Collaborative turn sequences*

Gene H. Lerner

In conversation, the pre-emptive completion of one speaker's turn-constructional unit (Sacks, Schegloff, & Jefferson 1974) by a subsequent speaker can operate on that unit in a way that transforms it's production into a sequence – a collaborative turn sequence. By completing the prior speaker's turn-constructional unit (or TCU) – that is, by producing a version of what had been projected as a part of the prior speaker's turn – a sequence can be initiated. Here a recipient responds to a prior speaker, not by waiting until completion to act, but by pre-empting that completion as a method of responding. When the completion is addressed to the original speaker in this way, the acceptability of the proffered completion can be implicated as a next action. The original speaker thereby maintains authority over the turn's construction even when completed by another.

Not all proffered completions result in such two-turn sequences. A TCU completion that is addressed to the *original recipient* of the turn-so-far (and thereby concludes the action implemented through that turn for its original recipient) will ordinarily not be treated as confirmable, and thus will not launch a sequence.[1] In this circumstance, the shared authority inherent in the co-construction of an action is left undisturbed by confirmation/disconfirmation, as when two participants co-construct an explanation (Lerner & Takagi 1999) or co-tell a story (Lerner 1992) for the same recipient.[2] In contrast, the present chapter focuses on those proffered completions that do seem designed to launch a sequence – a collaborative turn sequence – in which the original speaker ordinarily reasserts authority over the turn's talk by responding to the proffered completion (or by producing an alternative to it).

The Affiliating utterance as TCU completion

The affiliating utterance that launches a collaborative turn sequence can be characterized by the following observations.

1. Affiliating utterances are used in a wide range of interactional environments and with various types of compound TCUs. What is common to all of them is their use of the constructional format of the ongoing turn as a method to propose a version of the current speaker's projected talk prior to its occurrence (or in the case of teasing or heckling, the affiliating utterance will use the constructional format to pointedly mis-project the content of the turn's completion).

2. Affiliating utterances are *built* to be contiguous with the preliminary component of the TCU-in-progress, and are *placed* in the ongoing turn in a way that displays this contiguity (i.e., through placement at an opportunity space). Thus, affiliating utterances maintain the progressivity of the talk (or at least display an orientation to maintaining progressivity) across a change in speakers.[3] It is this feature that distinguishes a bid for speakership – in the course of another speaker's TCU – that is only a bid for conditional access to that ongoing turn (for pre-emptive completion) from a bid for next speakership at the same point which is a bid to begin a new turn. With pre-emptive completion, the projected turn-constructional format remains unchanged, achieving a syntactically unmarked speaker transition.

   In contrast, other next speaker startups (in the course of an ongoing turn) often display an orientation to their out-of-turn character, i.e., their character as a bid for turn transition at other than a transition-relevance place. This can be done, for example, by using the turn initial position to account for a mid-utterance startup.

   (1) [JJ:Invitation]
         B: I was just gonna say come out and come over here and talk this
              evening. But if you're going out // you can't very well do that.
         C: Talk you mean get drunk, don't you.
         B: what?

Here the turn-initial repeat of "talk" is used to tie C's response to an object in an earlier TCU – once it becomes clear that the next TCU begun in the turn is moving away from the invitation report. Locating a response target that occurred prior to the most recent transition-relevance place provides a warrant

for C's mid-utterance startup as a very late attempt at a response. That is, it locates the prior transition-relevance place as a transition space for a late-starting utterance.[4]

Progressivity is maintained by the contiguous placement of the pre-empting utterance. However, when contiguity is lost (e.g. when the affiliating utterance begins after the current speaker has begun the projected final component) immediate lexical progressivity is relaxed in order to achieve component contiguity. This suggests a relative ordering of component contiguity and sheer lexical progressivity in the sequential structure of the opportunity space. Component contiguity is maintained at the expense of progressivity. (cf. Lerner 1996a: 245–251).

3. Affiliating utterances are produced to bring the turn to completion, and to bring it to completion at the next possible completion. Further, affiliating utterances are oriented-to by their recipients as taking the already-projected turn unit to its next possible completion, and no farther.

Massively, affiliating utterances go only to next possible completion.[5] They are built as a continuation of the turn-in-progress and as a completion to that turn. The initiation of an affiliating utterance is not a bid for continued talk; it is a conditional entry device. What is projectable from the preliminary component of a turn-in-progress is a component type that will bring the turn to the next possible completion. However, when an affiliating utterance is initiated, the projected next *possible* completion is ordinarily as far as that speaker goes, and as far as the prior-as-next speaker allows them to go – the next speaker after the affiliating utterance treating the affiliating utterance as standing in for the completion of the turn it is tied to.

In the following case, this orientation to the affiliating utterance being one turn component long (bringing the current compound TCU to only the next possible completion) is especially visible because the location of the next possible completion is itself unclear.

(2)   [BC:III:Green]
      Caller: ... you _feel_ like you c'n handle _evrything_.
      BC: Mm::://hm::,
      Caller: _and_ anything.
      BC: except a cross wind at the short end a' that _run_way.
      Caller: ·hhh _Oh_ d'crosswind didn' you know wid a J-T'ree, well
      BC: jus' drop one wing an' // slide in,
      Caller: That's right,

The speaker of the affiliating utterance ("jus' drop one wing an' slide in,") produces only the completion of the current turn unit. However, this is overlapped by the next utterance, which is aimed at what could be taken to be an earlier possible completion. The overlap does not occur because the speaker of the affiliating utterance is attempting to produce more than the completion. It occurs because the location of the first possible completion after the onset of the pre-emptive completion is problematic for the participants (cf. Jefferson 1973).

4. Once an affiliating utterance is begun, it is treated by the original speaker of the TCU as a candidate completion. When a second speaker begins in the course of a turn that contains an opportunity space for such completions, and begins in the vicinity of that space, then that speaker's utterance is examined for its within-turn sequential import. That is, it is taken as continuing the current TCU, and as a possible instance of that unit's completion. This can be seen in the following instance.

(3) [GTS]
      Ken: insteada my grandmother offering him a drink, of beer she'll
                say [wouldju-
      Louise: [wanna glassa milk? [hehhh
      Ken: [no. wouldju like a little bitta he'ing?
                ((i.e. "herring"))

Here, the placement of the affiliating utterance ("wanna glassa milk") is central to it not being taken for a new turn beginning. If the target turn is removed from the fragment as in (4), the sequence is transformed into something entirely different.

(4) [GTS]
      Louise: wanna glassa milk? [hehhh
      Ken: [no. wouldju like a little bitta he'ing?

However, a quote is in force and it is projected to be an offer. By beginning the offer after the authorship attribution ("She'll say"), Louise produces an utterance that is not taken to be an actual offer, but a report of an offer by Ken's grandmother. The "no. wouldju like a little bitta he'ing?" is readily understood, not as a rejection of an offer (or even the answer to a question) followed by a counter-offer, but as a rejection of "wanna glassa milk" as a candidate instance of what Ken was about to say.

Affiliating utterances require no special tying devices, while other sorts of mid-utterance startups systematically use such devices as misplacement mark-

ers to suspend the "nextness" for which the utterance will otherwise be in-
spected. Objects placed in the opportunity space are inspected for their turn
continuation features. This is the case even when the affiliating utterance could
otherwise be heard to be the beginning of a new turn as in (3).

In summary, affiliating utterances 1. use the format of the TCU-in-
progress, 2. maintain the progressivity of the utterance from an opportunity
space, 3. bring the turn unit-in-progress to completion and 4. are treated as
candidate versions of what was about to have been said. That is, affiliating
utterances are built as and treated as a turn-completing action.[6]

The collaborative turn sequence

In conversation, turn size is locally managed and interactionally achieved
through a turn-taking system – that is, turn size is not prearranged. Therefore,
as far as the turn-taking system is concerned, any next possible completion
may or may not turn out to be the actual completion of a TCU, and may or
may not turn out to be the place at which transition to next speaker is ac-
complished. However, sequence organization influences turn-taking outcomes.
When an adjacency pair first pair-part occupies a TCU, that unit is likely to be
the last TCU a speaker produces prior to speaker transition (Schegloff & Sacks
1973). This constraint on turn organization is in the interest of preserving the
contiguity of the first and second pair-parts of the sequence (Sacks 1987). Se-
quence contiguity provides one systematic basis for the empirical finding that
pre-empting utterances (at least those that are designed to launch a sequence)
are limited to a single component.

