



## The Power of Rapport: An Analysis of the Effects of Interruptions and Overlaps in Casual Conversation.

Lucy Cantrell

### Introduction

This essay will analyse recorded spoken data from two casual conversations between a daughter, her father and her partner. The focus will be an aspect of Conversation Analysis, namely turn-taking, investigating whether interruptions and overlaps serve as cooperative devices or assertions of power and dominance, when within a familial context of high solidarity. This essay will be linked to theoretical arguments from Deborah Tannen (1983) and Julia Goldberg (1990) amongst others.

### Background

Conversation Analysis grew out of the ethnomethodological approach established mainly by Garfinkel in *Studies of Ethnomethodology* (1967), where he explored ‘how the structures of everyday activities are ordinarily and routinely produced and maintained’ (35-36) (Liddicoat, 2011). Duranti (1997: 85) argues that ethnography implies two apparently contradictory qualities; achieving an acceptable degree of objectivity, and achieving sufficient identification with/empathy to provide an insider’s perspective — ‘the emic view’. During the data collection, I encountered this contradiction and will briefly address it in my methodology.

Goffman (1964) built upon Garfinkel’s theories and argued that the activities of daily life and ordinary interactions of speech were important to study. This work was developed by Harvey Sachs, Emmanuel A. Schegloff and Gail Jefferson and Conversation Analysis began to emerge as a theory in its own right. Sachs’ approach was based on the orderliness of conversation (Sachs, 1992) and Psathas (1995) outlined three core assumptions of Conversation Analysis: i) Order is produced orderliness; ii) Order is produced, situated and occasioned; iii) Order is repeatable and recurrent; these make it clear that conversation analysts hold the view that conversation is skilled, structured and collaborative activity.

The data used by Conversational analysts is ‘closely transcribed examples of actual talk recorded in naturally occurring settings’ (Hutchby and Woofitt, 1998: 5). The interaction is studied because it is an instance of social interaction; an ‘analysis of real world, situated, contextualised talk’ (Liddicoat, 2011: 8). Conversational analysis attempts to understand how people interact, using naturalistic and spontaneous data that would have occurred regardless of the researcher (Psathas, 1990). It is for this reason that the data chosen for this essay consists of casual conversation between members of a community of practice of close relatives and partners.

Sachs, Schegloff and Jefferson (1974: 702) describe a model of conversation in ‘A Simplest Systematic for the Organisation of Turn-taking for Conversation’, from their observation of data in which they state that ‘at least, and no more than, one party speaks at a time in a single conversation’ and that each speaker will be subconsciously aware of a turn-

taking system in place, seeking to begin speech at ‘transition relevance places’. Therefore, any interruption or overlap is considered to be evidence of malfunction. (Tannen, 1983). Bennett (1978) differentiates between overlap and interruption on structural grounds and defines overlap as a descriptive term referring to timing of contributions, interruption as an interpretative category, reflecting speakers’ interpretations of ‘prevailing rights and obligations’ in the interaction (Schegloff and Sachs, 1973; Tannen, 1983).

Goldberg (1990) outlines within ‘Interrupting the Discourse of Interruptions’ that ‘interruptions have traditionally been viewed as reliable and objective indicators of such personal and relational attributes as domineeringness and dominance’ (883), and as interruptions disrupt the order and structure of turn-taking, they tend to be viewed as rude, disrespectful, indicative of indifference, aggressiveness or hostility (West, 1979). Goldberg (1990) continues to describe the ‘process’ view of power; the speaker who interrupts most, talks the most or changes/introduces new topics the most, is seen as the most powerful within a conversation. She goes on to dispute this view, by arguing that the interrupter expresses enthusiasm and active involvement in the discourse and designates interruptions as relational acts of neutrality, power or rapport; ‘since interruptions arise from a multitude of personal, relational and conversational sources, to claim that interruptions are all occasioned by an individual’s need to dominate or control is patently incorrect’ (Goldberg, 1990: 885). A variety of studies suggest that interruptions and overlaps are not simply an exertion of power and control over speech, but can convey rapport, cooperation or camaraderie with the other speaker (Goldberg, 1990).

