

## Selecting next speaker: The context-sensitive operation of a context-free organization

GENE H. LERNER

*Department of Sociology  
University of California  
Santa Barbara, CA 93106  
lerner@soc.ucsb.edu*

### ABSTRACT

This report extends earlier context-free treatments of turn-taking for conversation by describing the context-sensitive operation of the principal forms of addressing employed by current speakers to select next speakers. It first describes the context-specific limitations of gaze-directional addressing, and the selective deployment and more-than-addressing action regularly accomplished by address terms (most centrally, names). In addition to these explicit methods of addressing, this report introduces tacit forms of addressing that call on the innumerable context-specific particulars of circumstance, content, and composition to select a next speaker. (Turn-taking, turn allocation, conversation, context.)\*

### INTRODUCTION

Sacks, Schegloff & Jefferson 1974 describe a “simplest systematics” for the organization of turn-taking for conversation. Very roughly, this consists of turn-constructural features for determining where transition will be relevant, two types of turn-allocational techniques (current speaker selects next, and self-selection) for determining how a next turn will be allocated, and a set of practices for employing the turn-allocational techniques by reference to transition-relevance places. Their investigation led them to pursue aspects of turn-taking that “might be extracted as ordered phenomena from . . . conversational materials which would not turn out to require reference to one or another aspect of situatedness, identities, and particularities of content or context” (1974:699). They point out that the organization of turn-taking for conversation is a “context-free” organization, but one that is capable of context-sensitivity. However, they pointedly (and properly) decline to stipulate “the scope of reference to ‘context’ that is relevant” (699, n. 8). In a description of their investigation they state, “Focusing on [the grossly apparent facts of turn-taking], rather than on particular outcomes in particular settings, leads to an investigation of the organization of turn taking per se, and not its application and consequences in particular contexts, although the more formal understanding of turn taking illuminates more particular findings” (699).

Here, I take up an aspect of the orderliness of that context-sensitive use. As Sacks et al. suggest, “The particularities of context are exhibited in systematically organized ways and places, and those are shaped by the context-free organization” (699, n. 8). In this report, I explore aspects of next speaker selection practices that employ – and thereby make relevant and organize – various aspects of the situatedness, identities, and particularities of context and content on a case-by-case (that is, turn-by-turn) basis.

I begin by limiting the scope of this report in several ways. First, I limit the discussion to those turns-at-talk that implement “sequence-initiating actions” – that is, those actions that project type-matched responding actions for next turn, as when an information-seeking query makes a type-matched answer relevant. This kind of sequence organization is characterized by the adjacency pair relationship of “conditional relevance” between the two parts of an action pair (Sacks 1992, Schegloff 1968, 1990, Schegloff & Sacks 1973). The production of a sequence-initiating action (a “first pair-part”) makes specially relevant a related responding action or specifiable set of responding actions (a “second pair-part”) for next turn.

Action sequence initiation can contribute both to current speaker’s techniques for selecting next speaker AND to self-selection of next speaker. In this report, I restrict the discussion to current-selects-next techniques – that is, to those cases in which sequence-initiating actions are addressed to a single party. For a brief sketch of how action sequence initiation can shape self-selection practices in conversation, see Lerner (1993:226).

Sacks et al. 1974 (see also Schegloff 1987, 1995) propose that speaker selection techniques – and turn-taking organization more generally – operate on parties and not on participants, because it is sometimes possible for a single “party” to a conversation to be made up of more than one person. On these occasions, turn-taking practices may allocate speaking turns to the parties, but not to a specific person within the party. In this report, I examine current speaker practices that select a single next speaker for parties whose incumbents are single participants. However, current-selects-next techniques also include methods for selecting multiple-participant parties (Lerner 1993). Further, I limit the discussion to multiparty conversation. Addressing practices can be employed in two-party conversation, but in those cases, their deployment is, for the most part, not implicated in selecting who will be the next speaker. Finally, I concentrate on the “methods of addressing” speakers use and I discuss the initiating actions themselves only insofar as they are relevant to explicating how addressing is accomplished.

In summary, this report examines the context-sensitivity of addressing practices employed by a current speaker to make evident the selection of a next speaker in multiparty conversations. I begin with a discussion of two forms of EXPLICIT ADDRESSING: directing one’s gaze to a coparticipant and addressing a coparticipant by name or other address term. Though each of these alone can constitute a method of addressing (as part of a current-selects-next technique), I show that each seems to have some context-specific limitations on use. I then turn to an

examination of TACIT ADDRESSING. Roughly, this manner of addressing a recipient draws upon diverse features of the specific circumstances, content, and composition of a sequence-initiating action to make evident who is being addressed.<sup>1</sup>

EXPLICIT ADDRESSING IN THE SELECTION OF NEXT SPEAKER

How can speakers indicate that they are selecting someone to speak next in multi-party conversation? According to Sacks et al. 1974, this can be accomplished by composing a turn at talk that addresses a sequence-initiating action (a “first pair-part”) to a particular participant. Both elements must be present: a first pair-part and some form of addressing. Sacks et al. propose that affiliating either gaze direction or an address term to a first pair-part can constitute an explicit method of addressing whereby a current speaker selects a next speaker.<sup>2</sup>

*Limits of gaze as a routine method of explicit addressing*

Speakers’ gazing practices often demonstrate explicitly to coparticipants that an initiating action is being directed to a particular party, thus selecting that party to speak next. This shows the gazed-at participant that he or she is the intended recipient, and it shows the participants not gazed at that they are not the intended recipient. For this method to work, then, an intended recipient must see the gaze – and others may also need to see it to grasp that someone (else) has been selected. This method of next-speaker selection is employed by Michael in excerpt (1) at line 4. (Line 5 indicates at what points, relative to lines 3 and 4, each participant begins her or his continuing gaze, with the lower-case letters indicating at whom they are gazing.)

(1) [Chicken dinner: simplified]

- 1 Nancy: You see all these (.) cars comin: (0.4) toward you with
- 2 the[r h e a d l i g h t ]s
- 3 Vivian: [Wul– thank Go][d there weren’t that many. ]
- 4 → Michael: [‘Member the wah– guy we sa:]w?
- 5 Vm-----Nm/Mn----- Sm-----
- 6 (0.2)
- 7 Nancy: eh↑(h)Oh(h)o he[e Y(h)a(h)a h ha ha ha ↑ha
- 8 Michael [huh huh

Here, Michael’s question could sensibly have been for Nancy or Shane, or even for all of his coparticipants (initiating a joint reminiscence). However, he turns to Nancy as he begins speaking at line 4. She can see that he is directing his utterance to her (though she does adjust her gaze slightly after he begins speaking), and Vivian can also see that Michael turns to Nancy, since she is gazing at him when she begins to speak at line 3. Shane, a fourth participant, turns toward Michael at saw in line 4, and thus sees that Michael has been directing his utterance to Nancy, though it could well have been for him. Shane looks to Michael just before a response is due, finding at the last possible moment that the question is directed elsewhere. (Shane has been Michael’s “default recipient” throughout

the conversation.) It is common for speakers to look at or look for an addressed recipient as they begin to speak, and for the onset of a speaking turn to occasion a reciprocal gaze by coparticipants to determine if they (alone) are being addressed.

