Not Being Bound by What You Can See Now

Charles Goodwin in Conversation with René Salomon

Abstract: In this interview Charles (Chuck) GOODWIN not only reflects on his academic career, but also gives a fascinating and profound insight into the genesis of his own theoretical approach. On the one hand it becomes apparent that he and his spouse, Marjorie Harness GOODWIN, are among the few people who have contributed to the development of several approaches that now belong to the established canon of sociology. On the other hand GOODWIN allows a deep insight into the formation and background of a social-theoretical movement, more diverse and networked than currently visible. At the same time, he manages to introduce the more complex assumptions of his research results and theoretical conclusions. He thereby draws a line from his early work in the 1970s to this day—starting in the context of people like Gregory BATESON; working with people like Erving GOFFMAN, Gail JEFFERSON, Harvey SACKS, William LABOV and many more. It shows the creativity and openness, with which Charles GOODWIN was able to overcome the divide between theoretical schools and to thereby develop a genuine approach. In the early 1970s he already had succeeded in illuminating areas that could hardly be more topical today.

Table of Contents

Biographical Note

Charles GOODWIN (October 9, 1943 – March 31, 2018) was one of the most creative minds in the field of *interaction studies*, *distributed cognition*, *studies of visuality and materiality*, *conversation analysis* (CA), *ethnography of science* and *video analysis*. GOODWIN himself labeled his research focus with the term of *co-operative action*. He and his wife Marjorie Harness GOODWIN, who is a distinguished research professor of *anthropology* at the University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA), have been decisive in developing various approaches. Up until his retirement he worked as a distinguished research professor of communication at UCLA. At the beginning of his career GOODWIN used photography, video and computer technology to explore the unfolding processes of the co-operative production of meaning and the semiotics of utterances, gestures and the use of materials and tools in their sequentiality. After studying English literature and spending a year at New York University School of Law (1965-1966), he worked as a caseworker in Harlem for the New York City Department of Welfare for one year (1966-1967). He afterwards became assistant to Klaus KRIPPENDORFF from 1969-1971 at the famous Annenberg School of Communication (University of Pennsylvania), bringing him in touch with cybernetics. Due to his interest in the work of Gregory BATESON, GOODWIN began as a research associate and videographer at the Philadelphia Child Guidance Clinic where he studied family therapy sessions via video recordings. During this period he also met his wife, Marjorie Harness, who earned her doctorate under Erving GOFFMAN at the Department of Anthropology, who was affiliated with the University of Pennsylvania's Center for Urban Ethnography that was led by John SZWED, Erving GOFFMAN and Dell HYMES. As a result Charles GOODWIN attended classes of Erving GOFFMAN and William LABOV and worked closely with people such as Gail JEFFERSON. Through JEFFERSON in particular an intense exchange with the then protagonists of ethnomethodology was established. Charles and Marjorie Harness GOODWIN are for this reason among the few people who have studied within the intellectual spheres of numerous founders of different sociological and sociolinguistic approaches. Ever since, GOODWIN pursued the further development of the themes that were already laid out early in his work managing to transcend the boundaries of different social-theoretical approaches. After graduating with a Ph.D. in communications from the Annenberg School of Communications in 1977, GOODWIN taught anthropology at the University of South Carolina. From 1989-1991 he was a research consultant at the Xerox Palo Alto Research Center. In 1996, he and his wife transferred to UCLA where he worked first at the Department of Applied Linguistics and then in the Department of Communication; Marjorie Harness GOODWIN at the Department of Anthropology. In 2018 Charles GOODWIN received the Garfinkel-Sacks Award for Distinguished Scholarship from the American Sociological Association and the Lifetime Achievement Award conferred by the International Society of Conversation Analysis. Shortly before his death in 2018, GOODWIN's book "Co-Operative Action" was published; the book provides a synthesizing synopsis and further development of his research results

from the last 50 years, presenting an innovative and empirically saturated theoretical approach to the understanding of human interaction.[1] [1]

About the Interview

The nearly three-hour interview was conducted on June 22, 2017 via Skype as part of the project "Harold Garfinkel and the Studies in Ethnomethodology. An Interview Issue,"[2] edited by Dominik GERST, Hannes KRÄMER and René SALOMON. It was recorded on tape and transcribed and revised several times via e-mail exchange. Despite his advanced illness, Charles GOODWIN was eager to finalize this interview. The present interview text provides the final content as authorized by Charles GOODWIN on March 25, 2018. The final version was authorized after his death by his wife Marjorie Harness GOODWIN in April 2019. [2]

1. Encounters

René SALOMON: Chuck, do you remember when you first got in touch with "Studies in Ethnomethodology" (GARFINKEL, 1967)?

Charles GOODWIN: The way I encountered it, is that I was at the University of Pennsylvania and Erving GOFFMAN[3] was funding my wife Candy's [Marjorie Harness GOODWIN[4]] research. She was doing fieldwork with African American kids in Philadelphia and they had gotten a large grant for the Center for the Study of Urban Ethnography that John SZWED[5] and Erving GOFFMAN headed. In the building, there was a manuscript copy of "Studies in Ethnomethodology" (in the following also *Studies*)—so we read that. Now, my history with this book is probably different than that of many people. I wasn't as struck by that. I really liked the *Agnes* Chapter, but at that point it didn't really have an earthshattering effect on me. The thing that did was the SACKS-lectures[6] (SACKS, 1992). Both

---

1   See KRUG (2019) for a review.

2   See the Introduction by Dominik GERST, Hannes KRÄMER and René SALOMON (2019) in this issue.

3   Erving GOFFMAN (1922-1982) was a Canadian born sociologist, key figure in the studies of the *interaction order* and one of the most influential North American sociologists. President of the American Sociological Association in 1982. Major areas of work include sociology of the interaction order, the social construction of *self*, social organization (*framing*) of experience, total institutions and social *stigma* (see GOFFMAN, 1983).

4   Marjorie Harness GOODWIN (*1944), linguistic anthropologist, wife of Charles GOODWIN. From 1976 to 1996 she was professor of anthropology at the University of South Carolina and since 1996 she is professor of anthropology at UCLA. She worked as research consultant at Xerox PARC from 1989 to 1991. Her major research interests are the *embodied language practices* of children, co-operative action, interaction in families and workplace ethnography (see GOODWIN, M.H. 1990, 2006; GOODWIN, M.H. & CEKAITE, 2018).

5   John SZWED (*1936), anthropologist and sociologist, jazz scholar, record producer and musician. Professor of music and jazz studies and director of the Center for Jazz Studies at Columbia University in the City of New York. Major research interests of his work include arts, folk music and film noir (see SZWED & WHITTEN, 1970).

6   Harvey SACKS (1935-1975), founder of conversation analysis and prominent figure of early ethnomethodology, had a huge impact on sociology, conversation analysis and *linguistics*. Lecturer in Los Angeles and professor in Irvine (1964-1975). Major areas of his work include *sequential analysis*, membership categorization and social science methodology (see SACKS,

my wife and I were working with recordings of human interaction. I was working at the Philadelphia Child Guidance Clinic. Initially, my interest was in Gregory BATESON[7]; the people who were there had worked with BATESON and so I was video recording family therapy sessions. Candy was recording kids on the streets. Her advisor was GOFFMAN and he was interesting because he told her not to use any of his categories. So, at some point she decided, "Well, why don't we just try to figure out how the kids get from utterance to utterance?" And then after she'd done this for several months, she went to LABOV[8]. He really liked it and told her about Harvey SACKS. This was probably 1971. LABOV had the mimeographed early lectures of Harvey SACKS in his office and Candy would take them out so we could read them in our apartment—and it was mind blowing. I think we were in the best position, perhaps of anybody, to read the SACKS-lectures (SACKS, 1992), because both of us had been grappling with the problem of how to analyze *in situ* human interaction. We tried to see how what he was saying might be relevant to the kinds of phenomena we were each finding in the materials we were working with. Now, it wasn't just trying to "apply a concept," but how could you begin to look at interaction in the way he was looking at it? We did that for several months and went back together to present some of Candy's work on the "He-Said-She-Said" (GOODWIN, M.H., 1990) to GOFFMAN. We were kind of his students, though I wasn't officially, but we were working with him—but in a way that was quite different because he never worked with tapes the way that we did, though he would listen to recordings of radio shows. GOFFMAN refused to sign SACKS's dissertation. But when SACKS asked GOFFMAN to give Gail JEFFERSON[9] a post-doc at the Center for Urban Ethnography he happily accepted and that is how she came to Philadelphia—a major event in our intellectual lives. When we met her, our initial interest in Gail was only that she was someone who had actually met Harvey SACKS. We quickly discovered what an extraordinary analyst of data she was. We learned more about how to look at audio and video data with her than from anyone else. She was our main teacher. Moreover, after she arrived there was an extraordinary series of seminars at the Center for Urban Ethnography with GOFFMAN, LABOV, Gail JEFFERSON and other students. We didn't realize at the time just how extraordinary the education we were getting was. I later met many students from UCLA whose lives had been completely transformed by their experience of taking classes and seminars with GARFINKEL. It must have been extraordinary then. Unfortunately, we did not get

1992).

7   Gregory BATESON (1904-1980), anthropologist, philosopher, social scientist. One of the intellectual key figures of the last century that influenced disciplines like cybernetics, sociology, systems theory, visual anthropology, psychotherapy, epistemology and many more. BATESON had an impact on the writings of many scientists like Erving GOFFMAN and Paul WATZLAWICK (see BATESON, 1972, 1979).

8   William LABOV (*1927), linguist. He developed the *variationist sociolinguistics* approach and is professor emeritus at the Linguistics Department of the University of Pennsylvania. Major research interests of his work include semantics, grammatical features, phonological variation, synchronic patterns of sociolinguistic variation, language change and American dialectology (see LABOV, 1966).

9   Gail JEFFERSON (1938-2008), sociologist and co-founder of conversation analysis, is best known for developing notation conventions for transcribing talk/speech and for editing Harvey SACKS' "Lectures on Conversation" (1992). She held various research positions in the US, the UK and the Netherlands. Major areas of her work include sequential analysis, turn-taking, laughter in conversation, trouble talk (see SACKS, SCHEGLOFF & JEFFERSON, 1974).

to UCLA until many years later after he had retired. At that time, I was in charge of videotaping family therapy sessions and that was what I was initially going to do in my dissertation. But I was unhappy with it, because it was all from the perspective of family therapy. What could be quite interesting in retrospect, from the perspective of *studies of work* and for the study of video, is that about 1970, *SONY* came out with the *Portapak*—and I think that was quite important. The *Portapak* was the first video recorder that consumers could buy. The reason I was at the Child Guidance Clinic and the reason why most of the early video work, like SHEFLEN's[10] and so, was done with therapy sessions was that at that point you still needed a television studio to record people or setting up cameras. And with the *Portapak* you could go off into the field. So, I left the clinic and we began to videotape family dinners or picnics, or people working in a meat market. I started working on that for my dissertation and when I'd find something that was interesting we'd look at the recordings together in the seminar. And that to me was my real education. [3]

René SALOMON: So, would it be right to say that this way of doing ethnography influenced you more than the book "Studies in Ethnomethodology?"

