C: am I on air

J: you’re [ on air ]

I: [you’re an air]

(( )) Caroline there I thought (( laughs ))

I: (( )) d. we have we have discussed it

J: what happens now I’ll ju. I’ll answer that question [and then =

i: [yes

J: = and then I can stop

C: shall I go out again

I: no well no if you come an ([ ) join us

J: [([ )]

C: [([ )]

J: what happens next is I think in the narrative of life if I was to look at life as a narrative I had a very, very good erm ([ ) talk in Spain by a (0.25) Spanish writer and psychologist about about euthanasia an’ death .hh and he said that er we have a natural (0.25) narrative in life you know if we’ve, we’ve written our book planted our tree had our chil’ brought up our child then it’s time then to ↓die

Cathy who was to do the next interview had come into the room
I: [yes]
J: [if you die before that it [seems wrong]
I: [it feels wrong]
J: it feels wrong and er (1.0) I have done some of those things and I felt and I’d feel if I died now it would be too early
I: mm
J: because I haven’t ‘cos I think there something else to do
I: mm
J: and that’s to do with vocation and that’s to do =
I: mm
J: = that is a [religious approach to life
I: [mm
J: so it’s got to be something to do with (0.50) expanding the compassion “I was talking bout’ it’s got to being following that line (. ) I’ve got to do something but I FEEL next drawn to do something with other people .hh
I: mm
J: to get closer to other people
I: mm
J: and use all the insights that I’ve gained
I: mm
J: and I don’t know what that would be
I: ↑m↓m
J: that’s the next thing and then I’ll be and then it will be alright to die after that
I: mm
J: but if I died now
I: mm
J: that would be too early
I: we’re not having a morbid discussion honestly we’re not
I: ((( )))
I: just one last tiny wee question ggh you’ve used use the word repeatedly psychological,
I: psychological
J: mm
I: ggh in other words y. the ↑world the world and you in the world you as a thing in the ↓world (. ) are very much all tied up together [ (. ) somehow
J: [yeah
I: you know (0.50) how you are (0.25) this is clearly how you look upon things
J: I ↑don’t ↑see ↑myself as a separate [ (. ) entity
I: [a separate
I: no
J: set apart from the world I feel that that’s almost a childlike thing to do
I: mm
J: I I think (. ) I feel part of it
I: mm
I: involved in it affected by it all
I: mm (. ) mm
J: and I ↑don’t (0.50) I don’t see myself divided into mind and spirit and body and I see myself as one entity
I: mm
J: and I’m conscious and I can think and reflect
I: mm
J: but to me that’s part of (0.75) ↑always part of materialism as part of ↑nature
I: mm
J: nate. the ↑universe has thrown up .hh [this creature
I: [that’s the analogy I had it’s almost like a little machine you know that you’re looking at sort of the workings of the machine (( )) you know the workings are as they are (.) you can’t get het up about them they [just are

1704 J: [no
1704 I: that was a sort of (.) image I had
1706 J: yeah so I’m not (.) there isn’t a part of me that can escape (.) into a more perfect place or a different place (0.50) I am in the world
1708 I: mm
1710 J: and the world is and the world. there isn’t another world
1712 I: mm
1714 J: there is only the world that [↑ is that we see
1716 J: into the world and my consciousness and all the rest of me. hh won’t exist any more because (.) it’s a function [of my ph:physicality
1718 I: [mm
1720 I: yes I I see that yes
1722 J: and if and if I get Alzheiemer’s
1724 J: I’ll begin to die
1726 J: mm big gap .hh
1728 I: °I’ve got to ponder that one° ()°oh erm we can’t leave it there° () we’ll have to leave it there
1730 I: J: I understand
1732 I: you’ve left you’ve ended it on the most controversial sort of ( ( ))
1734 J: all I’m saying is I feel that I am a s. (coughs) a one entity physical mental
1736 I: mm
1738 J: you could change me psychologically by doing things to me
1740 I: mm
1742 J: that would change me as a person
1744 I: mm
1746 J: or a stroke or where I couldn’t (.) respond mentally then you then you will actually change my person
1748 I: mm
1750 J: I won’t be the same ‘cos I won’t be me I won’t reacte in the same way
1752 I: mm
1754 J: do you want another cup of coffee
1756 ((laughs))
C: you'll want a walk around the garden I should think
I: erm "no I won't have another cup of coffee thanks as you say" but that was fabulous
thank you so much erm
J: it was a pleasure
I: do you feel that you've done justice to [the topic
J: [oh [yes
I: you feel that you've said what you wanted to say
J: yes
I: there's nothing lurking oh I wish I could have said that
J: no not at all
I: erm () we could have talked of course of course
J: mm
I: we could have gone on and on and on erm but I'm sure we can () we can you know I
can take away that and starting to think about it and ponder it and come up with some things
J: great
I: if you're happy to let me
J: absolutely yeah well thanks very much
I: well thank [you
J: [it's was a privilege to be able to waffle on about yourself
I: aah
J: [((laughs))
I: [(( ))
J: does anybody need anything coffees, teas
C: well Caroline will need a little break
I: if you are gonna make some coffee
C: mm
J: yeah I can make some
C: would you like to walk round the garden or [something get some air
I: I'm just thinking of time that's the only [thing
C: [yeah
I: see it's half past twelve now
C: [yeah
I: erm (.) no (.) I think we'll buzz on if that's ok [with you
J: [yes
C: [I'll bring you some coffee then do you want some Cathy
J: [(( ))
I: [that's so kind let me just.

THE END
CATHY'S STORY

Fifth participant, first field transcript, ref. 5:1:1:0

4 I: thank you so much ((Cathy)) for this I do appreciate it.
C: it’s a pleasure.
6 I: yes well thank you thank you.
I: .hoh you know you know what we’re doing and what we’ve, (1.0) what I’m doing you know what what’s happening with it [all
C: [mm
10 I: erm (1.0) ggh (.) I’m not i:it it is psychology of religion I’m not trying to come and say I’ve got a theory I’ve got the answers I’m going to psychologise everything away from what you say it’s not that .hh it’s s:simply trying to listen to what people say about their own faith and trying to understand it.
14 C: o’kay.
I: from from you know yes if there are insights that psychology can give well I’ll (. if I can use them I will but .hh basically it’s it’s it’s you (.) erm talking of (.) your (1.0) faith but as I (((understand laughing word)) from John I mean I can’t call it faith necessarily “but whatever”
18 C: [mm
20 I: .hoh ah hh er:rm (1.25) so tha. I I will start with a. with a similar question to the one I started with John I’ve started it before in other interviews and it’s.
22 (.sometimes it’s the hardest quesition .hh which is simply this is that erm if you’re you know (0.5) at a party, or you’re with people and we all sat around and did our prayer this morning very happily because we knew each =
C: [mm
26 I: = other and we all knew where we were all coming [from
C: [mm
28 I: .hoh but supposing you were just out somewhere you meet people for the first time you’re in a pub you’re at a party (. you’re in a shop or wher’ev’er you might be
30 .hohh and somebody mentions oh these mad people with faith or Bush he thinks he speaks to God and all of this you know what people might say =
32 C: mm
34 I: = or they’re discussing supposed Muslim terrorism< .hoh somebody makes a comment and they and they turn to you and they say well (. have you got a faith or you’re religious yeah wha. what do you what do you pray (0.5) and
36 >>suddenly everybody looks at you and you there you are on the spot< what what do you say how [do you answer them or how what do you beg. what =
38 C: [mm
40 I: = do you begin to say
42 C: mm (.hoh it would be very hard wouldn’t it because (. prayer for me is a very personal thing and I wouldn’t want to (0.75) defend it or introduce it as a sort of (0.5)
44 party topic
I: right [right
46 C: in a way
C: I suppose if I felt that people were genuinely wanting to know
48 I: right
C: then I’d want to give some sort of response but I would find that hard especially if it was a social occasion and there were a lot of people
I: yes
50 C: sitting round a dinner table
I: yes
52 C: or something
I: yes
C: hh I suppose I would have to give (0.75) i think I'd have to say that (.) for me (.) I do have a personal. a personal experience of prayer .hh and I think maybe I'd have to say that I'd feel happier talking about it sort of (0.75) one-to-one I wouldn't I wouldn't want it held up as a sort of topic of debate (0.5) that would be quite hard for me (.) I think
I: is that because you think people would (.) misunderstand or or because you think
C: hh I tell it's i. >it would be< I'd find it very hard to sort of i. imagine (1.0) that situation and say how I'd respo because (.) I don't know I mean I'd respond how I would respond I don't (.) I haven't got a fixed idea about about what I'd say (1.0) erm I mean prayer for me has become (. ) personal and more real (0.75) since I've been meditating so I would feel more able to talk about it now (.) than I would have done say (1.0) eight years ago before I started meditating I mean then it would have been a much more (0.75) difficult question I suppose (.) I've got a lever in there 'cos (.) if I people really wanted to know .hh I could start talking about my experience of meditative prayer or contemplative prayer and if I felt people wanted to know I'd go on talking about it
I: mm
C: but if I felt they were sort of pushing or (.) erm (1.0) certainly mocking then I couldn't talk about it
I: right
C: because it is too (0.5) real an experience
I: so it depends how the question was asked
C: very much if there was a genuine spirit there =
I: yes
C: = and I fee. felt people were really interested [then =
I: yes
C: = yes I would [want
I: yes
I: but you don't want to lay yourself open to some people 'd say 'oh stupid old Cathy she prays' you don't obviously want to lay (.) yourself open to
C: I don't think I'd be prepared to
I: no
C: put pearls before (.) swine laughing word)
I: right oh right
C: hh no I wouldn't I mean I if I felt there was a any sense of [genuineness there
I: yes yes
C: fine
I: yes
C: but if I felt it was being held up (.) as any old topic to toss around [it is too =
I: yes
C: = important
I: it is too important
C: I [couldn't do that
I: I see I see
C: -yes
I: .hhh and so if you if you did think they were genuine
C: mm
I: what what sort of things would you want to say
C: mm hh I suppose I'd want to say (.) that for me prayer has become (1.0) a (.) daily practice that feeds into my life and that it's become increasingly (0.5) significant to me (.) as a sort of basis for all that I do really () and at that time of quiet () twice a day hopefully once a day usually (1.0) it's erm I mean it's a sort of (1.0) clearing my perspective and (0.75) erm (1.25) just allowing things to come together (1.0) and it's a
place of of rebalancing so (0.75) it just has become im\textsuperscript{por}\textsubscript{tant} and for \textsuperscript{m}\textsubscript{e} I’d call that God I call that an experience of an inner relationship that is me and God but God in a way is a convenient word to attach to what may be called all sorts of other things I mean (1.0) some people may see that as (.) being in contact with the sort of respectful attitude to erm I don’t know the one who is, the creator the source of all life (1.5) so it’s that sense being in contact with (0.75) my own source of being (1.0) \textsuperscript{a} \textsuperscript{nd} \textsuperscript{t} \textsuperscript{hat} for me is a quietening process and a sort of linking \textsuperscript{t}\textsuperscript{in}, (.) process that’s at once very (0.75) inside me but > \textsuperscript{t}\textsuperscript{al}< \textsuperscript{o} linked with everything< that is so (0.5) it’s > people often say don’t they that< and it might come back at this fictitious gathering you know that \.hh well isn’t that you know very introspective and (0.75) > for \textsuperscript{m}\textsubscript{e} it’s quite< the \textsuperscript{t} \textsuperscript{op}\textsuperscript{os} \textsuperscript{e} because it’s only in allowing (0.75) distractions to sort of shed and al\textsuperscript{low}\textsuperscript{i}ng myself to be in contact with my own true being that I find I actually (0.25) a. erm discover they’re a source of energy that takes me \textsuperscript{t}\textsuperscript{o}\textsuperscript{u}\textsuperscript{t} (.) and is a (.) a sort of \textsuperscript{e}\textsuperscript{r}\textsuperscript{m} \textsuperscript{e} engine room really that I find it a place (.) of (.) energy so it takes me out in fact it’s a source of (0.25) outgoingness as a result of (0.5) of going in so i. certainly I mean I’ve had people say oh contemplating your navel you know (.) introspective but I refute that one cos personally I don’t find that that’s what it is
C: well they (.) I’m not sure what they are no because I’ve completely lost contact (.)
162 with them and my parents have sort of moved on but erm .hh it was a very exclusive
164 sect and fundamentalist (0.5) sect (0.75) who believed that the Bible was (. ) literally
166 true the word of God and that you lived your life as God’s chosen people within very
circumspect line so it was very (. ) strongly disciplined my life as a child was
168 certainly very (0.5) channelled so (0.25) it was quite hard for me for example when I
went to school erm and began moving out as a ↑teenager because I felt myself
completely (0.5) ↑odd and different and ill-equipped to sort of face the social ↑world
1: ↓m↓m
170 C: and ↑that (. ) was hard
I: ↑where was this ↑where was this were you brought up
I: oh right (. ) oh not ↑far ↓then =
174 C: = no no erm so all sorts of things that (0.75) I struggled with for ↑yeas↑rs with that
and had to get over (. ) ↑but (. ) now I’m beginning to find >↑I ↑think maybe for the
176 first time< redemptive practice in that and ↑one of them is this being ↑easy↑ly with and
understanding the value of silence (1.0) because part of the. well I ↑think it comes I
178 ↑think it ↑does come from there because ↑part of the Brethren ↓thing .hh was to have
a morning service that was completely quiet =
180 = a ↑bit like the Quakers< [(.)but ↑no music
I: ↑mm
182 C: = and people sitting in a circle round the Lord’s Ta↓ble where the wine and the bread
would be [and erm
184 I: [so they would have Eucharist
C: yes
186 I: but not the not the liturgy
C: no they called it the breaking of bread
188 I: mm
C: and they saw themselves as people (0.25) set apart from the complexities of set
190 religion they were following the more true example of the disciples and meeting
simply
192 I: ↑mm
C: in the Lord’s name and ( ( _ ))
194 I: ↑mm
C: and it was very male geared so women had no voice in this set[up at all
196 I: [↑m↓m m m↓m
C: but the ↑me↓n erm could speak and they spoke spoke as the spirit led and usually and
198 ↑at its be↓st there would be a sort of [theme running through
I: [mm
200 I: mm
C: and at its worst (0.75) it was ridiculous
202 I: mm
C: erm ↑but I think one thing I did imbibe was this sort of (. ) spiritual ↑sil↓ence =
204 I: [↑m↓m
C: = you know when people would be sitting there with their Bibles open
206 I: so the ↑chil↓dren went to this as well
C: oh yeah well >we were dragged. my brother and I we were dragged along and sat
there< yeah for hours it seemed “silent” and you ↑had to be quiet and weren’t allowed
anything to read or to distract you you know you just had to sit (1.0) =
210 = ↑yes [so
I: [↑m↓m
212 C: that was my sort of (. ) background [(.) that has been a mixed experience
I: [↑m↓m
C: I mean a real grit in the oyster you know that I had to contend with

I: mm

C: but it's been thought-provoking and

I: mm

C: it's led me pushed me on

I: .hh so i. y:you at some point when you were growing up perhaps when you left home
or something you you started to quer y this particular way of

I: worship this [particular

C: [yeah

C: yes I suppose so as you get older you have the strength as an adult to sort of
look at it independently =

I: [mm mm

C: = and say well no I don't think that's right [and that's not for me

I: [mm

I: mm

C: but you can't as a child

I: mm

C: so certainly when I moved off to London I did nursing and (. ) started going to an
Anglican church

I: mm

C: and loved

I: was that because there wasn't a Plymouth Brethren Church near

C: oh no I wouldn't have gone didn't want to go (. ) but there were friends and the

I: [mm

C: Christian union who were Anglican and there was an Anglican church

I: [mm mm

I: mm

C: where we were and I loved the sort of sensuality of it

I: [mm

C: in a way I mean

I: mm

C: the church with beautiful things in it and (. ) a certain amount of ritual

I: [mm

I: mm

C: I thought was wonderful loved it

I: [mm mm

C: yes so it was different

I: mm

C: and so I could go on but

I: but you'd call yourself Christian at this point if someone asked you at this dinner
party this mythical dinner party

C: oh then

I: then you you would [have said oh yes I'm a Christian I go to church

C: [oh yes yeah I would have done

C: mm absolutely

I: [right

C: [mm

I: so you're a you're a erm late teens at this point are you

C: yes (0.25) late teens early 20s

I: and then you what happened next what happened

C: erm >what happened then< erm .hh yes kept going to sort of evangelical Anglican

church then did midwifery (0.75) back in (place) and then there was a Baptist

church [around I went to (. ) and went out with a Baptist minister for a while

I: [mm
I: mm
C: so I was very drawn to that particular church
I: mm
C: then (0.75) after that erm yes >worked as a District midwife for a while
>and then I went to The Meadows< and The ↑Meadows↓ was the bi:ig sort of catalyst
enormous [(( )]
I: ↑how ↑did you know about The Meadows and what attracted you
to it and why did you choose to go there
C: yeah well I was thinking about all sort of things I was thinking about (.) going abroad
(o.5) I was thinking about working in a hospital in ↑Israel↓ (0.75) thinking about all
sorts of different things (0.75) a:erm vocational sort of things I suppose something a
bit different and I saw this job in the Nursing Times [advertised
I: [right
282
I: right
C: therapeutic community
284
I: mm
C: (( ))
286
I: mm
C: it sounded different
288
I: mm
C: [so
290
I: I wondered what what attracted you to it
C: ↑yea↓h I [mean
292
I: [it was a different sort of community wasn’t [it
C: ↑it ↑wa:a↓s and I think
294
mysteriously the word Christian although, I. ↑the↓n didn’t (0.25) and I’ve ↑a:alwa↓ys
questioned things you know I’d never have just been a good Christian girl although
that was put on [me as a child
I: [mm
298
C: to be a good Christian girl
I: mm
300
C: but I would ↑al↓ways question question question all the time
I: mm
302
C: erm so this ↑drew ↓me but I took my questions and I suppose my questions were
allowed to go it was a therapeutic community so
304
I: allowed to, you mean it was allowed to leave you were allowed
C: my questions were allowed to go with me
306
I: right
C: I was allowed it was ↑possible to, to be there with [questions
308
I: [with questions
C: yeah
310
I: and it said Christian in the title of its name did it
C: it did yes
312
I: ↓see
C: yeah
314
I: right so when ↑you say you were allowed, (.) so i::t was all right it was ↑com↓fy for
you to go (0.5) with a load of questions
316
C: yeah I think partly it [was
I: [it was seen as
318
C: .hh no it was seen. I think it was probably seen as (0.75) ↑goo↓d I mean I wouldn’t
have been seen as highly contro↑ver↓sial by anything but .hh =
320
I: [mm
C: it was a highly controversial atmosphere because there were people there from all sorts of conditions and I mean some with really quite gross psychiatric disorders and =

