

3

On the Organization of Sequences as a Source of "Coherence" in Talk-in- Interaction

Emanuel A. Schegloff

Department of Sociology
UCLA

I

It is a common observation, and a common-sense one, that talk in interaction comes in what might be called *clumps*. In conversation, as in other types of talk in interaction, the successive contributions of the participants are understood to be orderly in their mutual relationship, in diverse forms of orderliness. Students of talk in interaction may be analytically concerned to develop an account of the practices of talking by participants which produce these clumps. A concern with *conversational coherence* I take to fall within this general domain.

One often relied on resource for giving an account of these clumps and the "coherence" which underlies them is the notion of *topic* or *topical coherence* (as in the original title of the conference for which the present paper was first prepared). "Topic" as an analytic tool is vulnerable to a number of problems, which I can only mention here—neither for the first time nor for resolution.

1. There is a recurrent problem in determining "what the topic is" even in a single sentence, let alone across several sentences or utterances, let alone warranting or defending the formulation of the topic which might be offered;
2. The common practice which we can call *topic shading* (Schegloff & Sacks, 1973), or *step-by-step transition* (Sacks, 1987 [1973]; Jefferson, 1984), by which participants gradually shift the topical thrust

of the talk contributes to this problem by rendering the topical thrust of a segment of the talk equivocal even if the "topics" of its several component sentences or clauses, each taken in isolation, could be rendered unequivocally;

3. Although, accordingly, it may be analytically feasible to characterize some talk as "on-topic" with some other (ordinarily immediately prior) talk (e.g., inter alia Dorval & Eckerman, 1984), it is quite a different matter to characterize discretely what that topic is, or to develop the notion of "a topic" as an organizing unit for talk in interaction;
4. This problem is further complicated by the observation that the practice of "formulating what the topic is/was" is something done *within* conversation by participants, is not done there as an unconstrained option (Garfinkel & Sacks, 1970), and is regularly used as a vehicle for doing some other, additional activity (cf., for example, Sacks's analysis of the utterance "We were in an automobile discussion" as not only a move to re-invoke or re-start a topic, but as an invitation to a newcomer, in his Lectures on Conversation, Spring 1966, lecture 4; see also Heritage, 1985); the status of unconstrained formulation of topics by professional analysts (unconstrained, that is, by the interactional import which any given formulation might have) is accordingly problematic;
5. focusing on "the topic" of some unit of talk risks the danger of not addressing analysis to what participants in real worldly interaction are *doing* to or with one another with their talk, with their talk-about-something, or with particular parts of it; that is, all talk is then treated as talk-about, not as talk-that-does, a vulnerability especially of academic analysis;
6. the preceding observation is meant to register, in the midst of the other observations, the recurrence of one distinct activity which persons can do together in talk-in-interaction—a type of sequence which we might term *doing topic talk*, together with subvarieties of that activity. But to recognize this as a type of activity in its own right is to recognize as well that much talk is best understood in the first instance for *what it is being used to do*, more than *what it is being used to talk about* (recognizing, of course, that "doing topic talk" is also, in its way, doing something).

The import of the preceding observations is not necessarily that analysis of clumps of talk by reference to the notion of topic is fatally flawed or analytically hopeless. It is only that it is not exclusively relevant and is surely not entirely straightforward. In the course of the discussion

which follows I want to display the utility and relevance of the "sequence" as another candidate type of unit, the practices of which can underlie the production of clumps of talk. The organization of sequences is an *organization of action*, action accomplished through talk-in-interaction, which can provide to a spate of conduct coherence and order which is analytically distinct from the notion of topic.

I intend here to explore in an at least sketchy way the structure of a moderately extended sequence of talk in interaction. Within an ongoing program of research in the organization of talk-in-interaction, the treatment of this spate of talk is another in a series of accounts designed to exhibit a range of ways in which long stretches of talk can be best understood as orderly expansions or elaborations of a single underlying unit of sequence construction.¹ For the purposes of this chapter and its central theme, I choose this presentational tack, and this bit of conversation, to make two major points: first, that the "sequence structure" of a spate of talk and its topical aspect or structure are analytically distinct and can be empirically at least partially independent; and second, that the sequence structure itself can provide for the organizational coherence of the talk. But I have other purposes as well which this fragment will allow us to explore. A third theme is to see how, even when misunderstandings and trouble arise, these can be coherently shaped by sequence structure in conversation. Finally, and in the service of the other aims, I hope to engage in an exercise in bringing past work on the analysis of conversational interaction to bear on this singular episode of talk, for its capacity to elucidate single episodes is one important criterion of the relevance and pay-off of this mode of analysis (cf. Schegloff, 1987a). But we begin by returning to the animating thematic concerns of this chapter.

Coherence and related terms and properties have attracted attention from a wide range of investigators, from diverse academic disciplines, with various research commitments and theoretical persuasions, working under different methodological constraints. These range from artificial intelligence (e.g., Hobbs, 1985; Hobbs & Agar, 1985), to systemic linguistics (Halliday & Hasan, 1976), to discourse analysis (Keenan & Klein, 1975; Keenan & Schieffelin, 1976; Li, 1976; Schiffrin, 1985), to more "formal" linguistics (e.g. Reinhart, 1980), to speech communica-

¹ Other contributions to this series of studies include Schegloff (1972, especially pp. 76-79, 106-114, 1980, especially 117ff. and 128ff., and 1988a especially pp. 118-131). Additional studies of other expansion formats are in preparation. See also Zimmerman (1984) for a treatment of certain forms of service exchanges as canonical expansion formats.

tion (e.g. Craig & Tracy, 1983). And quite commonly, when questions of coherence are in focus, the notion of topic hovers about as a prime resource (e.g., in some, though not all, of the preceding references). I do not propose to review here the range of conceptions of coherence or of topic which have been explored or favored in the literature. But without arguing which, if any, prior treatments of these areas has so committed itself, I want to sketch in a rough fashion a way of treating each of these topics that one must be wary of in analytically addressing the data of talk-in-interaction.

In one approach to analyzing the topic of a stretch of *text*, the analyst characterizes what a first subunit (e.g., a sentence or proposition) is "about," then a next, and so forth. An effort can then be made to depict a tree structure as an underlying organization for the whole, so that, if a first sentence (or set of sentences) about "x" is following by another sentence (or set of sentences) about "y," such that "x" and "y" can be understood as two branches of a "higher" node "z," then such an analysis provides for the coherence of that series of sentences. Now, put in that fashion, perhaps few would wish to subscribe to such a view, but before dismissing it, it is worth considering whether, in some form or other, it does not inform some going conceptions of topic and of coherence.

There are various problems with such a view (many of them remarked by my late colleague Harvey Sacks in various of his lectures; see also the discussions in Levinson, 1983, pp. 313-315; in Jefferson, 1984, *passim*; and in Tannen, 1984, pp. 41-43, who, however, believes that these problems can be overcome). One of the problems with this view is the way in which temporality and sequentiality figure in it. Such a treatment depends on already having the subsequent parts of the text in hand, and presumes the appropriateness of using the later parts as interpretive devices for the earlier parts. But some first sentence (or set of sentences) can have a diversity of potential relevancies, and a hearer (in real time) does not have what follows as a way of selecting among them; he or she must *produce* what will turn out to have followed, based on an analysis of the initial item(s) *without* the "later text." In real talk-in-interaction, coherence and topic must in the first instance be constructed into the talk and progressively realized, not found.

