Being a Couple in Life and Work

Marjorie Goodwin, Luca Greco, Lorenza Mondada

BEING A COUPLE IN LIFE AND WORK

Marjorie Harness Goodwin, entretien mené par Luca Greco, Lorenza Mondada

Article disponible en ligne à l'adresse :
----
https://www.cairn.info/revue-langage-et-societe-2021-2-page-167.htm
----

Being a Couple in Life and Work

Marjorie Harness Goodwin
UCLA
mgoodwin@anthro.ucla.edu

entretien mené par

Luca Greco
Université de Lorraine
luca.greco@univ-lorraine.fr

Lorenza Mondada
Université de Bâle
lorenza.mondada@unibas.ch

Cet entretien avec Marjorie Harness Goodwin a été mené en anglais par email au cours du mois de mars en 2021. Il retrace la vie intellectuelle commune de Charles (Chuck) Goodwin et Marjorie Harness (Candy) Goodwin. Les réponses ont été formulées par écrit par Marjorie Harness Goodwin.

The Beginnings with Chuck

Question: Chuck and you met and became a couple at a remarkable moment, corresponding with the very beginning of your training and career. Could you please come back to these beginnings? How the fact of being a couple in life and work made a huge difference for both of you? How did you start to work together and develop a truly collaborative way of doing fieldwork, doing video and engaging in data analysis?

As a couple, Chuck and I could share ideas constantly and review each other's work. Most importantly we shared enthusiasm for the other's projects. In the early 70's when I was doing my fieldwork among urban African American children in West Philadelphia, Chuck was working as a videographer at the Philadelphia Child Guidance Clinic filming therapy sessions, our dinner conversations concerned what types of observations we had been making about human interaction during fieldwork or at work. When Bill Labov gave us the Sacks lectures in 1971 (Sacks 1992[1]) we were constantly talking about them.

Each evening I'd come home from fieldwork exuberant that children had permitted me to audio-record in the midst of highly dramatic events I barely understood but was sure had to be central to the children's lives. After I transcribed events of the "he-said-she-said" gossip events, Chuck and I looked intensively at the data together. His legal training at New York University School of Law (1965-1966) was essential for helping me to understand how embedded utterances such as "Terry said you said I said" could generate a vernacular legal system.

With the African American children on the street in 1970 videotaping was unthinkable. I needed an unobtrusive recording device that appeared part of my persona. I carried a Sony TC110 Cassette recorder with an internal microphone over my shoulder and could move about with the children on the street quite easily.

The scenes we wanted to investigate with video were quite diverse (see Goodwin C. 1981:175-78). After documenting children's play on a public playground with a Super 8 camera that permitted filming for only three minutes in 1969, in 1970 we decided to invest in recording equipment that would record longer stretches of interaction: the Sony Portapak AV-3400/AVC-3400, battery-powered, self-contained video tape analog recording system. The portapack used the EIAJ-1 format, and had 30-minute capacity, as well as playback capability. Though deemed "portable" the Portapak itself weighed about 19 pounds, in addition to the weight of the camera. In order to capture interaction at a suburban Pittsburgh Fourth of July block party, we built a cart to transport the Portapak down the street to film neighbors talking on their lawn while viewing the events taking place on the street. We ventured to the Italian Market in Philadelphia and were able to capture Italian-American butchers telling stories about recent dates as they cut meat.

---

1. Les « lectures » auxquelles fait référence Marjorie Harness Goodwin ont été publiées à titre posthume en 1992.

Whenever we went to visit family in New Jersey, we took the Portapak and filmed every gathering of the Goodwins we could; this included bridge games, teen swim parties, birthday parties, and family reunions. Wherever we went, we were greeted by "Oh No. Here they come again!" The Portapak was part of our identity. When attending the Summer Institute of Linguistics in Ann Arbor and taking classes with Sacks and Schegloff in 1973, we took the Portapak with us and were able to film (with tape Sacks gave us) members of the Loyal Order of the Moose (a fraternal and service organization) and their families at both an ice cream social and a picnic in southern Michigan. Since my cousins lived nearby in Ohio we visited them, arriving early to place a microphone overhead in a tall tree above where their picnic table was set up. I, Candy, usually approached the people to be filmed and explained what we wanted to do; Chuck did almost all the filming (with headphones on to render him a nonparticipant in the scene).