Gaze as an addressing device is too complex a matter to consider fully here, but one can appreciate this complexity by noting that gaze-directional addressing is vulnerable to the looking/glancing practices of recipients.<sup>3</sup> One vulnerability of speaker gaze as an addressing technique is that it may not be seen by the gazed-at recipient (Goodwin 1979, 1980). Another vulnerability is that speaker gaze may not be seen by non-addressed recipients, though speaker and addressed recipient have established mutual gaze. For instance, in (2) at line 9, Shane clearly selects Vivian as next speaker by asking a question while speaker and recipient have established mutual gaze. (Their faces are less than a foot apart at this point, and they are looking directly at each other as can be seen in Fig. 1.) However, Michael, who only hears the question because he is looking down toward his plate, speaks next at line 11:

## (2) [Chicken dinner]

- |    |            |   |
|----|------------|---|
| 1  | Vivian:    | I gave Michael the bigges' piece– too:            |
| 2  |            | (0.7)   |
| 3  | Shane:     | What?   |
| 4  |            | (0.4)   |
| 5  | Nancy:     | Yeh I sa[w tha:]t.                                |
| 6  | Shane:     | [What?]   |
| 7  | Michael:   | We know'oo[rates he:re]:=                         |
| 8  | Vivian:    | [Of chicken,]                                     |
| 9  | → Shane:   | =Is this true?                                    |
| 10 |            | (0.2)   |
| 11 | → Michael: | She gay me the biggis' potato the biggis' chicken |

While Shane and Vivian look at each other at line 9, Michael is looking at a slice of bread as he butters it. Clearly, for Vivian and Shane, Vivian is being addressed and thereby has been selected as next speaker, but this is not available to Michael, who responds to Shane's feigned disbelief – though not to its question format – with a feigned taunt that upgrades Vivian's original remark. Further, this response is not marked as misplaced (e.g. as a preempting response), and it may be that both Vivian and Shane cannot see that Michael cannot see that Shane is visibly directing his question to Vivian. Importantly, nothing in the design of Shane's utterance or its placement in this particular sequential environment would suggest that he is addressing his remark to any particular party, or to Vivian in particular. His feigned disbelief, formatted as a request for confirmation of Vivian's assertion at line 1, is responsive to Vivian's announcement, but either the giver or receiver of the "biggest piece" could respond (and, in addition, Nancy has also put herself in a position to respond).

Gaze is an explicit form of addressing, but its success is contingent on the separate gazing practices of coparticipants. Speakers can look to a recipient to indicate whom they are addressing and thereupon discern whether or not that



FIGURE 1: “Is this true?”

participant recognizes that she is being addressed. (As Goodwin 1980 has shown, if the intended recipient is not found to be gazing back, the speaker has turn-constructural methods for eliciting recipient gaze.) Further, gaze-directional addressing is designed, in the first place, for the addressed recipient, and only thereby for others to see (or not see) that someone has been selected to respond in next turn.

Occasionally, speakers do produce a gazing pose that seems designed specifically to show other-than-addressed recipients that they are not being addressed, while nonetheless gazing at the intended recipient. For example, speakers sometimes pointedly gaze around one participant to address another beyond the more proximate party who is returning their gaze, even when the more proximate party is not really obscuring their view, as in the following instance:

(3) [Chicken dinner (simplified)]

Michael: W't kinda solution you-you: uh: u:se. Yi[h use-

Vivian: [Bausch'n Lomb,

Here Michael has suspended a return to eating after an exchange with Shane on the same topic; he then looks around Shane to Vivian as he begins his question as can be seen in Fig. 2.<sup>4</sup> For the most part, though, speakers do not (and in a sense cannot) look to other-than-addressed participants to determine that they too recognize who is being addressed.<sup>5</sup>

These considerations reveal an additional task speakers may encounter in addressing a recipient through gaze – a task that may have to be completed by means other than gaze. In addition to showing whom they are addressing with their gaze,



FIGURE 2: “What kind of solution do you use?”

speakers may need to indicate THAT they are addressing a single coparticipant. Coparticipants can be alerted to this when a speaker’s turn includes a second-person reference (Lerner 1996). The RECIPIENT REFERENCE term (‘you’) can indicate that a speaker is addressing a single participant, but it may not reveal who that participant is. I introduce ‘you’ here not as an explicit form of address, but as a form of reference that furnishes recipients with an additional resource in recognizing that a current-selects-next technique is being employed by the current speaker.<sup>6</sup> When it is employed, the recipient reference term can go a long way toward dealing with the contingencies of coparticipant gazing practices, as I show in the next section.

*‘You’ as an “unknown recipient” indicator*

When a speaker REFERS to a coparticipant by using that person’s name (as in excerpt 2 at line 1) or an other-than-recipient reference term (‘he/she’), then that participant can be excluded as an addressed recipient. On the other hand, if a speaker refers to a single coparticipant using the recipient reference term (‘you’), then that speaker’s turn will be treated as explicitly addressed to that participant – if the participant referred to is evident or can be made evident in some way.

The use of ‘you’ as a form of person reference separates the action of “addressing a recipient” from the designation of just who is being addressed. In interactional terms, then, ‘you’ might be termed a RECIPIENT INDICATOR, but not a recipient designator. As such, it might be thought of as an incomplete form of address. This both furnishes a resource and poses a task for recipients in multi-

party conversation, since speakers can indicate that they are addressing a specific participant in a manner that does not itself reveal who that individual is. Thus, the use of 'you' can indicate that a single recipient is being addressed without designating specifically who is being referred to, while an accompanying gaze can demonstrate just who that person is. Moreover, the use of recipient reference can alert coparticipants that someone has been selected, but those candidate addressed recipients only subsequently determine who has actually been addressed by inspecting the speaker's gaze direction. This can be seen in (4):

## (4) [Chicken dinner]

1		(1.5)
2	Nancy:	Let's <u>w</u> atch Rocky Th <u>re</u> .
3		(0.7)
4	Shane:	Y <u>h</u> eahh.
5		(0.8)
6	Michael:	°M gunna be s:[i]ck.°
7	Shane:	[Um (.) <u>a</u> lways up f' <u>t</u> h <u>a</u> :t
8	Michael:	*M gunna be sick.
9	Shane:	h <u>u</u> h ha h[oh haa-aa-heh
10	(Vivian):	[mm-h <u>m</u> -mm-h <u>m</u> -mm.
11		(1.6)
12	→ Vivian:	Have you been <u>w</u> atching it a lot?
13		Vs ----- Nv/Mv--
14		(1.2)
15		-----Sv----- ((here each "-" = 0.1))
16	Shane:	Ner- <u>n</u> ahwuh- (.) Well
17		(.)

In this instance, Vivian begins speaking at line 12 while all four participants are occupied with eating. As Vivian begins to speak, she turns her head to the left and looks toward Shane, who is busy scooping up a forkful of food. (She continues to hold this position through line 16.) Nancy looks up sharply toward Vivian at *it*, and Michael does the same. He begins his move an instant after Nancy but finishes his (shorter) head raise at virtually the same moment as Nancy. In the meantime, Shane finishes a bite of food from his fork and then turns toward Vivian during the silence at line 14. (This is shown at line 15.) In this case, *you* shows that the question is being addressed to a single participant, thus selecting that participant to speak next. However, all three of Vivian's coparticipants could warrantably take it that they were possibly being referred to and thereby addressed by *you*. However, when Nancy and Michael look up (at a point when a response may soon be due), they can see from Vivian's gaze direction that the question was visibly directed to Shane, and neither responds in the 1.2 seconds before Shane speaks at line 16. Shane finishes taking a bite, turns and sees Vivian's gaze, and then begins to answer at line 16. Thus, the use of recipient reference can make visual inspection by coparticipants relevant if the circumstances of its use do not otherwise disambiguate who is being selected to speak next.<sup>7</sup>

Excerpt (2) revealed one vulnerability of gaze as a lone method of addressing in multiparty talk-in-interaction: An other-than-addressed participant could not

see that someone (else) was being addressed. Excerpt (4) showed how the concurrent use of recipient reference ('you') may occasion coparticipants' gaze shift, thereby bringing speaker's gaze direction into view.<sup>8</sup>

*Context-specific deployment of address terms*

If one wants to direct a sequence-initiating action unambiguously to a particular coparticipant, then one can address that participant with a personal name or other address term, such as a term of endearment ('honey') or a categorical term of address ('coach') that applies uniquely to them on that occasion.<sup>9</sup> Although this is arguably the strongest form of address available, that does not mean it has the widest use. My investigation suggests that address terms are far from ubiquitous, even though their use is rather unconstrained in turn-constructural terms. In fact, they seem to be used primarily under specific circumstances in which they are deployed to do more than simply specify whom the speaker is addressing. In other words, this is a form of addressing employed when considerations beyond addressing are involved.