Pre-emptive completions are ordinarily produced as a rendition of 'what
the other was going to say' but are not composed as a guess (e.g. with a
try-marker) that would explicitly inviting acceptance or rejection. However,
pre-emptive completions are taken by the original speaker of the TCU they
complete as *candidate* completions (implementing an action) that can be ac-
cepted or rejected.

The production of 1) a TCU pre-emptive completion by 2) an addressed
recipient of an ongoing turn and 3) addressed to that turn's original speaker
selects that last speaker as next speaker, and sequentially implicates as a next
action, the acceptability of the pre-empting utterance as a completion for the
turn. This is the collaborative turn sequence.

A collaborative turn sequence is a collaboration of two speakers producing
a single syntactic unit not only in that a next speaker produces the comple-

tion to a TCU begun by a prior speaker, and that prior speaker does not continue once the pre-emptive completion begins, but also in that the first speaker ratifies the completion after its occurrence as an adequate rendition of the completion of the TCU they were about to voice.

The acceptance/rejection of the pre-emptive completion – or more precisely, the receipt of the completion in terms germane to the action implemented by the proposed completion – is the relevant next action. [7] However, outright rejection rarely occurs in the receipt slot. For one thing, a pre-emptive completion need not be done, since the action it implements does not ordinarily become conditionally relevant on the completion of the preliminary component of the ongoing turn. Responding actions, for the most part, are made conditionally relevant on completion of the sequence-initiating action – that is, on completion of the turn that carries the action. The completion is occasioned by the production of a preliminary component of a compound TCU, and it can be responsive to the action the ongoing turn is implementing, but in most circumstances that responding action is not called for until possible completion of the full TCU. Responding after the preliminary component, then, is in a sense optional, while responding upon completion may not be. Thus a recipient is free to offer a completion or not under most circumstances. [8]

The receipt slot is the place for the original speaker of the TCU to acknowledge the other speaker's completion as a continuation of their turn-in-progress by accepting it as in (5) or rejecting it as in (6). [9]

(5)   [Theodore]
      A: if you start watering, it [will get gree-
      B: [it will come back
      A: y- yes uh huh

(6)   [H and M]
      Hal: ... the answer is perhaps, though I don't really know, that it <u>isn't</u> a substitution,
      Max: it's a transformation.
      Hal: No it's not even a transformation

Other forms of completion-acknowledging response are possible – that fall somewhere between acceptance and outright rejection as in (7).

(7) [SEWING] (The participants are making a pillow.)
Daughter: Oh here dad (0.2) a good way to get tho:se corners out
            (0.2)
Dad: is to stick yer finger insi:de.
Daughter: we͟ll, that's one way.

In (7) Daughter seems to reluctantly accept Dad's method, but in a way that makes it clear that his proffered method was not the advice she was about to give – though it does acknowledge his completion as the proper type of completion, if not the exact one she had in mind. Another way to acknowledge the pre-emptive completion is for the original speaker to repeat the just-produced completion as in (8).

(8) [DTA: simplified]
B: you don't go primarily because alcohol is obtainable there.
    You go there cz its a whole social interaction. Your gonna
    be doing other things, your gonna hustle ladies, your gonna
    see stuff [yer yer
C: [( ) gonna me͟et pe͟ople
B: yer gonna meet people you know

When this second completion can be understood as substantially repeating the pre-emptive completion, then the original speaker can be seen as acknowledging and accepting it by now incorporating it into their own completion.[10]

The collaborative turn sequence occurs, not across two distinct turns separated by a transition-relevance place, but within the purview of one participant's turn at talk – within that participant's projected turn space. The collaborative turn sequence's sequence-initiating utterance occurs within the turn space of another participant, thereby colliding with the standard turn-taking practice of speaker change taking place at possible completion of TCUs. It is the onset of this second utterance – in this manner – that initiates and shapes the sequence, and informs what action is accomplished through it.[11]

The placement and form of pre-emptive completion re-produces the features of ordinary turn-taking in which one participant speaks at a time and turns are comprised of complete TCUs, while relaxing only the entitlement of a speaker to produce a complete TCU on their own. An orientation to a participant's right to complete one TCU, having been allocated a turn at talk, is nevertheless shown both by the initiation of a small sequence (the collaborative turn sequence) that allocates the next turn to the original speaker of the TCU in order to ratify the proffered completion as in fact 'what was about to have

been said', and by the use of the receipt slot alternative action of delayed completion, a turn-taking system repair device (described in the next section) that allows the original speaker of the TCU to regain speakership of their original turn and complete the original TCU themselves.

One way to further explicate the organization of collaborative turn sequences is through a comparison with repair. There is a striking parallel between pre-emptive completion and other-initiated repair (Schegloff, Jefferson, & Sacks 1977). Both are launched by sequence-initiating actions that locate the just prior speaker's talk as the object on which the sequence operates. Furthermore, both pre-emptive completions (by an addressed recipient) and next-turn repair initiators systematically select that just prior speaker as next speaker. Speaker selection occurs without the use of an address term in both cases. Not only is an address term unnecessary, but will not properly occur. This displays an orientation by participants to the right a speaker has to maintain control or authority over a turn to its completion. That is, the speaker who begins a turn maintains a right to determine what the utterance in that turn space will come to be. For next-turn repair initiators, this means having a right to repair any trouble even though it might be located by another participant. For collaborative turn sequences, this means maintaining control over what the completion will look like even in the face of a second participant making a bid for speakership within their turn space.

Both the speaker of the original turn-in-progress and the speaker of the pre-emptive completion orient to the turn after the pre-emptive completion as a turn allocated to the original speaker. This can be seen clearly in instance (9) in which the addressed recipient of the turn-in-progress (Daughter) produces the pre-emptive completion, but addresses it to Dad, rather than the TCU's original speaker (Mom), thus, in a sense, markedly "shifting" recipients.

(9)   [MOTHER'S DAY]
     Mom: if you should decide to live with a fella
                 (.)
     Daughter: Mom will still talk to me ((laugh))
     Mom: I'll still talk ta ya // but please take- please take the pill
     Dad: I d- I didn' s+

Here, Mom (the original speaker) does a receipt in the receipt slot position, while Dad, who is the addressed recipient of the completion, holds off his denial until sequence completion.

The following instance also suggests that participants other than those involved in producing the collaborative turn sequence take the pre-emptive

completion to be within the current turn space, and treat it as initiating a two-turn sequence with prior speaker selected as next speaker.

(10)   [GTS]
     Dan: but it seemed to be, to Ken at least
     Roger: the wrong kind
     Dan: the wrong kind // of distinction
     Ken: well you don't wanna- I mean

A participant referred to (as opposed to addressed) in the course of a turn can be topically in a position to speak in the turn after next turn – next turn regularly going to a selected recipient of the current turn. (The mentioned participant is excised – in and through the reference – from those present who could be considered a selected recipient.)

In the above instance, Ken is referred to by name, but does not begin to speak until a possible completion is reached in the course of Dan's receipt. The mentioned participant does not begin after the next speaker (Roger), but waits until sequence completion. Thus, there seems to be an orientation to the receipt slot as a place for the original speaker to address the adequacy of the proffered completion.

However, someone other than the original speaker may speak after the proffered completion (i.e. in the receipt slot), or some action other than a receipt may be produced in this slot by the original speaker. First I examine cases in which the speaker of the pre-emptive completion (and not the original speaker) speaks in the receipt slot, and then in later sections I examine other actions the original speaker can take in the receipt slot.

