

**Between and within:  
Alternative sequential treatments of continuers and assessments**

CHARLES GOODWIN

Department of Anthropology, University of South Carolina, Columbia, S.C. 29208, U.S.A.

**1. Introduction**

The primary source of data for the study of language has typically come from the activities of speakers. Noticeably lacking within linguistics has been systematic study of the actions of hearers. However there are strong grounds for conceptualizing language as intrinsically social in the sense that its prototypical organization includes not only an entity who produces speech but also another who attends to that talk. From such a perspective talk is not simply a form of action but a mode of interaction.

Recently some attention has been given to the hearer in contemporary speech act theory; for example Clark and Carlson (1982: 35) state

speech acts cannot be fully understood without considering the hearers as well as the speakers. Speech acts are directed at real people . . .

However Clark then proceeds to define speech act theory in such a way that what the hearer actually does is beyond the scope of what legitimately can be studied (Clark 1982: 54):

Speech-act theory, . . . is a theory about the speaker's intentions, not about the hearer's successful recognition of those intentions and subsequent behavior . . .

The effect of such a definition is to exclude any study whatsoever of what hearers actually do. In essence the hearer is dealt with only as a figment of the speaker's imagination, and not as active coparticipant in their own right.

Such a restricted view of the hearer does not seem either accurate or adequate. Speakers in fact treat what their recipients are doing as central to the

organization of their talk. John Haviland (1977: 228) reports that in the Sarakama village where he was doing ethnographic research

The headman of the village, wanting to make a formal speech to me, had to go out and find a 'listener' before he could talk at all – since I myself was unable to 'listen' with the appropriate responses.

The headman's perspective on the importance of hearers' actions is valid not only for his culture but for our own as well. Study of how turns at talk in conversation are constructed has demonstrated that speakers may modify the emerging structure of the sentence they are producing in response to what their recipient is doing (or not doing).<sup>1</sup> Within such a process talk emerges not from the actions of speaker alone, but rather as the collaborative product of a process of interaction between speaker and recipient(s).<sup>2</sup> This suggests that focusing all analysis on the speaker while treating the hearer as an entity imagined by speaker is not appropriate. Rather it seems more fruitful to actually look at what hearers do, and investigate how what they do is relevant to the organization of the talk of the moment.

Previous research<sup>3</sup> has demonstrated that recipients use a range of both vocal and nonvocal action to display to speakers (1) whether or not they are acting as hearers, and (2) how they are analyzing and participating in the talk of the moment. The present paper will focus on a particular type of recipient action: the vocal responses made by recipients in the midst of extended talk by another speaker. The following provides an example:<sup>4</sup>

(1) HGII:35

- Hyla : One time I member, 'hh 's girl wrote  
 end her, 'hh she wz like (.) fifteen er  
 six [teen end] her mother doesn let'er wear  
 → Nancy: [Uh hu:h, ]  
 Hyla : 'hh nail polish er sh(h)ort ski::rts  
 'er: [:: 'hhhhhhh ] =  
 → Nancy: [Oh: w:(h)w ] =  
 Hyla : =Oo:h no I remember what yesterday was

To describe more precisely the phenomena to be investigated we will first note briefly some structural characteristics of the talk that Hyla is producing, and then look at the responses to that talk made by Nancy. Crucial to the issues to be dealt with in the present paper is the fact that Hyla's talk contains not just a single turn-constructional unit<sup>5</sup> (such as a clause or a sentence) but rather a series of such units. For simplicity such a multi-unit turn will be referred to

as an extended turn at talk. In addition we will call the party producing such a turn the ‘speaker’ and the party responding to it the ‘recipient’, while recognizing that recipient in fact also produces talk.

Looking now at Nancy’s talk, we find that during Hyla’s extended turn she produces two brief vocalizations, ‘Uh hu:h’ and ‘Oh: wo:(h)w.’ Such bits of talk, produced by recipients in the midst of another’s extended turn have frequently been analyzed as ‘back channel behavior’ (Yngve, 1970; Duncan and Fiske, 1977). Schegloff (1982) criticizes such an approach for a number of reasons, including the fact that it attempts to analyze recipient’s behavior in isolation from speaker’s talk. Focussing on their sequential organization Schegloff notes that many of these vocalizations – the prototypical example being ‘uh huh’ – function as ‘continuers,’ actions displaying recipient’s understanding that an extended turn at talk is in progress but not yet complete, while simultaneously collaborating in the achievement of that multi-unit utterance by passing the opportunity to either (a) produce a more extended turn of their own or (b) initiate repair on the talk just heard.

