to facilitate coordination of the speaker’s actions, including his utterance, with the actions of a recipient, and to be useful in the accomplishment of various tasks posed in the construction of the turn at talk. Some of the reasons displayed by a participant for the addition of a new segment to a unit were also examined. Particular attention was paid to repairs, a class of actions utilized quite frequently to provide an account for the addition of sections to a unit. Often the reason displayed for the repair does not include some of the interactive tasks facilitated by the lengthening of a unit. Some ways in which the absence of focus on this process might be functional were considered. Insofar as both the length and the meaning of units such as the utterance are capable of such systematic modification, it might be appropriate to say that they are not produced by the actions of either party alone, but rather emerge through a process of interaction between speaker and hearer as they mutually construct the turn at talk.

5
Designing Talk for Different Types of Recipients

One of the most general principles organizing talk within conversation is recipient design. In this chapter we will investigate some ways in which talk proposes specific characteristics for a recipient to it and the consequences this has for the organization of action within the turn. To do this, we shall examine a situation in which recipients with mutually exclusive attributes are simultaneously present. Analysis will focus on systematic methods and procedures available to the speaker for transforming an utterance appropriate to one type of recipient into one that also provides for the participation of the other.

Requesting the Aid of a Knowing Recipient

In the following, three parties—Pat, Jere, and Chil—are teaching a fourth—Ann—how to play bridge. Pat is explaining the bidding system to Ann. Analysis will begin with the talk in Line 5.

(1)
1. PAT: Now Ann you gotta count points.
2. (1.0)

1 See Sacks et al. (1974:727) and Garfinkel (1967).
3. ANN: Oh Okay.
4. (15.8)
5. PAT: Now if you have thirteen points:; (1.0)

It may be noted that Pat's utterance proposes an ordered, but unequal, distribution of information between the participants: that is, the speaker is engaged in the activity of telling the recipient something that the recipient does not yet know. Specific characteristics are thus posited for both an appropriate recipient and an appropriate speaker. For convenience, a recipient who is proposed to lack relevant information that the speaker possesses will be referred to as an unknowing recipient; a recipient who is supposed to possess information that the speaker lacks will be referred to as a knowing recipient. This latter situation arises with many requests (e.g., "Where is Grand Central Station?"). Note that in such requests, as in the action being considered in the present data, the information states proposed for speaker and hearer are complementary to each other.

The utterance Pat constructs in the present data thus proposes criteria for a recipient to it that Ann, a party who has not yet learned the rules of bridge, meets. Ann, however, does not direct her gaze to the speaker. During the pause, Pat looks at her intended recipient and discovers that, rather than looking at her, Ann is continuing to gaze at her cards.

PAT: ______ Ann

ANN: Now if you have thirteen points:, (- - - - - - - -)

Gazing toward cards

In Chapter 2 it was seen that speakers who find that they do not have the gaze of an addressed recipient have access to systematic procedures for requesting such gaze. However, in the present case, what the speaker finds is not simply that gaze is absent, but that her recipient is engaged in another recognizable activity relevant to the talk being produced, that of analyzing her cards. Further, this is an activity that might have to be brought to some sort of completion before the recipient will be able to deal with the "then . . ." clause projected by the "if . . ." clause in the talk already spoken.

Rather than moving immediately to the projected "then . . ." clause, speaker at this point produces talk modifying the initial part of the utterance, that is, talk about how the counting being described, and being performed by Ann, is to be done. Further, rather than continuing to locate Ann as her addressed recipient, and thereby invoke the relevance of Ann's gazing at her, speaker moves her gaze to another recipient, Chil:

PAT: ______ Ann

ANN: ______ Chil

counting:

Unlike Ann, Chil knows how to play bridge. Explaining to a novice, such as Ann, the details of the bidding system is both necessary and helpful. Telling an experienced bridge player these same facts is either insulting or absurd.