Claiming authoritative knowledge over a pre-empted completion

Though the speaker of an affiliating utterance regularly produces just the completion for the TCU-in-progress and then stops (allowing the original speaker to acknowledge the completion and assess its acceptability), a pre-empting speaker occasionally appends an agreement token to the pre-emptive completion – thus, in effect, pre-empting the receipt slot, as well as the turn's completion.

In (11), which includes two instances of this [completion + agreement token] format, Ann begins by saying that she is not sure of what she is about to propose. Since these assertions are 'produced with uncertainty,' confirmation seems like a particularly relevant next action for Jenny, as a way of revealing or

(11) [Rahman:C:2 (simplified)]
      Ann: Now we've been told but I don't know whether this is true:.
      Jenny: Mm::,
      Ann: that (0.9) no wa:y can you get out,
      Jenny: <once 'n option is started. Ye:s that's right. Yes.
              :
      Ann: Ahn if you nohrn'lly pay ahnnually. ev'n if you hahven't paid
              ye:t,
      Jenny: you've gotta pay up tih date. Yes.

In both cases, Jenny not only claims her authority by confirming Ann's understanding, but she demonstrates her authoritative knowledge by producing the key elements herself. It is just when a speaker is uncertain about their own utterance (or when a recipient can otherwise claim superior personal or membership categorical authority) that the receipt slot may be pre-empted by the speaker of the pre-emptive completion. The uncertainty (or other reduced entitlement to the utterance they are voicing) weakens the original speaker's entitlement to confirm the appropriateness of the completion.[13]

In addition, this format can be used to confirm a pointedly unfinished (and possibly trailed-off) delicate assertion as in (12). (Note that speaker C is actually referring to "grampa" at the beginning of line 1, though she could seem to be addressing him.)

(12) [PV]
      C: well grampa it's bad enough when 'e when he uhm::=tells you how
          much t'make, but when 'e tells you what t' co:ok,
          (0.3)
      M: then it's rilly bad=yeah. yeah // didju- uh
      C: He tol me t' be sure'n check iz minu up there on the wall

Here, M offering the strongly projected, but unspoken, completion as an independently arrived at negative appraisal by quickly appending agreement tokens to it. In this way, she might be said to take equal responsibility for the negative appraisal and thereby for the complaint it helps constitute.[14]

In the next sections, I turn to a discussion of two receipt slot alternatives available to the recipient of the pre-emptive completion (i.e. the original speaker of the TCU): delayed completion and list construction.

Delayed completion as a receipt slot alternative to acceptance/rejection[15]

A recipient of a turn-in-progress can produce a pre-emptive completion which is offered as an assertedly correct completion (i.e., not as a candidate or heckling response), but which is not accepted – but which is also not rejected.[16] One device which provides a receipt slot alternative to pre-emptive completion acceptance *and* rejection is delayed completion. It was noted that pre-emptive completions are rarely rejected. An examination of delayed completion will provide one systematic basis for this finding.

Delayed completion is a device used to link a speaker's current utterance, across the talk of another participant, to their prior syntactically unfinished utterance, by constructing the current utterance as a syntactically fitted continuation of their own prior utterance which completes the turn unit begun in that earlier utterance.[17]

Delayed completion can provide a way to bring a current TCU to completion in the clear after another speaker initiates an utterance in the course of that turn unit.[18]

```
(13)  [GTS]
      Ken:    Seems like every week somebody- somebody in this group gets
              stepped on royal. Somebody gets- gets com
      Roger:  Why doncha all step on me.
      Ken:    pletely cremated.
```

Its use provides a way to resolve an overlap of utterances by stopping talking, while not losing the competition for the turn space.

```
(14)  [GTS]
      Dan:    as a matter of fact we may not have a group going after // the uh
      Roger:  maybe you're screening 'em too hard
      Dan:    next couple of weeks
```

Delayed completion is a current-speaker device for handling onset of speech by another participant within a TCU – with or without simultaneous speech, as in (14) and (13), respectively. For a next-speaker device see Schegloff's (1987) description of "recycled turn beginnings."

In addition, delayed completion can be used to turn a possibly complete TCU into merely the first part of a TCU the delayed completion now finishes.

(15)   [GTS]
    Roger: I don' wanna accept that responsibility.
              (0.7)
              cause I'm not trained along those lines
              (.)
    Dan: Mh=
    Roger: =so I wanna bu- I don' wanna raise an underachiever. (0.2) an
              an i(f)- 'n further the problem. (0.4) perpetuate the=uh (0.3)
              underachiever, (0.6) so ah'll just leave it (.) to somebody who is
              (0.2)
    Dan: you're not going to have children?
              (.)
    Roger: so trained, (.) t'have children.

Here the delayed completion ("so trained, (.) t'have children.") locates the intervening utterance as interruptive of the TCU-in-progress. As a continuation of the speaker's prior utterance it interdicts the sequential implicativeness of Dan's intervening question. Though the question is in effect answered, it is not built as an answer to a question.

Delayed completion can also provide a warrant for the initiation of overlap, through its claim of the unfinishedness of a speaker's just prior utterance.

(16)   [GTS]
    Ken: My opinion of the school system, the Los Angeles school dis-
              trict, dis- district, is the most fucked over,
    Roger: Yeah well we // all got that opinion.
    Ken: school syst'm WAIT is the most fucked over school system in
              the world.

(17)   [Frankel: House Burning]
    Pen: I don' wanna make yih ta:lk cuz I don't wantche tuh:
              (.)
    Pat: No: I f- I really do feel a lot // bettuh (I feel like)
    Pen: upset chiself a*ll over agai:n,

By producing an utterance which is a syntactic continuation of their own prior utterance a speaker claims to be merely continuing a TCU-in-progress. The continuation (i.e., the delayed completion) is thereby asserted to be part of the same turn space occupied by that prior utterance, making the intervening utterance out to be interruptive of that turn space whether or not there is any overlap.

So, delayed completion can 1. provide a means to produce a complete TCU across intervening talk, 2. make out an intervening utterance to have been interruptive of a turn at talking, 3. provide a warrant for the initiation of overlap, and 4. interdict the sequential implicativeness of the intervening talk.

With these features of delayed completion in hand, we can now look at the use of this device as a receipt slot alternative in the construction of collaborative turn sequences.

Pre-emptive completion is a bid to enter the ongoing turn of another speaker. Its success hinges on the way the sequence runs off. A delayed completion can be used to interdict the (collaborative turn) sequential relevance of the pre-empting completion. In (18) a delayed completion ("then you think he's gonna fall asleep") realizes a competing completion. It doesn't not acknowledge or ratify the pre-emptive completion.

(18) [GTS]

   Ken: no its when he turns a bright red that everybody has to start worrying

   Louise: no when he gets his eyes like this an' he starts thinkin, you know

   Ken: then you get to worry

   Louise: then you think he's gonna fall asleep.

And in (19), an interrupting (though not disagreeing) delayed completion interdicts the pre-empting utterance and its sequentially implicated receipt by not allowing it to come to completion in the clear and by outlasting it.

(19) [Labov:TA]

   C: Fact I said tuh Larry yuh don't think it's- thet- y'know thet the kids thet'r skinny, (0.7) are gonnuh yihknow haftuh worry about it. They c'n eat twice iz much iz you,

   D: en it doesn't mean // anything

   C: en not gain wei//::ght.

When the receipt slot alternative of delayed completion is produced, allowing the original speaker of the TCU to complete the syntactic unit and interdict the sequential relevance of the pre-emptive completion, the understanding, agreement or other responding action (first attempted through the pre-emptive completion) can remain relevant for next turn. Pre-emptive completion provides a way to display understanding of or agreement with an ongoing turn. It can be, for example, a same-turn alternative to producing an agreement token in next turn to show understanding or agreement.

However, once a delayed completion is produced, its receipt – and through it the receipt of the original speaker's turn as a whole – then becomes a relevant action for next turn. Next turn is now, again, a sequential slot for the original recipient (i.e., the speaker of the pre-emptive completion) to respond. This can be seen in (20).