Fieldwork

Question : You have a long-standing ethnographic fieldwork experience. You and Chuck always highlighted the importance of ethnography for the kind of research you were proposing on social interaction. Could you say something about your specific vision of ethnography for interactional studies? Could also say how you adjusted your way of engaging in fieldwork depending on the very diverse terrains you worked on ?

Long term ethnography (and a year's work of making transcriptions!) permits one to see the ways in which language has social consequences over time. By audio taping children regularly over a year's time I was able to track how gossip about someone at one point in time was consequential for rearranging the girls' social organization (Goodwin M. H. 1990). Talking about someone behind her back is treated as one of the most reprehensible actions of the girls' group I studied. By telling stories about such a party in her absence we see how the characters in the stories switch with new audiences so that tellings are continually and contingently made relevant to the current audience. Stories may elicit commitments to confront the offending party from which one cannot back down without losing face; stories launch an event that is entertaining for the entire neighborhood as drama is played out in confrontation. We witness the power of a girl who is an instigator to sanction another's inappropriate behavior in multiple phases, often enduring several weeks.

In our studies of family interaction at the UCLA Sloan Center on Everyday Lives of Families we had weekly lunch meetings with our cross-disciplinary team, which included psychologists, archaeologists, medical anthropologists, education researchers as well as linguistic anthropologists. The discussions at these meetings permitted understanding family interaction from multiple angles (Goodwin M. H. and Goodwin C. 2013).

In order to understand the complexity of scientific practice, in archeological or geological field schools, Chuck needed to immerse himself in the culture of the disciplines to grasp the embodied practices of each, as well as the ways in which newcomers were brought into the group. It was this total immersion with scientists, engaging with them around the clock – whether at the mouth of the Amazon (Goodwin C. 1995) or the back country of Yellowstone (Kastens et al. 2009) – that delighted Chuck.

Terrains

Question : With Chuck you have covered a large array of social situations: informal exchanges among friends in ordinary situations, interactions between children, complex professional settings, interactions with impaired participants, and later on the study of families within the Sloan Project. Would you say that these different types of situations have occasioned (but also responded to) different research questions and invited you to change your way of thinking about language and the body?

Certainly the different groups and communities we studied invited diverse types of analysis. Within children's groups conflict is ubiquitous and makes possible analysis of highly collaborative oppositional sequences that exhibit structures such as format tying for linking utterances across time. Stories told at dinner, at a picnic, or in other rather stationery locations render possible examination of a different form of verbal virtuosity among adults, resulting in the examination of how bodies, talk and gestures are coordinated. Throughout all that we investigated the idea of situated activity systems that Goffman (1961 : 95-99) proposed was fundamental. We focused on a variety of sign systems – posture, gaze, gesture and features of the environment – that were made use of in addition to talk to accomplish courses of action in the life worlds of various communities.

When we started working on the Workplace Project (1989-1991) at San José Airport with Lucy Suchman, we began to see that co-operative action is not restricted to co-presence. In complex work settings

such as an airport, participants are linked not only to immediate co-present workers, but also with coworkers with whom they communicate at a distance (Goodwin C. 1996; Goodwin C. and Goodwin M. 1996; Goodwin M. H. 1996). We are surrounded by objects that embody resources and solutions created by earlier actors no longer present. The airport's operations room comes equipped with a rich array of material artifacts (e.g., computers, radios of various types, documents, telephones, video screens, etc.). However, different tasks require alternative local tool kits; and, moreover, within each task, tools change as the activity progresses. The operations room, with its equipment, is like a stage set for multiple courses of action. However, it is not yet action itself; to describe the reflexive relationship between available tools and the actions that constitute the work of the operations room requires analysis of endogenous local activities. In the task of assembling a response to a radio call from a pilot about what gate a plane should go to ("I understand gate 14 is occupied. Do you have any instructions for it?") an operations worker makes use of an array of different types of technology clustered in her workspace; each piece of equipment provides structurally different kinds of information helpful in solving a problem (Goodwin M. H. 1995). Moreover, one can see the progressive reshaping of the operations worker's response as she takes into account these various tools and documents. Talk of the ops worker is embedded within situated activity systems which have their own routinized structure and sequence; without ethnography one would not understand this embeddedness or the nature of her achieved response. The work with Lucy Suchman had obvious relevance for many of Chuck's studies of scientific practice.