Some of the brief responses produced by recipients seem to go beyond this. Thus, Nancy’s ‘Oh: wo:(h)w,’ rather than simply acknowledging receipt of the talk just heard, assesses what was said by treating it as something remarkable. She thus analyzes that talk in a specific way and produces action that is responsive to its particulars. For clarity responses of this type will be referred to as assessments.

This suggests that the brief recipient vocalizations that occur during ongoing talk might in fact be divided into different classes. When the behavior of participants toward them is examined in empirical data this possibility is supported. Though assessments and continuers occur in roughly the same environment – i.e., in the midst of extended talk by another speaker – the detailed sequential treatment each receives reveals that they are in fact being treated as different types of phenomena. Such process will now be looked at in more detail.

## 2. Continuers as bridges between units

As suggested by Schegloff’s analysis of ‘uh huh’ as a term treating the current unit as part of a more extended series of units, this term frequently bridges the end of one unit and the beginning of a next. For example:

### (1) HGII:35

Hyla : One time I member, ‘hh ’s girl wrote  
 end her, ‘hh she wz like (.) fifteen er  
 six [ teen end ] her mother doesn let’er wear,  
 → Nancy: [ Uh hu:h, ]

## (2) HGII:11

Hyla : En she's fixed up, (0.4) en she meets this gu:y, 'hh a:n'  
yihknow en he's (.) rilly gorgeous rilly nice en  
everythi [ ng but li ] ke

→ Nancy: [ Uh h u:h ]

Hyla : 'hh He's ah 'hh Hollywood (0.3) s:star's

## (3) HGII:12

Hyla : This girl's fixed up onna da- a bline da:te.An' the(g)-  
en turns out t'be this gu:y. =

→ Nancy: [ Uh hu ] :h,

Hyla : = [ [ 'hhhh ] [ An' they goes oh I hear yer of  
the Jewish faith

In these data speaker moves to a next unit while recipient is still producing the 'uh huh' acknowledging receipt of the prior. Such patterning supports the argument that 'Uh Huh' functions as a continuer, a display by recipient that they are prepared for movement to a new unit. First, recipient's 'Uh Huh's do not occur just anywhere within the turn but rather at the boundaries of turn-constructural units, precisely the sequential position that is able to demonstrate both that one unit has been received and that another is now awaited. Second, speaker feels free to begin that next unit before the 'Uh Huh' itself has been completed, i.e., she treats it precisely as a signal to continue.

Moreover this process is accomplished with considerable precision. Thus in (1) and (2) recipient shows that she is tracking the emerging course of the current turn-constructural unit by beginning her response not after that unit is finished but rather just before it reaches completion, specifically during the final syllable of what is recognizable as the final word of that unit.<sup>6</sup> For her part, speaker then begins a new unit immediately, i.e., one syllable after recipient starts to speak, with the effect that there is no gap whatsoever (not even a definitive terminal pitch contour which would be marked in the transcript with a period) between the end of one unit and the beginning of a next. Thus speaker's movement from one unit in her talk to a next, despite the speed with which it is accomplished, is embedded within a process that includes the close coordination of her actions with those of her recipient.

Clearly not all 'uh huh's actually begin within one turn-constructural unit and end in another. This does not, however, undercut what has been demonstrated by the present data, namely that speaker's moving to a new turn-constructural unit while recipient's 'uh huh' is still in progress is a proper and appropriate thing for speaker to do. Indeed this is perhaps the clearest structural way for a speaker to demonstrate that recipient's action has been understood precisely as a continuer, and to act upon that understanding.