C: there would be enormous tensions and things you would have to face and think about that could be quite scar but there was something about that in a way was really honest and and quite free because questions could be addressed and it was like broken open in a way that wasn’t any neat shallow façade=

I: these are clinical questions are they or faith questions or both

C: I think both I think the faith questions and questions about my own self so the two kind of hold together in a way and it was the experience of living with Christian people and having chapel every day praying every day being able to lead prayers and chapel every. you know take my turn erm so once or twice a week leading prayers in chapel hh but there was a a commonality I mean we were there to do something

I: so we with there and a very mixed group ecumenically mixed

C: but a lot of people there who came for a year who were quite a lot younger

I: than that

C: so it was quite a young sort of atmosphere

I: mm

C: in a way although I mean I could talk forever about The Meadows which maybe isn’t the point but I mean it was an enormous influence on me

I: well y. yes you say I mean it was it was clearly a place of value which =

C: was important for

I: where were they all people of faith on the staff were they all Christians

C: they were mostly I mean they were either people of faith or people who were entirely sympathetic to Christian attitudes =

C: but it had a strong Christian underpinning

I: right but as you said it didn’t matter which denomination or =

C: no

C: I mean every every denomination

I: yes right so it wasn’t troubled =

C: by by sort of theoretical issues it was [not terribly no it wasn’t]

I: and the purpo of this was was to provide medical help and support for people in a Christian environment
C: yes I think in a way it was to (0.25) it was called a therapeutic community and it was a sort of experiment and (0.5) this was the 70s and =
I: [right]
C: = sort of linked [back from the 60s I suppose =
I: [mm mm]
C: = sort of a community was a big buzz[word
I: [mm mm]
C: but the ↑idea I ↓suppose was to sho↑w, (0.75) to ↑give people (_) an experience of living together (_) that was possible I mean people had come from very disintegrated backgrounds
I: mm
C: so you were showing how it was ↑poss↓ible to have some (_) order to the day [you know =
I: [mm]
C: = the day to be separate from night [and for there to be =
I: [mm]
C: = a work routine and people were (0.5) ↑val↓ued
I: mm
C: and were part ↑of this not. you wouldn’t call it a family but community people had their place (_) and we were all known by our name
I: mm
C: I mean I was there ostensibly as a nurse but
I: mm
C: I had no uniform
I: mm
C: I would cook a dinner or get involved in 101 different things
I: ↑m↓m
C: erm (1.0) so it was a very developing and growing sort of experience and perhaps the biggest point is that when I ↑left ↓there (0.75) I left because I was pregnant John and I had met and he’s a lot ↑youn↓ger than I and but we met and (0.5) we just we instantly sort of knew we were just there together
I: ↑mm yes that’s lovely yes
C: yeah it was an amazing story (1.0) so (_) we got married and I ↑left when I was pregnant with ((name)) erm (1.25) and we moved and ↑that was the beginning of a terrible separation for me really (0.75) of finding it really hard to find anything (_) that was as relevant as that had been because it was an integrated experience of (0.5) living and being a Christian and having a creative life
I: ↑m↓m
C: and once that was gone (1.0) and I mean I was (.) very naïve really I wo. I mean I was a midwife I should know more no >not because I was a midwife< but I expected to think >oh I’m a midwife I know everything about babies< I’ll be fine (0.25) and lovely:y I mean I was ↓older, I was in my early thirties by then I thought (0.75) I’d worked a long time and it’s all love:ly (_) time for home time to have babies and and course it ↑was↓n’t like that I missed it enormously and there was a whole part of myself that was developed and kind of (_) I felt as if it was just put to one ↑si↓de (0.75) it was just me and it’s very limited,
I: so did you get another [job or was it were you were you at home with ((name))
C: [(( )]
C: I was at ↑home yes I was at home with (( name)) and
I: I mean paid job
C: hhh yeah exactly ggh ((laughing sound)) John was beginning his [career =
I: [mm
C: = and it was very important to him to kind of go charging [off and develop his career
I: [mm
C: and I felt it was right for him to have that space cos I’d sort of done mine (1.75) erm
and that was the way we worked it and I ↓did (0.25) odd things ° (( )) ° this and that
C: and (.) now I had a baby I went to train with Relate it was
I: ↑m↓m
C: you know big moment and that opened another door
I: mm
I: ggh but (2.0) y:you you ↑talk as if it was a sort of a ↑loss ↓then =
C: [it was
I: = The Meadows that it had something (0.75) that you valued
C: ↑m↓m
I: and you you enjoyed
C: mm
I: and and needed
C: [mm
I: [and and so ↑when (.) when you left The Meadows ggh you didn’t have that any more =
C: = no
I: and and ↑what what was it (0.25) that you think you’d lost [from it was ↑it
C: I think what I lost was (0.75) erm it was that sense of community (1.0) and a sense of
(.) having (.) been ↑part of a Christian life that was ↑fun and that was (0.5) outgoing
and >again I don’t want to get stuck into The Meadows but I mean we did< all sorts of
things you know we’d take everybody on holiday in the summer at ↑Easter time there
would be big celebrations I mean Christmas time it would be wonderful you know .hh
the year was sort of marked with these festivities
I: mm
C: and there was I mean a ↑lot of tragedy but there was a lot of fun (.) and (.) so ↑that (.)
dimension and I, I ↑did ↓feel it was ↑lost
I: but you you you’d ↑now got your ↑o↓wn family you’d got your ↑o↓wn child that you
could mark the seasons off for (0.75) you you could’ve joined a local church or
something which, which was very much into the seasons in the [calendar =
C: ↑m↓m
I: = of the year
C: ↑m↓m
I: ↑would ↑would that not’ve (1.25) would that not’ve been a replace↓ment
C: well obviously it was in part [and =
I: [mm
C: = it was a time for kind of re↑think↓ing
I: mm
C: and (0.25) it’s just ↑differ↓ent isn’t it I mean one little boy
I: mm
C: a:erm can’t possibly be the same
I: mm
C: as a ↑big Christian (( [ )]) community and being and member of the ↑chur↓ch
I: [mm
I: mm
C: can’t possibly [(.) be the ↑save↓me and may be it was me erm
I: [mm
I: not being open enough to let things move on ↑differ↓ently I don’t know but in the end
they did
I: mm
C: but ↑cer↓tainly it was a big, (0.5) moment of [change erm
I: [mm
C: and yeah it ↑w↓as
I: mm
C: I had to look [back on that >as a big moment of change<
I: [mm
C: that ggh I mean regarding it from this point ↑no↓w I can see it had its own particular value
I: mm
C: but at the ↑time that one was quite hard (0.5) so
I: so ↑did you continue going to ↑church when you left there
C: ↑yes and we moved around a lot
I: [yes
C: and continued going to church and then when the children were oh I don’t know probably about three and five that sort of age (.) there was a big rumpus in our parish church in ((place)) where the vicar erm got into trouble he had a big breakdown there Mark and I, (0.5) were going through lots of changes our ↑selves he didn’t feel happy with the church (.) and ↑I wasn’t finding it very relevant so I ↓decided partly because of the vicar partly because my own view [to leave =
I: mm
C: = and ↑that was another big feeling for [me (( ))
I: ↑mm
C: when I left [cos I just left
I: [↑mm
C: I didn’t want it because there was so much going on =
I: [mm
C: to me and the children and everyone else (1.0) so we ↑gan looking around for replacements and (.) just didn’t ↑find ↓one and we [tried ↑all sorts of
I: [mm
C: we tried the Quakers tried one or two different churches (0.75 ) erm but ↑nothing
I: (0.25) seemed right, we weren’t meeting people who were like us
I: mm
C: so (0.5) you know that [was the
I: [you ↑didn’t meet people who you were like you that’s
I: [interesting isn’t it so ggh you could recognise in these people
C: [no (.) mm
I: that you were meeting in these various different churches something that you ↑didn’t recognise in yourself there was something (0.75) you know they ha. either had something you didn’t have or you had something they didn’t have
C: ↑mm
I: they weren’t like you
C: ↑no maybe they ↑were↓n’t but certainly I mean neither of us I mean speaking from my point of view now I didn’t find that (.) spark (0.75) that made me feel oh yes I mean we held great hope the Quakers I [remember and we took the kids =
I: [mm
C: = there but it didn’t work erm no it just ↓[n’t
I: [there wasn’t a sort of spark of of I’ve come home or this is [it my family my community
C: [no
I: I’m amongst like-minded people
C: no not at all (1.0) so (1.25) I didn’t go anywhere (.) for a while (.) and ↑threw ↓myself into counselling ↑threw ↓myself into Relate
I: mm
C: and got a lot (0.5) from ↑that↓t
I: mm
but threw myself into it overboard I [think in the end and (0.25) it was still =

I: = it wasn’t giving me completely what I needed and there there was more to 

me than Relate

I: and what did you think you needed at that time

C: I mean looking I don’t think I could have (0.25) voiced it at the (1.0) I mean

I:  (do you think. did 

you think you recogni. did you think (.) you knew that at the (0.5) looking back

C: that’s me looking back

I:  right

C: I think at the time (0.5) I was locked into what was happening (0.5) and getting on 

with the. all the usual business of doing I was doing juggling the children [and 

I:  ]yes

C: John’s needs

C: [and my needs and [their needs and all that stuff

I:  ]yes

C: so in a way you haven’t got the space to kind of think about anything else (0.5) but 

that was, I look back on that as a very. at its peak and its most stressful time of my life

I think (. ) for all that I know

I: mm

C: but (1.0) things began to change I mean children got older and went (0.5) John was 

bored with his work and we had all that to contend with but strangely I mean since 
moving to this (1.0) so much has happened I can’t begin to tell you how

much has happened

I: happened in a spiritual sense

C: yes (0.25) yes it’s as though the waves have come wooshing in (0.5) again and 

I: again so [you recognise this from (.) you say again why do you say again

C: [again

I: well I do say again I mean I was talking to you about The Mead (1.0) in terms of the people who are coming to this

and even sitting here talking to (0.5) well (. ) for all that I know

I: mm

C: spiritual life you know

I: mm

C: it’s a wonderful thing to be able to do [and (0.5) erm a few months ago I had 

I: mm

someone here doing her MA and she was talking about sort of spirituality and 
counselling

I: mm

C: speaker talking about that and (0.5) there have been so many people who have 

been in this room as you know ((hhh laughing breath))

I: mm

C: erm where we’re sharing our spiritual life together

I: its something very special to be able to do that in your own room [isn’t it =

C: mm
I: = in your own home

590 C: ↑m↓m
I: I do think that is I do agree with you

592 C: yeah it is special
I: yes and I ↑just wondered when you build the barn you’re going to go into the barn perhaps and it wont be in your own home anymore
C: I know I’ve ↑thought about that

596 I: ↑have ↓you
C: [yeah

598 I: [mm mm
C: and will just have to see (.) [what happens I don’t want to stop using (.)

600 I: [mm
C: my own home

602 I: mm
C: but the barn I think will be a. a I see it as (0.25) a development

604 I: mm
C: of all sorts of [things and I just want to see

606 I: [mm
I: ↑m↓m

608 C: how that goes
I: mm mm

610 I: erm but as you know I’m doing this course in Ignatian spiritua[lity =
I: [mm

612 C: = it’s called the Art of Ignation Spirituality and the Art of Spiritual Directorship
I: yes [yes yes
C: [a long and complicated title but I’m beginning to have sort of little (. ) ideas from ↑that

616 I: mm
C: and just listening to friends and .hh and ↑in ↑general what I perceive as the sort of (. ) need in society for something that people are trying hard to find that maybe reflects my ↑own searchings for a place of ↓qui↑et and relevant understanding opportunity to explo↑re, opportunity to find ↓God in ways that ar. are genuine and ↓real and not ↑im↓posed and where there is not erm some sort of expectation that you should conform to somebody else’s idea of what is you know but ↑room to discover who who ↑I ↓am and ↑share that with a group of people

624 I: mm
C: seems to me one of the most wonderful things

626 I: [mm
C: [and yet something that is not easily ac↑cess↓ible (.) in life

628 I: [mm
I: mm

630 C: it certainly not easily accessible in well ↑my experience of ↑church (.) has been
I: [mm

632 I: you don’t find it in the traditional church
C: well ↑I ↓have↑n’t found it [very much I find it in fits and starts =

634 I: [I see I see mm
C: = and (. ) Communion is important =

636 = to me [so I go along to our local Parish Church [and (. ) have Communion
I: [mm

638 C: that’s important ↑it’s important to know those ↑peo↓ple
I: mm
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but it is not possible to do the kind of thing that we have done on our retreat and have the possibility to talk to people like you, now =

= and our own meditation group where you can talk about real things =

= where you can talk as you are erm =

I: [yes]

C: I mean that’s a wonderful thing to be able to do

I: mm

C: so you would say that you worship a God or that you talk to a God or experience God in a way for example [that John wouldn’t]

I: mm

C: I mean that’s a wonderful thing to be able to do

I: mm

C: and I’m quite happy for God I don’t like to call God ‘him’

I: mm

C: erm or ‘her’

I: mm

C: but there isn’t another word so I say ‘him’ because everyone knows what you mean

I: mm

C: but for me I suppose God is the ultimate source of all creativity and therefore every thing that makes our lives energetic, and productive, and out going, and developed what ever is a source of all life-giving processes = [then I would identify that as God and that’s, who what erm =]

I: [mm]

C: = I feel I give time to when I meditate and I’m with so I feel myself to be and my experience confirms that sense of being in relationship

I: so it is akin at least to the Christian God a personal God

C: = if anyone was to analyse my faith and I would be regarded as the most liberal of the liberal and I mean

I: [mm]

C: I love the title of Richard Holloway’s [book =

I: [mm]

C: = Dancing on the Edge I think he called it =

I: [mm]

C: = and that was where I would say I am I’m dancing on the edge of things I think and

I: [but he was a bishop you see so he’s he

C: he can think [those things you know why not

C: [yes yes I know it was very encouraging isn’t it

I: °

C: °° erm now he’s a non-bishop

I: mm he’s retired now isn’t he
C: yes
I: .hh erm (1.75) so what brought about this change this was ((coughs)) when you went and heard the erm ((coughs)) excuse me or saw the tape with (. ) Laurence
C: [yes that's right (. ) and the Dalai Lama
I: I remember you mentioned that to me [before
C: [yeah
I: and this was put on by the er WCCM in [([place]) was it [(( )]
C: [.hh [↑y↓es it must have been yes
I: it must have been ah because ((name)) was there
C: so it obviously was and I know John and I saw this big ↑fly↓er saying you know with the words Buddhism and Christian
I: yes
C: on you know together and he was very interested in Buddhism at the time
I: [yes
C: [so (0.75) it seemed (0.75) just intr↑i↓uing [(. ) to go to something
I: [yes
C: = that we could we could both attend [we could both (( )) up together
I: [yes
C: un↑til that point did you ↑see yourself as having a different kind of faith to John's that that you had to sort of (coughs)) excuse me practice your faith in your way an' that was ↑different from. from what John was doing
C: .hh well we were ↑both aware that we were going in different direct↓ions erm we were both on different journeys erm (1.75) yeah I mean I've never really (. ) understood (0.75) John's medi↑ta↓tion and my moving into this (. ) has given ↑us (0.25) some unity of approach that we didn't we'd lost I mean ↑we used to pray together when we [were young
I: [mm
C: from a ↑Chris↓tian basis and then we progressively lost that (1.50) and I lost my ability to come and pray with. with words (1.50) so (0.25) I mean going to that going to that (. ) ↑meet↓ing was oh oh it was such a catalyst erm little did I ↑know↓w how how life was going to change as a result of going to ↑that↓
I: but you ↑felt when you went to the meeting that it was (0.25) something special
C: ↑not partic↓ularly I mean I ↑found it quite moving to see the the Dalai Lama there with the Beatitudes open in his hands and [mm
I: [mm
C: pouring over (. ) you know what is a beautiful ↑text
I: [mm
C: .hh so that was very moving and (0.75) of course I didn't know who Laurence Freeman was ([ .) a monk ((laughs))
I: [mm
C: never heard of ↑him erm so that con. connection I found quite moving and I I found I I ↑think I related to was the fact that both those men (0.25) were completely ↑op↓en to each other and neither was trying to convert the [other
I: [mm mm
C: but they were both quite happy to ↑be there (. ) looking at each other's point of view
I: [mm
C: so that was I liked that
I: [mm
C: that was good
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C: and then after we were invited to go and sign up for a meditation group if we’d like too so I did
I: m
748 I: and John didn’t
C: and John didn’t
750 I: right but he was happy doing his own Buddhist meditation [((  ))]
C: yes he was into Buddhism [at the time]
I: [yes yes]
754 C: heavily into Buddhism so
I: so you went along and started the practice started practising meditation
756 C: ↑m↓m
I: ↑Christian meditation
758 C: yeah
I: which you s. I mean they call it prayer
760 C: ↓ah↑r↓ye↓s I w. (.) this was erm with (name) who is now my sister-in-law of course (0.75) but she and I had never met before
762 I: mm
C: and she’s very ardent Catholic so come’s at it from her Catholic background (0.75) and ↑she introduced the John Main meditation and the word maranathah174 and ↑I ↑didn’t like maranathah (.) because for ↑me oddly enough it went immediately back to the ↑Brethren thing because maranathah (.) was a very common word in [Brethren parlance
766 I: oh really is it was it
C: yeah
770 I: what and they they used it as a as a sort of ↑pray↓er
C: yeah I mean maranathah (0.75) it was just a word that often came into sermons or came into prayers erm maranathah come Lord Jesus yeah it was just part of the Brethren (0.75) linguistic (1.0) frame you know
774 I: ↑mm↓m
C: I mean they had a very distinctive (0.75) way of speaking that my father would never recognise he always got them to come out any sort of conditioning that the’d got their own [conditioning and maranatha was one of their words [so
778 I: [mm] [↓m↑↓m]
C: so for me it was no good ‘cos it had all sorts [of
780 I: [so it had the. it had all sorts of (.) bagage with it [(.) the word
782 C: [it really did yeah [yes it did
I: [yes
784 I: ↓o↑↓h
C: so I couldn’t go with maranatha [so I have my own prayer w. er word =
786 I: [no
C: = I go with (0.5) but ((name)) was very good and erm (.) she (0.75) well I mean it was complete↓ly ↑ne↓w I had ↑n↓w inkling really of what it was all about other than that I was sort of instinctively ↑drawn ↓to it
790 I: mm
C: so erm
792 I: but it came at the right sort of moment in a way because [you were ready =
794 I: = to look for something weren’t you [at the time
C: [yes it did it came at quite the right moment

