"instigating": storytelling as social process

MARJORIE HARNESS GOODWIN—*University of South Carolina*

Within the past decade, research in several different disciplines has converged on the analysis of a particular speech event—stories. Recent work in folklore has analyzed the relationships of storytelling to larger social scenes (Bauman 1972; Kirshenblatt-Gimblett 1974; McCarl 1976, 1980; Nusbaum 1976). Such "performance-centered" (Hymes 1962, 1972, 1975; Abrahams 1968, 1970, 1972; Bauman 1977) studies argue for the need to investigate the relationship between folkloristic materials, such as "storytelling events" (Georges 1969), "and other aspects of social life *in situ* . . . where that relation actually obtains, the communicative events in which folklore is used" (Hymes 1972:46). By way of contrast, analysis of features of the internal structure of stories has been the primary focus of research by sociolinguists, anthropologists, and folklorists influenced by Labov and Waletzky's (1968) studies of narrative (Brady 1980; Kernan 1977; Polanyi 1977, 1979; Pratt 1977; Stahl 1977; Watson 1973; Wolfson 1978)[1] and Goffman's (1974) notion of "frame" (Babcock 1977; Schiffren 1980; Sherzer 1980). Despite the convergence of several fields of study on the analysis of stories, few researchers as yet investigate specific texts in detail to examine how the fact that stories can be part of larger speech events embedded in social processes extending beyond the immediate social encounter[2] is consequential for the construction of a story by a speaker and its interpretation by a hearer. Such is the endeavor of this paper.

In a gossip-dispute activity called "he-said-she-said," observed among urban black preadolescent children (M. Goodwin 1980b), the activity of reporting to a recipient what was said about her in her absence constitutes an important preliminary stage. It is the point where such an event becomes socially recognizable as an actionable offense. The party talked about may then confront the party who was reportedly talking about her "behind

This paper investigates a particular form of storytelling, instigating, *that occurs within a gossip-dispute activity called "he-said-she-said." Through the storytelling a party is informed about another person's having committed the offense of talking about her behind her back. The larger framework of the dispute provides organization for the storytelling process in several ways: (1) it provides structure for the cited characters and their activities within the story; (2) it influences the types of analysis recipients must engage in to appropriately understand the story; (3) it makes relevant specific types of next moves by recipients: for example, evaluations of the offending party's actions during the story, pledges to future courses of action near the story's ending, and rehearsals of future events at story completion and upon subsequent retellings.* [conversation analysis, social organization, narrative, gossip, situational analysis, Black English Vernacular]

0094-0496/82/040799-21$2.60/1

her back." Such informing typically is accomplished through use of structured descriptions of past events or "stories"[3] (Sacks 1974) by a girl who will stand as neither accuser nor defendant. Such storytelling is called "instigating" by the children. They talk about the activity of deliberately presenting the facts in such a way as to create conflict between people in the following way:

example 1 Sha: Everytime she- we do somp'm she don't like she go and tell somebody a lie. She make up somp'm and then she always go away.

The instigator may initiate a sequence of events that leads to conflict as part of a process for sanctioning the behavior of a girl who steps outside the bounds of appropriate behavior.

Instigating possesses features of the black speech event analyzed as "signifying" by Mitchell-Kernan (1971, 1972) and Kochman (1970). According to Mitchell-Kernan (1972:165) signifying refers to "a way of encoding messages or meanings in natural conversations which involves, in most cases, an element of indirection," either with reference to "(1) the meaning or message the speaker is adjudged as intending to convey; (2) the addressee—the person or persons to whom the message is directed; (3) the goal orientation or intent of the speaker" (1972:166). Kochman (1970:157), in discussing signifying, has stated that "the signifier reports or repeats what someone else has said about the listener; the 'report' is couched in plausible language designed to compel belief and arouse feelings of anger and hostility."

The sequence of events that occurs as a result of stories being told about what was said in a story recipient's absence is parallel to the sequencing of events resulting from the "signifying" that occurs in one of the most popular of black folklore forms, "The Signifying Monkey" (Abrahams 1964:147–157; Dorson 1967:98–99). In its "toast" form the lion confronts the elephant after the monkey tells him that the elephant was talking about him. The monkey provokes the confrontation by talking about the insults against the lion delivered by the elephant. As in the "he-said-she-said," past events are reported in such a way as to lead to confrontation; however, the offenses at issue are not the more general activity of having talked about someone in her absence, but rather personal insults. The folklore form of "The Signifying Monkey" crystallizes what in everyday life is a recognizable event configuration in black culture; the positions in the he-said-she-said drama are, however, transformed into animal figures.[4]

The larger social process at issue that interpenetrates the storytelling, bringing about future confrontation through indirection, has consequences for the actions of both speaker and hearer. It not only provides organization for the internal structure of the story (for example, the characters in the story and the actions they perform); but, in addition, it influences the types of analysis the recipient must engage in to appropriately understand the story, as well as the types of responses that the recipient is expected to provide. A later section of this paper investigates such features in detail and relates them to how storytelling is constitutive of larger social processes. In the next section of this paper I discuss how this feature of reporting is relevant to general issues of description in anthropology.

the relevance of this study for cultural anthropology

Because anthropologists frequently rely on reports as primary data sources, a central concern has been how accurately the report corresponds to the initial events it describes (Bilmes 1975). Others have argued, however, that the central issue is not the correspondence between the report and the event it describes but rather the organization of the description as a situated cultural object in its own right (Sacks 1963, 1972:331–332).

In the present investigation I am concerned not with how accurately a story reflects the initial event it describes but rather with the problem of how the description of the past is constructed in the first place such that it is a recognizable cultural object appropriate to the ongoing social project of the moment. Indeed, I wish to argue, as does Vološinov (1971), that the context of reporting itself provides the description with its primary organization. Anthropologists, rather than accepting reports as instances of the events they describe, must seriously investigate the process of reporting itself. In a similar vein, as recent writers on "the anthropology of experience" such as Bruner (1980) have argued, it should be kept in mind that the *ethnographer's* "story" of events is not itself unmotivated; rather, "how we depict any segment of the sequence [past, present, future] is related to our conception of the whole" (Bruner 1980:4).

Insofar as the present study of the activity of instigating attempts to analyze what Frake (1977:5-6) describes as "the script for planning, staging, and performing" a particular cultural "scene," it is situated within an approach to the analysis of culture that advocates description of the formal procedures for constructing culturally recognizable events (Goodenough 1964, 1971). While, as Goodenough (1971:102-103) notes, "anthropologists have rarely considered simple clusters associated with one or only a few activities as the units with which to associate the phenomenon of culture," here I am explicitly concerned with such an undertaking.

Previous studies of gossip have been concerned with different endeavors—outlining gossip's social functions (Gluckman 1963, 1968; Epstein 1969; Colson 1953; Hannerz 1967; Harris 1974; Herskovits 1937, 1947; Frankenberg 1957), as well as the uses to which it is put by individuals and factions (Szwed 1966; Hannerz 1967; Campbell 1964; Cox 1970; Paine 1967); discussing its performance standards (Abrahams 1970); and arguing that its investigation "reveals how native actors examine, use and manipulate cultural rules in natural contexts" (Haviland 1977:5). While gossip is constituted by what people say to one another, in no instance have researchers described how people gossip by providing transcripts of naturally occurring gossip;[5] that is, though gossip is recognized as a form of talk, that talk is not the phenomenon anthropologists have chosen to analyze. As this analysis shows, the structure of the interactive situation itself influences the form gossip talk takes; and, indeed, to be the recipient of appropriate gossip talk one must be a potential player in the larger event, something that most anthropologists who elicit talk are not.