### 3. Assessments

Assessments can occur in roughly the same environment as ‘uh huh,’ for example in the midst of extended turns at talk by another. However they are not treated like ‘uh huh’ by speaker, and indeed appear to have a different sequential organization. Briefly, rather than bridging two turn-constructional units assessments in the midst of another’s extended talk come to completion before a new unit is entered. For example:

(4) HGII:13

Hyla : I don’kno-ow, how it’s  
           g’nna b [ e, ] fer the- pla ] :y.  
 → Nancy : [ Oh ] w o : : w, ]

(5) G.50:00:45

Dianne : ·HHSSS! O(h)r, ·hhh y’know (if) she’e be in th<sub>r</sub>room’n  
           we’d- ·hh kinda put toilet paper across so  
           thet when she open’up the door whe’d aftuh co:me,  
           yih kno:w.

(0.4)

(Dianne): ss-ss =

Dianne : = la [ mbastin [ g through it ]  
 → Clacia : [ °Oh:: [ °Ghho::d, ]

(6) HGI:37

Nancy : = A:bbey jus-side with the mo:: [ :m, ]  
           Hyla : \_\_\_\_\_ [ ekhh ] u- =  
           Hyla : I wz so [ mad et [ that. ]  
 → Nancy : [ G o : : [ : d. ]

In these data, unlike the situation with the continuers looked at above, recipient’s assessment is brought to completion within the unit in which it began.

#### 3.1 Work to prevent assessments from intruding into subsequent units

It might be argued that placement within the boundaries of a single unit is not a distinctive property of assessments since some ‘uh huh’s also occur in such a position. However an active orientation by participants toward placement of the assessment *within* the current unit is demonstrated by cases in which the assessment has the potential to extend into a subsequent unit. In such a situa-

tion participants actively work to prevent this from happening, a state of affairs in marked contrast to that which holds for 'uh huh,' where such bridging is considered quite appropriate. For example shortly after the continuer analyzed in (3) recipient produced a brief assessment:

## (3) HGII:12

- Hyla : This girl's fixed up onna da— a bline da:te.An' the(g)–  
 en turns out t'be this gu:y.=
- Nancy:  
 Hyla : = [ [ Uh hu [ :h,  
 Hyla : = [ [ ·hhhh [ An' they goes oh I hear yer of  
 the Jewish faith yihknow so 'ere's  
 a whole thing i [ n that [ t, ·hhhhhh ] =  
 → Nancy: [ Q h : [ w Q : w ] =  
 Hyla : = A:n then they go t'this country club

Recipient's assessment extends past the end of the speaker's current turn-constructural unit. However by producing an inbreath speaker delays production of a subsequent unit until recipient's assessment has been brought to completion. Thus in these data speaker treats the two responses that recipient makes quite differently: The 'uh huh' is overlapped by the beginning of a new unit, but entry into a subsequent unit is held off while recipient's assessment is in progress.

What might such positioning tell us about how participants are differentiating recipient's actions? The placement of the assessment within the boundaries of the current unit treats the assessment as in some sense tied to what is happening in that unit, and indeed, unlike continuers, assessments display an analysis of the particulars of what is being talked about, an analysis that might not be appropriate to the talk that will follow. Holding off a subsequent unit constitutes an appropriate way to deal with such an action. Continuers on the other hand do not elaborate on the specifics of what is being said in the current unit but rather deal with that unit as a preliminary to another, an analysis that is validated by speaker's quick movement to that next unit. In brief the present data suggest that recipients have at least two structurally different ways of responding in the midst of another's extended talk – assessments which operate on the particulars of a current unit, and continuers which treat that unit as preliminary to further talk – and that the choices made by recipients have consequences for speaker's actions as well as their own.