With respect to coherence, one mode of approach may be characterized as beginning with observations about devices which provide for "coherence," and asking what units (or sorts of units) these devices relate in a coherence relationship, and how. This way of proceeding may, however, leave out of consideration bits of text, or talk-in-interaction, which do not appear to be picked up by such a procedure. That is, the

analysis is responsible for adequately analyzing any parts of the text that are related to each other by coherence relations, but it does not necessarily insist on *everything* in the text being so related (e.g., Halliday & Hasan, 1976, pp. 27, 295).

By contrast, for the concerns which preoccupy me here, analysis must resonate the concerns of hearers, and (by virtue of speakers' orientations *to* hearers' orientations) those of speakers as well. From that point of view, the issue of coherence is systematic and omnipresent, and is subsumed under, and as one version of, the generic question for parties to conversation (Schegloff & Sacks, 1973), "why that now." From this point of view, nothing in the succession of talk or other conduct in interaction can be omitted. Coherence should be findable for everything that is a demonstrably relevant aspect of the talk for the parties, or there should be evidence of trouble or of its suppression.

As noted above, often the notion of coherence in conversation is used in a manner which suggests that it is understood to refer to the topical relationship of a string of successive utterances; they are "about" the same "thing" or related "things." In the sequence I hope to sketch, it will be apparent that topic (however defined) may change within the boundaries of a still ongoing sequence without subverting the coherence or structural integrity of that sequence. (I take it as obvious enough that a number of discrete sequences can be initiated and completed in the course of a single topic-focused spate of talk.) If this is the case, then understanding what conversational coherence is, how it is constituted, and how the capacity to talk in a manner that constitutes it develops over time in the growth of individuals will require an account of the formal structure of sequences in talk-in-interaction (initially in conversation, of course). Such an account may have to be analytically substantially independent of reference to topic, even though in particular sequences of talk sequence structure and topical coherence may be thoroughly intertwined.²

The talk which I will examine is taken from a telephone conversation between two teenagers, aged approximately 14 to 15 when the conversation was recorded in 1974). Bonnie and Jim were at the time on-again-off-again boy/girl friends. After an opening section and first topic/se-

² For those who approach coherence from a Hallidayan point of view, I am addressed here to that "structural" component of discourse which Halliday separates from the cohesion practices which are the focus of his concern. As Halliday and Hasan (1976) themselves remark after mentioning the "adjacency pair" as a form of discourse structure (a structure on which the following discussion is based), "The discourse structure of a conversation is in turn reinforced by the cohesion, which explicitly ties together the [presumably independently—EAS] related parts" (p. 327; and see the larger discussion at pp. 326–327).

quence which have no discernible bearing on the matter at hand,³ and after a brief gap of silence at the end of the latter, the talk proceeds as follows.

- 001 B: But- (1.0) Wouldju do me a favor? heheh
 002 J: e(hh) depends on the favor::, go ahead,
 003 B: Didjer mom tell you I called the other day?
 004 J: No she didn't.
 005 (0.5)
 006 B: Well I called. (·) [hhh]
 007 J: [Uhuh]
 008 (0.5)
 009 B: 'hhh 'n I was wondering if you'd let me borrow your
 010 gun.
 011 (1.2)
 012 J: My gun?
 013 B: Yeah.
 014 (1.0)
 015 J: What gun.
 016 (0.7)
 017 B: Donchuh have a beebee gun?
 018 J: Yeah,
 019 (0.8)

³ The first sequence/topic is not entirely without relevance to the talk on which this chapter will focus. Aside from establishing that there is a meeting which both participants must attend and which is referred to at the end of the sequence we shall examine, it can be argued that the sequence may well have been an aborted approach to the matters taken up in the sequence examined in the body of the present paper, a point which Bruce Dorval has suggested in discussions of this first sequence. I wish to make three points in this regard.

First, as far as I can make out, nothing in the analysis here presented is materially affected by analysis of the preceding sequence.

Second, including an analysis of the preceding sequence would, accordingly, simply extend the spate of talk properly to be incorporated in our analysis of a single expanded sequence.

Third, and most important, there is much else to be said about the spate of talk to which I here address myself—much else which I think is more or less in hand, and undoubtedly a great deal else which has not yet been tapped or even suspected. I confine myself to a single theme of analysis here, and include only what I think necessary to carry through that line of analysis adequately. I try to show that this long stretch of talk is hung on a single underlying sequential armature which gives it structural coherence. Whatever does not bear on this theme, or is not necessary to allow the reader to see the relationships I am claiming, is excluded from the analysis, however interesting or important it may otherwise be. Of course, if such excluded analysis bears negatively on the claims I am making, that makes them relevant indeed, and their exclusion an error on my part.

Accordingly, I have provided in Appendix 2 the transcript of the talk preceding the point at which the analysis begins.

- 020 B: (I'm a-) It' [s-]
 021 J: [Oh] : I have a lotta guns.hehh
 022 B: Yuh do:?
 023 J: Yeah. aWhat- I meant was which gun.
 024 (0.5)
 025 B: Tch! 'hhh Oh (0.4) uh::m (0.4) t! 'hhh (0.5) well
 026 d'j'have a really lo:ng one,
 027 (0.8)
 028 J: A really l:ong one.hh [h
 029 B: [Yeah.
 030 (0.2)
 031 B: 't doesn't matter what ki:nd.
 032 (1.0)
 033 J: Why:: would you like a >really long one.<
 034 (0.8)
 035 B: Y'don' have a really long one.
 036 (1.0)
 037 J: What?
 038 B: Y- Donchuh have a l- really long one?
 039 J: Yea::hhh. A- all I wan' to know why you want a
 040 [gun,]
 041 B: [Oh] oh: OH::
 042 (0.5)
 043 B: Well: (0.7) becu:z, I'm do [ing
 044 J: [You're gon] na shoot
 045 your mo:m. [Go ahead.]
 046 B: [Heheh]
 047 (0.2)
 048 B: 'hh eheheh 'hh Because I'm I'm doi- heheh (0.8) 'hhh
 049 I am doing- a pl- a thing. (0.3) 'hhh in drama.
 050 (0.6)
 051 B: It's like- (*) kind of like- (*) you know what
 052 a pa:ntomime is?
 053 J: Uhh: hhh! (0.5) Yeah: I know.
 054 B: An:- I'm doin a pantomime (*) off a record
 055 [called]
 056 J: [Yuh gon] na be doin' it up on stage in
 057 front of the whole school?
 058 B: No:: no no::,
 059 J: Nuh: [huh]
 060 B: [jis' in] my drama class.
 061 J: Yeah I know. =
 062 B: =In front of my [drama class.]
 063 J: [I mea:n,] in your class
 064 when it ha:: (0.2) 'hh like you do it at lunch?
 065 (0.7)
 066 B: No, uhm jis' do it- during- drama period.

