On the "semi-permeable" character of grammatical units in conversation: conditional entry into the turn space of another speaker*
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In dialogue, the lines of the individual participants are grammatically disconnected; they are not integrated into one unified context. Indeed, how could they be?


Language structure has long been described in isolation from its natural home of talk-in-interaction. Some have even made this a research policy. On the other hand, a central concern of those disciplines that study speech has been to describe its function. For the most part grammar and particularly syntactic structure has been ceded to those who study language as a self-contained system. However, grammatical structure is not merely an artifact of linguistic inquiry that has isolated language form from its actualization as talk-in-interaction. Features of talk-in-interaction are structured by their producers, and an orientation to the structure of various features of talk-in-interaction can be seen in the ways participants treat various aspects of talk. Two prominent examples are the structuring of talk as turn-constructional units (Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson, 1974; Schegloff, this volume) – henceforth TCUs – and the further structuring of some turns at talk into "preferred" and "dispreferred" turn shapes (Sacks, 1987 [1973]; Pomerantz, 1984). Turns at talk are designed for (and as a part of) practical action in interaction. The structures of talk-in-interaction are social structures of practical actors, and the features of their talk then are features of practical action.

When one considers the grammatical structure of language as a set of social resources that is in the first instance situated in the hands of participants who can deploy and exploit (and play with)
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these used-in-common features of sociality, then the ground for grammatical description shifts from the structures of language to the structures of practice. This does not erase language structure from the description, but respecifies the features of language as features of talk in interaction. One question not addressed under the ordinary purview of grammar, but one that can be addressed by a sequentially informed "applied" linguistics concerns the permeability of grammatical units of turn construction.

Ordinarily, the transfer of speakership from one party to another becomes relevant at TCU possible completion, yet there are types of actions that can be accomplished by starting to speak elsewhere. Such an action may not so much interrupt the turn or the action(s) being accomplished in it, as forward the projected turn or its action project in some manner. In this chapter I take up some aspects of turn construction that provide the resources for such conditional entry into the turn of another speaker. What are the features of talk-in-interaction that provide enhanced resources for conditional entry? Here I emphasize the turn-constructional aspects of this organization, but I would like to stress at the outset that these considerations cannot be divorced either practically or analytically from the organization of the actions such grammatical resources sustain.

This chapter first briefly recapitulates and then extends previously published work on jointly constructed TCUs to set off a here newly reported line of work on the directional or progressive structure of language used as turns at talk. The first part of this report examines the moment of preliminary component completion of compound TCUs and shows how its sequential structure provides a place for anticipatory completion by another participant. The second part of this report describes additional directional aspects of turn construction that enhance the possibility of a recipient interposing talk before possible completion of a TCU. By examining the permeability of TCUs it becomes possible to, in effect, observe language users in situ as active analysts of language structure.
5.1 Compound turn-constructional units

In a previous report I identified an ordered two-component type of TCU – the compound TCU (Lerner, 1991). In brief, a compound TCU includes a preliminary component that projects roughly what it will take to bring that component to possible completion and projects a possible form for the final component of the TCU as well, and thereby a shape for the TCU as a whole. It is not until a recognizable final component is begun that the place of TCU possible completion becomes (roughly) projectable. It is the possible completion of the final component that constitutes a transition-relevance place. For example, it is not until the "then" component of a "when-then" or "if-then" TCU is begun (and this can be delayed by additional components after the first preliminary "when" or "if" component) that the TCU-in-progress heads toward unit completion. The preliminary component of a compound TCU is shown in boldface in excerpt (1).

(1) [Smith: Thanksgiving]

Lynn: When you don't get any appreciation back from the teachers, well its like forget it.

Many different aspects of talk in interaction can furnish participants with the features of a compound TCU-in-progress – i.e. project preliminary component completion and final component form – including syntactic features such as the TCU-initial subordinating conjunction in excerpt (1), productional features such as contrastive stress, as well as other aspects of the sequential organization of conversation such as the "dispreferred" form disagreements can take (Ford, 1993; Lerner, 1991).

The features that constitute compound TCUs represent one specification of the turn taking features that comprise TCUs generally: recognizable possible completion and the projectability of possible completion. It is by reference to TCU possible completion that transition to a next speaker is ordinarily organized and understood. However, compound TCUs-in-progress furnish the sequential resources for the anticipatory completion of the TCU by another speaker. Turns produced in a compound turn-constructional form provide a place – a projectable place at preliminary component possible completion – and a form – the projected final component form – for another speaker to finish the current TCU. In each of the
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(2) [GTS]

Dan: when the group reconvenes in two weeks—
-> Roger: =they're gunna issue strait jackets

(3) [GL:FN]

Alan: Did you use the button ho ler on that?
Beth: Once you cut the button hole open
-> Alan: you can’t use the button ho ler.

(4) [HIC]

ot

In each case, the arrowed utterance continues the projected compound TCU to a next possible completion place for the unit as a whole. Furthermore, in some (though not all) sequential environments, the production of an anticipatory completion by another participant can initiate a small sequence – the collaborative turn sequence – in which the acceptance or rejection of the proffered completion becomes a specially relevant responsive action as in excerpt (5).

(5) [CDHQ:II]

1 Marty: Now most machines don’t record that slow. So I’d wanna-
2 when I make a tape,
3 Josh: be able tuh speed it up.
->4 Marty: Yeah.

Also notice that in (5) the compound structure is not furnished at the outset of the turn or turn-constructional unit in which it is produced, but in the course of the TCU. Here the compound structure is established by the parenthetical insert at line 2.

5.2 A place for speaker transition

While distinctly different in social and interactional terms from TCU possible completion as a place of transition relevance, preliminary component completion (using grammatical and prosodic features in a fashion similar to those used to produce and recognize TCU completion) also provides a place for another participant to
begin speaking. Some preliminary components even seem to be more or less actively eliciting completion by another participant through the deployment of intonational resources or the relevance of an ongoing knowledge differential as found in e.g. a tutoring session. However, preliminary component completion provides an opportunity for another to begin speaking even when no form of elicitation is evident and the first speaker continues on without hesitation. Composing and positioning an utterance as a conditional entry into another’s turn does not require an “invitation.”

With anticipatory completion, onset occurs at a TCU-internal component completion, and therefore not at a place the turn itself could in most circumstances be finished. That is, a next speaker begins speaking before the projected completion of a TCU and thus within the projected turn space of the still current speaker. The onset of an anticipatory completion in the course of a compound TCU-in-progress shows that the possible completion of the preliminary component can be an oriented-to feature of the turn. Anticipatory completions launched just at the completion of the preliminary component can begin, and go toward completion, without incurring overlapping talk. In contrast, anticipatory completions that begin earlier or later than preliminary component completion regularly initiate overlapping speech.

How do anticipatory completions that are initiated at preliminary component completion come to start in the clear while others ordinarily do not? Component completion furnishes a socially organized site for possible silence – the slight pause that can precede the final component. Speakers may permit a beat of silence before continuing on to the final (or at least next) component of a compound TCU as in excerpt (6).

(6) [HIC]

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

Pausing at preliminary component possible completion is ordinarily not indicative of trouble in the forward movement of the turn (Schegloff, 1979), as its occurrence can be understood if positioned elsewhere in a TCU. Here, it is merely pausing before continuing. Pausing is treated as a rest beat in the normal cadence of the ongoing utterance. Indeed, work on the intonation patterns of natu-
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rally occurring speech has shown that intonation units are regularly bounded by a slight pause or rest beat (Du Bois et al, 1993; Du Bois, personal communication). A rest beat does not always occur between adjacent intonation units, but such junctures provide a foreseeable environment for a beat of silence.5

Similarly, other productional features that can be indicative of completion, for example, a sound stretch, can be indicative of possible trouble if it occurs away from a possible completion place, whether preliminary component possible completion or TCU possible completion. On the other hand, the occurrence of a sound stretch in the vicinity of preliminary component possible completion or TCU possible completion can be part of the procedure for bringing a preliminary component or a TCU to completion. A stretch can adumbrate a possible halt in speaking. When it occurs adjacent to a possible syntactic completion, it certifies the possible completion; when it occurs elsewhere it can forecast possible trouble ahead. In other words, the syntactic environment of a stretch or a pause informs the action it performs.

