

## **CHAPTER 8**

### **Sacks: Omni-relevance and the Layered Texture of Interaction.**

Richard Fitzgerald

In a series of lectures during Spring 1966 Sacks examines an introduction sequence from a group therapy session where a new member is introduced (Sacks 1995 p268-312). Within these lectures, Sacks shows how it is possible to analytically approach interaction as sequentially organised and multi layered, where the categorial relevancies and sequential actions unfold within a mutually elaborative and layered texture over the course of the sequence. By tracing his analysis over the series of lectures the chapter highlights the way Sacks' artfully brings in to view the analytic power of treating sequence and category work as entwined, before then discussing how this insight continues to be the central analytic puzzle that I have constantly returned to in my own research.

In a series of lectures during Spring 1966 Sacks examines an introduction sequence from a group therapy session where a new member is introduced (Sacks 1995 p268-312). The lectures follow on from Sacks' analysis of the beginning of a child's story, 'The baby cried. The mommy picked it up.' (Sacks 1995 p236-259) where he first introduces the main elements of his membership categorisation apparatus (see Housley, this volume), before then introducing a section of transcript from a Group Therapy Session and switching to examine how category and sequential work are mutually entwined. Over the course of these lectures Sacks builds up a multi-layered analysis starting from examining the introduction sequence as a sequential action before combining this with membership category work in order to demonstrate how the sequential action and category work are mutually entwined and made relevant to the overall context of the therapy session. In this chapter I trace Sacks' analysis over the course of the lectures to highlight the way that Sacks artfully demonstrates the analysis of sequence and category work as mutually entwined. Moreover, the discussion also emphasises the importance of examining the way Sacks develops his analysis over the course of the lectures, highlighting an approach to reading the lectures as a series of interrelated analyses that build on each other.

*Categorisation and the layered texture of interaction.*

In Sacks' analysis of the beginning of the child's story, taken from the book by Pitcher and Prelinger, (1963), *Children Tell Stories*, (Sacks 1974, 1995, see particularly Spring 1966, p236-259), he introduces a number of terms and concepts including 'membership categories', 'membership category devices', 'category predicates' together with some rules of application and some maxims for observing members category work. Through the analysis of these two short sentences<sup>i</sup> Sacks identified and mapped many of the insights and principles that underpin the routine work of members categorisation practices, and that would come to underpin the development of Membership Categorisation Analysis (MCA) (Hester and Eglin 1997, Fitzgerald and Housley 2015). While the emphasis within MCA was on naturally occurring data and uncovering members own category analysis in situ, this particular analysis is auto ethnographic, relying on Sacks' own understanding of the story, and the data is a story published in a book of stories, rather than from a piece of naturally occurring conversation.

However, in the series of lectures that follow *The Baby Cried* analysis Sacks (1995 p268-312) introduces a transcribed recording of a group therapy session for teenagers in Los Angeles. This new form of data heralded both a shift in some of the analytic principles

Sacks brought to the study of categorisation together with an explicit reorientation to analysis grounded in the participants actions and their orientation to the events (Lynch 2000). As Schegloff (1995) observes.

There is a shift here in analytic stance and procedure, from the analyst's understanding as initial point of departure on the one hand to the co-participant's understanding as initial point of departure on the other. In the former mode, the analysis begins with an asserted convergence of interpretations and recognitions by the analyst and the analyst's audience (for example, that something is a story, that 'the mommy' is 'the mommy of the baby,' that an utterance is doing an invitation, and so on). It proceeds by the provision of a methodical basis for both that convergence of understandings and the convergence between the 'understanders' and the producers of the to-be-understood 'in the data.' In the latter mode, analysis begins with an asserted observation (that not-overtly-engaged participants are attending, and, indeed, are obligated to attend to the talk), and then immediately grounds that observation in subsequent conduct by the co-participants in the episode being examined. That conduct is taken as displaying their orientation to, and understanding of, the setting and what has been transpiring in it. The site of analysis is located in the setting of the data at the outset. And further: the analysts' so treating the conduct of the participants is itself grounded in the claim that the co-participants so treat it.  
(Schegloff, 1995 Vol 1. *Introduction* pxliv-pxlv)

The data that become known as the Group Therapy Sessions (GTS) comprised of transcribed recordings of therapy sessions and became a regular source of data for Sacks' lectures (Sacks 1995, Harvey Sacks Papers 2017, Box 20, 46). While containing a number of volumes of recordings, Sacks mainly focuses on an 11-minute segment of the transcript that he first gives as a handout during the Spring 1966 lectures (Sacks 1995, p136-143, and p270-280). In the series of lectures that follow, Sacks concentrates on one short section of the transcript where the therapist introduces a new patient, Jim, to the group.