Pat is thus faced with the task of reconstructing her utterance from one that proposes the ignorance of its recipient about the event discussed in the utterance to one that proposes that its recipient has knowledge of that event. She accomplishes this task of moving from an unknowing recipient to a knowing one by changing her intonation so that her statement becomes marked as problematic. The pronunciation of "voi:ds?", the place in her utterance where her eyes reach Chil, is characterized by both a slight rise in intonation and an elongation of the syllable being spoken:

PAT: ______ Ann

ANN: ______ Chil

counting: voi:ds?

Through this change in intonation, uncertainty is displayed about what Pat is saying. A new action is therefore embedded within the ongoing statement. This new action, a request for verification, proposes that its recipient is knowledgeable about something that speaker is unsure of.
In producing this action, Pat does not simply change the state of knowledge proposed for her recipient; by displaying uncertainty about some aspect of the same phenomenon that she is elsewhere presenting herself as informed about she changes her own state of knowledge. The reciprocal changes of the states of knowledge proposed for both speaker and recipient have the effect of maintaining a complementary distribution of knowledge between them despite the fact that both action and recipient have been changed. Further, the speaker’s display of uncertainty accounts for and warrants the changes in action, recipient, type of recipient, and state of speaker’s knowledge that occur at this point in the talk.

It can also be noted that the talk to the knowing recipient continues to be relevant to the unknowing recipient. The talk addressed to Chil deals with how the activity of counting points—the activity Ann is performing—is to be done. It is thus inadequate to talk simply of this utterance as having an addressee; rather than being addressed to a single recipient, the utterance provides for the participation, not just of multiple recipients, but of recipients who differ from each other significantly in ways relevant to the talk in progress. Further, these different types of recipients are ordered relative to one another. Both the structure of the talk and the speaker’s gaze locate one party as the current focal recipient and the other as nonfocal recipient. Moreover, by combining shifts in gaze with modifications of her talk, speaker has the ability to change focal addressee and thus to reorder her recipients within a single utterance. The effect of all this is that an action to a knowing recipient can be embedded within an ongoing action to an unknowing recipient.

The knowing recipient Pat addresses here, Chil, fails, however, to attend her. Pat then brings her gaze to the last party present, Jere, who though he had briefly gazed at her, is discovered to have a glass in front of his face. Having failed to secure any of her three coparticipants as a recipient, Pat drops her eyes and escalates her action to the knowing recipients, adding to her utterance an explicit request for verification with full question intonation, “right?” Even this fails, and a gap over a second long follows:

1 Of particular relevance to what Pat does here is Vološinov’s argument (1973:86) that “orientation of the word toward the addressee has an extremely high significance. In point of fact, word is a two-sided act. It is determined equally by whose word it is and for whom it is meant. As word, it is precisely the product of the reciprocal relationship between speaker and listener, addressee and addressee. Each and every word expresses the ‘one’ in relation to the ‘other.’ I give myself verbal shape from another’s point of view . . . [italics in original].”

2 For other analysis of how different types of recipients might be distinguished see Goffman (1975:3).

---

**Requesting the Aid of a Knowing Recipient**

**PAT:**

| Now if you have thirteen points (1.00) counting: voi ds? singletons and doubletons = right? |

**ANN:**

**PAT:**

| Chil | Jere |

| counting: voi ds? singletons and doubletons = right? |

**ANN:**

**CHIL:**

**JERE:**

(1.2)

Pat’s failure to obtain a recipient generates the next item of talk. However, note that her recipients are chided, not for ignoring her, but for failing to attend to the tasks within which the talk is embedded:

**PAT:**

| Now if you have thirteen points (1.00) counting: voi ds? singletons and doubletons = right? |

(1.2)

**You gotta prompt Ann as she goes along. She’s never gonna remember all these things.**

These data reveal one systematic procedure for specifying recipients with different characteristics within a single turn. As speaker moves her gaze from an unknowing to a knowing recipient, she displays uncertainty about something that she and the knowing recipient presumably know in common and asks him to verify its accuracy. The states of knowledge made visible in the talk for both speaker and hearer are thus changed; focal addressee changes from an unknowing to a knowing recipient, and speaker becomes uncertain. By operating on her initial statement in this way, speaker not only explicitly recognizes knowing recipient’s special knowledge, but makes use of that knowledge for the organization of her talk.

