Identification and Recognition in Telephone Conversation Openings

Emanuel A. Schegloff

   In this paper Schegloff considers how parties in a telephone conversation display and achieve identification and recognition of each other, i.e., manage to show and tell who they each are and whether each knows who the other is and whether or not he is recognized by the other. The caller and the answerer are shown to produce and use, in their first utterances and turns at talk, considerable resources for accomplishing the task.

   Telephone conversations are particularly valuable for dealing with these issues since the speakers do not have sensory access to each other except through their voices and speaking. Identification and recognition can be studied as these occur in the talk—audiotape recordings providing adequate access to the phenomena.

The scope and range of Schegloff's paper is extraordinary, for he not only addresses an interesting and important topic of study but also displays, in systematic and rigorous fashion, how conversational analysts work. The transcripts of actual telephone conversations are presented. These are arranged in subgroups which present the variety of methods used by speakers to display and achieve identification and recognition; a number of issues displayed in the data are explored, particularly those structural matters which can be studied by examining the turn-by-turn sequential organizations of utterances; and then an effort is made to develop a description and analysis of the systematics of the organizational structure of identification/recognition. The power of this approach is demonstrated in two ways: first, exploration and illumination of a heretofore unexamined topic, —how speakers display and achieve identification and recognition; and, second, presentation of the methodical procedures by which such work can be accomplished.

I

The work in which my colleagues and I have been engaged is concerned with the organization of social interaction. We bring to the materials with which we work—audio and videotapes of naturally occurring interaction, and transcripts of those tapes—an interest in detecting and describing the orderly phenomena of which conversation and interaction are composed, and an interest in depicting the systematic organizations by reference to which those phenomena are produced.

What people do on the telephone is talk. Conversations on the telephone are, accordingly, natural materials for investigators working in this area, not because of any special interest in the telephone, but because they are instances of conversational interaction.

Materials drawn from telephone conversation *can*, however, have special interest. One feature of materials in which the parties lack visual access to one another was specially useful early in our work, when it helped obviate arguments about the possibility of successfully studying conversation and its sequential organization without examining gesture, facial expression, and the like. Telephone conversation is naturally studied in this manner, and shows few differences from conversation in other settings and media. The materials we have examined include a substantial number of telephone conversations and there are few areas of investigation in which we have had occasion to segregate them by virtue of important (or even unimportant) differences in how phenomena were organized. Indeed, the gross similarity of telephone and other talk has contributed to our confidence that a great deal can be found out about the organization of conversational interaction without necessarily examining

video materials (however important and interesting it is to do so in any case). The talk people do on the telephone is not fundamentally different from the other talk they do.

Our work over the last several years has yielded the description of a variety of the orderly phenomena of which conversation is composed, and initial efforts at depicting the systematic sequential organizations by reference to which those phenomena are produced, such as the organization of turn-taking in conversation,[1] the organization of repair in conversation,[2] and, less systematically as yet, the organization of sequences.[3] A number of reports have dealt with elements of another type of sequential organization, the overall structural organization of the unit "a single conversation," which operates on openings, closings, and some aspects of what transpires in between, describing several sorts of sequences which are regularly involved.[4] It is in the overall structural organization of a conversation—in its opening and closing—that the distinctive characteristics of various "types" of conversation may most prominently appear. The opening is a place where the type of conversation being opened can be preferred, displayed, accepted, rejected, modified—in short, incipiently constituted by the parties to it.[5] With all the similarity between talk on the telephone and other talk settings—in the systematic ways turns are allocated, sequences built, trouble repaired, words selected, and the like—openings are a likely place in which to find differences. And, indeed, the openings of telephone conversations generally do have a distinctive shape. One element of it is this: we regularly find in the telephone openings a type of sequence not much found in "face-to-face" conversation—a sequence in which the parties identify and/or recognize one another. Even when no sequence devoted to this job occurs, the issue (identification/recognition) is worked through. This paper is about those sequences and that issue.

I do not report about this topic, however, because of its specialized appearance in telephone conversation, but because identification appears to be generically relevant in interaction and its recognitional variant especially important among humans.

When social behavior is differentiated by reference to its recipient or target, investigators can hardly escape the importance that attaches to the processes by which identification of recipients is made. Biologists, for example, concern themselves with the differential capacities of the various species to identify conspecifics, nestmates and intruders, males and females, conspecifics at various stages of life, members of various "castes," and even particular individuals and the methods by which such identifications are made.[6]

Humans, of course, make these sorts of identifications, both categorial and "recognitional," (i.e., of particular, "known" others), and dif-

ferentiate their behavior toward them accordingly. We are just beginning to appreciate the degree of detail to which such differentiation—by "recipient design"—is applicable, but a sense of its range may be gleaned from considering that on the one hand the very occurrence or not of interaction may be contingent on it, and on the other hand, should conversation be entered into, the selection of words in the talk will be sensitive to it (e.g., the reference terms employed).[7]   Identification is important, then, to all the domains in interaction in which a formally constituted system, built for anonymous usability (not for use by particular classes of speakers for particular classes of recipients), is used to produce particularized talk (turn-taking organization, sequence construction, and word selection are such domains). In regard to openings, it is especially worth noting its centrality to the "gatekeeping" issue for interaction concerned with which of those who are potential cointeractants actually enter into an occasion of interaction.

No elaborate consideration of gatekeeping for interaction can be entertained here. One of its basic rules may be noted, however. Grossly put, such persons may (or may be required to) enter into interaction who have done so before. Necessary qualification, refinement, and supplementation aside, I am noting in a slightly different way what others have noted before:[8]   that "acquaintanceship" is one major basis for the undertaking of an interaction. Indeed, the vast majority of conversational interactions must certainly be between "recurrent parties," i.e., parties who talk to one another recurrently. If access to interaction is organized, and therefore at least partially restricted, and acquaintanceship is one basis for its occurrence, then recognition by one person of another will be important because recognition is central to the possibility of "social relationships." It can, therefore, be expected to be subject to some potentially elaborate organization.

In human social interaction, identification and/or recognition of others is largely accomplished through sighting by one of the visual appearance of the other, as the few descriptions we have of these phenomena make amply clear.[9]   When personal recognition of "other" occurs, and especially when it is prospectively reciprocal, a display of its accomplishment, subtle or elaborate, is made, and constitutes a "social,"—as distinct from "cognitive"—event, an event in interaction therefore.[10] The celebrations of recognition and its importance in the classic texts of Western culture, in the problem of recognition under conditions of partial masking of identity, address themselves to these central features. In the return of Odysseus, markedly changed physical appearance frustrates recognition by intimates, and the action is stopped precisely between the achievement of recognition cognitively and its display as an interactional event;[11] the drama involved in the story of the

allocation of Isaac's inheritance between Jacob and Esau turns on a recognitional problem grounded in Isaac's failing eyesight.[12]

When recognition is made problematic (as in literary texts), its processes can come to have texture as events, to have an obvious interest, drama, and centrality. In the normal course of daily routine, however, and especially by virtue of their accomplishment by visual inspection in the "pre-beginning" of interaction, they are somewhat resistant to study and appreciation. What one biologist reports about the social insects is to a large degree true of humans (if we read "eyes" for "antennae"): "recognition. . .seems outwardly a casual matter, usually no more than a pause and sweep of the antennae over the other's body."[13] A body of materials in which the identification and recognition of potential interaction co-participants is routinely problematic and has its solution carried through in such a manner as to make it more readily accessible to empirical inspection is, therefore, of considerable potential value to students of the organization of social interaction.

Telephone conversations supply such a body of materials. In them, recognition is regularly enough relevant, cannot be accomplished visually, and cannot be accomplished before and as a condition for the beginning of the interaction. The work of recognition has a sequential locus in the talk, occupying or informing a sequence of conversational turns, and is thereby accessible to research approaches developed to deal with turns and sequences. Attention to these sequences may contribute to our knowledge of one type of conversational opening; and by exploiting the special "visibility" of interactional work on recognition on the telephone, it may contribute to our understanding of it in other settings of conversation and interaction as well.

This, then, is another of a series of studies on parts of conversational openings. Its data base is made up of about 450 openings, the parties to which vary on the standardly relevant parameters—age, sex, region, social class, etc.—which here, as elsewhere in our studies of the sequential organization of conversation, are not relevant to the matters I shall be concerned with. This series of studies (including the present contribution) may be thought of as preliminary studies for an eventual examination of the systematic organization of opening sections as parts of overall structural organization; or they may be thought of as "brush-clearing" studies for the interactional analysis of particular openings of particular conversations, serving to help "partial out" those aspects of an opening that are products of an underlying systematic organization so as to allow more pointed analysis of what is particularly being done in some particular conversational opening.[14]

I shall proceed in the following manner: In Section II, I display in a number of segments something of the range of data with which we need

to come to terms. In Sections III and IV, I discuss somewhat discursively several segments which allow bringing to notice some of the major themes underlying the organization with which we are dealing. In Section V, I begin again from the beginning, somewhat more analytically and systematically, introducing several new themes and points, and hopefully showing how the observations of Sections III and IV are systematically produced. I shall conclude with a discussion of the relationship of the two tacks I have taken.

II

For reasons that will become apparent, the sequential focus of identification/recognition work in the conversations with which we are concerned is in the second turn, i.e., the caller's first turn. Those turns are, overwhelmingly, constructed from a very small set of types of turn components. Nine types may be listed, with exemplary displays, some of which occur infrequently, and/or largely in combination with others. (See Appendix I for a glossary of symbols used in the transcripts. The arrows locate the phenomenon for which the segment is cited.)

1) greeting terms:

        A: H'llo:?
→   B: hHi:,   (1)
              (TG, #1)

        M: Hello
→   J: Hello   (2)
              (MDE, #91)

        C: Hello::,
→   A: Good morning.   (3)
              (NB, #112)

        B: Hello:,
→   R: Howdy.   (4)
              (ID, #277)

2) answerer's, presumed answerer's, or intended answerer's name or address term (in varying combinations, of first name, title + last name,[15] nickname, etc.) in one of a range of interrogative or quasi-interrogative intonation contours.

        C: Hello:.
→   M: Miz Parsons?   (5)
              (JG, #73a)

I: Hello,
⟶ N: Irene?   (6)
             (ID, #244)

L: Hello here.
⟶ S: Colonel Lehroff?   (7)
             (CDHQ, #353a)

C: Hello:
⟶ R: 'hh Mother?   (8)
             (JG, #41c)

M: Hello:
⟶ E: Gina?   (9)
             (MDE, Supp.)

M: Hello?
⟶ J: Marcia?   (10)
             (MDE, #99)

C: Hello?
⟶ G: · Charlie?   (11)
             (CF, #157)

H: Hello?
⟶ R: Harriet?   (12)
             (RB, #186)

3) answerer's, presumed answerer's, or intended an-
   swerer's name or address term (in varying combi-
   nations of name components) in one of a range of
   assertive, exclamatory, or terminal intonation
   contours.

C: Hello?
⟶ M: Charlie.   (13)
             (CF, #155)

T: Hello::,
⟶ E: Uh Tiny.   (14)
             (CDHQ, #306)

P: Hello?
⟶ L: Phil!   (15)
             (CDHQ, #299)

M: Hello
⟶ G: Mommy,   (16)
             (MDE, #98)

4) question or noticing concerning answerer's state

   P: Hello::,

➡ A: Are you awa:ke?   (17)

         (NB, #105)

   I: Hello:,

➡ A: Did I waken you dear,   (18)

         (ID, #235)

   AL   Hello,

➡ B: Hi. // C'n you talk?   (19)

         (DS, #184)

   F: Hello:,

➡ S: Hello. You're home.   (20)

         (RK, #190)

   F: Hello:,

➡ R: Franklin are you watching?   (21)

         (RK, #189)

5) "First topic" or "reason for the call"

   F: Hello:

➡ R: Whewillyoubedone.   (22)

         (JG, #55)

   F: (. . .)-o.