The syntax-sensitive nature of intonational features of talk can illuminate the relationship of intonation contour (and especially terminal intonation contour) to syntax in another way, when we consider the relationship of preliminary component possible completion to TCU possible completion. The intonation contour of an utterance can certify various syntactic constituents as complete; however, it is the syntax (informed by its sequential location) that will show if the completion of an intonation unit is a preliminary component completion or a TCU completion.6

By placing an anticipatory completion at the completion of the preliminary component (or the completion of any extension of it), the utterance has a systematic chance of beginning in the clear, as David's contribution does in excerpt (7).

(7) [HIC]

    Sparky: An if you and Cheryl got together
    David: you don't have enough

David begins his utterance, which is tied syntactically to the compound TCU-in-progress as a continuation of it, at a possible completion of the preliminary component. No pause is marked on the transcript between the two utterances, but for David to have started
in the clear Sparky must necessarily have stopped talking. In addition to this, Sparky also refrains from resuming his turn even though he has not yet completed the TCU he began. Notice that the TCU is in fact continuing toward completion, but out of the mouth of a different participant — i.e. David is producing a rendition of the final component. In this way, two participants collaborate in the production of a single TCU. This results in an *intra-turn* change of speakers. The entitlement of a speaker to produce a complete TCU has been relaxed, but not abandoned (cf. Sacks and Schegloff, 1979). The achievement of one speaker talking at a time and the entitlement to produce at least one TCU to completion are intimately related, but they are not always co-occurring features as anticipatory completion demonstrates. Here participants manage to achieve one speaker talking at a time, and a rendition of the projected final component is produced — i.e. the TCU is brought to a next possible completion. Only the animator (Goffman, 1979) of the turn’s talk has changed.

This exploitation of turn taking can be used to accomplish a number of distinct types of action (Lerner, 1987). An analysis of these action types is not developed in this chapter, but the following represent the range of actions that can be accomplished by anticipatory completion. Anticipatory completion can be used to demonstrate agreement, or pre-empt a disagreement-in-progress with a current speaker or it can be used to collaborate with a current speaker in explaining something to another participant. It can even be used to heckle a storyteller by, in effect, placing words in their mouth.

The earliest point one can begin at preliminary component completion, and thereby possibly project beginning in the clear, is by latching the anticipatory completion to the completion of the preliminary component as in excerpt (2) above. Onset of the final component by still-current speaker closes down the systematic possibility of a recipient beginning a preliminary completion in the clear. (Yet, as I will show below, this does not completely close down the possibility of anticipatory completion.)

If an additional preliminary component is produced by current speaker, then another chance will become available. In the next excerpt, Kerry misses his chance at the first juncture provided by an indirect quotation marker, but then tries again at the next pro-
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jected juncture. This time he begins just at preliminary component completion. (Talk prior to this excerpt and the design of "let them make the decisions" itself reveal the utterance to be the first part of a contrast.)

(8) [HIC]

1 Sparky: It sounds like what you're saying
2 is that (.) [let them make the decisions=
3 Kerry: [(if ya)
->4 Kerry: =an let us know what it is

Of course a pause before the next component is not assured. The current speaker can simply continue through from the completion of the preliminary component to the next component without a pause.

In summary, when an anticipatory completion is initiated, it is ordinarily begun just after the preliminary component, at a place the final component could be due, and is designed as a syntactic continuation of the utterance part it follows at the point of onset, and in the absence of further talk by the prior speaker. This placement maintains contiguity of turn-constructional components (sustaining the progressivity of the turn's talk toward completion), while achieving speaker transition that regularly results in one and only one participant speaking at a time. However, anticipatory completions do start elsewhere in the course of the turn-in-progress, for example, after the onset of the final component.

5.3 Late-placed anticipatory completions

The onset of the final component by the current speaker does not close down the possibility of an interposing speaker beginning their own completion. However, in this case the preliminary component completion and not the point of actual onset still can be seen to have been the target that was aimed for — and missed, thereby rendering the anticipatory completion as "late." This can be seen in the following excerpt.

(9) [US]

Rich: if they come en pick it up it'll co[st yah
Mike: [they charge yuh

Mike begins his anticipatory completion after Rich has already begun the projected final component, but the anticipatory comple-
tion is not designed as a continuation of the prior turn unit from the point of its onset. Instead, it is designed to connect to the completion of the preliminary component as its starting place, and thereby marks its own misplacement – i.e. its own lateness.

There is a sequential limit as to how late a completion can be, and still result in a collaboratively produced TCU. Once a speaker finishes a compound TCU, the production of what earlier might have been an anticipatory completion may now be hearable as (or turned into) instead a next turn repeat of a prior turn's (now ratified) completion. Whether an utterance is heard as continuing a syntactic unit, and thus as a contribution to the turn-in-progress it comprises, or as a repeat of a portion of a syntactic unit, and thus as a new turn repeating part of a prior turn (or for that matter as a new turn that stands in some relation to the prior other than as a repeat), hinges on the position of its onset in relation to other contributions.

There are constraints on the production of late anticipatory completions. These are (1) component contiguity, i.e. achieving (or at least demonstrating an orientation to) contiguous placement of the affiliating utterance with the preliminary component, and (2) turn space occupancy, i.e. starting and producing the affiliating utterance within the current turn space, where the boundary of the current turn space is constituted by the impending possible completion of the final component of the compound TCU-in-progress. (That is, recipients produce late anticipatory completions in a manner that is oriented to getting it said prior to when the current speaker's utterance – their TCU-in-progress – reaches the next transition-relevance place.)

No conflict arises in the achievement of these features when the anticipatory completion is initiated at the completion of the preliminary component and the current speaker does not resume speaking. Anticipatory completions that begin after the current speaker has begun a next increment of their TCU can nonetheless demonstrate component contiguity by locating – through syntactic design – the completion of the preliminary component as their proper starting place. And speakers can accomplish turn space occupancy for anticipatory completions through utterance compression, by quickening the pace of their talk, or actually compressing the words which make up the utterance, or both. In the
following excerpt orientations to component contiguity and within-turn-space production are simultaneously displayed.

(10) [HIC]

Sparky: when it doesn' involve the basic agreement
    it is b[y stock] 
---> Dad: [it’s by majorlity]

Here the anticipatory completion ("it's by majority") is designed to be both contiguous with the preliminary component (even though its actual onset occurs later) and compressed. First, Dad begins with "it's," after Sparky has used the form, "it is." By producing a version of "it is," Dad positions his talk after completion of the preliminary component; by eliding it, Dad displays the compression appropriate for achieving within-turn-space production. Also, most of Dad's utterance ("its by majority") is done within Sparky's, "y stock." This attempt is not completely successful, since a small portion of Dad's utterance occurs after Sparky has reached a TCU possible completion. However, as with component contiguity, the speaker displays an orientation to the achievement of within-turn-space placement even when that feature is not completely achievable. The attempt displays an "intent" and thereby becomes a recognizable replacement for, or realization of, the attempted action.

Lexical compression can be taken further and still result in a recognizable anticipatory completion. In excerpt (11) Roger begins his anticipatory completion in the course of the second part of a contrast at the last possible place to produce it as an anticipatory completion (i.e., still be within the turn space).

