

Examining Interactional Organization in Conversations: A Conversation Analysis Study

Shuhui Lin^{1*}

¹ International College, Guangzhou College of Commerce, Guangzhou, Guangdong, China

Email Address

shlin16147@gmail.com (Shuhui Lin)

*Correspondence: shlin16147@gmail.com

Received: 7 September 2023; **Accepted:** 29 September 2023; **Published:** 25 October 2023

Abstract:

Conversation analysis offers a systematic and detailed study of human communication. The research investigates phenomena such as turn-taking, preference organization, and repair mechanism within the a short conversation by employing the principles of conversation analysis. It aims to offers insights into the participants' interactional organization and the social order within the exchange. The analysis may contribute to our understanding of how individuals engage in effective real-life interactions, manage breakdowns, and maintain social relationships within specific contexts.

Keywords:

Conversation Analysis, Turn-taking, Preference Organization, Repair Mechanism

1. Introduction

Conversation exists in humans' everyday lives as a typical manner of engaging in social activities. It provides various opportunities to interact with others, exchange ideas and opinions, and share feelings. The study aims to offers insights into interlocutors' interactional organization and the social order within the exchange. It starts with data collection from a two-party conversation between two randomly selected participants, Derek and Justin, who are university students of archaeology. The short conversation is recorded, transcribed and coded following the convention established by Atkinson and Heritage, and the transcription notation and transcript can be checked in Appendix One and Two, respectively. The analysis focuses on exploring the structure and content of the conversation, with particular attention to turn-taking, preference organization, and repair mechanism. These three dominant organizational structures are found to occur most frequently in their conversation, which are at the core of conversation analysis theory. This study may contribute to our understanding of how individuals engage in effective real-life interactions, manage breakdowns, and maintain social relationships within specific contexts.

2. What is Conversation Analysis?

Conversation Analysis (CA) has been applied in various fields, such as linguistics, sociology, psychology, anthropology and so on. CA is primarily founded and developed by Harvey Sacks and his colleagues, Emanuel Schegloff and Gail Jefferson, in the early 1960s[16]. Conversation Analysis (CA) refers to twofold interpretations, in a broad sense, “CA is the systematic analysis of the talk produced in everyday situations of human interaction”[17]. In its narrow sense, CA is “an approach within the social sciences that aims to describe, analyse and understand talk as a basic and constitutive feature of human social life”[15]. Speakers in daily conversation deliver information and messages orderly and sequentially with mutual collaboration, and the achievement of this meaningful interaction is on the basis of the underlying organized and implicit procedures. Thus, “the analytic objective of CA is to explicate these procedures, on which speakers rely to produce utterances and by which they make sense of other speakers’ talk”[18]. In other words, CA provides a rigorous and systematic approach to investigating social interaction, with the goal of revealing the underlying principles and mechanisms that govern conversation and contribute to our comprehension of human communication. By analyzing the sequential and interactive aspects of talk-in-interaction, it may help examine how speakers in a conversation collaboratively construct and negotiate meaning, manage turn-taking, repair communication problems, and display social roles and identities.

3. Turn-taking

As Yule indicated, the basic structure of conversation is “I speak, you speak, you speak, I speak”, it appears that talk-in-interaction among humans follows an orderly and systematically organized structure governed by underlying principles. In other words, there is a local management system that triggers the onset of turn-taking once a conversation begins, allowing interlocutors to take turns in speaking collaboratively[19]. While overlapping, interruptions, and silences are common in conversation, they do not occur randomly. Participants tend to employ measures to restore normal order where only one speaker has the “floor” at a time, ensuring the distribution of power and the right to speak.

The organization of turn-taking consists of two components: the turn-constructual component and the turn-allocation component. The first element focuses on how a turn is constructed. According to Selting, the basic unit of talk is the Turn-Constructual Unit (TCU), which can be defined as “a potentially complete turn”[14]. It is composed of words, phrases, sentences, and similar elements, providing participants in the conversation with predictability regarding the termination of a unit[6]. The TCU activates the other component called the “transition relevance place” (TRP), which signifies the identifiable potential end of a turn. In other words, “at the end of each unit, there is the possibility for a legitimate transition between speakers”[17]. Additionally, Ekawati claims that “transition between speakers usually occurs at such a point, and it is at a transition relevance point that speakers employ the conversational techniques that CA aims to discover”[3]. While turn-allocation component refers to certain techniques for participants to distribute the right of getting “floor” and exchanging turns in a conversation. Sacks et al. proposed a variety of rules regarding this allocation system, namely, the current speaker can select the next speaker, if not, any speaker can self-select the next turn, otherwise, the current speaker could continue his utterances[11].