(20) [HIC]
    Sparky: it sounds like what you're saying is that let them make the decisions
    Kerry: an let us know wh//at it is
    Sparky: and let us know what it is
    Kerry: yeah

Here delayed completion is used to reclaim the speakership of a TCU, thus reversing again the earlier reversal of speakership/recipientship that was accomplished by the pre-emptive completion.[19] In this way, the collaborative turn sequence is transformed from:

> preliminary component (completion source)
> pre-emptive completion (sequence-initiating action)
> receipt (sequence-responding action)

into:

> preliminary component (completion source)
> pre-emptive completion (sequence-initiating action)
> delayed completion (original turn/action completion)
> receipt (response to completed turn)

An attempted pre-emptive display of understanding is transformed into a next turn token assertion of understanding. The expanded form is, however, still a two-turn sequence.

Delayed completion and receipt of the pre-emptive completion are slot alternatives. One can find both occurring after the production of pre-empting utterances. However, since pre-emptive completion by an addressed recipient of an ongoing turn selects a particular party – last speaker – as next, one would not expect to get both an acknowledgement and a delayed completion occurring in the same instance – produced by different participants. There is, however, at least one environment where this can occur.

When the party addressed by the pre-emptive completion is a multiple-participant party (cf. Lerner 1993; Schegloff 1995a), then any member of the party can be a proper next speaker, since the party, and not a particular member

of that party, has been selected as next speaker. Thus, more than one member
may select to speak as Dad and Mom do in (21).

(21) [HIC]
    Dad: he's guaranteed, but (.) the rest of the members cn control that
           member from him:
    Kerry: goin any higher [than tha[t
    Dad: [goin hi [gher than that
    Mom: [ye::ah

Both co-members of the party (here Dad and Mom as co-explainers) may talk
in the receipt slot and as in (21) one produces a delayed completion in the
course of the pre-emptive completion, while the other produces a receipt of
the pre-emptive completion on its completion.

Two analytically distinct aspects of receipt slot work are discernable from
the above discussion. (That is, there are systematically available practices to
underwrite this distinction.) One job of a speaker selected to speak in the re-
ceipt position is the acknowledgement of the pre-emptive completion as the de
facto completion of the turn. That is, a preliminary component speaker is in a
position to either acknowledge or disregard the pre-empting utterance.

A second job is the explicit acceptance or rejection of the completion as
an instance of what was about to be said. It is possible to acknowledge the
pre-empting utterance as a TCU completion without agreeing with it. This can
be seen in (22). The daughter's utterance ("well, that's one way.") acknowledges
the completion ("is to stick yer finger inside"), but in so doing shows that it was
not what was about to be said – though it may well be an acceptable alternative
to the pre-empted advice.

(22) [SEWING]
    ((The participants are making a pillow.))
    Daughter: Oh here dad (0.2) a good way to get tho:se corners out
               (0.2)
    Dad: is to stick yer finger insi:de.
    Daughter: well, that's one way.

The following data array illustrates the separation of the two tasks.

1. Acknowledgement of the completion through agreement with it

(23)   [CDHQ:II:3]

    Marty: Now most machines don't record that slow. So I'd wanna- when
                 I make a tape,
    Josh: be able tuh speed it up.
    Marty: Yeah.

2. Acknowledgement of the completion through disagreement

(24)   [HYLA:simplified]

    Hyla: I wz deciding if if I sh'd write im the thankyou no:te // fer the
                 birthday gi:ft,
    Nancy: Yea:h
    Hyla: hh.hh I decided no:t to // though
    Nancy: How co:me,
    Hyla: ·t hhhhh (.) Becuz I figure, hhhh//hhh
    Nancy: If 'e hasn' written ye:t, (0.4) then 'e doesn' want to.
                 (0.2)
    Hyla: Oh:: don't say thahhh//a(h)t
    Nancy: NO is tha'whatcher think//ing?
    Hyla: No::,

3. Disregard of the completion through delayed completion

(25)   [Labov:TA]

    C: Fact I said tuh Larry yuh don't think it's- thet- y'know thet
              the kids thet'r skinny, (0.7) are gonnuh yihknow haftuh worry
              about it. They c'n eat twice iz much iz you,
    D: en it doesn't mean // anything
    C: en not gain wei//::ght.
    D: Right.

The form for acknowledgement of the completion (as the de facto turn unit completion) is the acceptance (23) or rejection (24) of the pre-emptive completion as an instance of what was about to be said, while the form used to leave the completion unacknowledged is primarily delayed completion (25) of the TCU by the turn unit's original speaker. This interdicts the sequential relevance of the pre-emptive completion.

    The acceptance or rejection of the pre-emptive completion as 'what was about to be said' ratifies the pre-emptive completion as an acknowledged completion qua completion. Rejection of the pre-emptive completion (as an instance of what was about to be said) can be circumventing. This can be done by producing a delayed completion, rather than ratifying the pre-emptive comple-

tion's status as a continuation of the turn unit-in-progress by disagreeing with it. This is another way that a preference for agreement is sustained in the practices of talk-in-interaction. As such, pre-emptive completion of a compound TCU provides a systematic locus for delayed completion.

Before moving on to another type of receipt slot practice (list construction), the relationship of collaborative turn sequences to overlap management can be sketch out. The following section describes how pre-emptive completion and actions ensuing from it provide systematic sites for overlap.

A place for overlap

Collaborative turn sequences constitute a systematic site for the occurrence of overlapping talk. Pre-emptive completions are built to continue a turn from a projected opportunity space. However, not all attempts at collaborative completion are successful. The speaker of the compound TCU-in-progress can talk through the onset of a developing pre-emptive completion and thereby retain control of the turn space.

(26) [HIC] ((Sparky is addressing Kerry))
      Sparky: it sounds like what you're saying is that // let them make the
               decisions
      Kerry: (if this is)

Here Sparky continues talking after Kerry begins; Kerry then stops without finishing the pre-emptive completion. The attempted collaboration fails, since the original speaker continues (cf. Jefferson 1983). This can also be seen in (27), but in this case the original speaker retrieves the overlapped pre-emptive completion after finishing the TCU involved in the overlap. (cf. Jefferson, this volume).

(27) [ADATO]
      J: Well it's a, it's a mideastern yihknow it's- they make it in Greece,
               Turke::y, //right around there.
      B: Armenia,
      J: Yeah, Armenia

So, overlapping talk can occur when the target speaker continues talking beyond the opportunity space, as in (26) and (27). Overlap can also occur when the speaker of the pre-emptive completion initiates the utterance outside of the slight pause between components.

(28) [HIC]
    Sparky: when it doesn' invol:ve thee basic agreement, it is b://y stock
    Dad: its by major*ity

Here Sparky has already begun the final component of his compound TCU, when Dad begins his "late" pre-emptive completion.

In addition, delayed completion also provides a systematic place within collaborative turn sequence organization for simultaneous talk. The turn after the pre-emptive completion is allocated to the prior speaker and is allocated to that participant to produce a receipt. To interdict the pre-emptive completion, the utterance done in the receipt slot must be heard as a delayed completion of the preliminary component, and not as a receipt of the pre-emptive completion. Some delayed completions can be seen to be interdictive of the prior utterance through their formulation as, for example, a competing completion as in (29).

(29) [GTS]
    Ken: no its when he turns a bright red that everybody has to start
           worrying
    Louise: no when he gets his eyes like this an' he starts thinkin, you know
    Ken: then you get to worry
    Louise: then you think he's gonna fall asleep.

The discordance of a competing completion constitutes it as a rival completion for the turn unit.

However, a delayed completion that repeats, extends, or perhaps even slightly revises a successfully completed pre-emptive completion may be taken to be an acknowledging receipt of the pre-emptive completion – unless the delayed completion is somehow made to be seen as a replacement for it. Position can achieve this, when composition does not – that is, overlapping the ongoing pre-emptive completion can interdiction it's relevance for subsequent action, when the content of the delayed completion does not do so. Starting the delayed completion in the course of the pre-emptive completion as in (30) can accomplish this.

