

Turn-Sharing: The Choral Co-Production Of Talk In Interaction *

Gene H. Lerner

Simultaneous speech in conversation, when it occurs, can be treated as a turn taking problem in need of repair (Sacks, Schegloff & Jefferson 1974). Speakers may cut short what they are saying or employ devices to compete for exclusive speakership when faced with an overlapping utterance by another participant (Jefferson, 1983b, Jefferson and Schegloff 1975, Lerner 1989, Schegloff 1987, forthcoming). However, some forms of participation in conversation are not serially organized -- that is, they are not designed for one participant speaking at a time. On occasion, participants may treat more than one at a time speaking as properly simultaneous. That is, some simultaneously voiced actions are not treated by participants as a violation or as being in need of repair (Coates 1996, Erickson 1992, Goodwin & Goodwin 1987; see James and Clarke 1993 for a review of research on “supportive and cooperative interruptions”).¹ Furthermore, there seem to be systematically describable sequential environments for such simultaneously voiced actions. For example, the beginnings and endings of social gatherings may be marked by collective greeting and leave-taking utterances. Also, consider the

¹ Not all of these reports make clear whether the simultaneous speech occurs within a single conversation. There seems to be a tendency on the part of some discourse investigators to consider all speech that occurs in the same gathering in an undifferentiated manner. This ignores the real possibility of momentary conversational schism in multi-party interaction (Egbert, 1997). Incipient simultaneous conversations (e.g. two speakers addressing two different recipients in a gathering of four or more persons) cannot be treated analytically in the same fashion as simultaneous speech within a single conversation, as turn taking practices only organize speaking turns within single conversations.

appreciative responses that can follow the opening of a gift. These can form a cacophony of verbal and vocal assessments.

Thus far I have only proposed that there are times when simultaneous speech and not just a one-at-a-time contribution seems in order. I have not yet said anything about the form of these simultaneous utterances. In the examples of properly simultaneous speech cited above, each speaker's contribution may consist of a somewhat different utterance or a differently timed utterance. This can result in properly overlapping speech, but does not reveal a specific orientation to the simultaneity of the speech. Yet, at times a participant may speak in a fashion which reveals that they are not aiming to produce a separate turn at talk or even a distinct utterance among other simultaneous contributions, but are instead aiming to simultaneously co-produce part or all of a turn-constructive unit (henceforth TCU) more or less in unison with another participant, by recognizably attempting to do such things as match the words, voicing and tempo of the other speaker. This type of turn sharing can be seen in Excerpt (1) at line 12 and again at line 15. Here three young children (speakers A, B and C) are addressing their remarks to an adult (D).

(1) [Osborn]

1 A: my teacher made me make it

2 (.)

3 taught us how to make (gate)

4 (0.8)

5 B: there

6 (.)

7 C: my teacher was
 8 B: you know what my teacher was gone
 9 fer a week, she went
 10 (.)
 11 [she's in the hospita:l
 12 -> C: [(she's in the) hospita:l
 13 D: mmm mm.
 14 B: she has an [operation
 15 -> C: [(opera)tion
 16 C: she gets this pretty (bathrobe)
 17 (.)
 18 B: nightgown

The difficulty in distinguishing the voices (as indicated by the parenthesized words in the transcript at lines 12 and 15) attests to how very closely matched these utterances are. Though choral co-production of a TCU or TCU-component refers to “voicing the same words in the same way at the same time” as another speaker -- or at least demonstrating that one is aiming at that result² -- it is important to note that this does

2 Accomplishing the choral co-production of a TCU-component does not seem to require that the second speaker's utterance match the current speaker's utterance word for word. Rather, the second speaker must demonstrate in the placement and delivery of their contribution that that is what they are aiming at -- as B does in the following instance. (Here both B and C are addressing their remarks to A.)

[SARI]
 A: () ((A looks to C))
 B: =It was a nice cake, [you kno:w
 C: [You, you just have
 to e:x::[per]ience them
 -> B: [per]ience that

not necessarily mean achieving the same action as the other speaker through that utterance. This chapter describes the ways some choral performances are arranged and then examines how some are used in conversation and other forms of talk-in-interaction. Finally, consideration is given to the phenomenon of gestural matching.

Co-Production -- Not Co-Optation

In an earlier series of investigations I described the sequential features of turn construction that furnish participants with the resources to co-opt the completion of the TCU-in-progress of a current speaker (Lerner 1991, 1996a), and I showed how such anticipatory completions can be employed interactionally (Lerner 1996b, Lerner and Takagi 1999). In the course of that earlier work, I occasionally came across instances of collaboratively produced TCUs that could not be characterized as co-opting the completion of the ongoing turn. That is, they did not seem to be designed to say first what the erstwhile current speaker was about to say, thus preempting the current speaker. Rather, these instances appeared to be designed to co-produce a turn's completion. And many of them seemed designed to match the voicing of the current speaker quite closely -- that is, they resulted in a fully choral rendition of the turn's completion.

There is a fine distinction between the anticipatory completion of a TCU described in those earlier investigations -- in which a speaker aims at taking over or co-opting the voicing of the final part of a compound TCU -- and the choral co-productions described in this chapter. However, as one can see in the following

comparison, these practices can be oriented to (i.e. composed and treated) as distinct forms of participation.

Anticipatory completions ordinarily begin at a place designed to allow the new speaker to finish the TCU by themselves (and current speaker can collaborate with this by not resuming or continuing their utterance), as in Excerpt (2).

- (2) [Mother's Day]
- R: Well honey,
- (0.5) ((R chews and swallows))
- in dis world, really truly.
- (.)
- C: you can't be sure.

And even when the new speaker begins a bit late, as in Excerpts (3) and (4), they do not attempt to match their utterance to the emerging final component of the current speaker.

- (3) [US]
- Rich: If they come en pick it up
- it'll co[st yah
- Mike: [they charge yuh

- (4) [Theodore]
- A: if you start watering,
- it [will get gree-
- B: [it will come back

In (3) Mike produces a recognizably alternative final component for the compound TCU whose final component Rich has already begun voicing, and in (4) speaker A cuts off her utterance to allow B to complete the TCU by herself.

By contrast, in Excerpt (5) Shane shifts his use of *I* and *you* in the course of a co-produced idiomatic expression to match Michael's usage.

(5) [Chicken Dinner]

MIC: [I kne:w you were co:ming so I ba:ked a ca:ke.

-> SHA: [You knew I you coming, so I baked a cake

And, in Excerpt (6) speaker B also shows herself to be beginning late, but designs her contribution to match the now-available beginning of A's TCU. Moreover, she shows that she is aiming at choral co-production through a precise mid-course adjustment of her utterance.

(6) [GL:FN:closing]

A: Good luck. Nice to [s e e:: y o u : :]

-> B: [>Nice to< see:: you::]

Speaker B begins with the same words, but rather than matching the tempo of the already produced part of A's utterance, she instead employs a very fast tempo until she catches up with A's utterance and then shifts to a much slower tempo and elevated pitch that match A's voicing, so that they come to complete their utterances in unison.

My aim here has been to highlight the design differences between co-produced and co-opted turn components. However it is important to keep in mind that one cannot always tell whether a second speaker's contribution is designed to co-opt or to co-produce a turn component, since that speaker's contribution is not always produced

with one or the other of these design features. In addition, the co-production or co-option that results is an interactionally achieved outcome, since the current speaker may or may not halt their utterance -- and if they do continue, the result can be more or less choral.³ In other words, though some instances are clearly designed as either co-production or co-optation, many are not designed and not treated in a distinctive manner. Thus, these two means of conditional entry into the turn space of another speaker might be seen as only partially distinctive alternatives.

Arranging Choral Performances In Conversation

Chorally co-produced turn elements can be set in motion in at least two ways. For the most part in the conversations I have examined, recipients of an emerging turn's talk join in without specific elicitation on the part of the speaker; yet it is also possible for a current speaker to elicit recipient co-participation that takes the form

³ In the following excerpt, speaker C can be seen to adjust her terminal item completion (through the use of a sound stretch) to match the onset of the current speaker's terminal item.

[SARI]
 B: ...I choose to wear my hair relaxed
 because that is a convenient style [for me,
 A: [It's convenient.=
 B: =but [that has nothing to do [with [self ha[te.
 A: [() [[self [hate.
 -> C: [s:::[self [hate.

However, in this case there does not seem to be any matching of rhythm or tempo. C's utterance is slower with each word discretely formed. Her contribution is realized as a separate, distinct utterance which is timed to be delivered at the point B's terminal item is due. It does not seem to be designed to either co-opt B's completion or to match its design features exactly.

of turn sharing. I will first describe some of the ways that recipients can use the ongoing talk and context to initiate co-production in an opportunistic fashion, and then I will examine how current speakers can make co-production a relevant next action for their recipients.