As shown in Excerpt (1), interlocutors take their turns orderly at line 7 and line 8, and there are two noticeable pauses (all the length of pause will be rounded down to the nearest integer) at line 9 and line 11. It demonstrates that Justin does not take his turn at the first lapse, as there is a notable audible breath-in by Derek at line 8, which is commonly considered as “a signal that its producer is about to speak, and so that sound can be consequential for the management of turn transition”[18]. After the gap, which is identify as a TRP at line 11, Justin takes his turn as he notices the completion of the current speaker’s turn. Apparently, participants seem to be aware of the underlying principles, their organization of the sequence of talk-in-interaction follows the rules of turn-taking.

Extract (1)

7 Justin: well, you said it’s almost done though,

8 Derek : Yeah. .hh hh.

9 (3.0)

10 Derek: yes, it’s almost done.

11 (2.0)

12 Justin: Um, why are are you missing just like um:

3.1. Overlap

Silence, overlap and interruption may occur as participants strive to get the “floor” or hold the “floor” in conversation. The distinction between overlap and interruption lies in whether the next speaker notices TRP before onset of his turn. Thus, it is essential to understand when to take a turn and how to make a repair in a conversation in order to achieve cooperative development of discourse. TRP can be signaled in various ways, such as through body motion, eye contact, nomination, shifts in volume or intonation of voice, and so on. Excerpt 2 could be helpful in distinguishing between interruption and overlapping talk, with the symbol “[” indicating the point of overlap onset in the transcript. It indicates that an overlap occurs at line 56 and 57, where Justin initiates his utterance to ask a question without waiting Derek to finish his turn. Although Justin seems to interrupt Derek’s speech, there is an about two-second pause before Justin’s utterance. This pause could be categorized as “progressional onset”, which means that the next speaker puts forward a termination of the current turn when some disfluency occurs in order to advance the talk [18]. Plus, the question that causes disfluency relates to what Derek uttered in his previous turn. Derek does not continue his turn at line 58, rather, he provides the next turn for Justin to finish his question. As Sidnell indicates, overlaps appear to be pervasive in conversations, but they are not treated as “violation or not listening to one another”, rather, as “extended episodes of overlapping talk provide some of the most remarkable displays of fine-grained orderliness in conversation”[15]. Overall, instead of regarding it as an interruption, this minimal gap or overlap still demonstrates a mutual orientation to keep the conversation going cooperatively.

Extract (2)

54 Derek: Um hh. (1.0) and so this guy was a young Peterson, and he,

55 Justin: =↑YEAH! <i’ve heard him>

- 56 Derek: he er he went after (2.0) [did it kind of built up that
57 Justin: [is]
58 Justin: =is it is it just stylistic changes or is it ()
because most of the time they made it out of wood.
59 Derek: No, um. (2.0)

3.2. Backchannels

A backchannel refers to “vocal indications of attention”, offering responses and feedback to the current speaker by the hearers. There are certain ways to give backchannels. First, non-verbal reactions (e.g. head-nodding, facial expressions); secondly, verbal words (oh, well, yes, yeah, good); also, non-verbal words (e.g. uh-huh, ah, m-hm)[9]. These backchannels commonly occur in conversations, either overlapping with the speaker or following gaps. The absence of backchannels may be expressed as rejection, disagreement, or denial, which can have a negative impact on communication.

As displayed in extract (3), backchannels such as “yeah” and “m-hm” are applied in each turn, providing attention and response to the current speaker. This positive feedback indicates that the hearer, Justin, indeed understands and acknowledges the messages delivered by Derek instead of expressing disagreement. Normally, overlaps may occur at TRP, which can be observed in this excerpt where Justin generally utters backchannels at the recognizable terminations of turns. Consequently, conversation analysts emphasize that overlapping talk should not be viewed as a violation of principles in turn-taking even though it may cause disorderly talk, it actually reveals “how closely participants orient to the rules”[18].

