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Abstract

Collectivities can become consequential social units in ordinary conversation. This article reports on the organization of talk in interaction at the juncture of two types of practical action. First, I consider the ongoing relevance of conjoined participation in two specialized forms of interaction (orator-audience interaction and teacher-student interaction) and I describe the range of practices that can be used to broaden the units of participation in conversational interaction from individual persons to larger social units. Second, I amplify earlier treatments of speaker selection practices for conversation. Finally, I bring these two lines of inquiry together. In multiparty conversation participants can address an association of recipients, thereby making relevant a response from those recipients as members of an association. By addressing a sequence-initiating action (e.g., a question) to an association of recipients, a conjoined opportunity to respond can be made relevant. Speakers can make conjoined participation relevant for relatively enduring collectivities (e.g., couples); moreover, occasion-specific and momentary collectivities can become relevant units of participation.
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Persons are not always treated only as separate individuals. On occasion an assemblage of two (or more) individuals can become relevant as a single social unit — and that association of participants can become procedurally consequential (Schegloff, 1991a) for the interaction. For example, when several people enter a crowded restaurant together it is only necessary for one of them to add his or her name and the number in their party to the waiting list. And when the name is called ('Lerner, party of three') all members of the party go to be seated at the same
time. Each member of the party does not have to sign in individually, nor is each member of the party called to be seated individually. Here an assemblage of individuals is treated as (and they act as) a single unit of participation — as a single party. And once the food is served, follow-up inquiries such as ‘Is everything all right?’ can be heard as adequately answered for the party as long as one member of the party answers. Finally at the conclusion of the meal a single check will ordinarily be produced unless other arrangements are made. Of course, not every phase of the meal includes conjoined participation (e.g., ordering food).

In this report I describe practices of speaking to a collectivity and practices of speaking (and acting) for and as a collectivity. In the above example, questions such as ‘Would you like smoking or non-smoking?’ can be addressed to the party — i.e., the question can be addressed to the assemblage of individuals as members of the party. Addressing an association of recipients can establish an opportunity for conjoined participation. One consequence of speaking to recipients as members of an association can be that one or more of its members may reply for the association. When the answer (‘Non-smoking’) is produced it will be delivered and treated as a reply for the whole party. Of course, members of the party may confer among themselves before a reply is produced. The practice of speaking to recipients as members of an association and the practice of replying for the association provide ways of broadening the unit of participation in interaction from individual participants to a multi-person unit. The association becomes a relevant and consequential social unit in the organization of talk in interaction.¹

I proceed in the following way. First, I examine forms of interaction that are organized to yield an ongoing relevance for the conjoined participation of individuals as an association. Next, I describe the range of ways conjoined participation can be made relevant in conversational interaction. Then, in order to explore one of these practices in more depth, I introduce a convergent line of inquiry. Here I describe practices used to select next speaker. Finally, I examine in some detail the methods speakers have for addressing an association of recipients and the types of collectivities that are thereby constituted.

For the sake of clarity I introduce several terms before producing the analysis that warrants their use. When speaking of any assemblage of co-present individuals that are in any of various ways cast as a collectivity I will use the term 'association'. However, I distinguish one special type of association. Members of some associations may sometimes speak or act together as an association. That is, the members of the association act in concert as an ‘ensemble’ or ‘team’. These ensemble-type associations I refer to as ensembles. All associations are constituted by the relevance
of, or opportunity for 'conjoined participation'. Ensembles (i.e., ensemble-type associations) are constituted by a distinguishable form of conjoined participation — the coordinated participation of a team. Finally, when I speak of a 'shared opportunity' to participate I am referring to occasions on which some or all of those co-present could each relevantly respond as individual participants.

The Audience as ensemble

Many occasions are organized in a manner that yield conjoined participation. In this section I examine the ensemble participation of audiences during a speech and in the follow section I examine the ensemble participation of students in a classroom. Events such as political speeches, political debates and scientific presentations are organized to produce the conjoined participation of the individuals that make up the audience. Orators ordinarily address their remarks to the audience as a whole. This practice can even be seen in the following excerpt in which the speaker, though talking to an audience, must cue one individual (Tom) to perform a task. Millie is introducing Andy as the next presenter.

(1) [ARQ:91]
1  Millie: ... we are going to start with Andy and we do have
2→ some slides to start with so if Tom can help us with that

In this instance the speaker addresses her remarks to the audience as an association even though her remarks are in part produced for an individual (Tom). The speaker displays an orientation to the conjoined participation of her recipients and to her part in sustaining the interaction as orator–audience interaction.

The persons associated as an audience may participate as an ensemble. Members of the audience (though not necessarily every member) can act in concert through applause, laughter, and speech that alternate with the talk of the orator.

(2) [Reagan at Bush Orange County rally, 1992]
Reagan: ... really don't think that we'll see the Democratic nominee down here
Several: No= ((scattered, overlapping shouts for (0.3)))
Audience: = NO::::::: ((many members in unison for (2.1)))
Reagan: [enjoying the Santa Ana winds
Moreover, orators can design their talk to provide opportunities for coordinated audience action by producing utterances such as contrast and ‘problem+solution’ statements that have compound formats (Atkinson, 1984; Heritage and Greatbatch, 1986).

Audience participation can be affiliative as in the case of most applause, but members of an audience may also demonstrate disagreement or displeasure as an ensemble through such actions as booing (Clayman, 1992). Each of these forms of response can be produced by one or a few individuals, but in most public speaking circumstances individual response is treated as a ‘second alternative’ (cf. Sacks, 1992) to ensemble response. Clapping (or laughing) alone can be treated as a source of trouble by the clapper or other audience members or both (cf. Jefferson, 1979). For example, lone clappers may cut off their burst of applause in mid-course as in (3) at line 7.

(3) [Bush, State of the Union, 1992]
1 Bush: I mean to speak- tonight of big things. Of big cha-
2 changes 'n the promises they hold and of some big
3 problems. (0.4) an' how together we can solv:
4 them and move our country forward as the undisputed
5 leader of the age,
6 (0.3)
7→ Member: xx=

8 Bush: = 'n we gather=

9 Audience: =xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

Lone applause makes audible the absence of applause by other members of the audience and through this it makes visible an opportunity not taken to applaud. An affiliating response by a single audience member concomitantly shows that most members of the audience are passing an opportunity to affiliate. This can be partially repaired by late applause as at line 9. Here the audience is not directly responding to something said by the orator, but to the opportunity for applause produced through the lone clapper’s direct response at line 7.

Audience response need not be restricted to a single ensemble. Several ensembles can be relevant units of participation. Clayman (1992) has shown that for presidential debates, with an audience that includes supporters of both candidates, supporters of each candidate can act as a
distinct partisan ensemble. The affiliative response of a candidate's supporters can occasion a competing disaffiliative response by the partisans of the speaker's opponent.