Ironically, it is not at all uncommon for anthropologists investigating activities constituted through talk—whether informal or rhetorical—to omit texts from their analysis (see Ben-Amos 1981:113). Yet, if "describing a culture in a way that allows one to have some confidence in a claim to have revealed a bit of reality rather than to have created a bit of fantasy" (Frake 1980:333) constitutes a goal of ethnographic description, providing texts for the scrutiny of others should be a primary rather than an incidental concern. Such texts enable the anthropologist to describe institutions such as social control mechanisms within a society as dynamic cultural processes rather than as formal static structures. The close analysis of verbal exchanges in the conflict situation of the "he-said-she-said" permits a dynamic study of the scripting and enacting of what Turner (1974, 1980) calls "social drama."

Lack of attention to what people say to one another may in part be due to a prejudice that such activities are banal by comparison with larger, more exotic spectacles or "big moments" through which societies, the social unit generally studied by anthropologists, as opposed to smaller "clusters," are felt to embody symbols which smack of their cultural core. Face-to-face talk is, however, not only one of the most pervasive, but one of the most central, types of social organization that human beings engage in. It should therefore be a

central concern for anyone attempting to develop a general theory of human social organization, one that embodies linguistic and cultural competence.

It was only in the 1960s and 1970s, primarily through Goffman's (1963, 1964, 1967, 1971) insights, that small and humble forms of social organization—the routine encounters of everyday life—came to be thought of as phenomena with a ceremonial structure as important, and sometimes as intricate, as that of the most elaborate rites of passage, worthy of study *because of* their utter banality and pervasiveness. A very powerful approach to the study of the details of ordinary conversational sequences was developed by Harvey Sacks and his colleagues (Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson 1974; Schegloff, Jefferson and Sacks 1977; Schegloff and Sacks 1973; Sacks 1974; Schegloff 1968, 1980; Jefferson 1974; Pomerantz 1978). Concurrently, philosophers and linguists, attempting to look beyond the sentence toward "pragmatics," hypothesized a theory of preconditions and postulates underlying "speech acts" (Austin 1962; Searle 1970; Grice 1969; Labov and Fanshel 1977). Thus, in recent years, anthropologists have been afforded new and rich tools for the systematic investigation of everyday talk, making possible the exploration of phenomena as diverse as how children acquire proficiency of conversational skills (Ochs and Schieffelin 1979); or how institutions such as the law (Atkinson and Drew 1979; Maynard in press), the schools (Mehan 1979; McDermott 1976), and the press (Fishman 1980) carry out their business; or how speakers and hearers jointly influence one another during the course of utterances (C. Goodwin 1981). In addition, activities seemingly unrelated to talk, such as how scientific facts are reported (Garfinkel, Lynch, and Livingston 1981; Lynch in press; Latour and Woolgar 1979), have received fruitful analysis from a perspective that includes focus on the details of the interactive organization of talk.

The importance of focusing anthropological research directly on conversational activities has been recently stated quite eloquently by Frake (1980:334):

> It is not . . . just that the ethnographer must talk to people to get his work done. It is also the case that the ethnographer's work, after all, is to describe what people do. And what people do mostly is talk. Another great mystery in my life has been to understand how social scientists of all breeds have so long been able to ignore this simple fact. Yet it is through talk that people construe their cultural worlds, display and recreate their social orders, plan and critique their activities, and praise and condemn their fellows . . . good ethnography requires careful listening to—and watching of—people talking to each other in the natural scenes of their social life.

The study of ordinary conversation not only focuses attention on what cross-culturally constitutes one of the most pervasive of all human activities; in addition, it causes us to examine critically the very process of reporting, which constitutes a primary vehicle for learning about culture.

characteristics of the girls' social organization

The data that form the basis of this study are the conversations of a particular group of black, working-class children from west Philadelphia, ages 7 through 13, whom I recorded for a year and a half as they went about their play activities on the street. These children, who for purposes of reference will be called the "Maple Street group," live within a block of one another and interact regularly in focused activities such as playing games and talking.

Instigating takes place only among those girls who regularly interact and judge themselves in terms of one another. This speech event reflects girls' rather than boys' social concerns. Boys make overt comparisons of one another through commands, threats, insults, and stories of others' cowardliness (M. Goodwin 1982), as well as in terms of skill in

play activities and games. They therefore evaluate one another using fairly explicit standards.

Girls, by contrast, have few games that result in ranking; they spend most of their time jumping rope, playing house or school, or talking (M. Goodwin 1980a:170–172). Among themselves, aggravated speech acts are called into play only when serious affronts have been committed, generally when a girl learns that she was talked about behind her back. Operating with reference to what appears by comparison with the boys' group to be a form of egalitarianism, girls critique others who "think they cute" or "better" than others. They employ criteria that may exist as much in the mind of the observer as in the actions of the observed. Such critiques among status equals create what has been discussed by social psychologists (Simmel 1902:45–46; Caplow 1968; Vinacke and Arkoff 1957), as well as the girls themselves (Goodwin 1980b:683), as coalitions of "two against one"; this form of social organization and exclusiveness is reportedly more characteristic of girls' groups than of boys' (Eder and Hallinan 1978).

Both the timing and the framing of complaints against others within girls' and boys' groups differ as well. Although boys confront others directly, girls instead complain about other girls in their absence. This situation thus has parallels with norms of social order among the Makah (Colson 1953:233–234) and in the village of Vacluse (Frankenberg 1957), in which to maintain the appearance of harmony and friendship and never give grounds to say that one has insulted another, differences of opinion are expressed in talk behind someone's back. In the Maple Street group, when a girl learns she has been talked about behind her back, she may initiate formal proceedings against another in a public dispute. Such a course of action, however, occurs primarily in instances where the girl doing the confronting can be expected to win because of factors such as friendship alignments, verbal skill, or seniority. Among boys, aggravated accusations of the form "You did X!" are used in verbal contests; frequently, retorts are admissions such as "I know" or "So what!" By way of contrast, among girls the form of action opening a he-said-she-said confrontation is framed in indirect speech: "Y said you said I said X" (M. Goodwin 1980b). This formating of the accusation provides for deniable return actions; it therefore differs form the baldly stated actions of boys by protecting the face of both parties to the dispute.

structure in telling and listening to instigating stories

In this section of the paper I analyze how the activity of bringing about a future confrontation has direct bearing on the way the speaker structures her instigating story and the recipient responds to it. (A complete transcript of the stories under discussion appears in the Appendix,[6] a careful reading of which, at this point, will enable readers to understand the specific points to be made here.) The activity of telling a story that leads to a confrontation is compared with other forms of storytelling that occur in the group. Analysis then turns to how recipients' responses to instigating stories are differentiated, depending on the identity relationship of listener to figures in the story. Much of Goffman's (1974) work on "the frame analysis of talk" will be relevant here. Following this discussion I provide a closer look at the speaker's telling to examine ways in which the speaker makes use of forms of indirection to coimplicate the hearer in a form of future activity.

the telling Frequently, the stories told by girls concern others who are judged to have behaved in an inappropriate fashion. When girls talk about other girls they frequently do so in a guarded fashion, being mindful of the possibility that the present listener could report to the talked-about party what was said in her absence.

