



The construction of shared laughter in an institutional setting: Who laughs at what in the classroom?¹

Mehmet Ali İbay^{a *} and Ali Yıldırım^b

^aAss. Prof., anakkale Onsekiz Mart University Faculty of Education, anakkale, Turkey

^bProf., Middle East Technical University Faculty of Education, Ankara, Turkey

Abstract

Abstract

This study aimed at making visible the “seen but unnoticed features” of shared laughter in an institutional setting (Garfinkel, 1967, p. 44). It was part of a larger project demonstrating how teachers and students accomplished establishing and restoring classroom order in three Turkish high schools (İcbay, 2008). The closer look at the details in the “cohort practices” (Payne & Hustler, 1980) suggested that one of the moments when the classroom members restored the previously established order was the ones when they laughed together (İcbay, 2011). Finding its analytic interest in making accountable the ordinary classroom achievement, this study uncovered how teachers and students laughed together in two 10th grade high school classrooms. The analyses showed that shared laughter in the classroom was predominantly volunteered and created alignment among the classroom members against the teased party.

© 2013 European Journal of Research on Education by IASSR.

Keywords: Laughter in the classroom, ethnomethodology, conversation analysis

1. Introduction

Laughter is essentially a social action. It is a locally situated and mutually accomplished action of (at least) two people in an interaction (Voge & Wagner, 2010, p. 1470). It is indexical: It refers to a laughable element immediately preceding the laugh (see Jefferson et al., 1977, p. 12; Schenkein, 1972, p. 365):

“(L)aughs are very locally responsive – if done on the completion of some utterance they affiliate to last utterance and done within some utterance they affiliate to its current state of development” (Sacks, 1974, p. 348).

By placing laugh relative to its laughable, a current speaker can signal laughter to other(s) in the interaction. That is to say, a current speaker can invite the other(s) in the talk to laugh together by placing laugh particles (or other means such as smiling, smile voices, laugh tokens, marked vocal or embodied features, punch lines or poetic wording) within his turn or following it (Haakana, 1999; Glenn, 2003; Jefferson, 1979; Jefferson et al., 1987). Following the first laugh from the current speaker, a second laugh from a next speaker (or speakers) operates as the

¹ Part of this study was presented in Laughter and Humor in Interaction Conference in June 2011 in Boston, MA. The data in this study was taken from Mehmet Ali İbay’s dissertation entitled “The role of classroom interaction in the construction of classroom order: A conversation analytic study.”

* E-mail address: maicbay@gmail.com

acceptance of laugh invitation (Jefferson, 1979). Alternatively, silence can take place after the first laugh, or the next speaker(s) can resume talk, thus resulting in the declination of laugh invitation (Glenn, 2010).

Different from a first laugh from a current speaker, a first laugh from a next speaker suggests that a laughable itself can invite laughter (Jefferson, 1974, p. 6). Putting it differently, a sequence of laughable from a current speaker and next speaker (recipient) laughter establishes an adjacency pair, indicating a laughable itself makes laughter relevant from a next speaker's laughter (Glenn, 2003, p. 81; Jefferson et al., 1977, p.30). For Jefferson (1979), a first laugh from the current speaker is called "invited laughter" while a first laugh from the next speaker is defined as "volunteered laughter."

Glenn (2003, p. 88) also argues that the number of parties in an interaction is relevant to who laughs first. In a multi-party talk, volunteered laughter might suggest that the current speaker who produces the laughable can take credit for his success by drawing laughter from the others in the talk (Glenn, 2003, p. 91 and see Pomeratz, 1978 for a similar mechanism in compliments). However, in a two-party talk, the first laugh by the current speaker within his turn or following it signals a laughable and invites the other to laugh together. Thus, laughter can take place without any gap.