Other studies such as Natale, Entin and Jaffe (1979: 874) and Murray (1985) that suggest interruption may be more a result of length of turns rather than the interrupter’s personality or dominance; however, these studies will not be used within this essay.

Deborah Tannen (1983) in ‘When is Overlap Not an Interruption?’ demonstrates that overlap can be a cooperative device in certain settings. She recorded naturally occurring conversation over a Thanksgiving dinner in 1978 among six native English speakers and her analysis indicated that cooperative overlap was one of the devices used by three of the participants. Other features they used included expressive phonology; sharp shifts in amplitude and pitch; fast rate of speech and fast pacing with respect to turn-taking, frequent, expressive back-channel responses and frequent topic switching, amongst others (Tannen, 1983). She argues: ‘thus overlap is one feature of a style whose cumulative effect is a feeling of intensity and rapid pace that left those who used it to experience the conversations as “great” but struck others present as “frenetic” and “dominating” ...to those who favour this style, the very fact of overlap is a vehicle for a metamessage of interpersonal rapport’ (121). Tannen (1983) states that one of the participants that did not use cooperative overlapping during the conversation, found it offensive when she first encountered it, as she was not accustomed to this manner of speech. This essay intends to analyse the interruptions and overlaps within the data to explore Tannen’s (1983) and Goldberg’s (1990) arguments, and investigate whether they are face-threatening assertions of power and dominance, or if they establish rapport and build solidarity among the participants.

## **Methodology**

Both participants were informed of the nature and purpose of the research, had the opportunity to ask questions and gave their written and verbal consent prior to being recorded. They understood that the data would be stored and treated in the strictest confidence and that anonymity would be secured; the participants have been given pseudonyms within the transcription. The School’s ethical policy was strictly adhered to during the recording, storing and transcribing of data. The participants were informed of their freedom to withdraw from the study at any point, and their right of access to any data.

The conversations were recorded on an iPhone rather than a Dictaphone, as I felt it would be less intrusive. The recording was stored on the password-locked phone and exported to an equally protected laptop, to ensure that the data was secure and could not be accessed by anyone other than myself. The data was collected on a day when my partner's father had come to visit; Section A was recorded in our home and Section B in a pub garden. This is because I wanted the data to be as naturalistic as possible with an atmosphere that would relax the participants, to ensure naturally occurring data. Unfortunately this does mean that there is some background noise that marginally affects the quality of the recording. There were also limitations to using an iPhone to record the data, as in order to keep it unobtrusive, it was not necessarily as close to the participants as I would have liked, meaning that some of the recording is rather quiet and difficult to transcribe. Goodwin (1981) closely explores the difficulties of sound recording in naturalistic settings and the proximity of the microphone to the participant and argues it is 'the main influence on sound quality' (39), which accounts for some of the poorer quality recording.

I feel I overcame the Observer's Paradox by using the participant-observer method, and as I am regarded as 'family', I am a member of their community of practice and so can participate naturally in the conversation without imposing. This 'emic view' (Duranti, 1997:85) does bring the objectivity of my insider perspective into question, but I feel I have managed to disregard any personal opinion and remain professional and impartial throughout the analysis. I have disregarded the first couple of minutes from Section A and have extracted Section B from the middle of the later recording, to ensure the authenticity of the data was not compromised. I feel the interaction was entirely effortless and akin to our usual conversation.

Both sections of transcription amount to between seven and eight minutes of recorded conversation, to ensure I had enough data of use for the intended analysis. The difference in accent and dialect between participants was a characteristic that was going to be covered, which is the reason for the recording being partially phonetically transcribed, as I wanted the transcription to be as close to the spoken words as possible.

### Data Analysis

Both sections consist of casual, spontaneous conversation, recorded at different points in the same day. In Section A, the participants discuss relatives they are all familiar with, and one participant's potential love interest. In Section B, participants discuss weddings.

The first notable interruption/overlap comes on line 8 of Section A. Both LB and LC interrupt B and overlap with his continuing turn, but they are cooperative gestures that encourage B. They are not attempting to take the turn away from B, but contribute to his narrative. Goldberg (1990) describes these types of interruptions as 'Rapport type interruptions' and states they often strive to bolster the interuptee's positive face, as can be seen here.

