

Making psychology relevant




Discourse & Society
Copyright © 2005
SAGE Publications
(London, Thousand Oaks,
CA and New Delhi)
www.sagepublications.com
Vol 16(5): 739–747
10.1177/
0957926505054944

JONATHAN POTTER
LOUGHBOROUGH UNIVERSITY

 **ABSTRACT.** This article describes some key features of a discursive psychological approach. In particular, discursive psychology is analytically focused on the way psychological phenomena are practical, accountable, situated, embodied and displayed. It describes its particular version of constructionism and its distinctive approach to cognition as points of contrast with a range of other perspectives, including critical discourse analysis, sociolinguistics, ethnomethodology and conversation analysis. Finally, it describes three areas where discursive psychology is involved with social critique: work on categories and prejudice, issues to do with cognitivism and its problems, and work developing a discursive psychology of institutions.

KEY WORDS: *categories, cognition, discursive psychology, institutions, social critique*

 This is the first time that *Discourse & Society* has devoted a Special Issue entirely to articles that come out of the emerging discipline of discursive psychology (DP). In this article I will try briefly to set out what is distinctive about DP in relation to the broader interdisciplinary field of discourse studies and some of the ways it contributes to critical social analysis. This will inevitably be schematic and contentious, but is intended to supplement the depth of the articles that came before.

What is discursive psychology?

One way of characterizing DP is as an approach that treats psychology as an object *in and for interaction*. It is specifically called *discursive* psychology, then, as psychology is understood as part of discourse, as a feature of practices in a range of settings. The difference from traditional psychological perspectives is stark.

Traditional psychological perspectives focus on giving a technical account of the actual psychological states, processes and entities that underpin (and thereby partly explain) action. DP focuses on psychology from the position of participants – it considers *their* practical and situated constructions, terms, orientations and displays. Using the classic linguistic distinction, DP considers psychology in fundamentally emic terms, eschewing the etic perspective that is standard in cognitivist and social cognitivist psychology. From its perspective, the traditional objects and distinctions of cognitivist psychology start to lose sense and a radically different terrain of psychology comes into view. What sustains the coherence of the enterprise of DP is not the idea of a mental space to be populated by expert research but the massive significance of psychological constructions and notions in human affairs.

Insofar as psychology is an object, in DP it is *practical, accountable, situated, embodied* and *displayed*. Let me take these elements in turn. In DP, psychology is . . .

. . . PRACTICAL

Psychology in DP is first and foremost something practical. Psychology in this sense is bound up with people's practices. Descriptions (of psychological, material or social objects) can be studied for the way they are invoked in activities such as blaming, complementing, inviting and so on (Potter, 1996). The psychological categories that make up the mental thesaurus can be studied as a kitbag of resources for doing things. For example, not remembering can be a resource for building or resisting an accusation (Lynch and Bogen, 2005); a construction of 'boiling anger' can be used to establish the extremity and inappropriate nature of provocation (Edwards, 1997); the moderator's use of a 'belief' construction in a focus group questions can encourage quick answers and discourage accounts and 'don't know' responses (Puchta and Potter, 2004). This practical focus is a contrast to the more traditional psychological focus on perception, information processing and understanding. This practical focus is one major reason for DP research to have moved away from the analysis of open-ended interviews and on to the analysis of situated interaction recorded in natural settings.

. . . ACCOUNTABLE

A major element of the way psychology is woven into everyday practices is through the focus on accountability. How are individuals (or collectivities, organizations, or intra-individual entities) constructed as sites of responsibility? The focus on accountability typically works on two levels at once. First, there is the speaker's construction of agency and accountability in the reported events (who or what should be blamed, complimented, and so on). Second, there is the speaker's construction of their own agency and accountability, including what they are doing through speaking. Often these two levels of accountability are closely bound together such that speakers can construct their *own* accountability via the

construction of others' and vice versa (Edwards and Potter, 1992). For example, Locke and Edwards (2003) studied the way President Clinton's constructions of Monica Lewinsky's actions, emotions and motivations were reflexively and constructively linked to his own accountability.

