

Searching For Universal Features Of Conversation

Wayne A. Beach

San Diego State University

Readers of *Talking Culture* encounter a mystic Moerman - anthropologist, ethnographer, conversation analyst - who declares himself to be engaging in "rough-and-ready applied phenomenology" (p. xiii): A researcher who will "sometimes tack rather than sail before the wind," "derive poise from a blur," and who invites readers into his messy kitchen to observe, firsthand, the way cooking gets done and meals get prepared. Empiricism is akin to art criticism - yet another reminder that the rigor and imagination of science should be designed to illuminate, not suppress, understandings of the "lives of relative strangers."

The possibility of universal features in conversation is central to *Talking Culture*. A considerable portion of the analysis is founded, and indeed empirically rests on the noticing of, apparently small and what may be (and typically are) readily taken for granted features of social action. A focus upon try- markers and person references across American and Thai speech, for example, draws readers' attention to seemingly isolated bits of what may appear to be randomly selected fragments from cultural gatherings among various Thai peasants and officials. Through analysis, certain of these "trivial" details emerge as conversational phenomena that appear in unrelated languages - candidate conversational universals.

351

352

Wayne A. Beach

Moerman argues that certain organizing features of otherwise routine speech events display surprising similarities across (assumedly) different languages and cultures. What were once unnoticed details of social interaction emerge, in due excavated course, from "data" to "findings" to a case offered as substantiation of cross-cultural resemblances. These may be accounted for by talk's locally organized, allocated, and constructed possibilities. That is, people everywhere must resolve similar interaction problems, hence they adopt some similar ways of doing so: Universal practices of conversation.

Throughout Moerman's search for and justification of universality in naturally occurring events, cultural similarities are exemplified and differences de-emphasized; fine-grained structures of interaction are edified while cultural stereotypes are rendered into folklore. In short, researchers' uninformed conceptions of cultural members' practices, those not accountable to the achieved character of talk-in-interaction, become grist for debunking *a priori's* mill.

The nature and scope of Moerman's dual concerns - "analysis" and "universality" - are central to the present essay. Of particular interest is the way he posits necessary connections ("interpenetrations") rather than espousing dichotomies between "conversation analysis" (CA) and "ethnography" - the result being "culturally contexted conversation analysis" [COCA]. This proposed integration is designed so as to exclude neither the richness of cultural knowledge gained from field work (e.g., background and local information gained from on-site participation/observation, notes, and interviews), nor the empirical rigor gained from sequential analyses of conversation (tape recordings, transcriptions, repeated listening). There are empirical and theoretical issues arising from such a proposed integration, to which I will return. These may be initially illustrated in recounting a recent, in some ways parallel examination of cross-cultural materials that influences both my re-reading of Moerman's book, and issues relevant to cross-cultural studies of conversation's features.

Searching for Universal Features of Conversation

353

THE TOKEN "EH" IN SWEDISH TALK

In a preliminary investigation of "acknowledgment tokens" in Swedish conversations (Beach & Lindstrom, in press), materials consisted of audio-recordings, transcriptions, and word-by-word (inevitably "rough") translations into American syntax and lexicon.' The empirical concern with "tokens" was stimulated by two curiously different though eventually interrelated modes of analysis.

First, particles such as "Mm", "Mm .Lmm", "Uh huh", and what was most readily heard as "Eh" repeatedly occurred in recordings and transcriptions. Attempts were made to discern what speakers and hearers might be doing through their deployment. Certain uses of these tokens appeared similar to acknowledgment tokens in North American and English interaction (Jefferson, 1981; Schegloff, 1981). Precise examinations of the specific locations and work of tokens in Swedish discourse remain to be conducted; however, these preliminary results do invite questions regarding acknowledgment tokens in a universalistic, cross-cultural perspective such as Moerman's (see his treatment of repair tokens, reference to persons, and overlaps). What qualities of acknowledgment tokens are isomorphic across diverse languages?

