CONVERSATIONAL ANALYSIS:
An Application in the Philippine Setting

Viveca V. Hernandez

1.0 INTRODUCTION

This paper focuses on the organization of conversation and its application to the Philippine setting. The term *conversation* may be defined as that generally informal or casual talk wherein two or more participants freely take turns in speaking, which on the average happens exclusive of specific institutional settings such as law courts, schools, religious services, medical consultations, etc.

Levinson (1983) cites several reasons why one should look to conversation for insight into pragmatic phenomena since conversation is plainly the prototype of language use, being the form of our first exposure to language; i.e., when we were first learning to speak. As he states, several aspects of pragmatic organization can be manifested as intrinsically organized around usage in conversation. This includes the aspects of deixis, or unmarked uses of grammatical encodings of temporal, spatial, social, and discourse parameters arranged around an assumption of participants conversing with one another. Likewise, he says that presuppositions may also be viewed as set up around conversations, this time involving constraints on how information should be presented to participants who have particular assumptions and knowledge in common about the world. The issues relate closely to the differentiation between the given and the new, and pertain to conditions on how information is formed, both issues being significant in the organization of conversation. In the same manner, implicatures, which are typical of conversation, result from particular assumptions about the backdrop of such linguistic interactions. Similarly, one can say that many kinds of speech acts are formed on the assumption of a conversational matrix. Undoubtedly, the dependence of illocutionary force on conversation is such that the notion itself can be said to be virtually replaced by concepts of conversational function (Levinson 1983: 284-85).

For all practical purposes, it can be said that almost all pragmatic concepts relate closely to conversation as the principal or most basic kind of language use. Levinson contends that if the proper way to study the organization is by means of empirical techniques, this would suggest that the mainly philosophical traditions that gave birth to pragmatics may have to yield to more empirical types of investigation of language use. He opines that careful inductive work should be based on introspective data. The question raised here is whether pragmatics is a discipline that is fundamentally empirical or one that is essentially philosophical and whether the present deficit of integration in the subject is attributable

chiefly to the non-existence of adequate theory and conceptual analysis or to the insufficiency of adequate observational data, and above all, an empirical tradition (Levinson 1983: 285).

1.1 DISCOURSE ANALYSIS VERSUS CONVERSATION ANALYSIS

Broadly speaking , two major approaches to the analysis of conversation can be considered, i.e., discourse analysis (DA) and conversation analysis (CA). Often contrasted with each other, these two approaches intrinsically have to do with providing an account of how coherence and sequential organization in discourse is produced and understood. However, the two have contrastive and considerably incompatible styles of analysis as can be seen below:

DISCOURSE ANALYSIS

(1) Discourse analysis uses typically linguistic methodology, theoretical principles, and basic concepts (e.g., rules, well-formed formulas, etc.); substantially it is a series of attempts extending linguistic techniques beyond the sentence. Procedures used (often implicitly) are the following:
   (a) isolation of a set of basic categories or units of discourse
   (b) formulation of a set of concatenation rules stated over categories, delimiting well-formed sequences of categories (i.e., coherent discourses) from ill-formed ones (i.e., incoherent discourses)
(2) Typically there is an appeal to institutions, e.g., about what is and what is not a coherent or well-formed discourse.
(3) There is a tendency to take one or a few texts (often constructed by the analyst) and to attempt to give an in-depth analysis of all the features of this limited domain to find out "what is really going on."
(4) Its main strength is that it promises to integrate linguistic

findings about intra-sentential organization with discourse structure.
(5) Analysts can be divided into two basic categories: text grammaticians and speech act or interactional theorists. Text grammaticians believe that discourses can be viewed simply as sentences strung together; i.e., "discourse can be treated as a single sentence in isolation by regarding sentence boundaries as sentential connectives" (Katz & Fodor 1964: 490).

CONVERSATION ANALYSIS

(1) Conversation analysis is a rigorously empirical approach which avoids premature theory construction; methods are essentially inductive:
  (a) The search is for recurring patterns across many records of natural conversation.
  (b) Instead of theoretical rules as used in syntactic description, emphasis is made on interactional and inferential consequences of the choice between alternative utterances.
(2) There is as little appeal as possible to intuitive explanations; emphasis is on what can actually be found to occur, not on what one would guess would be odd or acceptable.
(3) There is a tendency to avoid analyses based on single texts; instead, as many as possible of some particular phenomena are examined across texts, not to show "what is really going on," but to discover the systematic properties of the sequential organization of talk, and the ways in which utterances are designed to manage such sequences.
(4) Its strength is that its procedures have proven themselves capable of yielding the most substantial insights that have been gained into the organization of conversation.
(5) Such a view is not a feasible model for conversation where links between speakers cannot be paraphrased as sentential connectives.

