



University of Roehampton

PSYCHD

A discursive exploration of clients' and counsellors' metaphorical talk in counselling sessions.

Kasozi, Alexandra

Award date:
2018

Awarding institution:
University of Roehampton

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal ?

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

A discursive exploration of clients' and counsellors' metaphorical talk in counselling sessions.

By

Alexandra Kasozi BA, PgDip

**A thesis submitted in partial fulfilment
of the requirements for the degree of PsychD**

Department of Psychology

University of Roehampton

2017

The research for this project was submitted for ethics consideration under the reference PSYC 16/ 218 in the Department of Psychology and was approved under the procedures of the University of Roehampton's Ethics Committee on 12.07.16.

Abstract

This thesis presents a discursive analysis of clients' and counsellors' metaphorical talk in counselling sessions. Permission was granted for access to, and the research use of, existing data originally collected from the Pluralistic Therapy for Depression Clinic at the University of Strathclyde. This data took the form of audio recordings of counsellors' and clients' one-to-one counselling sessions. Of the data obtained, a total of thirteen counselling sessions from the therapy of three client-counsellor pairs' were transcribed using a modified version of Jeffersonian notation. Transcriptions were then coded to distinguish occasions of metaphorical talk. Subsequently they were analysed using a discursive psychology approach which drew on conversation analytic and ethnomethodological principles. This method considered the consequentiality of metaphorical talk on the surrounding interaction, how metaphorical constructions were assembled, and what actions were performed with metaphorical talk in the situated context of the therapeutic discourse. This was followed by a critical revisiting of some of the findings. The analysis found clients' and counsellors' uses of metaphor within the data related to three spheres of activity. The first related to constructions of identity through metaphorical talk – in particular a) the construction of relationships by both clients and counsellors using metaphors related to familial role categories, and b) clients' metaphorical constructions of past versus present identities. The second involved clients' use of metaphor to do topic management and resistance. The third involved the use of metaphor as a discursive resource in the construction of shared-meaning. Following this the implications of these findings for counselling psychology practice and other psychological therapists were discussed. In particular, a greater awareness of the possible impact of metaphorical talk and claims, and reflection on their impact in both limiting and freeing what is possible in the discourse was suggested.

Table of Contents

Abstract	3
Acknowledgements	7
Chapter 1: Introduction	8
1.1. Definition of terms	8
1.2. Some background to the research question	10
1.3. The aims of this research	11
Chapter 2: Literature Review	13
2.1. Introduction to the chapter	13
2.2. A brief historical overview of the study of metaphor	13
2.2.1. Early Enquiry into metaphor	14
2.2.2. The cognitive-linguistic study of metaphor	14
2.2.3. The discursive turn towards metaphor enquiry	16
2.3. Research into metaphor and psychotherapy & counselling	20
2.3.1. A contextual overview of research concerning metaphor in counselling & psychotherapy	21
2.3.2. Literature observing the occurrence of metaphor in counselling	21
2.3.3. A theoretical gap in metaphor and counselling research	24
2.3.4. Discursive research in metaphor in counselling & psychotherapy	25
2.4. The need for a social-constructionist discursive approach to the study of metaphorical talk in counselling	28
2.5. DP, CA and EMCA research concerned with counselling & psychotherapy talk	30
2.6. The present study	32
Chapter 3: Methodology	34
3.1. Introduction to chapter	34
3.2. Research methods & counselling psychology	34
3.3. Epistemological positioning	35
3.3.1. Social constructionism & discursive psychology	37
3.3.2. A spectrum of discursive approaches	39
3.3.3. Foucauldian discourse analysis	39
3.3.4. Discursive psychology & its influences	40

<i>Discursive Psychology: Influences from Conversation analysis & Ethnomethodology</i>	41
<i>Discursive Psychology: Influences from semiology</i>	43
<i>Discursive Psychology: Influences from speech act theory</i>	43
<i>Discursive psychology</i>	44
3.3.9. Critical discursive psychology	44
3.4. Choosing a method: a discursive approach	45
3.5. Justification of this approach	48
Chapter 4: Method	51
4.1. Introduction to chapter	51
4.2. The analytic & procedural process	52
4.2.1. Step 1: Devising a research question	52
4.2.2. Step 2: Gaining access and consent	52
4.2.3. Step 3: Data collection and building a corpus	54
4.2.4. Step 4: Transcription	55
4.2.5. Step 5: Coding	56
4.2.5. Step 6: Analysis	57
4.2.6. Step 7: Application	58
4.3. Ethical considerations	58
4.4. Summary	60
Chapter 5: Analysis	61
5.1. Introduction to chapter	61
5.2. Metaphorical constructions of identity	62
5.2.1. Keep it in the family: Metaphorical constructions of self & other using family roles	62
<i>Extract 1</i>	63
<i>Extract 2</i>	65
<i>Extract 3</i>	74
<i>Summary of section</i>	77
5.2.2. Past versus present me: Clients constructing multiple selves using metaphor	78
<i>Extract 4</i>	78
<i>Extract 5</i>	84
<i>Summary of section</i>	87

5.3. Clients' use of metaphor do topic management & resistance	88
<i>Extract 6</i>	89
<i>Extract 7</i>	93
<i>Extract 8</i>	98
<i>Extract 9</i>	103
<i>Summary of section</i>	106
5.4. Metaphor & clients' and counsellors' co-orientation to the construction of shared meaning	107
<i>Extract 10</i>	109
<i>Extract 11</i>	115
<i>Extract 12</i>	117
<i>Summary of section</i>	119
5.5. Summary of findings	120
Chapter 6: Discussion	122
6.1. Introduction to chapter	122
6.2. A brief recap of the findings	122
6.3 The findings & their implications	123
6.4. The validity of the findings	130
6.5. An evaluation of the research method	133
6.5.1. Evaluating the method of data collection	133
6.5.2. Evaluating the method of analysis	136
6.6. Future research	140
6.7. Reflexive conclusion	141
Appendices	143
Bibliography	165

Acknowledgements

Firstly I would like to thank my Director of Studies and Co-Supervisor, Dr Paul Dickerson and Dr Jac Hayes. The thoughtful reflection, enthusiasm and curiosity for this project that you brought to every meeting, as well as the cups of tea and kindness, have continually refuelled me when I was in need of it most.

A no less significant thank you goes to my husband, Alistair, whose patience and generosity have shone during the last three years as I have been training. Your support and encouragement for me to follow my dreams - in spite of it sometimes making life more difficult for you - has been remarkable. I hope that I can do the same for you in our future together.

To my parents, Tanya and Anthony and to my sister Robyn, thank you for your constant interest in this project and your willingness to ask questions and engage me in conversation about it. Most of all, thank you for cheering me on, sharing in my successes and commiserating with me in my failures... and then returning to cheering me on once more.

Lastly, I would like to thank three of my fellow trainees, whose dark sense of humour and quick wit have brought a smile to my face when I was in the murkiest depths of the research abyss. Niamh, Ruby and Tamara – thank you for keeping me sane and grounded!

Chapter 1: Introduction

“Metaphors have a way of holding the most truth in the least space.”

- Orson Scott Card, *Author, b1951.*

1.1. Definition of terms

This research uses a number of terms that are used with varying specificity in other contexts and as such their meaning in the present study is defined here for clarity.

“Metaphor” is defined in the Oxford English dictionary as, “A figure of speech in which a word or phrase is applied to an object or action to which it is not literally applicable,” or, “A thing regarded as representative or symbolic of something else” (Stevenson & Soanes, 2003, p. 5759). This study defines metaphor in accordance with this explanation, and interprets ‘metaphorical talk’ as identifiable according to the whether the communication in question is “a matter of finding indirect meaning” (Steen, 2007, p. 10) and the meaning of the communication makes contextual sense when understood figuratively (Lakoff, 1986; 1993; Tay, 2011a).

Throughout this study, the terms ‘counsellor’, ‘psychotherapist’ ‘therapist’ or ‘counselling psychologist’ are used to refer to a person trained or training in the delivery of a talking therapy or talking treatment, by a professional UK accreditation body.

‘Client’ refers to a person who is the recipient of counselling. ‘Counselling’, ‘psychotherapy’ and ‘therapy’ are used interchangeably to denote the practice of a talking therapy between a client and a counsellor, where these individuals have contracted to work together as such. The purpose of ‘talking therapy’ is understood broadly as counsellors working to help clients to understand feelings and behaviours better through exploring their

feelings and talking about things which are troubling them if they want to (How talking treatments work, 2017).

These definitions include the British Psychological Society's (BPS) definition of the professions of counselling psychologists, and the British Association of Counsellors and Psychotherapist's (BACP) definition of counsellors and psychotherapists. The former "work with both adults and children across a diverse range of issues, such as bereavement, relationships, mental health problems, etc., and aim to explore the underlying causes behind them" (Counselling Psychology, 2017); the latter "help people to talk about their feelings, think about their choices or their behaviour, and make positive changes in their lives" (What is Counselling and Psychotherapy?, 2017).

I have chosen definitions of counselling taken from websites available to clients and counsellors alike, rather than from academic texts, for a reason. This research considers the contextual nature of clients' and counsellors' metaphorical talk in interaction, and aims to explore what they as members of interaction are oriented to accomplishing with this talk (Schegloff, 1997; Ten Have, 2004). For this reason, definitions which are more likely to be available and applicable for both clients and counsellors seems important.

This study does not seek to further specify or subdivide the meaning of the terms. Whilst there are many ways in which these terms can be sub-divided – for example, by the counsellor's therapeutic modality or level of training – it is considered that further specificity would restrict the ability of this research to inductively explore metaphor in counselling talk by imposing pre-conceived assumptions and an analyst gloss regarding when, how and in what way metaphor occurs in certain discourses (Edwards, 1998; Potter & Hepburn, 2005; 2012; Schegloff, 1997).

1.2. Some background to the research question

The quote introducing this chapter, attributable to the science-fiction author Orson-Scott Card, aptly summarises what fuels my interest in metaphorical talk, and helps to address the question: How did this research come about?

In counselling sessions, when with clients as the counsellor, and in my own therapy as a client, I would notice how often metaphor was called upon in the dialogue. Where a problem or topic had been discussed literally for some time but with little progress, metaphorical talk seemed to suddenly provide something more, opening a perspective of communication that had previously been inaccessible. It was a new path of exploration – adjacent to the literal but with a slightly different view. A different kind of truth, perhaps, rather than “the most truth” as Scott Card suggests.

Yet from a social-constructionist stance “truth” is a complicated subject (Burr, 2015). Being a trainee counselling psychologist, my attitude towards my clients’ accounts was one which tried to prize their unique phenomenology; “to know and to empathically respect first person accounts as valid in their own terms” (British Psychological Society, 2017, p. 1). But I was also aware that the way accounts were talked and responded to was relevant and important to the interaction (Edwards, 1995; 1998; Widdicombe, 1998; 2017; Widdicombe & Woofitt, 1990). For example, there were times when clients had recounted their experiences metaphorically and I had topicalised what I understood to be relevant, only to have the client retreat from the metaphor. Or when I had sat, listening to clients talk metaphorically about a situation, and had felt a sense of unease, not at the metaphors, but at my certainty that the client was doing something else that I couldn’t identify. What was the “truth” of what metaphorical talk was doing in these situations?

Turning to existing literature to explore whether others could provide any insight into this question, I found a wealth of practitioner literature on metaphor in counselling and psychotherapy (Bowen and Nimmo, 1986; Cirillo and Crider, 1995; Clay and Sparks, 2001; Halprin, 2002; Hunter, 2012; Kopp, 1995; Loue, 2008; Lyddon,; Meares, 2005; Moon, 2007; Stott, 2010;). Yet most of this literature approached metaphor as an intervention to be deployed to accomplish therapy goals (Bowen & Nimmo, 1986; Kopp, 1995; 2013; Moon, 2007; Stott, 2010), rather than examining the functions it performed as it occurred in interaction.

These were the aspects of metaphor in counselling that seemed the most inaccessible and mysterious to me. However I realised that whenever I wore my ‘counsellor’ or ‘client’ hat, I was an active producer and effector in the interaction, and could not really understand what my clients and I were doing with our metaphorical talk (Edwards & Potter, 1992; Rapley, 2012). In order to remove this hat (as far as was possible), and consider the actions that metaphor accomplished hidden to me in my own counselling interactions, a discursive approach using naturalistic data seemed the most appropriate means of investigating this further (Potter & Hepburn, 2012; Wiggins & Potter, 2017).

1.3. The aims of this research

This research then, aims to address firstly the perceived lack of inductive, ethnomethodological and social constructionist research in metaphor in counselling interaction. Secondly, it recognises the importance of metaphor in counselling as indicated by the extensive practitioner-based research, and aims to contribute to this from a discursive perspective in both a methodologically rigorous *and* pragmatic manner. Thirdly, it aims to draw on the traditions of conversation and discursive analytic research by focusing on the consequentiality of metaphorical talk-in-interaction, what discursive and interactional tasks

the talk is oriented towards accomplishing, and how these actions are metaphorically performed (Edwards & Potter, 1992; Peräkylä, Antaki, Vehviläinen & Leudar, 2008; Potter & Wetherell, 1987; Madill, Widdicombe & Barkham, 2001; Sacks, Jefferson & Schegloff, 1995).

The view of this study is that whilst previous theorists have provided invaluable research that links previously disparate schools of thought and models of metaphor, there is a lack of research that offers a solely discursive enquiry, open to the possibility of whatever may emerge, of metaphorical talk in therapeutic interaction. Thus, this research aims to address this, by inductively exploring clients' and counsellors' metaphorical talk in counselling sessions.

Specifically, it aims to investigate the following research questions:

- 1) What does metaphorical talk accomplish or do in therapeutic interaction?
- 2) Are there any patterns in the consequentiality of clients' and counsellors' metaphorical talk?
- 3) What are the functions of clients' and counsellors' metaphorical talk in the counselling/psychotherapy context?

Chapter 2: Literature Review

2.1. Introduction to the chapter

The previous chapter introduced the topic of this research - clients' and counsellors' metaphorical talk in counselling - and discussed the researcher's motivation for and interest in investigating the nuances of this particular feature in therapeutic interaction. The present chapter continues to justify this exploration, through a thorough explication of related and relevant existing literature.

The title of the present research is: *A discursive exploration into clients' and counsellors' metaphorical talk in counselling sessions*. As such, there are several fields of research that need to be evaluated in order to consider all the literature related to this study. Firstly, this will begin with an historical overview of the study of metaphor, situating the approach taken in this thesis within the broader context of metaphor research. Secondly, attention will be paid to research that has specifically focused on metaphor within psychotherapy and counselling. Finally, a review will be undertaken of literature that has drawn on conversation and discourse analytic methodologies to analyse counselling and psychotherapy talk. Each of these subject areas has influenced the development of this research.

2.2. A brief historical overview of the study of metaphor

Historically metaphor has been the interest of philosophers and linguists who have attempted to model its usage in order to explain the mechanisms by which it works (Aristotle & Heath, 2003; Black, 1962; Glucksberg, 2001; Hesse, 1965; Johnson and Lakoff, 2002; Lakoff and Johnson, 1980; McGlone, 2007). Over time, authors have shifted from a focus on the philosophical enquiry into the rhetorical and poetic features of metaphor usage

(Aristotle & Heath, 2003; Black 1962; Hesse, 1965), towards a cognitivist-linguistic approach that attempts to model metaphor (Glucksberg, 2001; Lakoff and Johnson, 1980; 2002; McGlone, 2007).

2.2.1. Early enquiry into metaphor

Aristotle was one of the most influential early authors to discuss metaphor, defining metaphor in *The Poetics* in the following terms:

“The same word may at once be current and strange, though not in relation to the same people. . . . Metaphor is the transference of a word of another significance.” Aristotle, Baxter & Atherton, 1997 p. 187.

Aristotle put forward a theory of metaphor which outlined what he believed constituted metaphor, and the linguistic and poetic mechanisms necessary for metaphor to emerge (Aristotle et al., 1997). The general principle of this theory was that a term belonging to one ‘type’ is applied to another ‘type’ either directly or by means of analogy. The result of this is that new learning and greater clarity is brought about through this combination of words to cross-describe different types (Aristotle, Kennedy & George Alexander, 2007). This, Aristotle proposed, was performed deliberately by the speaker as a rhetorical device (ibid).

2.2.2. The cognitive-linguistic study of metaphor

Aristotle’s theory influenced the development of how metaphor was studied over the subsequent centuries, namely the tendency of researchers to attempt to model *how* metaphorical language is achieved. However, modern metaphor theory significantly extends Aristotle’s thoughts on the subject, seeking to explain not only metaphor as it occurs in language, but also metaphor as it occurs in the mind. In contemporary cognitive-linguistic theory, metaphorical language is frequently considered to be representative of the fundamentally metaphorical conceptual system of understanding and thought that humans are proposed to possess.

The most well-known proponents of this strand of metaphor research are Lakoff and Johnson. In their seminal text, *Metaphors we live by*, they set out the case for Contemporary Metaphor Theory (CMT; Lakoff & Johnson, 1980). They argue that far from being just a feature of language, humans think and act metaphorically, and a metaphorical understanding of the world is embedded in the way we process and make sense of the everyday. They use the following example in arguing this point:

“We don’t just talk about arguments in terms of war. We actually win or lose arguments” (Lakoff and Johnson, 1980, p. 4).

In other words, the process of mapping the concrete onto the abstract to create new meaning is only one part of a complex system. For Lakoff and Johnson, the mind works through the metaphorical conceptualisation of sensorimotor experiences (Lakoff & Johnson, 1999; Wallerstein, 2013).

The same theorists propose that this occurs through a systematic process whereby two conceptual domains - a source (literal) domain and a target (metaphorical) domain - are mapped on to one another. The result of a figurative concept being linked to a literal source is the creation of additional understandings which are rooted in the speaker’s culture and language. Because the model maps two systems which relate systematically to one another, CMT has become known as a correspondence model of metaphor (Lakoff, 1993).

According to this theory, metaphor both creates opportunity for additional meanings and ways of thinking about things (for example, arguments as conflicts, where ‘lines are drawn’ and ‘sides’ are chosen), *and* limits them (for example, if arguments are thought about in terms of being at war with one’s enemies, then the end of the argument might be limited to concepts of ‘surrender’, ‘defeat’ or ‘victory’. Concepts such as mutual agreement and shared understanding are likely to be limited by this metaphor.).

This theory has thus been hugely influential in cognitivist and linguistic spheres of inquiry. Lakoff and Johnson's contributions demonstrate just how saturated both language and thought is with metaphorical conceptualisations (Lakoff and Johnson, 1980; Lakoff, 1993). They also highlight how conceptual metaphors – for example “LIFE IS A JOURNEY”, can have vast and flexibly reaching metaphorical transformations in target domain language – for example “the night went downhill from there”; “we've hit a dead end”, or even “I've lost my drive”.

Numerous cognitive linguist authors have taken up and extended conceptual metaphor theory, or investigated it in relation to specific fields of study, for example, emotion metaphors (Kövecses, 2000) and time and spatial metaphors (Boroditsky, 2000). It has also been argued that when apparently new and ‘novel’ metaphors emerge in language, they can in fact be understood as extensions of and additions to pre-existing conceptual mappings (Kövecses, 2000). Other cognitive-linguistic metaphor theorists have presented alternatives to CMT. Gibbs' (1992) Class Inclusion theory of metaphor suggests that rather than metaphorical thought working by the linking together of two topics in correspondence, a metaphor functions to envelop literal concepts within the same classification, through superordinate similarities. As such, metaphor works through a process of categorisation as opposed to correspondence (ibid.).

2.2.3 The discursive turn towards metaphor enquiry

Despite its popularity amongst cognitive-linguists, CMT and other cognitive theories of metaphor are highly problematic for those taking a more discursive perspective. Indeed, one of the issues raised by discursive-linguists Cameron and Diegnan (2006) is that the theory detaches metaphor from language. As they put it:

“The cognitive turn thus deliberately shifted the attention away from language. While linguistic examples are cited throughout the central work in the field, their importance is as evidence for cognitive links rather than in themselves.” (Cameron and Deignan, 2006, p. 672).

From this perspective, the challenge made to CMT is that by focusing solely on the cognitive links and implications of metaphor, other variables such as individual experience and contextual factors (Cameron, 1999; 2007; Cameron and Deignan, 2006) cultural and intercultural variations (Kövecses, 2005; 2010) and discursive objectives (Semino, 2008; Tay, 2010; 2011a; 2011b; Wee, 2005) are completely ignored. Discursively oriented theorists have responded to these shortcomings by developing means of studying metaphor which take into account the discursive implications of metaphor use.

One such example of this is Cameron and Deignan’s Discourse Dynamics approach to metaphor. Through an analysis of metaphors in discourse, Cameron and Deignan (2006) proposed that non-literal expressions did indeed cluster together in patterns of usage. However they argued that these patterns were best characterised when the affective, semantic and pragmatic implications of the context were taken into account, in addition to the linguistic elements proposed in CMT. They created the term “metaphoremes” to describe these linguistic metaphors, which rather than being mapped onto stable conceptual target domains, were dynamic forces affected by numerous contextual factors, including the discursive setting and dialogic consequences (Cameron, 2003; Cameron & Deignan, 2006; Cameron, Maslen, Todd, Maule, Stratton & Stanley, 2009; Gibbs & Cameron, 2008).

Cameron and Deignan’s work has challenged CMT and an exclusively cognitivist approach to metaphor by considering metaphor in its discursive context. Nevertheless, their interest has not been on the intricacies of metaphor talk on a turn by turn basis, but rather on discerning linguistic metaphors or ‘metaphoremes’ that can be spotted and mapped in discourse in order to infer peoples’ values, beliefs and ideals (Cameron et al., 2009). In their

own words, their Discourse Dynamics approach to metaphor-led discourse analysis aims to answer questions such as “How can metaphor be used as a tool to uncover people’s attitudes and values through analysis of discourse?” and does so using an analytic method that “is neither inductively ‘bottom-up’” nor deductively ‘top down’” (Cameron et al. 2009, p. 4). Consequently, this approach is incompatible with the social constructionist and ethnomethodological perspective held by many discursive and conversation analysts (Edwards 1997; Potter, 1996b; Sacks et al., 1995; Schegloff, 1997; Wetherell, 1998; Willig, 2013).

Other discourse analytic work, however, has provided a still more radical challenge, questioning the whole notion of modelling the use of metaphor. Wee (2005), for example, investigated metaphor as ‘a discourse strategy’. He demonstrates that multiple cognitive models of metaphor can be exemplified in talk depending on the action the text or talk is oriented towards accomplishing, and challenges the position that models of metaphor are independent and competing systems. For example, he shows that when a topic is being explained and conceptual clarification is important, the correspondence model of metaphor (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980) is deployed, whereby a step by step comparison is made to highlight similarities. In contrast, the class inclusion strategy (Gibbs, 1992) is more suitable when talk is oriented towards the action of categorisation (Tay, 2010; Wee, 2005).

Other researchers have paid attention to how particular conceptual metaphors are selected and applied in certain discursive environments, and the social and interactional consequences they have on situating, framing and orienting the discourse. One of the concepts which developed out of this enquiry was ‘discourse metaphors’ – which are defined as, “A relatively stable metaphorical projection that functions as a key framing device within a particular discourse over a certain period of time” (p. 364, Zinken, Hellsten & Nerlich, 2008). An example of a discourse metaphor is HANDLING A DISEASE IS A

WAR. Through analysis of media discourses surrounding issues of biosecurity, Larson, Neirlich and Wallis (2005) demonstrate that discourse metaphors are imbued with a wealth of cultural knowledge. As a result, using such metaphors can provide a framework for talking a situation in a particular way. This can be beneficial when attempting to achieve particular social aims, for example, halting the spread of a disease proactively – or *combatting it*. How a situation is constructed *metaphorically* has important interactional implications for the way the situation is then metaphorically conceptualised and constructed (Zinken et al. 2008).

As well as being explored through discourse analysis, this has also been studied with even closer focus on the micro level of talk in conversation analysis. Leudar and Nekvapil (2004; 2011) use membership categorisation analysis (MCA) and CA to investigate the responses of several leaders to the 9/11 terrorist attacks. Although their specified aim is not to chart the development of metaphor, they demonstrate how the orientation of two allied world leaders' talk (Tony Blair and George W. Bush) mirror each other and build a rhetoric of "us" and "them", whereby "us" is categorised and contrasted with "them". "Us" is a collection of 'allies' who are 'strong', and emulate 'the brightest beacon of freedom'. This 'freedom and democracy' has come 'under attack' from 'them' – the 'evil' terrorists that have committed an act of war (Bush statement, 9/11/01). Thus the rhetoric of the war on terror evolves through interaction over the days following 9/11, and one speaker's talk is consequentially related to others. It informs the cultural discourse of a 'war on terror' that is constructed as a result of this interaction and continues long after.

The studies above demonstrate the variability amongst discursive approaches to considering metaphor in language. In quite different ways, these theorists all move beyond the purely cognitivist modelling of metaphor that Lakoff and Johnson propose, recouple metaphor with language and situate it in the context surrounding it; yet their foci differ.

There is therefore space for metaphor to continue to be studied in a discursive manner that challenges the cognitivist assumption underlying conceptual metaphor theory. This is namely that, “The structuring and organisation of language reflect[s] the structuring and organisation of cognition,” (Tay, 2014b, p. 52). This discursive study of metaphor would seek to address the bias in metaphor research towards deductive, linguistic and cognitivist approaches.

This research aims to do so by focusing on a particular discursive setting – counselling sessions, and observing metaphorical talk in interaction, free from the top-down models of metaphor that have preceded it. This does not mean, as Cameron et al. (2009) suggest, a rejection of the possibility of conceptual metaphor. Indeed, the reason why these models and theories of metaphor have been discussed in such depth above is because the researcher takes the view that in order to diverge from precedents of enquiry, it is important to acknowledge these precedents and understand them. Rather, it aims to use a less frequent alternative epistemological and methodological approach to the analysis of metaphorical talk in action, thus making the field of metaphor research a richer, more multi-dimensional environment.

2.3. Research in metaphor and psychotherapy & counselling

The literature pertaining to the development of the study of metaphor generally has now been outlined, and this research has been positioned in relation to it. However, there remains a significant proportion of relevant research still to be reviewed – namely literature discussing metaphor in counselling and psychotherapy. This section will provide an overview of this literature.

2.3.1. A contextual overview of research concerning metaphor in counselling and psychotherapy

It is broadly held amongst counsellors, psychotherapists and psychological practitioners that metaphor is a central tenant of therapy (Arlow, 1979; Kopp, 1995; Stott, 2010). Indeed, some therapists have gone as far as to name metaphor as the very act of psychoanalysis – with transference being equal to metaphor (Arlow, 1979), and metaphor being understood as “the currency of the mind” (Modell, 2003, p. 26). Concepts such as the unconscious, the Id, Ego and Superego and the Oedipus complex (Freud, 1977); the fragmented, emergent, verbal and narrative self (Stern, 1998); the good breast and bad breast (Winnicott, 1960); the basic fault (Balint, 1979) – are numerous throughout psychoanalytic writing. They are just some of the metaphorical and analogous means through which theorists and practitioners conceptualise human psychological and relational development.

In spite of the consensus amongst practitioners of the significance of metaphor in psychotherapy, there remains little consensus with regard to how to study it (Ingram, 1994; McCurry & Hayes, 1992; Needham-Didsbury, 2014). Practitioners have approached metaphor investigation in therapy using different theories, methodologies, and with various aims. One significant area of focus within psychotherapy literature has been the investigation of metaphor as an intervention.

2.3.2. Literature observing the occurrence of metaphor in counselling

Much of the literature concerning metaphor in psychotherapy focuses on the role that metaphor plays in therapy, and how practitioners can utilise metaphor to positive ends as an intervention (Bowen and Nimmo, 1986; Cirillo and Crider, 1995; Kopp, 1995; Loue, 2008; Lyddon, Clay and Sparks, 2001; Stott, 2010). Metaphor has been conceptualised as a bridge, whereby client and therapist can move towards greater understanding and shared meaning (Ingram, 1994) and through which the client can draw together contrasting realities

(Lenrow, 1966). It has also been held in high value as a means of subtly expressing alternative perspectives or reframing a problem (Bowen & Nimmo, 1986; Cirillo & Crider, 1995; Stott, 2010); as an empathic tool that uses shared language and concepts to build on the clients' experiencing (Cirillo & Cryder, 1995; Kopp, 1971; McCullen, 1996; Wickham, Daniels, White & Fesmire, 1999); as a means of extending and deepening awareness that can consequently result in significant therapeutic change (Pollio & Barlow, 1975), and in conceptualising and communicating difficult and intangible feelings (Cirillo & Crider, 1995; Kopp, 1995). Furthermore, these findings have emerged in various therapeutic models; in CBT (Stott, 2010); Client-centred therapies (Loue, 2008; Tay, 2014a, 2015), psychoanalytic/psychodynamic therapies (Long and Lepper, 2008); family therapy (Bowen & Nimmo, 1986) and in art and play therapy (Halprin, 2002; Hunter, 2012; Meares, 2005; Moon, 2007).

Other literature has observed therapeutic interaction in order to discern types of metaphor that occur in therapy. For example, through the observation of case material, Cirillo and Cryder (1995) established four functions of therapeutic metaphors – namely, making a point and a vivid comparison; accommodating disparate interests; changing perspective and shedding new light by combining topics. They also observed that some of these actions were more likely to be performed by counsellors than clients, and others no less likely.

A significant proportion of the literature has focused on how types of metaphor usage relates to favourable therapeutic outcomes. For example, Long and Lepper (2008) considered whether client, counsellor or collaboratively generated metaphor is linked to better outcomes. They found little difference between amount of client or counsellor metaphor usage and outcome improvement. However, they also categorised the types of metaphors used and found that in the case of metaphors categorised as 'Therapy/Self-transformation', those clients who improved used an average of 60 metaphors related to this category, in

comparison to one client who did not improve, who averaged 10 (Long and Lepper, 2008). Their findings suggested that though client generated metaphors may be preferable (as authors such as Kopp suggest), there are other factors such as what the metaphor is being used to discuss or work through, which are as important.

This emphasis on the use of metaphor in counselling and its implications in relation to outcomes has led to the development of ‘metaphor therapy’ literature, which commonly takes the form of advisory practitioner texts, with a focus on particular metaphors and on developing the skills to use metaphor as an intervention (Battino, 2005; Bowen and Nimmo, 1986; Kopp, 1995; Loue, 2008; Stott, 2010).

One example of this is Kopp’s (1995) “Metaphor Therapy”, which is proposed as a new perspective on existing theories of psychotherapy where metaphor is viewed and treated as a central intervention in the therapeutic process. The psychotherapist discusses the advantages of client-generated metaphors and the importance of therapists attending to these in therapy. He also instructs readers on how they might use metaphor theory in their own practice (Kopp, 1995).

Other prescriptive metaphor therapies include Bowen and Nimmo’s (1986) systemically oriented offering. Their argument is that families who can either volunteer or be coaxed in to using metaphors and analogies that represent their problems, can then use them to produce creative and shared solutions. This, they propose, is more effective than families merely discussing the problem and works to help families become unstuck, as by role-playing the metaphorical representation they can reframe their problem and positions in a creative way.

Other intervention-focused metaphor literature includes Battino’s (2005) step by step guide, where everything from the language of metaphor and its delivery and development, to more complex tasks such as reframing, are discussed. Perhaps the most recent instructive guide to metaphor in therapy is Stott’s (2010) discussion of the ways in which metaphor can be

used in CBT in relation to particular psychological problems such as anxiety and depression. Stott notes that metaphor in CBT plays a particularly important role in helping clients to explore unhelpful meanings and re-evaluate these (ibid.). He proposes metaphor as a means of helping clients to “step outside” the immediate perspective that they may be preoccupied with, and as a powerful tool in creating greater cognitive flexibility.

2.3.3. A theoretical gap in metaphor & counselling research

Research concerning metaphor in counselling, then, is extensive, and there is a significant body of literature available to the practitioner wanting to explore or experiment with metaphor in their practice. Yet it has primarily been concerned with the efficacy of metaphor as an intervention, and on providing pragmatic guidelines focused on supporting practitioners in utilising it as a therapeutic tool. An increasing number of practitioner-researchers have drawn attention to the disconnection between the study of metaphor in psychotherapy on the one hand, and experimentally, empirically-driven theories of metaphor on the other. For instance, it has been demonstrated how the latter have developed in areas of psychology independent of psychotherapy practice, such as cognitivist, linguist and discursive schools of thought (Needham-Didsbury, 2014; Tay, 2012; Wickham, et al., 1999).

A number of investigations have attempted to address this by proposing models or therapeutic interventions which take these theories into account. For example, Wickham and colleagues (1999), pay attention to the particular conceptual metaphors clients use as frames of reference, which are then utilised to achieve therapeutic goals such as greater empathic contact. Alternatively, Tay (2011b) considers how certain discourse metaphors emerge and are used in psychotherapeutic interaction (Tay, 2011b). It is these latter investigations – those which integrate discursive research into metaphor - that are most relevant to the present study, and are subsequently reviewed in greater depth.

2.3.4. Discursive research in metaphor in psychotherapy

A small body of literature has emerged in recent years that aims to address the deficit in studies that use discursively and interactionist driven, social-constructionist methodologies to study metaphor in counselling talk. This section reviews this literature, focusing on the work of Dennis Tay, an author who has contributed significantly to the use of discourse analysis to consider how metaphor is used in clients' and therapists' sessions. These studies range from exploring how discourse markers are deployed by participants to signal metaphoricality (2010), to an analysis of how metaphor emerges in trauma therapy (Tay, 2015).

Drawing on both Cameron and Deignan's work and Wee's research, Tay conducted a study to extend Wee's (2005) findings analysing two extracts from psychotherapy sessions to explore whether the type of metaphor strategy such as correspondence or class inclusion models could indeed be linked to different discourse strategies. He found that a linear relationship between one discourse objective and a corresponding metaphor strategy was absent, as a result of the continually changing discursive objectives of psychotherapeutic talk – even within a short extract (Tay, 2010). Nevertheless, whilst there was “no neat alignment”, there was ample evidence that different metaphor strategies were employed to accomplish a discursive activity *and revise* as it was necessary depending on the fluctuating demands of the interaction and discursive goals (ibid.).

The example was provided of a counsellor employing the correspondence strategy to make step by step comparisons between the multiple problems a client was facing in her life that were getting in the way of her hopes for the future, and an athlete having to “clear” hurdles in order to reach the finish line. However, when the counsellor tried to talk in more depth about one of these particular problems, the correspondence model was no longer the best

strategy, as it did not make sense to compare a difficult boss to the features of a hurdle, and thus this strategy was abandoned (ibid.).

Likewise, in another example, a therapist used a class inclusion strategy as a hedging device when he breached professional boundaries by discussing with a client their attraction for one another and desire to be intimate. The therapist employed the golf metaphor “It’s a playing lesson” most likely to make relevant a superordinate feature (the social acceptability of a playing lesson) and categorise his inappropriate talk in the same class as this acceptable social activity. Interestingly, however, when the client did not know what a playing lesson was, the therapist was then required to switch to using the correspondence strategy of metaphor in order to explain it. In doing so, he minimised his explanation of the correspondent features as this highlighted further the inappropriate nature of his intervention.

Thus, Tay points out that the metaphor strategy deployed does not always correspond with the discursive goals of the speaker, but sometimes depends upon the demands of the interaction, and in such cases the strategy can be maximised or minimised depending on whether the strategy being used and discursive action being attempted are aligned (Tay, 2010).

An additional finding in this paper and others was the correspondence of discourse markers (Shiffrin, 2008) with metaphor strategies (Tay, 2010; 2011a). Discourse markers such as “I mean”, “Right” and “You know” often acted as signalling devices which prefaced metaphorical talk in order to signal the most salient features of metaphor deployment. They also occurred at strategic junctures in the talk (Tay, 2011a). In contrast, discourse markers such as the minimisers “Maybe” and “Just” and “I mean” were associated with metaphor strategies such as that used by the therapist whose discursive aim was to downplay the correspondence between source metaphor and literal domain (Tay, 2010).

In the literature exploring discourse metaphors (Frank, Dirven, Ziemke & Bernádez. 2008; Zinken et al. 2008) the psychotherapeutic setting has also been used to demonstrate discourse metaphors in action. Tay (2011b) argued that the discourse metaphor “THERAPY IS A JOURNEY” operated on several levels within psychotherapeutic discourse. Firstly, as an un-situated conceptual metaphor related to the primary metaphor LIFE IS A JOURNEY, through which we use sensorimotor experience to inform our conceptualisations and thoughts as we encounter the world (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980; 1999). Secondly, and specific to the psychotherapeutic context, at the level of theorisation, where therapies such as cognitive-behavioural therapies can be seen to be represented as a journey. Here, the therapist is *a guide*, and the client and therapist work collaboratively to *navigate roadblocks* and ultimately to try to achieve the client’s established *goals*. Tay proposes that the third level of this discourse metaphor is evident in some training models, which have explicitly used journey metaphors to develop and exemplify their protocols or treatment models (Aranov & Brodsky, 2009; Rosenbaum & Ronan, 1998). Finally THERAPY IS A JOURNEY was found at the level of clients’ and therapists’ talk in the therapy. A series of extracts analysing one client-therapist pair’s talk showed that as they talked about their relationship they co-constructed it as at an *impasse* when they were finding working together difficult, and discussed *who is driving the car* as a means of co-constructing their positioning in relation to one another and in relation to who is leading the therapy (Tay, 2011b). The value of metaphor at characterising and constructing accounts of experience and events has been similarly demonstrated in clients’ trauma talk to discuss control (Tay, 2015), and in bodily-sensational experiences in sufferers of post-traumatic stress disorder (Tay, 2014a).

The literature that has been reviewed so far has attempted to charter the development of metaphor research over time, from a rhetorical and poetic device, to a cognitive-linguistic mechanism for conceptualisation and perception (Gibbs, 1992; Lakoff & Johnson, 1980), to a discourse strategy dependent on the demands of a given interaction (Cameron et al.,

2009; Semino, 2008; Wee, 2005; Zinken et al. 2009). Similarly, it has aimed to outline research in metaphor and psychotherapy, which has spanned from how metaphor use might relate to therapeutic outcomes, to pragmatic guidelines for practitioners focused on utilising metaphor as an intervention (Cirillo & Cryder, 1995; Kopp, 1995; Long & Lepper, 2009; Stott, 2010). Lastly, it has shown that in the past decade, metaphor theory and practitioner-focused theory have begun to come together (Needham-Didsbury; 2014; Tay, 2010; 2011a; 2011b; 2013; 2014a; 2014b; 2015) and particular attention has been paid to the literature that has taken or developed a discursive perspective whilst taking up this enquiry (Tay, 2010; 2011a; 2011b; 2014a; 2015)

2.4. The need for a social constructionist discursive approach to the study of metaphorical talk in counselling

For researchers grounded in a discursive and social constructionist epistemological stance subscribing to any top-down model of metaphor such as a contemporary metaphor theory (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980) can be considered problematic. This is because social-constructionist thinking brings an interactional framing to talk phenomena emphasising what metaphor does in interaction (Tay, 2010; 2011a; Wee, 2005). It also pays attention to the ideological work that is accomplished in and through talk (Frank et al., 2008; Zinken et al., 2008).