Second, several researchers relying exclusively on self-report data have reported that non-Swedes perceive Swedes to be lacking in a host of basic communication skills (cf. Beach and Lindstrom, in press). One such skill - giving and receiving "feedback" in conversation - was key to a cultural stereotype that Swedes may be "conversationally inept." Thus, it was the empirical nature of these studies (e.g., exclusive reliance upon self-report data), combined with what seemed to us rather sweeping generalizations, that prompted our query: Just what might "feedback" and "acknowledgment" *look* like in Swedish interaction? Does interactional evidence exist for claiming "ineptness" in conversations? While our corpus of materials included only Swede/Swede interactions, it remained of interest to discern the forms and functions of "feedback" in mundane Swedish talk. It was

354

Wayne A. Beach

not out of the question that any findings of this sort might address stereotypes of Swedes-in-interaction.

Repeated inspection of these materials produced ample intrigue and puzzlement. This was particularly novel for me, as a non-native Swedish speaker who knew few Swedes well and had never visited Sweden. It was nevertheless possible for me to collaborate in recognizing recurring instances of "tellings-in-progress", wherein recipients appeared to be displaying "passive reciprocity" at or near moments of transition relevance. The tokens "Mm", "Mm I mm", "Uh huh" and "Eh" appeared to be offered by recipients to tellings as free-standing turns, in lieu of fuller pursuit of speakership, and followed by continued telling from other speaker.

Previous descriptions of "um hm" and related tokens in English (Jefferson, 1981; Schegloff, 1981) have emphasized these tokens' use as "continuers," i.e., tokens that showed continuing reciprocity. This work may warrant a claim for the cross-linguistic status of continuers - in the spirit of Moerman's claims on behalf of repair-initiation, person reference, speech overlap management, and thelike. Other analysts of English have emphasized that continuer-tokens *alternate* with other recipient tokens such as assessments (Goodwin, 1984); "Oh" (Heritage, 1984a) and "Okay" (Merritt, 1976; Beach, 1990a). Such tokens apparently facilitate tellings differentially, but more than one kind of token shows a refraining from extended turns and thus working to preserve the prior speaker's status as teller. Again, it seemed reasonable to ask whether Swedish interactions display tokens in similar function-differential alternation. Our initial sense of the materials, then, was that the detailed work of these tokens appeared strikingly similar to tellings comprising English-speaking conversational involvements (cf. Jefferson, 1978; Goodwin, 1984; Mandelbaum, 1989). On these grounds, preliminary and available for re-inspection, initial claims toward universality seemed warranted.

A non-native analyst can get this far, and likely further, through repeatedly working with recordings and transcriptions. This is the case even though the non-native analyst is generally incapable of authenticating the most detailed accuracy of transcriptions/translations, clearly a crucial "link" in the chain of any research discovery process,

Searching for Universal Features of Conversation

355

and without which materials would not be readily accessible for inquiry - a point that Moerman (1988) does not overlook (see chapter 2). But it is also the case that, even though a native collaborator

is invaluable as research continues, non-native analysts needn't rely upon information about a culture/setting/speech community as *prerequisite* for making analytic progress toward discovering universals. Such a reliance may aid in determining social order in cultural events, a point taken up later in this essay.

Similarly, there are inherent constraints on what non-native analysts can *treat* as a resource void of knowledge about idiosyncracies of a given language. Consider, for example, the Swedish token "Eh":

(1) IN:SW/EN:I: 254-287 ((simplified))

I: Ja men ja prata me
 I pappa om de pa morronen= N: eh

N: =Eh,

I: sa hade han ingen skruvmejsel sa han till a•hh saj till skidlararn da om ja skulle bara aka ett
 uppvarmningsak

