

Enabling Human Conduct: Studies of Talk-in-interaction in Honor of Emanuel A. Schegloff
Geoffrey Raymond, Gene Lerner, & John Heritage (Eds.). Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company. 2017. Pp. 1 + 357.

This book presents a collection of academic papers in honor of Emanuel ‘Manny’ Schegloff, one of the three founders of the field of conversation analysis (CA). On one level, the curation of papers serves nicely to both embody and extend this esteemed scholar’s work by building on and debating the main tenets of his extensive research and contributions to relevant fields. On another level, the volume gives the reader a glimpse of Schegloff the man through an interview and personal anecdotes offered by some of the authors. The book is organized as follows: The first chapter relays some background on Schegloff and the field of CA, and previews the content; then, a two-part interview with Schegloff provides a firsthand account of his work endeavors, interests, and professional experience; next, a set of multilingual empirical studies examines concepts originating in Schegloff’s own research such as sequence-initiation, repair, person reference, practices found in telephone openings and closings, and embodied conduct; finally, two reflective papers by authors from surrounding disciplines assess Schegloff’s contributions to the understanding of human interaction, after which a response to one of the reflections by Schegloff himself gives the honoree the last word.

Editors Gene Lerner, Geoffrey Raymond, and John Heritage open the volume with some informative and intriguing background to set the stage for this Festschrift. For readers who are less familiar with his work and CA, included is the story of how Schegloff and his colleagues Harvey Sacks and Gail Jefferson established CA as a field through a series of foundational papers in the 1970s and 80s, which are summarized in terms of the various domains they explored for the “procedural infrastructure of interaction (Schegloff, 1992, p. 1338). Schegloff’s work that followed these groundbreaking collaborative efforts is then delineated, with attention to his extensions and revisions, or his “building out,” within the domains of sequence organization, repair, and turn-taking. For those who are already familiar with his work and the genesis of CA, this chapter offers an additional treat in the “getting to know Manny” sense, as the authors include not only some biographical information and details on his educational background, but also an inspirational description of what it was like to be a student in his introductory CA course at UCLA and to witness his engaging lectures. Following this background, the authors lay out the volume’s organization, preparing the reader to embark on a journey that utilizes research and reflection to both capture and honor the scholar’s great influence in the field of CA and beyond over the last 50 years.

Cmejrková and Prevignano’s interview with Schegloff, originally published in 2003, presents a certain “state-of-the-art” of CA as he viewed it at the time of the discussion. The interviewers’ questions prompt Schegloff to assess the field by speaking to some trends and weaknesses, and describing some of his recent work aimed at addressing some of the “troubles” with CA. Citing one limitation to the existing body of research, he points out that CA analysts were still very much focused on English data, and he calls on native speakers of other languages to examine non-English interaction to fill this gap. Regarding the critique that CA analysts tend to shy away from dealing with larger sets of data, he presents his own research on other initiated repair (OIR) as evidence that the theoretical framework can be used to examine larger collections. Overall, the questions and responses in this interview serve well to provide some

insight into Schegloff's "research programs," his motivation toward cross-disciplinary collaboration, and the particular stages of the establishment of CA. Scholars and students will likely be intrigued to read about his experience as a student of Garfinkel and Goffman, as well as to learn about the "fortunate accident" of losing access to his original dissertation data, an event which resulted in an unexpected move across the country, a shift in research focus and, ultimately, his eventual path to CA. Finally, as only a dedicated educator would, Schegloff takes the opportunity in his concluding remarks to offer some suggestions to novice researchers in the field and encourages young scholars to stick with the discipline long enough until they "get it" so that they might determine whether or not CA work is a fit for them.