There seem to be two broad classes of use, and these, to some extent, seem to be implemented through distinct positioning of the address term vis-à-vis the initiating action. This may consist in pre-positioning the address term as [Name + First pair-part], e.g. *Michael yih want s'more wine?*; or in post-positioning it as [First pair-part + Name], e.g. *What size is it Curt.*

Pre-positioned terms of address are regularly employed as a device to establish or verify the availability of a recipient in situations where this may be problematic. When a turn or turn-constructural unit (TCU) begins with the name of a coparticipant, then a sequence-initiating action that follows will almost certainly be treated as addressed to that participant – and it will be so treated, pretty much without regard to its other circumstances or to how that sequence-initiating action is composed.<sup>10</sup> In (5) at line 9, Vivian is engaged in an activity (pouring wine for herself) that requires her gaze, so she cannot look toward her intended recipient:

(5) [Chicken dinner]

- |    |           |   |                               |
|----|-----------|---|-------------------------------|
| 1  | Michael:  | Boy you ate a lot there                                       |                               |
| 2  |           | (0.2)   |                               |
| 3  | Michael:  | Hm:?  |                               |
| 4  |           | (.)   |                               |
| 5  | Nancy:    | Mm hm:. ( [ ] ). ((chewing))                                  |                               |
| 6  | Shane     | [Jesus Chris(t)]  |                               |
| 7  | Nancy     |   | [Hmm:. ((with head nod))      |
| 8  |           | (1.0)   |                               |
| 9  | → Vivian: | Mi[chael yih want s'mo]re wine? ((M takes glass to drink as)) |                               |
| 10 | Michael:  | [You're 'n animal. ]  | ((V pours wine in own glass)) |

In addition, Michael has produced a “noticing” at line 1 that garnered responses from two other participants. Thus, there is the imminent possibility of subsequent



talk on the topic by or for Michael, and, in fact, Vivian's addressed offer turns out to be overlapped by such an exchange between Michael and one of the other participants. The point I want to make here is that the emerging course of action, in various ways, creates a situation that might complicate addressing an offer to Michael – and that it is in just such places of possible complication that pre-positioned address terms seem to be used. (One systematic environment occurs after a prior failed attempt at addressing is followed by a subsequent attempt, as will be seen in excerpt 10.)

Post-positioned terms of address are regularly employed as a device to demonstrate a particular stance toward or relationship with a recipient under circumstances where that demonstration is particularly relevant. In these cases, addressing usually is first indicated by gaze and/or tacit forms of address, and then a name is appended to the sequence-initiating action. Of course, this also can be done when the success of other methods used over the course of a turn's talk is questionable. However, adding a post-positioned address term does not generally seem to be reparative in this way; rather, it upholds the (already adequately established) intended recipient. As such, it underlines the very act of speaking expressly to the already addressed recipient. Moreover, to use an address term is always to say something about the addressed party.<sup>11</sup> When the speaker is thus freed from the necessity of addressing, post-positioned address terms – coming in a turn/TCU-terminal position that carries virtually no grammatical restriction on its occurrence – can be employed selectively. For instance, a recipient's name can be appended to a question as a way to underscore personal concern for a problem, as in (6) at line 10:

(6) [Auto discussion]

- |    |         |   |
|----|---------|---|
| 1  | Curt:   | Well my problem is tryina find parts. 'n stuff. |
| 2  |         | I got en engine over there I stuck damn near a  |
| 3  |         | thousan dollars in it.                          |
| 4  |         | (0.4)   |
| 5  |         | I haven't got heads'r carburetion for it.       |
| 6  |         | (1.0)   |
| 7  |         | En it's never been run.                         |
| 8  |         | (1.7)   |
| 9  |         | En I=-  |
| 10 | → Mike: | =What [size is it Curt,                         |
| 11 | Curt:   | [I-   |
| 12 | Curt:   | Uh:: three, fifty fou:r no:w,                   |

In (6), Curt is in the midst of describing his failure to install an engine in his car, and Mike seems to be asking for information as a preliminary to giving advice (cf. Jefferson 1981). Note that, in this case, neither speaker or recipient is looking directly at the other at line 10; both are looking down at the picnic table at which they are seated with another participant, who is visually occupied with cleaning the top of his beer can.<sup>12</sup> Mike's question can be understood to be addressed to Curt even before the address term is produced, since it is occasioned by Curt's

problem presentation. (This type of tacit addressing is examined in the next section.) Thus, the addition of the address term can be understood to “personalize” the inquiry, registering Mike’s genuine concern with the problem, by registering his concern with it as Curt’s problem. By explicitly connecting his concern for the problem to Curt, when the addressed recipient is not in doubt, Mike can demonstrate his concern for Curt.

This positional division of labor for address terms is by no means an absolute division. For example, adding an address term to the end of a turn can sometimes be a “last-ditch effort” to establish reciprocity that has not been adequately established by other means over the course of the turn.<sup>13</sup> Nevertheless, the temporal (i.e. emergent) nature of talk-in-interaction privileges PRE-POSITIONED addressing for ensuring reciprocity for a turn’s upcoming talk, and it thereby also allows any pre-positioned address term to be understood in this way, no matter what else it might be doing.<sup>14</sup> The vulnerability of establishing reciprocity for a turn that includes a post-positioned address term can be seen in (7):

(7) [Chicken dinner]

- |   |          |  |
|---|----------|--|
| 1 | Vivian:  | I wz gunnuh take that <u>Michael</u> ,         |
| 2 |          | (0.3)  |
| 3 | Michael: | Wha [ :t?                                      |
| 4 | Vivian:  | [ <u>A</u> h wz gunna take [ that little pe]e- |
| 5 | Michael: | [Oh <u>h</u> e : r e]                          |

It is not until the production of the post-positioned address term at line 1 that Michael seems to realize that Vivian is speaking to him. Prior to line 1, Vivian had begun reaching diagonally across a coffee table to take the last small piece of chicken from a serving plate, but Michael (who has the serving plate in easy reach) took it instead, seeming unaware of Vivian’s movement.<sup>15</sup> As Vivian speaks at line 1, Michael is occupied with finding a way to take hold of the chicken. The prosody of Vivian’s post-positioned address term (Michael) is composed to strengthen her irritation at him as part of her reprimand, but in this case its use results in establishing reciprocity – though for an action that has almost ended now. (Michael does have available the “tone of voice” used to produce his name to indicate a possible reprimand.) His sudden gaze shift, which begins on the second syllable of his name, and the intonational contour of the repair initiator at line 3 suggest that he now recognizes that he has been addressed but does not grasp just what action has been addressed to him.

Notice that when Vivian reissues her complaint at line 4, she does not need to explicitly address Michael, since reciprocity is the one matter that has been settled through the repair initiation at line 3. However, when there is no uptake at all of an initiating action that includes a post-positioned address term, then that action can be reissued – but now with a pre-positioned address term. This can be seen in (8) and (9). In these exchanges, between an adult and a child, an instruction/command initially composed with a post-positioned address term is reissued with a pre-positioned address term after the sequence-initiating action has been ignored:

## (8) [Pre-party]

- 1 Ann: Turn around'n face the front sweetheart.  
 2 ((3-turn sequence between two other participants deleted))  
 3 (1.0)  
 4 Ann: Baby?  
 5 (1.0) ((Engine whines and catches))  
 6 → Ann: 'Omi, turn around, face the front.  
 7 Nao: Wha:::  
 8 Ann: Because it's better that way when we're drivving, okay?