*Roger* :            On Hollywood Boulevard the other night they were giving tickets  
                         for dirty windshields. ((door opens))  
*Jim* :                hh  
*Ther* :               Jim, this is uh Al,  
*Jim* :                Hi  
*Ther* :               Ken,  
*Jim* :                Hi  
*Ken* :                Hi  
*Ther* :               Roger.  
*Roger* :              Hi  
*Jim* :                Hi  
*Ther* :               Jim Reed.  
(     ):              ((cough))  
*Ken*:                We were in an automobile discussion  
*Roger*:              discussing the psychological motives for  
(     ):              hhhhhh  
*Al*:                  drag racing on the street.

(Sacks 1995 Vol 1 p271)

As the analysis of this introduction sequence unfolds over the next three lectures (Sacks 1995 Vol 1 p 270-319<sup>ii</sup>) Sacks focuses on both sequential turn actions and membership category work as layered within the sequence. Using this sequence Sacks first establishes what the action is (an introduction sequence) and then examines what form the introduction takes, how it is organised, and how the participants orient to relevant identities categories and actions during the course of the introduction. By tracing through Sacks' analysis, it is possible to see how he develops the analytic principles introduced in the *Baby Cried* analysis applied to naturally occurring interaction. In so doing, Sacks demonstrates the central principle and analytic potential of treating category work and sequential actions as mutually entwined with multiple categorial and sequential relevancies as the interaction unfolds.

#### *Lecture 04.a An introduction sequence*

In Lecture 04.a (p 281-291) Sacks introduces the new data and focuses on an introduction *sequence* with an interest in examining how the sequence is organised and how it is possible to recognise when it has been completed, and that it has been completed properly. Here Sacks pays particular attention to the possible order of those being introduced as a sequence of introductions. He notes that by looking at who is introduced first the participants are then able to figure out the order of the introduction sequence, and so when to anticipate when it will be their turn and when the introduction sequence would be completed. After first establishing that it is an introduction organised around a particular sequence of formatted introductions Sacks then begins to build up the analytic layers of the analysis. He first suggests that the series of introductions point to a *collection of people* being introduced.

Sacks first notes how the introduction sequence is managed by one person who is treated by everyone as the appropriate person to do this action. This then points to differential roles for and during the introduction sequence as one person initiates and manages the introduction while the others are the ones introduced. Sacks suggests that the actions of introducer and introduced point to a contextually relevant collection of categories, 'therapist-patient', and that these categories are part of an 'omni-relevant' membership device 'therapy session'. For Sacks, 'omni-relevance' refers to categorial devices that are composed of collections of categories that are always *potentially* applicable, and that,

when invoked, have priority in terms of organising action within—and only in—situated interaction. Sacks was clear that one omni-relevance does not preclude the relevance of other devices in the production of an interaction, and does not assume that an omni-relevant device is always in operation for the duration of an encounter, but that;

Things may be going along, the device isn't being used; at some point something happens which makes it appropriate, and it's used. And when it is used, it's the controlling device, i.e., there is no way of excluding its operation when relevant. (Sacks, 1995, Vol. 1, p. 314)

Sacks' observation points to both the categorial and sequential relevance of the device in that, at any point in an interaction, someone can expectedly and relevantly invoke an omni-relevant membership device to accomplish an activity, or in doing some activity invoke an omni-relevant membership device. For the introduction the device operates reflexively at an immediate sequential level when initiating the introduction and at the organisational level where the therapist is the relevant category to do this within the device 'therapy session'. Sacks goes on to flesh out the layered texture on the action in the next lecture where he examines how it is that the therapist is able to seemingly without trouble interrupt or suspend the course of the interaction at this point. For this, Sacks brings in the idea of there being some actions that can take *priority* over other ongoing actions.