- 067 J: Uhuh,
 068 (0.5)
 069 B: Thank Go(h)d.(h)u(hh) 'h [hh
 070 J: [(hheh)
 070 B: Uh::m, and so I'm doing it off a record
 071 called "Annie Get Your GUN," (0.2) and it's called
 072 "Doin What Comes Natchurly" an' she's got a gu:n.
 073 (1.0)
 074 J: An' you're A:nnie.(')hh
 075 (0.3)
 076 B: Yea:h.
 077 J: ehheheh 'hh
 078 (0.2)
 079 J: You a good- (') uh:: (1.8) actress?
 080 (1.0)
 081 B: No: heheheh?
 082 (0.5)
 083 J: Th'n how d'ju come out to be A:nnie.
 084 (1.0)
 085 B: No- I'n- it's jis' thet- everybody in the class has
 086 to do a different- (') pantomime, you know?
 087 J: Uhuh,
 088 (0.4)
 089 B: An :
 090 J: [Y] eah:, you can use 't,
 091 (0.4)
 092 B: 'hh Ca:n?
 093 J: >Yeh-<
 094 B: 'hh 'dju bring it to the meeting?
 095 (')
 096 B: The lon:gest one you [h a]ve.
 096 J: [>Sure<]
 097 (0.4)
 098 B: [An']
 099 J: [The] lon:gest one?
 100 B: The lon::gest one.
 101 (0.8)
 102 J: I tell yuh wha:t, I'll bring you my good one.
 103 (0.2)
 104 J: Oh:: no:,
 105 B: No, if you're- I mean don't gim- your-
 106 [gimme ()]
 107 J: [Say why don'tchuh come over.
 108 (0.2)
 109 B: 'hhhh Uh::m
 110 (0.5)
 111 J: Cause my: uh:: (') tch! hh it's a good beebie

- 112 g(h)un(h), 'hhh shootinwise, b't it doesn't look
 113 all that good. really.
 114 (0.2)
 115 B: 'hhh Okay w ell-
 116 J: [So,]
 117 (1.2)
 118 B: Uhh
 119 J: Why ['onchu come over, <I've got two gu::ns an' why
 120 'onchuh pick one.
 121 (0.5)
 122 B: Tch! Alright well I'll have to bring my friend
 123 because she is coming to the meeting and then I
 124 have to take her home..
 125 J: Okay.

II

A sketch of the structure of this sequence begins with the observation, or claim, that this long stretch of talk is organized around, and as a series of expansions on, one instance of what I take as the basic unit of sequence construction—the adjacency pair.

I will not review here the features of this unit (Schegloff & Sacks, 1973), beyond noting that, in its basic minimal form, it is composed of two turns, each by a different speaker, adjacently placed (that is, one after the other), of which one is a recognizable "first" (or first pair part—FPP) such as a question, request, offer, invitation, summons, announcement, etc., and the second is a recognizable "second" (or second pair part—SPP) such as an answer, grant, rejection, acceptance, response, acknowledgement, assessment, etc. Ordinarily, there are alternative "seconds" which constitute relevant responses to some "first." These are not symmetrical or sequentially equivalent; rather some may be termed *preferred* and others *dispreferred* (cf. Pomerantz, 1984; Sacks, 1987 [1973]; Schegloff, 1988b), these properties being distinct from the motivational commitments of the participants. (For example, hosts may find themselves "compelled" to invite someone to a party whom they would rather see not come, and that person may strongly prefer not to attend, but the interactional/sequential features of the sequence can result in them being brought together nonetheless.) This minimal, two turn, core or base form of the sequence can be expanded in various ways and in various positions—preexpansion before the first part of the pair, insert expansion between the first and second, and postexpansion after the second pair part.

The core or base adjacency pair here, around which the rest of this stretch of talk is organized, I take to be constituted by the request (a

"first pair part") at 009-010 (" 'n I was wondering if you'd let me borrow your gun.") and the grant/accession (a "second pair part") at 090 ("Yeah, you can use it"). Other parts of this talk were produced by reference to these basic sequence components and are to be understood by reference to them.

Perhaps the first issue to be addressed should concern the question of how six utterances, at the first eight lines of the transcript we are working with, can be said to be organized by reference to something which has not yet been said, and how they can be said to require understanding—by both the interlocutors and by us as professional analysts—by reference to that, as yet unspoken, utterance. Several observations are in point.⁴

First, it might be noted that the core of Bonnie's utterance at line 001, "W'dchuh do me a favor?" appears to be one subtype of a kind of sequential structure several times discussed in past work, especially of Sacks's and mine. I refer to the *presequence*—an ambiguous term both of whose possible meanings are intended. On the one hand, presequences are types of turns meant to be understood as specifically *pre* (or preliminary) to some contingently projected sequence start—thus, preinvitation, prerequest, preannouncement, etc. This sense of presequence stresses the *pre*. On the other hand, these specifically preliminary turn types themselves engender sequences; they are themselves first pair parts, and make some response (from a restricted set of relevant response types, generally second pair parts) relevant next. This sense of presequence stresses the *sequence*.

So, presequences are sequences, initiated by turn-types built to be specifically preliminary to some other turn-type, whose subsequent occurrence is projected to occur contingent on the response which the interlocutor gives to the presequence's first pair part. Many presequences contingently project particular sequence types (as is implied by terms such as *preinvitation*, *preannouncement*, etc.), and we may call them *type-specific* presequences.⁵ Bonnie's utterance at line 001 initially appears to be one of these, namely, a prerequest.

In general, one job presequences are designed to do is to explore the likelihood that the utterance being prefaced, and the action(s) it will do, will not be responded to in a dispreferred way—will not, for example,

⁴ Many others must be passed over in the interests of containing this account within tolerable limits—for instance, I shall leave unremarked (beyond this notice) the laugh tokens with which Bonnie ends her turn and Jim begins his at the beginning of the sequence.

⁵ Others are not type-specific, but are rather "generic" presequences. They project further talk, but not particular types. The prototype is the "summons-answer" sequence, or the general "attention-getting" device (Schegloff, 1968).

be rejected. That, for example, is what preinvitations such as "Are you doing anything" appear to do. In the case of requests, which may themselves not be the preferred way of acquiring some object or service, the prerequisite can make possible an offer by interlocutor before the actual request need be spoken. Thus, three main types of response can be relevant after a prerequisite: one which forwards the talk to the projected sequence type (a "go-ahead"); one which blocks the talk from proceeding to the projected sequence; and a preemptive response, in which a recipient of the prerequisite offers what he or she thinks the other will request. In the sequence under examination, for example, which directly follows talk about a meeting which is "mandatory" for both the participants in the conversation, Jim might have inferred (were these the circumstances) that Bonnie needed a ride to the meeting, and might have offered a ride in next turn after line 001, obviating the need for an explicit request on Bonnie's part. As it happens, of course, this was not relevant to the case at hand. We can note that, of the three response types sketched above, Jim gives the first (at line 002; here, and throughout the chapter, I strongly urge the reader to consult the transcript whenever referred to), but makes explicit the contingency to which the presequence is directed in the first instance—the possibility of rejection ("depends on the favor").

All this said, the possibility must be raised that this utterance is not to be understood as a prerequisite at all—or not as a prerequisite alone. Bonnie's 001 is produced in a format elsewhere (Schegloff, 1980) termed an *action projection*, other instances of which are utterances such as "Can I ask you a question?" and "Let me tell you something."

Action-projections are regularly used in two ways. One of these is as a *predelicate*. That is, the use of such an utterance may sound the alert that a particularly delicate utterance or action is upcoming (that is, one which the speaker takes to be especially delicate), and may, by its very production, confer the attribute of delicateness on an utterance/action which may not otherwise have borne it blatantly. In the sequence under examination, to the generic sensitivity of requests is added the special delicateness of the request being made here, a specialness reflected in the receipt which the request gets.