## (9) [Fearon:family]

- 1 Dad: Clean it. [ASH|LEY  
 2 Jor: [Oo::[:h ((moaning))  
 3 Ash: [Ol::[:h Woo: Woo  
 4 (2.0)  
 5 → Dad: ASHLEY. Don't ignore me.

Note that although the arrowed turns are addressed, sequence-initiating actions, the implicated responding action need not have a verbal component, so speaking next is somewhat optional (though responding obviously is not). The point here is that trouble in reciprocity can occasion a positional shift in the placement of the address term.

Thus, address terms seem to be employed when addressing is used to do additional work under specific circumstances: circumstances that portend possible trouble in establishing an addressed recipient, or circumstances in which a demonstration of personal concern or some other stance (positive or negative) toward an addressed recipient seems relevant.<sup>16</sup> Further, these two uses of address terms seem to have a (structurally based) differential distribution in their placement as pre-positioned and post-positioned addressing, respectively, when they are employed with a sequence-initiating action.

Next, I look more closely at pre-positioned addressing in order to distinguish between addressing that is composed as preliminary to and on the way to the sequence-initiating action it precedes, and addressing that is composed as a discrete sequence-initiating action – specifically, one that launches a summons-response sequence.<sup>17</sup>

Pre-positioned address terms can be designed and placed to accomplish both fully exposed and fully embedded forms of addressing, as well as intermediate forms.<sup>18</sup> In (5), Vivian's pre-positioned *Michael* is produced in an embedded or unexposed fashion. It is designed by its speaker to ensure the availability (for the upcoming initiating action) of the participant it locates as that action's addressed recipient in a sequential environment in which his availability could be in question, but she does not produce it in a fashion that treats ensuring that availability as a discrete task. There is no special stress, and no pause between address term and first pair-part. The two components seem "through-produced" as a single unit. The address term is affiliated with the initiating action in a way that is not composed or placed explicitly to summon a recipient; that is, it is not designed to initiate a summons-response sequence. Thus, it does not indicate explicitly that



FIGURE 3: “Michael”

there may be some question about the recipient’s availability in the same way that a summons markedly does. It is doing “just addressing,” but its pre-positioned placement allows it to accomplish more, if necessary.

Various features of utterance composition and placement can begin to expose the summoning of a recipient as a separate action – as one that implicates its own responding action.<sup>19</sup> Summoning a coparticipant by name can be a separate, preliminary action that sets the stage for a turn’s principal action, as in (10):

(10) [Chicken dinner]

- 1 Nancy: Michael  
 2 (0.4)  
 3 I thought you were going to church tomorrow?  
 4 (1.3)  
 5 Michael: I’ll go Wednesday night

Here Nancy first summons Michael by name and then asks him a question. The brief pause after the name provides a place for Michael to respond to the summons. He responds by turning toward her to show his availability as a recipient for her next utterance. (Fig. 3 shows the scene just as she begins to speak at line 1 and before he turns toward her at line 2.) Summoning Michael by name was not Nancy’s first attempt to address this question to him. She has made at least two previous attempts (not shown in the excerpt) at “I thought you were going to church tomorrow?” that did not become ratified speaking turns and as such did not succeed in selecting Michael as next speaker. She then makes a third attempt

to summon him by tapping on his shoulder. On this, her fourth try, she addresses him explicitly by name and waits to see if this makes him available for her query. (Nancy also gazes at and touches Michael again just as she addresses him by name.) Here, addressing by name is employed as a summons after three failed attempts, and in this case it is successful. (The just prior attempt was also produced with touch; the turn-initial address term is what has been added on this try.)

Summoning someone in this fashion does more than attempt to ensure the availability of an addressed recipient. As a “pre-sequence” initiating action (Schefflo 1968, 1990, Terasaki 1976) it projects a subsequent action by the summoner herself. Moreover, an addressed summons projects (and the response to the summons ratifies) that the addressed recipient of the summons will be the addressed recipient of the projected next action. This is, of course, what the recipient is being summoned for. Moreover, if the summoner’s next turn or next TCU is itself a sequence-initiating action (as in ex. 10, line 3), then the addressed summons can show that it is the summoned party who has been selected to speak next, in order to respond to that initiating action. That is, the pre-first utterance (the summons) prepares the place for its speaker’s next action and foreshadows who that next action’s addressed recipient will be.

It is important to underscore that summoning by name can be an action quite distinct from merely addressing by name, though both can involve problems of establishing reciprocity. Summonses are composed first to establish reciprocity by making relevant a responding action by a coparticipant (to demonstrate reciprocity before going on), whereas pre-positioned addressing by name can be composed to establish reciprocity while going on. The practical consequences of this distinction can be seen in (11). At line 1, Nancy summons Vivian by name and then stops, but does not succeed in getting her attention as a recipient. Moments later, she begins to summon Vivian again:

(11) [Chicken dinner]

- 1 Nancy: Vivian
- 2 :((intervening talk by others))
- 3 Nancy: V i v- The chicken is rilly goo:d.

This time, Nancy cuts off her summons at just the point when Vivian looks toward her. She abandons the summons at the point when it is responded to and restarts her turn with the action (a compliment) for which the summons was preparing the way. It is not through-produced with the sequence-initiating action, as a pre-positioned address term can be. In other words, here the speaker is treating *Viv-* as a (no longer needed) sequence-initial summons, and not as a turn-initial term of address.

Launching a summons-response sequence before producing the main sequence-initiating action is designed to take up securing an addressed recipient as an activity (a sequence of actions) in its own right, whereas a pre-positioned address term is used to ensure the same result in passing, as part of a turn’s talk. Producing a summons makes going on to the main action contingent, whereas producing a pre-

positioned address term may not. In this sense, summoning by name is the stronger form and a pre-positioned address term is the weaker form. However, both should be considered solutions to the same problem: Address terms are the solution to the addressing problem when reciprocity is in doubt for an upcoming First pair-part.

In the following section, I introduce matters of turn content, composition, placement, and context that can register that someone is being addressed: (i) whether the speaker visibly directs gaze to someone (and whether coparticipants see that speaker doing so); (ii) whether the speaker uses an address term; and (iii) whether a recipient reference term indicates that someone in particular is being addressed. That is, I show that an addressed recipient can be indicated without any of these explicit methods of addressing. These tacit ways of addressing count on the “thick particulars” available in situ at each interactional moment.<sup>20</sup>

#### TACIT ADDRESSING IN THE SELECTION OF NEXT SPEAKER

Action sequences can play an important part in the selection of a next speaker even when they are not accompanied by an explicit form of addressing. The organization of actions – as sequences of actions – shapes participation; each course of action shapes the opportunities to participate within it. For example, asking a question ordinarily makes an answer especially relevant. Furthermore, when a question is asked in one turn, an answer is not merely made relevant; it is made relevant in the first place for the next turn. This is so whether or not the question has a unique addressed recipient.

In this section, I show how the organization of actions as sequences of action can be bound up with the selection of a next speaker, insofar as the relevance of one or another type of responding action for a next turn can inform the selection of who speaks in that turn. It is possible for a sequence-initiating action to be realized in the thick particulars of a singular interactional moment in a way that makes it clear at a glance – or even without a glance – who is being spoken to, even when no (explicit) addressing technique is used. **WHEN THE REQUIREMENTS FOR RESPONDING TO A SEQUENCE-INITIATING ACTION LIMIT ELIGIBLE RESPONDERS TO A SINGLE PARTICIPANT, THEN THAT PARTICIPANT HAS BEEN TACITLY SELECTED AS NEXT SPEAKER.**

This is one place where the specifics of situatedness, identities, and particularities of content and context can shape the allocation of speaking turns in conversation. That is, sometimes sequence-initiating actions can be understood to have been designed for a single recipient. This form of recipient design (Sacks et al. 1974, Sacks & Schegloff 1979, Sacks 1992) can tacitly accomplish addressing, and thereby contribute to selection of next speaker.