Charles GOODWIN: I would not restrict the influence of *ethnomethodology* (EM) to the book. I think that for instance SACKS and then Gail were very crucial. Gail had a very unusual background. She didn't have a background in sociology or anything like that, but she was an incredible teacher and thoroughly blew us away with her brilliance. Not by reputation—which she didn't have at that point—but by the brilliance of the way that she could look. And she is actually one of the people who founded video analysis. So, we would go over in the apartment looking at the videos, I would say something and then she would comment on it and we'd talk about it. In many ways, she would lead us to think about the issues in ways that were relevant to analysis, which would certainly include EM. So that was really learning: very involved in going over actual materials together and in particular the SACKS-lectures (SACKS, 1992) and the encounters, the talks and the seminars with Gail, rather than initially starting from a literature research. I do think that that was crucial for several things. One thing, it's something that Jürgen STREECK[11] has talked about; was that in a certain way the earliest studies were still largely focused on *language*. And in this way, you were getting into all the issues of embodiment. Jürgen STREECK has an afterword to a new book by Christian MEYER[12] and Ulrich VON WEDELSTEAD[13] (STREECK, 2017). It's a very interesting book on sports, but what you're getting into is the apprehension of other people's bodies. And if you think of it, it raises a lot of questions about EM and *intersubjectivity*. The apprehension of other people's bodies in a way before or prior to language. So, we were immediately getting into all of these issues of *embodiment*. [4]

---

10 Albert E. SCHEFLEN (1920-1980), psychiatrist and key figure in the studies on body language in communication systems and social order (see SCHEFLEN, 1972).

11 See the Interview with Jürgen STREECK in this issue (STREECK, KRÄMER & SALOMON, 2019).

12 See the interview with Christian MEYER in this issue (BERGMANN, MEYER, SALOMON & KRÄMER, 2019).

13 Ulrich VON WEDELSTAED, sociologist and ethnomethodologist at the University of Konstanz, Germany (see WEDELSTEAD & MEYER, 2017).

René SALOMON: Embodiment was already a focus in these early years?

Charles GOODWIN: Oh yes, in 1970. In a certain way, CA is now, I would almost say reified, as a particular kind of a field with a research agenda and everything. And it looks, in a certain way, very monolithic. But I think that one of the things that we were really aware of at that point, was that there were three very different people involved in it—there was SACKS, there was SCHEGLOFF[14] and there was JEFFERSON. I almost saw them as like a CALDER[15] mobile that were flowing around each other. And I think the thing that's lost is that they each had very different interests. SCHEGLOFF was the big systematizer and I think that's really good. But that was only one perspective. Gail once said, "The boys are into systems." Now, for my way of thinking about the stuff that led to my dissertation: it was the interaction between speakers and hearers. So, it was the sense that an utterance is not something just in the stream of speech, but that an utterance requires the co-participation of a hearer. And there's controversy about this, but let's just say it's a semiotic modality. You've got the body and it's the way in which the body is showing orientation—the body is frequently displaying understanding and stance. So that the utterance is emerging through the co-operative work of the speaker and hearer together and not just in the stream of speech of the speaker. And Gail was very instrumental in developing that perspective. Right now, if you look at some of the work of LEVINSON[16] and everything, it is almost taken as a dogma that the place where understanding is demonstrated is in a next utterance. And I think that's wrong. The understanding was demonstrated within the utterance itself. And that's working with Gail—that is what really got me and then also Candy into those issues. So, if you look at Gail's paper, say on *precision timing* (JEFFERSON, 1973), it's the way that people are coming in right in the midst of an utterance. So, I would not want to buy into this picture of there being a single master architecture largely focused on *turn-taking*. I think *turn-taking* is very important, but it's only one of the systems that's going on. [5]

René SALOMON: Could you elaborate on the other important things?

Charles GOODWIN: What I do think, what Gail was into, was the *in-situ* intelligibility of the world as it's unfolding, moment by moment, through everything that the participants are doing. And she was anti-dogma—and I think it should go down that she was an incredible teacher and mentor. I had one other seminar once with another big person in the field and I made an observation of the tape and the comment came, "Where is that in the data?" And it immediately shut me down. But with Gail you would see something in the data and she'd be enthused. The main way of working with her was, "Oh, look at that!" And then we'd begin to develop it analytically as fun and a game. And she was into a whole host of

---

14 Emanuel SCHEGLOFF (*1937), co-founder of conversation analysis and best known for transferring CA into a discipline in its own right. Distinguished professor in Los Angeles (since 1996). Major areas of his work include sequential analysis, membership categorization and repair in conversation (see SCHEGLOFF, 1968).

15 Alexander CALDER (1898-1976), avant-garde artist and sculptor, member of the Abstraction-Création group, a loose association of abstract artists.

16 Stephen Curtis LEVINSON (*1947), British social scientist and linguist, studies and researches on the relation between culture, language and cognition. Works as one of the scientific directors of the Max Planck Institute for Psycholinguistics in Nijmegen, Netherlands (see LEVINSON, 2000).

crucial issues. But she didn't quote anybody—she didn't quote GARFINKEL. She wasn't quoting, but we were getting this vision of the world as something being woven together moment by moment through all of these things and finding out how to investigate that. [6]

René SALOMON: And how would you investigate this?

Charles GOODWIN: One thing she did, was that she got a television screen and the problem was that we began to hurt our tapes. And we'd freeze a crucial frame and then she'd put a piece of transparency on it and we kind of outlined key features of people's bodies—in essence making cartoons. Now that is not recognized, because everybody takes the JEFFERSON transcription system as just the typewritten symbols and columns. But she also developed a quite radically different system for how you would capture that video. And my sense is that the body is really a very different kind of thing than the phenomena you see in the stream of speech. But I think there was a focus on conversations being defined as talk in interaction and there was a focus on the organization of talk—notable exceptions early on were people like Christian HEATH[17] and Jürgen STREECK and right now Lorenza MONDADA[18] and Arnulf DEPPERMANN[19]. [7]

René SALOMON: What impact did the *turn-taking* paper (SACKS et al., 1974) have on your work then?

Charles GOODWIN: My sense of that was: Yes, *turn-taking* is great, but there is all this other stuff going on with the body and that's something else that is going to be developed. I was surprised that it became so exclusively the focus on talk. I have a few problems with the *turn-taking* paper—I think it's brilliant, but I don't know if you would really get things from reading the paper itself. I'll give you one example: Like it says in there, that initially a speaker is entitled to one *turn-constructional-unit*. But what's the basis for that? If you look in the lectures—and we'd been watching the whole set of ideas develop—for example at the *stories-structure* paper (SACKS, 1992)*,* SACKS said: "What's the definition of and what would you say about a story? It's a *multi-unit turn*." And then he got into: "initially a speaker is only entitled to one." So, are they in fact doing special work to produce more than one unit? And then you got the *story preface* coming up, that going on and then the multi-unit turn. Now analytically and experientially—and by experientially I mean going over the data, getting the basis for why a speaker is only entitled to one unit at a time, you're seeing it in things like the *story preface* and et cetera, so you got a basis for it—it seemed to me in a way, what the *turn-*

---

17 Christian HEATH (*1952), professor of work and organizations at King's College, London, England and leader of its Work, Interaction and Technology Research Centre. Main research interests of his work include workplace studies, organizational analysis, social interaction, technology and collaborative work. He is known for his video-based studies of social interaction, drawing on conversation analysis and ethnomethodology (see HEATH, 2013).

18 Lorenza MONDADA (*1963), linguist, is currently professor for French and general linguistics at the University of Basel, Switzerland. Her major research interests are multimodality, embodiment and conversation in workplace settings (see MONDADA, 1994).

19 Arnulf DEPPERMANN (*1964), professor of German linguistics at University of Mannheim, Germany. Head of Pragmatics Department at the Institute for German Language. Major research interests are language, conversation analysis, semantics, multimodal interaction and video analysis (see DEPPERMANN, 2001, 2013).

taking paper was doing, was giving you the products of an analysis and just kind of stating them. [8]

2. Seeing Deeper

René SALOMON: So, Gail JEFFERSON was a really important figure in the development of CA and your own approach?

Charles GOODWIN: One of my agendas is to try to also rescue Gail in this because I think right now, with some exceptions, she's being very forgotten. Gail was a true itinerant scholar and she went all over the world. And she taught people both through analysis and the methods of doing the transcription. It would be an objection to think the transcription systems laid down at the end of the *turn-taking paper* would get it—they don't—it was all the work she did to recruit cohorts of people who knew how to do the work. And I think that was something crucial to the spread of the field of CA. There was a sense that Gail was marginalized, in a variety of ways. She never got a full academic job. And I think there was also sexism. I'm not saying on the part of Harvey SACKS and Manny SCHEGLOFF. One of Harvey's incredible things was to recognize Gail—Gail came to him and she was a dance major, she had no background in sociology. He hired her as his secretary. And when he hired her, he said, "I've got these conversations, could you transcribe them? Oh, you don't have to worry about when they're all talking together, just get the main stuff." And so Gail discovered overlap and she developed a diagrammatic representation for overlap that I think laid out everything else you're going to find—all is coming from Gail's transcription system. And I think Gail initially saw all that deeper than anybody else. And she talked once about how it was, hanging around with SACKS all the time—all the philosophers—but they kind of dropped away and she is the one who stayed by virtue of her work. I think she was the most incredible ear and eye for human interaction and this was recognized by GOFFMAN and LABOV when she came to Penn (University of Pennsylvania). So, it was that development of a cohort of people beginning with us, able to work with the materials as a form of practice, that I think was crucial. Another thing that was very important—but it came quite a bit later for me—was John HERITAGE's[20] book "Garfinkel and Ethnomethodology" (1984)*.* For me, that was a whole education. My background was in communication, so I wasn't trained in either anthropology or *sociology*. I learned anthropology by teaching it. John's book was very important to me, but at least for me and Candy the whole sense of the thing was grasped through working with materials rather than reading in the first place. [9]

René SALOMON: And what role did GARFINKEL play in this—when did you first meet him?