A second use of action-projections is as *prepres*, that is, as preliminaries to preliminaries. It is notable that, in a great many occurrences of this practice, the action-projection is not followed directly by the projected action, but by a preliminary to it. After "Can I ask you a question," speakers generally do not ask a question, or do not ask *the* question they intended to ask, but insert a preliminary (or if they do ask *the* question they had projected, *it* turns out to be a preliminary to something else). In this usage (and it is by far the most common usage of

action-projections), then, what follows the action-projection is something other than the projected action (and that is why this form of talk merits the name *prepre* rather than *prerequest*, for what it seems preliminary to is not a request itself, but a preliminary to the request).

Note, then, that at line 003 Bonnie provides not the request she had appeared to be projecting in our earlier analysis, but something else. Although the "something else" does not appear to be any strategic precondition to the request, it is a something which intervenes between the presequence and the projected action, in a manner canonical for action-projections. The ground has, in that sense, been sequentially prepared for it; it has been sequentially accommodated.

Note next that intervening between the presequence at line 001 and the request at 009-010 are two exchanges, in adjacency pair format. They are not overtly addressed to the favor mentioned in line 001 and requested in lines 009-010. Rather, they are claimably concerned with the topic "I called the other day".

(I say "claimably" because it can also be claimed that other topics are involved or could be, that the two sequences have different topics—the first being concerned with whether "mom told," and that what topics they are concerned with is itself a continuously shifting matter and not treatable as statically formulatable, as I have done. These issues might well be inescapable were we to deal analytically and in detail with Bonnie's saying, "Well I called" instead of "Well I did," in light of Jim's apparent focus on "mom's telling" when he says, "No she didn't." I leave these matters aside for now, in order to make a more general point which I think will hold across all these issues, employing a simplest, that is, most vernacular, sense of topic.)⁶

⁶ Some remarks may be in order to provide some sense, however rough and unargued, of the interactional issues animating these two exchanges which come between the pre- and the request?

First, at 003, "Did your mom tell you I called the other day?". For one thing, if the answer is "yes" then issues are presumably raised about, e.g., how come he didn't call back. Also, if Bonnie had told the mother what she wanted, and if the mother passed on the message to Jim, that could have consequences for the form the telling should take now. So, along these lines, there are complaints, apologies, excuses, and the like as potential consequences of a "yes" answer, together with consequences for the form of Bonnie's telling. A "no" answer is "simple" in its consequences for ensuing talk now; it may make relevant only a certain testiness about Jim's mother, possibly realized here in Bonnie's reuse of the full form in "I called" rather than "I did" (drawing here from the connection which may have shown up in some of Barbara Fox's data, in her UCLA Linguistics dissertation, linking reuse of full form instead of proterm to disagreement, when reference to persons is involved).

There are two things tucked into 003—"I called the other day," and the question "Did your mom tell you . . ." If the answer is "no" then the former becomes in effect a kind of

Various lexical and semantic ties connect the parts of the adjacency pairs at 001–002 (e.g., “favor”/“favor”), 003–004 (“Did your mom . . .”/“no she didn’t”), and 006–007. And 009–010 (“let me borrow”) can be analyzed as the specification of the “favor” mentioned in 001. However, the lexico-semantic ties between 001/002 and 009/010 on the one hand and 003–008 on the other hand are by no means apparent, even though, when the request itself is done, it is linked to this inserted preliminary by a conjunction, and the preliminary is used to provide a history for the request.

What I mean to point out is the integrity of the sequential relationships here, the sequential structure of the presequence if you will. This sequential structure leads us, as it leads the participants, to search for a meaningful relationship between topically disparate exchanges of talk.

announcement. Actually, although she has already sort of announced it by mentioning it at 003, she announces it again at 006, now “doing it as an announcement.”

What is involved in announcing such a thing? For one thing, Bonnie can be showing that this is not the first occasion for the request. That is, she has used the request as an occasion for initiating this contact (although she seems to have done the talk about the meeting first, perhaps to displace a dispreferred sequence from first topic/reason for call position). In any case, she can be showing the magnitude of the request by making available that this is the second call it has engendered—something he would not have known if mother hadn’t told him. Bonnie not only tells him, and tells him twice; she explicitly connects it to the request. What could have been just a mitigator for the request, i.e., “I was wondering if you’d . . .” now becomes almost equally a vehicle for historical reportage: “Well I called. ‘n I was wondering . . .”

Indeed, the point here seems to be the order of the elements. That is, by doing the “Wouldju do me a favor” first, the mention of the prior call becomes informed by it, and gets understood as having been about this favor, without that having to be said explicitly. Had “Did your mom tell you. . .” been done first, it would remain to be said from ground zero what that call had been about. Indeed, it could be noted that, although “Did your mom . . .” can be heard as almost interruptive because of its apparent lack of topical continuity or coherence, it is not prefaced by the misplacement marker (Schegloff & Sacks, 1973, p. 319ff.) it might well have been given had it come up for its speaker as an “afterthought”—i.e., “By the way, did your mom . . .” Indeed, this was not misplaced; it was placed quite precisely and informedly.

Further, a likely response to “Did your mom tell you”, if the answer is “no”, is “No + [further talk],” and a candidate for the addition is “what did you call about” and that allows the request to be done as a matter of telling about the prior call, which is a rather modulated way of doing the request. In fact, Jim does use a “no + [further talk]” format, but the addition does not inquire at all about her call. Indeed, it explicitly focusses on the frame sentence, not the embedded one, as what the utterance is all about; it totally fails to address the embedded report. That may have something to do with why Bonnie repeats it in full at 006. Once again, Jim could treat it as a matter for further inquiry—e.g., “what about?” He doesn’t. He offers just an acknowledgement, or at most a continuer allowing that there is more to tell. Bonnie avails herself of the latter possibility, in building her request as a sort of telling about the call, but it does come off much more as a current request than as a recounting.

The coherence here is provided by the sequential structure, not by any topical linkages. Indeed, it is the sequential structure which provides the basis for finding some topical linkages across what are, at the surface, topically unrelated and noncohering utterances.

III

The talk from line 001 to line 008, preceding as it does the first part of the core of the sequence (the request at lines 009–010), may be termed a *preexpansion*. The minimal, two-turn version of the basic adjacency pair is expanded before its first pair part. Talk which elaborates or expands the sequence between its first and second pair parts may in parallel fashion be termed *insert expansion(s)* (Schegloff, 1972). There is considerable such talk between the first pair part at 009/010 and the second pair part (the granting of the request) at 090.

Two major types of insert expansions are, on the one hand, those which are directed overtly to the clarification of the first pair part which has preceded, and, on the other hand, those which are directed to establishing the conditions (e.g., collecting necessary information) on which a decision between alternative second pair parts may be contingent or requisite for executing a projected second pair part (as knowing where interlocutor is leaving from is requisite for giving directions in response to a request for them).⁷

The lengthy insert expansion in the sequence under examination includes components of both sorts. Because the first type, which occurs first in this sequence, engenders some confusion among the parties and requires some disentangling, we shall take it up only after examining what occurs temporally later in the sequence.

