



4805/2

Please type throughout

Please indicate whether there has been any change in investigator, research staff or institution since the grant was awarded

1 INVESTIGATOR(S) ~~PROF/DR/MR/MRS/MISS~~ INITIALS SURNAME  
G. Jefferson  
J. Lee

2 DEPARTMENT Department of Sociology

3 INSTITUTION University of Manchester

4a OFFICIAL ADDRESS  
Department of Sociology  
Faculty of Economics and Social Studies  
University of Manchester  
Manchester

4b OFFICIAL TELEPHONE NUMBER  
(give STD code from London)  
061 273 7121

5 TITLE OF PROJECT  
"The Analysis of Conversations in which "Troubles"  
and "Anxieties" are Expressed

6 AIMS AND METHODS OF RESEARCH (up to 300 words)

The aim of the project is to analyse and describe qualitative socio-linguistic data. The intention is to collect and analyse tape recordings of ordinary conversations in which "troubles" are told and discussed. Whilst our main concern is with the organisation of "ordinary" conversation some data from institutional settings will be used for comparative purposes.

The attention of the research is focussed upon the interactional features of "troubles talk" in an effort to explore the fine-grained nature of social action and interaction. The aim is to systematically characterise and describe the social accomplishments of co-participants as in the course of the conversation they achieve the constructed character of this social organisation.

The research is concerned to locate and to investigate procedures and structures that are used in orderly conversation dealing with "troubles." Each procedure and structure located will be characterised so that its general abstract shape is developed by reference to a collection of instances. In the course of an in aid of the general consideration, single instances will be examined in fine detail to discover precisely how the abstract shape of the phenomenon is manifested in and through any particular unfolding interaction.

The study is a study in the tradition of conversation analysis as developed by H. Sacks and hopefully will make a contribution to that tradition. As such it embraces the aims and ways of working that characterise that tradition.

On the Sequential Organization of Troubles-Talk  
In Ordinary Conversation

Contents

	<u>Page No.</u>
<u>Introduction: The Sequence That Wasn't There</u> . . . . .	1- 9
<u>Section I: The Candidate Troubles-Telling Sequence</u> . . . . .	10- 74
List of Segments and Elements . . . . .	10- 11
Array of Instances . . . . .	11- 71
Approach . . . . .	12- 18
Initiation . . . . .	12- 13
Inquiry . . . . .	12
Noticing . . . . .	13
Trouble Premonitor . . . . .	13- 17
Downgraded Response to Inquiry . . . . .	14
Improvement Marker . . . . .	14- 15
Lead-Up . . . . .	15- 17
Premonitor Response . . . . .	17- 18
Arrival . . . . .	18- 20
Announcement . . . . .	18- 19
Announcement Response . . . . .	19- 20
Delivery . . . . .	20- 31
Exposition . . . . .	20- 24
Affiliation → Affiliation Response . . . . .	24- 31
Work-Up . . . . .	31- 37
Close-Implicature . . . . .	37- 42
Optimistic Projection . . . . .	38- 39

	<u>Page No.</u>
Invoking the Status Quo . . . . .	39- 41
Making Light of the Trouble . . . . .	41- 42
Exit . . . . .	43- 71
Boundarying Off . . . . .	43- 58
Conversation Close . . . . .	43- 48
Conversation Restart . . . . .	48- 49
Introduction of Pending Biographicals . . . . .	49- 54
Contrast Cases for Pending Biographicals . . . . .	51- 54
Reference to Getting Together . . . . .	54- 56
The 'Entre-Nous' Warrant (and contrast cases) . . . . .	56- 58
Stepwise Transition (to reported 'good times') . . . . .	58- 71
Troubles-Talk as Consequential for Subsequent Talk . . . . .	70
<u>Summary of Section I</u> . . . . .	71- 74
<u>Section II: Some Sources of Disruption of the Candidate Sequence</u> . . . . .	75-185
Interactional Asynchrony . . . . .	75- 88
Activity Contamination . . . . .	88-175
Building a Case: The 'Trouble as a possible 'Misdeed' . . . . .	88-120
Detailing and Glossing . . . . .	102-114
Troubles-Talk as 'self-contaminable'. . . . .	119-120
Negotiating a Plan: The 'Trouble' as a possible 'Obstacle' . . . . .	120-158
Tacit Negotiations . . . . .	131-158
Dispute: The 'Trouble' as a 'Source of Contention' . . . . .	158-175
The Service Encounter as a Problematic Contaminant . . . . .	170-175
The Cargo Syndrome . . . . .	171-175
<u>Summary of Section II</u> . . . . .	175-181
<u>Conclusion</u> . . . . .	181-185

Brief Index of Incidental Phenomena

- ambiguity, 85-87, 90, 92-93 (embedded activities), 98-102, 104-105,  
108-109, 112, 123-124, 131-158 (embedded activities),  
144-145, 157
- American versus British options, 26-31, 142 fn.1., 180
- disappointment markers, 155-157
- dismissing a prior utterance, 146-147
- formatted 'on topic' talk 91-92
- interactionally-generated activities, 94, 116, 149
- no-hitch adjustment to a new topic, 134-135, 138
- offer to close as a topic-shift device, 134-135, 138
- practical mysticism, 162-164
- pre-dispute asynchrony, 160-162
- reported conjecture, 117-119
- response-onset at hitch in prior utterance, 86-87, 102, 173
- silence bodes 111, 77, 103-104, 151-152, 160
- talking positively about a negative matter, 81-82
- telephone call as instrumental to in-person interaction, 150-152
- topic-shift format, 67-68
- topical pivot, 137-138, 148
- touched-off talk, 64-68

## Preface

From the very beginning of sociology its practitioners have claimed that the discipline is primarily concerned with analysis and with the naturalistic description of social action and interaction. Amongst its classic figures Weber and Parsons insisted that all successful depictions of social organization must be constructed from representative or typical 'unit acts'. It is therefore surprising that, until recently at least, little or no attention has been given to the analysis and description of talk. It is as though practitioners of the discipline did not notice or realise the significance of the fact that most social interaction is accomplished in and through talk.