Charles GOODWIN: The first time I met GARFINKEL was in 1979. There was a big conference in Oxford and we went there and met him. He was an

---

20 John Christopher HERITAGE (*1946), sociologist. Distinguished professor of sociology at UCLA, professor emeritus since 2009. One of the key figures of conversation analysis. Areas of his work include institutional talk, turn-taking, political speeches, doctor-patient interaction and epistemic authority. His book "Garfinkel and Ethnomethodology" introduced EM to a wider public (see HERITAGE, 1984).

extraordinarily difficult person, as you probably know. I remember Gail JEFFERSON introduced us and said, "Candy is Erving GOFFMAN's student." And GARFINKEL came up like this, [Chuck bends forward and comes very close to the screen] "You work with Erving GOFFMAN? Are you into ritual?" [laughs] It was awful. I know that it was a big fight that was going on. And my own sense of it is: GARFINKEL had a deep phenomenological background and GOFFMAN also had a rich phenomenological background, but GOFFMAN would cite people writing books about airline stewardesses instead. What Anne RAWLS[21] said to me once was that probably SARTRE[22] was a major influence on GOFFMAN and you could certainly see things from SARTRE like the waiter and everything. And apparently, I don't know if this is true, he went to Paris before he did his fieldwork on Shetland Island and was able to read parts of SARTRE. But nonetheless, GARFINKEL had the deeper phenomenological, philosophic background—whereas GOFFMAN was getting into trouble by analyzing things as ritual. And I do think that at various points the ritual analysis was way too superficial. But on the other hand, what GOFFMAN had—that GARFINKEL really didn't—was the sense of mutual monitoring; the sense of how people were building things together. And I think that was a crucial thing. In a certain way, if you look at things like some of the experiments with the random number generator, where the kid is asking all those things (GARFINKEL, 1967). OK, that's one mind making sense out of what the other is doing. But it's not yet mutual minds together. And that's the thing that GOFFMAN had and GOFFMAN was also not restricted to talk. I think that there was a real, profound contribution of GOFFMAN. And I'm now also thinking there are also issues of face and everything. You're not going to say you're just going to do *ritual*, but those things have to be integrated into it—so there are things to be gathered from all of them. And despite that it would be crazy to get lost in the fights, because they both had these unique, really deep pictures of how human beings build intelligible social worlds in concert with each other and how to look at that. And I've known so many people who took the GARFINKEL classes and the stories I've heard about taking the classes here at UCLA are wonderful—that they were mind-changing experiences. And sometimes not only for the good. It would lead people down into a completely weird trajectory for their lives—and I don't mean this, but maybe it's right—it was almost like a religious encounter. People would get this deep sense. And the more I read of GARFINKEL the more I see how right he was about many of these things. When I read it now, it more and more resonates with things I've only now discovered. So how would I say? I didn't have a big direct influence from GARFINKEL, either through his writing or through him in person. But if I'm going to talk about historically sedimented environments, he was perhaps the most important person and then with GOFFMAN, in creating the environment that CA, *studies of work* and also my own work emerged from. So if I want to say you got an architecture of perceptions and things like that—he was almost seen but

---

21 Anne Warfield RAWLS (*1950), sociologist, director of the GARFINKEL archive. Professor at Bentley University, Massachusetts. Major areas of her work include ethnomethodology, workplace studies and social theory (see GARFINKEL & RAWLS, 2002).

22 Jean-Paul SARTRE (1905-1980), philosopher, author, political activist. Founder of existentialism (see SARTRE, 1943).

unnoticed for me, because certainly a lot of his thinking was embedded in the perspectives of SACKS and Gail, which then became part of my perspective. [10]

René SALOMON: Do you have any idea what the starting point was for SACKS and Gail JEFFERSON to develop their own approach—and where would you see the biggest differences to GARFINKEL?

Charles GOODWIN: The way CA was founded, was that Manny SCHEGLOFF and Harvey SACKS were students of GOFFMAN at Berkeley and then they came here to UCLA to meet with GARFINKEL. But GARFINKEL would turn against the people who were closest to him. The story I heard once, was that SACKS was afraid that suddenly GARFINKEL would turn against him and he would be left alone, as happened frequently. And so, he thought he should have something of his own. Thus, he began to get into CA. Where SACKS went and I don't think GARFINKEL did, was into the actual interactive constitution. If I said GARFINKEL was largely one mind, SACKS was getting people operating off each other and doing all those things. In a sense that integrated both GOFFMAN and GARFINKEL, but it wasn't just putting those two together: I think SACKS was brilliant—he did his own work and he transformed the work of both of them into a much more thoroughly interactive picture of people building worlds together. I think that's something that Gail did as well, through the depth of how she got into it. For instance, when I talk about Gail's depth, consider her work on laughter which she was working on while we were in Philadelphia. She was hearing in the midst of overlapping laughter differences in how a syllable was pronounced and how the other person would then go and match that syllable. And she was also into that at the same time, when she said she was *into intrigue*: that there would be a person proposing that this is all laughable and the other person wouldn't quite go along with them, they'd be fighting to get the other person to go along. And my sense is, that that work has never been followed up, because I don't think anyone else could listen with the depth that she did. And when she'd listen, she was more like a poet than a transcriber or an academic. She was seeing things. It is like what RUSKIN[23] wrote on drawing—you don't want to get just a generic tree you want to get this particular tree—the way it's been shaped by these processes, the way it's leaning over now (RUSKIN, 1857). And that's what Gail would do. She would go into the particulars and then come back out with a generalization. But the generalizations weren't always going into the big system, like the *turn-taking*-system. And I think in many ways this was true for SACKS as well. There is a level of formal analysis that isn't tied to the full-fledged system. There is this thing going on here, precision timing and overlap. There is all this, you could bring it together later—but there is a host of phenomena that are being discovered by virtue of looking very closely at something and asking what people are doing to make this come off. And I think that Gail in particular, but also Harvey, had an incredible eye for that. Which is why I think the "Lectures on Conversation" (SACKS, 1992) should be continued to be read. There is lots and lots of stuff in them that isn't incorporated into the predominant architectures now.

---

23 John RUSKIN (1819-1900), writer, painter, art historian and critic, social philosopher. His work included topics like art, architecture, geology, botany, myth, literature/ poetry, education and political economy (see RUSKIN, 1857).

You can read them and get an idea of how you might look at things in those different ways. [11]

3. "Under GARFINKEL's Orbit"

René SALOMON: Who would you say was primarily involved in this intellectual field and the further development of the ethnomethodological approach at that time?

Charles GOODWIN: My own experience was—whatever EM is—you had a number of different people. You had GARFINKEL and everybody I've met has been blown away by GARFINKEL. But you also had Harvey SACKS, you had Gail JEFFERSON, you had Manny SCHEGLOFF and—for whatever relationship—you had GOFFMAN in that mix as well. And that's the framework for interaction where work emerged. Then there were, maybe, a couple more peripheral people in this sense—for example LABOV. And I think that LABOV's looking into sociolinguistics wasn't all that incorporated. I mean he was a major figure in linguistics, but he wasn't cited. He was very important for opening up the possibility of looking at what people were actually saying to each other, but also doing this in a cultural sense. Someone else around at the time, but I don't think was as important, was Dell HYMES[24]. He was at Penn as well. But he wasn't somebody we turned to. These were my initial encounters and my encounters with GARFINKEL would be repetitively this way: He was very, very interested in our work, he would really like it. And my sense was that he really liked the work I was doing with scientists a lot. But then, after really getting into it a couple of days later, he would become very, very distant and turn away and look away. And this was a very common process with many people—he would get very, very close to people and then suddenly distance himself dramatically, I mean, super dramatically. So, I think it was very hard for people to actually get their dissertations approved under him. GARFINKEL was certainly a thoroughly charismatic person. I've met so many people who were absolutely blown away by their encounters with him. But unlike, say CHOMSKY[25]—who would plant his students all over the place,—GARFINKEL had a hard time getting his students to complete their dissertations and then positioning his students. And I think that that was one of the things that led to the difficulty. I'm only talking third hand, but things I've heard, was that when students would begin to develop their ideas building from GARFINKEL, he accused them of having stolen his ideas. So, it was actually very difficult if you were directly under GARFINKEL's orbit to begin to flourish in your own way. [12]

René SALOMON: And you were in the middle of that group of people, so how was the way to your own approach on EM?

---

24 Dell Hathaway HYMES (1927-2009), linguist, sociolinguist, folklorist and anthropologist. Founded the journal *Language in Society*. Former president of the Linguistic Society of America, the American Anthropological Association and of the American Folklore Society (see HYMES, 1962).

25 Noam CHOMSKY (*1928), one of the major figures in linguistics, philosopher and social critic. Creator of the *universal grammar theory* and the *generative grammar theory*. Professor emeritus at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT) (see CHOMSKY, 1957).

Charles GOODWIN: I began to move away from simply family dinners. I was very influenced by anthropology, also in part by Elinor OCHS[26] and Alessandro DURANTI[27]. And even while working with family dinners I was already working with the body and, to some extent, with objects. But then we got jobs in the Anthropology Department in South Carolina, we got the opportunity to go off and record archaeologists. And that really changed my thinking. The work with archaeologists would have been an early version of *studies of work* and I didn't realize it; I hadn't even known about this. But I think the issues we were getting into there were quite consistent with EM. It was: How can somebody make the world intelligible to somebody else; like by, you make a mark, trying to outline something on the dirt in front of you—how can you get other people to recognize that they can recognize the dirt in the way that you are? And this is all done through these processes of working closely with other people in these settings. And at the same time, in 1989, Lucy SUCHMAN[28] asked us to go on to the *workplace project* (SUCHMAN, 1997). Lucy had been at Berkeley—her advisor was John GUMPERZ[29]—and we're obviously talking about an East Coast and a West Coast division. And in the West Coast division—and we were very jealous —everybody could go and talk to GARFINKEL and SACKS. And we were all of on the East Coast. Though we had good people— I mean GOFFMAN and LABOV were really good people. So, Lucy invited us to participate in a very innovative project that she was organizing. The *workplace project* studied the actual practices through which work was accomplished at a large metropolitan airport. It grew from earlier ethnomethodological interests in the organization of activity, in the difference between giving instructions for activities in the abstract. Something directly relevant to programmers designing systems and models of planning at PARC (Palo Alto Research Center, California) at Palo Alto and Stanford; thus her classic "Plans and Situated Action" (SUCHMAN, 1985) demonstrated the impossibility of providing instructions with abstract plans. Here, rather than having computer programmers design systems in the abstract, we were to look at the *in situ* practices and skills used by airport workers to accomplish the actual activities that made up their work. It was an innovative project that had an immense, transformative impact and influence on our thinking. Two things were important: that was looking at the workplace and Lucy also introduced us much more to GARFINKEL's thinking. Later I had a similar world-opening experience by participating in a project analyzing surgical interaction with

---

26 Elinor OCHS (*1944), American linguistic anthropologist, distinguished research professor of anthropology at UCLA, California and director of the Center on Everyday Lives of Families. Developed the field of language socialization and is also known for her contributions to applied linguistics and the theorization of narrative and family discourse (see OCHS, 1988).

27 Alessandro DURANTI (*1950), Italian-born linguistic and anthropologist, distinguished professor of anthropology at UCLA, Fellow of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences. Collaboration with Elinor OCHS. In 1992 he co-edited with Charles GOODWIN "Rethinking Context: Language as an Interactive Phenomenon."

28 See the interview with Lucy SUCHMAN in this issue (SUCHMAN, GERST & KRÄMER, 2019).

29 John GUMPERZ (1922-2013), was German-born American linguistic anthropologist and professor of anthropology at the University of California, Berkeley. His research interests include ethnography of communication, *code-switching* and conversational interaction and he is a main figure in the field of sociolinguistics and discourse analysis. With Dell HYMES he formed an independent approach to interactional sociolinguistics (see GUMPERZ & HYMES, 1972).