1.2 CONVERSATION ANALYSIS

Conversation analysis (CA) as a term used in linguistics and associated disciplines to refers to a method of studying the sequential structure and coherence of everyday conversation, usually using the techniques of ethnomethodology (Crystal 1985).

CA was started in the early-1970's by a break-away group of sociologists who are often known as ethnomethodologists on account of the methodology they used. Relevant to the pragmaticist are methodological preferences that result from this sociological background. The CA movement emerged in reaction to the quantitative techniques and the arbitrary imposition on the data of presumably objective categories which were characteristic of mainstream American sociology. Proposing to replace the predominantly deductive and quantitative methods of sociological studies prevalent at the time, CA exponents disputed that the proper objective of sociological research is the set of techniques that the members of the society themselves use to interpret and act within their own society. Hence the use of the word *ethnomethodology*, coined by Garfinkel, combining *ethno-* and *methodology*. It was proposed that any competent member of the society, the social scientist included, is equipped with a methodology for analyzing social phenomena. Therefore, the term ethnomethodology "refers to the study of the ways in which everyday common-sense activities are analyzed by participants, and of ways in which these analyses are incorporated into courses of action" (Roger and Derek 1989: 3). Levinson (1983: 295) adds:

> Out of this background comes a healthy suspicion of premature theorizing and *ad hoc* analytical categories: as far as possible the categories of analysis should be those that participants themselves can be shown to utilize in making sense of interaction; unmotivated theoretical constructs and unsubstantiated intuitions are all to be avoided ...

The most prominent development within thnomethodology is that which has come to be known as CA, which, as mentioned earlier, examines the procedures used in the production of ordinary conversation. The approach studies data consisting of tape-recordings and transcriptions of natural conversations in order to establish the properties that are systematically used in casual linguistic interactions of people. As with any undertaking involving data made up of conversations, a lot rests on transcriptions and practical problems come up, such as those relating to how broad or how narrow such transcriptions should be, and what notations or symbols should be used. For the purposes of this paper, in presenting excerpts of transcripts from my data, I have taken the liberty to modify the notation generally used in CA. (See Appendix for the list of diacritics used in the transcription of the data.) Standard orthography is used for both the English and Filipino data.

Although most of the literature reviewed are based on English data, and thus, the findings thereof may be partially culture specific, it is the aim of this paper to apply CA methodology to data in the Philippine setting and explore the structure of natural conversation in this cultural milieu.

Most of the data presented here was tape recorded surreptitiously by myself, thus ensuring reliable spontaneous data for analysis. If the participants had known that their conversations were being recorded, it would in all likelihood have affected their use of language, let alone the overall development of their conversations. But due to certain unavoidable constraints, some of the data used in this paper were not actually recorded (for example, telephone conversations). These were transcribed by me as soon as the said conversations were uttered, and I exerted all effort to faithfully transcribe the details of the conversation.

2.0 CA In The Philippine Setting

2.1 Turn-taking

Probably the most obvious observation one can make about conversations is that when people engage in such interactions, they usually take turns. The term *turn* or *turn-taking* is used in sociolinguistics as part of the study of conversational structure; i.e., conversation is seen as a sequence of conversational turns wherein each participant's contribution is viewed as part of a coordinated and rule-governed behavioral interaction (Crystal 1985). As Schegloff (1986) states, the sequencing of a two-party conversation is alternating, which he describes by the formula *ababab*. Adding that such a formula is "a specification of the basic rule for conversation," i.e., "one party at a time," he opines that

> [t]he strength of this rule can be seen in the fact that in a multiparty setting (more precisely, where there are four or more), if more than one person is talking, it can be claimed not that the rule has been violated, but that more than one conversation is going on ... (Schegloff 1986: 350)