In ignoring the topic of talk sociology has not just been omitting a subject on a par with, for example, leisure activities. Instead it has been ignoring a phenomenon that occurs in, and is constitutive of most of the activities that it proposes to study. As Austin reminded us, it is by talking, and in talking, that ordinary everyday activities get accomplished. It is therefore ironical that it was Austin, a philosopher, and not a sociologist, who first proposed the empirical study of how utterances in the course of talk perform the social activities that they do.<sup>1</sup> It is implicated in his work that "ordinary" talk and conversation provides an empirically available locus for the study of the organization of social interaction.

---

1. J. L. Austin, 'How to do Things with Words', J. O. Urmson (ed.), Oxford University Press, Inc. 1965.

The seriousness of this neglect can be appreciated if one considers that sociology massively uses talk and conversation both as a methodological resource to obtain data and as data itself. Questionnaire responses, interview materials, and participant and direct observational reports are obtained as data from, and through, talk. Even questionnaire responses are a product of, and feature as a part of, the "conversational" interaction between researcher and researchee. Such materials are routinely taken as expressing 'attitudes' or evidencing the existence of 'norms' and 'values' which are taken to be revealing of the speaker's behaviour in other settings. However, because sociological research has not taken seriously the question of how such conversational engagements work, it has not appreciated the ways in which the sense and meaning of items of talk are locked into the sequential context of which they are a part. In the interests of testing pre-established theory, or supporting a model of enquiry, sociologists have categorized talk in terms of 'attitudes', or as reflecting 'norms', and in so doing have dislocated it from the conversational organization of which it is necessarily a part. The character of the activity of the talk has either been taken for granted, or imposed by fiat, by the requirements of the model.

As Sacks and others have shown many times, the activity accomplished by an utterance, or by lexical items in the course of an utterance, is embedded in the sequential organization, and in other organizations, of the conversation. The interactive sense of an utterance, the activity that it is performing, is constrained by its position in relation to prior objects, utterances, or sequences of utterances in the course of the unfolding talk. Sacks has shown that utterances which might appear literally to be performing one activity can on closer inspection be seen to be performing quite another. This can only be appreciated when the

utterance is considered in relation to its place in the sequential organization of the conversation.

In fact the sociologist is inclined to characterise his utterances as though they were produced as de-contextualised truth statements. As a consequence of this summary characterisation sociological studies are criticised for the invalidity of their representation of persons', 'attitudes', and 'values'.<sup>2</sup> They are also vulnerable to the criticism that they use talk and conversation as an unanalysed and unexplicated methodological resource in the production of their studies.

By contrast this research is concerned to explicate talk by submitting conversation to intensive analysis thereby to explore the fine-grained nature of social action and interaction. At the most general level it is concerned with the question of how members of a speech community engage in the production of socially organized and orderly interaction. It examines conversational extracts but it does not do so in order to treat them as a resource for the extraction of 'attitudes', 'norms' and 'values', nor does it use them to test preselected theory, nor to sustain a model of enquiry. Instead the extracts are treated as conversational social interactional accomplishments which it is the business of the research to systematically characterise and describe.

Such an analytic concern is of course in part related to certain recent developments in Sociological Theory. Following Garfinkel and others stress has been placed upon the achieved, negotiated, and in-course-constructed character of social organization. This view of social order

---

2. A. V. Cicourel. 'Method and Measurement in Sociology'. New York. Free

has emphasised that the mundane everyday world is a thoroughly achieved world and that 'data' can be examined in order to analyse and describe the methods of that achievement. The argument has been that sociology should not leave the terms of natural language unexamined but should seek to discover the methods and procedures of their use. The policy recommendation to sociology is that the organization of natural talk be examined with the understanding that it is a means by which social organization is accomplished. Talk rather than being merely a resource for sociological enquiry represents a proper subject of sociological enquiry.

The design of this research accepts such a policy recommendation, except the production of natural conversation as a feature of members' "ordinal" practices. It works under the assumption that conversation analysis studies have found rewarding that the organization of conversational interaction is achieved by the manner in which members furnish and follow orderly and organized procedures.

When we refer in this way to interaction as organized or as orderly, we are not just suggesting that it is organized or orderly for the researcher as a consequence of the researcher's special capacity to understand, define, or theorise about interaction. Rather, we mean that such interactions are orderly to the procedures or co-conversationalists. They are of course orderly to the researcher in as much as he relies upon his common-sense practices. As Sacks and Schegloff say:

The materials are produced by members in orderly ways that exhibit their orderliness and have their orderliness appreciated and used, and have that appreciation displayed and treated as the basis for subsequent action.<sup>3</sup>

---

3. E. Schegloff and H. Sacks, 'Opening up Closings', 'Semiotica', Vol. 8, 1973



It is the researcher's, or any beholder's, capacity to make sense of the data as a competent native speaker that provides him with the resources to appreciate the procedures or structures that co-conversationalists have oriented to in the course of their production; resources which the researcher/observer must possess in order to follow the course of the talk. Whilst native speakers have the resources to furnish and follow such procedures, they do not have the resources to explicate them.

Conversation analysis has centred around the step by step construction of conversation. It has addressed the issue of the methodic ways co-participant in the course of a conversation analyse the procedures that were involved in the construction of an immediately prior utterance in order to understand its prospective consequentiality for what they might say next, and for when they might say it. Participants also take it that the production of their next utterance will in its turn be analysed for what others may say next, and for how and when they may say it. Such analyses have exhibited the ways in which prior utterances are implicative for the production of next utterances. In doing so they have exhibited a variety of ways in which utterances are synchronised interactionally so that conversationalists jointly achieve various conversational organizations.