The set of 11 empirical studies examine the following set of general topics: (1) responses to sequence-initiations; (2) repair; (3) person reference; (4) the overall structure of talk-in-interaction; (5) cross-linguistic analysis of practices; and (6) nonverbal behavior. In the first of five studies on responses, Pomerantz looks at the role of inference in recipients' responses to inquiries for which the purpose is not explicitly formulated. She describes three sequence types that reflect distinct inferences that recipients make when determining an inquiry's purpose, and her analysis suggests that listeners utilize their sense of the "why that now" principle, more than they do an interpretation of the constraints of question formation, in order to make sense of what an inquiry is doing in the interaction. Koshik's study focuses on responses to another inquiry phenomenon—wh-questions that convey *reverse polarity assertions*. These utterances are shaped like wh-questions but, rather than seeking information, they function to display a negative assertion and challenge claims made in prior talk. She found that, while this particular usage of the wh-question is not designed to elicit a response, responses that do occur in a subsequent turn will be either type-conforming or type nonconforming (Raymond, 2000, 2003) depending on the specific action intended by the wh-question. Lee's contribution to the examination of responses looks at Korean telephone data and focuses on how longer question-answer sequences unfold. She found that second pair parts (SPPs) following questions can actually extend over several turns, and responses can essentially be built through extended sequences. Lindström's study also looks at non-English data, and examines how responses to remote proposals (i.e., speech events like requests, invitations, etc., that cannot be immediately satisfied) are handled in Swedish telephone conversations. Like Koshik, Lindström also employs for her analysis Raymond's (2000, 2003) framework for type-conformity, in conjunction with considerations of preference in adjacency pairs and speaker alignment. Her study reveals that responses to remote proposals that bear a *yes-no* initiation formulation tend to be type-conforming, however these turns also tend to extend beyond a mere *yes* token in the SPP. She concludes that *yes* tokens alone appear to be insufficient responses to remote proposals. In the final study on responses to sequence-initiations, Oh and Park continue the trend of looking at non-English data in their analysis of the use of acknowledgement tokens *ung* and *e* in responses to multi-unit turns (MUTs) in Korean conversation. Aligning with claims by prior researchers, including Schegloff, who demonstrated that acknowledgement tokens are underestimated when treated as an undifferentiated class, this study shows that the function of these tokens can depend on how they are deployed in interaction, and that their meaning is, in fact, *situated*. In particular, it delineates how the tokens' precise usage seems to be contingent upon how a recipient aims to display orientation to an ongoing MUT, with *ung* being deployed as a continuer that treats the other speaker's talk as ongoing, and *e* acting as a display of appreciation for the content of the other speaker's talk.

The papers on responses are followed by two studies that aim to contribute to the understanding of sequential organization by revisiting two of Schegloff's primary areas of research: repair and person reference. Egbert considers the selection principles behind a special type of OIR called *positioned questions* in German conversation. Offering a small window into the experience of attending office hours with Schegloff, Egbert recounts how the seed for this study was planted when she was his student at UCLA and she showed him an instance of repair that, unlike the typical form which would address a trouble source in the immediately prior talk, seemed to target talk in a much earlier turn in the interaction. Beyond describing the characteristics and frequency of positioned questions, and demonstrating that OIR placement in conversation is not always governed by nextness, Egbert's study sheds light on the oft-debated relationship between the interactional, linguistic, and sociolinguistic systems in talk-in-interaction. Specifically, she argues that her findings on the practice of positioned questions provide evidence that the interactional system supersedes both the linguistic and the sociolinguistic system in determining a speaker's choices in naturally-occurring interaction. Kitzinger and Wilkinson's paper considers the question of when person reference terms which are intrinsically gendered (e.g., "husband") actually "do gender" and when they do not. Looking at how gendered person reference terms are employed to refer to non-present third parties during service telephone calls, the authors discovered that, while these linguistic items may be used to invoke the gender of third parties, they may also do the work of making relevant non-gendered categories.

The final group of studies in this volume considers talk-in-interaction through a slightly broader lens. Drew's analysis on call openings examines instances in which there is an intersection between domestic life and the workplace (i.e., one spouse at home calling the other at work). In particular, he looks closely at one instance of a husband failing to recognize his wife's voice when she calls him at work. The analysis reveals that participants do noticeable work (e.g., a wife may choose to use a pet name when addressing her husband on the phone) that functions to display their orientation to the context in which they are interacting. The author concludes that this work serves to locally manage and establish participants' identity during summons-answer sequences, and the salience of identity is not wholly determined by the setting. Thus, when participants do not do this work, there can be a failure of recognition. Following Drew's paper on openings, Bolden's paper looks at the other end of telephone interactions: closings. Focusing on the *initiations* of closings during phone calls between Russian-speaking participants, she found that speakers can do either tacit or explicit closings, depending on how the conversation is unfolding. Specifically, she concludes that a speaker's choice between the two closing types appears to be tied to the placement of the closing within the larger topic or activity—at hearable topic closings, tacit initiations were more common, while explicit closings were found more often at points where the topic had not yet been properly closed. Where Drew's and Bolden's efforts to consider talk more globally involves looking at the two bookends of one interactional activity, namely telephone openings and closings, Wu and Heritage widen the lens with their cross-linguistic analysis of particles in English and Mandarin. Examining the use of the particles *oh* in English, and both *a* and *ou* in Mandarin, this study considers the actions that speakers accomplish in either language through particle prefacing and suffixing in responses to "inapposite" questions (i.e., queries for which the answer is already available in prior talk or the context). The analysis sheds light on the particular work these particles do in responses in either language—they can acknowledge receipt of information, display surprise, or invoke contrast, and

there are subtle differences between the languages when the particles are used to register new information. The contribution of this study within the scope of this volume is that it implicitly highlights the relevance and value of comparing the converging and diverging patterns of linguistic items in distinct languages in terms of their actions, functions, or practices (and not translations) in order to gain a better understanding of possible cross-linguistic universality in interaction. The final empirical paper by Lerner and Raymond is the only study in the collection that includes analysis of nonverbal behavior. Looking at video data from a variety of contexts and focusing on the formal and progressional features of gesture as described by Sacks and Schegloff (2002), the authors consider the “reintentionalization” of body behavior, or instances in which the action accomplished by nonverbal behavior is adjusted in an observable and recognizable way. This analysis of action “pivoting,” which includes the accelerating, retarding, suspending, or withdrawing of gestures, demonstrates how, like talk, participants’ nonverbal behavior can adapt and react contingently to the interactional environment.