(4) [Clayman, 1992: 38]

Clayman (1992) states, 'Audience members may be moved to boo in part ... to drown out those who are expressing approval.' Whatever the individual motive, it is only through the concerted, collective action of an ensemble that 'drowning out' can be accomplished. That is, the booing is not only booing against a speaker, but booing with others as an ensemble.

Further, Clayman shows that competing evaluative responses can turn into a competition between ensembles. In (5) some members of the audience (Aud-A) begin to laugh after Bush ridicules Dukakis' income tax enforcement proposal, then other audience members (Aud-B) begin to hiss. As Bush reiterates his position Aud-B members begin booing, then Aud-A members add substantial clapping to their laughter near the beginning of line 7. As the booing dies out the clapping then grows in strength. Two more episodes of booing are produced with each coming after about two seconds of unabated applause. As Clayman states, 'Those who are booing thus show themselves to be actively competing with others in the audience by offering a countervailing assessment of what was said.'

(5) [Clayman, 1992: 39]
In (5) the incremental escalation of response type and amplitude occurs interactively between ensembles. Members of each side 'pull together' as in the conjoined participation of a 'tug-of-war'. Further, each ensemble is identifiable in a manner beyond that directly connected to the present affiliating or disaffiliating response. The ensemble of booers in (5) is not only expressing dislike of a derogatory remark of the orator. They show themselves to be booing as supporters of the orator's opponent. (Of course, in this setting the members of the co-present audience participate as ensembles for the viewing audience as well as in response to the speakers and other co-present ensembles.)

In summary, orators ordinarily address their remarks to the audience as a whole — i.e., to the audience as an association — and they can design their utterances to provide prominent places for conjoined response. Further, the response of audience members ordinarily takes the form of ensemble participation. In the next section I examine one form of talk in interaction where the circumstances of the occasion establish the ongoing relevance of conjoined participation, yet ensemble participation is only one among several forms of participation.

Classroom interaction

Some occasions of talk in interaction include turn taking practices that are designed to produce the conjoined participation of an assemblage of individuals as a single social unit. In a classroom, when a teacher presents a lesson to the whole class, the students participate in part as co-incumbents of a single association — 'the class'. Turns at talk alternate between teacher and students as an association (McHoul, 1978; Mehan, 1979, 1982; cf. Schegloff, 1987). Here a question from the teacher addressed to the class as a whole can make relevant whole class (i.e., choral) response as in (6), or students may make a bid to speak by raising their hands as in (7), or both as in (8). All of these instances are taken from a lesson in which a new book is introduced to the whole class.

(6) [CIRC:HUG]
1 Teacher: And who did we say this book was written by again?
2 Student A: Alice::: (A trails off first name and stops))
3 (·)
4→ Class: Alice Dashly ((mostly in unison))
Teacher: Do we know what this side is called?

(1.4) ((several children raise their hands))

Teacher: ((Teacher nods head)) Paul,

Teacher: How many chapters in the book?

Student B: (((raises hand))

Student C: [Eleven

Class: [Eleven ((mostly in unison))

A turn taking system for whole class lessons provides for different forms of participation by the class. Bidding for a chance to answer a question provides one systematic solution to the problem of determining just who will get a turn to speak once an action (e.g., answering) has been made relevant for the class as an association. Another solution consists of the class as a whole (i.e., as an ensemble-type association) speaking together. Choral response demonstrates the shared orientation of the students to conjoined participation. In choral responses students coordinate the tempo and loudness of their talk to produce a response in unison. Each response is not only produced at the same moment as other responses, but in the same way as other responses.

Further, teachers can specifically design their talk for choral response by the class as a whole as in (9).

Teacher: Where was this book published?

Teacher: McMillan publishing company in?

(.).

Class: New York ((mostly in unison))

Teacher: Okay,

As in the case of public address, a teacher can address the class as an association of students and this can be done in a way that establishes the relevance of a response by the members of the class as an ensemble. The conjoined participation of 'audience' and 'class' as ensembles has an ongoing relevance for public speaking and classroom lessons respectively. Establishing the relevance of such participation is bound up in commencing (the activity of) the occasion. In comparison, conjoined participation is not an fundamental feature of ordinary conversation.
Nevertheless, there are ways to establish the relevance of participation by two (or more) individuals as a single social unit in conversation.

Establishing the relevance of an association in conversation

Several types of practices for initially establishing the relevance of an association of participants can be singled out. These include practices of: 1) speaking to recipients as an association; 2) speaking for and as an association; 3) one member speaking to another member of an association; and 4) speaking about an association of participants. These practices are distinguishable in terms of the relationships of the speaker and their addressed recipients to the incipient association. Is the speaker a member of the association or not? And are addressed recipients members or not? There are four speaker-recipient combinations possible and practices for each can associate participants as a collectivity. 5

1. A speaker can conjointly address co-recipients as an association, thereby establishing the relevance of a multi-person unit of participation. In (10) at line 1 a speaker casts two coparticipants as an association by addressing them as a couple.

\[\text{(10) \ [Chicken Dinner]}\]
1\(\rightarrow\) B: So what've you guys bin doin'?
2 T: oh not much, we went to Santa Barbara last weekend

Detailed examination of this excerpt will be provided in a later section.

2. A participant can speak straightway for themselves and a co-participant. In this case a speaker casts themselves as a spokesperson or representative for an association of participants. In (11) a member of an arriving couple begins an announcement of news addressed to their hosts by issuing a pre-announcement (Terasaki, 1976). The speaker designs the pre-announcement as not his news alone, but as news carried by the arriving couple. 6

\[\text{(11) \ [KC4]}\]
1\(\rightarrow\) R: Hey we got good news.
2 K: [I know.]
3 D: [What's the good news.
4 (.)
5 F: [Ya heard it?]
6 R: [Oh ya do]:

\[\text{(10) \ [Chicken Dinner]}\]
1\(\rightarrow\) B: So what've you guys bin doin'?
2 T: oh not much, we went to Santa Barbara last weekend

Detailed examination of this excerpt will be provided in a later section.

2. A participant can speak straightway for themselves and a co-participant. In this case a speaker casts themselves as a spokesperson or representative for an association of participants. In (11) a member of an arriving couple begins an announcement of news addressed to their hosts by issuing a pre-announcement (Terasaki, 1976). The speaker designs the pre-announcement as not his news alone, but as news carried by the arriving couple. 6

\[\text{(11) \ [KC4]}\]
1\(\rightarrow\) R: Hey we got good news.
2 K: [I know.]
3 D: [What's the good news.
4 (.)
5 F: [Ya heard it?]
6 R: [Oh ya do]:
In addition to casting themselves as a representative of an association speakers can demonstrate their co-participation with the prior speaker retrospectively by joining in the production of an ongoing action. For example, a participant can show their association with a speaker through the anticipatory completion (Lerner, 1991) of that participant’s not-yet-completed utterance (or through the use of other syntactic and ‘choral’ tying devices). In (12) both speakers are addressing a third participant. Carl joins in to co-explain the rules of a family investment club.