(30) [HIC]
    Sparky: it sounds like what you're saying is that let them make the
           decisions
    Kerry: an let us know wh//at it is
    Sparky: and let us know what it is
    Kerry: yeah

Pre-emptive completion provides a systematic place for delayed completion – and delayed (especially non-discordant) completion provides a systematic place for overlap.

One practice associated with overlap management in conversation is the post-overlap retrieval of a previously overlapped utterance (Jefferson, this volume). For instance:

(31)   [GTS]
    Dan: Like Ken is describing a guy who c'n sort of (1.0) get
              [in with the group=
    Louise: [be himself.
    Dan: =but still be himself,

When overlap of the pre-emptive completion with a continuing (or delayed) final component occurs then both systematics (collaborative turn sequence and overlap management) are concurrently relevant. Since overlap and pre-emptive completion intersect here, the next position after an overlapping completion may be both a receipt slot position and an overlap retrieval position. In this case, the two interactional tasks – the ratification/interdiction of a pre-emptive completion and the retrieval of an overlapped utterance – can be accomplished concurrently.

The post overlap/receipt position can be used to retrieve the overlapped pre-emptive completion as Dan (the original speaker of the TCU) does in (32).

(32)   [GTS:5]
    Dan: And as you said there's a who:le segment of our society,
             (.)
             that is [dropping out.]
    Roger: [are failing.] (Right).
    Dan: are failing. Sure.

Or this position can be used to reassert the original speaker's own formulation of the events as Ken does in (33) by adding an increment to his own completion.

(33)   [GTS]
    Ken: And you think I really got pleasure out of getting uh well I-
             getti//ng in that debate?
    Louise: stomped on.
    Ken: Cause that's what it ended up to be, a big debate.

In addition, when overlap occurs, the speaker who initiated the pre-empting utterance may also engage in post-overlap utterance retrieval as D does in (34).

(34)   [Gerald]
    R: if you don't put things on yer calendar
               (.) [(f o r g e t   I t)]
    D: [yer outta luck.] yeah(p). fo:getit

In this way, D ratifies R's completion, thereby explicitly marking the pre-
emptive completion as unsuccessful.

The use of the receipt position to accept a pre-emptive completion or re-
claim the turn space by producing a delayed completion, and the post-overlap
retrieval of an utterance are both aimed at the same result: they are ways of re-
asserting a claim over a turn after another participant has either made a claim
for the turn space (overlap competition), or has made a conditional entry into
the turn space (pre-emptive completion), or both.

List construction as a receipt slot alternative to acceptance/rejection[20]

Jefferson (1990) has shown that "less-than-three-item three-part lists are recur-
rently constructed by occupying a third slot with a generalized list completer."
She gives the following instance as an example.

(35)   [JG:II(a):3]
    Heather: And they had like a concession stand like at a fair where you can
               buy coke and popcorn and that type of thing.

Here the list, "coke and popcorn and that type of thing," contains two items and
is followed by a generalized list completer which locates the first two items as
members of a class. This type of list construction seems to be a way to formulate
a reference to a class of items. The reference includes the listed items but is not
limited to them.

The construction of a list in the receipt slot, incorporating the just pro-
duced pre-emptive completion as an item, can both propose an initial ac-
ceptance of the affiliating utterance and then transform that acceptance into
something else as in (36).

(36)   [GTS]
    Ken: He said all the colored people uh walk- walk down the street
               and they may be all dressed up or somethin and these guys eh
               white- white guys'll come by with ·hh
    Louise: mud.
    Ken: mud, ink or anything and throw it at 'em

The (unprojected opportunity space) terminal item completion, "mud," is followed in receipt position by a repeat of the completion by Ken. This alone could constitute an acceptance of the completion, but "mud" becomes the first item in a list. Incorporation of another speaker's utterance into a list proposes that that item is one among others, rather than the single, correct (i.e., acceptable) item.

The availability of this analysis to participants can be seen in instance (37). Here Jay uses a list structure to propose a series of clues in pursuit of a recognition by Sy of the object referenced as "my box." In the course of the recognition pursuit, Jim proposes "Forms." This utterance is not built as a continuation of the list. It is not linked to the prior with a conjunction and is not produced with an upward intonation. In fact, it is produced with a distinct downward intonation.

(37)   [ADATO]
      Jay: I- I told <u>Jim</u> thet uh, I wz going to:: leave you my um, my <u>box</u>
                of, --thet I use?
      Sy: What box,
      Jay: fer the SLIPS? 'n PAPERS?
      Jim: Forms.
                (pause)
      Jay: 'N FORMS?
      Jim: Forms.

The form of the repeat is what is of interest here. The receipt of Jim's utterance is constructed as the third item of the list of clues. This is constructed by Jay and understood by Jim to be another clue in a series of clues. In the last line, Jim displays this analysis of the receipt by repeating his utterance in its original form, reasserting that it is a substitution for the prior list items, and not simply another clue. The incorporation of an utterance into a list is a device for accepting a candidate in a way which also displays that it is not the exclusive acceptable candidate. Whereas, a simple repeat in the receipt slot can be used to indicate acceptance of the pre-emptive completion.

In (36), Ken repeats the terminal item completion. However, the utterance that continues on from that item is constructed as a list, and therefore the repeat of "mud" comes to be available as having been the first item of a list. And since it is a list of the [item + item + generalized list completer] form, the sort of object being referenced is transformed from the items themselves into the class to which the first two items belong. (One might think of the "generalized list completer" as a *generalizing* list completer.) In this way, the grounds on

which the pre-emptive completion is accepted is changed from an acceptance of "mud," to an acceptance of the class of objects (perhaps throwable objects) to which "mud" belongs. It accomplishes a move away from acceptance, without outright rejection of the candidate.

List construction can also be used in receipt position to retrieve an utterance from overlap as in (38).

(38) [GTS]
      Dan: well I do know last week that uh Al was certainly very
              (0.6)
      Roger: pi//ssed off
      Dan: upset, 'n pissed off, 'n angry en w'z bout ready tuh fi:ght+uh
              with Ken

In this instance, "upset" as a characterization of how Al was feeling last week could be a possible completion of the TCU-in-progress. One feature of list organization shown here is that a single, in itself sufficient, person characterization term can be turned into having been a first term rather than the only term. In this way, list construction can be used as an overlap resolution device.

In this instance, the list is produced using the item ("upset") + item ("pissed off") + item ("angry") format. The list construction format seems to be a way to acknowledge the overlapped pre-emptive completion, while not endorsing it. Though the second and third items seem to be different formulations of the same reference, both of which are upgrades of the original characterization ("upset"), they are produced in a way (placing conjunctions between the items) that formulates them as, in fact, somewhat different states. This list format allows a shift to "angry" rather than a substitution of "angry" for "pissed off." In this way, the pre-emptive completion is not rejected outright, but it is also not acknowledged as the sole acceptable item projected to follow "very."

As in instance (36), the construction of a list in (38) provides a way to acknowledge another speaker's terminal item completion. The turn is extended by turning the final word of the TCU into the first item in a list. Dan incorporates the overlapped utterance as the next item in the list. By producing the acknowledgement as a part of a list, the speaker can move away from the acceptance of the candidate as the sole completion of the source turn-in-progress.

These technically-described practices underwrite a solution to a local problem. In (38), Dan is producing a 'delicate' characterization. It is marked as such through the break in progressivity just prior to the terminal item of his turn. The search for a "just right" word can reveal the searched-for word as delicate

(Lerner 1999). Also, he chooses the careful term "upset." One issue seems to be how to refer to the way one of the participants was feeling at the group's last meeting. Roger is proposing what might be seen by this group to be a teenager/hotrodder version (cf. Sacks 1979), while Dan seems to be proposing, with "upset," an adult/therapist version.