As laughter happens in a naturally occurring talk, it can also take place in institutional contexts: Job interviews (Glenn, 2010), professional meetings (Markaki et al., 2010), doctor-patient interactions (Haakana, 2001), and classrooms (İcbay, 2008). However, when laughter is produced in an institutional setting, there are a number of constraints. The sequential organization of laughter in an institutional setting regulates who can produce a laughable, what parties can initiate laughter, and what they can laugh at (see Drew & Heritage, 1992, p. 19 for the organization of talk in an institutional setting). It also constrains the kinds of activities to which laughter contributes (Glenn, 2010, p. 1478; see Haakana, 1999, 2002; West, 1984 for the asymmetries in doctor-patient interaction, Buttny, 2001; Markaki et al., 2010; Osvaldsson, 2004 for the asymmetries in the professional meetings).

One of the institutional settings where laughter takes place is classrooms. Commonly a regular classroom involves a teacher and a group of students who spend a certain amount of time together to accomplish the objectives stated in the teacher's plan (Mehan, 1979). While they are performing certain tasks to accomplish those aims, they laugh. They laugh at content matter, teacher questions, student answers, class comments, off-task behavior, i.e. practically anything taking place in the classroom. Although there have been many studies done to make accountable shared laughter in different institutional contexts, there has been no detailed account publicly showing how teachers and students laugh together in the classroom. In order to provide an answer, this study focused on the classroom members' own methods for making laughter "visible-rational-and-reportable-for-all-practical-purposes" (Garfinkel, 1967, p. vii).

2. Method

2.1. Data

The data in this study were taken from the corpus of a larger project. This project aimed at making observable and accountable how classroom order was interactionally accomplished in three high school classrooms in Ankara, Turkey (İcbay, 2008). The classroom talks in these tenth grade classrooms were video recorded for 6 months (47 hours were recorded in 69 different sessions with 15 different teachers between November 2007 and May 2008). The preliminary aim in the project was first finding the moments when the classroom order was lost and then making observable the process of how the teachers and students were collaboratively restoring the order in the classroom. One of those moments in the classroom was the short periods when the class was laughing at something (İcbay, 2008). Following a similar theoretical direction, this paper will talk about two episodes taken from this corpus. The two episodes analysed extensively were taken from two different lessons (history and biology) in a tenth grade high school classroom.

The study was theoretically and methodologically built on the ethnomethodological principles. The analytic framework was formulated such a way that "detailed study of small phenomena may give an enormous

understanding of the way humans do things and the kinds of objects they use to construct and order their affairs” (Sacks, 1984a, p. 24):

“to take singular sequences of conversation and tear them apart in such a way as to find rules, techniques, procedures, methods, maxims, in order to generate the orderly features in these conversations, and then to come back to the singular things observed in a singular sequence with the mechanism that can handle those singular features, and at the same time to handle other prospective events” (Sacks, 1984b, p. 413).

Making accountable shared laughter in the classrooms has a practical problem. This problem is rooted in a bigger discussion of transcription as theoretical act. Transcription, the process of representing graphically what takes place in a recording, is a political and theoretical act (see Edwards, 2001; Green et al, 1997; Ochs, 1979). The decision on how the talk in a classroom should be transcribed reflects the researcher’s theoretical perspective towards what constitutes as classroom talk. The problem with transcribing the shared laughter in this study particularly is rooted in the fact that when a party (teacher or students) laughs, or when both parties laugh together, there are other overlapping laughs (and side talks). Representing each laugh (and talk) in the transcriptions is a challenging task: The onset and offset of those overlapping laughs are practically unidentifiable. Further, because there are many participants in the classroom using nonverbal actions at the same time, the decision on whose nonverbal actions to include in the transcriptions is equally challenging. Although most of the students in the classroom remain silent during laughter, they can make use of nonverbal actions: They smile, grin, shift their gazes, or shake their heads. The solutions to these technical problems are first treating the class laugh as a single unified laugh, i.e. transcribing the class laugh as hhhhhh (or HHHHHH) (Clayman, 1993, p. 128), and focusing on the teacher’s actions in the transcripts and putting the teacher’s actions as the locus of the interactions (Markee, 2000, p. 71).