. . . SITUATED

In DP psychology is situated in three senses. First, psychological concerns, orientations and categories are studied as embedded in interaction. Such an analysis draws on the methods and findings of conversation analysis. For example, take the traditional social psychological category of 'attitude' – a relatively enduring mentally encoded construct. DP radically reworks the notion of attitudes by focusing on situated evaluations (Potter, 1998; Wiggins and Potter, 2003), drawing on Pomerantz' (1984) foundational work on assessments in talk. Second, psychological concerns, orientations and categories can be rhetorically oriented. For example, the construction of a particular evaluation (of the British royal family, in an argument, say) may be built to counter an alternative (Billig, 1996). Third, psychological concerns, orientations and categories are situated institutionally, in the practices of relationship counselling talk, family chat, courtroom summaries and so on. The primary analytic focus for analysing this third sense of situation is how psychological matters are introduced, constructed and made relevant to the setting's business (Edwards and Potter, 2001).

. . . EMBODIED

DP focuses on discourse. As a perspective it holds back from what might superficially appear to be the direct study of embodiment (as seen in parts of experimental social cognition, for example, or in some traditions of the sociology of the body, or in some ethnographies). The reason for this is that such an approach dislocates embodiment from participants' own constructions and orientations. Instead in DP embodiment comes in through analysis of situated constructions of the body (as in Hepburn and Wiggins, 2005, this volume), through the procedural unfolding of talk (as in Wiggins, 2002), or through video analysis of embodied interaction that, crucially, treats orientations and constructions as primary analytic resources (as in Heath et al., 1999).

. . . DISPLAYED

For a range of conceptual, theoretical and analytic reasons DP rejects the John Locke picture of an inner, private psychology for which language serves as the conduit for transporting thoughts between minds. This is what Harris (1988) calls the telementation view of language. In its place, DP focuses on psychology as something displayed in talk and interaction. DP here is building on Wittgenstein's (1953/1958) critique of the idea of a private language, Coulter's (1990) sociology of mind and, most fundamentally, Sacks' (1992) project for understanding interaction, which emphasized that language must be

understandable and learnable. From Sacks' perspective, mind, intentions, understanding and so on are part of interaction through their current hearability in the interaction itself. Rather than seeing such things as lying behind the talk they are seen as features visible in the talk itself. It radically counters the traditional psychological dualism of inner and outer. For example, the important cognitive psychological idea of shared understanding has been understood in terms of displays involving collaborative sentence production (Sacks, 1992), in terms of the procedural role of the turn and repair organization of talk (Schegloff, 1992), and in terms of how the basis for ongoing interaction is constructed in talk (Edwards, 1999). These traditions are discussed in detail in Potter and te Molder (2005).

DP is not an alternative analytic approach to the topic of cognition. It is a thoroughgoing respecification of cognition in particular and psychology more generally. The centrepiece of this respecification is DP's emphasis on psychology's practical and interactional role and the associated methodological move to focusing on the analysis of naturalistic discourse in everyday and institutional settings.

Discursive psychology and the field of discourse studies

The thoroughgoing respecification of the psychological in DP puts it at odds analytically with alternative perspectives in discourse studies (some strands of sociolinguistics, some kinds of discourse process work, some styles of critical discourse analysis) that link studies of interaction to psychological processes or representations. See, for example, Edwards and Potter (1993) on discourse processes work, Potter (1996) on critical discourse analysis, and Potter and Edwards (2001) on sociolinguistics. An important part of the contrast with these approaches comes from the aim in DP to work with a consistent constructionist perspective that recognizes the contingency of descriptions and their involvement with practices. It is this consistent constructionism that provides part of the distinctive take on issues of 'psychology' as well as a range of topics such as 'context', 'material objects', 'embodiment'.