Tim KOSCHMANN[30]. And there is an aspect that I would apply to both GARFINKEL and GOFFMAN, but not to SACKS and that is: They weren't working with actual materials. I mean GOFFMAN did work with actual materials—to some extent—he was a very good observer. In one of the seminars, he was working on what eventually became "Footing" (GOFFMAN, 1979), which I think was his most important article in the later part of his career. Now as he was working on this, he had a number of things which were bloopers, mistakes on the radio and interviews with people (announcers) working in classical music stations—really insightful analyses. And he was also wonderful at working in video: we would show video, or he would bring video and it was incredible the way he would look at that. But what I'd found when he was doing "Footing," was there was an announcer at a Berkeley radio station. Of course, Berkeley, it was the '60s you know, very political. And the announcer said something like: "And now from Stockholm comes word that Henry KISSINGER[31] has won the Nobel Peace Prize?" And he was all into the whole prosody as inflecting the stance on what was being said. Now, I thought that was brilliant. And it got me really into the concept of lamination and stance—ideas I still have today. But when I read "Footing," I found it much less rich—almost shallow. He laid out all these categories and the categories were very brilliant. But like I was saying earlier about SACKS' *story-preface paper* (SACKS, 1992): you miss the richness of what GOFFMAN was saying. You miss the way that that was so present in the details of the way he'd done the analysis in class. So, I was a bit unhappy about that. [13]

4. "The World as Being Woven Together by Multiple Participants in Concert With Each Other all the Time"

René SALOMON: Are there other points at which you might even see shortcomings?

Charles GOODWIN: I was also unhappy in another way and I wrote about this in "Interactive Footing" (GOODWIN, 2007). About that time when GOFFMAN was working on "Footing," he came up to us one day and said, "You should really read VOLOSHINOV's[32] 'Marxism and the Philosophy of Language' (VOLOSHINOV, 1973)." The whole analysis, what he was looking at, was reported speech. I think that you could look at "Footing" as GOFFMAN's reworking of VOLOSHINOV; though GOFFMAN probably had a lot of ideas of his own, I'm not trying to deny that. But GOFFMAN's "Footing" had the same problems as VOLOSHINOV. Because if you look at "Footing" you have a very rich life and all these categories of the speaker. And then hearers are put off in an analytic grey to the side: there are overhearers, there are addressed hearers, there are indirect hearers, or unaddressed recipients, bystanders or eavesdroppers, etc. But it's an analytic

---

30 Timothy KOSCHMANN, professor emeritus at Southern Illinois University School of Medicine, Department of Medical Education. Areas of study in social organization of learning and instruction, ethnomethodology, language, social interaction and conversation analysis (see ZEMEL, KOSCHMANN & LeBARON, 2011).

31 Henry KISSINGER (*1923), German-born American diplomat and political scientist. Served from 1973-1977 as United States Secretary of State and from 1973-1975 as National Security Advisor. Was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize in 1973.

32 Valentin Nikolaevich VOLOSHINOV (1895-1936), Russian linguist and a pioneer of Russian literary theory, theory of speech and semiotics (see VOLOSHINOV, 1973).

grey. And cognitively—and I say cognitive, because I think *cognition* is a public process—the hearers were empty, whereas the speakers were having this rich life. The speakers were laminated. And I took the idea of lamination from him there. So, I think a major problem with "Footing" is that you divide speakers from hearers. He analyzed them in different parts of the article with different analytic frameworks and he didn't bring them together. Instead, what I was trying to do is to see the world as being woven together by speakers and hearers, or multiple participants, in concert with each other all the time. I'm trying to get away from something—which I think is still going on in CA—I think of as a punctual, categorical view of action and actors. You think the speaker is one place, over here, at one moment in time; the hearer is something different and then you get a switch. Whereas I think continuously there is an interactive field and we're pulling upon distributed resources throughout that interactive field. I think that's what was lost with GOFFMAN's framework there. Though it was available with GOFFMAN in other parts of his work. I'm not sure it was as available with GARFINKEL per se, which is not to deny the richness of what he was looking at. And it came up in SACKS, though I think the current focus on *turn-taking* gives an impoverished picture of the richness of what hearers are doing. And I mean people like Lorenza (MONDADA) and Arnulf (DEPPERMANN), their work is all great now and it's all coming into this, but in classical CA the hearer was still a shadow figure, a penumbra around the speaker. And it wasn't getting into the kinds of things that they were doing. So there were those frameworks coming and that would go to the little "Afterword" by Jürgen STREECK in the new book by Christian MEYER and Ulrich von WEDELSTAEDT (STREECK, 2017). He was putting out that GARFINKEL and SCHÜTZ[33] took an early, very linguistic and cognitive picture of *phenomenology* and that in fact there were other visions of phenomenology that would allow you to give greater importance to phenomena other than language—such as the body. And, you know, I don't want to be critical ... [14]

René SALOMON: Be critical! That's fine.

Charles GOODWIN: OK, it's opening up a dialogue about the different ways that you could do analysis. So, for instance, what Candy is working on and initially some impetus from Jürgen STREECK too, is the idea of intertwined bodies. She's into things like hugs and stuff. Instead of only having cooperative action or adjacency pairs in terms of language, you've also got bodies that are intertwining with each other, you've also got these cooperative processes. And you have these processes which you can get especially with mothers and kids—say, a mother will be proposing a big hug and a kid will be trying to get out of it; here you're having whole negotiations going on entirely through bodies. And that's also getting beyond traditional pictures of gesture, which are focused on largely the hand as a manifestation of the individual. They are getting into the fact that we're intensely social creatures, who I would say are inhabiting each other's actions. There are ways of moving that kind of study in new directions. I think that, in a way, the other thing that is missing, certainly from CA but also from GARFINKEL and GOFFMAN, is history. If you look at SCHÜTZ and GARFINKEL, there's this

---

33 Alfred SCHÜTZ (1899-1959), Austrian sociologist, philosopher, banker and lawyer, is the founding father of phenomenological sociology (see SCHÜTZ, 1967 [1932]).

tremendous emphasis on *common sense*, understandings of where we are. But that's—as GARFINKEL would say—taken for granted. And his experiments would get the seen but unnoticed practices that are taken for granted. But where does this web of common understandings come from? What I'm trying to argue in my book "Co-Operative Action" (GOODWIN, 2018) is that there's a distinctive character in human action. And one of the things we're doing is that we're operating on things that other people have put in a public environment, but transforming them. A simple example from Candy's data: kids on the street, "Why don't you get out of my yard?—Why don't you *make* me get out of the yard?" And what happens in the subsequent utterance is you've taken the materials of the first one, taken parts of them, deleted a few things, changed them and you've built something new from them. And I think that's what's going on all the time. I think it's what's going on in the historical development of tools, et cetera. What we're always doing through action, is that we're reusing materials created and put in a public environment by others, decomposing them, transforming them and reusing them to create something new. [15]

René SALOMON: Where does this lead you?

Charles GOODWIN: What you're getting with this is that there is an unfolding, because there are historical path-dependent chains that are going on. You're accumulating diverse languages, cultures, settings, as you go through the chains of accumulated things. A very simple example: Some of our good colleagues, Lourdes DE LEÓN[34] and John HAVILAND[35] did fieldwork in Nabenchauk, Chiapas, Mexico. So, in the book I have a picture of a kitchen in Nabenchauk and a picture of an American kitchen. You've got a whole cohort of different tools and settings. I first became aware of this when I first went into a chemistry lab and the chemist pointed out, "Yes, we've got all this stuff here, some of it isn't even used anymore." So, I think there's this whole accumulation into settings of the resources you're going to use and need to accomplish something. Like the resources you need to do cooking. But it's gone in different histories in the West, where we get the American kitchen and in traditional societies in, say, Highland Mexico or Guatemala. And you get different sets of tools. You've always got these accumulations. In my experience visiting people in hospitals as well as when looking at tapes of operations in hospitals we see forms of accumulations there as well. Say, if you were to take the anesthesiologist; there are people who come that stick a probe down your throat before you can have a heart operation to make sure there is no clot; there is the heart surgeon, all of them have different tools, different understandings—there are all these different worlds and these accumulations so that every one of these groups is faced with the ongoing task of creating new competent members. People who are able to recognize the objects in their world—whether it's post molds for archaeologists, or types of rock for

---

34 DE LEÓN PASQUEL, Lourdes, professor of anthropology and linguistics at CIESAS, Mexico. Research interests are language socialization, interaction and communicative competence in indigenous children's lives (see DE LEÓN, 1998).

35 John HAVILAND, anthropological linguist. Professor for anthropology at University of California San Diego (UCSD). Research interests are the social life of language, including gesture, emerging sign languages and interaction. Founded UCSD's Linguistic Anthropology Laboratory (see HAVILAND, 2015).

geologists, or things for surgeons—they all have that. You've got simultaneously built *in situ* and in the midst of interaction both: the discursive objects that animate the life-world of a community—and that I think would be the "taken-for-granted" things—and simultaneously, you've got to create actors able to recognize those objects and work with them. Every community has the ongoing task of creating new competent members. It's not something you can take for granted. And that's one of the things I've looked at a lot in my work with scientific settings. A lot of it is in the midst of interaction like archaeological and geological field schools. You have a skilled whatever-you-want, trying to outline a post mold in archeology or looking at some rocks in geology and you have the newcomer working on that in this public environment, where somebody can look at the work and can look at the things they're doing and then you can begin to calibrate this perception. And this is why cognition sometimes is a bad word in EM. [16]

5. Not Being Bound by What You Can See Now

René SALOMON: Could you tell me a little bit more about your view on cognition?

Charles GOODWIN: It's stupid to think that cognition should not be approached within our field; though it must be radically reconceptualized. The central issue that's posed for cooperative action and in action in general, is *intelligibility*. If you're going to cooperate with somebody, or even if you're going to fight them, you've got to be able to understand what they're doing. And this is the nature of the background understandings. This whole question of the intelligibility of the local scene and the intelligibility of action sits at the center of what all these things are. Cognition is a sensible issue. But it's not something that is lodged in the individual psychology. It's lodged in the realm of public practice. You've got to be able to create something like a public persona of a geologist or an archaeologist or a surgeon or whatever. And then it's also instantiated in the tools. I was very struck when I was on the oceanographic ship. The only way you can see the sea under the ship is through some of the computer graphs that are being made. So, you've got those tools, but those tools are all inherited from our predecessors. You had people who had to figure out how to take measurements under the sea, how to drive, etc.—like with the kitchen—we're always in this world where we inherit the solutions that earlier actors have found. So we're constantly in a world of not just objects, but of things that are shaping both our actions and our thinking, that has an historical sedimentation. And we can't ignore that historical sedimentation, which I think is what happens in CA. Maybe not in *studies of science*, because the *science studies*—at least LIVINGSTON[36] and then people like SHAPIN[37]—use very rich data. But it's not that we've got this little self-

---

36 Eric LIVINGSTON, sociologist and senior lecturer at the school of psychology, University of New England, Australia. His famous Ph.D. thesis (supervised by GARFINKEL) is about the "Ethnomethodological Foundations of Mathematics" and was one of the first studies of scientific practices. His research interests are the study of mundane expertise, scientific practices and practical reasoning of the discovering sciences and the technologies of everyday social life (see LIVINGSTON, 1987).