### Investigating "Troubles"

Clearly there is nothing new in seeking to investigate 'troubles'. Many sociologists, particularly those concerned with social problems have been concerned to explore troubles; for example, those who have been concerned to explore the social origins and etiology of troubles. Some have concentrated upon the description of the social world and the culture of

troubled persons. Others have devoted their attention to the analysis of institutions and institutional organizations which society has developed in order to deal with troubles. Whilst all these studies have necessarily been dependent in a variety of ways upon "ordinary talk", they have ignored that dependence.

Some of the ways they are dependent can be listed:

1. "Ordinary" talk frequently provides the basis by which persons are discovered to have "troubles" in the first place.
2. It is most frequently in the course of ordinary talk that "troubles" become identified and categorized as the "troubles" they are.
3. The seeking of help whether in an institutional context or not occurs by and through ordinary talk.

And as has already been suggested:

4. Often the sociologist's data, as well as the ways in which the data is collected for studies of the 'troubled' consists of ordinary talk.

It is therefore surprising to find how little attention that these studies, and studies of sociology generally, have given to any analysis of the part that ordinary talk has played, and plays both in the affairs of the 'troubled' and in the production of the studies about them. It is even rare for such

studies to reproduce any part of the conversations that they have encountered as data.

Generally by this neglect the sociologist has failed to display in any detail the manner in which the troubled, and his co-participants orient to those "troubles". This involves the critical question of what those "troubles" are; what they represent. This aspect of "troubles" is available in conversation in the way that the telling of "troubles" structures the conversational interaction. Sociologists' neglect of these members' orientation has serious methodological implications in that a failure to base analysis upon the phenomena as they are grounded in the lives and understandings of the interacting persons, makes any analysis liable to the charge of invalidity on the grounds that the subject of study becomes, in effect, a study of analyst's version of the phenomena.

As we have suggested the work of categorizing or conceiving of persons as having this or that "trouble" frequently occurs in "ordinary" conversations. Given that sociologists study officially designated troubles, we are considering the kind of conversations that might lead, or might not lead, to co-participants seeking official help. We are therefore considering the organization of conversations which themselves organize sociologists' fields in ways they have neither recognised nor studied.

Focussing upon the ways troubles are oriented to in the everyday world we come to see that for most members of society, relatives, friends, and acquaintances constitute a set of persons with whom "troubles" are raised in the course of interaction before any possible question of professional help is raised. Participants treat such persons as the proper recipients such

that only their non-availability, or their "failure" as co-participants, can sanction the turn to professional help.<sup>4</sup> Given this it is obvious that the ways in which "troubles" are addressed and handled in such interaction scenes may have a considerable bearing upon the way in which trouble tellers and recipients come to handle and possibly to conceive of their "trouble". That means that such conversations have some bearing upon whether the "troubles" are conceived of as "self-handleable" or not, in the sense that they are not taken to a professional.

Some of the data which has so far been analysed in the course of this research suggests that it is possible to regard at least some "trouble" telling conversations as involving ongoing negotiation as to versions of the "trouble". Indeed, some data appears to exhibit the existence of machinery by which interactants can engage interactionally in the reconciliation of potentially competing versions of "troubles".

By "troubles talk" we mean members' talk about situations and events that are seen as distressful and disruptive of the routines of everyday life, but which are essentially self-manageable. The materials that constitute our initial corpus catch for us the sense that "telling a trouble" seems to have. The materials display a member's orientation to this sense of a "trouble" as something to be "coped" with, where that "coping" might involve difficulties and discomforts. We refer to this description of our phenomenon as a 'provisional specification'. By this we mean to make clear that it is not an 'operational definition' or 'analytic construct' which acts as a benchmark to control the operations of the research. In fact we are concerned to avoid

---

4. H. Sacks, 'The Search for Help: No One to Turn to'.

binding the research by the adoption of either pre-established theory or pre-set operational definitions. The excitement of the research is that analytical categories are emerging and are being developed out of the data itself. Throughout the endeavour the research attempts to ground its analytical categories, its descriptions and formulations of procedure, upon the revealed orientations of the co-conversationalists as they developmentally achieve the interaction that constitutes the data. It is of critical significance that our understandings of the nature of a phenomenon and its features are built from the ways in which co-participants orient to those phenomena in the data of our investigation. A proposal that we have discovered methods whereby members achieve a phenomenon or its features, any constraints if we cannot demonstrably show that members are in fact orienting to that as an achievement.<sup>5</sup> Therefore research descriptions of a phenomenon and its features must evolve from an enquiry into the ways by which members are in the "real world" (in the data) accomplishing those features. The task of description is therefore, of necessity, an emergent task.

Some sociologists have continually warned of the dangers of operational definitions and of arbitrarily preceding enquiry with definition<sup>6</sup> in sociology generally. They suggest that the use of operational definitions not grounded in the actors orientations, necessarily implies that the

- 
5. See H. Sacks, unpublished manuscript 'Aspects of the Sequential Organization of Conversation', Chapter 2.
  6. H. Blumer, 'The Problem of the Concept in Social Psychology', American Journal of Sociology (1940), 707-19, and 'What is Wrong with Social Theory', ASR, 19, February 1964. A. V. Cicourel, 'Method and Measurement in Sociology', New York, Free Press of Glencoe, 1964. See also A. Schutz. 'Concept and Theory Formulation in the Social Sciences', Journal of Philosophy, Vol. 51, 1954.

products of the research will have an arbitrariness. As operational definitions are based upon the operational requirements of the research rather than upon the orientations of the members, which should necessarily be a topic of the research, they involve an imposition by fiat of the researcher's version of the nature of the interaction.