(11) [GTS]

Dan: the guy who doesn't run the race doesn't win=it
    (.) but he doesn't lose it
Roger: [>but- lu:zit<]

In this instance contiguity and within-turn-space completion are both achieved since both the beginning and end of the anticipatory completion are produced. However, the middle of the unit is skipped. Not only does Roger use a faster pace and condense the utterance, but he abandons the part of the utterance on which the display of agreement literally hinges in favor of attempting to finish his utterance before Dan completes the contrast himself.9
The interactional significance of these practices must be seen against the backdrop of the ordinary course of overlap competition. In contrast to the practices of condensing and speeding up their talk in order to finish before the still-current speaker does, speakers in overlap regularly call on procedures that are oriented to *outlasting* the other speaker. Rather than speeding up an utterance, participants stretch and extend their talk in various ways (Jefferson and Schegloff, 1975; Schegloff, 1987).

Anticipatory completions are designed to occur as part of the current turn and not in opposition to it. Though the beginning and middle of the anticipatory completion may be sacrificed, the final part of the utterance cannot be abandoned in the same way, since stopping the utterance prior to a recognizable completion shows that the affiliating utterance has failed as an anticipatory completion (and the various kinds of interactional work that such completions can accomplish fail with it).

The intersecting organizations of actions into sequences-of-action, on the one hand, and talk into locally allocated turns-in-a-series, on the other, furnish one systematic basis for the compressed form of late anticipatory completions. The following instance demonstrates the "pressure" that speaker sequencing exerts on the placement of the initiation of an anticipatory completion.

(12) [US]

Rich: if they come en pick it up it'll co[st yah]  
Mike: [they]
Carol: [y e a h ]

At the moment Rich's entire compound TCU comes to possible completion, Mike has only produced a single word ("they"), which is not yet recognizable as the beginning of an anticipatory completion. At this point, another participant (Carol) produces a next turn that ratifies Rich's turn as completed, thereby placing the continuing anticipatory completion outside of the turn space. Mike has failed in a bid to provide a rendition of the TCU's final component. The "yeh," which occurs in the clear at the end of Mike's utterance, transforms the attempted completion into having been a receipt of the prior turn rather than a continuation of it. The interactional import of this is that the action Mike comes to have produced has been transformed from collaboratively answering a question that Carol has asked about getting a cat "fixed" to
confirming Rich’s answer, and doing this after Carol herself has done so.

5.4 Early-placed anticipatory completion

In this section I examine anticipatory completions in which initial onset occurs before the completion of the preliminary component. First, I examine the pre-beginning of one anticipatory completion, then I examine an excerpt in which the anticipatory completion itself actually begins prior to preliminary component completion.

In excerpt (13), Fran, a recipient of an at least somewhat tongue-in-cheek correction, produces an anticipatory completion just at completion of the preliminary component, but launches it with a "response cry" (Goffman, 1978) prior to component completion.

(13) [CS:3]

1 Fran: BUT WHUT UH YUH GONNA DO, YUH JUST GONNA SPREAD
2 THAT STUFF ON THE DRI:VEWAY?=
3 Mike: = 's gonna load [up with it<
4 Steve: [I'm not gonna spread it
5 on the dri:veway, I'm gonna dump it
6 Fran: [Aih! you gonna dump it

There are various actions that can occur in the moment before a participant produces the beginning of a TCU and thereby the beginning of a turn at talk. For example, participants produce such things as audible inhalations that foreshadow the onset of speech. This can be done in a manner that matches the pace of the end of the current turn so that the recipient culminates the inhalation and begins speaking just at possible completion. A turn at talk does not always begin after such inhalations, but they can be treated as indicating that a turn is on the way and as such are elements of a turn’s pre-beginning. “Aih!” occupies this pre-beginning position in excerpt (13) and it is placed in the course of the ongoing utterance in a manner that shows Fran to be precisely targeting completion of Steve’s preliminary component for the onset of her anticipatory completion. In this case, the stretch in “dri:veway” (indicated by the colon) puts Fran’s token a bit before the final syllable of preliminary component completion and so puts the onset of her anticipatory completion a bit early also.

Similarly, the anticipatory completion in excerpt (14), or more precisely its initial onset, “we’re s-” at line 8, can be characterized as
having begun "early." Though this utterance is begun in the course of the preliminary component, it is syntactically tied to the completion of the preliminary component. The utterance, "we’re s-,” which is cut off, is designed to follow "agreement," though it was begun before "agreement” has ended. (Note that in the first part of the contrast concerning types of decision making (lines 1 to 2) Sparky uses the term "agreement” and not "agreement contract” to refer to the document they are discussing. In line 7 “contract” seems to be added as a way to extend the preliminary component, and thus manage the incipient overlap in an unmarked fashion.)

(14) [HIC]

1 Sparky: so what yer saying then is that when (): when it doesn’t
2 invol:ve thee basic agreement, it is b:[y stock ]
3 Dad: [its by majority]
4 Sparky: by majority according to stocks=
5 Dad: =(right)
6 Sparky: an when it does: ah involve the basic
7 agree[m ent ] cont[r act its by: uhm ]
8 Dad: [we’re s-] [we’re still letting us set aside]
9 the agreement contract ( )
10 Sparky: its- its by ah unanimous decision
11 Dad: [right]

Dad, having begun early and finding himself in overlap, recycles (Schegloff, 1987) “we’re s” at precisely the place the preliminary component could be finished. This suggests that the juncture was taken to be an upcoming potential within-turn place to begin the anticipatory completion. That is, the anticipatory completion is built to display its placement at the completion of the preliminary component of the projected compound TCU-in-progress, even though it began early; and it is at just this preliminary completion that the early, overlapping completion is recycled.

Both speakers are engaged in competition for the turn here. For his part, Sparky adds the clearly awkward “contract” as an attempt to outlast the overlapping utterance – i.e. to extend the current preliminary component, rather than progressing with what is a far from finished TCU. Both participants are oriented to what is only a preliminary completion as a completion nonetheless – i.e. as an organizationally relevant locus for overlap resolution. Also, here we see an overlap management device – the recycled turn beginning – that ordinarily operates at turn transition relevance places, also available to the interposing speaker for use within a TCU. That is, a
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practice ordinarily associated with the boundaries of a TCU, is also available for use at internal boundary points.

Taken together, these excerpts, then, evidence the orientation to the juncture at preliminary component completion as a projectable place for anticipatory completion onset, and as the location where the onset of anticipatory completion should properly occur. Exact placement is not required since fine tuning of placement can be accomplished in situ (cf. Goodwin, 1986).

5.5 A restricted opportunity to speak: what gets done at these junctures

Since the juncture between components of a compound TCU provides a projectable place for speaker onset, one would expect that it could be used to begin actions other than anticipatory completion of the projected final component. These other actions can also display an orientation to this internal juncture in a compound TCU-in-progress as a site for restricted or conditional access to the ongoing turn of another speaker. Further, the actions accomplished by entry can be built upon the intra-turn nature of that entry or alternatively display their misplacement.