➡ C: Yeah I'm jus leaving.   (23)

         (JG, #55)

   M1: ((Hello))

➡ M2: What's goin' on out there, I

       understand y'got a robbery,   (24)

         (WGN, #2)[16]

   L: H'llo:,

➡ C: Hi, 'r my kids there?   (25)

         (LL, #8)

6) request to speak to another ("switchboard" request)

   A: Hello

➡ B: Is Jessie there?   (26)

         (NB, #118)

   S: ((Hello))

➡ B: Iz yur (eh) gramother there   (27)

         (JG, #62)

```
    M:   Hello:,
 ── C:   May I speak to Bonnie,                     (28)
            (ID, #289)

    A:   Hello:?
 ── I:   u̇ Can I speak to Dr. S _____           (29)
         please,
            (ID, #254)
```

7) self-identification[17]

```
    B:   H'llo?
 ── D:   Hi Bonnie. This is Dave.                   (30)
            (ID, #234a)

    R:   Hello,
 ── M:   Hey:: R:i:ck, thisiz Mark iz              (31)
         Bill in?
            (#198)

    M:   Hello?
 ── D:   Hi. = Thisiz David Williamson             (32)
            (JG, #34a)

    M:   Hello? =
 ── C:   = Hello it's me.                           (33)
            (MDE, Supp.)
```

8) Question re identity of answerer

```
    L:   Hello:,
 ── M:   H'llo, is this Kitty?                      (34)
            (LL, #27)

    M:   Yhello,
 ── L:   H'llo who's this,                          (35)
            (LL, #23)
```

9) a joke, or joke version of one of the above (e.g.,
   mimicked intonation, intendedly incorrect identi-
   fication, intendedly funny accent, etc.)

```
    Ba:  Hello?
 ── B:   Hello?
    Ba:  Hello?
 ── B:   Hello?                                      (36)
    Ba:  Hi Bonnie.
    B:   Hi he heheheheh 'hh
    Ba:        heheheh
            (ID, #287a)
```

```
        L:    H'llo::,
──►M:    H'llo::    ((intended intonation echo))
              (1.0)
        L:    H'llo? =                                              (37)
──►M:    = H'llo?    ((intended intonation echo))
        L:    Oh hi.
                  (LL, #9)

        C:    Hello?
──►G:    Grrreetins.    ((gutteral "r"))                          (38)
                  (CF, #160)

        C:    Hello?
──►G:    Helloooooo,                                               (39)
                  (CF, #160)

        C:    Hello?
──►G:    Is this the Communist Party Head-                        (40)
              quarters?
                  (CF, #147)

        M:    Hello?
──►G:    Hi = This is your daughter chewing                       (41)
              on beets.
                  (MDE, #93)
```

Very nearly all second turns are composed of these component types, singly (as presented above, for the most part) or, frequently, in combinations of various sorts. In fact, if one omits requests to speak to another (collection 6 above) as a single component or one of several (usually the other is a greeting which precedes), the overwhelming majority of second turns after "hello" are composed of collection 1 (greetings), collection 2 (other's name interrogative), collection 3 (other's name declarative), or a combination of collections 1 + 2 or 1 + 3. The various turn types that are constructed with these nine components and the various combinations of them initiate a range of different types of sequences: greeting sequences, request sequences, request for confirmation sequences, question/answer sequences, apology sequences (post "Did I wake you," for example), and others. In each of them, however, the identification/recognition issue is addressed.

It is worth noting that all the data segments displayed above have "hello" (however variously inflected) as their initial turn. Elsewhere,[18] I have examined the major other type of initial turn: self-identification. I tried to show that who answered a ringing phone, and with what type of

intial turn, was "recipient designed," even though the particular recipient was at that moment unknown. The determination of who should answer, and with what, is sensitive to putative orientations of an at-that-moment unknown caller to a set of potential answerers of the phone he has called. At a phone whose callers are not expectably recognizables and are not expectably oriented to answerers as recognizables, answerers' first turns routinely are designed to afford categorial confirmation that the caller reached what he intended, typically by self-identification (e.g., "American Airlines"), a self-identification which projects a type of identification for caller (e.g., "customer") and aspects of the type of conversation getting under way (e.g., "business"). For a phone whose callers may be oriented to a set of potential answerers who are recognizables, answerers' first turns regularly supply a voice sample—"hello" is its conventional vehicle—as materials from which confirmation of reaching the intended locus may be achieved, but no overt self-identification. The confirmation may be achieved by recognition, and the caller's first turn is the place in which such recognition, or trouble with it, can be displayed.

It is by reference to this placement that the turn-types constructed from the components listed above address the identification/recognition issue. Even the request to speak to another (the "switchboard request"), which seems to claim the nonrelevance of identification or recognition of current recipient,[19] displays a recognition of recipient as "not the intended recipient" or an inability to recognize answerer as intended recipient. The vast majority of second turns address the identification/recognition issue for caller. I will initially focus on the latter issue. For this focus it is useful to group together those second turn components which specifically initiate an indentification/recognition *sequence* (collections 2, 7, and 8) when constituting the sole or final component of the turn, and those which are informed by that issue while not addressing a sequence to it overtly (all the other components).[20] For simplicity of presentation, I will consider from the first group mainly the turn-type composed of interrogative name (collection 2 above), sometimes preceded by a greeting, and from the second group the turn-type composed of a greeting alone or greeting plus name in "assertive" intonation (collection 3).

III

Greetings are generally, and not incorrectly, treated as the first exchange of a conversation. It is important to note, however, that they are,

as well, the end of a phase of incipient interaction—what I referred to earlier as "pre-beginnings." Routinely, the actual exchange of greeting terms follows a set of other activities, such as lookings, eye aversions, pace changes, body, head, and arm maneuvers.[21] One important component of the pre-beginning is identification of other(s) in the scene. Among the possible outcomes of the pre-beginning are that no interaction is entered into; that a passing exchange of greetings only is undertaken;[22] that greetings are followed by further talk of variously projected length; or that some talk is begun but without greetings. If some talk is undertaken, the first turns regularly display (by each party for the other) understandings of the outcome of the pre-beginning phase. The types of turn employed begin to constitute a conversation of some type, and are selected, at least partially, by reference to determinations made in the pre-beginning, among them the identification made there. For example, a greeting, e.g., "Hi," in first turn can display a claim of recognition by its speaker of its recipient, and can make reciprocal recognition relevant, if it has not already occurred nearly simultaneously.[23] An "excuse me" in first turn can display an identification of its recipient by its speaker as a "stranger" (as well as displaying, for example, that something other than a full or casual conversation is being initially projected, but rather a single sequence, very likely of a "service" type). The proferring of a greeting can, then, be one way of displaying to another that he has been recognized, and can be a way of soliciting reciprocal recognition. The completion of a greeting exhange can involve, therefore, claims by the parties to the exchange that they have recognized each other.

On the telephone, visual access is denied, and typically there is no pre-beginning. But by the time of the caller's first turn, the answerer's first turn has occurred (with occasional exceptions), and with it, its voice and manner. A caller's use, in his first turn, of a greeting term alone, or a greeting term plus an address term "terminally intoned" or other of the earlier-listed components in this class, constitutes a claim by caller that he has recognized the answerer from the answerer's first turn. And it invites reciprocal recognition from the single, typically small turn it constitutes. In being selected from the set of possible turn-components at just the point that recognition of the answerer is claimed, it shows itself as well to be recipient-designed, i.e., selected by virtue of who the recipient is. It carries, then, the promise that the caller is, for this answerer, one who can be recognized from this resource. In doing so, it initiates an effort to have the identifications (in such cases, the recognitions) accomplished *en passant*, while doing an otherwise relevant part of the opening (a greeting exchange), and without building a special sequence to accomplish that work.

The doing of an initial greeting in second turn[24] has two aspects at least. First, it is the first part of a basic sequential unit we call an "adjacency pair," whose simplest form is a sequence of two turns, by different speakers, adjacently placed, typologically related such that the occurrence of some particular type of first part strongly constrains what occurs in the next turn to be one of a restricted set of second parts.[25] In the case of the adjacency pair initiated by a first greeting, of course, its recipient properly responds with a second greeting, or greeting return. Second, it is a claim to have recognized the answerer and a claim to have the answerer recognize the caller. These two aspects of the caller's initial "Hi" are intertwined. A first greeting having been done, a second greeting is what should relevantly occupy the next turn. But as the first greeting displays recognition, so will a second greeting; it will thus do more than complete the greeting exchange, it will stand as a claim that the answerer has reciprocally recognized the caller.

Regularly answerers do follow callers' initial greetings with return greetings, accomplishing thereby both an exchange of greetings and an exchange of recognitions.

A:	H'llo:?	
→ B:	hHi:,	(42)
→ A:	Hi:?	
	(TG, #1)	
M:	Hello	
→ J:	Hello	(43)
→ M:	Hi	
	(MDE, #91)	

A:	Hello::,	
→ B:	Hi:::,	(44)
→ A:	Oh: hi:: 'ow are you Agne::s,	
	(NB, #114)	

That is, the callers' "recipient-designed" use of such a turn type in T2 (as I shall hereafter refer to the second turn of the conversation, the caller's first turn) is regularly successful. It is employed with such recipients as callers suppose, and, on the whole, suppose correctly, will recognize them from a small voice sample. Recipients of such turns are aided in accomplishing the recognition by the information, supplied by the form of the turn, that the caller has rights, and grounds for supposing, that he can be so recognized. Such information can considerably restrict the set

of candidate recognizables they search to discover who the caller is. Recipients display their reciprocal recognition by doing a sequentially appropriate second part for the type of sequence initiated by the caller, a sequence which is (in the cases here under consideration) not overtly directed to identification, and can be occupied with some other opening-revelant job, such as greeting.

If answerers/recipients do not recognize callers from the initial "Hi" (or other sequence start, not overtly identificatory), several courses are available to them.

Sequentially, the initial greeting has made a second greeting relevant, but a second greeting will claim the answerer's recognition of the caller. Answerers who do not recognize the caller may withhold the return greeting in order not to claim a recognition they have not achieved. Thus:

```
          C:     Hello?
    ───►G:       Hello.                                    (45)
    ───►         (1.5)
                      (CF, #130)
          C:     Hello?
    ───►Y:       Hello Charles.                            (46)
    ───►         (0.2)
                      (CF, #145)
          L:     Hello,
    ───►B:       Hi Linda,                                 (47)
    ───►         (0.1)
                      (ID, #212a)
```

The caller's first turn is followed by a gap of silence.

Such a sequence of events is familiar to us from other instances of this sequential structure.[26] The first part of an adjacency pair not only makes one of a set of type-fitted second parts relevant in next turn, but typically displays a preference for one of them. Questions may be built to display preferences for yes or no answers; requests prefer grants rather than rejections; offers and invitations prefer acceptances, etc. The occurrence of a gap following the first part displays the incipient possible occurence of a dis- or less preferred second part. It affords the speaker of the first part an opportunity to back down from the turn-type he has done, revise it so that it displays a different preference (so that the second part that is apparently "in the cards" will be the preferred one for the reconstructed first part), etc. If the speaker of the first part does not do so, then its recipient may do the dispreferred second, or may continue to withhold it and do another pre-dispreferred, affording the speaker of the first part yet

another opportunity to modify it before the dispreferred second is done. He may do this by "questioning" all or part of the first part of the adjacency pair with what we have elsewhere termed a "next turn repair initiator (NTRI).[27]

In the sequential environment under discussion here, the first part greeting, as we have noted, involves more than the initiation of a greeting exchange; it invites recognition. The preferred next, then, is a display of recognition, a display which is accomplished by completing the adjacency pair which is the vehicle for the recognition exchange with a second greeting. The withholding of the second greeting may then be understood as pre-the dispreferred—no recognition.

The alternative courses which follow are familiar as well. The speaker of the first part, we noted, may modify his stance, may modify his turn, and back down from the constraint placed on the next turn. In the present sequence type, that would involve backing down from the claim that the recipient recognize him from a voice sample alone. One way of doing this is to supply additional resources for the recognition, which weakens the claim of degree of recognizability. The two sequences presented below follow this course:

```
        C:    Hello?
        Y:    Hello Charles.
——→           (0.2)                                          (48)
——→     Y:    This is Yolk.
        C:    Oh hello Yolk.
        Y:    How are you heh heh
        C:    Alr(hh)ight hah hah It's hh very
              funny to hear(hh) from you.
                    (CF, #145)


        L:    Hello,
        B:    Hi Linda,                                      (49)
——→           (0.1)
——→     B:    's Bonnie. =
        L:    = Yeh I know = I've been trying to call you
                    (ID, #212a)
```

In both segments, the upgrading of resources by the caller as a way of backing down from the strength of the initial claim to recognizability (i.e., from voice sample alone) is sufficient to allow the achievement of recognition, which is displayed in the next turn. In both cases as well, the snag in the sequence is further dealt with, in #49 by a claim that the full

self-identification was unnecessary, the recognition having been already achieved (and indeed, only the slightest of gaps had developed before B's upgrade). In #48, C recognizes caller, display by the "oh" (which marks both success and success "just now") that he had not recognized before, and produces the return greeting, but uses for it what I will call "the big hello," which is used with "long time no see" recipients or "unexpected" callers. Then, one turn later, he explicitly comments on the unexpectedness of this caller, finding therein a bit of warrant, and a diagnosis, for having failed to recognize from the voice sample alone.

