UC Santa Barbara

UC Santa Barbara Previously Published Works

Title

On Sacks and the Analysis of Racial Categories-in-Action

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/2h73w0q6>

ISBN

978-0-367-11103-8

Author

Whitehead, Kevin

Publication Date

2020-12-31

Peer reviewed

On Sacks and the Analysis of Racial Categories-in-Action

Kevin A. Whitehead

Department of Sociology, University of California, Santa Barbara

and

School of Human and Community Development, University of the Witwatersrand,

Johannesburg

kwhitehead@soc.ucsb.edu

In Smith, R. Fitzgerald, R., & Housley, W. (Eds.), *On Sacks: Methodology, Materials and Inspirations* (pp. 195-207). London: Routledge.

Acknowledgments

Earlier drafts of portions of this chapter were included in a presentation at the National Communication Association Convention in 2016 as part of a panel in honor of Gene Lerner, which in turn was based on a part of my Ph.D. dissertation. Gene Lerner and Geoff Raymond's encyclopedic knowledge of Harvey Sacks' work, their enthusiastic encouragement of my efforts to use it as a foundation for my research on racial categorization in interaction, and their detailed and valuable feedback on my work, have profoundly shaped the material I present in this chapter, and indeed all the work I have done since beginning my graduate studies at UCSB.

Introduction

As a new graduate student with an interest in using CA to study race, I was quickly directed by my mentors to read Harvey Sacks' (1984, 1986) analyses of "the Bullock's story". These analyses were compiled by Gail Jefferson for publication some years after Sacks' death, based on materials from several lectures he delivered in 1970 and 1971. They have rightly been lauded for their foundational observations with respect to storytelling in conversation, the normative bases of experience, and the interactional management of rights and responsibilities relating to knowledge, or "epistemics" (Heritage and Raymond 2005). However, an under-appreciated feature of these analyses, and one that was revelatory for my intellectual project, is his discussion of the storyteller's use of a racial person reference in the course of the telling. In this chapter, I discuss the penetrating analyses Sacks offers in this regard and some important observations with respect to (racial) categories in talk-in-interaction to which they give rise, and which inspired the research I produced as a graduate student and subsequent years. I then offer a further contribution to this work in the form of an analysis of racial self-categorizations produced in the course of complaint sequences.

Racial person reference in the Bullock's story

This story, shown in excerpt 1¹ below, was told by a speaker named Ellen in a telephone conversation with her friend, Jean. This conversation, and the story told by Ellen in its course, was occasioned by an incident Ellen witnessed while driving past the department store, Bullock's, at which Jean was employed.

---

¹ There are some differences between the transcripts of this conversation included in Sacks' 1984 versus 1986 analyses, including in the pseudonyms allocated to the speakers and in some of the details of the talk transcribed. The transcript included here largely follows the (more detailed) 1984 version, while also including some features present only in the 1986 version.

(1) [Sacks 1984, 1986]

1 Jean: Hello,

2 (0.4)

3 Ellen: Jean.

4 Jean: Yeah.

5 (0.4)

6 Ellen: Well I just thought I'd- (.) re-better report to you
7 what's happened at Bullock's today=

8 Jean: =What in the world's happened. [hhh

9 Ellen: [Did you have
10 the day off?

11 Jean: Ya:h?

12 (0.3)

13 Ellen: Well I: got out to my car at five thirty I: drove
14 around and of course I had to go by the front of
15 the store,=

16 Jean: =Yeah?=
17 Ellen: =And there were two (0.2) police cars across the

18 street en leh-e colored lady wanted to go in
19 the main entrance there where the silver is and
20 all the [(gifts and] things).

21 Jean: [Y e a h,]

22 (0.4)

23 Ellen: A:nd, they wouldn't let her go i:n, and he, had
24 a gu:n,

25 (0.2)

26 Ellen: He was holding a gun in his hand a great big
27 lo:ng gu:n?

28 Jean: Yea:h?

29 Ellen: And the over on the other side, I mean to the

30   right. of there, where the (0.2) employees come
 31   ou:t, there was a who:le, oh:: must have been ten
 32   uh eight or ten employees standing there, because
 33   there must have been a:, it seemed like they had
 34   every entrance ba:rred. I don't know what was
 35   goi[n]g o:n.
 36   Jean: [Oh my Go:d,