#### *Lecture 04.b An introduction sequence (ctd)*

In Lecture 04.b (p 292-299) Sacks introduces the idea of '*priority items*', sequences or actions that can take priority in the on-going interaction and without regard to what has been occurring prior to them being used. Here the introduction sequence is seen as a 'priority item' as it is seemingly out of sequential place, occurring sometime after the session has begun.

Can we say something like: Under some conditions there are conversational possibilities which can be called *priority items*, or priority sequences, and that they have *superseding relevance* over whatever it is that may be being done, or over somethings that may be being done? It does appear that there are some 'priority items', and they're priority items whose character is not given by the last thing that occurred, in the sense that given a question an answer may be a priority item, given a first greeting the second may be. But these seem to have rights and obligations to be done, perhaps without regard to what it is that has been taking place, under some proper conditions occurring. They don't have, in that sense, a 'place' in the conversation. (Sacks 1995, Vol 1 p 296)

Here Sacks observes how these actions do not have a 'place' in the conversational sequence, in that they are not part of the topical and sequential flow of interaction, yet they are not treated as interruptions when invoked, but as both a relevant action and something to be attended to by everyone in the setting. While the lecture contains much more analysis and discussion for the purpose here I highlight this point as part of Sacks' interconnected layering of strands of analysis. From noting that some actions may be priority items he goes on to note that someone whose business it is to do the action may be seen as *relevantly* doing these actions by the participants. That such an action may be *tied* to particular identities, such as a 'host' at a party whose job it is to introduce the guests to each other.

### *Lecture 6, Omni-relevant devices; Cover identifications*

In Lecture 6 (p312-319) Sacks pulls the elements of the previous analyses together to focus on how the introduction is a *categorially relevant* sequence. That it was the *therapist* who initiated and conducted the introduction when he did. Here Sacks fleshes out the idea of *omni-relevance* as *omni-relevant category devices*, devices which contain membership categories some of whom may have rights to introduce *contextually* relevant actions that may not be sequentially matched to the on-going interaction. Sacks is then able to tie omni-relevant categories and devices to sequential actions such that sequentially relevant 'priority items' may be categorially ordered. Sacks describes the process of his own discovery.

I had a sense a year ago that 'therapist/patient' is an omni-relevant device here. I didn't know how to show that this was so, or even how to find that this was so. There were bits of data that looked like it, but until, as it happened, I was working on these things without any intention of dealing with the issue of omni-relevance, not much was happening. It was when I was working on the priority character of those insertable sequences [lecture 04.b], and asked, 'how is that priority invoked, and what allows this one or that one to do it?' that it became apparent that it was very much related to the phenomena of omni-relevance.

(Sacks 1995, Vol 1 p316)

In this fascinating reflection, Sacks describes how omni-relevance was something that he had not been able to pin down until he came across this sequence. That is, it was through his analysis of this new data as both transcribed interaction and focused on the participants' actions that he was able to connect up previous observations on categorisation and omni-relevant devices. Thus, moving from the auto ethnographic

analysis of the *Baby Cried*, to transcribed data and participant focused analysis reveals a fundamental shift in Sacks' approach, and which he also addresses at times in the course of these lectures (Sacks 1995, p290-291, p292, p295, p300-301, p306). For me this series of lectures provided the key to treating members' category work as entwined and layered within the sequential flow of interaction and that sequential and categorial relevancies are oriented to, invoked and made operative over the course of interaction.

*Omni-relevance and Membership Categorisation Analysis.*

Sacks' analysis of the therapist's actions as organised through an omni-relevant device has been picked up in further studies of other institutional contexts (Fitzgerald and Housley 2002, Schegloff 2007, Butler 2008) as part of the 'reflexive co determination' of sequence and identity (Schegloff 2007). While this research focused on omni-relevant devices invoked as appropriate to the sequential actions, research has also examined instances where the lack of an action by an omni-relevant category is treated as a breach. For example in McHoul and Rapley's (2002) study of a 'quality of life' assessment they examine how a 'breach' occurs when a non relevant category invokes a priority action. Taken from the beginning of the session, the person who is the subject of the assessment makes the request, 'shall we make a start then?'. McHoul and Rapley argue that this utterance invokes the situated relevance of their interaction and makes relevant that it is the professional who should initiate the beginning of the session. Similarly, Butler (2008) shows how the omni-relevance of a device used to organise a children's game based on 'playing schools' is invoked when a 'student' says 'aren't I supposed to do my work now', when the 'teacher' has failed to allocate a next activity for the students. In this way, the 'student' displays her attention to the categories and actions that are relevant and consequential for the ongoing interaction, thus invoking a device that has omni-relevance for the episode but which was not being done properly.