Just as each next turn in a conversation is ordinarily designed to follow the just prior turn, so a recipient's utterance begun internal to a turn's talk (i.e. in the midst of the projected turn space of the current speaker) is shaped by, and understood by reference to, its placement. For example, acknowledgment tokens or "continuers" are often used in the course of an extended turn to show that the current turn-so-far, though at a possible completion of a turn-constructional unit, is understood not to be a transition-relevance place for the turn (Schegloff, 1982; Jefferson, 1984). Continuers can also be used in the same way at the completion of the preliminary component of a compound TCU, as in Ann's "Mm hm" at line 4 in excerpt (15). (It is important to note here that the tempo of Dad's talk is quite slow relative to Ann and that he often pauses. I mention this here in order to suggest that the slight pause at line 3 should not be seen as a marked pausal extension of the preliminary completion.)
(15) [Mother's Day]

1   Dad:  s- so if ah you were strong in yer feel:ings
2   about (0.2) people
3   (0.2)
->4  Ann:  Mm hm=
5   Dad:  =your tht you li:ked (0.3) an it was in comple:ty (.) contras=to (0.4)
6   what your mother (.) thought was right (0.8) comple:ty (.) hhh it would
7   be extremely difficult for yer mother to=sh to to adapt to that (0.2) .h
8   where she could adapt to=. h see:ing you::
9   (0.2)
10  Ann:  Mm hm
11  Dad:  but not (.) endorse what cher doing
12  Ann:  Yeh.

By producing an acknowledgment token at line 4, Ann both acknowledges the turn-so-far and shows that she expects the turn to continue. That is, she is treating it as a preliminary component of a not-yet-completed turn and thereby demonstrating that her contribution is not to be taken as a full turn at talk that should itself be attended by subsequent talk. (It is the work that this placement and design accomplish that is ordinarily glossed and lost by the term "back-channel.")

In addition to producing anticipatory completions and continuers, recipients of a compound TCU sometimes begin a new turn at the completion of the preliminary component. Beginning a new turn in this way can be compared to recognition point entry (Jefferson, 1973, 1983a). In recognition point onset recipients use the recognizability of the emergent action as a resource and warrant for beginning a new turn. One feature of many recognition point entries is that they are done not merely as responses to a foreasted complete TCU, but are used in circumstances where it would be felicitous to pre-empt the current speaker's utterance before completion – i.e. to forestall the action that is currently underway and recognizable as part of the TCU's projectability.

The projectability of a TCU-internal preliminary component completion furnished by a compound TCU provides an additional syntactic resource for recognitional entry. In excerpt (16) Cathy pre-empts her mother's warning to show that she has already "learned her lesson." (Here "that" at line 3 and "it" at lines 4 and 5 refer to an ankle bracelet Cathy has just received as a birthday gift.)
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(16) [BIRTHDAY]

1. Mom: now when you take yer stockins off, or things
2. like that (0.4) kinna ease um down cause
3. if that's caught on it
->4 Cathy: [I know I broke my other one just like it
5. Mom: [y'll bust it

One option here would be for Cathy to produce an anticipatory completion to co-opt the consequence of not heeding the warning, thus demonstrating that she has already learned her lesson. But in this case Cathy uses preliminary component completion to begin an early next turn response. Even though her utterance is designed as a new turn and not as an anticipatory completion, its placement contributes to a demonstration that she has already learned her lesson and does not need to be reminded by her mother. That is, it is placed and designed to pre-empt the relevance of the projected final component of Mom's turn (i.e. the consequence of not taking off her stockings carefully), and not merely as an early response to it.

Anticipatory completions continue the current TCU, while continuers encourage continuation by other. Recognitional entry can be used to interdict the completion of a turn, thereby forestalling the turn's project. In each of these three cases the mode of utterance initiation presses the speaker's claim that they are entering the turn space of another to accomplish work that cannot wait for completion; indeed it is by reference to their early placement - early, vis-à-vis TCU completion - that the action import of these utterances is recognizable.

On the other hand, next speakers sometimes begin in the course of a TCU in a fashion that shows itself to be unresponsive to the current TCU, e.g., by responding to an earlier increment of talk by the current speaker and beginning the response at other than a place of transition relevance. Preliminary component completion can be used as a resource for this. In excerpt (17) speaker B is responding to something said in an earlier increment of A's turn, but the onset of her turn is hearable as sensitive to the projected completion of the preliminary component ("if you're going out").

(17) [J:Invitation]

1. A: I was just gonna say come out
2. and come over here and talk this evening.
3. But if you're going out I can't very well do that.
->4 B: [Talk you mean get drunk, don't you.
5. A: what?
Speaker B's turn begins with a turn initial repeat of a word used in an earlier TCU by speaker A. This explicitly shows that her utterance is not to be heard (as it otherwise ordinarily would be) as coming next after the talk it directly follows, but is responsive to something else – the reported invitation.

Notice that this is quite different from the way the "late" anticipatory completions discussed earlier are tied to the completion of the preliminary component of a compound TCU. Here in excerpt (17), an element is placed at the beginning of the TCU to show its "misplacement"; while in the case of anticipatory completion, it is precisely the fact that the utterance is not specially designed either constructionally or intonationally to have a marked turn beginning that allows its structural connection to preliminary component completion to be registered.

In summary, preliminary component completion might be thought of more generally as a TCU-internal place for recipient entry, where a variety – a restricted variety – of utterance forms may begin. In the first part of this chapter I have been examining the character of compound TCU permeability that this grammatically formed place provides. As I have shown, compound TCUs project the form of the final component and indicate a place for recipient entry. In the next section I examine one two-part action format that can projectably furnish recipient with the form of the second part, but does not always furnish a preliminary component completion. This can provide enhanced resources for producing a completion, but it does not also provide a distinct TCU-internal completion place to begin.

5.6 Two-part formats without preliminary completion places

There are certain actions in conversation that regularly go together and have a sequential ordering between them, yet are not produced in a compound turn-constructional form, and thus do not provide a distinct syntactic place for anticipatory completion. For example, complaints can take the form: disparaging reference + complainable action, as in excerpts (18) and (19).

(18) [US]

Vic: He's a bitch he didn' pud in duh light own dih sekkin flaw,
Not only do disparaging references accompany complaints, but they regularly precede the complainable action. So, in (18) Vic first uses a disparaging reference "He's a bitch" then follows this with a complaint "he didn't put in a light on the second floor." In (19) Joe first refers to someone as "the son of a bitch" then issues the complaint "he tore up everything."

This constitutes a two-part format, in which the action-type of the second part can be projectable from the first. Yet, in contrast to excerpts (18) and (19), the two parts of the format may be combined in a single grammatical unit, such that the first part does not project that is ordinarily followed by a beat of silence a preliminary component completion. Nevertheless, this format does provide a resource for TCU completion by an interposing speaker as in excerpts (20) and (21).

(Note that in (21) Joe is reporting someone else's complainable matter, and so here the two-part format is preserved in the form of the report of the complainable action.) The "disparaging reference + complainable action" two-part format provides an additional resource for projecting the form of TCU completion and this is used to finish the TCU-in-progress. Yet, notice that in each case the interposing speaker's completion comes quite near the end of the TCU. This TCU position alone can contribute resources for completion.
5.7 Terminal item completion

The final word or two – the terminal item of a TCU – can be co-produced by a recipient, as in (22), or actually co-opted by an interposing speaker, as in (23). (I cannot here provide an explication of the differences between choral co-production of a completion and co-optation of another’s completion, but I would at least like to register that these can be quite distinct forms of action by the entering speaker.)

(22) [Family Tree:4]

1 T: Greg can be Santa Claus.
2 M: Yeah, he’s got the [beard!]
->3 C: [beard!]

(23) [CDHQ: Hurricane I:5]

1 Tiny: Chief Jerruso and Vic are on their way to Haynes Boulevard now, and
2 they say you better have yer [transper:tation=
->3 Charlie: =ready,=
4 Tiny: =alerted ‘hh

So, the beginning edge of the turn transition space (what Schegloff, this volume, calls the “pre-completion” position in a TCU) can also be used for completion of the current turn by a recipient. Here possible completion of the ongoing TCU is both projectable and imminent. It is the turn-taking mandated orientation to the imminent possible closure of the turn and with it the opening up at the point of pre-completion of the relevance of transition (and not any particular turn-constructional format) that furnishes an opportunity for completion. Terminal item completion begins in the same place in current turn (its pre-completion) as the pre-beginning of a next turn could begin, and therefore, in one sense, might be thought of as an alternative to it. Correspondingly, Jefferson (1983a), looking at overlap onset, finds that the beginning of the terminal item of a TCU (i.e. at pre-completion) is one systematic place for another speaker to begin a next turn.