In the course of recounting what she saw happening outside the store, Ellen singles out a “colored lady” (line 18), who she reports was trying to enter the store, and was prevented from doing so by a police officer (lines 23-24). In his analysis of the story, Sacks describes how Ellen’s elaboration of the “main entrance” of the store, describing it as the place “where the ↓silver is’n all the (gifts and things)” (lines 19-20), allows her to make the inference that “the colored lady wanted to go in to where the silver is and all the gifts and things” (Sacks 1986:133). Simply by explicitly referring to the race of the person at the door (“colored lady”), and elaborating her description of the entrance to the store, Ellen “works to put in information relevant to seeing what was happening” (Sacks 1986:134). Thus, the identification of the woman as “colored,” when combined with her position outside a particular entrance of the store, provides for the inference (on the part of both Ellen and her recipient) that she is engaged in the activity of trying to rob the store. By contrast, an alternative categorical formulation of the woman as “an employee,” for example, would not have provided for this type of inference. In this way, with respect to both what Ellen saw as happening on the scene as she observed it, and in her subsequent recounting of the events, the identification of the woman as a member of a racial category serves as a tacit account for the woman’s observed and reported actions (Sacks 1986).

Importantly, and as Sacks (1984:422) notes, “This lady is not designing a rightwing report. All she is doing is reporting what she saw.” Ellen thus designs her account “not in a

nasty fashion” (Sacks 1986:134), but simply in the service of achieving a recognizable description – and, likewise, there is no hint that Jean treats Ellen’s use of this racialized account as in any way problematic. Nonetheless, the way in which Sacks’ analysis problematizes her actions, criticizing their essentially racist character, shows how the treatment of race as an account for action is vulnerable to sanctioning. Specifically, Sacks (1986:133) notes how Ellen assumed that the woman was “involved in a robbery of the store” while having

no idea that the colored lady had any idea what was in behind the main entrance, or that she was going through the main entrance to get to what was right in the main entrance area; where for all anybody knows, she was going into the store, up to the second floor.

Moreover, Sacks (1984:423; 1986:137) notes how Ellen singles out this particular lady for “non-witness, party-to-the scene status”, in contrast to the “eight or ten employees” (line 32) she describes later in her telling as being present at the scene, and in contrast to the confidence she displays that she herself was at no risk of being assigned a similar non-witness status² (Sacks 1984, 1986). These observations are driven home by a subsequent

---

² Although Sacks never explicitly mentions Ellen’s own racial category, he does implicitly make it relevant by contrast with those of other racially-identified potential observers of this scene, noting that “if this action took place in a black neighborhood, watched by black people, then ‘the very same scene’ would perhaps turn into, for the perception of the parties, an altogether different phenomenon” (Sacks 1984:421; 1986:136). In addition, Sacks (1984:422; 1986:137) suggests that Ellen’s “massive comfort in her innocence, and in the legitimate audience status that she has” are so taken-for-granted for her that “she can have no sense of an empathy with, for example, a kid in the ghetto.” These aspects of his analysis thus serve as a remarkable early example of how implicit features of whiteness can be identified and critiqued on the basis of a technical, empirically grounded analysis of participants’ conduct and orientations in talk-in-interaction. In Whitehead (2020) I provide a detailed demonstration of the use of CA in conducting analyses of these phenomena.

conversation between Jean and a third person, who was present in the store at the time of the incident, and who reveals that the lady was in fact an employee, and was having a friendly conversation with the police officer rather than being prevented by him from entering the store (Sacks 1984:423).

In sum, Sacks' analyses of this story provide for at least three important observations regarding uses of racial categories in talk-in-interaction, namely, that 1) using a (racial) category in referring to an actor can serve to tacitly provide an account for their actions, grounded in what recipients can be taken to know about the category; 2) in this way, racial (and other) categories, and the common-sense knowledge associated with them, can be reproduced as a "by-product" of whatever else participants are doing, even if it ostensibly does not involve race and/or race has not been directly topicalized; and 3) speakers who use racial categories in these ways may become vulnerable to sanctioning or criticism of their conduct as effectively racist. In combination with his largely convergent, but more widely-recognized, work on membership categorization devices, or MCDs³ (Sacks 1972a, 1972b, 1992), these observations were profoundly important for my efforts to develop a conversation analytic approach to examining uses and management of racial categories in everyday interactions (Whitehead 2009; Whitehead and Lerner 2009; Whitehead 2011, 2012, 2013a,