To shed further light on why assessments might occur during the talk being assessed we will briefly look at a more substantive recipient assessment:

## (7) HGII:37

Hyla : Abbey says ·hh we::ll, ·hh you haftih give yer mother chance tuh (r) to: u (.) realize thet she: ·hh hass– thet she c'n respectchu'n that c'n only be by you acting matu:re. ·hh en not c'mplaining about the way she– m– yihkno:w =

→ Hyla : = [ [what] ru [ :le she se [ t s [do:wn, ]  
Nancy : = [ [Oh:, ] [Come o n [are y [ou se ] riou [ s, ]  
Hyla : [ I = ]

Hyla : s:šwea [ r.tih Go:d. ]  
Nancy : [ ·hhhawhhhhhh ]

(Hyla) : = °·hh–·hh°  
(0.5)

Hyla : a-I wz [ °shho hhh [ ma:d ] .°  
Nancy : [ Ihh don't [ buh ] ] ieve– I don't read her,

Extensive overlap is sometimes viewed as an intrusion into the talk of the speaker being overlapped, i.e. an 'interruption'.<sup>7</sup> Here however not only does Hyla fail to treat Nancy's simultaneous talk as problematic for her own, but she in fact provides an answer to that talk in her next utterance. She thus demonstrates that even though she was saying something else while this talk was being spoken she not only heard and understood it, but is prepared to treat it as the event in the conversation that she will utilize as the basis for her own subsequent action.

Moreover the particular kind of talk being done by recipient may be relevant to its placement during speaker's talk rather than after it. Rather than simply acknowledging receipt of the information Hyla is providing, Nancy performs specific operations on it, i.e., assesses it in a particular way as remarkable, 'hard to believe', etc. The positioning of these comments during the talk, rather than after it, seems to enhance rather than detract from the activity being done. By speaking where she does Nancy is able to perform her outraged comments while the object being commented on is still present. What results is a particular type of participation in the talk of the moment, this participation being constructed in part through its occurrence while Hyla's talk is still in progress.

Even brief assessments of the type that are the focus of the present paper can embody elaborated participation displays (note for example the stress and sound stretches in (3)), which permit recipient to react to the talk in progress by showing enthusiasm, appreciation, outrage, etc. By positioning the assessment within the current unit speaker provides recipient a place for this display to run its course before proceeding to further talk.<sup>8</sup>

Several additional examples of speaker's delaying entry into subsequent

units while assessments are in progress will now be examined. We will begin by looking again at example (1):

## (1) HGII:35

- Hyla : One time I member, 'hh 's girl wrote  
end her, 'hh she wz like (.) fifteen er  
six [ teen end ] her mother doesn let'er wear  
→ Nancy: [ Uh hu:h, ]  
Hyla : 'hh nail polish er sh(h)ort ski::rts  
'er: [ :: 'hhhhhhh ] =  
→ Nancy: [ Oh: wo:(h)w ] =  
Hyla : = Oo::h no I remember what yesterday was

Here recipient's assessment is timed to coincide with the projected completion of a three part list that speaker is producing.<sup>9</sup> However speaker never produces that third item. Instead she abandons her current line of talk in favor of another one that she displays as suddenly having been remembered. At the point where the line is abandoned recipient is beginning an assessment. Rather than moving immediately to her subsequent unit speaker produces an inbreath that ends precisely as recipient's assessment is completed.

The elaborated and apparently spontaneous 'oh' marking the discovery<sup>10</sup> occurs as soon as recipient's assessment comes to completion but not a moment before (the equal sign in the transcript indicates that Hyla's talk follows the prior without any break whatsoever), and this despite the fact that the discovery of the new topic is offered as an event which is entitled to disrupt the talk currently in progress. Such a state of affairs stands in marked contrast to the treatment given the 'uh huh' that occurs a moment earlier, which speaker feels free to overlap with the beginning of a new unit of talk.

In the following speaker receives no recipient response during either the completion of her current turn constructional unit or an inbreath that follows it. At that point she produces something that is semantically marked as the beginning of a new unit, a conjunction. Conjunctions of this type (note for example the extended sound stretches within it) in this sequential position frequently act as solicits for recipient response of some type<sup>11</sup> and indeed at this point recipient does produce an assessment:

## (8) HGII:36

- Hyla : Y'know specially some(h)thing that'd sh-w'd show her  
          navel, 'hhhh [ A : : n : : d, ] =  
Nancy: [ °°hhhh Ghod. ] =  
Hyla : = En Abbey agreed thet you don't.