As has been demonstrated, however, some studies *have* taken a more constructionist discursive approach to metaphor in discourse (Cameron & Deignan, 2009; Leudar & Nekvapil, 2004; 2011; Wee, 2005; Zinken et al., 2008), and metaphor in therapeutic discourse (Tay, 2010; 2011a; 2011b; 2014b; 2015) and by doing so have challenged cognitive theory by positing discursive alternatives (Tay, 2010; 2011a; Wee, 2005; Zinken et al., 2008).

Nevertheless, what does remain starkly lacking are ethnomethodologically and discursively grounded explorations of metaphorical talk in action, that come unencumbered by hypothetical-deductive goals *and* have a *primary focus* on metaphor in interaction on a turn by turn basis, and considering it only in the context of its consequentiality and orientation to the surrounding talk.

From a conversational and discursive perspective, the study of metaphor, just as with the study of any feature of interaction, must begin and end with what metaphor does within the context of interpersonal interaction and in the different situational contexts of text and talk (Burr, 2015; Schegloff, 1997). Social constructionists refute the cognitivist position that what is demonstrated in and through language can somehow be used as evidence of stable cognitive processing systems or attributes (Burr, 2015; Potter & Hepburn 2008). Instead all that is knowable, from an epistemological constructionist perspective, is what occurs in social interaction (Potter & Edwards, 2003; Potter & Hepburn, 2008). As such, mapping a model of metaphor may provide a hypothesis for the systems involved in its occurrence, but even these systems are situationally construed in order to fulfil the purpose of doing theory and model making.

Furthermore, what these approaches do not do is notice what metaphor is doing and how it is done at the level of talk itself. They do not ask how metaphorical talk constructs versions of events or functions as a conversational tool to accomplish particular actions. Methods such as CA and DP could provide important insight into metaphor in interaction and its consequentiality within counselling interaction. Additionally, when these approaches incorporate the ethnomethodological (EM) principle that the actions and categories observed in talk must be demonstrably *member, not analyst* actions (Schegloff; 1997; Ten Have, 2004) there is even further opportunity for implications to be drawn that are genuinely relevant to counsellors' and psychotherapists' practice.

Previous researchers and practitioners have argued that metaphor can be considered a central tenant in psychotherapy and counselling – either as a purposeful intervention as suggested by the practitioner literature (Bowen & Nimmo, 1986; Cirillo & Cryder, 1995; Kopp, 1995; Stott, 2010) or as a means of facilitating the communication of often challenging and difficult experiences and often bringing about therapeutic change (Arlow, 1979; Cirillo & Cryder, 1995; Ingram, 1994; Modell, 2003). Therefore, just as other interactional features and the interactional tasks of therapy have been studied from a DP and CA perspective (Antaki, Barnes & Leudar, 2005a; 2005b; Heritage & Watson, 1979; Leudar, Antaki & Barnes, 2006; Leudar, Sharrock, Hayes & Truckle, 2008a; Madill, Widdicombe & Barkham, 2001; Pain, 2009; Peräkylä & Silverman, 1991; Peräkylä, et al., 2008; Potter, 1996b), it seems important that similar contributions are made to the literary field in relation to metaphorical talk in psychotherapeutic interaction.

2.5. DP, CA and EMCA research concerned with counselling and psychotherapy talk

Conversation analysis has been a method of study that many argue is an ideal methodology for investigations into clients' and counsellors' talk-in-interaction in counselling settings (Gale, 1991; Madill, Widdicombe & Barkham, 2001; Pain, 2009; Peräkylä et al., 2008). Some of this research has explored interactional features common to all conversational settings in order to discover intricacies unique to therapy talk, such as turn taking and dominating the conversation (Maynard, 1991), questions being raised and answered (Pain, 2009), members formulating and reformulating other members talk (Heritage & Watson, 1979) and talking identity through membership categorisation and variable identity construction (Antaki, Condor & Levine, 1996; Antaki & Widdicombe, 1998; Condor, 2011; Housley & Fitzgerald, 2009; Stokoe, 2010; Widdicombe, 2017).

Other studies in this area have focused more particularly on discursive and conversational tasks specific to counselling contexts. These have included the interactional task of formulating and reformulating (Antaki 2008; Antaki, et al., 2005a; Davis, 1986; Fitzgerald & Leudar, 2012) and actions related to this task. In the case of formulation, Antaki and colleagues draw on the established CA definition of formulation (Heritage & Watson, 1979) whereby a version of events is proposed which attempts to directly represent another member's former utterance (Antaki et al. 2005a). However, other actions which are interactionally related to formulating, yet appear to be distinct, are noted. These include, formulation extensions (Vehviläinen, 2003), challenges and corrections (Lea & Auburn, 2001); resistance to problem formulations (Madill et al., 2001) and re-interpretative statements (Bercelli et al., 2008). Bercelli and colleagues' work in particular focuses on the instances where counsellors ground their talk in the clients' speech, but propose "his or her own version of the clients events and experiences", rather than relaying the client's talk more directly (Bercelli et al., 2008. p. 43).

Further CA and DP counselling research has explored how emotions are talked in therapy (Leudar, Sharrock, Truckle Colombino, Hayes & Booth, 2008); the ways that clients resist the optimistic questions of therapists in sessions – by either giving 'answer-like' responses or more explicit 'non-answer' refusals (MacMartin, 2008); self-disclosure (Antaki, et al. 2005b); active listening (Fitzgerald & Leudar, 2010); the co-construction of meaning (Strong, Pyle, deVries, Johnston & Foskett, 2008) and how particular features of identity are made relevant in talk by one client in relation to another in couples therapy (Edwards, 1998).

In his analysis of couples' therapy sessions, Edwards (1998) demonstrated how two clients made different features of their identity relevant. Participants ascribed, denied and claimed different social identities by referring to features that suggested or contradicted membership

of certain categories. For example, the features that each of the participants refer to when discussing “a girls’ night” construct different accounts of the activity, identities of those participating and the consequences of this. Identity construction in this sense is “used in talk...brought off in the fine detail of everyday interaction” (Antaki & Widdicombe, 1998, p. 1).

Recent research has also observed how counsellors situate their actions of *doing therapy* in and through their talk (Costall & Leudar, 1996), drawing on “stocks of interactional knowledge” (SIKs) which inform not only the content but also the structure of their talk, in order to orient the interaction to achieve therapy-related goals (Peräkylä & Vehviläinen, 2003). SIKs are described as collections of institutional knowledge drawn from the institution’s normative models and theories that then inform patterns of interaction between client and counsellor. For example, they inform particular actions-in-talk oriented to *doing therapy*, such as formulating and reformulating (Leudar, et al., 2008a; Peräkylä & Vehviläinen, 2003).

2.6. The present study

It is evident, then, that with such attention being paid to other interactional features of therapy talk by conversation analysts and discursive psychologists, benefit could be gained from similar investigations in relation to metaphor – particularly given that it is deemed so vital to therapy. In applying a DP approach to the analysis of clients’ and counsellors’ metaphorical talk in therapy, this study adopts a gaze informed by DP, CA and ethnomethodological principles, and approaches counselling talk taken from clients’ and counsellors’ sessions in a manner as uninhibited by deductive theoretical models as possible. Thus, this research analyses metaphorical talk without the intention of finding

evidence of any existing deductive theories of metaphor such as CMT or Discourse Dynamics.

Instead, the researcher is highly interested in the consequentiality of clients' and counsellors' metaphorical talk, the actions members' metaphorical talk is oriented towards accomplishing or negotiating and its functions as a discursive strategy and resource (Sacks et al., 1995; Schegloff, 1997; Ten Have, 2004; Wiggins & Potter, 2017). In accordance with other CA and DP analyses of counselling talk, it pays particular attention to interactional tasks such as talking identity (Edwards 1998; Widdicombe, 2017) and the construction of meaning and experience (Buttny, 1990; 1996; Strong, et al., 2008) as well as the discursive and interactional task of orienting towards situationally related aims such as formulation, re-formulation, reinterpretation and resistance (Antaki, 1998; Bercelli et al., 2008; Leudar et al. 2008b; MacMartin, 2008; Madill et al., 2001), and seeks to observe whether metaphorical talk is involved in performing some, if any, of these activities.

Chapter 3: Methodology

“I have isolated a type, if not a genre, of reading from an infinite series of trajectories or possible courses. I have pointed out the generative principle of these courses, beginnings and new beginnings in every sense: but from a certain point of view. Elsewhere – in accordance with other subjects, other colloquia and lectures, other I/we drawn together in one place – other trajectories could have come to light.” Derrida, 1992, p.251.

3.1. Introduction to chapter

In this section I outline the considerable journey I went on when considering how to methodologically approach the study of clients’ and counsellors’ metaphorical talk in counselling sessions. This begins with my initial reflections on why and in what way I found the topic of interest as a Counselling Psychologist in training, and how this led me to make the decision that a social-constructionist perspective was the most appropriate method of study. I then charter my enquiry of the different social constructionist methods and their differing foci, and explain how this informed my choice to use a discursive psychology approach (Edwards & Potter, 1992; Potter & Edwards, 2003; Wiggins & Potter, 2017), which draws heavily on ethnomethodological (EM) and conversation analytic (CA) research in psychotherapy (Antaki et al., 2008a; 2008b; 2011; Perakyla et al., 2008; Sacks et al., 1995; Stokoe, 2012; Ten Have, 2004; 2007).

3.2. Research Methods & Counselling Psychology

If a methodology is the system through which one studies (Stevenson & Soanes, 2003), it follows that such a system is contingent on the knowledge framework that it rests upon. Consequently, this section firstly considers how the epistemological positions of various research methods impacted the way I approached and related to the research topic as a

counselling psychologist in training, and how this informed my decision to use a discursive psychology approach.

3.3. Epistemological positioning

Central to my experience of what it has meant to train as a counselling psychologist has been the constant epistemological tension inherent in the identity of the profession. Counselling psychologists, it is suggested, “Are expected to have two strings to their bows, one empirical-scientist string and one subjective-reflective-practitioner string” (Kasket & Gil-Rodriguez 2011). Yet this division of counselling psychologists as logical-positivist researchers and interpretive-realist practitioners – although already complicated – seems a significant oversimplification. Particularly when we are also told that Counselling Psychology is inherently post-modern and constructionist (Rizq, 2013; Strawbridge & Woolfe, 2003) and also pluralistic its nature (McAteer, 2010).

I draw attention to this epistemological ambivalence within the profession because it has been a significant factor in the methodological development of this research. In choosing a research method to study metaphor in counselling and psychotherapy, I have had to ask myself the simpler questions such as why and in what way I found the topic of interest, and which system allows me to study it accordingly? I have also had to follow this with reflections on the impact taking a given epistemological position has on my identity as a training researcher and practitioner.

Much of the therapeutic practice that counselling psychologists undertake with their clients might be understood as a mutual attempt to discern the significance and meanings of experience together (Cooper, O’Hara, Schmidt & Bohart, 2013; Howard 2017; Kennerly, Westbrook & Kirk, 2017; Lemma, 2016). As a result, in studying metaphor in counselling sessions it would have been possible to conduct an interpretative phenomenological analysis

(IPA; Smith, Larkin & Flowers, 2009) or use a grounded theory approach (GT; Glaser, 2017) to investigate clients' and/or counsellors' reported experiences of metaphor usage in therapy, in order to discover the significance that participants attributed to it. Indeed, I encountered a number of counselling psychology lecturers and researchers who questioned the validity of a DP/CA approach to metaphor in therapy and suggested that, as a counselling psychologist, would a realist-interpretive approach not deliver a more fitting focus?

Whilst I have no doubt that a realist methodology would have produced valuable insights, in my view there is a valuable alternative to studying participants' experiences of metaphor in counselling sessions, where "experiences" and "meaning" are viewed as subjective phenomena that can be accurately perceived and reported on. Rather, it seems to me that meaning is *constructed* in therapy through language, with multiple actions and agendas being achieved through this interaction. If I had chosen to study metaphor using a realist methodology, participants' accounts of their experiences of metaphor in counselling would be constructed and situated in the context of the interview (Potter & Hepburn, 2005; 2012), thus I questioned the assumption that the representations of their proposed "real" experiences might be generalisable outside of this particular discursive environment (Potter, 1996a).

Instead of taking participants' reports of what metaphor did in their therapy at face value, I became interested in metaphor as an interactive resource in their talk; as one of the many resources deployed to accomplish multiple other actions within counselling talk. As a counselling psychologist in training, talking is the mode through which I hoped therapeutic and relational change would occur. As DP focuses on discourse as "the primary arena for action, understanding and intersubjectivity" (Wiggins & Potter, 2017, p. 93), the two seemed to sit coherently alongside one another.

Consequently, when I became interested in metaphor in the talk of counselling and psychotherapy, it was with an inherent interest in this feature of interaction itself. I was less interested in the meanings attributed to metaphor usage – considering these ultimately unknowable (Burr, 2015; Potter & Edwards, 2003), and more interested in how metaphor was used in therapy conversations to assist in the accomplishment of the implicit tasks of the setting. For example, through orienting the talk to particular conversational actions (Antaki et al., 2008; Peräkylä, et al., 2008; Sacks et al., 1995 Schegloff, 2007a; Ten Have, 2007;), truth claims, identity construction (Antaki & Widdicombe, 1998; Wetherell, 1998; Widdicombe, 2017), construction of meaning, and the negotiation of representations of reality that were inherently socially constructed (Edwards, 1996a; Potter & Wetherell, 1989; Wiggins & Potter, 2017).

3.3.1. Social Constructionism & Discursive Psychology

Within psychology, social constructionism sits as an alternative epistemological position to the cognitivist and empiricist stances that dominated the “scientific inquiry” of the preceding century. Speaking broadly, logical-positivist theorists hold the position that there is a direct and objective relationship between the things that we encounter and perceive in the world and what actually exists (Burr, 2015; Edwards, 1997). Empiricist philosophers add that whilst our perceptions of the world may represent it as it actually is, this knowledge development is not a linear process but one in which we are continuously encountering the world through sensory experience and inferring knowledge which evolves through constant hypothesis testing and falsification (Popper, 1968). Taking this further, cognitivist researchers hypothesise that among the objective and enduring structures that can be inferred by observation, are mental processes that can be mapped and modelled (Wiggins & Potter, 2017). Thus the hypothetico-deductive method of experimental psychology which developed in the 20th Century arose out of these traditions, whereby extraneous variables

are controlled and independent variables tested in order for researchers to infer knowledge with regard to particular pre-specified phenomena and nothing else.

Social constructionists' opposition to the hypothetico-deductive experimental and cognitivist psychology position lies in their refutation of the idea that phenomena such as language, attributions, memory and recall, categorisation and identity can be studied independently of the complex social, historical and cultural contexts within which they occur (Burr, 2015). Instead, they suggest that as inherently social beings existing in a social world, our experience of the world, perception of it, and any "knowledge" we claim to have about it, is historically, socially, culturally and linguistically mediated (Willig, 2013).

Consequently, phenomena that might be considered objective and treated as uncomplicated truths such as identity and other attributes are in fact "*truth claims*". These claims are constructed and accomplished socially in, through and by language, and the situated nature and social context in which this construction occurs (ibid; Burr, 2015; Potter & Wetherell, 1987). As a result, although these phenomena may exist in an ontological manner independently and objectively of discourse, as language is the only means of constructing our experience of the world it is impossible to know objectively in an epistemological sense. This distinction is what Edwards defines as the difference between ontological and epistemic forms of social constructionism (Edley, 2001; Edwards & Potter, 2003).

In psychology the adoption of this epistemology has become known as the "turn to language" (for example: Gergen, 1985; Harre, 1993). It is a challenge to the cognitivist position that humans use language to describe "internal states" that transparently depict actual cognitions or cognitive processes in the mind (Edwards, 1997; Willig, 2013). On the contrary, discursive psychologists argue, all descriptions are both *constructive and functional* (Edwards & Potter, 1992). Through linguistic resources and in the context of their cultural dependence, people construct a version of events in a way that performs

complex social functions and manages interpersonal issues at stake (Burr, 2015; Potter & Hepburn, 2005; Potter & Wetherell, 1987). Thus, discursive psychologists are interested in the discursive means through which these constructions are assembled and adapted in accordance to the action orientation of peoples' talk (Wiggins & Potter, 2017).

3.3.2. A spectrum of discursive approaches

Although social constructionist discursive approaches are generally in agreement that versions of reality are constructed linguistically and culturally in and through text and talk (Burr, 2015), there remain considerable theoretical and methodological variations. These perspectives and approaches are perhaps best understood as being at varying points on a constructionist spectrum. Below, three of these discursive perspectives are outlined (though many others exist) that represent both ends and the rough centre of the spectrum. The approaches are then discussed in relation to the ultimate choice to use a discursive psychology approach in this research.

3.3.3. Foucauldian Discourse Analysis

At one end of this spectrum sits Foucauldian Discourse Analysis (FDA). FDA draws on post-structural and post-modern philosophies, which sought to deconstruct the myth that language is transparent or that it neutrally reports the truth and what is known. Instead, post-modern theorists called for the recognition of language as producing "truth effects" (Barthes, 1972; Derrida, 1992). Taking this further, Foucault became interested in how these various truths are produced; not only in the productive quality of language, but in the genealogy of various knowledges, and particularly institutions which Foucault referred to as "regimes of truth" (Foucault, 1990; 2002). Consequently, in FDA, socio-political structures are approached with an inherently critical perspective and an ethic of suspicion.

Foucauldian discourse analysts tend to focus on social, political and ideological issues such as sexuality, ethnicity and power - where these regimes of truth are observed being perpetuated, produced and performed. FDA posits that they are social and political structures, discursively constructed and navigated, not metaphysical phenomena in and of themselves (Rose, 1984). Rather than being interested in a micro level with *how* they are constructed and discursively deployed, Foucauldian discourse analysts focus on the *social and political function* of these pervasive, ‘capital “D”’ Discourses, and how they assist in regulating, perpetuating and maintaining social norms. Language is understood as both producing these Discourses, and restricted by them, and thus it is performative (Butler, 1997; 2011). The actions that it is possible to *do* and *perform* are regulated (or are regarded as being so) by what is allowable in the pervasive social and political Discourses one is situated within, for example, by the cultural narrative. In this way, Discourses affect the ways-of-being that are available as constructions of individuals’, groups’ and objects’ identities, and in turn subject positions and interpretive repertoires are developed to manage the positioning of the individual within the Discourses one exists within (Willig, 2013).

3.3.4. Discursive Psychology & its influences

Similarly to Foucauldian discourse analysts, discursive psychologists are also interested in how phenomena are constructed, negotiated and maintained in peoples' talk. However DP diverges from the former approach with regard to focus. In contrast to the macro focus of FDA, researchers using DP focus more on the detail and minutiae of exchanges in text and talk. It focuses primarily on the action orientation of participants' talk, and considers how this talk is constructed - through words and categories that draw on socially and sequentially situated categories and actions, and is constructive - in that these accounts do not exist independently of the talk (Potter, 2003; Potter & Edwards, 2003; Wiggins & Potter, 2017).

In part this micro focus is the result of the various traditions which influence discursive psychology. In comparison to FDA which grew primarily from the post-modern socio-political debate, DP evolved from a series of other fields of enquiry in philosophy, sociology and linguistics.

Discursive Psychology: Influences from Conversation analysis & Ethnomethodology

Conversation analysts are interested in how ordinary people conduct conversational practices and interact in everyday situations. They argue that by studying the sequential organisation of talk, insight can be gained into just how ‘speech acts’ are accomplished as situated actions (Ten Have, 2007). Similarly, ethnomethodology (EM), which emerged from the work of Harold Garfinkel, enquires into the way that members of a given social situation “create and maintain a sense of order and intelligibility in social life” (Ten Have, 2004, p. 14). In order to appreciate how DP and indeed this research is influenced by conversation analysis and ethnomethodology, it is worth noting how the focus of CA is closely aligned with that of ethnomethodology.

Ethnomethodology provides an alternative to the traditional sociological position that considers phenomena that occur in particular social groups or situations as the ‘social facts’ of a given context that are understood in the light of a larger explanatory account. Instead, EM considers how such social facts are constituted, created, adapted and maintained in context (Garfinkel, 2002). As such, given that conversation analysis and ethnomethodology are closely epistemologically and methodologically related, it is common for them to be mutually drawn on in conversation analytic literature (EMCA), and this is certainly the case in many of the studies below. Both are concerned with the construction and upkeep of socially and contextually situated actions (Ten Have, 2004).

Conversation analysis emerged from Sacks' exploration of the telephone conversations between callers to a suicide prevention helpline and helpline workers, when he became interested in the norms that became apparent in the conversations that seemed to stipulate when particular conversational activities could happen or when they were appropriate (Sacks et al., 1995; Woofitt, 2005). He and others became further interested in what participants did in their talk when these conversational norms were not met, and the consequentiality of this, for example a caller not giving their name and the effect this had on the subsequent turns of talk in interaction (Sacks et al., 1995; Schegloff, 2007a). Subsequently, CA has developed as a method of study for many spheres of conversational activity, from the institutional talk of schools (Gardner, 2013; Heap 1997), clinical settings (Maynard, 1991; Maynard & Heritage, 2005), mediation (Sarangi & Roberts, 1999), and, most importantly for this research, psychotherapy (Antaki, et al., 2005a; 2005b; Heritage & Watson, 1980; Leudar, Antaki & Barnes, 2006; Leudar et al., 2008a; 2008b; Madill et al., 2001; Pain, 2009; Peräkylä, et al., 2008).

Furthermore it has been used to look at how particular actions are accomplished across these institutions and to notice conversational patterns in how these actions are performed, for example in talking identity (Antaki & Widdicombe, 1998; Widdicombe, 2017) or expressing uncertainty or reluctance through hedging or disclaimers (Hewitt & Stokes, 1975).

One of the significant influences from EMCA that DP draws on is the means through which it approaches the data of conversations. DP also focuses on the consequentiality of features of talk on subsequent interaction. It pays attention to the EM principle of the indexicality of terms – how particular expressions and actions are ordered as a result of organisationally demonstrated agreement amongst members of the same context – or ‘cultural colleagues’ (Garfinkel, 1986; Ten Have, 2004). Furthermore, DP borrows from CA its interest in what

is made relevant in the conversation and how this is accomplished through individuals' talk. It also claims validity in its findings by what is evident in the data that participants are orienting their talk towards, and emphasises the importance of analyses that study members' actions and categories, not analyst imposed phenomena (Schegloff, 1993; 1997; Stokoe, 2012).

Discursive Psychology & Influences from Semiology

From semiology DP draws on Saussure's (1983) work in linguistics on the arbitrariness of the sign and myth. Saussure argues that the process of signification – the process through which something comes to be associated and “signified” by a sound that describes it - a “signifier” - is arbitrary. He also proposes that this should not be termed a naming process because there is no meaningful procedure that defines what sounds or signifiers come to symbolise the signified (ibid.). Most importantly for DP is Barthes' additional contribution semiology, which points out that multiple levels of signification can occur in relation to the same sign, and that additional levels of signification are often related to culturally and socially embedded symbols which he refers to as “myth” (Barthes, 1977).

Discursive psychology has drawn on semiology in relation to the flexibility of meaning creation and construction through language. Meaning-making is both a complex process and socially and culturally situated practice which is alive and adaptive and is determined not by linguistic features in isolation but is instead variable and dependent on the context of the social and cultural history.

Discursive Psychology & Influences from Speech Act Theory

Speech act theory has influenced DP in its understanding of speech and language as not only descriptive but also as performative. J. L. Austin, who first proposed the theory, suggested two types of utterances: constatives – those which were descriptive statements, and

performatives – those which as a result of being uttered perform a function (Searle, 1969). However, in testing and developing this theory, he found that in fact all utterances are *both* descriptive *and* performative.

Discursive psychology draws on speech act theory to refute the cognitivist position that peoples' descriptions and statements can be interpreted simply as such. In order to accomplish a description of a state of affairs as fact “there is *work* involved” (Edwards and Potter, 1992, p. 96). First, the description must be “*made to seem* precisely that: a *description* rather than a claim, a speculation or indeed a lie” (ibid., p. 104).

Discursive psychology

In contrast to the macro focus of FDA, then, Discursive Psychologists focus on the detail and minutiae of exchanges in text and talk, in order to observe how features such as attitudes, identity and accounting, are constructed in interaction in order to manage issues at stake and negotiate interpersonal objectives (Willig, 2013). Like the more critical approaches, DP is also interested in how positions and norms are constructed, negotiated and maintained in peoples' talk and as such participants are understood as active producers of versions reality, rather than passive describers (Potter & Hepburn, 2012). However, analyses are most interested in the micro level of talk. Indeed, in the subsequent decades since DP was first proposed as a meta-approach, it has moved closer to its EMCA foundations, using naturalistic materials to observe how actions are talked on a turn by turn basis within a given context. Furthermore, it does not tend to make inferences with regard to how these discourses “do” and/or are “done to” by pervasive social and political Discourses.

3.3.9. Critical discursive psychology

Between the ‘macro’ focus of FDA at one end of the social-constructionist spectrum, and the ‘micro’ focus of DP at the other end, a third method - critical discursive psychology

(CDP) - combines elements of both. Developed by Edley & Wetherell (1997), CDP incorporates both a bottom up discursive exploration of what is being accomplished in talk and how, alongside a critical and top-down analysis that focuses on how the prevailing Discourses are influencing the availability of what can be done and how in the first instance, and how these are managed. Edley and Wetherell (1997) suggest that studying interactions in this way allows for an analysis that is more demonstrative of “the ways in which people are simultaneously the master, and the slave, of Discourse” (p. 206). Furthermore, it is argued that CDP allows for richer analytic opportunities, where participants’ actions in talk are deconstructed not just at the level of the talk (as in CA and DP), but also through the observation of how different discourse identities are called upon and how participants negotiate these subject positions (Wetherell and Edley, 1999). As a result, CDP has been increasingly favoured as an analytic method for institutional talk in interaction, where social and discursive norms are explored and brought to light through a close examination of participants’ talk.

3.4. Choosing a Method: A discursive approach

So far in this chapter, I have outlined a number of ways in which theorists and researchers have approached the study of text and talk, including, DP, EMCA, FDA and CDP. I will now outline how I intend to draw on some of these methodologies in the present analysis.

This research is an enquiry into a feature of talk-in-interaction (metaphor) and an exploration into what it does in a particular discursive setting (counselling sessions). This starting point reflects the interests of both a CA and a DP focus, and draws on previous DP and CA approaches to analysing therapy talk (Edwards, 1998; Madill, et al., 2001; Perakyla, et al., 2008) and metaphor in talk (Tay, 2010; 2011a; 2011b; Wee, 2005).

The focus is first and foremost at the level of the orientation of participants' talk. It seeks to observe how metaphorical talk is deployed and how it functions to accomplish actions. For example, making truth claims and categorisations, negotiating interpersonal goals, constructing identities and managing issues at stake within the talk. As these areas of interest were in line with other DP analyses (Wiggins & Potter, 2017), DP was therefore deemed the most suitable method for this undertaking.

However, as referred to above, DP draws on many other theoretical and methodological traditions, all of which provide an often subtle but alternative perspective and focus, and together contribute towards a rich analysis. As a result, from an EMCA perspective, I was interested in the consequentiality of metaphor use on subsequent interaction from an immediate, here and now perspective, and the indexicality of participants' talk. At times I drew on specific CA approaches – for example, membership categorisation analysis (Sacks et al., 1995; Stokoe, 2012) where such methods were thought to enhance an analysis of what participants' seemed oriented to accomplishing in their talk.

Consequently, what the analysis does not feature is an exploration of all metaphorical and figurative talk that occurred in the data. Rather, it explores metaphorical talk and the surrounding indexical and conversational features associated with its deployment in interaction, which seem to be significant to the interactional tasks clients and counsellors are orienting to and attempting to achieve in the therapeutic setting. In doing so, the business and gambits of therapy conducted through talk that previous analyses in this area have noted are often observed and discussed. For example, how counsellors re-formulate or interpret clients' utterances and clients' subsequent management of this (Antaki, et al, 2005a; Antaki, 2008; Bercelli et al., 2008; Davis, 1986; Hak and de Boer, 1996); how clients present accounts of themselves drawing on a complex array of conversational tools for different purposes (Edwards, 1995; 1998); and how both clients and counsellors manage interaction

when the talk becomes problematic in some way (MacMartin, 2008; Wetherell, 1998; Wetherell & Edley, 1999; Vehvilainen, 2008).

Furthermore, analysis considers not only the here and now context of clients' and counsellors' talk, but also the situated and 'structured immediacy' of the talk, and how this is brought about (Leudar et al., 2008b). The argument for this is that identifying what action a description is performing in a given context is not solely a matter of considering the immediate sequential/here-and-now context (ibid.; Leudar & Nekvapil, 2011). Rather, interactions-in-talk can also involve participants orienting their talk towards contextual details outside of the here and now, and part of the tasks of interaction involve them indexing the immediate interaction to these aspects. For example, counsellors do not arrive at therapeutic interaction *tabula rasa*, instead they draw on 'stocks of interactional knowledge' based on the theoretical and practical models that make up their professional and institutional knowledge base, which they use to structure the interaction (Perakyla and Vehvilainen, 2003).

Additionally, where it is relevant, analysis makes more critical observations, noticing features such as participants' subject positioning and exploring how metaphorical talk functions to negotiate these (Wetherell and Edley, 1999). For example, what metaphorical talk is available to clients but not counsellors and vice-versa and what are the implications of metaphorical talk for each party? This is considered closer to the territory of critical discursive psychology (Wetherell, 1998; Wetherell & Edley, 1999), but could also be understood from a CA perspective through the idea of talk being "context renewing" and "context shaping" (Heritage, 1984). For instance, what is allowable (or indeed disallowed) in talk and how does this relate to the social and institutional actions that are being negotiated?

Consequently, the analysis that follows can broadly be described as a DP analysis that intertwines: An EMCA focus on the minutiae of interaction by considering the action orientation, the indexicality, the consequentiality and the relevance of metaphorical talk to the immediate exchange; a DP emphasis of the implications of client's use of metaphorical talk in relation to the social actions it is used to accomplish and how it is constructed and achieves these actions; and a critical gaze concerning how these relate to the subject positions available to participants and the consequences of this (Potter and Edwards, 1992; Wetherell, 1998).

3.5. Justification for this approach

Jonathan Potter has said of discursive psychology:

“It is misleading to talk of DP as a method. It is not a freestanding set of data-generating and data-analytic procedures. It is an approach embedded in a web of theoretical and meta-theoretical assumptions,” (Potter, 2003, p. 785).

Yet it is also important to remember that,

“This approach is not without restraints. DP cannot sensibly be used as a ‘toolbox’ approach, for example,” (Wiggins & Potter, 2017, p. 104).

In this chapter, I have outlined where the present study sits methodologically in the so-called theoretical web of assumptions that makes up the DP approach. Whilst I draw on a number of approaches in order to do this, these approaches are not so epistemologically or methodologically incongruent as to be referred to as belonging to different schools of thought entirely; and there is precedent for them being combined in research (Couture, 2006; Edley & Wetherell, 1997). As such, the methodological position I have described above

identifies my location as one of many possible options within the discursive field of research as a whole.

This position has been taken due to the additional insight that I believe may be gained by counselling psychologists and other psychological practitioners from this more open and flexible methodological approach. This is because firstly, there is strong evidence that how metaphor occurs in talk is strongly influenced by the discursive setting in which it is embedded, making a discursive analysis the optimal means for observing it as a discursive resource (Cameron et al., 2009; Semino, 2008; Tay, 2011a;). Secondly, the use of naturalistic data - in this case where participants' therapy sessions are routinely recorded with their consent – is considered best practice in DP and CA (Potter & Hepburn, 2005; 2012; Willig, 2013). Thirdly, the emphasis this method puts on the constructed and constructive qualities of language within particular discourses is particularly suited to this investigation because therapeutic talk between counsellors and clients has been recognised as a particularly rich interactional setting (Perakyla, 2012; Tay, 2010, 2011b). Clients and counsellors are proactively 'doing' therapy', constructing the therapeutic relationship and positioning themselves in certain ways through the constant action-performative and occasion-centred nature of talk (Edwards, 1998, p. 16).

Finally, the broader structures that clients and counsellors exist within also potentially influence the language that is available to these participants due to the social and institutional implications of identifying with these social categories (Edwards, 1998). Paying attention to these wider discourses by drawing on critical discursive tools in analysis is important in exploring the factors that may have contributed to how metaphorical talk is used (Cameron and Deignan, 2006; Tay, 2010; Wetherell and Edgely, 1999). Counselling psychologists have the opportunity to engage in an interpretive exploration with what is happening in and through their metaphorical talk, both at the level of interpersonal

negotiation through talk and by and through the discourses and SIKs they draw on and that are available to them.

Chapter 4: *Method*

4.1 Introduction to chapter

In the present analysis, I began by employing the iterative process of inquiry that Wiggins & Potter (2017) outline in seven steps of analysis. These are as follows: Step 1: Devising a research question; Step 2: Gaining access and consent; Step 3: Data collection and building a corpus; Step 4: Transcription; Step 5: Coding; Step 6: Analysis; Step 7: Application (Wiggins & Potter, 2017). Discursive psychology researchers acknowledge that each dataset and analytic process is unique, and that although procedural stages can be suggested, in reality these steps are neither linear nor should they be adhered to rigidly (Potter & Wetherell, 1989; Wiggins, 2017; Wiggins & Potter, 2017).

Furthermore, as an inductive and interpretative method of enquiry, many other versions of this analysis were possible depending on the researcher's focus (Willig, 2013). As DP is not a method wedded to strict data-gathering procedures, but rather an approach that draws on multiple contributing theories (Potter, 2003), the seven steps were used as a guiding structure in the procedural and analytic process to assist in the development and direction of the evolving study, rather than a prohibitive rule system. The stages are used in the rest of this chapter as a framework to describe the methodological process and development of this research.

4.2 The analytic & procedural process

Step 1: Devising a research question

As the research questions developed and discussed in the *Introduction* and *Literature review* chapters, I will presently repeat what they are here without further explanation. They are as follows:

- What does metaphorical talk accomplish or do in therapeutic interaction?
- Are there any patterns in the consequentiality of clients' and counsellors' metaphorical talk?
- What are the functions of clients' and counsellors' metaphorical talk in the counselling/psychotherapy context?

Step 2: Gaining access and consent

One of the key principles of the methodological position outlined in the previous chapter is the context-dependent and situated nature of talk. Consequently in order to study metaphor in the context of clients' and counsellors' talk in counselling and psychotherapy talk, data from therapy sessions were required.

Accordingly, permission was obtained for the researcher to have access to, analyse and use in this study of existing data originally collected from the Pluralistic Therapy for Depression Clinic in Glasgow at Strathclyde University (Cooper, Wild, van Rijn, Ward, McLeod, Cassar, Antoniou, Michael, Michalistic & Sreenath, 2015), provided I meet the University of Strathclyde Ethical Guidelines in addition to being granted ethical approval from the University of Roehampton Ethics committee (*see Appendix C for ethics approval & Appendix G for permission to use the discussed data*). This data took the form of recordings of counsellors' and clients' 1-1 therapeutic sessions. The recordings came from the

University of Strathclyde's Pluralistic Therapy for Depression counselling clinic, which was set up during the investigation by Cooper and colleagues into the efficacy of pluralistic therapy as a method to treat individuals with depression (Cooper et al., 2015). At the time of original data collection, client and counsellor participants gave consent for every session to be recorded and for these recordings to be used for research purposes beyond the immediate investigation by other researchers.

Naturalistic data is the preferred source of data in discursive psychology (Wiggins, 2017; Wiggins & Potter, 2017). Although it was previously acceptable and common to use open-ended interviews method of data collection (Potter & Edwards, 1992; Potter & Wetherell, 1989), there has more recently been a debate with regard to the appropriateness of this technique (Potter & Hepburn, 2005; 2012; Widdicombe, 2017).

Potter & Hepburn (2012) highlight some of the issues around using open ended interviews. These include the fact that how participants are recruited and are introduced to a study is already likely to be making assumptions and categorisations that are not acknowledged at analysis. Furthermore, extensive conversation analytic research into the question and answer pair has resulted in an awareness that questions are a powerful design feature of interaction – which can restrict the recipient's response, build pre-suppositions and manage the topic of conversation (Clayman & Heritage, 2002). As such, far from being a neutral interviewer, "The importance of the researcher as person is magnified because the interviewer himself or herself is the main instrument of obtaining knowledge," (Brinkman & Kvale, 2017, p. 266). There are thus ethical implications when using interviews as a method of data collection, where the researcher does not reflexively include and consider herself as an active producer and effector of the interaction she analyses (Rapley, 2012).

That is not to say that the researcher who analyses naturalistic data is invisible. This is far from accurate, as the analyst, as interpreter, cannot help but interpret the data through the

lens of her own experience and prior knowledge (du Plock, 2009). Consequently there is a need for continual researcher reflexivity and a conscious effort to bring into awareness what of herself the researcher is bringing to the data. Nevertheless, as the researcher is not present at the point of data collection, naturalistic data is considered at least to avoid researcher bias at this point in the analytic process (Potter & Hepburn, 2012).

Step 3: Data collection and building a corpus

In the original University of Strathclyde study, eighteen clients participating in therapy at the clinic were offered a 24 session course of pluralistic counselling for moderate to severe depression and the majority completed this (Cooper et al., 2015). The client participants recruited to the study were students at the University of Strathclyde, and their ages ranged from 18 to 58. Whilst the data did not record the ages of the counsellor participants, I understand from a personal communication from the lead researcher that they were a mixture of qualified and trainee counsellors and counselling psychologists (Cooper, June 2016, *personal communication*).

I was given access to a subset of this data which contained all recorded sessions of 12 client-counsellor pairs. I did not expect to use all of this data for analysis as some of it was not relevant to the research topic. However, the collection of a bank of data and subsequent analysis for relevant data is the recommended standard practice when using discursive methodologies in general (Edwards and Potter, 1992; Potter and Wetherell, 1987; Wiggins & Potter, 2017) and in relation to recording therapeutic sessions for discursive analysis in particular (Peräkylä, et al, 2008; Tay, 2010, 2011). A large data set therefore ensured there was a large sample to provide a rich source of data from which to carry out a meaningful analysis.

It is worth noting that ethics approval was also given for me to recruit clients and counsellors undertaking counselling from a local charitable counselling service. *Appendices D, E & F* show the participant information sheet and consent forms that were created for this recruitment method. Ultimately, however, they were not used, as the availability of pre-collected suitable data from the Pluralistic Therapy for Depression Study was deemed preferable (see *ethical considerations* below).

Step 4: Transcription

Of the 12 client-counsellor pairs' audio-recorded sessions in this bank of data, the audio recordings of 7 client-counsellor pairs sessions were listened to closely at least twice. An excel spreadsheet was kept and used to record metaphorical talk across these clients' and counsellors' sessions. Identifying metaphorical talk required a method of measurement. As outlined in the introduction, metaphorical talk was identified according to whether the meaning of the communication makes contextual sense when understood figuratively as opposed to literally (Lakoff, 1986; Steen, 2007).

Three client-counsellor pairs' audio-recordings that were identified as using metaphorical talk frequently, and thirteen sessions belonging to these client-counsellor pairs went on to be transcribed and analysed further. An example transcript from which one of the analytic extracts is taken is shown in *Appendix B*. The transcription convention used was based on a revised version of Jeffersonian notation (Jefferson, 2004; *Appendix A*). It is worth noting that whilst the original sample consisted of client participants whose ages ranged from 18 to 58 years, the subset of audio-recorded sessions and subsequent transcriptions which were used in this study consisted of a smaller age range of between 21 and 28 years of age. Furthermore, those recordings which were selected for transcription due to their metaphorical talk content featured trainee counsellors, rather than qualified counsellors or counselling psychologists.