Instances where there was a hitch in the interactional work or the progressivity of the action offered the possibility of extending the study of omni-relevance and multi layering to non-institutional settings. Extending the analysis to non institutional settings, however, brings with it particular challenges in terms of demonstrating participant relevancies. As Raymond and Heritage (2006) succinctly point out, while the focus on institutionally relevant identities highlights how institutions are talked into being the application of membership categorisation concerns that 'much more severe analytical problems emerge once we are in the open sea of ordinary conversation' (p 680). The challenge for studies

of omni-relevance and non-institutional interaction is where no explicit category or identity is mentioned is it possible to make sound analytic claims concerning the relevance and consequentiality of the phenomena to the participants is difficult. As Hester and Hester (2012) point out, for such analysis there needs two forms of analytic sensitivity for it to be demonstrably relevant for the participants.

The first concerns how the parties to some scene or setting demonstrate for one another that a particular sense of social context relevant for them, while the second refers to the methodological problem for the analyst of how to demonstrate that a particular sense of context is relevant for those participants. (Hester and Hester 2012 p 13)

In Raymond and Heritage's (2006) study they focused on a telephone call between two people and how the identity of one of the speakers as a 'grandparent' is made demonstrably relevant and consequential in the production of assessments about her grandchildren. Focusing particularly on the primary epistemic rights of the category 'grandparent' the analysis examines the way such rights are demonstrably consequential for the participants through turn design, turn content, and the trajectory of the sequence. While Raymond and Heritage's (2006) focus was on sequential actions, a more categorisation focused body of work has been developed through studies including friends talking, family mealtimes and couples using video chat (Fitzgerald, Housley and Butler 2009, Butler and Fitzgerald 2010, Hester and Hester 2012, Fitzgerald and Rintel, 2013, Rintel 2015).

These studies sought to examine how it was possible to analytically show an orientation to omni-relevant devices in non-institutional settings. In doing this they also sought to demonstrate how categories and membership are not fixed but rather invoked and open to negotiation over the course of interaction, that categories and membership can change over the course of conversation and that category membership can be reconfigured at any point. Returning back to Sacks' and his discussion of a herring attempting to be served to a recalcitrant relative (Sacks 1995) he highlighted how category membership, devices and category predicates are not fixed even within the interaction, in that relevant categories and categorial relevancies may emerge, or become 'operative', at some point as the event unfolds and may evolve over the course of the interaction (Sacks 1995, Butler and Fitzgerald 2010).

In Sacks' lecture titled 'The 'old man' as an evolved natural object' (Sacks 1995, vol. 2, p. 318-331) he examines an extended sequence of mealtime talk between a middle-aged



couple, Ethel and Ben, their son Bill, and Ethel's recently widowed stepfather-in-law Max. In his analysis, Sacks notes how the operative identity of the 'old man' as an 'old man', and as a 'burden' was accomplished through the repeated attempts of the man's son and daughter-in-law to get him to eat some herring. What is interesting in this analysis and related to the analysis of the introduction sequence discussed above is how Sacks combines both the sequential organization of talk (how an offer is followed by a request and then a threat, and so on) and the categorial organization in the sense of the unstated categorial relevancies being made operative and oriented to by the participants. Here Sacks demonstrates how unstated, tacit or implicit relationships between the parties can emerge into relevance over the course of the sequence and come eventually to drive it (Schegloff 1995 p. xxvii). While this particular analysis is not couched in categorial terms it further contributed to understanding how sequential and inferential orders of interaction can be examined together by treating category incumbency as not fixed but how it can evolve and shift between interactional layers of relevance. Moreover, that participants can shift membership in relation to different orientations within the interaction, that categories can become 'promiscuous' within interaction.

### *Promiscuous Categories<sup>iii</sup>*

In building the up the analytic understanding of the multi layered texture of interaction it also became possible to examine the way a *single* category can have different meanings for different participants within interaction. For example, how a category introduced or treated as a member of one device can be shifted to other devices within the interaction, and, in doing so, collect different predicates and have different import to the interaction (Fitzgerald and Rintel 2013). To illustrate this categorial phenomenon the brief analysis below examines how the story recipient gradually treated a character in a story differently as the story unfolded and eventually re-categorised the 'lifeguard' as a 'bitch' at the end of the story.