8	LB	[You're ↑joking?]
9	LC	[ Awwww ]
10	B	← [ She were cryin ]

Section A contains 6 main examples of these interruptions by LB and LC; lines 8 and 9 described above, and lines 20: 'Awww', 22: 'Bless her' and 30: 'Aww bless her' all contain the same encouragement and reactions to B's speech, reinforcing the collaborative nature of the conversation. They can also be described as 'rapport-orientated' interruptions; expressions of empathy, affection, and solidarity, viewed as acts of mutual orientation (Goldberg, 1990). Some of these can also be called strong involvement backchannels.

Line 14: ‘[He ↑left her? He’s a [↓bugger!]]’ is also reactionary rapport, but as it comes in what could be labelled as a transition relevance place, after B’s pause of (1.0), it cannot be classed as an interruption.

Line 37 indicates a new topic introduced by LB with a filler ‘um’ to maintain her turn and a hedge: ‘you know’, establishing the shared knowledge between the speakers. However her turn is both interrupted and overlapped by LC asking B if he wants a cigarette (38), which prevents LB from resuming her turn until line 41, which is potentially face-threatening, but LB persists and retains her turn by overlapping LC.

37	LB	Um you know [Mum mum gets all um]
38	LC	[D’you wanna smoke?]
39	B	Ah you’re a star thank you
40	LC	[S’alright]
41	LB	[Mum gets] Mum cried last time when we left dint she=

According to Goldberg (1990) this is a ‘relationally neutral’ interruption, as it is not intentionally face-threatening. It does however require the speaker to temporarily relinquish her speakership rights (Goldberg, 1990). Once completed, the discourse returns to its pre-interruption state (Jefferson, 1972).

However, LB is forced to give up her turn on line 48, as LC and B continue a separate conversation about the before mentioned cigarette. This becomes obvious at the 2.0 second pause where LC realises she has overridden LB and executes a repair in the form of an apology and encouragement to continue: ‘Sorry ((laughs)) go on go on’ (53). This interruption does not seem to phase LB as she overlaps LC on line 56 and picks up where she left off, undeterred. B interrupts and overlaps LB to instigate a slight shift in topical perspective (lines 60-61) but does so with a rapport type interruption, building upon and adding to the topic LB had introduced, using the shift mark ‘It’s like...’ (61), which makes it collaborative rather than assertion of power.

Lines 78-81 highlight that interruption within this discourse has no adverse effect on the flow of conversation between these participants. LB is interrupted and overlapped by B and simply continues in her turn, repeating ‘be like dad’ (81) to reinforce the continuation. It is even more apparent when listening to the recording, that the overlap is humorous and builds on solidarity between the participants.

The close relationships of the participants are demonstrated through lines 101-108, where LB interrupts B mid-turn and overlaps him as he continues speaking, but they are both developing the same topic. They are displaying their joint understanding of each other and involvement in the topic, as they both put across the same point but word it differently. B uses the metacomment ‘tell you something’ (104) which is interesting as they are usually used in more formal situations to save face; it could be that B feels he needs to give an excuse to explain further why the date hasn’t happened. This could also account for B’s use of the empathiser ‘you know what I mean’ (107), eliciting an overlapping of solidarity building response of laughter from LB and LC.

102	LB	[Cos you two just as bad as each other cos you daren't say
103		owt to each other ( )]
104	B	←[tell you something we both same] she don't wanna give
105		her (1.0) single lifestyle up and I don't (1.0) soon as I meet someone like that
106		Sharon (2.0) er within thirty seconds me me me lifestyle were under threat you
107		know what I [mean( )]=
108	LB + LC	[((laughs)) ]

An example of Tannen's (1983) choral repetition can be seen on lines 121-123 where both LB and B say 'she might...' at the same time. This demonstrates the cooperative nature of the conversation, and how close their relationship is.

Section B differs from Section A in the way that it contains more minimal responses, there were only 5 in the first section, and 12 in Section B. This may be because it is a shorter recording, with much shorter turn lengths and swifter topic change. There are also 19 points of overlap or interruption in Section B, which could be due to the fast pace of the conversation.