There are in fact a number of systematic procedures that can be used to transform a statement, or a subordinate part of it, into an action appropriate to a knowing recipient. The following provides an example of two such techniques. As speaker moves her gaze to the party she is talking about, she asks that he verify what she has just said by adding the tag question “wasn’t it?” to her initial sentence. While continuing
to gaze at the knowing recipient, she provides further substantive information but finishes this talk with question intonation.3

(2) PAM: Well I think what’s funny is when he was in grade

.... Curt

[ sch ool. = wasn’t it? And y- (0.2) you were up playing

Curt

poker with the other; little kids? (0.6) And, these

kids; wouldn’t have their lunch cause Curt’s (0.7)

getting their lunch money from them.

In the discussion of Example (1), it was suggested that the talk explicitly addressed to the knowing recipient was still being directed to the unknowing recipient as well. Further support for that possibility is provided by the present example. Note that the addressee of the sentence produced after the speaker’s gaze leaves the knowing recipient is presumed to have heard that earlier talk. For example, the word “kids” in this subsequent talk is tied back to the earlier talk with the word “these,” and the way in which Curt obtained the other kids’ lunch money is not repeated but presumed to be already known. Thus, in the earlier talk, though the statements made are transformed (through intonation and the addition of a tag question) into statements appropriate to a knowing recipient, they are still being spoken for their unknowing recipients as well. Indeed, speaker organizes her subsequent talk on the assumption that unknowing recipient has made such a hearing.

Procedures for transforming a statement into a request for verification (for example, pronouncing the material to be marked as problematic with rising intonation) are available quite generally in conversation. It is there-

3 In addition to the change in actions, the change in recipients in this example also requires a change in the pronouns utilized to identify Curt: When Curt is not being gazed at, and the proposed recipients of the story are unknowing recipients, Curt is referred to as “he”; however, when Pam brings her gaze to Curt and locates him as her recipient, he is referred to as “you.” The same person is thus referred to with both second and third person pronouns within a single sentence. George Lakoff (1986) has examined some of the ways in which the same person might be different entities in the same sentence and the consequences this will have on features of the sentence such as its pronouns (see also Goffman 1974:524). In the data currently being examined, Curt is a present participant in one universe of discourse and a schoolboy in another. Pam’s request for verification notes this distinction as well as the link between the two characters. Curt-the-present-participant can only be asked to verify the doings of Curt-the-little-boy because of some assumed relationship between them.

fore not surprising that such techniques are used frequently when the task of addressing a knowing recipient is posed. The following provide some examples:

(3) PAT: Jere had to help me. I gotta twist it. They told her to

PAT: ............. Unknowing recipient

[ twist it co mpletely around like six times.

PAT: ............. Knowing recipient (Jere)

[ (- - - - - -) three times a day or something?

(4) PAT: Unknowing recipient

They just staple it. And the carring is in and you leave it

PAT: ............. Knowing recipient

in. (0.4) for:, (0.6) for :; (0.4) six weeks or something?

(5) BARBARA: Gordie bought some Orange Crush at

BARBARA: .... Unknowing rec... Knowing recipient (Gordie)

[ [ Rink’s this morning. Six? For what?

These examples provide support for the possibility that producing a request for verification in fact constitutes a systematic resource available to speakers for making visible the appropriateness of their talk for its current addressee as they move their gaze from one type of recipient to another.

Such procedures for including a knowing recipient in talk otherwise addressed to an unknowing recipient do of course provide a resource for dealing with interactive problems that might arise within the turn. For example, if an unknowing recipient fails to display proper hearsership, speaker has the ability to change the talk in progress so that it can be addressed to another recipient (note Example [1]). However, not all such shifts in address are motivated by difficulties with a recipient’s lack of attentiveness. In the conversation from which Examples (3) and (4) are taken, unknowing recipient was quite attentive. Nevertheless, speaker repeatedly used a request for verification with a concurrent gaze shift
to include her knowing recipient in her talk. The regular presence of phenomena such as these requests in situations where both types of recipients are present makes it relevant for us to examine the interactive organization of such a situation more carefully.