At the airport the plane schedule for mechanics and airplane baggage loaders was like an architecture for perception, similar to the Munsell color chart for archeologists. We began to see the importance of artifacts for accomplishing work-relevant tasks. For Vygotsky (1962, 1978) the inclusion of the material world was obvious, though it had been neglected by most conversation analysts. By including the material world in our analysis we began to see, for example, how the hop scotch grid made it possible for English language learners new to the US to articulate the moves of the game and constitute moves of players as violations. Opening up the material world to investigation along with embodied interaction was crucial, as it is abundantly utilized, especially by aphasics, in meaning making.

Working on practices in the children's game of hop scotch, on interaction with an aphasic person in his family and with intimate interactions among family members with the Sloan project, we saw the centrality of affect in generating stance in new ways (Goodwin M. H., Cekaite & Goodwin C. 2012). We began to consider including pitch contours and later voice quality spectrograms in our work to demonstrate some of the acoustic features of interaction that are important. Alongside good sound (made possible with lavaliere mikes within the Sloan project) we needed good depictions of the gestural and postural stances taken by embodied actors as well. With the investigation of families in the Sloan project, attention was given to features of touch that construct and constitute intimacy. The Sloan project was the launching of my investigation of multi-sensorial haptic interactions (Goodwin M. H. 2017).

Bodies and Multimodality in Interaction

Question : Your common and individual work on bodies in interaction has been ground-breaking for the study of human interaction in communication and anthropology as well as the social sciences in general. How did you start to conceive the dimension of embodiment in interaction and how did your vision evolve during your careers? Which models inspired you and how did you aim at doing a distinctive kind in enquiry (for example when compared to Kendon and the tradition of gesture studies?)

The first year we were together (1969) we filmed children in the playground with a super eight camera to attempt to discover what we termed "rituals," patterned sequences of interaction in the midst of play. Thirty pages of transcripts of these embodied actions are saved in notebooks along with course notes, readings and syllabi from Goffman and Labov. We made frame-by-frame transcripts of the interactions of two girls in their playground encounters (each with her own column), with particular attention to the achievement of joint attention through such actions as "hand tapping on the arm, touch in the small of the back" by one party and "swing around join group, look up in indicated direction" by the other. We examined the ecology of embodied conflict -- how positions of victim and perpetrator were co-constructed by children themselves and in interaction with a playground aide. In a diagram (resembling a cybernetic model) Chuck drew, he noted possibilities of "control others" and "show others respect." Though cumbersome, the descriptions captured how bodies were positioned vis-a-vis one another in social space.

Working with Gail Jefferson in the early seventies at weekly seminars in our home, we began to look intensively at non-vocal behavior in videotapes we had collected. Gail had an incredible ability to help us discover things about the simultaneity of various modalities (in assessments, for example). With Gail we began to see the value of line drawings of video frames to illustrate embodied activity. To show how collaborative action is achieved through modifications in non-vocal units, in repair-like moves, we froze video images and Gail drew on plastic Saran wrap on top of the television screen. Her images are captured in Figures 4.1 to 4.5 of Chuck's book Conversational Organization (1981: 145-147). Chuck wanted to show how participants can modify their emerging nonvocal action so that precise collaborative actions can be achieved (1981: 144). In chapter three of the book, "Notes on the Organization of Engagement," he included a series of five of Gail's line drawings to illustrate forms of engagement display and disengagement. There, in an early discussion of participation, Chuck noted that "one feature of engagement displays is that the display of one individual proposes something about the participation status of the other" (1981: 96). Chuck further states: "Each party's body thus displays an analysis of what the other is doing and by that very display constrains what the other can or should be doing." (1981: 96).