The collaborative nature of this conversation can be seen between lines 10 and 16 as LB begins a narrative, uses a filler 'um' on line 11 and there is no break as LC takes over the narration. The use of 'Whats it you and the boys' by LB to begin line 10 is almost a confirmation question, opening up the floor for LC to take over. LB completes the narration on line 17, making the whole exchange a cooperative discourse.

10	LB	Whats it you and the boys were discussing what would um . what I would wear
11		for our wedding if we had if we were [gonna get married] and um=
12	B	[((laughs)) ]
13	LC	=Gareth was like oh well cos I said that I'd . probably wear an <i>off</i> white I
14		don't I'm not not a fan of just the <i>complete</i> white . so I'd wear off white . and
15		he was like oh you can always put her in a white tshirt and skinny jeans↓
16		(1.0)
17	LB	I was like if I had if I had [that option I probably would]

A turn made by B on line 18 is almost exactly the same as the rapport type interruption on line 61 of Section A, discussed above. He uses the same shift marker 'That's like' and interrupts in the middle of LB's turn, as he did in the previous section. LB in turn interrupts B with a minimal response, continuing to build on the topic shift and adding to the collaborative floor (20).

B again interrupts LB on line 27 and claims her turn, providing additional information about the belt she was talking about and elaborating on the topic, and it is seen as an act of collaboration and cooperation, not as a striving for power. LB supplies overlapping confirmation question on lines 30 and 36, indicating that she has not felt B's interruption was face-threatening.

There are other aspects evident in the data that I would have liked to investigate to explore the evidence of close relationships: repetition; narrative; humour; other examples of cooperative overlapping and interruption, but unfortunately limitations on this essay do not allow for it.

## Discussion

The analysis of the data shows that there is a great deal of overlap and interruption in these sections of conversation, but an unequal power balance does not emerge. The data does not indicate any participant being negatively affected or threatened by the interruptions. This

is due to their collaborative and cooperative nature; the speakers all participate in the discourse by developing common topics that they share joint enthusiasm for. The large majority of the interruptions are rapport-orientated (Goldberg, 1983), succeed in cooperative overlapping (Tannen, 1990) and serve to build upon ongoing topics rather than introducing completely new topics. They encourage and contribute to the speech, rather than obstructing it. It is not evidence of domination, but of participation, not power but solidarity (Tannen, 1990). One of the reasons for this is that none of the participants hesitate to take part in the fast-paced latching and cooperative overlapping; they are all comfortable with this method of conversation, and persist in their attempts at turn-taking until they are successful. This is partly due to the participants' relationship with each other and how comfortable they are with talking over one another without feeling any threat to their negative face.

From this data, it is clear that within this familial community of practice, overlapping and interrupting are not errors or violations of the system of turn-taking, as outlined by Sachs et al. (1974), but are necessary and desired by the participants in order to casually converse animatedly with one another. As argued by Tannen (1983), the failure to participate in this mode of conversation would be perceived as dullness and lack of interest.

### **Conclusion**

This essay has looked briefly at the development of Conversation Analysis to understand its importance in the field of sociolinguistics, and has focussed on two aspects of turn-taking: Overlapping and Interruptions. It has explored Tannen's (1983) and Goldberg's (1990) arguments that interruptions and overlaps within conversation are not unequivocal signs of control, power or dominance, but instead can be integral to building relationships of rapport between participants. The data analysed provided many examples of cooperative overlapping and rapport-orientating interruptions without any face-threatening or domineering consequences, proving their theories to be correct within this fieldwork study. If I were to execute this study again, I would use shorter sections of data in order to obtain a closer focus, but overall I think it was successful in investigating whether power assertion and control are core instigators in interruptions and overlaps, within a particular context.