For example, on some occasions the known-in-common circumstances made relevant by a sequence-initiating action can restrict who is eligible to respond properly to a single participant (and thus become procedurally consequential for turn-taking).<sup>21</sup> This can be seen in (12) at line 1:

## (12) [Auto discussion]

- 1 Curt: Wul how wz the races las'night.  
 2 (0.8) ((Mike nodes head twice))  
 3 Curt: Who w'n [th'feature.]  
 4 Mike: [A l w o n,]  
 5 (0.3)  
 6 Curt: [(Who)]=  
 7 Mike: [A l.]=  
 8 Curt: =Al did?

Since Curt's question is formulated as a request for an eyewitness account, it makes relevant a report for next turn from participants who could properly make such a report. By making especially relevant a particular next action, the question thereby makes especially relevant, in the first place, talk by a QUALIFIED coparticipant. In this way, an action can provide a locally relevant form for what is known and for how a participant can be identified. This may or may not uniquely select a next speaker from among the current speaker's coparticipants. Insofar as it is known-in-common that Mike is the only one present who attended the races, then the question could only be properly for him.

The question of whether a fact of this sort is "positively" known or known-in-common ("I know he was there" or even "I know he, alone, was there"), or "negatively" known or known-in-common ("I know I wasn't there") by various combinations of participants – as well as the question of participants' assessments of what others could deduce is known, and by whom – can bear on the recognizability, "strength," and results of tacit addressing on a case-by-case basis. In this case, Mike's attendance at the races, while Curt was at Mike's house alone with Mike's wife, Phyllis, has been a repeated topic of teasing discussion in this conversation.

It is also possible to compose a turn in a way that tacitly selects a speaker in a "negative" fashion – not by showing who is uniquely eligible to speak, but by eliminating every other possible recipient as a possible next speaker. In (13), there are four participants present. They make up two couples and their "couplesness" is currently relevant as they are trying to decide when they, as couples, will go to a swap meet. In the course of this discussion, Nancy asks, *So what time should they come over tomorrow?*

## (13) [Chicken dinner]

- 1 (0.7)  
 2 → Nancy: Soo w'time sh'd they c'm over t°morruh.°  
 3 Michael: (Sniff)  
 4 (1.5)  
 5 Michael: I don'know wuh ti-.me  
 6 (1.1)

At line 2, Nancy refers to the other couple (*they*) and thereby eliminates them as proper recipients of her question and reduces those present who could speak next to one – to her partner, Michael. Addressing is tacitly achieved through the turn's design; in this case, addressing is enabled (in a negative sense) in the reference to

all of her coparticipants but one. The use of *they* aggregates the other couple as a party to the talk, thus making it, for that moment, a three-party conversation.

In a similar fashion, by referring to one coparticipant by name (and thus explicitly excluding him or her as a possible addressed recipient), another participant can be shown to be the addressed recipient of the sequence-initiating action when only three participants are present. In (14), Curt refers to one of his coparticipants, thereby indicating that he is addressing the other one:

(14) [Auto discussion]

- 1 Curt: D'd I ever tell you about th'time Mike en I were in Vietnam en
- 2 got captured by the enemy; ((thumb point to Mike))
- 3 (0.4)
- 4 Gary: Oh :: come o::n.

Three-party interaction must solve the turn-allocational problem on a turn-by-turn basis, but the “one or the other” nature of the task may be solved by practices distinctive to this configuration.

Producing a sequence-initiating action that is understood to reduce the number of response-eligible recipients to one participant can amount to a method of indicating who is being addressed, though no one has been explicitly addressed. When a turn is composed as a sequence-initiating action, anything in the design and content of the turn, or the circumstances relevant or made relevant to its production (identities, situation, course of action, setting, sequential position, etc.) that indicates that only a single participant is response-eligible, constitutes a current-selects-next device.

*'You' as a “known recipient” indicator*

In a previous section, I described how the recipient reference term ‘you’ can indicate that some one participant is being addressed without specifying who that participant is. When ‘you’ is used as an “unknown recipient” indicator, it can occasion a visual search procedure by coparticipants to determine from the speaker’s gaze just who the addressed recipient is. In that case, who is being referred to is resolved by determining who is being addressed. On the other hand, if the reference is known from the specifics of situatedness, identities, and/or particularities of content, context and sequential position (so that a visual search for the addressed recipient is not needed), then who is being addressed can be established through the recipient reference. This can be seen in (15). Here, Shane’s question at line 1 recognizably refers to Vivian (through the use of *you*), thereby addressing her, and thus selects her as next speaker:

(15) [Chicken dinner]

- 1 → Shane: Did you cook this all the way through?
- 2 (0.7) ((V finishes taking butter and looks over at S’s plate))
- 3 Vivian: ↑Ye:s.

Shane is seated between Vivian and another participant, Nancy. Here, gaze is not used to demonstrate who *you* addresses. If anything, Vivian may see Shane turn



slightly away from her and toward Nancy as he says *Did you cook* at line 1. (He does a slight but sharp head-shake toward Nancy as she passes the butter to Vivian.) In this instance, the person referred to by *you* can be located in the thick particulars of the occasion, and thereby next speaker selection is achieved. Shane and Vivian are hosting the dinner, while Nancy and Michael are guests. The use of *you* along with the turn-initial deployment of *did* shows that a current-selects-next technique has been launched, but to determine just who is being addressed, coparticipants must turn elsewhere. In contrast, if Shane had used a form that did not include *you*, such as *Is this cooked all the way through?*, then his initiating action would not uniquely select Vivian to speak next. In this instance, all present know-in-common that Vivian cooked the meal, and since Shane is the only other conceivable food preparer and he is the one asking the complaining question, Vivian is unambiguously bound to the action, and his use of the recipient indicator *you* makes it clear she is being addressed.<sup>22</sup>

### *Sequential position of a sequence-initiating action*

In (12), tacit addressing seems to rest on participants' knowledge of Mike's whereabouts the night before, which was discussed earlier in the conversation. He alone was at the races, so he alone is entitled to give a first-hand report of the event. Yet the social identities of a participant that are constituted or made relevant in the course of interaction, as a resource for tacit addressing, can be a much more local matter, and they need not be discussed at all or known in advance. In fact, these local identities need not even be namable by the participants. In (16) and (17), a coparticipant's "sequential identity" as the producer of the just prior response to an earlier addressed sequence-initiating action (in the first case), or as the speaker of the just prior turn (in the second case) provides a systematically available momentary identity that can be used to address a single recipient tacitly. In these cases, the local sources for tacitly addressing a participant come from formal features of sequence organization and turn-taking organization, respectively.

Sequence organization can provide the circumstances for accomplishing tacit addressing. The positioning of a turn-at-talk as an action within a sequence of actions can provide the resources for tacitly addressing a recipient.<sup>23</sup> Once a question is answered, as in (16) at line 2, it is possible to produce a later turn that tacitly selects the answerer as next speaker by designing that later turn (line 4) as a follow-up question, showing that this turn is addressed to the same speaker as the sequence-initiating question:

- (16) [Sacks et al. 1974, ((multiparty conversation))]  
 1     Sy:    See Death 'v a Salesman las' night?  
 2     Jim:    No.  
 3            ((pause))  
 4 →  Sy:    Never see(h)n it?  
 5     Jim:    No.

In this case, the subsequent turn by Sy is composed to show that it is tied to the just prior sequence as a post-expansion of that sequence. Thus, in sequence-organizational terms, this form of tacit addressing might be called “post-expansion addressing.”