Kendon's work on "the role of visible behavior in the organization of social interaction" (1973) was informative in Chuck's work. More importantly, we attended a range of seminars with Goffman. His Fall 1969 seminar on "Public Order" offered a nine page bibliography featuring four divisions: animal studies, expression and indicators, cross-cultural, and public order. A crucial Goffman seminar was based on ethological displays (which became "Gender Advertisements" Goffman 1976); Goffman with ethologist John Smith and the class collectively explored the ads of gendered positionings and fashioning of bodies, examining eye gaze and material settings. In a seminar on "Frame Analysis" we looked at bloopers, Johnny Carson monologues, and Berkeley radio announcers. In other seminars Goffman presented his ideas which launched Relations in Public (Goffman 1971) and Forms of Talk (Goffman 1981). When Gail Jefferson came to the University of Pennsylvania, we had seminars together with Goffman and Labov, and went over some of our video and audio materials with them. Goffman wanted his students to explore their materials without any pre-conceived schemas or framings. After presenting my PhD proposal he chided me

for wanting to combine multiple perspectives and disciplines without first staking out my own position.

The Issue of Participation and How it Evolved Over Time

Question : Your common work has been very important for the way you revisited Goffman's notion of footing but also the general idea of participation as presented by him and then developed by some of his other students (e.g. rather in terms of participation 'structure'). Could you tell us the main distinctive points you wanted to make in rethinking these two notions and more generally in putting participation at the center of the agenda in anthropology and communication? Later on, both of you insisted on the multi-layered, polyphonic, laminated dimension of turns at talk and more generally of participants' contributions to interaction: is that a prolongation of your ongoing discussion of Goffman's ideas?

From the onset we felt that participation was central to the organization of human activity. We think of participation as temporally unfolding process through which separate participants demonstrate to each other their ongoing understanding of the events that they are engaged in by building actions that contribute to the further progression of these same events.

Our work on the interactive organization of a sentence (Goodwin C. 1979) as well as mutual monitoring (Goodwin M. H. 1980) closely analyzes the ways multiple recipients in face-to-face encounters attend to talk through various sorts of non-vocal displays (headshakes that express awe at what the speaker is saying, nods that enthusiastically endorse the speaker's talk), or simply acknowledge the speaker, causing a speaker to seek to a more attentive recipient (Goodwin C. 1979). The form of listenership affects the ongoing progress of speaker's talk, as new segments of an utterance are appended to solicit a more appreciative hearer. Hearers can, in addition, also choose to provide playful commentary on speaker's talk through byplay (Goodwin M. H. 1997), or heckling, opening up two simultaneously organized floors orchestrated relative to one another with respect to gaze direction and body position.

When examining children's disputes using audiotape we saw that initially a contest of reciprocal counters or ritual insults partitioned the field into two disputing parties. However when a participant changed the operative field to storytelling, much more than movement from one genre to another was involved. The story expanded the somewhat limiting participation framework of the dispute. A story makes it possible for parties not initially involved to align themselves within particular

positions in the dispute and introduce into it events from beyond the immediate interaction. Tellers could animate characters in the story in the past that worked to recruit others into the story, with alignments that could change the story field dramatically. Our concern was always with how the local social organization of the group was constituted or reconstituted. Initially the focus was on talk. However, looking at storytelling on videotape we could examine the "practices used by rich, feeling bodies to perform relevant operations on a public substrate provided by others" (Goodwin 2018: 135). This entailed attention to the multi layered polyphonic laminated dimensions of turns, the ways that affect pervades what we do. Attention to such features was crucial to examining the resources utilized by an aphasic man to make meaning with his interlocutors. Although he only could speak three words, by making use of affectively rich prosody and embodied action to display stances tied to previous talk, in combination with gesture and the material environment, he not only could express complex ideas, but also recruit others who could function as the animators of what he wanted to say.

Working With and On Chuck

Question : A last part of your work is currently looking at interactions between Chuck and his friends, as well as his medical doctors at the end of his life. How could you connect this approach to the work Chuck did on his father Chil and how this research contributes to refresh participant observation in ethnography? What are the analytical but also moral-political implications of this kind of approach?