37 Steven SHAPIN (*1943), American historian and sociologist, known for being one of the earliest scholars on the sociology of science. After previous work as professor of sociology at UCSD he joined Harvard and is professor of the history of science (see SHAPIN & BARNES, 1979).

contained bubble in interaction and that everything is bounded by what you can see now. I still think you should really be using the camera, looking, because I think a crucial insight of SACKS—maybe SCHEGLOFF, I don't know where the idea came from—is that you've got to show the understandings that people are demonstrating to each other in the moment. And the understandings that people are showing are relevant; they are frequently these historically sedimented resources that they're now using to build their current action in terms of whatever it is they might be doing. Or take for instance a language you don't understand. I have a section in my book "Co-Operative Action," entitled "The Co-Operative Organization of Emerging Action" (GOODWIN, 2018), where I think that you're inhabiting—and this I took from Gail—the unfolding structure of an utterance moment by moment. Like, an adjective is projecting what might come next. So, you've got an open-ended set of constrained, but open-ended, possibilities. And I think that we're actually living moment by moment—making those projections impossibilities. And that's the inhabited experiential world we're living through. But if you come, and you don't understand the language then you are not able to participate in that unfolding organization of experience. So even the most mundane bit of talk has that deep historical sedimentation of having to build actors capable in engaging in what we're doing right this minute. I would think in a way that GARFINKEL and SCHÜTZ pointed toward that whole world and our constant reliance on background understandings. But I don't think they took the constitution of both, understandings and actors who you could trust to have those understandings, as an ongoing analytic project in its own right. [17]

6. Ethnography

René SALOMON: How important do you think is an ethnographic approach in this field?

Charles GOODWIN: There was a strong anti-ethnographic strain in SACKS and SCHEGLOFF and in CA in the beginning. And we should get into it because there is a way in which you don't just want to say, "I was there, so I'm right." But on the other hand all my work, maybe *studies in science* in general, started with ethnography. You've got to get into the particulars of what people are doing, what counts for an archaeologist or a geologist. For me, you do the ethnography by getting recordings of their work and showing that what they're showing to each other is crucial for the kinds of understandings we have to do this. Now, Candy was doing this. Her fieldwork with kids in the streets and she was getting incredible things from those kids on the street. Her ethnography I think was radically different than almost all other ethnographies, because in a way it was the kids' own voices that came through, through the way she transcribed their talk. She had analytic things like the "He-Said-She-Said" (GOODWIN, M. H., 1990) and all that, but it was very much uncovering the things that counted; find out what's crucial for the participants themselves. That's what she was uncovering in her analysis. And Gail JEFFERSON made incredible comments on her dissertation as she was writing. She would come back with eight or ten type-written pages of comments on a single chapter of her dissertation. But there has been—and this is where I would disagree with Manny SCHEGLOFF—a very

strong opposition in CA to ethnography. I think that if you look at standard CA it's, in a way, a very CHOMSKY'an enterprise. You're trying to come up with these major system architectures, like the *turn-taking-system*. But I think and maybe this is where it goes into *studies of work,* that you've got to get into the particulars of every setting because that's what counts for the people who are there and that's something that's revealed in their actions. So, if you're trying to uncover what they're doing: instead of saying there is only *turn-taking*, you can look at the precise ways that they're looking at the objects they're working with to do the endogenous activities they're engaged in. So, that's my sense of it. [18]

René SALOMON: You already said that in the beginning you had that copy of the *Studies*, but you weren't really impressed. But you mentioned that you were getting back to the *Studies* later on?

Charles GOODWIN: Well, the more I read it I think, "By God, this is brilliant." But let's get into a question of, "What does it mean to read something?" I think grad school is bad, because you're supposed to read a whole bunch of stuff all at once. You got a week on MARX and all this kind of stuff. But for me, reading is working over materials and then you can see the validity of what's being said. And as I look at the things now with GARFINKEL, I'm more and more aware. And it might be moving beyond talk: situated settings. Then it makes so much more sense for the ongoing constitution of the intelligibility of the world. In a way, I would say that GARFINKEL's perspective deeply resonates with mine, but the reason it resonates with mine is because of the people who were my intellectual guides. And by that I mean mostly Gail JEFFERSON and after that SACKS through the SACKS-lectures (SACKS, 1992). [19]

René SALOMON: But you met Gail JEFFERSON and Harvey SACKS after you already started your work—so who and what inspired you in the beginning?

Charles GOODWIN: I went to make my video work in the Philadelphia Child Guidance Clinic because of BATESON and I still think BATESON is an interesting writer. But the problem with all of them—BATESON, GOFFMAN and GARFINKEL—was they were all up in the big generalizations of these anecdotal kind of stories, but they weren't as much into the particulars. Now, one interesting thing with the video work about the family therapy was that they were in a big fight with classical therapy. The family therapists thought everything was in the interaction. So what I would have to film were the interactions between people. And the analysis was always the interactions, rather than the individual. Fascinating was, we were filming anorexia—usually girls—and the way they did that is: we'd have a meal and bring everybody into the room with therapists and we all ordered food and we'd watch them eating together. And that's one of the things that led me in my early work to record dinner conversations. But then the way I saw anorexia was that it was always emerging at particular points in the life cycle and particular points where you had a transition period. And one of the things that's going on is anorexia typically hits at early adolescence, at twelve or thirteen years of age. And in a sense it wasn't just the kid, it was also the mother. The mother had been developing and investing an incredible amount of attention in the kid. And it was as much a difficult transition for the mother as it was for the

kid. So they try to work on that relation. And they had the theory—and I'm not sure if it was right—that the kids had a childhood diabetes. And these were kids with a special kind of diabetes, who would go into big crises. And there now was the father and there were tensions between husband and wife and as the tensions were escalating the kid would begin to get sick. And after the kid got sick the parents would suddenly become very warm and mobilized around the sickness of the kid. And that would diffuse their tensions. So the therapy would then be trying to get everybody to be able to deal with those tensions somehow. That was their theory and I think there was some truth in there. But it got me to constantly see the world in interactive terms, both in terms of how I frame a shot and theoretically as well. So I've never been very keen on *theory of mind*, because it's trying to look at things back in individual mental states. And I do think people have rich cognitive lives. But I think the way that's manifested is in the details of interaction and that the richness is not just that you have a mental state over there. But one of the richnesses is the kinds of ways I have to project what you are about to do; if I'm going to be able to build the next action; where all the rich forms of understanding are manifested, I have to trust that you have; if I'm going to give a statement; etc. So it's out there in these endogenous practices, where the mind is really getting shaped. That was the environment that I emerged from. And for me the big person was Gail JEFFERSON and if you think of this as kind of a gravitational field, probably the biggest weight in that gravitational field was GARFINKEL. But it was a field; it wasn't just one person. [20]

René SALOMON: Chuck, you come from such a diverse background—how did other people see your work? Did they see you as an ethnomethodologist or as a conversation analyst, or as someone who comes from GOFFMAN—and is such a classification of any importance?

Charles GOODWIN: In all honesty, I used CA as my point of departure and considered myself a conversation analyst. But I think others thought of me as the one that does the study of interaction on video. And I'm not saying I stood apart or at a distance, but I think that was perhaps the perception. And that was a perception that in a way could cut across other things, because it was also available to anthropologists in that way. It was available to KENDON[38], who was somebody we got to know very early on. I'm not sure if I was as much into EM as some of the other people like Doug MACBETH[39] or people that Lucy SUCHMAN knew. I don't think it's always so good to just be trying to get a name and affiliate to a particular brand. I think it's better to do the work and to look at all the resources people have given you. Some people want to be thoroughly orthodox, they want to have their work accepted as a perfect version of EM. I think that's a mistake and that you should go where the materials lead you. [21]

---

38 Adam KENDON (*1934), one of the key figures on the topic of gesture, studies in sign systems and developer of a general framecode for understanding gestures. Co-editor of the journal *Gesture* and honorary president of the board of the International Society for Gesture Studies (see KENDON, 1977).

39 Douglas MacBETH, sociologist. Associate professor emeritus at the Ohio State University and member of the steering committee of the International Institute of Ethnomethodology and Conversation Analysis (see MacBETH, 1996, 2014).

René SALOMON: You told me that after he learned that GOFFMAN was Candy's advisor, GARFINKEL came up to her and challenged the analytical interest in rituals. So, what do you think about the notion of rituals? Do you think that ethnomethodologists could also deal with the phenomenon that GOFFMAN tries to describe with the notion of rituals?

Charles GOODWIN: It's a really big question and I hate to make big statements. GOFFMAN was much better in person than he was in his writing—even though his writing is very good. Because he had this sense of always wanting to come up with categories and things and he eliminated the actual materials that had led him to get there. So, he's the opposite of me and of most of us. For me, it's not enough to say, "Oh, the world is put together every moment" or whatever. You have to show it in the materials, but GOFFMAN was the opposite of that. And that's part of GOFFMAN's continuing appeal. He had all of those wonderful category systems. It would be really good to read his dissertation. There is a section in there that struck me when I read it about comparing the other person to a god that you have to give all this deference to. I think he was onto something. I mean there has been all this other work on how we're constantly trying to sustain ourselves in the midst of interaction and that's part of the work that's going on. If you just get it as categories, like *impression management* or something, it doesn't take you far enough. And it might seem from GARFINKEL's perspective that you've lost the richness, because the categories are limited. [22]

7. "Turn-Taking Became a Different Kind of Project"

René SALOMON: Do you think that the perception of what EM is about has changed during the years?

Charles GOODWIN: I think that one of the defining things was a fight that happened early, before the *turn-taking paper*, between EM and CA and between the so-called early SACKS and the late SACKS. I had this experience, because we encountered SACKS in the early years. We were reading the early lectures and as we began to get into the lectures, the *turn-taking-system* had not been discovered. I remember riding in a bus with SACKS one day—I had been very impressed with one of his early lectures—and I told him how much I'd been impressed. And he looked at me and said, "I was really shitting then." [laughs] I think the early lectures are absolutely brilliant, but in a certain sense a lot of the early stuff was exploratory but critical—finding things that other people hadn't. Now, once you began to get into *turn-taking*, you had a system that you'd found. And if you look at the *turn-taking paper* again, it's written very much like a hard-science paper. So, they now had a theory in a way. They had a thing. And that thing became a different kind of project. I'm not confident to talk about this, but I think in a way there might have been efforts to go back to GARFINKEL and the pre-*turn-taking* SACKS. And that this led then to strong fights between EM and CA and *studies of work.* And I think this also comes up in linguistics. I know that there were contentious debates with Manny SCHEGLOFF and people in Germany about *interactional linguistics.* And I know that Manny did not want interactional linguistics per se, at a variety of points. I have always been opposed to this, because I think language is thoroughly important and that you want to

draw upon the resources of people who are linguists. I would say the push into *interactional linguistics* is an important addition to the kind of work on conversation. I think that CA has not gotten as strongly into the actual endogenous organization of the grammar. I mean, there're things by John HERITAGE about the different formats you're going to get for preferences and stuff. But it hasn't developed a full-bodied attack on the monological view of syntax and I think it should. And I think that's one of the things that's coming up with interactional linguistics. I can go right over to the building right over there (linguistics) which is CHOMSKY and then the Applied Linguistics Department in another building and they have nothing to do with us. And the whole world of my academic life has been shaped by these crazy fights, like a fight between linguistics and what we do. It was shocking to me; I met someone who thought the full range of battles in sociology was the battle between GARFINKEL and GOFFMAN. So, we've had these fights and I always thought that it would be much more important to get all these linguists, who had a tremendous amount of skill in language and integrate them because language is thoroughly interactive. And if you go to Germany, you always have people who are linguists and they're taking an interactive perspective. And I think that's the way to the future and not a path of exclusions. [23]

René SALOMON: Chuck let's talk about teaching. How do you teach EM and CA? Is there a certain way to teach it? Are the *Studies* a book that can be used to teach EM?