For example, in beginning a story about a nonpresent party Terry makes the following admonition to Nettie:

example 2 Ter: Don't tell nobody about what I said, Nettie. Bout- don't even tell Pam cuz I **know** Pam might go back and tell.

In stories about others' inappropriate activities, as well as in the instigating stories in the Appendix, certain features are common: (1) *the principal character in the story is a party who is not present;* (2) *the nonpresent party performs actions directed toward some other party;* and (3) *these actions can be seen as offenses.* Although much of girls' talk concerns negative evaluation of female agemates' activities, such talk need not necessarily lead to a confrontation if the activities of the talked-about party were not in the past directed toward the present recipient of the teller's talk. Thus, the feature of instigating stories that distinguishes them from other types of gossip stories is that: (4) *the recipient of the offenses is the present hearer, target of the cited offenses.* The placement of the present recipient within the story as a principal figure provides for her involvement in it and, consequently, for the story's rather enduring lifespan by comparison with other recountings.

Some evidence is available that the four features listed above are oriented toward the listener (offense recipient) by the teller in the construction of her stories (see Appendix), that lead to a confrontation. When one hearer leaves (following the completion of example A1), the speaker changes her stories. While the absent party remains constant, the recipient of her actions is changed so that the target of the offense remains the present hearer. Through such changes the speaker maintains the relevance of her story for its immediate recipient.

In Pam's instigating stories the nonpresent party whose offensive actions are described is Terry. As is the case for other societies, gossip is used among the girls of the Maple Street group "to control aspiring individuals," as Gluckman (1963:308) puts it. In the present case the girls are annoyed with Terry for previewing for them everything that will happen to them in junior high; though she is the same age as the other girls, she has skipped a year in school. The first group of stories (example A1), told in the presence of Maria and Florence, involves Terry's having excluded Maria's name from a hall bathroom pass. When Maria leaves and is no longer a recipient to the stories being told, Pam begins a series of stories (example A2) in which Florence is the target of a different set of offenses by Terry. Some demonstration is therefore provided that in building her stories the speaker is oriented toward constructing them such that the target of the absent party's offense is a listener in the present.

Stories may also be locally organized with respect to the figure selected as the offender. The fact that Terry is reputedly the agent of offensive talk in the story to Maria may well be why she is selected as a similar agent in the stories to Florence several minutes later. When the confrontation is played out it is discovered that it was actually Maria, rather than Terry, who said something about Florence in the past (M. Goodwin 1980b:678). Pam misconstrues the person rightfully occupying the position of offending party to create conflict between Florence and Terry. The structure of the immediate reporting situation is thus relevant to the organization of the description of the past and the figures in it being reported through these stories.

recipients' responses In listening to a story a recipient is expected to provide some demonstration of his/her understanding of the events recounted (Sacks 1970, lecture 5:5). Places for listener responses are provided not only following a story (Sacks 1974:347–348), but also throughout its telling (Sacks 1974:344–345; Jefferson 1978).

According to Goffman (1974:503), listeners to replayings "are to be stirred not to take ac-

tion but to exhibit signs that they have been stirred." The recipients of the present reports, however, are invited to be moved to action. These recountings are embedded within a larger realm of action, one that provides for a dynamic involvement of coparticipants and is not restricted to the present encounter. This prospect of future involvement provides for recipients' participation in the present in more active roles than generally occur in response to stories. The report of offenses in the he-said-she-said event is constructed to inform someone that she has (from the teller's perspective) been offended and thereby to invite her to take action against the offender.

A story might be told to several listeners, not all of whom are characters in it. Various forms of recipient response are available depending upon the occasion-specific identity relationship of the listener to the storyteller and the parties talked about. In explaining the types of identity relationships which are operative in responding to stories, some consideration of Goffman's (1974:516) critique of traditional sociological analysis that "breaks up the individual into multiple roles but does not suggest that further decimation is required" is helpful. While telling a story, a speaker not only portrays events, he animates figures within them (Goffman 1974:516–544). Thus, a single person, the present speaker, in replaying past experience, maintains both the identity of teller to listeners in the present and animator of "cited figures" (Goffman 1974:528) within it. Generally these figures are taken to be *principals* or originators of utterances, parties held responsible for having willfully taken up the position to which the meaning of the utterance attests (Goffman 1974:517).[7] In example A1 (see Appendix), for instance, Pam cites things said about Maria by Terry in Maria's absence (examples A1.14, A1.16, A1.22–A1.24). In the stories Pam tells Florence in example A2 (see Appendix), Pam recounts what Terry said about Florence (examples A2.1, A2.16).

Listeners as well as speakers occupy multiple identities, both vis-à-vis the teller in the present and the cited figures in the reported story. A listener who is a cited figure reported to have been offended may respond by directing counters to the charge of the cited figure who reportedly offended her, despite the fact that the cited figure may not be present in the ongoing interaction. One form of counter is a challenge to the truth of statements concerning her. For example, when Pam reports what Terry said that Maria said (example A1.16), Maria responds with a denial (example A1.17): "°No I didn't." Pam's report that Terry characterized Maria's actions in the past as "acting stupid" (example A1.14) is likewise countered by Maria: "But **w**as I actin stupid with them?" (example A1.15). Challenges also occur in example A2 when Pam reports what Terry said about Florence, that she had nothing to do with writing about her: "If I **wro**:te somp'm then I wrote it.=Then I got somp'm to do with it.=W'then I **wrote** it" (example A2.11) and "WELL IF I WROTE SOME 'N **I** HAD SOMP'M T'**DO** with it" (example A2.17). A second form of counter to a reported statement that is pejorative about the current recipient may be a return pejorative statement about the cited figure, as occurs in Maria's utterance "So: **she** wouldn' be **ac**tin **l**ike **that** wi' that **oth**er girl" (example A1.25, responding to examples A1.22–A1.24). Parties denied the opportunity to counter offensive statements about them in the past when the offenses were committed may deal with them in their retelling. In this way the offended party may also discover the present speaker's alignment toward the cited speaker's statements by observing her next utterances to the counter. Parties who were both present when the action described occurred and are figures in the story may not only respond to the story but also may participate in its telling, as Maria does (examples A1.25–A1.27, A1.37–A1.39). Such a collaborative telling is dependent on knowledge of the event and generally utilizes past tense.

A different form of recipient response is possible for a party who is not a figure in the story: providing comments on the offender's character, referring to ongoing attributes of the offender in the present progressive tense. For example, in response to Pam's story about

Terry's actions toward Maria, Florence, who is not a figure in the story, states: "SHE TELLIN Y'ALL WHERE TA **SI**T AT?" (example A1.28); "Terry **al**ways say somp'm" (example A1.19); "Terry-always-mad-at somebody" (example A1.9). These comments or "evaluations"[8] blatantly display what the point of the story is for listeners, an instance of Terry's inappropriate behavior.

Evaluation of this form may also be made by the party in the present who is offended in the story. However, the offended party can choose to make a far stronger evaluation of the reported action by stating that she will confront her offender; she may interpret the reported action as an offense and state that in response she will seek redress. For example, following Pam's stories to Florence about Terry, Florence states: "Well you **t**ell her to come say it in front of my fa:ce. (0.6) and **I'll p**ut **her** somewhere" (example A2.2); "I better not see Terry to**day.** I'm a say 'Terry **I** heard **y**ou was talkin bout me' " (example A2.36); "W'll I'm tellin ya **I** better not catch **T**erry to**day.** Cuz if I catch her I'm gonna give **her** a wor:d from my **mou**th" (example A2.49). In response to the stories that Pam tells Maria about Terry, Maria states: "I'm a I'm a **t**ell her about herself to**day**" (example A1.33).