5.8 Unprojected opportunities for completion

Up to this point in the discussion I have only considered opportunities for completion that are foreseeable in the course of a turn-in-progress. The discussion of TCU permeability will now turn to a characterization of several features of TCU production that furnish
The temporal character of talk provides the possibility that it can be directional. The organization of talk-in-interaction into turns realizes that directionality as a directionality toward possible completion (Schegloff, this volume) that can be found (at least in part), and projected, in the directional structure of TCUs — i.e. it can be found and projected in the *progressivity* of the turn's talk toward (next) possible completion. (The compound TCU form is one realization of that directional structure.) However, the progressivity of a turn's talk is an emergent, productional and social-interactional achievement, and therefore is not guaranteed. There are systematic and local bases for the occasional halting of a turn's progressivity prior to TCU possible completion. These unprojected "disruptions" to progressivity can occasion practices aimed at continuing the turn toward possible completion, both by current speaker and by recipients. Unprojected disruptions to a TCU-in-progress afford an opportunity for recipient entry into the stalled turn and can provide a warrant for TCU completion.

Unprojected opportunities for entry are occasioned by any conversational practice that disrupts the progressivity of talk within a turn (Jefferson, 1983a; Schegloff, 1979). For the present discussion, progressivity can be thought of as constituted by the co-occurrence of two features of talk that concern the adjacent placement of words. First, after a turn at talk is launched, talk ought to continue — and show itself to be continuing beat by beat — at least until a recognizable TCU completion is reached (at which time the relevance of utterance progressivity can end). The adjacent placement of words both achieves the pace of the talk and, through the pace of the local preceding talk, provides a metric for what constitutes continued adjacency. Second, after a turn at talk is gained, each next word ought to be a successive word. That is, a turn's talk should show continued *syntactic* progress, word by word, toward a completion.

The first feature represents serial adjacency, while the second can be characterized as sequential adjacency. Serial adjacency proposes
that talk ought to be continuous to a next transition-relevance place, while sequential adjacency proposes that the words that are produced reveal reflexively that they represent progress for the turn-so-far toward a (next) possible completion. (Schegloff (1979) further extends progressivity to a consideration of "sound progressivity.")

Progressivity ordinarily requires the concurrent fulfillment of both types of adjacency. However, they are separable features, at least insofar as the undoing of one does not necessarily imply the breakdown of the other; a serially adjacent word can be delayed (e.g., by pausing or laughing), a sequentially adjacent word can be delayed (e.g., by word repetition) or both can occur. In either case, the impedance of progressivity provides an opportunity — a restricted opportunity — for another speaker to talk prior to the next (now delayed) word. I will refer to entry by a recipient to complete a TCU-in-progress at such unprojected openings as "opportunistic completion."

5.8.1 Laughter tokens

In the case of TCU-internal laughter, it is possible to distinguish between in-speech laughter that only minimally retards the progressivity of the TCU and laugh tokens placed within the TCU, but between the words that comprise the unit, that retard the serial adjacency of the words. The former furnishes a social-sequential basis for entry (i.e. affiliation with the laugh), but no place to begin without incurring overlap, while the latter can provide a place for a recipient to begin, as well. I will first look at between-word laughter, then in-speech laughter.

Between-word laughter. Laughter by current speaker can constitute an opening for opportunistic completion. Laughing can impede the progressivity of an utterance-in-progress. The serial adjacency (and thereby the pace) of the utterance-in-progress is disrupted even though there is a continued stream of sound bursts. However, sequential adjacency is not actually disrupted. Rather the adjacent placement of successive words is held in abeyance by the laugh tokens since a next word has not yet occurred after a last word.
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In excerpt (24), there is a strongly projected utterance completion since the utterance-in-progress is somewhat idiomatic. Though “through circumstances” strongly projects “beyond their control” it is important to remember that no preliminary component completion is forecast here – i.e. there is no foreseeable place for another speaker to co-opt the completion. In (24) a break in the utterance’s progressivity occurs. Here the laugh token (really a gasping in-breathing laugh token) occurs within the TCU and forestalls its completion. This *TCU-internal* laughter can be contrasted to the *in-speech* laughter that occurs earlier in Roger’s turn (e.g. “c(h)ircumsta(hh)nces”) that does not retard the progressivity of the talk in the same fashion. The in-breath laugh at line 3 ("hmhh") gives Dan a place to initiate an opportunistic completion.

(24) [GTS]

1 Roger: by the time they’re eighteen they’re back wa(h)lki(h)ng
2 (0.6) ’hhhehh through c(h)ircumsta(hh)nces
3 ’hmhh [hheh
4 Dan: [beyond their contro[l
5 Roger: [uh(hh) ye(h)š

Jefferson, Sacks, and Schegloff (1973) have suggested that laughers can and regularly do terminate their laughter at the onset of speech. Thus a speaker can initiate a completion in the course of a laugh and nevertheless have a good chance that it will run off in the clear.

*In-speech laugh tokens.* Jefferson (1979) has shown that in-speech (and therefore TCU-internal) laughter makes recipient laughter specially relevant as a demonstration of understanding or affiliation. There are, of course, ways of asserting or showing understanding or affiliation through talk, but ordinarily these must wait until transition to a next turn becomes relevant at TCU possible completion. (But see M. H. Goodwin, 1980, and C. Goodwin and M. H. Goodwin, 1987.) In the case of laughter – since it is not turn organized – a recipient need not delay affiliation until next turn. Opportunistic completion furnishes another way to respond without delay after the onset of in-speech laughter. Producing an opportunistic completion renders an version of the upcoming portion of the utterance, thus demonstrating understanding of it or affiliation with it or both. Excerpt (25) provides an instance of this usage.
In this excerpt the in-speech laughter by Jim provides an occasion for recipient affiliation. Ken’s opportunistic completion provides a way to achieve agreement with the proffered opinion in the course of its production.

5.8.2 Intra-turn silence

A range of conversational practices result in or contain speaker silence as a feature. Pausing speech (in any of a variety of ways) in the course of a TCU retards the forward movement of the turn’s talk toward next possible completion. This type of silence belongs to current speaker – i.e. it is treated as a pause within a turn (Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson, 1974; Schegloff, 1979). In the following excerpts the progressivity is halted by the current speaker pausing, and this intra-turn silence provides a recipient with an opportunity to complete the TCU.