Charles GOODWIN: When we were in South Carolina, I used the *turn-taking paper*. I don't think I actually assigned "Studies in Ethnomethodology" but I would assign John HERITAGE'S book, "Garfinkel and Ethnomethodology" (HERITAGE, 1984), which had a tremendous influence on my thinking. Because at that point I was having to teach CA. Now, once we came to UCLA, it would be crazy for me to teach CA. We had Manny SCHEGLOFF over in the next building, we had John HERITAGE, etc. So, there's no way I'm going to try to claim to be teaching that. Now, ultimately what I do is teach them a basic seminar in *discourse analysis* here. The big thing that happened at UCLA and it's a tragedy that it ended, was in my Department of Applied Linguistics we would constantly have students who'd been foreign language teachers, but they all came in with a deep background in language structure and linguistics. And it was very easy to get them to go over and they were all very impressed with Manny and others and CA in general, because they had all that background. Whereas if you take a sociologist and you try to teach them everything about linguistics, it doesn't work. So, an awful lot of my students were Applied Linguistics students. You had this thing of having a big CA-ethno perspective with a whole cohort of people deeply skilled in language, so I wouldn't do that. The way I teach is in seminars. And the way I've taught most recently for the past couple of years and still do is: people come in and we look at data. And we get a whole bunch of ideas and we talk about literature and all sorts of things. But this is a continuation of the way I learned from Gail. So, I try to train people by showing them how to work in the way similar to what I learned from Gail. We get in the field together, we get a piece of data and we go over a piece of tape and we go over the things together trying to work up analyses. And that's

the way that I'm most comfortable in teaching. And meanwhile we'll read various things. But for me the heart of it is the encounter and engagement with what people are actually doing. And I'd rather train people to come up with something new. [24]

René SALOMON: Do you have an example?

Charles GOODWIN: Right now, one of my students, who I think is doing really incredibly interesting work, is working on geological materials. He's getting into their diagrammatic gestures and their map-making. He looks at how geologists are trying to analyze what the structure in the ground may be. Somebody begins to build a model of the structure with their hand. Then they'd look at the ground, then they'd change the model by virtue of the hand. Then someone else may come up and take their hand and move it to a new position. So, you're actually interactively building off the diagrams that each one is producing in a moment as a form of endogenous local interaction with their hands. And I think it's fascinating. It's this whole idea of *practical reasoning and* this is where I come back to GARFINKEL and that he means more for me now and what I mean with cognition being public. I'm more and more struck by how much what people are doing is reasoning. But my objection is that they look at reasoning in a mono-logic perspective as though you've just got a syllogism. When in fact what's happening in reasoning is that people are constantly building off what each other is doing and changing. And that was PEIRCE's[40] notion of science and of truth, that you build off these things together. And that's what I would see. But I would want to look, then, at these processes of practical reasoning, which are about the only thing you can see going on with the geology as interactive in public. You look at them as kinds of things lodged within interaction, but also within the body. But then you're coming back to practical reasoning. I don't want to be attacked, because people always say GARFINKEL had all this and I didn't understand it. Maybe it's true. But I think, as I read the "Studies in Ethnomethodology" there wasn't as much on this ongoing back and forth of: somebody putting something out there, someone else taking that, modifying it and that as a course of reasoning that was unfolding in concert and being simultaneously investigated. Maybe he did have that; I mean, that was kind of in those experiments. But if you look at those experiments—for example the random number generator wasn't operating on what the subject was doing, whereas that I think is what's crucial to what I'm seeing going on. And it's similar to the work I did with aphasia (GOODWIN, 2000, 2003, 2004, 2006, 2010) with my father: he would put something out and everybody as progressively operating on what each other has done through a course of practical reasoning, but one that's being done interactively in the world with whatever resources happen to be at hand. [25]

---

40 Charles Sanders PEIRCE (1839-1914), American philosopher, mathematician and logician. After being an educated chemist he was employed as a scientist and is famous for his contributions to today's understanding of semiotics and pragmatism (see PEIRCE, 1998 [1923]).

8. "I Don't Want to Spend Time on a Fight"

René SALOMON: You say you don't want to be attacked—different understandings seem to be a source for tensions—which reminds me of Aaron CICOUREL[41] and the tensions between him and GARFINKEL. But different opinions can also be instructive: did the tensions between GARFINKEL and CICOUREL influence your understanding of EM?

Charles GOODWIN: First of all, I want to say, Aaron CICOUREL is one of the senior figures that has been so warm and helpful and who was also very, very important. And I think Aaron has a justifiable fear of his position being minimalized, because there were all these tensions with GARFINKEL. It seems that there are people wanting to get into a fight and to say, "You haven't really understood GARFINKEL." And I would be the first to say I haven't read all his works; I doubt I understand GARFINKEL. I work off my materials and I'd been deeply informed by Gail and I'm willing to admit that I'm wrong. Lucy SUCHMAN informs my thinking a lot, so did Ed HUTCHINS[42], who's outside this whole thing. Moreover, in my work on the body and video I came in contact with other crucial scholars pursuing similar kinds of research, including Christian HEATH and Jürgen STREECK. I don't really want to spend time on a fight. I don't want to spend time defending... I do want to spend time finding out more on the intricate ways the people are building their worlds with each other. And there is a lot of cool stuff I have with the geologists and all. And I'd rather look at what they're doing, than get into an academic battle. And you know, the same thing, I also find PEIRCE very useful but a lot of it is the typical academic battle, "You didn't really understand what PEIRCE said here," or: "You didn't really understand what GARFINKEL was doing here." And yes, maybe that's true—I don't care. Maybe there's two visions of academia. There is a vision of academia as carrying on this discursive battle with the texts of our predecessors and ancestors and interrogating. And then there is another one that to me was the shock that came with SACKS. Of being able to look at the world in front of you and interrogate that world and try to see how it might be put together as a project and an enterprise. And that's what continuously interests me. The reason I've gotten into the aphasia is because of my father; it was so interesting what was happening. And you suddenly find these interesting things going on and you want to look at them. And you don't want a superego standing over your shoulders saying: "No, you can't go here," or: "You've got to cite ...," or: "You can't quote ... ." You want to begin to find out the organization they have—they're doing the things you never dreamed of. The way you have to do a PhD now, is you've got to come up with a big proposal and essentially in the proposal tell everybody what you're going to find before you get there and that's why I think the whole academic enterprise is

---

41 Aaron Victor CICOUREL (*1928), sociologist. Professor emeritus at the UCSD, where he was research professor of cognitive science in the Department of Sociology and professor in the School of Medicine since 1989. CICOUREL had major impact on the reception of ethnomethodology. His research interests are sociolinguistics, socialization, social action, decision-making and medical communication (see CICOUREL, 1964).

42 Edwin HUTCHINS, professor emeritus of cognitive science at the UCSD. Key figure in the development of the field of *distributed cognition* and *cognitive ethnography*. Well known for his studies on human-computer interaction, distributed and embodied cognition and multimodal interaction (see HOLLAN, HUTCHINS & KIRSH, 2000).

screwed. When Candy got out into the field she came home one day and she said these kids had this incredible all-day argument and we didn't know what it was. And when she looked at it, it was this big triadic thing. You know, "Kerry said that I said" etc. So, she discovered the "He-Said-She-Said" (GOODWIN, M.H., 1990), but she didn't know it was there ahead of time. She only found it by going and looking carefully; so she learned from the world, instead of trying to impose her already existing categories on what might could be found. And that's the way I'd rather be. So, I let other people debate these things and if they say I'm not being true or whatever—fine. I'm trying to be true to what the people do on the tapes that I see. I'm trying to be true to the participants and analytically to Gail and to things I owe to Gail. [26]

9. Materiality and WITTGENSTEIN

René SALOMON: We already mentioned it—but could you elaborate a bit on the role that materiality has for your kind of approach?

Charles GOODWIN: I think it's central. There was this early thing of working with tapes, the original stuff SACKS was working with, the group-therapy-session was actually people face to face but all he had was audio. And that's fine, you can do a lot with audio. But I don't think you should reify that. If you want to come back to materiality there is a way to think over WITTGENSTEIN[43]. There are big issues of WITTGENSTEIN of language games and critiques saying everything has to be in language. Look at his original example of the *language game* (WITTGENSTEIN, 1953). It was somebody coming up, on a building site. And one guy would say "slab" or "hammer" or "brick," and the other guy would give him a brick. The way of understanding was producing the material object. It wasn't restricted. So, you go all back to WITTGENSTEIN and you still got the materiality in the midst of that. Now, for reasons of convenience that gets lost, because of our methods of writing, it's easier to work with audiotape. It really is, it's very hard to work with videotape. I'm just putting together with one of my students a paper on *objects* for a presentation at the 15th International Pragmatics Association Conference in Belfast. And we're going to look in that paper at three different objects: first, a little piece of *down*; second, a *rock*; and third, a vat of *fibers*. And what I want to show in each case, is what the object is—I'll take this explicitly from HEIDEGGER[44] and HUSSERL[45]—an object is something that emerges through time and becomes what it is through time. And what I'm thinking is that there are the practices of a community that reveal what that object is. First let's take the *rock,* that's out with the geologists. It turns out, they may want to take a sample of

---

43 Ludwig WITTGENSTEIN (1889-1951), one of the most influential philosophers in the 20th century. His ordinary language philosophy forms the bases for the linguistic turn and influenced practice theory (see WITTGENSTEIN, 1953).

44 Martin HEIDEGGER (1889-1976), one of the most influential philosophers in the 20th century. He was professor in Marburg, Germany (1923) and Freiburg, Germany (1928). "Sein und Zeit" (Being and Time) (1927) is one of his most influential books (see HEIDEGGER, 1962 [1927]).

45 Edmund HUSSERL (1859-1938), one of the most influential philosophers in the 20th century and founder of phenomenology. He was professor in Göttingen, Germany (1901-1916) and Freiburg, Germany until his retirement in 1928. Important topics in his work include intersubjectivity, psychology, intentionality, logic and phenomenological reduction as a contribution to transcendental idealism (see HUSSERL, 1964 [1950]).

that rock, so they're going to have to cut the rock up. One of the senior geologists asked for a hammer and he begins to tap the rock and he gets the sounds coming from the rock. And by hearing the sounds he can figure out its internal structure and where it's going to break. OK, so what's the materiality? The materiality is a project that's emerging through time. And at the same time, he's showing this to one of his students and you're showing historically the practices required to slowly reveal the properties of the rock. And the properties of the rock that are relevant to the specific practices of your community, you're not a photographer or whatever, you want to know where to break that up. And there have been historically solutions to that for geologists. Secondly the piece of *down.* It is actually from a film about Inuit. And they're hunting seals in the winter on the ice. And what happens is that each seal has a bunch of breathing holes. In order to get enough seals to live, you've got to have enough hunters to cover most of their breathing holes—it's actually a whole thing on social organization. So, they go out to one of these breathing holes and they go and they smell the breathing hole and they find out it's still being used by a seal. And again, it's the seal as an object, as a material thing, its manifestation through its smell and through other things. And then what they do is they carefully stake it out and they put snow on top and they figure out where it is and then they get a little piece of down and they attach it with a little piece of antler. And when the seal comes, its breathing will disturb the down. And then the hunter will know the seal is there and then he'll strike. So, what is the down? The down then becomes the seal. And I think phenomenologically what the hunter is seeing is the seal in the movement of the down. So how is that down constituted as an object? It's constituted within a course of activity—if you want a work setting. And it's constituted and the way it's constituted is historically structured. You had earlier people discover that solution, pass it on to others. So that object then, the way it's being seen, the perception is something that emerges through time within the endogenous activities of a specific community and it has an historical constitution of it. And it's similar to VON UEXKÜLL[46] and his idea of the *Umwelt* (FAVAREAU, 2010). And the third one is the *fibers*. The chemist in my article "The Blackness of Black" (GOODWIN, 1997) is the one that discovered the chemical reaction they are monitoring. But they're constantly working over these fibers and he begins to notice a smell coming off from the fibers. And he draws this to the attention of his graduate student and asks her to come over to look at it. And he says "So are you getting some of that ammonia smell?," and she goes over and she coughs, she doesn't get it. So from his engaged work, the fibers are not just there in the vat, the fibers are a whole; like the seal, they're giving off all these things around him, a penumbra of sensory experience that has not yet been categorized. And from his position as a skilled practitioner monitoring chemical processes as they unfold he's recognizing something, then beginning to interrogate what he's recognizing within the interests of his community as a chemist, to try to figure out something more about the reaction. In all these cases then, the objects are emerging through time; through the distinctive practices and interests of a historically constituted community. And the resources that they are using are