In listening to instigating stories recipients have available a range of possible responses. Through their descriptions instigators report events which can be seen as offensive and provide recipients the opportunity to assume the identity of offended party. The mere reporting of offenses is not itself sufficient to bring about a future confrontation; rather, a recipient must publicly analyze the event in question as an offense against her. In comparing the responses to stories in the Appendix, Florence takes a much stronger stance vis-à-vis Terry's reported actions than does Maria. Even though the events at issue would seem to be positive ones from Florence's perspective—not being found guilty for having written pejorative things about Terry (example A2.2)—the fact that Terry *said* something about Florence in her absence makes possible a response from her. The identity of the offended party is thus a position that is collaboratively brought into existence through both the teller's description of a third party's past activities and the recipient's orientation toward the absent party's past actions as offenses. The alignments offended parties maintain with the offending party may in part account for different types of responses. Maria is a close friend of Terry's, while Florence rarely plays with her or anyone in the older girls' group on Pam's street. Thus Florence, in contrast to Maria, has little to lose by confronting Terry.

Offended parties' responses of plans to confront the offending party are made in the presence of witnesses; they thus provide public displays of someone's intentions to seek redress for the offenses committed against her. Failure to follow through with a statement such as "I'm a **t**ell her about herself to**day**" can be remarked on as demonstrating inconsistencies in a person's talk and actions, thus reflecting negatively on her character. In the case of the he-said-she-said dispute being examined, later in the day of the instigating stories, when Maria could have confronted Terry but didn't, the following was said about her:

example 3 Pam: Yeah and Maria all the time talking bout she was gonna tell whatshername off. And **she** ain't do it.

People who refuse to confront someone once they have reported their intentions to do so are said to "swag," "mole," or "back down" from a future confrontation and may be publicly ridiculed in statements such as "You molin out." The fact that a statement about future intentions can be treated as a relevantly absent event at a future time provides some demonstration of how responses to instigating stories are geared into larger social projects.

teller's procedures for coimplicating offended party: features of indirection Although I have considered the relationship of figures in instigating stories to participants in

the present interaction and the actions generated in response to them, I have not yet discussed many details of the internal organization of the stories themselves. It has been noted that the description of the past is organized so as to display the status of that event as an offense. The actual presentation of past events is carefully managed, utilizing features of indirection.

Consider first the initiation of the story in examples A1.6–A1.11. This story beginning has the form of a reminiscence. Pam asks Maria to remember with her a particular event: "**How- how-** h- uhm, uh h- h- how about me and Ma**r**la, ·h and all them um, and **Te**rry" (example A1.6). The proposed story concerns pejorative attributes of Terry. The telling of pejorative stories, especially in the context of the "he-said-she-said," poses particular problems for participants; that is, such stories constitute instances of talking behind someone's back, the action at issue in a "he-said-she-said." A party who tells about another is vulnerable to having that fact reported to the person being talked about by her recipient; the activity of righteously informing someone of an offense against her can itself be taken and cast as an offense. In the "he-said-she-said" under consideration, story recipient tells talked-about party (Terry) that teller (Pam) was saying something about her; subsequently, talked-about party confronts teller.

Are there ways by which a party telling such a story can protect herself against such risk? One way might be to implicate her recipient in a similar telling so that both are equally guilty and equally vulnerable. This still poses problems; specifically, it would be most advantageous for each party if the other would first implicate herself. This can lead to a delicate negotiation at the beginning of the story. In example A1.6 Pam brings up the story, providing references to the event, requesting the opinion of others, yet refusing to state her own position. In response Maria provides a particular description of her relationship vis-à-vis Terry, asking Pam "**Is**n't **T**erry **mad** at **me** or s:omp'm" (example A1.7). If Pam in fact provides a story at this point demonstrating how Terry is mad at Maria, Pam will have talked pejoratively about Terry before Maria has coimplicated herself in a similar position. Pam subsequently passes up the opportunity to tell a story, saying "**I 'on'** know" (example A1.8). Then Maria provides an answer to her own question: "Cuz- cuz cuz I wouldn't, cu:z she ain't put my **n**ame on that **pa**per" (example A1.10). And only after Maria implicates herself does Pam begin to join in the telling (example A1.11).

I previously discussed how the teller presents the absent party's actions toward the hearer as offensive. This form of description is relevant to the project of constructing a future confrontation because it has the possibility of eliciting from the hearer promises to confront her offender. The figures of participants present at the encounter are also portrayed in a manner relevant to the present interaction. The target of the offense in the story, the hearer in the present conversation, is portrayed as someone whose actions were appropriate and exemplary, unlike those of the offender: "And Maria w'just sittin up there actin- actin:, ac- ac- actin sensible" (example A1.29). The present speaker is pictured as someone who defended the position of her present hearer against the offender (examples A1.29, A1.36).

In addition to carefully organizing the story beginning and demonstrating her alignment to the listener, the storyteller also suggests to the listener how she might respond to the events being described. For example, when Maria makes an evaluative comment, "OO: r'mind me a- you old b:ald-headed Terry" (example A1.39), at the close of the story about Terry's actions toward Maria, Pam states, "**I** should say it in fronta her **f**ace. (0.8) Bal: head" (example A1.39). Pam presents a model of how she herself would confront the offending party and thereby invites recipient to see the action in question as she herself does: as an action deserving in return an "aggravated" (Labov and Fanshel 1977:84–86) response, such as an insult.

Such suggestions, forms of indirection, also take the shape of embedded stories within the instigating stories. These embedded stories make use of variations on the same structural features used to inform the listener of an offense against her. Thus, one of the principal characters in these stories is the same absent party who appears in the informing stories; the other principal character is the present *speaker* rather than the present hearer. These stories also deal with offenses; the absent party is the recipient of these offenses, however, rather than their perpetrator. Briefly, the speaker makes her suggestions by telling her present recipient the kinds of actions that she herself takes against the offender, these actions being appropriate next moves to the offenses described in the informing stories (examples A2.21, A2.42–A2.46). In these stories Pam tells how she confronted Terry with aggravated insults. Specifically, she describes how she told Terry to her face that she had talked about her behind her back (example A2.21). In addition, Pam describes having performed insulting actions directly to Terry's face, issuing a direct command to her (example A2.44–A2.46). The aggravated nature of the command is highlighted by placing it in contrast to a more mitigated form (example A2.46).

Thus, through a variety of activities—passing the opportunity to align herself with a definitive position before hearer does at story beginning, presenting herself as having defended the offended party in the past, and portraying how she boldly confronted the offending party—speaker carefully works to coimplicate her present recipient in a next course of action. Features of indirection are evident in the reporting in several ways. In accordance with Kochman's (1970:157) definition of indirection, the teller presents a believeable picture of past events, involving what was said about the recipient, which arouses feelings of anger and hostility. In keeping with Mitchell-Kernan's (1972:166) analysis of indirection, the goal orientation of speaker in presenting her story is obscured. Although the report is reputedly a narrative account of past events involving teller and offending party, and speaker's alignment of righteous indignation toward these acts, it may also function to suggest future courses of action for present recipient.

future stories, retellings, and idealized models

Analysis so far has focused on the description of events in the past. However, Pam's stories about past events in which Florence was offended also permit Florence to describe future scenes contingent on possibly occurring events. To provide strong demonstrations of her understanding of Pam's stories, Florence makes herself a character who confronts Terry just as Pam had in the past. In these scenes Florence is the accuser and Terry is the defendant. These enacted sequences have certain regular features: (1) an evalaution of the offending party's actions, (2) an accusation, and (3) a response to the accusation.