Extract (3)

- 37 Derek: I did to an extent, but (2.0) there were sometimes when I was just gonna (1.0) end up going down the rabbit hole,
→38 Justin: =yeah
39 Derek: ↓so to speak.
→40 Justin: =yeah
41 Derek: I was um hh. (1.0) there’s a (.) a weapons (2.0) typology i was looking at? °um° (1.0) ↑ and I was looking specifically at swords,
→42 Justin: = m-hm
43 Derek: um (.) and how this guy used (1.0) the: [the hilts to date (1.0) what year they were from,
→44 Justin: [= m-hm]

Apart from serving as a backchannel in talk, “um” is frequently applied in utterances to cause disfluency. Disfluencies are common in speech production and can interrupt the usual flow of speech. Examples of disfluencies include “filled pauses (e.g. such as uh and um), repetitions, prolongations, silent pauses, and repairs litter spontaneous speech”[4]. These disfluencies often arise from delays in cognitive processes during language production and can be considered as signals of momentary trouble with language production[2]. As shown in Extract (4), Justin apparently takes more “floors” and speak more. It is noteworthy that there are several “um”, pauses

and word repetitions in Justin's turns. Although disfluencies are often regarded as interruptions in speech, research has revealed that they can actually facilitate communication understanding. This is because disfluencies draw attention to the speech stream and project the content of the next turn to the hearer[5].

Extract (4)

30 Justin: err, more condensed papers it's harder to (.) probably discuss? (1.0) um, the topic (.) instead of (2.0) um: (2.0) instead of (1.0) being(.) °i don't know° I guess the word is (2.0) and to to properly explain it sometimes you need to be: (2.0) need the space to do so

31

Derek: =yeah,

32 Justin: and and and (.) this being so condensed it's hard to properly (1.0) say what you need to say but say effectively, but (1.0) I suppose that's HAVE the (1.0) the point.

4. Preference Organization

A significant portion of talk is organized into sequences of paired actions known as adjacency pairs (AP). Employing the first part of an AP is another manner to select the next speaker in a conversation. Each AP is consisted of two parts, the first pair part (FPP) and the second pair part (SPP) of the turn, which are particularly relevant[8]. Employing the first part of an AP is another manner to select the next speaker in a conversation, the second part of an adjacency pair is typically expected in response to the first part. There are different types of paired utterance, for example, question and answer, request and granting, offer and acceptance, greeting and greeting, complaint and remedy. Questions could be replied to with unexpected answers or non-answers, invitations can be accepted or declined. The format for agreement and acceptance is labeled the 'preferred' action turn shape, while the format for disagreement and refusal is referred to as the 'dispreferred' action turn shape[10].

Conversationalists point out that the term "preference" mentioned here is not associated with the personal preferences of the parties involved in the conversation. Instead, it "involves issues of affiliation and disaffiliation in relation to social actions"[13]. The alternatives in second pair part can be categorized into preferred turn format and dispreferred turn format. For instance, if person A invites person B to go shopping on weekends, and person B is individually reluctant to accept the invitation for various reasons, although person B may personally prefer to reject the invitation, "this does not alter the fact that acceptance is the preferred alternative in terms of the preference organization of the talk"[15]. According to Wooffitt, "preferred actions are characteristically performed straightforwardly and without delay, while dispreferred actions are delayed, qualified and accounted for"[18]. It is important to recognize the characteristics of different responsive formats in order to receive an affirmative reply and avoid being declined. In Extract (5), Derek shows disagreement in his utterances at line 37 by using the "yeah...but" structure, delay is one of the typical characteristics involved in disagreement in terms of preference organization, which can be conveyed through "silence, question, reluctance markers (e.g., "uh" or "well") and agreement prefaces (e.g., "yeah...but")"[17]. Understanding preference organization helps interlocutors anticipate forthcoming dispreferred actions and enables them to produce corresponding measures and incentives, such as repair by

building pre-sequences or insertion sequences. In other words, the design and construction of first pair parts can be tailored in specific ways to prevent the imminent occurrence of dispreferred second parts. Overall, as an inferential tool, “preference organization provides the participants with a subtle and powerful apparatus for making interpretative inferences”[7].

Extract (5)

35 D: and i thought were (.) would be really good to include? but i just (.) couldn't because they veer away too much from the main (1.0) point of discussion.