Making meaningful how laughter is accomplished starts with making observable how the participants orient themselves to laughter in the talk (Glenn, 2003). This begins with finding who laughs first (i.e. finding the first laugh particles in the participants’ turns). It is followed by deciding whether the first laugh is delivered by a current speaker or next speaker(s) (i.e. deciding whether it is invited or volunteered laughter). The making-accountable-procedure ends with showing how the other(s) react to the laughter (i.e. showing whether the other(s) laugh, keep silent or resume talk). It also involves making visible how laughter is terminated and how the participants resume talk.

2.2. Episode I

The following fragment is taken from a biology class. In this fragment, the class is discussing evolution. The teacher is giving the evidence for evolution by showing some examples from certain species. As the next evidence for evolution, she gives the whale flipper. While she is waving her hand to suggest the meaning of flipper, the teacher asks the question: What is a flipper? A student self-selects himself as the next speaker and answers the teacher’s question: A filter. The class treats his answer laughable and laugh in the next turn.

(I) R03P071210P02C02 (39:03-39:18)¹



01 - 39:03



02 - 39:04



03 - 39:05



04 - 39:06



05 - 39:17



06 - 39:18

Turkish (Original)¹¹

```

1      T      [flipır [↑ne
2          [((P01)) [((P02))
3      S1     [s- süzgeç ( )=
4          [((P03))
5      T      = [süzgeç
6      S+     [HHHHHHH (13) ---
7          [((P04-P05))
8      T      [peki meseLA: bak toplan]
9      S+     [(
10         [((P06))
    
```

English (Adapted)

```

1      T      [flipper [↑what is it
2          [((P01)) [((P02))
3      S1     [f- filter ( )=
4          [((P03))
5      T      = [filter
6      S+     [HHHHHHH (13) ---
7          [((P04-P05))
8      T      [well for exampLE: get together]
9      S+     [(
10         [((P06))
    
```

Theoretically in a talk, either a current speaker or someone else provides the first laugh in a shared laughter sequence (Jefferson, 1979). A current speaker might produce a laughable, might initiate the laugh, and then other(s) can join in. Or, a current speaker might produce a laughable, and then other(s) can initiate the laugh, and others join in. Deciding who (teacher, students or both parties together) laughs first thus will give us some insight about how laughter is accomplished in the classroom.

In the first episode, as a response to the teacher's question in line 1, what is a flipper, a student self-selects himself and gives an answer in line 3: Filter. In lines 5 and 6, the students laugh at his answer while the teacher repeats his answer as part of an IRE^{II} sequence. Following the laughter, the teacher makes use of a tying signal in line 8 to restore the order in the classroom.

The closer look at the laughter sequence in this episode shows us how the teacher and students accomplish laughing together in the classroom. Firstly, the cohort's laugh in line 6 suggests that the students treat the self-selected student's answer in line 3 as laughable. The next speakers' laugh thus makes this sequence an example of volunteered laughter: A current speaker delivering laughable and a next speaker producing laughter following the laughable.

Secondly, the cohort's laugh takes place simultaneously as the teacher repeats the self-selected student's answer. The teacher's repetition here is the evaluation stage of the IRE (Initiation-Reply-Evaluation) sequence (Mehan, 1979). The teacher initiates the question and directs it to the cohort in line 1. The self-selected next speaker (the student) answers the question in line 3. Next, in line 5 the teacher starts evaluating the student's answer by repeating it. Before the teacher gives the correct answer, the cohort laughs at their classmate's answer. Following that, the teacher joins the cohort's laugh. The teacher's laugh (together with the repetition of the student's answer) works as the evaluation part of the IRE sequence.