Opportunistic Co-Production

The sources of TCU projection are always situated in what might be called the “thick particulars” of each individual instance of turn construction as it emerges within its circumstances, sequence and turn. Thus, turns at talk are somewhat projectable as they emerge. This projectability furnishes possible next speakers with the resources to locate an upcoming place to begin speaking (Sacks, Schegloff & Jefferson 1974, Ford, Fox & Thompson 1996, Ford & Thompson 1996). However, on some occasions the form or even the specific words that will be used to construct a TCU or TCU-element can be strongly projected. It should be noted that overwhelmingly it is the final part of a TCU -- its terminal item -- that is co-produced. These foreseeable features of a turn’s emergent construction can be used by recipients to accomplish choral co-production of the turn’s completion. Here co-production is not specifically elicited, but an opportunity for co-production is furnished by the enhanced projectability of the TCU.

Ordinarily, what it will take, roughly, to possibly complete a TCU can be projected from the TCU in progress, so that its imminent arrival at possible completion can be warrantably anticipated by recipient action. However, this does not necessarily imply that the particular words employed can ordinarily be projected

precisely, but only that the form of an action and reflexively the action realized through that turn-constructive form can be projected and its possible completion can be recognized. Yet, the position of a TCU (in a sequence of actions) and the composition of that TCU (i.e. its emerging syntactic and prosodic realization) can sometimes enhance the projectability of what it will take to complete a turn, so that the particular items and not just the form of completion can be foreseen.

In Excerpt (7), prior actions by the speaker and her coparticipants (as well as relevant particularities of content and context) not only make clear the specific word that will complete a TCU, but also exactly how it will be pronounced. Here a richly structured TCU is established through a quoted sequence of exchanges that projects a corrected pronunciation as the terminal item (and punchline) of a story.

- (7) [SARI]
- 1 C: Now okay having young girls name their children
 2 is one thing, but when you have middle aged
 3 people trying to make their name fancy,
- 4 B: Mm mm
- 5 C: My friend's mother got married right.
 6 I said huh- w'll what's what's
 7 yer stepdad's name. <she said L'roy.
- 8 -> <I said no baby, it's [LEROY.]
- 9 -> A: [Leroy]
- 10 -> B: [Leroy]
- 11 ((All three participants laugh together))

(It is noteworthy that *no baby* at line 8 carries a horizontal right hand shaking “no way” gesture, and that the speaker’s right hand goes up in front of her face on *its*. Her index finger is then thrust downward at *LEROY*.) In this instance, we can see a number of interactional elements that can be used to establish a place for, and enhance the possibility of, choral co-production. First, a dichotomy is established between fancy names and plain names, then an example of a fancified name (*L’roy*) is given. This is then rejected using a two-part [NO + Correction] format. Further, the speaker sets off the contrasting plain name (which is concomitantly the punchline of her story) with a preparatory gesture at pre-possible completion. (Here the gesture is seeably a feature of the quoted exchange where the gestural accompaniments of [No + Correction] might be glossed as [stop-gesture + make-a-point-gesture]. The hand raise at *it’s* is in preparation for the “make-a-point-gesture.”) Thus, many elements of the story project the specific terminal item of the TCU and its placement. Moreover, pre-possible completion, as the onset of the transition space, itself opens up the possibility of talk by others, since possible completion is imminent. The fact that both of the speaker’s coparticipants initiate a choral co-production simultaneously (and simultaneously with the onset of the current speaker’s terminal item) argues strongly for the availability of a place that has been prepared for a specific terminal item and thus furnishes the resources for co-production.

In Excerpt (7) I showed how concurrently available resources of action and TCU structure can strongly project a place and specific lexical and phonological

forms for coparticipant entry into the turn.⁴ In Excerpt (8) (which was briefly considered in note 2) the availability to coparticipants of a specially stressed realization of the first syllable of an emerging single word (at line 18) provides enough of a clue to (and opportunity for) TCU completion for a coparticipant to initiate a choral co-production.⁵

- (8) [SARI]
- 1 B: One of those Kay Sweets brought him a cake.=
- 2 C: =O:h.=
- 3 B: =Oh, let's not talk about it though ahuh huh
- 4 (1.2)
- 5 A: Why: [no:t ((smile voice))

4 Though I will, for the most part, examine instances of choral co-production that are successful, it is important to point out that not all projections of a possible turn-constructural component turn out to have been correct. Sometimes an attempt at co-production can misfire. For example, in the following instance speaker A aims at a possible pre-completion place and attempts a rendition of a projectable terminal item -- however this turns out to be a mis-projection of the turn position and of the formulation that speaker B actually produces.

[SARI] ((dreadlocks-indicating gesture at *them*))

B: ... Oh, but no. Now you got the nineteen
ninety Angela look an' she got like
them (re[al kanky) and dreaded look

-> A: [Dr:ea::ds

In this case B seems to assimilate A's misfired rendition into her own turn through a form of colligation (Jefferson, 1986), thus rehabilitating A's completion. (See Lerner, 1994 for a fuller description of this sort of assimilation.)

5 An additional enhancing feature in this instance may be the slight retarding of the word's articulation that is realized through the first syllable's special accentuation, thereby producing a slight retardation of the turn's progress toward completion. Retardation of a turn's progressivity toward completion is one systematic locus of recipient entry (Jefferson 1983a, Lerner 1996a).

6 C: [(You don't) one of those sisters.
7 A: Oh you mean (.) one of the sweethearts=
8 B: =the () Kappa [Sweethearts]
9 C: [Y e a:h s:]=(mo:re)
10 B: brought him a cake.
11 (0.7)
12 yep.
13 (0.3)
14 [It was a ni-]=
15 A: [()] ((A looks to C))
16 B: =It was a nice cake, [you kno:w
17 C: [You, you just have to
18 -> e:x::p[er]ience them
19 B: [per]ience that
20 ((B & C laugh))

Speaker B actually begins with a preparatory lip close slightly earlier than indicated by the square bracket at line 19. B is gazing directly at C as line 18 is produced, thus she can see the speaker's mouth behavior and her preparation (a kind of "wind-up") for an emphatic head dip and recoil that punctuates the second syllable of *experience*. In particular, B can see the momentary halt in the speaker's head dip prior to the plosive burst at the beginning of the second syllable. B produces the recoil component of a head dip, though abbreviates the dip itself which C already

has underway before the plosive burst. In other words, B attempts to catch up to the emphatic head dip and recoil by shortening the dip.

By comparison, Tannen (1989) has described a phenomenon which she calls “shadowing.” She suggests that a recipient hears what someone is saying, syllable by syllable, and then quickly reproduces or copies it in an automatic fashion. Choral co-production is a somewhat different phenomenon. In Excerpt (8), as in other co-produced utterances, a recipient hears (and sees) what another participant is saying (in this case, a word’s initial syllable) and she uses that -- along with what came before in the turn and the rest of the context and structure of the talk -- to project what is possibly being said, and then co-produces that projected TCU component. This case shows that projection may not be precise. In fact, the simultaneity and imprecision support the view that these are not merely instances of shadowing. It should also be clear that choral co-production is not composed as a repetition of a prior or even emerging utterance (cf. Johnstone 1994), though repetition or projected repetition by a speaker furnishes an important resource for contributing a matching TCU component.

The use of the repetition of the structure and content of prior talk as a resource for enhancing the projectability of a TCU can be seen clearly in Excerpt (9). Here the specific word that will possibly complete a TCU (and its voicing) is established in the preceding talk. Excerpt (9) follows on from (7) in which the pronunciation of *Leroy* was at issue. This is another example -- that is, it is on the order of a second (reciprocal) story about another person using a fancy name.

(9) [SARI]

B: She goes () Joaye Lee.

I'm like GI:RL you know your

name is [Joy

C: [Joy ((lip prep at is))

In this case, the fancy and plain pronunciations have been issued several times in the course of rejecting the use of the fancy version prior to the excerpt shown -- including several earlier renditions of *you know your name is Joy*. So, when B again addresses the absent target of their evaluations with another correction, the terminal item (*Joy*) is fully foreshown. Since the exact form of the TCU *you know your name is Joy* has been used by the speaker several times, this rendition is hearable and treatable as a repetition -- and therefore as known-in-common.

This section has shown that the structure of TCUs in their course and context can provide enhanced opportunities for a speaker's coparticipants to join in the production of a turn's talk. Beyond speaking in a way that provides such opportunities for co-production, a current speaker can act in a fashion that seems explicitly designed to draw another participant into co-participation. The following section examines several ways that speakers can elicit co-participation.