The data is a recording of a couple, Des and Kay, in a long distance relationship and who would use video relay chat technology to talk to each other at the end of the day. During the routine work of catching up on the day's events Des tells a story about what he did that day, that he and his friend Lizzie sneaked into a residential complex in order to use the pool. As the story unfolds Des introduces various characters including a female character that is central to the story the 'lifeguard'. The lifeguard is seen as a gatekeeper

to the pool and so Des describes his actions as having to “play it- (0.3) d<sub>o</sub>:wn low or whatever” in order to avoid being found out.

As the story continues Des returns to the character of the lifeguard and adds more to his description, that the lifeguard is a ‘girl’, and she is ‘super nice’.

*Extract 1*

- 51 Des: - =so we- we go in, (.) a:nd (.) >the lifeguard's this girl,  
52 - and she's li:ke super nice,  
53 so I started li:ke ta(h)lki(h)ng to h(h)e(h)r he .hh

In fleshing out the character of the lifeguard Des builds on the professional category membership of lifeguard with personal attributes such that the lifeguard becomes a ‘girl’ and who is ‘super nice’. In the next line Des mentions that he started to talk to her. Previously, at the beginning of the story Des described how he and Lizzie had to be on the ‘down low’ to avoid being noticed by the lifeguard. Since then the lifeguard has now become a super nice girl who he starts talking to.

Des continues with his story and how he continued his subterfuge when talking to the lifeguard by giving the lifeguard an apartment number pretending it was his friend Lizzie’s apartment and so able to legitimately use the pool.

*Extract 2*

54. Des: \$an [I made up this whole sto:ry about like,\$]  
55. Kay: [@Smiles a little ((‘tightly’))@]  
56. Des: how Lizzie lived in the building  
57. and I was just mooching off her  
58. to get the free poo::l a(h)n(h)d  
59. (0.4)  
60. Des: .hh  
61. Kay: mh °hmhmh.°  
62. Des: [\$like all this] stu:ff,\$  
63. =like I gave a phony nu:umber and everyth(h)i(h)ng?  
64. (0.4)  
65. [an she like-]  
66. Kay: [Wai:t, you gave] her a number to ca:ll you?  
67. Des: No no a hou- uh >an apartment number,<  
68. (0.4)  
69. Kay: L°Oh.°  
70. Des: >I j’st like, looked at some of them  
71. when we were walking up the:re,<  
72. (0.5)  
73. Des: and I was like yeah I live in: thirty one

74. eig(h)ht(hi)ty hu.  
 75. Kay: Yo[u mean Lizzie lives there?]  
 76. Des: [and um er] >Lizzie lives  
 77. in °thirty one eighty.=yeah.° u:m (1.0) so:

After initially glossing his subterfuge (“made up this whole story”; “and all this stuff”), Des produces a specific example of giving the lifeguard false information. That he gave the lifeguard a ‘phony number’. At this point (line 66) Kay halts the story to ask if he ‘wait, you gave her a number to call you’. Kay’s action halts the flow of the story and operates as a ‘priority item’, that she is able to legitimately do this, and provides a subtle first glimpse of her treating the lifeguard as possibly more than only a character of a story. Suspending the story to clarify if he gave the lifeguard a *phone* number provides an analytic glimpse of a possible omni-relevant device being oriented to by Kay, that of *our relationship*. Within the omni-relevant device ‘our relationship’ the category of super nice female lifeguard who you gave a phone number too has potentially different meanings, different predicates, than the original category ‘lifeguard’ first introduced by Des. This mishearing points to a possible shift of the character ‘lifeguard’ from a character *within* the story to now *outside* the story, as a category relevant to Des and Kay’s relationship.

While Des continues on with the story Kay begins to circle back within the story and to point out various discrepancies in Des’s story about the lifeguard, such as wanting be on the ‘down lo’ but then talking to her. Again these actions point to the re categorisation of the lifeguard from within the story to one relevant to their relationship. While the story continues to the end, and it turns out the point of the story was that Des finds out they have mutual friends with the lifeguard, Kay provides a more explicit re categorisation for the lifeguard.