Thirdly, after the laughter takes place, the teacher makes use of a tying signal in line 8 (Icay, 2011): Well. With the tying signal, the teacher resumes the instruction before the laughter sequence. That is to say, the tying signal here works as a signal to the cohort that they are moving back to the content. It can be said that the teacher's tying signal creates a bridge between what has been talked before the laughter and what is to be talked in the classroom.

2.3. Episode II

The second episode is taken from a history class. The topic is the Renaissance and Reformation periods in Europe. At the beginning of the session, the class is discussing the separation of the Church of England from the Roman Catholic Church, and then moves to the talk on Henry VIII's wives.

(II) R03D080114P03C1 (21:20-21:52)



01 - 21:20



02 - 21:24



03 - 21:26



04 - 21:27



05 - 21:33



06 - 21:36



07 - 21:38



08 - 21:44

Turkish (Original)

1 T [tabi:]sekizinci henrinin ilk yaptığı şey ↑ne çocuklar,
 2 [((P01))]
 3 [((başıyla öğrenciye işaret ediyor))]
 4 [((P02))]
 5 S1 papayı öldürmek=
 6 T =>.hayır c(h)a(h)nım< [papayı niye öldürsün] ala [kaya bak]
 7 [((P03))]
 8 S+ -hhhhhh (1.2) ----]
 9 S2 [BOŞANMAK]
 10 T [evet] boşanmak
 11 [((P04))]
 12 ve sevgilisi ↑meri enle evleniyo
 13 sevgili de hazır- [bekliyo]
 14 [((P05))]
 15 (2.4)
 16 kör talih [çocuğu] ↑olu [yo mu,]
 17 [((P06))]
 18 S3
 19 S+ hhh-hhh (3.2) ----]
 20 T [ho ho ()] üçünke kez evleniyo
 21 [((P07))]
 22 yanlış hatırlamıyosam
 23 üçüncü evliliğinden bir erkek çocuğu oluyo
 24 hemen adını [ceyms kokuyo ve birinci ceyms diyo ona]
 25 [((P08))]

English (Adapted)

1 T [we:ll] the first henry the eighth did ↑what was it kids,
 2 [((P01))]
 3 [((pointing the student with his head))]
 4 [((P02))]
 5 S1 killing pope=
 6 T =>.no d(h)ea(h)r< [why would he kill pope] see [the link]
 7 [((P03))]
 8 S+ -hhhhhh (1.2) ---]
 9 S2 [DIVORCE]
 10 T [yes] divorce
 11 [((P04))]
 12 and he gets married to his love ↑marry anne
 13 she is ready- [waiting]
 14 [((P05))]
 15 (2.4)
 16 bad luck [child] ↑could he [have a child,]
 17 [((P06))]
 18 S3
 19 S+ hhh-hhh (3.2) ----]
 20 T [ho ho ()] third time he gets married
 21 [((P07))]
 22 if I remember it correctly
 23 he has a son from his third marriage
 24 right away he names his son [james and james the first]
 25 [((P08))]

Similar to the laughter in the first episode, the shared laughter in the second episode takes place in an IRE sequence (see Table 1).

Table 1. Shared Laughter I in Episode II

Party	Turn	Function
Teacher	What was the first thing Henry VIII did?	Initiation
Student I	Killing Pope	Reply I
Teacher	No + laugh	Evaluation I
Cohort	Laugh	
Student II	Divorce	Reply II
Teacher	Yes divorce	Evaluation II

The student selected by the teacher answers the teacher's question in line 5: *Killing Pope*. As an evaluation, the teacher in line 6 rejects his answer with a non-affirmative particle (plus within-speech laughter): *No dear*. While the teacher is delivering the rest of the evaluation to the selected student, *why would he kill Pope, look at the link*, the other students in the classroom joins in the teacher-initiated laughter. Meanwhile, another student self-selects himself and gives an alternative answer in line 9: *Divorce*. The teacher evaluates the self-selected student's answer with a combination of an affirmative article, *yes*, and the repetition of the correct answer, *divorce*.