°sa det a_sak samma°=

N: L Mm

I: =aker man langsam

Yes but I talked to
 I

dad about it in the morning= Eh

=Eh,

so had he no screwdriver said he to and say to

ski teacher that if I should only go one warm-up run

°so it doe I sn't matter°= Mm =to go slowly

In segment (1) above, I initiates a story that is hers to tell, and does so in a manner projecting non-completion. As recipient, N noticeably does not pursue fuller speakership but rather orients to I's telling as one in progress through placement of two different continuers: "Eh" and "Mm." Each token occurs at or near moments of transition relevance, just as each visibly preserves I's status as story-

355

Wayne A. Beach

356

teller by refraining from more active speakership. This segment begins an extended segment, one in which N repeatedly receipts I's telling with free-standing tokens "Mm" and "Mm !.mm". However, the conclusion that "Eh" and "Mm" both served sequential roles as continuers seemed difficult to warrant in several ways. Initially, "Eh" appeared to be yet another *unmarked* token used by N to receipt the trajectory of noncompletion offered by teller. This was due, in large part, to a necessary reliance upon *English* translations of *Swedish* discourse, and also an inability to understand what "Eh" might count as an instance *of*, given my lack of Swedish speaking competence. In this circumstance, I relied upon "Eh's" serial placement by N to decipher its "meaning" and use.

But such reliance on sequential ordering proved insufficient for the analytic task. For example, my Swedish collaborator (Anna Lindstrom) brought to my attention that the Swedish "Eh" may arguably be equivalent to "Oh really" in English. Further consultations with native speakers of Swedish, however, only partially confirmed this translation. And other problematic issues remain. A prime example is the possibility that "Eh" is one prosodic and phonological variation of the word "Ja" (yes) (cf. Allwood, 1987; Allwood, Nivre, and Ahisen, 1990; Ehlich, 1986), the discernment of which requires not only native speaking competence but also the resolution of ambiguities concerning *how* to transcribe slight shifts in pronunciation.

For these and related reasons analyses of " Eh" required reframing, perhaps as N's offering of a

specialized "news- receipt marker" (cf. Heritage, 1984a) or simply as an acknowledgment/affirmation (i.e., "yes") in the segments analyzed. The formulation of equivalence between "Eh" and other tokens (e.g., "Mm", "Mm I mm," "Uh huh") became an obvious focal point, and further examination clearly is needed to solidify the empirical status of "Eh" in a manner aligned with how conversation is organized, in the first instance, by and for participants themselves. A non-native analyst may be especially vulnerable to being misled by inter-language analogies. There is no necessity that categories of acknowledgement be structured

similarly in different languages. That is precisely the information we seek: That is the empirical question.

This brief example of "Eh", then, has much to say about the transformation of an empirical claim - from an unnoticed token, to recipients' acknowledgment displaying passivity akin to other tokens in the immediate sequential environment, to the possibility of a specialized marker receipting news offered by teller. While each variation appears at work in the preservation of rights and privileges of the teller - compared, as noted previously, with data possessing "speaker incipency" features - each can thus be found to have different consequences "as meaningful parts of the world created and inhabited by [the] participants" (Moerman, 1988, p. 5). This is the case even though they initially appeared to be positioned similarly in the sequential organization of the tellings examined.

In the course of cross-language searching for universals and for differences, therefore, there are opportunities for analysts (native and non-native alike) to reflexively (and collaboratively) inspect the order *imposed* upon (rather than naturally residing within) the constituent features of an alternative culture's social activities.² Various "field" activities, such as the discussions with native Swedes noted above, and/or being "filled in" on such features as the nature of relationships among participants, are not infrequently relied upon in the course of raising questions and resolving emergent problems with analysis (i.e., with same and/or cross-cultural materials). Ethnography and conversation analysis converge at this point, in that such inspection "permits us to locate the perturbations made by the researcher's presence" (Moerman, 1988, p. 7). In this sense, CCCA may allow comparison of pre-existing theories vs. actual practices/structures employed by natives.