Talk in the Presence of a Knowing Recipient

There are in fact sound reasons for why speakers repeatedly find themselves in the presence of both knowing and unknowing recipients. For example, spouses regularly tell each other any new news that happens to one of them, but also attend many events, such as parties, together. At these events, some of the same news will be told, news that the spouse has already heard. In such circumstances, the knowing recipient might politely feign interest or even join a different conversation. However, it is also possible for such a party to systematically attend the talk. Instead of listening for the news that the speaker is providing, the knowing recipient might monitor the adequacy of the speaker’s presentation. By comparing what he already knows with the speaker’s current description, a knowing recipient can find inaccuracies and omissions, and might even decide to provide his own version of the events being recounted.

The following provides an example of such a process. Jim and Nadine have gotten married to each other on three separate occasions. Fred attended their third wedding. In this fragment Nadine tells the story of their three weddings. Both Jim (in Lines 6, 8, 11, 14, 17, 27–28, 31) and Fred (in Line 22) overlap her telling with their own versions of the events she is describing:

(6) (Simplified Transcript)
1. NADINE: You remember Father Denelland that mar– Well yeah we were married three times. You knew that story.
2.  
3. ANITA: I didn’t know ever
4. ANITA: hear that.
5. NADINE: Yeah well we were married in–

--This paragraph draws heavily upon analysis developed in much greater detail by Sacks (10/1977).
--Such phenomena are not of course unique to American culture. Thomas (1959:89–90), writing about the San of southern Africa, reports a dispute between two parties over the correct version of a story.
which tellings are organized. Further, such problems are not confined to spouses; they emerge whenever parties who have experienced an event together are jointly in a position to describe it to someone else. As Sacks (10/19/71:9) notes, the difficulties spouses face in telling stories arise “not so much by virtue of being a spouse, but by virtue of the consequences of being a spouse.”

The procedures being investigated in this chapter provide some techniques for dealing with the problems that emerge when both unknowing and knowing recipients are copresent. By producing a request for verification about a subordinate aspect of the event being described, a speaker can provide for the inclusion of a knowing recipient in a turn otherwise addressed to an unknowing recipient. A request for verification engages its recipient in many of the same operations that can lead to repeated correction and competition such as was found in Jim and Nadine’s story. The knowing recipient is asked to monitor what the speaker is saying for its correctness, but his participation in the telling of the event is constrained by the form of the request. For example, a request for verification both provides a specific type of next turn—that is, an answer to the request (which might be a simple nod or “mm mm”)—and focuses the attention of its recipient not on items omitted by the speaker in his telling (such as the reason for the meeting with the priest in Nadine and Jim’s story), but rather on the things he has actually said. Some of the potential for competitive talk is thus undercut. Moreover, such a request may also operate ritually, displaying deference to the other party present who could be telling the story and obtaining his approval of, and agreement with, the way in which it is being told.

The repeated forgetfulness that is sometimes found when spouses are in each other’s presence might thus be socially engendered. Rather than reflecting cognitive difficulty, such uncertainty, because of its interactive organization, provides a resource for dealing with some of the consequences that sharing experience with another has for the organization of talk.

**Discovering New News**

In the data so far examined, the inclusion of a knowing recipient in a turn initially addressed to an unknowing recipient has been accomplished by producing an action, such as a request for verification, that changes the information states projected for speaker and hearer by the talk of the moment. An utterance will now be investigated in which the
information states of speaker and hearer remain constant while the event being reported is transformed as the speaker moves his gaze from one type of recipient to another.