---

174 maranatha meaning ‘come Lord’ or ‘the Lord comes’ in Aramaic, used by the WCCM as a prayer mantra, a word repeated internally and continuously during a period of silent meditation.
I:  I think
I:  I: so you star ted going to the group and (1.0) what happened to your faith at this time would you say it began to change
C:  certainly not (0.5) instantly by any means at all I mean I just went partly because I liked having a group of people
I:  mm
C:  and they were nice people
I:  mm
C:  and one of my things had been that I’d not got my tribe you know I felt I was tribe-less
I:  I:  mm
C:  for quite a few years (. . .) The Meadows had been such a tribe
I:  I:  mm
I:  mm
C:  and obviously your own family is a tribe (too in a sense
I:  I:  mm
I:  mm
C:  but I’d had a very developed (. . .)
I:  I:  mm
I:  mm
C:  sense that a lot of people wouldn’t have
I:  mm
I:  mm
C:  been given so in a way (0.5) wasn’t content
I:  I:  mm
I:  mm
C:  with just family I needed more that I had more
I:  I:  mm
I:  mm
C:  so yeah it was a a very early sense of tribe again (.) and maybe that’s why I went nt
and I got to like people and got friendly with people and it just felt very relevant sitting there (0.5) the silence became (0.25) an experience of healing I think (. . .)
because there were no words and there was no implication that you’ve got to be anything or do anything but that wonderful kind of unity
I:  mm
C:  of silence and drawn strength
I:  mm
C:  and I suppose the longer we met the more we have the experience of sharing each others’ lives and (( name )) had a long experience of illness and (0.75) we saw her through that as a group (0.75) and we listen to each other’s stories and become sort of woven into each other’s lives to some extent so
I:  I:  mm
I:  mm
C:  it became an increasingly significant place to be (1.25) and I sup pose (0.75) after some yeas’ erm (. . .) I don’t know (. . .) what happened really just the process of meditating (1.25) just brings creative positionality I mean (1.0) John and I moved here and it was the first time we’d ever moved (1.0) because we wanted to move we s. we’d always moved because we’d had to (.) for his job and I hadn’t liked it and we’d not had much money and we’d moved to houses we hadn’t particularly liked but (0.25) were okay near schools and er but moving here was different and it ( . . .) it was the sort of house that expressed us and things had just changed led an meditation (1.0) and (0.5) I don’t know just being open in Christian language open to the spirit I think and (0.75) I mean for me its just been an immense experience of being Spirit led and being (. . .) aahh it was a big sigh of relief really that here things have happened and the idea kind of came from the beginning to have retreat days beginning to meet up to talk about our faith or have themes and that has so grown (0.75) erm so contacts suddenly you know people have come pouring in
C: an’ there’ve been people, people, people and people and who have been able to talk to and life has expanded and erm [(0.25) I dunno just growing [so the, so these people that have come in [would say] that you were like them]

I: [yes]

C: [there was some kind of recognition]

I: [it was any spark of compatibility or (.)]

C: absolutely mm

I: and and could you put your finger on (0.25) what it was do you (((think laughing word)) that made you like those people and not like the other people

C: yeah it was n’t so much not li::ik[ing them

I: [not not like I don’t mean like as in like the [person not a like]

C: or that kind of (0.25) deeper level of communication where you could already be talking about things that are you it’s it’s just a certain level I ((don’t know laughing word)) what it is real ly

I: so talking about things which are you

C: mm

I: in other words that in this kind of milieu erm (1.25) fo. fo. wh. the things that you do the things that you talk about are more (1.0) more really you they’re more what do you mean by more you

C: what do I mean .huh er I am and in we all when we used to lived in ((place)) and we of ten used to say when we were living there that (...) the people we meet were nice people they were ok people but you couldn’t we were talking about to them at some level we used to think ‘is this snobby thing’ you know or is it. (...) was it an inte Illectual thing well maybe it was in part (...) we just weren’t meeting people who (0.25) we had common, things in [common enough

I: [you weren’t communicating with them]

C: no (1.0) and I suppose both John and I have got a strong need to develop spiritual

I: sen se cos we were both brought up with that

C: and we both had that a lot working in our lives in a different way (1.0) er I d. (.) what is it I don’t know erm really hard to sort of put your finger on define

I: it’s not just dare I say it that you and John have just grown older (0.25) do you think that I mean if you went back now do you how do you think it would be if you went back

C: well I suppose I really think that if we had been in contact then with the people we know now (0.5) 10 years a go that there would have been that contact but we weren’t meeting them we weren’t meeting up with them

I: [I see]

C: and wh y I don’t know it’s a bit of a mystery I mean (1.75) I don’t know

I: is it (1.25) that when we meet here when we pray together when we talk about our faith we are ‘active ly talking an’ spirituality things (1.0) whereas if you’re just going about your ordinary daily life (.) you’re not

C: mm

I: so do you think that (0.25) that it’s in some some sense a a (.) talking and doing spiritual things (1.25) and it was that that was missing

C: mm

I: in the previous one
C: ↑ye↓ah I think so I mean I needed that to complete myself I feel personally it's something I need
I: so that whatever they were doing in the ↑church↓ches
C: mm
I: in the previous places
C: mm
I: it wasn’t the same thing as what you are doing now in prayer
C: no absolutely not (,) it really wasn’t I mean there might have been elements of it
I: yes
C: erm I’m sure there were elements of it (,) but ↑this this just feels so:0 much more free
I mean there’s l. erm phrases bandied around now I’ve heard about the experience of
monasteries without walls [or churches without walls [(.)
I: [mm][mm]
C: and there seems to be that going on
I: mm
C: you know the capacity for ↑thin↓king Christian people [(.) to talk about their
I: [mm]
C: understanding of God
I: mm
C: in their lives in a way that is open and cre↑at↓ive [in a more where are we at ↓now
I: [mm]
C: wh. what ↑how is this relevant to ↓now’ [(.) with↑out (.) the the constraints of the =
I: [mm]
C: = Church form and I ↑know it has its ↑val↓ue [and it has place
I: [mm]
C: but I find a ↓lot of ↓people who experience it as a place of constraint [and that has =
I: [mm]
C: = been ↑my experience
I: mm
C: so of course [( ) some [people who are there (1.0) but erm
I: [mm][mm]
I: so ↑where hh (0.75) question here million-dollar question ↑where is God in all of this
was he ↑present in the churchches and is he present, (0.25) ↑now in these ↑talks or
was he (0.75) different (0.75) or
C: I mean God is there in all of it (0.75) yeah I me. I. I suppose (0.75) what I feel is that
(0.5) God is there I mean God is (1.5) infinitely ↑the↓re erm (1.0) and how whether we
access that is another ↑ques↓tion
I: but ↑what’s different then about the (0.5) the praying that goes on now from the
groups
C: mm
I: from the praying that went on then with the other people in the previous communities
C: well (1.25) I ↑think that I ↑think (0.5) that the experience of ch↓urch for me has been
that (,) prayer is a contained thing and ↑often a very busy (,) thing (0.5) where words
are are defined (,) to make sure they we’re all (0.5) thinking the same thing and (0.5)
it’s either the the set (0.75) ↓form ch the church p, prayer erm (,) or (,) even in sort of
open prayer groups it comes as sort of (0.5) common language erm and I mean I find
that the wonder of this is the fact it’s (0.5) silent and yet the silence somehow is so
↑el↓quent and (0.75) moves us on you know to poss↓ibilty of (0.25) discussion
and the sort of themes that have been developed here on our retreat days (0.5) that
move on for ↑ev↓er I mean you know it’s the kind of thing we talk about for ↑ev↓er and
I ↑feel that somehow does reflect what (0.5) God ↑is you know that God is the source
of (,) all energy and all creative experience and all creative rel↓at↓ionship you know
with each other and that that therefore has sort of erm portent of community and
something about living in community that has rich possibility of being an ex↑am↓ple
I: think God can be found yeah
C: no I think it would be a spark that’s the same
I: I mean you would say it’s something to do with God
C: I would say that yes
I: but John wouldn’t
C: no
I: but you would recognise it as something similar
C: well I’ve attached that word to it and John wouldn’t and [yet what we’re talking =
I: [yes
C: = about and what John and I would [sit down and talk about =
I: [yes
C: = is often very very much the same
I: yes yes
C: and it’s [words probably divide it
I: yes yes
C: rather than the actual experience it sel f
I: so would you say your faith has developed.

1008 C: it is certainly a m. m. m. I might I mean it's certainly a much more expressed and a much more

1012 I: it's expressed

1014 C: yeah

1016 I: you see some people would think that’s odd isn’t it sitting saying nothing it expresses your faith more than than chanting the psalms or whatever

1018 C: mm yeah well I suppose it is the experience erm the incredible experience of being united without language when there are no words

1020 I: yes

1022 C: because there is a sense of it being a united language and an expression that is= [yes]

1024 I: mm

1026 C: because we’re saying here well we’re not saying we just are

1028 I: yes

1030 C: so (1.5) it yes er >it’s a mystery isn’t it..<hh but that that experience of (0.75) no words when we are, () we are open erm and in Christian language I suppose to (0.5)

1032 the Holy Spirit should be here and (0.5) that we have that in common and we just are being in on (0.75) and my experience is that as a result of (0.25) of having that as a regular practice then life does become more for me it it becomes more possible to talk about (0.25) God with other people erm = I mean [[(( ))] moving in my life that’s where I am now

1034 I: if it enables you to talk

1036 C: =pro=fou=nd

1038 I: right so it enables you to talk about [God more easily

1040 C: mm

1042 I: with other people

1044 C: mm

1046 I: because (0.75) whatever the experience has done its done something

1048 C: it’s () for me it’s (1.0) it’s sort of allowed the pieces to come together it’s a harmonious experience

1050 I: right

1052 C: so it’s not something that I’m struggling with as much (0.5) I’m still struggling with it () in terms of identifying my faith (0.25) with a group of other people () in my Ignatian course for example but (0.25) something is lifting and something that is still in the process so I can’t describe it too much but it’s something (0.25) that is sort of easing in my life and allowing me to say (0.25) that yes my understanding of God is a high relevant part of my life and in a sense is my life and I find for example erm it’s making a difference in my counselling erm cos I’m working at a place) counselling< one day a week now but aahh it is so hard to define these things hh but I’m there’s a lady who seeing me at the moment = I: mm

1054 C: = and we are talking about prayer and we’re talking about God and my remit as a counsellor is that I don’t do those things unless other people specifically bring them

1056 I: mm

1058 C: but she has brought them

1060 I: mm

C: so why is she able why does she feel free to bring them now
C: well because things are different in me

I: mm

C: and I am more open and so therefore she is able to be more open

I: mm

C: and I take that regularly to my own supervision [so it's ethically fine]

I: [mm]

C: and it's appropriate [and that's all right with you]

I: [mm]

C: = from the point of view of my supervisor and so on but you know so it is a kind of wider sea to work in and for its as though certain barriers have kind of gone down and yes I am a spiritual person and yes I can identify that God, because that's a convenient word to use

I: mm

C: is an acknowledged part of my life and I am able to use that language in my life

I: mm

C: in a way that is enabling and expanding [and I feel with all sorts of]

I: [mm]

C: senses the barn going on and and just intimations of things that are around at the moment that all these things work together for good and that you know that they work for life experience because of your experience with meditation

C: yes I mean hard to pin it down too succinctly but in a mysterious sort of way that seems to me to be true but of course I mean it links in with every other experience I've had

C: so do you [are you saying are you saying that =

I: = the fact that these things are happening like the barn for example are connected they're not meaningless events

C: = not at all I feel they are very connected

I: they are connected and you can recognize that connection because of your experience with meditation

C: yes I mean hard to pin it down too succinctly but in a mysterious sort of way that seems to me to be true but of course it seems to have been a sort of catalyst that allows the water to flow in and I remember being in the Scillies at the beginning of me beginning to attend meditation group and I was reading Jesus the Teacher Within

I: mm I'm reading it [now

I: mm

C: and I mean I just found that book so amazing and I felt as though during that holiday in the Scillies I think it was right at the beginning of me beginning to attend the group and I was reading Jesus the Teacher Within

I: mm

C: and talking to him

I: mm

C: and I couldn't sit here and tell you what the book is about

I: mm it's jolly hard I think
C: ↑ye:↓ah but there was just something about Laurence’s attitude, and his sort of revelation often he talks about paradoxes and (.) kind of opposites coming together and that opposites can coexist, (.) with each other and actually enhance each other

and (1.0) I don’t know i:it just seemed to open doors and windows for me for the time of that book

I: mm

C: and I can remember sitting on a rock in the Scillies with him out there an so I wrote to Laurence

I: ↑m↓m

C: and (0.25) ↑not know↓ing kind of who he ↑wa↓s even really but I just felt =

I: = ↑this ↑was (0.5) a. af↓ter the erm session in in ((place)) Cathedral the video

C: yes
I: yeah

C: shortly after yeah
I: shortly after

C: yeah (0.25) certainly in the early [days of the Christian meditation groups
I: [yes

I: right okay s. sorry I interrupted
C: that’s ok ggh I just felt Laurence had given me so much and I felt I’d listened to him

and I wanted to come back I wanted to [enter the conversation

I: [right right

I: right you wanted to enter the conversation
C: mm =

I: = with Laurence
C: mm

C: so I wrote to him I mean I sat on a rock and wrote to Laurence (0.75) and you know just with erm ballpoint pen and paper [qui. rough letter

I: [mm

C: and ↑told him a bit about my life and why this I just to thank him so much for writing this book

I: ↑m↓m

C: and ↑sent ↓it to him and he, (0.25) he ↑wrote me back a postcard which I’ve got stuck into the book now (0.75) and he just said er (0.75) the things I’d written to him was why (.) he had written that book and (.) was glad that the target had arrived, (.) home something of the target had arrived where it was meant to (.) be

I: ↓↑m↓m

C: ‘and then’, .hh so I mean that was my first ever (0.75) connection with ↑Lau↓rence

I: ↑m↓m

C: and now I’ve got Laurence coming to our home

I: ↑m↓m

C: [to open the [barn ↑and ↑it ↑just ↑seems s↑↓o:o wonderful .hh

I: [mm

I: mm

I: [mm

I: mm

I: mm

I: [mm

C: and ↑that going to the erm meeting at ((place)) Cathedral of the Dalai Lama and Laurence and the video (.) ↑is for me like a ↑just a. stone being thrown in the pool you

I: [know

I: [mm

C: from that circle’s moved out and out and out .hh only because (0.75) er you know there were circles be↑neath that [to start with and =

I: [mm

C: = the experience and understanding but it was ↑just that ggh ignition [you know

I: [mm

C: ggh it was ↑that was the sort of pivot to. all sorts of things

I: mm
and maybe it’s getting older as not just that (0.5) it was just to me things coming together

C: as being more as (0.25) being part of me to a life that feels (.) much more (1.0) balanced and fulfilled and ( ( ... colour the picture and move in))

I: mm

C: in a way that has been absolutely wonderful

I: I suppose it’s not possible for you to (0.5) to think what it was about that that caused all this to happen this change (0.5) too hard a question

C: (1.75) there’s nothing I don’t think there is there’s not a neat reply erm (0.75) I think it was this word catalyst ggh I really I can’t completely understand it (0.5) I think

[and does it matter to you]

C: no: o I

I: do you ponder it at all or does

C: yeah

C: a. and sometimes in (.) the reading erm or Bede Griffiths people like that (0.5) you catch intimations you know of this basic truth that (.) there is, there is this beautiful unity of silence that reflects people’s own (.) humility really in coming before God with out my own eloquence you know without trying to tell God what I want to talk or ought to be doing

I: and that’s who we are that’s our total value what more can we bring but that (0.5) and that if you bring that (0.25) to gether and seek God and acknowledge God in that silence

I: mm

C: = and that’s who we are that’s our total value what more can we know and what more can you bring but that (0.5) and that if you bring that (0.25) to gether and seek God and acknowledge God in that silence

I: mm

C: then there is no more relevant place to be

I: so do you feel as if you have found your home do you feel as if you’ve come home (.) do you feel as if you are now in a place where you are (0.5) supposed to be

C: yes (0.25) and I say that very quiedy (.) and gently (0.5) erm because I haven’t ( ( ) to come< and grab it too much or or pin it down because who knows (0.75) but certainly today this moment [talking to you (0.75) it feels that

I: [mm

I: what you don’t want to ggh to latch onto it as it were and sort of hold it and own it

C: mm

I: and turn it into something it’s not

C: yes or or turn it to something that (.) I think it ought to be or

I: yes

C: you know start turning it into what I have (.) had to shed

I: yes [yes

C: [which is too much definition

I: yes

C: and people trying to put definitions on to me that is just limiting

I: yes .hh is this the end of (0.5) your journey then or is the beginning

C: I don’t know w do I erm

I: but you d. you don’t have a sense that its you don’t you wouldn’t say that it was the end and you wouldn’t say it was the beginning