The turn that launches the sequence of actions need not be addressed to a single participant for the follow-up question to be understood as tacitly addressed to the answerer of the original question. In (17), Mom asks if anyone wants dessert, to which Virginia responds in the affirmative. Mom then asks a follow-up clarifying question at line 4, addressing Virginia as the speaker of the prior sequence-responding action. It is by producing a clarifying question that is occasioned by the response to her earlier unaddressed offer that the recipient indicator *you* can be understood to refer to Virginia. (Note that Mom is away from the table and has her back to it as she speaks.)

(17) [Virginia]

- |   |           |   |
|---|-----------|---|
| 1 | Mom:      | Is everybody going to have ice crea:m 'n sherbet or whatever. |
| 2 | Virginia: | I jus' want a liddle bit.                                     |
| 3 |           | (0.6)   |
| 4 | → Mom:    | And you want sherbet and (.) ice crea:m?                      |
| 5 | Virginia: | Mm Hm   |
| 6 |           | (0.2)   |
| 7 | Mom:      | Everybody want that?  |

Post-expansions can also make clear who is being addressed even when they come at some distance from the original sequence. Thus, in (18), as a topic seems to be closing down, Virginia again asks her mother for a raise in her weekly allowance from five dollars to ten dollars, almost seven minutes after the original request and after a distinct change in topics:

(18) [Virginia]

- |   |             |  |
|---|-------------|--|
| 1 |             | (1.0)                                      |
| 2 | → Virginia: | ^Please let me have ten dollars, ^please?  |
| 3 | Prudence:   | ehh-huh! h h                               |
| 4 | Mom:        | [^O:::h!Here we go again.I'm gonna have    |
| 5 |             | indigestion 'fore I ever get through here. |

None of her coparticipants looks toward Virginia as she speaks, and no one (including Mom) looks toward her as Mom replies, but all clearly know whom Virginia is addressing.

It is also possible to initiate a sequence in a manner that strongly sets the stage for a subsequent turn by the same speaker to be heard as addressed to the same recipient as the sequence-initiating action was. Pre-expansions such as the summons-answer pre-sequences discussed earlier can operate in this fashion.<sup>24</sup>

A participant's momentary sequential identity as just prior speaker provides a systematically available resource – described solely in terms of turn-taking organization – for tacitly addressing a coparticipant. Of course, this form of tacit addressing is highly constrained, since there ordinarily will be only one partici-

part for each speaking turn who can be addressed in this way, and that participant changes with each next turn. Not surprisingly, the sorts of sequence-initiating actions that use this turn-by-turn sequential identity for tacit addressing are also highly constrained.

Sacks et al. 1974 (cf. Schegloff et al. 1977) have pointed out that other-initiated repair (e.g. *Hm?* and *What?*), at least when it occurs in its ordinary position of next turn after the trouble source, “may be used without any affiliating technique for selecting a particular other, and thereby selects the just prior speaker as next speaker” (1974:717). This can be seen in (19) at line 5. (Note that lines 1 and 3 are not addressed to Michael.)

(19) [Chicken dinner]

- |   |            |   |
|---|------------|---|
| 1 | Shane:     | D’y’have any sa:line s’lution?                                      |
| 2 |            | :   |
| 3 | Shane:     | Lemme <u>have</u> some (0.2) t’night (.). Lemme hev– cz I ran ou:t. |
| 4 |            | (0.4)   |
| 5 | → Michael: | <u>What</u> .   |
| 6 |            | (.)   |
| 7 | Shane:     | u–Saline solution gunnuh git s’m duhmorr’. ((gaze to M then V))     |
| 8 |            | (0.7)   |
| 9 | Michael:   | <u>Mm</u> ..  |

Michael’s utterance *What* (and next-turn repair initiators generally) is a sequence-initiating action. Here, Michael’s *What* locates a problem of reference in the just prior turn and makes a repair of that problem especially relevant for next turn. In locating a trouble source in the prior turn, next-turn repair initiators are directed to matters of that turn’s production, and therein (when not addressed elsewhere) directed to that turn’s producer as the one participant ordinarily entitled to complete the repair (though not necessarily the only participant capable of doing so). Here, then, the turn-taking features of “just prior turn” and “just prior speaker” provide the relevant “context” for tacit addressing.

These instances show that elements of sequence organization and turn-taking organization can be added to the shared particularities of circumstance, content, visible action, and so forth that are employed tacitly to restrict addressing of a sequence-initiating action to a single participant.<sup>25</sup>

#### CONCLUDING REMARKS

This report has described a range of practices that speakers use to address a sequence-initiating action to a single coparticipant, thereby selecting that participant to speak next. (However, one must remember that the employment of a practice does not automatically ensure who will actually speak next because additional interactional contingencies can intervene.) Explicit addressing has been shown to be context-sensitive in several ways. Gaze-directional addressing is sensitive to the gazing practices of coparticipants, while address terms seem to be selectively deployed in particular sequential environments where they can do more than indicate who is being addressed. The efficacy of tacit addressing is

bound up with members' methods for determining who is eligible to speak next from the specifics of what has been said, and from the thick particulars of its saying, on a case-by-case basis. In this sense, TACIT WAYS OF SELECTING A NEXT SPEAKER HAVE NO CONTEXT-FREE FEATURES: Their recognizability has to be dug out of the situated details on a case-by-case basis by participants and analysts alike.

These practices, both explicit and tacit, have been described for the most part individually, but it is important to point out that they can also occur in concert – though it is equally important to remember that no one practice is essential, and that each can be employed alone. Further, one can discern at least a partial ordering among these practices when they are used concurrently, since gaze direction, if inconsistent with other forms of addressing, will ordinarily give way to them. (In other words, it is possible to gaze at one participant while addressing another participant through other means.)

A central aim of this article has been to show how speaker selection practices operate, and to establish an empirical basis for the claim that turn-taking for conversation can have a context-free organization because participants can call upon the thick particulars of content and context at each interactional moment in a conversation, as needed. It is here, in the methodical use of content and context in the service of selecting a next speaker, that systematic organization and local deployment are conjoined.

## NOTES

\* An early version of this article was presented to the Sociolinguistics Section of the International Sociological Association, Bielefeld, Germany, July 1994. I am indebted to Emanuel Schegloff and Anita Pomerantz for providing comments on several drafts.

<sup>1</sup> Before beginning the discussion of specific practices for selecting next speaker, it is important to point out that even the perfect execution of a practice does not guarantee an immediately successful result. That is, the employment of a current-selects-next technique does not always result in the addressed recipient of an initiating action actually speaking next. In this report, I limit the discussion to the speaker-selection techniques themselves; elsewhere (Lerner 2001) I have described some of the interactional contingencies that may intervene systematically in their operation.

<sup>2</sup> Of course, several explicit methods can be employed in the same turn – for example, an address term, gaze, and even touch can be deployed in combination to address a sequence-initiating action to a particular recipient, as in (10). And these can be used even in circumstances, as in (10), in which tacit addressing could be adequate. In this report, for the most part, I focus on the “context-specificity of operation” of individual methods for indicating that some one participant is being addressed, and who that participant is. The attention to individual methods is not meant to imply that they are employed only individually in conversation.

<sup>3</sup> There are also other orders of complexity that I cannot develop in any detail here, especially having to do with what might be called the “strength” or “weakness” of the tacit addressing that gaze-directional practices accompany. Every sequence-initiating utterance – situated within the particulars of its circumstances – indicates (more or less) that a single party is being addressed or not, and it can designate (more or less) who that participant is or not, and do so to one or more of the speaker's coparticipants. At its weakest, a speaker is relying almost entirely upon gaze direction, while at its strongest, gaze direction can be redundant and may be used (or seen to be used) to other ends. In this section, I have attempted to employ instances that place all or most of the burden of addressing on gaze, so as to isolate its operation and expose its vulnerability. Conversely, in the later discussion of tacit addressing, I have attempted to pick instances that do not seem to rely upon gaze. Note that

names and other address terms can operate as addressing devices more independently of tacit addressing (and of gaze).