Eliciting Co-Participation

One way to make choral co-production specially relevant is to initiate a shared reminiscence. In Excerpt (10), considered briefly above in (5), Michael draws Shane into a co-produced rendition of a well-known line from a movie (*I knew you*

were coming, so I baked a cake). At line 14, Michael initiates a common preliminary sequence to accomplish this; he produces a reminiscence recognition solicit (Lerner 1992).

- (10) [Chicken Dinner]
- 1 VIV: =We got anothuh boddle, jist in case.
- 2 (0.9)
- 3 NAN: You knew I wz comin:g. =
- 4 VIV: =Yeh ehh [hhuh huh heh hn]
- 5 NAN: [The lush is here,
- 6 VIV: So I baked=[a cake.]
- 7 SHA: [hhhuh hu]h[huh huh]
- 8 NAN: [Yhhheah ah]h huh hu
- 9 MIC: So I baked a cak[e.yeh.
- 10 VIV: [nhheh heh he[h huh
- 11 MIC: [Wuzzat Three Stooges?
- 12 VI?: (``Yeh.``) ((Vivian nods))
- 13 VIV: heh heh (.) heh
- 14 -> MIC: Remember that? =
- 15 SHA: =Yeah
- 16 MIC: [I kne:w you were co:ming so I ba:ked a ca:ke.
- 17 SHA: [You knew I you coming, so I baked a cake
- 18 VIV: [I knew you were coming so I () ca(h)ke heheheh
- 19 NAN [You watch the Rascals today,
- 20 SHA: En thez about eighteen cakes

21 MIC: an Shemp's (sitting there) like [this
 22 SHA: [Yeah, yEAH,
 23 YE(h)AH(h)
 24 NAN: Didju watch The Rascals tihday? ah luh I love
 25 (tuh watch them ther so fu:nny)

At the beginning of this sequence, Vivian, at line 6, retroactively turns Nancy's prior possibly complete turn into now having been the first component of a two-part idiomatic expression. Michael recognizes the expression as a line from a "Three Stooges" movie. He first repeats the second component of the expression and then requests a confirmation of its source from Vivian. At this point, the source of the movie line has been proffered and confirmed, but the full expression has not been fully reenacted. Next, Michael addresses Shane, asking if he remembers the line from the movie. Shane turns to directly face Michael, and as he responds at line 15 he can see Michael preparing to deliver the line -- including incipient preparation of a gesturally realized cake presentation.

A reminiscence recognition solicit initiates a preliminary sequence that can project a follow-up action. However, the character of mutual reminiscence (with its shared entitlement) blurs the entitlement to perform that next action. The performer need not be the originator of the sequence. For example, if a story is projected by the reminiscence recognition solicit, this pre sequence does not establish who will begin the telling (Lerner 1992). In the present case, the delivery of the full movie line becomes relevant for both Michael and Shane, after Shane's confirmation. Vivian, who initiated this course of action at line 4, also treats this as a place to

deliver the movie line, further demonstrating its shared relevance at this point. Both Shane and Vivian can see that Michael is in the pre-beginnings of this reenactment, but nonetheless both join in. Additionally, Michael uses the cake presentation gesture to conduct the beats of the joint reenactment, thus showing that he too sees this as a locus for shared participation. This is a place -- an action environment -- in which one-at-a-time speaking is suspended by the participants -- by participant conduct -- in order to accomplishing a specified action. This is not the same thing as saying that turn taking is irrelevant, since what they are co-constructing is a speaking turn.⁶

In Excerpt (10), one speaker (Michael) initiated a sequence of actions (the reminiscence recognition solicit sequence) that established a sequential environment for co-production. This is one method for creating a shared opportunity to participate. Though co-participation is made specially relevant here (and in this sense co-participation has been elicited), I am not suggesting that such participation

⁶ Edelsky's (1993) notion of "collaborative floor" might come to mind here. Edelsky states, "The floor is defined as the acknowledged what's-going-on within a psychological time/space." I would prefer to speak of "what's-going-on" in terms of action and sequences of actions. Action sequences have their own describable organization and this can influence turn taking within a sequence of action. For Edelsky, a "collaborative floor" occurs when no single participant establishes "what's-going-on" -- that is, when several people are "on the same wavelength." What she refers to as "collaborative floor" seems to me to gloss a range of sequence-specific organizational features of the organization of action sequences, and the opportunities to participate within them that specific action sequences furnish at each moment. Doing reminiscing is a recognizable and specifiable form of action that is constituted, in part, by a shared entitlement to the source events and reciprocal reciprocity. It is this specific type of sequence of actions and the opportunities to participate within it that furnish the basis for choral co-production here, and not the fact that the course of action is being co-constructed, since "co-construction" is a generic property of sequence organization, as well as other forms of organization that structure talk-in-interaction.

is conditionally relevant (Schegloff and Sacks 1973) in the sense that it will be a noticeable absent if it does not occur. Here an opportunity can be passed over rather than declined, since other forms of participation by speaker and recipient are also relevant. For example, Michael's co-participants could demonstrate appreciation of his sole rendition of the reenacted line during its production or after its completion (Goodwin & Goodwin, 1987).

Before examining another form of elicitation, I will need to briefly pursue the matter of a speaker's entitlement to voice the words that make up their turn. In (10) Michael initiated a sequence of actions that relaxed his entitlement to be the sole animator of a projected turn's talk. Other ways that such entitlement can be relaxed (though there does not seem to be any special elicitation involved) also seem to enhance the conditional entry of other participants into the turn. One form of talk (seen in some of the earlier excerpts) that can relax a speaker's entitlement to a turn -- i.e., that seems consequential for that entitlement -- occurs when speakers are voicing a TCU or TCU-component that is not attributable to them as author/owner (in the current turn). Two forms this can take are the voicing of an idiomatic expression and the voicing of an utterance that is attributable to someone other than the speaker (including a categorical other).

This type of relationship to the talk is established in Excerpt (11) and seems to provide, along with other features of the talk and its action context, an enhanced opportunity for entry. Again, I am introducing this analysis here, not because it exemplifies a form of co-production elicitation, but because it establishes a sequential environment for a form of elicitation which I will then describe. It is

necessary to show how entitlement is relaxed in this instance before describing how one of the speakers subsequently elicits co-participation, since these actions are accomplished separately in this case. In (11), A voices the criticism that someone like herself might receive as a way of holding up that sort of thinking to ridicule.

(11) [SARI]

A: You have too many white friends. You don't know
how to be with (.) your p[people.

B: [people

Here speaker A not only voices the turn as the words of others, but specifically marks off its terminal item as idiomatic by momentarily halting the progressivity of the talk and by attaching gestural quotation marks. She constructs a two-handed double quote gesture at *your*. B produces two quick nods latched to the end of *your* and then enters the turn at its possibly final word and co-produces that final word.

I am now ready to use this instance of opportunistic co-production to introduce a form of co-production elicitation that speaker A employs subsequently. In Excerpt (12), which expands (11), speaker A uses the occurrence of co-production itself to elicit subsequent co-production. As I have mentioned, projected repetition of a TCU or TCU-component can provide coparticipants with the resources of enhanced projectability. Here, speaker A specifically composes and packages subsequent TCUs to project repetition of the (co-produced) terminal item at line 2. Thus, at line 4, she again produces the quotation gesture and post-preposition pause found in line 2. This projected terminal item repetition structures her subsequent TCUs as subsequent items in a list -- though not a list with a common syntactic

frame, but a linked series of accusations held together by projection and repetition of the terminally placed membership category that the target of the accusations has ostensibly become estranged from within the enactment.

- (12) [SARI]
- 1 A: You have too many white friends. You don't know
 2 how to be with (.) your p[people.
 3 B: [people
 4 -> A: Why are you not proud of (0.2) [you:r [peo:ple.
 5 C: [you:r [peo:ple
 6 B: ['people'
 7 A: What makes you think that?
 8 You're not seeing enough of your [people.
 9 B: [people.

By turning the initial co-produced TCU into now having been the first item in a list of accusations, A can be seen to be setting up a next place for co-production within her turn. This amounts to a method for eliciting continued co-participation.