Step 5: Coding

Coding represents a precursor to the analysis proper, where data can be sifted through in order to identify the occurrence of the particular feature(s) of interaction that are of relevance to the research questions – in this case instances of metaphor (Wiggins & Potter, 2017). The transcriptions were read and re-read numerous times. With each reading and re-reading new features in the data emerged, and interpretations shifted, deepened and changed.

At each cycle of enquiry I noticed different interactional features of clients' and counsellors' metaphorical talk, and with each cycle my focus evolved as I became more familiar and “close” to the talk. Hepburn & Potter (2006) have noted that this can be a common feature of the coding stage, where analytic issues can both develop and vanish.

This, however, made “coding” a difficult task. In my initial readings of the data, for example, all metaphorical and figurative utterances were noted as I attempted to notice any pattern that could be found in how, when and in what interactional and discursive context they were deployed. As reading and coding progressed though, it became increasingly apparent that the way that metaphor in clients' and counsellors' talk was used and could be studied were numerous. Equally however, as it progressed my initial anxiety regarding what I *should* do was replaced by excitement and curiosity as I began to notice interesting features within the talk. At this point, in order to produce a more focused coding of the data, I used the DP and CA requirements of the necessity of consequentiality, action orientation and relevance of talk in relation to the surrounding interaction as a means narrowing down and choosing which instances and features of clients' and counsellors' metaphorical talk to analyse further (Ten Have, 2007).

Step 6: Analysis

Using this approach, there were three ways in which metaphorical talk was identified as particularly impactful on the surrounding talk.

In each of these three cases, the most interesting, salient and consequential patterns that emerged related primarily to what was being “done” in the therapy at the time; how metaphorical talk functioned to assist in the accomplishment or management of particular interactional and discursive tasks, namely 1) identity construction 2) topic management and resistance, and 3) constructing shared meaning. Consequently, these findings are better identified as three spheres of activity, or actions of metaphorical talk (what task or action metaphorical talk is oriented towards accomplishing in the talk), as opposed to types of metaphorical talk that are being used.

The first metaphorical action identified is concerned with how metaphorical talk assisted in the construction of identities and the actions these identity constructions performed (1a & 1b below). The second is concerned with how metaphor was deployed by clients' to manage the conversational topic at hand and explored the means and ends of this strategy, and the third explores how metaphorical talk facilitated the co-construction of meaning. These are listed below:

1. Clients’ metaphorical constructions of identity

- a) *Keep it in the family*: Metaphorical constructions of self and other using familial roles

- b) *Past vs Present Me*: Clients’ constructing multiple selves using metaphor

2. Clients’ use of metaphor to do topic management and resistance

3. Metaphor & Clients' and Counsellors' co-orientation to the construction of shared meaning

Step 7: Application

The applications of this research are addressed extensively in the *Discussion* chapter. Briefly, however, if one takes the view that human experiences is mediated by and through language, culture and history, which is in keeping with the social-constructionist perspective of counselling psychologists, then DP analyses that concern themselves with talk-in-interaction are inherently relevant to this field. Counselling sessions, regardless of the therapeutic orientation of the counsellor, or the problem that the client brings, are conducted and experienced through talk. If metaphor is indeed a fundamental linguistic and therapeutic tool in counselling and psychotherapy, as evidenced in the literature review, then it follows that any DP enquiry into how this resource occurs in counselling, can produce valid insights for counselling psychologists and other psychotherapeutic practitioners into what their own, and their clients' metaphorical talk is doing as they sit across from one another, doing therapy.

4.3. Ethical Considerations

In conducting this research, the most significant ethical consideration related to the aspects of participants and data collection. In choosing to conduct a discursive analysis of clients' and counsellors' metaphorical talk in counselling sessions, naturalistic data was required. However, by their very nature counselling sessions are confidential, and this confidentiality is important not only in protecting the clients' anonymity and freedom to discuss highly personal material. It is also important for the practitioner – that they may feel free to respond appropriately to their clients' needs, within the ethical boundaries of their accrediting body, and free from the scrutiny of academics.

Nevertheless, there is equally no doubt that access to audio-recorded or transcribed counselling sessions can be profoundly helpful to counselling psychologists' and other psychological therapists' training and professional development (Pretorius, 2006; Tay, 2011b). Data such as this provides practitioners with the chance to learn from others, and offers the opportunity to notice things retrospectively in their own audio-recorded work that they are likely to have missed during the therapeutic interaction, given the numerous other activities they are juggling at the time. Furthermore, it has been pointed out that the nature of DP and CA analyses means that only short segments are usually analysed, meaning that when combined with standard ethical practices such as anonymity, issues of confidentiality tend not to be an ethical concern (McCleod, 2011).

As it is often common practice amongst trainee counselling psychologists and counsellors to audio-record clients' counselling sessions with their consent, I saw an opportunity to gather data from this group of individuals in a way that would limit any increases in intrusiveness to a minimum. However, I was also aware that there were many other studies which had used audio-recordings of counselling sessions as their main data source, and that in these cases researchers often used a bank of existing audio-recorded sessions, where permission had been given by participants for the data they provided to be used in current and future research (Edwards, 1995; 1998; 2000). I considered this even more preferable than using clients' and counsellors' sessions that were currently being recorded for training purposes, as it did not interrupt current and ongoing counselling in any way.

Thus, though ethical approval was given to use either or both sources of data (see *Appendices C - G*), once it became apparent that I would be able to have access to a plentiful data source that was originally collected for a previous research project, I withdrew from attempts to recruit new participants, deeming this to be both unnecessary and unethical under the circumstances.

Throughout this research, I have abided by the regulations and principles of the British Psychological Society's Code of Human Research Ethics (2011). Although no participants have been recruited to take part specifically in this research, I have nevertheless needed to pay attention to the careful, respectful and ethical handling and storage of participant data. This abided by both the University of Roehampton's data collection and storage guidelines *and* the University of Strathclyde's data collection and storage guidelines.

4.4. Summary

Thus, the current research sought to do justice to concerns within many social constructionist approaches, not least discursive psychology, by utilising naturally occurring, or researcher independent, data. These data facilitated the researcher's investigation into how metaphorical talk was used in clients' and counsellors' talk in therapy sessions, whilst minimising the researcher's interference with the data to the inevitable interpretive process of analysis. Here, a DP approach which drew on EMCA methods and principles, as well as utilising CDP where it was deemed particularly beneficial in analysis, was employed. After extensive analysis, three metaphorically accomplished actions were discovered. These are explained and discussed further in Chapter 5, and the analysis of these actions is demonstrated.

Chapter 5: Analysis

5.1. Introduction to Chapter

This chapter provides an analysis of clients' and counsellors' metaphorical talk in therapy sessions. As noted in the previous *Method* section, the audio recordings of twelve counselling sessions belonging to three client-counsellor pairs were transcribed and analysed using a DP method which drew on both EMCA, DP and limited CDA principles.

Specifically, it identifies three actions of metaphorical talk present in either or both clients' and counsellors' talk. These were:

1. Clients' metaphorical constructions of identity
 - a) *Keep it in the family*: Metaphorical constructions of self and other using familial roles
 - b) *Past vs Present Me*: Clients constructing multiple selves using metaphor
2. Clients' use of metaphor to do topic management and resistance
3. Metaphor & Clients' and Counsellors' co-orientation to the construction of shared meaning

The analysis that follows devotes a section to each of these metaphorically accomplished actions using the approach specified in *Chapter 4*. Each section explores and analyses extracts that relate to each discursive action, and demonstrates how metaphorical talk functions in the context of and to contributes to their accomplishment. Where appropriate, existing research will be drawn on to provide both validation and critique. An evaluation of

the findings and their implications for counselling psychology practice and metaphor research is continued in greater depth in *Chapter 6: Discussion*.

5.2. Metaphorical constructions of identity

One of the most prominent findings that emerged through analysis was the extent to which clients' and counsellors' metaphorical talk was employed to construct identity. In turn this talk was concurrently oriented towards accomplishing additional actions. This section looks at two of the most salient features of these metaphorical actions. The first part considers how familial role metaphors were used by clients and counsellors to construct identity, how they did this, and to what end. The second part explores how clients deployed metaphorical talk to construct past identities that were in turn made relevant to here and now discursive tasks.

5.2.1. Metaphorical constructions of identity a) *Keep it in the family: Metaphorical constructions of self and other using familial roles*

In analysing clients' and counsellors' talk in therapy, a recurrent feature was metaphorical talk that drew in some way on familial positions or roles. Furthermore, metaphorical familial references were made relevant and oriented towards in order to assist in identity construction. This analysis considers the participants' constructing identity by drawing on both membership categorisation analysis (MCA) and the sequential analysis of CA and DP (Sacks, 1979; Sacks et al., 1995; Schegloff, 2007; Stokoe, 2012). Membership categorisation analysis concerns itself with the analysis of "constructed reality; of culture, identity and morality; of inference and meaning...[in an] ethnomethodological spirit" that focuses on members use of categories rather than analyst imposed categories (Stokoe, 2012, p. 283). As such, the metaphorical talk discussed is considered to function to provide a clear characterisation to self and other identity construction which *members* are making relevant

as “identities-for-interaction” (Antaki & Widdicombe, 1998; Edwards, 1998; Hester & Eglin, 1997). The following three extracts demonstrate this across three different client/counsellor pairs. In all extracts the metaphorical talk which is the focus of the analysis is highlighted in bold for clarity.

Extract 1

Extract 1 shows a female client in discussion with her female counsellor using familial categories to metaphorically construct herself in relation to her flatmate, whom she is recounting having difficulties living with.

Extract 1 (C-C2 T5)

Client	1	<My flat mate> (.) I I never (.) I won't (1.5) like (1.0) I always
	2	feel <u>so guilty</u> when I ask her to do the washing up↑ [or to =
Counsellor	3	[Mmhm
Client	4	= (1.5) erm: (1.5) to to get (.) give me her share of (0.5)
	5	particular kinds of (0.5) sorts of <u>bills</u> ↑ and [<u>things</u> ↑
Counsellor	6	[Mmhm
Client	7	And like erm (3.0) everyone else I know says that >you I
	8	shouldn't< (1.0) >treat she's not< my <chi:ld> >shouldn't treat
	9	her like I shouldn't< <u>mother</u> her and do things like that for her =
Counsellor	10	Mmhm
Client	11	= >But then I always think< (3.0) my (.) my I feel like my dad
	12	would want me to (0.5) <do that>↑ and I feel so <u>guilty</u> if I go
	13	(1.0) can I have (.) get the money (.) can we split the the money
	14	for the shopping or whatever I feel <u>bad</u> <about it>↑ (2.0) so it
	15	stops [me from ever =
Counsellor	16	[Mmhm
Client	17	= < <u>asking</u> >↑
	18	(1.5)

In this extract, the client is constructing an account of a problem. She performs multiple discursive actions in order to accomplish this. First, she topicalises the problem in line 1, by beginning with “My flat mate”. However this is immediately followed by multiple references to herself – “I never”; “I won't”; “I always feel”, and thus the problem and topic is quickly modified as not just simply her flat mate, but as the client in relation to her (Prince, 1984). The client conveys some of the troublesome features of this relationship by citing particular examples – that she “always” asks her flatmate to do the washing up (line 2) and for her “share” of the bills (lines 4 & 5). These function as evidence in favour of the version

of events she is accounting (Edwards, 1998; Potter, 1996a). Whilst the client does not explicitly say that her flatmate does not do these things, the implication made through her use of the extreme case formulation “always” is that this is a frequent occurrence (Pomerantz, 1986). The use of “I always” (line 1) and “share” (line 4) also adds the notion of imbalance to the relationship.

The client is thus elaborating the details of the problem and constructing it further. Consequently an account is constructed whereby it is not only her flatmate that is the problem, nor their relationship, but the inequality that results from the flatmate’s behaviour. This inequality is represented further in lines 7 to 9, the most important turns of talk for the present analysis. The client continues to construct herself and her flatmate in contrast to one another, but this time metaphorically.

Her flatmate is constructed as “child” and the client as “mother” albeit indirectly (lines 8 & 9). This functions to achieve several things. Firstly by drawing on the familial roles “mother” and “child”, the client represents two highly salient and inference rich categories, for which there is a reservoir of social knowledge (Sacks, 1979; Sacks et al., 1995). These metaphorical categorisations function to strengthen and accelerate the identity construction *and* the problem already presented.

The client’s talk positions herself as ‘mother’ and the flatmate as ‘child’ but “*not* my child” (line 8; emphasis added), and the inference is that the category bound features of these identities also retrospectively construct the examples of the flatmate’s and client’s behaviour given in lines 2 and 4 as “childish” and “grown-up” respectively. Thus these earlier descriptions become ‘category relevant’ – although the categories are not explicitly mentioned, they “convey a sense...of being deployed as categories” (Schegloff, 2007, p. 480). Metaphorically, the “mother/child” identity constructions represent and extend the inequality earlier accounted for in an extreme case formulation (Pomerantz, 1986); asking

to do the dishes and pay bills is being metaphorically constructed as mothering. The consequence of this metaphor is that it stresses the incongruence of their actions in relation to one another: “Mother” and “Child” belong to the membership categorisation device (MCD) “Family”, as well as being what Sacks refers to as a ‘standardised relational pair’ – a category pair that carries “duties and moral obligations in relation to one another” (Stokoe, 2012, p. 285). Thus whilst the flatmate’s expectations of the client are congruent with the expectations of a mother and child relationship, there is discordance between the way the client and flatmate are behaving in relation to the membership category “Flatmate”.

The reference to child and mother metaphorically represents the inequality in the relationship *and* that it “shouldn’t” be that way (line 8). Why shouldn’t it? Because neither client nor flatmate “should” belong to that category. Either way, the client “shouldn’t” behave towards her flatmate in a manner consistent with a category bound relationship (child-mother) which they do not share. She thus proposes her own membership to the category “mother”, and simultaneously constructs herself as not wanting to belong to this category but being trapped by her membership to it. When she tries to disavow her membership she feels “guilty” or “bad” (lines 12 & 14). Yet she corroborates her original position with consensus talk (Potter, 1996a) “*everyone else I know says you I shouldn’t*” (lines 7 & 8, emphasis added). As such, the client’s child/mother metaphorical talk is both representative of and congruent with the existing construction of the client and her flatmate, and is successful in activating highly inference rich membership categorisation; yet it is framed as problematic because it is used to represent their relationship as it “shouldn’t” be.

Extract 2

Another example is shown in extract 2. Here a client is discussing with his counsellor his relief about finally having some financial separation from his mother, who has up until this point also been his landlady.

Extract 2 (C-C3 T2)

Client 1 But apart from that I'm (.) I'm looking forward to: (.) **having**
 2 **no ties with her** (.) [especially financial (.)][I mean =
 Counsellor 3 [Mm [mm
 Client 4 = they say you shouldn't do business with your friends and
 5 family
 Counsellor 6 Mmhm
 Client 7 And this is certainly (1.0) <been a (.) an example>
 Counsellor 8 Mm
 Client 9 °really unfortunate actually°
 Counsellor 10 So you're looking forward to (.) **<getting (1.0) those strings**
 11 **attached>** or as it were
 Client 12 Mm
 Counsellor 13 **Removed or (.) cut**
 Client 14 Aye
 Counsellor 15 Mmhm (1.5) mmhmm
 Client 16 Mm
 17 (4.0)
 Client 18 Even when you look back at (0.5) the whole last twenty odd year
 19 it's been very much a two way thing↑
 Counsellor 20 Mm
 Client 21 **It's not been so much mother and child↑ it's been sorta** (1.0) a
 22 **(.) a jump from child to sorta**
 Counsellor 23 Mmhm
 24 (7.0)
 Counsellor 25 [**<parent↑>**
 Client 26 [°Er ah ah eh° aye↑ (.) in a way↑
 Counsellor 27 Is that what you were about to say↑
 Client 28 **AYE↑** i i i it's weird that's what it's like↑ I mean she's just
 29 so: (0.5) immature she's <so: immature> in some ways
 Counsellor 30 Mmhm
 Client 31 Like she really is (.) and in other ways she can be really
 32 mature but that comes with being unreasonable
 33 (3.0)
 Counsellor 34 Mmhm (.) mmhm
 Client 35 But she left school whe er eh (0.5) °she got pregnant at
 36 seventeen she had me at eighteen she's° (1.0)
 Counsellor 37 [mm
 Client 38 [°She's basically not (.) she's not done anything with herself
 39 she's not got a degree or something she's got a° (.)
 40 qualification for hairdressing (0.5) but she didn't like that
 41 after three years of doing it so
 Counsellor 42 Mm (.) mm (.) so there's something about (1.0) the kind of (0.5)
 43 **there's not a cre clear (1.0) like (0.5) erm: (.) son mother**
 44 **relationship there** it's a bit (1.0) it kinda sometimes can be
 45 but then at other times it's the other way round where (1.0) **you**
 46 **feel like you're (0.5) maybe being the parent and she's being**
 Client 47 [Mm
 Counsellor 48 [**immature and she's being the child**
 Client 49 Eh (.) probably >it er eh< not so much like that **it's more like**
 50 **er ah (1.0) like in roles that a husband would usually do**
 51 actually [it's not =
 Counsellor 52 [mm
 Client 53 = so much being a (0.5) **WELL (1.0) I suppose you're right we**
 54 **treat her like a child because of the way she behaves** (1.0)

What is quickly apparent in this extract is how differently the metaphorical representation of self and other as child and parent are used, here by both the client and the counsellor, despite on the surface comprising similar 'identity construction' talk. In both extracts the identities of the client and an "other" in relation to them are constructed by metaphorically

representing each as salient family positions or categories. However, whereas the client is the speaker negotiating this activity in her talk in extract 1, in extract 2 the client and counsellor are actively co-constructing the identity of the client and other (his mother) and each in relation to one another.

The client begins in his first turn with the claim that he is “looking forward to having no ties with her” (lines 1 & 2). It is worth noting that in the talk that precedes this extract he has repeated the phrase that he wants “nothing to do with her” several times. Thus, “looking forward to having no ties with her” can be seen as a metaphorical adaptation of this utterance, reiterating and strengthening this claim.

“Having no ties” begins to construct a version of the client in relation to other whereby up until this point he has been *tied to* the other; perhaps trapped. Consequently, this subtly constructs a power differential between the client and the other. The counsellor evidently interprets the metaphor as such, as in line 10 she responds by repeating the clients’ talk using the same phrase “looking forward to” and pausing before introducing her own metaphorical talk. Her direct reflection of the client’s words and the delivery of his metaphorical talk “having no ties”, coupled with the preceding discourse marker “*so you’re looking forward to*” (emphasis added) can be seen as signalling an upshot formulation to the client (Heritage & Watson, 1979), indicating that what comes after pertains to what he said in turn 1, despite several turns of talk in between (Fraser, 1999).

This signal is important, as the counsellor does not continue to directly repeat the client’s metaphor “having no ties”. Instead she continues “getting those strings attached” (lines 10 & 11). However, there are obvious problems with this response. The client has been talking about having less involvement with his mother and “strings attached” implies more, and the counsellor modifies and repairs her response in line 13 when she amends “attached” to “removed or cut”. These metaphors build a construction consistent with the action of

“having no ties”, yet they are not identical – they extend or stretch the original meaning, elaborating the construction of the client’s experience in a way that is more subtle than offering a literally expressed formulation (Antaki, et al., 2005a).

Indeed, it is possible to see the counsellor’s talk in lines 10-13 as experimenting with different features of identity and the membership categories and reworking the metaphorical membership category features that are referenced in the client’s talk, as they are contrary to what might typically be represented by the standardised relational pair “mother” and “child”. “Ties” (line 2) is metaphorically reconstructed as “strings” (line 10) possibly due to the power implications that have already been discussed. “Strings” that are “attached” “removed” or “cut” (lines 11 & 13) from a powerful other whom one “wants nothing to do with” are reminiscent of features of puppet/puppeteer identity construction. Thus, a subtle representation that is suggested through the counsellor’s metaphorical talk is the client as puppet and his mother as puppeteer – from whom he will soon be free. Consequently, we can see the counsellor’s response to the client as a reformulation, or reinterpretation of the client’s reported experience situated in context of doing therapy (Antaki, et al.; 2005a; Bercelli et al., 2008).

In MCA terms, the category-activity puzzles (where an unexpected combination is put together for a particular category in order to accomplish an action; Sacks, 1979; Stokoe, 2012) in the client and his mother’s relationship are highlighted. In this case, ‘Mother’ and ‘child’ are congruent with the metaphors ‘strings’ and ‘attached’ (lines 9 & 10), but are made puzzling when taken together with ‘removed’ or ‘cut’ (line 13). The extension and adaptation of meaning orients the interaction towards the problematic features of the client and his mother in relation, namely problems related to power and control. In the following turn, the counsellor receives explicit affirmation from the client (“aye” in line 14) as corroboration of this interpretation.

It is worth noting that there is another possible reading of the extract above. The metaphorical talk “strings” and “attached” and the talk of getting them “removed” or “cut” can also be read as category-relevant features to the mother-child standardised relational pairing. Rather than accounting the mother-child relationship as a problematic one of puppet and puppeteer, it could be that the client and counsellor are orienting towards the changing mother-child relationship in the sense of a developmental rite of passage, where the client getting his “strings cut” is a metaphorical representation of growing up. There are, however, reasons why this is not the researcher’s principal interpretation of the data. In the client’s and counsellor’s surrounding talk – both within the session from which this extract is taken and in the preceding and subsequent sessions, the client has recounted his mother in a way that has constructed her as frequently manipulative of him and made her both historically and currently accountable for many of the problems he is struggling with. As a result, the interpretation of the client’s “strings” being “cut” as metaphorically representing the relationship as something like a puppet/puppeteer, relates to the researcher’s drawing on the surrounding interactional context in which this account occurs.

What is particularly significant about these few turns of talk, is that both the client’s and counsellor’s metaphors change throughout the sequence as they create divergent interpretations of the client’s relationship with his mother. This has gone from wanting nothing to do with her to “having no ties” (line 2) – which constructs him as trapped or bound and his mother as entrapping, to the client “getting those strings” (line 10); “removed or cut” (line 13) – which strengthens the construction of the client as powerless, and shifts the construction of his mother as manipulative and powerful – like a puppeteer. Yet despite the fact there is not a single unified construction, there is a shared action of co-constructing the client and his mother’s identities in relation to one another, as the client and counsellor propose different categories and category features and move closer towards an agreed understanding. In turn, these various and subtly different identity constructions

create subtly different subject positions which the client has been able to try on, adjust, discard or adopt (Wetherell, 1998; Wetherell & Edley, 1999).

In the next part of the extract, a 4.0 second pause (line 17) marks a shift in the focus of the participants talk whereby the action orientation of the talk also moves from discrete or situationally focused construction of client and mother currently, to a broadening of this construction to their relationship historically:

Client 18 Even when you look back at (0.5) the whole last twenty odd year
19 it's been very much a two way thing↑
Counsellor 20 Mm
Client 21 **It's not been so much mother and child↑ it's been sorta** (1.0) a
22 **(.) a jump from child to sorta**
Counsellor 23 Mmhm
24 (7.0)
Counsellor 25 [**<parent↑>**
Client 26 [°Er ah ah eh° aye↑ (.) in a way↑
Counsellor 27 Is that what you were about to say↑
Client 28 **AYE↑** i i i it's weird that's what it's like↑ I mean she's just so:
29 (0.5) immatu she's <so: immature> in some ways
Counsellor 30 Mmhm
Client 31 Like she really is (.) and in other ways she can be really mature
32 but that comes with being unreasonable

The client's claim in line 19 that his relationship with his mother has historically "been very much a two way thing", at first seems to contradict the previously constructed version of reality (lines 10 - 16). Although phrases such as "unequal" and "one-sided" have not been used in the talk, notions of powerlessness and being at the behest of another have been constructed through the "ties" that the client wants to get away from (line 2) and the "strings" (line 10) that he has agreed he is looking forward to being "cut" and "removed" (line 13). Thus, when the client suggests that for more than two decades his relationship with his mother has been "a two way thing" (line 19), it seems to contradict the earlier accounting of their relationship.

This apparent contradiction becomes clear, however, when the client gives context to his claim by using mother and child to metaphorically represent the problem in lines 21 & 22.

Client 21 **It's not been so much mother and child↑ it's been sorta** (1.0) a (.) a
22 **jump from child to sorta**

As in extract 1, what is meant by “mother” and “child” is not explicitly described or constructed. Rather, the client relies on the inference rich nature of these categories and uses category-resonant descriptions in order to achieve a construction of his and his mother’s identities in the context of their relationship with one another. Once again then, the use of these family categories are performative – they *do* and *talk* the identities of those the interaction is oriented towards (Butler, 2011). In contrast to extract 1, however, the problem here is that for the client and his mother “it’s not been so much mother and child” (line 21); they have not been and are not mother/child category members, when they *should* be.

With this in mind, the apparent incongruence between the client’s utterance “it’s been very much a two-way thing” (line 21) suggesting notions of equality that contradict earlier power imbalance constructions is made consistent and becomes congruent through the client and counsellor’s exchange in lines 21 to 32. The client states he had to make a “jump” from “child” (lines 21 & 22), and the counsellor completes this construction by suggesting “parent” (line 25). Thus the “two way thing” represents two adults, being tied to and having strings attached is congruent with being trapped in a role or category that the client *should not* and does not want to be in.

As in lines 10, 11 & 13, the counsellor that extends the client’s utterance, adding “parent” (line 25) after a long pause from the client and seemingly completing his sentence. This provides another instance which can be seen as the counsellor structuring the conversation by ‘doing formulating’ - orienting the client’s talk towards the tasks of therapy (Antaki et al, 2005a). Perhaps mindful of the extent and power of her formulation in line 25, in which she proposes the full formulation “child” in comparison to lines 10 & 13 where “strings cut/removed” was a more subtle reformulation of the client’s preceding turn, she explicitly seeks confirmation that this was what the client was “going to say” (line 27). This is even when the client has already agreed with her formulation (line 26).

Taking up the counsellor's formulation, the client then continues to build a construction of his mother as belonging to the category "child", outlining the features that suggest her membership of this category (Sacks et al., 1995). She is "immature" (line 29) and when she is mature she is "unreasonable" (line 32). The client's speech in lines 35 & 36 and 38 to 41 function as evidence for his mother's irresponsibility and immaturity by providing occasions on which her behaviour represents category resonant features of "child" and accounts of behaviour that are consistent with the existing construction (Schegloff, 2007a).

The counsellor, however, does not take-up the client's constructions solely of his mother, and instead once again draws on the existing metaphorical construction of parent/child in reverse. In doing so she reorients the focus from the problem of mother as child, back to a focus on the problem as their relationship. Furthermore she once again makes explicit in her talk the metaphorical representation of client as *parent*. At this point however, despite having provided a highly functional construction of his mother as child, the client revises this construction.

Client	49	Eh (.) probably >it er eh< not so much like that it's more like
	50	er ah (1.0) like in roles that a husband would usually do
	51	actually [it's not =
Counsellor	52	[mm
Client	53	= so much being a (0.5) WELL (1.0) I suppose you're right we
	54	treat her like a child because of the way she behaves (1.0)

Once again, this construction seems, although not entirely incongruent with the clients' construction of mother as child and client as parent, at the very least problematic. This is until the client's earlier utterance regarding their relationship as always having been "a two way thing" and that it has not been a "mother and child" relationship, but a "jump from child to sorta..." is revisited. The construction of *son as partner* makes much more sense in the context the client's original talk, and it was the counsellor not the client who first suggested the construction of *son as parent*. The construction of his mother as immature and *childlike* (line 35) can be made consistent with her metaphorically constructed identity as a powerful,

manipulative puppeteer. The client, in contrast, bears the obligation of responsibility as well as the sense of entrapment and powerlessness as *son as partner*.

One of the features of this shared metaphorical talk in action is that it unfolds over a considerable number of turns of talk, much of which features both client and counsellor providing and responding to one another's metaphorical identity characterisations in a fine tuning of the constructions of self, other and self-other in order to accomplish a version of reality that the client accepts as representative of reality (Potter 1996a). In order to reach an accepted version, a stream of metaphors that are talked back and forth between the client and counsellor as they both try out various categorisations and characteristics, before reaching the mother/parent/partner metaphor that comes at the end rather than the beginning of the extract. Both extract 1 and 2 are oriented towards accomplishing the account of a problem and positioning the client and other within it. But in extract 2 this discursive process is more transparent as the client and counsellor are doing sense-making *in order to* construct self and other identities that they are happy with.

Widdicombe (2017) has identified four ways that interviewees can respond when questioned about a particular identity category (also see Condor, 2011; Widdicombe, 1998; 2011). Interviewees can give minimal confirmation, modify membership in responses that reject some category-bound features but confirm others, and position the category in question as obvious whilst at the same time denying it in the context of a particular question or creating an additional or alternative identity in relation to it. Although not being interviewed in the same manner, when in discussion about the client and his mother's identities in extract 2, each of these actions is present in the client and counsellor's talk. The significant difference is that the action orientation in the therapeutic setting contrasts to that of the semi-structured interviews of the studies above. In the latter, there is a tendency for the interviewee to resist the implications of a category that is imported into the conversation

by the researcher (Condor, 2011; Widdicombe, 1998; Widdicombe and Wooffitt 1995). In the former, present case, however, although there is re-working and revision, and rejection of categories, there is an ongoing negotiation which both counsellor and client are oriented to accomplishing.

Considering the interaction through a more critical lens, the task of negotiating and manoeuvring subject-positions is also noticeable. Both the client's and counsellor's metaphorical identity talk constructs various subject-positions for the client to try on and adapt or reject, and indeed, this is the process that unfolds as he initially adopts the subject position of mother as child, only to reject the construction of himself as parent, and finally, to reposition himself as partner (Wetherell, 1998).

Extract 3

With this in mind, consider extract 3, where the final example of a family membership categorisation device is metaphorically represented in the client's and counsellor's talk and is oriented to the task of identity construction. In contrast to extracts 1 and 2, however, here it is the counsellor who introduces these metaphors which dominate the discursive action. In this extract, the counsellor is going through the client's results of a schema-focused therapy (Young, Klosko & Weishaar, 2003) questionnaire with the client.

Extract 3 (C-C2 T7)

Counsellor 1 Erm: the last two we have are the (.) **parent modes** and you've
2 scored (0.5) erm in **the punitive parent** high to very high and
3 that's kind of what (1.5) what it suggests as a **punitive parent**
4 that (1.0) erm but basically a talk (1.0) that we: (0.5) **take**
5 **the parent mode towards ourself**↑
Client 6 Oh: [K
Counsellor 7 [Erm so we feels that oneself or others deserves punishment
8 or blame and often acts on these feelings by (.) being blaming
9 punishing or abusive towards self (0.5) or others erm (0.5) this
10 mode refers to the <style> with (0.5) which rules are enforced
11 rather than the <nature> of the rules (0.5) so it's not about
12 your beliefs but it's about <how you> (0.5) reinforce those
13 beliefs to yourself
Client 14 Mm (2.0) yeah I get that
Counsellor 15 Erm and **the other one is the (.) d<emanding parent>**↑ and that's
16 qu (.) quite a (.) kind of <critical (0.5) self talk> erm feels

17 that the <right> way to be is to be perfect or achieve at a very
18 high level to keep everything in order to strive for high status
19 (0.5) to be humble to put (.) others needs before one's one or to
20 be efficient or avoid wasting time (0.5) or the person feels that
21 it is wrong to express feelings or act spontaneously (1.0) so
22 this refers to the nature of the internalised high standards and
23 strict rules (0.5) erm rather than the rules themselves again
24 (4.0)
Counsellor 25 Does that make (0.5) sense again
Client 26 Yeah
Counsellor 27 ((clears throat)) So it's kind of (.) I guess (1.0) erm:
28 <expecting a lot from yourself> (1.5) erm so it's about (3.0)
29 what you expect from yourself so (.) your (0.5) <internalised
30 roles> [type thing
Client 31 [Mm:
Counsellor 32 Erm and I guess having <these two together> (.) would be like it
33 seems like you have kind of a <moderate to high (.) expectation>
34 (1.0) erm although I don't really want to say (.) expectation
35 because it's more kind of a demanding and critical expectation
36 from yourself (.) erm the way that you: actually enforce those
37 expectations or rules is (.) quite harsh:
Client 38 Mm: K
Counsellor 39 do you (0.5) would you agree [with that =
Client 40 [Er yeah
Counsellor 41 = like that's just basically like what I'm interpreting
Client 42 Mm:
43 (2.0)

In this extract, the counsellor reads and elaborates the results of the Schema-focused questionnaire.¹ She then discusses these with the client. She discusses the different “parent modes” that the client scored highly in. Namely the “punitive parent” (lines 2 & 3) characterised as “blaming punishing or abusive towards the self” (lines 8 & 9) and the “demanding parent” which strives for high status, achievement, efficiency and to be humble (lines 15 to 23). The speech fluency and lack of pauses and non-lexical speech sounds indicate that the counsellor is at times reading the descriptions (lines 7 to 11; lines 16 to 23), and an empiricist discourse is apparent which uses externalising tools to present the account as both neutral and factual (line 7, 15, 21, 22, 32 & 33; Gilbert & Mulkey, 1984; Potter, 1996a).

¹ Schema-focused therapy is a psychotherapeutic model developed by Jeffrey Young (Young et al., 2003). It combines psychoanalytic and cognitive behavioural theory principles, and involves identifying “adaptive” and “maladaptive” schema – where schema are understood as core patterns and behaviours that develop in early childhood in response to our environment and emotional needs. Individuals are also understood as having different emotional “modes” which are activated under different circumstances and can continue to be triggered in adulthood by similar (perceived or experienced) circumstances.

Far from being an objective account, however, “demanding parent” and “punitive parent” “modes” are metaphorical constructions of ways of being, or ‘parts of self’. They are part of a stock of interactional knowledge specific to those trained or practiced in using a schema-focused approach to therapy, and those practicing it have an interest in orienting the talk in such a way that they can accomplish the tasks necessary to do this type of therapy (Leudar, et al., 2008b; Peräkylä and Vehvilainen, 2003). This is apparent when noticing that one of the marked differences between extract 3 and extracts 1 and 2 is that the metaphorical categorisations are not grappled with in relation to the clients’ unique experience, rather they are presented with a ready-made construction that is cited to the client.

By considering them in this context, then, it is apparent that what the counsellor utters and what the client initially understands are likely to be different, as the client does not possess the same SIKs. In semiotic terms, the metaphorical expressions such as “demanding parent” and “punitive parent” possess an additional level of signification for the counsellor than for the client – and the task that the counsellor is oriented towards achieving is not only representing elements of the client’s identity metaphorically in this framework of understanding, but also teaching her something of the SIK in order for her to interpret and understand these metaphors in the same way, and for them to signify the same meanings as they do to the counsellor (Chandler, 2007; Levi-Strauss, 1978;).

The client is subsequently told that she scores highly on these “modes” (lines 32 & 33). Although there is much evidence that schema-focused therapy is effective and helpful for clients, the focus in this analysis is on what is happening discursively. This is arguably that aspects of the client’s identity are being performed by the counsellor, through her prescription of imported categories or representations of identity. The counsellor does not struggle to accomplish these representations as truth claims given that she also holds the powerful discourse position of counsellor, and coupled with her taking up the positions of

teacher and explainer, the lack of negotiation of these constructions as they are applied to the client might be due to the institutional power her position holds when performing particular discursive actions such as *doing expertise* (Van Dijk, 1993).

As the constructions are not grappled with in the here and now through the client's and counsellor's talk, they are therefore not adaptable or pliable in relation to constructing meaning unique to the client and counsellor. This latter point is particularly poignant when considering the earlier finding that metaphorical talk that draws on salient familial roles as categorisation devices are less flexible in terms of the associated meanings due to the highly inferential category membership features which can do identity construction even without an external construction of what it is they mean. In this case, then, the client can be perceived as having her identity "done" by the counsellor both due because the counsellor makes explicit knowledge that the client is not privy to, and because the client's identity is constructed out of this knowledge without interactional negotiation.

Summary of section

This first section of the analysis has explored metaphorical talk that constructs identities, specifically focusing on the use of family role metaphors as membership categorisation devices (Sacks et al., 1995). Clients' use of familial metaphorical talk (extracts 1 & 2), client and counsellors' collaborative development of identities in and through familial metaphorical talk (extract 2) and counsellors' use of familial metaphors have all been demonstrated (extract 3).

The analysis has drawn on membership categorisation theory (Housley & Fitzgerald, 2009; Sacks et al., 1995; Schegloff, 2007a; Stokoe, 2012) in order to consider the conversational impact of using such salient and inference rich metaphors, and what is made both possible and limited within the talk as result. It has also introduced some of the implications of using

such metaphors for counsellors to consider – namely that counsellor introduced family category talk may create opportunities to explore clients’ identities, their relationships with others and negotiate subject positions within the talk, but may conversely also perform their identities in this talk in a way that limits further possible constructions and a more collaborative meaning making process. This is something that it is vital for counselling psychologists and counsellors to think carefully about given their position of power in the institutional setting of psychotherapy – particularly when choosing to make explicit in their talk their ‘expertise’.

5.2.2. Metaphorical constructions of identity b) *Past vs Present Me* – Clients constructing multiple selves using metaphor

This section of the analysis (Section 1b) continues to explore metaphorical talk in identity construction with reference to two further extracts (Extracts 4 and 5). The focus shifts to investigate how clients deploy metaphorical talk to construct ‘past’ identities and versions of self. Furthermore, it considers how they are made relevant in relation to constructions of ‘present’ identities, and the consequentiality of this identity talk on the subsequent interaction – for instance, the counsellor’s subsequent uptake.

Extract 4

Extract 4 is taken from an early session in a client’s therapy with her counsellor where they have been having a conversation about what she wants to get out of therapy.