(26) [GTS]

Jim: Did they do that old trick with the basketball where they putta
Ken: string around it

(27) [GTS]

Dan: Well I do know last week the=uh Al was certainly very
Roger: pissed off

The silences in (26) and (27), on their occurrence, provide recipients of the turn the chance to initiate talk without being implicated in overlap. However, the character of the utterance is somewhat constrained, insofar as designing an utterance as a new turn may be seen as pre-empting another speaker’s not-yet-completed turn. However, not every new contribution of talk begun in such a place will constitute an interruption of the current speaker’s turn. It will not if, for example, the new talk is hearable as furthering the action partially constituted by the pause, as in the case of searching for a specific or a delicate word (as in (26) and (27) respectively). Here, recipient contributions, whether furnishing a single word,
“Semi-permeable” character of grammatical units in conversation completing the TCU, or beginning a new turn that, for example, provides a clue, can be seen to be in the service of the further progress of the halted turn; i.e. they further the project of the turn-in-progress. I am not suggesting that every intra-turn silence is equally available for opportunistic completion. The circumstances, sequential position, method of “braking” (so to speak) and the position of the silence in the turn and within the TCU matter here. For example, Goodwin (1980) describes the use of pauses as a device for achieving mutual gaze at turn-beginnings. He writes, “By producing a pause near the beginning of his sentence, a speaker is able to delay its onward progression until the gaze of a recipient has been obtained.” Clearly, this use of intra-turn silence near turn beginning (to repair possibly problematic recipiency) will not provide the prospective recipient with much material on which to build a completion. In Schegloff’s (this volume) terms, “post-beginning” is not a position for completion, while, for example, pre-completion is (as terminal item completion demonstrates).14

Word searches. Word searches (Sacks, 1992; Goodwin and Goodwin, 1986) are specifically designed for conditional entry by recipients. Though word searches can expand into long sequences, roughly they minimally provide conditional access to the current turn for other participants to aid in the search by suggesting candidate words and a slot for the original speaker to accept or reject proffered candidates. In a word search, progressivity toward TCU completion has been halted, but the search is organized to show that an ongoing attempt is being made to continue the TCU. The halt in TCU progressivity does provide the possibility for another participant to produce an opportunistic completion for the TCU, but ordinarily only the searched-for next word is actually produced as in excerpt (28).

(28) [GL:DS]

L: he said, the thing thet- thet- sad about the uhm black uhm
(0.3)
P: muslims,
L: muslims, he said is thet they don't realize ...

However, notice that L’s first utterance in (28) is designed so that P does, in fact, produce a “completion,” the completion of a preli-
inary component in a compound structure of the type called a pseudo-cleft construction. In fact, many turn units that end up containing word searches are designed in such a way that the search is placed near the end of the unit, thereby providing a place for candidates which will concomitantly be terminal item completions as in excerpt (29).

(29) [Adato:II]

Jay: Well, I- I pretty much had in mind the...
G: the human race.

One finer distinction can be drawn here concerning the placement of contributions by recipients to a word search. Repair organization seems to divide the opportunity to contribute to the search into "immediate" and "delayed" contributions. Many word search candidates are held off or delayed, giving the current speaker an opportunity to self-repair (Schegloff, Jefferson, and Sacks, 1977) and when a candidate is finally produced it is regularly designed as a confirmable - "try-marked" (Sacks and Schegloff, 1979) - guess as in excerpt (30).

(30) [GTS]

Roger: He just had to take that attitude because everybody says why be y'know-(2.0)
Louise: Big man?
Roger: well uh- I don't know how to phrase it lemme think about it awhile.

In contrast, recipient contributions initiated at the beginning of a search - i.e. immediately after the onset of the search - are ordinarily not produced as guesses. As in excerpt (31), the searched for word is produced by speaker L right at the outset of the search and is designed as an assertedly correct continuation and not as a try-marked candidate. Here V is addressing a third participant (i.e. V is not addressing L).

(31) [GL:DS]

V: oh, it was funny we were up at Elsinore when they were having an
L: =contest

The point here is that, while delayed candidates may also be done as assertedly correct, the early phase of the search seems to be left to the speaker, except when a co-participant can assert some special access to the trouble source. For example, early opportunistic com-
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pletion of a word search is a device that can be used to initiate or sustain a special alignment with a speaker, one of story consociate-ship or association co-membership rather than recipientship (Lerner, 1992, 1993).

Word cut-offs. Word searches are designed to allow entry into the turn by recipients, but specifically limit that entry to the search for the item due next. Other practices for self-initiation of repair also disrupt the progressivity of a TCU and allow for opportunistic completion, but are not designed to elicit entry.

In a discussion of “conversational disruption markers” Jefferson (1974) describes a two-part format which she calls “the error correction format.” This format is used to begin one type of self-initiated self repair (Schegloff, Jefferson, and Sacks, 1977). Here a speaker abruptly cuts off a word before it has been fully articulated and then produces another word that is recognizable as a replacement for the cut-off word. Speakers use this procedure to replace a word that is currently being uttered or to recast a turn-in-progress or to launch a variety of other types of self-repair. The cut-off can show recipients that the unfinished word, or some (as yet) unspecifiable unit containing this word, may be being withdrawn (see Fox et al., this volume). Recipients can make use of this social-sequential fact by offering a replacement themselves. That is, the production of the first part of the format (cut-off) provides an opportunity for a recipient to offer up a replacement as a next action.

The continued progress of the turn is delayed by the initiation of repair. Error correction or other forms of self-initiated same-turn repair disrupt the progressivity of the utterance-in-progress. There is, however, a continued orientation to progressivity (Schegloff, 1979). Though the “error correction” format requires a suspension of sequential adjacency, it is built to minimize the disruption of serial adjacency.

While this device constitutes a recognizable self-repair, and does not in itself relinquish the ongoing turn, it nevertheless provides an unprojected opportunity for the production of talk by others. In the following instance, the cutoff (“across ah-”) marks a break in adjacency that provides an occasion for opportunistic completion.
In excerpt (32) Roger initiates opportunistic completion somewhat after Al has resumed a reprojected turn. Nonetheless, Roger locates his utterance as a continuation of the TCU to coincide with an earlier constituent boundary that the incipient replacement by Al shows to be the point the replacement begins from. (When the opportunity to enter the turn is taken by the recipient, and the prior speaker then also continues trying to produce the utterance-in-progress, it results in the "progressional overlap" that Jefferson, 1983a has described.)

"No-trouble" silences. Intra-turn pauses are regularly associated with "trouble" in the talk and with repair, but repair import is not a prerequisite for the production of an opportunistic completion. In excerpt (33) there is a pause of more than one second after the third part of what has been pre-formulated as a four part list.

Here the pauses in the talk are "filled" with writing by the still current speaker. Pauses result since the writing of the list takes longer than the saying of the list. Pausing in the course of the list is organized by reference to writing and provides time to catch up. The speaker silence does not indicate trouble in producing the next item. However, the pause furnished by the writing activity provides an opportunity to produce the final list member. The progressivity of the utterance itself (or more specifically its serial adjacency) is halted even though the disruption is "incarnately" accounted for in the scene. Various conversational practices can result in – and furnish a context for understanding – a pause in a TCU, yet the mere presence of a pause seems to provide a chance for a recipient to interpose an opportunistic completion. On the other hand, some self-initiation of repair can halt the progressivity of a TCU without necessarily resulting in a pause in the talk. (For example, cutting off
a word and then producing another word as a replacement need not result in speaker silence.)

5.8.3 Word repetition

Though there are exceptions (such as intensification), word repetition ordinarily disrupts one aspect of turn progressivity: sequential adjacency is abandoned, while serial adjacency may be sustained. When words are repeated the sheer serial production of one word followed by a next may not be undone. No pause need occur in the talk; however, the adjacent placement of grammatically complementary words (that constitutes the sequential progressivity of the turn's talk) is halted by the repetition of the just prior word(s) as in excerpt (34).

(34) [GTS]

Ken: There's kids in electric shop who get the biggest kick outta sticking a sticking a bobby [pin- 
Jim: [their finger in.

Here, the serially adjacent next words by Ken after "outta sticking a" are recognizable as the repetition of words already spoken and not possible sequentially adjacent words. In addition, the repetition foreshows, in its course, where the sequential adjacency of the syntactic unit can be resumed, and the TCU may again begin progressing toward completion. This provides an enhanced opening for opportunistic completion. Moreover, once the progressivity of a TCU has been halted — even if it is subsequently re-established after a repeat as in (34) or after a cut-off as in (32) — the chance of interposing a completion continues as a possibility into the resumed TCU. However, there is one complication here. If more than one word is repeated, it cannot be determined (in real time) during the repeat of the first word whether the speaker is repeating, for example, two words, or whether they are recasting or reprojecting the TCU by repeating the first word and then changing the second word.