“Elicitation” here, as in the case of the reminiscence recognition solicit, does not constitute a strong form of initiating action; it does not make the form of uptake (e.g. co-production) conditionally relevant as an adjacency pair first pair part is understood to do for the type of action it implicates.⁷ Nevertheless, I believe it can

⁷ Actions such as these stop short of making co-participation conditionally relevant and its absence officially noticable. They provide a sequential opportunity for carrying out an action through co-production, but it is an opportunity that can be passed up. It should come as no surprise that sequences of action that are carried out through conditional entry into another's turn space would operate in a somewhat different fashion than sequences that operate across distinct

be seen to be actively encouraging continued co-production. Indeed, speaker C seems to be treating it as just this by gesturally conducting the chorally produced TCU terminal item. Once the list format is established in and as the second list part at line 4 and its terminal item is co-produced by all present, then the next accusation (which takes the form of a follow-up question + answer format) seems recognizable as the third list part even without the explicit marking of a quotation gesture or post-preposition pause. And this terminal item is also co-produced by a recipient.

Launching a search for a word in the course of a turn can be another method for eliciting conditional entry. In Excerpt (13), C elicits help from B in a search for a list of names. At line 1 speaker C addresses participant A (who is from the West Coast) to describe a shirt (available at southern universities) to her, then turns to B (a fellow southerner) for help in listing all the names that appear on the shirt. She elicits help by turning to an already knowledgeable participant, while producing what I would call a dispreferred or recognizably inadequate reference form (*all the "M"::s on it*) with a sound stretch on the voicing of the "M". This can count as an embedded clue in a search for the names glossed by "M".

- (13) [SARI]
- 1 C: Oh, we have the (multi) shirts ()
- 2 all the "M"::s [on it. ((C looks to B at all))
- 3 B: [Oh yeah.
- 4 B: Ma[:lcolm:,] Ma[:rtin:,] ah::
- 5 -> C: [Malcolm:,] [Martin:,]

turns.

6 B: what is that. (It's) Marcus (.)
 7 [Malcolm:, Ma-]
 8 C: [(always) ends with] me[::.] you know ((gaze->A))
 9 B: [me:.] yes ((gaze->C))

Note that in this case the original speaker is not the primary recipient of the elicited help. B uses the opportunity to offer assistance in the search to aid in the explanation being addressed to C's original recipient (A). Here is a case where the speaker of record (C) is not the one who selects the words spoken in what to this point has been her turn. Nonetheless, she voices the words in chorus with B as a way to retain speakership and then at line 8 continues the description in her own words. (At that point B drops out and then co-produces the TCU's terminal item at line 9.)

To summarize, I have now shown how recipients can make use of the particularities of turn structure, content and context to produce simultaneous, matching TCU elements in chorus with the current speaker. I have also shown that current speakers have methods for gaining the co-participation of recipients by eliciting conditional entry into their turn space (e.g. through reminiscence recognition solicitation and word search initiation). In the next section I look more directly at how choral co-production is used in conversation.

Or choral co-production can be employed to issue a joint complaint to a third participant -- which in Excerpt (15) may also enact a conjoined request.⁸

- (15) [NC Home] ((The family is eating dinner))
- 1 Jerl: Mom, why didn't you make
- 2 some (.) Che:rr:y [Che:rr:y [Cherry P(h)ie::]
- 3-> Jasn: [Che:rr:y C[herry P i e],
- 4 oowh[y:
- 5 Jerl: [>hah-hah-hah-<

These are both forms of action that are ordinarily realized through individual participation, but can accommodate conjoined participation. Here conjoined participation is accomplished through the sharing of a speaking turn -- addressed to a third participant -- that voices the action.

However, joining with another speaker to implement an action addressed to a third participant is only one way that choral co-production can be employed. The action realized through any turn at talk is contingent upon both that turn's composition and its placement in an emerging course of action. This holds for the utterances that comprise a chorally co-produced turn as well. The placement of an utterance in an emerging course of action and the opportunities to participate that are relevant at that moment -- especially the opportunities to participate that can be made

⁸ See Excerpt (1) for an instance where two children chorally co-tell elements of a story to an adult, and Maynard (1986:267-8) for an instance in which several children use choral co-production in conjoined disagreement with another child.

relevant through the “directionalities of address” associated with each contribution -- can prepare differing contexts for action.⁹

Co-producing part of a turn’s talk along with another speaker need not implement the same type of action as the other speaker’s contribution is implementing. For example, choral co-production can be employed by an addressed recipient of a turn to demonstrate agreement with what is being said -- when agreement and disagreement are implicated as relevant responding actions. In Excerpt (16), which repeats (11), speaker B first asserts agreement with the emerging turn (through head nods at *your*) and then co-produces its final word.

(16) [SARI]

A: You have too many white friends. You don’t know
how to be with (.) your p[people.

-> B: [people

⁹ Differing opportunities to participate are furnished to participants differentiated by their relationship to the talk -- what Goffman (1981) would call their “footing” as hearers of an utterance. Is the co-production contributed by an addressed recipient of the current turn or another participant? Is the co-production itself addressed to the current speaker, to that speaker’s addressed recipient, or to someone else? In short, the action a co-produced utterance accomplishes is, in part, understood by participants by reference to its directionality of address, given the context of the footing established by the directionality of address of the ongoing turn. Does it sustain, reframe, or shift the footing established by that prior utterance? The consequentiality of directionality for organizing opportunities to participate has also been noted for anticipatory completion (Lerner 1987, 1996b) and overlap management (Schegloff 1995). In order to glimpse the import of this matter, let me just mention that the directionality of address of an anticipatory completion relative to the directionality of address of the co-opted turn-in-progress is consequential in establishing whether or not that action will launch a small sequence or not.

Here A is reenacting a complaint as a way of holding it up to ridicule, and B's co-production exhibits that she is in agreement with A's assessment of this type of complaint.

So far I have described two types of action that choral co-production is used to accomplish: conjoined action for a third participant and demonstration of agreement with the current speaker. Not surprisingly, these are also the types of action that the closely related form of conditional entry -- turn co-optation -- can be used to accomplish. In the next two subsections I describe the role of choral co-production in opening and closing conversations and in reminiscing. A final subsection then shows that co-production can be appropriated for use in other than "cooperative" or "affiliative" action.

Openings and Closings

Co-production can be used in both openings and closings to convert a sequence of actions that ordinarily have their initiating and responding parts in adjacent turns at talk into simultaneously and chorally completed reciprocal actions. Some greetings and leave-takings can be specifically designed to achieve a choral crescendo, as in Excerpts (17) and (18).

(17) [GL:FN:opening]
 A: HI:EE[:::]:
 B: [HI:EE::

- (18) [GL:FN:closing]
- A: Good luck. Nice to [s e e:: y o u::]
- B: [>Nice to< see:: you::]

Turn sharing of this sort provides a way to relax the turn-taking requirement that action accomplished in the talk must have a serial placement on top of which a sequential relationship can be built. Here, actions are designed to be positioned as simultaneous -- converting a serially placed [action + return action] sequence into a coordinated joint action. Of course, actions and action sequences accomplished without the constraints of turn taking -- i.e. outside the constraints of the talk -- can allow for, or can be organized for, “overlapping” initiating and responding actions (e.g. object transfers and hand shakes). Responding actions that take place outside of the talk can be launched by reference to *recognition* of the initiating action, rather than by reference to *completion* of the initiating action (i.e. completion of the initiating action’s enabling turn). Turn sharing, as in (17) and (18), as well as other “recognition point” (Jefferson 1973, 1983a) entries furnish methods for overlapping actions within the talk -- in certain conversational environments.

Reminiscing Together

Another special environment for mutually or reciprocally organized action is mutual reminiscence. At the arrowed lines in Excerpt (19) (which we have already considered at some length when describing how co-productions can be elicited),

each participant seems to be simultaneously a speaker and a recipient -- entitled both to produce and appreciate the known-in-common matter.

- (19) [Chicken Dinner]
- MIC: Remember that?=
 SHA: =Yeah
 -> MIC: [I kne:w you were co:ming so I ba:ked a ca:ke.
 -> SHA: [You knew I you coming, so I baked a cake
 -> VIV: [I knew you were coming so I () ca(h)ke heheheh
 NAN [You watch the Rascals today,
 SHA: En thez about eighteen cakes
 MIC: an Shemp's (sitting there) like [this
 SHA: [Yeah, yEAH,
 YE(h)AH(h)
 NAN: Didju watch The Rascals tihday?

Choral co-production can provide a way to produce an action as a reciprocal reminiscence of a known-(or imagined or created)-in-common experience.¹⁰

Reminiscing is not the only type of activity that can accommodate mutual or reciprocal action. For example, mutual commiseration over a shared trouble or shared type of trouble furnishes another relevant domain for co-production of action

¹⁰ It is my impression that shared laughter is similarly organized for this type of reciprocal appreciation with laughers searching out another participant to establish mutual gaze, so as to both see the other laughing and to present one's own laughing face to the other - thus resulting in a situation of mutual or reciprocal laughing together (cf. Jefferson, 1979).

in a turn. This can be seen at the arrowed lines in Excerpt (20), which I have examined in some detail above.