36 J: but couldn't you use the main point of discussion (1.0) and then use the specific(1.0) ideas like as as a er examples of the of the spectrum?

→37 D: yeah: i did to an extent, but (2.0) there were sometimes when i was just gonna (1.0) end up going down the rabbit hole,

38 J: =yeah

39 D: ↓so to speak.

5. Repair Mechanism

It is important for interlocutors to learn how to repair their utterances in order to facilitate successful and orderly communication. Normally, participants take turns speaking, but in situations where no one speaks or both individuals desire to speak at the same time, overlaps and interruptions may occur. Besides, breakdowns including misunderstandings, disagreements, rejections and other difficulties often occur in conversation. Repair practices are the various ways of addressing problems and breakdowns in speaking, hearing or understanding of the talk.

The organization of repair system is complex. Primarily, repairs tend to occur near the trouble source due to the structural organization. It is essential to identify the “trouble source”, which are terms referring to specific segments that repair practices address. If speakers or hearers do not identify and address problematic segments promptly, significant organizational issues, typically misunderstandings, may arise. Furthermore, repairs can be triggered by either speakers or recipients, self-repair refers to speaker-initiated repairs, while other-repairs is related to hearer-initiated repairs[12]. Specifically, there are four types of repair: “1)Self-initiated self-repair; 2)Other-initiated self-repair; 3)Self-initiated other-repair; 4)Other-initiated other-repair”[18]. In Extract (6), there is an example of the first type of repair, namely, self-initiated self-repair. Justin produces three trouble sources at line 30. Firstly, he doesn't continue what he uttered initially, after repeating the trouble segment “instead of” twice, there are slight gaps and an uncertain reply of “I don't know”, which is the first self-repair. However, here comes the second trouble source where he supposed to give a noun, the first repair can be viewed as a new trouble source. The final trouble segment is partially reserved, and after a gap, the third self-repair is implemented instead of providing an adjective. In fact, as shown in the extract, repair organization tends to be a self-correction mechanism, as participants in social interaction often prefer to initiate and resolve trouble segments by themselves.

Extract (6)

30 Justin: err, more condensed papers it's harder to (.) probably discuss? (1.0) um, the topic (.) instead of (2.0) um: (2.0) instead of (1.0) being(.) °i don't know° I guess

the word is (2.0) and to to properly explain it sometimes you need to be: (2.0) need the space to do so

31 Derek: =yeah,

32 Justin: and and and (.) this being so condensed it's hard to properly (1.0) say what you need to say but say effectively, but (1.0) i suppose that's HAVE the (1.0) the point.

33 Derek: YEAH YEAH, (.) that's true. .hh NO: um: (2.0) hh. (2.0) it's: (.) it's °a° really broad topic, and i found (.) when i was writing? (1.0) a lot of it, *there were a lot of things that i uh (.)↑i wanted to include?

6. Conclusions

Conversation analysis (CA) is an approach that focuses on the study of social talk-in-interaction, originating from the work of Sacks et al.. As a branch of sociology, it has had a significant impact on various scientific fields such as psychology and applied linguistics. Through the application of CA, this study reveals the intricate dynamics and underlying principles that shape the interaction between the two participants. The analysis may examine how interlocutors take turns to initiate their speech and select the next speaker at transition relevance place, and manage the flow of conversation. Furthermore, it investigates the use of preference organization strategies, such as the selection of preferred responses and the avoidance of dispreferred answers. Additionally, the study delves into the repair mechanism employed by the participants to address and resolve communication problems. Overall, the study may contribute to our understanding of how individuals engage in effective communication, manage misunderstandings, and maintain social relationships within specific contexts.

Conflicts of Interest

The author declares that there is no conflict of interest regarding the publication of this article.

Funding

This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial or not-for-profit sectors.

Appendix

Appendix 1: Conventions Used in Transcript

A full discussion of CA transcription notation is available in Atkinson & Heritage (1984). Punctuation marks are used to capture characteristics of speech delivery, not to mark grammatical units.