5.9 Extending opportunities for entry

Projected and unprojected opportunities for entry into another's turn space are not mutually exclusive. Retarding the progressivity
of a TCU can occur in conjunction with preliminary component possible completion – as an extension of it – as in excerpts (35) to (37) below.

(35) [GTS] Quote + laugh

Roger: they rationalized it. They say heh heh heh
Louise: it wasn’t there it was a(h)ll in hi(h)s imagination.

(36) [GL:DF] Quote + pause

Joan: she wz wizzle she’d pick up the phone en say, (0.4)
Linda: I’m comin’ over,

(37) [GTS] List + pause

Roger: Think about it you gotta be strong.
That’s- that’s three bottles a’ champagne,
three: exerting rides, and uh (0.5)
Al: three [exerting women
Dan: [six exerting rides

In each of these cases the disruption provides an extension for a preliminary component completion as indicated.

In addition, word cut-offs and repetition, and within-turn laughter and silence can occur in combination to produce and then extend an unprojected opportunity for entry as in excerpts (38) and (39). (Of course, the combination of these practices is partially ordered, insofar as, for example, a pause cannot be extended by a cut-off.)

(38) [GTS] Cut-off + pause

Louise: my father’s six foot two feet he’s large
an’ he’s a very s- (1.0)
Ken: st(hh)able person

(39) [GTS] Cut-off + pause + repeat

Ken: Like he c’d he c’n draw uh uh room
that’s- that’s round, and he c’d make it square,
and it’s still- (0.2) still [the same kind-
Jim: [looks like a round room ehhhehh

These instances show that the onset or initiation of a break in progressivity of a TCU can sometimes be distinct from its extension. The way in which the progressive movement of the talk is halted can indicate what sort of procedure is underway: a cut-off demonstrates retraction or consideration of retraction and adumbrates replacement of some type, while a sound stretch (or pre-pausal token such as “uhm”) shows a concern not with current or prior
words, but with the item due next (Schegloff, 1979). Either of these may or may not result in a pause. Further, a pause can occur without any pre-pausal indications and it may or may not occur in circumstances that indicate trouble in the talk. Yet, each of these halts the forward movement of the TCU (and the turn), and therein provides a chance for opportunistic completion. And this opportunity can be constructionally invoked by tying an opportunistic completion to the prior locus of retardation even if progressivity is re-established by current speaker. Further, the action accomplished by the interposed talk hinges on the context of its occurrence.

Recipients treat the progressivity of an utterance in a way that suggests that the orientation to minimizing gaps in the talk is not only an aspect of the production of turn transition at transition-relevance places, but reaches into turns as well. One cannot stop talking and maintain silence indefinitely in the course of a turn or otherwise retard the turn’s progressivity indefinitely. A speaker is entitled to produce a complete turn, but he or she is also obliged to continue the turn’s talk to that completion. Moreover, a speaker is obligated to continue the forward movement of the utterance-in-progress – i.e., its progress toward completion. The possibility of opportunistic completion provides a systematic “motivation” or basis for speakers to produce their turn without extended pauses and as fluently as possible. Opportunistic completion furnishes recipients with one device for enforcing this obligation, since the recipient of a halted turn-in-progress can bring the current turn-constructional unit to completion once the turn’s progressivity has been disrupted. On the other hand, speakers of TCUs-in-progress also have practices available to them to maintain or re-establish their speakership of the turn once another speaker attempts completion. One type of current speaker’s device that has been identified is delayed completion (Lerner, 1989).

5.10 Concluding remarks

One aim of this chapter has been to show that the juncture between the preliminary and final components of a compound TCU is a grammatically specifiable locus for anticipatory completion. One import of this characterization is that it represents a formal specification of the place a small sequence of action begins – the colla-
borative turn sequence – and further provides a specification of the form of its initiation – anticipatory completion.

This juncture amounts to a completion opportunity place, since (1) it is a systematically locatable possible intra-turn/intra-TCU component completion point, and (2) anticipatory completions are designed to begin here even when next speaker actually begins speaking elsewhere in the ongoing compound TCU. Moreover, I have shown how one material feature of speech production (a beat of silence at preliminary component completion) is a systematic possibility. This allows for the possible achievement of speaker transfer without overlap in the talk.

Moreover, I have shown that an “orientation to completion” extends beyond TCU completion to TCU-internal preliminary component completions, with some of the practices associated with the former available to participants at the latter location. Further, I have shown that this completion opportunity place is located at the point of completion of the preliminary component, but is operative (i.e. it can be invoked by a recipient through utterance tying) well into a current speaker’s final component-in-progress. The opportunity to complete another’s TCU, then, can be characterized as both bounded and flexible, with those completions begun after onset of a current speaker’s next or final component nonetheless attending preliminary component completion as the proper locus of anticipatory completion onset.

In summary, this chapter has described some of the turn-constructional resources for initiating intra-turn talk by recipients of the current turn, and it has examined some of the forms this entry can take. An orientation to grammatical structure – or perhaps a more felicitous term might be “grammatical practice” – in the form of compound TCUs, projectable TCU completion, and TCU progressivity provides recipients with resources for recognitional, pre-transitional (i.e. terminal item) and progressional completion of the TCU-in-progress, respectively. As such, these grammatical practices in the emergent construction of turns at talk can furnish semi-permeable points of reference for organizing bits of sequential and interactional business.
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Notes

* Elinor Ochs, Sandy Thompson, Tom Wilson and especially Manny Schegloff contributed to the development of this chapter. The work of Harvey Sacks has informed my analysis, both in its broadest strokes and in its finest detail.

1 It must be remembered that a transcript presents the talk in a manner that is unavailable to participants. Speakers issue their talk in real time and each increment of it can continue, modify, or abandon a previously projected turn-constructional form. So, for example, at a possible completion of a preliminary component, a speaker may extend that component or produce another recognizably preliminary component, as well as begin the projected final component or re-project the turn altogether. Please consult the glossary in the Appendix to this volume for an explanation of the transcript symbols that were used to prepare the data excerpts in this chapter.

2 In the case of excerpt (1), participants must suspend analysis of "when" until at least the next word to be able to determine what sort of unit type is underway, since it can also turn out to have been the beginning of a question.

3 In excerpt (4) the anticipatory completion is left incomplete. A fuller excerpt shows that Kerry has not simply stopped prematurely. Rather, he drops out after David begins a delayed completion of his own prior utterance.

[HIC]

David: So if one person said he couldn’t invest (.)
Kerry: then I’d have to wait [till]
David: [he’d have to wait till January
Kerry: Right

The concern of this report is with the structure of the juncture between the preliminary component and the projected final component as a place for speaker transition. Here transition occurs without overlap as in excerpts (2) and (3) and then continues the TCU toward a possible completion place. A characterization of the type of overlapping talk that occurs later in the turn has been described elsewhere (Lerner, 1989).

4 I believe this feature of anticipatory completion has led some researchers (e.g. Duncan and Fiske, 1977) to include it in their list of "back channel" responses. This designation obscures the range of interactional work anticipatory completion can accomplish and lumps it together with such distinct practices as the use of continuers (Schegloff, 1982). Though some forms of anticipatory completion can be specifically designed to accomplish adjunct speakership, positioning the anticipatory completion to begin at preliminary component
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completion is ordinarily a move to speak in the "forefront" of the turn and not in its background.

Similarly, a slight pause can occur between TCUs in what turns out to be a multiple TCU turn. This beat of silence (typically left unmarked on transcripts, since it seems to be unmarked for participants) is consistent with Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson's (1974) proposal that opportunities for self-selection by next speaker come before current speaker's option to continue. Wilson and Zimmerman (1986) provide some additional evidence for this position as a socially organized site for a beat of silence. Of course, in anticipation of another participant possibly self-selecting to speak next, a current speaker can reduce or eliminate this beat of silence by rushing-through the transition space (Schegloff, 1982, 1987).