---

³ Given that this work has received substantial attention elsewhere, I provide no further elaboration of its details here – readers are directed instead to useful introductions by Schegloff (2007b) and Stokoe (2012). It is potentially noteworthy, however, that although much of Sacks' work on membership categorization predates the lectures in which he discusses the Bullock's story, he does not mention this work in his analyses of the racial categorization in this story. While any attempt to account for this would be speculative, it may simply be reflective of the focus of the lectures during the period in question. That is, the lectures that focused on membership categorization were largely delivered in the 1964-1968 period, and the lectures during 1970-1971 period that included analysis of the Bullock's story focused primarily on storytelling, the overall structural organization of conversations, sequence organization, and turn-taking (also see Schegloff 1992).

2013b, 2015, 2018b, 2020). It is also worth noting that these features of the analyses also obliterate the subsequently propagated myth that conversation analysis is poorly suited to, or even incapable of, contributing to critical or politically-engaged research, providing a brilliant demonstration of the use of a technical analysis of everyday talk-in-interaction as a basis for political commentary and critique (also see Schegloff 1992:xxii-xxiii) – something that I have similarly sought to demonstrate in my own work.

In the remainder of the chapter, I build on this work by examining some ways in which speakers producing complaints on South African radio call-in shows claim membership in a racial category implicated as an object of the complaint. I begin by briefly describing some of the conversation analytic research on intersections between complaint sequences and membership categories that informs this analysis.

Complaints and categories⁴

Schegloff (1995, 2005) describes the following canonical trajectory for complaint sequences:⁵

1. A first pair part in the form of a complaint, or mention of a “complainable.”

---

⁴ There is some overlap between this section and Whitehead (2013a:187-90), as a result of their related respective analyses and their common origin in a chapter of my dissertation.

⁵ See Schegloff (2007a) for a more comprehensive treatment of the organization of sequences of action-in-interaction more generally. As Edwards (2005) notes, it can be difficult to distinguish complaining from related actions, such as criticizing, denigrating, accusing, and so on. However, these related actions share important features with complaints, most centrally the display by a participant of a negative stance towards an object, and a similar set of interactional contingencies associated with producing or responding to them (Edwards 2005). As such, the distinctions between complaints and other related actions are not crucial for the purposes of the analysis that follows.

2. A responsive, and either aligning or disaligning, second pair part, such as an expression of sympathy, apology, agreement or disagreement, remedy or offer of remedy, excuse or account, etc.
3. Uptake of the response in third position, such as acceptance or rejection of the response.

The actions produced in the unfolding of these sequences implicates a set of situated participant categories, including a complainer, one or more complaint recipients, and the object(s) of the complaint or complained-about party/ies⁶ (also see Edwards 2005).

While complaints can easily be recognized as implicating some kind of moral failing on the part of the object(s) of the complaint (Drew 1998; Edwards 2005), they can also, through what Edwards (2005) refers to as the *subjective side* of complaining, index morally implicative characteristics of the complainer. Thus, the production of complaints can occasion evaluations of “the propriety or fairness or justice or accuracy with which we have reported some (external) events, or our motives in doing so” (Drew 1998:295-296), and may result in a complainer’s actions being treated as complainable in their own right, as well as implicating particular dispositions on the part of the complainer (Sacks 1992; Edwards 2005). In addition to this speaker indexicality potentially resulting in a complainer being seen as (for example) a “dispositional moaner” (Edwards 2005:24), complaints that implicate a particular (racial) category as their target can, as my analysis shows, index the complainer’s (racial) category membership (also see Whitehead 2009, 2013a, 2020).

My analysis thus also builds upon a broader body of conversation analytic research on the relationship between category membership and complaint sequences, with Sacks’ early

---

⁶ Although the object(s) of a complaint need not always be (a) person(s), the collection of complaints on which my analysis below is based consists entirely of complaints that target either specific persons or collectivities (e.g., categories or groups of people, institutions or organizations, etc.).

work again planting the seeds of much of what has followed. For example, Sacks (1992:vol. I, 599-600) observed the role of membership categories in distinguishing between “safe” and “unsafe” complaints, with unsafe complaints being those that may implicate other people who could be categorized under the same membership category as the object(s) of the complaint. Sacks (1992:vol. I, 417) also described how “intentional misidentification” (i.e., identifying someone using a category of which they cannot properly be claimed to be a member) can be used as a way of producing complaints, by treating someone’s actions as being category-bound to the category of which they have been misidentified as a member. Building on Sacks’ work on membership categorization, Schegloff (2005:452) notes that the “complainability of some form of conduct can be contingent on the identity of the agents and the recipients of the conduct – identities often grounded in category memberships”. That is, the degree to which someone’s conduct is treated as complainable may depend on the category of which they are seen to be a member in producing the conduct, and on the category membership of those observing the conduct. In a related analysis, Laforest (2009) examines how members of different categories (specifically, children versus parents) are treated as having differential rights to complain about one another.