C: no I wouldn’t and I was just thinking of a. another thing we were told in our ggh group erm Ignatian group the other week that apparently .hh there’s an old Sanskrit word (0.5) for (0.25) for knowing (1.0) and the the meaning of the Sanskrit word for knowing is restraint (1.0) and the Sanskrit meaning of the word unknowing is
freedom (3.0) and I love that because that kind of describes where I am now there's something about the unknowing (1.0) that has about it the freedom you know that I would identify as a s. as a spiritual quality and that God is unknowing and that God is mystery (.) and God is where I can't reach but I reach towards it (1.0) but any attempt to define and know and begin to put God into this definition and that this is what you come to and (0.5) erm I suppose the story that the Church drags along like shackles be hind itself (0.75) you know that definition and knowing has about it so much constraint (1.5) and for me that's a hard place to be because I find claustrophobic by it but here we come to our place (0.5) where there are no words but you know it's our common place of commitment and where we come (0.25) with our understanding and with what we've got (0.75) but we're in a place of unknowing (1.0) and but knowing but also unknowing do you not have. see sense in that

I: there is there is there is erm (.) there is but as you say it's very hard to, (0.75) categorise = and [so or to say
C: [it is and so many people want to categorise [quite understandably
I: yes
C: and the majority of people feel much safer you know when they're in a group where we all know what we think
I: mm [mm
C: [this is who we are
I: mm
C: and there's a human ne ed for that erm personally I don't feel comfortable with it and although, (1.0) I suppose a. of course we have our definition our characteristic now characteristics within the WCC[MM I mean
I: mm
C: we define ourselves as certain kind of people. hh but there's I find within that this (0.75) room for this Sanskrit sense of unknowing and that in the unknowing there's freedom I mean I find that in Laurence's writing
I: mm
C: that he says over and over again
I: mm
C: that you know we stay with questions
I: mm
C: and that's the acceptance I found that at The Mead I was able to go with my questions and I find it within Laurence's understanding of the purpose of of God in life (0.5) you know questions constantly hold things open
I: mm
C: so I'm comfortable with that (( ))
I: [so questions, uncertainties, doubts .hh things you don't know loose ends all of this stuff (1.50) they are all okay you can just have them all out here on the [table and have them as loose [ends =
C: [mm
I: = and it doesn't worry you doesn't (.) bother you or stress you
C: I'm happy with that I can I can sit with that
I: mm
I: mm
C: because for me that's (1.50) it's like abstract art in comparison with something very rig id [you know erm,
I: mm
I: you find it it it broadens you widens you opens you you [up =
C: [oh yeah
I: makes you bigger
1278  C: ↑o:oh entirely [yes
1280  I: [so having the ↑quest↓ion an ↑un↓ answer[ed [question =
          [question = [mm
1282  I: = is actually (1.50) hh it’s not the right word but almost better than having it
1284  ↑answ↓ered
C: oh yes I think so bec. yeah it is just keeping op. (.) ↑o↓pen I
1286  mean who is God we’re ↑ne↓ver going to grab him
I: mm
1288  C: I mean God is never going to be
I: mm
1290  C: defined he never [has been yet
I: [mm
1292  I: = and so much attempt have been [made you know =
1294  I: [mm
C: = in terms of (0.5) re↑ligion, and phil↑osophy an ↑sci↓ence
1296  I: m[m
I: [mm
1298  C: = [so ↑ghh and it’s ne↓ver never a neat answer been ↑fou↓nd
I: mm
1300  C: and I’m ↑quite sure it never ↑wi↓ll I mean all we know is I suppose that within ↑us
there seems to be this incredible (0.75) need and facility to move beyond ourselves
1302  and acknowledge and understand that there are ↑some↓things that erm (0.75) I don’t
know (1.50) we want to do it we want to paint pictures =
1304  C: = we want to (.) write poems [you know
I: [mm
1306  C: we want to explore the infinite we we ↑sense that there is something beyond ourselves
[you know it just seems to be (0.5) a facility =
1308  I: [mm
C: = that there is in no other animal it’s in ↑u↓s
1310  I: and and we ↑all do ↓this and then we we try and (.) describe what’s going ↑o↓n
C: mm
1312  I: and categorise ↑( ( ) )↓ but what you’re saying with with the practice that you ↑now do
( .) it does the same thing but without seeking to impose any particular category
1314  C: yes ↑it’s a good way of putting it↑
I: whereas in the ↑prev↓ious communities that you were in you were talking about they
↑had put this category onto you if you like to put it that way
C: mm
1318  I: erm An↑glo, er Roman Catho↑lic or Plymouth Brethren whatever it [was
C: [mm [mm
1320  I: which by (1.25) ggh encl↑ong it in that particular ↑cate↓gory (0.25) excluded the
people who weren’t ↑in [the category
1322  C: [yes absolutely
I: even though you might both be after the same thing
1324  C: yes and even tho’ the people on the other side of the category (0.25) are valuable
wonderful [human beings
1326  I: [yes yes
C: who I would be enhanced by ↑know↓ing
1328  I: [by knowing
C: yes
I: and that’s how you felt when you perhaps you felt excluded when you went into the other churches you didn’t feel

C: yeah. hh I mean my my sort of primary experience I suppose wasn’t of being excluded from wider social context

I: mm

C: I mean that’s what I was given in the Brethren it was very its so it was a very narrow world and I’m sure that’s affected my psychology ever since

I: mm

C: so I love that’s basic I love Norfolk for the Norfolk beaches =

I: mm

C: = places where you can breathe

I: mm

C: hh but my understanding of God is that that’s what God is he’s the widest widest wide we could possibly have

I: mm

C: erm never know and that that’s the wonderful thing and I find that within erm the theology that Laurence gives us so I can sit happily with all of that

I: mm

C: mm right ok yes

I: so you do feel that that’s yes we discussed that before ok. hh so that erm ggh trying to pin God down is in some way diminishing this process where accepting him as (0.25) as wide as you like

C: yeah

I: h.helps the spiritual expression

I: well for me a good that for me it’s a fallacy its a fallacy to let God be pinned down =

I: for you

C: = defined ‘cos he can’t

I: mm

C: he I wish there was another word

I: mm

C: erm ‘‘yeah it is hard

I: [yes

I: well I suppose we could say she

C: but if we said she that would be equally limiting wouldn’t it I don’t like

I: a sort of she [him

C: there ought to be another [word ‘cos I don’t see God =

I: mm

C: = as [a sort of sexual entity =

I: [yes

C: and gender of [any kind at all

I: [yeah

C: mm

I: mm

C: erm but we’ve never found another word (.)) ((we are both)) with erm (0.75) what was I going to say we’re limited I. I’m really surprised in a way that theology hasn’t (0.5) developed maybe it has and I don’t know about it (0.25) into allowing us another word to describe God you know that’s not limited to, (0.25) he [or she you’re in it

I: have you ever come across Meister Eckhart (1.0) he was a Dominican monk in I think the 13th (1.0)

C: yeah

I: and I th. I seem to remember that was a lot of mysticism going on at this time

C: mm
I: particularly amongst women
C: mm and he eventually got the Inquisition caught up with him but erm I’ve a feeling
that he always called God mother (1.75) or he tended to <he had this this called apoth. apophatic theology
C: mm
I: which you know who is God well I’m not this
C: yes
C: yes
I: who am I well I’m not this
C: yes
C: yes
I: and on the next page you see he’d reverse it so whatever you thought you weren’t
before now you are
C: right
I: and God’s ground is my ground but I am not God’s ground God is not me I am not in
God
C: yes
I: and then the next page I am in God
C: yeah ((( )))
I: ((( )))
1394 I: chucking of (1.0) you know boundaries [is exactly that
C: mm
C: yeah
I: it’s pretty [incomprehensible
C: yes Meister Eckhart is somebody for some reason is I’ve never read erm
people have时常 said to me ’oh you’d like Meister Eckhart’ =
C: I’m sure I would [er
I: [you’d ↑like the sentiments but h. ggh he used to give (.)
1397 ↑ser↓mons to to these groups of nuns in these convents and things and I’ve ↑of↓ten
thought ‘what on ↑earth did they make of↓ it’ and just picture these people all sitting
dutifully in the pews listening to his sermons
C: yes
I: wondering what on earth they thought
C: mm
C: but you feel that the mystics .hh certainly the sort of 14th [and 15th century mystics
C: often did grab the this sort of sense I [mean Julian
I: [yes
1398 I: Julian of Norwich yes yes indeed
C: yeah
1399 I: yeah
C: having a wider vision somehow (1.75) yes
C: so it’s always been around but like a minority sport hasn’t it this kind of
view and I mean certainly in modern living doesn’t encourage that sort of expansive
and investigative understanding of God you know approaching it in that attitude of (.)
1403 well of dispove↓ry you know .hh there’s a (0.25) much bigger tendency to (0.5) want
to define (1.5) and or scientific technologically minded it’s so easy very easy (0.5) to
sort of define things and clamp this out
C: mm
1405 C: and it I suppose it requires a certain turn of mind and a certain ability (1.0) ↑I think
to be quiet and and therefore to allow one’s defences to go down we talk a lot about
the ego don’t we
I: mm
C: and that’s part of our mode of talking in Christian conversation but I think there’s a lot of truth in it you know in allowing that ego self a chance to move down

I: it’s possible to be somehow in contact with something that is different is it that mysteriously becomes more accessible so it’s possible to live in the context of spiritual communication and understanding

C: but I think is not part of our language you know our language is media language and the language of advertising and marketing language and we’re almost marketed away I mean we’re defined by marketing and somebody approached me a while ago in the city with a board and wanting to know questions about me so that I could be fed into the system but =

I: [laughs]

C: = that would define who buys

I: [laughs] mm

C: = soap who buys this

I: [laughs] mm mm

C: sort of newspaper so I’m kind of you’re categorised a way almost

I: [laughs] [laughs] [laughs] [laughs] mm mm

C: so where am I now

I: mm

C: you know well I’m this

I: mm

C: this kind of person and it all serves to put lids on perceptions that are way beyond that burst beyond all that stuff

I: [laughs]

C: and to do with just a much wider way of viewing but I think meditation does have access to and does provide a voice you know some kind that counters that very defined way of going about things

I: [laughs]

C: which is

I: [laughs]

C: so you feel very comfy where you are now

I: very happy

C: yeah

I: satisfied almost (0.75) comfy

C: comfy is fine yes

I: yeah

C: I mean not a not a comfy of sitting back and thinking ‘oh well this is it’ kind of hot-water-bottle sort of comfy I it’s a comfy a feeling of (0.75) relaxation of myself a feeling a harmony within myself that I feel has potential for a more creative way of living

I: so you used the word struggle before

C: mm

I: you would stay it has less struggle

C: less painful struggle

I: mm

C: I think it’s always necessary to have a certain amount of struggle with things but it’s not that painful struggle =

I: [laughs] it’s appropriate struggle as opposed to inappropriate

C: sorry yes I interrupted you you said ‘what

I: [laughs]

C: I think before I’ve had a sense of struggling against bits of myself in a way

I: mm

C: erm that is I feel that the bits of myself are are together
I: so that almost in a way you didn’t recognise these other people in these communities and there were bits of you that you didn’t recognise in yourself

C: yes I think I was fighting probably against [bits in myself its complicated to (0.25)

I: [mm

understand i. i. what that’s about

I: mm

C: and I think I kind of of know what it’s about its (0.5) yeah I I mean now it’s not that (.) now it’s (1.5) feeling at ease with these separate parts of myself

I: mm

C: and feeling that together (2.5) they can be held and that with this (1.0) silent erm understanding (.) communication with other people and communication of God that that er a very coherent (.) and relevant (1.5) basis

I: mm

C: for everything

I: mm

C: that feels entirely right and certainly where I am at the moment there’s nothing that could be more right

I: mm

C: than that (0.5) if I could a basic sort of erm block being there > not in a rigid way but just he is

I: ↓m↑m

C: so er (2.0) >that’s all I can say about it< and and you see what happens

I: mm

C: life is what it is

I: mm

C: you know ( () for me it seems to hold a spiritual content that erm just feels right and which has to be allowed to be what it is I think

I: yes I mean you ss. particularly that last little bit was very similar to something that ↘John was saying

C: mm

I: and it just struck me you know that some people would say ↘John’s a lapsed Catholic and and or a Buddhist (0.5) and you’re a lapsed Plymouth Brethren and possibly an Anglican so really you’ve got nothing in common spiritual. spiritually (.) some would say

C: mm

I: ↑yes

C: if they were wanting to work with definitions

I: ↑yes

C: yeah

I: but clearly (0.5) that’s not it at all

C: no

I: you’ve got, most of what you do you can do you know about 99% you have in common

C: mm well there’s the spirit that moves beyond all [that stuff = [mm

I: [mm

C: = and moves beyond definition and we found it. we found that funnily enough I mean going turning the circle right back when we very first met

I: mm

C: people said [exactly what you have [said and people ↑did say that = [mm

C: = that John at the time was a completely committed Catholic

I: mm

C: and that I have got this

I: he might himself have ↑said such a thing

C: oh he ↑would have
cos he was yeah he was very high-profile [Catholic in University

I: mm

C: so of course erm I was very into Catholicism when he first came to The Meadows and I'd had my Brethren back[ground and Free Church and

I: mm

C: so couldn't be more ↑different really

I: mm

C: ↑so different and the age difference you know there was ↑so [much =

I: mm

C: ↑so different and the age difference you know there was ↑so: ↑much in

I: mm

C: so couldn't be more ↑different really

I: mm

C: ↑so different and the age difference you know there was ↑so [much =

I: mm

C: ↑so different and the age difference you know there was ↑so: ↑much in

I: mm

C: so couldn't be more ↑different really

I: mm

C: ↑so different and the age difference you know there was ↑so [much =

I: mm

C: ↑so different and the age difference you know there was ↑so: ↑much in

I: mm

C: so couldn't be more ↑different really

I: mm

C: ↑so different and the age difference you know there was ↑so [much =

I: mm

C: ↑so different and the age difference you know there was ↑so: ↑much in
C: = outside that definition
I: mm
C: when you’re (.) ↑ qui↓ et you’re ↑ not =
= and you’re in keeping your doors ↑ op↓ en [somehow
1604 I: [mm
C: and I’m sure that’s why (.) you know Laurence’s done all the dialogue he has with
Northern Ireland and [the Muslim community
I: [mm
1608 C: the inter-faith things [(.) his ((  )) the sort of [ex↑am↓ple of that I I feel
I: [mm
1610 I: mm
C: that that just by ↑ be↓ ing (.) in the silence and not looking to say ‘right we’re this we’re
this we’re [this we’re this ↑this is what how life should be =
I: [mm
1612 I: = [this is you know
I: [mm
1616 C: imm↑edi↓ately sets up great ↑ [big ↑ wa:a↓lls a (.) barrier
I: [mm
1618 I: mm
I: so ↑ what hh what is next for you you don’t ↑ know and you’re not (.) troubled by not
knowing
C: erm no I ↑ don’t ↓ kno↑w I mean I have an ex↑cit↓ ing sense of (.) ↑ so ↓ much of things
to be (0.5) growing up and gi. and giving life possibility erm (1.25) just so much ama.
a friend popped in last night who lives in ((place)) and erm she’d been (.) I mean she
is a Baptist ↑ min↓ister but like me has sort of moved and become ↑ more than just a
Baptist Minister .hh but she’s been doing a. been leading a, been part of a led week of
prayer at a church in ((place)) and we’d been talking about that (0.5) and I began to
see possibilities for (0.5) some connections from ↑ that leading to maybe days of quiet
prayer (0.25) in the ↑ ba↓rn I m. I suddenly had this idea we ((can)) we could really do
that now or have the barn as a place where people who can’t find space in a busy
world could come and spend the ↑ da↓y
I: mm
1620 C: easily
I: mm
1622 C: and (0.5) ↑ I ↓ could do led days of prayer [(.) erm (1.0) ↑ so ↑ that was a li.< =
I: ↑ m↓m
1624 C: = a little ↓ idea [that kind of came
I: ↑ m↓m
1626 C: and that is just one of many
I: ↑ m↓m
1628 C: ↑ lots of little ideas have come (.) and ad↑dress↓ ing what seems to be a
↑ funda↓mental problem in society at the moment (.) in that life is so de↑fin↓ ed and
categorised and that people’s spirits are sort of categorised away from its not and its
not easy to find access to one’s own spirit (0.75) and yet this is part of, of who we are
(1.0) and ↑ may↓ be I’m [(( )]
I: ↑ its not easy to find access to one’s own spirit that’s erm (3.0)
that’s quite a phrase isn’t it
C: (.) ↑ m↓m
1630 C: yes (0.5) I well I don’t want to project my own journey upon other ↑ peo↓ ple but I
perceive that that’s a struggle I have ↑ learned ↓ a ↓ lot about (0.75) and my my
perception is that it is a common (0.75) difficulty with people (0.5) now in our our
modern 21st century way of ↑ be↓ ing
C: I find it in my ↑coun↓selling [I pick it up
1654 I: [mm
I: ↑m↓m I guess you would mm mm
1656 C: and its my obser↑va↓tion (.) generally (0.75) that erm (0.75) because church is not as
successful as it was
1658 I: mm
C: and is not easy for people to (0.5) find their own spiritual ↑sel↓ves
1660 I: mm
C: and I’d see that (0.75) as an awful ↑sha↓me ((laugh)) ’cos I to find one’s spiritual
1662 and and and means of spiritual expression (.) is to be a bigger ↑per↓son (0.75) and to
be more
1664 I: right that’s almost like you know a task worth trying to do in life
C: ↑yeah
1666 I: and and you would say that you (1.75) for whatever reason have have stumbled across
it for yourself [if
1668 C: stumbled across it for myself you could say may [be some people would say =
I: [or
1670 C: = I’d been led into [it =
I: [led into
1672 C: = or its been the momentum of my ↑li↓fe a. a natural sort of (0.75) ↑move↓ment or
process a journey (0.75) and that I’ve now got to a point in it now where a lot is
1674 coming together (.) so I’d like to feel that that’s something that I can (.). have my play
my small ↑part ↓in
1676 I: so you wouldn’t mind if somebody said that was God directed and God was calling you
to find your vocation =
1678 = if they wanted to say it in that terms [you’d be hap↑py
C: no no that would be fine yeah yeah
1680 I: likewise if they said ‘no its not God you’ve worked it out and you’ve found it and now
you can go you [wouldn’t mind that either
1682 C: [yes
C: no
1684 C: no (0.75) no because it’s all language my own language kind of slips between the two
probably somewhere
1686 I: ↑mm (4.5) well that was that was (.) really ↑ni↓ce I’m sorry to use such a (0.25) silly
word but it was you’re very very articulate (0.75) you’re very good with ((words
laughing word)) which is ironic isn’t it
1688 C: ((I don’t know laughing words)) yeah I love words an I did an English degree late in
life (0.75) in my forties because erm I do love words and some sort of beauty with
words (0.75) but a greater beauty of the silence
1690 I: that ↑is ironi↓c isn’t it (2.5) that’s lovely isn’t it [a real sort of (1.25) ↑para↓dox
C: [yeah
1694 C: yes [when you think
I: ↑↑m↓m
1696 C: Laurence is extremely good with language too isn’t he
I: was it I don’t know
1698 C: mm
I: (( )
1700 C: yeah maybe that’s one of the paradoxes words and silence (4.0) unless of course God
is the word
1702 I: ↓m↑↓m
C: (( ) interesting theme for another day perhaps words and silence
1704 I: yeah
I: L er do you I ↑think we’ve sort of come to a natural (.) pause [and
1706 C: [[( )]
I: and do I'll ask the same thing that I asked of John is that do you feel that we've covered the sort of things that you could say it's good to kind of pau se