Such a rule seems simple enough; however, when one pays closer attention to this, it is not so clear how such a distribution is actually done. For one thing, Levinson states that there are facts that show that less than five percent (5%) of the speech stream consists of overlap; i.e., two participants speak at the same time, but the gaps between the speakers' turns to talk usually take a few tenths of a second. Another perplexing thing cited by Levinson is that whatever mechanism is responsible for such turn-taking, it is clear that it has to be able to operate in quite diverse circumstances. For example, the number of participants may range from two to more than twenty; they may enter and/or exit the conversation at any given time; turns at speaking can also vary from minimal utterances, like "hhmm"or one-word utterances to several minutes of uninterrupted talk; and if there are more than two participants,

everybody is given the chance to speak without any specified order of speakers, plus the fact that the same mechanism seems to function equally well in face-to-face interaction as well as in instances when the speakers do not see each other, as on the telephone (Levinson 1983: 297).

Levinson cites the suggestion offered by Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson (1974; 1978) that the mechanism governing turn-taking is a set of rules with ordered options that operate on a turn-by-turn basis, i.e., a local management system. Such a system calls for minimal units from which turns at talk are structured. These units are analyzed as turn-constructional units partially by prosodic, especially intonational means. Just one of these turn-units is initially assigned to a speaker, the end of which consists of a point where speakers may change, called a transition relevance place (TRP). It is at a TRP where rules regulating the transition of speakers come in. Its projectability or predictability explains the recurrence of split-second transitions between speakers. Another feature of turn-units pointed out by Levinson is the possibility of selecting next speakers, some techniques of which include devices such as questions, offers, or requests together with an address term and tagged assertions plus an address.

Slightly modifying Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson (1978), Levinson presents the following rules that operate on turn-units (C = current speaker, N = next speaker, TRP = end of a turn-unit):

Rule 1 — applies initially at the first TRP of any turn
    (a) If C selects N in current turn, then C must stop speaking, and N must speak next, transition occurring at the first TRP after N-selection.
    (b) If C does not select N, then any (other) party may self select, first speaker gaining rights to the next turn.
    (c) If C has not selected N, and no other party self selects under option (b), then C may (but need not) continue (i.e. claim rights to a further turn-constructional unit).

Rule 2 — applies at all subsequent TRPs

When Rule 1 (c) has been applied by C, then at the next TRP Rules 1 (a)-(c) apply, and recursively at the next TRP, until speaker change is effected (Levinson: 298).

Consider the following:

(1) C: Hwag na lang tayo magsimba:, nove-magnovena na lang tayo
   V: // Oo nga, novena
   R: Para kay Willie?
(2) B: Anong pangalan ng aso nyo?
   V: // Sino?
   C: Sino sa kanila?

It will be observed that the rules cited in (1) take care of the basic observations noted earlier. Generally speaking, only one speaker speaks at any given time. Still overlaps do take place, and when they do, in most cases, these can be predicted. Either they occur as first starts competing with each other as in (1), as permitted by Rule 1 (b); or they occur in places where TRPs are misprojected; for example, in (2) the use of an address term, here a pronominal, triggers simultaneous, overlapping replies.

The rules also predict that when silence or the absence of vocalization occurs, it is specified in different ways based on the rules as either (i) a gap before a succeeding application of Rules 1 (b) or (c); or (ii) a lapse, i.e., when Rules 1 (a), (b), and (c) are not applied; or (iii) a significant or attributable silence of a selected next speaker following the application of Rule 1 (a). Take the following example:

(3) L: O sige, ako na lang ang maglalakad ng papeles
   I: E::
      ...
   I: A-ako sana:: ... pero::
      ...   ...
   I: Ang *init* init na ano?

Observe that in (3), a gap is caused by the delay of Rule 1 (b) applying; and then a lapse, indicated by a slightly longer pause, is brought about by not applying (a), (b), and (c) of Rule 1. Meanwhile two instances of attributable silence can be seen in (4) below. Since C selects V as the next speaker, it is expected that V should reply as provided for by Rule 1 (a):

(4) C: Sasama ka ba o hindi?

   ... ...

   C: Hmm?

   ... ...

   C: O, ano ba?

   V: Hindi na lang.