Now given that Dan is doing therapist's talk, and also taking it that one part of therapist's talk seems to be to acknowledge the talk of the participants, a problem occurs. How can Dan continue to talk as a therapist, while at the same time displaying 'empathy' with his clients? The use of a list format in the receipt slot provides a solution. Its use allows a shift from, but not abandonment of "upset." After acknowledging "pissed off," Dan produces the third item ("angry"). This retains the upgrade of "pissed off," while returning to the adult/therapist register of "upset."

Rejected pre-emptive completions

The initiation of a pre-emptive completion implicates a receipt for next turn. Pre-emptive completions are not built as candidates, but are produced as assertedly correct completions for the TCU-in-progress. The receipt slot provides a place to acknowledge the pre-emptive completion as the proper continuation of the turn unit-in-progress. However, the receipt slot alternative to acceptance is ordinarily not the explicit rejection of the completion. Delayed completion can be used by the original speaker to produce an alternative, possibly competing completion that interdicts the sequential relevance of the pre-emptive completion. Nevertheless receipt slot rejection does occasionally occur as in (39).

```
(39)   [MOTHER'S DAY]
       D:        .h and they do thi:ngs
                 (1.2)
       C:        ta hurt th'm (0.2) huh huh=
       D:        =no:no: I'm sayin that ugh ugh (0.7) that's the compromise
                 they have ta do with themselves
```

Overwhelmingly, collaborative turn sequences that include explicit rejection of the pre-emptive completion also contain laugh tokens produced by the speaker of the pre-emptive completion. This can be appended to the completion as in (39) or it can occur as in-speech laughter as in (40).

(40) [GTS]
Ken: you gotta get up. G'way. Y'gotta get up. ((heavy whisper)) put
          the dogs out. Feed the fish
Roger: hyuhh heh hehh t(hh)ake the fi(hh)sh fer a wa(h)lk hh hehh //
          hheh hh //hehh
Ken: No
Ken: He takes the dogs, heaves em in the backyard,

In (41), the pre-empting speaker does append a laugh token to her comple-
tion, however, the receipt slot rejection begins simultaneously with it and so
cannot be said to be responsive to it. Yet, the laugh token does show this was
not produced as a serious contender for what Ken's grandmother offers his
father ("She'll say")

(41) [GTS]
Ken: she'll say // wouldja-
Louise: wanna glassa milk? // hehhh
Ken: No. wouldju like a little bitta he'ing?
Louise: heh// ha ha
Ken: wouldja like some crekles?
Louise: ehh ha ha ha ha
Ken: wouldja like a peanut butter an' jelly sandwich?

It is these recognizably not serious completions that original speakers reject.
The point is that the pre-emptive completion is produced to be rejectable. It
is produced as not serious and is marked by the laugh tokens to display that
it is not being produced as assertedly correct. It is done as a recognizably not
serious version of what the other was about to say. But it can nonetheless be
inaccurate in a way that displays by its very selection that it has resulted from
accurate knowledge of what sort of utterance had been projected to complete
the TCU. For example, in (41), "glass of milk" catches perfectly the complaint
being issued by the original speaker – that his grandmother treats his father
like a child.[21]

The following instance reveals that it is actually not necessary for the
pre-empting speaker to employ laugh tokens at all to display the not serious
character of the completion.

(42)   [GTS]
    Ken: I was on a road on the way to Roswell New Mexico. An' I was,
               y'know, plonkin along at a regular speed,
    Roger: an' a grasshopper // jumped onto the road who you recognized.
    Ken: An'- wait minute
    Ken: No. //No I was goin along, an' I had
    Jim: ehhhhha ha: hhhh hhh

Here, the not serious character of the utterance itself (invoking an earlier reference to "grasshoppers" in a rather nonsensical way) shows that Roger is putting words into Ken's mouth, and is therefore built to be rejected. One might even say that it requires a denial to be successful (cf. Drew 1987). Since Roger has an audience here, he need not initiate the laughter himself (Glenn 1989).

Concluding remarks

Utterances which continue an in-progress TCU and are addressed to its speaker make relevant a next action and select a next speaker. They select last speaker as next and make relevant as a next action the acceptability of the affiliated utterance. Pre-emptive completions are noteworthy as sequence-initiating actions (or Firsts) not only in that their production makes relevant a characterizable set of second actions, but especially in that both their placement (at a projected or unprojected opportunity space) and composition (as a syntactic unit completion) can be characterized formally.

The production of a pre-emptive completion proposes for the original speaker of the turn-in-progress the alternative possibilities of retrieving (continuing) the turn from the opportunity space or addressing the completion as a continuation of the ongoing turn.

What a TCU-in-progress will come to be remains the province of the speaker that initiated the unit. Collaborative turn sequences represent evidence of an orientation to speaking turns in a series as including an orientation to turn *spaces* in a series, where entry of a speaker into the turn space of another party is interactionally organized as a conditional entry. This is the interactional import of the receipt position – as the place for the original speaker to maintain authority– i.e., authorship – over their turn's talk.

The use of delayed completion can be seen to, in a sense, push back the recipe slot to next turn, rather than displace it. Since pre-emptive completion implements a form of early response to a turn, delayed completion returns the

relevance of the receipt to its original place, thus co-constructing as a four action sequence [preliminary component + pre-emptive completion + delayed completion + receipt] (issuing from the pre-emptive completion), what on other occasions can be accomplished in its unexpanded form through a two-action sequence produced in two turns: a sequence-initiating action (in one turn by one speaker) followed by a sequence-responding receipt (in a next turn by another speaker).

Notes

* This chapter is a somewhat revised version of Chapter 4 of my doctoral dissertation (Lerner 1987). For example, I have updated the references. For a description of the features of turn construction that furnish occasions for co-participant completion, see Lerner (1991, 1996a). For a description of some actions that can be accomplished through this practice, see Lerner (1996b).

1. The "directionality of address" is too complex a matter to develop here, but suffice it to say that when a pre-emptive completion is produced by an addressed recipient, then it will almost always be addressed to prior speaker, while completions produced by someone other than the addressed recipient will almost always be addressed to that addressed recipient. In other words, who the completion is addressed to is not independent of who the prior turn was addressed to and thus the footing of the participant who produces it as addressed recipient or non-addressed recipient is consequential.

2. If the original speaker does confirm or reject this type of completion – one that co-constructs an action for the original recipient of the TCU – they can be seen to be asserting special (unilateral) authority over the action – for example, over the elements of an explanation or the events of a story.

3. 'Contiguity' refers to the placement of next speaker's utterance, while progressivity is the one-after-another placement of words within the turn. Progressivity then is maintained by the contiguous placement of the pre-emptive utterance.

4. Another device commonly used is the turn-initial disjunction marker, "Oh" (Jefferson 1978; Heritage 1984). Jefferson provides the following instance:

    [GTS:II]
    Ken: The cops, over the hill. There's a place up in Mulholland where they've-
               where they're building those hous//ing projects?
    Roger: Oh have you ever taken them Mulhollan' time trials? ...

In contrast with these marked turn beginnings, pre-emptive utterances are constructed without any display of misplacement.

5. On occasion the pre-emptive completion itself can be extended to include an agreement token. The addition of such a token can do distinct interactional work. This work can best be understood once the regular shape of the collaborative turn sequence (pre-emptive com-

pletion followed by a receipt by prior speaker) is described, and so this form will not be examined until after the sequence itself has been presented.

6. For the record I have found only one instance of a TCU-continuing utterance by a co-participant that attempts to extend the preliminary component of a compound TCU-in-progress, rather than bring the unit to a next possible completion. (It is not irrelevant in this case that the parenthetical expansion of the preliminary component – which does not bring the ongoing TCU to its next possible completion – is addressed to the recipient of the ongoing turn, and thus does not make its acceptability relevant as a next action.)

> [HIC]
> Mom: See this is little peanuts now, but if it ever got to be something
>   [people would be fi:]:ghting an ah: that's
> Dad: [an an it could   ]

Here Mom is admonishing one of her adult sons (during a family meeting) not to take lightly the preparation of a written "basic agreement" the family is preparing as the guiding document for a newly established family investment club. Dad chimes in to corroborate mom's premise ("if it ever got to be something"). Here Dad uses the projected opportunity space to second the premise implemented in the preliminary component, rather than to produce a completion and thereby align with its consequences.