C: I mean it is lovely to sit down and say them because it's good to kind of pau se

I: mm

C: and express these things

I: mm

C: it helps me I think to kind of clarify

I: mm

C: again quietly [the balance of things at the moment (.) so yeah I do

I: [mm

C: mm I'm sure you are

I: and you know its lovely to be able to sit (.) just pondering

C: mm mm

I: as you've said hh yeah I often think that (.) you know children's lives i.i. pondering is something children do

C: mm yeah this goes on another track but. hh yeah I often think that (.) you know children's lives i.i. pondering is something children do

I: mm

C: in my observation so =

I: m

C: = naturally and I used to ponder as a child I loved pondering as a child

I: [mm

C: had some very happy pondering time but that's a modern thing isn't it that's been really pushed and children are encouraged to be so:o active and so doing

I: [mm

C: and so assessed you know been little tots on they're assessed and that to me seems a bit sad (0.25) I'd like to think I gave our children lots of time just to be with their gran to wander around not doing anything in particular

I: mm

C: but pottering about [and dreaming a bit

I: [mm

I: did you bring them up in any particular faith or none

C: erm not no not really we didn't and I talked to them about (.) God and when they were little and they went to Sunday School and then when church all broke up I used to do a little Sunday School for them (0.75) they both have grown up with I mean they they reject ideas of God now both of them completely =

I: [mm

C: how old are they

I: they're twenty (0.25) erm what are they twenty-three and twenty-five

I: right I think its .hh both you have John have described this idea of going through this period of rejecting and questioning and querying and all the rest of it I think it is very very common (.) in a normal sense(0.75) I would expect (0.75) in fact I would think it I'm I am a when you meet people who say you know from at the age of 15 they knew they wanted to be a priest or something

C: I know
I: how on earth how [on earth and they don’t seem to go through =
1762 C: [yeah
I: = this [sort of .hh massive pondering sta↓ge
1764 C: [yes
C: yeah its so necessary isn’t it creative pon[dering
1766 I: [↑m↓m I’m sure it is mm
I: I’m sure it is (1.5) what time is it what was I going to say (.) oh well (.) come back
1768 C: mm
I: erm (1.0) ↑right well I have to go away and write all that up ((laughs))
1770 C: ((laughs)) what a lot of writing
I: ooh we’ve talked for a long time
1772 END
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6 I: everything’s o↓kay .hh ↑yup everything’s o↓kay
   M: ↑good

8 I: so I’m just gonna ↑put that over there so we’re not watching it an (1.0) .hh that’s a bit
   of a crib sheet for me (0.25) so (1.0) erm thank ↓you ↓((Margaret)) and I’m really
   sorry [about erm\textsuperscript{175}]
   M: ↑don’t ↓worry (.)↑please don’t say another word of ↓sorry

12 I: oh okay =
   M: = I’ve been doing my ironing (0.25) [I’ve been to the p↑ost

14 [right
   I: right

16 M: and there weren’t too many people th↑ere
   I: re↑illy

18 M: yeah
   I: ↑m↓m

20 M: [which was good (.)
   I: [remarkable

22 M: I dro. I left my ↑gla:ass↓es in there the other day but fortunately I got them back
   I: ↑did y↓ou well that ↑was ↓good ↑y↓es

24 M: ↑mm they were on the floor too
   I: ↑wo↓w

26 M: they said "yes they were found on the floor"
   I: ggh in a ↑ca↓se they’re ↑not

28 M: ↑no:o they were just they’d ↑had ↑them in my pocket and I pulled my purse ↓out
   (0.5) and I expect the glasses fell [out

30 I: [oh
   M: at [the same time

32 I: [but they’re not scratched they’re ok
   M: no ↓they’re ↓fine\textsuperscript{176} they’re ↓these

34 I: ↑I don’t re↑mem↑ber ↑you ↑wear↓ing ↓them you don’t ↑you don’t ↓wear ↑them
   M: I ↑do for [read↓ing

36 I: [you do
   I: so you [don’t wear them so much

38 M: [you don’t see me [reading much =
   I: [right

40 M: = now I’d just been ironing and
   I: right

42 M: I have been wearing [them
   I: [I have to take my specs ↑off for ironing because the ↑stea↓m

44 steams them↑up
   M: yeah it does

46 I: [[[laughs]])
   M: [[[laughs]])

48 M: ↑OPENING the oven too is another thing
   I: that’s a nightmare ↑o:oh ↓wow

50 M: [you you ↑go to the ↓oven and open it up and then you can’t see
   anything ((laughs))

\textsuperscript{175} I had been late arriving for the interview, (due to technical difficulties getting the laptop to record).

\textsuperscript{176} Margaret brings out the glasses
I: well I’ve got to the stage *ggh* it started when I. when I was still doing some *ser*mons [and]

M: [mm]
I: I had to have my glasses *↑*off for read↓ing [().]

M: [mm]
I: but *↑*o:*n* for looking *↑*up at ↓peo[ple]

M: [people mm]
I: so you i aah its a *nightmare isn’t ↑*it

M: [yes]
M: mm

I: (. ) *↑*erm (. ) any↓way
M: tell me about what you want

I: ↓right a. as you ↓know *((Margaret)) I’m do↑ing a ↓PhD [it’s into ↑faith (.)]
M: [yes]

I: progress or development [or movement]
M: [development]

M: [don’t know that I can dis↑ern much of mine but I’ll ↑answ↓er any questions =]
I: =↓we:ll i. it’s ↑not really questions and inter↓view its more like a conversa↓tion its

M: [yes]

I: for ↑you to be able say ↑in your own ↓words
I: [.hh some of the things that that you feel [are important to you =

M: [mm]
I: = in your ↓faith

M: ↑m↓m
I: and (. ) as I said it will be er its under the bona fides of

M: ↑yea [mm]
I: [London University

M: ↑mm
I: and *↑*is discussed and it’s (. ) I ↑hope it ↑will be discussed at seminars and

M: ↑[London University
I: what have you obviously .hhhh then I anonymise all the na[mes
M: [that’s right I’ve read all

I: [that so so I want you to feel comfy that it’s ↑all you know secure

M: [mm]
I: .hh erm (0.5) *ggh* and I’ve ↑real↓ly I have had some ↑wonderful ↓conversations
with people, people’s faith, I mean it’s ↑just so inter↓esting .hhhh and I ↑usually start
out (. ) by asking a ↑quite up front quest (h) ion ((laughing word)) >which is
↑some↓times quite hard for people to a↑nsw↓er but I ↑think in your case it ↑might
↑not ↑be ↑the ↑sa↓me because< .hhhh it’s ↑this it’s (. ) that (. ) it’s really how ↑you
would describe your ↓faith (1.0) .hh if someone that you didn’t know >perhaps you
met at a<↓par↑ty (.)> [and they =

M: [yeah
I: = didn’t know ↑who you were< .hh and they ↑suddenly said out of the ↓blue ↑↑oh

M: [mm]
I: = (0.25) ↑do ↓you have a ↓faith ↑then or are [you religious =

M: [mm]
I: = or >whatev↑er and I just wondered<
M: [mm]
I: .hh what would you sa:a↓y if they [i:if =
I: = if they suddenly said ↑well ↑you ↓kno↑w ↑what ↑about ↑you ↓then

M: mm
I: if we'd maybe they're discussing terrorists \(\uparrow\) Muslims and things
106 M: mm
108 I: and they would suddenly turned round [and said
110 M: \(\uparrow\)yes\(\downarrow\)
I: well well \(\uparrow\) how \(\uparrow\) would \(\uparrow\) you describe your \(\uparrow\) self \(\downarrow\) then
112 M: well certainly I would say that I do \(\uparrow\) and that I can't remember a time when I didn't have \(\downarrow\) hhh erm
114 I: \(\uparrow\) the sense that I've I've (0.25) always believed in God (2.0) and it \(\uparrow\) it \(\uparrow\) isn't so much \(\downarrow\) rational a belief \(\uparrow\) at this stage \(\downarrow\) it is right from the word (0.25) it's \(\uparrow\) not \(\downarrow\) anything to do with my rationality
116 M: well certainly I would say that I do \(\uparrow\) and that I can't remember a time when I didn't have \(\downarrow\)
118 I: \(\uparrow\) the sense that I've I've (0.25) always believed in God (2.0) and it \(\uparrow\) it \(\uparrow\) isn't so much \(\downarrow\) rational a belief \(\uparrow\) at this stage \(\downarrow\) it is right from the word (0.25) it's \(\uparrow\) not \(\downarrow\) anything to do with my rationality
120 I: \(\uparrow\) the sense that I've I've (0.25) always believed in God (2.0) and it \(\uparrow\) it \(\uparrow\) isn't so much \(\downarrow\) rational a belief \(\uparrow\) at this stage \(\downarrow\) it is right from the word (0.25) it's \(\uparrow\) not \(\downarrow\) anything to do with my rationality
122 I: \(\uparrow\) the sense that I've I've (0.25) always believed in God (2.0) and it \(\uparrow\) it \(\uparrow\) isn't so much \(\downarrow\) rational a belief \(\uparrow\) at this stage \(\downarrow\) it is right from the word (0.25) it's \(\uparrow\) not \(\downarrow\) anything to do with my rationality
124 I: \(\uparrow\) the sense that I've I've (0.25) always believed in God (2.0) and it \(\uparrow\) it \(\uparrow\) isn't so much \(\downarrow\) rational a belief \(\uparrow\) at this stage \(\downarrow\) it is right from the word (0.25) it's \(\uparrow\) not \(\downarrow\) anything to do with my rationality
126 I: \(\uparrow\) the sense that I've I've (0.25) always believed in God (2.0) and it \(\uparrow\) it \(\uparrow\) isn't so much \(\downarrow\) rational a belief \(\uparrow\) at this stage \(\downarrow\) it is right from the word (0.25) it's \(\uparrow\) not \(\downarrow\) anything to do with my rationality
128 I: \(\uparrow\) the sense that I've I've (0.25) always believed in God (2.0) and it \(\uparrow\) it \(\uparrow\) isn't so much \(\downarrow\) rational a belief \(\uparrow\) at this stage \(\downarrow\) it is right from the word (0.25) it's \(\uparrow\) not \(\downarrow\) anything to do with my rationality
130 I: \(\uparrow\) the sense that I've I've (0.25) always believed in God (2.0) and it \(\uparrow\) it \(\uparrow\) isn't so much \(\downarrow\) rational a belief \(\uparrow\) at this stage \(\downarrow\) it is right from the word (0.25) it's \(\uparrow\) not \(\downarrow\) anything to do with my rationality
132 I: \(\uparrow\) the sense that I've I've (0.25) always believed in God (2.0) and it \(\uparrow\) it \(\uparrow\) isn't so much \(\downarrow\) rational a belief \(\uparrow\) at this stage \(\downarrow\) it is right from the word (0.25) it's \(\uparrow\) not \(\downarrow\) anything to do with my rationality
134 I: \(\uparrow\) the sense that I've I've (0.25) always believed in God (2.0) and it \(\uparrow\) it \(\uparrow\) isn't so much \(\downarrow\) rational a belief \(\uparrow\) at this stage \(\downarrow\) it is right from the word (0.25) it's \(\uparrow\) not \(\downarrow\) anything to do with my rationality
136 I: \(\uparrow\) the sense that I've I've (0.25) always believed in God (2.0) and it \(\uparrow\) it \(\uparrow\) isn't so much \(\downarrow\) rational a belief \(\uparrow\) at this stage \(\downarrow\) it is right from the word (0.25) it's \(\uparrow\) not \(\downarrow\) anything to do with my rationality
138 I: \(\uparrow\) the sense that I've I've (0.25) always believed in God (2.0) and it \(\uparrow\) it \(\uparrow\) isn't so much \(\downarrow\) rational a belief \(\uparrow\) at this stage \(\downarrow\) it is right from the word (0.25) it's \(\uparrow\) not \(\downarrow\) anything to do with my rationality
140 I: \(\uparrow\) the sense that I've I've (0.25) always believed in God (2.0) and it \(\uparrow\) it \(\uparrow\) isn't so much \(\downarrow\) rational a belief \(\uparrow\) at this stage \(\downarrow\) it is right from the word (0.25) it's \(\uparrow\) not \(\downarrow\) anything to do with my rationality
142 I: \(\uparrow\) the sense that I've I've (0.25) always believed in God (2.0) and it \(\uparrow\) it \(\uparrow\) isn't so much \(\downarrow\) rational a belief \(\uparrow\) at this stage \(\downarrow\) it is right from the word (0.25) it's \(\uparrow\) not \(\downarrow\) anything to do with my rationality
144 I: \(\uparrow\) the sense that I've I've (0.25) always believed in God (2.0) and it \(\uparrow\) it \(\uparrow\) isn't so much \(\downarrow\) rational a belief \(\uparrow\) at this stage \(\downarrow\) it is right from the word (0.25) it's \(\uparrow\) not \(\downarrow\) anything to do with my rationality
146 I: \(\uparrow\) the sense that I've I've (0.25) always believed in God (2.0) and it \(\uparrow\) it \(\uparrow\) isn't so much \(\downarrow\) rational a belief \(\uparrow\) at this stage \(\downarrow\) it is right from the word (0.25) it's \(\uparrow\) not \(\downarrow\) anything to do with my rationality
148 I: \(\uparrow\) the sense that I've I've (0.25) always believed in God (2.0) and it \(\uparrow\) it \(\uparrow\) isn't so much \(\downarrow\) rational a belief \(\uparrow\) at this stage \(\downarrow\) it is right from the word (0.25) it's \(\uparrow\) not \(\downarrow\) anything to do with my rationality
150 I: \(\uparrow\) the sense that I've I've (0.25) always believed in God (2.0) and it \(\uparrow\) it \(\uparrow\) isn't so much \(\downarrow\) rational a belief \(\uparrow\) at this stage \(\downarrow\) it is right from the word (0.25) it's \(\uparrow\) not \(\downarrow\) anything to do with my rationality
152 I: \(\uparrow\) the sense that I've I've (0.25) always believed in God (2.0) and it \(\uparrow\) it \(\uparrow\) isn't so much \(\downarrow\) rational a belief \(\uparrow\) at this stage \(\downarrow\) it is right from the word (0.25) it's \(\uparrow\) not \(\downarrow\) anything to do with my rationality
154 I: \(\uparrow\) the sense that I've I've (0.25) always believed in God (2.0) and it \(\uparrow\) it \(\uparrow\) isn't so much \(\downarrow\) rational a belief \(\uparrow\) at this stage \(\downarrow\) it is right from the word (0.25) it's \(\uparrow\) not \(\downarrow\) anything to do with my rationality
156 I: \(\uparrow\) the sense that I've I've (0.25) always believed in God (2.0) and it \(\uparrow\) it \(\uparrow\) isn't so much \(\downarrow\) rational a belief \(\uparrow\) at this stage \(\downarrow\) it is right from the word (0.25) it's \(\uparrow\) not \(\downarrow\) anything to do with my rationality