<sup>4</sup> Gaze-directional ambiguity can be remedied in other ways, as in the following instance. (Note that Hal is at some distance down a hall from the other two participants, who are themselves next to each other.)

[GL:FN]

Hal: I forgot to email you.  
(0.2) ((John and Chris look to Hal))  
Chris.

Here Hal recognizes that John and Chris cannot determine which of them was addressed from what has been said or from where his gaze is directed. Seeing this, he adds a disambiguating address term. (This use of an address term, when reciprocity is problematic, will be taken up in the next section.)

<sup>5</sup> Occasionally, speakers do look to an other-than-addressed recipient, if they are addressing their intended recipient in another way. This can occur in conjunction with referring to another participant, or when a speaker is registering that an action addressed TO one participant is also understood as another action FOR another participant (e.g., when heckling or teasing is afoot, as in the following instance):

[Chicken dinner (simplified)]

Vivian: One guy that I wanna call he usually comes ou:t. Yihknow  
so you js tell'm it's eighdy degree:s he'll get onna pla:ne  
:  
Shane: Woah  
Vivian: [[n a h-ha-ha]  
Nancy [[heh heh heh]  
Shane: [[wai woah w[oa]h  
Vivian: [ih hih hehh he[h  
Shane: [Wu wai'a wai'a wu.  
(0.4)  
→ Shane: One: gu::y you usually ca(h)a(h)ll? What[ is this  
Michael: [mm-hm-m-h[m  
Vivian: [No  
we [ca: l l.]  
Shane: [W'd is this]:.  
(0.5)  
Shane: Oh: Okay it wz: friend a'mi:ne too.Awright.

At the arrow, Shane looks to Michael, who returns his gaze and laughs, before Vivian responds to his seemingly feigned protest of her use of *I* rather than *we* and all that that might imply. (The type of tacit addressing employed by Shane here to select Vivian as next speaker will be dealt with in a later section.)

<sup>6</sup> I am not claiming here that *you* is employed specifically to remedy a problem that manifests itself in gaze-directional addressing (though I am not rejecting the possibility of such use either). Its use – as the preferred method for referring to an addressed recipient (Schegloff 1996) – provides a systematic resource to a speaker's coparticipants by indicating that someone is being addressed.

<sup>7</sup> Goodwin 1986 has shown that a similar sequence of actions can be launched by the use of the indexical term *this* as in *Man, she's this wide*. Here speaker selection is not at stake, but to understand the utterance a recipient must visually inspect the speaker's hand gesture; and for a recipient who is gazing elsewhere, this expression makes a shift in gaze toward the speaker relevant.

<sup>8</sup> Sequence-initiating actions that do not include *you* can sometimes indicate that one participant is being addressed without designating who that is. However, *you* furnishes a systematic resource in this regard.

<sup>9</sup> Here, I am leaving aside circumstances in which an address term does not apply uniquely to one participant, but is a shared term. (Note that this can pertain to personal names as well as categorical terms.) In these circumstances, addressing someone with an address term (as part of a current-selects-

next technique) will indicate that someone is being addressed, but other means will be needed to show just which participant it is. As I have shown, there is one form of address that always has this property of indicating addressing, but that does not itself uniquely specify who is being addressed: the recipient reference term *you*. A situationally shared address term (e.g. *son* on some occasions) is also an incomplete method of addressing a recipient, since it begins the action of addressing but does not complete it. The categorical identity of the speaker is also a relevant matter here.

<sup>10</sup> As Sacks (1992:I:665) has pointed out, a potential addressed recipient can be oriented to a turn-initial name as indicating they are being specifically addressed, even on an occasion when that turns out not to be the case:

[GTS]

Dan: Well, Roger uh  
 Roger: Hm?  
 Dan: –introduced a kind of topic when he uh . . .

<sup>11</sup>Ervin-Tripp 1972 has described some of the actions of status and relationship that can be achieved through choice of address term (e.g. insulting an addressed recipient by selecting the race-based address term *boy*). In addition, the way an address term is voiced, especially the way a personal name is voiced, can be used to accomplish a wide range of actions. For one example, see the description of line 1 of (7).

<sup>12</sup> I chose an instance without direct mutual gaze so as to focus more easily on the operation of the address term. Mutual gaze is by no means a prerequisite for speaking or listening in all circumstances of co-present interaction.

<sup>13</sup> This use can be seen in the following case.

[Fish dinner]

Mom: Have you seen the place?  
 (.)  
 Dad?

In addition, there is one systematic (turn-internal) environment for post-positioned address terms that does seem to be aimed specifically at establishing, or, more precisely, shifting reciprocity. (Nonetheless, both cases that I have examined also seem to be highly emotionally charged environments in which relational connections are quite relevant.) This occurs when a speaker shifts recipients in the course of a turn in order to address a second coparticipant after completing a response to a first recipient. In both of the following cases, this is done to solicit support from one coparticipant for a just-completed response to another coparticipant.

[Virginia]

Virginia: Yer the one– (0.4) –who got bo:mbed at graduation so  
 bad couldn’ even see[:.  
 Beth: [Well graduation. ’s some’ in else.  
 → Don’tchyou think so<sub>6</sub> Wesley<sub>6</sub>

[Chicken Dinner]

Vivian: It’s not do:ne? th’ potato?  
 Shane: Ah don’t think so,  
 (2.2)  
 → Nancy: Seems done t’ me how ’bout you Mi[chael.]  
 Shane: [Alri’] who cooked  
 this mea:l.  
 Michael ‘hh Little bit’v e-it e-ih-ih of it isn’ done.

See Lerner (1995:114–15) for a case of a post- or tag-position address term that is employed to deal with a problem of reciprocity in a classroom; by contrast, see Goodwin 1980 for methods, such as stopping and restarting a turn, that speakers can use to gain a recipient’s gaze toward the beginning of a turn’s talk.

<sup>14</sup> This use of pre-positioned address is to some extent a consequence of the turn-taking system itself, since a next speaker can self-select at a first possible completion, and post-positioned address terms are vulnerable to overlap as tag elements that occur after projectable completion – especially when affiliated to a sequence-initiating action that makes relevant a responding action on its completion. Jefferson 1973 describes this vulnerability of tag-positioned address terms in closing sequences.

<sup>15</sup> I doubt that he sees Vivian's movement at all, and if he does there is nothing in the early phase of her movement to suggest its trajectory. At the point he redirects his reach to the chicken plate, she has simply brought her hand up in front of her face, and it still remains formed into a fist (as it was in its original rest position). Vivian can see Michael's hand movement, but he is reaching for a nearby object and only at the last moment makes a lateral move to the chicken plate.

<sup>16</sup> See line 1 of (7) for an instance of a post-positioned address term that features a negative stance. This stance is partly carried by its position, coming after a complaint, but it is also partly composed by the way she voices his name.

<sup>17</sup> This analysis builds on Schegloff's (1968; 2002 [1970]) description of the organization of summons-answer sequences and the problem of establishing the presence and availability of an interlocutor through these small sequences of action. Here, I reserve the term "summons-answer" to refer to those sequences in which the response consists of a verbal answer (as in answering the telephone), and I use "summons-response" as a more general term to refer to all summoning sequences, whether the response includes a verbal answer or only a visible action (e.g. a responding gaze-shift).

<sup>18</sup> Here I am following a distinction developed by Jefferson 1987 to differentiate between methods of correction: "exposed" as an activity "on the surface" of the conversation, or "embedded" as an action that takes place within a turn but is not the main action that is ordinarily taken up by a recipient in next turn.