### *Extract 3*

142. Kay: Okay well now that you've  
 143. - flirted with the bitch a who:le day. hehehe.  
 144. Des: Yep yep yep

Kay’s summary, then, re categorises the lifeguard explicitly in relation to the omni-relevant device ‘our relationship’, that the lifeguard is not welcome in the device ‘our relationship’. Moreover that the device ‘our relationship’ takes priority over other actions, possibly because this is what is being oriented to through the call, of catching up

with each other at the end of the day. That is, that relating stories about their day are routine actions as part of relationship maintenance, but are subordinate to this omnirelevant device.

The analysis was able to show not only how categories can evolve within the interaction but also how they can be treated as a member of two devices simultaneously. For Des the category of the lifeguard was relevant to the story characters, to be revealed later as having mutual friends, while for Kay the lifeguard became relevant to their relationship as someone Des had ‘flirted’ with. That is categories can be ‘promiscuous’ as they can be removed and repurposed within the interaction irrespective of how they were originally introduced.

## **Summary**

My aim in the chapter has been to highlight the continuing relevance and payoff of going back to Sacks’ lectures and that as I have pursued a particular methodological problem Sacks so often provides the insight needed to push the analysis further. For me the problem was how to analytically explore interaction as three-dimensional. I took this to be at the heart of Sacks’ approach when he moved from the *Baby Cried* data to the therapy session data and where this new data produced a profound shift in both data and his approach to analysis. It might be argued that use of transcribed data provided Sacks with the solution to his data ‘problem’. As he discussed in a seminar with Garfinkel in 1962, he was not so much interested in the study of the discipline of Sociology, but wanted to study people doing sociology in everyday actions (Harvey Sacks Archive 2017, Fitzgerald, forthcoming). The problem was getting the data. Prior technology had provided newspapers and published books but the tape recorder provided the means by which to capture the actual lived problem solving, of people doing sociology in action (Fitzgerald 2019).

Sacks then orients to data in two different, but interrelated ways. As something that is interesting in itself as a phenomenon, but also of a way to solve analytic problems and develop his principles of analysis. This, for me, is the abiding relevance of Sacks: his constant demonstrations of creative ways to solve analytic problems together with an invitation to develop upon his initial analysis. This invitation is made explicit by Sacks in a description of how he approaches his form of sociological inquiry. In a folder entitled ‘*Notes on Method*’ (Box 32), a draft document in the archive written for a volume of

studies that was never published, Sacks introduces the studies that will follow as 'exercises' before describing how he goes about doing them and how the reader should understand them.

The studies, let me call them more appropriately, the exercises that compose this volume...Let me note that the exercises tend to have a recurrent form. A presentation of some small fragment of transcribed conversation is followed by a quite bland, uncontroversial and unilluminating observation about a fragment, followed by an attempt to determine how the observed features might possibly be achieved or some such explanatory effort devoted to the observations, followed by some further observations which the attempted analysis generates, which further observations may well be news, may well be illuminating and interesting, and then further analysis devoted to explaining the presence or the operation of the newsy facts. The procedure of analysis generating new observations which provide for a further analysis can be carried on again and again, but I have happened to stop after one or two or three applications and to start over again on new materials, for fear that a sort of abstractness would be reached which would not permit the actual materials to control how I think about them.

(Harvey Sacks Papers, 2017, Box 32, File *Notes on Method* p 2-3)

Here Sacks makes clear that his analysis is only the start, it is to kick things off, as he then invites the reader, the analyst, to build on his work and take his analysis further. The lesson taken from this is that his analysis is to be treated as practical exercises that show the potential analytic power of this form of analysis and an invitation to continue developing upon and extending the analysis of social action wherever it occurs.

## References

- Butler, C. W. (2008). *Talk and social interaction in the playground*. Ashgate Publishing.
- Butler, C. W. Fitzgerald, R. (2010) Operative Identities in a family meal. *Pragmatics*. Vol 42. (9) p2462-2474
- Fitzgerald, R. (2012a) Membership Categorisation Analysis. Wild and promiscuous or simply the joy of Sacks. *Discourse Studies*. 14 (3) P 305-311
- Fitzgerald, R. (2019) The Data and Methodology of Harvey Sacks: Lessons from the archive. *Journal of Pragmatics*. Vol. 143 p205-214
- Fitzgerald, R. Housley, W (2002) Identity, categorisation and sequential organisation: the sequential and categorial flow of identity in a radio phone-in. *Discourse and Society* 13(5): 579-602.
- Fitzgerald, R., Housley, W., Butler, C. (2009) Omni relevance in interactional context. Special Issue of *Australian Journal of Communication*. Vol 36 (3)