Constructionism is one of the things that sets DP apart from some strands of ethnomethodology and conversation analysis. However, the contrast is a complex one. There are, of course, differences between 'classic' ethnomethodology and Garfinkel's more recent programme, and between Sacks' earlier interest in membership categorization and the broader conversation analytic tradition he founded. This makes any contrast difficult. Moreover, the constructionism in DP comes from a rather specific tradition. It developed out of problematics in sociology of scientific knowledge (Ashmore, 1989) focused on the constructive role of descriptions and versions. This sets it apart from the phenomenological social constructionism of Berger and Luckmann (1966). Indeed, Berger and Luckmann offer more of a cognitivist position in their focus on the construction of an individual's experience. They do not consider how constructions (in talk and texts, in settings) of that 'experience' are used to do things, which would be

a more DP project. Within ethnomethodology there is a long tradition of considering fact construction (most notably in the studies collected in Smith, 1990) and Sacks' earliest work was focused on the topic of description (Sacks, 1963). Hutchby and Wooffitt (1998) provide an account of what a conversation analytic approach to fact construction might look like. Nevertheless, some ethnomethodologists argue strongly against constructionist positions (Button and Sharrock, 1993).

Another potential difference arises in the theorizing of cognition. DP is not a cognitivist perspective. That is, it is not an attempt to explain actions by reference to underlying cognitive states or processes. However, the concepts, entities and distinctions of cognition are a major *topic* on two levels. First, studies consider the wide range of ways that cognitive language is used in settings such as neighbour disputes or child protection calls (Hepburn and Wiggins, 2005, this volume; Stokoe and Hepburn, 2005, this volume). Second, studies consider ways in which psychological methods and instruments reproduce cognitivism by failing to analytically encompass the way cognitive talk is oriented to action (see, for example, Antaki, 2004, and Auburn, 2005, this volume). Discourse workers have also developed different ways of engaging with, and reconsidering issues of psychodynamics and the unconscious (Billig, 1999; Wetherell, 2003).

This focus on cognitive concepts and distinctions in practice is distinct from some approaches from ethnomethodology and conceptual analysis. For example, Coulter (1999) has criticized DP for taking an empirical and discourse analytic rather than an a priori approach, and for not offering a corrective to mistaken cognitive constructions whether in academic, institutional or everyday settings. DP researchers have argued that the indexical and rhetorically oriented features of cognitive constructions means that conceptual analysis, while important, is not *sufficient* for analytic work (Edwards and Potter, 2005; Potter and Edwards, 2003). When people talk on the proposed and oriented-to basis that their words express inner thoughts and feelings, in counselling say, this is an analytic topic for DP rather than something to be corrected. Nevertheless, DP is much closer to some other strands in ethnomethodological work addressed to, and respecifying, cognition such as Lynch and Bogen (2005).

The relationship with conversation analysis is equally complex. One way of understanding conversation analysis is as providing a consistently non-cognitive analytic perspective that is concerned with the mind in terms of formulations and displays embedded in the turn and sequence organization of conversation. Sacks' very first published lecture advocates the analysis of interaction independently of any concerns about the cognitive basis of what might be going on (Sacks, 1992). For the most part, conversation analysts have not been focused on issues of mind. Yet where they have addressed such issues there has been some ambivalence over the role of cognitive processes. For example, in recent discussions Drew (2005), Heritage (2005) and Pomerantz (2005) in different ways attempt to link interactional phenomena to underlying cognitive states rather than following a DP approach of understanding putatively cognitive phenomena in interactional terms.

Discursive psychology and critique

This short article will end with some brief observations about the status of critique in DP, highlighting its enduring interest in a cluster of issues to do with categories and prejudice, its debates with traditional cognitivist approaches to psychology, and its interest in psychology and institutions.