In the course of gathering data and preparing for this paper, although I have observed that visual signals (for example, gaze), to some extent, play quite a significant role in regulating turn-taking during face-to-face conversations, I quite agree with Levinson that

> it is not clear how a signal-based system could provide for the observed properties of turn-taking ... for example, a system of intonational cues would not easily accomplish the observable *lapses* in conversation, or correctly predict the principled basis of overlaps where they occur, or account for how particular next speakers are selected ... the signaling view, plausible as it is, viewed as a complete account of turn-taking seems to be wrong: signals indicating the completion of turn-constructional units do indeed occur, but they are not the essential organizational basis for turn-taking in conversation ... (1983: 302)

2.2 ADJACENCY PAIRS

Another local management organization in conversation is adjacency pairs. This is a term used in sociolinguistic analyses of conversational interaction that refers to a single stimulus-plus-response sequence by the participants or interactants of a conversation. Adjacency pairs have been analyzed in terms of their role in starting, maintaining, and closing conversations, prototypes of which include paired utterances such as question-answer, greeting-greeting, offer-acceptance, and the like (Crystal 1985; Levinson 1983: 303).

Levinson cites the characterization provided by Schegloff and Sacks (1973) of such paired utterances :

> *Adjacency pairs* are sequences of two utterances that are:
> (i)   adjacent
> (ii) produced by different speakers
> (iii) ordered as a **first part** and a **second part**
> (iv) typed, so that a particular first part requires a particular
>   second (or range of second parts) — e.g., offers require
>   acceptances or rejections, greetings require
>   greetings, and so on (Levinson 1983: 303-04).

He further adds the following rule that governs the use of such pairs:

> Having produced a first part of some pair, current speaker
> must stop speaking, and next speaker must produce at
> that point a second part to the same pair (Levinson 1983:
> 304).

> Although some consider adjacency pairs as "*the*
> fundamental unit" of conversational organization,
> Levinson, however, is of the opinion that "there are many
> other kinds of more complex sequential organizations

operating in conversation ..." and so he thinks it is important to view the characterization of such pairs given above only as a first approximation and is not adequate in a number of ways (Levinson 1983: 304).

He points to some problems relating to each condition in adjacency pairs, focusing on (i) adjacency and (iv) the kinds of second parts that are expected. First, strict adjacency is a very strong requisite, citing the usual occurrence of insertion sequences as in the following example where a pair of questions is embedded within another pair (Q1 is the first question, A1 its answer, etc.):

(5) A: Could you tell me where the play is playing?   (Q1)
     V: Which play are you talking about?   (Q2)
     A: Uh ... that one over there ... Macbeth   (A2)
     V: Oh ... that building over there ... on the 2nd floor   (A1)

Or, consider the following excerpt of a telephone conversation where again a question-answer pair plus a temporary exit, and its acceptance are embedded within another question-answer pair:

(6) R: Hello? pwede key Mang Boy?   (Q1)
     V: S - sino to?   (Q2)
     R: Si Robin.   (A2)
     V: Sandali lang, titingnan ko kung nandyan siya   (HOLD)
         . . .   .   (ACCEPT)
     V: Wala na sya e.   (A1)

As we can see, a number of levels of embedding may occur quite often such that a question and its corresponding reply may be many utterances apart. In such cases, the answer is only held in abeyance while preliminaries are thought out, hence limiting the contents of insertion sequences to clearing up of such preliminaries. So it seems reasonable to replace the strict standard of adjacency with the notion of conditional relevance. In other words, given a first part of a pair, a second part is immediately relevant and can

be expected. In the event that such a second part does not take place, it is conspicuously absent. If, on the other hand, another first part occurs in its place, it will be taken as a preliminary to the action of the second part and its relevance is not lifted until the time it is either directly heeded or aborted.

Another problem that crops up with the notion of adjacency pairs pointed out by Levinson relates to the range of possible second parts to a first part. Save for the fact that for any first part there is a small or fixed set of second parts, the concept will be unable to describe the coherent organization in conversation. In actuality, he calls attention to the fact that there are a lot of responses to questions other than answers which are considered acceptable second parts, for example, assertions of ignorance, 're-routes,' unwillingness to give an answer, and challenges to the presuppositions or sincerity of the question. So in effect, although answers to questions may be restricted, undoubtedly they do not consist of a small set and this seems to refute or weaken the structural significance of the notion of an adjacency pair.