(12) [HIC]
1    Dad: we take care of all of our business but any time we go
2    contrary to any of the rules: "here" =
3→ Carl: = it takes unanimous vote

In (10) an opportunity for conjoined participation is made relevant from ‘outside’ the incipient association for next turn. In (11) conjoined participation is asserted through an utterance that shows a participant to be speaking as a representative of an association, while in (12) coparticipation is achieved in the talk through the joint production of a single sentence.

3. ‘Conferring’ provides another way to establish the relevance of an association of participants for the interaction. Here one member of an incipient association addresses remarks to the other member concerning the association. The character of the connection between members of the association is expressly formulated in the talk between its members. In (13) at line 1 Joe confers with his spouse about a jar of herring during a multi-generational family gathering. He suggests an action they ought to take as a couple. Detailed examination will be provided in a later section.

(13) [JS]
1→ Joe: maybe we aughta take one home with us
2    Jim: where’d juh get it
3    Edith: alpha be[ta
4    Joe: [alpha beta (up here)

Conferring with a co-participant as members of an association can be used in conjunction with other actions to accomplish speaking for that association to other participants. In excerpt (14) Nancy is addressing Vivian and Shane at line 5, but turns to Michael in the course of her announcement. Here a conference sequence is embedded in the announcement.
Nancy: I'll have to make lasagna for you guys ... I make good lasagna.

Nancy: We'd had ravioli last Sunday night?

((Nancy looks to Michael at 'Sun'))

((Michael does not look up or nod))

Nancy: We sat in from the tee vee?

((Nancy turns back to her plate at 'sat'))

Michael: 'hh Yah.

Shane: Yeh?

At line 5 Nancy is speaking about something she and Michael did as a couple. Soliciting Michael's recognition shows that he has a part in the delivery.  

When a person speaks on behalf of or about a co-participant it can provide a warrant for that other speaker to speak for themselves (Lerner, 1989; and see the discussion following excerpt (22) below). This suggests that when an association of participants is spoken about by someone 'outside' the association, that action could make relevant some form of conjoined participation. For example, it could make relevant: 1) talk to the association; 2) talk by a member of the association as a representative of the association; or 3) conferring by members of the association.

In (15) at line 9 a speaker outside the incipient association addresses their remarks about an association of participants to someone else outside the association. The four participants have been talking about going to a swap meet the next day.

Michael: ((Simplified)) But we'll go to the swap meet early, cause you only want to spend like = yer done with that place in three hours anyhow.

Nancy: Yeah. (Be[d ey)

Michael: ((Okay))?

Shane: ((Yeah.))

Nancy: So what time should they come over t' morrow.°

((Nancy does a head point toward Shane & Vivian)}
Here Nancy confers with Michael about arrangements they are making with the other couple. Asking Michael a question about a matter that affects the other couple can make relevant an answer addressed to the couple. In this instance Michael hesitates and this provides an occasion for Shane (a member of the association) to turn to the other member at line 15. Michael’s answer and its conjoined reception are then produced.

In this section I have briefly described four ways associations of participants can become relevant and consequential units of participation in conversation. The balance of the current report focuses on the first of these types in which a speaker addresses a sequence-initiating action to an association of recipients, and thereby establishes an opportunity for conjoined participation. Since this involves the use of turn-taking practices through which next speakers are selected, I first examine the operation of speaker selection techniques for conversation. The confluence of these activities (establishing the relevance of conjoined participation and selecting next speaker) is then examined through a description of techniques for addressing an association of recipients.

Selecting a next speaker

Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson (1974) describe a simplest systematics for turn-taking for conversation. Very roughly, this consist of: 1) turn-constructional features for determining where transition will be relevant; 2) two types of turn-allocational techniques (current speaker selects next and self-selection) for determining how a next turn will be allocated; and 3) a set of practices for employing the turn-allocational techniques at each transition-relevance place. In this section I amplify their description of turn allocation. See Lerner (1991) for one amplification of turn construction.
Action sequences such as question–answer sequences play an important part in selection of next speaker. The organization of actions as sequences of actions shapes participation. Each course of action shapes the opportunities to participate within it. And as participants make relevant various opportunities to participate, they thereby organize themselves. When a sequence-initiating or 'first'-type action is produced, a sequence-responding or 'second'-type action becomes specially relevant (Schegloff and Sacks, 1973). Further, when a sequence-initiating action (e.g., a question) is produced in one turn a sequence-responding action (e.g., an answer) is not merely made relevant, but it is made relevant in the first place for next turn. The special relevance of a particular responding action for next turn can contribute to speaker selection both for current selects next and self-selection techniques. First, I describe how sequence-initiating actions can be combined with several types of addressing techniques to select a specific participant to speak next. Second, I show how sequence-initiating actions can shape self-selection of next speaker. Finally, I show how sequence-initiating actions can be addressed to a combination of recipients. This can occur in at least two ways. A speaker can address a sequence-initiating action to two recipients in a manner that makes relevant individual responses from both. And a speaker can address a sequence initiating action to two recipients in a manner that makes a response from them as representatives of an association a relevant possibility. It is this latter possibility that I will examine in detail.

Current selects next

A current speaker can select a coparticipant to speak next by producing a turn at talk that includes a sequence-initiating action and an addressing device (Sacks et al., 1974). In general, a sequence-initiating action alone does not allocate next turn to some particular participant (though repair initiation constitutes one class of initiating actions that does not require the affiliation of an addressing device). However, selecting a next speaker can be accomplished by affiliating a name or other identifying term to a sequence-initiating action as in (16).

(16) [Chicken Dinner]

1→ Michael: Nance kin you- kin you, cut my chicken.
2  (0.3)
3 Nancy: Do yer own cut(h)'n(h)n(h)n

A current speaker can also employ gaze direction as an addressing device while producing a sequence-initiating action by gazing at a single recipi-
Collectivities in action

However, this can be vulnerable to the gazing practices of their coparticipants (cf. Goodwin, 1980). For example, a non-addressed recipient may not see that mutual gaze has been established and self-select to speak next. Gaze regularly accompanies other types of addressing. Addressing can be embedded in person reference by employing the ‘recipient proterm’ you. Referring to a person with the recipient proterm can indicate that a single recipient is being addressed without indicating who is being referred to, while accompanying gaze direction can demonstrate just who that person is by showing who is being addressed.

Embedded addressing can be employed without gaze. If the person referred to by the recipient proterm is clear from the ‘specifics of situatedness, identities, and particularities of content and context’ (Sacks et al., 1974), then addressing is also accomplished. This can be seen in excerpt (17). The question at line 1 refers to Vivian, thereby addressing her and thus selects her as next speaker. It is pertinent here that Shane and Vivian are the host couple and all present know that Vivian prepared the meal they are now eating.

(17) [Chicken Dinner]
1 → Shane: Did you cook this all the way through?
2
3 Vivian: Yes.

Here Shane does not gaze at Vivian. In fact, Vivian may see Shane glance slightly toward one of their two guests. The use of ‘you’ along with the turn initial use of ‘did’ shows that a current selects next technique is being initiated, but to determine just who is being addressed coparticipants must turn elsewhere. In this case ‘cooking’ is clearly bound to the cook, Vivian.