This brief tracing of one non-native analyst's experiences in working with a foreign language may help to identify the kinds of problems confronted throughout the search for universals of conversation. It also draws attention to ways in which analyses of what Moerman refers to as "exotic", cross-cultural languages occasion reliance upon cultural knowledge and background assumptions in making claims about discourse structure.

Questions remain regarding these ways of working, but the major concern here is to use the present explication as a backdrop for some broader questions raised by Moerman's proposed relationships among conversation's *structure*, cultural *order*, and participants' *experience*. We now turn to these issues.

ISSUES OF METHOD AND ANALYSIS

Conversation analysts examine how participants orient to and thereby enact the moment-by-moment, turn-by-turn organization of talk. In these ways, conversation analysis "delineates the structure of social interaction and thus provides the loci of actions" (Moerman, 1988, p. 57).

Moerman treats "structure" as a necessary but not sufficient criterion for an adequate

understanding of what is consequential in cultural occasions. This is particularly the case when he argues to substantiate the universality of conversation features in Thai and American, relying upon talk as a "metric for cultural variations" (p. 4) exposing "processes and problematicity of culture" (p. 5). Conversational structures, however revealing, are not end-products in and of themselves but instruments to be utilized in a more encompassing ethnographic enterprise. Within this view the "Achilles heel" of conversation analysis is its potentially skeletal and "arid" renderings of what is purposeful and experientially significant in social action. Such vulnerability is evident, for example, in the ways transcriptions "freeze" the lived-in social world "for the analyst's distant and impartial inspection" (p. 46); in the tendency to distill the "heart" and "drama" of humans' lives (e.g., pride, character, passion, strategy) into material objects, dressed in the robes of conversational collections and recurring instances (p. 40); and in a general and apparent disinterest in the shared and intersubjectively constituted sense of "values", "motives, or "moral order" in society.

It is through presuppositional examination of this sort that Moerman situates his own work, inviting others to reflect upon and refine

the study of social interaction through hands-on analysis. Moerman's position is fundamentally rooted in *not* equating "structure" with "experience." He calls for descriptions of both structure and experience (and their interactions) that do not confuse the two.

Moerman repeatedly urges social scientists to recognize the cost of "purchasing" (reporting on) patterns and structures in a disassociated manner; to resist the temptation of equating conversation as a vehicle of personal expression with conversation as an objectified corpus of empirical redundancies. In the search for social order, Moerman himself struggles with this temptation, as do all researchers granting priority to talk and holding faith in the tape recorder's fidelity to empirical fact.

Moerman (1988) argues that ethnographers may remedy these problems: "Ethnography can provide the meanings and material conditions of the scenes in which the actions occur" (p. 57). As a synthesized result CCCA provides an analytic alternative revealing "the nexus between cultural rules and individual intentions" (p. 57); "a description of the interactive system within which meaningful actions occur" (p. 66); and an appreciation of how the "larger order" influences conversational interaction from the "top down" (p. 69). These concerns are

directed toward discovering which of the many culturally available distinctions are active and relevant to the situation, how those distinctions are brought to bear, and what they consist of. (p. 70)

Science and art, *Natur* and *Geist*, nature and culture, conversation analysis and ethnography must be combined... Ethnography must be provided with explicit methods for testing conclusions against uninterrupted public data. Conversation analysis must aspire to bring us into touch with the lives of strangers and with our own lives; to resonate with culture's meanings; to acknowledge that talk is placed in a society, one sometimes cruel and inequitable. (p. 87)