Extract 4 (C-C1 T1)

Client	1	Erm (2.5) so yeah I just [↑] (.) I feel like the medication helps
	2	(.) but I don’t want to be on medication forever so [I want =
Counsellor	3	[right
Client	4	= to be able to sort of (1.0) <control things> [and not get =
Counsellor	5	[mm
Client	6	= upset or: (0.5) >you know be able to leave the house and just
	7	be like I <u>used</u> to be<
Counsellor	8	Yeah (.) yeah
Client	9	Erm: (1.0) that’s the main thing really

Counsellor 10 Mm
Client 11 Erm cos
12 My parents don't really: (1.5) they don't really understand
13 [like
Counsellor 14 [°yeah°
Client 15 They sort of see it as like (1.0) well **you've just got too much**
16 **time on your hands** [or: like (.) you know what I [mean (.) like
Counsellor 17 [mm [yeah:
18 So really <not feeling understood (.) [not really (.) =
Client 19 [yeah
Counsellor 20 = understanding yourself as well>
Client 21 Yeah
Counsellor 22 <Yeah>
Client 23 Because I wasn't (.) I never had any problems like that before I
24 was always you know (1.0) high achiever at [scho:ol (.)
Counsellor 25 [Mm:
Client 26 at uni (1.0) and then it just like one day **it just snapped**↑ and
27 it was just
Counsellor 28 Mmhm
Client 29 Completely downhill from there [and I just want =
Counsellor 30 [right
Client 31 = to be how I was
Counsellor 32 Yeah:
Client 33 Before
Counsellor 34 °So° (1.5) so you feel as if it w- happened all very quickly:
35 (1.0) >you said this was what< <January↑ last year↑>
Client 36 Well like (0.5) I started feeling **started feeling sort of quite**
37 **down:**↓ but (0.5) you know when it's January you think
38 oh [**it's just <blues>** (.) [you know: it'll be fine =
Counsellor 39 [Yeah [uhhu
Client 40 = and then (0.5) I remember one day I was sat library trying to
41 finish an essay >I remember the exact time< [and I was =
Counsellor 42 [Mm
Client 43 = with two of my friends (.) and I just (1.5) **it was like s-**
44 **something in my head just <broke>** and [I just
Counsellor 44 [°wow°>
Client 45 got up (.) and like (0.5) <left> and didn't hand in my essay: (.)
46 [didn't hand in my dissertation
Counsellor 47 [mm
48 Mm
Client 49 you know: (.) and just sort of hid in my room for months
Counsellor 50 <yeah> yeah

In the first 4 of her turns (which take place between lines 1 to 9), the client establishes what it is she wants and does not want to be like in the future. This list of prospective wishes includes not being on medication (line 2), being able to control things (line 4), not getting upset (lines 4 & 6) and being able to leave the house (line 6). They are transformed from a list of desires into a description of her former characteristics in line 7 with the statement “just be like I used to be”, which accomplishes her description not only as who she would like to be, but as an account of her past self, and this past self as someone whom she wants to return to.

In this brief accounting, the client can be seen as historicising *and* making relevant this constructed history, situating her current circumstances in the here and now relation to the concurrently constructed past. By simultaneously constructing versions of her past and present self, the client accomplishes multiple discursive tasks at once and structures local details retrospectively in what Garfinkel, Lynch and Livingston (1981) referred to as ‘local historicity’. Leudar & Nekvipil note that the way that we understand ourselves is historically situated (Leudar & Nekvapil, 2011; Leudar, et al., 2008b). As we change “so do our understandings of ourselves and what we have done. Such historical changes and contingencies are...something that can be explicitly built into their understanding and accounts....These can become an essential and explicit characteristic of how we understand ourselves and account for what we do” (Leudar & Nekvapil, 2011, p. 68). Consequently, when the client constructs contemporary events in the context of an accounting of her history, she can be understood as managing ‘historical indexicality’.

The client accomplishes this by making relevant and significant particular features of the here and now (in her case the things she cannot do currently but would like to). Edwards (1998) indicated how participants of couples’ therapy made relevant particular features in their partner’s identity in their talk, in order to achieve particular discursive tasks. In the present case, the client does something similar. It is *because* of the past (because she used to be able to do all these things) that her current identity is problematic. Furthermore, because these features are how she ‘used to be’ (line 7), this current identity is constructed as neither historical nor enduring. The implication is that this is a challenge for her; that it is not only that she cannot do these things but that she *can no longer* do these things, therefore a sense of loss is created through her construction.

It is into this environment that the client’s metaphorical talk is voiced. The client then goes on to explain that her parents don’t understand, and uses the idiomatic phrase “time on your

hands” (lines 15 & 16) to construct her parent’s position in relation to her as not recognising that she is not currently the person she used to be. The counsellor responds to this in what seems like a simple formulation uptake that mirrors the client’s talk, but actually subtly reformulates the client’s account of her parents not understanding (line 12) as and replaces it with “*feeling* misunderstood” (line 18, emphasis added) topicalising the client’s feelings rather than the parents behaviour (Antaki, 2008). This reformulating is then more explicitly extended by the counsellor with “not understanding yourself as well” (line 20; Antaki, et al; 2005a). This builds on the existing construction that how the client “used to be” is not how she is now, but adds a formulation that how she is now is incomprehensible in some way, a sort of *not who I really am*. It thus opens up the possibility of a new subject position for the client (Edley & Wetherell, 1997; Wetherell, 1998). In the subsequent talk of the extract, the client addresses this ‘phenomenon’ by storying an account of how it came about and employing metaphorical talk to aid in achieving this task.

In lines 23 to 29, the client effectively stories the downfall of her past self. Before she was a “high achiever” (line 24) then “one day it just snapped” (line 26) and it was “completely downhill from there” (line 29). Various rhetorical devices are used in this account to accomplish it as a truth claim. For example, using the discourse marker “you know” (lines 24, 38 & 49) in order to recruit the counsellor into this version of events (Fraser, 1999; Jucker & Smith, 1998; Tay, 2011a). Furthermore, the account ends once again with “I just want to be how I was” (lines 29 & 31), which continues to retrospectively construct the past, historicising the present by emphasising the idealised self that must be gotten back to, as well as constructing a sense of distance from this past self in the present (Leudar & Nekvapil, 2011; Leudar et al., 2008b).

Perhaps the most effective exercise in constructing this account, however, is the immediate explanation that follows, in which the client elaborates on her metaphorical construction of

the version of events when her old self “snapped” (line 26), which the counsellor reformulates as meaning that it “happened all very quickly” before seeking specificity (lines 34 & 35). It seems, however, that this reformulation does not capture something of the meaning of “snapped” to the client, and in the exchange that follows (lines 36 to 44) the client does to task of substantiating her account and accomplishing it as significant.

The client begins by qualifying that although she had been feeling down (lines 36 & 37), her assumption had not been sinister or dramatic, but rather she had *underestimated* what was just around the corner, thinking, “you know: it’ll be fine” (line 38). This builds a construction of herself as far from melodramatic and instead very ordinary, whilst at the same time creating suspense as both she and the counsellor know that everything was *not* all right.

The client then extends this sense of the ordinary and ‘everydayness’ of the circumstances under which this ‘phenomenon’ occurred, which by now has been constructed as extraordinary and inexplicable by both client and counsellor. What is particularly interesting here is that the means by which the client does this is not dissimilar from Woofitt’s observations of participants’ constructions of paranormal encounters (Woofitt, 1992). First, the client recounts with exacting detail the context and circumstances surrounding what happened (lines 40 to 43) highlighting the mundaneness of the context in a manner highly similar to Woofitt’s formulation of paranormal accounts “I was just doing X...”

Client	40	= and then (0.5) I remember one day I was sat library trying to
	41	finish an essay >I remember the exact time< [and I was =
Counsellor	42	[Mm
Client	43	= with two of my friends (.) and I just (1.5) it was like s-
	44	something in my head just <broke> and [I just
Counsellor	44	[<°wow°>

This is then followed in with the “...when Y” part of the formulation in Woofitt’s terms, when “something in my head just <broke>” (line 43). In Woofitt’s analyses, the ordinariness of participants’ constructions does accountability and externalisation – for

example – *‘I wasn’t looking for it so my account is not motivated by my intent to find the paranormal’*. In the present example, the ordinariness also does accountability in the sense that because it happened to the client whilst going about her ordinary activity, the client is a victim of it occurring to her rather than bringing it on herself. The ordinariness of the first half of the account may also be positioning the client as not exaggerating her issues but reporting a thing that happened to her whilst she was just doing regular things.

These metaphors and the metaphorical talk – “*it just snapped*” (line 26) and “*something in my head just broke*” (line 44) appear to function in multiple ways. Firstly “it” and “something” act as externalising devices (Potter, 1996a), suggesting that the thing that broke and snapped was outside of the client’s control and understanding. She cannot (or does not) name what “it” is – adding to the mystery and lack of understanding of what it was precisely that actually broke. Nevertheless, the fact that this happening is constructed metaphorically as a snapping or breaking also functions to externalise and distance the client’s current identity from the person who she was *before*. They construct a version of events in which something powerful but out of anyone’s control damaged who she used to be, and the counsellor is well aware of who she used to be as this identity is well constructed in the first half of the talk. Finally, on an interactional level, situating this account in the specific and everyday guards against any objections or challenges from the counsellor, as it functions to neutralise or indeed reverse any stake the client has in her account. The client positions herself as astonished as anyone that such a happening could occur – and constructs the event as extraordinary at the least, at the most as supernatural (Woofitt, 1992). Thus losing one’s old sense of self or identity is successfully negotiated in the talk as having very suddenly happened.

Extract 5

Extract 5 features a different client and counsellor pair and shows the client employing metaphorical talk in a similar way as he constructs his past, idealised self in stark contrast to his present one.

Extract 5 (C-C3 T1)

Client 1 But (4.0) °and that **gets me down** as well because I ken that Lucy
2 and her sister (*two syllables*) it to work all the time and (1.0)
3 this that and the next and I feel like a **complete bum bumming**
4 **about** (1.0) and: (3.5) I don't know° (3.0) this is (.) a **downward**
5 **spiral** to when I end up =

Counsellor 6 Mm

Client 7 = thinking that and **getting stuck** for a day so

Counsellor 8 Mm
9 (2.5)

Client 10 And I'm angry I'm (0.5) I'm really angry >with myself when I say
11 all of that< (0.5) cos this is <not> what I used to be like (1.0)
12 I used to be the guy who had a full (.) a full time job and a part
13 time job (0.5)

Counsellor 14 °Mm[m::°

Client 15 [and still had a massive social life on top of it and (1.0) er:
16 (1.0) and I mean of the three of my brothers I was the only one
17 who had a constant (0.5) wh- like I got my first job when I was
18 **twelve**↑

Counsellor 19 Mm

Client 20 And then I've never been unemployed until last year↑ (1.5) nd
21 (1.5) now I worked full time during my first year↑ I had a job all
22 the way through

Counsellor 23 [Mm

Client 24 [Until everything **went tits up** and (0.5) er: (1.5) in December of
25 my third year and

Counsellor 26 Mm

Client 27 It's just since then (3.0) I don't know what I'm doing with myself
28 **in the long haul** as well↑

Counsellor 29 OK

Client 30 It's like (0.5) I had (.) my scholarship↑ I had (.) my big
31 interest in electrical engineering↑ I had all that to go for↑
32 (0.5) and **it all fell away:**↑ and (1.0) I think especially when I
33 got told I'd lost my scholarship and the only reason they gave me
34 was because I wasn't open↑ with them (1.0) when (.) things were
35 tough (1.0) er: I lost <that>↑ and then I kind of thought well
36 (2.0) how am I guna get employed now after that↑ it's

Counsellor 37 Mmhm (.) [So it seems like =

Client 38 [Mm

Counsellor 39 = you (.) you kind of (0.5) those things happened and you started
40 doubting yourself and you doubted your abilities (2.5) and belie
41 (.) even belief [in yourself↑

In contrast to extract 4, in extract 5 the client begins by describing how he currently feels. He contrasts himself to his partner and her sister who “work all the time”, rather than to a construction of his former self (lines 1 to 4). By using the idiomatic references “complete bum, bumming about” (lines 3 & 4), the client formulates his construction of himself with

a negative and rhetorically potent cliché that has the effect of characterising himself in the extreme as opposite to the hard working women he has described (Pomerantz, 1986). A number of studies have looked at the consequentiality of contrastive constructions between self and other in interaction (Buttny, 1990; Dickerson, 2000; MacKinlay & Dunnett 1998; Widdicombe, 1998), and have noted that such category assignment in talk is “an accomplishment rather than something which can be assumed” (Widdicombe, 1998; p. 67). Furthermore, Dickerson (2000) has noted that when members contrasted self-deprecating versions of themselves with positive constructions of others, this action was often oriented to issues of accountability, for example, accounting for a prior construction of another or the self in a way that might accomplish self-repair (Dickerson, 2000).

The client’s self-deprecating construction of himself in comparison to his girlfriend and her sister in extract 5, also shows the client performing a complex negotiation for his accounting of his identity. It is important to note that the client does not say “I *am* a complete bum bumming about” but “I *feel* like a complete bum bumming about” (line 3). As a result, the client avoids wholly placing himself in the category of “bum”. Rather his distaste and anger (line 10) result from the category-congruent features which the client constructs as “bum”. This cleverly positions himself as *not a bum, but like a bum* and has the similar effect of constructing a ‘*this isn’t who I am/used to be*’ version of events as the client in extract 4. Later, the client explicitly expresses in his anger towards himself (line 10). He uses metaphorical talk that is comparable to the client in extract 4 in order to construct an account of his feelings worsening: here “downward spiral” and “getting stuck” (lines 4, 5 & 7 respectively) rather than “downhill” (extract 4, line 29). Both similarly construct the unwanted current self as going from bad to worse, and perhaps being out of control, even if it is “for a day or so” (line 7).

This first part of the extract functions as in extract 4, as an introduction to and accounting for the current state of affairs regarding the client's dissatisfaction with who he is and his circumstances, in which he constructs his identity and compares and contrasts it to others'. What follows this in lines 10 to 36 mirrors the talk of the client in extract 4 – both construct the events of the downfall of their former selves.

The client first says that the “complete bum, bumming about” “*is not what I used to be like*” (line 11, emphasis added). This works in the same way as the client's statement in extract 5 that she wants to “*be like I used to be*” (extract 4, line 7, emphasis added). In both cases the clients construct a contrast between their current and past ways of being, using historical particulars to structure this version of self (Leudar & Nekvapil, 2011). However, for the client in extract 5 it is more explicit rather than an implied, truth claim. As a result of this, there is work to be done in substantiating this claim, which the client immediately goes about doing. In the lines that follow he constructs a rich account of *how he was* (lines 11 to 22) that covers his work life and social life and involves multiple recent and historical examples to strengthen these claims. This accounting is this client's version of extract 5's client's “high achiever” (extract 4, line 24) and it verges on an extreme case formulation given the amount of evidence that is called upon to support this construction of former self (Pomerantz, 1986).

This is followed by the *fall* construction, where everything takes a turn for the worse. Instead of “snapped” and “broke” (extract 4, lines 26 & 44), “everything went tits up” (extract 5, line 24) – but equally just as in extract 5 this description functions to construct a version of events that were out of his control and that happened *to him*. Where the client in extract 4 then uses the metaphor “downhill from there” to follow this sudden change in circumstance (extract 4, line 29), the client in extract 5 uses “I don't know what I'm doing with myself *in the long haul*” (extract 5, line 28, emphasis added). This metaphor indicates ambiguity with

regard to his future, rather than a deteriorating future, yet both clients deploy metaphorical talk to convey the drastic impact that this ominous turn in events had on *who they are*.

As in extract 5, this is then followed by a second accounting of *who the client was* and the ideal circumstances he was in, and a reiteration of the moment of downfall with more specificity than in the first account:

Client 30 It's like (0.5) I had (.) my scholarship↑ I had (.) my big
 31 interest in electrical engineering↑ I had all that to go for↑
 32 (0.5) and **it all fell away:**↑ and (1.0) I think especially when I

Here, a comparison can be made once again to Woofitt's (1992) "I was just doing X ... when Y" formulation. In extract 5 however, the client's "just doing X" part of the formulation is more specific than his previous account of what happened prior to everything going "tits up" (line 24), but not as specific as the examples Woofitt uses or indeed the example shown in extract 4. Instead, the counsellor is made aware more generally of the circumstances preceding *the happening*, and rather than these circumstances being constructed as highly ordinary and every day, they instead signify the ideal circumstances and characteristics of the client *before*; that he had "all that to go for" (lines 30 & 31). Thus, this construction emphasises a personal contrast between *me then being so different to me now*, rather than the situationally focused, 'I was just doing X, when Y', and strengthens the significance of the loss of this former identity, indicating that when "it all fell away", this *fall* was vast and devastating. It effectively and vividly sets up the contrast between his former and current circumstances.

Summary of Section

What is apparent from the comparison of extracts 4 and 5 above, is that metaphorical talk is used in clients' speech to construct the moment that a past idealised 'self' ended, and that this is constructed as a 'happening'. In this way the clients' talk shares some of the

characteristics that Wooffitt (1992) noted are present in talk about paranormal experiences, whereby the unexpected (or paranormal) intrudes into the ordinary, mundane activity, captured by Wooffitt as ‘I was just doing x, when y’ (ibid.).

There are also clear markers or themes which emerge across accounts or narratives, such as the tendency to construct a lost past identity which happened unexpectedly out of the mundane, and which in turn resulted in misfortune which is constructed as a ‘fall’ of some kind. This functions to account for clients’ unfamiliarity with their current identities, the construction of these in sharp contrast to their previous selves. At the same time, because of this ‘happening’ having been externalised and constructed as mystical, they are at a loss of how to get back to their former self.

Metaphors such as “snapped” “broke” “tit’s up” and “all fell away” are highly effective in constructing not only a sense of powerlessness and lack of control, but also an impression of not understanding and a strong communication of the devastating consequences of these happenings on the speaker. The metaphorical construction of this highly significant happening acts to make the account more mysterious and incomprehensible when contrasted against accounts of ordinary and idealised prior events, as well as tragic.

5.3. Clients’ use of metaphor to do topic management & resistance

The following section demonstrates the second metaphorically achieved action that was identified in the analysis, and discusses how it was found to function in the data. Here, extracts show metaphorical talk being deployed by clients and counsellors to manage the discourse in such a way that topics under discussion or negotiation were foregrounded, backgrounded or avoided altogether as a result of its deployment. Despite the extracts showing these different interactional tasks being performed, there is an overarching

discursive objective that is identifiably shared between them all; namely clients' managing their resistance to the counsellors' previous turn(s).

Here, resistance is understood as when clients' responses disaffiliated in some way with the recipients' utterance (MacMartin, 2008). For example, in her research into clients' responses to counsellors' optimistic questions, MacMartin showed that clients "often disaffiliated with certain questions posed by their trainee therapists" (MacMartin, 2008, p. 80). These questions often contained optimistic pre-suppositions which positively referred to clients' attributes or actions in either an interrogative or declarative manner – such as – "What do you think it says about you that you were able to... make the choice to stay and kind of deal with that" (MacMartin, 2008, p. 84). Clients' disaffiliative responses included non-response actions such as complaining about the question, or answer-like responses which included refocusing the question or optimistic down-graders (ibid.). This analysis does not look specifically at optimistic questions, but rather notes that such disaffiliative responses were apparent in reply to a variety of counsellors' interventions, and that metaphorical talk seemed to contribute towards clients' accomplishment of the associated action of resistance.

Extract 6

Extract 6 demonstrates what is meant by doing *topic management & resistance* aided by metaphorical talk. In this extract a client is talking about a semester abroad she will be undertaking in a few months' time. One of her lecturers has suggested that she tell a fellow student that she suffers from depression, and the counsellor, who initially reacted positively to this idea, is asking the client how she feels about doing this.

Extract 6 (C-C1 T2)

Client	1	But you: (.) it's like a home stay	[you stay with like a Russian
Counsellor	2		[mmhm
Client	3	family↑	

Counsellor 4 Mmhm
Client 5 And so he said (.) I haven't told anyone in my <class> (0.5)
6 because it's like (.) I haven't known them that long >and he was
7 like< well maybe it's worth mentioning it to:
Counsellor 8 Mmhm
Client 9 One of them just so you know that there's someone there that can
10 help you
Counsellor 11 Absolutely
Client 12 Erm (.) so (.) I might wait nearer to the time
13 [(h) (h) to (h) tell them (h) :but [yeah
Counsellor 14 [ye:ah: [yeah:
Client 15 That was the only issue we were really talking about [that =
Counsellor 16 [right
Client 17 = could be a problem (.) but hopefully I'll be a lot better by
18 then (.) [(h) (h) and it won't be a [problem °so°
Counsellor 19 [Ye:ah:: [yeah:
20 And how do you: how do you feel about that (.) um you (0.5) him
21 suggesting this and (.) and
Client 22 erm↑
Counsellor 23 Is that something that you would want to do or
24 (2.0)
Client 25 I th ((sigh)) (1.0) I feel like I don't really know:
Counsellor 26 [yeah:
Client 27 [how people would react [cos I haven't (1.0) like even some of =
Counsellor 28 [Yeah
Client 29 = my friends that I've known for four five years <[don't react =
Counsellor 30 [mm
Client 31 = well> (.) [so how is someone who's only known me six seven =
Counsellor 32 [yeah
Client 33 = months [guna
Counsellor 34 [Right right (.) °mm°
Client 35 React so I'm a bit s (.) I'm a bit <hesitant>
Counsellor 36 Mmhm absolutely
Client 37 <About it> (0.5) but there's a couple of people who I think
38 would maybe be quite (2.0) okay with it (.) [that I've thought =
Counsellor 39 [yeah
Client 40 = about (1.0) talking to but
Counsellor 41 Mm
Client 42 I'll wait and see °how (1.0) how it goes° I'll need to tell
43 some(h)one(h)
Counsellor 44 Ye:ah:
Client 45 Because if I'm there by myself I think I'll feel (1.0) worse
46 [knowing that there's no one there that could (0.5) sort of =
Counsellor 47 [yeah
Client 48 = help me or [talk to me
Counsellor 49 [Mm (.) mm
Client 50 But erm (1.5) **we'll cross that bridge (h) when I (h) come (h)**
51 **to it (.) (h) °there's no point (h)° =**
Counsellor 52 Ye:ah: (.) absolutely
Client 53 °Thinking about it now: [so°
Counsellor 54 [absolutely
Client 55 Yeah

The metaphor in question here is deployed in the client's speech in turn 50 & 51: "We'll cross that bridge when I come to it" which might commonly be referred to as an idiom, figure of speech, or a proverb (Drew & Holt, 1998; Sacks et al., 1995).

The topic under discussion is what the client thinks of her professor's idea to tell a peer that she is struggling with depression (lines 5 to 10). However the counsellor's reaction to the professor's suggestion is emphatically positive – "absolutely" (line 11). MacMartin has

written about clients' resistance responses to counsellor's optimistic questions, and suggests that the presuppositions that precede or accompany these questions can make it difficult for clients to respond without refuting the counsellor's agenda (MacMartin, 2008). The counsellor's utterance in line 11 is obviously not a question, nor is it accompanied by presuppositions. What is interesting, then, is the extent to which the client works to resist this statement. MacMartin identifies three types of misaligned responses which are partial answers that disaffiliate with a counsellor's optimistic question, of which there are three subtypes: optimistic downgrades, refocusing responses and joking responses. The client utilises each of them. Between lines 12 and 18 she first refocuses the issue on *when* she will tell a peer rather than *if* (line 12), and she does this whilst laughing. It is clear from this turn that she is not as emphatically positive about her professor's suggestion as her counsellor, and so the two are misaligned and the client is attempting to manage this. She continues to do so by doing 'optimistic downgrading' in lines 17 and 18: "hopefully I'll be a lot better by then and it won't be a problem"; again this is scattered with laughter.

The counsellor approaches the topic again by explicitly asking with a neutral "how" question: "How do you feel about that?" (line 20), which the client does not respond to directly, but instead states that she really doesn't know and then provides an accounting for this (lines 25 to 42). However, she nevertheless presents the case for both options (lines 25-40), and brings this discussion to a close before the counsellor can enquire any further on the topic saying she will "wait and see how it goes" (line 42). This positions the client as thoughtful, moderate and open to both options, and gives the impression that timing and circumstance are the reason for her not committing to one option or the other rather than her preference. "Wait and see how it goes" (line 42) – a non-metaphorical discourse marker that acts as a hedging device to distance the client from making an imminent decision, is then followed in with what seems like a clarifying utterance that "I'll need to tell some(h)one(h) because if I'm there on my own I think I'll feel worse" (lines 42 & 43). In interaction, this

works as an act of self-repair (Schegloff, 1997), and to reposition the potentially problematic position of *waiting and seeing how it goes* as a dismissal of the client's need to tell someone, and makes available the softer the position of just not deciding *right now*.

However, this is then followed in line 50 by the stronger metaphorical equivalent to “wait and see how it goes”. The revised idiom, “We’ll cross that bridge when I come to it” (lines 50 & 51) acts as a hedging device in the same way as its non-metaphorical counterpart, although the alteration from the usual turn of phrase “when we come to it” to “when I come to it” is interesting in that it magnifies the client's wish to set the agenda on this topic. Immediately after using the idiom, the client's extreme case formulation (Pomerantz, 1986) “*there is no point // thinking about it now*” (lines 51 & 53, emphasis added) means that the counsellor would be required to directly oppose this position in order to pursue the topic. This consequently draws a more substantial line under the topic. Accordingly, perhaps in the interest of being supportive or not wanting to directly contradict the client's position, the counsellor strongly agrees with the client in lines 52 and 54 with a repetition of her earlier emphatic response “absolutely” (line 54), and the conversation moves on to a review of how the client has been during the week, led by the counsellor.

Looking specifically at figures of speech in a sequential analysis, Drew and Holt (1998) noted that a common feature of such expressions in talk was their occurrence at the end of sequences and their association with topic transition or closing down a topic. They noted that, “termination is managed by the participants in a brief exchange of agreements, followed by a transition to a new/next topic” (Drew & Holt, 1998, p. 502). The interaction in extract 6 certainly seems to follow this sequential pattern, as the client closes the topic idiomatically in line 50, before the client and counsellor proceed to manage this closure (lines 52 to 55).

Ultimately, then, the client has successfully resisted the counsellor's request for a categorical answer to the question, "Is that something that you would want to do or" (line 23). Not only that but she has negotiated the termination of the topic. Yet she has done so in a staged way, beginning with softer expressions that hint at disaffiliation, before seemingly backtracking to weigh her options and positioning herself as neutral, and only then making an explicit refusal to answer. This she does metaphorically using an idiom which appeals to popular knowledge and thus seems more reasonable than an outright refusal. It is also harder for the counsellor to counter without the need for repair (Drew & Holt, 1998). Taken as a whole, the client can be seen as performing a resistance through extended disagreement (Bercelli et al., 2008), but this is easily missed by the way the client orientates her talk to accomplish this action.

Extract 7

Extract 7 is taken from a different client and counsellor pair, and shows a similar instance in which a client uses a single metaphorical utterance to manage the topic that is the focus of the interaction. In contrast to extract 6, however, rather than an idiom functioning as a hedging device to do the work of bringing a topic to a close, the client in extract 7 metaphorically constructs a version of reality that justifies and legitimises her not answering a question put to her by her counsellor.

Extract 7 (C-C2 T2)

Client	1	How does it how does it feel <no:w↓>
Counsellor	2	Mmhm (2.0) how does it feel having just having kind of talked about
	3	these in the session (0.5) today
	4	(4.5)
Client	5	You're guna completely disagree with [me::
Counsellor	6	[°OK°
Client	7	like so I don't wana say:
Counsellor	8	That's ok
Client	9	I don't know it feels like I'm (.) <over:reacting> and that I'm
Counsellor	10	Mmhm ok that's fine
Client	11	Whinging about (0.5) things that aren't (1.0) that (.) >do you know
	12	what I mean< it's not (.) it's not that [ba:d
Counsellor	13	[Mmhm
	14	OK and (1.5) kind of I do (1.5) disagree obviously with the (.)
	15	thought that you're overreacting with at the same time I can really

16 <understand> (1.0) that thought that it feels like you know (0.5)
17 just get on with it it's not that big a deal
Client 18 Mmm
Counsellor 19 And I can understand (1.0) that (3.5) and you know that might (1.5)
20 be a way: (0.5) of coping with things (0.5) It might be something
21 that's been <told> to you when you were a child that you kind of
22 <internalised> (1.0) you know saying just get on with it just deal
23 with it it's not a big deal
Client 24 Mm
Counsellor 25 So we kind of (.) adopt that stance for (0.5) various reasons and
26 it might be that (.) well yeah these things are hard but (.) they
27 didn't have that big an impact on you (1.0) so it might be any one
28 of those
29 (8.5)
Client 30 Mhm erm
Counsellor 31 And I'm not kind of (.) asking for an answer about which one it is
Client 32 Yeah↑
Counsellor 33 But (0.5) mm
Client 34 I think (7.0) I acknowledge they had an impact and (.) it wasn't
35 nice to see (.) people always fighting and to have (1.5) that
36 relationship with my mother: and things like that (1.5) erm (25.0)
37 and it's hard <remembering some things>
Counsellor 38 Mmhm
Client 39 Like there I can't (1.0) there are things that (2.0) feel (4.0) are
40 <unresolved> but I don't >kind **of I can't quite< (2.5) get into the**
41 **memory vault and unlock them** (0.5)
Counsellor 42 Mmhm
Client 43 <Yet> I don't know
Counsellor 44 [°OK°
Client 45 [>I feel like there are some of<there are things: that I can't
46 (0.5) talk about because I can't think of them↑
Counsellor 47 Mmhm (0.5) OK so you just (1.0) do you: >because you've said< you
48 think of **your memories are quite abstract** (1.0) are >th is it more<
49 just a <physical feeling that you have>
Client 50 Yeah::
Counsellor 51 °OK° O↑K↓

At the beginning of the extract, the counsellor asks a question (line 1) that the client doesn't want to answer as the counsellor will “completely disagree” (lines 5 and 7) with it – namely that the client has been “over-reacting” in what they have talked about in the session (line 9). The counsellor *does* disagree (line 14), but adds to this by saying she understands where the client is coming from (lines 15 & 16), which she reiterates several times, repeating back the client's position (lines 14 to 17). She then qualifies a number of possibilities for why the client may feel like this (lines 19 to 28).

The counsellor goes on to construct the client's “over-reacting” feeling as a “stance” that has been adopted (line 25) for one of three reasons. The three main positions that are made available for the client to take up are firstly, feeling like she is overreacting because this is a way of coping with things (line 20); secondly, feeling like she is overreacting as this

position has been internalised due to what others have told her (line 22); and thirdly, feeling that she is overreacting because things were hard but they did not in fact have any great impact on her (line 27).

Lines 14 to 28 can be read as the counsellor doing the task of making a re-interpretation through asking a question (Bercelli et al., 2008; McGee et al., 2005). In order to make the interpretation persuasive, the counsellor grounds her formulation in the client's talk by reflecting back her comments before making an interpretation about why this might be (Vehvilainen, 2003). Her utterance creates options, and the presupposition attached to these options "it might be" (lines 19 & 20) cause the question to "carry with it a framework of presuppositions that constrain the client to answer in such a way as to ratify, and hence affiliate with, the presupposition of the informing questions" (MacMartin, 2008, p.80).

However, the options made available by the counsellor's utterance are not responded to for some time (line 29), and the 8.5 second pause that follows the counsellor's speech before the client responds may be indicative of "the client's refusal to take her turn" (Madill et al., 2001, p. 42). When the client does respond it is only with a non-lexical and non-committal speech sound. The counsellor then says:

	29	(8.5)	
Client	30	Mhm erm	
Counsellor	31	And I'm not kind of (.) asking for an answer about which one it is	

This is perhaps recognition of the limitations her previous turn imposed on the client, and an effort to make other positions available to the client. Yet the client still does not respond directly to the options the counsellor outlined until line 34. The client's acceptance that the things that happened did have an impact on her (lines 34 to 37) and that there are things that are "unresolved" (line 40) has the effect of doing *being reasonable* or considered, whilst still disaffiliating from the options the counsellor has provided. This *being reasonable* was also apparent in extract 6 shortly before the client curtailed the topic by saying "we'll cross

that bridge when I come to it; there's no point thinking about it now" (extract 6, lines 50 to 53). The result of this is that it positions her following claim as more reasonable: that although she knows they did have an impact she is *unable* to answer how these things impacted her exactly. The justification for this inability is done metaphorically in lines 40 and 41.

Client 39 Like there I can't (1.0) there are things that (2.0) feel (4.0) are
 40 <unresolved> but I don't >kind of I can't quite< (2.5) get into the
 41 **memory vault and unlock them** (0.5)
Counsellor 42 Mhm
Client 43 <Yet> I don't know

By characterising her memories metaphorically as in a "vault" (line 41), the client brings to the construction the symbolism of memories being impenetrably locked away. However, these "things" are not only in *a* vault, they are in *the* memory vault, and with this statement she enacts a version of the world in which each of us must unlock this vault in order to gain access to them. By prefacing this statement with "I can't quite get into..." the client positions herself as attempting to and even trying to do so, but being unable to. Consequently, when "I don't know" follows in line 43, her metaphorical talk has already positioned her not knowing – and this not knowing is one in which she is unable, rather than unwilling.

Potter (1997) has observed how participants' "I don't know" (or "I dunno") utterances can be seen as oriented to accomplishing issues of stake, rather than being straightforward 'uncertainty markers' as cognitive psychologists might refer to them. One of Potter's findings suggests that "I don't know" can be used to do 'stake inoculation' (ibid.). Here, a stake inoculation after or before making a claim was shown to be used by "conversationalists and writers... to limit the ease with which their talk and texts can be undermined" (ibid., p. 197).

Considering this in relation to the sequential positioning of the client's "I don't know" in extract 7, it is apparent that it too works as a stake inoculation device to prevent the prior metaphorical accounting of the client's inability to get into the memory vault and unlock it (lines 40 and 41) from being undermined. In other words, it positions the client as not overly invested in this metaphorical construction, because if she were, the counsellor might respond that perhaps she does not want to answer, or think about how things have affected her. Rather, it gives the impression that the metaphorical account she has provided is an approximation, perhaps similar to what Potter has called "a display of wondering" (Potter, 1997b, p. 201).

In extract 7, then, the client accomplishes directly responding to the counsellor's intervention in a manner previously shown as common in the expression of resistance to counsellors' optimistic questions, with an account of why it is she cannot answer (MacMartin, 2008). However, by metaphorically talking this account the client does not only legitimise the claim "I don't know", but also positions herself as unable to know and unable to answer. It is a complex use of a hedging device (Hyland, 1996; Jucker & Smith, 1998), in which the "I don't know" is legitimised by her metaphorical claim, and also inoculates her metaphorical account from being undermined (Potter, 1996a; 1997b). The implication of this is that, far from merely providing a mechanism for the communication of metaphorically conceptualised thought (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980), metaphorical talk does not only have descriptive purposes, but rather functions as a rhetorical device oriented in this case towards resisting responding to counsellors' interventions, and is used with other interactional resources as is necessary to aid in accomplishment.

The client continues to negotiate the foreclosure of the topic, as she goes on to use non-metaphorical language to strengthen her claim that her "memory vault" is currently locked:

Client 45 [>I feel like there are some of< there are things: that I can't
 46 (0.5) talk about because I can't think of them↑

This functions to make future requests for this information from the counsellor unreasonable, as she has constructed her inability to respond as due to not being able to think of the “things” that would be required to answer (lines 45 & 46). Accordingly, the counsellor abandons the earlier options she proposed and attempts to clarify the client’s current thoughts and feelings (lines 47 to 50). Thus the topic and orientation of the interaction is moved away from an investigation of the possible causes for the client’s feeling that she is overreacting, and towards the feeling she has about not being able to give an answer “yet” because something is preventing her – the metaphorical inference is, perhaps, that she does not have the right ‘key’.

Extracts 6 & 7 have demonstrated use of metaphor to assist in the negotiation of the topic of focus, where clients’ metaphorical talk is oriented towards moving on or closing of the discourse some way. Some similarities have been noted between Drew and Holt’s (1998) observations with regard to figures of speech and topic transitioning (extract 6). However, it is also apparent that in novel metaphorical talk, the precise metaphorical construction used by clients to represent their experience can actively construct a version of reality that makes the counsellors continued pursuit of the topic challenging. Extract 7 in particular demonstrates the client doing the complex task of resistance – of not answering a question proposed in the previous turn – which she legitimises through making the claim that she doesn’t know – and justifying this claim metaphorically. Below, extracts 8 to 11 give several further examples of very similar negotiations in action, most of them achieved metaphorically.

Extract 8

In Extract 8 the counsellor is trying to make sense of what connects the various difficulties that a client is reporting having. Several turns before the extract begins, the client starts to talk about another topic and then asks “Are we not maybe going away down another path

here”. The extract begins by the counsellor re-orienting the talk to this comment and then posing an alternative question back to the client rather than answering his question directly. The client resists responding by using metaphorical talk and vivid description to manage and legitimise his non-response.

Extract 8 (C-C3 T2)

Counsellor 1 °Mmhm° >um I can understand what you were saying there as in: (.)
 2 you know how did we get to this (.) when we were kind of (.)
 3 [doing =
 Client 4 [mm
 Counsellor 5 = the sleep stuff< (0.5) but kind of like (.) it’s kind of (.) one
 6 thing we talked about >kind of lead to another and then to another
 7 and then we’ve kind of gone down to< (.) you know **what is this**
 8 **underneath what is underneath** all these things that causing all
 9 these things
 Client 10 I I really don’t know because
 Counsellor 11 Mm
 12 (3.0)
 Client 13 °I just dropped that sorry° I used to be (4.5) I used to be really
 14 (.) I **I used to be the bloody space cadet** in school right
 Counsellor 15 Mm
 Client 16 Doing stupid stuff around about the playground and (*two
 17 syllables*) **a bloody magic wand**
 Counsellor 18 [mm
 Client 19 [And all this carry on (1.0) and one of the things I used to do
 20 myself was (0.5) because I did get picked on a wee bit cos I
 21 wasn’t °er eh eh er er° I was fat in secondary school I was (1.0)
 22 er:: the geek (.) I was a boy who came in with star trek models
 23 and (2.0) >er er er< too much of trekkie things
 Counsellor 24 (h) (h)m hm
 Client 25 I can quote the movies line for line °right° (.) I’M NOT LIKE THAT
 26 WELL (1.0) ↓depending on the company I can still be like that↓
 27 (0.5) but erm: (2.5) <there’s er:> (3.0) I used to just say: **er**
 28 **like build up a wall**
 Counsellor 29 Mm
 Client 30 To the point where nobody would really bother me (.) I don’t get
 31 bothered by anything >anybody says now<
 Counsellor 32 [mm
 Client 33 [I’m not bothered about °>humiliating myself and things like
 34 that°< (1.0) and (3.0) there’s just parts of it where (1.5) I
 35 don’t see how there er er I don’t (0.5) that’s >to myself I don’t
 36 notice any:< (1.0) on a conscious level I don’t let any of that
 37 affect me
 Counsellor 38 Mm
 Client 39 So I don’t I don’t know: (1.5) I don’t know how some of these
 40 things affect me I don’t know:
 Counsellor 41 Mm
 Client 42 I just sort of try and get up and get on with it I (.) >I don’t
 43 know what I’m try I (.) I know what trying to say but **I can’ee get**
 44 **it out**< but er:
 Counsellor 45 You like what I was hearing was <basically that you don’t let
 46 things get to you> [you TRY and (.) you try not to mm (.) mm
 Client 47 [I try not to things like that I try just to: get on
 48 with it
 Counsellor 49 Mm
 Client 50 So: (.) I don’t ((sigh))

The client's query that they may be "going down another path" is paraphrased by the counsellor in line 2, and rather than answering directly, the counsellor has responded by asking the client the different but related question "what is underneath" the many topics they have talked about (lines 7 & 8). The presupposition "wh-" question functions to construct a version of reality in which *the answer* or *the truth* lies hidden "*underneath*" what has been spoken (McGee et al., 2005). This version of reality is unlikely to be problematic to the counsellor, or even considered anything other than normal talk, as one of the principles shared amongst most psychological therapists and counsellors is that personal meanings can sit "underneath" our thoughts, feelings and actions, and that part of the therapeutic process is about exploring and becoming more aware of these meanings and what important experiences have helped to form them (Kennerly, Kirk & Westbrook, 2017; Lemma, 2016; Mearns, Thorne & McLeod, 2013; Spinelli, 2005;). She thus draws on a therapeutic stock of interactional knowledge and structures the therapeutic conversation in a way that orients the interaction within this frame (Peräkylä & Vehviläinen, 2003; Vehviläinen, Peräkylä, Antaki & Leudar, 2008).