But the significance of the concept is revived by the notion of preference organization wherein the salient point is that not all possible second parts to a first part of an adjacency pair are of equal footing. Alternative seconds are ranked such that at least one is preferred and one dispreferred. The idea of preference here is not psychological in that the speaker's or hearer's individual preference is not referred to. Instead it is a structural notion closely corresponding to the concept of markedness as used in linguistics. In brief, preferred seconds or simply preferreds are unmarked, while on the other hand, dispreferred seconds or dispreferreds are marked. Consider the following examples illustrating the contrast between the two:

(7) V: Yun balat mo, akin na lang, ibibigay ko sa aso
    B: Sure!

(8) C: Ah::....bisi ka ba bukas?, pwede kaya tayong pumunta
       sa Makati?

       ... .

    V: e - e ... malamang:·

    C: hhmm::

    V: Kasi mey tinatapos akong papel

Notice that in (7), the request is granted without much delay; in fact, it is done almost without any gap between the two parts of the pair. While on the other hand, in (8), rejecting a request to accompany a friend somewhere is done after a long pause, and then after further delay (illustrated by *e – e* and a short pause), and by a lengthened *malamang.*:, followed by an explanation for the rejection. Dispreferreds, e.g., rejections of requests, are usually uttered and marked this way, i.e., (a) after a significant delay, (b) with a preface that serves as a marker of their dispreferred status, and (c) with some kind of explanation as to why the preferred second cannot be performed.

2.3 OVERALL ORGANIZATION

Aside from the two types of local organization that operate in conversation, i.e., turn-taking and adjacency pairs, there are other varied orders of organization in conversation, like repair or pre-sequences. In addition to these, there are those that can be called overall organizations since these "organize the totality of the exchanges within some specific kind of conversation" (Levinson 1983: 308-09).

The telephone call is one such conversation that has a discernible overall organization. As mentioned earlier, due to unavoidable circumstances (i.e., I have no resources to tap telephones), the data presented here are not recordings. Rather, they are self-transcribed telephone conversations of which I was a participant. Anyway, conversations over the phone may be said to

belong to a type of verbal interactions that have many common characteristics, that is to say, those social activities that are created by talk itself. Such linguistic interchanges have a tendency to have clear-cut beginnings and carefully organized closings.

Adhering to Schegloff (1986), the openings of telephone conversations here are assimilated to summons-answer sequences; i.e., the ringing of the telephone is considered the summons, such that the first turn at talk — the *hello* uttered by the receiver — is viewed as the second interactional move. Quite unlike other adjacency pairs, summons-answer sequences always are a prelude to something. Hence these are in actuality elements of three-turn sequences at the minimum.

An important feature of openings in conversations over the telephone is the instantaneous relevance and the possible problems of identification and recognition. It is interesting to note that there is not much difference in the first three turns of many telephone conversations in either English or Philippine setting. Probably due to the fact that the telephone is a Western invention, we Filipinos usually answer the phone in English. It usually goes like this, or something very similar to this:

(9) C: ((causes telephone to ring at R's location))
T1 R: Hello
T2 C: Hi
T3 R: Oh hi:: (Levinson 1983: 311)

As Levinson states, such opening sections explain a vital finding of CA, viz., "that a single minimal utterance or turn can be the locus of a number of quite different overlapping constraints" and in this way it can perform and can be made to perform several distinct functions concurrently (Levinson 1983: 311). In this case, for example, T1, although it is the first turn in the vocal interchange, is not the first move in the conversation. The telephone ring is actually the summons, while T1 is the response to it. However, at the same

time T1 also manifests the recognition of the identity of the receiver of the call. Regardless of the fact that it is the symbol of greeting, T1 does not actually function as a greeting. It is T2 that is the first part of greeting-greeting adjacency pair, and this being so, gets a greeting in return in T3, thus indicating that T1 is not a greeting at all. Furthermore, because of its minimal greeting form, T2 really claims recognition of the receiver based only on the quality of the voice in T1. It also claims that the receiver likewise can recognize the caller based on the minimal voice-quality provided. Hence, T3 also claims recognition of the caller by returning the greeting. Therefore, the overlapping organizations just discussed are: (a) conversations on the phone and others akin to it start with summons-answer pairs; (b) mutual greetings are appropriate at the very beginning of calls; (c) recognition or identification is of chief importance also at the start of the calls. This may be summarized as:

```
(10) C: ((rings))(SUMMONS)
  T1  R: Hello   (ANSWER) + (DISPLAY FOR RECOGNITION)
  T2  C: Hi      (GREETINGS 1ST PART)
                 (CLAIM THAT C HAS RECOGNIZED R)
                 (CLAIM THAT R HAS RECOGNIZED C)
  T3  R: Oh hi :: (GREETINGS 2ND PART)
                 (CLAIM THAT R HAS RECOGNIZED C)
(Levinson: 312)
```

The opening section of a phone call is usually followed by an announcement of the reason for the call by the caller in the first topic slot. This first topic slot is a privileged one since it is the only one most likely to be free from any topical constraints. The main body of the call is structured by topical constraints. The first topic slot is viewed as the chief reason for the phone call, after which topics of the body are preferred to be 'fitted' to those preceding ones.