472
I: its *gh* (0.25) ↑this is a sort of *gh* (0.25) you describe it as a sort of deep down, a sort
of knowing,
M: ↑ye:s
160 I: a [sort of *gh* *gh*
M: [yea.
162 M: it’s a sort of (.) r. [(.)
I: [experiência [sort of thing
164 M: ↑roo of of of life I th. at the ↑very ↑root ↓of
↓things ↓that the
I: ↑right
M: the knowledge that, (1.0)
168 I: and yr your ↑knowledge has ↓changed obviously [as you’ve grown-up
M: [yea.
170 I: and ↑that’s changed [but ↑has. ↑has this experience this kno. this belief =
M: [mm
172 I: = ↑not this be.↑hh this feeling that it’s in you deep down has ↑that ↓changed
M: has ↑it ↓changed
174 I: or has that ↓stayed [↓the ↓same
M: ↑erm (0.25) I think it’s pretty much like a ground base
176 I: ↓much ↓older I mean ↑I’m 75 ↓now I was [75 last week↑
182 I: [mm
184 M: ↑much ↓older I mean ↑I’m 75 ↓now I was [75 last week↑
186 I: [mm
188 M: erm (.) [and the news is so appalling and sometimes I think (.) and I say to ((husband’s
name)) ↑oh for God’s sake° let’s turn it off↑
190 I: [mm
192 M: and it it all seems ↑that (.) side of things seems ↑really ↓dark
I: [mm
194 M: erm (1.5) but it does↑n’t alt↓er (.) the feeling (0.75) that i:is always ↓there the
↑knowledge ↓that is always there that there is (0.75) a purpose and and it’s very
difficult (.) for to expl↑ain to people when they .hh are in (0.5) extreme (0.75) er
sorrow or trouble
196 I: [mm
198 M: erm (0.25) how a loving God permits such things
200 I: [yes
M: [to happen in the world =
204 I: [mm
M: = or to them you know the things that are happening to them .hhh and ↑yet I know
that what ↑is ↑at the root ↓of ↓th↑ings ↓is something that is is (1.0) is ↑deeply
providential and↓ loving and that it has a (.) a purpose
208 I: [mm
M: for human beings
206 I: m[m
M: [mm I ↑think that has stayed pretty much the [same
208 I: [mm
I: so even when you d↑o have these (.) qu↑e↓ries or black moments =
210 M: mm
I: = it doesn’t really shake this belief at it root
212 M: [it ↑hasn’t it hasn’t so↓ far and I I ↑do ↑pray
 ↑that ↑it ↑wo↓nt b[cause er,
214 I: [mm (1.0)
I: mm
216 M: I ↑do ↓pray that it ↓won’t
I: [mm
218 M: [erm (0.75) because it’s ↑it’s (0.5) it ↑seems to me such a ↑gift [in ↓life
I: [mm
220 M: but I ↑don’t think I’m as optimistic as I was about the outcome
I: mm
222 M: erm you know for human BEINGS I really don’t think I am
I: mm =
224 M: = because I think facing up to what’s happening in the world and the [environment
I: [mm
226 M: and yet (0.25) I can also (. ) use my brain and rationalise and say↑well (. ) human
beings are ↑no↓t (. ) the full total of God’s (. ) er
228 I: mm
M: pro↑vidence, God’s:s (0.5) erm creation
230 I: mm “just checking it still going” ((checks laptop))
I: .hh erm (. ) and you really can’t remember a ↑ti↓me (. ) when you haven’t (. ) had this
232 (1.0) er (. ) feeling =
M: = n↓o (0.25) ↓no I ↓can’t .hh and think that I I ↑think that’s ↑possib↓ly quite
234 un↑us↓ual (0.75) ↑EVEN when my son was very ill [erm
I: [mm
236 M: and I ↑couldn’t (. ) erm (1.25) I couldn’t bear what was happ↓ening and it was so
↓painful
238 I: mm
M: erm (0.25) and I ↓couldn’t pray, (0.75) but it didn’t seem to me that it was contrary
240 I: mm
M: to the will of God
242 I: [mm
M: [that he:e. that even if he was lost from ↑us he would be lost
244 I: mm
M: (0.75) for↑ever [you kno↑w
246 I: [yes
I: yes
248 M: mm
I: you you could (0.25) in some fundamental way accept what was happening even
250 though it was so awful
M: (1.5) I ↑don’t ↑know whether accept is the r:right word I didn’t have to accept [it
252 I: [mm
M: because he got better
254 I: mm
M: but erm (0.75) the pain I think would have gone on
256 I: mm
M: erm the pai. at a perfectly human []level
258 I: [mm
M: but it didn’t make me feel (. ) erm (2.25) “how could (. ) a loving” [God =
260 I: [no
M: = (0.5) er perf↑mit this to happen =
262 I: [permit this
M: = which is which ↑is on the whole [what
I: [mm
M: w: what people ↑do ↓feel =
266 I: = oh yes [that’s
M: [so I’m I’m I’m speaking I ↑thin↓k
268 I: [mm
M: from my knowledge of other people
270 I: [mm
M: I I ↑think I have (.) something (0.25) that is a little un↑us↓ual ↓in ↓that ↓sense
272 I: ↑y↓es [so you you find in your experience =
M: [↑you ↓know
274 I: = when talking to people =
I: = that perhaps other people don’t ↑have ↓this kind [of stra. this strong
276 M: ↓people ↓have ↓it [but I think,
278 I: [yes
M: (.) I think most people =
280 M: = [d↓on’t you you know i:its some[thing much more thought↓ful
I: [yes (.) yes [yes
282 I: [yes
M: whereas I feel I’ve been ↑gif↓ted [with it
284 I: [mm (.) mm
I: .hh I mean good ↑Christ↓ian people say (.) re↑lig↓ious people (0.75) you might say
286 but they don’t have this ↑ki↓nd of (0.5) base =
M: = well I don’t think it was quite as ↑ea↓sy (.) shall I say that =
288 I: = [mm (.) mm
M: [mm
290 I: .hh ↑so hhh (1.0) in if you ↑can’t remember a time when you didn’t have this
↓feel↑ing (.) .hhh
292 M: no I wouldn’t ↑call it ↓feeling =
I: = or [or
294 M: [I would call it just know[ledge
I: [knowledge then rather know[ledge ok yes I’m sorry
296 M: [mm [mm
I: ↑erm (0.75) would you say in your faith (0.75) is it w:would it be a corr↑ect
298 des↑crip↓tion then to ↑talk about (0.25) progress or maturing of your ↑fa↓th because
perhaps its [always been like this
300 M: [no it probably wouldn’t
I: right
302 M: it probably wouldn’t ↑I ↑think there are ggh↑chan↓ges en↑or↓mous changes
I: ↑m↓m
304 M: about what erm what feeds, and erm what satisfies, what a holds .hh for instance
coming to to med[it↑a↓tion [in these er later [years has =
306 I: [mm [mm [mm
M = been (0.5) erm (0.5) enormously (.) helpful because I have f:found the older I’ve got
308 the less I’ve needed erm (1.0) needed ↑voice, ↑words
I: mm =
310 M: = those sorts of things
I: [m↓m
312 M: [↑m↓m
M: but I ↑do re I’m able to recognise that for other people
314 I: m↓m
M: erm (1.0) those things continue to be extremely important
316 I: so th so the style the way you’ve ex↑pressed ↓your ↓faith may [have changed
M: but your faith itself as such =
I: = I think I think that that’s right I think that it hasn’t changed so very much =
M: = =
I: = so ggh when we read in the Bible when we discuss things er it may talk about strength or deepening our faith or or (0.75)
M: walking with Christ in some way
I: =>
M: \([\text{in discipleship I would say yes y. in dis}]\)
I: and what does that mean though growing in in =
M: = well the way in our life our experience our relationships that << we can express >> the life of a Christian
I: right (0.5) right so [what
M: [I mean I don’t think in spite of the gift that I’ve been given
I: =
M: that I have been a good person
I: \([\text{yes}]\)
M: \([\text{I think so}]\)
I: \([\text{yes}]\)
M: \([\text{I would think that has been}]\)
I: \([\text{yes}]\)
M: \([\text{er er something that I’m still having to struggle with and learn and erm (1.75)]\)
I: \([\text{right okay so there are always things that one can become more mature in}]\)
M: \([\text{yes}]\)
I: \([\text{yes}]\)
M: \([\text{almost all the time}]\)
I: \([\text{mm}]\)
M: \([\text{mm}]\)
I: \([\text{yes}]\)
M: \([\text{isn’t it yes yeah}]\)
I: \([\text{I think it is mm}]\)
M: \([\text{had and you have a vocation}]\)
I: \([\text{yes}]\)
M: \([\text{to be a priest}]\)
M: \([\text{mm}]\)
I: \([\text{where did this come from have you always had a vocation do you think}]\)
M: \([\text{I don’t know if I’ve always had a vocation I ggh I think the Christian vocation (1.0) was empha sised you know er I was brought up in the Baptist Church and (0.75) it wasn’t called the priesthood of all believers but priests don’t mean the same}]\)
I: [no]  
M: within that erm denomination .hh and therefore everybody was (0.25) you know was  
I: [but did you did sorry did you want to be  
374  a ↑Baptist ↓minist↑er before [you wanted to be  
M: [I ↑did↓n’t ↑n↓o  
376  M: no don’t think so (0.5) I ↑think when I was a lit↓tle ↓girl  
I flirted with the [idea that I  
378  I: would be a min ↑miss↓ionary when [I grew up  
380  I:  
M: I can remember ↑once telling my ministers I wanted to be a missionary↓  
382  I: = yes  
M: .hh because we used to hear a lot about missionaries in those days  
384  I: yes  
M: they used to come and [talk and  
386  I:  
M: [and er  
388  I: ↑yes I did [too once  
M: ↑and er that seemed rather erm a grand and (0.5) perhaps romantic  
390  no↑tion-- .hh but it ↑cert↓ainly didn’t erm (0.75) as I got older [and in my  
I:  
M: ↑-miss↓ionary when [I grew up  
392  M: teens [and [other  
I:  
394  M: things ↑took my interest .hh =  
I:  
396  M: but I was ↑al↓ways very keen to be at church on Sundays  
I:  
398  M: at my Baptist ↑Church ↑and  
I:  
400  M: then when (. ) I was with (((husband’s name))) =  
= at the Anglican Church ↑erm [(.) BUT N:O  
402  I: [so you changed to become an Anglican =  
I: = when you were married to (((husband’s name)))  
404  M: [I did when we were engaged [yes yes  
I:  
406  M: we we decided that we had to. to change one or one or other of us ↑should change  
because it was important to us to worship to↑ge↓ther  
408  I:  
M: and er I was the one who did it but erm I don’t think anything (. ) presented itself (. ) in  
the way (. ) of a vocation then (0.75) I always I always took an active part in (. ) church  
life both in (. ) the Baptist Church in which I grew up [and then  
410  I:  
M: in the various churches I attended including (((church name))) here  
412  I:  
I:  
414  I: [yes (0.5) so its always been [here =  
M:  
416  I: = its always been with you =  
M: = y↓e↑es ↑I ↑think it just wasn’t a poss↓ibili↓ty ↓rea↑lly you know i:it ↑didn’t dawn  
418  ↓upon (1.0) it didn’t dawn upon me as a possibility (0.75) for a very long time and of  
course I did hear I re↑member where I was when I heard about the Synod’s decision  
420  (0.5) I was in a car coming back from erm (1.0) going:↑con↓cert (. ) in  
↑Lon↓don (((laughs))) =  
422  I: = (((laughs))) so  
M: and I HEARD on [the RADIO that er the [ANGLICAN
I: [right] [so you were †intentrest ‡in ‡that = = and you †were pleased to hear the result
M: [oh ″yes oh yes I was a tre‡ mendous †fem‡in‡ist
I: [yes
M: [and my mother was too () so erm =
I: [yes yes
M: = yes I was interested and I was pleased and i:it w:[was
I: [but not then =
M: [↑no ↓no (0.5)
M: no it was expressed that erm the Anglican Church had debated that day and had
I: concluded .hh erm by a †reason‡able ma‡for‡ity [that there was no theological =
M: [↑ye:‡yes
M: [THEOLOGICAL
I: [yes yes
M: erm (0.5) er (0.5) obstacle
I: mm
M: to women
I: mm
M: being received into the priesthood
I: so it [was after that
M: [and I re‡member †feel‡ing that was () you know that [was †great
I: that was [great
M: that was [great
I: [yes
M: erm (0.5) [but after that
I: [so you didn’t have a sense of frustration before that [because you =
M: [no not at ↓all
I: hadn’t yet had a voc‡a‡ion =
M: = not at ↓all in ↑fact I was erm when I ↑did ↓my ↓theology degr↑ee I was going. I
I: ↑thought I was going back into teaching
M: I think I may have told you [that once before
I: [↑m↓m mm
M: er when I first [went in I ↑spent quite a bit of time at ((place))
I: [mm
I: talking [to
I: [↑mm
M: one or two of their erm members of staff
I: mm
M: about how one might combine erm religious [education
I: [mm
M: with PE which [was my
I: [mm
M: original [↑subject you see
I: [mm mm
M: that’s what I I was when I [was young
I: [mm
M: a ↑lot ↑of ↑people seem to do ↓that I’ve no↑ticed =
I: = ↓combine ↓PE ↓and ↓religious [↓studies ↓at ↓school
M: [↑well they they are erm
I: it seems a good combin‡a‡ion =
M: = they ↑are a good combin‡a‡ion and I always thought it [would be a good
I: [mm
combination to ↑tea↓ch
because you get o. you have such a (. ) a very ↑privi↓leged relationship with the
children if you’re [their PE teacher
I: [mm mm
mm mm get to know them [quite well
I: [get to know them [quite ↑we↓ll
I: [yes
yeah
M: [↑m↓m
hh so it was ↑la↓ter that you so [↑how
it was
how did you decide to to go for the er [selection committee
well it was ↑during it was during my studies my

theology erm [studies
here at ((place))
mm
yes
. hh erm what did I ↑d↓o I s. gradually became aware .hh ↑I ↑think ↑it was church
↑his↓tory which [sounds rather [strange
. hh but I think I gradually became aware through studying church [history
the fathers you know
patriarchs [of the church and
erm hh and erm and then more recent history that erm (. ) the ↑church really
al↑though people complain about it in its done some fairly heinous things over the .hh
centuries
I: mm
I: ↑don’t think the Gospel would have arrived in the 20^{th} cen. 20^{th} century and
the 21^{st} century
if it hadn’t been for this (0.75) ↑vess↓el if [you like
by which it’s carried
and with all its imper-fections it it it dawned upon me that it [was important =
= and that we should stand up we should all fly the flag for the [church
hah and that’s [getting more and more important
as ((far as I can [see it ((laughing intonation))
and it seemed erm (0.5) then that (0.25) this vocation [was
was really beginning [to grasp me
and [wouldn’t go away
I: 
M: that erm well yes and women you know
I: mm
M: women can do this ↓Œordin ary [women like
I: [mm
M: like myself
I: [like ↑me
M: can ↓do ↓it mm
I: [mm
M: yeah [yeah (.) yes
I: [right
M: so I ↑think that’s real↓ly how it developed
I: mm
M: which ↑wasn’t very comfortable at the time
and I didn’t tell my husband for a::g↓es =
M: ↓no
I: wh. wh. why =
M: = I didn’t like ↓it
M: ↑why wasn’t it comfort↓able
M: [it just didn’t feel. you kn. it felt it was asking a bit (0.75)
I: ↓much ((laughs))
M: ggh you felt that y. you asking to become a [priest was
I: ↑n↓o I felt it was asking too much of me
M: ↑oh I ↑s↓ee (0.75) really
M: yes well it’s a a ↑very complete thing ↓you ↓kno↑w
I: yes
M: ↑m↓m well you ↑do ↓know mm
I: well (0.25) to an extent but erm okay but so you but you said yes I’m going to take this
M: on and I’ll I’ll
M: erm (0.5) well it wouldn’t go a↓way [and eventually
I: [mm
M: I had to (1.0) say to my local (1.0) “you know (.) vicar here° erm I I think I’m
discerning
I: ↑m↓m
M: within [myself
I: [mm
M: a vocation
I: mm
M: and of course it wasn’t to the priesthood in those [days ‘cos it =
I: [mm
M: = ↑wa↓s’t erm
I: mm
M: you know that wasn’t what it ↑wa↓s =
I: = no
M: it was a erm (0.75) it was ↑just ↑on ↑the. the hor↑iz↓on of possibility [that women
I: [mm
M: might be [made deacons
I: [mm
M: mm (0.5) this was before the Synod debate
M: er no this was after the Synod [debate
I: [it was after the debate but [it was (.) yup
round about the 1980s it was I second year theology student yeah I became a deacon not knowing if you could ever become a priest I was hugely surprised when the vote went the way it did and when asked beforehand what I would do as a deaconess who were saying I shall not stay but I wasn’t tests and they would but you didn’t feel that probably would have felt some thing I was amongst those dancing on Church House steps you knew the night that the Synod voted saw something on television all these unseemly women outside Church house
M: [waving banners and jumping up and down
640 I: [yes [yes
M: ↑spent the ↓day in London [and listen to the debate
642 I: [yes
M: over [in Westminster in er the Methodist Hall Central Hall
644 I: [mm [mm
I: mm
646 M: and er ↑oh it was just wonderful
I: mm
648 M: = mm
I: so you ↑felt pretty sure ↓then you felt secure in your ↑faith you felt sh secure in your
650 I: vocation .hh and (.) and you were on the road
M: yeah I would have stayed an. and ministered
652 I: mm
M: in the way that I ↑was ministering cos it was ↑huge↓ly satis↓fying
654 I: mm
M: to me to me
656 I: mm
M: right from the start =
658 I: = yes
M: I felt
660 I: yes
M: ↑right from the start
662 I: mm
M: that this
664 I: mm
M: this was [yes its what I was
666 I: [mm
M: [called to do
668 I: [mm mm
M: mm
670 I: .hhh so ggh ↑moving on from there ↓the ↑n ↑erm (1.0) how do you. do ↑you (0.5)
have a sense that you (.) gh sort of man↓age your faith in the sense that you’re trying
to pro↓gress ↓it trying to .hh de↓velop trying to prog↓ress (.) are there things that you
think well I’ll do ↑this or I’ll try ↑that or I’ll I’ll (.)
674 M: m:mmno
I: ↑any sense that your
676 M: not really (.) no
I: n↑o
678 M: n↓o I don’t feel that I I ↑man↓age it I mean I I’m feeling .hh erm inspired and
enlightened (.) all the time
680 I: mm
M: but a. its more something that happens to me
682 rather than something I [strive for
I: [right
684 I: okay okay so you’re just minding your own business as it were and [carrying on
M: [I think so
686 M: [((laughs)) CARRYing on a a ↑fairly busy life
I: [and seeing
688 I: yes
M: erm (0.5) which er (0.75) I don’t do so very much [now in [the
690 I: [mm [mm
M: the ministry line =
692 I: mm
but when I was busy it was a weaving together of (0.5) strands of my life at home and at church and and er .hh also singing which I did a lot of and it all seemed erm (1.25) that it wove together =

and i. they weren’t hugely separate things mm scuse me ((coughs)) sorry ((coughs)) so I wonder if if we are on some sort of journey or progression or movement =