Consider, then, the following rough sketch of the segment. At line 032 and then again at 038/039 Jim asks Bonnie why she wants a (really long) gun. Since some response has been made conditionally relevant by the request for a gun, what the response will be appears to be contingent on the answer to this inquiry. (Just as, earlier, Jim had made the answer to "Wouldju do me a favor" contingent on "depends on the favor," he now again appears to make acceding to the request for a gun contingent on "why you want a gun," and underscores the point by offering a (presumably) mock response himself, "You're gonna shoot your mom," at line 043/044.)⁸

⁷ Cf. Schegloff (1972) where such a pre-direction-giving insert expansion is described.

⁸ This is an instance of a practice described elsewhere (Schegloff, 1987b) as the "joke-first" answer. The present instance is unusual in that it is done by the questioner, whereas it is ordinarily done by a question-recipient.

At line 047 Bonnie begins a response, sustained through a number of increments in the face of a number of interruptive sequences by Jim. One such "next" increment is interrupted at 090 by Jim's granting of the request. (Here, as throughout this text, I have not inserted the relevant segments of transcript each time they are discussed, relying on the reader to consult again the transcript of the whole sequence provided at the outset. It is crucial to the understanding of the paper that the reader confront the discussion in the text with the transcript of the talk of which the discussion is meant to offer an account.) Note that Jim interrupts the telling with an inquiry at 055/056 (engendering a subsequence which lasts until 062) and another at 063, these two subsequences ending at 069. At line 070 Bonnie resumes the telling which was interrupted at line 053/054 and shows that she is resuming by reusing the phrase ". . . I'm doing it [pantomime] off a record called. . . ."⁹ Her account is "brought to an end" by having it arrive at the piece of information ". . . an' she's got a gun" at line 072, thereby finally linking to the question which has engendered this telling, ". . . why you want a gun" at 038/039.¹⁰ But Jim has additional questions which focus, not on the gun, but on the rest of Bonnie's telling—that she is to play Annie, and on the quality of her acting and her qualifications for the role (074–088), before he responds to the request with the core second pair part at 090. I hope that this very rough sketch is sufficient to allow the sequential structure of this segment of the talk to be discernible.

I wish to make only one point about this part of the insert expansion, and that is along the same lines as the point which I stressed about the preexpansion. The "topic" of Bonnie's telling, and of Jim's interrogation of her, is her performance for drama class. Although produced under the aegis of the question "why you want a gun," the telling touches on that matter only once, at Bonnie's intended completion (072), and there it is not honored by Jim, whose ensuing questions have no apparent relevant bearing on "why you want a gun," but are directed to the "performance in the drama class." So much is this the case that, when Jim grants the request at line 090, this comes virtually "out of the blue." It seems almost interruptive, not so much of the talk with which it in fact overlaps, but of the topic then apparently being sustained—performance in the drama class.

⁹ Elsewhere I describe the practice of using the same words to show "what I am saying now is what I was saying before." This is from work in progress, briefly reported in Schegloff (1987a).

¹⁰ Work in progress is describing a practice by which "extended" or multiunit turn answers to questions, sometimes involving stories or story fragments, show that they are coming to an end by the reappearance in them of elements (e.g., words) from the question to which they are a response.

In the face of this, we must note that the apparent topical disparity, or noncoherence, is nonetheless fully contained within a coherent sequential structure. A response to a request is pending; the recipient of the request has asked a question on which the response is relevantly, and transparently, contingent; the answer to the question is topically focused in a manner directed by the question and the questioner; its topic is a matter entirely apart, or substantially so, from the topic of the request, even while the response to the latter is contingent on the response to the former. The sequence remains "well formed" and coherent—an expansion between the two parts of an adjacency pair being in no way unusual. Here again, as in the preexpansion, topical disjunction is compatible with structural coherence and integrity. These are analytically separable matters, which can be empirically linked or not.

IV

We turn next to the first part of the insert expansion at lines 011–042. This is the type I referred to earlier as a clarification of the first pair part. If the segment of insertion sequence examined in the preceding section can be called *presecond*, then the segment under examination here is *post-first*. In insert expansions, postfirsts regularly precede preseconds. What the first pair part is, and has made relevant, gets addressed before the contingencies of response are.

In examining this segment of talk, I must confine myself to a very rough analytic parsing that will be relevant to the theme of the volume, while eschewing the more systematic analysis that would deal with what is going on interactionally here in greater depth.

Recall that the talk we are examining directly follows Bonnie's request at 009–010. The initial response to the request is a *next turn repair initiator*, or NTRI (Schegloff, Jefferson, & Sacks, 1977), at 012, and it is delayed by a 1.2 second gap. Both of these are regular indications that some dispreferred response type is "in the works." (cf. Pomerantz, 1984; Sacks, 1987 [1973]) In the case of a request, the response of which they may be a preindication is rejection, this being the dispreferred response type. What follows the response to the NTRI (a response—"yeah"—which reaffirms the request rather than backing down from it) is another gap (at line 014), giving further indication that a rejection may be brewing. Once again, opportunities to change the request, back down from it, clarify it, explicate it are passed. Jim's next utterance (at line 015) is a complicated one which will turn out to be a source of trouble for the participants.

Its *prima facie* format is that of another NTRI, in one of the canonical formats for next turn repair initiation—a partial repeat + question word. The target of this repair—its “trouble source”—is the same as the trouble source for the first NTRI, namely, the phrase “your gun” in the request. The first NTRI (“My gun?” at 012) targeted the trouble source by making it the object of a partial repeat of prior turn (with appropriate change of pronoun to adjust for the change in speaker). The second targets it, and further specifies it, by repeating “gun” as a frame for what is now marked as the focal repairable by replacing it with a question word, “what gun.” The trouble which this NTRI means to mark (we and Bonnie learn a moment later) is that “your gun” displays the presupposition that Jim has one gun, leaving the central question, “will he lend it or not?” But for Jim, he has more than one gun, leaving as a prior question the determination of which gun the request is referring to. It is this “trouble” which the NTRI at 015 (“*what gun*”) is apparently designed to address.

As it happens, however, the phrase constructed by Jim to do this job is hearable, not only *constructively*, that is, with its sense built up from its components, but also *compositely* or idiomatically.¹¹ Heard in the latter way, “*what gun*” is understandable as a denial that the speaker possesses a gun. In the context of a request sequence—that is, where a request has made some second pair part relevant, whether grant or rejection,—such an utterance can amount to a rejection. It can be understood, that is to say, not as a repair *preliminary* to a response, but as the response itself. The sequential environment of a *delicate* request may even conduce to such a hearing of an utterance which is ambiguous in the sense that it is accessible to alternative hearings/understandings (Schegloff, 1984 [1976]). What Jim built to be a follow-up repair initiator, further identifying the “trouble” with the request turn and trying to specify the object of the request, is hearable as a rejection of the request by denying possession of that which is being requested. As the utterance at 017 shows, this is the way Bonnie hears it, and she responds by questioning the assertion by which the rejection seems to her to be being done.