Analysis will focus on the following sentence (which has already received some attention, though from a different perspective, in Chapter 4): "I gave up smoking cigarettes one week ago today actually." The sentence was spoken during a dinner in the home of John and his wife Beth attended by their friends Ann and Don. While he is speaking, John directs his gaze to three different recipients during three different sections of the utterance. His gaze is directed to Don during "I gave up smoking cigarettes," to Beth during "one week ago today," and, finally, to Ann during "actually."

(7) JOHN: ............... Don. Don________
I gave u p smoking ci garettes:.. =
DON: =Yeah,

JOHN: .......... Beth......... Ann
l-u: one--one week ago toda: y. actually,

By plotting aspects of the speaker’s gaze, it is thus possible to divide his sentence into three separate sections during each of which a different recipient is gazed at.

An attempt will now be made to demonstrate that each of these sections is designed specifically for the recipient toward whom the speaker is gazing at the moment. It will be argued, first, that each segment is appropriate to a specific recipient and inappropriate to other possible recipients and, second, that the recipient to whom it is appropriate is the recipient toward whom the speaker is gazing during its production.

The first section of John’s sentence, "I gave up smoking cigarettes.", is a member of the class of actions that propose that the speaker has knowledge of an event about which the recipient is ignorant; it would be inappropriate to announce to someone that one had given up smoking when that recipient already knew it. Don and his wife Ann are the dinner guests of John and his wife Beth. Neither has seen the speaker for some period of time before the present evening. John thus has reason to suppose that Don has not yet heard the news he is now telling. He would therefore be an appropriate recipient to an announcement such as that made by John; and it is to Don that John directs his gaze during this section of his utterance. At least one party present at the dinner would not be an appropriate recipient of the first section of John’s sentence. Beth, the speaker’s wife, has been living in the same house with him for the past week and knows that he has given up smoking. Further, this is something that the speaker knows that she knows and indeed the others present can also legitimately see these things. Insofar as John’s initial statement is appropriate to an unknowing recipient and Beth is a knowing recipient, the present line of analysis implies that the event described to Don should not be reported to Beth.

For the next section of the sentence, "l-u: one--one week ago today.", John switches his gaze from Don, an unknowing recipient, to Beth, a knowing recipient. With the addition of this section to the sentence, the news that John has stopped smoking cigarettes is transformed into a different piece of news, that today is an anniversary of that event. Such an anniversary is a new event that none of the parties present, including Beth, need be expected to know about. By finding this new news, speaker thus manages to reshape his talk so that it becomes appropriate to a knowing recipient.

The structure of an anniversary makes it particularly appropriate as a solution to a problem such as that faced by John. An anniversary is constructed via the lamination of events at two separate moments in time—an original event which becomes the object of celebration, and the anniversary itself. The two are related by the occurrence of some regular period of time between them.13

---

10 Note that what is at issue is not the actual state of Don’s knowledge, but rather the speaker’s analysis of what is known by his recipient. Further, participants in conversation have access to systematic resources for affirming, denying, or negotiating that analysis (on this issue see the work cited in Note 2). For detailed study of specific ways in which participants analyze what their co-participants know, display that analysis to each other, and utilize that analysis in the detailed production of their talk, see Schegloff (1972).


12 The analytic notion of lamination as a structural feature of events and actions is discussed in Goffman (1974:82, 156–157).

13 An interesting discussion of how measurements producing ‘round numbers’ can construct distinct cultural phenomena (a “four-minute mile,” for example) is provided by Lotz (1968). Jefferson (1973:65–66) gives an analysis of how participants in conversation orient to, and utilize, this phenomenon in the construction of their talk. Gudhil (1976:20) notes how numbers that are recognizably not round, such as percentages given in decimals may be employed by a scientist to demonstrate “meticulous attention to details . . . thereby avoiding a judgement by the reader that he has been less than scrupulous.”
An anniversary is an appropriate object to call to the attention of someone who shared with the speaker the experience of the event that it celebrates. More precisely, interest in the anniversary is contingent upon interest in the event itself (for example, few other than a particular couple have any interest in the anniversary of their meeting). However, a party who knows of the original event need not be aware of the fact that a period of time appropriate for the location of an anniversary has passed. The laminated structure of the anniversary thus integrates items of common experience with novel information in a way particularly suited for the inclusion of a knowing recipient, such as Beth, in John’s utterance.