Fitzgerald, R. Rintel, S. (2013) From lifeguard to bitch: The problem of promiscuous categories in story telling in a long-distance relationship. Special Issue of the *Australian Journal of Communication*. (40.3)

Harvey Sacks Papers (Accessed 2017), *Collection 1678*. UCLA Library Special Collections, Charles E. Young Research Library, University of California, Los Angeles.

Hester, Stephen. (2016) *Descriptions of Deviance. A study in Membership Categorisation Analysis*. Edited by Peter Eglin and Dave Francis. <http://emca-legacy.info>.

Hester, S., & Hester, S. (2012). Categorical occasionality and transformation: Analyzing culture in action. *Human Studies*, 35(4), 563-581

Lynch, M. (2000), "[The ethnomethodological foundations of conversation analysis](#)", *Text & Talk*, vol. 20, no. 4, pp. 517–532.

McHoul, A., & Rapley, M. (2002). "Should we make a start then?": A strange case of (delayed) Client-initiated psychological assessment. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 35(1), 73-91.

Pitcher, E., G., Prelinger, E (1963) *Children Tell Stories. An Analysis of Fantasy*. New York International Universities Press Inc.

Raymond, G., & Heritage, J. (2006). The epistemics of social relations: Owning grandchildren. *Language in society*, 35(5), 677-705.

Rintel, S. (2015). Omnirelevance in technologised interaction: couples coping with video calling distortions. In Fitzgerald, R. and Housley, W. (Eds) *Advances in Membership Categorisation Analysis*. London Sage.

Sacks, H. (1974) On the Analyzability of Stories by Children. in R. Turner (ed.) *Ethnomethodology*, Penguin, Harmondsworth, pp. 216–232.

Sacks, H. (1995). *Lectures on Conversation, Volumes I and II* Edited by G. Jefferson with Introduction by E.A. Schegloff, Blackwell, Oxford.

Schegloff, E. (1995) Introduction Vol 1 and 2. In Sacks, H. *Lectures on Conversation, Volumes I and II*" Edited by G. Jefferson Blackwell, Oxford.

Schegloff, E. A. (2007). A tutorial on membership categorization. *Journal of pragmatics*, 39(3), 462-482.

Stokoe, E. (2012). Moving forward with membership categorization analysis: Methods for systematic analysis. *Discourse Studies*, 14(3), 277-303.

---

<sup>i</sup> Sacks collected data from a range of different contexts including news print, overheard conversations, stories, children's street games, children's drawings, his own recollections, comic books, classic and contemporary research reports and of course transcripts of various forms of interaction (Fitzgerald, 2019). The recorded interactions and transcripts include conversations between colleagues and between family members, shopping for a used car (where Sacks made 23, presumably secret, recordings of him visiting different used car lots (Harvey Sacks Papers, 2017, Box 20, File, *Auto Shopping*), transcripts from TV and Radio phone-in programs (Harvey Sacks Papers, 2017, Box 121, File, *Crandall*), as well as the Group Therapy Session (GTS) data (Harvey Sacks Papers, 2017, Box 46, File, *GTS 5. H.S. Copy*).

<sup>ii</sup> It should be noted that Lectures 4a and 4b were not delivered in Spring 1966 but in Fall 1966. However, as Jefferson points out these two lectures are part of the sequence of analysis (Jefferson in Sacks 1995, Vol 1 p281 fn).

<sup>iii</sup> The term 'analytic promiscuous' is used by Schegloff (1995, 2007) in his critique of MCA where he cautions against analysts imposing their own understandings of the meaning of categories and predicates over that of the participants (see also Stokoe 2012, Fitzgerald 2012, Hester 2016). Indeed Sacks own work on categorisation had encountered this problem where he notes that he had dropped the term 'category bound activities' because his students would just invoke 'zillions' of predicates rather than from the data (Harvey Sacks Papers, 2017 Box 15, File *Worktapes S72*). While 'analytic promiscuity' can of course be an issue for any form of analysis, including CA, our interest was in 'categorial promiscuity' as a members' phenomena.