Also noteworthy is the heightened nature of the abovementioned delicacy and moral implications associated with complaints in cases where particular categories of people are made relevant, especially when the categories at hand are politically sensitive ones, as is the case with racial categories (Whitehead 2009). A substantial body of research has examined the range of practices that speakers may employ in such cases in order to avoid appearing prejudiced or racist in the course of talking, and particularly complaining, about people of particular racial categories (see reviews in Augoustinos and Every 2007; Whitehead 2018a).

Racial self-categorization in complaint sequences

A first instance of a speaker displaying his co-membership in a category of which he has treated the objects of his complaint as incumbents is shown in excerpt 2. Just prior to this excerpt, the host and caller have collaboratively complained about executives who help companies to engage in illegal or unethical financial practices. As he continues this complaint starting in line 1 of the excerpt, the host claims that these companies recurrently hire “some black guy” to serve as “the face” of the company (cf. Shrikant 2019), thereby taking the blame for their unethical practices or financial failures (lines 1 and 3-5). The host then shifts from complaining about the companies who engage in these racialized scapegoating practices to complaining about the specific individuals who agree to take these positions, and in the process he uses the pronoun “we” (line 7) to refer to this collectivity, thereby including himself in the category of people about which is complaining (cf. Sacks 1992; Lerner and Kitzinger 2007; Shrikant 2019).

(2) [237 - SAfm, 5-12-08]

1 Host: They do that a lot. .hh[h=pt When a company's looking

2   Caller: [(Can he   )

3 Host: to go down or looking really ugly, .hh they think "Whoa!

4   You can't put a >blonde blue eyed person there,"< .hh

5   they ge[t some black guy, and he's the face everywhere.

6   Caller: [(Wow.)

7 Host: .hhh But how do we say "nye:s" to that, I wonder? <Maybe

8   it's the paycheck?

9 (0.8)

10   Caller: Hey, ya, now, hey we- we in big trouble, I'm

```
11         tel(h)l[ing (you!)
```

12 Host: [Huh huh!

It is also significant that, in aligning with the host's complaint (following a pause at line 9), the caller similarly uses the collective pronoun "we" (line 10). Assuming that neither the host nor the caller has actually personally taken on the scapegoat position for the type of company being complained about, either or both of them could have instead distanced themselves from the group of people criticized by the host by using the alternative pronoun "they". Their use of "we" thus apparently indexes their co-membership with the objects of the complaint in a racial category, rather than claiming co-incumbency of a professional category. As such, it is recognizable as the outcome of a choice between (at least) two alternatives, with the chosen outcome serving to treat inclusion in a complained-about category as preferred over exclusion from it.

While the speakers' uses of pronouns in excerpt 2 enabled their displays of co-membership in a complained-about category to be seamlessly integrated into their turns-in-progress, excerpt 3 shows a case in which such a display is more overtly exposed through being produced as an increment to a possibly complete turn. Here, a caller who has just previously complained about a lack of action being taken in response to a series of violent xenophobic attacks that were being carried out at the time produces a follow-up complaint about those who he treats as primarily culpable for the violence. In doing so, the caller singles out members of a particular racial and citizenship category ("black South Africans" – line 3) for criticism, reaching a possible completion of his turn constructional unit (see Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson 1974) at the end of his utterance of this category, before quickly adding the pronoun "Us" (line 3). The caller thus retrospectively includes himself in the category he has criticized, having not done so initially⁷. The caller then continues with his

---

⁷ Also see Whitehead (2018b) for related and additional analysis of this case.