In evaluating Pam's stories (example A2), Florence provides first a statement of how the offender should have acted and a warning for her: "So, she got anything t'say she come say it in front of my face. (1.0) I better not **see Ter**ry today" (example A2.8); "I better not see Terry to**day**" (example A2.32); "W'll I'm tellin ya **I** better not catch **T**erry to**day**" (example A2.49).

The next element in Florence's rehearsals is a statement of how she will confront Terry with a formal complaint: "I'm-a-say 'Terry **what you say** about me' " (example A2.8); "I'm a say 'Terry **I** heard **y**ou was talking bout me' " (example A2.32); "Cuz if I catch her I'm gonna give **her** a wor:d from my **mou**th" (example A2.49).

Following the offended's enactment of her own future action as an accuser, she projects how the defending party will respond with denials, actions that are expected following opening accusations: "She gonna say 'I ain't **say** nuttin' " (example A2.8); "Then she gonna

say 'I ain't- **What I** say about you' " (example A2.34). At the close of the future stories in examples A2.36 and A2.49, Florence enacts additional parts of the drama, which are contingent on Terry's action to Florence: "An if she get **bad** at m:**e**: I'm a, punch her in the eye" (example A2.38); "An if she **j**ump in my **f**ace I'm a punch her in her **fa**:ce" (example A2.49).

These enactments of possible worlds (Lakoff 1968), in which Florence is confronting Terry, not only provide strong displays of her commitment to carry out a confrontation with Terry; but they also enable her to rehearse future lines in that encounter. In some sense such enactments might be viewed as idealized versions (Werner and Fenton 1973:538–539) of the sequence of activity in the actual confronting. That is, a minimal he-said-she-said sequence would, given this model, contain an accusation, a defense, and a warning or evaluation of offender's actions. Typically, anthropologists, and ethnoscientists in particular, employ elicited informants' accounts to substantiate their statements about the "ideational order." However, as these stories show, participants in their own talk provide images of encounters specifying minimal sequences of appropriate utterance types.

Indeed, encounters with others not part of the he-said-she-said event following the instigating stories display a similar orientation toward highlighting certain features of storytelling to the exclusion of others. Consider, for example, the following set of stories Pam tells Sharon after her reporting to Florence:

example 4 ((After Sharon answers Pam's knock on the door))

(1) Pam: Hey you- you n- you know- you know I- I- I had told **F**lorence, what um, what Terry said about her? And I- and she said "I **b**etter **n**ot **s**ee um, um **Ter**ry, b'cause" she said she said "Well I'm comin around Maple and I **j**ust **b**etter not **see** her b'cause I'm- b'cause I'm gonna tell her behind her- in front of her **f**ace and **n**ot be**hi**nd her- I mean in front of // her face.

(2) Sha: She call her baldheaded and all that?

(3) Pam: Yep. And she said- she said- // she said "I'm gonna-"

((returning home from school Priscilla addresses her sister))

(4) Pri: Sharon what was all them teachers that was, holdin signs.

Pam's story in this example directly concerns the responses of a nonpresent party, Florence, to stories told her by the present speaker (Pam) about offenses to the nonpresent parties committed by someone else (Terry). It can be shown that these are the skeletal features of the stories by considering several of their features. An initial characteristic is the positioning of the part of the story regarding Florence's responses relative to other possible parts of the retellings, Pam's talk with Florence and her talk with Maria. The report of Florence's responses (example 4.1) occurs immediately following a brief summary of the statements by Pam that elicited them (talk with Maria, which had preceded talk to Florence, is omitted). Although it has been noted that clauses in "narratives" are characteristically ordered in temporal sequence (Labov 1972:359–360), here the ordering is altered. Florence's responses, rather than Maria's, project a future confrontation, and are therefore more relevant to Sharon.

The speaker marks the importance of the principal character's action not only by its placement, but also through its elaboration. Pam summarizes her own participation in the past recounting in a single statement: "I had told **F**lorence what um, what Terry said about her?" (example 4.1). Informing Florence of these events had in fact involved the major portion of the informing process (examples A2.1–A2.18). However, this is reported succinctly and in indirect speech. By contrast, Pam reports in direct speech what Florence said in response to her informings (example 4.1).

In response to Pam's replaying of her informing to Florence, both teller and recipient participate in constructing an imaginary event:

example 5

(1)	Sha:	Can't wait t'see this **a**::**k**shu**:n.** Mm**fh.** Mm**fh.**
(2)	Pam:	But if **Flor**ence say // she
(3)	Sha:	I laugh- I laugh I laugh if Terry say- Pam s- I laugh if Florence say, "**I wrote** it so what you gonna **do** about it."
(4)	Pam:	**She** say, she- and- and- and she and she probably gonna back out.
(5)	Sha:	I know.
(6)	Pam:	**B**oouh **b**oouh // boouh
(7)	Sha:	And they she gonna say "You didn't **have** to **write** that about me Florence." She might call her Florence **fat** somp'm. = Florence say "**Least** I don't have no long: bumpy legs and bumpy neck. **Spot** legs, ·h Least I don't gotta fluff my hair up to make me look like // I hadda bush."
(8)	Pam:	Y'know **she**'s- she least she **fa**tter than her.
(9)	Sha:	Yeah an "**L**east I got bones. = At least I got **shape.**" That's what she could say. (0.6) Florence **is** cuter than her though.
(10)	Pam:	Yah:p. And Florence got **shape t**oo.

In this sequence the party (Sharon) who was a nonparticipant in the informing stories but is present to the replaying of such stories projects herself as a spectator to an upcoming confrontation (example 5.3). The enactment of the possible event, however, is made up of forms of utterances that contrast with those actually enacted in a confrontation. Sharon notes that it would be an event that would evoke an unusual response, laughter, were Florence to actually admit the offense (example 5.3). In dramatizing what Terry would say to Florence, Sharon uses personal insults (examples 5.7, 5.9), actions that among girls may occur in the absence of the talked-about individual, but generally do not occur in her presence.

The informing about a past meeting with an offended party thus provides for forms of enactments about possible future events for those not occupying the identity of accuser or defendant in the confrontation, in much the same way that informing about offenses to an offended party provides for enactments by that party. In addition, the reporting is a way of recruiting future spectators to the event, in that it provides for their involvement in a future event.