- (20) [SARI]
- A: You have too many white friends. You don't know
how to be with (.) your p[people.
- B: [people
- > A: Why are you not proud of (0.2) [you:r [peo:ple.
- > C: [you:r [peo:ple
- > B: ['people'

Co-producing a TCU-component is, then, one way that participants can establish or sustain their entitlement to co-authorship/ownership of experience, and do it in a fashion that concomitantly allows them to demonstrate their appreciation of their coparticipant's shared entitlement.

Choral Co-Production And Turn Competition

In Excerpt (21), choral co-production is used as a solution to the problem of turn competition.

- (21) [SARI]
- 1 A: How close (is it).=
- 2 B: =They're all in the [sa::me area.
- 3 C: [()
- 4 B: (This is [the)
- 5 A: [Oh.

6 B: Like you walk from one campus
7 [you can walk right to the others]
8 C: [C l a r k A t l a n t a,]
9 Morris [Bro:wn, M [o r e [house and Spellman=
10 -> B: [Bro:wn, [() [house
11 B: =yeahs
12 C: they're all in this big ().

At line 1 speaker A asks how close together two colleges are situated. Both B and C respond directly to A's question at lines 2 and 3 (in part, by each producing a gesture that indicate the close proximity of the two colleges to each other). Speaker B begins to expand the answer, explaining the close proximity of a whole cluster of colleges, by describing how one can walk from one campus to the others. In the course of this description C begins her own form of explanation by listing the colleges by name. These, then, are competing formulations (in response to a third participant's query) and they are competing turns at talk. Rather than attempt to retrieve or extend her own explanatory formulation, speaker B withdraws from her line of explanation and adopts speaker C's formulation by co-producing some of the names at line 10 as speaker C continues her list.¹¹

In (21), co-production provides a method for arranging the conjoined production of an action addressed to a third participant and thus furnishes one solution to competing formulations of that action. Here, turn competition was

¹¹ See Excerpt (14) for another instance in which an explainer loses a recipient to another speaker and then uses co-production to continue as an explainer in a conjoined fashion.

transformed into turn sharing. Yet, co-production can also be employed as part of a method used to *compete* for a speaking turn, rather than as a way to share the turn. An examination of Excerpt (22) will show how this method for resolving turn competition can itself be part of a sequence of actions designed to re-establish a participant's position as explainer in order to forward their own competing version.

Though much might be written about the "cooperative" nature of co-production and some have even suggested that differing "styles" of speaking can be grounded in the presence or absence of this type of practice (e.g., Coates 1996), the following analysis suggests that it is important to distinguish between the cooperative form of the action (as a co-production) and the less-than-cooperative action that may result from its use in a specific sequential environment.¹² Though the use of a matching utterance may seem cooperative on the face of it, its deployment -- as an entry device into another's turn -- may be in the service of something that might not always be best characterized as cooperative. Excerpt (22)

¹² Investigators, such as Coates (1996), have linked "cooperative" simultaneous speech to a particular category of participant (women friends). However, as Goodwin's (1995) investigation of the games of African American girls has lead her to state, "Strong claims about female cooperative language styles fall apart under close scrutiny." Further, readers will have noticed that a number of the excerpts I present contain choral co-productions by African American women (though I suspect this is noticable more from the content of their talk than its organization). My aim in this chapter is to describe how an interactional practice is accomplished and to lay out some of the systematic uses it is put to in conversation and other forms of talk-in-interaction. This can provide a technical basis for grounding claims about the distribution of conversational practices across various "communities of practice." That type of investigation might tell us something about the character of those collectivities, but not about the structures and practices of talk-in-interaction. In saying this, I am not saying that membership categorization cannot be consequential for the organization of interaction; I am just saying that formal or informal distributional claims cannot furnish a demonstration of consequentiality. See Garcia (1998) for an empirical analysis of an apparent gender difference in the distribution of an interactional practice.

shows that co-production can be used as a method for gaining sole speakership. Here, it is used after more directly competitive methods fail -- as a subsequent attempt to achieve sole speakership. In this case, turn sharing is a first step to sole turn occupancy.¹³

In Excerpt (22) speakers B and C (who are from the South) are both engaged in explaining to A (who is from the West Coast) what students from a pair of traditionally Black southern colleges are like. At this point in the explanation B is competing with C for a speaking turn they are both addressing to A -- with C pursuing a description, while B attempts to produce an assessment. At first, co-production is used as a solution to the problem of conjoined participation. Speaker B cuts off her attempt at producing an assessment (*an its just all, its just-*) and then resumes by co-producing the terminal item of C's competing description (*woman*) at line 6.

- (22) [SARI]
- 1 C: ...Morehous:e (.) [ma::n,
 2 B: [Yes:
 3 C: the epitome of [ma:nhood]
 4 B: [an its just] a::ll
 5 C: [dates the Spellman w[oman]
 6 -> B: [its jist- [woman] an all that B.S.

¹³ This maneuver might be profitably compared to Jefferson's (1984) description of the reciprocity token *yeah* that recipients can use as a device to launch a shift from reciprocity to active speakership. In that case, recipient action is the first step to speakership.

However, this is only part of the action. In this case B uses co-production in another attempt at issuing her assessment of the students. Both the co-production (*woman*) and the conjunction (*and*) that follows it realize a “cooperative and additive” format, but here it is used after a more openly competitive approach has been abandoned. It seems important to distinguish between formal or format cooperation and the action being pursued through that format. Someone may come in to share a turn, but use that to gain a recipient so as to continue as the explainer of record, or it may be that if a speaker loses an addressed recipient to a competing speaker, then this is a way to make another bid for speakership of an extended turn such as can be produced in explaining. Thus, co-production can be a device used for countering the loss of a speaking turn to another participant. Rather than compete openly, one can drop out and take the other’s line by co-producing it -- and then use that as a basis for continuing one’s own line as in (22), where B finishes her once-abandoned assessment (*all that B.S.*) though it is now tied to C’s utterance as an expansion of it.¹⁴ So, one upshot here is that co-production is not just a way to conjointly accomplish an action such as explaining or storytelling, but it can be part of arranging who will continue the action when there is competition to do so. Thus, it might be seen as one second-order solution to the problem of turn allocation.

¹⁴ See Lerner (1992) for an analysis of how story consociates can take over as storytellers by assisting the current teller, and Lerner (1989) for another method for winning turn competition by first dropping out and then restarting in the course of a competitor’s utterance.

In the final sections of this chapter I would like to expand the discussion of choral co-production in two ways. In the next section, I will show how this form of participation is employed in talk-in-interaction beyond conversation. And then in the subsequent section I will look beyond the “utterance matching” of choral co-production and examine the phenomenon of gestural matching.

Conjoined Participation Beyond Conversation

Some forms of speech exchange, with their own forms of turn taking and their own social arrangements, can provide an ongoing relevance for conjoined or collective participation. Some of these forms of talk-in-interaction can be organized to provide opportunities for choral co-production -- and some contributions can be specifically designed to make choral co-production specially relevant. In this section, I examine choral features of teacher-student interaction and several forms of public speaker-audience interaction. In each of these, speech exchange is organized for two parties and it is the members of the collective party (students or audience members) who chorally co-produce the contributions of their party (cf. Lerner 1993, Schegloff 1995).

Whole Class Instruction

Opportunities for choral co-production can be seen in whole class instruction where the social arrangements include a turn-taking system that, in the first place, allocates speaking turns to two parties -- the teacher and the students. With this arrangement speaking turns alternate between a single person party (the teacher) and a

multi-person party (the whole class of students). Of course, this can be constantly breached, defended and impinged upon by side involvements, but nevertheless continue to organize much of the participation. When speech exchange includes the systematic possibility of more than one participant speaking for a multiple participant party, then various procedures may be used to arrange just which participant will speak as a student (e.g. calling on a student who has raised their hand). However, there is another type of solution to the multi-person party problem here; all or many of the students, as co-incumbents of the party, can speak simultaneously as a whole class, as in Excerpt (23), which comes from a third grade language arts lesson.

(23) [CIRC:HUG]

Teacher: What is the title of that chapter?

Class: Night in the forest.

The choral co-production of an answer may be one among several methods students attempt to use in alternation (or even simultaneously) in response to a teacher's question. Excerpt (24) suggests at least one possible systematic basis for determining when a choral response is specifically called for.