It is also worth noting that both the caller and the host display an orientation to their actions as delicate (also see Lerner 2013). This can be seen in the brief pause and restarts produced by the caller just prior to his formulation of “black South Africans” (lines 7-8), and in the host’s numerous restarts prior to agreeing with the caller’s claim that “we” are “not educated” (line 14). This provides further evidence for the possibility that speakers’ self-inclusion in a category being targeted for complaint or criticism may be a way of orienting to and managing the potential for sanctioning in response to their actions.

In a final and more complex case, shown in excerpt 4, a caller initially does not claim co-membership in the category about which he has complained, but then explicitly racially self-categorizes as an apparent way of managing what he thereby treats as the possible racial implications of his complaint. The caller launches the complaint by noting a recent discussion of “the skills shortage” by the deputy president of South Africa (lines 1-2), before suggesting that this problem was one of the ANC (African National Congress) government’s own making (lines 5-6).

Unlike in the excerpts above, the recipient of the complaint in this case does not immediately align with the complainer, with the host remaining silent during a relatively lengthy (0.4-second) pause at line 7. While pauses of this sort recurrently occur in my data as a result of hosts orienting to allowing callers to take extended turns in order to say whatever they have called in to say (cf. the 1.0-second pause at line 3, followed by the host prompting the caller to continue at line 4), it is noteworthy that the pause at line 7 comes at a place at which the caller has explicitly solicited a response from the host through his use of the tag question (“hey?”) at the end of his turn in line 6. As conversation analytic research on preference organization (as described by, e.g., Schegloff 2007a) has shown, silences in places prepared for an aligning or disaligning response are recurrently treated by participants as indicative of an incipient disaligning (or “dispreferred”) response, while also providing

speakers with opportunities to do further work in pursuit of alignment, and/or to forestall or mitigate the potential disalignment. Consistent with these findings, following the pause at line 7 the caller pursues alignment from the host by producing an upgraded reaffirmation of the complaint he has just produced (line 8), but the host continues to withhold a response during an even longer (0.8-second) pause at line 9. This second pause provides a further, and stronger, indication of incipient disalignment on the part of the host, and in the face of this evident trouble the caller first denies being a member of the category “white person” and then claims membership in the category “black person” (line 10).

(4) [573 – 702, 4-23-08]

1 Caller: Uh look, uh: thee: deputy: °president° uh:: (0.5) was
2 talking about the skills shortage.

3 (1.0)

4 Host: Mm [hm?

5 Caller: [°>↑The thing is=is< the ANC government has made a
6 <helluva mess> hey?

7 (0.4)

8 Caller: And there's no doubt about it.

9 (0.8)

10 Caller: I'm not a white person, °I'm a° black person.

11 (.)

12 Caller: .hhhh Number one, they decided to close down=hh
13 most (.) of the nursing colleges.

((22 seconds omitted as caller continues complaint))

14 Caller: So we've messed it up there.

15 (.)

16 Caller: Alright, okay. .h We mess it up with education,
17 we('ve) now gotta import thirty thousand teachers,

18 ((continues))

By producing these racial self-categorizations, the caller orients to his complaint about the government as potentially implicating a complaint about the racial category “black”,⁸ and as thereby indexing his own racial category membership (cf. Edwards 2005; Whitehead 2009, 2020). Moreover, he thereby overtly treats complaining as a member of a racial category implicated as the object of a complaint as being less potentially problematic – and thus less likely to result in a full-blown realization of the interactional trouble that has thus far been only incipiently projected – than complaining as a non-member of the category (also see the analysis of a strikingly similar case of the use of racial self-categorization as a way of managing incipient disalignment, although not in the context of a complaint sequence, in Whitehead 2015:378-81).

When the host still does not respond during a further brief pause at line 11, the caller launches a series of more specific claims in support of his complaint (and possibly in further pursuit of an aligning response) starting in lines 12-13, and continuing through a non-transcribed portion of the call thereafter. Then, importantly, in formulating the upshot of these claims (as marked by his use of the word “So” in line 14; see Raymond 2004), the caller claims co-membership in the category of people he is complaining about through (as in excerpts 2 and 3) multiple uses of the pronoun “we” (lines 14, 16, and 17). Thus, having oriented to the possibility that his complaint was being treated as a problematic by virtue of coming from a non-member of the complained-about category, and having used a racial self-categorization as a way of addressing this possible hearing, the caller subsequently shifts to consistently displaying his co-membership in the category about which he is complaining.

---

⁸ I demonstrate this orientation, which is systematically evident throughout my data, in more detail in a forthcoming report.