---

46 Jakob Johann von UEXKÜLL (1864-1944), Baltic German biologist, zoologist and philosopher. His notion of *environment* became important for philosophic anthropology and had influence on fields like cybernetics and radical constructivism (see UEXKÜLL, 1926).

public practices that have to be handed on from generation to generation to help
properly constitute the object. And that is what I would say and this would be a
critique of philosophy and people like SEARLE[47] on *qualia* and so on. If you look
at von UEXKÜLL that's what he meant by qualia. That it's the relevant and
meaningful perception of an object within the lifeworld of an animal. It is what that
means for the seal hunter—what that means for the chemist. That's the way I
would see materiality and objects. And it's also the way that we communicate with
our predecessors. Because we inhabit the material world they had given us. Not
as mere objects, but for example, as architectures of perception. And the last
thing on materiality: If you look at HUSSERL when he went to the *lifeworld*, in a
way his overcoming of his early solipsism was to say that we inhabit a public
world of objects together in a variety of ways. That's the other part of the objects.
But the way I would see that myself is its public character. What I see with both
the geologist and the archaeologists, you've got a public object down here. So,
you can both look at it together and you can calibrate what you're doing by virtue
of the public character of that object. My best example is: You get a student to
draw a line in the dirt of where she thinks is the outline of post mold. And the
professor comes back and says, "No, I think it's over here." And the whole
calibration is because of the public placement of that in the world. But then, what
we're really dealing with here is the public character of things and I would
consider language like "Why don't you get out of my yard?—Why don't you *make*
me get out the yard?" equally a manifestation of the public organization that
people require. And in that sense, there's not a radical difference then between
materiality and language, except that materiality has a greater durable presence
in certain ways. [27]

10. Emotions

René SALOMON: When we talk about materiality and language, where do you
see *emotions* in this constellation? What is your perspective on emotions?

Charles GOODWIN: My sense of emotions is that they are very important and it
was something that was crucial especially with my father. You could see him
getting frustrated and there are all these ways that the thing he did preserve was
prosody. So, he could convey powerful emotions through his prosody. And the
emotions were a way of displaying understanding. A good place to look would be
Paul EKMAN[48]—that comes out of DARWIN[49]. And DARWIN was arguing that the
emotions, like disgust, come from the way the face would react to food. Now,
there's a very interesting thing if you get EKMAN's version of DARWIN's "The

---

47 John Rogers SEARLE (*1932), American philosopher, professor emeritus of the philosophy of
    mind and language (Department of Philosophy at Berkeley, California). Best known for his work
    on speech act theory. Areas of work are philosophy of language, philosophy of mind and social
    philosophy (see SEARLE, 1969).

48 Paul EKMAN (*1934), anthropologist and psychologist. Retired professor of psychology at the
    UCSF medical school, California and the Langly Porter Neuropsychatric Institute. Major areas of
    his studies are cross-cultural studies of nonverbal behavior and facial expression and emotions
    (see EKMAN, 2003).

49 Charles DARWIN (1809-1882), English natural scientist and biologist. One of the best-known
    scientists for his work on evolution by natural selection. His theory of evolution and the process
    of natural selection became known as *Darwinism* (see DARWIN, 1859).

Expression of the Emotions in Man and Animals" (DARWIN, 1998 [1872]), because he has a wonderful set of footnotes on it. He says that he went to BATESON and he said, "I'm really going to pursue this emotion" because for EKMAN it's all in the inside of the individual. And he has BATESON's saying, "No, you're wrong. Emotions are something larger than interaction, not inside the individual." And I'm glad that he put that in and that's the way I would see it. For example, Candy did work at a very exclusive school in Los Angeles that brought very poor African American kids in through a kind of a scholarship and everybody thought the school was great because of diversity, "Oh, you've got these poor kids" etc. You may have the same thing with refugees in Germany. But the rich kids totally excluded this poor African American girl. She had the wrong body type, she was heavy. And he said, "You're going to be in the gutters." And they had a thing where they were eating together and they said, "You sit over there!" And she didn't have a spoon and began to stick her tongue in a container of yoghurt or something rather than using a utensil. And they said, "Eww, that's disgusting!" and all three of them turned away in unison. The thing is that they actually had the word "disgust" and that's one of the things that makes it interesting. But instead of just being lodged inside the individual you had three girls together and they were preteen girls. Their prosody matched and they all moved their bodies. So that was a public display degrading and denigrating somebody else. You had an alliance formation, a coalition against an outsider that was constituted through the display of emotion and through the unfolding display of emotion *in situ* moment by moment. And the interesting thing was that the actual emotion of disgust occurred over the non-lexical response cry, "Eww" and that's when they all got together, rather than the word itself. I see in all these ways emotion as interactive phenomena. And I think there is this whole richness of the way we perceive something that is engaging us. It's not just that we recognize something as food, but we get hungry; we get desire and the whole thing is then being woven into this web, like the girls are doing. So, I do find emotions something very much to be pursued and do pursue this a little bit in my own work, not as much as I'd like. [28]

René SALOMON: And do you think you can also find that in GARFINKEL's work?

Charles GOODWIN: Yes. Well, also in GOFFMAN. I mean GARFINKEL—he broke up marriages. That's part of the issue and I don't know if you knew GARFINKEL but sometimes it could be very delicate; I mean some of his experiments broke up marriages, you know? He got into the emotions of people getting really angry if you pretend to be a boarder in your house. And he really talked about the emotions. Or the emotions with the *breaching experiments* where people got very angry. And that was one of the things that he was mobilizing. Now, GOFFMAN, at least analytically, has a good essay on *shame*, because what he is arguing is that shame has to be a thoroughly social emotion. You can't have shame as an isolated individual. So, I think both of them dealt with that in interesting ways. In a way GARFINKEL liked to throw hand grenades at the existing social world and break it apart in front of people and the people would get quite angry, that began to happen sometimes. [29]

René SALOMON: I have got one last question: Is there any favorite part in the book, or a favorite quotation in "Studies of Ethnomethodology?"

Charles GOODWIN: Two things: It's the first lines of "Studies in Ethnomethodology" (GARFINKEL, 1967): "All the world is put together ..." and the other thing would be *Agnes*. And that is the first thing that really gets you reading. But I still think it's rich. He is way ahead of his time and feminism and all this stuff. But that picture you have of having to weave the world together moment by moment is completely valid. You may know that there was a writer who was popular at one point named Carlos CASTANEDA[50]. And there was a line in one of his books—"The Teachings of Don Juan" (CASTENADA, 1968)—about people sitting in a cafe and looking outside and the character in there is saying, "Well, do you see those people, the world...they're having to weave their world together moment by moment in every instance." And that is something that's always stuck in the back of my head. Except I don't think it's just a local contingent accomplishment; I think it's done with the history. [30]

René SALOMON: Chuck, thank you so much that you took all that time for me. It was a real pleasure talking to you.

Charles GOODWIN: I want to say one more thing, but it's not about GARFINKEL: I feel deeply indebted to have been in that environment—and that was the '70s—where I would encounter first Gail and later SACKS and Manny, GOFFMAN etc. I feel enormously privileged to have grown up in that intellectual and personal environment. I can't imagine how you could have gotten a better education than we did, combined with us also doing our own fieldwork at the same time. I just want to end with that because I do feel in a way, partially that Gail could be forgotten and that she was an extraordinary person—and I wanted to be quoted with that. [31]

Personal Note René SALOMON

At this point I would like to express my gratitude to Chuck and Candy GOODWIN for their candor, cordiality and willingness to help wherever possible. Not only did Chuck agree on supporting our project in every possible way, but he did so in an incomparable manner. I would like to thank both of them and emphasize my gratitude to Candy GOODWIN, who has been of indispensable help and support in every respect from the beginning to the present day. Without her, this interview could not have been published. [32]

---

50 Carlos CASTANEDA (1925-1998), anthropologist and author – best known for his studies of the mystical secrets of shamanism and his book "The Teachings of Don Juan: A Yaqui Way of Knowledge" (CASTANEDA, 1968).

References

Bateson, Gregory (1972). *Steps to an ecology of mind. Collected essay in anthropology, psychiatry, evolution and epistemology*. Chicago,IL: University of Chicago Press.

Bateson, Gregory (1979). *Mind and nature. A necessary unity.* New York, NY: E.P. Dutton.

Bergmann, Jörg; Meyer, Christian; Salomon, René & Krämer, Hannes (2019). Garfinkel folgen, heißt, die Soziologie vom Kopf auf die Füße zu stellen. Jörg Bergmann & Christian Meyer im Gespräch mit René Salomon & Hannes Krämer. *Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung / Forum: Qualitative Social Research*, *20*(2), Art. 23, http://dx.doi.org/10.17169/fqs-20.2.3289.

Castenada, Carlos (1968). *The teachings of Don Juan: A Yaqui way of knowledge*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Chomsky, Noam (1957). *Syntactic structure*. Den Haag: Mouton & Co.

Cicourel, Aaron V. (1964). *Method and measurement in sociology*. New York, NY: Free Press of Glencoe.

Darwin, Charles (1859). *On the origin of species by means of natural selection, or the preservation of favoured races in the struggle for life.* London: John Murray.

Darwin, Charles R. (1998 [1872]). *The expression of the emotions in man and animals* (Introduction, afterword and commentaries by P. Ekman). London: Harper Collins.

de León, Lourdes (1998). The emergent participant: Interactive patterns in the socialization of Tzotzil (Mayan) infants. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology, 8*(2), 131-161.

Deppermann, Arnulf (2001). *Gespräche analysieren: Eine Einführung*. Opladen: Leske + Budrich.

Deppermann, Arnulf (2013). Interview als Text vs. Interview als Interaktion. *Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung / Forum: Qualitative Social Research*, *14*(3), Art. 13, http://dx.doi.org/10.17169/fqs-14.3.2064 [Accessed: March 19, 2019].

Duranti, Alessandro & Goodwin, Charles (1992). *Rethinking context: Language as an interactive phenomenon.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ekman, Paul (2003). *Emotions revealed: Recognizing faces and feelings to improve communication and emotional life*. New York, NY: Holt.