= in some way if we are right so you you do have a sense that we are on some [sort of progression]

that’s what (1.0) growing old is about =

I think that’s what it’s ((for laughing word))

but it’s something that you just sort of plug in to as it were you can’t sort of push it on yourself

no well I do encourage it up to a point in that I like like to [read] I there are people whose thoughts and erm .hh but when I was a little girl in my Baptist Church we had very good BiBLE

she was in fact a head teacher .hh but she not only did her head teaching but she did this on Sunday’s [as well as people used to]

we had a most wonderful lady called .hh and every Sunday we gathered in the church room =

and we all had our little classes and small chairs [I can remember =

(name))

so I mm
I: [yes
M: = [we had crayons and [papers
I: [oh yes
M: but ↑one part of what happened every week
I: mm
M: was that ((name)) went ↑on to the little platform and told us a ↑sto↓ry about ↑Je↓sus
I: mm mm
M: ◦and she made it ↓glow◦
I: oh right
M: Jesus just ↓glowed [from then
I: [right
M: from the [beginning
I: [so it was the inspirational teaching of of [((name )) that
M: [she she. I I ↑put ↑it do↓wn to her
I: mm
M: = to a large extent that Jesus was always so (0.5) such an attractive (.) compelling
charac[ter =
I: mm
M: = for me
I: mm (. ) ggh she right =
M: = so that anything I I could read [or I anything I saw
I: mm
M: about erm (0.75) whether it was erm
I: mm
M: you know plays or anything written about the historicity [or a↑ny↓thing like that
I: [mm
M: .hh as I grew up it [was ↑al↓ways there to grab me I could see it n =
I: [mm
M: = you know it used to jump out of pages [at me
I: [so you could re↑mem↓ber these stories
years later you [would think of them back
I: [yes
M: oh yes yes
I: [yes yeah
M: and er you would (. ) [review your. if you were reading a story =
M: [mm
786 = you would perhaps remember (. ) what [ ((name ))
M: [↑oh ↑yes I can remember I can see her in
my [minds ↑ey↓e
I: [yes
M: and she had such a wonderful ↑way of tell[ing s. telling the stories of [Jesus
I: [mm [↑m↓m mm =
M: = that that you they ↑made us love [Je↓sus ↓you ↓know
I: [mm
M: I ↓can’t ↓remember ↓which ↓stories ↓they ↓were ↓now [they probably weren’t any
I: [no
M: of the cont er controversy [ones (. ) cos =
M: [no
= that’s not what you feed to small [children is it
I: [no
M: [erm
802 I: [mm
M: I do understand you [know cos I have done
804 I: [mm
M: biblical [study teaching
806 I: [mm of course yes
M: there was there ↑much much darker [side to the Bible stories the [menace
808 I: [mm [but perhaps you got your er (. ) your interest in teaching from from that [time onwards
810 M: [↑y↓es maybe
M: certainly she was a very [fine teacher
812 I: [mm mm
M: and then there was a lady later on who (0.5) she took me under her wing because of
814 my voice
I: ↑m↓m
816 M: and she she was a wonderful Christian lady (0.75) ↑so ↑I ↑was ↑luc↓ky =
I: = because of your voice to help train your voice
818 M: ↓yes [she she was a [trained singer
I: [mm [mm
820 M: and it was a ↑gain in our ↓Baptist ↑church
I: [mm
822 I: ↑m↓m
M: she she erm (1.0) you know (1.0)
824 I: [mm =
M: not only t:took an interest in me and brought [me into the choir
826 I: [mm
M: and [things like that she er (. ) she used to erm (. ) take me [home with her
828 I: [mm [mm
M: and [er you know I used to [↑do things [with her
830 I: ↑[mm [mm [well your face has lit up when you when you’ve been [describing this and you’re ↑smiling away =
832 M: [↑↑ye↓↓es
M: = so ↑those ↑those people [were very, very seminal [very important =
834 I: [yes [yeah
I: = ↑ye↓↓s ob↓↓vious↓↓ly
836 M: erm (. ) it ↑was it was in itself a good ↓experience but [er
I: [mm [mm
838 M: ↓hh I must say that (. ) having moved into the ↑Ang↓↓li↓↓can Church
I: [mm
840 M: that too has been very (0.75 ) very, satisfying there’s been a very defi definite development .hh in ↑styles↓↓les of worship =
842 I: [mm
M: = [and things that I’ve found helpful
844 I: [ggh a develop. ggh a personal development for [you
M: [yes I think so
846 M: yeah I I doubt if going back to my ↑Sunday ↓school ↓class for [instance
I: [mm
848 M: that would seem now [as it seemed [then
I: [mm [mm
850 M: but that was right for me ↑the↓↓n
I: so it’s it’s s:s hh ↓is ↓style ↑of ↑worship ↑the ↑right ↑word but the the way you (. ) the way the way you worship (. ) is ↓that that’s ↓moved on
M: [well for instance I I wouldn’t be a
854 happy-clappy person
I: no

856 M: and never (.)↑probably never ↑would ↓have [↓been
I: [mm mm

858 M: so ↑that's [what moved some [people on [and
I: [mm [mm [mm mm

860 M: and does things for them but it [wouldn't for me
I: [mm no

862 M: I ↑think more (1.0) the beauty of holiness I think [is
I: [mm

864 M: is (.) much more important to me now
I: the ↑beauty of holiness [that the the ↑sense of holiness =

866 M: [mm
M: = ↑sense of holiness and and (1.0) I find beautiful surroundings very [helpful

868 I: [mm
M: in wor[ship and er
870 I: [mm
I: ↑yes

872 M: mm
I: yes indeed

874 M: a lot of people ↑d↓o ↑don't ↓they =
I: = in↑dee↓d ↑ye↓s

876 M: yeah
I: yes I'm enjoying (( place)) in a way I never thought =

878 M: yes
I: = that I would cos it's ↑not my trad↑i↓tion

880 M: mm
I: but you're ↑ri↓ght but if something's done with obvious obviously it's done well

882 M: mm
I: erm and people are obviously =

884 M: = reverently =
I: = ↑rever↓ent [yes ind↑e↓ed yes =

886 M: [mm
I: = indeed hh so erm wh. ?what would you ↓say (0.75) if you are on this pro↓gress↓ion

888 (0.75) the ↑go↓val (0.75) you know people talk about a development =
or a progression from [here to =

890 M: [mm
I: = there

892 M: mm
I: .hh what what would the ↓there ↑b↓e what would the ↓goal ↑b↓e how will you know if

894 you are (.) further (.) along in [your (.) journey
M: [↑don't know =

896 M: = probably won't=
I: ((laughs))

898 M: ((laughs)) probably [won't
I: [you don't really have a sense of that at all do you

900 M: ↑well I know that erm (2.0) ↑↑know that I'm a more ↓tole↑rant per↑son that I ↓was
when I was you↑ng (.) that I under↓sta↑nd and erm (0.75) make allowances (2.0) for
human ↓fail↑ings and so ↑forth I'm more capable of forgiveness than I was I know I
sha. I ↑know I know those ↓thin↑gs

904 I: mm
M: erm do you mean ↓more ↑than ↑that

906 I: ↑I just wondered what you know I I it's a ↑difficult question pe:e it ↑is very hard to
think these things through but .hh I I just thought that when you're ↑talk↓ing about
development or moving [forward

908
M: people have a sense of what they're moving forward to =
910 I: = to mm
912 M: well
914 I: = perhaps that's not particularly relvant in your case =
916 do n't they
918 mm no I don't think I have a specific thing I want to go .hh except to (0.5) to live each day ((being kind to my husband laughing phrase)) and
920 I: [mm
922 M: .hh erm (1.0) I think about the day and (0.25) and pray that erm (1.25) those people
924 (1.0) whom we meet
926 I: mm
928 M: you know those of us who are gathered
930 I: mm
932 M: during the day =
934 I: mm
936 M: that that is just my daily ly
938 I: [mm well
940 mm
942 M: I don't think there's (0.5) gh any way of exa\(\)gerrating
944 I: mm
946 M: the importance [of of =
948 I: = that that is is it's the essence of love I think =
950 I: yes yes
952 (2.0) what shall I ex (0.5) the mon\(\)poly on [truth =
954 I: = I think other people [have come to God =
956 M: = in other [ways .hh erm (1.0) I do think that [this is something that [we have that is
958 [mm
960 I: mm
962 M: erm (0.75) if they could grasp it
M: would be the richer ↑for ↓it

964 I: mm
M: that this [this ↑essen↓ce of love ↓is in forgiveness
966 I: [mm [mm
[and and this [((.hh is breathing-in word)) something =
968 I: [right [mm
M: = that is ↑off ↑ered to ↓us
970 I: [mm
M: it has already ↑happ↓ened ↓for ↓us
972 I: [mm
I: yes (0.5) and you do feel yourself personally you feel your self forgiven
974 M: oh yes
I: [mm
976 M: [mm (0.25) yes
I: in a in a personal, [direct sense
978 M: [yes I do ↓yes (0.25)
I: [mm
980 M: when I do things ((laugh)) and I:I know that they (0.75) ggh that I’ve fallen short I’ve [failed in some way
982 I: [mm
I: mm
984 M: erm (0.75) ↑its ↑not particularly ↓easy if if erm (.) it requires (1.0) a PERSONAL AP↑O↓LO↓GY or [something like that but it ↑does [sometimes
986 I: [yes [mm
M: an I:I think that that’s important you got to be got to be prepared to do that
988 I: yes
M: but erm yes I don’t I don’t for one minute feel that I am unforgiven
990 I: [mm
M: [no (.) no
992 but that’s ↑not (.) not the ↑case for every[body I meet
I: [mm
994 M: it’s very, very di↑ffi↓cult for some people to [feel for[given
I: [mm [mm
996 I: so you feel that your faith is is as ↑you experience it it’s it’s specific perhaps even un↑rique to you (0.25) [and that
998 M: [no I ↑don’t think it’s uni↓que [but I certainly think it’s a gift
I: [no
1000 I: yes yes
M: mm
1002 I: ↑have you ev↓er had anything (0.5) that’s shak↓en ↓that (.) have you ever had a. I I mean you must have had (0.5) ↓doubts =
1004 I: = everyone [has doubts
M: [oh yes INTELLECTUAL DOUBTS [all the time
1006 I: [intellectual doubts yes
M: and I ca. I mean for years and years =
1008 I: mm
M: = cos I was brought up in the Baptist [Church and we didn’t have to say the creed =
1010 I: [mm
I: mm
1012 M: = hh for ↑years and years I stood in an Anglican church without [saying =
I: [mm
1014 M: = the creed =
I: mm
1016 M: = I wouldn’t say it
I: mm
1018 M: because. I cannot. in a literal sense (0.75) erm (1.0) say it with sin\ce\rity an as .hh there are still things I ca\n't
1020 I: so which aspects (0.25) partic\ularly
M: [well I think the virgin [birth is en\ti:irely
1022 I: mm
M: \down{unece\ssary}
1024 I: [yes
M: it is totally ir\re\vant [as far as I can see it
1026 I: [yes
M:.hh I mean this is an Anglican [\priest saying \this =
1028 I: mm
M: = and there are [a \lot of others like me
1030 I: mm
1032 M: [mm
I: [so certain finer points of theolog. theo\logical doctrine =
1034 M: = doctrine [I
I: [are \not (0.5) germane to your sense of your own faith
1036 M: no mm =
I: = mm so you could query those in debate those inte\lllec\tually (0.5) quite separately
1038 from your from your sense [of grounding in =
M: \down{oh yes mm}
1040 I: = in God
M: mm
1042 I: ok .hh so you've \never \had (0.5) you've \had inte\lectual doubts but you've never had your actual faith \shaken
1044 M: \down{no} I've had it I suppose I've had it tested in [(2.0)
I: [mm (1.0) mm
1046 M: in lots of ways [and I've fallen short in Christian [dish. disciple\ship
I: \down{mm}
1048 M: in [lots of ways
I: \down{mm mm}
1050 M: [which are things that make you \sad
I: [mm
1052 I: mm
M: that \don't necessarily
1054 I: mm
M: y:you don't blame God for them and say =
1056 I: mm
M: = where are you what are you doing you \know (1.0) you blame ((yourself \laughing \word)) =
1058 I: = well you \do perhaps (((Margaret)) but =
1060 M: (((laugh\s))
I: = er lots [of other people might
1062 M: [well er (,) sorry
I: \up{no} \up{no} \up{no} \up{no} \up{no} \up{please} \up{I} \up{don't} \down{mean it in any sense
1064 M: [no no
I: I'm just saying that =
1066 M: mm
I: = you know other people do ex\act\ly that and \down{blame \down{God \down{don't \down{they
1068 M: [yes
M: they do yes
1070 I: yes
M: yes and that's something that has to [be dealt with quite gently =

1072 I: [mm

M: = when it happens

1074 I: °mm yeah°

M: °↑yeh↓h°

1076 I: °mm°

M: ↑yes it's it's natural in a way I suppose

1078 I: so you encounter in others

M: yes =

1080 I: = and you have to deal with it =

M: = BUT ONLY when when the view of God is erm (1.0) I think (2.25) quite erm what

1082 shall I say without sounding (1.0) ↑arrow↓gant is a a simplistic [I think

I: [yes

1084 M: mm

I: yes

1086 M: you know if people (.) think that God (1.50) is responsible [for everything =

I: [yes

1088 M: = that happens

I: mm

1090 M: for them to them

I: mm

1092 M: I mean as far sickness and those sort of things are concerned (1.0) I mean I can look at
the human body I know ↑quite a bit about the human body

1094 I: mm

M: and think it is ↑so a ↑mazing its just a wonder anything goes ↑right

1096 I: its astonishing [yes I agree

M: (((laughs)))

1098 I: yes

M: it's not a disaster that anything goes ↑wrong

1100 I: but but ↑God (0.5) God's responsibility is God's responsibility but ↑that doesn't what
you're saying is that .hh people still have their ↑own↓n responsibilities

1102 M: oh I think [so yes

I: [of course

1104 M: mm

I: erm (0.5) along↑side ↑with ↑God's↓ responsibilities (.) I mean God God is present n

1106 ↑doing things in in ↑the ↑world

M: God is erm (1.0) is (0.5) has provided us with (0.5) the gift of life

1108 I: mm

M: and I do believe that God (0.75) ↑God's↓ purpose for us is a ↑loving pur↓pose

1110 I: mm

M: and its leading us I believe (0.75) to ↓love

1112 I: mm

M: and we experience God

1114 I: mm

M: to the extent that we ourselves learn (.) to truly love

1116 I: right

M: and er we are expressing God (1.0) to the extent that we are able to express love