The third of the segments we are examining, #45, in which a gap follows the T2 greeting, is resolved in a different manner. Here, the opportunity—indeed, given the length of the gap, the opportunities—for the caller to upgrade the recognitional resources are not taken. (Very likely we have here an instance of the sort of "option cycle" discussed in formal turn terms elsewhere,[28] the gap being occupied by alternating options for the prior speaker to continue—here to upgrade the resources—and for the recipient to start up—here, eventually with a repair initiator—the options being several times passed by the relevant party.) Finally, the recipient breaks the gap, with "who's this."

"Who's this" makes explicit, and embodies in a sequentially consequential turn, C's failure to recognize. Following, as it does, a turn in which is implicated an invitation to recognize, it disappoints that invitation. It thus appears to be the dispreferred next turn which the 1.5 second gap foreshadowed. Its form, however, is notable. It does not simply declare the failure of recognition, as is done, for example, in another segment in the corpus, "I can't place you." Rather it is a form of question we call a "next turn repair initiator" (NTRI).[29] NTRIs are directed to trouble of some sort in a prior turn, which the speaker of the prior turn has not repaired elsewhere in the prior turn, or in the "transition space" immediately following it. Generally, NTRIs afford the prior speaker, the speaker of the trouble source, another opportunity in the turn that follows to repair that trouble. If that is done, the speaker of the NTRI may, in the turn after *that,* do whatever turn-type was made sequentially appropriate by the turn that contained the trouble. Thus, if the trouble-source turn was a first part of an adjacency pair, its second part may follow the NTRI and the repair it solicits.

In the segment under examination here, the T2 "Hello" has been offered as the resource from which recognition should be achieved. The gap of 1.5 seconds has displayed the incipient failure of the recognition, and provided an opportunity for the caller to repair the turn, for example, by upgrading the resources from which the recognition might be made. She does not do so. "Who's this" located the source of

trouble—the insufficiency of the resources for achieving recognition—and provides another opportunity, in the turn that follows, for G to repair the trouble, for example, by giving her name. Had the sequence developed that way, and the name been a sufficient repair to allow recognition, then the still relevant second part of the greeting pair might have been produced. The sequence would then have gone:

<pre>
C: Hello?
G: Hello.
       (1.5)
C: Who's this.
G: ((Gloria))
C: ((Oh hi, Gloria.))
</pre>

In such a sequence, the caller would have been marked as the speaker of the trouble source, the difficulty having been with the resources supplied for recognition, as in #48 and #49.

The sequence, however, does not develop this way.

<pre>
C: Hello?
G: Hello.
       (1.5)
C: Who's this.   (49a)
C: Who is this. = This is your (0.2)
       friendly goddess,
G: OHhh, hhh, can I ask for a wish
                 (CF, #130)
</pre>

G somewhat turns the tables on C by affording *him* yet another opportunity to accomplish the recognition from less than a full self-identification, making his failure to recognize, rather than her failure to give her name, the trouble source. She does this by availing herself of a device available to recipients of questions, the "joke first answer."[30] Her "joke first answer" preserves the sequentially appropriate type of turn for the question it follows, a self-identification. But instead of self-identifying by name, she does a joke self-identification, and one which supplies potential clues for recognition (e.g., that she is a friend, that she is female, etc.) as well as a further voice sample. C does thereupon recognize her, displaying his recognition with the "success marker" described earlier, and continues not with a greeting return, but with a turn-type fitted to the joking self-identification that precedes it.

In the data segments I have examined, there are differences in who

ends up moving to fix the snag that the gap after the second turn
displays, with derived interactional consequences for who is "at fault,"
the caller for not supplying sufficient materials from which to be
recognized, or the recipient for failing to recognize. In all cases,
however, the gap in which a return greeting is momentarily withheld is
understood by the parties to display trouble with recognition. Whichever
of the parties breaks the silence, it is with identification-revelant talk.
And in cases in which an intitial gap after T2 is followed by the caller
with additional talk which is not identification-relevant and fails to
secure recognition, the same sequel may ensue, and ensue recurrently un-
til some next gap is followed by identification-relevant talk.
For example:

```
          M:     Hello?
          R:     Hello wise guy.
  ——►            (1.0)
          R:     What's going on:.
  ——►            (0.3)                                    (50)
          R:     I just received your letter. I don't
                 understand all of it.
  ——►            (1.8)
  ——► R:         This is Reah.
          M:     Oh. (0.2) I didn't even recognize your voi:ce.
          R:     It's about three octaves lower. (0.1)
                 Right?
          M:     No  it's  about  three  octaves
                 higher.
                         (MDE, Supp.)
```

When the self-identification is done, recognition is achieved, and a next
turn displays it. (Of course, it happens that even self-identification does
not achieve recognition right away, and sometimes not at all, as in wrong
number calls.)

   The segments I have examined all began with a greeting or greeting +
address term in second turn. But as was noted at the beginning of this
discussion, this T2 turn-type was selected for convenience from the set of
T2 turn-types which do not overtly address the identification issue. We
have found that the identification theme underlies these sequences, their
success being at the same time a success of reciprocal recognition, and
their failure being not a failure of greetings but a failure of recognition.
This holds equally true for the other not overtly identificational turn-

types which get used in the caller's first turn. If recognition, or at least some identification, is not achievable from that turn, then the identification issue is raised in the ensuing turn. Regularly, of course, no such trouble arises, because the use of a nonidentificational turn-type at T2 is recipient-designed. When it is not, or when it fails despite its recipient design, then identification trouble becomes overt. To cite but one instance: even the call to a bank during a robbery answered by the robber cited earlier (#24) shows this sequence:

         M1:   ((Hello))
         M2:   What's going' on out there, I
                understand y'got a robbery,
    ⟶   (0.8)
⟶   M1:   Uh yes, who's this speaking,
                please?
         M2:   WGN   (51)
         M1:   WGN?
         M2:   Yessir,
                (0.7)
         M1:   Well this is the robber, (0.2) or
                the so- so called robber, I guess,
                        (WGN, #2)

It is because nearly every turn-type in the second turn which appears to evade the identification/recognition issue is vulnerable to its immediate appearance—by a "who's this" or by a gap which is understood as displaying the need for self-identification—that it seems that the identification/recognition issue is generically relevant at second turn, whatever the overt composition of the utterance placed there.

Two turn-types for T2 are a partial exception here, for they may delay the relevance of identification by a turn or two. Both the switchboard request at T2 ("May I speak to. . .?" "Is X there?") and some questions regarding the answerer's state (in particular "Did I wake you?") may get their answers with no gap, without that displaying claimed recognition by answerer of caller. It seems likely that this is so because each of these turn-types is a possible pretermination of conversation with this answerer at this time (the "Did I wake you?" question being a possible "pre-first-topic closing offering,"[31] to be followed, if answered positively, with an offer to call back). However, should the caller try to press beyond this sequence without self-identification and without having been recognized, except for proceeding to a closing sequence, the identification issue regularly gets raised. For example:

```
        F:      Heelo.
  ──►    O:      Hello, iz uh Frank there?
        F:      ·hh Well no he isn't                        (52)
  ──►    O:      Uh he out. Huh.
  ──►    F:      ·hhh U: h he wetuh- who am I
                speaking with?
                with?
                        (JG, #47)
```

```
        I:      Hello:,
  ──►    A:      Did I waken you dear,
  ──►            (0.5)                                      (53)
        I:      nn yeah. hn·.
  ──►    A:      D'you want to call me back when
                you're awake?
  ──►    I:      Who is this.
                        (ID, #235)
```

It appears then that identification/recognition is generically relevant at the very beginning, at best deferable for a turn or two if it appears the conversation between the current parties may terminate thereafter. This is so whether the turns overtly address the matter or not. We have been examining the set of cases in which they do not. We will shortly turn to the other major class of turn-types, those which are overtly addressed to the identification/recognition issue at T2. Before doing so, two additional matters concerning the class we have been discussing require brief treatment: deception and mistakes.

We have noted that the not-overtly identificational second turn is recipient-designed, selected for use to such a recipient as caller supposes will recognize him from it. The caller thereby displays a claim on the answerer and on their relationship. Failure of the recipient to recognize may reflect on the state of the relationship, and we have seen that there can be some manuevering sequentially which can place the blame on one or another party. Another possibility is open to the nonrecognizing answerer than withholding a next turn, and that is deception, in which the answerer returns the greeting (if that is what is required by the turn-type done at T2) although no recognition has been accomplished. It is not unlikely that many answerers' return greetings are deceptions when produced, but are never "caught" because a next turn by the caller suffices to allow the answerer to achieve the recognition he had not achieved at the moment of the claim, a resource on which answerers may rely in choosing this tack. Such deceptive uses may thus routinely escape notice

both by callers and by analysts. They do, however, sometimes become visible, and sometimes are "caught." A few instances will suffice:

```
        A:   Hello
        B:   Hi:                                               (54)
 ━▶     A:   Hi: (0.3) Oh Hi Robin
                        (EN, #183)
```

Earlier we noted the use of some "oh"'s to mark success and to mark success "just now." In #54 above, the "oh" displays the point at which recognition is achieved, and the re-greeting is proved to be "honest" by affixing the caller's name to it. But thereby we (and caller) are allowed to see that A's first "Hi" in T3 was deceptive; it claimed recognition, although, it turns out, it had not been achieved.

Another, more dramatic, instance:

```
        S:   Hello
        R:   Yeah. Hi:::. How are you boyfriend
 ━▶     S:   I'm good. How are you.
 ━▶     R:   Ha ha ha. You don't know which
             of these girls you eh that talking
             to you.
        S:   Huh?
 ━▶     R:   You do not know which one of
             your girlfriends is talking to you.
        S:   Yes I do.
 ━▶     R:   You do.
        S:   Yeah.                                             (55)
 ━▶     R:   And so who.
        S:   Is this Mary?
 ━▶     R:   Ahh haa! I knew it, see::, I knew
             I wasn't the only girl you had on
             your string.·
             (1.0)
        R:   This is Lena.
        S:   Lena! // How are ya honey.
        R:   Ha ha
        R:   Oh I'm fine. How are you. Listen,
             how did. . .
                        (JG, #49)
```

In this segment, some fairly overt joking is going on, the elderly lady caller clearly enough not being S's girlfriend. Still, the sequence displays a direct orientation to the possibility of deceptive claims of recognition, as does the following segment, in which a young teenage boy calls his mother at work and disguises his voice:

```
        C:   Dresses?
             (0.8)
        R:   Oh. Hi Cathy, ((disguised voice))
  ───►C:     Hello:
  ───►R:     (Hewo) d'ya know who this is?
        C:   Yeah.
  ───►R:     'hh Who.
        C:   This is my boyfriend?                                  (56)
        R:   'hh Huh?
        C:   Are you my boyfriend?
        R:   Uh huh,
        C:   Oh. Okay.
             (0.5)
        R:   Okay whaddiyuh wanna eat for dinner.
                  (JG, Supp.)
```

The deception of answerers' recognition claims can, then, be matched by deception on the caller's part. And such deception seems aimed at luring the answerer into making a mistaken recognition. Such mistaken recognitions, of course, occur without a deception as bait. Thus:

```
        IL:  Hello;:,
        D:   Hi:.
  ───►IL:    Hi Mickey,
  ───►D:     No it's Debbie . . .                                   (57)
              •
              •
              •
  ───►IL:    Yih sounded like Mickey.// We expected
             Mickey,
                  (ID, #292)

        M1:  Hello?
        M2:  Hello?    ((intonation echo))
  ───►M1:    Hi.
        M2:  Hi, Howaryou.
```

```
          M1: Okay, Howaryou.
          M2: I'm just fine thank you.                    (58)
          M1: Did you get the note?
          M2: What note.
  ──►M1: Oh it's Gary,
          M2: Yeah,
  ──►M1: Oh I'm sorry.
          M2: (      ) that's okay.
                (LL, #18)
```

The second of these cases especially can remind us that even when the shoals of recognition appear to have been skirted in the opening sequences, identification/recognition issues may yet need to be overtly addressed; to the risks of nonrecognition are added those of misrecognition.

IV

The caller's first turns which initiate a sequence specially directed to the identification issue fall into two classes: those directed to self-identification, and those that appear occupied with identification of the answerer.