Conversation analysis is also concerned with specifying which distinctions participants use to construct social situations; most particularly, analysts aim to describe the *achieved character* of any candidate phenomenon. At stake is the articulation (and variable absence of articulation) of what participants can be heard and seen to

be doing, collaboratively, in the ongoing course of a given spate of talk. Most pointedly, the issue becomes crystallized when considering relationships among *warrants* and *claims*: *Why is* it that a given talk's features require special consideration, and *how is* it that such talk might be treated, on its own merits, as an instance of one phenomenon as opposed to another? As the argument goes, to the extent a socially constructed phenomenon's existence is assumed rather than analytically specified, what was recognizably available to interactants "in the first instance" would remain unknown; the activities with which participants are occupied would be unaccounted for, "in all their visibility," as endogenously produced features of social organization. The result would be a failure to preserve the integrity of the local and detailed contingencies of the very achievements called into question, i.e.,

what it is that participants themselves relied upon and made available to one another in the course of accomplishing "status," "role," "intention," "understanding," and the like (cf. Beach, 1990b, c). Conversation analysts most often forgo exogenous explanations of inherently endogenous events: Relying upon materials external to the talk itself may compromise the very details displayed and detected by speakers and hearers. As shown by work with the token "Eh" in Swedish talk, concerns with "setting," "context," or "culture" cannot be disembodied from talk itself, but in fact *constitute* what participants do and find meaningful, and work through accordingly in talk (Schegloff, 1987). It is in this sense that the reliance upon exogenous explanations may be contrary to "forestalling the process of idealization" (Heritage, 1984b, p. 236), or as Moerman puts it, to discerning among *micro phenomena* and *macro notions*. [Editor's note: See Mandelbaum, this issue.] Hypothetical, reconstructive, and/or self-report data may not only prove to be inappropriate substitutes, but potentially problematic in the ways they enter into analysis and are contingently treated as "complementary" to sequential analysis. The solution proposed in conversation analysis, therefore, is to carve out understandings of "ethnographic engagement" as *packaged* in the organization of interactional, inherently sequential conversational activities. It is the priority and sensitivity rendered to such

Searching for Universal Features of Conversation 361

emergent and empirical constraints that reveals several marked differences between Moerman's CCCA and conversation analysis in general. One way to begin to elucidate these differences is to inspect Moerman's (1988) analysis of a segment entitled "The Leper" (pp. 20-22). Moerman posits that ethnographic "background" information is essential for interpreting the meaningful nature of this conversational event. Ways in which the invocation of such background information may or may not facilitate analysis remain to be addressed.

RE-INSPECTING "THE LEPER"

Since speech overlaps occur at or near turn-transition places in both Thailand and North America, Moerman (1988) posits the operation of strikingly similar "turn-constructural and speaker-allocation principles" (p. 20) in these two dissimilar languages. Moving beyond sequential and thus skeletal renderings of overlaps to the cultural "meanings" of such occurrences, is a task Moerman identifies as central to an understanding of the "text/context" relationship (p. 20) - a task that can reveal what participants *do through* overlap in real Thai speech events, and thus reveal "Life in Dry Dust."

Moerman therefore relies upon residual background knowledge, gleaned from field residence within a Thai village, as an explicit resource for understanding this conversational event. He selects these exogenous features to frame his tale: The scene is a sheltered porch upon which a group of villagers, a district official (DO) and the ethnographer himself, stand on the day of the latter's return to a village where he formerly resided. The villagers speak Lue, and DO speaks Siamese. S and WS are man and wife (respectively), B a village elder, and the topic is recordings of Lue folk songs. It is the overlap in line #44 (marked with arrow) that Moerman treats in detail, particularly in the ways it is rooted in the interpretive world of the participants co-producing these turns-at-talk. Only Moerman's English translation is included here:

362Wayne A. Beach(2) "The Leper" (Moerman, 1988, pp. 125-127)32DO:Where was the singer from33(7)34DO:Someone from this village?35S:Um= (.) a guy= um who stays at the infirmary36at Acan B's there(1.0)37BWhat38(.3)39B:You talking about the singer?40S:That's right.41(2)42S:That Ba Naaw.43WS:Ba Naaw the 1 leper>44S:Heis sort of si:ck, that guy.