CATEGORIES AND PREJUDICE

One of the first critical themes in the style of discourse analysis that evolved into DP was focused on issues to do with racism, prejudice and minority groups (Potter and Wetherell, 1987; Wetherell and Potter, 1992; Wetherell et al., 1987). Much of this early work used open-ended interviews with the aim of identifying interpretative repertoires and practices. The current collection shows two kinds of evolution in this work. First, Tileagă (2005, this volume) has worked primarily with open-ended interviews in his analysis of the management of producing extreme accounts against Romanians. A feature of his study is its careful, conversation analytically informed, analysis of the interview talk (cf. Edwards, 2003). It avoids a number of the difficulties that have been highlighted in recent qualitative work using open-ended interviews (Potter and Hepburn, in press). Second, Eriksson and Aronsson (2005, this volume) and Sneijder and te Molder (2005, this volume) illustrate the way that categories and issues to do with prejudice can be studied through studying natural settings where such things come up and are managed.

CRITIQUES OF COGNITIVISM

All of the articles in this Special Issue show the continuing development of a non-cognitivist approach to psychological matters. They do this in different ways. For example, Stokoe and Hepburn (2005, this volume) consider material where noise is reported. However, their analysis is worlds apart from the traditional cognitive psychology of noise that is focused on perception, thresholds and so on. Instead, they analyse the way noise is worked up in descriptions to provide legitimate concern for complaint. Auburn (2005, this volume) takes as his topic the way that semi-technical cognitive notions become bound up with the practices of participants.

PSYCHOLOGY AND INSTITUTIONS

Most of the articles here show the value of working with materials collected from institutional settings. This allows researchers to address the way particular psychological (or 'psychological') terms and orientations have institutional roles in particular settings. This is a rather different approach to social organization than most late-20th century social psychology, which aimed to identify the operation of generic social processes, independently of institutions or historical settings (Gergen, 1982/1994). One of the aims of DP is to show the way

institutions such as therapy, education, focus groups and court cases are characterized by specific 'psychological business'. Moreover, analyses of this kind can explicate both the specifics of the psychological business and the nature of the institution. For example, Stokoe and Hepburn's (2005, this volume) article on noise reports in NSPCC and neighbour mediation provides a way of explicating subtle differences in the considerations underlying interaction in these different institutions.


These are only some of the critical themes that can be illuminated by DP; Hepburn (2003) and Speer (2005) review further strands of work.