On the whole, self-identification is not much done in the caller's first turn.[32] Examination of those openings in which it does occur reveals:

a. Many of the instances have a caller's first turn in the *form* of a self-identification which nonetheless operates in the manner of the turn-types discussed in the previous section. For example:

```
          M:   Hello? =
  ──►G:   = Hello it's me.                              (59)
          M:   Hi.
                (MDE, Supp.)
```

```
          P:   Hallo? =
  ──►C:   = Hi it's only me.                            (60)
          P:   Hallo there, you,
                (CG, #182a)
```

In such openings, though the form of caller's first turn is self-identifica-tory, it is largely by voice recognition (supplemented by the clue supplied by use of the "It's me" form, which may be used specially by nuclear family members) that it works.

   b. Another subset of the instances have a self-identification in the caller's first turn followed in that turn by another turn component, regu-larly the first part of an adjacency pair. It is the latter turn component which is then sequentially implicative, constraining the next turn, and the self-identification does not in that case occupy its own sequence. Two main types of component follow the self-identification: switchboard requests and "How are you" type questions. Thus:

> S: Hello:.
> → P: Pt. 'hh H:i. This is Penny Rankin
>   from Lincoln I'm a friend of Pat's.
>   can I speak t'her at all?   (61)
> S: She:re.
>   (RF, #180)

> C: Hello.
> → M: Good evening. My name is Murray
>   Murray and (I've called to talk to   (62)
>   Alice Andrews).
> C: (Yes, just a minute).
>   (JG, #53)

"Switchboard requests" are regularly followed by an identification ques-tion (e.g., "who's this," "who is calling," etc.) from the answerer, and the cases above appear to be anticipations of this question. Such antici-pation is especially in point when the one being asked for is not usually associated with that number, in which case the unprefaced switchboard request is vulnerable to being heard as a wrong number. This is the case in #61 above, and is clearly shown in #63.

> I: Hello:,
> → JM: Hello. i- This is Jan's mother.   (63)
> I: Oh yes.
> JM: Is Jan there by any chance?
>   (ID, #233)

Here the switchboard request is started in turn 2 ("i-" being the start of

"is Jan there . . ."), but is cut off to do a self-identification first. It is also characteristic, though not invariable, about T2 preswitchboard self-identifications that they are not by first name (hence for recognition), but are by first name + last name, sometimes by, or supplemented by, recognitional descriptions, and that they sometimes use the frame that shows that the self-identification is not intended to solicit recognition: "My name is."

Another component type that follows a T2 self-identification in our corpus is the "How are you" type question.

> R: Hello.
> ➞L: Hi. Rob. This is Laurie. How's
>   everything.   (64)
> R: ((sniff)) Pretty good. How 'bout you.
> L: Jus' fine. The reason I called was
>   ta ask . . .
>   (LM, #199)

Such cases share with others, in which T2 self-identification is not followed by another turn component, the feature of projecting an abbreviated opening and a quick move to first topic or reason for the call. An instance of such abbreviation in which the T2 self-identification is not followed by another component:

> C: Hello.
> ➞G: Charlie? = Gene.
> C: Oh, Hi. =   (65)
> ➞G: = The whole weekend I forgot to tell
>   you, I have this book, . . .
>   (CF, #164)

These cases, then, appear to be related to #22–25, in which first topic is initiated in the caller's first turn. Here, the risks of nonrecognition entailed by that procedure are avoided by self-identification in the caller's first turn, at the cost of one turn (the first topic being initiated in the caller's second turn) but avoiding a fully expanded opening section.[33]

The caller's first turn is not the main position for self-identification. Such self-identifications as appear there seem to be, for the most part, derivative from other sequential interests. When self-identification by name is done, it mainly occurs in the caller's second turn. When the

opening develops in that way, the caller's first turn is occupied with the
major turn-types yet to be discussed here: an address term for the an-
swerer (or intended or presumed answerer), in interrogative or quasi-
interrogative intonation, alone or preceded by a greeting term. Because
the use of title + last name in that position frequently displays that
recognition is not a relevant outcome of the sequence,[34] I will not deal
with cases of that sort in what follows.

Sometimes, of course, the use of interrogative name in the caller's first
turn displays a real uncertainty in the caller's recognition of the answerer
from the initial "hello." Sometimes, indeed, the caller's recognition of
the answerer is incorrect, as in several calls in our corpus in which mother
and daughter are mistaken for each other. For example:

```
        M:   Hello?
——►E:   Tina?
        M:   This is Martha.
——►E:   Well if I had said "Martha" you
             would've said "This is Tina".              (66)
        M:   Oh, Esther! // hih hih
        E:                    (yah) hih hih heh heh hah
        E:    ⌈Hi:*
        M:    ⌊hih heh* hah
——►M:   ˙hhh Hi:: I didn' recognize your
             voi:ce. Either.
                 (MDE, Supp.)
```

In some cases, then, when the caller's "guess" at T2 is correct, it is
marked as uncertain. The form thus raises the issue of the possible in-
adequacy of voice sample for recognition, a theme to which we shall
return. It should be noted, however, that in many cases of this form of
T2, caller's recognition of the answerer nonetheless seems certain enough
(consider again #65 above, in which interrogative name is used, though it
appears that the caller does not doubt identity of answerer); and even
when it does reflect a serious uncertainty, the form has other sequential
uses and consequences as well.

One sequential consequence of the "confirmation-request" form of
this turn-type may be appreciated by contrast with a form of turn iden-
tical to it in all respects but intonation, and that is "assertative" name
with or without a preceding greeting. We have seen that the latter form
constrains its recipient to do a greeting in return, which displays recip-
rocal recognition (whether achieved or not). The alternative, we saw, was

to ask the caller for a self-identification, which displays a potential failure, and disappoints an expectation the caller claimed a right to have.[35] The "interrogative name" form of second turn adds to these possibilities "confirmation" and "disconfirmation + correction" (and overwhelmingly it is the former of these which occurs) as turn-types for next turn, both possibilities allowing avoidance of identification/recognition of caller at that turn position. It is, then, a more flexible instrument than the same components in "assertative" or "declarative" intonation, in allowing, but not requiring, deferral of recognition of a caller.

Most importantly, interrogative name in caller's first turn operates as a "presequence." That term is used to collect a variety of turn-types which initiate a sequence understood to be specifically preliminary to a later turn or sequence, one which will be placed in the presequence speaker's next turn or not, depending on what is placed in the turn following the presequence. The most accessible instance is the preinvitation; questions of the form "Are you doing anything?" or "What are you doing?"—especially just after, or even in, the opening—are understood to preface an invitation; if the answer to the preinvitation is "no" or "nothing," the next turn will have the invitation; other answer types may result in no invitation, or in a report of what the invitation would have been, e.g., "I was gonna say let's go to the movies." A range of sequence types can take "pre-"s; there are prerequests, preannouncements,[36] etc., as well as the "generalized pre-"—the summons—described elsewhere.[37] The T2 interrogative name takes a form identical to some summonses, but is more properly understood as a pre–self-identification.

One use of some presequences, for example of preinvitations, is the avoidance of dispreferred second parts. A prospective inviter can guard against the possibility of an invitation being rejected by using a preinvitation first; some answers to the preinvitation can project acceptance of the invitation, others its prospective rejection, and in the latter case the invitation may be withheld.

Another use of some presequences, for example of prerequests, is the avoidance of relatively less preferred first parts of adjacency pairs. For some projected outcomes, alternative sequential routes are possible, of which one may be structurally preferred to another. Thus, for example, my late colleague Harvey Sacks argued that offers were structurally preferred to requests as a way of getting transfers accomplished. Where such preferences between alternative sequence types, and therefore between alternative first parts of adjacency pairs, operate, a presequence can elicit from its recipient the preferred first part. Thus, a prerequest can get an offer next, obviating the need for actually doing the request (sometimes; the offer may be of something other than the projected request).

The use of an address term in interrogative or quasi-interrogative into-
nation in caller's first turn operates in the second of these ways. Al-
though recognitional identification is the preferred form of identifica-
tion[38] (most importantly for reference to third persons, but for self-iden-
tification as well), and name is the preferred form of recognitional iden-
tification, all the evidence we have so far reviewed points to the fact that
for achieving recognition from co-participant, self-identification by
name is less preferred than recognition by "inspection." The heavy use
of non-identification-relevant turn-types discussed in the preceding sec-
tion, and the substantial absence of self-identification from the second
turn even when identification is directly addressed in a sequential locus in
which identification/recognition is focused and where the answerer's
initial, strong interest is in "who is calling," all point to the relative dis-
preference for self-identification as a route for achieving recognition.
How does interrogative name in the caller's first turn serve as a pre-self-
identification which can potentially avoid self-identification? And why is
it needed?

It will have been noted that I have frequently referred to the intonation
of the turn-type under discussion as "quasi-interrogative." Sometimes,
and especially when displaying a serious doubt about the identity of the
answerer, callers employ a fully inflected interrogative intonation (in
many of these cases following a slight gap of silence after the first
"hello"). But for many of the occurrences of the turn-type being exam-
ined, a less inflected intonation is used (hence "quasi-interrogative"),
rather like what has elsewhere been termed a "try-marker."[39] In the
organization of reference to persons in conversation, recognitional refer-
ence (of which name is the basic type) is the preferred reference form "if
possible." The latter constraint concerns a supposition of the speaker
that his current recipient knows the one being referred to, and that the
recipient can be expected to suppose that the speaker so supposed. This is
a specification, in the domain of reference to persons, of the general
recipient design preference: don't tell the recipient what you ought to
suppose he already knows; use it. This principle builds in a preference to
"oversuppose and undertell." But even with "oversupposition," or be-
cause of it, a speaker may suppose a recipient knows the one to be
referred to (and knows that one by name), but have doubts about it. In
such cases, a speaker regularly employs the name with a slight upward
(or "quasi-interrogative") intonation, marking the reference as a "try."
It is this intonation which characterizes the caller's T2 pre-self-identifica-
tion use of answerer's name.

When recognition of self by other is at issue, as it is at T2, the
speaker's supposition concerns whether recipient knows him, and by

what resource that recognition can be secured; the relevant recognitional resource may be voice sample. But here the preference to oversuppose and undertell may be especially guarded against oversupposition, if not countered by an inclination to undersuppose and overtell,[40] avoiding the interactional consequence of presumptuous and embarrassingly disappointed claims, and the technical organizational consequence of dispreferred sequence expansion. When the supposition that the recipient can recognize by voice sample is doubted, then the try-marker may be employed, qualifying not the recipient's knowing who he (recipient) is, and not (in these cases) the speaker's knowing who the recipient is, but qualifying the supposition that the recipient will know, from the voice sample which that turn supplies, who the speaker (i.e., caller) is.[41] The reciprocity of recognition is nicely caught in the use of form which also can display the possible inadequacy of voice sample for the caller's recognition of the answerer.

The try-marked address term in the caller's first turn can then work as a pre-self-identification by (1) providing a voice sample, (2) displaying a doubt that the recipient will be able to recognize the caller from it, (3) providing a next turn in which the recipient can display recognition if it is achieved, (4) providing an option in the next turn which will not exhibit failure of recognition if recognition does not occur, and thereby (5) allowing caller to supply, and to project the possibility of supplying, in his second turn, self-identification by name from which the recipient can achieve recognition, if recognition is not achieved from the T2 turn and displayed in the turn following. The pre-self-identification thus provides the possibility of success without recourse to the less preferred route of self-identification, while retaining the possibility of the less preferred route should the presequence not avoid it.

The pre-self-identification can have a number of outcomes. Its greatest success, achieved in a substantial proportion of the cases in which it is used, is "evidenced recognition" in next turn. From the voice sample it supplies, and sometimes from other "clues" that are put into the turn (for example, such wholly or partially self-identifying address terms as "Mommy"), the answerer achieves a recognition, and displays it in the next turn in a way that obviates the possibility of deception. The basic form of evidence is inclusion in the recognition-exhibiting turn of the caller's name, usually as an address term, occasionally as a "try."

```
        A:   Hello.
——→B:   Connie?                                           (67)
——→A:   Yeah Joanie
             (JG, #65a)
```

```
        I:      Hello:,
    ─►B:        H'llo Ilse?                                    (68)
    ─►I:        Yes. Be:tty.
                    (ID, #231)

        F:     ┌Hello?*
        M:     └Hello,*                                        (69)
    ─►M:        H'llo, Donna?
    ─►F:        Oh. yeah, Hi Jim,
                    (JH, #86)

        I:      Hello:,
    ─►D:        Hello mo:m?                                    (70)
    ─►I:        Debbie?
                    (ID, #296)
```

No self-identification by name is then in point, and the opening continues.