**References**

- Duranti, A. (1997). *Linguistic Anthropology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Garfinkel, H. (1967). *Studies in Ethnomethodology*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Goffman, E. (1964). 'The neglected situation', *American Anthropologist*, 6 (2): 133-136.
- Goldberg, J. A. (1990). 'Interrupting the Discourse of Interruptions: An Analysis in Terms of Relationally Neutral, Power-and Rapport-Oriented Acts', *Journal of Pragmatics*, 14(6): 883-903.
- Goodwin, C. (1981). *Conversational Organisation: Interactions between Speakers and Hearers*. New York: Academic Press.
- Hutchby, I., and Woofitt R. (1998). *Conversation Analysis: Principles, Practices and Applications*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Jefferson, G. (1972) 'Side sequences'. In: D. Sudnow, ed., *Studies in social interaction*. New York/London: Macmillan. pp. 294-388.
- Liddicoat, A. J. (2011). *An Introduction to Conversation Analysis*. London: Continuum.
- Murray, S. O. (1985). 'Toward a model of member's methods for recognizing interruptions', *Language in Society*, 14:31-40.
- Natale, M., Entin, E., and Jaffe, J. (1979). 'Vocal interruptions in dyadic communication as a function of speech and social anxiety', *Personality and Social Psychology*, 37(6): 865-78.
- Psathas, G. (1995). *Conversation Analysis: The Study of Talk in Interaction*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Sachs, H. (1992). *Lectures on Conversation* (2 vols). Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Sachs, H., Schegloff, E. A., and Jefferson, G. (1974). 'A simplest systematic for the organisation of turn-taking for conversation', *Language*, 50: 696-735.
- Schegloff, E. A., and Sachs, H. (1973). 'Opening up closings', *Semiotica*, 7: 289-327.
- Tannen, D. (1983). 'When Is an Overlap Not an Interruption? One Component of Conversational Style'. In: Di Pietro, R. J., Frawley, W., and Wedel, A., eds. *Selected Papers*. University of Delaware Press, pp. 119-29.
- West, C. (1979). 'Against our will: Male interruptions of females in cross-sex conversations'. In: Orasanu, J., Slater, M., and Adler, L., eds. *Language, sex and gender*, Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences, 327, pp. 81-97.

**Appendix - Section A**

1	B 0:17	...Anyway to Mark were sayin Mark says to er . summat about this Christmas er
2		(1.0) I didn't really know what he wa on about at first he goes oh bloomin heck I
3		suppose (1.0) ah says what does he say? I'll get you this surprise this Christmas
4		he says I'll get you <i>fuck</i> all like that [she didn't like that ( )]-3
5	LC	[((laughs)) ]
6	LB	[((laughs)) ]
7	B	←and she looked at him and she went(1.0) and she she welled up-3
8	LB	[You're ↑joking?]
9	LC	[ Awwwww ]
10	B	← [ She were cryin ]
11		Mark went ohh bloody hell he says I'm goin . anyway he went out for a smoke
12		and we were stood there and I wa like (1.0) hm ((facial expression))
13	LC	[((laughs)) ]
14	LB	[He ↑left her? He's a [↓bugger!]
15	B	[ So ] [well yeah]
16		cause he cause he he knows she's really pappy like that thought what she doin?
17		[whats up↑ anyone'd thought ]she'd been told me she just got cancer or
18		[summat]-3
19	LB	[((laughs)) mm (oh god) ((laughs))]
20	LC	[Awww ] ((laughs))
21	B	←[bloody hell]-3
22	LB	[Bless <i>her</i> ((laughs))]
23	B	←anyway er I did well actually I started rabbiting on about something spurious
24		absolutely nowt to do with it
25	LC	[((laughs)) ]
26	B	[I stood there] I just carried on rabbiting [( )]-3
27	LB	[Did you
28		not give her a cuddle ]
29	B	←I did alright she just] sort of fought it back a bit and then and then this but
30	LC	[Aww
31		bless her]
32	B	[She
33		she ] I thought he'd told her mum had flippin er death's [door or summin]
34	LB	[She might be um ]
35		probably be a bit time of month but she's past that int she=
36	B	=Yeah
37	LB	Um you know [Mum mum gets all um]
38	LC	[D'you wanna smoke?]
39	B	Ah you're a star thank you
40	LC	[S'alright]
41	LB	[Mum gets] Mum cried last time when we left dint she=
42	LC	[=yeah]
42	LB	[and then] came like two weeks later (1.0) Mums always blubberin
43		when we leave now and um . and . yeah . she was just like