REFERENCES

- Antaki, C. (2004) 'Reading Minds or Dealing With Interactional Implications', *Theory and Psychology* 14: 667–83.
- Ashmore, M. (1989) *The Reflexive Thesis: Wrighting Sociology of Scientific Knowledge*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Auburn, T. (2005) 'Narrative Reflexivity as a Repair Device for Discounting "Cognitive Distortions" in Sex Offender Treatment', *Discourse & Society* 16: 697–718.
- Berger, P.L. and Luckmann, T. (1966) *The Social Construction of Reality*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday.
- Billig, M. (1996) *Arguing and Thinking: A Rhetorical Approach to Social Psychology*, 2nd edn. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Billig, M. (1999) *Freudian Repression: Conversation Creating the Unconscious*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Button, G. and Sharrock, W. (1993) 'A Disagreement Over Agreement and Consensus in Constructionist Sociology', *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour* 23: 1–25.
- Coulter, J. (1990) *Mind in Action*. Oxford: Polity Press.
- Coulter, J. (1999) 'Discourse and Mind', *Human Studies* 22: 163–81.
- Drew, P. (2005) 'Is Confusion a State of Mind?', in H. te Molder and J. Potter (eds) *Conversation and Cognition*, pp. 161–83. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Edwards, D. (1997) *Discourse and Cognition*. London: Sage.
- Edwards, D. (1999) 'Shared Knowledge as a Performative and Rhetorical Category', in J. Verschueren (ed.) *Pragmatics in 1998: Selected Papers From the 6th International Pragmatics Conference*, Vol. 2, pp. 130–41. Antwerp: International Pragmatics Association.
- Edwards, D. (2003) 'Analyzing Racial Discourse: The Discursive Psychology of Mind–World Relationships', in H. van den Berg, M. Wetherell and H. Houtkoop-Steenstra (eds) *Analyzing Race Talk: Multidisciplinary Approaches to the Interview*, pp. 31–48. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Edwards, D. and Potter, J. (1992) *Discursive Psychology*. London: Sage.
- Edwards, D. and Potter, J. (1993) 'Language and Causation: A Discourse Analytical Approach to Description and Attribution', *Psychological Review* 100: 23–41.
- Edwards, D. and Potter, J. (2001) 'Discursive Psychology', in A.W. McHoul and M. Rapley (eds) *How to Analyse Talk in Institutional Settings: A Casebook of Methods*, pp. 12–24. London: Continuum International.
- Edwards, D. and Potter, J. (2005) 'Discursive Psychology, Mental States and Descriptions', in H. te Molder and J. Potter (eds) *Conversation and Cognition*, pp. 241–59. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Eriksson, K. and Aronsson, K. (2005) "'We're Really Lucky": Co-Creating "Us" and the "Other" in School Booktalk', *Discourse & Society* 16: 719–38.
- Gergen, K.J. (1994) *Toward Transformation in Social Knowledge*, 2nd edn. London: Sage. (Originally published 1982, Springer, New York.)
- Harris, R. (1988) *Language, Saussure and Wittgenstein*. London: Routledge.
- Heath, C.C., Hindmarsh, J. and Luff, P. (1999) 'Isolation and Interaction: The Fragmented World of the Train Driver on London Underground', *Sociology* 33: 555–75.
- Hepburn, A. (2003) *An Introduction to Critical Social Psychology*. London: Sage.
- Hepburn, A. and Wiggins, S. (2005) 'Size Matters: Constructing Accountable Bodies in NSPCC Helpline Interaction', *Discourse & Society* 16: 625–45.
- Heritage, J. (2005) 'Cognition in Discourse', in H. te Molder and J. Potter (eds) *Conversation and Cognition*, pp. 241–59. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hutchby, I. and Wooffitt, R. (1998) *Conversation Analysis: Principles, Practices and Applications*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Locke, A. and Edwards, D. (2003) 'Bill and Monica: Memory, Emotion and Normativity in Clinton's Grand Jury Testimony', *British Journal of Social Psychology* 42: 239–56.
- Lynch, M. and Bogen, D. (2005) "'My Memory Has Been Shredded": A Non-Cognitivist Investigation of "Mental" Phenomena', in H. te Molder and J. Potter (eds) *Conversation and Cognition*, pp. 226–40. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Pomerantz, A.M. (1984) 'Agreeing and Disagreeing With Assessments: Some Features of Preferred/Dispreferred Turn Shapes', in J.M. Atkinson and J. Heritage (eds) *Structures of Social Action: Studies in Conversation Analysis*, pp. 57–101. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Pomerantz, A.M. (2005) 'Using Participants' Video Stimulated Comments to Complement Analyses of Interactional Practices', in H. te Molder and J. Potter (eds) *Conversation and Cognition*, pp. 93–113. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Potter, J. (1996) *Representing Reality: Discourse, Rhetoric and Social Construction*. London: Sage.
- Potter, J. (1998) 'Discursive Social Psychology: From Attitudes to Evaluations', *European Review of Social Psychology* 9: 233–66.
- Potter, J. and Edwards, D. (2001) 'Sociolinguistics, Cognitivism and Discursive Psychology', in N. Coupland, S. Sarangi and C. Candlin (eds) *Sociolinguistics and Social Theory*, pp. 88–103. London: Longman.
- Potter, J. and Edwards, D. (2003) 'Rethinking Cognition: On Coulter, Discourse and Mind', *Human Studies* 26: 165–81.
- Potter, J. and Hepburn, A. (in press) 'Qualitative Interviews in Psychology: Problems and Prospects', *Qualitative Research in Psychology*.
- Potter, J. and te Molder, H. (2005) 'Talking Cognition: Mapping and Making the Terrain', in H. te Molder and J. Potter (eds) *Conversation and Cognition*, pp. 1–54. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Potter, J. and Wetherell, M. (1987) *Discourse and Social Psychology: Beyond Attitudes and Behaviour*. London: Sage.
- Puchta, C. and Potter, J. (2004) *Focus Group Practice*. London: Sage.
- Sacks, H. (1963) 'Sociological Description', *Berkeley Journal of Sociology* 8: 1–16.
- Sacks, H. (1992) *Lectures on Conversation*, Vols I and II (G. Jefferson, ed.). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Schegloff, E.A. (1992) 'Repair After Next Turn: The Last Structurally Provided Defense of Intersubjectivity in Conversation', *American Journal of Sociology* 98: 1295–345.
- Smith, D. (1990) *Texts, Facts and Femininity: Exploring the Relations of Ruling*. London: Routledge.