Also, in a discussion of overlap onset, Jefferson (1983a) reports that of all the transition-place points, "unmarked next position" onset seems to be the most frequently used. In describing this position she states, "A recipient/next speaker ... permits just a bit of space between the end of the prior utterance and the start of his own" (emphasis in original). Here Jefferson is describing onset of overlap, with both current speaker continuing and next speaker beginning, one beat after possible completion of a TCU. This can also be seen to operate at preliminary component completion.

[Jefferson (1983a)]

1 R: if you don't put things
->2 on yer calender (.) [(f o r g e t i t)]
3 D: [yer outta luck.] Yeah(p). Fo;get it.

Here D begins in overlap with R. Since D begins simultaneously with R's continuation after a rest beat, it is not by reference to that continuation that he starts to speak. D's completion is responsive to R's preliminary component completion.

This distinction can be seen in an excerpt from Ford and Thompson (this volume, note 12) that they offer as a puzzling instance of two intonation units with final (i.e. downward) intonation contour, yet which do not coincide with syntactic completions as is otherwise massively the case in their data. These intonation units occur at lines 1 and 6.

[Ford & Thompson, this volume]

1 V: so the doctor said.
2 that they would
3 (0.3)
4 If he:
5 (0.5)
6 didn't wanna keep being active and do sports 'n things.
7 right now at his age and with the bad condition of his knee,
8 they normally put in a plastic knee.
Strikingly, both of these intonation units constitute preliminary components of a compound TCU type that I have described elsewhere (Lerner, 1991). They are preliminary components from [quote marker + quote] and [if x + then y] compound TCUs, respectively. The downward intonation contours can thus be understood as coinciding with (and certifying) preliminary component completion.

Note that unlike most of the previous cases, this anticipatory completion is produced not by the addressed recipient, but by a co-aligning speaker. Both the position of the interposing speaker (as addressed recipient or other participant), and the “target” of the anticipatory completion itself (erstwhile current speaker or their addressed recipient) are constitutive of the type of action accomplished. These two features of anticipatory completion furnish four “directional” combinations, all of which can be found in empirical materials. However, only two seem to be structurally preferred or unmarked.

In contrast, in another TCU-internal environment, that of “post-conjunctival silence,” Jefferson (1983b) found that others do not start speaking once the current speaker restarts. And that the converse – if another speaker begins speaking, the erstwhile current speaker regularly does not restart – also seems to be the case for post-conjunctival silence. Jefferson proposes that this is one specification of “First starter gets the turn” (Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson, 1974), but applied to the not-currently-speaking occupant of the turn space. However, neither of these findings hold for preliminary component possible completion. That is, even if current speaker begins the next component of a compound TCU, an interposing speaker may still render a completion as in excerpt (9) and even if an interposing speaker begins in the clear at preliminary component possible completion, the erstwhile current speaker may very well interject their own completion as the excerpt in note 3 demonstrates. I believe the difference here lies in part in the form of the contribution of the interposing speaker and the different types of actions they can accomplish. Jefferson examined cases in which the interposing speaker begins a new turn, while I am describing cases in which a rendition of the foreshown final component of the TCU-in-progress is produced.

This sort of compression may be taken further, though the compression itself makes this difficult if not impossible to establish. In the following excerpt, Mike, at line 7, begins in the course of a compound TCU, but not until the last possible place to begin still within the current turn turn space.
Here most of the "then" part of a [when X + then Y] format may have been skipped. Mike may be producing a very late anticipatory completion in which component contiguity is abandoned in favor of producing what could still be recognizable as an anticipatory completion prior to the completion of current speaker's final component. The faster tempo of line 7 (">fertilizer<") does show he is hurrying to completion. On the other hand, another systematic form of next speaker completion is "terminal item" completion in which only the final word or two of a TCU is produced. See, for examples, excerpts (22) and (23). These need not occur in compound TCUs. It may be that Mike has abandoned a demonstration of contiguity with the preliminary component, but in doing so he ends up producing a terminal item completion.

Recycling the beginning of the anticipatory completion is only one option here. Speakers, finding themselves in overlap after having started an early anticipatory completion, can continue to completion as Kerry does in the following excerpt. Here the compound turn-constructual format is furnished by the production of a parenthetical insert ("if we're gunna do it on that").

As Jefferson (1986) has noted, "merely continuing" provides one standard practice for dealing with overlapping talk.

One could argue the opposite: that laugh tokens constitute on-time next increments to the TCU preserving serial adjacency, but they delay arrival of next elements that "count" syntactically, thus disrupting sequential adjacency. However, it is my view that laughter is not treated as an element of TCU production, though it is an element of the turn — or in Schegloff's (this volume) terms, the laughter does not belong to the TCU, though it belongs to the turn. It is only when an element can be entertained as possibly the sequentially next word that the possibility of a delay in sequential adjacency can be assessed.

In this regard, this instance is similar to the two-part complaint format described earlier that provides enhanced resources for completion, but does not foreshow a preliminary component completion that could further enhance the possibility of pre-empting the current speaker.
However, initial investigation suggests that there are circumstances where isolated laugh tokens are used as interjections to construct short responsive turns. Nevertheless, most laughing that occurs in talk is not bound by an orientation to "one at a time" and in fact Jefferson (1979) shows that there seems to be an orientation to not laughing alone, but laughing together. In that sense, initial laugh tokens can be seen as an "invitation" to others to also laugh.

Schegloff (this volume) provides another example of post-beginning silence. In describing a speaker's rush-through at a transition-relevance place, he writes, "it is common for the speaker to allow the break which might otherwise have occurred at possible completion to develop just after the start of the new TCU, at a place of ... 'maximum grammatical control'."

I am indebted to Manny Schegloff for pointing this out to me.

It is worth noting that the participant who adds "agent" had been mentioned as the author of the yet-to-be enumerated list of officers, and in addition has been, wants to continue to be, and as it turns out does continue to hold the position of, "agent."

This chapter has focused on various forms of restricted or conditional entry into the turn space of another speaker. However, there are other social-organizational bases for jointly participating in the production of a single TCU. Certain courses of action shape what counts as a contribution to the talk, in terms local to that course of action. So, for some activities, a TCU can sometimes constitute a shared environment or shared opportunity for participant contributions. For example, when elementary school students in a cooperative work group are jointly engaged in defining a word or answering a story question, they can accomplish this task by contributing candidate definitions or answers-to-the-question designed as complete TCUs. However, students can also accomplish these tasks by transforming them into shared tasks of utterance completion (Lerner, 1995), as they are doing in the following excerpt.

(CIRC:Dugg)

A: Doctor Moore wouldn't tell mister (Auldin) becau::se.
( )

--> B: uhm,
(0.2)

--> A: because .hh doctor Moore wanted to keep it a secret,

--> B: because doctor Moore wanted to keep him working for him

A: ((A begins writing the group's answer))

(In a related vein, Ochs, Schieffelin, and Platt (1979) have examined major arguments and their predications in the propositions of language-learning children that are produced across utterances.) These courses of action, and they are not found only in classroom interaction, provide a shared opportunity to produce the anticipated completion. In these instances it is not so much the case that one speaker is
entering the turn space of another speaker, but rather that there is a
shared entitlement to speak (cf. Lerner, 1993).

This closely complements Jefferson's (1983a) description of overlap
onset loci, since overlap in each of these locations (e.g. excerpts (13),
(22) and (32) respectively) can result from recipient attempts at com-
pletion, if current speaker also continues speaking.
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