Embedded addressing can take two forms: expressed and tacit. The use of the recipient proterm expressly embeds addressing in the act of referring to a person. In addition, addressing can be accomplished in an unexpressed or tacit form. When the ‘requirements’ for responding to a sequence-initiating action limit eligible recipients to a single participant, then that participant has been tacitly addressed. This is particularly clear for (but not limited to) ‘sequence-subsequent’ addressing. That is, once a participant has been initially addressed in a sequence of turns it is possible to tacitly embed addressing in a subsequent turn by showing, for example, that that subsequent turn is a follow-up question as at line 4 of (18).

(18) [Sacks et al., 1974: 703 ((multiparty conversation))]
1 Sy: See Death’s a Salesman last night?
Other shared particulars of the situation, social identities, biographies, etc. can be employed to tacitly restrict addressing of a sequence-initiating action to a single individual. Embedded addressing (both expressed and tacit) can also be used to address more than one, but less than all recipients in several ways. Anticipating a theme I develop in a later section, I will just mention here that both a 'pluralized' form of the recipient proterm (e.g., 'you guys') and tacit addressing can be employed to address an association of recipients.

**Self-selection**

In the prior section I showed how the affiliation of an addressing device to a sequence-initiating action provides a way for current speaker to select a next speaker. The production of sequence-initiating actions can also shape self-selection (even when it does not restrict eligible recipients to a single participant).

Speakers can produce a sequence-initiating action that makes relevant a second, responding action without addressing that action to anyone in particular as at line 1 of (19).

(19) [Chicken Dinner]

1 $\rightarrow$ Michael: Anybuddy wan' anymore pgas?,
2 (0.5)
3 Shane: Oo I [want s]ome
4 Vivian: [(eh) [An(h)ym↓ːre, ((eh = cough))]

The sequence-initiating action at line 1 does not select a next speaker, thus allowing for self-selection. However, more than an option for self-selection is involved here. The pending action in (19) makes relevant a next turn at talk even though no one participant has been selected to produce it. Here self-selection is not only an option that each party may or may not exercise; rather self-selection by at least one recipient is implicated in the relevance of a responsive action for next turn. Further, it is a turn that should begin at the completion of the initiating action — i.e., at the completion of the current turn unit. Since a next turn is now due, the absence of a response (i.e., the absence of at least one participant
exercising the option to speak) would be noticeable as more than a gap in the talk. It would be noticeable as a failure of recipients to respond.

A sequence-initiating action can be addressed to a combination of individuals, thus making self-selection specially relevant for those addressed as in the sequence-subsequent addressing at line 9 of (20).

(20)  [Jefferson and Schenkein, 1978: 156]
1 Salesboy: G’n aftuhnoon sir, W’dju be innerested in subscribing to the Progress Bulletin t’help m’win a trip tuh Cape Kennedy ...
2 :
3 Jus’ fer a few short weeks sir, tuh help me win my trip.
4 Richard: Well I live in Los Angeles. I don’ live around here but these fellas live here, you might- ask the:em, I don’ know
5 9→ Salesboy: W’d eejer- any of you gen, tuhmen be innerested in subscribing to it,
10 Notice that the position of ‘any of you’ at line 9 after the exchange between Salesboy and Richard limits its purview. That is, Richard does not share the opportunity to respond (and the concomitant option to self-select) with the other participants.

Current speaker selects more than one as next speaker

Speakers can address an individual in a manner that selects that participant to speak next. Speakers can also address their talk to coparticipants in a manner that allows for self-selection of next speaker from among all or some identifiable combination of recipients. In addition to addressing an initiating action to one person or to no one in particular, speakers can specifically address their talk to more than one person. In the next excerpt the speaker at line 1 simultaneously selects two recipients to individually answer a question.

(21)  [GL:TF]
1→ Al: you two both stay at home?
2 Bob: no I’m living out, couple of blocks from campus.
3 Carl: eh’h. I’m at home.

In excerpt (21) the question is designed to make relevant an answer from each recipient. Since each has been selected, each could begin a turn at talk they are entitled to take. Yet, two responses are foreshown.
This can make problematic who should speak next. On some occasions this can lead to the explicit arrangement by the addressed recipients themselves of who will answer first. That is, the addressed recipients treat the projected next turn as place of possible upcoming simultaneous talk and forestall that outcome. This then is not so much a 'first order' turn-taking technique, as much as it is an overlap management technique.  

The main point here is that addressing a question to some or all recipients, in a manner that implicates a responding action from each, constitutes a different type of next speaker selection problem than, e.g., asking a question that anyone may answer, but where all need not respond. When asking a question that anyone may answer, then anyone may self-select to speak. Yet, when two participants are individually asked to answer a single question the ordering of answerers (and therein the selection of next speaker) is expressly raised in the question, but may not be resolved there.

The foregoing examination of addressing now brings us back to the central topic of this article — the formulation (in the talk) and participation (through talking) of collectivities in conversation. The final sections of this paper describe several ways sequence-initiating actions can be addressed to two participants, not as individual recipients, but as an association of recipients. Moreover, describing how associations can be addressed in conversation provides a resource for characterizing — in interactional terms — the kinds of collectivities that can become consequential in conversational interaction. I begin by examining practices speakers employ for talking to ‘couples’ and other social units whose existence extends beyond the interaction and which are made relevant in and through the talk. I then extend the analysis to encompass other types of multi-person units. These include collectivities that have an ongoing incipient relevance for the occasion itself, and those that have a momentary sequential relevance during the course of talk in interaction.

**Addressing recipients as members of an association**

In conversation, individual participants are usually identical to the individual parties to the conversation. But as Schegloff (in press) has shown this is not always the case. Sometimes the party addressed in a turn is not a single participant but an association of participants. It is possible for an individual to speak to or address co-recipients as members of a collectivity. This can be accomplished by using a compound address form (e.g., the names of the members connected by and) or it can be accomplished through embedded addressing techniques. Expressed embedded
addressing of an association can be seen at line 1 of (22). (Tacit embedded addressing is examined in a later section.)

(22) [GL:TF]

1→ B: So what've you guys bin doin?
2 T: oh not much, we went to Santa Barbara last weekend =
3 J: = you went to what? =
4 T: Santa Barbara last [weekend.
5 J: [Oh diju? (.) [How was it ( )
6 M: [It was really ni:ce)=
7 T: = It was outta si:ght. We stayed in a Hotel Six, =
8 M: = hhh =
9 J: = Was it warm up the[re?
10→ M: [Motel Six =
11 T: = Oh it was beautiful = Motel Six.

The question at line 1 is designed so that either T or M (or both) could respond. The question does not oblige both of them to answer, since there is the possibility that they are being conjointly addressed as an association. This is achieved here through the use of a pluralized recipient proterm (‘you guys’) to refer to the couple. Speaker B refers to T and M as members of a couple with a reference form that concomitantly shows that his question is possibly addressed to them as a couple.