Concluding remarks

In the cases I have examined above, and across my data, participants appear to be systematically oriented to the maxim, *if you can claim membership in a category about which you are complaining, then do*. This orientation serves to reflect and reproduce the relevance of category-based entitlements in the production of everyday actions; specifically, it constitutes category (co-)membership as a basis for differential entitlement to complain.

In addition to the analyses of these cases drawing in many respects upon Sacks' work, broadly construed, these findings also build more specifically on the abovementioned observations afforded by Sacks' analyses of the Bullock's story in a number of ways. First, and consistent with my Sacks-inspired analysis of "categorizing the categorizer" (Whitehead 2009) this analysis demonstrates a way in which, in addition to tacitly accounting for the actions of a referred-to party, membership categories can provide for differential understandings of the actions of the party doing the referring. That is, in this case, complaining as a co-member of a category implicated as an object of the complaint is treated as meaningfully different from complaining as a non-member of the category (also cf. Schegloff 2002, 2007b). Second, although race is more overtly topicalized in some (but not all) of the cases in my data than it was in the Bullock's story, this analysis nonetheless extends the observation afforded by Sacks' analyses of the Bullock's story regarding the reproduction of race as a "by-product" of whatever else participants are doing. Specifically, race is made relevant in the process of participants' engagement in the "main business" of complaining about a diverse set of matters (events, actions, personal attributes, etc.), with racial categories thereby produced *in situ* as intersecting both with these matters and with categories from other MCDs (profession, citizenship, political party, etc.)(cf. Whitehead 2012, 2013b). Third, these findings build on the observation regarding the vulnerability to sanctioning that may result from speakers' uses of racial categories, with participants'

displays of co-membership in a category implicated as an object of a complaint evidently serving as a way in which participants may address the potential trouble that may arise from their production of the complaint. That is, participants treat complaining as an “insider” as less risky for self-other relations than complaining as an “outsider”, and they may deploy category (co-)membership as a resource for managing the potential relational consequences of complaints (cf. Whitehead 2013a, 2018b, 2020).

Conducting detailed examinations of these sorts of everyday uses of racial categories constitutes an important component of efforts to describe the operation of race as a form of social organization, and the mechanisms through which it is (re)produced as such. This is in keeping with the spirit, abundantly evident in so much of Sacks’ pioneering work, of observing the features of so-called “macro” social structures in the details of “micro” interactions, rather than treating these as fundamentally distinct levels of social organization and analysis (also cf. Schegloff 1987). This, in turn, is underpinned by close attention to the fine-grained details of the production of ordinary actions-in-interaction, including the ways in which they are enabled by the types of generic interactional practices and structures (e.g., pronoun use, turn constructional units and increments, sequencing and preference organization, etc.) evident in the data I have examined here. More generally, my work to this end, and my intellectual agenda as a whole, owes an immeasurable debt to Sacks, whose rare genius left a legacy that is more vital than ever more than 45 years after his untimely passing.

References

- Augoustinos, Martha, and Danielle Every. 2007. "The Language of ‘Race’ and Prejudice: A Discourse of Denial, Reason, and Liberal-Practical Politics." *Journal of Language and Social Psychology* 26 (2): 123-41.

- Drew, Paul. 1998. "Complaints About Transgressions and Misconduct." *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 31 (3&4): 295-325.
- Edwards, Derek. 2005. "Moaning, Whinging and Laughing: The Subjective Side of Complaints." *Discourse Studies* 7 (1): 5-29.
- Heritage, John, and Geoffrey Raymond. 2005. "The Terms of Agreement: Indexing Epistemic Authority and Subordination in Talk-in-Interaction." *Social Psychology Quarterly* 68 (1): 15-38.
- Laforest, Marty. 2009. "Complaining in Front of a Witness: Aspects of Blaming Others for Their Behaviour in Multi-Party Family Interactions." *Journal of Pragmatics* 41 (12): 2452-64.
- Lerner, Gene H. 2013. "On the Place of Hesitating in Delicate Formulations: A Turn-Constructional Infrastructure for Collaborative Indiscretion." Pp. 95-134 in *Conversational Repair and Human Understanding*, edited by Jack Sidnell, Makoto Hayashi, and Geoffrey Raymond. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Lerner, Gene H., and Celia Kitzinger. 2007. "Extraction and Aggregation in the Repair of Individual and Collective Self-Reference." *Discourse Studies* 9 (4): 526-57.
- Raymond, Geoffrey. 2004. "Prompting Action: The Stand-Alone 'So' in Ordinary Conversation." *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 37: 185-218.
- Sacks, Harvey. 1972a. "An Initial Investigation of the Usability of Conversational Data for Doing Sociology." Pp. 31-74 in *Studies in Social Interaction*, edited by David N. Sudnow. New York, NY: Free Press.
- . 1972b. "On the Analyzability of Stories by Children." Pp. 325-45 in *Directions in Sociolinguistics: The Ethnography of Communication*, edited by John J. Gumperz and Dell Hymes. New York, NY: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