For Bonnie, then, they are no longer in an expansion *between* the parts of this adjacency pair, they are in an expansion *after* its second pair part—a postexpansion. Recipients of dispreferred responses (such as rejections) can take different tacks toward them. (For a discussion of this area, cf. Davidson, 1984.) They can accept them and allow the sequence

¹¹ I take these terms and their referents from Sacks' 1964–65 lectures (1989). See also the discussion in Schegloff (1987b).

to close, or they can take issue with them in various forms of sequence expansion (to vastly oversimplify what happens after rejections), the latter tack clearly being the one taken by Bonnie here. The response to her challenge makes clear that Jim has more than one gun (his "lot'v guns" is a boast, to be scaled down later at line 118), the details of this sequence not requiring our attention beyond noting Bonnie's surprise (line 022) at the assertion, understandable in view of her just prior understanding of line 015 as a denial of any guns at all, and her prior apparent belief that he had but one.

It is Bonnie's reaction to his "what gun" at line 017, and the sequence it sets off, which displays to Jim that Bonnie has understood it, not as a question which is initiating repair in search of a specification of the request, but rather as a denial of her request. In line 023 he undertakes to repair the misunderstanding with a *third position repair*. This term names repairs initiated in just this position—after a responsive turn has displayed to a prior speaker that, and how, the prior turn has been misunderstood (Schegloff, in preparation). One recurrent source of misunderstandings which are subject to third position repair are just such utterances which are accessible to both constructive and composite understandings (Schegloff, 1987b). Although the format through which the third position repair is initiated here varies somewhat from the quite regular format ordinarily found, it clearly is doing the same job—redoing the trouble source turn so as to allow its recipient to respond to it again, but under a revised understanding of its import.

Here, Jim locates what the target of the repair is by reproducing its format, with a new "question word" ("which" instead of "what") in contrastive stress with the earlier phrase whose format is reproduced. The utterance at line 023, in particular its second part or turn-constructive unit, thus is offered as a replacement of line 015, with the understanding that it should be responded to under a different analysis than was accorded 015. At line 025–026, Bonnie first registers the replacement/repair ("Oh"; cf. Heritage, 1984) and then addresses herself to the now reunderstood tack that Jim has taken.

In the second part of the turn at 025–026, Bonnie addresses herself to "which gun" and offers a (further) specification of her request as being for "a really long one." Her response to "which gun" is itself formatted as a question, a yes/no type question, and is accordingly itself analyzable as potentially opening a sequence. Such a sequence could be understood either as seeking to establish that there is this sort of gun to ask for, or as reenacting in now-specified form the original request. Such a sequence, on either analysis, would take a "yes" or "no" answer, with the "yes" clearly preferred, whether confirming the availability of such

a gun or actually granting the request for it. However, at the same time, this utterance at 025–026 is an answer to Jim's "which gun," an answer which happens to have been put in "question" format. These different aspects of the utterance project sharply different sequential consequences.

The critical issue here appears to be the import given the format of Bonnie's response to "which gun". Jim seems to take it as an *answer*, specifying the gun which is wanted as "a really long one." He appears to disattend the question format, as perhaps just a matter of "politeness" (e.g., the answer might have been "a really long one, if you've got it," with the contingency clause upgraded to a sequence, giving its recipient greater rejective power with less effort; he can just say "no," and doesn't need "I don't have a really long one," etc.). Bonnie, on the other hand, appears to take the question format seriously, that is, as opening a sequence, either requesting information or reinstating a now-specified request for the gun. Jim's line 028 ("a really long one") gets quite different interpretations and has quite different sequential and interactional implications in these two contrasting versions of the sequential context, along the following lines.

Taking Bonnie's utterance ("well d'j'have a really long one") as just an answer, Jim (at 028) is "receiving" or "recepting" that answer to his question—possibly with a bit of puzzlement at the terms in which the answer has been formulated. Taking Bonnie's utterance as a question—a yes/no question with a "yes" preference—Jim's "a really long one," especially coming as it does after an 0.8 second gap of silence, appears to project the imminence of a dispreferred response.

One issue, then, is: Exactly how many sequences are open here, and where are the parties' utterance situated within them. Certainly the "base" or "core" sequence—initiated by the request at 009–010—is still open (or "open again," if "what gun" had been earlier treated momentarily as a rejection). But is the sequence initiated by "which gun" still open? And is there a sequence open which was initiated by "D'ja have a really long one?"?

Bonnie's talk here is produced under the aegis of *her* understanding of the sequential context of that talk. Treating her utterance at 025–026 as opening a sequence (either a subordinate information-gathering one, or a renewal of the request), Jim's 028 after the gap can be taken as possible prerejection. Following her initial response at line 029 ("Yeah"), there is another brief gap, and her follow-up response ("t doesn't matter what kind") is followed by another gap. Both Jim's response at 028, and the gaps of silence interwoven with it, contribute to produce a failure of that contiguity of response which ordinarily charac-

terizes preferred responses to first pair parts, as Sacks (1987 [1973]) has shown with special reference to yes/no questions. So when Jim breaks the silence at 032 with yet another question, yet further delaying a response to her question about a "really long one," Bonnie takes it that a dispreferred response is what is being broadly "hinted at," and preemptively states it herself at 035.¹²

On a different grasp of the developing sequential context, however, Bonnie has not opened a new sequence at 025–026 but has just answered Jim's question "which gun." His "a really long one" is, then, not "after a first pair part" and breaking contiguity (as it was in the previous analysis), but is "after a second pair part," marking the second pair part as of potentially special interest and perhaps puzzlement. The nature of the puzzlement is explicated by the question at line 033, "Why would you like a really long one," a question which in this view does not further delay an answer to "d'ja have a really long one," but follows up on the question "which gun" as part of determining whether or not to accede to the original request.¹³

If Jim is operating with this last-mentioned grasp of the developing sequential context, it is not surprising that he would be puzzled at the response he gets to his "why would you like a really long one" question: "you don't have a really long one." *Perfectly coherent sequentially on Bonnie's view of the sequence, it is structurally incoherent in Jim's, even though the topic is (obviously) the same for both, and the utterance is topically coherent with the surrounding utterances on either reading.* In an earlier discussion we noted the possibility of *topical divergence or change in the context of sequence-structural coherence*; here we have the possibility of *a breakdown of sequence-structural coherence in the context of the integrity of topical coherence.*

Jim expresses his puzzlement with a repair initiator, "What?" at 037, and Bonnie responds canonically by backing down in "epistemic strength" from assertion to preference-marked question in her reply at 038.¹⁴ As his "yeah" at 039 asserts, it turns out that Jim was not pre-denying possession of a really long one. And here again, as he did just before

¹² For another instance of an anticipatory or preemptive guess at a possible reason for imminent rejection following a "delay in response" by interlocutor, cf. Drew (1984, p. 134), instance #5, line 9.

¹³ This is suggested as well by the later (039) "All I wan' to know why you want a gun."

¹⁴ Note that this sequential origin yields the form of the question "Donchu have a really long one" at 038, in comparison with the original form "do you have a really long one" at 025–026. (Note as well that "a really long one" appears to have become a temporary "package," as Bonnie aborts the saying of "a l-[ong one]" in favor of "a really long one" at line 038.)

with "what gun/which gun," he undertakes repair of a misunderstanding of an earlier utterance.

In this case, as in the earlier one, something not meant to be a rejection has been taken as one. In the earlier case, the source of the misunderstanding was the ambiguity between constructive and composite (or literal vs. idiomatic) hearings of the utterance. Here it appears to have been a difference in the understanding of the sequential context in which the utterance was produced and was accordingly to be understood.¹⁵ Jim moves to rectify the situation at 039-040, "All I wan' to know why you want a gun." After the earlier effort to repair misunderstanding, Bonnie registered her "change of state" (cf. Heritage, 1984) with "oh"; here she registers it triply at 041, and then begins a response to the reunderstood utterance, in a segment previously discussed (cf. Appendix 1).