It is not the entire repair sequence in lines 32-41, thoroughly described by Moerman as involving successive repair initiators (cf. Schegloff, et al., 1977; Moerman, 1977) so as to accomplish specific person-reference (Sacks & Schegloff, 1979), that is the focus of discussion here. However, such immediately preceding work does bear on what comes next interactionally (in lines 42-44), and on what Moerman argues participants are orienting to beginning with lines 42 and 43. Here Moerman draws attention to repeated person-referencing done by S ("Ba Naaw"), more specifically achieved by WS's addition of an "eponym" ("the leper") in line 43. Moerman observes that such eponyms are common reference-types among villagers:

But on this occasion the normally inert eponym is treated as, and so becomes, a sudden source

of danger. Precisely upon its appearance, S overlaps it (44) and then immediately challenges it as if this mere standard identificatory device had been a considered diagnosis.

Labelling what S does at line 44 "a challenge" relies on the following observations. "He is sort of sick" topicalizes the eponym, reacting to it as a description rather than as to a mere part of a name... the topicalization is substantively a disagreement, challenge, or dismissal. What it argues with is made visible - to participants as to us - by its sequential placement: on top of and obliterating WS's reparative re- reference... The mechanical image is of pinpoint bombing, not careless collision, of turns. (p. 21)

In drawing attention to "pinpoint bombing" in line 44, Moerman identifies a phenomenon of interaction quite similar to what Jefferson (1973) examined upon noticing how tag-positioned address terms

(e.g., Dear, Love, Ted, Phil) are precisely overlapped in closing sequences.' This analysis, and others on overlap onset (cf. Jefferson and Schegloff, 1975; Jefferson 1983), clearly establish the technical capacity for interactants to overlap in precise and non-trivial ways. In the course of monitoring the operation and "vertical package" (Jefferson, 1973, p. 54) of what a given " sequence" projects, next speaker may overlap so as to not only contribute to but possibly *alter* the development of subsequent talk. Such appears to be the case in line

44 above. But the question remains: *Why* does S overlap in just this time and place, for *what* purposes, and *how* might analysts¹⁶ account for its occurrence and interpret its meaning" (Moerman, p. 21)?

To answer these questions, Moerman posits the necessity of "ethnographic background" (i.e., "local") knowledge that this particular conversational event⁶ 'calls to mind" (p. 21). A synopsis might go like this: S, who sometimes visits Naaw in a missionary compound in which Naaw resides, relies upon a nurse's assurances that Naaw does not have leprosy but rather a harmless skin ailment. If the District Officer knew that townsmen have complained that Naaw may in fact be a leper, DO could remove him to a leper colony for these villagers' protection. Since DO has considerable status and power ("the highest official a villager can hope or fear to meet," p. 22), WS's normally inert identification sequence in line 43 occasioned S (and no other villager) to obliterate "the leper" eponym through overlap.

In short, Moerman concludes that S's overlap is designed purposefully to delete DO's overhearing the word "leper." This action is designed to minimize trouble and negative consequences for Naaw

that may arise from DO's newly acquired knowledge. Moreover, by integrating what conversation analysis can reveal about "units of action" such as turns and overlaps, with ethnographic knowledge regarding "motives and meanings" in cultural enactments, Moerman proposes that enlivened insights can be gained about social institutions and membership (e.g., loyalty, kinship, authority).

There is little doubt that the analysis summarized above has appeal; the possibility of its motivated "accuracy" must be granted as an attempt to integrate "structure" and "experience". But several issues might be raised concerning criteria by which the warrants and claims offered might be reasonably evaluated.

First, readers are not informed as to the means by which Moerman obtained such knowledge

(e.g., notes, interviews, relistening to the recordings with participants for purposes of stimulated recall, and/or the accumulation of more or less casual observations while engaging in field work in the Thai village). In this absence the conclusions drawn are not necessarily "uninterrupted public data" (p. 87) for readers' critical inspection, a criterion Moerman posits for ethnographic materials to be verifiable and potentially complementary to CA findings.