The way in which Pam presents her description of past events to Sharon differs from her informings to Maria and Florence. Although in examples 1 and 2 Pam took precautions to elicit responses from Maria and Florence with regard to their alignment toward the offending party, building in opportunities for them to do so before indicating her own orientation toward Terry, with Sharon (examples 4-5) she launches into her story in an unguarded fashion. Because Sharon and Pam are best friends who complain to one another about both Terry and Florence, Pam can expect Sharon to side with her on most issues. In fact, as this "he-said-she-said" is played out when Terry confronts Pam for having talked about her, both Sharon (M. Goodwin 1980b:676-678) and Pam provide denials. The friendship alignments between girls are thus relevant to the structuring of gossip stories.

conclusion

Although the majority of anthropological research on gossip deals with its functions, content, and normative behavior, in this study I have focused on talk itself—on the activity

of accomplishing gossip. In the "he-said-she-said" the identity of "offended party" is not one that recipient assumes automatically, but rather one that is collaboratively brought into existence through teller's reporting and recipient's cooperation in seeing the reported event as an offense. Thus, though a set of formal criteria for setting up a gossip confrontation is of central importance to the participants (and one way in which the analysis in this paper, especially that developed in the "telling" section, builds from the tradition of cognitive anthropology), it is the *interaction* between teller and recipient, rather than the properties of a formal structure, that make possible the unfolding of "social drama." By the same token, while researchers making use of speech act theory or formal cultural analysis may locate important structural features or organizations, these should not be considered in themselves adequate end products for anthropology. What is needed is a specification of the process of interaction through which such formal possibilities are made real and operative social events.

The stories examined in this paper concern past, future, and imaginary events and therefore differ from the forms of stories most frequently dealt with by students of stories. Although Goffman (1974:505) has noted the possibility of "preplays," most researchers have a narrower vision of what constitutes a narrative; it is generally defined as "a method of recapitulating past experience by matching a verbal sequence of clauses to the sequence of clauses which (it is inferred) actually occurred" (Labov 1972:359–360). Given this orientation toward the structuring of stories, it is not surprising that researchers of narrative make use of role-played data or elicited texts, assuming that narratives can be analyzed in isolation from the course of events in which they are embedded. And, similarly, professional anthropologists often assume that the accounts they receive from informants are context-free renderings of experience.

If we are to follow Malinowski (1959:312–313), however, and consider narrative "a mode of social action rather than a mere reflection of thought," then we need to investigate the details of how competent members of a society use language to deal with each other. This requires, first, methods of data collection that maintain the sequential structure of natural events (unencumbered by an anthropologist's elicitations) and make visible the process that these events are both embedded within and constitute; and second, a mode of analysis that, rather than treating talk as either a means for obtaining information about other phenomena or a special type of verbal performance, focuses on how competent members use talk to socially organize and indeed accomplish the ordinary scenes of their everyday lives.

In the stories examined here, the primary organization of the descriptions in them, as well as responses to them, is to be found not in the properties of the past events being described but rather in the structure of the present interaction, which includes an anticipated future. Indeed, that anticipation is possible because of the embeddedness of this entire process, including the constructing and understanding of the stories, within a larger cultural event the properties of which can be recognized in detail, the "he-said-she-said."

notes

Acknowledgments. The fieldwork constituting the basis for this study was made possible by a National Institute of Mental Health research grant (17216-01), administered through the Center for Urban Ethnography, University of Pennsylvania. I am indebted to Erving Goffman, Charles Goodwin, Gail Jefferson, and William Labov for comments on an earlier version of this paper.

[1] All too frequently, research investigating the internal structure of stories is based on stories that are "collected" by the researcher. The interviewer generally solicits the story from an informant by making an initial request for a story. For example, Watson (1973:260) reports, "A child who wished to tell a story responded to the eliciting frame, 'Tell us a story' " (see also Polanyi 1979:213–214). While

such an approach is valuable for the collection of linguistic data and for understanding the structure of a story produced in response to a question, it does not aid us in understanding how the story might have been initiated in conversation without having been initially warranted by the interviewer's question.

[2] For ethnographic analysis of how the telling of stories by urban black boys might function within larger social tasks, see Berentzen (in press) and M. Goodwin (1982).

[3] Among the children themselves the term "stories" is used primarily in the expression "telling stories"; this expression refers to false accounts in response to accusations, as in "And she gonna tell you another story anyway."

[4] See Sacks (1978:262) for a consideration of the motive power of preformulated talk.

[5] Although Haviland (1977) provides texts of gossip, they are elicited talk.

[6] Data are transcribed according to the system developed by Jefferson and described in Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson (1974:731-733). A simplified version of this transcription system appears in M. Goodwin (1980b:695).

[7] In fact, talk that is cited may well have originated in response to a question posed by the current teller. Consider the following in which the ethnographer's answer to a question is transformed into talk initiated by her:

((Boy skates by as Pam and ethnographer are sitting on steps.))
Pam: That boy have ugly sneaks, don't he.
Eth: Yeah,
Pam: HEY BOY THAT GIRL SAY YOU HAVE UGLY SNEAKS!

[8] On the multiple meanings that "evaluation" may have in research on stories, see Bauman (1977: 37-45); Labov (1972:366-393); Polanyi (1979:230-236); Pratt (1977:45-51; 63-68); Robinson (1981: 75-76); Watson (1973:255).

references cited

Abrahams, Roger D.
1964 Deep Down in the Jungle: Negro Narrative Folklore from the Streets of Philadelphia. Hatboro: Pennsylvania Folklore Associates.
1968 Introductory Remarks to a Rhetorical Theory of Folklore. Journal of American Folklore 81:143-158.
1970 A Performance-Centered Approach to Gossip. Man (NS)5:290-301.
1972 Folklore and Literature as Performance. Journal of the Folklore Institute 9:75-91.

Atkinson, J. Maxwell, and Paul Drew
1979 Order in Court: The Organization of Verbal Interaction in Judicial Settings. London: Macmillan.

Austin, J. L.
1962 How to Do Things with Words. London: Oxford University Press.

Babcock, Barbara A.
1977 The Story in the Story: Metanarration in Folk Narrative. *In* Verbal Art as Performance. Richard Bauman, ed. pp. 61-79. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Bauman, Richard
1972 The La Have Island General Store: Sociability and Verbal Art in a Nova Scotia Community. Journal of American Folklore 85:330-343.
1977 The Nature of Performance. *In* Verbal Art as Performance. Richard Bauman, ed. pp. 3-58. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Ben-Amos, Dan
1981 *Review of* The Social Use of Metaphor: Essays on the Anthropology of Rhetoric. J. D. Sapir and J. C. Crocker, eds. Language in Society 10:111-114.

Berentzen, Sigurd
in press The Contextualization of Behavior and Transformational Processes: A Study of Gang Formation in a Black Ghetto. *In* Transaction and Signification (preliminary title). R. Gronhaugh, ed. Oslo-Bergen: Scandinavian University Books.

Bilmes, Jack
1975 Misinformation in Verbal Accounts: Some Fundamental Considerations. Man (NS)10:60-71.

Brady, Margaret K.
1980 Narrative Competence: A Navajo Example of Peer Group Evaluation. Journal of American Folklore 93:158-181.

Bruner, Edward M.
1980 Ethnography as Narrative. Paper presented at the 79th Annual Meeting of the American Anthropological Association. Washington, D.C.