Though the assessment in these data occurs well after the completion of speaker's original unit, and indeed during a type of talk, a conjunction, that semantically displays movement to a new unit, speaker nonetheless arranges her talk so that the assessment does not co-occur with what in fact becomes her next unit. As soon as recipient's assessment is finished speaker uses a second conjunction to display that the talk now in progress is an entirely new unit, a unit begun after recipient's assessment has been completed. Thus despite the distance of the assessment from what is in fact the end of the prior unit, it does not intrude into the boundaries of speaker's next unit. Moreover the division of the talk in this fashion is not accidental but rather accomplished through systematic work by speaker – for example the use of a second conjunction immediately after a first.

The possibility that speakers might actively work to organize their talk so that recipient assessments are placed before the talk in progress moves to a new unit invites us to reexamine data in which the concurrent placement of the assessment initially appeared unproblematic. Consider again example (4), only this time with special attention to the structure of speaker's talk while recipient's assessment is being spoken:

(4) HGII:13

Hyla : I don'kno-ow, how it's

→ g'nna b [ e, ] fer the- pla ]:y.  
Nancy: [ Oh ] w o : : w, ]

At the point where Nancy begins her assessment, Hyla is producing an intonation contour (the comma in the transcript marks a falling rising contour) that could be used to close the current turn-constructural unit. Immediately on hearing Nancy's 'Oh' Hyla adds additional talk to this unit (and note how the fact that the additional talk begins with a preposition displays that it is to be heard as a continuation of the talk just produced rather than as the beginning of new talk). In brief the concurrent placement of Nancy's assessment might result not from her actions alone, but also from work that Hyla does.

The actions of the participants in the data which have been analyzed support the possibility that as types of recipient response assessments are distinguished from continuers. In brief it appears that within extended turns at talk<sup>12</sup> participants work to place assessments so that they do not intrude into subsequent units, while finding it quite appropriate for continuers to bridge separate units. Such differences in sequential placement suggest that as responses assessments and continuers might be dealing with the talk in progress in quite different ways. Continuers treat a unit of talk as part of a larger series of units. However, through their sequential placement within individual units assessments deal

with the specifics of what is happening in those units rather than the way in which these units are sequenced relative to other units. Recipients thus have at least two different ways of dealing with the talk they are hearing. On the one hand they can attend to individual units as emerging elements of a larger structure that is not yet complete, while on the other they can comment on the specifics of what is being, and has been, said without treating it as a preliminary to something else, i.e., with assessments they can in some sense deal with the specifics of the talk in progress as phenomena in their own right rather than as a prelude to further talk.

#### 4. Conclusion

Once assessments and continuers are focussed on as distinguishable phenomena it becomes clear that they differ from each other not just in the details of their sequential placement within an extended turn, but in other significant ways as well.

First, though assessments can take the form of talk with clear lexical content (for example 'Oh wow' and assessment adjectives such as 'beautiful'), they can also be done with sounds such as 'Ah:::' whose main function seems to be the carrying of an appropriate intonation contour, as well as gesturally (cf. M. Goodwin, 1980). In this they resemble continuers, which can be performed both with talk whose lexical status is not always granted, and with appropriate gestures such as nods. In view of the way in which both continuers and brief assessments are characteristically situated within a rather specialized environment, the ongoing talk of another, it is not surprising that they share these characteristics. Indeed in so far as these features provide minimal lexical and auditory interference with the other talk already in progress, they are precisely some of the adaptations that would be expected of action able to function in such an environment. Given such structural similarity in action that is also quite brief, the clarity with which assessments can be distinguished from continuers becomes interesting. If in fact these objects are doing different work in the same environment, the salience of their distinctness from each other becomes an important feature of the structure of each. In view of the economy and clarity that brief assessments require, it is all the more remarkable that many of them, through the details of the way in which they are pronounced and their intonation contour, are able to convey quite detailed, even intricate, information about their speaker's involvement in both the assessment and the talk of the moment.

Second, while 'uh huh' seems to be restricted to placement in the midst of extended talk by another, assessments can occur at the completion of such ex-

tended turns as well. Indeed assessments are one of the prototypical ways of bringing an extended turn such as a story to completion. Such differential placement is quite compatible with what has already been noted about the organization of these phenomena. For example, insofar as a continuer treats the talk just heard as preliminary to further talk it would be quite inappropriate as a technique for marking completion of an extended turn. On the other hand by virtue of the way in which they appreciate the details of what has just been said without marking that talk as a prelude to something else, assessments are apt structures for doing terminal work on an extended sequence.