There is evidence that this analysis is shared by participants. This can be found in the talk that issues from the initial inquiry. First, at line 2 T's answer refers to the couple by employing the collective speaker proterm we. T and M are cast as a single unit. (This is not the only way such an inquire can be treated as an examination of (25) will show.) By describing what they as a couple jointly did in this way — with the other member of the couple co-present for the exchange — T may be seen to be speaking for the other member as well as himself. He is speaking as a representative of the couple. T's spouse could also respond to the question, since she is also being addressed. But if she does not answer, her response will not be missed as would be the case if they had been addressed in a manner that made individual responses relevant.

The association referred to at line 1 has also become a relevant unit of participation for M. At line 10 M corrects a place name T used at line 7. This must be understood in light of the fact that most correction in conversation is self-correction. The operation of a repair organization for conversation (Schegloff et al., 1977) produces the empirical finding that other parties seldom correct a speaker, rather other parties ordinarily limit themselves to pointing out the trouble source for self-correction.
Here we see that correction is done. M does not use, e.g., a partial repeat with question intonation ("Motel Six?"), but comes in with a correction. How should this be understood? Schegloff, et al. (1977) point out that there are 'sequence-type environments' in which other-correction is used. One such environment for other-correction that I have described elsewhere (Lerner, 1989) is produced when one party speaks on behalf of a co-participant or reports on their speech and action. Here correction is produced by the spoken-for party.\(^\text{11}\)

In excerpt (22), 'Hotel Six' at line 7 contains an error. But as Schegloff et al. (1977) point out, knowing that an error has been made can remove the need to repair it. The other participants may well hear T to have misspoken, but that would not be fatal to their understanding or responding. The correction in (22) demonstrates the speaker's own involvement in the event. When M produces 'Motel Six' as a correction, she is not only correcting T, but she is producing the correction for his recipients, and she is doing so on behalf of herself and T as a couple.

When someone asserts something about another participant that participant is ordinarily entitled to confirm or correct the assertion. Or described more systematically, when another participant reports your actions (or words) or as is pertinent for the present discussion when another member of an association reports your joint actions, then the dispreference for other correction may be relaxed for 'self' correction.\(^\text{12}\)

In a sense the preference still operates for the distinct parties to the conversation. Establishing the relevance of an association of participants for a spate of talk makes M a co-principal (cf. Goffman, 1981: 144) of the association's talk, even though it is produced by another member of the association. Here 'couple' is both a relevant and a procedurally consequential unit of participation. Not only is the couple relevant to the topic of talk, but its relevance is consequential for the emerging course of action.

In excerpt (22) the participants treat T and M as a couple. In (23) Vivian and Shane form a couple as do Nancy and Michael. But the fact of couple membership does not preclude other associations from being established. In the following excerpt the question at lines 3 and 5 establishes the relevance of an association of participants through an inquiry concerning a shared activity that cuts across couples.

(23) [Chicken dinner]
1
2 ???: mhh hhh
3→ Vivian: S'you guys arn't gunnuh do a scene fer awhile then.
4 Shane: "Hm-m" ((S does minimal head shake))
Vivian addresses Shane and Michael as classmates in an acting class and both respond for the association. Initially, she uses a pluralized recipient proterm. However, the pluralized recipient proterm contains another concurrently possible formulation of the referent. It can also be taken to refer to both Shane and Michael, but as individuals. Vivian's orientation to this possibility can be seen at line 5 where she clarifies the reference. It is a question about them together — i.e., as an association. And as members of an association either of them could confirm the fact proffered in her question. Here co-recipients are expressly addressed as members of an association through reference to a future shared activity that will not occur. Once an association of participants becomes relevant subsequent references to the association can be accomplished without using a pluralized token as at line 8.

In excerpts (22) and (23) associations are initially made relevant through the use of the pluralized recipient reference form 'you guys'. In (13), repeated here as (24), a conjoined opportunity to respond is made relevant by the question at line 2, even though an explicitly pluralized form of you is not employed. In this case the question at line 2 is asked just after a turn in which one member of a couple speaks to the other member. The conference at line 1 makes relevant the treatment of 'you' in line 2 as a plural — i.e., collective — reference.
2→ Jim: where’d juh get it
3 Edith: alpha be[ta
4 Joe: [alpha beta (up here)

The question at line 2 occurs just after Joe confers with Edith about a proposed action they might take as a couple — i.e., take a jar of herring home. Coming just after this conference, the use of ‘you’ at line 2 is treated by Edith and Joe as conjointly addressed to them. So, talking together as a couple can make that couple a relevant association that can subsequently be talked to without having to explicitly establish the relevance of the association through the use of an initial collective reference form.

Reciprocal associations

One consequence of speaking to an association is that a reciprocal association may also become relevant. Excerpt (25) displays how talk by, and about, one couple can make relevant talk by and about their co-recipients as a couple.

(25) [Chicken dinner]
1 (2.1)
2→ Vivian: So wudju guys do diday
3 (1.8)
4 (Nancy): N-mm ((throat clear))
5→ Nancy: Ah went ↓groshry sho:pp’n ’n we wgn’ovuh t’th’ma:ll
6 (Nancy): .pt °hhh
7 (0.5)
8→ Michael: Baw s’m vitamins =
9 Nancy: = The mall wz [p a]cked.
10→ Shane: [Oh yeh?]
11→ (0.5) ((Shane nods to Michael, then Michael nods to Shane))
12 Nancy: Cz’v Valentine’s Day?
13 (0.5)
14 Vivian: [Mm hm?]
15 Nancy: [Oh: Go: [Id.]
16 17→ Michael: [Cr [azy.]
18 Shane: [Yah i]t[would.
19 Vivian: [Oh is that↑w’t it wz from?
20 Nancy: W’r driv’n roun’roun[parkin’spot’n[evry]^th’n[g°
21 Shane: [Ye-e:h. [ ] [ [Oh:-] [We
Vivian conjointly addresses a question to her co-recipients Nancy and Michael at line 2. In response, Nancy first speaks on her own behalf. This is one way that the question could be taken (i.e., what did each of you do today). She then speaks of what she and Michael did as a couple. (Notice that in practice these are not mutually exclusive interpretations.) It is here that Michael offers what they purchased at the mall as the next item in what is a possible list in progress. That is, Nancy is listing what she, then they did today and Michael adds an item. (Also, notice his contribution at line 17 in which he joins her assessment turn.)