In his interview "Charles Goodwin's Reflections on Retirement" in the April 11, 2017 column in Anthropology News (Gershon & Goodwin 2017), Chuck wrote that he considered the most important work he did his work on the social life of aphasia. As he states "With that I (and others) have been able to change the way that people encounter and think about not only people with aphasia, but, more generally, others who differ from themselves." A blood clot that formed on the left hemisphere of Chuck's father's (Chil)'s brain left him with only a three-word vocabulary. However despite this he remained for the rest of his life (19 years after the stroke) a powerful actor. Chuck and I documented Chil's repertoire of resources including rich prosody, gesture, fluid timing, and the ability to understand what others were saying (Goodwin C., Goodwin M. H. & Olsher 2002). Although he lacked syntax, he was able to construct meaning with the help of others. The demonstration of his competence as a speaker who could not speak

underscores the importance of considering the concept of participation; it highlights forms of distributed cognition, central to understanding communication as a distributed multiparty system. An important document of Chuck's thinking about aphasia is accessible in an interview with Chuck conducted by Kathryn A. Bayles, Assistant Director of the National Center for Neurogenic Communication Disorders that was a videotape made in 1996 by Telerounds at University of Arizona. (Goodwin C. & Bales 1996) It is available on Chuck's website[2] as a Youtube video.)

Chuck considered Chil a model for how to live his life. He saw that Chil accepted where he was with his impairment and lived with it. This is the mindset Chuck adopted after his cancer diagnosis. While in the West we often steer clear of discussions of death, Chuck made visible to his students and colleagues the trajectory of his living towards death in email communications and in his lab discussions. This provided a model for others regarding how to accept death as a part of life and has profoundly changed many people's (including medical doctors') ideas about how to approach death. I am working with his cardiologist Mario Deng and colleague Federica Raia, both practitioners of relational medicine, to write about Chuck's journey (see Raia, Goodwin & Deng 2020). Making use of a corpus of two years of interaction between Chuck, Drs. Deng and Raia, and myself taped by Deng in the medical office, in our homes and coffee shops, we are examining how Chuck interprets the meaning of his life through stories he relates as a patient and a colleague in dialogue as well as in public speeches made at his retirement party and a surprise party with friends and colleagues. I am interested in how he incorporates stories of others into the way he chose to live his final days. Lourdes de León's story sent to us via email about how her comadre in Nabenchauk, Chiapas wanted to be surrounded by friends at the end of life was extraordinarily meaningful for Chuck and me. With a Mayan altar I remember Chuck throughout the day. By continuing his Co-Operative Action lab each week scholars from around the world present their ongoing work; we engage with each other in discussions related to his ideas. In the same way that Chuck's work with Chil has opened up discussions about people with impairments, Chuck's own experience serves as an example of how one might discuss death more openly, leading to changes in practices of physicians and patients. My own experiences in talking with a bereavement group in Mexico as well

---

2.   http://www.sscnet.ucla.edu/clic/cgoodwin/

as giving presentations about Chuck's journey have affirmed the relevance of the project.

References

Gershon I. & Goodwin C. (2017), « Charles Goodwin's reflection upon retirement », *Anthropology News* 58, p. e309-e312.

Goffman E. (1961), *Encounters: Two Studies in the Sociology of Interaction*, Indianapolis, Bobbs-Merrill.

Goffman E. (1971), *Relations in Public: Microstudies of the Public Order*, New York, Basic Books.

Goffman E. (1976), *Gender Advertisements*, New York, Harper & Row Publishers.

Goffman E. (1981), *Forms of Talk*, Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania Press.

Goodwin C. (1979), « The interactive construction of a sentence in natural conversation », in Psathas G. (dir.), *Everyday Language: Studies in Ethnomethodology*, New York, Irvington Publishers, p. 97-121.

Goodwin C. (1981), *Conversational Organization: Interaction Between Speakers and Hearers*, New York, Academic Press.

Goodwin C. (1995), « Seeing in depth », *Social Studies of Sciences* 25, p. 237-274.

Goodwin C. (1996). « Transparent vision », in Ochs E., Schegloff E. A. & Thompson S. (dir.), *Interaction and Grammar*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, p. 370-404.