- Sneijder, P. and te Molder, H. (2005) 'Moral Logic and Logical Morality: Attributions of Responsibility and Blame in Online Discourse on Veganism', *Discourse & Society* 16: 675–96.
- Speer, S. (2005) *Gender Talk: Feminism, Discourse and Conversation Analysis*. London: Palgrave.
- Stokoe, E.H. and Hepburn, A. (2005) "'You Can Hear a Lot Through the Walls": Noise Formulations in Neighbour Complaints', *Discourse & Society* 16: 647–73.
- Tileagă, C. (2005) 'Accounting for Extreme Prejudice and Legitimizing Blame in Talk About the Romanians', *Discourse & Society* 16: 603–24.
- Wetherell, M. (2003) 'Paranoia, Ambivalence and Discursive Practices: Concepts of Position and Positioning in Psychoanalysis and Discursive Psychology', in R. Harré and F. Moghaddam (eds) *The Self and Others: Positioning Individuals and Groups in Personal, Political and Cultural Contexts*. New York: Praeger/Greenwood.
- Wetherell, M. and Potter, J. (1992) *Mapping the Language of Racism: Discourse and the Legitimation of Exploitation*. Hemel Hempstead: Harvester/Wheatsheaf.
- Wetherell, M., Stiven, H. and Potter, J. (1987) 'Unequal Egalitarianism: A Preliminary Study of Discourses Concerning Gender and Employment Opportunities', *British Journal of Social Psychology* 26: 59–72.
- Wiggins, S. (2002) 'Talking With Your Mouth Full: Gustatory Mmms and the Embodiment of Pleasure', *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 35: 311–36.
- Wiggins, S. and Potter, J. (2003) 'Attitudes and Evaluative Practices: Category vs. Item and Subjective vs. Objective Constructions in Everyday Food Assessments', *British Journal of Social Psychology* 42: 513–31.
- Wittgenstein, L. (1958). *Philosophical Investigation*, 2nd edn (G.E.M. Anscombe, trans.). Oxford: Blackwell. (Originally published 1953.)



JONATHAN POTTER is Professor of Discourse Analysis at Loughborough University. He is currently focused on issues of social psychology theory and method, and in particular the way psychological and institutional issues are bound up together. His most recent books include *Representing Reality* (Sage, 1996), which attempts to provide a systematic overview, integration and critique of constructionist research, *Focus Group Practice* (Sage, 2004, with Claudia Puchta) which analyses interaction in market research focus groups, and *Conversation and Cognition* (Cambridge University Press, 2005, with Hedwig te Molder) which brings together different interaction researchers to consider the topic of cognition. ADDRESS: Discourse and Rhetoric Group, Department of Social Sciences, Loughborough University, Loughborough LE11 3TU, UK. [email j.a.potter@lboro.ac.uk]