In the research that follows 'troubles talk' interaction will be examined and is found to occur in terms of a sequential and interactional package. The package can be seen as made up of a progressively arrayed set of categories which denote activities which the co-conversationalists properly negotiate and achieve in the course of the interaction. However, as will be seen, the package does not regularly occur in such a way as to reveal all the categories we have noticed, nor are the categories necessarily arrayed in the ideal order that we have portrayed. The package is put forward very tentatively as a model or 'ideal type'. Our observations have led us to the view that whilst co-conversationalists may not orient-to or conceive of the package as a whole in the course of their interaction, their particular next moves or next activities can be and are, monitored by reference to the overall requirements of a trouble-telling sequential package model. We are suggesting that such understanding is available to co-participants and tentatively propose that the data and its analysis supports this view. If we are correct in this view, then the package proposed, or the roles underlying its construction, provide some basis for understanding the basis of co-conversationalists orientations in the production of their next-utterances.

Our tentative and exploratory moves towards the construction of a model of this kind remind us of the classic methodological position of Max Weber.<sup>7</sup>

---

7. Max Weber, The Methodology of the Social Sciences.

In his methodology of the social sciences he proposed that social organization should be studied via the construction of 'local types' which, whilst not existing in the world, represent a framework for understanding particular courses or sequences of action. It will be remembered that amongst his conditions for the construction of an Ideal Type are: that it be a logically possible course of action, adequate at the level of meaning and adequate at the level of causality. Real life "departures" from such a model do not disqualify such a model but (providing that the model is successfully constructed) are themselves understandable by an understanding of how interactants have departed from such a model.

Of course Weber was principally concerned with understanding large-scale socio-historical movements rather than day to day social interaction. However, the validity, or otherwise, of his epistemological arguments apply equally to the study of social interaction and it is therefore interesting, if not entirely coincidental, to find them echoed in our study of conversational interaction.<sup>8</sup> Perhaps it is more surprising that there has been so little development of Weber's epistemological position in mainstream sociology.

On the other hand the research categories that form the basis of this research are not the products of any pre-formulated theory nor of following a pre-established methodological plan. They are grounded in and have emerged from the data analysed. If we have developed a model which is reminiscent of the requirements of Weber's 'Ideal Type' then it is a model which has emerged rather than a model that has been sought.

---

8. It is not coincidental in the sense that Harvey Sacks, the founder of conversational analysis, was both a scholar of, and critic of, Weberian methodology. See his 'Sociological Descriptions' Berkley Journal of Sociology, 1966.

On The Sequential Organization of Troubles-Talk  
in Ordinary Conversation

Introduction. The Sequence that Wasn't There

In the course of our first year's work with conversations in which people talk about their troubles, a range of relevant topics were located. These aspects of troubles-talk came to light in an unmotivated scan of the materials. We were not pursuing any particular aspect of troubles-talk; rather, we made ourselves available to whatever might emerge as a possibly systematic feature. Included among the Emerging Topics listed in our Progress Report is the possibility that Troubles-Talk is a 'package' with standard components in a standard order of occurrence. Again, this possible feature was not something we were looking for, but as we noted in the introduction to that report, "in general we are interested in 'sequencing', both local and general; in the relationship of one utterance to a next [and] the organization of activities into standardized 'packages' with specific components in a specific order".

As we examined the range of conversations which constitute the current corpus, we began to get a sense that, although many of the conversations were long and multifaceted, they were not amorphous. There seemed to be a shape to them; a shape which recurred across the range of conversations; a shape which could be sensed to be rather well formed in some of the conversations and distorted or incomplete in others. Furthermore, a series of utterance-types were found again and again across the corpus. A few of these were isolated and considered in the Progress Report. They seemed to 'belong' in various positions within that, as yet dimly defined, shape. Thus, at the time of the Progress Report we had a strong, if vague sense of troubles-talk as a sequentially formed phenomenon,



and a seed collection of elements which might constitute the components out of which a troubles-telling 'sequence' is constructed.

The prospect of gaining some analytic control over large chunks of conversation such as those we were confronted with was exciting, and we decided to direct our attention to an investigation of troubles-talk as a coherent, sequentially organized unit. While the sort of analysis of conversational interaction which we practice tends to focus on very small, crystalline bits of the conversational machinery, we have an ongoing interest in the analysis of what Harvey Sacks talks of as the "big packages". In a lecture of April 12, 1971, he notes that the ways we tend to work with talk; i.e., by "characterizing some two or three utterance sequence which occurs in some larger fragment, completely ignores how the sequence fits into that fragment, or how it is part of the analytic package that is being developed." He goes on to say:

It turns out that one central problem in building big packages is that the ways of dealing with the utterances that turn out to compose the package as single utterances or pairs of utterances, etc., may have almost no bearing on how they get dealt with when an attempt is made to build a larger package.

That is to say, the operation is not at all additive. It is not an operation in which one develops adequate and interesting characterizations of some utterance or some small sequence and then assembles them into a package. It does not work that way at all. So that information about utterances and their organization for smaller units might be done which would yield a discussion of all the utterances in some fragment and would not tell us anything about some such larger package as we might try to get at. Thus, certain aspects of the work you might do on 'sequence' won't do you any good in trying to package longer sequences. Indeed, they might be misleading in that you would figure that you have dealt with some pair in some fashion, and even in a sequential fashion, and thereby not see the potentiality for building a larger package, for which the way you had studied the smaller sequence did not have much bearing, or had only some relatively intricate bearing.

The investigation of long sequences as coherent matters, as compared to simply studying, utterance by utterance, a long sequence which you then have as an, in some way connected, series of small fragments, is at a rather primitive stage, assuming that it is going to develop.

(April 12, 1971 pages 1-3, slightly edited)

As a background to our investigation of troubles-talk as a big package, we had, then, an ongoing interest in that type of phenomenon in general, and a sense that what must be sought was an overall design and function, by reference to which the various discrete elements could be seen to operate. And indeed a scan of the troubles-talk corpus yielded a gross sense of such a design and function. A series of recurrent, positioned elements were found which could be grouped into a rough segmental sort of order. And that order could be characterized in terms of (1) a trajectoried alignment of attention to the trouble vis-a-vis attention to the normal, routine requirements and proprieties, and (2) a correlated alignment of interactants vis-a-vis each other.