A closely related but somewhat weaker class of outcomes, which adds another substantial proportion of cases, is that of "unevidenced recognition claims." Again, the device to display a claim of recognition is a greeting term. It may occupy the turn (after the pre-self-identification) alone, or it may be preceded by the "oh" previously described as a marker of "success" and "success just now," which upgrades its strength as a claim of recognition.

```
        A:      Hello:?
    ─►B:        Shar'n?                                        (71)
    ─►A:        Hi!
                    (RB, #185)

        C:      Hello.
    ─►M:        Hello, Charlie?                                (72)
    ─►C:        Oh, hi.
                    (CF, #153)
```

It may also be upgraded by the addition after it of other turn components, especially first parts of adjacency pairs (the characteristic one in this sequential environment being "How are you") which set constraints on the next turn to be a fitted second part, and thereby immediately advance the opening past identification.

```
       C:   Hello?
─── M:   Hello, Charlie?
─── C:   Oh hi. // How are you.                    (73)
       M:            How are you.
       M:   Hey listen . . .
               (CF, #146)
```

Or the greeting as recognition claim may be upgraded productionally, by raised amplitude, pitch, or duration.

```
       S:   Hello::?
─── J:   H'llo, Sima?                              (74)
─── S:   hhhHI!
               (TAC, #122)
```

The import of these unevidenced recognition claims can be equivocal. Regularly, they are taken by callers to display recognition. An exchange of recognitions is thereby completed, no self-identification by caller is necessary, and the opening proceeds to other components. Sometimes, however, especially when the recognition-marking greeting is not upgraded, the caller proceeds to a self-identification in his second turn anyway, perhaps sensitive to the deception potential of an unevidenced recognition claim, and the inclination to undersuppose, or at least not press oversupposition too far.[42]

```
       B:   'hhh Hello,
─── Ba:  Hi Bonnie,
─── B:   Hi. =                                     (75)
─── Ba:  = It's Barbie. =
       B:   = Hi.
               (ID, #275a)

       L:   H'llo:,
            (0.3)
─── M:   Hello, hi Laura,                          (76)
─── L:   Hi:
─── M:   Howyadoin it's Michael.
       L:   Hi Michael, how are you.
               (LL, #30)

       J:   Hello,
─── B:   Hello Jim?
```

➖➡J: Hi-,   (77)
➖➡B: Hi, it's Bonnie.
　　J: Yeah I know
　　　　　(ID, #246)

The "upgraded" recognition claims, thus, appear to operate like the evidenced recognitions in allowing deletion of self-identification by caller, and thus shade into that class of next turns to the presequence.

   The major class of next turns after the pre-self-identification is even more equivocal. The prototype turn component here is "yes" or "yeah," but the range of its intonational shadings is vast, and its sequential import seems at least partially tied to them. In a very large proportion of the cases, "yeah" or "yes" in next turn is treated by caller as evidencing the failure of the presequence to achieve recognition by the answerer, and the projected self-identification is then produced in the caller's second turn. For example:

　　C: Hello?
➖➡S: Hi. Cathy?
➖➡C: Yeah?   (78)
➖➡S: Stanley.
　　C: Hi Stan,
　　　　　(JG, Supp.)

　　L: H'llo:
➖➡P: Laura?
➖➡L: Yeah,   (79)
➖➡P: This is Pam.
　　L: Hi.
　　　　　(LL, #13)

　　M: Hello.
➖➡C: Hello, Mary?
➖➡M: Yes?   (80)
➖➡C: Hi. This is Bernie Hunter.
　　M: Oh hello. How are you.
　　　　　(CF, #177)

But even the apparently polar intonational values—a clearly interrogative "Yes?" or an emphatically assertive "yeah!"—which might appear to display confirmation-of-answerer's-identity-but-no-recognition-of-caller on the one hand, and confirmation + recognition on the other, do

not unequivocally elicit regular sequels. There are T4 self-identifications
after enthusiastic "yeah"'s which might be taken to exhibit recognition:

H:	Hello?	
➤ G:	Henry?	(81)
➤ H:	Yeah!	
➤ G:	Yeah. It's Gary. Is Neil there?	
	(LL, #33)	

E:	Hello,	
➤ G:	Eddy,	
➤ E:	Ye:h.	(82)
➤ G:	Guy Huston.	
	(NB, #109a)	

And caller may not self-identify by name in fourth turn after a pre-self-
identification, even when the prior turn has been a fully interrogative
"Yes?". For example:[43]

L:	H'llo,	
➤ E:	Laura?	
➤	(0.5)	(83)
➤ L:	Yeah?	
➤ E:	Hi,	
	(0.5)	
L:	Hi. // Erin?	
E:	Didju-	
E:	Yeah.	
	(LL, #17)	

H:	H'llo:?	
➤ R:	Harriet?	
➤ H:	Yeah?	(84)
➤ R:	Hi!	
H:	Hi:.	
	(RB, #186)	

C:	Hello.	
➤ J:	Hello, Charlie?	
➤ C:	Yeah?	(85)
➤ J:	Did I wake you up?	
C:	No. It's alright.	
	(CF, #171)	

But it is not only after interrogative "yeah?" that the callers may fail
to deliver in their second turn what they apparently had prefigured in
their first. In 25 of approximately 60 calls in which callers did an inter-
rogative or quasi-interrogative address term in T2 or its equivalent, no
self-identification by name appears in T4 or its equivalent. Instead, these
second turns by callers contain all the various turn components earlier
listed as components of T2, except the one actually used in the preceding
T2 in that call. Thus, roughly half of the 25 are composed of greetings
and/or some version of the "how are you" question, 3 are "Did I wake
you"s, 3 are switchboard requests, 5 start first topic, and one is a mock
self-identification:

```
          A:    Hello:,
 ──►B:    Hello M::A?
 ──►A:    Ye:AH! =                                          (86)
 ──►B:     = It's m:e.
          (RF, #179)
```

Those components behave sequentially in T4 as they did in T2: they in-
vite recognition from less than name self-identification, but (1) they do
not require it at T3, which lowers the degree of their claim, (2) they sup-
ply a second voice sample, which upgrades the resources for recognition
that have been provided, and (3) in a higher proportion of the cases, the
composition of the turn provides additional clues for recognition (for
example, in the five first topic starts).

The withholding of self-identification by name from T4 as well as T2,
when T2 has prefigured it, supplies additional evidence of the relative
dispreference for that recognition resource, and the persistence of the
effort to secure recognition from inspection. It shows a second way in
which the pre-self-identification contributes to the potential avoidance of
self-identification. Not only does it get a "safer" (i.e., from "who's
this") position for possible recognition at T3, but if recognition does not
occur there, the other less-than-self-identification turn-types may be
tried at T4 and get recognition at T5. Furthermore, the persistence of the
effort to get recognized without self-identification at T4 can inform
answerer that the caller has reason to suppose such recognition is pos-
sible, even if not at T2. Indeed, in only two cases of the 25 in which T4
employs a non-self-identificatory turn-type, does the "who's this" (to
which it is, of course vulnerable) occur. And in one of them, the "who's
this" follows a switchboard request in T4, a turn-type regularly followed
by "who's this."[44] In the other 23 cases, recognition is secured without
self-identification. Sometimes, it is evidenced recognition in T5:

```
              B:    Hello?
              J:    H'llo, Barb?
              B:    Mmhm?                                    (87)
              J:    Is uh: Larry there?
───►B:    No he's not home yet Jim, . . .
                    (JH, #81)
```

Sometimes the recognition is achieved and evidenced only late in T5:

```
              M:    Hello,
              C:    H'llo Marcia?
              M:    Yea:h.                                   (88)
              C:    Oh it's good to heah yur voice-
                    sound like yur in a hurry though.
───►M:    'hh Yea:h kind of- hi C- is- you're
                    home! Carolyn.
                    (MDE, #102)
```

Sometimes, the evidence of recognition does not come until a later time, but caller appears to "mark time" until it appears:

```
              J:    Research Design,
              P:    Jim?
              J:    Yeah.
              P:    Wha' d'ya say.                           (89)
              J:    Oh:: not much.
              P:    What's doin.
───►J:    Not a damn thing Jeff.
                    (JG, #66)
```

Sometimes, no evidence from address terms ever appears. It is completion of one sequence after another through which recognition is evidenced. The pre-self-identification thus has considerable success in allowing avoidance of self-identification.

Still, most openings in which a pre-self-identification is employed at T2 have a self-identification done at T4. And, in most cases, a display of recognition occurs in the next turn, and reciprocal recognition has been achieved (see #78–80). But it must be recalled that self-identification by name is only a resource, although the basic one. Recognition still must be achieved by its recipient, and this is not guaranteed. This is so especially since those doing a self-identification will include those who could not

suppose they could be recognized by inspection at T2, and who could not suppose that they could be recognized by inspection at T4: in short, those whose supposition of recognizability by this recipient is tinged with doubt. And, we noted earlier, T4 self-identification by name could be try-marked.

Indeed, the same evidences of trouble in accomplishing the recognition after a non-self-identificatory turn-type at T2 can be found after self-identification at T4. Recognition may not come directly upon provision of the name, and the delay can reflect trouble in recognizing even from that resource.[45]

C:	Hello: ((weak))	
L:	H'llo, Cathy?	
C:	Yeah?	
→L:	This is Lorraine.	(90)
→	(0.5)	
C:	Oh hi honey, how//areya.	
	(JG, Supp.)	

L:	H'llo:,	
B:	H'llo Lana?	
L:	Yeah?	(91)
→B:	This' Brigette.	
→	(0.3)	
L:	Hi.	
	(LL, #31)	

C:	Hello?	
M:	Charles?	
C:	Yeah?	(92)
→M:	Hi this's Marian.	
→	(0.2)	
C:	Oh, hi.	
	(CF, #167)	

In these cases, a display of recognition eventually comes, after a gap. It is notable that the caller does not break into the gap to add further resources, as was the case with gaps after the not overtly identificatory T2 turn-types. Of course, it must be recalled that, here, callers have already supplied the basic resource for securing recognition. With what shall they upgrade the resources?

   Still, there is a version of that phenomenon (in which the caller up-
grades when trouble is exhibited) at T4 as well. It is, however, a bit
subtler than at T2. Here, the self-identification offered is first name. It is
delivered in turn-terminal intonation. If there is not an immediate start
of a recognition display, even if no appreciable gap develops, the caller
upgrades the resources—by the addition of last name.

        L: H'llo:,
        M: Laura,
        L: Ye:s,   ((intonation echo))   (93)
——▶M: It's Peter. (0.7) Williams.
        L: HI: just a minute, let me close the
             uh thing.
               (LL, #25)

        B: Hello,
        A: Hi. Susan?
        B: Ye:s,   (94)
——▶A: This's Judith. Rossman.
        B: Judith!
              (TAC, #121)

We do not find the gap after self-identification broken by the caller at T4
as we did at T2 because the caller may not let it develop in the first place.
In these cases, it appears that callers are hyperalert to the possible insuf-
ficiency of first names as self-identifications, and at the first evidence
that recognition is not occurring—no immediate recognition at comple-
tion of their turn—they are ready to supplement. It is of interest then to
note that in both cases, when recognition *does* occur, it is displayed with
a much upgraded recognition display—the "big hello." It is the "big
hello" that callers can look for at the very beginning of their self-identi-
fication, and, not finding its beginning there, know that they may need
to supplement their self-identification. The basis for expecting a "big
hello" and the need to supplement the basic "first name" to get recogni-
tion cannot be elaborated here.[46]
   Finally, we find after the T4 self-identification the other development
noted earlier in the T2 environment: a gap develops, the caller does not
break it with supplementary resources, and the recipient initiates repair.

        K: Hello,
        B: Kim, // it's Bonnie.
        K: Yeah.

⟶   (0.4)
⟶K: Who?   (95)
B: Bonnie. =
K: = Hi, where we//re you.
B: Remember ME:?
K: Where were you. = I though you said
       Connie. ( )
              (ID, #223a)

I: Hello:,
K: Hello. (0.2) uh May I speak to Missiz
       Mallett uh Dallett.
I: Yes. Speaking.   (96)
K: uh This is uh Ken speaking.
⟶   (0.4)
⟶I: Who is speaking?
K: Kay.
⟶I: Ken?
K: uh: who attend uh last quarter English
       two C,
I: Oh yes
              (ID, #232)

M: (Hello.)
L: Hi. Is Mrs. (Sturbridge) home?
       (0.5)
M: What?
L: Is Mrs.-Marcia?
M: Yeah
L: Oh HI. I didn't recognize your voice. =
⟶   This is Linda.
⟶   (1.0)
M: Linda,
L: Rubin.   (97)
       (2.0)
⟶M: I-uh can't place you.
       (1.0)
L: Have I got the- is this three eight
       four five oh six five,
M: No. = you really have the wrong number.
       //But-
L: And is your name Marcia? =

```
M:    = Yes! //heh
L:                Isn't that swee:t
        (MDE, #88)
```

Although this last case is a "wrong number," that only turns out to be its
outcome. From inside its developmental course, it is not a wrong number
until L's fifth turn. Until then, she is first not recognized by voice inspec-
tion, then not recognized by her friend from first name self-identifica-
tion, and after a 2.0 second gap, is not recognized even from a last name
supplement. The possibility that she has reached a wrong number does
not follow immediately after the last of these three failures; a gap of one
second passes before she begins her inquiry. Those who prefer not to call
and not to answer the telephone have, perhaps, such interactional perils
in mind.