(24) [CIRC:HUG]

Teacher: And who did we say this book
was written by again?

Student: Al'ice:'. ' ((trails off & stops))
(.)

Class: Alice Dashly ((mostly in unison))

Here, the teacher asks a question that is formulated as a request for a repeat of known information -- information known to (or at least owned by) everyone (*we*). Also notice that one student trails off her solo response. The prosodic features of her utterance suggest that she designed the onset of her contribution to be part of a whole class response and then, finding at the first beat that she is the lone speaker, she trails off the first name.

The possibility for opportunistic choral response can be ongoing, since speech exchange can be organized for two parties over the course of a whole class instructional activity. However, a teacher can also specifically structure their contribution to elicit choral co-production, as in Excerpt (25) at line 3.

(25) [CIRC:HUG]

1 Teacher: Where was this book published?

2 :

3 -> Teacher: Mcmillan publishing company in?

4 (.)

5 Class: New York ((mostly in unison))

6 Teacher: Okay,

By using a “fill in the blank” turn format as the beginning of an answer turn, the teacher can direct students (who have not yet been able to answer her original question at line 1) where to look in their currently open books for the answer. And since this format does not require an answerer to begin a new turn, but only requires conditional entry into the current turn to furnish the answer to the still-relevant question, other forms of whole class instruction turn taking are not as relevant. I am not suggesting here that

students never raise their hands at this point when doing answering, but only that this word-search format is not designed as a place for that form of participation.¹⁵

Audience Participation

There are forms of talk-in-interaction that establish opportunities for participation in which talk is ordinarily associated with or bound to one category of participant (e.g., performer or orator) and is not, for the most part, a proper activity for the other category of participant (e.g., Audience). However, speech exchange can be made a relevant part of performer/orator - audience interaction. This type of exchange can be designed as two-party talk-in-interaction with the performer/orator as one party to the talk and the audience as the other (multi-person) party to the talk, as in Excerpt (26) from a partisan political rally.

(26) [Reagan at Bush's Orange Co. rally, 1992]

Reagan: ... really don't think that we'll see
the Democratic nominee down here

Several: No= ((Up to a dozen scattered,
overlapping shouts for (0.3)))

¹⁵ It seems to me that these technical observations might be applied directly to classroom management. There are times when a teacher might make good use of establishing a place for a chorally co-produced response from the class. For example, it could be made a relevant form for response during a "noisy moment" in a whole class lesson. It can be used in this way as a device to quiet the class (i.e. to defend the whole class turn taking system). This may seem counter-intuitive, since choral co-production produces even more "noise" in that it is made up of many or all students talking at once. However, one way to get all the students to be quiet at once is to get them first to speak at once -- as one. In this way they will all finish at the same time and thus come to be not speaking at once.

Audience: =NO:~::~: ((Large number of members
 mostly in unison for (2.1)))

Performers and orators can design their talk to provide a place for co-ordinated audience response (Atkinson 1984, Heritage and Greatbatch 1986), and this can be done in a fashion that makes choral co-production specially relevant. This can be seen in Excerpts (27) and (28), which are both taken from the performance of an experienced storyteller at a public library. (There are both adults and children in the audience and both join in.)

(27) [GL:Storyteller FN]

ST: He lived in the woods and lived all by him

(.)

Aud: self

(28) [GL:Storyteller FN]

ST: He couldn't see his hand in front of his

(.)

Aud: face

In these excerpts the storyteller prepares a place for audience choral co-participation by halting his turn before the projectable final word of a TCU. This is not just a shared opportunity for audience members to individually contribute, as can be the case when a performer asks for audience volunteers and then simultaneous, even competitive talk ensues. The structure of TCUs and projectivity of talk (e.g. grammatical and idiomatic structuring) provide audience members with the

resources to furnish the completion of the storyteller's TCUs. And, as in the case of ordinary conversation and whole class interaction, TCU possible completions are the most strongly projectable parts of a turn.

There are some forms of "talk"-in-interaction that furnish additional structure to their utterances -- for example, singing a song. The systematic and recurrent voicing structure of sung utterances is one solution to the problem of vocal and verbal coordination.¹⁶ Excerpt (29) is taken from a live recording of a novelty ballad that uses rhyming structure to enhance the projectability of the final word of each couplet, and the performers (and presumably the song's composer as well) recurrently leave it for the audience to produce the final word.

(29) [Roberts and Barrand: "The Ballad of the
Cowpuncher" from "Live at Holsteins"]

Duo: I am an old cowpuncher,
I punch them cows so hard
I have me a cowpunching bag,
set up in my back
(.)

Aud: ya::rd.

¹⁶ Songs furnish just the social-productional form that is specifically designed for choral co-production, as both the text and delivery are prespecified; moreover, such verbal coordination can be used to coordinate other forms of collective action as in the case of sea chanties which were used to coordinate work on early sailing ships. There are also fully scripted forms of audience participation that do not include singing, but do seem to include a shared prosodic form (i.e. a shared tempo and accent structure) -- e.g. the recitation of the "Pledge of Allegiance."

Duo: This bag is made of leather,
 and so are cows of course
 When I get tired of punching cows,
 I go and punch a
 (.)

Aud: ho::rse.

Taken together the recurrent melodic, pre-completion pausing and rhyming structures strongly project each next slot a chorally co-produced audience contribution is relevant and the item that goes in that place -- and in unison the audience flawlessly produces the proper item in the proper place.

Gestural Matching

Schegloff (1984) points out that hand gesturing is on the whole a speaker's activity. Yet he does state that there are several sequential environments for gesturing by other-than-speaker. He reports on the practices used in three sequential environments: 1. gesturing by a nonspeaker as a way to make a move for a speaking turn, 2. gesturing in lieu of talk as a way to communicate without interrupting a current speaker and 3. maintaining a gesturing pose after yielding to an interrupting speaker to show that one considers their own turn to still be in progress. None of these "exceptions" strays very far from the original observation that hand gesturing is a speaker's activity. The present discussion briefly examines additional forms of nonspeaker hand gesturing that aim at gestural co-production --

or perhaps a better term might be “gestural matching.”¹⁷ I do this to suggest that some of the practices that result in the choral co-production of talk may not be limited to talk, but are features of social-sequential organization more broadly.

Though hand gesturing is not ordinarily itself a turn organized activity, it can be organized in relation to turns at talk and to the actions produced in those turns at talk (see, e.g., Streeck & Hartge 1992). Ordinarily iconic gestures are “pre-positioned relative to their lexical affiliates” (Schegloff 1984:276), in effect preparing a place for the lexical affiliate. By contrast, in this section I examine gestures that are post-positioned as visible realizations of something prefigured in the talk. Here, the just prior talk prepares a place for an iconic hand gesture. It is this preparation that provides recipients of the prior talk with an enhanced opportunity both for producing and for matching the gesture. This type of sequential environment, in a sense, parallels those places in the talk that enhance the possibility of choral co-production of a TCU-component.

First, I show that an iconic hand gesture can be made relevant as a form of responding action and that participants, in this case, orient to co-producing or matching the gesture that constitutes that relevant action. Then I show that gestural

17 Over the years, a number of researchers have reported on the phenomenon of “interactional synchrony” (see Davis 1982 for an important collection of papers on this topic). Roughly, this concerns the cyclic, patterned co-actions of coparticipants. Researchers in this tradition have found that the micro-momentary changes of bodies, gestures and vocal behavior can be quite precisely synchronized between speaker and recipient. I would like to distinguish the “achieved synchrony” described in this report from that type of seemingly unintended, unconscious and unrecognized synchronization. Participants can construct closely synchronized hand gestures as a feature of the recognizable actions they are seeably engaged in producing, and not merely as a mainly unrecognizable orchestration for such actions.

matching furnishes a method to a nonspeaker for assisting a speaker in a conjoined fashion -- that is, I show one type of action that gestural matching can be used to accomplish.¹⁸

Achieving Matching Gestures

Prefiguring an action that is not yet realized in the talk provides a special opportunity for recipients to show understanding in the strongest way; they can show that they are closely following and understanding the development of what is being said by demonstrating that they can project and produce the next development. If the prefigured action lends itself to visible depiction, then gestural demonstration by a recipient can be relevant.

In Excerpt (30) there is an opportunity to demonstrate recognition and understanding of *that Angela Davis look*. I will provide an analysis of the sequential slot prepared for the iconic gestures that demonstrate this recognition and understanding as I describe how the gestures by both recipients and the speaker are composed as matching two-handed gestures.

- (30) [SARI]
- 1 A: ... I have to (comb it), cause if I don't
 2 -> I'm gunna have that Angela Davis look,
 3 [That [went] out [in the sixties.]