In the Progress Report it was proposed that a central feature of troubles-talk was the constant tension between attending the trouble and attending to business as usual. The troubles-talk package seemed to us specifically designed to move elegantly and fluently between those polar relevancies. We could begin to array the segments and their elements, and to characterize their work by reference to such a function. The basic design seemed to us utterly simple. There is a trajectory which starts out attending to business as usual, moves gradually towards an attention to the trouble, arrives at an intense and uncontaminated focus on the trouble, and then moves back to an attending to business as usual. Interactionally as well, a simple corresponding design seemed apparent. The interactants start out at a distance appropriate to their routine conversation, become gradually closer, arrive at an intense intimacy as the trouble is focussed upon, and then return to a more distant relationship as they re-engage with business as usual.

However, these considerations were based on a template or model of the troubles-telling sequence constructed out of extracts of the materials.

Specifically, a detailed examination of the materials did not yield a single instance of troubles-talk in which the candidate sequence was present, element by element, or even segment by segment, in order. To get a sense of what we were confronted with, we show some of the results of one of our attempted 'coding' runs. Over the year we had been locating and positioning the element-types as they ought to occur in sequence, starting with a rough assignment of numbers, from (1) "How's your foot?" through (10) "Never mind, it'll all come right in the end", to (11) exit from the troubles-talk, gradually refining the system to catch the segmental ordering of various elements, now from A.1.a. "How's your foot?" through E.Ø.a. "Never mind, it'll all come right in the end", to F. exit from the troubles-talk. The results of a run using the latter coding were only slightly less problematic than the results of a run using the former, rough coding. For seven fragments, we show the results of each run.

- (1) [NB:II:5:2-4R]
  - (1), (3), (3a), (4), (7), (8), (9), (6), (7), (8), (9), (6), (8), (9), (10), (11)
  - (A.1), (A.2), (B.1), ([B.2.]), (C.1.), (C.2), (C.3), ([C.2]), ([D]) ([E]), (C.2), (C.3), ([F]).
- (2) [W:PC:III:2-3]
  - (3), (4), (7), (6), (5), (8), (9), (10), (11)
  - (A.1), (B.1), ([B.2]), (C.1), (B.2), (C.3), (D), (E), (F)
- (3) [JGI(S):X15:4-5]
  - (1), (2), (11), (2), (3), (4), (5), (6), (7), (8), (5), (8), (9), (7), (8), (9), (10), (11)
  - (A.1), (A.2), (A.3), (F), (A.2), ([-A.3]), ([B.1]), ([B.2]), (C.1), (C.2), (C.3), (C.2), (C.3), (D), (C.2), (C.3), (D), (E), (F)

1. The bracketed items indicate problematic, bi-valent, dubious instances.

## (4) [FDII:88ftr:1-2]

(3), (4), (11), (5), (6), (7), (9), (10), (7), (9), (11)  
 (A.2), ([-A.3]), (B.1), (B.2), (C.1), (C.2), (B.2), ([E]), (C.1),  
 (E), (C.2), ([D]), (F)

## (5) [Rah:B:1:(11):3-5]

(3), (4), (11), (2), (4), (6), (7), (10), (6), (9), (10), (9),  
 (10), (9), (10), (9), (6), (7), (10), (11)  
 (A.2), ([-A.3]), (B.1), ([B.2]), (E), (A.2), (B.1), (D), (E), (D),  
 (F), ([E]), (C.1), (C.2), (E), (F)

## (6) [NB:II:4:1-2]

(1), (2), (3), (4), (1), (6), (7), (8), (7), (6), (9), (3), (6),  
 (7), (11)  
 (A.1), (A.2), (B.1), ([B.2]), (C.1), (C.2), (C.3), ([C.2]), ([D]),  
 ([E]), (C.2), (C.3), ([F])

## (7) [Campbell:4:5-7]

(1), (2), (7), (9), (6), (9), (7), (11), (9), (6), (5), (10), (11)  
 ([A.1]), (A.2), (C.2), ([B.1]), (D), ([-E]), ([C.2]), ([D]), (E), (F)

The various coding runs, whether rough or refined, showed the actual instances of troubles-talk to comprise very messy versions of the candidate sequence, to say the least. A question, then, was what sort of sequence were we proposing? Was it some sort of philosophical/logical construct, an ideal-type not to be subjected to such a requirement as that it actually occur? In as much as it is our aim to locate, describe and then analyze objects which actually occur, if that is what we had come up with, then the results were of no interest to us. Whatever consideration we did of troubles-talk would not be done by reference to a troubles-talk 'sequence'.

However, it can be noted that in the several actual series shown above, although we do not get straight runs of [1, 2, 3 . . . 9, 10, 11]

or [A, B, C, D, E, F], for one, the talk tends to run off within a constrained set of elements; i.e., troubles-talk elements might be characterized as occurring in a 'disordered' fashion. Secondly, although the elements are 'disordered', there is nevertheless a very gross sort of observable order; i.e., the data tend to start off in the low numbers or alphabet-initial letters, and end up in the high numbers or alphabet-subsequent letters. That is, our initial vague sense of a set of components occurring in order was not, as we supposed, vague because we had not yet carefully enough inspected the data, where then the investigation was now a matter of turning to a close inspection of the data out of which a clear and refined sequence would emerge. Rather, our initial vague sense was accurate. What emerges from a close inspection of the data is just that sort of array of elements which might accurately be characterized as vaguely orderly. Our initial sense of the phenomenon was not to be accounted for as a product of casual perusal, to be improved upon by careful examination. What we saw is what we got.