Second, even if readers were informed as to how Moerman obtained access to S's knowledge-base and daily activities, as well as such phenomena as the "hopes and fears" of villagers, how can these reconstructions be shown to have immediate and unequivocal relevance to a brief moment of passing talk at line 44?⁴

And finally, what gave rise to Moerman's noticing of line 44? Were there particular "clues" in the interactional/porch environment that Moerman - as participant/observer-oriented to upon the *initial* sequential occurrence of this event (e.g., a quickened or intonationally marked delivery by S, a facial expression and/or postural/gestural "shift" co-occurring with the vocal delivery)? If so, the "ethnographic meaning" of this particular moment was more fully "packaged" in sequential organization than articulated in Moerman's analysis (and likely inaccessible for future analysis without a video recording of the event). Or was it the case that upon analysis of the audio-recording at

Searching for Universal Features of Conversation 365

a later date, Moerman was able to "fit pieces of the puzzle" together in a manner eventuating in the analysis summarized above?

These and related questions are ripe for further exploration, not only in terms of Moerman's analysis but in any attempt to articulate the "interpenetration" of structure and experience in cultural events. In sum, the issues raised above neither subvert nor substantiate Moerman's claims about the overlap instance. Neither do they contribute unequivocally to a confirmation of the necessity to integrate such background information - both in making sense of sequences of talk as structural-units, and (more importantly) in describing *the work of* participants co-involved in producing meaningful, understandable actions. Or as Moerman (1988) puts it: "No instance or sum of instances proves any claim, except as "proof is in the pudding," bite after bite." (p. 22).

CONCLUSION

Many of the issues emerging from a proposed integration of ethnography and conversation analysis stem from problems in discerning the empirical status of "background understandings" and "local knowledge" (cf. Beach, 1983; Maynard, 1989). These are deceptively complex, long-standing issues that Moerman's *Talking Culture* once again brings to the forefront for readers' critical reflection and consideration. In a sense, it is the ability of the work to draw attention to such a diversified and historically relevant set of concerns - language/meaning, structure/experience, knowledge/culture, said/unsaid, micro/macro - that speaks to its innovation and significance for future developments in the study of conversational events. Such is the case regardless of the unresolved issues that remain between conversation analysis and CCCA. For in raising possibilities for integration, opportunities are created for dialogue that might otherwise not have taken place.

One likely focal point of future dialogue will involve further exploration of a foundational element in Moerman's mysticism: The

Beach

role of applied phenomenological license in the recognition and verification of conversational structures. This is a key contribution of *Talking Culture*, perhaps equivalent in importance to enhanced understandings of conversation's universal features.

NOTES

1 These materials were collected, transcribed, and initially translated by Anna Lindstrom, now a doctoral student in the Department of Sociology, UCLA.

2 Moerman (1988) raises this distinction at the outset in his reference to micro-phenomena *in the world* vs. macro- notions *in the head* of those engaged in research (p. 1).

3 One basic example drawn from Jefferson (1973, p. 52) is: (Trio: 12)

Penelope: Yeh alright Dear
Jeanette: [Dear
Penelope: Bye bye Jeanette: Bye bye

4 For example, consider the following analytic possibility: In line 42, S might be seen as beginning an assessment of Ba Naaw (delivered, perhaps, with a smilevoice, lowered and/or guttural tone, and/or head-shake). Then in line 43 WS offers a second assessment, at a transition relevant place, with an extension upgrade ("the leper"). In overlap, line 44, S continues and completes the assessment initiated in line 42. In this case, S's obliterative overlap in line 44 may not be occasioned due to a trouble-source in WS's prior turn ("the leper" eponym). S, therefore may not disagree, challenge, or dismissively obliterate line 44 pursuant to preventing DO's overhearing.