V

The preceding two sections have somewhat discursively depicted the
main, structurally engendered, sequential developments through which
recognitional identification is worked throughout, and they have offered
interactional accounts of particular sequences representing some of these
possibilities, tracing their workings on a turn by turn, moment by
moment basis. Much of what has been discussed draws on other organi-
zations much more general in their domains than the recognition prob-
lem. The import of the gap is provided for first by the turn-taking
organization, which provides for its status as an event; and secondly by
the organization of sequences, adjacency pairs, and agreement/disagree-
ment which provides a sequential consequence, and an interactionally
interpreted import, for the gap. But is there an independent structure
which engenders these possibilities and underlies the particular sequences
with their interactional drama?

One apparent finding that emerges from the preceding discussion is
that much of what occurs by reference to the recognition issue happens in
sequences of quite distinctly other types. It is tied not to a form of se-
quence, but is overlaid onto sequences of various types by virtue of the
positioning of their first part, that positioning being first and, more par-
ticularly in our treatment, second turn of the conversation. These posi-
tions are defined by reference to the overall structural organization of the
conversation. They are the first turns of its respective participants, and
much of the material we have been exploring pertains to an organization
built around first turns of participants. That organization appears to run

parallel to whatever other organization operates there, e.g., the particular sequence type used there, running underground as long as they run compatibly; but if they don't, the one we have been examining takes priority.[47] It is a neat bit of architecture that has the initial turns regularly composed of greetings, one of the very few sequence types ("good-byes" is the other one I can think of) which do not have alternative second parts. Thereby, a gap after the first does not reflect on trouble in selecting which of the alternative seconds will be done, or temporarily delay a dispreferred second. Indeed, one would have thought that nothing could be more uncomplicated than finding the return to a greeting; the same item returned will do the trick. (And, indeed, that underlies the possibility of deception.) Nonetheless, as we have seen, first greetings are followed by delays, and recognition trouble turns out to be the issue. The underlying organization surfaces in the greeting sequence.

There does, therefore, appear to be an organization operating here, not identical with, nor merely a special instance of, the other organizations—of turn-taking, of sequences, etc.—always operating side by side in conversation. What happens in the first turn might be substantially accounted for by virtue of the fact that it is in second position in a sequence, and thus subject to the constraints of the sequence type in which it is placed. Even so, the turn components used there are not standard items for second parts of summons-uptake sequences. In any case, · it will clearly not do to treat the second turn, which follows completion of a sequence, as free to be any of a range of next sequence starts. In fact, we find a concentration among a few types. More important, across even that variation one underlying theme predominates, and the sequence type initiated in second turn governs third turn only if that underlying theme has *its* requirements met. And third turn will be as much involved in showing that as in meeting the other sequence-type constraints (if any) set by second turn. Can anything systematic be said about the kind of organization operating here?

Several constraints preclude the systematic description of an organizational structure here. First, the appropriate organization almost certainly operates for the domain "openings" (if not for the yet larger domain, "overall structure of the conversation"), and not for its identification/ recognition component alone. Second, as noted early in this paper, throughout conversation, but with special density in openings, a great many jobs and a great many organized resources are compacted into any turn. The considerations developed here about the turns that occupy the beginnings of these conversations need to be examined together with an analysis of the various other jobs these turns are occupied with; a systematic description that did not take such "interaction effects" into

account would almost certainly pack into one organizational box the fruits of different trees. But it is possible to offer some systematically ordered features which seem to underlie many of the phenomena we have been examining, which seem to be candidates for inclusion in a description of an organization which engenders them.

1. Identification of other by each party is relevant.

2. Identification of other is relevant at first opportunity. (I.e., in co-presence, it is relevant pre- the beginning; on the telephone, not relevant until talk starts, but "I wonder who that is" can precede picking up the phone).

3. If recognitional identification of/by other—as one already known —is possible, it is preferred.[48]

4. Recognitional identification, if relevant and possible, is preferred where identification is relevant (and not, for example, as an additive form, subsequent to some other type of identification).[49]

5. Recognition as an interactional accomplishment has two components: a recognition source (composed of various of the resources from which recognition can be achieved), and a recognition solution (composed of the various resources by which the achievement of recognition by other can be claimed, displayed, evidenced, etc.).

6. Preferredly, recognition is "effortless," i.e., the recognition solution occurs next after the witnessing of the recognition source, or after the witnessed witnessing of the recognition source (i.e., when A has seen B seeing him see B).

7. If the recognition work is done wholly in turns to talk, it may occupy turns addressed to it, or it may inform turns occupied with some other sequential work (the "vehicle" or "host").

8. If the recognition work is done wholly in turns to talk, the recognition solution should occur in the turn after the recognition source, and should occur contiguously, with no gap.

9. Separation of source and solution exhibits trouble or failure to accomplish the recognition from the resources supplied in the source. Trouble or failure warrant repair.

10. A recognition solution terminates the sequence, unless trouble preceded the solution, in which case a turn component, turn, or sequence of turns diagnostic of the trouble may be added by the speaker of the recognition solution involved. (This theme has not been discussed in this paper, though the phenomenon has occurred in some of the segments cited.)

11. A recognition problem, once solved, is normatively solved for the duration of the conversation. What may be a recognition resource before

solution, loses that character after solution, and its recurrence (e.g., "voice") does not reoccasion recognition solution each time. But recog-nition/identification may be reopened when occasioned by evidence of misidentification.[50]

12. Two types of resources serve as recognition sources: "inspectables" and "self-references." Inspectables include appearance, voice sample, and behavior (e.g., talk) not directed to securing recognition which may include self-identificatory clues, as well as other possible resources. Self-references include most notably name (in the varieties in which name may be used: first name, title + last name, etc.) and self-description.

13. The recognition resources are graded. The basic recognitional resource is self-identification by name, the sort of name (first name, first name + last name, title + last name) being sensitive to recipient design for current recipient. Other resources are graded as "less than" or "more than" the basic resource. "Less than" resources may themselves be graded, from the minimal small voice sample devoid of other "clues," to more extended or multiple voice samples, to talk which adds to the voice sample self-identificatory clues (e.g., an address term, joke, first topic clues, distinctive recipient-designed intonation production, displayed knowledge of other such as "you're home," etc.). "More than" resources may also be graded, from fuller forms of name than that which constitutes the recipient-designed basic resource, to recognitional descriptions (i.e., descriptions that allow recipient to find who it is that they already know, e.g., "what you know about me," "where you know me from," etc.). There is a "maximum recognitional resource" which is recipient-specific; it is that resource, or set of resources, beyond which speaker will not go: Should it not achieve recognition from other, identification of other may be reviewed for possible misidentification (see #11 above). Frequently, the maximum is first name + last name when the basic resource is first name.[51] These grades are variable ethnographically and situationally, but "basic," "less than" and "more than" are more robust.

14. Recognition from least possible recognition resources sensitive to recipient design is preferred. Thus, recognizable should select lowest graded resource he can suppose can secure an "effortless" recognition solution.[52]

15. Should trouble or failure to recognize be displayed (see #9 above), recognizable may offer, or recipient request, supplementary resources. Regularly, supplementary resources are higher graded than previously offered resources, except when these have reached the "maximum" or when the provision of an additional voice sample is itself exploited as the

upgrading. The present provision may apply recurrently upon recurrent display of trouble, until the "maximum" is reached (see #13), until recognition is achieved, or until its irrelevance is warranted.

Several observations may be made from this list of probable elements of a systematic organization for the work of recognition:

a. Given that, on the whole, on the telephone, the answerer speaks first,[53] recognition of answerer by caller is the first recognition problem posed. It is posed at that point (unless the turn-type done there is such as displays recognition to be not oriented to) by virtue of the occurrence of a voice sample. A recognition solution is, therefore, relevant in next turn, T2. Since T2 is caller's first turn, it supplies a recognition resource, whose solution should be in next turn, T3. T1, T2, and T3 are, thus, the basic loci for the identification problem of the recognition type: T1 for the initial recognition source, T2 for the initial recognition solution and second recognition source, and T3 for the second recognition solution. "Hello" "Hi" "Hi" (see #42–45 above) realizes this sequence, and is very frequent. It, and much of what occurs in the other forms of sequence through which recognition is worked out, can be derived from the elements sketched above.

b. Aspects of the list of elements above are skewed in the direction of the caller-identification problem as central. Most notably, the selection of initial recognitional resource by recipient design is a tack callers can take, operating as they do after recognition of answerer.

It should be noted that the grading of recognition resources is a grading in information relevant to recognition; the higher graded resources are richer in clues that enable recognition. The lesser the resources provided, the greater the recognition claim. The recognition resources are thereby differentially discriminating; the import of recipient design is partially that an order of relationship can be defined by the resources needed, and supposed by other to be needed, for recognition. Those who can recognize from a "hi," or who would presume to be recognized from one, constitute a bounded population. And the preference for use of least possible resources tests the boundaries of that population, and any given person's membership in it for some interlocutor, on each occasion of such an interaction.

It must be recalled, however, that, whereas caller can select between the basic recognitional resource and a "less than" resource by reference to his suppositions about a particular, already identified recipient, in T1 answerer must select between the same classes of recognition resources— self-identification and what amounts to a voice sample, "hello"—but

has that selection organized on other grounds. These grounds concern classes of putative callers, not particular, recognized ones. When recognizability is not expectable between answerer and caller, self-identification is regularly used in the first turn. But when it is, by reference to the setting, expectable, "hello"—a voice sample, a minimal resource—is employed.

Callers, therefore, routinely find themselves confronted with a discriminating recognition resource to work with. In T1, the discriminating recognition resource is used indiscriminately. It is not tailored to the supposed capacity of a particular caller to recognize from it, as it is tailored by callers for particular answerers. It should therefore come as no surprise that the incidence of uncertainty-marked recognition solutions is substantially greater among callers' recognitions of answerers than among answerers' recognitions of callers; that is, there are more interrogative names (leaving aside the clear pre-self-identification cases) in T2 after the T1 "Hello" than there are in T3 after a T2 "hello" or "hi." Nor should it be surprising that trouble and equivocation on the caller recognition problem is more volatile, sensitive, worthy of diagnosis, and implicative for the relationship.

c. Partially related to the preceding point: the voice is a variable instrument. Its use is at least partially socially organized, on the one hand for the organization of expression, and on the other because the impact of certain voice variations is treated as different in part by reference to sequential locus. Consider the following segment:

M:		Hullo?	
→ R:		(Hi.) Did I wake you up?	
M:		No:	
		(0.8)	
R:		Are you sure,	
		(1.5)	
M:		(Well,) hhhuh huh huh `hh	
		(0.5)	
→ R:		's this Marcia?	
M:		Yeah.	(98)
R:		(Howayou,)	
M:		Yeah. You did not wake me up Reah.	
R:		Oh your voice sounds different.	
		(0.8)	

R: (   )
M: Gee everybody's been saying that
        lately.
R: It's lower.
        (1.0)
M: Huhh
R: Sounds   better. = Sounds. .like
        you're happier.
M: I am. I'm taking a leave of
        absence. . .
                    (MDE, Supp.)

Here, the voice of the answerer is heard first for "just current state"
("Did I wake you up?"), then for its recognition relevance ("'s this Mar-
cia?"), and then for "general mood" ("Sounds like you're happier").
Voice can be inspected for any of these types of categories; of course,
elsewhere in the conversation, quite other ones might be involved; these
are regular to the opening. Voice quality can vary through a considerable
range later in the conversation, and be subject to varying interpreta-
tions—emphasis,   anger,   attitude,   mood,   interest,   excitement,
etc.—relating the variation to some sequentially local event(s) in the con-
versation. It is very rare, if it happens at all, for voice quality, once "in-
to" the conversation, to occasion a review of who is talking. But the
same variation in the first turns can make trouble for caller's recognition
of answerer. Added to the indiscriminate use of the discriminating
recognition resource—voice sample—in T1, the problem is potentially
formidable.
    It is therefore worth noting the substantial standardization of first turn
production by individuals.[54] That is, persons regularly do a standard-for-
them "Hello" in first turn, which serves as a signature of sorts. This
standardization seems at least partially to contribute to the usability of
voice as a recognition resource for the range of callers for whom recogni-
tion is relevant by narrowing the range of voice type and quality
employed in that sequential position, however much voice variation is us-
ed in immediately following turn. Correlatively, in view of the restriction
on voice variation in first turn by reference to its use as a recognition
resource, the importance of the solution of the recognition problem in
the first turns may be appreciated to include that the resources of voice
variation are thereupon freed for other uses (see point 11 above), uses
especially and subtly exploited in the opening. Consider as well the
achievement of getting first turn to display excitement, depression,

sleepiness, etc.,. while nonetheless allowing recognition; a tightrope is
walked between restriction of the voice for recognition purposes, and ex-
pressive variations in its use.

   d. Finally, it should be noted that the list of elements omits mention of
the recognition solution resources. As was noted in the previous two sec-
tions, these also are differentiated, partially fitted to the recognition re-
sources they follow, partially recipient-designed. But they are especially
sensitive to the articulation of the turns which address the recognition
problem with the rest of the opening, and therefore especially require
treatment within the context of a systematic account of the organization
of the opening section as a whole.