Campbell, J. K.
1964 Honour, Family and Patronage: A Study of Institutions and Moral Values in a Greek Mountain Community. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
Caplow, Theodore
1968 Two Against One: Coalitions in Triads. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
Colson, Elizabeth
1953 The Makah Indians. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
Cox, Bruce A.
1970 What Is Hopi Gossip About? Information Management and Hopi Factions. Man (NS) 5:88–98.
Dorson, Richard M.
1967 American Negro Folktales. Greenwich, CT: Fawcett Publications.
Eder, Donna, and Maureen T. Hallinan
1978 Sex Differences in Children's Friendships. American Sociological Review 43:237–250.
Epstein, A. L.
1969 Gossip, Norms and Social Network. *In* Social Networks in Urban Situations. J. Clyde Mitchell, ed. pp. 117–127. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
Fishman, Mark
1980 Manufacturing the News. Austin: University of Texas Press.
Frankenberg, Ronald
1957 Village on the Border. London: Cohen and West.
Frake, Charles O.
1977 Plying Frames Can Be Dangerous: Some Reflections on Methodology in Cognitive Anthropology. Quarterly Newsletter of the Institute for Comparative Human Development 1:1–7.
1980 Author's Postscript. *In* Language and Cultural Description: Essays by Charles O. Frake. Selected and Introduced by Anwar S. Dil. pp. 333–336. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
Garfinkel, Harold, Michael Lynch, and Eric Livingston
1981 The Work of Discovering Science Construed with Materials from the Optically Discovered Pulsar. Philosophy of the Social Sciences 11:131–158.
Georges, Robert A.
1969 Toward an Understanding of Storytelling Events. Journal of American Folklore 82:313–328.
Gluckman, Max
1963 Gossip and Scandal. Current Anthropology 4:307–315.
1968 Psychological, Sociological and Anthropological Explanations of Witchcraft and Gossip: A Clarification. Man (NS) 3:20–34.
Goffman, Erving
1963 Behavior in Public Places: Notes on the Social Organization of Gatherings. New York: Free Press.
1964 The Neglected Situation. *In* The Ethnography of Communication. John J. Gumperz and Dell Hymes, eds. American Anthropologist 66(6) Part 2:133–136.
1967 Interaction Ritual: Essays in Face to Face Behavior. Garden City, NY: Doubleday.
1971 Relations in Public: Microstudies of the Public Order. New York: Harper & Row.
1974 Frame Analysis: An Essay on the Organization of Experience. New York: Harper & Row.
Goodenough, Ward H.
1964 Cultural Anthropology and Linguistics. *In* Language in Culture and Society: A Reader in Linguistics and Anthropology. Dell Hymes, ed. pp. 36–39. New York: Harper & Row.
1971 Culture, Language and Society. Reading, MA: Addison Wesley Modular Publications.
Goodwin, Charles
1981 Conversational Organization: Interaction between Speakers and Hearers. New York: Academic Press.
Goodwin, Marjorie Harness
1980a Directive/Response Speech Sequences in Girls' and Boys' Task Activities. *In* Women and Language in Literature and Society. Sally McConnell-Ginet, Ruth Borker, and Nelly Furman, eds. pp. 157–173. New York: Praeger.
1980b He-Said-She-Said: Formal Cultural Procedures for the Construction of a Gossip Dispute Activity. American Ethnologist 7:674–695.
1982 Processes of Dispute Management among Urban Black Children. American Ethnologist 9:76–96.
Grice, H. P.
1969 Utterer's Meaning and Intentions. Philosophical Review 68:147–177.
Hannerz, Ulf
1967 Gossip, Networks and Culture in a Black American Ghetto. Ethnos 32:35–60.
Harris, Clement
1974 Hennage: A Social System in Miniature. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
Haviland, John Beard
1977 Gossip, Reputation and Knowledge in Zinacantan. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Herskovits, M.
1937 Life in a Haitiian Valley. New York: Knopf.
1947 Trinidad Village. New York: Knopf.
Hymes, Dell H.
1962 The Ethnography of Speaking. *In* Anthropology and Human Behavior. Thomas Gladwin and William C. Sturtevant, eds. pp. 13–53. Washington, DC: Anthropological Society of Washington.
1972 The Contribution of Folklore to Sociolinguistic Research. *In* Towards New Perspectives in Folklore. Américo Paredes and Richard Bauman, eds. pp. 42–50. Austin: University of Texas Press.
1975 Breakthrough into Performance. *In* Folklore: Performance and Communication. Dan Ben-Amos and Kenneth Goldstein, eds. pp. 13–74. The Hague: Mouton.
Jefferson, Gail
1974 Error Correction as an Interactional Resource. Language in Society 2:181–199.
1978 Sequential Aspects of Storytelling in Conversation. *In* Studies in the Organization of Conversational Interaction. Jim Schenkein, ed. pp. 219–248. New York: Academic Press.
Kernan, Keith T.
1977 Semantic and Expressive Elaboration in Children's Narratives. *In* Child Discourse. Susan Ervin-Tripp and Claudia Mitchell-Kernan, eds. pp. 91–102. New York: Academic Press.
Kirshenblatt-Gimblett, Barbara
1974 A Parable in Context: A Social Interactional Analysis of Story-Telling Performance. *In* Folklore: Performance and Communication. Dan Ben-Amos and Kenneth S. Goldstein, eds. pp. 105–130. The Hague: Mouton.
Kochman, Thomas
1970 Toward an Ethnography of Black American Speech Behavior. *In* Afro-American Anthropology: Contemporary Perspectives. Norman E. Whitten, Jr., and John F. Szwed, eds. pp. 145–162. New York: Free Press.
Labov, William
1972 The Transformation of Experience in Narrative Syntax. *In* Langauge in the Inner City: Studies in the Black English Vernacular. William Labov, ed. pp. 354–396. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
Labov, William, and David Fanshel
1977 Therapeutic Discourse: Psychotherapy as Conversation. New York: Academic Press.
Labov, William, and Joshua Waletzky
1968 Narrative Analysis. *In* A Study of the Non-Standard English of Negro and Puerto Rican Speakers in New York City. Report on Cooperative Research Project 3288. William Labov, Paul Cohen, Clarence Robins, and John Lewis. pp. 286–338. New York: Columbia University.
Lakoff, George
1968 Counterparts, or the Problem of Reference in Transformational Grammar. Bloomington: Indiana University Linguistics Club Mimeo.
Latour, Bruno, and Steve Woolgar
1979 Laboratory Life: The Social Construction of Scientific Facts. Los Angeles: Sage.
Lynch, Michael
in press Art and Artifacts in Laboratory Science. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
McCarl, Robert S.
1976 Smokejumper Initiation: Ritualized Communication in a Modern Occupation. Journal of American Folklore 89:49–67.
1980 Occupational Folklife: An Examination of the Expressive Aspects of Work Culture with Particular Reference to Fire Fighters. Ph.D. dissertation. Department of Folklore, Memorial University of Newfoundland.
McDermott, R. P.
1976 Kids Make Sense: An Ethnographic Account of the Interactional Management of Success and Failure in One First Grade Classroom. Ph.D. dissertation. Department of Anthropology, Stanford University.
Malinowski, Bronislaw
1959 The Problem of Meaning in Primitive Languages. *In* The Meaning of Meaning. C. K. Ogden and I. A. Richards, eds. pp. 296–336. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World.
Maynard, Douglas W.
in press Person-Description in Plea Bargaining. Semiotica.
Mehan, Hugh
1979 Learning Lessons. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
Mitchell-Kernan, Claudia
1971 Language Behavior in a Black Urban Community. Monographs of the Language Behavior Laboratory, No. 2. University of California, Berkeley.
1972 Signifying and Marking: Two Afro-American Speech Acts. *In* Directions in Sociolinguistics: The Ethnography of Communication. John J. Gumperz and Dell Hymes, eds. pp. 161–179. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Nusbaum, Philip
1976 Some Methods of Accomplishing Talk among Operatives in a Bagel Bakery in Queens, New York. Ms. Files of the author.
Ochs, Elinor, and Bambi B. Schieffelin, eds.
1979 Developmental Pragmatics. New York: Academic Press.
Paine, Robert
1967 What Is Gossip About: An Alternative Hypothesis. Man (NS) 2:278–285.
Polanyi, Livia
1977 Not So False Starts. Working Papers in Sociolinguistics 41. Austin: Southwest Educational Development Laboratory.
1979 So What's the Point? Semiotica 25:207–241.
Pomerantz, Anita
1978 Compliment Responses: Notes on the Co-operation of Multiple Constraints. *In* Studies in the Organization of Conversational Interaction. Jim Schenkein, ed. pp. 79–112. New York: Academic Press.
Pratt, Mary Louise
1977 Toward a Speech Act Theory of Literary Discourse. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
Robinson, John A.
1981 Personal Narratives Reconsidered. Journal of American Folklore 94:58–85.
Sacks, Harvey
1963 Sociological Description. Berkeley Journal of Sociology 8:1–16.
1970 Unpublished Lecture Notes. Mimeograph. University of California, Irvine.
1972 On the Analyzability of Stories by Children. *In* Directions in Sociolinguistics: The Ethnography of Communication. John J. Gumperz and Dell Hymes, eds. pp. 325–345. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
1974 An Analysis of the Course of a Joke's Telling in Conversation. *In* Explorations in the Ethnography of Speaking. Richard Bauman and Joel Sherzer, eds. pp. 337–353. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
1978 Some Technical Considerations of a Dirty Joke. *In* Studies in the Organization of Conversational Interaction. Jim Schenkein, ed. pp. 249–269. New York: Academic Press.
Sacks, Harvey, Emanuel Schegloff, and Gail Jefferson
1974 A Simplest Systematics for the Organization of Turn-Taking for Conversation. Language 50:696–735.
Schegloff, Emanuel A.
1968 Sequencing in Conversational Openings. American Anthropologist 70:1075–1095.
1980 Preliminaries to Preliminaries: "Can I Ask You a Question?" Sociological Inquiry 50:104–152.
Schegloff, Emanuel A., Gail Jefferson, and Harvey Sacks
1977 The Preference for Self-Correction in the Organization of Repair in Conversation. Language 53:361–382.
Schegloff, Emanuel A., and Harvey Sacks
1973 Opening Up Closings. Semiotica 8:289–327.
Schiffren, Deborah
1980 Meta-Talk: Organizational and Evaluative Brackets in Discourse. Sociological Inquiry 50: 199–236.
Searle, John R.
1970 Speech Acts: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Sherzer, Joel
1980 Tellings and Retellings: An Aspect of Cuna Indian Narrative. Paper presented at the Fourth Annual Meeting of the Semiotic Society of America. Bloomington, Indiana.
Simmel, Georg
1902 The Number of Members as Determining the Sociological Form of the Group. American Journal of Sociology 8:1–46, 158–196.
Stahl, Sandra S. K.
1977 The Personal Narrative as Folklore. Journal of the Folklore Institute 14:9–30.
Szwed, John
1966 Gossip, Drinking, and Social Control: Consensus and Communication in a Newfoundland Parish. Ethnology 5:434–441.
Turner, Victor
1974 Dramas, Fields and Metaphors: Symbolic Action in Human Society. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
1980 The Anthropology of Experience. Paper delivered at the 79th Annual Meeting of the American Anthropological Association. Washington, DC.
Vinacke, W. Edgar, and Abe Arkoff
1957 An Experimental Study of Coalitions in the Triad. American Sociological Review 22:406–414.