Searching for Universal Features of Conversation

367

REFERENCES

- Allwood, J. (1987). Om det svenska systemet for aterkoppling. [About the Swedish mechanism for feedback]. In P. Linell V. Adelsward, T. Nilsson, & P.A. Pettersson (Eds.), *Svenskans Bekrivning*, 16, University of Linkoping, Department of Communication Studies.
- Allwood, J., Nivre, J., & Ahisen, E. (1990). On the semantico pragmatics of linguistic feedback systems. Paper presented at the International Pragmatics Conference, Barcelona.
- Beach, W.A. (1983). Background understandings and the situated accomplishment of conversational telling-expansions. In R.T. Craig & K. Tracy (Eds.), *Conversational coherence: Form, structure, and strategy* (pp. 196-222). Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.
- (1990a). Language as and in technology: Facilitating topic organization in a Videotex focus group meeting. In M.J. Medhurst, A. Gonzalez & T.R. Peterson (Eds.), *Communication and the culture of technology* (pp. 197-220). Pullman: Washington State University Press.
- (1990b). Orienting to the phenomenon. In J.A. Andersen (ed.), *Communication Yearbook 13* (pp. 216-244). Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.
- (1990c). On (not) observing behavior interactionally. *Western Journal of Speech Communication*, 54, 603-612.
- Beach, W.A. & Lindstrom, A.K. (in press). Are Swedes conversationally inept?: Examining a cultural myth by turning to acknowledgment tokens-in-interaction. *Communication Theory*.
- Ehlich, K. (1986). *Interjektionen*. Tubingen: Niemayer. Goffman, E. (1955). On face work. *Psychiatry*, 18, 213-231.
- Goodwin, C. (1984). Notes on story structure and the organization of participation. In J.M. Atkinson & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Structures of social action: Studies in conversation analysis* (pp. 225-246). London: Cambridge University Press.
- Heritage, J. (1984a). A change-of-state token and aspects of its sequential placement. In J.M. Atkinson & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Structures of social action: Studies in conversation analysis* (pp. 299-345). London: Cambridge University Press.

(1984b). *Garfinkel and ethnomethodology*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Jefferson, G. (1973). A case of precision timing in ordinary conversation: Overlapped

tag-positioned address terms in closing sequences. *Semiotica*, 9, 47-96.

368

Wayne A. Beach

(1978). Sequential aspects of storytelling in conversation. In J. Schenkein (Ed.), *Studies in the organization of conversational interaction* (pp. 219-248). New York: Academic Press.

(1981). Caveat speaker: A preliminary exploration of shift implicative reciprocity in the articulation of topic. Mimeo. End of Grant Report. London: social Science Research council.

(1983). Notes on some orderliness of overlap onset. *Tilburg Papers in Language and Literature*, 28 Tilburg University: Netherlands.

Jefferson, G. & Schegloff, E. (1975). Sketch: Some orderly aspects of overlap in natural conversation. Paper presented at the meetings of the American Anthropological Association.

Mandelbaum, J. (1989). Interpersonal activities in conversational storytelling. *Western Journal of Speech Communication*, 53, 114-126.

Maynard, D. (1989). On the ethnography and analysis of discourse in institutional settings. *Perspectives on Social Problems*, 1; 127-146.

Merritt, M. (1976). On questions following answers (in service encounters). *Language in Society*, 5, 315-357.

Moerman, M. (1977). The preference for self-correction in a Tai conversational corpus. *Language*, 53, 872-882.

(1988). *Talking culture: Ethnography and conversation analysis*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Sacks, H. & Schegloff, E. (1979). Two preferences in the organization of reference to persons in conversations and their interaction. In G. Psathas (Ed.), *Everyday language: Studies in ethnomethodology* (pp. 15-22). New York: Irvington.

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

(1987). Between micro and macro: Contexts and their connections. In J.C. Alexander, B. Giesen, R. Munch, & N.J. Selzer (Eds.), *The Micro-Macro link* (pp. 207-234). Berkeley: University of California Press.

Schegloff, E., Jefferson, G., & Sacks, H. (1977). The preference for self-correction

in the organization of repair for conversation. *Language*, 53, 361-382.