7. Sometimes it may be more suitable to use the terms "accept/reject" at other times "agree/disagree" or "confirm/reject." In this chapter, I am primarily concerned with those turns at talk that make relevant some form of understanding and/or alignment by co-participants. Pre-emptive completion of these actions constitutes one way to strongly demonstrate such understanding/alignment by voicing a part of the TCU which realizes that action. It is ordinarily then up to the original speaker to validate the proposed completion as an adequate completion for their turn. However, some types of action (e.g. a request or other-correction) are not primarily built for alignment. Here the use of pre-emptive completion can implement a complementary action (e.g. an offer or self-correction), and thus the receipt of that action may also be of a different character (cf. Lerner 1996b).

8. There may be some special activity contexts in which the absence of a pre-emptive completion by a recipient at the end of a preliminary component may become noticeably absent. For example, this may be the case in certain instructional or tutorial exchanges in which, for example, an instructor/tutor is leading a student toward the understanding of some concept. Instructors/tutors may elicit completion as a tutorial practice, and similarly students may elicit completion from their instructor/turor (cf. Fox 1993; Lerner 1995).

9. For another form of rejection receipt, [Disagreement token + substitute completion], see instance (3).

10. See Schegloff (1996) for a description of another environment in which repeating is used as a method for agreeing – in this case, to confirm an allusion. There is a further parallel here. In the case of confirming an allusion, the original speaker has made clear (but not in an explicit fashion) some state of affairs which is then made explicit by a recipient. It is this that can be confirmed by a repeat. In the present case of pre-emptive completion, the original speaker has made clear some not-yet-said component of their turn (and its attendant state of affairs) which is then voiced (i.e. made explicit) by a recipient. Here again, a repeat of the

proffered completion) can confirm what had not yet been said explicitly. However, as we will see in the next section, if the original speaker begins their own "delayed" completion before the pre-emptive completion has come to a possible completion itself or if they produce a delayed completion that disagrees with the pre-emptive completion or both occur, then their completion can count as a replacement for the pre-emptive completion.

11. Projected and unprojected opportunity spaces provide for the sequential possibility of producing a syntactically fitted TCU completion. For completeness, I should mention that there is, in a sense, an additional opportunity space. The transition space also constitutes an opportunity space for the production of a syntactically fitted TCU completion, so that a single syntactic unit is produced across speakers as in pre-emptive completion.

```
[GTS]
Ken:     Well there was a certain amount of uh as far as I could see anyway there
         was a certain amount of uh dis- discontent between uh you and Louise
Roger:   to begin with
```

Rather than completing a TCU-in-progress, Roger's utterance ("to begin with") is appended to an already possibly complete unit. By "re-completing" the prior TCU, he can demonstrate agreement, but one which attaches a distinct modification. The prior utterance is not pre-empted in its course; rather the second speaker begins in the transition space and adds an additional increment to the TCU. He therefore does not violate the prior speaker's right to speak at least until a first possible completion is reached, but shows that the action carried by that TCU had not been adequately formulated (cf. Sacks 1992, Vol. 1:657; Lerner 2004).

12. This type of sequence relationship has more recently been dubbed a "retro-sequence" (Schegloff 1995b) in which a sequence is initiated as a response to a prior speaker's action, but where that prior action did not make such a response conditionally relevant.

13. This is one way that Goffman's (1981) concept of "speaker footing" can be seen to operate in interaction.

14. For a recent discussion of the negotiation of the relative "epistemic authority" parties can claim toward agreement in assessment sequences, see Heritage and Raymond (2003). For a discussion of the negotiation of the "authorship of delicates" see Lerner (1999).

15. A revised version of this section appeared as Lerner (1989).

16. One straight forward reason pre-emptive completions are rarely rejected is that they need not be produced. For the most part, preliminary components of compound TCUs do not require – that is, do not make conditionally relevant – the production of a completion by another participant. Though they do furnish distinct opportunities for completion, that action is ordinarily optional. This can be seen in each of the following instances. In (16.1), no one takes the opportunity to pre-empt the completion and the TCU is finished by the original speaker. In (16.2), another speaker does enter the turn space at the completion of the preliminary component, but produces a continuer rather than pre-empt the completion, while the original speaker finishes the TCU. In (16.3). the original speaker produces preliminary component and stops speaking – leaving an explicit offer projected, but unsaid. The completion is not produced by the recipient, who instead responds to the offer. And in (16.4) there is a break in the progressivity of the turn (thus creating an unprojected opportunity space), but no recipient speaks and the original speaker completes their own

turn. Finally, in (16.5) a recipient does speak after a break in progressivity, but responds to the question, rather than produce the completion.

(16.1) [HIC]
       Sparky: If dad and Sherrie got together, (.) they would have a quorum

(16.2) [Mother's Day (standard orthography)]
       Dad: So, if you were strong in your fee̲lings about (0.2) people
                   (0.2)
       Daughter: Mm hm
       Dad: your thet you liked ((continues to completion))

(16.3) [F:TC (in Davidson 1984: 125)]
       A: So if you guys want a place tuh sta:y.
                (0.3)
       B: ·t ·hhh Oh well thank you but you we ha- yihknow Thomas.

(16.4) [Agorio]
       E: Didju request a copy of the: (0.3) instructions then?
       R: Yeah.

(16.5) [Smith:Thanksgiving]
       R: Where's thah:
       T: °It's on the counter °((pointing))
       R: Oh, okay.

Further, a completion need not be produced even when one seems to be encouraged by a speaker as in B's second utterance in (16.6).

(16.6) [GL:DS]
       B: and uh but then she says she gets to thinking, oh well she's just not
                gonna worry about it.
       A: Mm hm.
       B: you know, she's just gonna –
       A: yeah.

Uncompleted TCUs, whether ended at a projected or unprojected opportunity space, can be treated as a trail-off, whose final part was left unspoken, yet can be seen to have been understood when a recipient responds as in (16.3), (16.5) and (16.6). (Token responses re-sist repair. That is, responding to an action with an agreement/disagreement token, is not vulnerable to rejection in the same way as a pre-emptive completion, since it cannot be in-spected for content correctness, but only action-type correctness.) In these ways, potentially rejectable completions need not be done, and they are not noticeably absent.

17. Delayed completion can be seen as one device for achieving what Sacks (1992) referred to as "skip-connecting."

18. Instances (13) to (17) do not contain pre-emptive completions. They are included to illustrate the phenomenon of delayed completion only. The use of this devise is not limited to pre-emptive completion.

19. Formally, the production of a pre-emptive completion switches the occupants of the speakership/recipientship positions and converts a turn into a sequence, selecting the initial speaker of the turn unit as next speaker. A second switch in positions can be achieved by countering the pre-emptive completion in the receipt slot position. This occurs when the original speaker of the TCU deletes the sequential implicativeness of the pre-emptive completer by producing a (delayed) completion of their own rather than producing an acceptance or rejection of the pre-emptive completer.

20. A revised version of this section appeared as Lerner (1994).

21. Consistent with the use of list construction as an alternative to straightforward acceptance and rejection of the candidate, list construction can also be used in the receipt slot as part of a pre-emptive completion rejection. In (41), the use of a list displays that what is rejected is not simply the particular quoted offer completion. A [rejection token + substitute] could well be seen to be quibbling. The pre-emptive completion "wanna glassa milk" does catch the point being made – his grandmother treats his father like a child – though it is built as a punch line. In this case, Louise proffers a child's drink ("milk") in contrast to the adult's drink ("beer") that has been already been mentions. However, the contrast turns out to have been – or one might say is made out to have been – an adult offer (a drink) versus a child's offer (a snack). Ken's contrast is accomplished through the construction of a list. The replacement of the pre-emptive completion with another offerable item would simply be another instance of what you can offer a child. But the construction of a list displays the *class* of items that is intended and thereby, warrants the rejection of "milk" since it is not in that class. Nevertheless, notice that Ken's list become more juvenile with each item. In a way, Ken's third item does seem to capture the same flavor, if I can put it that way, of Louise's pre-emptive completion, thereby moving in the direction of agreement even while explicitly rejecting her completion at the outset of his receipt (cf. Sacks 1987).