Goodwin C. (2018), *Co-Operative Action,* Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Goodwin C. & Bales A. K. (1996), « Co-constructing meaning in conversations with a man with severe aphasia (videorecording) », *Telerounds: A Continuing Education Series*, National Center for Neuro-

genic Communication Disorders (University of Arizona) Tucson. Online : <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=rnrikvxeBaI&list=P-LoAkqLNKq5aI-JAIKIJJndI5nAraJlHxq>.

Goodwin C. & Goodwin M. H. (1996), « Seeing as situated activity: formulating planes », in Engeström Y. & Middleton D. (dir.), *Cognition and Communication at Work*, Cambridge Cambridge University Press, p. 61-95.

Goodwin C., Goodwin M. H. & Olsher D. (2002), « Producing sense with nonsense syllables: turn and sequence in the conversations of a man with severe aphasia », in Fox B., Ford C. & Thompson S. (dir.), *The Language of Turn and Sequence*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, p. 56-80.

Goodwin M. H. (1980), « Processes of *mutual monitoring* implicated in the production of description sequences », *Sociological Inquiry* 50, p. 303-317.

Goodwin M. H. (1990), *He-Said-She-Said: Talk as a Social Organization among Black Children*, Bloomington, Indiana University Press.

Goodwin M. H. (1995), « Assembling a response: setting and collaboratively constructed work talk », in Have P. T. & Psathas G. (dir.), *Situated Order: Studies in the Social Organization of Talk and Embodied Activities*, Washington DC, University Press of America, p. 173-186.

Goodwin M. H. (1996), « Informings and announcements in their environment: prosody within a multi-activity work setting », in Couper-Kuhlen E. & Selting M. (dir.), *Prosody in Conversation: Interactional Studies*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, p. 436-461.

Goodwin M. H. (1997), « Byplay: Negotiating evaluation in story-telling », in Guy G. R., Feagin C., Schriffin D. & Baugh J. (dir.), *Towards a Social Science of Language: Papers in Honor of William Labov 2: Social Interaction and Discourse Structures*, Amsterdam, John Benjamins, p. 77-102.

Goodwin M. H. (2017), « Haptic sociality: the embodied interactive constitution of intimacy through touch », in Meyer C., Streeck J. & Jordan J. S. (dir.), *Intercorporeality: Emerging Socialities in Interaction*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, p. 73-102.

Goodwin M. H., Cekaite A. & Goodwin C. (2012), « Emotion as stance », Sorjonen M.-L. & Perakyla, A. (dir.), *Emotion in Interaction*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, p. 16-41.

Goodwin M. H. & Goodwin C. (2013), « Nurturing », in Ochs E. & Kremer-Sadklik T. (dir.), *Fast Forward Family: Home, Work and Relationships in Middle Class America*, Berkeley, University of California Press, p. 151-173.

Kastens K. A., Manduca C. A., Cervato C., Froderman R., Goodwin C., Liben L. S. & Titus S. (2009), « How geoscientists think and learn », *Eos Transactions. American Geophysical Union* 90 (31), p. 265-266.

Kendon A. (1973), « The role of visible behaviour in the organization of social interaction », in Von Cranach M. & Vine I. (dir.), *Social Communication and Movement: Studies of Interaction and Expression in Man and Chimpanzee*, London, Academic Press, p. 29-74.

Raia F., Goodwin M. H. & Deng M. (2020), « Forms of touch during medical encounters with an advanced heart failure doctor who practices relational medicine », *Social Interaction: Video-Based Studies of Human Sociality* 3 (1). Online: <https://tidsskrift.dk/socialinteraction/article/view/120259>.

Sacks H., ([1964-1972] 1992), *Lectures on Conversation* (2 volumes), (edited by Gail Jefferson, with an introduction of Emanuel A. Schegloff), Oxford, Basil Blackwell.

Vygotsky L. S. (1962), *Thought and Language*, Cambridge, MIT Press.

Vygotsky L. S. (1978), *Mind in Society: The Development of Higher Psychological Processes*, Cambridge, Harvard University Press.