Each of the empirical studies just described touches upon and extends some component of Schegloff’s foundational work, although the connections in some papers are notably more explicit than in others. Some authors like Egbert, Drew, or Lerner and Raymond delineate in a more unequivocal and grounded manner how their analyses are influenced by his research, while for other papers like Lee’s study of extended responding in Korean, the reader must do more extrapolation and remind him or herself of the main tenets of Schegloff’s body of research in order to make the connection. Nevertheless, all of the studies, in the way that they each use CA to explore new contexts and additional languages, and to answer calls made by Schegloff to strengthen the field, honor the scholar by contributing to the shared discipline.

The remainder of the volume, which offers two reflections and a response paper by Schegloff, provides commentary and insight on the overall value of the scholar’s work and of CA in general. Couper-Kuhlen’s paper is drawn from a 2007 panel that also honored Schegloff at a pragmatics conference, and it chronicles the influence, albeit probably unwitting, he has had on the field of linguistics. She organizes these contributions in a way that is at once chronological and scalar, describing Schegloff’s initial “small-scale” observations on concepts like silence, timing, non-lexical tokens (e.g., *uh-huh*), person reference, and deixis, then moving into his subsequent “large-scale” observations on concepts like sentences, questions, speech acts, and coherence, and ending with his eventual “full-blown linguistic theorizing” on the nature of language and grammar. Whereas assessments of a scholar’s work by individuals outside his field may often display a more critical tone, Couper-Kuhlen’s reflection is devoted to illuminating Schegloff’s applaudable contributions to linguistics. Levinson’s reflection, in contrast, takes a more critical view of the scholar’s overall stance on interaction. Originally published in 2005, this paper draws a parallel between Schegloff and Charles Darwin’s attributable theories, specifically the notion that each of these great minds asserted that one system (natural selection in Darwin’s case, and interaction in Schegloff’s) was at the center of and could explain essentially *everything* in our social system. Levinson’s standpoint is that there is “danger” to a related argument Schegloff has made that social order is collaboratively and locally produced as a result of social interaction, and he contends that a viewpoint that posits interaction as central, with the linguistic and sociocultural systems as secondary, carries the potential to have serious and “corrosive” consequences when it is applied analytically. To support his argument, Levinson provides an analysis of kinship terms in the matriarchal Rossel society in Papua New Guinea,

aiming to prove that it is necessary to attend to both the sociocultural and interactional levels of analysis. Whether Levinson succeeds in substantiating his claim through this analysis can be left up to the reader, however, the editors choose to leave Schegloff with the last word in this volume, which gives the floor back to the voice of the CA analyst, and seems to implicitly support this “dangerous” approach to understanding human interaction. In his response to Levinson’s assertion that the analyst must consider each of the linguistic, sociocultural, and interactional levels of analysis equally when doing social inquiry, Schegloff turns to the “proof procedure” perspective, explaining that a grounded understanding of what humans are doing is “internal to” conversational data. He cautions against the application of any theory that is “not available to the participants in interaction,” as would be the case of kinship theory Levinson employed in his analysis, and he ultimately argues for the power of the interactional view insofar as it continues to reach “indisputably real occurrences, phenomena, facts, etc.” (p. 353).

As a whole, this volume is a laudable effort by the editors to curate a collection of papers that at once reflects upon Schegloff’s impressive influence in the field of CA and extends several tenets of his considerable body of research. Beyond this, the inclusion of some of the more personal details and anecdotes from former students and colleagues also paints a thoughtful and revering picture of Schegloff the man and the educator. Ultimately, this book can give readers from outside disciplines or who are novices to the field of CA insights into the vastness, robustness, and progression of Schegloff’s body of work, while members of the CA community may gain a deeper understanding of familiar problems and concepts from the studies that extend his foundational research through the examination of new contexts, additional languages, and fresh angles.

ALLIE HOPE KING

Teachers College, Columbia University

REFERENCES

- Raymond, G. (2000). *The structure of responding: Type-conforming and nonconforming responses to yes/no type interrogatives* (Doctoral dissertation). University of California, Los Angeles.
- Raymond, G. (2003). Grammar and social organization: Yes/no interrogatives and the structure of responding. *American Sociological Review*, 68, 939-967.
- Sacks, H., & Schegloff, E. A. (2002). Home position. *Gesture*, 2(2), 133-146.
- Schegloff, E.A. (1992). On talk and its institutional occasions. In P. Drew & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Talk at work: Social interaction in institutional settings*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.