A question then was, what had we got? Was this a designedly loose convocation of elements, in which case the articulatory work we were proposing for it was not, at least in the elegant, fluent way we proposed, part of its design, or were we seeing instance after instance of a tightly-designed sequential package being actualized in variously distorted ways? It is certainly the case that for the various sequence-types we have located, described and analyzed, we find mis-shapen, incomplete, variously problematic instances. It was at least conceivable that while there is an existing elegant, efficient design to carry out a particular function, it just so happens that on occasion after occasion after occasion of its relevance and use the 'template' sequence is being distorted.

One thing was clear: Troubles-talk does not occur as a consecutive

sequence of ordered elements. The question was, is that a design feature of the troubles-talk package (perhaps a feature of 'big packages' in general); i.e., is the sequence designedly gross and flexible and thus well able to handle a range of contingencies it might, perhaps predictably, encounter over a long stretch of interaction? Or is the observed gross ordering a byproduct of recurrent incidentals; i.e., is it that the package is designedly tight and elegant, but that on any given occasion of its use something is happening in that interaction which is producing a 'disordering' of the sequence? That is, were we looking at something gross but strong, or something elegant but weak? On any given occasion of its occurrence would it be most apt to say that the package is going alright, or that it is going awry? One further possibility was that while the consecutive unfolding of the package might be a design feature, its observably disordered occurrence is not accountable in terms of a particular conversation with its particular events, but is an artifact of troubles-talk in its relationship to other types of activities. That is, that the 'disordered' occurrence is accountable by reference to a or some rather general problems that troubles-talk encounters and/or generates.

Coming to terms with these possibilities required close analysis of troubles-talk on a single instance by single instance basis, and a collection of materials was subjected to preliminary analysis. In that regard we note that many of the single-instance analyses were extensive and elaborate. In the interests of economy and clarity we have tried to constrain ourselves to only as much detail as seems necessary to capture a given phenomenon by reference to which a given fragment is being developed. Some of the more extended, elaborate analyses yielded phenomena and generated research questions not directly relevant to troubles-talk per se. Many of these were simply noted and set aside for future attention. Others

generated data-searches and collections which were useful in the analysis at hand, for example, indicating that we were on or off track in our sense of the activities we were examining, but constituting, as well, a preliminary stage in the analysis of those phenomena in their own right. While the extensive and elaborately detailed single-instance analyses incorporate and address these various phenomena, the shorter, simplified versions used in this report do not. Following are some of the phenomena encountered in our analyses of troubles-talk which generated data-search and collections.

1. Abandoned and Subsequently Repositioned Utterances
2. Post-Gap Activities (Backdowns, Recycles, Recompletions, etc.)
3. Pregnant Confirmations ("Yup", "Oh yeah", etc.) as Attending to the Significance While Withholding Explication of Inquired-Into Matters
4. "Good." as an Especially Terminal-Implicative Assessment
5. Doing 'Granting' (via lexical items and/or intonation contour)
6. "Yeah well" as a Dismissor of a Prior Utterance
7. Where-Are-We-Now Topical Negotiations in which an Utterance may be part of Current Topic or Inaugurating a New Topic

We take it that these phenomena, some of which will assuredly be developed and will comprise or be incorporated into future research papers, are spin-off products of our investigation of troubles-talk.

The results of our single-instance analyses suggest that in case after case we are seeing a potentially tight sequence going awry. Further, it appears that the problems encountered by the sequence are not incidental, are not best characterized by reference to a particular interaction and its events, but are general problem-types which recur across the corpus of troubles-talk.

The investigation proceeded in alternating phases; i.e., a rough

scan of the data for an initial array of sequence components was followed by preliminary single-instance analysis which, in turn, resulted in a refining of the candidate sequence, the refined sequence itself leading to a refining of the single-instance analyses. We do not follow this alternation in our report, but present the results of our investigations (which we take to be not at all in a finished state, but stopped in progress, still refinable, still tentative) in two discrete sections.

In Section I we present utterances taken from troubles-talk, arrayed as an ordered series of components of the candidate sequence, and consider the topical/interactional work such a design can accomplish. In Section II we present a collection of single-instance analyses of larger fragments of troubles-talk, and consider the problem-types confronting the candidate sequence.



## Section I. The Candidate Troubles-Telling Sequence

Inspection of the corpus of conversations in which troubles are talked about yields a series of recurrent elements which can be grouped into a rough segmental sort of order, out of which a candidate package may be built up. The rough segmental order is as follows.

- A. Approach
- B. Arrival
- C. Delivery
- D. Work-Up
- E. Close Implicature
- F. Exit

Within that segmental ordering a series of elements are found which may occur singly or in combination within a particular segment. Following is an array of elements grouped according to segment. The array is not exhaustive of the elements recurrently found in troubles-talk, and the orderings and formulations provided are preliminary and subject to revision. It will be noted that some segments have a rich collection of elements while others do not. This disparity of richness and thinness tends not so much to reflect the phenomena as it does the current state of the investigation. For some of the segments we have proposed an ordering of elements. These are numerically ordered within a segment. For some of those ordered elements we have listed some devices, alphabetically or in small roman numerals. These devices may stand in alternation to one another or may occur in combination. They are not intendedly sequentially ordered in this array.

- A. Approach
  - 1. Initiation
    - a. Inquiry
    - b. Noticing

2. Trouble-Premonitor
    - a. Downgraded Conventional Response to Inquiry
    - b. Improvement Marker
    - c. Lead-Up
  3. Premonitor-Response
- B. Arrival**
1. Announcement
  2. Announcement Response
- C. Delivery**
1. Exposition (Includes descriptions of symptoms, events, etc.)
  2. Affiliation
  3. Affiliation Response
- D. Work-Up (Includes diagnoses, prognoses, reports of relevant other experiences, 'relationalized' remedies, etc.)**
- E. Close Implicature**
- a. Optimistic Projection
  - b. Invocation of the Status Quo
  - c. Making Light of the Trouble
- F. Exit**
- a. Boundarying Off
    - i. Conversation Closure
    - ii. Conversation Restart
    - iii. Introduction of Pending Biographicals
    - iv. Reference to Getting Together
  - b. Transition into Other Topics

Following is a series of arrays in which actual instances of troubles-talk elements are grouped into segments organized by reference to the candidate package. The arrays are not exhaustive of the actual instances,

but are designed to give a sense of the recurrence of any given element while providing for as economical a display as possible.