[	indicates the point of overlap onset
]	indicates the point of overlap termination
=	a) turn continues below, at the next identical symbol b) if inserted at the end of one speaker's turn and at the beginning of the next speaker's adjacent turn, it indicates that there is no gap at all between the two turns
(3.2)	an interval between utterances (3 seconds and 2 tenths in this case)
(.)	a very short untimed pause

word	underlining indicates speaker emphasis
e:r the:::	indicates lengthening of the preceding sound
-	a single dash indicates an abrupt cut-off
?	rising intonation, not necessarily a question
!	an animated or emphatic tone
,	a comma indicates low-rising intonation, suggesting continuation
.	a full stop (period) indicates falling (final) intonation
CAPITALS	especially loud sounds relative to surrounding talk
◦ ◦	utterances between degree signs are noticeably quieter than surrounding talk
↑↓	indicate marked shifts into higher or lower pitch in the utterance following the arrow
><	indicate that the talk they surround is produced more quickly than neighbouring talk
()	a stretch of unclear or unintelligible speech
(guess)	indicates transcriber doubt about a word
.hh	speaker in-breath
hh.	speaker out-breath
→	arrows in the left margin pick out features of especial interest

Appendix 2 Conversation Transcript (4'32'' in total)

- 1 Justin: how's it going?
- 2 Derek: fine
- 3 (5.0)
- 4 Justin: well, how's the paper coming?
- 5 (3.0)
- 6 Derek: It's been better! [hh], it's been better! [hhh].
- 7 Justin: well, you said it's almost done though,
- 8 Derek: Yeah. .hh hh.
- 9 (3.0)
- 10 Derek: yes, it's almost done.
- 11 (2.0)
- 12 Justin: Um, why are are you missing just like um:
- 13 Derek: =now I've just got one more section to put in and then: .hh
- 14 Justin: conclude?
- 15 Derek: CONCLUDE and then i have to make sure it all makes sense,
- 16 Justin: =um:
- 17 Derek: because
- 18 Justin: =yeah
- 19 Derek: there's a whole bunch of stuff that I didn't put it in because I don't think I've room so i have to make sure it makes sense WITHOUT (1.0) case studies having put in?

20 Justin: yeah. (4.0) um (2.0) are you finding that an any difficulties? (1.0) Um, (1.0) putting it all together? or is it (1.0) as you said, so much information to condense:

21 Derek: it's really just a lot of information to condense, um, (2.0) it's it's stuff I know, (1.0) °and° stuff I have experience with, [but

22 Justin: = [m-hm

23 (2.0)

24 Derek: pulling from so many different sources that it's really hard to (1.0) create a narrative(.) and (.) make sense,

25 Justin: = right.

26 Derek: .hh SO THAT'S what i'm gonna be going over tomorrow is just (.) after i finish writing it (.) going through it and making sure it all makes sense as one: PAPER.

27 Justin: do you think that (1.0) sometimes with these(1.0) smaller

28 Derek: =hh.

29 (3.0)

30 Justin: err, more condensed papers it's harder to (.) probably discuss? (1.0) um, the topic (.) instead of (2.0) um: (2.0) instead of (1.0) being(.) °I don't know° I guess the word is (2.0) and to to properly explain it sometimes you need to be: (2.0) need the space to do so

31 Derek: =yeah,

32 Justin: and and and (.) this being so condensed it's hard to properly (1.0) say what you need to say but say effectively, but (1.0) i suppose that's HAVE the (1.0) the point.

33 Derek: YEAH YEAH, (.) that's true. .hh NO: um: (2.0) hh. (2.0) it's: (.) it's °a° really broad topic, and i found (.) when i was writing? (1.0) a lot of it, *there were a lot of things that i uh (.)↑i wanted to include?

34 Justin: = m-hm

35 Derek: and i thought were (.) would be really good to include? but i just (.) couldn't because they veer away too much from the main (1.0) point of discussion.

36 Justin: but couldn't you use the main point of discussion (1.0) and then use the specific(1.0) ideas like as as a er examples of the of the spectrum?