- . 1984. "On Doing 'Being Ordinary'." Pp. 413-29 in *Structures of Social Action*, edited by J. Maxwell Atkinson and John Heritage. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- . 1986. "Some Considerations of a Story Told in Everyday Conversation." *Poetics* 15: 127-38.
- . 1992. *Lectures on Conversation*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell.
- Sacks, Harvey, Emanuel A. Schegloff, and Gail Jefferson. 1974. "A Simplest Systematics for the Organization of Turn Taking in Conversation." *Language* 50: 696-735.
- Schegloff, Emanuel A. 1987. "Between Micro and Macro: Contexts and Other Connections." Pp. 207-34 in *The Micro-Macro Link*, edited by Jeffrey Alexander. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- . 1992. "Introduction." Pp. ix-lxii in *Lectures on Conversation*, edited by Gail Jefferson. Oxford, UK: Blackwell.
- . 1995. "Discourse as an Interactional Achievement Iii: The Omnirelevance of Action." *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 28 (3): 185-211.
- . 2002. "Accounts of Conduct in Interaction: Interruption, Overlap and Turn-Taking." Pp. 287-321 in *Handbook of Sociological Theory*, edited by J.H. Turner. New York, NY: Plenum.
- . 2005. "On Complainability." *Social Problems* 52 (4): 449-76.
- . 2007a. *Sequence Organization in Interaction: A Primer in Conversation Analysis*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- . 2007b. "A Tutorial on Membership Categorization." *Journal of Pragmatics* 39 (3): 462-82.
- Shrikant, Natasha. 2019. "'Who's the Face?': Communication and White Identity in a Texas Business Community." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 42 (2): 254-71.

- Stokoe, Elizabeth. 2012. "Moving Forward with Membership Categorization Analysis: Methods for Systematic Analysis." *Discourse Studies* 14 (3): 277-303.
- Whitehead, Kevin A. 2009. "'Categorizing the Categorizer': The Management of Racial Common Sense in Interaction." *Social Psychology Quarterly* 72 (4): 325-42.
- . 2011. "An Ethnomethodological, Conversation Analytic Approach to Investigating Race in South Africa." *South African Review of Sociology* 42 (3): 1-22.
- . 2012. "Racial Categories as Resources and Constraints in Everyday Interactions: Implications for Non-Racialism in Post-Apartheid South Africa." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 35 (7): 1248-65.
- . 2013a. "Managing Self/Other Relations in Complaint Sequences: The Use of Self-Deprecating and Affiliative Racial Categorizations." *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 46 (2): 186-203.
- . 2013b. "Race-Class Intersections as Interactional Resources in Post-Apartheid South Africa." Pp. 49-63 in *Social Inequality and the Politics of Representation: A Global Landscape*, edited by Celine Marie Pascale. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- . 2015. "Everyday Antiracism in Action: Preference Organization in Responses to Racism." *Journal of Language and Social Psychology* 34 (4): 374-89.
- . 2018a. "Discursive Approaches to Race and Racism." Pp. 324-39 in *The Oxford Encyclopedia of Intergroup Communication*, edited by Howard Giles and Jake Harwood. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- . 2018b. "Managing the Moral Accountability of Stereotyping." *Journal of Language and Social Psychology* 37 (3): 288-309.
- . 2020. "The Problem of Context in the Analysis of Talk-in-Interaction: The Case of Implicit Whiteness in Post-Apartheid South Africa." *Social Psychology Quarterly* 83 (3): 294-313.

Whitehead, Kevin A., and Gene H. Lerner. 2009. "When Are Persons 'White'? On Some Practical Asymmetries of Racial Reference in Talk-in-Interaction." *Discourse and Society* 20 (5): 613-41.