VI

   When examining a large number of openings, it is striking that some
run off quite straightforwardly, in a very nearly, if not totally, standar-
dized way, while others look and sound idiosyncratic—almost virtuoso
performances. But it is worthwhile keeping in mind that the "special"
cases are variants engendered by a systematic sequential organization
adapted and fitted by the parties to some particular circumstances; the
outlines of the organization's "standard product" are discernible
through the variations of the particular case. At the same time, the
standard-looking cases may be nonetheless special to the parties for their
local circumstances. I shall close by examining these two themes in turn.

   Consider the following segment:

```
M:     Hello::,
A:     Hello Margie?
M:     Ye:://s,
A:     ˙hhh We do pai:nting, a:ntiquing,
M:     I(hh) is that ri:ght.
(A):    eh!hh//hhh: : : : :
M:     hnh hnh hnh
A:     nhh hnh hnh! ˙hh                                    (99)
M:     ˙hh
A:     -keep people's pa'r too:ls,
M:     Y(hhh)! hnh//hnh
A:     I'm  sorry  about  that//that//I  din'
       see that-
              (NB, #119)
```

A is calling to apologize for keeping overlong some power tools borrowed from M.[55] It is an interactionally delicate task, which she brings off with considerable skill by building it into a joke, constructed in the form of a list, the fact that the joke list is a vehicle for an apology not becoming evident until the end, when laughter is already in progress. It is a virtuoso performance in a potentially embarrassing situation. Among the many interests this segment has, its bearing on openings, and on identification/ recognition is not prominent. Yet what is being brought off interactionally in the segment depends deeply on the organization of identification/recognition in telephone openings, and the outlines of one of that organization's standard sequences is apparent in it.

The segment is based on the sequence type described in section IV above. In T2 the caller uses a pre-self-identification, though M and A stand in a relationship which could well have a T2 greeting sufficient to secure recognition. The T2 pre-self-identification projects a self-identification in T4, and, indeed, T4 is built in the form of a self-identification. But the turn, and the form, are used to package a mock self-identification (like "This is your friendly goddess"). The mock self-identification is a joke, but its appreciation as a joke turns on M having already recognized who the caller is, and what is involved in that caller describing herself in this way, a recognition allowed to be in hand from the beginning of T4 by the voice sample in T2; it might well not have worked to begin "We do painting. . ." in T2; besides which, the mock self-identification takes a "business" form, and would be (were it real) placed in a fourth turn, preceded by an interrogative address term. With all the special circumstances involved here, the shape of a standard sequence is visible, and depended on for the special interactional job being done.

On the other hand, what appear to be standard identification/recognition sequences can have quite idiosyncratic and special status. Since for the most part those for whom recognition is relevant have talked before, any next opening—and recognition sequence—can have a prior history of such sequences informing it. By reference to such a history, a standard-appearing opening can be for the parties quite special. Thus,

A:	Hello,	
B:	Mr. Lodge,	
A:	Yes,	
B:	Mr. Ford.	
A:	Yes.	(100)
B:	Y'know where Mr. Williams is?	
A:	What?	

```
B:      hhhahhah
A:      Do I know where who?
B:      Leo is.
A:      No.
B:      Oh. Okay.
              (HS, #207)
```

Here, the standard appearing sequence is a joke; the parties are "on a first name basis"; the joke, indeed, interferes with A's recognition of the friend being referred to.

For parties to be "on a first name basis" can take doing. There is likely to be an historical development, in which the parties may first use T2 interrogative names with first name + last name self-identifications, then drop the last name, then perhaps one starts displaying evidenced recognition after the T2 interrogative name. Finally a greeting alone, perhaps in a distinctive intonation, would be sufficient. The first occurence of any of these will look like a standard sequence; to its parties it may be a minor event of sorts, a small *rite de passage* between phases of a relationship. In any case, the development is one through a series of standard, organizationally produced sequence types, as is the reverse direction, when, as noted earlier, a caller may supply more recognition sources after a long hiatus between conversations than had otherwise been the practice with some particular recipient.

The "practice" between a pair of persons can come to be a signature. A special form can come to be used by a caller for a particular recipient. Above, we noted a case in which a "joke" interfered with recognition. In other cases, the absence of a joke in favor of a standard "serious" procedure may be special, and may interfere with recognition. The segment, earlier treated in some detail, between the "friendly goddess" and her sometime boyfriend is a case in point. A number of conversations between these two are included in the corpus, and in nearly all of them in which she is the caller, she employs a "joke" of some form as her T2 turn-type; a number of the illustrations of joke T2s in section II above are hers. Whatever was involved in her not using that form in the second turn of the call which was examined in section III, the fact that she did not appears connected to C's failure to recognize her from the T2 she used. That she herself might have supposed that this was so may be reflected in her use, in T4 after the "who's this," of a joke form. And when she uses the joke form, she is recognized.

Recipient design can work over time to set a form "for us," and this standardized "for us" form will be incorporated into the grading scale that is otherwise operative for recognition resources. For C and his

friendly goddess, the special recipient-designed form is "joke"; in other cases, other forms can be given the same status, most notably, special inflections given to otherwise standard items, such as greetings.

In any particular case, such idiosyncratic particulars may be operative, but they are made operative as local adaptations of an independent organizational format, and work the way they do by virtue of it. Particular cases can, therefore, be examined for their local, interactional, biographical, ethnographic, or other idiosyncratic interest. The same materials can be inspected so as to extract from their local particularities the formal organization into which their particularities are infused. For students of interaction, the organizations through which the work of social life gets accomplished occupy the center of attention, and whatever of their materials can be extracted and related to such organizations should be. For those whose lives are being led in interaction, those organizations are always filled out by the locally relevant details, the organizations by reference to which that detail is relevant receding into an unnoticed background.

Whatever a telephone conversation is going to be occupied with, however bureaucratic or intimate, routine or unusual, earthshaking or trivial, it and its parties will have to pass through the identification/recognition sieve as the first thing they do. The contingencies of its organization thus have a pervasive relevance, a relevance inherited from less specialized settings of interaction and adapted to a technological innovation, by which it is made more prominent. As a result, what was associated in the mythic past of the West with heroes and elders—recognition when identity is partially masked—has become democratized. Writ incomparably smaller, it has become anyone's everyday test.

NOTES

1. See Sacks, Schlegloff, and Jefferson (1974).
2. See Schegloff, Jefferson and Sacks (1977)
3. Schegloff and Sacks (1973); Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson (1974)
4. Schegloff (1968); Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson (forthcoming), chapters 2 and 3; Sacks (1974); Schegloff and Sacks (1973); and Jefferson (1973).
5. See Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson (forthcoming) chapter 3.
6. For a review of some of the relevant studies, see Wilson (1975), pp. 203-206, *passim*; and Wilson (1971), chapter 14.
7. Sacks and Schegloff, This Volume.
8. Goffman (1963), chapter 7.
9. For example, Goffman (1963) and Kendon (1973).

10. See Goffman (1963), pp. 112-113.

11. *The Odyssey,* Book 19; see also Auerbach, (1953), chapter 1.

12. Genesis 27.

13. Wilson, (1971)p. 272.

14. Openings are organizationally and interactionally very "dense." In them, and in the very short turns of which they are generally composed, are compacted the treatment of many issues central to the organization of interaction, and to the shape of any particular interaction getting underway. Accordingly, each turn is partially implicated in a number of different organizational issues, and the treatment accorded some turn or sequence of turns when addressing a particular organizational issue will almost necessarily be only a partial treatment of those turns. Further, since the various organizational issues and their solution in particular openings are concomitant and interact, even our understanding of a single issue being addressed will likely be partial until the full range of issues is at least somewhat surveyed, and the way particular sequences integrate and reconcile the requirements of different organizational structures is appreciated. (See note 7 for a discussion of a reconciliation of competing organizational preferences.) For example, in the data to which this paper is addressed, running parallel to the issues of identification on which I focus is the issue of the length and shape of the opening as it bears on the allocation of first topic and the displayed priority it should have. In sum, the paper is preliminary not only for a larger study of openings, but for its own narrower topic.

15. Title + Last Name can be distinct type, as will be seen below.

16. This telephone call, from a radio station to a bank where a robbery was in progress, with the robber answering the phone, was kindly made available to me by Mr. Sam Surrat, archivist of CBS News.

17. Self-identification occurs overwhelmingly in combination with other components.

18. In Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson, (forthcoming) chapter 3.

19. A cause for considerable resentment on the part of those who frequently find themselves in this position; for example, wives answering the phone when husbands' colleagues, often met at social occasions, are calling.

20. There *are* sequentially relevant differences between the forms in each group, but they do not bear on the present discussion.

21. The best description based on recorded (in this case, filmed) data I know of is Kendon's (1973) account of greetings in the setting of a party.

22. An outcome which Goffman, in his discussion of greetings as access rituals, treats as marginal. See Goffman (1971), chapter 3, and p. 79 in particular.

23. Goffman (1971), notes urban/rural differences in this regard, rural folk offering greetings to strangers as well. It seems likely, however, that some aspect(s) of the first turn(s) will display some discrimination between recognizables and others (e,g., in the form of greeting used, the adding of an address term to it,or some less familiar variation).

24. I have argued elsewhere (Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson, forthcoming), chapter 3, that first turn "Hello" is, sequentially, not fundamentally a greeting.

25. See Schegloff and Sacks (1973) pp. 295-298; Sacks, Schegloff, Jefferson (1974) pp. 716-718. Question-answer, request-grant/rejection, and the like are instances of types.

26. This paragraph sketches in a nontechnical way our current understanding of some aspects of this area based on the work of several investigators, but not yet published. Much of this work was reported by Sacks (1973). See A. Pomerantz (1974), which provides an illuminating discussion of these matters and more for "assessment sequences.

27. See Schegloff, Jefferson, Sacks, (1977).

28. See Sacks, Schegloff, Jefferson (1974), p. 715.

29. See Schegloff, Jefferson, Sacks (1977). The most familiar NTRIs are the various one-

word questions ("Huh?", "What?", "Who?"), whole or partial repeats of the trouble source in prior turn, and others. "Who's this" does not otherwise appear as an NTRI (except as an expanded variant of "who?"); it is, then, an NTRI specialized for use in openings for the identification/recognition issue, and is rarely found outside the first several turns.

30. Her "conversion" of C into source of the trouble is marked, as well, by her repeat of his question at the beginning of her turn. As stated in note 29 and in the paper cited there, repeats of all or part of the prior turn are one form of NTRI, the repeat marking the trouble source. Here it is not fully exploited as an NTRI, no room being left after it for its recipient to do a repair.

31. Schegloff and Sacks (1973) pp. 313-317.

32. This refers to the type of call under consideration here, in which the first turn is "Hello." In calls whose first turn is a self-identification, self-identification in the second turn is much more frequent. It is because of the different sequential consequences of "Hello" and self-identification in the first turn, directly reflected in the second turn, that these constitute different types.

33. Gail Jefferson (personal communication) has proposed that an address term without greeting in the second turn may operate similarly to foreshorten the opening. Initial examination of my materials lends some support, but to my mind leaves the issue open.

34. The sequences develop in this manner:

```
        C:    Hello:.
        M:    Miz Parsons?
        C:    Ye:s,
                                                                    (a)
        M:    Fay Martin, Arthritis Foundation, the
              volunteer service,
        C:    Um hm.
                    (JG,#73a)
        I:    Hello,
        C:    Uh H'llo Mrs. Davis?
        I:    Yes.
                                                                    (b)
        C:    Yeah = Hi, this is Diane from Mr. Eds.
        I:    Oh: great. . . .
                    (ID,#262)
        I:    Hello:,
        T:    H'llo Missiz Thomas?
              (0.4)                                                 (c)
        I:    uh no. Who is speaking please,
        T:    uh This is Tasha Mann, from Southern
              Nevada Music Company . . .


        IL:   Hello:,
        T:    Hello, Is this Missiz Thomas,
        IL:   Ye:s.                                                 (d)
        T:    Hello this is Tasha Mann. = I'm calling for:
              Southern Nevada Music // Company.
        I L :                              Y e a h .
                    (ID, #295-295a)
```

Note that the self-identification is regularly more than first name: First Name + Last Name, or supplemented by descriptions and/or affiliations. When no recognition occurs or is relevant, the self-identification may be followed not with a greeting, but with an "uh huh"—as in segments (a) and (d) cited above.