37 Derek: yeah: i did to an extent, but (2.0) there were sometimes when i was just gonna (1.0) end up going down the rabbit hole,

38 Justin: =yeah

39 Derek: ↓so to speak.

40 Justin: =yeah

41 Derek: i was um hh. (1.0) there's a (.) a weapons (2.0) typology i was looking at? °um° (1.0)↑ and i was looking specifically at swords,

42 Justin: = m-hm

43 Derek: um (.) and how this guy used (1.0) the: [the hilts to date (1.0) what year they were from,

44 Justin: = [m-hm

45 Derek: um (.) what specific (.) part of the Viking age they were [from?

46 Justin: [Is it Boher? (1.0)
B-O-H-N-E-R?

47 (1.0)

48 Derek: NO.

49 Justin: =No, he did axes(.) °i think°.

50 Derek: you might be thinking of Baemer? hh.

51 Justin: Maybe.

52 Derek: Balmer did (1.0) she did um: migration period swords,

53 Justin: =Um.

54 Derek: Um hh. (1.0) and so this guy was a young Peterson, and he,

55 Justin: =↑YEAH!
<I've heard him>

56 Derek: he er he went after (2.0) [did it kind of built up that

57 Justin: [is

58 Justin: =is it is it just stylistic changes or is it ()
because most of the time they made it out of wood.

59 Derek: No, um. (2.0)

60 Justin: [What

61 Derek: [WHEN (2.0) WHEN HE was (1.0) well (.) for for the migration periods
swords (.) yes er (.) there's a lot of organic material (.) °on the hilt components°?

62 Justin: [°mm°.

63 Derek: [um (1.0) but you get to the Viking ages mostly (1.0) iron,

64 Justin: Un-huh.

65 Derek: decorated with bronze? with silver? copper?

66 Justin: Un-huh.

67 Derek: [°whatever°.

68 Justin: [yeah

References

- [1] Atkinson, J.M.; Heritage, J. (1984a). Structures of social action: Cambridge University Press.
- [2] Bouwsema, J.A. Disfluency as... er... delay: An investigation into the immediate and lasting consequences of disfluency and temporal delay using EEG and mixed-effects modelling. 2014.
- [3] Ekawati, R. Turn Taking in Math Tutorial Session: a Conversation Analysis. *Jurnal Prosodi Bahasa dan Sastra Inggris*, 2011, 5(2).
- [4] Finlayson, I.R. Testing the roles of disfluency and rate of speech in the coordination of conversation (Doctoral dissertation, Queen Margaret University, Edinburgh). 2014.
- [5] Fraundorf, S.H.; Watson, D.G. The disfluent discourse: Effects of filled pauses on recall. *Journal of memory and language*, 2011, 65(2), 161-175.
- [6] Jones, R. Turns, topics and tyranny: Conversation analysis and power in Alan Ayckbourn's Absurd Person Singular. *Innervate*, 2008, 1, 167-174.
- [7] Mazeland, H. Conversation analysis. *Encyclopedia of language and linguistics*, 2006, 3, 153-162.
- [8] Nordquist, R. (2017). Adjacency Pair (Conversation Analysis). Available online: <https://www.thoughtco.com/adjacency-pair-conversation-analysis-1688970> (accessed on 12 September 2023).
- [9] Pipek, V. On backchannels in english conversation. Masarykova univerzita, Pedagogická fakulta, 2007.
- [10] Pomerantz, A. Agreeing and disagreeing with assessments: Some features of preferred/dispreferred turn shaped. 1984.
- [11] Sacks, H.; Schegloff, E.A.; Jefferson, G. A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation. *Language*, 1974, 696-735.
- [12] Scarcella, R. Conversational analysis in L2 acquisition and teaching. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 1988, 9, 72-91.
- [13] Seedhouse, P. Conversation analysis and language learning. *Language teaching*, 1988, 38(4), 165-187.
- [14] Selting, M. The construction of units in conversational talk. *Language in society*, 2000, 29(4), 477-517.
- [15] Sidnell, J. Conversation analysis: An introduction (Vol. 45): John Wiley & Sons. 2011.
- [16] Ten Have, P. (2007a). Doing conversation analysis: Sage.
- [17] Wong, J.; Waring, H.Z. Conversation analysis and second language pedagogy: A guide for ESL/EFL teachers: Routledge. 2010.
- [18] Wooffitt, R. Conversation analysis: principles, practices and applications: Polity. 1998.
- [19] Yule, G. Pragmatics/George Yule. In: Oxford: Oxford University Press. 1996.



© 2023 by the author(s); licensee International Technology and Science Publications (ITS), this work for open access publication is under the Creative Commons Attribution International License (CC BY 4.0). (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>)