Third, 'uh huh' seems to be an exclusively recipient action – indeed its work as a continuer is accomplished precisely through placement relative to more extended talk by another speaker. Assessments, however, can be done by speaker as well as recipient.

Fourth, though analysis in the present paper has focussed on brief assessments (the type of assessment most similar in form to continuers), assessments unlike continuers can in fact take many shapes, some of them quite elaborate with, for example, extended sentences and even sequences of turns being devoted exclusively to the activity of doing an assessment.<sup>13</sup>

In sum, alternative types of action are available to recipients for constructing responses in the midst of another's extended talk. Though the responses themselves are typically brief, the presence of alternatives that can be placed in a variety of sequential positions provides recipients with resources that enable them to participate in speaker's emerging talk in a differentiated fashion, something which has consequences for speaker's actions as well.

## Notes

1. For specific analysis of such phenomena see C. Goodwin (1979, 1981), M. Goodwin (1980, 1982), Erickson (1979), Heath (forthcoming, 1984), Jefferson (1979, 1983a, 1984), Sacks and Schegloff (1979), Schegloff (1982). See Vološinov (1973) for an early insightful statement about the problems of conceptualizing language without taking into account the hearer.
2. It might seem that written texts, in which producer and recipient are not physically present to each other, provide a strong example of language that does not require an interactive framework for its analysis. However work on such texts (see, for example, Smith, 1982) has shown the reader to be a very active participant in the process of constituting what is to be found in the text.
3. For example the research cited in note 1.
4. Data was transcribed by Gail Jefferson using the transcription systems she developed (cf. Sacks et al., 1974: 731-733). The transcription conventions most relevant to the present analysis are the following:
  - Subscripted left and right brackets mark the beginning and end of overlapping talk;
  - A dot before a series of 'h's (e.g., ·hhh) indicates an inbreath;

- Colons mark sounds that have been noticeably lengthened;
  - Underlining indicates that the talk underlined is spoken with heightened emphasis.
5. See Sacks et al. (1974: 702) for a more complete description of turn-constructional units and the importance they have in the turn-taking process. For analysis of some of the systematic procedures used by participants to produce multi-units turns such as stories see Sacks (1974).
  6. For analysis of how processes of overlap provide evidence for the precision with which recipients are tracking speaker's emerging talk see Jefferson (1973).
  7. Among the work that does not suffer from such a bias is the extensive analysis of overlap that has been done by Gail Jefferson (for example, 1973, 1975, 1983b, 1983c).
  8. For more detailed analysis of both the participation possibilities provided by assessments, and the way in which talk containing assessments can be extracted from a larger strip of talk for treatment in its own terms see Goodwin and Goodwin (1982).
  9. For detailed analysis of how participants utilize three part lists in the organization of their talk see Jefferson (1985).
  10. For more detailed analysis of how 'oh' functions as a change of state token see Heritage (1984).
  11. For more detailed analysis of such phenomena see Jefferson (1983a).
  12. A different organization holds at the ends of extended turns, where a sequence of assessments may be used to close the turn.
  13. For some analysis of such events see Pomerantz (1978).