¹⁸ Gestural matching can also be used by a recipient to match a speaker's gesture as part of a method for exhibiting agreement with that speaker (e.g. a recipient strikes the palm of his left hand with his right fist, just as a speaker produces the same gesture to illustrate the impact of a recent earthquake). However I cannot provide a full analysis of this type of action in this chapter.

4 C: [((hair [gest]ure [onset by C]))
5 B: [Woo] [hoohoo
6 B: [((hair gesture onset by B))
7 (0.2)
8 ((hair gesture onset by A))
9 ((some laughter at apex, then matched/concerted
10 decomposition of gesture))
11 A: No thank you
12 B: Oh (.) but no, now you have the nineteen ninety
13 Angela look.

At line 2, the speaker alludes to a large “Afro” hairstyle by naming a person that is known for that hairstyle, rather than by describing its form directly. This form of reference to a hairstyle seems to initiate a sequence ([person reference + descriptive specification]) that is something like a [Puzzle + Solution] sequence. It does not present a direct description, but only names as an exemplar someone who carries (or is known for) this attribute, and thus can make relevant a further specification by speaker or recipients.

Both of speaker A’s recipients then construct two-handed gestural depictions of the hairstyle. These gestural descriptions both specify *that Angela Davis look* and, in so doing, can be seen as demonstrating adequate recognition by recipients.¹⁹

19 The following is another instance of this type of sequence of actions in which the first action is an unresolved reference and the second action resolves the reference as a recognitional reference (Sacks and Schegloff 1979). Here the sequence is completed in the talk, rather than through gesture.

MIC I hate thet fuckin guy who does those c'mmmercials

Notice that the onset of recipient gestures occurs at the same time as the speaker produces a next increment to her turn which refines or clarifies her prior allusion for her recipients, but does not furnish a direct description.²⁰ In other words, A can be seen to be pursuing recognition by her recipients at just the point at which they exhibit their recognition. At the next possible completion (after the onset of both recipient gestures) the speaker then produces a matching gesture. This seems to be in response to the recipient gestures, but can retain an ambiguous status for participants since it is produced at a next place such a gestural description could otherwise be relevant. (The slight pause after her utterance may be designed to further this latter analysis by recipients.)

The gestures are composed in the following fashion. First C begins her gesture at a possible completion of the speaker's exemplar. She puts down a pencil on the way into the gesture, and then moves her arms outward and upward around her head (in an large encompassing fashion) toward the apex of the gesture. The onset of B's gesture follows closely on C's, but emerges from a table-top hands-

that assho[le

-> SHA: [Weh Al[an: °uh:° .tch Alan Hammil?

-> VIV: [Oh Alan:::

Michael's descriptive person reference strongly prepares a place for candidate names; responding with a name can be a way to demonstrate recognition when a prior recognitional person reference has not included naming. In this case both Shane and Vivian launch name searches in response to *thet fuckin guy* Michael may be employing a descriptive person reference here as an alternative to an explicit name search -- leaving it to his coparticipants to supply the name he is unable to produce. In addition, see the discussion of the inadequate reference in Excerpt (13).

²⁰ This may be especially important here, since Davis, as the participants go on to discuss, has more recently changed her "look," so which hair style is being invoked may not be entirely clear to the recipients.

together position just as C's arms reach table level. Her onset is just at the end of C's gesture preparation (i.e. C has moved her hands from their home position to the position the gesture will begin from). B matches the upward movement of C's arms, since her gesture is begun without a preparatory move. Finally, A begins her gesture slightly after the end of her own utterance, but moves toward the apex at a very quick rate and in as direct a line as possible (see Figure 1 where A, B, and C are arranged left to right). All have composed their gestures so that they reach the apex at virtually the same moment.²¹ (Compare A's action here to that of the second



21 There could be no clearer example of what McNeill (1995) calls “muscular bonding,” but here it is accomplished without the practiced structures of ritual dance or military drill that he describes. Moreover, it is members’ methods for accomplishing the structuring and sequencing of ordinary occasions of social life that furnish the mundane resources that are called upon to achieve, for example, practiced close order drill.

speaker in Excerpt (6). That speaker first uses a very quick speech tempo and then upon catching up with the other speaker, slows down to match that other speaker's tempo.)

At this point all three participants have produced a gestural rendition of the *Angela Davis look* hairstyle by placing their arms and hands fully above their heads and to one degree or another separating their arms to depict its fullness (see Figure 2). The apex of each gestural pose is somewhat different from the others: B has arms forming a full circle with fingers touching, C has arms wide apart, and A has arms straight up as if indicating a goal in football. Yet, it is clear and mutually appreciated that these are all depictions of *that Angela Davis look*. All three then hold this pose for a moment at the apex of the gesture, laugh and then bring their arms down in unison. They produce the decomposition of the gesture in a mutually matching fashion (see Figure 3). Both B and C return their hands to their home resting position at almost exactly the same moment, while A's hands segue into another gesture that is affiliated with her next TCU at line 8. This is not interactional synchrony, but achieved co-production.



Accomplishing Conjoined Action

Gestural matching of a speaker's gesture by another participant can be used to participate in the production of an action in a visibly conjoined fashion with that speaker, and for that speaker's addressed recipient. This procedure can provide, for example, one way to visibly assist in telling a story.

In Excerpt (31), C is telling A a story about someone's drinking behavior on an occasion when both she and co-participant B were present. At one point in the story C employs a warning (*nobody light a match*) as a device to assess how much alcohol the main character was consuming. The warning is composed in a fashion that alludes to a consequence (if the warning is not heeded), but does not make explicit in the talk what the consequence will be. However, C makes that consequence visible subsequently through a two-handed iconic gesture (of the force of an exploding flame from her mouth). Just as this gesture begins, B looks toward C as she (B) matches the gesture. At the resolution of the gestures, both C and B look to their recipient A, who throws her head back in laughter.

- (31) [SARI]
- 1 C: ... the other night
- 2 before we went out, ((turns from A to B))
- 3 B: Yeah.
- 4 C: And we were like, "What's to drink here", and he was
- 5 like, "Oh. I'm chasing some orange juice with some
- 6 vodka" cause that's how ba(h)d () cause he was

7 outta juice. This much juice in the glass and this
8 much vodka.

9 B: woo[o::

10 C: [Please, [nobody light a match [(right [now)=

11 B: [hih hih [((lau[ghs))

12 A: [((laughs))

13 C: =((laughs))

14 -> ((All are laughing. C's gesture preparation begins
15 about (0.5) after now & B begins slightly after C.))

16 C: Whoosh ((This occurs after both C & B have their arms
17 directly in front of their faces and is produced along
18 with the outward movement of the gesture.))

19 ((all laugh))

20 B: and you know it's like (killing) that Jello you know
21 you had to see the look on his face when he was eating
22 that Jello. He was all (.) frank and stuff.

All three participants are laughing and have their arms resting on the table at line 14. A is looking up and toward C, but as they laugh C & B look down toward the table. C, while laughing, begins to move her body up from the table and she simultaneously begins to move both her arms off the table in a possible gesture preparation. (This movement seems to be visible to B.) As soon as C's arms have left the table, B begins to move her head up. Both participants bring their hands up together and reach their gestural apex at about the same moment (see Figure 4).



They are doing the same thing at the same time. Finally, B (not C) continues on with the story about the main character's behavior. Note that the use of the matching gesture furnishes an occasion for reallocation of tellership. Here, as in the discussion of co-explaining, a co-produced action is part of and sustaining of conjoined participation, and it provides an occasion to enter the telling for a story consociate. So, gestural matching furnishes many of the sequential features of co-produced actions that are realized through the talk, but here they are realized in the hands of the participants.

Concluding Remarks

This report should again remind us that a turn at talk is an interactionally constituted social structure of conversation and should not be thought of as just an analytic template. It is necessary to develop a detailed account of a course of action to understand what part any utterance plays within it. Moreover, producing an utterance is not equivalent to gaining and producing a turn. Choral co-production of a TCU shows us that there are other forms of participation in conversation in addition to taking and being given a full turn at talk.

Speakers who do get a turn at talk are entitled by the socially sustained practices for turn taking to produce at least one TCU to its first possible completion. But this is not an unconditional entitlement. And yet, although other participants can enter a current speaker's turn, they cannot (or at least in practice, ordinarily do not) do so without restraint or countermeasure or both. Rather, entry is regularly enough based on forwarding the action of the turn or sequence and thus is a conditional entry. Further, a review of the instances of choral co-production in this chapter will reveal that many of the speakers are co-producing reenacted speech. Whatever else may be relevant in establishing opportunities for co-production, reenacting speech of another person, place or moment seems to systematically weaken or relax a speaker's sole entitlement to voice that speech, thus enhancing the opportunity for conditional entry into the turn space by another speaker.