What is made relevant in the counsellor's utterance then, are not the many problems that the client has reported, but the far fewer factors that unite these problems. Furthermore, the existence of these unifying factors is not suggested by the counsellor, but rather assumed as a truth, which the client is responsible for reflecting on with the counsellor. This pattern of interaction is one that has been noted in psychoanalytic interpretation, where the analyst responds to the client by using a "noticing statement" which "topicalises the client's action...[which] shifts the focus of the talk and makes the client accountable for [his] action" (Vehviläinen, 2008, p. 126). The result of this is that the *responsibility* for "going down another path" is placed on the client.

Consequently, in this sequential context the metaphorical talk can be seen as showing the counsellor managing and re-orienting the topic of the conversation, requiring the client to engage with the topic in a different way.

For the client, however, this poses a potential difficulty. He is now required to provide an answer that he either doesn't know, does not understand (as he may well not construct reality as one in which personal meaning sits "underneath" talk and is unlikely to share the stock of interactional knowledge that the counsellor's intervention has drawn on) or does not want to answer. He has thus been talked by the counsellor's construction of reality into a problematic position (Wetherell, 1998). Consistent with this, the client's uptake is one of disaffiliation with the counsellor's question: giving a non-answer response that, "I really don't know" (line 10). He then continues in lines 13 to 42 to justify his answer of "not knowing" by accounting for it using metaphor (MacMartin, 2008).

The client begins by building an elaborate construction of himself as a child, storying an account in which he "used to be a bloody space cadet" (line 14) to the extent that he "had a bloody magic wand" (line 17). It is unclear whether "this carry on" (line 19) is supposed to serve as evidence to counter the construction that follows as "fat" "geek" "with the star trek models" (lines 22 to 23), or whether his construction of himself as a smart whizz kid is further evidence of the fact that he was an easy target. Regardless of this, with a succinct but flamboyant description a clear construction of this "boy" as *misfit* is accomplished, through vivid metaphorical imagery prefaced by the repetition of the phrase "I was" three times in a single turn (lines 19 to 23). The function of this account becomes apparent in lines 27 and 28: it is necessary in order to provide a rationale for the fact that the client would "build up a wall" (line 28).

The rationale that is constructed is that *in order to* deal with getting "picked on" (line 20) *because* he was "the geek" (line 22) and "fat" (line 21), he would *therefore* "build up a wall"

(line 28) “to the point that nobody could bother me” (line 30). This activity further legitimates the claim that he built up a wall, because the caricature of his younger past-identity-as-misfit is so vivid that this was obviously something that he *had* to do. Consequently, metaphorical talk here functions to bolster the skilled historicising of his identity, as the vivid account provided legitimises the claim that follows: that as he “built” a wall, he does not “get bothered” about humiliating himself and that on a “conscious level I don’t let any of that affect me” (lines 33, 36 & 37). This results in him not knowing “how some of these things affect me” (lines 39 & 40). Thus, as in extract 7, a metaphorically constructed account of past identity is also being done in order to give legitimacy to not answering, or not knowing the answer, of the question.

Similarly to extract 7, the metaphorical talk of extract 8 is accompanied by the utterance “I don’t know”. However, there are some important differences between them, both sequentially and discursively. Firstly, in extract 7 the client’s “I don’t know” follows her metaphorical account (extract 7, line 43), whereas in extract 8 it is used in the client’s turns that both directly precede and follow the metaphorically accounted justification (lines 10, 39 & 40). Secondly, where “I don’t know” has been understood to be doing stake inoculation of the metaphorical claim in extract 7, in extract 8 it seems that it is the metaphorically talked identity construction that is doing stake inoculation of the preceding claim “I really don’t know” in line 10, as the extensively vivid and figurative nature of this account constructs a history in which there is no possible way the client could know the answer to the counsellor’s question.

Conversely, the *I don’t know*s that follow the metaphorical identity construction in extract 8 (lines 39 & 40) seem to act to inoculate the metaphorical account just given, again indicating that when identity is talked metaphorically it is not done merely for descriptive communicative purposes, but is employed to manage interactional issues at stake.

The client has constructed a vivid version of himself, and storied an account of his childhood in order to provide a rationale for building a wall that legitimises the claim he originally made in line 8 that he doesn't know "what is underneath all this". This action might be considered as being accomplished in lines 45 and 46, when the counsellor repeats the client's claim when she says "you don't let things get to you". The counsellor has thus been successfully recruited in to the client's version of events. The result of this is that the topic of the talk has to move on.

Similarly to the client featured in extract 7, the client's skilled management of the discourse in extract 8, primarily performed through the use of metaphorical constructions of identity and stake inoculation has resulted in the impression that it is not that he is unwilling to answer, but rather that he is unable. Thus he remains a cooperative participant in the therapeutic process, but one who struggles with the consequences of his own history. This strategy has done more than accomplish the client's position as a truth claim, however. It has also acted as a mechanism *against* participation in the counsellor's version of reality that things sit underneath what is talked about in the conversation (Bercelli et al., 2008).

Extract 9

Extract 9 is an extract taken from the same counsellor and client's therapy but a later session, and shows the client deploying the same strategy in response to a question from the counsellor. In this instance, however, the client's metaphorical talk is limited and at most he uses lightly figurative talk to enhance the construction he builds.

The counsellor and client have been creating a 'timeline' or narrative of the client's history and his associated levels of anxiety on a whiteboard, and as the client describes a time in which he was "up and down" (line 1) because of his parents "breaking up and getting back

together” (lines 3 & 4) the counsellor suggests that he was “higher up” (line 13) on the scale – referring to his anxiety.

Extract 9 (C-C3 T4)

Client 1 I was very up and down depending
Counsellor 2 Mm
Client 3 Because of my mum and dad (0.5) br breaking up and getting back
4 together three [times
Counsellor 5 [mm
6 Mmhm
Client 7 And then: eventually when they split up they went (.) she went
8 and met a new partner
Counsellor 9 Mm
Client 10 Who: (2.5) again (1.0) cheated on her
Counsellor 11 Mm
Client 12 And [that was so
Counsellor 13 [So maybe you were higher up
14 (2.0)
Client 15 I I really don't [know
Counsellor 16 [mm
Client 17 The thing is when I was younger I (.) got this mindset that
Counsellor 18 Mmhm
Client 19 **Nothing can get me down (.) [just plod away so**
Counsellor 20 [Yeah
21 Yeah
Client 22 I've never ah (1.0) although I've had anxiety I've never really
23 been (1.0) the only thing I've ever worried about
Counsellor 24 Mm
25 (2.5)
Client 26 ((sigh)) (1.5) i i is (1.0) well one thing right now which is
27 important is getting chucked out of uni (.) right [because
Counsellor 28 [mm
Client 29 My degrees worth (0.5) that's my future I've got nothing else to
30 fall back on
Counsellor 31 Yeah

What is first apparent is that whilst the client's metaphorical talk is limited in relation to the identity construction work he does, throughout the extract both client and counsellor are using directional and topographical metaphors to describe emotions; “up” as feeling better, good or more positive, and “down” as low or negative. Conversely, “higher up” on the anxiety timeline is equivocated to feeling more anxious (line 13).

The use of these directional metaphors “high” “low” and “up” and “down” to describe emotions were pervasive throughout the data, and they do commonly seem to represent metaphorical shorthand for emotional descriptions in interaction. Indeed, in conceptual metaphor theory, the conceptual metaphor “life is a journey” is understood as accounting

for the description of the happenings of life as “ups and downs”, as these metaphorically represent the variable nature of this journey (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980; Tay, 2011b).

In the present study clients and counsellors seemed to use these metaphors relatively consistently to describe emotional variants of sad and negative emotions (for example, “down-hill” in extract 4 line 29; “downward spiral” in extract 5 lines 4 and 5; “tits up” in extract 5 line 24), and happy and positive emotions, in a way that required little negotiation.

In the present extract, however, the counsellor’s suggestion that the client’s anxiety was “higher up” (line 13) when his parents split-up and then his mother’s new partner cheated on her (lines 7 to 10) does seem to be problematic in some way, and the client responds once again with the non-answer disaffiliate response (MacMartin, 2008), “I I really don’t know” (line 15) – an exact replication of his response in extract 8 (extract 8, line 10). He then proceeds once again to historicise an account of himself, constructing a version of himself that was established when he was younger that legitimises his not knowing (lines 17 to 23; Leudar & Nekvapil, 2011).

This is not done as substantially as in the previous extract, nor is metaphorical talk drawn on to the same extent: nothing could get him down when he was younger and he would “just plod away” (line 19) builds a construction of him as determined and resilient and perhaps stubborn, but none of the extensive categorisation talk and rich historical narration are performed as in extract 8. However as this is in the subsequent session, it could be supposed that having provided such a thorough account in the previous week, this representation merely builds on the former construction. As Antaki, Condor & Levine (1996) suggest, “Such bringings-to-bear are briefly over and done, of course, but their accumulated record is what gives a person their portfolio of identities” p. 448.

Again, what is accomplished is not only a rationale for not knowing (and not answering) the counsellor’s question. The counsellor is attempting to construct a timeline of the client’s

anxiety – a position that firstly makes a truth claim with regard to anxiety as a representable phenomenon and secondly requires that the client share or at least adopt this representation. Additionally, the task towards which the counsellor is structuring the interaction takes the position that this anxiety has existed in greater or lesser amounts over time, and requires the client to adopt this reality historically as well as in the here and now in order to answer the question. The client’s refusal to do this activity is a rejection of the counsellor’s move to structure the interaction according to her therapeutic and institutional goals (Leudar et al., 2008b), and a refusal to adopt this interactional or intersubjective position.

Summary of section

Extracts 6 to 9 show how metaphorical talk plays a significant role in the negotiation and management of the topic under discussion in counselling interactions. This has been shown particularly in relation to clients negotiating disaffiliative ‘non-answer responses’ to counsellors’ interventions, where these interventions feature presuppositions or implicit truth claims. In these cases, clients performed what MacMartin (2008) has referred to as resistance, by responding in ways that are misaligned with the presuppositions or assumptions represented in the questions posed to them. Metaphorical talk assisted in accomplishing this task where it was oriented towards both doing resistance and topic transition.

In addition, a feature common to extracts 7, 8 & 9 was the sequential relationship between the utterance “I don’t know” and metaphorical accounts for not knowing. Hutchby (2002) discusses the use of “I don’t know” in psychotherapy sessions to try to “close-down unwelcome counsellor questions”. What we see in the extracts above, however, is how metaphorical talk which unfolds over a number of turns is used to accomplish accounts which provide a justification for *not knowing/not participating* in the counsellor’s structured

interaction. At times metaphorical accounting seemed to do stake inoculation (Potter, 1996a; 1997b) – protecting clients’ claim to not knowing and thus not being able to answer from being challenged (extracts 8 & 9). At other times, however, the relationship between the two was reversed (extract 7).

What is clear is that metaphorical constructions are evidently an important resource in legitimising and justifying *not* answering counsellors directly. The lengths which client participants were shown to go to in order to accomplish resistance is perhaps indicative of the fact that there is pressure on clients to respond to counsellors questions given “the central principle that clients must examine their own experiences” (Vehviläinen, 2008, p. 123). Here, it seems, metaphor functioned to aid in the negotiating the difficult task of resisting this institutionally embedded principle, through rich and vivid accounting.

5.4. Metaphor & Clients’ and Counsellors’ co-orientation to the construction of shared meaning

Many counselling and psychotherapy theorists and practitioners value greater self-awareness and self-knowledge as a significant part of the counselling process (Bion, 1984; Kennerly, Kirk & Westbrook, 2017; Rogers, 1967; Spinelli, 2005). It is unsurprising, then, that exploring the personal meanings and ‘lived experience’ of clients and counsellors is a popular area of study in counselling psychology and psychotherapy research (Smith, 2004) as interpreting clients’ subjectivity and personal meaning is so central to the role of the counsellor (Kasket & Gil-Rodriguez, 2011; Peräkylä, 2008;). Although the study of meaning is traditionally the remit of realist methodologies, if meaning-making is part of the work of therapy, one would expect this *action* to be represented in therapy talk. This has been shown in the cases where the construction of meaning has been explored discursively (Ferrera, 1993; Shotter, 1993) in particular in relation to narrative analysis (Bavelas, Coates and Johnston, 2000; Strong & Knight, 2012) and problem formulating in psychotherapy

(Buttny, 1990; 1996; Madill, Barkham & Widdicombe, 2001). Strong and colleagues describe the action as follows:

“As speakers, client and counsellor have a choreography of talk to work out as well as a coordinated sense of what each other intends and means with their use of words. When that goes well, they develop understandings and ways of talking that are uniquely theirs, taking up or extending each others’ language in what is later said, in an interweave of shared dialogue” (Strong et al., 2008, p. 120).

Understanding the personal meanings of clients’ problems and how they relate to past and present circumstances, is one of the central aspects of the act of therapeutic formulation. As such there is a significant amount of both practitioner literature (Johnstone & Dallos, 2014) and CA/DP literature (Antaki, 2008; Antaki et al., 2005a; Buttny, 1996; Davis, 1986; Heritage & Watson, 1979; Madill et al., 2001; 2000;) exploring this institutional action.

This section of the analysis focuses on the means through which meaning is co-constructed (or not) between clients and counsellors, and focuses on how metaphorical talk is involved in this action. The extracts below can be understood to follow the sequential turn-taking pattern described as formulating – whereby a problem is defined, evidence is gathered in relation to it, and there is work done to establish the client’s consent to work on the problem (Davis, 1986). As this research is focused on exploring the actions of metaphorical talk, however, this literature will be drawn on specifically to enhance the analysis of the contribution that metaphorical talk makes.

The following three extracts demonstrate the ways in which metaphorical talk was involved in the clients’ and counsellors’ co-orientation to constructing shared meaning, focusing on two metaphors that were often associated with the action: “ties in” and “cycle”. It also demonstrates that meaning-making was a collaborative process, where meanings were co-constructed through both client and counsellor being mutually oriented towards

accomplishing ‘greater understanding’ as a discursive action. This action seemed to be accomplished through a sequential pattern noticed in cases of ‘extended agreement’ in therapy conversations, where counsellors’ reinterpretations and reformulations that were grounded in their client’s previous utterances, were taken up by clients and responded to in non-minimal ways (Bercelli et al. 2008). This is discussed further during the analysis of the extracts.

Extract 10

The first extract in this section is taken from a session mid-way into the client’s therapy, where she and her counsellor are discussing some of the emotional responses and thoughts she has when interacting with her friends and family. At the beginning of this conversation, the counsellor has begun to write down some of the things that the client reports in a place where it is apparent from the talk that both she and the client can see what is being written.

Extract 10 (C-C2 T5)

Client	1	I suppose it’s doing something to be nice but then (0.5)
	2	expecting (1.0) to be thanked for it [and you’re not =
Counsellor	3	[Mmhm
Client	4	= thanked for it and [you get (.) [angry
Counsellor	5	[ok [s:o
Client	6	Kind of (.) I guess it’s not just (.) about (.) they’re not
	7	there for you when you need them [but it’s also
Counsellor	8	[They don’t <u>thank</u> you:
Client	10	Not being <appreciated>
Counsellor	11	Yeah
	12	Erm ((writing 4.5)) <appreciated> and I guess that ties in with
	13	(1.5) where we’re (0.5) where we are here
Client	14	Yeah
Counsellor	15	So what’s the consequence of this (1.0) for you you kind of
	16	(0.5) always doing things (1.5) without much
Client	17	Erm
Counsellor	18	°Appreciation°
	19	(2.0)
Client	20	(exhale) (5.0) I suppose (4.0) it makes you (2.0) reluctant to
	21	believe that peoples (1.5) friendships and relationships with
	22	you are genuine↑
Counsellor	23	Mm ((writing))
Client	24	And you feel like people are out to what (.) for what they can
	25	get sometimes↑
Counsellor	26	Mmhm ((writing)) so then it comes back to the (1.0) trust
Client	27	Yeah
Counsellor	28	Okay ((writing 11.0))
	29	It’s quite kind of (1.0) an interesting (0.5) cycle with a lot
	30	of (.) <different (1.0) levels > to it because on the one hand it
	31	sounds like you’re kind of (.) >you know< this is feeding <into>
	32	(0.5) here >to the< anger and sadness and feeling <worthless>

Client 33 Mm
Counsellor 34 Erm (2.0) but there's also something about (0.5) your belief
35 that you should put (0.5) other people first
Client 36 Mm so it does make you feel good to a certain [extent =
Counsellor 37 [Mmhm
Client 38 = because >you feel like you're doing< (2.0) the right thing
Counsellor 39 Mmhm so it takes the guilt↑ (.) does it make you <feel good>↑
40 or does it take the guilt away a bit↓
Client 41 Um:↑ (.) it wh↑ (.) it takes the guilt away a bit↓
Counsellor 42 Mmhm
Client 43 I think it also (2.0) it makes you feel a little less selfless
Counsellor 44 °Okay°
Client 45 A little <more> selfless
Counsellor 46 More selfless ok
Client 47 °<And a suppose that's to do with feelings of being (1.5) fears
48 of guilt nd (.) feelings of not feeling great as well> cos you
49 feel like should be selfless because you (0.5) you need to give
50 (.) back (2.0) for (.) **for being such a (0.5) burden** (0.5) and
51 such a like (1.5)°
Counsellor 52 Mm
Client 53 Rubbish person umm
Counsellor 54 ((writing)) Ok so **who were you a burden on** ((writing))
55 ((writing 3.0))
Client 56 °M (1.0) friends (.) and family and°
Counsellor 57 Mm ((writing 3.0)) °ok° ((writing 2.0)) ok so that kind of (0.5)
58 doesn't seem to be only about the guilt but that to me sounds
59 like (.) the <worthlessness> that feeling talking as well
60 >saying that you're< (1.0) **being a burden** to friends and family
Client 61 Yeah

Extract 10 begins with the client as the dominant speaker in the interaction as she contemplates what it is she finds problematic about interactions with others (lines 1 to 11). She defines it as the fact that she does not feel appreciated (line 10). The counsellor, who has either been listening or reflecting back, then writes this down in line 12 before adding “I guess that **ties in** with...where we are over here” (line 12), to which she receives an affirmative response (line 14).

By beginning her turn by reflecting back, she establishes the inter-subjectivity of her utterance – that she is drawing on what she has heard the client say (Sacks et al., 1995). The counsellor continues with collaborative talk which is evident in her use of a gist formulation “I guess” together with the pronoun “where *we* are here” (lines 12 & 13, emphasis added). By framing this claim as a question “I guess that ties in with...where we are here” and waiting for a response, the counsellor is demonstrating an observation made previously in Madill and colleagues investigation into problem formulations in psychotherapy, whereby

“the successful accomplishment of a topic change or reformulation requires uptake and ratification by the client” (Madill et al., 2001, p.424; also see Heritage and Watson, 1979).

These devices frame the reformulation as a collaborative process as it provides opportunity in the client’s uptake for disagreement without rupture. The crux of the reformulation is constructed metaphorically through “ties in with” (line 12). Although the data was audio recorded and no visual record was taken – it does not seem unreasonable to assume that the counsellor is referencing what she has written down or drawn so far as a result of their conversation, as this is a common practice in some forms of therapy (Johnstone & Dallos, 2014). Her reference to “where we are here” (line 13), indicates a metaphorical transformation of the client’s reported emotions, situations and thoughts into a spatially represented conceptualisation. Many counsellors call this a way of creating a formulation (Johnstone & Dallos, 2014; Kennerly, Kirk & Westbrook, 2017).

“Ties in” (line 12), then, is an important metaphor in this co-constructive process. It both verbally and visually links the client’s most recent accounting to what has come before. Arguably, what this metaphor does is both summarise and make relevant certain aspects of what the client does, acting as an efficient “double barrel” formulation device (Antaki et al., 2005a); a kind of counsellor shorthand.

Once the client has agreed with this representation (line 14), the counsellor and client seem to inhabit positions that are co-oriented to accomplishing the same task: the construction of an agreed understanding or meaning. Subsequently the counsellor becomes investigator and questioner, asking the client about the consequence for her of what she has described (lines 15 and 16). As the client begins to answer the counsellor once again becomes listener and reflector, before moving to summarise and formulate what the client has said, which she again uses metaphorical talk to accomplish:

Counsellor 28 Okay ((writing 11.0))

29 It's quite kind of (1.0) an interesting (0.5) **cycle** with a lot
 30 of (.) <different (1.0) **levels**> to it because on the one hand it
 31 sounds like you're kind of (.) >you know< this is **feeding <into>**
 32 (0.5) **here** >to the< anger and sadness and feeling <worthless>

Once again the counsellor represents what the client has said by reformulating it in relation to what she has said before *and* as a part of the agreed and spatially represented record that she has been writing (lines 29 to 32). Metaphor is again important in accomplishing this. Instead of “ties in”, in line 29 the counsellor represents the client’s account as a “cycle with a lot of different levels”, and again refers directly to the visual representation when she says “this is feeding into here” (lines 31 & 32). The “here” (line 32) is clarified as the metaphorically spatial representation of the clients’ anger, sadness and worthlessness (line 32). Arguably, by employing metaphorical talk in this manner, the counsellor transforms the client’s account from the words that she has used to construct her experience, into a tangible entity that can be physically and spatially looked at and thought about together. With the assistance of metaphor, then, the counsellor’s talk goes beyond a diagnostic formulation in that it constructs the client’s account in a manner that invites co-orientation to it.

The counsellor follows this reinterpretation in a manner that mirrors the earlier interactional pattern. Although an explicit question does not follow as in lines 34 & 35 the counsellor expresses a query with the formulation or “cycle” so far in a manner similar to Heritage and Watson’s “upshot formulation” (Heritage and Watson, 1979; also see Antaki et al., 2005a; Hak & de Boer, 1996).

Counsellor 34 Erm (2.0) but there's also something about (0.5) your belief
 35 that you should put (0.5) other people first

The client takes this up evidently recognising this as an appeal for more information which she then provides, and in lines 36 to 61 the interactional pattern continues of the client describing/accounting for her feelings and what she finds challenging (lines 36, 38, 45 &

46), the counsellor listening and reflecting her words (lines 39, 42, 44, 46 & 47 to 51), then asking follow up questions (lines 39, 40, 54) and then finally formulating once more (lines 57 to 60).

What leads to the final formulation in lines 47 to 50 is the client's metaphorically constructed claim that she must "give back" for "being such a burden". With this utterance, the client brings together several emotions and behaviours that have been talked about (guilt, line 41; being selfless, line 45; feeling worthless, line 32) and relates them metaphorically to "being such a burden" (line 50).

"Burden" is then picked up by the counsellor and addressed directly in a pre-supposition "wh" question, "Who were you a burden on?" (line 54) and this becomes the focus of the interaction. What is noticeable here is that this presupposition appears unproblematic for the client, most likely due to the fact the assumption of the presupposition (that the client is a burden on others) has come from the client's talk in her previous turn. As a result we see a demonstration of Strong's observation that "words, stories, and their respected parts in dialogue serve clients and counsellors as collaborative sense-making tools" (Strong et al., 2008, p. 120). This seems to be accomplished by means of what Bercelli refers to as "extended agreement" in therapy talk whereby the counsellor is able to "direct both topic development and sequential organisation by alternating inquiry and elaboration" – seemingly in a manner that avoids resistance (Bercelli et al., 2008, p. 46). Yet it is also important to point out that there are three important features in the counsellor's reformulation strategy. Firstly, the counsellor's talk is constructed tentatively using gist formulations ("I guess", line 6; "so that kind of", line 57; "sounds like", lines 58 & 59). Secondly, the counsellor's uptake in reformulation engages and takes up what the client has made relevant *before* metaphorically transforming it and formulating it. Thirdly, the counsellor seems to provide genuine opportunity for disagreement with her formulations.

Once the client provides more information about this metaphorically represented feeling and belief, the counsellor then offers a final reinterpretation, drawing on some of the language used by both client and counsellor to describe how she feels and has formulated this previously, and repeating the sense of being a burden once more (lines 57 to 61).

What is particularly interesting in extract 10 is that metaphorical talk was often deployed in counsellors' and clients' talk at particular points in the action of constructing shared meaning. For example, as discussed above, one of the notable features of the counsellor's metaphorical talk was the tendency for it to occur as part of the action of formulation or reformulation. For the most part, the counsellors' listening and reflecting back were non-metaphorical (see lines 3, 5 & 11 and lines 42, 44, 46 & 52), as were her questions (for example lines 15, 16 & 18 and 39 & 40) – with the exception of when the question included the client's metaphorical talk (line 54). However, there were several occasions when the counsellors' summarising and formulating talk was metaphorically constructed (for example "ties in with" in line 12 and "cycle", "levels" and "feeding into" in lines 29 to 32). In the second instance, the counsellor's talk took the format of reinterpretation, where the counsellor used firstly questions and secondly statements grounded in the client's talk expressed in previous turns, in order to make additive statements and offer alternative perspectives (Becelli et al., 2008).

In both cases the particular metaphors deployed served to re-work the client's talk, by figuratively transforming it in a way that meant it could be spatially represented, and this spatial representation provided an additional means for collaborative enquiry. On the other hand, for the client metaphorical talk was deployed to do accounting, but only towards the end of this process, seemingly in order to link previous accounts together and add an additional layer of meaning or a new conceptualisation and construction of what had been expressed before. It is interesting to note that the metaphorical construction the client

ultimately voices is one that also transforms her problem spatially into a “burden” (lines 50; 54 & 60). This is perhaps indicative of the shared nature of the meaning that the client and counsellor have constructed, having tested out and developed a shared language for the problem (Strong et al., 2008).

Taken together, both the client’s and counsellor’s metaphors appear to be more prevalent at points in the interaction after the initial description-listening/reflecting back where there is a reworking of what has been said or a recapturing of it.

Extract 11

Extract 11 is taken from later session in therapy from the same client and counsellor as extract 10. It differs from extract 10 in that in the first half of the interaction the client and counsellor effectively switch positions in the relation to both metaphorical talk and formulating. In the present extract, it is the client who deploys metaphor to formulate her earlier talk – using the metaphor “cycle” again, and the counsellor who responds to this formulation by providing a non-metaphorical description of what is problematic about this cycle. Nevertheless, the participants’ co-orientation to constructing a shared meaning is evident in the sequence.

Extract 11 (C-C2 T6)

Client	1	Mm:: (1.5) maybe that’s why (.) I (.) partly do it >cos I
	2	don’t< (.) ↑mind feeling bad the next day↑ cos I still (0.5) I
	3	feel like I deserve to feel (.) ba:d (0.5) sometimes
Counsellor	4	<°O:K°> so in a sense it’s a kind of (.) <punishment as well>
Client	5	Yeah:: so I’ll do (1.5) I don’t know (2.0) yeah I s’pose it’s
	6	like a cycle
Counsellor	7	Mmhm
Client	8	And you go back to where you were before:
Counsellor	9	Mmhm so I guess it’s like (2.0) you know you you’re (.) feeling
	10	quite low you’re feeling ba:d (0.5) you get your immediate
	11	<u>high</u> ↑ but at the same time (1.0) you’re punishing yourself
Client	12	Mm
Counsellor	13	Because you know that that’s going to (1.5) mean
	14	(2.0)
Client	15	It’s not good f for (.) you and
Counsellor	16	Mmhm
Client	17	How you feel

Counsellor	18	Mmhm (1.0) OK so it (.) seems to serve a <u>dual (0.5) process
	19	[with> (.) immediate gratification but =
Client	20	[Mm
Counsellor	21	= <also: (.) the kind (0.5) of self punishment [or (1.5) yeah>
Client	22	[Mm

In this extract the client recounts her feelings in lines 1 to 3, and the counsellor listens and then extends her account with a reinterpretation in line 4: “it’s a kind of punishment as well” (Bercelli et al., 2008). This is phrased in such a way as to require clarification or confirmation from the client, and so is also an implicit question (Heritage & Watson, 1979; Madill et al., 2001). The client answers the question in line 5 by agreeing, and begins to provide an account: “so I’ll do” (line 5) before going on to construct her previous account metaphorically as “like a cycle” (line 6). What follows this is a collaborative exploration of this “cycle” where both client and counsellor orient their talk towards the task of characterising this cycle further.

In extract 10, the client does accounting and the counsellor constructs an understanding of this accounting in relation to a cycle it “ties in with” (extract 10, line 12) by gathering more information and then referencing how it relates. In extract 11, after the client has constructed her account as a “cycle” (line 6) the counsellor summarises the client’s account non-metaphorically (lines 9 to 13), the client extends this by adding an emotional or moral judgement construction “it’s not good for you and// how you feel” (lines 15 and 17) and the counsellor then specifies the metaphor “cycle” further to add the spatial transformation that the cycle construction provides, that it “seems to serve a dual process” (line 18).

In this extract, there is again a gradual move towards a co-constructed meaning that is satisfactory for both the client and counsellor, and both the client and counsellor move through and exchange positions as listener, summariser, investigator and formulator as a sequence of extended agreement is performed (Bercelli et al., 2008). Once again, gist formulations are used by the counsellor in her metaphorical and non-metaphorical

formulation talk (“so I guess” in line 9 and “OK so it seems to” in line 18). These make her talk tentative – inviting agreement but leaving opportunity for disagreement without rupture.

What this extract also shows though, is that there is some flexibility in who deploys metaphor for the purposes of constructing meaning, and indeed that ‘therapy talk’ or such institutional phrases such as “cycle” can be picked up and proposed by clients, perhaps as a consequence of their use by counsellors previously. In both cases, whether counsellor- or client-introduced, what seems important is that the metaphorically constructed formulation is explicated fully through an exchange that is co-oriented towards a working the precise relevance of the meaning for the client. When this occurs, metaphorical talk brings an additional characterisation of the previous accounting of meaning and experience that enhances collaborative construction of the problem

Extract 12

There are occasions, though, when metaphorical talk does not assist in the action of meaning making. Take extract 12 for example, where the metaphor “cycle” is used again by a different client/counsellor pair.

Extract 12 (C-C1 T4)

Client	1	[I don't know what it is
Counsellor	2	[uhhu
Client	3	[<I don't know why (4.0) why I do that> (.) and then I feel
	4	really guilty that I've not done
Counsellor	5	Yeah:
Client	6	Work [that week
Counsellor	7	[yeah
	8	So it sounds like this like vicious cycle [and kind of
Client	9	[Yeah: and I've not
	10	checked my emails as well for about a week
Counsellor	11	Ok: (.) ok
Client	12	Erm: that was another thing like (0.5) I have to hand in (1.5)
	13	well (.) I've still got two assignments from last semester I
	14	haven't handed in

In this extract, the client gives an account of feeling guilty for not working and expresses not knowing why she doesn't just work (lines 1 to 6). The counsellor responds with the

continuers (Schegloff, 1982) “yeah” and “uhhu”, which signal her position as listener (lines 2, 5 & 7), but rather than going on to summarise she moves immediately to formulate the client’s statements with a reinterpretation, constructing the client’s difficulty as a “vicious cycle” (line 8). The client seems to agree (line 9), but does not take up this formulation in her next turn and instead immediately progresses her account (lines 9 & 10), to which the counsellor provides a minimal continuer (line 11), and then the client moves on to orient her talk to a new topic (13 & 14).

In extract 12, the metaphor “vicious cycle” is used to characterise the content previously provided by the client, just as the counsellor does in extract 10 and the client does in extract 11. The fact that this metaphor is not picked up by the client may mean it is problematic, and yet it hasn’t been treated as overtly accountable. For example, the client does not respond with, “No it’s not like that”, or, “What do you mean?” Thus on the one hand the ‘vicious cycle’ is not overtly problematised or the counsellor held accountable in that the client does not treat it as problematic by challenging it directly (MacMartin, 2008). Nor is it implicitly problematised as might be the case with certain forms of silence (Madill et al., 2001). However, in contrast to the metaphorical talk found in the other sequences of interaction examined, here the metaphor does not become a resource through which client and counsellor capture and re-refer to the client’s experience.

In considering the possible explanations for this, one of the key differences between the cases where metaphorical formulations develop into co-constructions of shared meaning can be found in the sequential development of the talk. In extract 12, although the counsellor has formulated the client’s talk as accounting a problem, she does not do the important task of making relevant in her uptake the features which were relevant to the client (Madill et al., 2001). As such she does not draw on or situate the formulation intersubjectively by grounding it in the client’s prior talk as is done in extracts 10 and 11 (Madill et al., 2001;

Vehviläinen, 2008). Without any summarising or questioning being performed by the counsellor though, the characterisation of the client's account as vicious cycle has the effect of generalising the client's experience, rather than a move towards co-constructed meaning and shared agreement.

Arguably what this indicates is that the interactional process through which metaphorical talk is deployed in meaning-making is as, if not more, important than the metaphorical talk itself. Whilst metaphor can be highly useful to co-construct difficult and unspoken experiences, metaphor itself can be relatively *meaningless* in accomplishing this task if it is not a part of an interactive cycle of extended agreement that both client and counsellor are co-oriented towards accomplishing through responsiveness to one another's utterances.

Summary of section

Extracts 10 & 11 demonstrate that metaphorical talk can be a powerful interactional tool in progressing towards new understandings of meaning that are co-constructed in talk. However, as extract 12 indicates it is important that the metaphor is sourced in the existing representations put forward both by client and counsellor, or it risks becoming a generalised and *meaningless* intervention. Although several metaphors are used across the extracts, "cycle" appears in each, yet the effects of its deployment in talk are variable depending on the other actions that are performed around it. Without questioning, summarising *and* listening, it seems that investigating/exploring is not fully done, and as a result a metaphorical formulating or constructing of the problem is not co-constructed, it is merely one participant's statement that is unreferenced in the others' talk. In contrast to this, when metaphorical talk is deployed in the context of these other actions it can provide an additional construction, and as such an additional means of thinking and talking about the

problem account; which can then be summarised, questioned and explored in another repetition in an iterative co-constructed movement.

5.5. Summary of findings

This chapter has demonstrated three spheres of activity, or actions, that were found in clients' and counsellors' metaphorical talk in counselling sessions.

First, this analysis drew on category membership analysis to show how clients and counsellors used metaphor in their identity talk. Extracts 1 and 2 demonstrated how clients drew metaphorically on familial role categories in order to communicate relational problems between themselves and others. Extract 3 showed how counsellors can use family role related metaphors in their interventions. Here, the potential danger of counsellors talking, or performing, their clients' identities was highlighted, given the inference rich nature of these categories.

Clients' were found to metaphorically talk identities in another way, namely to construct past vs present identities. This action was demonstrated in extracts 4 and 5. In these extracts, clients' talk followed a pattern whereby a past idealised identity was constructed as mysteriously and devastatingly lost. Here, metaphorical talk was employed to vividly construct these identities, and to accomplish the almost paranormal accounts of clients' losing who they used to be.

Metaphor was also shown to be involved in clients' acts of resistance, and this was the second action found, identified and analysed in extracts 6 to 9. In these extracts, clients' used metaphor in their disaffiliative resistance responses to counsellors' prior turns, which often resulted in them negotiating a change in the topic under discussion. These extracts also considered the potential problems with the counsellors' talk, which often assumed a

version of reality that the client may not have shared. Furthermore, it demonstrated an interesting relationship between metaphorical claims and “I don’t know”, showing that at times each of these resources was used as a legitimisation and stake inoculation device in relation to the other.

The third and final section of this analysis explored how clients and counsellors used metaphor in their constructions of shared meaning. Extracts 10 and 11 showed how both clients and counsellors introduced metaphors common in therapy in order to formulate the client’s problem. “Cycle” and “ties in” were used to transform problems into spatially represented formulations that could be referenced and discussed at ‘different levels’, and meaning seemed to develop in an iterative intersubjective exchange. However, extract 12 showed the importance of counsellors’ metaphorical problem formulations referencing clients’ talk, as when they did not, a co-orientation towards greater meaning did not develop. In this case, the metaphorical formulation worked to generalise the problem, rather than to contribute to a greater understanding of its personal meaning.

Chapter 6: Discussion

6.1. Introduction to chapter

This chapter reviews and evaluates the findings that were produced in the preceding analysis. It begins by summarising the findings, before discussing their implications on counselling psychology practice and psychotherapies. It also considers implications for metaphor research more generally. Following this it evaluates this study as a whole, in a critique that considers the method of data collection and the analytic process. Finally it discusses the possibilities for future research that could make further contributions to this area.

6.2. A brief recap of the findings

This study conducted a discursive analysis on transcribed audio-recordings of clients' and counsellors' talk in their counselling sessions. It used DP and at times drew on EMCA and CDP in order to explore participants' metaphorical talk, and to attempt to answer the following research questions:

- What does metaphorical talk accomplish or do in therapeutic interaction?
- Are there any patterns in the consequentiality of clients' and counsellors' metaphorical talk?
- What are the functions of clients' and counsellors' metaphorical talk in counselling/psychotherapy talk?

The result of this investigation produced three spheres of activity which either clients, counsellors, or both used metaphor to accomplish. These were 1) clients' and counsellors'

use of metaphor to construct of identity; 2) clients' use of metaphor to do topic management and resistance; and 3) clients' and counsellors' use of metaphorical talk to co-construct meaning.

Each of these actions was explicated through a substantial analysis of the extracts that they were deemed to occur within, and across several instances of client-counsellor pairs' talk. They came about through the careful exploration of patterns of interaction within the talk, and of the consequences of these interactions.

6.3. The Findings & their implications

The demonstration of these functions through analysis shows that clients and counsellors did indeed use metaphorical talk in their counselling sessions to accomplish or aid in the performance of particular tasks. Furthermore, it showed that this usage followed noticeable patterns of action in talk. Each of these has been explored and analysed extensively in the previous chapter. This provides the present opportunity to focus on the implications shared across the findings, the theory and research they can be seen to relate to, and a discussion regarding their validity.

Metaphorical talk was shown to be used in relation to many of the discursive and conversational tasks previously identified in other studies focusing on psychotherapeutic talk (Edwards 1998; Leudar et al., 2008a; 2008b; Madill et al., 2001; Peräkylä et al., 2008, Perakyla, 2012). Institutional and conversational tasks such as formulating and reformulating (Antaki, 2008; Antaki et al., 2005a; Davis, 1986; Heritage & Watson, 1979; Madill et al., 2001; Peräkylä, 2012), resistance (Madill et al., 2001; McMartin, 2008; Peräkylä, 2005; Vehviläinen, 2008); interpreting and reinterpreting (Bercelli et al. 2008) were all present within the data which was analysed, as would be expected in an analysis of

counselling session talk. When metaphorical talk was deployed, it was used as a resource in the effective accomplishment and negotiation of these tasks to achieve various ends.

Indeed, perhaps the most significant and noticeable feature of clients' and counsellors' metaphorical talk which emerged across the actions identified, was how participants' harnessed its capacity to vividly impact the interaction, regardless of what action they were orienting towards intersubjectively. This was apparent when clients used its contrastive effects when constructing self and other identities in order to relate relational problems, or to create a sense of mystery and loss as they produced comparative past vs present identity accounts. Metaphorical talk was equally effective in assisting in disaffiliating from counsellor's pre-supposition utterances, accomplishing resistance and constructing a shared characterisation of a problem.