44		((indecipherable with TV noise)) (2.0)
45	LB	she was like even when she got to Matthew's [like a week ]and a half later
46	B + LC	[[((laughs))]]
47	LB	[Got to Mum] came to see us a
48		week and a half later with [Matthew you know bearing loads of gifts for her um ]
49	B	[indecipherable]
50	LC	[ey? you don't like them or you do?]
51	B	[yeah]
52	LC	You do yeah (2.0)
53	LC	Sorry ((laughs)) go on go on=
54	LB	=Can't remember what I was gonna say now
55	LC	She came over a week and a half [later ]
56	LB	[NO no ( )] She was like I haven't seen you
57		lot in ages and Lucy was like we only saw you a week and a half ago
58	B + LC	[[((laughs))]]
59	LB	[And mum]
60		was like[I was so upset when you left]
61	B	[It's like my dad that ] that were like my dad when he crawled
62		into hospital well he were round the bend like he didn't know what were
63		'appenin . but Michelle comes in one she she came round one Saturday and she
64		goes I just been round to see yer dad she says / don't know what is it wi you? I
65		goes what? I says put my cornflakes down I go what? she says yer dads bin in
66		hospital for 2 weeks you ant bin to see him (1.0) says you what=
67	LB	=Yer dad's
68		been in 'ospital . dad's . erm is in 'ospital?
69	B	Nah this were a few years ago=
70	LB	=Oh right [I was gonna say you ant told me]
71	B	[Before he went gaga ] erm I says you what? Says we went
72		in (.) this were Satday (.) says I went in Monday (.)I did miss a day (.) I went in
73		Wednesday and I bin in Friday! (.) she went well I just sin him this morning and
74		he says he ant sin you for past two weeks
75	LC+ LB	((laughs))
76	B	Silly old twat
77	LC + LB	((laughs))
78	LB	The daft bugger! . That's what you'll be like although I'll come in and be like dad
79		[we saw you yesterday ]
80	B	[I'll make sure I will I'll tell ya ( )]
81	LB	I'll be like dad we saw you yesterday (.) saw you an hour ago dad (.) wah you ant
82		bin in two weeks=
83	B	=Yeah don't bode for me don't bode well for me getting to seventy ( ... ) me
84		memories at its best ( ... ) but . ah that Friday night Mark dint remember
85		anythin, Moira don't remember anythin wa happened . says . I mean I dint have
86		quite as much as Mark but I were wobblin a bit=
87	LB	=bluddy hell (1.0)
88	B	I do remember absolutely everything (2.0)
89	LB	[Flippin eck ]
90	B	[Moira I'm surprised] she even remembers to breathe
91	LB + LC	((laughs))