Given that topics of the body usually are structured by topical constraints and that marked topic jumps or shifts do occur quite often in natural conversations, it has been suggested that topics can be described in terms of reference. Levinson is of the opinion that:

> [w]hat needs ... to be studied is how potential topics are introduced and collaboratively ratified, how they are marked as 'new', 'touched off', 'misplaced' and so on, how they are avoided or completed over and how they are collaboratively closed down (Levinson 1983: 315).

He continues stating that such collaborative procedures for opening, changing, and closing topics, although not exactly part of the overall organization of phone calls, however interact intricately with matters of overall organization. For example, as noted earlier, the first topic slot after the opening section is given importance by later topical constraints, supported by the fact that after a summons-answer pair is uttered, a reason for the summons will be given. In the same manner, techniques for closing a topic are closely linked to the introduction of the closing section of the phone call.

With regard to the closing sections of the overall organization of phone calls or the like, Livens says that these are delicate matters technically and socially. Technically, because they have to be positioned in such a way that no participant is made to exit when he still has something to say, and socially, since endings that are too hurried and too slow can convey unpleasant inferences about the social relationships between the interactants. Although the characteristics discussed by Levinson (1983: 317) are undoubtedly valid in both English and Philippine settings, the limited data gathered for this paper did not provide appropriate illustrations. This may be accounted for by the fact that the majority of the telephone conversation transcripts were very short due to the fact that the telephone being used was an official phone.

To summarize, here is the overall organization of one complete call:

```
(11) C: ((rings))    (SUMMONS)
 T1   R: Hello::?(ANSWER) + (DISPLAY FOR RECOGNITION)
 T2   C: Heidi::?    (GREETINGS 1ST PART)
                     (CLAIM THAT C HAS RECOGNIZED R)
                     (CLAIM THAT R CAN RECOGNIZE C)
 T3   R: Te          (CLAIM THAT R HAS RECOGNIZED C)
 T4   C: Dumating na ba si Vida?
                     (1ST TOPIC SLOT/REASON FOR CALL)
                     (Q1)
 T5   R: Hindi po.   (A1)
 T6   C: H - hindi::? ... Hindi siya dumating?    (SAME TOPIC)
                                                  (Q2)
 T7   R: Sa Sabado na lang daw.    (A2)
 T8   C: Ah ... pag tumawag siya, ipaalala mo
         y - yung damit na hinihiram ko ha?    (SAME TOPIC)
                                               (REQUEST)
 T9   R: Oo, ate.                  (RESPONSE)
 T10  C: O sige.                   (GOODBYE)
 T11  R: Opo                       (RESPONSE)
```

3.0 CA AND LINGUISTICS

In the above discussion we have seen that CA has made significant contributions to the comprehension of utterance meaning by showing how a big proportion of the situated significance of utterances can be traced to the sequential environs surrounding them. As mentioned earlier at the beginning of this paper, the different aspects of pragmatic theory may be studied in CA terms, whether these pertain to problems of indirect speech acts, problems with regard to analyzing deixis.

CA's contributions to the study of linguistic form, i.e., prosodics, phonology, syntax, and lexicon, may be less clear; nevertheless, they exist. Levinson explains some of the manifest relations between conversational and linguistic structure by taking some conversational organizations and looking into how each could be a functional source of, or explanation for, some linguistic structures and expressions.