References

Davidson, Judy (1984) "Subsequent Versions of Invitations, Offers, Requests, and Proposals Dealing with Potential or Actual Rejection". In J. M. Atkinson & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Structures of Social Action* (pp. 102–128). Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Drew, Paul (1987). "Po-Faced Receipts of Teases". *Linguistics, 25*, 219–253.

Fox, Barbara (1993). *The Human Tutorial Dialogue Project: Issues in the design of instructional systems.* Lawrence Erlbaum: Hillsdale, New Jersey.

Glenn, Phil (1989). "Initiating shared laughter in multi-party conversations". *Western Journal of Speech Communication, 53* (2), 127–149.

Goffman, Erving (1981). *Forms of Talk*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Heritage, John (1984). "A Change-of-State Token and Aspects of Its Sequential Placement". In J. M. Atkinson & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Structures of Social Action* (pp. 299–345). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Heritage, John, & Raymond, Geoff (2003). The Terms of Agreement: Indexing Epistemic Authority and Subordination in Talk-in-Interaction. Paper presented at the International Institute on Conversation Analysis, Copenhagen.

Jefferson, Gail (1973). "A Case of Precision Timing in Ordinary Conversation: Overlapped Tag-Positioned Address Terms in Closing Sequences". *Semiotica, 9*, 47–96.

Jefferson, Gail (1978). "Sequential Aspects of Storytelling in Conversation". In J. Schenkein (Ed.), *Studies in the Organization of Conversational Interaction* (pp. 219–248). New York, Academic Press.

Jefferson, Gail (1983). "Notes on some orderlinesses of overlap onset". In V. D'Urso & P. Leonardi (Eds.), *Discourse Analysis and Natural Rhetoric* (pp. 11–38). Padua, Cleup Editore.

Jefferson, Gail (1990). "List Construction as a Task and Interactional Resource". In G. Psathas (Ed.), *Interaction Competence* (pp. 63–92). Washington, International Institute for Ethnomethodology and Conversation Analysis and University Press of America.

Jefferson, Gail (This volume). "Some Orderly Aspects of Overlap in Natural Conversation". In G. H. Lerner (Ed.), *Conversation Analysis: Studies from the first generation*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Lerner, Gene H. (1987). Collaborative Turn Sequences: Sentence Construction and Social Action. Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, University of California at Irvine.

Lerner, Gene H. (1989). "Notes on overlap management in conversation: The case of delayed completion". *Western Journal of Speech Communication, 53* (Spring), 167–177.

Lerner, Gene H. (1991). "On the Syntax of Sentences in Progress". *Language In Society, 20*, 441–458.

Lerner, Gene H. (1992). "Assisted storytelling: Deploying shared knowledge as a practical matter". *Qualitative Sociology, 15* (13), 247–271.

Lerner, Gene H. (1993). "Collectivities in action: Establishing the relevance of conjoined participation in conversation". *Text, 13* (2), 213–245.

Lerner, Gene H. (1994). "Responsive list construction: A conversational resource for accomplishing multifaceted social action". *Journal of Language and Social Psychology, 13* (1), 20–33.

Lerner, Gene H. (1995). "Turn design and the organization of participation in instructional activities". *Discourse Processes, 19* (1), 111–131.

Lerner, Gene H. (1996a). "On the "semi-permeable" character of grammatical units in conversation: Conditional entry into the turn space of another speaker". In E. Ochs, E. A. Schegloff, & S. Thompson (Eds.), *Interaction and Grammar* (pp. 238–276). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lerner, Gene H. (1996b). "Finding 'face' in the preference structures of talk-in-interaction". *Social Psychology Quarterly, 59* (4), 303–321.

Lerner, Gene H. (1999). The Collaborative Construction of Delicate Formulations: Negotiating the Authorship/Ownership of Unkind Words. Paper presented at the convention of the National Communication Association, Chicago.

Lerner, Gene H. (2004). "On the place of linguistic resources in the organization of talk-in-interaction: Grammar as action in prompting a speaker to elaborate". *Research on Language and Social Interaction, 37* (2).

Lerner, Gene H., & Takagi, Tomoyo (1999). "On the place of linguistic resources in the organization of talk-in-interaction: A co-investigation of English and Japanese grammatical practices". *Journal of Pragmatics, 31* (1), 49–75.

Sacks, Harvey (1979). "Hotrodder: A Revolutionary Category". In G. Psathas (Ed.), *Everyday Language: Studies in Ethnomethodology* (pp. 7–14). New York: Irvington.

Sacks, Harvey (1987). "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 Matter.

Sacks, Harvey (1992). *Lectures on Conversation* (2 Vols.). Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Sacks, Harvey, Schegloff, Emanuel A., & Jefferson, Gail (1974). "A Simplest Systematics for the Organization of Turn-Taking for Conversation". *Language, 50*, 696–735.

Schegloff, Emanuel A. (1982). "Discourse as an interactional achievement: some uses of 'uh huh' and other things that come between sentences". In D. Tannen (Ed.), *Analyzing Discourse (Georgetown University Roundtable on Languages and Linguistics 1981)* (pp. 71–93). Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.

Schegloff, Emanuel A. (1987). "Recycled Turn Beginnings: A Precise Repair Mechanism in Conversation's Turn-taking Organization". In G. Button & J. R. E. Lee (Eds.), *Talk and Social Organization* (pp. 70–85). Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.

Schegloff, Emanuel A. (1995a). "Parties and talking together: two ways in which numbers are significant for talk-in-interaction". In P. Ten Have & G. Psathas (Eds.), *Situated Order: Studies in Social Organization and Embodied Activities* (pp. 31–42). Washington, DC: University Press of America.

Schegloff, Emanuel A. (1995b). Sequence organization. Unpublished Ms, UCLA Department of Sociology.

Schegloff, Emanuel A. (1996). "Confirming allusions: toward an empirical account of action". *American Journal of Sociology, 104* (1), 161–216.

Schegloff Emanuel A., Jefferson, Gail, & Sacks, Harvey (1977). "The Preference for Self-Correction in the Organization of Repair in Conversation". *Language, 53*, 361–382.

Schegloff, Emanuel A., & Sacks, Harvey (1973). "Opening Up Closings". *Semiotica, 8*, 289–327.

The amplitude shift mechanism
in conversational closing sequences

Jo Ann Goldberg

In an earlier investigation I established the existence of the Amplitude Shift Mechanism for utterance affiliation in natural conversation (Goldberg 1978). Amplitude shift can be used to indicate the inter-turn relationship between utterances by a speaker, either affiliating one utterance to a prior in a sequence by a downward shift in amplitude, or disaffiliating with a prior to indicate the initiation of a new sequence through an upward shift. I now proceed to (1) further explore aspects of its operation and (2) initiate another line of investigation as to the generality of its scope of operation, viz., to examine another type of conversational sequence in which the Amplitude Shift Mechanism is operative. The question/answer sequence was found to be a format of considerable generality in terms of the conversational tasks it embodied, "summoning," "requesting," "inviting," etc. The operational generality of the Amplitude Shift Mechanism for a range of conversational tasks was thereby implicit. Here I focus on one pervasive conversational task: ending a conversation by means of a "closing sequence," a termination apparatus for the structural unit "a single conversation."[1]

After describing the closing sequence, I will develop two observations.

1. The Amplitude Shift Mechanism as described within the question/answer sequence (Goldberg 1978) displays similar operational regularities within the closing sequences inspected. I will provide confirmation of the original findings in this sequence type. More importantly, the materials suggest another conversational sequence over which the Amplitude Shift Mechanism is a relevantly operative device.