## References

- Clark, H.H. (1982). The relevance of common ground: Comments on Sperber and Wilson's paper. In N.V. Smith (Ed.), *Mutual knowledge*. New York: Academic Press.
- Clark, H.H., and Carlson, T.B. (1982). Speech acts and hearers' beliefs. In N.V. Smith (Ed.), *Mutual knowledge*. New York: Academic Press.
- Duncan, S., and Fiske, D.W. (1977). *Face-to-face interaction: Research, methods, and theory*. New York: Wiley.
- Erickson, F. (1979). Talking down: Some cultural source of miscommunication in interracial interviews. In A. Wolfgang (Ed.), *Nonverbal behavior*. New York: Academic Press.
- Goodwin, C. (1979). The interactive construction of a sentence in natural conversation. In G. Psathas (Ed.), *Everyday language: Studies in ethnomethodology*. New York: Irvington Publishers.
- Goodwin, C. (1981). *Conversational organization: Interaction between speakers and hearers*. New York: Academic Press.
- Goodwin, M.H. (1980). Processes of mutual monitoring implicated in the production of description sequences. *Sociological Inquiry* 50: 303-317.
- Goodwin, M.H. (1982). 'Instigating': Storytelling as a social process. *American Ethnologist* 9: 799-819.
- Goodwin, C., and Goodwin, M.H. (1982). *Concurrent operations on talk: Notes on the interactive organization of assessments*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Sociological Association, San Francisco.
- Haviland, J.B. (1977). *Gossip, reputation, and knowledge in Zinacantan..* Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Heath, C. (Forthcoming). Interactional participation: The coordination of gesture, speech and gaze. In P. Leonardie and V. D'Orsy (Eds.), *The proceedings of the International Symposium on analysing discourse and natural rhetoric*. Padua: University of Padua.

- Heath, C. (1984). Talk and reciprocity: Sequential organization in speech and body movement. In J.M. Atkinson and J. Heritage (Eds.), *Structures of social action*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Heritage, J. (1984). A 'change of state' token and aspects of its sequential placement. In J.M. Atkinson and J. Heritage (Eds.), *Structures of social action*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Jefferson, G. (1973). A case of precision timing in ordinary conversation: Overlapped tag-positioned address terms in closing sequences. *Semiotica* 9: 47-96.
- Jefferson, G. (1975). *Sketch: Some orderly aspects of overlap onset in natural conversation*. Paper presented at the 74th Annual Meeting of the American Anthropological Association, Mexico City.
- Jefferson, G. (1979). A technique for inviting laughter and its subsequent acceptance/declination. In G. Psathas (Ed.), *Everyday language: studies in ethnomethodology*. New York: Irvington Publishers.
- Jefferson, G. (1983a). Caveat speaker: Preliminary notes on recipient topic-shift implicature. *Tilburg Papers in Language and Literature* 30.
- Jefferson, G. (1983b). On a failed hypothesis: 'Conjunctionals' as overlap-vulnerable. *Tilburg Papers in Language and Literature* 28.
- Jefferson, G. (1983c). Notes on some orderlinesses of overlap onset. *Tilburg Papers in Language and Literature* 28.
- Jefferson, G. (1984). Notes on a systematic deployment of the acknowledgement tokens 'yeah' and 'mm hm'. *Papers in Linguistics* 17: 197-216.
- Jefferson, G. (Forthcoming). List construction as a task and interactional resource. In G. Psathas and R. Frankel (Eds.), *Interactional competence*. New York: Irvington.
- Pomerantz, A. (1978). Compliment responses: Notes on the co-operation of multiple constraints. In J. Schenkein (Ed.), *Studies in the organization of conversational interaction*. New York: Academic Press.
- Sacks, H. (1974). An analysis of the course of a joke's telling in conversation. In R. Bauman and J.F. Sherzer (Eds.), *Explorations in the ethnography of speaking*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sacks, H., Schegloff, E.A., and Jefferson, G. (1974). A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation. *Language* 50: 696-735.
- Sacks, H., and Schegloff, E.A. (1979). Two preferences in the organization of reference to persons and their interaction. In G. Psathas (Ed.), *Everyday language: Studies in ethnomethodology*. New York: Irvington Publishers.
- Schegloff, E.A. (1982). Discourse as an interactional achievement: Some uses of 'uh huh' and other things that come between sentences. In D. Tannen (Ed.), *Georgetown University Roundtable on languages and linguistics*. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.
- Smith, D.E. (1982). *The active text: An approach to analyzing texts as constituents of social relations*. Paper prepared for presentation at the World Congress of Sociology in Mexico City.
- Volosinov, V.N. (1973). *Marxism and the philosophy of language*, transl. Ladislav Matejka and I.R. Titunik. New York: Seminar Press. (First published 1929 and 1930.)
- Yngve, V.H. (1970). On getting a word in edgewise. In M.A. Campbell (Ed.), *Papers from the Sixth Regional Meeting, Chicago Linguistics Society*. Chicago: Department of Linguistics, University of Chicago.