A. Approach 1. Initiation a. Inquiry

If a coparticipant knows about the presence, or possible presence, of a trouble, he can inquire into its current status and thus initiate talk about the trouble.

A.1.a.(1) [NB:I:6:13ffR]

L: How: 's your foo:t.<sup>1</sup>

A.1.a.(2) [NB:II:3:10ffR]

E: How is your arthritis. You still taking sho:ts,

A.1.a.(3) [W:PC:1:(1):42ff]

J: How is your back anyway.

A.1.a.(4) [JGII(a):3:ex:1]

L: Are you dying?

A.1.a.(5) [Campbell:4:5]

A: You feeling better now.

A.1.a.(6) [TCI(b):9:1]

J: [How are you] feeling now.

A.1.a.(7) [Campbell:7:1]

A: hHow are you feeli:ng.

1. As in our Progress Report we attach a Guide to the Transcript Conventions. Likewise, we note that the transcripts in this Final Report are rendered in standard orthography in an attempt to make them somewhat easier to read. So, for example, a fragment appears in the master transcript as follows.

I: Cuss ah thou:ght 'h well az 'ee duun something en- 'ee 'eez fri:ght'n tih †sa:y you knoh,

It appears in the report, rendered in standard orthography, as follows.

I: Cause I thou:ght 'h well has he done something and- he he's fri:ghtened to †sa:y you know,

A. Approach 1. Initiation b. Noticing

Whether or not a coparticipant has prior knowledge of a trouble, he may be prompted by something in the talk to notice a possible trouble.

A.1.b.(1) [TCI(b):7:1] ((Opening unrecorded, L is caller, is identifying herself to C.))

L: Jo:dy's mothe:r?  
(0.6)

C: ((hoarse)) Oh ye<sup>h</sup>

L: [Jo:dy Lih- tempi,

C: ((hoarse)) Oh: yeh,  
(0.2)

L: → Are you si::ck,

A.1.b.(2) [Rah:A:1:(2):1]

T: Re:dear three oh five two?

I: Thom:s?  
(.)

I: Has Mummy gone shopping,

T: No she's still here do you want her.  
(0.3)

I: Is she in be::d,

T: No?

I: Ri:ght thank you,

T: ( )?  
(0.4)

I: hgm m-mghm.  
(5.0)

J: khhhh-huh khh-huh khh 'hhh Hello there I da. 'hhhh

I: → [Oh: dea:r me:.

J: khh=

I: → A (ro) You still've got i:t.

J: [khh.

However, troubles-talk is so arranged that a coparticipant need not know about the presence of a trouble to effectively initiate talk about it. As can be seen in the following array (for example, in Fragments A.2.a.(4), A.2.a.(5) and A.2.a.(6) below) a conventional "How are you?" recurrently can stand as a first component in a troubles-talk package, the trouble emerging in response to such an inquiry.

A. Approach 2. Trouble Premonitor

An elaborate consideration of this phenomenon was presented in the Progress Report. Essentially, with such an item as a Downgraded Conventional Response or an Improvement Marker (i.e., instead of something like

"Fine", an item like "Oh, pretty good" or "Better"), a speaker can orient his coparticipant to the presence of a trouble, or if the trouble is already known about, then to the continuing state of trouble.

A. Approach 2. Premonitor a. Downgraded Response to Inquiry

A.2.a.(1) [Campbell:7:1]

A: hHow are you feel:ng.  
M: → Oh: not so ba:d?

A.2.a.(2) [TCI(b):9:1]

J: [How are you] feeling now.  
M: → Oh::? (.) pretty good I gue:ss,

A.2.a.(3) [NB:II:3:10fR]

E: How is your arthritis:. You still taking sho:ts,  
L: → Ye:ah, well it's: e-it's alri:ght

A.2.a.(4) [TG:2]

A: \*hh How've you bee:n.  
B: → \*hh Oh:: survi:ving I guess, hhh!

A.2.a.(5) [NB:IV:13:2]

E: What's new with you:.  
(0.7)  
L: → Nothi:ng, (.) really,

A.2.a.(6) [NB:II:4:1] ((Opening unrecorded, N is caller))

E: Hi: honey how are yo-u.  
N: Fine how're you.  
E: → \*khhhhhhhh. Oh:: I'm pretty goo:d

A.2.a.(7) [W:FC:1:(1):1]

J: How are you anywa:y.  
M: → [hh [Oh I'm not too bad,

A. Approach 2. Premonitor b. Improvement Marker

A.2.b.(1) [W:FC:1:(1):2]

M: How is your mother by: the wa:y.h  
(.)  
J: → We:ll she's a:,h bit bette:r,



A.2.c.(6) [Fr:CSI:57ff] ((Multiparty. V is finishing a story))

V: Cause that- that's (his policy).  
 J: Hey Victor.  
 V: So I have to say  
 J: - The next time you see me I'm gonna be looking like he:ll you know why,

A.2.c.(7) [JG:I:8:1] ((Phone call for someone who is not at home))

M: Well Mister Hanson? um:: 'hh he went to his band practice  
 toda::y, 'hh'p'hh A:nd uh [hhh  
 C: [To whe:re?

. ((ca 7 lines omitted re. where Called has gone))  
 .

M: - to: uh practice a:n::d u-I don't kno:-:w uh where he went  
 from the:re, I:ee uh hnhuh 'hnhuh 'hnhh I r: I really couldn't  
tell you where he went from the:re

A.2.c.(8) [Pah:B:1:(11):3ff]

J: Anyway she just rang up and I said oo well no Ann's eh: off  
 to North Or:msby.  
 A: - Oh:: No well Ann's (absolutely in) a pig sty cause the two  
beds've come this morning.the new be:ds.