V

I noted earlier that, when Jim finally responds to the request with a second pair part at line 090, it seems almost interruptive of the talk then in progress. An inspection of that line in the context of the preceding lines might suggest to a reader not familiar with the larger sequence that this is an utterance incoherent in its context. Certainly topically it has little to do with the immediately preceding utterances. The closest topical connection is the possible tie of "it" in 090 to "gun" in 072, but, of course, those do not refer to the same gun, and their relationship is available only from knowing the larger sequential context.

Yet 090 gets heard by Bonnie as the response to her request. It gets that hearing without benefit of other linkages to the original request turn. Note, for example, that 090 permits her to "use it," a verb form not previously employed in this sequence, whose original request was to "borrow your gun" (009-010), and whose subsequent usage was "have" (017, 025) or "want" (038). In spite of no surface lexical connections either to the immediately preceding utterances or to the initial request and its subsequent formulations, Jim's utterance is grasped.

To be sure, there is a moment's delay (at 091), and the utterance is subject to repair initiation in next turn. But what is most striking is that the repair initiation does not reflect a recipient "at a loss" to understand so potentially decontexted an utterance, for which NTRIs such as "huh?" or "what?" are ordinarily used. This repair initiator is out to

¹⁵ Another case of this, but with different sequential structures being implicated, is discussed in Schegloff (1984 [1976]).

confirm that a positive rather than negative form was used,¹⁶ that is, that the response was a granting of the request, despite the rejection heavily projected by the multiple insertions and long delay of response. This hearing of the response, and the type of repair addressed to it, are facets of the organization of the *sequence*. It is by her orientation to position in a continuing, open sequence that Bonnie hears and grasps 090, and finds what to repair in and about it.

Although there is more postexpansion to this sequence, in which issues already taken up are taken up again, for the purposes of our concern with the sources of coherence in topic and sequence, they are not of great interest.

VI

I have tried to show that the structure of sequences in talk-in-interaction is a source of coherence in its own right. Disparate topics can occur coherently within the framework of a single, expanded sequence and achieve coherence by being framed by it. An utterance apparently coherent topically with preceding talk can appear incoherent nonetheless if it is structurally anomalous within the sequence it is part of. And an utterance with no obvious surface ties to either its immediate topical context or to the sequential origins to which it is responsive is nonetheless accessible to understanding by the participants, who are oriented to the pending business of the as-yet open sequence.

Whatever solutions may be in the offing to the vexing problems in settling upon an analytically useful notion of topic, the structure of sequences will supply us as analysts with a crucial tool in understanding the coherence of stretches of talk of varying sizes, from two utterances in consecutive turns to extremely long spates of talk. It will do so because sequences, both in minimal adjacency pair format and in multiply expanded forms, are a generic form of organization for parties to talk-in-interaction.

Professional analysts sometimes lose sight of the constitutive role of sequentiality in talk and treat talk as a collocation of single sentences, which are to be inspected for either coherence or arbitrariness (e.g., Schiffrin, 1985, p. 660, "Both conversationalists and discourse analysts attempt to find criteria which allow them to differentiate a discourse which is coherent from a random collection of sentences"). But for parties to talk-in-interaction, utterances are built in some sequential context

¹⁶ Jefferson (1978) has shown that the contrast between positive and negative is a recurrent site of equivocal production, and a recurrent target of repair.

in the *first* instance—are inspectable as built *for* some sequential position in the first instance.

Coherence is, for the participants, programmatically relevant; it is not an alternative “hypothesis,” equivalent with randomness. Participants are oriented to finding coherence—“if they can”; that is the import of the “why that now” question. Professional accounts of the sources of, and resources for, coherence offer proposals about ways which participants in talk-in-interaction have of meeting that “if they can” constraint. Such accounts propose various different orders and organizational domains of coherence which the talk can allow, or compel, parties to the talk to address and find. Professional analysts will need to include the tool of “sequence organization” among the resources of coherence—because practicing speakers and recipients employ it.

APPENDIX 1

It may be worth noting (cf. the chart following the text of this appendix) the apparent structural parallels between two series of turns examined in the text of this chapter, parallels which are nicely underscored by the fact that, except internally to “equivalency blocks,” wherever there is an interturn gap in one sequence, there is an interturn gap in the other. The sole exception to this is just after Jim reformulates “what he means”; there is a gap before the “oh” in the first sequence (before 025) but not the second (before 040), possibly related to Bonnie’s unsureness about how to respond to the first—the appropriate terms of description.

I call attention to this apparent reduplication of structure, not only because it is so striking and suggests a robustness of organizational and sequential coherence, but because claims of parallelism, albeit not necessarily of exactly this sort, have been noted at least twice before in the literature. One such reference is by Schenkein (1980); the other is by Michael Silverstein (1984). I cannot here examine the sequences which they explicate in conjunction with the one discussed in the body of the present chapter. I have been skeptical about the import of such claimed parallel structures in the past. Perhaps it is time for a reassessment.

B: Let me borrow (009)	<-->	d’j’have a really long (026)
(gap)		(gap)
J: My gun (012)]	A really long one (028)
B: Yeah (013)	<-->	Yeah (029)
		(gap)
B:		’t doesn’t matter (029-031)
(gap)		(gap)

J: <u>What</u> gun (015) (gap)	<-->	Why would you like . . . (033) (gap)
B: Donchuh have . . . (017)]	[You don't have . . . (035) (gap)
J:	<-->	What? (037)
B:]	[Donchuh have . . . (038)
J: Yeah (018) (gap)]	[Yeah (039)
B: (I'm a-) It//s (020)	<-->	
J: Oh I have a lot (021)	<-->	
B: Yuh do? (022)	<-->	
J: Yeah (023)	<-->	
J: What I meant was (023) (gap)	<-->	All I wan' to know . . (039)
B: Oh (025) (gap)	<-->	Oh Oh: OH:: (041) (gap)
B: Uhm (pause) well dja have a really long (026)	<-->	Well (pause) becuz . . . (043)

APPENDIX 2. THE BEGINNING OF THE CONVERSATION

- 044 ring ring
-043 J: H'lo,
-042 B: H'lo Jim?
-041 J: (Hi-)/(Hah-?)
-040 B: Hi.
-039 (')
-038 B: It's Bonnie,
-037 (')
-036 J: Yeah = I know
-035 (0.3)
-034 B: *Oh yeah: yih know*
-033 (0.2)
-032 B: U::mhh tch! are you going to the meeting t'nigh(t)?
-031 (0.5)
-030 J: Is it t'nigh?
-029 (0.4)
-028 B: Yu:h it's t'nigh,
-027 (0.4)
-026 J: Oh wow. I jus' got u:p. off the cou:ch.
-025 (')
-024 J: My head's hurting. 'hhh haw [h hh ()]
-023 B: [Why is it] hurting.
-022 (1.5)
-021 J: I 'o know, (h)huh

- 020 (0.2)
 -019 J: 'hh I ain'- jis' di'n git m'ch sleep lately huh,
 -018 (0.8)
 -017 B: (Pt) Oh
 -016 J: hhh=
 -015 B: =So you're- (*) Well, are you goin on the
 -014 sn[ow tr] ip?
 -013 J: [Yeh]
 -012 J: What?
 -011 B: Are you goin' on the snow trip?
 -010 J: iYeh.
 -009 B: Tch 'hh Oh cuz this m-meeting's "man da to ry:."
 -008 (1.6)
 -007 J: Wha:?
 -006 B: This meeting is mandatory.
 -005 J: Mandatory.
 -004 (0.2)
 -003 J: All right, t!hehh
 -002 B: 'hhh
 -001 (0.2)
 001 B: But- (1.0) Wouldju do me a favor? heheh
 002 J: e(hh) depends on the favor::, go ahead,
 Etc.