Such a laminated structure also maintains the relevance of this section of the sentence for its original recipient. First, the initial report to him is incorporated within it as the lowest layer of the lamination. Second, the report of the anniversary continues to perform an action relevant to an unknowing recipient, the description of that original event. In particular, it specifies the time at which the event occurred, an item that a recipient presumed to be ignorant of that event would not be expected to know. Thus, though this section of the sentence is made appropriate to a new type of recipient, it maintains its relevance for its original recipient.

In essence, each layer of the lamination locates an alternative type of recipient. Thus, like the request for verification, this structure provides for the simultaneous participation of different types of recipients, one of whom is located as focal addressee. What happens here indicates that on some occasions a cultural object, such as an anniversary, might be selected for presentation at a particular moment because its structural properties permit the solution of interactive problems posed in the construction of the turn.

Other features of John’s utterance provide support for the argument that he is reshaping his sentence in order to make it appropriate to a new type of recipient.

First, an alternative to the section of his sentence actually produced at this point is begun and abandoned:

JOHN: 1–uh: one—one week ago today.

The word beginning, “1–”, plus the hesitation, “uh:”, plus the second word “one” correspond to what Jefferson (1974:186) has described as the Error Correction Format. The word begun by the initial fragment constitutes an alternative to the second word, which corrects it, “Last week” and “last Monday” are possible alternatives to the section actually produced. An expression beginning with “last” in this position would do more than simply specify the time at which the event occurred; it would argue for the status of the speaker’s statement as news to an unknowing recipient by explicitly telling the recipient that it happened since they were last in contact with each other. In view of Don’s “yeah” after the first section of the sentence, which neither acknowledges the newsworthiness of the event nor requests elaboration of it, warranting what has just been said in this fashion may be a relevant act for the speaker to perform.

Such an alternative differs, however, from the one eventually selected in that it does not construct an action appropriate to a recipient already informed about the event being described. Its rejection thus provides further support for the argument that John, faced with the task of making this utterance appropriate to a new type of recipient, reshapes the event being described through the utterance.

Other evidence that the anniversary, which redesigns the sentence for its new recipient, was not projected as an element of the sentence from its beginning is provided by the speaker’s intonation, which locates sur-

---

14 Jefferson (1974a: 185–186) provides evidence that participants in conversation do orient to such fragments as word-beginnings and analyzes the procedures utilized for such recognition.

15 On this issue see Sacks (1974:341).

16 The relevance of a recipient’s acknowledging the newsworthiness of an event and ways in which this is done have been investigated by Terasaki (1976:4–9).
prise at the beginning of the section and places stress on the revelation of the anniversary:

**JOHN:** I-uh: one-one week ago today.

The discovery intonation at the beginning of the section is placed in contrast to a possible beginning without such stress. Specifically, the first and second “one” differ noticeably in their intonation so that the change in intonation is marked as the warrant for the restart. Such a structure both announces that something unanticipated has been discovered and locates where that discovery occurred. Recipients are thus informed not only that some new basis for listening is being offered, but also that this new information was discovered after the first section of the utterance. Such an announcement would be particularly important for a party, such as Beth, who has been located as an unlikely recipient to the speaker’s sentence by its first section.

John’s utterance thus provides some demonstration that a speaker in natural conversation has the capacity to modify the emerging meaning of his sentence as he is producing it with the effect that its appropriateness to its recipient of the moment can be maintained and demonstrated. Though the sentence originally begun proposed that its recipient had no knowledge of the event being described, by transforming that event and locating a new piece of news, the speaker was able to make the sentence appropriate to one who shared experience of it with him.