Not only does Vivian make one association relevant here, but in so doing she produced the sequential opportunity for the talk to be organized along couple lines. Not only is she asking a question of the other couple, but in so doing she may be seen as asking on behalf of her couple. Since the activity of two participants as an association has been made a topic of conversation, this can make relevant a similar contribution from the other couple. At line 22 Vivian introduces (with contrastive stress) the mall she and Shane visited. The reciprocal relevance of a second association of participants can be understood in terms of 'second story' organization (Sacks, 1992). One feature of second stories is that they are regularly designed to both include similar events and a similar relationship between narrator and story events as the relationship between narrator and story events in the preceding story. By eliciting the events of the day from the other couple Vivian also provides the possibility that there will be an occasion for relating similar events about her own couple.¹³
Turning a shared opportunity to participate into the conjoined participation of an ensemble

Excerpt (20) showed that speakers can address an offer to a restricted combination of recipients in a manner that provides a shared opportunity to participate. However, as shown below in a slightly expanded excerpt, once the salesboy addresses his offer to subscribe to the three remaining participants at line 9, the two residents of the halfway house treat the solicitation as a matter for conjoined reply. That is, they change the form of participation prescribed by the salesboy.

(20) [Jefferson and Schenkein, 1978: 156]

1 Salesboy: G’n aftuhnoon sir, W’dju be innerested in subscribing
to the Progress Bulletin t’help m’win a trip tuh
Cape Kennedy ...

: 

5 Jus’ fer a few short weeks sir, tuh help me win my trip.

6 Richard: Well I live in Los Angeles. I don’ live around here
but these fellas live here, you might- ask the:m, I don’
know

9→ Salesboy: W’d eejer- any of you gen, tuhmen be innerested in
subscribing to it,

11→ Ted: Whaddiyou [think uh Beany,

12→ Steve: [Na::w

13→ Steve: Naw. [I don’t go faw it.

14 Salesboy: [Pleaz jst fer a short weeks sir,

15 Y’won’ haftuh [t’] next month

16 Ted: [Well, you er talk t’ the lady of the house.

17 Steve: Ye:h,

Though an association of participants had not been selected to speak next, two of the participants that share the opportunity to respond use that opportunity to establish an ensemble by expanding the opportunity to respond into a sequence at lines 11 to 13. An association of participants that acts in concert as an ensemble is established through the production of a conference sequence. It is produced in response to an inquiry that makes relevant shared, but independent opportunities to participate. In this ‘conference pass’ (Jefferson and Schenkein, 1978) one of the addressed recipients confers with another member. In this way recipients of the solicitation can make the rejection that emerges into a response that is a jointly developed and held position. Though the question was for any
individual, the conference pass turns the response into a conjoint accomplishment of which the residents are co-principals.

**Occasion-specific identities and conjoined participation**

Many associations made relevant in interaction draw upon extra-interactional relationships as their source (e.g., couples). That is, it is through a reference to participants as, e.g., a couple, that conjoined participation is made relevant in interaction. However, the circumstances of a gathering can itself furnish relevant shared identities — ones that have an ongoing incipient relevance for the occasion. In excerpt (27) there is no expressed reference to an extra-interactional relationship, but an inquiry by a guest makes the *shared*, occasion-specific, incipiently relevant identity of ‘host’ locally consequential. Here selection is tacitly embedded in the inquiry by Nancy at line 2. The question is addressed to Shane and Vivian not through their extra-interactional ties, but insofar as they, as co-hosts, can be expected to have shared knowledge of the details of meal preparation. This can again be seen in the follow-up question at line 9, and at line 2 of (28) in which another guest asks, ‘What’s for dessert?’. In these excerpts the speaker is not expressly addressing their recipients as a couple, yet a specific combination of participants is being addressed together as co-hosts and not as individual participants. When Shane and Vivian both respond (as they do in all three cases) they are responding as hosts.

(27) [Chicken dinner]

1 (0.9)
2→ Nancy: Is this ril butter? en:,wha:t,=
3 Shane: = Mm:[hm,
4 Vivian: [Margerine.
5 (0.6)
6 Nancy: [Uh: muh?]
7→ Shane: [S h : ]: (Shouldn’t tell ’em.)
8 (0.9)
9→ Nancy: Is this ParKA::[X?
10 Vivian: [Ye:h. =
11 Shane: = Ye::h i[tis.
12 Nancy: [ehh:hm[tch hu

The relevance of the host-guest division can be seen in Shane’s conference remark to Vivian at line 7. When it turns out that their responses at lines 3 and 4 differ this is treated as a problem by Shane. He treats the replies
to the question as having been not only replies to Nancy, but as addressed to the guests as an association (with Nancy as its spokesperson) and from the hosts as an occasion-specific association. It is here that a multi-person party (Schegloff, forthcoming) becomes an association of participants. In other words (with apologies to Marx) it is here that a party *in sicht* is transformed into a party *für sicht*.

An opportunity for conjoined participation need not be sustained by co-recipients. They can simply design their talk to demonstrate that they are speaking only on their own behalf or they can expressly disaffiliate from the incipient association. In (28) the shared identity of co-hosts again becomes consequential through Michael's inquiry at line 2. Shane and Vivian simultaneously glance directly at Michael just before line 4 is produced. Shane smiles as he begins this movement toward Michael, and Vivian probably does as well. Bringing her right arm across her body, Vivian also begins to point at Shane. The point reaches Shane at line 6. She ends up poking Shane with her pointing gesture as she begins to speak at line 7. It seems clear that the inquiry has touched-off something beyond a simple answer for both of them. They have had some sort of previous 'go-round' over dessert.

(28) [Chicken Dinner]
1
2  Michael: What's fer dessgt.
3  (1.3) ((both Vivian & Shane are chewing food))
4  Vivian: Mm:
5  (0.3)
6  Shane: I: - mm-
7→  Vivian: = u-That wz his idea. (.) Okay? ((smile voice))

With her poking point and utterance at line 7 Vivian disaffiliates herself from her co-host. This is a way to distance herself from the dessert Shane has chosen. That she finds it necessary to distance herself from the description of the dessert made relevant by Michael’s inquiry shows that she takes it that the dessert might otherwise be seen as (at least in part) her doing even if Shane replies as he has begun to do. She shows that she does not want to share the credit (or more likely the blame) that she might otherwise share as a member of the host couple.

Taken together (25), (26) and (28) highlight the fact that establishing the relevance of conjoined participation is an interactional achievement. A speaker can address recipients in a manner that does not call for conjoined participation, but recipients can turn that into an opportunity for conjoined participation as in (26). Or a speaker can make conjoined
participation relevant, but members of the incipient association can respond as individual participants as Nancy begins to do in (25), or a member can expressly disaffiliate from the incipient association as Vivian does in (28).

A momentary association of participants

As Schegloif (1991b) has shown there are actions performed through conversation that do not carry a vernacular name. It is only through the detailed and repeated examination of recorded conversational materials that such actions as 'confirming allusions' can be found. Similarly, though speaking to a couple or speaking to co-hosts entails speaking to an association of participants for which there is a vernacular name, there are collectivities (i.e., relevant multi-person units of participation) that go unnamed and are discursively unrecognized.

In (22), (24) and (25) a relatively enduring social unit (couple) was made relevant and procedurally consequential. In (23) a reference to conjoined participation in a future activity bound Shane and Michael together as classmates. In (27) and (28) an occasioned identity (host) associated with the overall organization of the event and one that has an incipient relevance over the course of the occasion was made procedurally consequential.

