

In the analysis of interactions, we draw on **conversation analysis** with its underpinning supposition that language and actions are inextricably linked and that people themselves make visible to each other anything of relevance in the pursuit of an activity, including not only matters of production but also matters of social order (Sacks, 1992).

Conversation analysis involves the careful turn-by-turn scrutiny of talk based on its sequential and structural properties in order to uncover how social phenomenon become constituted, in other words, how social work gets done. Thus, for example, in the analysis of the following two turns, researchers pay attention to how the second turn takes up the first rather than interpreting what the individual speaker (might have) meant:

5 Tia: [NO BUYING]

6 Tony: [who wants to ]=who wants to buy a box↓

What matters in conversation analysis, employed to understand how participants orient towards and built on each other's turns, is the relation between the two turns. This relation, therefore, no longer is an individual act but an irreducibly social one. Here, whereas turn 5 constitutes an offer/invitation to close a debate on making or buying a box and opt for a no-buying decision, this offer is de facto rejected in the counter-offer of deciding by means of a vote. The social act is one of a rejected offer/invitation, which necessarily requires this social act to be taken as a phenomenon *sui generis* (i.e., in a class of its own) that cannot be broken down into individual components, for neither turn 5 nor turn 6 is anything in itself. The function of a turn is determined by its neighbors; they are like a system of equations that do not allow separating variables. Turn 5 is an offer because there is a rejection (turn 6), and turn 6 is a rejection because there is an offer (turn 5).

Fundamental to this kind of analysis is attending to the ways in which participants themselves make social structure available. Often this occurs in terms of a process known as *formulating*. For example, in the following turn pair, the second turn makes visible that the first turn is to be treated as a question. In the statement, "a better question is," turn 6 is treated as a question rather than as a negative comment that might otherwise be equivalent to "who *would* want to buy a box."

6 Tony: [who wants to ]=who wants to buy a box↓ (0.4)

→ 7 Tia: u:m↓(0.5) its better if we make it (0.9) ((inhales loudly)) a better question is who takes custody (0.4) af [ ter- ] after

In this way, **conversation analysis** can be employed to analyze such decision-making episodes. Analysts focus on pairs of turns in conversation, follow their links through excerpts of talk, and tune into the joint work participants do to make their talk recognizable and intelligible to each other. Hence, social structure, in the way participants themselves make it visible to each other and jointly produce it, comes to the fore. By analyzing talk, it is possible to get at the locally rational ways in which decisions are produced by teams. This approach has been successful for explaining situated practices in work contexts (Vom Lehn, 2014), including design behavior (e.g., Matthews & Heinemann, 2012; Oak, 2012).