Choral co-production can be used to initiate or continue conjoined action, thus providing another vehicle for broadening the units of participation in conversation

from individual participants to broader social entities, or it can be used to exhibit understanding, affiliation and agreement with a current speaker. Choral co-production also furnishes a way to construct mutual participation in activities that included both a shared entitlement to voice an utterance and reciprocal reciprocity such as can occur when reminiscing together. It is easy to assert, as some investigators have done, that actions such as these are outside the purview of turn taking practices that have as their main result one-at-a-time speaking. However, that assertion seems inappropriate to me in the case of choral co-production. Here, it is precisely the practices and products of turn taking that furnish the resources for sharing a moment of speaking together.

Finally, co-production, as a feature of the organization of social interaction, does not seem to be limited to talk, but can be accomplished through gestural matching. Gestural matching practices employ the social situatedness of the body to accomplish social action. This reveals one way the body-in-action is available as a situated social resource and demonstrates that recognizable actions composed of body behaviors can be organized along the same lines as similar actions carried out through speech.

* I would like to thank Sandy Thompson and Barbara Fox for their thoughtful comments and kind patience. Earlier reports of this research were presented at the International Conference on Perspectives and Current Work on Ethnomethodology and Conversation Analysis, Urbino, Italy, 1994, and at the annual meeting of the Speech Communication Association, San Diego, CA, 1996.

References

- Atkinson, J. Maxwell. 1984. Public speaking and audience responses: some techniques for inviting applause. In J. M. Atkinson and J. Heritage, (eds.), Structures of social action: studies in conversation analysis. 370-409. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Coates, Jennifer. 1996. Women talking: conversation between women friends. Oxford:Blackwell.
- Davis, Martha. 1982. Interactional rhythms: periodicity in communicative behavior. New York:Human Sciences Press.
- Edelsky, Carole. 1993. Who's got the floor? In D. Tannen (Ed.), Gender and conversational interaction. 189-227. New York:Oxford.
- Egbert, Maria. 1997. Schisming: the collaborative transformation from a single conversation to multiple conversations. Research on Language and Social Interaction 30. 1-51
- Erickson, Frederick. 1992. They know all the lines: rhythmic organization and contextualization in a conversational listing activity. In P. Auer and A. d. Luzio (Eds.), Contextualization of language. 365-397. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Ford, Cecilia E., Barbara A. Fox and Sandra A. Thompson. 1996. Practices in the construction of turns: the "TCU" revisited. Pragmatics 6:3. 427-454.

- Ford, Cecilia E. and Sandra A. Thompson. 1996. Interactional units in conversation: syntactic, intonational, and pragmatic resources for the management of turns. In E. Ochs, E.A. Schegloff and S.A. Thompson (eds.), Interaction and grammar. 134-184. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Garcia, Angela. 1998. The relevance of interactional and institutional contexts for the study of gender differences: A demonstrative study. Symbolic Interaction 21:1. 35-58.
- Goffman, Erving. 1981. Forms of talk. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania.
- Goodwin, Charles and Marjorie Harness Goodwin. 1987. Concurrent operations on talk: notes on the interactive organization of assessments. Papers in Pragmatics 1:1. 1-50.
- Goodwin, Marjorie Harness. 1995. Games of stance: Conflict and footing in hopscotch. Paper presented at the Linguistic Institute, Conversation Symposium. Albuquerque, NM.
- Heritage, John and David Greatbatch. 1986. Generating applause: a study of rhetoric and response at party political conferences. American Journal of Sociology 92:1. 110-157.
- James, Deborah and Sandra Clarke. 1993. Women, men, and interruptions: A critical review. In D. Tannen (Ed.), Gender and conversational interaction. 231-280. New York:Oxford.

- Jefferson, Gail. 1973. A case of precision timing in ordinary conversation: overlapped tag-positioned address terms in closing sequences. Semiotica 9. 47-96.
- Jefferson, Gail. 1979. A technique for inviting laughter and its subsequent acceptance/declination. In G. Psathas (Ed.), Everyday Language: Studies in Ethnomethodology 79-96. New York: Irvington Publishers.
- Jefferson, Gail. 1983. Two explorations of the organization of overlapping talk in conversation: (a) notes on some orderlinesses of overlap onset and (b) on a failed hypothesis: 'Conjunctionals' as overlap-vulnerable; with an appended glossary of transcript symbols. Tilburg Papers in Language and Literature 28. 1-33.
- Jefferson, Gail. 1986. Colligation as a device for minimizing repair or disagreement. Paper presented at the Talk and Social Structure conference, Santa Barbara, CA.
- Jefferson, Gail. 1984. Notes on a systematic deployment of the acknowledgement tokens 'Yeah' and 'Mm hm'. Papers in Linguistics 17. 197-216.
- Jefferson, Gail and Emanuel A. Schegloff. 1975. Sketch: some orderly aspects of overlap onset in natural conversation. Paper presented at the 74th Annual Meeting of the American Anthropological Association, Mexico City.
- Johnstone, Barbara (ed.). 1994. Repetition in discourse: interdisciplinary perspectives. Norwood, New Jersey: Ablex Publishing.

- Lerner, Gene H. 1987. Collaborative turn sequences: sentence construction and social action. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation. University of California, Irvine.
- Lerner, Gene H. 1989. Notes on overlap management in conversation: the case of delayed completion. Western Journal of Speech Communication 53. 167-177.
- Lerner, Gene H. 1991. On the syntax of sentences in progress. Language in Society 20. 441-458.
- Lerner, Gene H. 1992. Assisted storytelling: deploying shared knowledge as a practical matter. Qualitative Sociology 15(3). 247-271.
- Lerner, Gene H. 1993. Collectivities in action: establishing the relevance of conjoined participation in conversation. Text 13 (2). 213-245.
- Lerner, Gene H. 1994. Responsive list construction: a conversational resource for accomplishing multifaceted social action. Journal of Language and Social Psychology. 13(1). 20-33.
- Lerner, Gene H. 1996a. On the “semi-permeable” character of grammatical units in conversation: conditional entry into the turn space of another speaker. In E. Ochs, E.A. Schegloff and S.A. Thompson (eds.), Interaction and Grammar. 238-276. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lerner, Gene H. 1996b. Finding “face” in the preference structures of talk-in-interaction. Social Psychology Quarterly 59(4). 303-321.

- Lerner, Gene H. and Tomoyo Takagi. 1999. On the place of linguistic resources in the organization of talk-in interaction: a co-investigation of English and Japanese grammatical practices. Journal of Pragmatics 31.
- Maynard, Douglas W. 1986. Offering and soliciting collaboration in multi-party disputes among children (and other humans). Human Studies 9. 261-285.
- McNeill, William H. 1995. Keeping together in time: dance and drill in human history. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Sacks, Harvey. and Emanuel A. Schegloff. 1979. Two preferences in the organization of reference to persons in conversation and their interaction. In G. Psathas (Ed.), Everyday language: studies in ethnomethodology 15-21. New York, NY: Irvington Publishers.
- Sacks, Harvey, Emanuel A. Schegloff and Gail Jefferson. 1974. A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation. Language 50. 696-735.
- Schegloff, Emanuel A. 1984. On some gestures' relation to talk. In J. M. Atkinson and J. Heritage (eds.), Structures of social action: studies in conversation analysis. 266-96. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Schegloff, Emanuel A. 1987. Recycled turn beginnings: a precise repair mechanism in conversation's turn-taking organization. In G. Button & J. R. E. Lee (Eds.), Talk and social organisation. 70-85. Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters, Ltd.

- Schegloff, Emanuel A. 1995. Parties and talking together: two ways in which numbers are significant in talk-in-interaction. In ten Have & Psathas (eds.), Situated order: studies in the social organization of talk and embodied activities. Washington, D.C.: University Press of America.
- Schegloff, Emanuel A. forthcoming. Overlapping talk and the organization of turn taking for conversation. Language in Society 29:1.
- Schegloff, Emanuel A. and Harvey Sacks. 1973. Opening up closings. Semiotica. 7. 289-327.
- Streeck, Jürgen and Ulrike Hartge. 1992. Previews: gestures at the transition place. In P. Auer and A. d. Luzio (Eds.), Contextualization of language. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Tannen, Deborah. 1989. Talking voices: repetition, dialogue, and imagery in conversational discourse. UK: Cambridge: University Press.