For instance, the turn-taking system directly generates the prosodic and syntactic signaling of the completion and incompletion of turns. In its turn, the signaling of incompletion provides the basis for syntactic subordination, and predicts a preference for structures that are left-branching, or traces to the left of structures that are right- branching. It is interesting to note that just like the English relative clause in *I am reading the book which I gave you* (Levinson 1983: 365), the Tagalog gloss *Binabasa ko ang librong binigay ko sa iyo* is more liable to overlap than its equivalent in, say, Japanese *Watashi wa anata ni ageta hon o yondeirui.* On the contrary, the likelihood that the speaker may be able to continue after completion, such that it is possible that a turn may extend over more than one turn-constructional unit, makes it preferable that syntactic structures permit open-ended conjunction or addition to the right. The fact that the predicate normally precedes the subject in say, situational sentence structures in Tagalog, as well as in other Philippine languages, makes this observation very feasible in the language. The system of turn-taking also provides demands that are more particular on linguistic structure. For instance, the stipulation in Rule 1 (a) above for selecting the next speaker directly induces tag-formation. In Tagalog, utterance/ sentence tags like *ha, ano, di ba* seem to have a role pertinent to the system of turn-taking.

In the same manner, the organization of adjacency pairs motivates aspects of linguistic structure. As Levinson (1983: 365) states:

a general explanation for the cross-linguistic prevalence of the three basic sentence-types (declarative, interrogative and imperative) may lie in the basic distinction between, respectively, utterances that are not first-pair parts, utterances that are first parts to other utterances, and utterances that are first parts to actions.

Likewise, the organization of such pairs gives rise to ways of classifying first parts of adjacency pairs as needing particular types of second part, for example, Yes-No questions vs. WH-questions.

Lastly, aspects of overall conversational organization also interact with linguistic structure, the most conspicuous of which can be seen in the formulas that are typical of openings and closings.

APPENDIX

Diacritics used in the transcription of the data:

//	= current utterance is overlapped by that transcribed below
(( ))	= probable transcription or some non-vocal action
'	= natural pause in conversation
...	= a short pause
... ...	= a slightly longer pause
... ...	= a long pause
italics	= word stressed by amplitude, pitch, and duration
(CAPS)	= analytical labels
:	= lengthened vowels
::	= lengthened syllables
-	= self-editing marker
?	= rising intonation contour (not a punctuation mark)
.	= falling intonation contour
!	= expression of surprise, delight, anger, etc.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Coulthard, Malcolm. *An Introduction to Discourse Analysis.* 2nd ed. New York: Longman, 1985.

Crystal, David. *A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics.* Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1985.

Garfinkel, Harold. "Remarks on Ethnomethodology." In Gumperz and Hymes, eds., *Directions in Sociolinguistics,* 1986.

Gumperz, John Joseph and Dell Hymes, eds. *Directions in Sociolinguistics.* 2nd rev. ed. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1986.

Heritage, John. "Current Developments in Conversation Analysis." In Roger and Bull, eds., *Conversation: An Interdisciplinary Perspective,* 1989.

Keller, Eric. "Gambits: Conversational Strategy Signals." *Journal of Pragmatics* 3: 219-38, 1979.

Levinson, Stephen. *Pragmatics.* Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1983.

Murray, Stephen O. "The Sound of Simultaneous Speech, the Meaning of Interruption." *Journal of Pragmatics* 12: 115-16, 1988.

_____ and Lucille H. Covelli. "Women and Men Speaking at the Same Time." *Journal of Pragmatics* 12: 103-11, 1988.

Roger Derek and Peter Bull, eds. *Conversation: An Interdisciplinary Perspective.* Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 1989.

Sacks, Harvey. "On the Analyzability of Stories by Children." In Gumperz & Hymes, eds., *Directions in Sociolinguistics*, pp. 325-45, 1986.

Schegloff, Emmanuel A. "Sequencing Conversational Openings." In Gumperz & Hymes, eds., *Directions in Sociolinguistics*, pp. 346-80. Reproduced from *American Anthropologist* 70 (6), 1986.

_____. "Presequences and Indirection." *Journal of Pragmatics* 12: 55-62, 1988.

Schiffrin, Deborah. *Conversation Analysis. Linguistics: The Cambridge Survey*. Ed. by Frederick J. Newmeyer. Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1988.

Sebeok, Thomas A., ed. *Encyclopedic Dictionary of Semiotics*. Vol.1 (A-M). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 1986.

Talbot, Mary. "The operation was a success: Unfortunately the patient died." *Journal of Pragmatics* 12: 113-14, 1988.

Ventola, Eija. "The Structure of Casual Conversation in English." *Journal of Pragmatics* 3: 267-98, 1979.