Transforming the event being told in the way John does here is an unusual solution to the problem of including a knowing recipient in a turn otherwise constructed for an unknowing recipient. John could have employed the procedures examined earlier in this chapter to make his utterance appropriate to Beth. For example, on turning to Beth, John could have produced the time that the event took place (as he indeed began to do at the beginning of this section) but indicated that it was problematic by pronouncing it with rising intonation, that is, “last week?” or “last Monday?” In a certain sense a solution of this type would have been simpler than the one actually used since it would have involved less modification of the emerging utterance. John’s choice of an atypical procedure for including a knowing recipient in his turn, and, further, a procedure that is not the most simple available for performing the tasks posed, invites speculation as to why his particular solution was chosen.

It is revealed several utterances later that John is taking a course on how to stop smoking from a group of Seventh Day Adventists. Seven days is of course precisely the time relationship necessary for the discovery of the anniversary. Sacks and his colleagues have shown that one feature systematically implicated in word selection in conversation is punning relationships of various types.” The availability of this particular name in the event being reported might thus be relevant to John’s discovery of the anniversary. Moreover once the anniversary has been found it has a preferred status for telling since it is the latest news, the original event being news that is already a week old.

Despite John’s careful and precise work to redesign his utterance for Beth, and, with his phrasal breaks, to signal that her gaze is needed, she does not bring her gaze to him. It was seen in the last chapter (pp. 131–133) that at this point John secures the gaze of a different recipient, Ann. In order to provide time within his turn for Ann to move her gaze to him, he adds to his sentence a new section, the word “actually”:

```
JOHN: . . . . Beth . . . . . Ann

[ ]

1-uh: one-one week ago today: y actu . . . .

BETH: . . . .

ANN: . . . . Beth . . . . . John
```

When John moves his gaze from Beth to Ann, the task of reconstructing his utterance so that it is made appropriate to his recipient of the moment is posed a second time. Unlike Beth, but like Don, Ann did not share with John experience of the event he is describing. Thus, a constraint on the segment to be added to the sentence to provide for her inclusion is that it make the proposed recipient of the sentence an unknowing recipient. “Actually” accomplishes this task. Through its addition the discovery of the anniversary is transformed into a report about it. Rather than being asked to recognize the anniversary, the recipient is told that in fact the event being marked by it did occur a week ago. The addition of “actually,” thus again reconstructs the emerging meaning of John’s sentence so that once more it becomes appropriate to its recipient of the moment.

In the course of its production, the unfolding meaning of John’s sentence is reconstructed twice, a new segment is added to it, and another is deleted prior to its production but replaced with a different segment. The sentence eventually produced emerges as the product of a dynamic process of interaction between speaker and hearer as they mutually construct the turn at talk. The fact that a single coherent sentence emerges is among the more striking features of this process.

---

17 See, for example, Sacks (1973), Jefferson (1974a: 189–190), and Sacks’s first three fall 1971 class lectures.
In this chapter, analysis has focused on the ability of the speaker to appropriate the different types of recipient utterances and to display them in the turn of the moment. Though different types of recipient utterances may be relevantly distinguished from each other in many different ways, the relevant analysis has been restricted to the one relevant to the moment. This analysis involves the speaker's knowledge of the recipient's knowledge about the recipient's utterance, the recipient's state of knowledge, and the construction of the recipient's knowledge. The ability to construct an appropriate utterance for a recipient is found to be useful for the accomplishment of both types of recipient utterances, and for the achievement of social organization. In order to explain the construction of the appropriate utterance, the speaker's role in the achievement of social organization is discussed. The speaker's role in the achievement of social organization is found to be useful for the construction of the appropriate utterance, and the construction of the recipient's knowledge is found to be useful for the achievement of social organization.

In Chapter 2, the interaction of the turn at talk in natural conversation was examined. It was found that particular states of the turn at talk are achieved in the process of producing utterances, by adding new sections to the units of organization, and the consequences of such processes. Chapter 3 examined the ways in which the speaker's role in the achievement of social organization is achieved, and examined the ways in which the speaker's role in the achievement of social organization is achieved. Through use of such resources, new sections to the units of organization were constructed, and the consequences of such processes were examined.