In excerpt (29) momentary discourse identities which have no vernacular names and are not part of a member's 'discursive consciousness' (Giddens, 1984) become relevant for establishing an opportunity for conjoined participation. In this excerpt Curt, Gary and Mike are sitting at a picnic table and talking about racing a snowmobile. Curt and Gary are on one side of the table and Mike is across from Gary. Just before the segment that starts at line 5 begins, Carney (Gary’s spouse) walks up to the table, reaches between Gary and Curt to pick up a cup of beer, then backs away from the table so she is behind Curt. She is standing off a few steps from the table. Her movements are not acknowledged in any way by the three at the table. The analysis concerns the exchange that begins at line 18.

(29) [Auto Discussion]

1  Gary:  Well he has a snowmobile out there’n, one guy came
2      out’n bet im twunny duh-bucks’e c’d beat iz snow-
3      mobile, (0.4) on dry la:nd.°(   ).
4      ((CA. 1 MIN. OF TRANSCRIPT DELETED))  
5  Mike:  Ain’ no way I’d get in’na snowmobile going that fast.
6  Gary:  [They ain’t nothin underneath yuh.
Now when heh! th(h)at thing le[ts go:] 
[No, b't-]yea[h.]

[yer rollin.

[Christ,

Yeah. Suppo suppose you git a little bump in th'road

in something like[that.

[Anything.

You'd fly off of it. That speed?

(. ) ((Gary glances toward Carney, but Curt cannot see

this move))

Carney: What.

Gary: Snowmobile.

Curt: Snowmobile

Carney: Oh-th[ey go how fa]st?

Gary: [Over a hunnerd]- 'hh=

Gary: = Over a hunnered miles'n hour, about a hunnerd'n

twunny

At line 16 Gary who has been looking directly at Curt turns sharply
(though slightly) to look at Carney. At this point she produces a 'next
turn repair initiator' (Schegloff et al., 1977) that locates a trouble source
('it') in Gary's prior turn. In response, Gary and Curt both supply the
needed reference for the pronoun almost simultaneously. The aim of my
analysis here is to recover the systematic basis for the simultaneous
responses at lines 19 and 20. In particular, I want to show that there is
a problem and a solution to the problem of how it is that Curt can take
Carney's 'what' to be for him as well as Gary. The questions are, how
could this utterance establish an opportunity for conjoined participation,
and what multi-person unit of participation is made relevant?

To formulate the problem and its solution it is necessary to review one
aspect of the organization of repair described by Schegloff et al. (1977)
and its relationship to the organization of turn-taking (Sacks et al., 1974).
Schegloff et al. (1977) describe a highly delineated sequential organization
for other-initiation of repair. Briefly, the initiation of repair by other
than speaker of the trouble source turn ordinarily occurs in the next turn
after the trouble source turn. These 'next turn repair initiators' (such as
Carney's 'what' at line 18) perform next speaker selection without
addressing a specific recipient. They are designed to select the speaker of
the just prior turn (i.e., the speaker of the trouble source turn) as next
speaker. Finally, next turn repair initiators make repair of the trouble
source relevant for last speaker in next turn. The features of other-
initiation just described provide, in part, for the organizational preference for self-correction and the resulting empirical finding that most correction is self-correction. Massively, other-initiated repair occurs in next turn and does in fact select prior speaker as next speaker to complete the repair. In addition, Sacks et al. note that addressing problems of understanding is a priority activity in conversation. Other parties ordinarily withdraw when other-initiation occurs and stay out of the repair sequence (at least during the first ‘round’).

We are now in a position to see that Curt’s utterance at line 20 is problematic. Since it is almost always the case that a repair initiator like Carney’s ‘what’ will select the just prior speaker and only that speaker (in this case Gary) as next speaker, how can we account for Curt’s response? The solution can be found in the momentary alignment of participants that occurs with Carney’s entry into the conversation as a new participant.

Carney had not been a ratified participant of the conversation until her utterance at line 18. (This is certainly so for Curt since she is standing several steps behind him.) She seems to be far enough away that she has been at most ‘looking in’ on the conversation. And until Gary glances toward her at line 16 none of the other interactants look toward her or acknowledge her presence. Thus, she is a new entrant into the conversation. At that point the momentary identities of ‘new arrival’ and ‘pre-present’ can be relevant for the participants and this division can be consequential for the organization of participation (Sacks, 1992; Schegloff, forthcoming). Specifically, it can be consequential for how Carney’s ‘what’ is treated. That a repair initiator is produced as a first contribution by a new arrival informs how it will be treated and who it will be heard to be selecting.

When produced by a new arrival a repair initiator can be heard as addressed to those pre-present as an association. This assertion can be supported by examining an aspect of the organization of reference in conversation. Initial references to persons, places, and things differ systematically from subsequent references. Subsequent references are regularly done with proterms. When a new entrant arrives in the course of a topic, they may find that the persons and objects that tie the topic together are referred to only by pronoun. (In (29) ‘Snowmobile’ had not been referred to by name since line 5 and there it occurred in overlap with other talk.) Though it may be possible on some occasions to locate the referent from actions bound to it, this does not seem to be the case here. Carney’s repair initiation locates a subsequent reference form (’it’) as the trouble source in Gary’s prior turn. That is, repair initiation is directly associated with her circumstances as a new entrant into the
conversation, since it is both her first contribution to the conversation and because it locates as a trouble source a problem in understanding that could only be a source of confusion for a new entrant. It is therefore possible for Curt to treat the repair initiator as being addressed to a problem of a new entrant and thereby conjointly addressed to those who are pre-present — establishing the relevance of an opportunity for conjoined participation. When he speaks he is speaking as someone who is pre-present and as a representative of the conversation as a social unit.

Concluding remarks

This report contributes to the development of an empirical basis for a systematic understanding of two features central to the organization of social life. These are the organization of collaborative actions and the operation of shared and linked social identities in society.

To the extent that the social sciences are concerned with collectivities, collective action and social relationships, work in these disciplines could be informed by the distinction between conjoined and shared participation, the organization of associations of participants in interaction, and the distinction between associations in general and ensemble-type associations. The analysis of collectivities, collective action and social relationships could be informed by the practical analysis and achievement of these phenomena by members of society, since members' actions provide the enabling organization for their relevance in society and for social science.

This investigation has shown that various units of social organization such as couples and other social relationships among persons can be described in a way that depicts them as endogenous to actual, particular occasions, situated within a course of action, and consequential for subsequent action. The present report looked closely at how participants establish and orient to such associations of participants as a practical achievement in the course of ordinary conversation and in two specialized forms of interaction.

The practices for talking to, for, and as an association of participants described in this article can be expanded to include other and larger units of social organization and other forms of interaction. Forms of these practices can be seen in the organization of talk and action in a range of collaborative activities from sports teams (e.g., volleyball) to negotiating teams.