Favareau, Donald (2010). Jakob von Uexküll (1864-1944). In Donals Favareau (Ed.) *Essential readings in biosemiotics: Anthology and commentary* (pp.81-89). Dordrecht: Springer.

Garfinkel, Harold (1967). *Studies in ethnomethodology*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Garfinkel, Harold & Rawls, Anne W. (2002). *Ethnomethodology's program: Working out Durkheim's aphorism*. Boulder, CO: Rowman and Littlefield Press.

Gerst, Dominik; Krämer, Hannes & Salomon, René (2019). Harold Garfinkels "Studies in Ethnomethodology" – ein Interviewprojekt. *Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung / Forum: Qualitative Social Research*, *20*(2), Art. 25, http://dx.doi.org/10.17169/fqs-20.2.3288.

Goffman, Erving (1979). Footing. *Semiotica*, *25*, 1-29.

Goffman, Erving (1983). The interaction order. American Sociological Association. 1982. Presidential address. *American Sociological Review*, *48*, 1-17, http://www.csun.edu/~snk1966/Erving%20Goffman%20The%20Interaction%20Order.pdf [Accessed: March 19, 2019].

Goodwin, Charles (1997). The blackness of black: Color categories as situated practice. In Lauren B. Resnick, Roger Säljö, Clotilde Pontecorvo & Barbara Burge (Eds.) *Discourse, tools and reasoning: Essays on situated cognition* (pp.111-140). Berlin: Springer.

Goodwin, Charles (2000). Gesture, aphasia and interaction. In David McNeill (Ed*.) Language and gesture* (pp.84-98). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Goodwin, Charles (2003). Conversational frameworks for the accomplishment of meaning in aphasia. In Charles Goodwin (Ed.), *Conversation and brain damage* (pp.90-116). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Goodwin, Charles (2004). *A competent speaker who can't speak: The social life of aphasia. Journal of Linguistic Anthropology*, *14*(2), 151-170.

Goodwin, Charles (2006). Human sociality as mutual orientation in a rich interactive environment: Multimodal utterances and pointing in aphasia. In Nicholas J. Enfield & Stephen C. Levinson (Eds.), *Roots of human sociality* (pp.96-125). London: Berg.

Goodwin, Charles (2007). Interactive footing. In Elizabeth Holt & Rebecca Clift (Eds.), *Reporting talk: Reported speech in interaction* (pp.16-46). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Goodwin, Charles (2010). Constructing meaning through prosody in aphasia. In Dagmar Barth-Weingarten, Elisabeth Reber & Margret Selting (Eds.), *Prosody in interaction* (pp.373-394)*.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Goodwin, Charles (2018). *Co-operative action*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Goodwin, Marjorie Harness (1990). *He-said-she-said: Talk as social organization among black children.* Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.

Goodwin, Marjorie Harness (2006). *The hidden life of girls: Games of stance, status and exclusion*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Goodwin, Marjorie Harness & Cekaite, Asta (2018). *Embodied family choreography: Practices of control, care and mundane creativity*. London: Routledge.

Gumperz, John & Hymes, Dell (Eds.) (1972). *Directions in sociolinguistics*. New York, NY: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Haviland, John B. (2015). *Where do nouns come from?.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Heath, Christian (2013). *The dynamics of auction: Social interaction and the sale of fine art and antiques*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Heidegger, Martin (1962 [1927]). *Being and time*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Heritage, John (1984). *Garfinkel and ethnomethodology*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Hollan, James; Hutchins, Edwin & Kirsh, David (2000). Distributed cognition: Toward a new foundation for human-computer interaction research. *ACM Transactions on Human-Computer Interaction*, *7*(2), 174-196.

Husserl, Edmund (1964 [1950]). *The idea of phenomenology.* Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Hymes, David (1962). The ethnography of speaking. In Thomas Gladwin & William C. Sturtevant (Eds.), *Anthropology and human behavior* (pp.13-53). Washington, DC: Anthropology Society of Washington.

Jefferson, Gail (1973). A case of precision timing in ordinary conversation: Overlapped tag-positioned address terms in closing sequences. *Semiotica*, *9*, 47-96.

Kendon, Adam (1977). *Studies in the behavior of social interaction*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.

Krug, Maximilian (2019). Rezension: Charles Goodwin (2018). Co-Operative Action. *Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung / Forum: Qualitative Social Research*, *20*(1), Art. 15, http://dx.doi.org/10.17169/fqs-20.1.3197 [Accessed: May 5, 2019].

Labov, William (1966). *The social stratification of English in New York City*. Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics.

Levinson, Stephen C. (2000). *Presumptive meanings: The theory of generalized conversational implicature*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Livingston, Eric (1987). *Making sense of ethnomethodology*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

MacBeth, Douglas (1996). The discovery of situated worlds: Analytic commitments, or moral orders?. *Human Studies*, *19*(3), 267-287.

MacBeth, Douglas (2014). Studies of work, instructed action and the promise of granularity: A commentary. *Discourse Studies*, *16*(2), 295-308.

Mondada, Lorenza (1994). *Verbalisation de l'espace et fabrication du savoir: Approche linguistique de la construction des objets de discours* [Verbalization of space and the fabrication of knowledge: A language approach to the construction of discourse objects]. Lausanne: Université de Lausanne.

Ochs, Elinor (1988). *Culture and language development: Language acquisition and language socialization in a Samoan village*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Peirce, Charles S. (Ed.) (1998 [1923]). *Chance, love and logic: Philosophical essays* (ed. by M.R. Cohen. Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press.

Ruskin, John (1857). Letter II: Sketching from nature. In John Ruskin (Ed.), *The elements of drawing: in three letters to beginners* (pp.118-193). London: Smith, Elder & Co.

Sacks, Harvey (1992). *Lectures on conversation* (Vol. I & II). Oxford: Blackwell.

Sacks, Harvey; Schegloff, Emanuel & Jefferson, Gail (1974). *A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking in conversation. Language*, *50*(4), 696-735.

Sartre, Jean-Paul (1943). *L'être et le néant. Essai d'ontologie phénoménologique* [Being and nothingness: An essay on phenomenological ontology]. Paris: Gallimard.

Scheflen, Albert E. (1972). *Body language and the social order: Communication as behavioral control.* Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall Direct.

Schegloff, Emanuel A. (1968). Sequencing in conversational openings. *American Anthropologist*, *70*(6), 1075-1095.

Schütz, Alfred (1967 [1932]). *Phenomenology of the social world*. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press.

Searle, John R. (1969). *Speech acts: An essay in the philosophy of language*. London: Cambridge University.

Shapin, Steven & Barnes, Barry (Eds.) (1979). *Natural order: Historical studies of scientific culture*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Streeck, Jürgen (2017). Afterword. In Christian Meyer & Ulrich von Wedelstaedt (Eds.) *Moving bodies in interaction—Interacting bodies in motion: Intercorporeality, interkinaesthesia and enaction in sports* (pp.345-354). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Streeck, Jürgen; Krämer, Hannes & Salomon, René (2019). Zwischen den Stühlen der Konversationsanalyse und der Ethnomethodologie. Jürgen Streeck im Gespräch mit Hannes Krämer & René Salomon. *Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung / Forum: Qualitative Social Research*, *20*(2), Art. 15, http://dx.doi.org/10.17169/fqs-20.2.3269.

Suchman, Lucy A. (1985). *Plans and situated actions—The problem of human-machine communication*. Palo Alto, CA: Palo Alto Research Center.

Suchman, Lucy A. (1997). Centers of coordination: A case and some themes. In Lauren B. Resnick, Roger Säljö, Clotilde Pontecorvo & Barbara Burge (Eds.), *Discourse, tools and reasoning: Essays on situated cognition* (pp.41-62). Berlin: Springer.

Suchman, Lucy; Gerst, Dominik & Krämer, Hannes (2019). "If you want to understand the big issues, you need to understand the everyday practices that constitute them." Lucy Suchman in conversation with Dominik Gerst & Hannes Krämer. *Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung / Forum: Qualitative Social Research*, *20*(2), Art. 1, http://dx.doi.org/10.17169/fqs-20.2.3252.

Szwed, John & Whitten, Norman (Eds.) (1970). *Afro-American anthropology: Contemporary perspective on theory and research*. New York, NY: Free Press.

Uexküll, Jakob von (1926). *Theoretical biology.* New York, NY: Harcourt, Brace & Co.

Voloshinov, Valentin N. (1973). *Marxism and the philosophy of language.* New York, NY: Seminar Press.

Wedelstead, Ulrich von & Meyer, Christian (Eds.) (2017). *Moving bodies in interaction—Interacting bodies in motion: Intercorporeality, interkinaesthesia and enaction in sports*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Wittgenstein, Ludwig (1953). *Philosophical investigations*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Zemel, Alan; Koschmann, Timothy & LeBaron, Curtis (2011). Pursuing a response: Prodding recognition and expertise within a surgical team. In Jürgen Streeck, Charles Goodwin & Curtis LeBaron (Eds.), *Embodied interaction: Language and body in the material world* (pp.227-242). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Authors

Charles GOODWIN (October 9, 1943 – March 31, 2018) studies of English literature, one year at the New York University School of Law (1965-1966). GOODWIN worked as a social worker in Harlem, New York City (1966-1967). In 1969 he transferred to Annenberg School of Communication and Journalism, California, for the assistant position under Klaus KRIPPENDORF. He worked as a research associate and filmmaker at the Philadelphia Child Guidance Clinic from 1971-1974 and transferred to the Developmental Center for Autistic Children in Philadelphia for a position as a video director, where he studied video-guided family therapy sessions. GOODWIN completed his dissertation entitled "Some Aspects of the Interaction of Speaker and Hearer in the Construction of the Turn at Talk in Natural Conversation" in 1977 at the Annenberg School of Communication. From 1976-1990 and from 1991-1996, GOODWIN taught anthropology at the University of South Carolina. From 1989-1991 he was a research consultant at the Xerox Palo Alto Research Center and from 1996 until his retirement, he worked as a distinguished research professor of communication at the Department of Communication at UCLA, California. In 2018 Charles GOODWIN received the Garfinkel-Sacks Award for Distinguished Scholarship from the American Sociological Association and the Lifetime Achievement Award conferred by the International Society of Conversation Analysis.

Contact:

Marjorie Harness Goodwin

Distinguished Research Professor of Anthropology
Department of Anthropology
University of California
Los Angeles CA 90095-1553, USA

E-mail: mgoodwin@anthro.ucla.edu
URL:
http://www.anthro.ucla.edu/faculty/marjorie-harness-goodwin

René SALOMON, born 1976, Member of faculty and researcher at the Chair for General Sociology at the Julius-Maximilians-University Würzburg. Research interests: practice and systems theories; qualitative methodology; sociology of knowledge.

Contact:

René Salomon

Chair of General Sociology and Sociological Theory
Institute of Political Science and Sociology
University of Würzburg
Wittelsbacherplatz 1
97074 Würzburg, Germany

Tel.: +49 (0)931 / 31 80083
Fax: +49 931 31800830

E-mail: rene.salomon@uni-wuerzburg.de
URL: https://www.politikwissenschaft.uni-wuerzburg.de/en/lehrbereiche/allgemeinesoziologie/academic-staff/rene-salomon/

Citation