<sup>19</sup> This raises some complex issues about the organizational relationship between actions realized within a turn-at-talk as compared to actions realized over a sequence of turns-at-talk. These may not always be distinct forms of action organization, or even distinct interactional outcomes, as can be seen in the following instance, in which a speaker ensures the availability a recipient who is in another room:

[Chinese dinner]

Bet: Oh: waitaminnit we did:n' I didn't– get out any kni:ves.  
 Hey Don? cdju bbring out s'm [kni:ves?  
 Don: [Yeahz  
 Don: Knives. Sure. Yeah.

Here *Hey Don* is produced as a preliminary component to a next TCU of an ongoing turn, but is treated by Don as deserving of a responding action in a next turn. On some occasions, both speaker and recipient treat summons-response as a separate two-turn sequence in which a summons is produced and the speaker stops, and this is then responded to with an answer in next turn (i.e. as a summons-answer pre-sequence):

[Auto discussion]

Curt: eh[hun[hunh=  
 Pam: [Cu:rt,  
 ( ) = hnnn  
 Curt: Ye[ah?  
 ( ) [( ]  
 ( ) [uhhhh!  
 ( ) hn [fnn!  
 Pam: [Tell'em tha::t, (0.2) one about thih:: hh S.H.O.W.  
 just fer the camra.=  
 Curt: =Well that's Mi(h)ke's j(h)o(h):ke[hheh!

In many cases, however, an adequate response takes the form not of a turn-at-talk but of a return gaze that allows the speaker to continue within what turns out to be a single turn-at-talk. I cannot fully address this intersection of turn construction and sequence organization here, or even the way it bears on the organization of address terms.

<sup>20</sup> I use the phrase “thick particulars” to collect all of the specifics of setting, circumstance, activity, shared knowledge and experience, sequential environment, turn composition (including prosody), and whatever else participants can inventively call on in inspecting and making sense of actual spates of talk in real time. I will show that speakers can rely upon elements of these thick particulars to select a next speaker.

<sup>21</sup> On other occasions, a sequence-initiating action can reduce the number of eligible next speakers to fewer than the total number of coparticipants, but more than a single participant. In this case, self-selection is possible from among the set of eligible possible next speakers (cf. Lerner 1993:227).

<sup>22</sup> Even the visible action of a participant can make it clear that he or she alone is being referred to and thereby addressed in a sequence-initiating action that includes a recipient reference term. In the following instance, Michael requests the butter just as Shane is cutting a pat of butter from a stick of butter on a butter dish:

[Chicken Dinner]

Michael: L'mme have that butter when yer through there

Tacit addressing does not require recipient reference. However, recipient reference is one systematic way to register that a sequence-initiating action is being addressed to a single recipient, while concomitantly serving as a conduit for participants to establish who that recipient is in the thick particulars of its use.

<sup>23</sup> By “positioning” I am referring to where the turn is placed within a sequence of actions, and also to the way the turn is composed so as to display its positional relationship to that sequence of actions.

<sup>24</sup> I would expect insert expansions to operate in this fashion as well, but I have not pursued this matter.

<sup>25</sup> It is important to remember that tacit addressing is vulnerable to participants' possibly differing understandings of the thick particulars brought to relevance in and through the sequence-initiating action. For example, in the following instance, a question is asked in a way that permits one of the speaker's coparticipants to respond as an addressed recipient, but it turns out that someone else was actually being addressed. While driving in a van, Ann (in the front passenger seat) and Sally (seated behind the driver, Chuck) have been discussing a roadside stand they can see out the window:

[GL:FN]

Chuck: ((places soda can in dashboard holder))

Sally: Is that empty

Ann: I can see a few things (there).

Sally: Nah I was talking to Chuck.

Sally's question is occasioned by Chuck's action, but Ann is still looking out the window and understands the question in terms of what she seems to assume is the object and topic of their continuing joint attention.

#### REFERENCES

- Ervin-Tripp, Susan (1972). On sociolinguistic rules: Alternation and co-occurrence. In John Gumperz & Dell Hymes (eds.), *Directions in Sociolinguistics: the Ethnography of Communication*, 213–50. New York, Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Goodwin, Charles (1979). The interactive construction of a sentence in natural conversation. In G. Psathas (ed.), *Everyday language: Studies in ethnomethodology*, 97–121. New York: Irvington.
- \_\_\_\_\_. (1980). Restarts, pauses, and the achievement of mutual gaze at turn-beginning. *Sociological Inquiry* 50:272–302.
- \_\_\_\_\_. (1986). Gesture as a resource for the organization of mutual orientation. *Semiotica* 62:29–49.
- Jefferson, Gail (1973). A case of precision timing in ordinary conversation: Overlapped tag-positioned address terms in closing sequences. *Semiotica* 9:47–96.
- \_\_\_\_\_. (1981). The rejection of advice: Managing the problematic convergence of a 'troubles-telling' and a 'service encounter'. *Journal of Pragmatics* 5:399–422.
- \_\_\_\_\_. (1987). On exposed and embedded correction in conversation. In G. Button & J. Lee (eds.), *Talk and social organization*, 86–100. Philadelphia: Multilingual Matters.



- Lerner, Gene H. (1993). Collectivities in action: Establishing the relevance of conjoined participation in conversation. *Text* 13:213–45.
- \_\_\_\_\_. (1995). Turn design and the organization of participation in instructional activities. *Discourse Processes* 19:111–31.
- \_\_\_\_\_. (1996). On the place of linguistic resources in the organization of talk-in-interaction: “Second person” reference in multi-party conversation. *Pragmatics* 6:281–94.
- \_\_\_\_\_. (2001). Intervening action in the selection of next speaker: When other-than-addressed recipient speaks next. Paper presented at the National Communication Association convention, Atlanta.
- Sacks, Harvey (1992). *Lectures on conversation*. 2 vols. Ed. by Gail Jefferson, with Introductions by Emmanuel A. Schegloff. Oxford: Blackwell.
- \_\_\_\_\_, & Schegloff, Emmanuel A. (1979). Two preferences in the organization of reference to persons and their interaction. In G. Psathas (ed.), *Everyday language: Studies in ethnomethodology*, 15–21. New York: Irvington.
- \_\_\_\_\_, \_\_\_\_\_, & Jefferson, Gail (1974). A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation. *Language* 50:696–735.
- Schegloff, Emmanuel A. (1968). Sequencing in conversational openings. *American Anthropologist* 70:1075–95.
- \_\_\_\_\_. (1987). Between macro and micro: Contexts and other connections. In J. Alexander et al. (eds.), *The micro-macro link*, 207–34. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- \_\_\_\_\_. (1990). On the organization of sequences as a source of ‘coherence’ in talk-in-interaction. In B. Dorval (ed.) *Conversational organization and its development*, 51–77. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- \_\_\_\_\_. (1995). Parties and joint talk: Two ways in which numbers are significant for talk-in-interaction. In P. ten Have and G. Psathas (eds.), *Situated order: Studies in the social organization of talk and embodied actions*, 31–42. Lanham, MD: University Press of America.
- \_\_\_\_\_. (1996). Some practices for referring to persons in talk-in-interaction: A partial sketch of a systematics. In B. Fox (ed.), *Studies in anaphora*, 437–85. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- \_\_\_\_\_. (2002 [1970]). Opening sequencing. In J. E. Katz and M. Aakhus (eds.), *Perpetual contact: Mobile communication, private talk, public performance*, 325–85. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- \_\_\_\_\_; Jefferson, Gail; & Sacks, Harvey (1977). The preference for self-correction in the organization of repair in conversation. *Language* 53:361–82.
- \_\_\_\_\_, and Sacks, Harvey (1973). Opening up closings. *Semiotica* 8:289–327.
- Terasaki, Alene (1976). Pre-announcement sequences in conversation. *Social Sciences Working Paper No. 99*. Irvine, CA: University of California.

(Received 30 October 2001; accepted 14 March 2002).