The first implication for the field of counselling psychology, then, is that from the findings presented metaphorical talk and the activities it assists to accomplish are pervasive in counselling talk. There is therefore good cause for continued enquiry into metaphor in counselling and psychotherapy talk studied from a CA and DP perspective. This is because taking a methodological perspective which considers the sequential organisation, orientation and consequentiality of clients' and counsellors' talk, allows insight and greater awareness not only into accomplishment of both broader institutional tasks (such as formulation and interpretation) but also into complex conversational tasks which as a counselling psychologist or trainee one can experience as challenging in the session, yet the explanation as to why this *is* can often elude us.

It is apparent in these findings, for example, that the relationship between 'good' and 'bad' metaphor usage by counsellors is more complicated than the rule applied in other literature that client introduced metaphors are preferable (Kopp, 1995; Stott, 2010). For instance, in this study, it seems that the way in which the counsellor and client build on a metaphor and

construct it in relation to the clients' surrounding utterances has a significant impact on generating a shared meaning and understanding of the clients' problems. This was the case even if it is a counsellor-introduced metaphor that is common to therapy talk, such as "cycle". At the same time, with so few studies approaching metaphor in psychotherapy in this way, it is impossible to make the claim that client versus counsellor introduced metaphors do not impact therapeutic talk in ways that might influence outcomes, nor that common metaphorical therapy talk has the same effect on the discourse as novel metaphors. These are just two of the areas where further investigation could aid greater understanding.

The second implication, drawn from the first, is that metaphor is a powerful discursive tool regularly deployed in counselling talk, and that practitioners should be mindful of how it is being used in talk by clients', and also what they themselves are doing with it in their own talk. For example, is the client using it to close down a topic? If so, what could this tell the counsellor about their resistance to or readiness to enter into this discussion?

Likewise, as a counsellor, is using metaphors that evoke powerful membership category associations limiting or expanding the range of possible positions for the client to inhabit and talk through. On the one hand, the counsellor might argue that breaching a potentially taboo position such as 'son as parent' might provide an opening for the acceptability of this position, making a discussion of it possible. On the other hand, there are ethical considerations to take into account with regard to the imposition of such inference-rich categories on clients, whom may find it hard to explicitly resist such categorisations in a setting where the counsellor may be viewed as expert.

Analysis of the first function of metaphorical talk – its role in the construction of identity using membership categorisation – has implications for counsellors' membership categorisation talk. Depending on the occasion of the talk, the counsellor can exhibit considerable discursive influence and also risks forcing a subject-positions on to the client

which is unsatisfactory for the client and yet difficult or problematic to reject (Stokoe, 2010). Indeed, this was not only the case for metaphors that drew on troubled category membership or membership features, but was also apparent in counsellor's metaphorical talk that appeared to draw on stocks of interactional knowledge (Perakyla & Vehviläinen, 2003). Here, metaphorical references often made epistemological assumptions that proved problematic for clients in some way, and meant that they had to perform intricate acts of resistance. Put simply, counselling psychologists and therapists must consider to what extent their metaphorical talk and categorisations *talk and perform* their clients' identities (Butler, 2011; Wetherell, 1998).

The power of language, and the power that the counselling psychologist can yield in and through the language they employ therapeutically and professionally, is a topic that is much discussed in counselling psychology and psychotherapy (Rizq, 2013; Strawbridge & Woolfe, 2010). The crux of this problem lies with the inherent power imbalance present inside and outside the consulting room, particularly when the counsellor is positioned as expert in psychology and the client as novice (Rizq, 2013). Yet drawing on its humanistic and phenomenological origins (Buber, 1959; Rogers, 1967), counselling psychology has sought to offset this imbalance by positioning the client as expert in themselves, and the role of the counselling psychologist as one whom above all prioritises the client's unique phenomenology and personal experience, avoiding psychopathology where possible (British Psychological Society, 2017).

Despite this, however, it is difficult to avoid a discursive imbalance between what subject positions and conversational actions are readily available to clients and counsellors when they are in the institutional setting of "therapy". It is, for example, against normative practice for the client to be questioner (Bercelli et al, 2008), and whilst it is acceptable for counsellors to violate turn-taking principles and not answer, there is perhaps even more pressure on

clients to provide answers, given “the central principle that clients must examine their own experiences” (Vehviläinen, 2008, p. 123).

It is interesting, then, to consider the implications of the power of metaphorical talk, given cautioning from the fields of counselling psychology (Rizq, 2013b) and humanistic therapies (Sanders, 2004). Indeed, one might expect that with an interactional tool as powerful as metaphor, the counsellor’s continual moulding and orienting the interaction toward their theoretical and practical goals would demonstrate this imbalance in action. Where, in therapeutic terms, the counsellor risks becoming ‘do-er’ to the client, who is ‘done-to’ (Benjamin, 2004).

Conversely, however, the findings in this research indicate that clients have substantial discursive manoeuvrability available to them through the resources they choose to deploy, of which metaphorical talk is one. Furthermore, not only do they have access to these resources, they are readily and effectively used to orientate or re-orientate the interaction in a means preferable to the client. Indeed, even when counsellors do dictate the conversation, play expert or impose their constructions and versions of the world or problem, clients have substantial power in negotiating their own responses (or lack of responses) to these, which they accomplish highly effectively often using metaphor to do so. In fact, the majority of the time, if a question, proposal or task oriented towards by the counsellor was problematic for the client in some way, they successfully negotiated away from it. As a result the counsellor moved on or away from the original action of their talk. Contrary to being ‘done-to’ by counsellors then, this indicates clients were, excuse the pun, ‘doing it for themselves’.

It is apparent, therefore, that there is a need for counsellors to pay close attention to what clients are accomplishing in and through their metaphorical talk, which practitioners may be missing if they make the assumption that they are ones setting the conversational agenda. For example, in all of the cases in which clients performed resistance using metaphorical

talk, the counsellor responded by accepting or affirming the clients' account and position, and changing the topic. It may be that through greater awareness of the role that metaphorical talk can play in accomplishing resistance, counsellors can become more sensitive to acts of disaffiliation, allowing them a wider repertoire of uptakes.

One factor that emerged from analysis as important, was that the way that metaphorical formulations were presented by the counsellor was key to whether this language was developed as a collaborative construction in subsequent talk. This can be seen to be related to how counsellors transformed their SIKs into situated interventions.

On the one hand, it is difficult to argue against the fact that counsellors possess institutionally relevant expert knowledge which clients don't have access to, and that there are consequences on clients' and counsellors' interaction a result of this. By virtue of having trained as a counsellor or psychologist, or indeed, any kind of specialist training, one's practice in one's specialist field is informed by this training. This said, what is arguably apparent in the analysis is that it is not access to stocks of interactional knowledge that are problematic in interaction, but how this "knowledge" is presented and communicated by the counsellor to the client. Is this "knowledge" up for grabs? Is it positioned as challengeable and/or refutable? If not, the counsellor risks imposing her own (informed by her training) construction of the state of affairs, which runs contrary to one of the generally agreed aims of therapy in contemporary theory and practice: an understanding of personal meaning as vital to understanding and working with any experience the client brings (Mearns & Cooper, 2005; Westbrook et al. 2017).

Examples of this are shown and contrasted in relation to each function in the findings, albeit to different extents. For example, in extract 3, where the counsellor uses pre-defined family category metaphors to describe schema-therapy, there is little opportunity nor uptake for discussion of these categories and this proposed knowledge. In contrast, in extracts 1 and 2

the metaphorical categories of child, mother, parent, and partner are exchanged and developed in a way that both draws on the feature-laden categorisations *as well as* fine-tuning personal and particular meaning. Similarly, in findings where the focus is on metaphorical talk in the co-construction of meaning, there is a contrast between metaphors that ground themselves in the language of the client (as in extracts 10 and 11), and those that were used without referencing the clients' talk and are not made particular to their reported experience (extract 12). In the case of the former, an extended process of meaning making evolved over many turns of talk, with an exchange where the client and counsellor seem to co-orient themselves to the act of greater understanding. In contrast, in the latter extract, the client does not take up the metaphor and instead moves the conversation on.

As is discussed in the literature review, metaphor has commonly been viewed as central to psychotherapy and counselling as a means of talking about our experiences – or as Modell puts it as “the currency of the mind” (Modell, 2003, p.26). The implication of the finding above, then, is the importance of counselling psychologists and other practitioners dealing in this “currency” to either ensure it is one that is shared between client and counsellor – or can become shared through a process of co-construction – where revision is welcomed or expected. When this is the case (as is shown in the last section relating to clients' and counsellors' co-orientation to the construction of shared meaning), there seem to be rich opportunities for new meanings to flourish that are grounded in the client's experiencing and founded on the counsellor's careful and attuned formulation and reinterpretation. On these occasions, metaphor acts as both a tuning device and a vehicle of transformation. In relation to the former, it offers positions or characterisations that can be picked up, considered and discarded, accepted or – most fruitfully – elaborated (Bercelli et al. 2008; MacMartin, 2008; McGee et al., 2005). In relation to the latter, it can offer a shared platform for co-oriented action to be directed towards (Strong, 2008). For example in the instances in which metaphorical talk spatially transformed the clients' problem, and in this way both

the client and counsellor oriented their talk towards further developing this understanding (extracts 10 & 11).

This study also has implications for how metaphor has been understood in past research. For example, were metaphor to be studied here cognitively, it might have drawn on CMT and focused on metaphors used by clients and counsellors. However these metaphors would have been understood as belonging to a system which informed understanding of cognitive phenomena such as thoughts and perceptions (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980; 1999). What these findings show, however, is that (whilst this may or may not be the case) metaphor can be seen as more than a descriptive means of linguistic communication; it functions as a powerful rhetorical device in the performance of discursive actions. Furthermore, this research shows that it is possible to study metaphor discursively in a way that does not mirror cognitivist methods by modelling or mapping precise metaphors or types of metaphor, even if these categories take into account the discursive context (Cameron and Deignan, 2006; Cameron et al., 2009; Gibbs & Cameron, 2008). Rather it is apparent that studying metaphor as it occurs sequentially in talk, observing its consequentiality, the variability of its use and how *members*' make it relevant in the accomplishment of actions, is a hugely fruitful area of investigation. This approach to the study of metaphorical talk is one that has begun to be taken up (Tay, 2010; 2015; Wee, 2005), but there is evidently much opportunity for further exploration.

6.4. The validity of the findings

In considering the significance of these findings, it is important to consider their validity, as well as their implications for counselling psychology practice. However, methods of establishing validity and reliability in research have traditionally been fashioned in relation to quantitative methodologies (Potter, 1996b). Nevertheless, the guidelines that do exist to

assess validity of findings in discursive psychology have been drawn on in the following section to assist in this process. These include asking whether findings are coherent and fruitful, whether findings are evident in participants' orientations within the data and whether deviant cases were found and were accounted for (Potter, 1996a; Potter and Wetherell, 1989). Most importantly, however, this author has endeavoured to follow a key principle in the validation of qualitative research: that "The research write up is designed as far as practical to allow the reader to assess the validity of the analytic claims made about the materials" (Wiggins & Potter, 2017).

During the course of analysis I endeavoured to record and pursue 'noticings' that emerged across several client-counsellor pairs' talk, in order to ensure that the functions that were documented were not unique to only single conversations, but rather were generalisable in some way to counselling interaction across instances. This required the noticing of patterns of interaction that were shared across the data set, where it was noticeable that participants were oriented towards accomplishing the same discursive task – for example, resistance, talking identity, and constructing meaning.

There are, of course, limitations to this technique as a means of establishing validity. The most significant of which being that as a social constructionist study the analysis conducted has been a process of interpretation. As such, despite my efforts to avoid analyst categorisations or glosses of context (Schegloff, 1997) this does not mean that I have become 'neutral observer'. On the contrary, "the analyst still decides what to include and leave out of analysis, employs analytic concepts, and their rhetoric is interpretive rather than neutral and open to debate" (Dickerson, 2000, p386). Thus my reading of the data has informed and influenced this process, and the findings are espoused through this lens. Many other possible readings of the data exist, and the aim of the findings produced is to act as a

marker for future researchers' curiosities to take-up and develop or refute, and for practitioners' to hold tentatively in their awareness.

The activities related to metaphorical talk that were extracted and investigated, then, are not proposed as an exhaustive list of the functions of metaphorical talk in counselling. Rather what is represented here is an exhaustive list of the actions of metaphorical talk which this researcher noticed and developed in their particular reading of this specific dataset. As such, these categories may repeat themselves and can be built upon in further research.

When considering the fruitfulness of findings, Potter & Wetherell ask whether findings 'can generate fresh solutions to the problems in a field of research' (Potter & Wetherell, 1989, p. 171). As indicated in the literature review, this research offers an alternative means of studying metaphor, namely in the sequentiality of counselling talk – which, in agreement with Peräkylä and colleagues, I believe “is a major vehicle of the psychotherapy process”, (Peräkylä et al., 2008, p. 16). However, it also offers new perspectives within existing DP and CA research in psychotherapy.

As would be expected in conducting a discursive analysis that investigated counselling talk, the analysis found and drew on a number of institutional tasks being negotiated and performed which have been mentioned above. These tasks were apparent in the interactional patterns present in the data, which have also been documented in previous CA and DP research. By finding metaphorical talk which functioned in relation to and as part of the accomplishment of these tasks, the present findings can be seen to offer an additional feature to be taken into account when considering these discursive actions. For example, resistance has previously been considered in psychotherapy talk discursively (Bercilli et al., 2008; Vehviläinen, 2008), and one of the implications of the findings is that metaphorical talk can play an important role in the accomplishment of this task. Consequently, this finding extends previous analyses by offering a new perspective.

This is likewise the case for metaphorical talk and the construction of shared meaning, which was shown to relate to previous research on formulation, re-interpretation and extended agreement (Bercelli et al., 2008; Davis, 1989; Heritage & Watson, 1979; Madill & Widdicombe, 2001); and to metaphorical talk and identity, where identity was talked by vivid metaphorically constructed membership categorisations and in turn was used to do accounting and resistance (Edwards, 1998; Dickerson, 2000; Sacks, 1979; Sack et al., 1995; Stokoe, 2010; Widdicombe, 1998).

6.5. An Evaluation of the research method

This section evaluates the method of data collection and the method of analysis.

6.5.1 Evaluating the method of data collection

The method of data collection in this study was audio-recordings of clients' and counsellors' counselling sessions that had already been collected from participants for a previous study. Participants gave permission for recordings to be used in future research at the time of their original collection. This method of data collection is evaluated in *Chapter 4: Method*. In summary, the conclusion is reached that there are a number of advantages of having access to naturalistic data necessary for a DP/CA analysis. These include, for example, the avoidance of researcher bias at the point of data collection – where the researcher cannot help but be a producer of the interaction being analysed (Rapley, 2012). Consequently, transcribing and analysing audio-recordings of counselling sessions resulted in the ability to observe naturally occurring talk, without the need to examine how additional discourses were at play or actions being oriented towards as a result of an interview context or interviewer imposed gloss (Potter & Hepburn, 2012; Schegloff, 1997).

Even so, there are other factors to consider in the evaluation of the data set used. The first of these is the sample from which the data was taken. Although DP analyses are methodologically distant from experimental psychology approaches that seek to deductively test theories by controlling variables, DP nevertheless has both empiricist and phenomenological influences (Ten Have, 2007). What is meant by this, is that although the systematic generalisation of findings to a given group are avoided, nevertheless DP and CA seek to observe and document the procedures which participants use in their talk, which are common to social interaction, and yet which are unique to each particular interaction. As such, there is a tension, or a generalisation problem, whereby discursive findings both seek to generalise by finding commonalities in discourse, but do so by shining a light on the particular (Maynard, 2003; Sacks et al., 1995; Ten Have, 2004).

Whilst DP and CA tend to seek out a kind of generalisability in peoples' everyday talk within specified settings, for example, a given institutional setting (Antaki 2011; Heritage & Clayman, 2002; Ten Have, 2007), ethnomethodology emphasises the uniqueness of situations in relation to its indexicality – the “local, time-bound and situational aspects” of a given action, which is specific to a single conversation (Ten Have, 2004, p. 20; Garfinkel, 1967). Though this research has considered the indexicality of clients' and counsellors' metaphorical talk, it has been thought of broadly in relation to the institutional setting of ‘counselling’ as a whole, and the more precise and unique contexts of the speakers' circumstances have remained unanalysed, and, indeed, unknown. As a result, the analysis sought Sacks' definition of generalisability in its findings – they are both “context free” and “context sensitive” (Sacks, Schegloff & Jefferson, 1974); taking unique instances of talk within a given setting, and seeking to find patterns and practices that might emerge across them. This perspective is a choice in focus, rather than a negation the individuality of each interaction.

Indeed, even the choice to focus on emerging patterns of metaphor in participants' talk came with its challenges. In most instances, metaphorical utterances did not occur in isolation, but were used in the context of ongoing interactions that evolved over the course of pages of transcribed turns of talk. It was in these contexts that metaphors were heard, understood and responded to – by participants and by the researcher. As a result, one of the most significant analytic challenges was choosing where to begin and end extracts for analysis, given that the researcher's reading and interpretation of the metaphorical utterances in focus was undoubtedly influenced by the surrounding context. Several methods of data inclusion were experimented with to attempt to address this dilemma, such as including non-metaphorical extracts from other points in therapy sessions that provided the context that the researcher thought grounded her interpretation of the metaphorical talk in question, or using shorter extracts that focused only on metaphorical talk and less on the context surrounding it. Ultimately, however, the decision was made to include in the extracts the surrounding interaction that the researcher considered to be sufficiently relevant for showing how her interpretation of what metaphorical talk was doing was grounded in members' orientations, as opposed to an analytic gloss.

This study used data from 21 to 28 year old client participants, and trainee counsellor participants who used pluralistic therapy for depression protocols, but within this exhibited a variety of therapeutic techniques drawn from a number of therapeutic modalities including cognitive-behavioural therapy, schema-focused therapy and person-centred therapies. One of the criticisms of this study then, is that the action-orientations of clients' and counsellors' metaphorical talk may differ, for example, to qualified counsellors, counsellors using alternative theoretical approaches, or clients who are not 'depressed' but are seeking therapy for another reason - and that patterns of talk may differ in these circumstances to those found in this study (Schegloff, 1993).

This said, whilst one might expect more experienced clinicians to gain better clinical outcomes in their client work, there are several studies which have shown that there is no significant difference in whether counsellors are professional or paraprofessional (Cooper, Watson & Hölldampf, 2010; Bratton, Ray, Rhine & Jones, 2005), and that the differences between counsellors' of the same theoretical orientation outweigh the differences between those of different theoretical orientations (Cooper, 2008; 2010; Crits-Cristoph, Barnackie, Kurcias, Beck & Carroll et al., 1991).

Furthermore, it is increasingly pointed out in psychology and psychiatry literature that although practitioners cluster symptoms together under superordinate diagnostic label categories, there is little evidence that these represent discrete diseases (Dalal & Sivakumar, 2009; Davies, 2014). As such, it may well be that the variability in clients' problem talk is not dependent on their 'presenting problem', and the similarities within trainee and qualified counsellors' metaphorical talk are as great as those between them. Nevertheless, further enquiry into areas such as this, or whether levels of counsellor training and experience influence metaphorical talk, could produce valuable learning opportunities.

6.5.2. Evaluating the method of analysis

This study set out to perform a discursive analysis on psychotherapy talk. However, it held multiple methodologies lightly, drawing on DP, EMCA and CDP, unified under the umbrella of epistemological constructionism.

The purpose of this toolbox of approaches was to be able to respond flexibly to the data that emerged at the analysis stage, and arguably, this was the case. From EMCA, for example, membership categorisation analysis was used to explore the first activity metaphorical talk was oriented towards accomplishing in the analysis (Stokoe, 2012; Ten have, 2007; Wiggins & Potter, 2017), and investigated metaphorical talk in the construction of identity. Likewise,

sequential organisation was considered throughout analysis (Sacks et al., 1995; Schegloff, 2007), particularly in relation to topic orientation and resistance – where clients used metaphorical talk to disrupt the normative turn-by-turn pattern and disaffiliate with counsellors’ prior utterances. Furthermore, recent CA theories such as the consideration of stocks of interactional knowledge (SIKs) in the orientation of counsellors’ talk were drawn on (Peräkylä & Vehviläinen, 2003), and the developments which have emerged from CA literature over the last twenty years which consider institutionally-situated actions (Antaki & Widdicombe, 1998; Antaki et al., 2005a; 2005b; Leudar et al., 2008a; 2008b; Peräkylä et al., 2008; Peräkylä, 2012).

From DP, the analytic process drew on the idea that talk is rhetorical – that it performs actions that are situated within the discourse and the notion that “claims and descriptions offered in talk are often designed to counter potential alternative versions, and to resist attempts (whether actual or potential) to disqualify them as false, partial or interested” (Potter & Edwards, 2001, p.13). Thus, analysis did not only look at the occasioned nature of participants’ talk as in CA, but particularly on their functionality in accomplishing ongoing discursive tasks (Ten Have, 2007). Finally, it drew on elements of CDP in order to consider some of the implications of counsellors’ talk. In order to do this, it was necessary to bring in tentative proposals outside of what was directly relevant in the talk. In particular, the concept of subject positioning that was used on occasions throughout the analysis, to explore how counsellor’s talk might be understood as creating ‘troubled’ or problematic positions for clients (Edley & Wetherell, 1997; Wetherell, 1998).

Arguably, the CA and DP methods used in the analysis are broadly reconcilable, given that they both prioritise that reported findings are evident in participants’ talk and its orientation (Ten Have, 2007; Wiggins & Potter, 2017). In contrast, the intertwining of more CDP observations creates more of a methodological tension, given that it subverts the

ethnomethodological assumptions underlying both CA and DP: that analysis should focus on the participants' orientation, rather than the analyst's assumption (Billig & Schegloff, 1999; Schegloff, 1997). Despite this, Margaret Wetherell argued persuasively for the combination of these approaches – regardless of the degree taken from each. She proposed that the combination of CA and DPs focus on the minutiae of the details of interaction, with the addition of a critical gaze which asked what pervasive social Discourses and discursive positions might be limiting or making available in members' talk, led to a fuller analysis (Wetherell, 1998).

Admittedly, the critical gaze suggested by Wetherell is limited in the present analysis, and CA and DP methods take priority in the analytic process. This emphasis is the result of the researcher's responsiveness to the data. Not knowing what she would find in the data at the point at which she chose her broad analytic method, the initial inclusion of a CDP approach alongside EMCA and DP allowed for a flexible and inductive analysis that was receptive to what emerged from clients' and counsellors' talk. During the analytic process, the findings that were found to be most conspicuous with regard to metaphorical talk were its rhetorical functions and conversational features, as opposed to how metaphor was related to negotiating and perpetuating ideological issues. As a result, where issues related to, for example, power are discussed, they can at times be seen as less grounded in the interaction and members' orientations, and more closely related to the importance that the researcher places on issues of power from a practitioner perspective (Rizq, 2013). Nevertheless there are occasions where CDP is drawn on to combine sequential analysis and a critical gaze, for example, in the discussion of subject positions in relation to doing identity construction in extract 3, where the *counsellor as expert* performs her client's identity using family membership categories by recounting a prescribed representation of features of her identity via schema-focused therapy.

I would argue that in order to make the leap from the implications of the findings in relation to other discursive studies, to inferring implications for counselling psychology practice, at least a limited critical analysis has been necessary. Furthermore, this is a leap that counselling psychologists are familiar with. We continuously shift our focus and our wonderings from utterance to interpretation, drawing on meanings, experience and theory outside of the consulting room yet cross-checking it fits with our clients' talk. As Peräkylä has noted, "There is an endemic orientation in the therapist, and usually also in the patient, to examine the patient's talk *beyond its intended meaning*" (Peräkylä, 2012, p. 2). This differentiates therapeutic interaction from other forms of institutional interaction where the speaker's utterances are taken as displaying their communicative intentions (ibid.). As a result, this blend of approaches, though compromising of methodological purity, is perhaps most in keeping, and most relevant, to the counselling psychology and psychotherapy professions.

Finally, it is worth considering the more general criticisms raised against discursive methodological approaches, particularly in the fields of counselling and psychotherapy. One of the shortcomings of a discursive approach is the lack of insight into individuals' phenomenology – the *why* of what has occurred in the talk (Willig, 2013). For counselling psychology, which prioritises clients' phenomenology as one of its core principles (British Psychological Society, 2017), this is indeed a short-coming. As a result there is a tendency in counselling psychology research to employ realist methodologies that can capture this experience. Yet as Kasket & Gil-Rodriguez (2011) reminds us, counselling psychology also holds a constructionist perspective. Theoretical integration is common and encouraged, where differences in perspective are seen not as deviations from an ideal form, but rather as "fortunate expressions of the countless ways in which human experience can be organized" (Mitchell, 1991, p. 6). In my view, therefore, taking a discursive methodological approach to explore how clients' and counsellors' use metaphor in their talk does sacrifice an insight

into their reports of metaphorical talk in counselling, and yet it is fruitful in numerous other ways, not least in its ability, to quote Peräkylä (2012) once again, “*to go beyond intended meaning*” and to ask: what is this metaphorical talk *doing here*?

6.6. Future research

I believe that one of the strengths of this research is that it highlights multiple actions of metaphorical talk in counselling sessions. However, by doing so, it has left open the opportunity for further, more in depth investigations into each of these actions. When metaphor was used by clients to construct identity, for example, it seemed that this talk at times evolved across sessions. Metaphorically accounted identities both presented alternative historicised identities to achieve tasks in the here and now, whilst maintaining a fairly consistent current identity. It would be interesting to explore this further through a longer case study of a single client-counsellor pair, whereby the client’s evolving metaphorical historicising and identity talk could be analysed to investigate how they are developed, and responded to, at different stages and junctures of the therapy.

Likewise, whilst clients’ use of metaphor to do resistance and topic management was analysed, a study which considered these same actions performed in talk *without* the use of metaphor, and the implications of this on the interaction, would be highly beneficial in further specifying the unique effects of metaphorical talk on these tasks. Another interesting feature which raises further questions is whether the metaphorical talk of trainee counsellors (as used in this study) differs from that of qualified, experienced counsellors. Future research could explore this, and could help both qualified and trainee practitioners in noticing metaphorical resistance talk and provide additional awareness of the possibilities available when responding to resistance. It might be, as is suggested by MacMartin (2008), that experienced counsellors are more willing to pursue a topic, question or interpretation

even when they are met with the client's resistance. This would sit in contrast to the findings shown in this study where it was common for counsellors to accept or pursue a new topic as a result of the clients' metaphorical justification for 'not knowing'.

Finally, what was shown in analysis in relation to metaphorical talk in the construction of shared meaning between clients and counsellors, was that *how* metaphor was deployed and taken-up by counsellors had a significant impact on clients' subsequent uptake of the metaphor, and the opportunities that developed from this. Previous research has set extended agreement and extended disagreement in contrast to one another, with the former being understood as clients agreeing or affirming the counsellor's interpretation and elaborating on it, whilst the latter is more or less akin to resistance – a rejection of the counsellor's interpretation performed either explicitly or partially (Bercelli et al., 2008; MacMartin, 2008).

What the findings in this study suggest, however, is that one of the most valuable aspects of the action of meaning-making was that both client and counsellor were co-oriented to its accomplishment, regardless of disagreement or agreement in the discourse. As a result, there is an opportunity to revisit the binary representation of extended agreement and extended disagreement, and consider extended co-agreement, which is not about the client performing agreement or disagreement with the counsellor's interpretation, but rather both working towards a shared agreement within one another. This could be investigated in relation to metaphorical talk as it is here, but it would also be interesting to determine what other interactional features are apparent in this action.

6.7. Reflexive conclusion

Conducting this research has been a lesson in managing surprises. I was surprised, when I first listened to the audio-recordings, to find metaphorical talk used in a far less explicit way

than I had expected it to be. I was surprised by the vast ways and means by which metaphorical talk *did* appear, and how complicated the process of determining some kind of method to the metaphorical madness was as I tried to complete the coding stage. I was surprised, once I had grouped together and mapped out the activities to which metaphorical talk was related, at how many possibilities seemed to exist, tentatively, within them, but floundered when I pursued them further and towards a sense of coherence. These were the ideas that I had to leave behind; and I was surprised by the grief I felt as I ‘killed my darlings’ in my move to greater analytic clarity.

What, however, has been the biggest surprise of all, has been the complexity I observed in the way that clients in particular used metaphor to accomplish tasks in sessions. As a trainee counselling psychologist, I began this doctoral project thinking I knew what I might be likely to hear in the way of metaphorical talk in counselling. I thought that, with several hundred therapy hours under my belt, I might be beginning to get an idea of the types of things clients did with metaphor, and that I had a sense of how I used it in my own talk. I was both right and wrong. I did know – I knew particular cases and particular responses, and it was these that sparked my initial interest in the subject. What I hadn’t appreciated, however, were the many ways in which metaphor was functioning outside of my awareness, and as a result this research has been a small step towards a greater understanding of this, one that I know must be practiced and revised.

Above all, and this has not been such a surprise, this research has enhanced my appreciation of the client who sits across from the counsellor. They often do not have the therapeutic training that their counsellor does, yet they easily run rings around them if they so desire. This, for me, is the wonder of talk, and the privilege of working in a profession that trades in it.

Appendices

Appendix A: Glossary of transcript symbols

The following transcription notations are a revised version of those shown in Gail Jefferson's (2004) Glossary transcript symbols, with some additions.

[*A left bracket* indicates the point of overlap onset

Client: having no ties with her (.) [especially financial(.)][I mean
Counsellor: [Mm [mm

= *Equal signs* indicate no break or gap

A pair of equal signs, one at the end of one line and one at the beginning of a next, indicate no breaks between the two lines with the equal signs.

Client: [I mean =
Counsellor: [mm
Client: = they say you shouldn't do business with your

The pair is also used as a transcript convenience when a single speaker's talk is broken up in the transcript, but is actually through-produced by its speaker

Client: Completely downhill from there [and I just want =
Counsellor: [right
Client: = to be how I was

(0.0) *Numbers in parentheses* indicate elapsed time to 0.5 of a second

(.) *A dot in a parenthesis* indicates a brief interval which is less than 0.5 of a second and occurs within or between utterances

Client: So it's kind of (.) I guess (1.0) erm: <expecting a lot
from yourself> (1.5) erm so it's about (3.0) what you expect
from yourself so (.) your (0.5) <internalised roles> [type thing
Counsellor: [Mm:

— *Underscoring* indicates some form of stress, via pitch and/or amplitude. A short underscore indicates lighter stress than does a long underscore.

Counsellor: And I can understand (1.0) that (3.5) and you know that might
(1.5) be a way: (0.5) of coping with things (0.5) It might be

something that's been <told> to you when you were a
child
that you kind of <internalised>

:: **Colons** indicate prolongation of the immediately prior sound. The longer the colon row, the longer the prolongation.

Client: Yeah:: so I'll do (1.5) I don't know (2.0) yeah I
s'pose it's
like a cycle
Counsellor: Mmhm
Client: And you go back to where you were before:

↑↓ **Arrows** indicate shifts into especially high or low pitch.

Counsellor: Mmhm so it takes the guilt↑ (.) does it make you <feel
good>↑
or does it take the guilt away a bit↓
Client: Um:↑ (.) it wh↑ (.) it takes the guilt away a bit↓
Counsellor: Mmhm

Word **Emboldened text** indicates the metaphors that present in the extract being analysed.

WORD **Upper case** indicates especially loud sounds relative to the surrounding talk.

Client: I can quote the movies line for line °right° (.) I'M NOT
LIKE THAT WELL (1.0) ↓depending on the company I can still
be like that↓ (0.5) but erm: (2.5) <there's er:> (3.0)

°word° **Degree signs bracketing an utterance** indicates that the sounds are quieter or softer than the surrounding talk.

Client: And this is certainly (1.0) <been a (.) an example>
Counsellor: Mm
Client: °really unfortunate actually°
Counsellor: So you're looking forward to (.) <getting (1.0) those
strings attached> or as it were

>< **Right/left carats** bracketing an utterance or utterance-part indicate that the bracketed material is speeded up in comparison to the surrounding talk.

Client: And like erm (3.0) everyone else I know says that
>you I shouldn't< (1.0) >treat she's not< my <chi:ld>
>shouldn't treat her like I shouldn't< mother her
and do things like that for her =
Counsellor: Mmhm

<> **Left/right carats** bracketing an utterance or part-utterance indicate that the bracketed material is slowed down in comparison to the surrounding talk.

Client: And this is certainly (1.0) <been a (.) an example>
Counsellor: Mm
Client: °really unfortunate actually°

Counsellor: So you're looking forward to (.) <getting (1.0) those Strings attached> or as it were

(h) *Parenthesised 'h' indicates laughter.*

Client: Erm (.) so (.) I might wait nearer to the time
[(h)(h) to (h) tell them (h) [but yeah
Counsellor: [ye:ah: [yeah:
Client: That was the only issue we were really talking about

(()) *Doubled parentheses contain the transcriber's descriptions.*

Counsellor: Is that something that you would want to do or
(2.0)
Client: I th ((sigh)) (1.0) I feel like I don't really know:

(*word*) *Asterisks bracketing a word or words that are also in parentheses indicate that the data was inaudible and thus impossible to transcribe for the specified number of syllables.*

Client: But (4.0) °and that gets me down as well because I ken that Lucy and her sister (*two syllables*) it to work all the time and (1.0) this that and the next and I feel like a complete bum bumming about (1.0)

Appendix B. Example Transcript

(C-C3 T2)

Client 1 But erm: (2.0) another thing as well is I'm conscious of is I
2 don't (2.0) this is something I really struggled with as well
3 is I don't know if it's just me being (.) an idiot[↑] (1.0) or
4 if (0.5) the (0.5) like (.) because I'll have <good times> and
5 bad times and when I'm really down (0.5) I find it (1.0)
6 ridiculously difficult to do anything[↑]

Counsellor 7 ok

Client 8 Right and I'm aware of that[↑] and [I feel

Counsellor 9 [mm

Client 10 >as though there's no end< and then when I have a <good day[↑]
11 (.) <it's like> (1.0) how could you even struggle the with
12 things and [then (.) I get angry with myself

Counsellor 13 mmhm

Client 14 And it's like well is it really something wrong with me or is
15 it just being lazy (.) is it idleness is it [that and then(1.0)

Counsellor 17 [mmhm

Client 18 but I know that when I'm down it's not the case it's difficult
19 to explain it's like suddenly you can't (1.5) I mean I've not
20 felt like that for a wee while now since I've moved (1.0) er
21 (.) since the last couple of weeks since I've stayed with Lucy
22 but

Counsellor 23 Mm

Client 24 A wee bit of resentment (.) to myself

Counsellor 25 Mm

Client 26 Because I've (.) I have messed up and I've not done things
27 right

Counsellor 28 Mm

Client 29 But (1.0) I dunno it's

Counsellor 30 What [do you mean by like you've messed up like what's (.)
31 what's messed up

Client 32 Well (.) er: (2.5) it's going to take me an extra two years to
33 get my degree[↑] (0.5) erm: (3.0) because (2.5) my third year
34 carried on and I missed six months of that (2.5) and I I I
35 understand I couldn't have avoided that I was ill >°I was°<
36 (.) (*3 syllables*) I had (.) er:: (2.0) I had stuff at home
37 which was ridiculous and I understand that so: (3.0) when I
38 had to do a whole (2.0) redoing that semester

Counsellor 39 Mm

Client 40 Without funding but trying to work at the same time (.) I
41 struggles to get a full time job but I did have two jobs

Counsellor 42 Mmhm

Client 43 But (.) there was a period of about four months (.) over that
44 period where I couldn't work and I had to sell off a lot of
45 stuff[↑]

Counsellor 46 Ok

Client 47 To make ends meet (.) and then when I <came back (1.5) last
48 September> (1.0) it was as though (.) all the financial
49 stresses were relieved (.) because I had my funding and I can
50 live quite comfortably on a very modest amount of money

Counsellor 51 Yeah

Client 52 And (0.5) erm: (0.5) but at the same time I just could not get
53 my head into gear for uni I (0.5) °I (.) I (.) I I jus I just
54 couldnee (1.0) couldnee (.) couldn't° (.) erm (2.0) I was on
55 my phone to my phone to my dad for about an hour (1.5) that's
56 why [I'm =

Counsellor 57 [°ok°

Client 58 = (ha ha) speaking like this (*four syllables*) erm: (2.0) and
59 I could not get er:: the rhythm of uni work[↑] it was just (1.0)
60 I was scared to turn up to class it was mm mm (1.0) people I'd
61 never (.) would recognise me as well[↑] there was anxiety about
62 that[↑] I I I had to go and use the printers before I came in
63 here (0.5) [in =

Counsellor 64 [mm

Client 65 = one of the labs (.) and even the anxiety trying to walk into
66 the class I was really (0.5) sort of panicky going in↑

Counsellor 67 Ok

Client 68 In case anybody recognised me↑ (.) it's like >er er er< a wee
69 bit ashamed there that (1.0) I'm (1.0) I'm not (.) at the same
70 stage as what all the people that I recognise are at it's

Counsellor 71 Ok so I kind of heard you saying about >you know< you felt
72 like you (1.0) >you know when I said to you< (.) what's messed
73 up and stuff (.) what messed up and you're saying your degree↑
74 but then you're saying (.) <well (.) I was ill (0.5) and (.)
75 you know how> (.) I'm kind of wondering you know (.) you being
76 ill and then having to (2.0) having to to take that semester
77 out (.) and >you know< how much (.) do you think that it's
78 your fault↑
79 (2.5)

Client 80 It's fifty fifty (1.5) I think I could have coped with it a
81 lot better (.) I could have done (0.5) that semester
82 (2.0)

Counsellor 83 So

Client 84 I feel as though I could have done it I don't if I could >I'd
85 I< er: (1.0) When I go back there it was tough cos I had my
86 mother (.) crying (.) all the time on the phone(1.0) °I had
87 (.) at the time I could (.) <hardly walk (1.5) cos I was (1.0)
88 badly injected (h) (h)°

Counsellor 89 Ok [so you could hardly walk (2.5) so it's not like you =

Client 90 [erm

Counsellor 91 = were

Client 92 °mm°

Counsellor 93 You just had a bit of a cold or the flu:: you were quite
94 unwell
95 (7.0)

Client 96 But I'm not there any longer so I don't remember what it's
97 like (.) that's the thing

Counsellor 98 Yeah

Client 99 So

Counsellor 100 So now: er maybe you're just thinking (.) well (.) it should
101 like this I should have done this and like (.) I could have
102 [done this

Client 103 [mm

Counsellor 104 But then i (.) it's hard to remember that time when (.) being
105 at the time and what (.) >what what< what was it like at that
106 time and (0.5) at the time (.) it seems like
107 [(°*two syllables*°)

Client 108 [But even then (3.0) when I look back at that though >I I I<
109 I'm looking back at the amount of energy I had (2.0) when I
110 before I started my degree and I °I've just I've just lost
111 that <energy>° =

Counsellor 112 OK

Client 113 = That drive >I don't I er er I it's< (2.0) ((sigh)) usually
114 I'm really good at giving you black and white answers to these
115 thing but this is this is where

Counsellor 116 Mm:

Client 117 This is where (.) <I get angry I feel annoyed with myself er a
118 w (.) a wee bit ashamed>

Counsellor 119 Mmhm

Client 120 I don't know if I'm being lazy I don't know if I'm making up
121 excuses for myself (.) and (4.0) <I'm (.) just as angry (.)
122 and (.) pissed off with myself (0.5) as I am with anyone else
123 =

Counsellor 124 Mmk

Client 125 = And it's counter-productive> and I don't know how to (1.0) I
126 wish I could just have a clean slate with everything and start
127 again and I don't (0.5) you can't go back in time