Title + Last Name does not always project the nonrelevance of recognition. It can be the recipient-designed appropriate address term, by virtue of relative age, status, degree of acquaintanceship, etc. For example:

F:	((Hell))o,	
B:	Hello Missiz Fineman,	(e)
F:	Hi Bonnie.	
	(ID, #237)	
S:	Hello,	
I:	uh Dr. Santos?	
S:	Yes.	(f)
I:	Inge. Hi. =	
S:	= Hi Inge.	
	ID, #273)	
M:	((Hello))	
P:	Mr. McDougal?	
M:	Yeh sir	(g)
P:	This ih Mr. Perkins.	
M:	Hi::ya Mr. Perkins. How ya doing.	
	(JG, #50)	

Still, for convenience, I will exclude the Title + Last Name cases from the data considered in the main text.

35. Another possibility should be mentioned here for the turn after a T2 greeting, intermediate between reciprocal recognition and "who's this," and that is an "uncertainty marked" reciprocal recognition, a guess. For example:

M:	Hello.	
P:	Hehlo.	
	(1.2)	
➡ M:	Pe:t?	
	(JG, #43)	
M1:	Hello.	
M2:	Hello.	((intonation echo))
	(1.0)	
➡ M1:	This Sid?	
	(LL, #32)	

36. Terasaki, (1976)
37. Schegloff (1968), and Sacks, Schegloff, Jefferson (forthcoming) chapter 2.
38. Sacks and Schegloff, this volume.
39. Ibid.
40. This counterpreference is evidenced in those seqments, cited later, in which caller self-identifies even though recipient has responded to the pre-self-identification with a recognition token.
41. The try-marker can also be applied to self-identification by name in the caller's second

turn when the speaker's supposition that the recipient can recognize from name is uncertain. As will be seen below, other of the procedures used in T2 are used in T4 as well.

42. Indeed, deception may be clear to the caller, if the answerer has not used the correct, recipient-designed greeting—i.e., the greeting in characteristic intonation which "that one" always uses "to me." The issue of recipient-designed opening components, although important, cannot be entered into here.

43. This segment is striking on a number of counts. L's interrogative "yeah" seems clearly nonrecognitional, following as it does a gap of 0.5 sec. Still, E does not self-identify after it. Nor does she supplement the greeting with self-identification when a gap develops after it. Finally, we find in L's third turn another evidence of deceptive recognition display, in a different locus from that discussed before, but similarly placed sequentially—after an invitation to recognize from les than self-identification. Her guess—"Erin?"—after the greeting shows the latter to have claimed a recognition that had not been fully achieved.

44. It may appear contradictory to say that the switchboard request defers or eliminates the relevance of recognition, when it is noted at various points that "who's this" is not uncommon in next turn. But it should be noted that the "who's this" that follows other T2 turn types and displays recognition-trouble is regularly preceded by a gap, whereas the "who's this" that occurs in the turn following a switchboard request hardly ever does. It is less a reflection of failure of recognition than a self-arming by first answerer for the potential question from the one who will be called to the phone, "who is it?" It is not the first answerer's recognition interest that is being served, in that case, but the intended answerer's. In those cases in which the first answerer "guesses" the callers identity, it may be treated as an "extra."

> M: Hello?
> K: Hello. Uh: is Tina there?
> M: Yes she is. I'll call her.
> K: ⌜Thanks*
> M: ⌞Is it-* 's this Karen?
> K: Yeah. Hi:.
> M: Hi Karen, I recognized your voice. This time.
>   Here's Tina.
>   (MDE, Supp.)

45. Note that in all three cases, T2 uses the try-marker, reflecting a doubt about voice recognition, and that in all three cases, the next turn is an interrogative "yeah?", indicating possible trouble.

46. The crux of the matter is this: Callers seek recognition because they suppose themselves to be, for the current recipient, "recognizables." However, answerers do not treat the recognition-of-caller problem as one involving a search of all those they know, or all recognizables, to find which one this is. Rather, it appears, answerers are oriented to a set of "potential callers." It happens that the two sets—"recognizables" and "potential callers"—are not identical for answerers. One familiar class of persons who are members of the former set but not of the latter is that of friends and nonimmediate kin who live "far away," and are not often "heard from." When they offer a voice sample, even with clues, from which to be recognized, they seek recognition as "recognizables," and often fail to get it because the answerer does not search that set to "find" them, but rather searches the set "potential callers," of which they are not members. "First name" may fail on these grounds as well. It is members of this class of persons who sometimes offer the challenge, "You'll never guess who this is," for that is one way of displaying that, while

recognizables, they are not potential callers. When recognized, however, they get the "big hello," and the talk is briefly occupied with the specialness of hearing from them, as happens in both calls here, as well as in #48 (the "Yolk" call) earlier cited. "Non-potential-caller" callers are another major source of self-identifications in T2, when they decline to initiate a recognition test from lesser resources.

47. This result is familiar from the study of third-person reference, where we found that when the preferences for recognitional reference and sequential minimization could not be satisfied simultaneously, the former took precedence (See Sacks and Schegloff, this volume). Several themes of that investigation recur here, with the same results. Indeed, the identification/recognition issue, and sequences examined here, are central to the domain of person reference, being the site at which the "I" and "you," which are used for "speaker" and "recipient" throughout the conversation, are grounded. I have preferred not to develop that theme here, but to reserve it for a paper on the organization of reference to persons in conversation, in preparation.

48. Two sorts of evidence on this point not previously adduced may be mentioned here. One is the occurrence of mid-turn repair, from a nonrecognitional identification in the process of being produced to a recognition try, if possible. See #97, and the switch from "Is Mrs.-" to "Marcia?". A second is the persistence of the attempt to secure recognitional identification even when it is prohibited by formal rule, and embarrassment when apparently recognized, though one had obeyed the rule. The materials are drawn from a radio call-in show, one of whose official rules was "no self-identification by name." The program had several "regular callers," who apparently felt themselves to be "recognizables" to the "host." A number of these calls have at T4 or T6 a turn beginning "I called you X amount of time ago about. . . .", many of which seem to be self-identifications by recognitional description in lieu of the forbidden name, but could as well be treated as prefaces to the reason for the call, which is, in many cases, a continuation of an earlier conversation. Some, however, are unequivocally recognitional self-identification. For example:

    A: Good evening, W.N.B.C.
    B: Alrighty Brad.
    A: How uh you sir.
    B: Ah fine. How's yerself.
    A: Mhhm?
    B: Listen I uh call' you a couple a' weeks ago
          an' yuh hadda cut me short because a' the
          Pueblo uhhh:
    A: Yah.
                (BC, Red, 159)

B goes on to talk about Mayor Lindsay and taxes. His T6 seems designed to replace a nonrecognitional identification as "call-in participant" by a recognitional identification, so as to be recognized. In another call, the caller does no such self-identification, but describes his problem, a six-month suspension of his driving license. Then:

    A: . . .wha'diyuh do, fer a living.
    B: Eh : m I woik inna driving school.
    A: Inna dri:ving school,
    B: Yeah. I spoke t'you menny ti:mes.
                (BC, Beige, 20)

What B hears is a dawning recognition of him by A, not a noticing of the special comedy and tragedy of a driving instructor having his license suspended. (It turned out that B was not a driving instructor.)

49. The import of this point: organizational self-identification (e.g., "American Airlines") or nonrecognitional self-identification by name (e.g., "Ms. Jones speaking") can show that recognition is not expectably relevant by occupying, with a nonrecognitional component, the position at which a recognition-relevant turn would be done, and done preferredly, if relevant. If recognition were not relevant where identification is relevant, the nonrecognitional component could be a routine first phase, a preliminary, leaving the relevance of recognition still an open question. To be sure, caller can override this display of irrelevance for recognition in next turn, and show that, although not organizationally expectable, in *this* call recognition *is* relevant. But in doing this, he is transforming the incipient type of the call, and the resources for doing it are shaped accordingly. For example, a T2 "Hi" is rarely found in this sequential environment. Such "transformations" are discussed in a chapter with that name in Schegloff (1967).

50. Consider, for example, #58 above. M1 (the answerer) has apparently achieved and displayed recognition of M2 (the caller) at T3, from the voice sample at T2. At T9, he reidentifies him as someone else, occasioned by some trouble engendered by a recipient-designed inquiry. But two turns by M2 have intervened which might have allowed reidentification if the issue was still open, and the voice, for example, treated as a voice sample for recognition purposes on a continuing basis. The same is true in #97, where there is initial difficulty in "recognizing Marcia" from voice. Once done (incorrectly, as it turns out), further voice uses by "Marcia" do not occasion review of the recognition; that occurs only when "Marcia" fails to recognize caller.

"Voice" is initially treated as "voice sample," while recognition is a relevant issue; once solved, it is no longer attended to in that way.

51. For example, in #97, caller first uses the "basic"—first name ("This is Linda"); when it does not secure recognition, she adds a "more than"—last name ("Rubin"). When recognition is still not achieved, it turns out that she has reached her maximum for the recipient she means to be talking to. She does not upgrade further, e.g., to a recognitional description, but initiates a review of her identification/recognition of recipient.

52. But recall, other sequential organizational interests are concurrently relevant here, and may modify the selection. Thus, a move to shorten the opening section may lead to selecting the basic form even when "less"might be supposed to be adequate, as in #65 above.

53. Schegloff (1968); Sacks, Schegloff, Jefferson (forthcoming)

54. Independently noted by Gail Jefferson (personal communication).

55. I merely allude here to a rich and elaborate analysis of this segment by my late colleague, Harvey Sacks, included in various sets of lectures of his, hopefully to be published at some time in the future.

REFERENCES

Auerbach, Erich. (1953). *Mimesis.* Garden City, New York: Doubleday Anchor.

Blount, Ben, and Sanchez, Mary (eds.) (1974) *Ritual, Reality, and Innovation in Lanuage Use.* New York: Seminar Press.

Goffman, Erving (1963). *Behavior in Public Places.* Glencoe: Free Press Macmillan.

_____ (1971). *Relations in Public.* New York: Basic Books.

Jefferson, Gail (1973). A case of precision timing in ordinary conversation: over-
lapped tag-positioned address terms in closing sequences. *Semiotica.* 9, 1.

Kendon, Adam, and Ferber, Andrew (1973). A description of some human greet-
ings. in Michael and Crook (1973).

Michael, R.P., and Crook, J.H. (eds.) (1973). *Comparative Ecology and the Be-
havior of Primates.* London: Academic Press.

Pomerantz, Anita (1974). Second Assessments. Ph.D. dissertation, School of
Social Sciences, University of California, Irvine.

Sacks, Harvey (1973). On the preference for agreement in conversation. Unpub-
lished lecture, Linguistic Institute, University of Michigan.

_____ (1974). Everyone has to lie. In Blount and Sanchez (1974).

Sacks, Harvey and Schegloff, Emanuel A. Two preferences in the organization of
references to persons in conversation and their interaction, this volume.

Sacks, Harvey, Schegloff, Emanuel A. and Jefferson, Gail (1974). A simplest sys-
tematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation. *Language* 50,
4.

_____ (forthcoming). *Studies in the Sequential Organization of Conversation.*
New York: Academic Press.

Schegloff, Emanuel A. (1967). The First Five Seconds: The Order of Conversa-
tional Openings. Ph.D. Dissertation, Department of Sociology, University
of California, Berkeley.

_____ (1968). Sequencing in conversational openings. *American Anthropologist*
70, 6.

Schegloff, Emanuel A. and Sacks, Harvey (1973). Opening up closings. *Semi-
otica* 8, 4.

Schegloff, Emanuel A., Jefferson, Gail and Sacks, Harvey (1977). The prefer-
ence for self-correction in the organization of repair in conversation. *Lan-
guage* 53, 2.

Terasaki, Alene (1976). Pre-announcement sequences in conversation. Social Sci-
ence Working Paper #99, School of Social Science, University of California,
Irvine.

Wilson, Edward O. (1971). *The Insect Societies.* Cambridge: Harvard University
Press.

_____ (1975). *Sociobiology.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press.