REFERENCES

- Butterworth, B. (Ed.). (1980). *Language production. Vol. 1, Speech and talk*. London: Academic Press.
- Button, G., & Lee, J. R. E. (Eds.). (1987). *Talk and social organization*. Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.
- Craig, R. T., & Tracy, K. (Eds.). (1983). *Conversational coherence: Form, structure and strategy*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.
- Davidson, J. (1984). Subsequent versions of invitations, offers, requests, and proposals dealing with potential or actual rejection. In J. Atkinson & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Structures of social action* (pp. 102-128). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Dorval, B., & Eckerman, C. O. (1984). *Developmental trends in the quality of conversation achieved by small groups of peers*. SRCO Monographs (No. 206).
- Drew, P. (1984). Speakers' reportings in invitation sequences. In J. Atkinson & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Structures of social action* (pp. 129-151). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Drew, P., & Wootton, A. (Eds.). (1988). *Erving Goffman: Exploring the interaction order*. Oxford, England: Polity Press.
- Garfinkel, H., & Sacks, H. (1970). On formal structures of practical actions. In J. C. McKinney & E. A. Tiryakian (Eds.), *Theoretical sociology* (pp. 338-366). New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.

- Halliday, M. A. K., & Hasan, R. (1976). *Cohesion in English*. London: Longman.
- Heritage, J. (1984). A change-of-state token and aspects of its sequential placement. In J. Atkinson & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Structures of social action* (pp. 299-345). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Heritage, J. (1985). Analyzing news interviews: aspects of the production of talk for an 'overhearing' audience. In T. van Dijk (Ed.), *Handbook of discourse analysis, Vol. 3: Discourse and dialogue* (pp. 95-117). London: Academic Press.
- Hobbs, J. R. (1985). *On the coherence and structure of discourse*. (Report No. CSLI-85-37). Center for the Study of Language and Information, Stanford University.
- Hobbs, J. R., & Agar, M. H. (1985). *The coherence of incoherent discourse*. (Report No. CSLI-85-38). Center for the Study of Language and Information, Stanford University.
- Jefferson, G. (1978). What's in a 'nyem'? *Sociology*, 12(1), 135-139.
- Jefferson, G. (1984) On stepwise transition from talk about a trouble to inappropriately next-positioned matters. In J. Atkinson & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Structures of social action* (pp. 191-222). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Keenan, E. O., & Klien, E. (1975). Coherency in children's discourse. *Journal of Psycholinguistic Research*, 4, 365-379.
- Keenan, E. O., & Schieffelin, B. B. (1976). Topic as a discourse notion: A study of topic in the conversations of children and adults. In C. Li (Ed.), *Subject and topic*. New York: Academic Press.
- Levinson, S. C. (1983). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Li, C. (Ed.). (1976). *Subject and topic*. New York: Academic Press.
- Pomerantz, A. (1984). Agreeing and disagreeing with assessments: Some features of preferred/dispreferred turn shapes. In J. Atkinson & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Structures of social action* (pp. 57-101). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Reinhart, T. (1980). Conditions for text coherence. *Poetics Today*, 1(4), 161-180.
- Sacks, H. (in preparation [1964-1972]). *Lectures on Conversation*, edited by G. Jefferson. Oxford, England: Basil Blackwell.
- Sacks, H. (1987 [1973]). On the preferences for agreement and contiguity in sequences in conversation. In G. Button & J. R. E Lee (Eds.), *Talk and social organization* (pp. 54-69). Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.
- Sacks, H. (1989 [1964-65]). *Lectures on Conversation for 1964-65*, edited by Gail Jefferson. *Human Studies*, 12, forthcoming.
- Schegloff, E. A. (1968). Sequencing in conversational openings. *American Anthropologist*, 70, 1075-1095.
- Schegloff, E. A. (1972). Notes on a conversational practice: formulating place. In D. N. Sudnow (Ed.), *Studies in social interaction* (pp. 75-119). New York: Free Press.
- Schegloff, E. A. (1980). Preliminaries to preliminaries: 'Can I ask you a question.' *Sociological Inquiry*, 50, 104-152.

- Schegloff, E. A. (1984 [1976]). On some questions and ambiguities in conversation. In J. Atkinson & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Structures of social action* (pp. 28–52). (First appeared in *Pragmatics Microfiche*, 1976) Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Schegloff, E. A. (1987a). Analyzing single episodes of interaction: an exercise in conversation analysis. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 50, 101–114.
- Schegloff, E. A. (1987b). Some sources of misunderstanding in talk-in-interaction. *Linguistics*, 25, 201–218.
- Schegloff, E. A. (1988a). Goffman and the analysis of conversation. In P. Drew & A. Wootton (Eds.), *Erving Goffman: Exploring the interaction order* (pp. 89–135). Oxford, England: Polity Press.
- Schegloff, E. A. (1988b). On an actual virtual servo-mechanism for guessing bad news: A single case conjecture. *Social Problems*, 35(4), 442–457.
- Schegloff, E. A. (in preparation). *Repair after next turn*. Unpublished manuscript.
- Schegloff, E. A., Jefferson, G., & Sacks, H. (1977). The preference for self-correction in the organization of repair in conversation. *Language*, 53(2), 361–382.
- Schegloff, E. A., & Sacks, H. (1973). Opening up closings. *Semiotica*, 7, 289–327.
- Schenkein, J. (1980). A taxonomy for repeating action sequences in natural conversation. In B. Butterworth (Ed.), *Language production. Vol. 1, Speech and thought* (pp. 21–47). London: Academic Press.
- Schiffrin, D. (Ed.). (1984). *Meaning, form, and use in context: Linguistic applications*. Georgetown University Round Table on Languages and Linguistics, Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.
- Schiffrin, D. (1985). Conversational coherence: the role of 'well.' *Language*, 61(3), 640–667.
- Silverstein, M. (1984). On the pragmatic 'poetry' of prose: parallelism, repetition, and cohesive structure in the time course of dyadic conversation. In D. Schiffrin (Ed.), *Meaning, form, and use in context: Linguistic applications* (pp. 181–199). Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.
- Tannen, D. (1984). *Conversational style: Analyzing talk among friends*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing Corp.
- Zimmerman, D. H. (1984). Talk and its occasion: The case of calling the police. In D. Schiffrin (Ed.), *Meaning, form, and use in context: Linguistic applications*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.

Conversational Organization and its Development

edited by

Bruce Dorval
Long Island University, Brooklyn Campus

Volume XXXVIII in the Series
ADVANCES IN DISCOURSE PROCESSES
Roy O. Freedle, Editor

1990



ABLEX PUBLISHING CORPORATION
NORWOOD, NEW JERSEY