Counsellor 128 Ok so that's kind of important there like (0.5) you were
129 saying (0.5) you know >I wish I could have a< clean <slate>
130 and (.) but you can't go back in time (0.5) so (.) if you
131 can't go back in time (.) how can you: (1.0) erm: (1.5) <what
132 can you do about (1.0) kind of moving forward>
133 (5.0)

Client 134 Well (1.0) I've got my (.) my application <sorted out> (0.5)
135 for my academic suspension> I never had (.) a doctors letter
136 until last night> [°I had an appointment at the doctors =
Counsellor 137 [°mm°
Client 138 = yesterday° (0.5) it's taken about four weeks to get it so:
139 (0.5) <and I typed> that's what I went to print out because I
140 typed a letter when I was on the train (.) on the way down (.)
141 erm: (2.0) so that I hope will mo will mo will make way: for a
142 clean slate
Counsellor 143 Mmhm
Client 144 For a:: this year↑ (1.0) erm: but (1.0) I don't know how that
145 will (.) effect (1.0) I mean (0.5) °I'm not too interested in
146 a Phd that was just a bit of shiny shiny that I got excited
147 about (1.0) erm: (4.0) it's proving anybody in my line of work
148 >I mean< an engineer and a Phd actually (1.5) you'd have a
149 ceiling in wages there before you do (*four syllables*) or so°
150 (1.0) it'll be different probably in your line of work
Counsellor 151 Mmhm
Client 152 Erm (7.0)
Counsellor 153 When like you know: (.) what I was kind of trying to:
Client 154 <Lucy as well> being with Lucy's (1.0) a wee bit of a clean
155 slate but °even then I've got these certain reservations and°
156 (0.5) I don't know if I'm going too quick and (1.0) <I suppose
157 this is a typical guy thing whether I'm just scared of
158 commitment it's like do I really want to do this [because =
Counsellor 159 [mm
Client 160 = I'm only twenty-eight (.) or twenty-seven (.) to get my age
161 right (0.5) erm: (2.0) at the same time °I don't want to mess
162 her about° so (0.5) erm:
Counsellor 163 It seems like (.) a little bit of indecisiveness about quite a
164 few things
Client 165 There is
Counsellor 166 What's that about
Client 167 Er: I've always been like that↑ (1.0) erm: it's the I never
168 went to university when I left school↑ it's (1.0) er: <I done
169 an HNC in (.) college> (.)
170 [when I first left school (1.0) and I now =
Counsellor 171 [°mm:°
Client 172 = suck at computers cos it's a hobby and I know that inside
173 and out and <I could not (0.5) dare work with them (0.5)
174 [day =
Counsellor 175 [mm
Client 176 = and night and the same time as everybody were >er er er< at
177 home were >er er er< sort of their computers er (1.0) I get
178 frustrated with them when (.) things go wrong now (2.0) I'll
179 have my odd weekend when it's like °aw let's (.) let's tinker
180 and see >th th< (.) see what's going on here but°
Counsellor 181 Mm
Client 182 So that (2.0) I then went to join the royal navy (2.0) and I
183 was in the reserves for a bit
Counsellor 184 Ok
Client 185 °Er::°
Counsellor 186 [so
Client 187 [people there were (1.5) they weren't er on my level they were
188 a wee bit (.) <snobby> so er (4.0) maybe (.) °maybe I was just
189 immature and not seeing things from their point of view at the
190 time I've put it down to snobbiness but it probably wasn'tee°
191 (0.5) so I left that (.) erm (3.0) <I've been all over the
192 place> (.) staying in different places ((place names)) (2.0)
193 I've never really had a fixed °sort of thing so I don't know
194 if that's°
Counsellor 195 And what's that all about that kind of moving about from (.)
196 different careers to different places to::
Client 197 °That was just (1.0) well it was family moving about or°
Counsellor 198 Ok
Client 199 °Me making different decisions always didn't want to settle
200 er:°
Counsellor 201 OK (0.5) and so:
Client 202 <Following friends (0.5) once stupidly (.) following a lassie
203 (1.5) but everybody makes these mistakes when they're

204 eighteen [(h) (h) (h) (h)]
 Counsellor 205 [mm (h) (h)]
 206 [Erm: (0.5) ok so: =]
 Client 207 [mm]
 Counsellor 208 =I'm kind of wondering about (.) that a bit more: like it
 209 seems like it seems to me: like this is me just kind of (.)
 210 what I'm thinking (1.0) is that (.) you know there's (2.0) is
 211 (1.5) there's a bit of indecisiveness about (.) <you know> am
 212 I doing the right thing is this doing (.) is this the right
 213 thing to do: and
 Client 214 °mm°
 Counsellor 215 And not being sure of yourself
 Client 216 Maybe that's under there as well (1.0) that's a thing that >er
 217 that er eh I know this sounds stupid but event when I< first
 218 started my degree (1.0) I would never <envisioned> I would get
 219 to my final year never mind finish it
 Counsellor 220 OK
 221 (1.0)
 Client 222 [°>I don't know why (*three syllables*)°<
 Counsellor 223 [<But you>
 224 Ok but why did you (.) why did you think I'm not (1.0) I'm not
 225 going to get there
 Client 226 I don't know(2.0) erm:
 Counsellor 227 Cos to me it seems like you're a really [smart guy (.) and:
 Client 228 [hard↑
 229 Well (3.0) °I'm not that smart° (.) erm: (8.0) I don't know↑
 230 (1.0) I've never really seen a lot of things through to the
 231 end↑ so:: (1.5) why would this be any different
 Counsellor 232 OK
 Client 233 Erm: it's not that I (0.5) I did lose enthusiasm af after
 234 everything went (1.0) pear-shaped but apart from that I really
 235 enjoyed it I I found the theory <fairly (.) easy> but that's
 236 just cos I was the sort of kid when I was (0.5) running about
 237 >°at Christmas I remember I got°< a remote control car when I
 238 was like (0.5) six (.) I teared it apart it never worked again
 239 after [Christmas eve (.) er =
 Counsellor 240 [Mm
 Client 241 = Boxing day erm: so↑
 242 (5.0)
 Counsellor 243 >So what's this (.) what's this< abou:t not seeing (.) things
 244 through to the end (0.5) what is (.) what is scary about the
 245 <end> or what is
 Client 246 Change (.) further change maybe (.) I don't know
 Counsellor 247 mmk
 Client 248 Maybe (.) maybe maybe↑ that's what it is (.) further change
 249 (2.0)
 Counsellor 250 OK (.) [so:
 Client 251 [I'm sick of change to a degree
 Counsellor 252 Ok
 Client 253 I'm absolutely sick of (0.5) erm: >we were< we were
 254 <contemplating> doing that timeline thing the other day
 Counsellor 255 mmhm
 Client 256 >I mean< (2.0) that's what it is maybe I'm just getting °sick
 257 of the change° (.) cos I'm (.) every night and time now >when
 258 it's like< moving house >°and it's like°< aw: for °Christ sake
 259 (.) again° (1.0) I mean I think I said to you or Sue that I
 260 (.) lived in about twenty different places since I was sixteen
 Counsellor 261 Yeah I remember you [saying
 Client 262 [And and it's just (.) I'm °just sick of
 263 it there's never consistency° (0.5) but at the same time (1.0)
 264 I get used to it (.) and then I get bored (ha ha) it's a bit
 265 silly (.) but [erm:
 Counsellor 266 [ok (0.5) so maybe it's something about: (.)
 267 finding a balance
 Client 268 Aye but (.) aye [probably
 Counsellor 269 [how much change is <enough> (0.5) for me to [<be: =
 Client 270 [mm
 Counsellor 271 = ok:> but not too much
 Client 272 Are we not maybe going away down (.) another path here↑ °>I
 273 don't< I have no idea (.) I don't know°

Counsellor 274 Yeah (.) m yeah cos I I think you >you know< we
275 [started with sleep then
Client 276 [>IT COULD LOT< I THINK THERE COULD be lots of little things↓
Counsellor 277 Mm
Client 278 Yeah (.) it's not (0.5) [there's =
Counsellor 279 [Mm
Client 280 = no really one massive issue here and now apart from (.) the
281 flat and everything there (.) and with me↑ staying there and
282 now <that's↑ (0.5) sorted things> out (.) there's a few wee
283 niggles here there and everywhere
Counsellor 284 Mmhm
Client 285 And I'm really uncertain about (0.5) the future and (2.0)
286 ((sigh)) °I er er er (1.0) see I I I've° always (.) w wanted
287 to go and do some things like (0.5) go and spent some time in
288 America or do some (.) things here there and everywhere (1.0)
289 she's not for that (1.5) and that I I I mean there's doubt (.)
290 there's doubt there as well
Counsellor 291 Mm:
Client 292 °erm: (0.5) I don't know°
Counsellor 293 °Mmhm° >um I can understand what you were saying there as in:
294 (.) you know how did we get to this (.) when we were kind of
295 (.) [doing =
Client 296 [mm
Counsellor 297 = the sleep stuff< (0.5) but kind of like (.) it's kind of (.)
298 one thing we talked about >kind of lead to another and then to
299 another and then we've kind of gone down to< (.) you know what
300 is this underneath what is underneath all these things that
301 causing all these things
Client 302 I I really don't know because
Counsellor 303 mm
304 (3.0)
Client 305 °I just dropped that sorry° I used to be (4.5) I used to be
306 really (.) I I used to be the bloody space cadet in school
307 right
Counsellor 308 Mm
Client 309 Doing stupid stuff around about the playground and (*two
310 syllables*) a bloody magic wand
Counsellor 311 [mm
Client 312 [And all this carry on (1.0) and one of the things I used to
313 do myself was (0.5) because I did get picked on a wee bit cos
314 I wasn't °er eh eh er er° I was fat in secondary school I was
315 (1.0) er:: the geek (.) I was a boy who came in with star trek
316 models and (2.0) >er er er< too much of trekkie things
Counsellor 317 (h) (h)m (h)m
Client 318 I can quote the movies line for line °right° (.) I'M NOT LIKE
319 THAT WELL (1.0) ↓depending on the company I can still be like
320 that↓ (0.5) but erm: (2.5) <there's er:> (3.0) I used to just
321 say: er like build up a wall
Counsellor 322 mm
Client 323 To the point where nobody would really bother me (.) I don't
324 get bothered by anything >anybody says now<
Counsellor 325 [mm
Client 326 [I'm not bothered about °>humiliating myself and things like
327 that°< (1.0) and (3.0) there's just parts of it where (1.5) I
328 don't see how there er er I don't (0.5) that's >to myself I
329 don't notice any:< (1.0) on a conscious level I don't let any
330 of that affect me
Counsellor 331 Mm
Client 332 So I don't I don't know: (1.5) I don't know how some of these
333 things affect me I don't know:
Counsellor 334 Mm
Client 335 I just sort of try and get up and get on with it I (.) >I
336 don't know what I'm try I (.) I know what trying to say but I
337 can'ee get it out< but er:
Counsellor 338 You like what I was hearing was <basically that you don't
339 things get to you> [you TRY and (.) you try not to mm (.) mm
Client 340 [I try not to things like that I try just
341 to: get on with it
Counsellor 342 Mm
Client 343 So: (.) I don't ((sigh))

Counsellor 344 But I'm kind of wondering how: (.) for how long can you keep
345 doing that↑ (.) How long can you keep <going> and just keep
346 <moving> (1.0) and keep doing things and keep doing things
347 (2.0)

Client 348 ↑°But they're not a pressure at the moment so they're fine°↑
349 (.) It's when the pressure builds up

Counsellor 350 Mm:

Client 351 Erm: (5.0)

Counsellor 352 And did the pressure not build up before

Client 353 That was only things to do with home (0.5)

Counsellor 354 [mm

Client 355 [And my mother

Counsellor 356 Mm↑

Client 357 Erm (2.0) and it's just <in (.) in: (.) you're (0.5) I think
358 you hit something there about the (.) well me you whoever it
359 was>
360 °mmhm°

Counsellor 360 About the uncertainty and (.) not (1.5)er: what was it can I
Client 361 just put it here cos my [minds: (1.5) spinning
362 [yeah

Counsellor 363 Like ((sigh))
Client 364 That (.) that one↑
Counsellor 365 Aye [not straight next to them =
Client 366 [yeah
Counsellor 367 = that's (.) that's something which
Client 368 Mmhm
Counsellor 369 (1.0) is quite a big (2.5) ((Client's name)) never sees
Client 370 anything to the end
371 (2.0)

Counsellor 372 Mm
Client 373 And that's my catch(h)ph(h)rased (h) (h) (h)
Counsellor 374 (h) (h)m (h)m
Client 375 And it's quite bad I'm annoyed with that as well because
376 there's a lot of things I could have done(1.5) erm:
Counsellor 377 Mm [um↑ (0.5) we =
Client 378 [°Which I never°
Counsellor 379 = kind of (1.0) maybe: (2.0) got a little (0.5) where
380 somewhere with that(0.5) where you were kind of saying
381 well(1.0) if I do see something >to the end< it could mean
382 that thing could change
383 Mm
Client 384 And (.) you know: (.) or that you know things are changing a
Counsellor 385 lot all the time so if I do see (.) this to end this will
386 change too and
387 I think that li links in possibly to >seeing how I said that<
Client 388 I was losing a bit of my (1.0) I'm not as confident as what I
389 used to be
390 Yeah
Counsellor 391 I mean (0.5) I've seen you a few times now so I'm quite happy
Client 392 to be: (1.0) <loud and (*two syllables*) on about (0.5) being
393 early
394 [mm
Counsellor 395 [And (.) just having a giggle
Client 396 <ye:[ah>
Counsellor 397 [°but< (.) erm:
Client 398 (2.0)
399 >I dunee think that I've got the confri (.) the confidence
Client 400 now< to go: outside my comfort zones as much >that's a big
401 thing< where as =
402 Mmk
Counsellor 403 = before I embraced that I didn't mind the change
Client 404 Mmhm
Counsellor 405 I moved to where I like new meet new pla (.) new people doing
Client 406 different things (1.0) erm:↓ (2.0) and >°er eh eh er I ah°< I
407 would love that I would (0.5) I would love just getting >I
408 mean< you can tell by all my friends↑ and social [group =
409 [mm:
Counsellor 410 = the folk I hang about with (1.0) they're all completely
Client 411 different (.) from different walks of life
412 OK
Counsellor 413

Client 414 <Now (1.0) I can't bear the thought of doing that now I get
415 (0.5) shy (0.5) >and< the first time I go somewhere and I I
416 feel like a >a a< dafty sitting there quiet (0.5) erm: (0.5)
417 my friend James he was always really bad but he was that <bad>

Counsellor 418 Mm

Client 419 That (.) we went to (.) this has happened a few times and I've
420 kinda (.) even fell out over them sometimes (.) we'll go to a
421 sand (.) like subway

Counsellor 422 mmhm

Client 423 He would be behind me in queue (.) ↑instead of him ordering
424 (1.5) he (.) his meal↑ (1.0) I I'll do my order >and he goes
425 oh get me mine for me and I'll be like ↑what do you mean
426 you're standing right beside me↑<

Counsellor 427 mm

Client 428 >°and he'll be like well< (1.5) ah just do it <and I was like<
429 right ok° (0.5) and again >he was like< do you want salad↑ (.)
430 ↓do you want salad↑ (.) aye (.) aye (0.5) right (.) [and =
431 [mm

Counsellor 431 = just how shy he's feeling there (1.0)>°I'm starting to°< I'm
432 not <nowhere near> that bad but I'm starting to get >that
433 that< that way with er with er with erm (2.0) with change

Counsellor 425 OK

Client 426 I think

Counsellor 427 Ok so: (.) you're starting to feel:
428 (2.0)

Client 429 I've just lost a a really big bit of confidence I think =

Counsellor 430 [Ok

Client 431 [>I mean< before I used to love doing (1.5) new new things and
432 it's: (0.5) °I don't know°

Counsellor 434 mk

Client 435 I feel: (0.5) >I I I< don't even (3.0) I don't even (2.0)
436 ((sigh)) 2.0) I don't know where I'm going with this

Counsellor 437 Ok (.) <maybe we can::> look into this a bit more cos this has
438 not really come up in the <last> (1.5) couple of weeks (1.0)
439 about confidence and (0.5) you know (.) you didn't (.) I think
440 you mentioned a couple of times I feel like I have lo (.) lost
441 confidence but (2.0) maybe we could (0.5) put that down as one
442 of your kind of (.) erm things to work on↑ and how (.) how to
443 build you confidence↑ up again

Client 444 mm

Counsellor 445 Cos I don't think you put that [down

Client 446 [°I I I< think it can be quite
447 a a always a thing because [when people =

Counsellor 448 [mm

Client 449 = talk to me now ((stutter)) (3.0) I can come across as being
450 (0.5) a (.) a bit confident cos I'm (.) maybe a wee bit more
451 er (.) extrovert now as what I used to er (.) er like (1.0)
452 It's strange (2.0) you er I thought I was a lot quieter before
453 but I've been more willing to do a lot more different things

Counsellor 454 Mm:

Client 455 Now it's turned the opposite way about I'm maybe a wee bit
456 (4.0) more of an extrovert but still (1.0) I don't like
457 leaving my circle now as much

Counsellor 458 [ok

Client 459 [It's (1.0) I've more confident in er (.) er: (.) no (.)
460 that's not the right word (1.5) I'm more <used> (1.0) to the
461 status quo now

Counsellor 462 Mm [k

Client 463 [and confident within that (.) but I won't do anything
464 outside that

Counsellor 465 So you're confident in you're (.) in you're circle (.) in
466 you're group (0.5) but out of that (1.0) you don't feel that
467 you're confident out of that

Client 468 Mm: not now (.) [not anymore no

Counsellor 469 [Not now

470 Mmhm(0.5) mmhm (1.0) and what is what is (0.5) kind of the
471 scary thing about being in that (.) <bigger↑ circle> or that
472 different↑ circle
473 (5.0)

Client 474 I don't know what's <scary> about it <possibly> (0.5) making a
475 mess of it (0.5) erm: but (2.0) the scary thing for me not
476 being able to do↑ that anymore is (1.0) that if I wanted to
477 <do: well (.) through my degree and (.) get into that industry
478 afterwards>

Counsellor 479 mm

Client 480 <fifty percent of the job will be: (2.5) travelling and
481 meeting new people constantly> so I'm more worried about not
482 being able↑ to do that

Counsellor 483 Mm ok

Client 484 Erm: (4.0) °so I would er: I'm just trying to think of a few
485 examples I had when (*four syllables*) um°° (4.0) °just (*5
486 syllables*)° I'm worried that I won't be able to interact with
487 people as well I couldn't like with engineering =

Counsellor 488 Mm

Client 489 = It's the case of having to take responsibility when things
490 (1.5) >°er eh°< and being able to just have the confidence to
491 get on with the work

Counsellor 492 Mm:

Client 493 And I'm actually a wee bit worried that I've maybe even lost↑
494 that I mean

Counsellor 495 Mm↓

Client 496 I I've been (1.0) I think (.) >one of the< sure points of that
497 is (2.0) one of the interviews I had last year for an
498 internship↑

Counsellor 499 Mmhm

Client 500 Erm: (0.5) and a few other things like that I mean this year
501 I've been petrified to even go for these sort of placements
502 I've just been going for =

Counsellor 503 Ok

Client 504 = Stacking shelves jobs and things like that there's
505 [even been a change there

Counsellor 506 [mm
507 mm

Client 508 that's just an example↓ (0.5) °I don't° (0.5)
509 [I'm not making =

Counsellor 510 [ok

Client 511 = sense am I

Counsellor 512 No you're [making sense

Client 513 [rambling

Counsellor 514 No you're not rambling it makes sense (.) like I (.) I kind of
515 take from it what I think is (1.0) important and I'll kind of
516 then [reflect it back to you =

Client 517 [Right ok

Counsellor 518 = so (0.5) erm: (.) what I was hearing there was (0.5) you
519 feel like you've lost that
520 (1.5)

Client 521 Mm

Counsellor 522 And I'm kind of wondering (1.0) erm: (1.5) can you lose
523 something like that (1.0) completely
524 (4.0)

Client 525 That's more a philosophical question but I think so yes (h)

Counsellor 526 So you can lose your confidence completely
527 (1.5)

Client 528 I think you can (0.5) er er I if you're if you're talking
529 about is it <possible> has that <happened> I don't think
530 that's completely happened yet

Counsellor 531 Ok [but you think it's possible

Client 532 [I don't think it <will> but I think it is (.) a ar a a ar
533 real possible thing for it to happen [°yeah↑°

Counsellor 534 [So it's a possibility
535 that it could happen

Client 536 I don't think it has happened yet [it's not completely gone

Counsellor 537 [It's not happened yet

Client 538 <And I don't think it will (.) because (1.5) I'm getting (3.0)
539 I I've changed a lot in the last couple of months>

Counsellor 540 Mm

Client 541 °I mean you seen me the first few times and°

Counsellor 542 Mm

Client 543 °I could barely get out of my bed and things like that° >but
544 erm:<

Counsellor 545 So: (0.5) you do have some confidence back (1.0) compared to a
546 couple (1.0) a while ago
547 (3.5)

Client 548 Maybe↑ not confidence (0.5) because my anxieties↑ still↑ I
549 mean↑ (0.5) >that's the thing< I've been avoiding university
550 (.) apart from coming here (1.0) for the last [few months
551 anyway =

Counsellor 552 [°mm°

Client 553 = so I've avoided the anxiety things >°the things that
554 brought°< (.) but that the day when I jumped in the lift to go
555 up (1.0) to fl (.) what is it ((floor number)) in the
556 ((building name)) building

Counsellor 557 mmhm

Client 558 (2.0) my my my stomach was churning

Counsellor 559 [Mm:

Client 560 [And I was trying not to look at it and I (.) [>and you know =

Counsellor 561 [Mm

Client 562 = and I was and then I was (.) and I was in and out as quick
563 as I could< (1.0) but er (1.5) that er (.) er (.) I don't know
564 what that's about (.) that [er

Counsellor 565 [ok

Client 566 that's (.) that's =

Counsellor 567 Erm:

Client 568 STUPID that's that's what's cau (.) that was (0.5) that was a
569 lot (.) <that's what caused me to miss so many of my classes
570 in my first semester this year> is I was just that <scared of
571 going in and (2.5) aye that's>

Counsellor 572 Mm (.)so it's >to get rid of that< feeling (.) >to: get rid of
573 that< anxiety you didn't go to class (1.5) but then (1.0) is
574 the anxiety still there↑

Client 575 Oh it gets worse [because then I know that I've (.) I've got =

Counsellor 576 [yeah

Client 577 = work piling up and

Counsellor 578 Mm

Client 579 A(.) and then I've only got my notes to go by and

Counsellor 580 Mm (.) so basically avoiding (.) what does avoiding do (.) to
581 the anxiety

Client 582 It makes it worse

Counsellor 583 yeah

Client 584 It does

Counsellor 585 mm

Client 586 Don't get me wrong there were a few times when I was like
587 right let's just go in here

Counsellor 588 mm

Client 589 And when I did show up it was like (1.0) ah I'm in there (.) I
590 know what I have to do and all that

Counsellor 591 Mm

Client 592 Right let's keep this up (1.5) then next week

Counsellor 593 Mm

Client 594 Ah it's like °ah I can't° I can'ee cope

Counsellor 595 Mm

Client 596 So: er (.) that (.) I mean there was times where I'd pop in
597 and out (1.0) sporadically (0.5) erm (1.0) >m m m< my last
598 semester was (0.5) <equally as bad> (1.0) and so one of the
599 things I (1.0) said to myself at Christmas is come on (.)
600 fresh start let's get going

Counsellor 601 [mm

Client 602 [so my first week (.) I attended all my classes (1.5) my dad
603 (2.0) my my mum and dad split up but dad and her partner >er
604 er his partner at the time< split up and

Counsellor 605 mmhm

Client 606 Erm: (1.0) he asked me to go down and help him move out that's
607 fine I got the <NORA VIRUS> (1.0)

Counsellor 608 °mmhm°

Client 609 <So I was (.) ill for about three days>

Counsellor 610 Mmhm

Client 611 <and then passed it on to LUCY> and because I (.) >I er I< I
612 (.) we'd already argued because I never thought I had it

Counsellor 613 [°Mm°
 Client 614 [right I never knew I had it I wasn't SICK
 Counsellor 615 [°mm°
 Client 616 [right (0.5) I had HAD EVERYTHING ELSE BUT I WASN'T SICK (1.5)
 617 I pass it on to her (.) she got the full works but was ill for
 618 the whole week (1.0) so: (1.0) >I I< I spent time with her
 619 because (.) feeding her and (1.5) going up to her but (1.0)
 620 and then when came to actually coming back to uni >↑I felt
 621 responsible so I just done it↑ °I thought ah uni I can go back
 622 to° (0.5)
 Counsellor 623 mmhm
 Client 624 And then back at uni (0.5) it's a <whole> (1.0) anxiety thing
 625 built up but er (.) what else happened there was something
 626 else that happened (2.5) (h) I GOT THE FLU (0.5) I GOT THE
 627 NORA VIRUS AND I GOT THE FLU
 Counsellor 628 mmhm
 Client 629 AND THEN (.) BECAUSE I'd missed (.) like a week and a half
 630 (0.5) two weeks then the anxiety thinking came back again
 Counsellor 631 mmhm
 Client 632 But erm: (1.0) and I should never have went to my dad's
 Counsellor 633 mmhm
 Client 634 And they should at
 635 [least have told me they all had (.) Nora Virus
 Counsellor 636 [ok
 Counsellor 637 Mm (.) so: (0.5) anxiety (1.5) you know: (0.5) sometimes you
 638 were (.) like (.) you were avoiding (.) going to classes to
 639 kind of (0.5) decrease the anxiety but (1.0) as a result (2.0)
 640 it actually <increased> the anxiety because then you had work
 641 piling up
 Client 642 I was conscious [of what I =
 Counsellor 643 [mm
 Client 645 = was missing out on yeah
 Counsellor 646 mm
 Client 647 But that er th ((sigh))
 648 (11.0)
 Client 649 °>I don't< (*sigh*) (2.0) <I don't know where (2.5) I don't
 650 exactly know where that anxiety (1.0) usually came from> I
 651 mean°
 Counsellor 652 mm
 Client 653 °There's° (2.0) I'm even annoyed at that it's something that
 654 isn't even tangible something that's just stupid (0.5) there's
 655 nothing physically stopping me from walking into class (.)
 656 there was plenty↑ of times I actually walked to class and
 657 turned round↑ at the door↑
 Counsellor 658 mmhm
 Client 659 There was times where there was people at the house at the
 670 flat walked in and then: (1.0) thought no I can't (0.5) go
 671 there (0.5) let's detour somewhere else
 Counsellor 672 Mmhm (.) do you think it's (.) <maybe:> important for us to
 673 think about this anxiety and how to manage↑ the anxiety
 Client 674 Yeah that was one of my aims [I'm aware that =
 Counsellor 675 [Yeah:
 Client 676 = anxiety is a [big issue =
 Counsellor 677 [mm
 Client 678 = but (0.5) it's (1.0) c cos I'm getting that used to bloody
 679 avoiding it now [I don't suffer from it terribly
 Counsellor 680 [mm
 681 mm
 Client 682 Unless I'm (0.5) told to go to class
 Counsellor 683 [Mm
 Client 684 [Or I have to in today
 Counsellor 685 [mm
 Client 686 [I mean (.) later on I have to go in to student business or
 687 whatever and I'm (.) I've been avoiding that for weeks on end
 688 it's
 Counsellor 689 Mm
 Client 690 I mean I don't even know if my a appeal my (.) application for
 691 (.) er (0.5) suspension will even go through now (1.0) I'm
 692 confident if I appeal it will be so [that's not a huge worry
 Counsellor 693 [yeah

Client 694 I (.) [I'm
 Counsellor 695 [Mm mm
 Client 696 Erm but the pens mightier than the sword in that re(h)gard (h)
 697 (.) but
 Counsellor 698 But avoidance is <prolonging> the anxiety and is <keeping it
 699 [there> longer and longer still =
 Client 700 [mm
 Counsellor 701 = erm: ok (0.5) erm: I'm conscious of ti:me so I'm kind of
 702 (0.5) wondering (0.5) about next week(.) and you know: (1.0)
 703 we tried to (.) work on the sleep and trying to (1.0) to: (.)
 704 understand it (0.5) erm: (1.5)[maybe
 Client 705 [°I don't know what's happening
 706 there I just don't seem [to be able to fall off°
 Counsellor 707 [mm
 Client 708 I mean there's times when I've lay in bed for two hours got up
 709 (1.5) messed with the hamster (.) >the only reason I went to
 710 bed last night< [is she got up (.) she's had a nightmare =
 Counsellor 711 [mm
 Client 712 = and came through wondering where I was (0.5) and then I went
 713 to bed then
 Counsellor 714 Mmhm
 Client 715 [And that was the only reason I went to bed↑
 Counsellor 716 [mmhm
 717 (3.0)
 Counsellor 718 Mm (1.0) erm ok (0.5) what about (.) <ok so I'm kind of
 719 thinking for next week (.) erm: (3.5) about the kind of sleep
 720 and: you know not getting: (0.5) not feeling kind of rested
 721 and feeling fatigued during the day
 722 [because you (.) haven't slept enough
 Client 723 [mm
 724 It's a vicious cycle that
 Counsellor 725 It is↑ a vicious cycle (.) yeah: that's what I was thinking
 726 cos then: (0.5) it affects >the next and the next and the next
 727 thing< [and it just keeps going on and on
 Client 728 [and yeah it does
 Counsellor 729 Erm: (1.0) so I'm kind of thinking about: t erm: (2.5) <what do
 730 you think (1.0) are ways>
 731 (2.0)
 Client 732 FORCE MYSELF TO GET UP IN THE MORNING regardless of how tired
 734 I am and just
 Counsellor 735 yeah

Appendix C: Ethics Final Approval

Ethics Application Ref: PSYC 16/ 218 - Final Approval

Jan Harrison

Tue 12/07/2016 09:25

To: Alexandra Kasozi (Research Student) <kasozia@roehampton.ac.uk>;

Cc: Joe Levy <J.Levy@roehampton.ac.uk>; Amanda Holmes <A.Holmes@roehampton.ac.uk>; Paul Dickerson <P.Dickerson@roehampton.ac.uk>;

Dear Alexandra,

Ethics Application

Applicant: Alexandra Kasozi

Title: How clients and therapists use metaphor to construct, characterise and negotiate the therapeutic

relationship in therapeutic talk

(Participants title: How language is used in clients' and therapists' interactions in therapy)

Reference: PSYC 16/ 218

Department: Psychology

Many thanks for your response and the amended documents. Under the procedures agreed by the University Ethics Committee I am pleased to advise you that your Department has confirmed that, apart from the minor conditions below, all conditions for approval of this project have now been met. We do not require anything further in relation to this application.

Comment:

I am pleased to confirm that the risk assessment for your project has been reviewed and approved by the Health, Safety and Environment Department.

Minor Conditions:

- i. **Application, P10:** please change reference to appendix 15 to appendix 13.
- ii. **Appx 3, Organisation Info Sheet:** please rephrase the sentence regarding numbers of participants - at present it could be read as 8 – 16 pairs, therefore 16 – 32 participants.
- iii. **App 6 & 7, Therapist & Clients Info Sheets:** please add the word “pairs” after “therapist – client”.

As these are only minor conditions it is assumed that you will adhere to these conditions for approval and therefore we do not require a response.

Please note that on a standalone page or appendix the following phrase should be included in your thesis:

The research for this project was submitted for ethics consideration under the reference PSYC 16/ 218 in the Department of Psychology and was approved under the procedures of the University of Roehampton's Ethics Committee on 12.07.16.

Please Note:

- This email confirms that all conditions have been met and thus confirms final ethics approval (it is assumed that you will adhere to any minor conditions still outstanding, therefore we do not require a response to these).
- University of Roehampton ethics approval will always be subject to compliance with the University policies and procedures applying at the time when the work takes place. It is your responsibility to ensure that you are familiar and compliant with all such policies and procedures when undertaking your research.
- Please advise us if there are any changes to the research during the life of the project. Minor changes can be advised using the Minor Amendments Form on the Ethics Website, but substantial changes may require a new application to be submitted.

Many thanks,

Jan

Jan Harrison

Ethics Officer

Research Office

University of Roehampton | London | SW15 5PJ

jan.harrison@roehampton.ac.uk | www.roehampton.ac.uk

Tel: +44 (0) 20 8392 5785

Appendix D: Participant information poster*

*This information poster was granted ethics approval but was not used due to permission being given to the researcher to use pre-existing naturalistic audio-recorded data of counselling sessions that fulfilled ethical, data protection and research requirements. See Appendix G below.



Therapist & Client Participant Information Poster

I am recruiting therapist and client participants to be involved in a study exploring:

How language is used in clients' and therapists' interactions in therapy

This research will analyse clients' and therapists' interaction to explore how clients and therapists characterise their emerging working relationship. It will therefore involve audio-recording between 2 and 5 therapeutic sessions of 8 therapist and client pairs who are respectively providing / receiving standard 50 minute counselling sessions at Balham Community Counselling Service.

Participant Inclusion/Exclusion Criteria

Participation is open to:

- Clients and Therapists who are currently receiving/providing therapy at Balham Community Counselling Service
- Therapist participants who registered counsellors, psychotherapists or psychologists with one or more of the organisations: BACP, UKCP or BPS **OR trainees in any of these professions.**
- Therapists to record therapeutic sessions with their clients' consent as standard practice.
- Therapist and client participants' who are planning on working together in mid to long term counselling (15+ sessions).
- Therapists and clients who conduct their sessions in English.

Who is organising the research?

This research is being undertaken by the Department of Psychology at the University of Roehampton. This project has been approved under the procedures of the University of Roehampton's Ethics Committee.

.....
If you would be interested in supporting this research please contact Alex Kasozi (primary investigator) for further information:

Alex Kasozi

Email: kasozia@roehampton.ac.uk

Phone: 07949940275

Counselling Psychologist in training

University of Roehampton

Department of Psychology

Whitelands College

Holybourne Avenue

London

SW15 4JD

Appendix E: Consent form for client participants*

*This consent form was granted ethics approval but was not used due to permission being given to the researcher to use pre-existing naturalistic audio-recorded data of counselling sessions that fulfilled ethical, data protection and research requirements. See Appendix G below.



Consent Form

Exploring how discursive resources are used in therapeutic talk and interaction between counsellors and clients.

Consent Statement:

I have read the information sheet and understand the purpose and procedure of this research. I understand that I may request further details and information should I wish.

As a client, I agree for (please select one option)

2 3 4 5 of the therapeutic sessions that I receive to be shared with, audio-recorded and transcribed by the researcher, and for the material to be used in the preparation of a thesis and accompanying papers and presentations.

Furthermore (please select one option),

- I wish to discuss and agree with my counsellor which audio-recorded sessions are shared
- I am happy for my counsellor to choose which audio-recorded sessions are shared

After finishing my participation in this study (please select one option):

- I wish to be debriefed directly by the researcher on the in person/via telephone/via email (circle one)
- I wish to receive a debrief information sheet via postal service/email/my counsellor (circle one)

I understand that audio recordings will be destroyed after ten years and that anonymised transcriptions will be kept for an unlimited period of time, and that within these time conditions this data might be used for other research projects and data analyses (at the discretion of the researcher).

I agree to take part in this research, and am aware that I am free to withdraw at any point without giving a reason and that should I do so this will not result in any adverse effects to the service that I receive. I do so I understand that, should I withdraw my data might still be used in a collated form.

I understand that the information I provide will be treated in confidence by the investigator and that my identity and the identity of Balham Community Counselling Service will be protected and removed in the publication or presentation of any findings, and that data will be collected and processed in accordance with the Data Protection Act 1998 and with the University's Data Protection Policy.

Name

Signature

Date

Investigator contact details

**Alex Kasozi
Counselling Psychologist in Training**

Department of Psychology
Whitelands College
Holybourne Avenue
London, SW15 4JD

Phone: 07949940275
Email: kasozia@roehampton.ac.uk

this with the investigator or contact the Director of Studies. However, if you would like to contact an independent party please contact the Head of Department.

Director of Studies Contact Details:

Head of Department Contact Details:

Dr Paul Dickerson

Department of Psychology
Whitelands College
Holybourne Avenue
London, SW15 4JD

Email:
p.dickerson@roehampton.ac.uk

Phone:
+44 (0)20 8392 3613

Dr Diane Bray

Department of Psychology
Whitelands College
Holybourne Avenue
London, SW15 4JD

Email:
d.bray@roehampton.ac.uk

Phone:
+44 (0)20 8392 3627

Appendix F: Consent form for counsellor participants*

*This consent form was granted ethics approval but was not used due to permission being given to the researcher to use pre-existing naturalistic audio-recorded data of counselling sessions that fulfilled ethical, data protection and research requirements. See Appendix G below.



Consent Form

Exploring how discursive resources are used in therapeutic talk and interaction between counsellors and clients.

Consent Statement:

I have read the information sheet and understand the purpose and procedure of this research. I understand that I may request further details and information should I wish.

As a therapist (please tick):

- I agree to follow the protocols outlined for therapist participants in this study in the information sheet
- I agree to provide all information given to me for client participants in a clear manner and emphasise their right to decline their consent and/or withdraw once it has been given
- I agree for a minimum of 2 and a maximum of 5 therapeutic sessions I provide to be shared with, audio recorded and transcribed by the researcher, and for the material to be used in the preparation of a thesis and accompanying papers and presentations.
- I agree to share the number of audio-recorded sessions that my client has consented to
- If my client wishes it (indicated on their consent form), I agree to only share audio-recorded sessions with the researcher which the client has explicitly approved.

I understand that audio recordings will be destroyed after ten years and that anonymised transcriptions will be kept for an unlimited period of time, and that within these time conditions this data might be used for other research projects and data analyses (at the discretion of the researcher). I agree to take part in this research, and am aware that I am free to withdraw at any point without giving a reason and that should I do so this will not result in any adverse effects. I understand that, should I withdraw my data might still be used in a collated form. I understand that the information I provide will be treated in confidence by the investigator and that my identity and the identity of Balham Community Counselling Service will be protected and removed in the publication or presentation of any findings, and that data will be collected and processed in accordance with the Data Protection Act 1998 and with the University's Data Protection Policy.

Name

Signature

Date

Investigator contact details

**Alex Kasozi
Counselling Psychologist in Training**

Department of Psychology
Whitelands College
Holybourne Avenue
London, SW15 4JD

Phone: 07949940275
Email: kasozia@roehampton.ac.uk

Dr Paul Dickerson

Department of Psychology
Whitelands College
Holybourne Avenue
London, SW15 4JD

Email:
p.dickerson@roehampton.ac.uk

Phone:
+44 (0)20 8392 3613

Dr Diane Bray

Department of Psychology
Whitelands College
Holybourne Avenue
London, SW15 4JD

Email:
d.bray@roehampton.ac.uk

Phone:
+44 (0)20 8392 3627

Appendix G: Permission to use audio-recorded data from the University of Strathclyde Pluralistic Therapy for Depression study. (Email exchange).

Email 1/2

Re: Meeting re. Research into metaphor

Alexandra Kasozi (Research Student)

Mon 27/06/2016, 09:41

Mick Cooper

Sent Items

Hi Mick,

Thanks very much for your email. Yes I can confirm that I'm very happy to work with the data protection protocols and have made reference to this in my ethics form.