The present discussion has been limited to associations of participants. I have described the organization of multi-person social units for occa-
sions where both members are present, but this analysis can also be extended to collectivities when only one member is present, yet that member is spoken to and speaks as a representative of some collectivity (e.g., a couple or union local or firm or state).

A central sociological concern addressed in this paper is the understanding of the relationship between individual and collectivity. I have shown how collectivities (i.e., associations of participants) can be constituted through the situated, routine practices of their members and their coparticipants. I have shown that how they are initiated, sustained and terminated are moment by moment accomplishments of those involved.

Notes

1. An interest in conjoined participation has a long history in sociology. Simmel (1950) sketched out the relational possibilities of triads at the beginning of the century, and Goffman (1959) suggested that interactants can act in concert as a performance team to sustain a single definition of the situation. Further, small group research has been a mainstay of empirical social psychological inquiry for almost half a century. From Bales (1950) onward researchers have isolated and coded acts that show solidarity, give help, and form alliances; and an interest in coalition formation within small groups has been a concern of investigators from the beginning (e.g., Mills, 1954; Strodbeck, 1954; Vinacke and Arko¿, 1957). Coalitions are usually thought of as forming in opposition to another participant for some sort of gain (Caplow, 1956, 1968). Kahan & Rapoport (1984) review theories of coalition formation derived from mathematical game theory and bargaining experiments in social psychology.

2. Although applause and booing usually demonstrate affiliation and disaffiliation respectively, the action accomplished by each depends upon its placement after a particular utterance by the orator. Applause can be disaffiliative in some circumstances.

[Bush, State of the Union, 1992]  
Bush: Really there are only two options (0.2) and we can move toward a nationalized system =  
Audience: \[x\times x\times x\times x\]  
Bush: [which will restrict patient choice  
Here, the applause are produced to show approval of the first part of a contrast thereby showing disapproval of the orator's upcoming and contrasting position. On the other hand, booing can sometimes be affiliative.  
[Clinton campaign speech, 1992]  
Clinton: Can you believe a man like this could compare himself to Harry Truman?  
Audience: Boo::: ((mostly in chorus))

3. Additional types of next speaker selection can also occur. For example, a single student can shout out the answer, or the teacher can select an individual student without waiting for hands to be raised. Also, the teacher-student division is not limited to whole
class interaction. Even when presenting a lesson to a small work group, turns can alternate between teacher and small work group, and the teacher's question can be treated as a question for the ensemble and elicit a choral response.

[CIRC]
Teacher: 'You are there.' Which way do you spell that.
A: [T-H-E-R-E-]
B: [T-H-E-R-E-]

4. Some classroom interaction is organized in a manner that also provides opportunities for students to speak as spokespersons for fellow students. For example, students can be divided into 'cooperative learning groups'. During these sessions (in which students interact mainly within their groups) the teacher may address the class not as an association of individuals, but as a collection of work groups. In one case a teacher has instituted an explicit turn taking system ('numbered heads') that makes relevant talk by a spokesperson for each group in a manner that formally pre-selects who in the group will speak for the group, then provides for teacher allocation of speaking turns for the spokespersons.

5. I restrict my discussion of conversational interaction to two person associations, though the characterization could be extended to larger social units. Also, since the organization of storytelling in conversation shapes conjoined participation in distinct ways I examine it in a separate report (Lerner, 1992).

6. In this excerpt the speaker uses a 'collective speaker pro-reference term' (we). The use of one proterm over another (e.g., 'I' instead of 'We' in the following excerpt) can be a notable and consequential matter for participants. In the following excerpt Shane treats the use of 'I' by Vivian as wrongly excluding him. At line 1 Vivian refers to herself using 'I'. Shane objects to this at lines 5 and 8. Vivian then corrects the reference to 'we' at line 9. This is then accepted by Shane at line 12.

[CD:II:39–40 (simplified)]
1 → Vivian: One guys that I wanna ca:wll =
2 = he usually comes out. you know so you js tell 'm it's eighty
3 degrees hi'll get onna plan[e
4 Nancy: [nnh[Yheh
5 → Shane: [Woah wai' we e way:e ee- Wu wai'a
6 waj'a wu.
7 (0.4)
8 One: gu:;y you usually ga(h)a(h)ll? W'd 'z's
9 → Vivian: No we[ca : 11.
10 Shane: [W'd is this]::
11 (0.5)
12 → Oh: Okay it wz: friend a'mine too. Awright.

7. Elsewhere, I describe how reminiscence recognition solicits ('Remember when...') can be used to collaboratively initiate the telling of a story by an ensemble (Lerner, 1992). Other uses of conferencing are discussed in subsequent sections of this report.

8. The possibility of this method was suggested to me by Pomerantz (personal communication).

9. It is beyond the scope of this article to provide a detailed treatment of speaker selection in conversation, though the present report is intimately bound to that topic. This section should be seen only as summarizing research findings (necessary to the present discussion) that will be reported in detail elsewhere.
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10. Something similar to this can also be found in specialized speech exchange systems such as debates and interviews. For example, in the second presidential debate of 1992, when all three candidates are addressed, selection of next speaker can become a matter for explicit arrangement as in the following excerpt.

[Second Presidential Debate, 1992]
1 Audience Member: Please state your position on term limits and if you are in favor of them how will get them enacted
2
3 (1.6)
4 → Bush: Any order?
5 (0.6)
6 I’d be glad to respond
7 Audience Member: Thank you

Above, Bush at line 4 queries the moderator who then visibly shows during the silence at line 5 that no particular ordering is relevant. In this excerpt (unlike ordinary conversation) one of the selected answerers turns to the moderator to resolve a problem of next speaker selection. Also, in interviews with multiple interviewees, Heritage and Greatbatch (1991) note that questions can be asked that make answers relevant from all interviewees and that these answers can be produced in succession without intervention by the interviewer after each answer.

11. This type of other-correction can be seen at line 2 in the following excerpt.

[GL:TF]
J: Bruce went to Santa Barbara (this week.)-
→B: [Yeah (I was, Two weeks ago though)

12. Schegloff et al. (1977) state that other-correction is found in sequence-type environments such as storytelling. Other-correction is used by story 'consociates' as a bid for (and vehicle for) co-telling the story, thereby making a team with the current teller. The making of a team (i.e., an ensemble type association) with another participant is closely tied to the establishment of an opportunity for conjoined participation. For example, producing an anticipatory completion, as in excerpt (12), accomplishes co-explaining and therein establishes an ensemble of co-explainers. However, not all conjoined participation includes team talk. That other-correction seems to be found in team talk may be in part closely related to the entitlement to speak for oneself that seems to be operative when a co-member of an association is speaking for the association.

13. One consequence of this situation is that there may be alternating opportunities to participate for reciprocally established associations, but no systematic method for determining which member will speak for each association (cf. Schegloff, forthcoming). Moreover, once the opportunities to participate are divided along couple (i.e., association) lines, there is a systematically provided for possibility of conversational schism as can be seen in incipient fashion at lines 10 and 11.
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