1118 I: right so when we ↓love (1.25) we are (0.5) if we are loving =

= we are we are [capable of expressing God

1120 M: [I ↑think we are capable of of expressing [God and I think =

I: [mm

1122 M: = we're doing what [is (.)↑what ↑is God's will for ↑u↓s

I: [mm

1124 I: mm
M: that's my belief (0.5) erm,
1126 I: God's [will for us is is to love =
M: [but
1128 M: = that we [should ↓love =
I: [that we should love
1130 M: = that we should ex↑perience love this this is this is the great thing
I: mm
1132 M: I think these ↑thr↓ee faith hope and love
I: mm
1134 M: these three mm
I: yes yes
1136 M: yes
I: so ggh ↑when did you go start going to the contemplative prayer ↑group
1138 M: erm ↑when ↑I re↓ti:ired (.) which is five years (0.5) five years ago mm
I: and and ↑what was the impulse behind that then you you said you you that you you
1140 felt you didn’t need words so much but when how did you get to ↑hear of it
M: well I got to hear hear of it through a friend of mine who lives erm (.) she lives in
1142 ((place)) now =
I: mm
1144 M: = but she she went to one of the London groups (.) at that stage and she also (.) got
the (.) meditation leaflet sent to me so I've had those for a while
1146 I: [m↑m mm
I: because it wouldn't have been in your par your ↑back↓ground particularly that kind of
1148 prayer
M: ↑well ↑not partic↓larly except but ↑yes I mean I’ve been running =
1150 I: mm
M: = er a prayer group and we've had silent [prayer and so forth for 25 ↑yes↓rs =
1152 I: [mm [right
M: = so it ↑is ↓there =
1154 I: [it ↑is in your background
M: = and Lent erm Lent groups [with with meditative [prayer and =
1156 I: [mm [mm
M: = .hh and er i:i in my training and also in the training of ordinands =
1158 M: = [which I’ve been involved [in .hh
I: [mm [mm
1160 M: = we’ve had I ↑I mean (1.0) quiet ↑days, [retreats =
I: [mm
1162 M: = [all those sorts of things =
I: [mm
1164 M: = are part of
I: mm
1166 M: of of [what has happ[ened to me
I: [mm [yes
1168 I: right
M: I I mean I think it's an enormous ↑priv↓ilege ↓really to have (0.5) been in the
1170 ↑w:aa↓y of ↓all ↓these ↓things
I: yes
1172 M: an ↑enormous ↓privilege (0.75) ↑yes↓s
I: that you’ve been lucky enough to [experience
1174 M: ↑yes↓s yes I do yes
M: and erm these things have been part of my life but erm (1.0) ↑when when there’s
1176 seemed to be more ↓tim↓e
I: mm
1178 M: erm this this was something I I felt ↑a↑gain↓n that was drawing me to it
I: mm
1180 M: this is how things have seemed to happen to me (.) that I’ve been drawn ↑ to them
I: ↑ m ↓ m
1182 M: ↑ yeah ((small laugh))
I: ↑ mm
1184 I: right that’s ↑ good that’s n that’s (0.75) so (1.5) what do you think happen what is ↑ happ ↓ en ↓ ing (0.75) in contemplative prayer
1186 M: (4.0) I think that what what is happening is that we are (0.5) letting g ↓ o (1.0) of (.) what did you call it yesterday de ↑ bris, detr ↑ itus ((small laugh))
1188 I: mm
M: erm we’re letting go of the things (0.25) erm (1.0) no they’re ↓ not they’re ↓ not they they are important ↓ in themselves
I: ↓ distractions
1192 M: the distractions
I: mm
1194 M: erm (0.75) we’re lett ↑ ing g ↓ o of (0.25) the ↑ things that (0.75) occu ↓ py ↑ us at a superficial level all the time =
1196 I: mm
M: = .hh in order to sink more deeply
1198 I: mm
M: into (.) what ↑ Michael Maine on the tapes con ↑ tinual ↓ ly calls the ground of our
1200 ↓ be ↑ ing but of course =
I: [mm
1202 M: hh that comes er I think that was John Robinson [originally I: [mm
1204 M: who talked [of that I: [mm ((lap top beep))
1206 I: (3.0) ↑ o ↓ h was it not switched ↓ o ↑ n ((Talk unclear laptop had hibernated – missed out discussion was only of the laptop))
1208 M: ↑ ye ↓ s I think ↑ you ↓ kn ↓ ow that’s what we’re (.) I think there is this deep longing (.) which is ↑ probably ↑ real ↓ ly at the very ↑ root of of my whole religious ↑ sen ↓ se (.) that erm of (0.50) wanting (.) to be ↓ long to to be (0.25) ↑ not ab ↓ solved but erm (0.75) to rest you know (.) and (.) and feel (0.5) erm (0.75) part (1.75) of a whole
1210 I: yes I can certainly understand exactly what you are saying (.) its it’s ↑ hard to put into words isn’t it
1212 M: y ↓ e ↓ s I [erm
1214 M: but that’s how I feel about it when I don’t very often do it very well I’m not much good at it .hh but (0.5) erm
1218 I: [do y M: [we’re not supposed to say that are we (((laughs))) I: [no ((laughing word))
1220 I: ↑ we ↓ ll but but there is a ↑ quali ↓ ty to it [isn’t there
1222 M: [some sometimes it’s much better than others [isn’t it
1224 I: ↑ y e ↓ s it ↑ i ↓ s M: [erm
1226 I: sometimes it ↑ i ↓ s yes M: but it is ↑ deep it is ↑ deeply restful, and [re ↑ fresh ↑ ing, and enl ↑ ive ↑ ning
1228 I: [yes M: yes
1230 ↓ there =
M: = not doing [anything
I: [yes
M: yes
I: so er we are ↑not not si we are ↑not sitting there not doing [anything =
I: [I think we are resting
M: = [we’re sitting there
doing [something =
M: [just resting
M: = sitting on God’s lap almost [(((small laugh))]
I: (((right laughing word)) ok erm
I: so do yo. (0.75) ggh has a ↑ny ↓thing ↓changed do you think since you started doing that prayer
M: goodness knows (0.25) I don’t know
I: you don’t
M: °no°
I: you don’t particularly have a sense that it’s changed
M: erm
I: I mean ((name)) for example says that it’s changed his his ↑li ↓fe he says that (1.0) I’ll have to go and ask him what he means [by that but erm
M: ↑ye ↓s
M: °goodness knows° I mean there’s nobody () comes and tells me that () it’s changed me or they don’t there ↑aren’t ↓many people who kno ↑w about it quite [honestly =
M: = at the moment
I: mm
M: my prayer group people like that know
I: mm
M: I er in that sense it isn’t very different from things that I’ve been doing [before =
I: [no
M: = except that [I’m doing it more ↑regularly
I: [no
I: yes yes yes
M: and I would say that I do word ss word type prayers ↑le ↓ss
I: yes okay and ↑that ↑that’s just because (0.75) you’ve reached a time in your life when it [just feels to ↑help
M: [mm
M: ↑ye ↓s it ↑do ↓es
I: yes
M: yes it ↓does
I: mm
M: I feel that I’ve ↑ye ↓ah been moved al ↓ong to that actually [if anything
M: and I don’t have to deal in words in the way that I did
M: mm (0.5) mm
I: mm (0.5) I’m happy to do this [this con[templative prayer
M: [mm [mm
I: ↑ye ↓ah
M: and it’s very ver:ry nice to think that it’s such an old tra ↑di ↓tion and
I: mm
M: and it has been used [in the Christian =
I: [mm
M: = church for so ↑lo ↓ng =
I: mm
M: = and of course in o†her religions too .hh this is a ve†ry fascinating thing for me .hh that erm when you get in†to this sort of ․pray†r and you hear from other faiths you realise how close [we are
I: [indeed indeed
M: [right =
I: [yes
M: = ․much more that when you’re [talking about ․doctr†ine I:
M: = [a[n anything or [practice erm y:you you get c†lose [together =
I: [a[olutely [yes yes [yes
M: = when you’re talking about erm (.) human ․kind†ness I:
M: = [a[n ․ser†vice I:
M: = and [†ser†vice =
I: [yes yes
M: = and you get close together when you’re talking about (0.25) erm contemplative ․prayer
I: [ye†s
I: = so you we. ․ggg you can exper†ience your (. ) faith if I can put it this way .hh (0.25) gh in ways that (. ) since it’s ․not ↓connected to ․doc†rine (. ) is more (0.25) meaningful to you (0.25) in a sense it’s it’s
M: well I’ve ․had ․to deal in doctrine [where we do we do I:
M: [you’ve had to deal =
M: = in doctrine of course I’ve put it badly M: we do have to =
I: [yeah
M: = but this is important to me (. ) ↓yes at this [time of my [life and =
I: [mm [mm M: = and I don’t I don’t really ↓read ↓very much theology [now =
I: [mm no M: = read much when I read it [tends to be much more erm spirituality
I: [mm
I: [mm M: = erm that’s not because I dis†count er theology I think theology is very important =
I: [mm
M: = and we need to be able if somebody asks us I:
M: [mm
M: = to s†ay what it is I:
M: [mm
M: = we believe I:
M: [yeah
M: = ․ermlink (.0) and of course with ․preach↓ing and so [forth = I:
M: = you ․need to have a good grounding in [theology = I:
M: [yes
M: = or you can’t ex†ress [your self I:
M: [yes
M: = but erm = I: = but you can use theology (. ) you use it like a tool as [it were
I: [yeah mm M: it’s not something which is your faith it’s it [des†cribes your faith [or it’s a =
I: [no [yes yes M: = a tool [of your faith M: [yes I ․think ↓so °yes°
I: yeah yeah
M: ↑m↓m

I: so ↑would (1.0) are there any aspects of your faith today or the wa↑y you worship today that you would say (.) are ↑more ↑mature or less mature than ↑before (0.5) or would you say some are (. ) more ↑immature ↑than ↑before or would you say that maturity is not a ↓relevant ↓word ↓to ↓use ↓at ↓all

M: (2.5) I think maturity ↑is a relevant word to say (1.0) because I can see some what I ↑think are probably very (. ) immature ways

I: mm
M: of erm of public worship (.75) I think (0.75) you can see (0.75) people erm (1.25) I ha ↑hate to be judg↑men↑tal [about it but I think = I: [mm
M: = ss. I think the way things .hh are ↑go↓ing (1.0) people are wanting a high I: mm
M: and they’re wanting the sort of ↑mu↓sic very often that they get in ↑pop concerts I: mm
M: and the sort of experience that they get in pop concerts I: mm
M: and it’s ↓difficult ↓for ↓me (.) to ↑think (1.25) that that will lead them (0.75) along (1.25) a good (1.0) a good path (1.25) it may just be a stage I don’t know =

I: [mm
M: = [something to ke. .hh (0.25) to keep (.) people interested and keep them going
I: so worship (1.0) which panders to this need for some sort of im↑medi↓ate (0.5) experience (0.5) as opposed to something which ((clears throat)) (0.5) does
M: something ↑else you would describe as immature

M: (3.0) well I ↑think the the ↑fruits of it all are in erm (1.0) they’re ↑not seen easily but they are seen in peoples’ lives I think aren’t they (1.0) I think that the fruit the fruits of it (0.75) you shall know them by their fruits

I: mm
M: erm (2.0) it’s its not for me to s↑a↓y what is what is immature
I: no
M: erm but un↑less it is leading you (3.0) to be more the sort of person (1.0) who can express Christ in the world (0.75) ↑not necessarily by one’s lips (1.0) but in one’s life (1.25) ↑then (0.5) it is ↑not ↓mature (1.75) “way of worship”

M: so the the purpose of worshipping is to get us to be more able to express [Christ ↑y↓yes I

think go in ↑pea↓ce to love [and serve the ↑Lo↓rd I: [mm [yes
M: that’s what that’s [what our I: [yes
I: mm
M: Eucharist has been about go in peace [to love

I: mm
M: and serve the [Lord =

I: [mm
M: = .hh the ↑for↓give↓ness
I: mm
M: the ↓learn↑ing

I: mm
M: you kn↑ow from the [Scriptures =

I: [mm
M: = particularly [the Gospels (0.5 ) erm (1.5) the pra↑yers

[mm
M: and and particularly the eucharistic prayer and the communion

1394 I: mm
1396 M: the purpose of of that (3.0) \( \uparrow \) not to make us jump up and down (.) its to make us
1398 (1.25) "go out and (1.5 ) and be \( \Theta \) =
1400 I: yes
1399 M: = more \( \uparrow \) Christ \( \downarrow \) like
1402 I: yes (0.25) right so it isn’t it isn’t for us to feel happy or glad or s:sing-songy or
1404 whatever but to go out and (0.75) and do =
1406 M: = something [about it
1408 M: well I hope (.) I \( \uparrow \) hope it will make us feel happy [and glad ((laughs))]
1410 I: [yes I meant (0.5) but
1412 the \( \uparrow \) pur \( \downarrow \) pose isn’t to [to make us [feel happy
1414 M: [no [no
1416 M: no
1418 I: \( \uparrow \) pose if I’m aiming for \( \downarrow \) anything I in a \( \uparrow \) sense (.) that that is what I would like to feel
1420 I: mm
1422 M: that people found in me
1424 I: me
1426 M: if I was aiming for anything
1428 I: mm
1430 M: I sup \( \uparrow \) pose that would be the [answer to \( \uparrow \) that question =
1432 I: [yes
1434 M: = that you gave me .hh some time ago
1436 I: yes
1438 M: but I’m \( \uparrow \) not consciously aiming [for it
1440 I: [no
1442 M: but I think that that is that would be a very (.) commendable goal
1444 I: yes
1446 M: and it is what I have loved to [find in certain other people
1448 I: [yes
1450 M: ye so you cn what\( \uparrow \) ever the something is you \( \uparrow \) have seen it in others
1452 M: oh \( \downarrow \) yes oh [\( \uparrow \) yes
1454 I: [and and you would \( \uparrow \) like to feel that that something is something \( \uparrow \) you
1456 express =
1458 M: = yes
1460 M: I [that \( \uparrow \) that would seem to me .hh to be the purpose of [a Christian life
1462 I: [yes [right right
1464 M: = and \( \uparrow \) it \( \uparrow \) it its \( \uparrow \) joy that’s there even in in (0.75) times of \( \uparrow \) suffer \( \downarrow \) ing
1466 I: ind\( \uparrow \) fed
1468 M: [in people =
1470 I: yes
M: = you know even in times of hard-ship and suffering =
I: = yes
M: = there is that =
I: mm perhaps particularly then
M: = and =
I: perhaps that's when you can see
M: [and then you recognise it even more strongly]
I: [yes] yes
I: mm perhaps particularly then
M: = and =
I: = and you'll recognise it even more strongly
I: [yes] yes
I: mm
M: up to the is hard to put it into words it's hard to work it all through
I: up to the
M: you need to sort of ponder
I: [it's very hard to do justice to it in words =
M: too isn't it =
I: =yes =
M: = yes
I: yeah =
M: mm
I: yeah
I: *tricky subject* well do you think I've covered it
M: ((laughs)) I don't know
I: ((( ))) I mean do you think I've done justice to how you feel
M: [erm well it's been its been quite interesting =
I: ok (.). yes
M: up you've had to wrest from me ((laughs))
I: up not (0.5) not really its
M: [erm cos (1.0) I I don't give it a lot of conscious =
I: up I
cos (1.0) I I don't give it a lot of conscious =
I: up
1480 M: [=consideration I must say
I: [no
1482 I: mm
M: and I've (1.5) I've reached a fairly old and (0.5) relatively confident stage in life
1484 =
I: mm
1486 M: = you know that I don't really mind very much what people in general =
I: [mm
1488 M: [think of me
I: [mm
1490 I: mm
M: you know I there there are some (.)
1492 I: mm
M: some people that I would be very sad if they thought I was
1494 I: mm
M: a fool or a charlatan
1496 I: mm
M: or or a particularly mean person
1498 I: mm
M: but (2.0) I don't give it much [thought
1500 I: [yes
M: = because it doesn’t exercise me on the whole

1502 I: so I suppose John Maine would say that you’ve got to a stage
when you can discern and you can attend to those things which you think are worth

1504 attending [to =
M: [well I hope so

1506 I: = [you can let [the others =
M: [I hope so

1508 I: = you can let the others go by =
M: I would certainly [hope so

1510 I: [yes
M: mm

1512 I: that is something [worth
M: [we have to grow old =

1514 = for some reason don’t you (((laughs)))
I: [hh (((laughing out breath ah)))

1516 M: have to be some advantages ↑some people get to it much younger than others look at
Jesus he was ((only 30 laughing phrase)) =

1518 I: = I don’t know how they do it
M: ((laughs))

1520 I: I don’t know how they er (.↑you ↓know I met someone the other day who said they
had a vocation they were ↑training for the Priesthood he said he’d had his vocation
when he was ↑eight
M: mm

1524 I: and he’s never never
M: never

1526 I: and I just
M: mm mm

1528 I: I don’t know
M: yes well some people do

1530 I: = yes
M: that ↑does n’t mean to say that he won’t go on developing

1532 I: = oh no no no I’m just you know he at that young age he he =
M: he knew what he =

1534 I: = he ↑knew
M: = what he was ↑called ↓to

1536 I: [[yeah
M: [mm yes

1538 I: and some people are and others agonise for ↑years [and years
M: [years yes

1540 I: [[it ↑is a very ((())) a perso ↑nal ↑thing I [suppose
M: [mm [mm

1542 M: I think it ↑i ↓s yes
I: well

1544 M: its quite a difficult one you’ve ↑chosen for yourself in a way isn’t it
I: I suppose I did because I I was going through a period in my ↑own ↓life when I was
doing quite a lot of querying and questioning (.↑in my ↑faith and in my ↑life n
↑general ↓ly [speaking

1546 M: [[yes
I: and I just really wanted to know what was going ↑on

1548 M: ↑m ↓m
I: and I wanted to know you know I I I the ↑big question for me was ‘was I losing my
↑faith’
M: mm

1552 I: and was my faith sin ↑ce ↓re was I (0.75) was I a a proper ↑Chris ↓tian
I look back and I think what a frightful question to ask myself if there is such a thing. hh

I was at the sort of church where people (.) people would ask this

M: [laughs] if there is such a thing .hh I: [laughs]

M: yeah I: I was reduced to tea rs once when somebody .hh suddenly turned round and said what was the day you were saved

M: yes I: and [didn’t know

M: this is this is the: e. tack in evang[ical churches =

M: = and it’s quite dangerous in my way of thinking

I: well he he sort he then went on to say you know there are people going around who think they are Christians and they’re not =

M: yes I: = he said and of course I immediately thought that’s in probably m e

M: but ggh that’s so judg men tal

I: yeah

M: how could

I: yeah

M: yes

I: erm this is a long time ago [it happened

M: [it is highly dangerous stuff (.)

I: mm

I: mm

I: so (. ) ggh =

I: but its on the as cen dant I’m afraid I: it seems to be doesn’t it

M: mm I: ye s it does

M: [because people want certaint ies

M: you know they want intellectual certainties [if you like I: [yes

I: yes

M: erm I: and they want this instant knowledge you [know to to learn something over a few years isn’t (1.0) isn’t going to [work

M: [work no

M: got to have the ans wers I: yes

M: they want a pat answer I: yes

M: yeah I: but what I have found is that wh when people ask me you know as they do wh

what you doing what are you studying and I tell them
I: and with out exception people who have no faith people who aren’t Christian people who are even ti-Christians they say hh ‘ooh gosh that sounds so interesting yes

M: mm 

I: so people are interested

M: mm 

I: in faith

M: mm.hh 

I: mm (0.5) mm

I: mm (0.75) mm (0.5) yes and I mean people who don’t profess religion (0.25) when you start to have a chat with them they often do have a spiritual side = 

M: = yes a very good spiritual side

I: yeah

M: mm

I: yeah

M: mm

I: yeah

M: mm

I: yeah

M: mm

I: well I’ll go away and ponder all of that lot (((laughs)))

M: and and so thank you

I: well it may not seem reasonable thank you, thank you

M: when you er

I: it will be love-ly thank you very much for your time and sorry about the hh

M: well no I felt sorry for you but I was going to be here this afternoon anyway

M: do you want me to sign this thing

I: if you’re happy with it =

M: =yes

I: and erm

M: and do I s:take it from this there will be a further interview at some other stage

I: well if you will I mean I put that in because erm the way I’m doing this study is not a typical way of doing it in psychological terms

M: ah

I: erm you know we’ve more or less had a conversation we haven’t had a structured interview

M: yes

I: erm and I’ve I’m going to go away and analyse this using something called conversation analysis

M: yes

I: which looks at how it all works you know

M: yes =

I: = you know tone of voice and le volume and

M: right

I: all that sort of stuff in a technical sense and that’s my technical analysis erm because it is based on a theory of language which says that =

M: yes

I: = you know language mat[ers how we when we speak =

M: yes

I: = we’re actually doing something
M: yes
1664 I: erm (1.25) and ↑so
M: well that in itself is quite an aspect [isn’t it
1666 I: [it ↑is it is I mean it’s something I find (. ) very
intriguing. hh but the point is that erm I might ↑well say well look this is what I’ve
done on this are you interested in putting your four-pen ny ↓worth in you might want
to say well ↑↑↑n o I disagree with you [about that
1668 M: ((laughs))
1670 I: ↓↓↓if you know ↓[if you want that’s that’s =
1672 M: ↓[yes ( )
1674 I: = if you ↓ don’t want that’s equally ((fine laughing word)) as well of course =
1676 M: = I’m just saying that .hh I put that in so that you could feel
1678 I: you had com↑lete control (0.25) ↓over what =
1680 M: ↓over what
1682 I: = come’s out at the end
1684 M: no I don’t think I would want complete control =
1686 I: = well I ggh if you wanted it
1688 M: mm ( ) yeah
1690 I: = I’m going to do ↑stop narration and save it ↑straight away.
1692 THE END
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