Vološinov, V. N.
1971 Reported Speech. *In* Readings in Russian Poetics: Formalist and Structuralist Views. Ladislav Matejka and Krystyna Pomorska, transls. pp. 149–175. Cambridge: MIT Press.
Watson, Karen Ann
1973 A Rhetorical and Sociolinguistic Model for the Analysis of Narrative. American Anthropologist 75:243–264.
Werner, Oswald, and Joann Fenton
1973 Method and Theory in Ethnoscience or Ethnoepistemology. *In* A Handbook of Method in Cultural Anthropology. Raoul Naroll and Ronald Cohen, eds. pp. 537–578. Garden City, NY: Natural History Press for the American Museum of Natural History.
Wolfson, Nessa
1978 A Feature of Performed Narrative: The Conversational Historical Present. Language in Society 7:215–237.

appendix

example 1 ((Pam (12), Florence (13), and Maria (12) are sitting on Maria's steps discussing substitute teachers during a teacher's strike.))

(1)	Flo:	**T**each us some little **six**th grade work. (0.4) **Th**at's how these volun**teers** doin now. A little um, ·h **Ad**din n all that.
(2)	Pam:	**Y**ahp. **Y**ahp. // Yahp. An when we was in the-
(3)	Flo:	Twenny and twenny is // fordy an all that.
(4)	Pam:	**H**ow bout when we was in-
(5)	Flo:	Oo I **hate** that junk.
(6)	Pam:	**How- how-** h- um, uh h- h- how about me and Mar**l**a, ·h and all them um, and **Te**rry, ·h // and all thum-
(7)	Mar:	**Is**n't **T**erry **mad** at **me** or **s:om**p'm,
		(0.4)
(8)	Pam:	**I 'on'** kn//ow,
(9)	Flo:	Terry-**al**ways-mad-at somebody. °**I** // 'on' care.
(10)	Mar:	Cuz- cuz cuz I wouldn't, cu:z she ain't put my **n**ame on that **pa**per.
(11)	Pam:	**I** know, cuz // OH yeah. **Oh** yeah.
(12)	Flo:	An next she,
		(0.2)
(13)	Flo:	[talk-bout-**peo**ple.
(14)	Pam:	[**She** said, **She** said, that um, (0.6) that- (0.8) if that **girl** wasn't there = **You** know that girl that always makes those funny jokes, ·h Sh'aid if that **girl** wasn't there **you** wouldn' be **ac**ting, (0.4) a:ll **stu**pid like that. // °Sh-
(15)	Mar:	But **w**as I actin stupid w//ith them?
(16)	Pam:	Nope, no, = And she- and she said that **you** sai:d, tha:t, "**Ah**: go tuh-" (0.5) somp'm like // tha:t.
(17)	Mar:	°No I didn't.
(18)	Pam:	She's- an uh- somp'm like **that.** She's-
(19)	Flo:	Te//rry **al**ways say somp'm. = When you **jump** in her **face** she gonna
(20)	Pam:	She-
(21)	Flo:	de**ny** it.
(22)	Pam:	Yah:p Y//ahp. = An she said, ·h An- and she said, h that **you**
(23)	Mar:	°Right on.
(24)	Pam:	wouldn't be **ac**tin like **that** aroun- around **peo**ple.
(25)	Mar:	So: **she** wouldn' be **ac**tin **l**ike **that** wi' that **oth**er girl. = **She** the one picked **me** to **sit** wi'them. = ·h She said // "Maria you sit with
(26)	Pam:	Y:ahp.
(27)	Mar:	her, ·h and I'll sit with her, ·h an Pam an- an Pam an- an an // Sharon sit together.
(28)	Flo:	SHE TELLIN Y'ALL WHERE TA **S**IT AT?
		(2.0)
(29)	Pam:	An so **we** sat together, An s- and s- and so Maria was ju:st s:ittin right there. = An the girl, an- an- the girl: next to her? ·h and the girl kept