The closer look at the two instances of laughter shows that both of the laughter sequences takes place in an IRE sequence, i.e. after the selected student's reply to the teacher's question. Following the student response, either the other students or the teacher initiates the laughter, and the others join, thus making both sequences volunteered laughter (i.e. second position: retrospectively identifying a laughable in the student's reply).

Further analysis on the participants' orientation to the laughter suggests that the laughter creates affiliation among the teacher and students against the selected student (see Holt, 2012; Osvaldsson, 2004; Voge, 2010). The affiliation among the classroom members is rooted in the practical characteristic of classroom life. Customarily classrooms are the settings where a teacher is institutionally held responsible for covering the content matter and managing a number of students while the students are held responsible for attending to the content matter delivered by the teacher (Hammersley, 1976, p. 104). Because the content matter written and scheduled in the lesson plans are communicated through the exchanges between the teacher and students (Francis & Hester, 2004, p.11), there are a set of mechanisms regulating these exchanges. As part of those mechanisms, teachers treat students as a party, address to them as a unified body, and react to them as a cohort. The cohort machinery mainly regulates the interactions in the classroom and at the same time helps teachers manage the students by creating a two-party classroom setting: the teacher as the first party and the students as the second party (see Davies, 1983; İçbay, 2008, 2010, 2011; Macbeth, 1987, 1990; Payne & Hustler, 1980).

In both cases here, shared laughter changes the nature of the cohort machinery: Teacher joins in the student-initiated laughter (Episode 1), or the students join in the teacher-initiated laughter (Episode 2). The shared laughter thus provides affiliation among both parties against the student with the laughable response. It also creates a new set of parties in the classroom: Laughers (Teacher and the students) and the recipient of tease (the student with the laughable response) (see Drew, 1987).

The second laughter in the second episode takes place in another IRE sequence. In this sequence, the cohort's laugh in line 19 works as a reply to the teacher's question in line 16: *Could he have a child?* The teacher joins in the cohort's laugh and then moves to the next item in the story in the following turn. Both the students' laugh and the teacher's follow-up laugh works as stages of IRE sequence.

The closer look at the laughter sequence here suggests that the cohort's laugh works as a response to the teacher's question. Seeing that the students give the correct answer by laughing, the teacher first joins the cohort-initiated laugh and then continues with the content. Similar to the previous shared laughter, this laughter is both an example of volunteered laughter and creates alignment among the students.

3. Discussion

The examination of shared laughter in a classroom setting is part of the efforts that have been trying to uncover how laughter is locally produced and interactionally organized in institutional settings (Glenn, 2010). Following a similar effort, this study focused on the shared laughs in two class sessions recorded in a 10th grade high school classroom in Ankara, Turkey. The theoretical framework guiding the analyses in the study was rooted in the conversation analytic commitment that the order in a social phenomenon can be found and thus be empirically demonstrated in the details of a talk-in-interaction (Sacks, 1992). The sequential development of laughs in the classroom was thus the methodological base to reach an accountable understanding of how a teacher and students in a classroom locally produced and interactionally organized laughter.

In order to make accountable the seen but unnoticed machinery of laughter in the classroom context, the analysis first focused on discovering who laughed first in the classroom. The sequential analysis of deciding who laughed first was considered to provide the evidence for the participants' orientation to the organization of the laughable and their demonstrable laugh-making role relationship to each other. It was also expected to show who can produce laughables in the classroom. The analyses continued with uncovering what the teacher and students laughed at in the classroom. The closer look at what they laughed was thought to provide what roles laughter played in the classroom setting. The analysis suggested that the shared laughter played an affiliation role, i.e. promoting the sense of unity among the teacher and students against the selected (or teased) student. However, this proposition needs more evidence especially because the two examples of student laughter came after the teacher's evaluation of a student answer, implying that the students might tease a co-present student by laughing together (Drew, 1987). Teasing a student, either self-selected or selected by the teacher, can indicate another form of bonding and affiliation among students (Glenn, 2003, p. 112). However, as indicated above, this proposition needs further evidence.