92	LB	She's crackers
93	B	Well Friday night we were stood in (.) er little madge with madge me and madge
94	LB	[Oh aye ]
95	B	[Margeret ]and Moira and er I've asked er out for a meal again I says to her not
96		last weekend weekend ( )weekend before says are we right for this meal
97		sometime then ↓or the week before[ then ]-3
98	LB	[yeah]
99	B	E-an she goes yeah yeah (1.0)yeah that were it then
100		we just leave it at that an then [when we see each other next weekend say same
101		thing again]-3
102	LB	[Cos you two just as bad as each other cos you daren't say
103		owt to each other ( )]
104	B	E-[tell you something we both same] she don't wanna give
105		her (1.0) single lifestyle up and I don't (1.0) soon as I meet someone like that
106		Sharon (2.0) er within thirty seconds me me me lifestyle were under threat you
107		know what I [mean( )]=
108	LB + LC	[((laughs)) ]
109	LC	=But if she doesn't wanna lose it and you don't wanna lose it then maybe that's
110		the perfect match↓
111	B	Correct (1.0) I were I was thinkin along them lines yeah (1.0.)but (1.0) I think
112		(1.0) it's only a meal it's not a ( fuckin ) marriage marriage proposal =
113	LC	=Yeah exactly
114	B	(.) I think we'll probably just probably go out now and again cos we're both a bit
115		long in'tooth to take up all serious
116	LC	((laughs))
117	B	But thing is (1.0) her two kids I think she's I think . she might be . sorta thinkin
118		bout future cos her two kids . er er think one's . gonna move out . other one
119		won't be long so she'll be rattling round on her own then so er she might be
120		think . graspin at straws (1.0)
121	LB	((laughs)) what (1.0) you say [she might be but you've obviously] thought about
122		it-3
123	B	[She might come round a bit ]
124	B	[what?]
125	LB	E-[would ]you let
126		her move in with you?
127	B	Ah . would she ↑move in with me? Would you? (1.0) [Bluddy hell]
128	LB	[I would ]=
129	LC	=I would (1.0)
130		Christ (1.0) if you bring yer overalls [wi yer ]
131		[↑Lucy says she still wants to see . she still
132		wants to see you even if even if if we split up (1.0) ( )
133	LB + LC	[((laughter)) ]
134	LB	[Am I still allowed to see your dad?] no you flipping cant! (1.0)
135	B	((laughs)) (1.0) [Ah I'll phone you up one day I'll say I'm ↑coming down]-3
136	LB	[Thats why she's sticking with me so she can ]
137	B	E-to Nottingham next week (1.0) Pick your pick your ex up
138	LC	((laughs)) ((laughs))
139	LB	[ah Flippin eck ]
140	B	[We're going out] for a drink . wi Mark and Moira
141	LC 6:13	((laughs))

**Appendix – Section B**

1	5:17 LC	I've gotta book my grad ticket (1.0)
2	LB	Oh yeah . get me one
3	LC	[Yeah ], for the grad ball=
4	LB	[Yeah] =yeah] (.) what?(1.0) with a ball?
5	LC	Yeah - I told you cos last year they had the flapper (1.0) theme - didn't they
6		[like 1920s ]
7	LB	[I'm gonna have to wear a dress ant l]=
8	LC	Probably yeah (1.0)
9	B	Heh (1.0)
10	LB	Whats it you and the boys were discussing what would um . what I would
11		wear for our wedding if we had if we were [gonna get married] and um=
12	B	[((laughs)) ]
13	LC	=Gareth was like oh well cos I said that I'd . probably wear an <i>off</i> white I
14		don't I'm not not a fan of just the <i>complete</i> white . so I'd wear off white . and
15		he was like oh you can always put her in a white tshirt and skinny jeans↓
16		(1.0)
17	LB	I was like if I had if I had [that option I probably would]
18	B	[Thats like ] thats like Mark that
19		jeez I were better dressed than 'im (1.0) [at his wedding (1.0) bluddy hell]
20	LB	[Ah yeah mark just wear shirt and]
21		jeans done he=
22	B	Yeah (1.0) no . he I think he actually wore trousers (1.0 ) but (1.5) looked a
23		[ <i>right</i> scruff]
24	LB	[Should hope so] he had um he had his belt tucked into' side he do his belt
25		up and had it tucked in (1.0) [on the photo]
26	LC	[((laughs)) ]
27	B	[That belt an old an old battry belt ] →
28	LB	[And moira was in a suit as well want she ]
29	B	←that ma dad got when he were in [when he were in] the marines
30	LB	[Battry belt?]
31	B	Battry belt they used to have these leather belts to strap battries together .
32		when they radio operators=
33	LB	Yeah =
34	B	An me dad still had his old belt from marines an he wore that [Mark wore]
35		that
36	LB	[↑Did he? ]
37	B	Yeah (2.0) [it just looks like a normal belt ]
38	LB	[people do get married in uniform ]don't they still if you're in the
39		army you get married in uniform =
40	LC	mm yeah=
41	B	Yeah
42	LB	Which is pretty [good]
43	LC	[And ]if you have yer army friends there they all do the .
44		thing with their[ swords ]so you can walk underneath it
45	B	[yeah ]
46	LB	mm
47	B	Yeah (1.0)

49	LC	((coughs))
50	LB 6:55	Why aren't you in the army ey? Mm? (2.0)
51		((background noise))