Just to clarify, we discussed me having access to the Strathclyde data from the previous Pluralistic Therapy for Depression study with already exists, rather than using the data that is currently being gathered from Roehampton. So this is the data that I am requesting access to. Is this still OK? In my ethics form I have also made reference to and included the Strathclyde data protection protocols which was one of the conditions we discussed.

Best wishes,

Alex

Email 2/2

RE: Meeting re. Research into metaphor

Mick Cooper

Mon 27/06/2016, 19:51

Alexandra Kasozi (Research Student);

Sarah Cantwell (Research Student)

Inbox

Hi Alex. Sorry, my mistake, didn't read your email closely enough. Yes, that's fine re the Strathclyde data. I think its about 12 clients or so that I have recordings for. I'm actually copying in Sarah Cantwell here, one of our PhD students, who is also using this data and at this point is a bit closer to the data than I am. Sarah, how many specific clients do we have recordings for – do you have that info to hand? Warm regards. Mick

Mick Cooper

Professor of Counselling Psychology

Department of Psychology

University of Roehampton | London | SW15 4JD

Bibliography

- American Psychiatric Association. (2013). *Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders: DSM-5* (5th ed.). Arlington, VA: American Psychiatric Association.
- Antaki, C. (1998). Identity ascriptions in their time and place: 'Fagin' and 'the terminally dim'. In Antaki, C., & Widdicombe, S. (Eds.) *Identities in talk* (pp. 71-86). Thousand Oaks; London: Sage.
- Antaki, C. (2008). Formulations in Psychotherapy. In A. Peräkylä, C. Antaki, S. Vehviläinen, & I. Leudar, (Eds.) *Conversation analysis and psychotherapy* (pp. 26-42). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Antaki, C. (2011). *Applied conversation analysis: Intervention and change in institutional talk*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Antaki, C., Barnes, R., & Leudar, I. (2005a). Diagnostic formulations in psychotherapy. *Discourse Studies*, 7(6), 627-647.
- Antaki, C., Barnes, R., & Leudar, I. (2005b). Self-disclosure as a situated interactional practice. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 44(2), 181-199.
doi:10.1348/014466604X15733
- Antaki, C., Condor, S., & Levine, M. (1996). Social identities in talk: Speakers' own orientations. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 35(4), 473-492.
- Aristotle, & Heath, M. (2003). *Poetics*. London: Penguin.
- Aristotle, & Kennedy, G. A. (2007). *On rhetoric: A theory of civic discourse* (2nd ed.). New York; Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Aristotle, Whalley, G., Atherton, P., & Baxter, J. (1997). *Aristotle's poetics*. Montreal; Buffalo: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Arlow, J. A. (1979). Metaphor and the psychoanalytic situation. *The Psychoanalytic Quarterly*, 48(3), 363-385.
- Aronov, N. E., & Brodsky, S. L. (2009). The river model: A metaphor and tool for training new psychotherapists. *Journal of Contemporary Psychotherapy*, 3(39), 187-195.
- Bager-Charleson, S. (2010). *Reflective practice in counselling and psychotherapy*. Exeter: Learning Matters.
- Balint, M. (1968). The basic fault. London: *Tavistock Publications*, 1(24), 129-123.
- Barthes, R. (1972). *Critical essays*. Evanston, Illinois: Northwestern University Press.
- Barthes, R., & Heath, S. (1977). *Image, music, text*. London: Fontana Press.

- Battino, R. (2005). *Metaphoria: Metaphor and guided metaphor for psychotherapy and healing* Carmarthen: Crown House Publishing.
- Bavelas, J. B., Coates, L., & Johnson, T. (2000). Listeners as co-narrators. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 79(6), 941-952. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.79.6.941
- Benjamin, J. (2004). Beyond doer and done to: An intersubjective view of thirdness. *The Psychoanalytic Quarterly*, 73(1), 5-46.
- Bercelli, F., Rossano, F., & Viaro, M. (2008). Clients' responses to therapists' reinterpretations. In A. Peräkylä, C. Antaki, S. Vehviläinen, & I. Leudar, (Eds.) *Conversation analysis and psychotherapy* (pp. 43-61). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Billig, M. (1999). Whose terms? Whose ordinariness? Rhetoric and ideology in conversation analysis. *Discourse & Society*, 10(4), 543-558. doi:10.1177/0957926599010004005
- Bion, W. R. (1984). *Learning from experience*. London: Maresfield.
- Black, M. (1962; 1972). *Models and metaphors: Studies in language and philosophy*. Ithaca; London: Cornell University Press.
- Boroditsky, L. (2000). *Metaphoric structuring: Understanding time through spatial metaphors*. *Cognition*, 75(1) 1-28. doi:10.1016/S0010-0277(99)00073-6
- Bowen, B., & Nimmo, G. (1986). Going over the bridge - A practical use of metaphor and analogy. *Journal of Family Therapy*, 8(4), 327-337.
- Bratton, S. C., Ray, D., Rhine, T., & Jones, L. (2005). The efficacy of play therapy with children: A meta-analytic review of treatment outcomes. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice*, 36(4), 376-390. doi:10.1037/0735-7028.36.4.376
- Brinkman, S., & Kvale, S. (2017). Ethics in Qualitative Psychological Research. In C. Willig & W. Stanton Rogers, (Eds.) *The SAGE Handbook of Qualitative Research in Psychology* (2nd ed.), (pp. 259-273). London: Sage.
- Buber, M. (1959). *I and thou* (2nd (rev. ed.)). Edinburgh: Clark.
- Burr, V., (2015). *Social constructionism* (3rd ed.). London: Routledge.
- Butler, J. (1990). *Gender trouble: Feminism and the subversion of identity*. New York; London: Routledge.
- Butler, J. (1997). *Excitable speech: A politics of the performative*. London: Routledge.
- Butler, J. (2004). *Undoing gender*. New York; London: Routledge.
- Butler, J. (2011). *Bodies that matter: On the discursive limits of "sex"*. London: Routledge.

- Buttny, R. (1990). Blame–account sequences in therapy: The negotiation of relational meanings. *Semiotica*, 78(3-4), 219-248.
- Buttny, R. (1996). Clients' and therapist's joint construction of the clients' problems. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 29(2), 125-153.
doi:10.1207/s15327973rlsi2902_2
- Cameron, L. (1999). Identifying and describing metaphor in spoken discourse data. In L. Cameron, & G. Low (Eds.), *Researching and applying metaphor* (pp. 105-132). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. doi:10.1017/CBO9781139524704.009
- Cameron, L. (2007). Patterns of metaphor use in reconciliation talk. *Discourse & Society*, 18(2), 197-222. doi:10.1177/0957926507073376
- Cameron, L., & Deignan, A. (2006). The emergence of metaphor in discourse. *Applied Linguistics*, 27(4), 671-690.
- Cameron, L., Maslen, R., Todd, Z., Maule, J., Stratton, P., & Stanley, N. (2009). The discourse dynamics approach to metaphor and metaphor-led discourse analysis. *Metaphor and Symbol*, 24(2), 63-89.
- Chandler, D. (2007). *Semiotics: The basics* (2nd ed.). London: Routledge.
- Cirillo, L., & Crider, C. (1995). Distinctive therapeutic uses of metaphor. *Psychotherapy: Theory, Research, Practice, Training*, 32(4), 511-519. 511-519. doi:10.1037/0033-3204.32.4.511
- Clayman, S., & Heritage, J. (2002). *The news interview: Journalists and public figures on the air* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Condor, S. (2011). 'Sense and sensibility: The conversational etiquette of English national self-identification' in A. Aughey & C. Berberich (eds.), *These Englands: A conversation on national identity* (pp. 29-55). Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Cooper, M. (2008). *Essential research findings in counselling and psychotherapy: The facts are friendly*. Los Angeles, California; London: SAGE.
- Cooper, M., O'Hara, M., Schmid, P. F., & Bohart, A. (2013). *The handbook of person-centred psychotherapy and counselling* (2nd ed.). London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Cooper, M., Wild, C., van Rijn, B., Ward, T., McLeod, J., Cassar, S., Sreenath, S. (2015). Pluralistic therapy for depression: Acceptability, outcomes and helpful aspects in a multisite study. *Counselling Psychology Review*, 30(1), 6-20.
- Costall, A., & Leudar, I. (1996). Situating action I: Truth in the situation. *Ecological Psychology*, 8(2), 101-110. doi:10.1207/s15326969eco0802_1

- Counselling Psychology. (2017, November 10). British Psychological Society. Retrieved from <http://beta.bps.org.uk/a-z-of-psychology#C>
- Couture, S. J. (2006). Transcending a differend: Studying therapeutic processes conversationally. *Contemporary Family Therapy*, 28(3), 285-302.
- Crits-Christoph, P., Baranackie, K., Kurcias, J., Beck, A., Carroll, K., Perry, K., Zitrin, C. (1991). Meta-Analysis of therapist effects in psychotherapy outcome studies. *Psychotherapy Research*, 1(2), 81-91. doi:10.1080/10503309112331335511
- Dalal, P. K., & Sivakumar, T. (2009). Moving towards ICD-11 and DSM-V: Concept and evolution of psychiatric classification. *Indian Journal of Psychiatry*, 51(4), 310-319. doi:10.4103/0019-5545.58302
- Davies, J. P., (2014). *Cracked: Why psychiatry is doing more harm than good*. London: Icon.
- Davis, K. (1986). The process of problem (re)formulation in psychotherapy. *Sociology of Health & Illness*, 8(1), 44-74. doi:10.1111/1467-9566.ep11346469
- Derrida, J., & Attridge, D. (1992). *Acts of literature*. New York; London: Routledge.
- Dickerson, P. (2000). 'But I'm different to them': Constructing contrasts between self and others in talk-in-interaction. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 39(3), 381-398. doi:10.1348/014466600164552
- Dijk, T. A. v. (. A. (1993). *Elite discourse and racism*. London: Sage.
- Drew, P., & Holt, E. (1998). Figures of speech: Figurative expressions and the management of topic transition in conversation. *Language in Society*, 27(4), 495-522. doi:10.1017/S0047404500020200
- du Plock, S. (2009). Humanistic approaches. In R. Woolfe & S. Strawbridge (Eds.), *Handbook of Counselling Psychology* (3rd ed.), pp. 130-150.
- Edley, N. (2001). Unravelling social constructionism. *Theory & Psychology*, 11(3), 433-441.
- Edley, N., & Wetherell, M. (1997). Jockeying for position: The construction of masculine identities. *Discourse & society*, 8(2), 203-217.
- Edwards, D. (1991). Categories are for talking: On the cognitive and discursive bases of categorization. *Theory & Psychology*, 1(4), 515-542. doi:10.1177/0959354391014007
- Edwards, D. (1995). Two to tango: Script formulations, dispositions, and rhetorical symmetry in relationship troubles talk. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 28(4), 319-350. doi:10.1207/s15327973rlsi2804_1

- Edwards, D. (1998). The relevant thing about her: Social identity categories in use. In Antaki, C., & Widdicombe, S. (Eds.) *Identities in talk* (pp. 15-33). Thousand Oaks; London: Sage.
- Edwards, D. (2000). Extreme case formulations: Softeners, investment, and doing nonliteral. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 33(4), 347-373.
doi:10.1207/S15327973RLSI3304_01
- Edwards, D. (2001). *Discourse and cognition* (2nd Ed.). London: Sage.
- Edwards, D., & Potter, J. (1992). *Discursive psychology*. London: Sage.
- Edwards, D., & Potter, J. (2001). Discursive Psychology. In A. McHoul & M. Rapley (Eds.), *How to analyze talk in institutional settings: A casebook of methods*, (pp. 12-24). London: Continuum.
- Ferrara, K. (1994). *Therapeutic ways with words*. New York; Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Fitzgerald, P., & Leudar, I. (2010). On active listening in person-centred, solution-focused psychotherapy. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 42(12), 3188-3198.
- Fitzgerald, P., & Leudar, I. (2012). On the use of formulations in person-centred, solution-focused short-term psychotherapy. *Communication & Medicine*, 9(1), 13-22.
- Foucault, M. (2002). *The archaeology of knowledge*. London: Routledge.
- Foucault, M., & Gordon, C. (1980). *Power/knowledge: Selected interviews and other writings, 1972-1977*. Harlow: Longman.
- Frank, R. M., Dirven, R., Ziemke, T., & Bernárdez, E. (2008). *Body, language, and mind: Sociocultural situatedness*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Fraser, B. (1999). What are discourse markers? *Journal of Pragmatics* (31), 931-952.
doi:10.1016/S0378-2166(98)00101-5
- Freud, S., Richards, A., & Strachey, J. (1977; 1991). *On sexuality: Three essays on the theory of sexuality and other works*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Gale, J. E. (1991). *Conversation analysis of therapeutic discourse: The pursuit of a therapeutic agenda*. Westport, CT, US: Ablex Publishing.
- Gardner, R. (2013). Conversation analysis in the classroom. In J. Sidnell & T Stivers (Eds.) *The handbook of conversation analysis* (pp. 593-611). Chichester, West Sussex, UK Wiley-Blackwell.
- Garfinkel, H. (1967). *Studies in ethnomethodology*. Englewood Cliffs (N.J.): Prentice-Hall.
- Garfinkel, H. (1986). *Ethnomethodological studies of work*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

- Garfinkel, H. (2002). *Ethnomethodology's program: Working out durkheim's aphorism*. Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.
- Gergen, K. J. (1985). The social constructionist movement in modern psychology. *American Psychologist*, 40(3), 266-275. doi:10.1037/0003-066X.40.3.266
- Gibbs, R. W. (1992). Categorization and metaphor understanding. *Psychological Review*, 99(3), 572-577. doi:10.1037/0033-295X.99.3.572
- Gibbs, R. W. (1993). Why idioms are not dead metaphors. In C. Cacciari & P. Tabossi (Eds.), *Idioms: Processing, Structure, and Interpretation*, (pp. 57-77). London: Routledge.
- Gibbs, R. W. (1994). *The poetics of mind: Figurative thought, language and understanding*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gibbs, R. W., & Cameron, L. (2008). The social-cognitive dynamics of metaphor performance. *Cognitive Systems Research*, 9(1-2), 64-75.
- Gilbert, G. N., & Mulkay, M. (1984). *Opening Pandora's box: A sociological analysis of scientists' discourse*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Glaser, B. (2017). *Discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research*. London: Routledge.
- Glucksberg, S. (2001). *Understanding figurative language: From metaphors to idioms*. New York: Oxford University Press.
doi:10.1093/acprof:oso/9780195111095.001.0001
- Hak, T., & de Boer, F. (1996). Formulations in first encounters. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 25(1), 83-99.
- Halprin, D. (2002). *The expressive body in life, art and therapy: Working with movement, metaphor and meaning*. London: Jessica Kingsley.
- Harré, R. (1993). *Social being* (2nd ed.). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Have, P. t. (2004). *Understanding qualitative research and ethnomethodology*. London: Sage.
- Have, P. t. (2007). *Doing conversation analysis* (2nd ed.). Los Angeles, California; London: Sage.
- Heap, J. L. (1997). Conversation analysis methods in researching language and education. In N. Hornberger & P. Corson (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of language and education*, (pp. 217-225). United States: Springer.
- Hepburn, A., & Potter, J. (2006). Discourse analytic practice. In C. Seale, D. Silverman, J. F. Gubrium, & G. Gobo (Eds.), *Qualitative Research Practice: Concise Paperback Edition*, (pp. 168-184). London: Sage.

- Heritage, J., & Clayman, S. (2011). *Talk in action: Interactions, identities, and institutions*. Chichester, West Sussex: John Wiley & Sons.
- Heritage, J., & Watson, D. R. (1979). Formulations as conversational objects. In G. Psathas (Ed.), *Everyday Language: Studies in Ethnomethodology* (pp. 123-162). Chichester, West Sussex: John Wiley & Sons.
- Hesse, M. (1965). Aristotle's logic of analogy. *The Philosophical Quarterly*, 15(61), 328-340.
- Hester, S., & Eglin, P. (Eds.). (1997). *Culture in action: Studies in membership categorization analysis*. University Press of America.
- Hewitt, J. P., & Stokes, R. (1975). Disclaimers. *American Sociological Review*, 40(1), 1-11. doi:10.2307/2094442
- Cooper, M., Watson, J. C., & Hölldampf, D. (Eds.). (2010). *Person-centered and experiential therapies work: A review of the research on counseling, psychotherapy and related practices*. Ross-on-Wye: PCCS Books.
- Housley, W., & Fitzgerald, R. (2009). Membership categorization, culture and norms in action. *Discourse & Society*, 20(3), 345-362. doi:10.1177/0957926509102405
- How talking treatments work. (2017, November 10). Mind. Retrieved from https://www.mind.org.uk/information-support/drugs-and-treatments/talking-treatments/how-talking-treatments-work/#.WhR0KEpl_IU
- Howard, S. (2017). *Skills in psychodynamic counselling and psychotherapy* (2nd ed.). Los Angeles: Sage.
- Hunter, M. R. (2012). *Reflections of body image in art therapy: Exploring self through metaphor and multi-media*. London: Jessica Kingsley.
- Hutchby, I. (2002). Resisting the incitement to talk in child counselling: Aspects of the utterance 'I don't know'. *Discourse Studies*, 4(2), 147-168. doi:10.1177/14614456020040020201
- Hyland, K. (1998). *Hedging in scientific research articles*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Ingram, J. L. (1994). The role of figurative language in psychotherapy: A methodological examination. *Metaphor and Symbolic Activity*, 9(4), 271-288. doi:10.1207/s15327868ms0904_2
- Jefferson, G. (2004). Glossary of transcript symbols with an introduction. In G. H. Lerner (Ed.), *Conversation analysis: Studies from the first generation* (pp. 13-23). Amsterdam: John Benjamin's Publishing Company.

- Johnson, M., & Lakoff, G. (2002). Why cognitive linguistics requires embodied realism. *Cognitive Linguistics*, 13(3), 245-264.
- Johnstone, L., & Dallos, R. (2014). *Formulation in psychology and psychotherapy: Making sense of people's problems* (2nd ed.). London; New York: Routledge.
- Jucker A. H., & Smith, S. W. (1998). And people just you know like 'wow', Discourse markers as negotiating strategies. In A. H. Jucker & Y. Ziv (Eds.), *Discourse Markers: Descriptions and Theory* (pp. 171-202). Amsterdam; Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Kasket, E., & Gil-Rodriguez, E. (2011). The identity crisis in trainee counselling psychology research. *Counselling Psychology Review*, 26(4), 20-30.
- Katz, S. M. (Ed.). (2013). *Psychoanalytic inquiry book series. Metaphor and fields: Common ground, common language, and the future of psychoanalysis*. New York: Routledge.
- Kennerley, H., Westbrook, D., & Kirk, J., (2017). *An introduction to cognitive behaviour therapy: Skills & applications* (3rd edition). Los Angeles: Sage.
- Kövecses, Z., (2000). *Metaphor and emotion: Language, culture, and body in human feeling*. Cambridge, U.K; New York; Paris: Cambridge University Press.
- Kövecses, Z. (2005). *Metaphor in culture: Universality and variation*. Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Kövecses, Z., & Benczes, R. (2010). *Metaphor: A practical introduction* (2nd ed.). Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press.
- Kopp, R. R. (1995). *Metaphor therapy: Using client-generated metaphors in psychotherapy*. Philadelphia, US: Brunner/Mazel.
- Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (1980). *Metaphors we live by*. Chicago, Illinois; London: University of Chicago Press.
- Lakoff, G. (1986). A figure of thought. *Metaphor and Symbol*, 1(3), 215-225.
- Lakoff, G. (1993). The contemporary theory of metaphor. *Metaphor and Thought*, 2, 202-251.
- Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (1999). *Philosophy in the flesh: The embodied mind and its challenge to western thought*. New York: Basic Books.
- Larson, B. M. H., Nerlich, B., & Wallis, P. (2005). Metaphors and biorisks: The war on infectious diseases and invasive species. *Science Communication*, 26(3), 243-268. doi:10.1177/1075547004273019
- Lévi-Strauss, C. (1978). *Myth and meaning*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

- Lea, S., & Auburn, T. (2001). The social construction of rape in the talk of a convicted rapist. *Feminism & Psychology, 11*(1), 11-33. doi:10.1177/0959353501011001002
- Lemma, A., (2016). *Introduction to the practice of psychoanalytic psychotherapy* (2nd ed.). Chichester, England: Wiley Blackwell.
- Lenrow, P. B. (1966). Use of metaphor in facilitating constructive behavior change. *Psychotherapy: Theory, Research & Practice, 3*(4), 145-148. doi:10.1037/h0087921
- Leudar, I., Antaki, C., & Barnes, R. (2006). When psychotherapists disclose personal information about themselves to clients. *Communication & Medicine, 3*(1), 27-41.
- Leudar, I., & Nekvapil, J. (2011). Practical historians and adversaries: 9/11 revisited. *Discourse & Society, 22*(1), 66-85.
- Leudar, I., Sharrock, W., Truckle, S., Colombino, T., Hayes, J., & Booth, K. (2008a). Conversation of emotions: On turning play into psychoanalytic psychotherapy. In A. Peräkylä, C. Antaki, S. Vehviläinen, & I. Leudar, (Eds.) *Conversation analysis and psychotherapy* (pp. 152-172). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Leudar, I., Sharrock, W., Hayes, J., & Truckle, S. (2008b). Psychotherapy as a “structured immediacy”. *Journal of Pragmatics, 40*(5), 863-885.
- Leudar, I., Marsland, V., & Nekvapil, J. (2004). On membership categorization: ‘Us’, ‘Them’ and ‘Doing violence’ in political discourse. *Discourse & Society, 15*(2-3), 243-266. doi:10.1177/0957926504041019
- Long, P. S., & Lepper, G. (2008). Metaphor in psychoanalytic psychotherapy: A comparative study of four cases by a practitioner–researcher. *British Journal of Psychotherapy, 24*(3), 343-364.
- Loue, S. (2008). *The transformative power of metaphor in therapy*. New York: Springer Publishing Company.
- Lyddon, W. J., Clay, A. L., & Sparks, C. L. (2001). Metaphor and change in counseling. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 79*(3), 269-274. doi:10.1002/j.1556-6676.2001.tb01971.x
- MacMartin, C. (2008). Resisting optimistic questions in narrative and solution-focused therapies. In A. Peräkylä, C. Antaki, S. Vehviläinen, & I. Leudar, (Eds.) *Conversation analysis and psychotherapy* (pp. 80-99). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Madill, A., Widdicombe, S., & Barkham, M. (2001). The potential of conversation analysis for psychotherapy research. *The Counseling Psychologist, 29*(3), 413-434. doi:10.1177/0011000001293006
- Maynard, D. W. (1991). Interaction and asymmetry in clinical discourse. *American Journal of Sociology, 97*(2), 448-495.

- Maynard, D. W., & Heritage, J. (2005). Conversation analysis, doctor–patient interaction and medical communication. *Medical Education*, 39(4), 428-435. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2929.2005.02111.x
- McAteer, D. (2010). Philosophical pluralism: Navigating the sea of diversity in psychotherapeutic and counselling psychology practice. In M. Milton (Ed.), *Therapy and Beyond: Counselling Psychology Contributions to Therapeutic and Social Issues*, (pp. 5-19). Chichester, West Sussex: John Wiley & Sons.
- McCurry, S. M., & Hayes, S. C. (1992). Clinical and experimental perspectives on metaphorical talk. *Clinical Psychology Review*, 12(7), 763-785.
- McGee, D., Vento, A. D., & Bavelas, J. B. (2005). An interactional model of questions as therapeutic interventions. *Journal of Marital and Family Therapy*, 31(4), 371-384. doi:10.1111/j.1752-0606.2005.tb01577.x
- McGlone, M. S. (2007). What is the explanatory value of a conceptual metaphor? *Language & Communication*, 27(2), 109-126.
- McKinlay, A., & Dunnett, A. (1998). How gun-owners accomplish being deadly average. In Antaki, C., & Widdicombe, S. (Eds.) *Identities in talk* (pp. 34-51). Thousand Oaks; London: Sage.
- McLeod, J. (2011). *Qualitative research in counselling and psychotherapy* (2nd ed.). Los Angeles; London: Sage.
- McMullen, L. M. (1996). Studying the use of figurative language in psychotherapy: The search for researchable questions. *Metaphor and Symbolic Activity*, 11(4), 241-255. doi:10.1207/s15327868ms1104_1
- Mearns, R. (2005). *The metaphor of play: Origin and breakdown of personal being* (3rd ed.). London: Routledge.
- Mearns, D., Thorne, B., & McLeod, J. (2013). *Person-centred counselling in action*. London: Sage.
- Mitchell, S. A. (1991). Editorial philosophy. *Psychoanalytic Dialogues*, 1, 1-7.
- Modell, A. H. (2003). *Imagination and the meaningful brain*. Cambridge, MA, US: MIT Press.
- Moon, B. L. (2007). *Role of metaphor in art therapy: Theory, method, and experience*. Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas.
- Needham-Didsbury, I. (2014). Metaphor in psychotherapeutic discourse: Implications for utterance interpretation. *Poznan Studies in Contemporary Linguistics*, 50(1), 75-97.

- O'Hara, M., Cooper, M., Schmid, P. F., & Bohart, A. C. (2013). *The handbook of person-centred psychotherapy & counselling* (2nd ed.). Basingstoke, Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Pain, J. (2009). *Not just talking: Conversational analysis, Harvey Sacks' gift to psychotherapy*. London: Karnac.
- Parker, I. (1999). *Deconstructing psychotherapy*. Thousand Oaks, California; London: Sage.
- Peräkylä, A. (2012). Epilogue: What does the study of interaction offer to emotion research? In A. Peräkylä & M. Sorjonen (Eds.), *Emotion in Interaction*, (pp. 274-289). Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Peräkylä, A., Antaki, C., Vehviläinen, S., & Leudar, I. (Eds.). (2008). *Conversation analysis and psychotherapy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Peräkylä, A., & Silverman, D. (1991). Reinterpreting speech-exchange systems: Communication formats in AIDS counselling. *Sociology*, 25(4), 627-651. doi:10.1177/0038038591025004005
- Peräkylä, A., & Vehviläinen, S. (2003). Conversation analysis and the professional stocks of interactional knowledge. *Discourse & Society*, 14(6), 727-750.
- Pollio, H. R., & Barlow, J. M. (1975). A behavioural analysis of figurative language in psychotherapy: One session in a single case-study. *Language and Speech*, 18(3), 236-254. doi:10.1177/002383097501800306
- Pomerantz, A. (1986). Extreme case formulations: A way of legitimizing claims. *Human Studies*, 9(2), 219-229.
- Popper, K. R. R. (1968). *The logic of scientific discovery* (2nd English ed., Rev. ed.). London: Hutchinson.
- Potter, J. (1992). Constructing realism: Seven moves (plus or minus a couple). *Theory & Psychology*, 2(2), 167-173. doi:10.1177/0959354392022004
- Potter, J. (1996a). *Representing reality: Discourse, rhetoric and social construction*. London: Sage.
- Potter, J., (1996b). Discourse analysis and constructionist approaches: theoretical background. In J.T.E. Richardson, (Ed.), *Handbook of Qualitative Research Methods for Psychology and the Social Sciences*, (pp. 125 – 140). Leicester: British Psychological Society.
- Potter, J. (1997). Discourse analysis as a way of analysing naturally occurring talk. In D. Silverman (Ed.), *Qualitative Research: Theory, Method and Practice*, (pp. 200-222). London; Thousand Oaks, California: Sage.

- Potter, J. (2003). Discourse analysis and discursive psychology. In P. M. Camic, J. E. Rhodes & L. Yardley (Eds.), *Qualitative Research in Psychology: Expanding Perspectives in Methodology and Design* (pp. 73-94). Washington DC: American Psychological Society
- Potter, J., & Edwards, D. (2001). Discursive social psychology. In W. P. Robinson & H. Giles (Eds.), *The New Handbook of Language and Social Psychology* (pp. 103-118). Chichester, West Sussex: John Wiley & Sons.
- Potter, J., & Edwards, D. (2003). Rethinking cognition: On Coulter on discourse and mind. *Human Studies*, 26(2), 165-181. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/20010326>
- Potter, J., & Hepburn, A. (2005). Qualitative interviews in psychology: Problems and possibilities. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 2(4), 281-307.
doi:10.1191/1478088705qp045oa
- Potter, J., & Hepburn, A. (2008). Discursive constructionism. In J. A. Holstein & J. F. Gubrium (Eds.), *Handbook of Constructionist Research* (pp. 275-293). Guildford: Guildford Press.
- Potter, J., & Hepburn, A. (2012). Eight challenges for interview researchers. In J. F. Gubrium, J. A. Holstein, A. E. Marvasti & K. D. McKinney (Eds.), *The Sage Handbook of Interview Research: The Complexity of the Craft* (2nd Ed.), (pp. 555-570). Thousand Oaks, California; London: Sage.
- Potter, J., & Wetherell, M. (1987). *Discourse and social psychology: Beyond attitudes and behavior*. London: Sage.
- Pretorius, W. M. (2006). Cognitive behavioural therapy supervision: Recommended practice. *Behavioural and Cognitive Psychotherapy*, 34(4), 413-420.
- Professional Practice Guidelines Division of Counselling Psychology. (2017, August 15). British Psychological Society. Retrieved from http://www.bps.org.uk/sites/default/files/documents/professional_practice_guidelines_-_division_of_counselling_psychology.pdf
- Rapley, T. (2012). The (extra) ordinary practices of qualitative interviewing. In J. F. Gubrium, J. A. Holstein, A. E. Marvasti & K. D. McKinney (Eds.), *The Sage Handbook of Interview Research: The Complexity of the Craft* (2nd ed.), (pp. 541-554). Thousand Oaks, California; London: Sage.
- Rizq, R. (2013). IAPT and thought crime: Language, bureaucracy and the evidence based regime. *Counselling Psychology Review*, 28(4), 111-115.
- Rogers, C. R. (1967). *On becoming a person: A therapist's view of psychotherapy*. London: Constable.

- Rose, G. (1984). *Dialectic of nihilism: Post-structuralism and law*. Oxford; New York: Basil Blackwell.
- Rosenbaum, M., & Ronen, T. (1998). Clinical supervision from the standpoint of cognitive-behavior therapy. *Psychotherapy: Theory, Research, Practice, Training*, 35(2), 220-230. doi:10.1037/h0087705
- Sacks, H. (1979). A revolutionary category: Hotrodder. In G. Psathas (Ed.), *Everyday Language: Studies in Ethnomethodology* (pp. 7-14). New York: Irvington.
- Sacks, H., Jefferson, G., & Schegloff, E. A. (1995). *Lectures on conversation. With an introduction by Emanuel A. Schlegloff*. Oxford; Cambridge, Massachusetts: Blackwell.
- Sacks, H., Schegloff, E. A., & Jefferson, G. (1974). A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation. *Language*, 50(4), 696-735.
- Sanders, P. (2004). *The tribes of the person-centred nation: A guide to the schools of therapy related to the person-centred approach*. Ross-on-Wye: PCCS.
- Sarangi, S., & Roberts, C. (Eds.). (1999). *Talk, work and institutional order: Discourse in medical, mediation and management settings*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Saussure, F. d., Harris, R., Riedlinger, A., Bally, C., & Sechehaye, A. (Eds.). (1983). *Course in general linguistics*. London: Duckworth.
- Schegloff, E. A. (1982). Discourse as an interactional achievement: Some uses of 'uh huh' and other things that come between sentences. In D. Tannen (Ed.), *Analyzing Discourse: Text and Talk* (pp. 71-93). Washington DC: Georgetown University Press.
- Schegloff, E. A. (1997). Whose text? Whose context? *Discourse & Society*, 8(2), 165-187. doi:10.1177/0957926597008002002
- Schegloff, E. A. (2007a). Categories in action: Person-reference and membership categorization. *Discourse Studies*, 9(4), 433-461. doi:10.1177/1461445607079162
- Schegloff, E. A. (2007b). A tutorial on membership categorization. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 39(3), 462-482. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2006.07.007
- Schiffrin, D. (2008). Discourse markers: Language, meaning, and context. In D. Schiffrin, D. Tannen & H. E. Hamilton (Eds.), *The handbook of discourse analysis* (pp. 54-75). Blackwell Publishers Ltd. doi:10.1002/9780470753460.ch4
- Searle, J. R. (1969). *Speech acts: An essay in the philosophy of language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Semino, E. (2008). *Metaphor in discourse*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Shotter, J. (1993). *Conversational realities: Constructing life through language*. London: Sage.

- Smith, J. A. (2004). Reflecting on the development of interpretative phenomenological analysis and its contribution to qualitative research in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 1(1), 39-54. doi:10.1191/1478088704qp004oa
- Smith, J. A., Larkin, M., & Flowers, P. (2009). *Interpretative phenomenological analysis: Theory, method and research*. Los Angeles; London: Sage.
- Spinelli, E. (2005). *The interpreted world: An introduction to phenomenological psychology* London: Sage.
- Steen, G. (2007). *Finding metaphor in grammar and usage: A methodological analysis of theory and research*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing.
- Stern, D. N. (1998). *The interpersonal world of the infant: A view from psychoanalysis and developmental psychology*. London: Karnac Books.
- Stevenson, A., & Soanes, C. (2003). *Oxford dictionary of English* (2nd ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Stokoe, E. (2010). 'I'm not gonna hit a lady': Conversation analysis, membership categorization and men's denials of violence towards women. *Discourse & Society*, 21(1), 59-82. doi:10.1177/0957926509345072
- Stokoe, E. (2012). Moving forward with membership categorization analysis: Methods for systematic analysis. *Discourse Studies*, 14(3), 277-303. doi:10.1177/1461445612441534
- Stott, R., Mansell, W., Salkovskis, P., Lavender, A., & Cartwright-Hatton, S. (Eds.). (2010). *Oxford guide to metaphors in CBT: Building cognitive bridges*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Strawbridge, S., & Woolfe, R. (2010). Counselling psychology: Origins, developments and challenges. In R. Woolfe, S. Strawbridge, B. Douglas & W. Dryden (Eds.) *Handbook of Counselling Psychology* (3rd Ed.), (pp. 3-22). London: Sage.
- Strong, T., & Knight, S. (2012). Agency and dialogic tension in co-editing more preferred narratives. *Narrative Inquiry*, 22(1), 181-185.
- Strong, T., Pyle, N. R., deVries, C., Johnston, D. N., & Foskett, A. J. (2008). Meaning-making lenses in counselling: Discursive, hermeneutic-phenomenological, and autoethnographic perspectives. *Canadian Journal of Counselling*, 42(2), 117-130.
- Tay, D. (2010). Revisiting metaphor types as discourse strategies: The case of psychotherapeutic discourse. *Text & Talk - an Interdisciplinary Journal of Language, Discourse & Communication Studies*, 30(4), 445-463.
- Tay, D. (2011a). Discourse markers as metaphor signalling devices in psychotherapeutic talk. *Language & Communication*, 31(4), 310-317.

- Tay, D. (2011b). THERAPY IS A JOURNEY as a discourse metaphor. *Discourse Studies*, 13(1), 47-68.
- Tay, D. (2012). Applying the notion of metaphor types to enhance counseling protocols. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, 90(2), 142-149.
- Tay, D. (2014a). Bodily experience as both source and target of meaning making: Implications from metaphors in psychotherapy for posttraumatic stress disorder. *Cognitive Linguistic Studies*, 1(1), 84-100.
- Tay, D. (2014b). Lakoff and the theory of conceptual metaphor. In J. Littlemore & J. R. Taylor (Eds.), *The Bloomsbury Companion to Cognitive Linguistics*, (pp. 49-59). London; New York: Bloomsbury.
- Tay, D., & Jordan, J. (2015). Metaphor and the notion of control in trauma talk. *Text & Talk*, 35(4), 553-573.
- Vehviläinen, S. (2003). Avoiding providing solutions: Orienting to the ideal of students' self-directedness in counselling interaction. *Discourse Studies*, 5(3), 389-414.
- Vehviläinen, S., Peräkylä, A., Antaki, C., & Leudar, I. (2008). A review of conversational practices in psychotherapy. In A. Peräkylä, C. Antaki, S. Vehviläinen, & I. Leudar, (Eds.) *Conversation analysis and psychotherapy* (pp. 188-197). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wallerstein, R. (2013). Metaphor in psychoanalysis and clinical data. In M. Katz (Ed.), *Metaphor and Field: Common Ground, Common Language, and the Future of Psychoanalysis* (pp. 22-38). New York: Routledge.
- Wee, L. (2005). Constructing the source: Metaphor as a discourse strategy. *Discourse Studies*, 7(3), 363-384. doi:10.1177/1461445605052191
- Wetherell, M. (1998). Positioning and interpretative repertoires: Conversation analysis and post-structuralism in dialogue. *Discourse & Society*, 9(3), 387-412. doi:10.1177/0957926598009003005
- Wetherell, M., & Edley, N. (1999). Negotiating hegemonic masculinity: Imaginary positions and psycho-discursive practices. *Feminism & Psychology*, 9(3), 335-356.
- What is Counselling and Psychotherapy? (2017, November 10). British Association of Counselling & Psychotherapy. Retrieved from <https://www.bacp.co.uk/student/what.php>
- Wickman, S. A., Daniels, M. H., White, L. J., & Fesmire, S. A. (1999). A “primer” in conceptual metaphor for counselors. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, 77(4), 389-394. doi:10.1002/j.1556-6676.1999.tb02464.x

- Widdicombe, S. (1998). Identity as an analysts' and a participants' resource. . In Antaki, C., & Widdicombe, S. (Eds.) *Identities in talk* (pp. 191-206). Thousand Oaks; London: Sage Publications Ltd.
- Widdicombe, S. (2011). 'I am a believer but not a conformist': Negotiating claims to being religious among Syrian Christians and Muslims. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology*, 21(6), 468-483.
- Widdicombe, S. (2017). The delicate business of identity. *Discourse Studies*, 19(4), 460-478. doi:10.1177/1461445617707011
- Widdicombe, S., & Wooffitt, R. (1990). 'Being' versus 'doing' punk: On achieving authenticity as a member. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, 9(4), 257-277. doi:10.1177/0261927X9094003
- Widdicombe, S., & Wooffit, R. (1995). *The language of youth subcultures: Social identity in action*. New York: Harvester Wheatsheaf.
- Wiggins, S., & Potter, J. (2017), Discursive Psychology. In C. Willig & W. Stainton-Rogers (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of qualitative research in psychology* (3rd Ed.), (pp. 93-109). Thousand Oaks; New Delhi; London: Sage.
- Willig, C. (2013). *Introducing qualitative research in psychology* (3rd Ed.). Maidenhead, Berkshire: Open University Press.
- Winnicott, D. W. (1960). The theory of the parent-infant relationship. *The International Journal of Psycho-Analysis*, 41, 585.
- Wooffitt, R. (1992). *Telling tales of the unexpected: The organization of factual discourse*. Hemel Hempstead: Harvester Wheatsheaf.
- Wooffitt, R. (2005). *Conversation analysis and discourse analysis: A comparative and critical introduction*. London: Sage.
- Young, J. E., Klosko, J. S., & Weishaar, M. E. (2003). *Schema therapy: A practitioner's guide*. New York, NY, US: Guilford Press.
- Zinken, J., Hellsten, I., & Nerlich, B. (2008). Discourse metaphors. *Body, Language and Mind*, 2, 363-385.