The study also demonstrated what took place in the classroom after a shared laughter. The teacher held the floor, and continued what he was talking about before the laugh took place. As a consequence, it can be said that shared laughter is an off-task action that can take place at any time during the session. When it happens in the classroom, the participants turn back to main flow. The teacher's task is then making a bridge between what is talked last before the laughter and what is to be talked now by using a tying signal (Icbay, 2011).

The data shown in this paper is limited to the laughs that took place in two 40 minute history and biology lessons. The limitation is also related to the difference in the organization of teacher's position in the classroom. The organization of teacher's position observed in the class can be thought as a teacher-centered classroom where student self-selection is minimized and regarded as a form of violation to the classroom order. In a more learner-centered classroom where student self-selection is motivated and treated as a form of participation, laughter might be produced equally by the teacher and students (see Jacknick, 2011). Therefore, the analysis of laughter in a more student-centered classroom needs to be done in a further study.

Notes

^ISpeaker designation is shown as follows: *T* as teacher, *S* as a student, *S+* as a number of students and *X* as unknown party. Transcription conventions are adapted from Jefferson (1979) and Clayman (1993).

^{II}Blurred images are numbered (i.e. *P01*, *P02* and so on) according to their places in the sequential development of laughter.

^{III}*IRE* is alternatively called as *Initiation-Response-Feedback* (Sinclair & Coulthard, 1975), or as *Question-Answer-Comment* (McHoul, 1985), or as *Initiation-Response-Follow-up* (Hall & Walsh, 2002).

References

- Buttny, R. (2001). Therapeutic humor in retelling the client's tellings. *Text*, 21(3), 303-326.
Clayman, S. E. (1993). Booing: The anatomy of a disaffiliative response. *American Sociological Review*, 58, 110-130.
Davies, B. (1983). The role pupils play in the social construction of classroom order. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 4(1), 55-69.
Drew, P. (1987). Po-faced receipts of teases. *Linguistics*, 25, 219-253.

- Drew, P., & Heritage, J. (1992). *Talk at work: Interaction in institutional settings*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Edwards, J. A. (2001). The transcription of discourse. In D. Schiffrin, D. Tannen & H. E. Hamilton (Eds.), *The handbook of discourse analysis* (pp. 321-348). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers.
- Frances, D., & Hester, S. (2004). *An invitation to ethnomethodology: Language, society and interaction*. London: Sage.
- Garfinkel, H. (1967). *Studies in Ethnomethodology*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Glenn, P. (2003). *Laughter in interaction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Glenn, P. (2010). Interview laughs: Shared laughter and asymmetries in employment interviews. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 42, 1485-1498.
- Green, J., Franquiz, M., & Dixon, C. (1997). The myth of the objective transcript: Transcribing as a situated act. *TESOL Quarterly*, 31(1), 172-176.
- Haakana, M. (1999). *Laughing matters: A conversation analytical study of laughter in doctor-patient interaction* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Department of Finnish Language, University of Helsinki.
- Haakana, M. (2001). Laughter as a patient's resource: Dealing with delicate aspects of medical interaction. *Text* 2(1/2), 187-219.
- Haakana, M. (2002). Laughter in medical interaction: From quantification to analysis, and back. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 6, 207-235.
- Hall, J. K., & Walsh, M. (2002). Teacher-student interaction and language learning. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 22, 186-203.
- Hammersley, M. (1976). The mobilization of pupil attention. In M. Hammersley & P. Woods (Eds.), *The process of schooling* (pp. 104-115). London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Holt, L. (2012). Using laugh responses to defuse complaints. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 45(4), 430-448
- Icbay, M. A. (2008). *The role of classroom interaction in the construction of classroom order: A conversation analytic study*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Middle East Technical University, Ankara, Turkey.
- Icbay, M. A. (2010). Classroom order as cohering practices: A mutual interactional achievement in a kindergarten classroom. *Journal of Theory and Practice in Education*, 6(1), 50-67.
- Icbay, M. A. (2011). Tying signals: Restoring classroom order after transitions. *Classroom Discourse*, 2(2), 236-250.
- Jacknick, C. M. (2011). "But this is writing": Post-expansion in student-initiated sequences. *Novitas-ROYAL Research on Youth and Language*, 5(1), 39-54.
- Jefferson, G. (1974). Error correction as an interactional resource. *Language in Society*, 3(2), 181-199.
- Jefferson, G. (1979). A technique for inviting laughter and its subsequent acceptance/declination. In G. Psathas (Ed.), *Everyday language: Studies in ethnomethodology*. New York: Irvington.
- Jefferson, G., Sacks, H., & Schegloff, E. (1987). Notes on laughter in the pursuit of intimacy. In G. Button & J. R. E. Lee (Eds.), *Talk and social organisation* (pp. 152-205). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Jefferson, G., Sacks, H., & Schegloff, E. A. (1977). *Preliminary notes on the sequential organization of laughter. (Pragmatics Microfiche)*. Cambridge: Cambridge University, Department of Linguistics.
- Macbeth, D. (1987). *Management's work: The social organization of order and troubles in secondary classrooms*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of California, Berkeley.
- Macbeth, D. (1990). Classroom order as a practical action: The making and un-making of a quiet approach. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 22(2), 267-277.
- Markaki, V., Merlino, S., Mondada, L., & Oloff, F. (2010). Laughter in professional meetings: The organization of an emergent ethnic joke. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 42, 1526-1542.
- Markee, N. (2000). *Conversation analysis*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- McHoul, A. (1985). Two aspects of classroom interaction: Turn-taking and correction. *Australian Journal of Human Communication Disorders*, 13, 53-64.
- Mehan, H. (1979). *Learning lessons: Social organization in the classroom*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Ochs, E. (1979). Transcription as theory. In E. Ochs & B. B. Schiefflin (Eds.), *Developmental pragmatics* (pp. 43-72). New York: Academic Press.
- Osvaldsson, K. (2004). On laughter and disagreement in multiparty assessment talk. *Text*, 24(4), 517-545.
- Payne, G., & Hustler, D. (1980). Teaching the class: The practical management of a cohort. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 1(1), 49-66.
- Pomerantz, A. (1978). Compliment responses: Notes on the co-operation of multiple constraints. In J. Schenkein (Ed.), *Studies in the organization of conversational interaction* (pp. 79-112). New York: Academic Press.
- Sacks, H. (1974). An analysis of the course of a joke's telling in conversation. In R. Bauman & J. F. Sherzer (Eds.), *Explorations in the ethnography of speaking* (pp. 337-353). Cambridge, UK; Cambridge University Press.
- Sacks, H. (1984a). Notes on methodology. In J. M. Atkinson & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Structures of social actions: Studies in conversation analysis* (pp. 21-27). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sacks, H. (1984b). On doing "being ordinary". In J. M. Atkinson & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Structures of social actions: Studies in conversation analysis* (pp. 413-429). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sacks, H. (1992). *Lectures on conversation*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Schenkein, J. N. (1972). Towards an analysis of natural conversation and the sense of Hehe. *Semiotica*, 6, 344-377.
- Sinclair, J. M., & Coulthard, R. M. (1975). *Towards an analysis of discourse: The English used by teachers and pupils*. London: Oxford University Press.

The construction of shared laughter in an institutional setting: Who laughs at what in the classroom?

- Vöge, M. (2010). Local identity processes in business meetings displayed through laughter in complaint sequence. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 42, 1556–1576.
- Vöge, M., & Wagner, J. (2010). Social achievements and sequential organization of laughter: Studies in the honor of Gail Jefferson. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 42(6), 1469-1473.
- West, C. (1984). *Routine complications. Troubles with talk between doctors and patients*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.