A feature of these Approach devices is that they can be systematically ambiguous as to their troubles-implicativeness. As was discussed in the Progress Report, they are available to troubles-disattentive/resistive responses by coparticipants. So, for example, of the above-listed Approach devices, several are responded to in such fashion.

(1) A.2.a.(4) [TG:2]

A: 'hh How've you bee:n.  
 B: 'hh Oh:: survi:ving I guess, hhh!  
 A: - [That's good,

(2) A.2.c.(3) [FDII:08ffR:1]

B: We got a (:). We got a little bit of it out he:re,  
 C: - Eh not too much though huh,

(3) A.2.c.(8) [Pah:B:1:(11):3ff]

A: Ann's (absolutely in) a pig sty cause the two beds've come  
 this morning.the new be:ds. 'hhhh An:d uh but only one  
 J: [ ( )  
 J: - That was quick that was quick them coming,

## (4) A.2.c.(7)[JG:I:8:1]

M: I don't know:--w uh where he went from there, I see uh hhuh  
 with I r: I really couldn't tell you where he went from  
 there he may  
 C: - [(I tell you)] Is he pra- Is he prohn planning to go  
 to:: Las Vegas next week?

However, this ambiguity also provides an opportunity for a participant to exhibit receptiveness to the possible trouble-premonitory work being done. Recurrently a recipient of a possible trouble-premonitor will exhibit that he is tracking the item as on the way to further talk, as not in itself assessable (as in Fragments (1)-(3) above) or dismissable by reference to other matters (as in Fragment (4) above). Rather, he produces a 'continuer', an item which expects and is ready to receive further talk.

A. Approach 3. Premonitor Response

## A.3.(1) [W:PC:I:(1):2]

J: She's a:,h bit better,  
 M: - Mm::,

## A.3.(2) [Fr:HB:II:1]

J: I'm much better this afternoon.  
 P: - =Ye:h,

## A.3.(3) [NB:II:5:2ffR]

E: I went to the dentist and=  
 L: - =Yea:h,

## A.3.(4) [NB:IV:14:1]

E: I been to the do:ctor hhhhh=  
 L: - =Yeah?

## A.3.(5) [Rah:II:2-5]

I: He went for his exray:s, on Frida:y?  
 J: - eeYe:s,

## A.3.(6) [Fr:TC:I:1:9]

S: Wendy and I have been really having problems.  
 G: - M-hm,



Of interest in these responses is that while they exhibit an alertness to further talk, for items which might otherwise be treated as then and there assessable or receivable as 'news' (see, e.g., A.3.(5)), they seem to be specifically attentive to, and fitted to, the ambiguously premonitory character of the prior utterance and do not commit themselves to, for example, hearing a trouble underway when it is possible that a trouble is not in fact underway. In the Progress Report it was proposed that the pressure towards business as usual is a centrally oriented-to feature of troubles-talk. The fact that when there is any response to possibly trouble-premonitory talk it is either weighted towards no trouble (as in Fragments (1)-(4) pages 16-17 above) or is specifically, recognizably 'neutral' (as in Fragments A.3.(1)-A.3.(7) above) constitutes another aspect of an orientation to business as usual. Specifically, as the troubles-talk is being entered, we see a strong alignment with business as usual and an ambiguous alignment with trouble.

#### B. Arrival 1. Announcement

Recurrently a troubles-teller proceeds from an Approach device to an Announcement of the trouble across the range of recipient responses; i.e., across silence, as in Fragments B.1.(1)-B.1.(3) below, across disattention/resistance as in Fragments B.1.(4) and B.1.(5) below, and across 'neutral' receptiveness, as in Fragments B.1.(6) and B.1.(7) below.

B.1.(1) [Fr:TC:I:1:9]

J: The next time you see me I'm gonna be looking like he:ll you know why,  
(0.7)

J: → Cause e:very damn one of these teeth coming out.

B.1.(2) [W:PCIII:1:2]

S: 'nhhh Uh:m:: 'tch Oh it's all been happening he:re ((this with clogged throat)) ukhh Oh: God. (.) the voice is going now, 'hhh (0.2) eh We got bu:rgled yesterday.

B.1.(3) [NB:II:4:1]

E: - 'khhhhhhh. Oh:: I'm pretty goo::d I had a little o:peration on my toe this week. I had to have (.) toenail taken o:ff.

B.1.(4) [FDII:88cfr:1]

B: We got a (.) We got a little bit of it out he:re,  
C: Eh not too much though huh,  
B: - We:ll, (0.4) Oh I got hurt a little bit last night.

B.1.(5) [Rah:B:1:(11):3ff]

A: Ann's(absolutely in) a pig sty cause the two beds've come this morning.the new be:ds. 'hhhh A:nd uh but o:ly one  
J: ( )  
J: That was quick that was quick them coming,  
A: - Not too bad. But there's only one mattress with it. They don't know where the other mattress is.

B.1.(6) [Fr:TC:I:1:9ff]

S: 't'hhhhh Well Wendy and I have been really having problems.  
G: M-hm,  
S: ((confidingly)) 'hh And yesterday I talked to her. 'hhhh A:nd (0.3) apparently her mother is terminal.

B.1.(7) [NB:II:5:2cfr]

E: 'hhh Oh I went to the dentist and=  
L: - [[Yea:::h,  
E: - [[uh:::God he wanted to pull a tooth and make me a new go:ld uh  
L: [a h h h h !]  
E: - 'hhhhh (.) bridge for (.) EI:GHT hundred dollars.

B. Arrival 2. Announcement Response

In contrast to the range of responses which follow the Approach devices considered above, the Announcement is recurrently followed by an item which marks arrival at the topic which was so far being approached. And there seem to be two types of Announcement Response; one which marks arrival and elicits further talk on the matter but does not necessarily align recipient as a troubles-recipient, as in Fragments B.2.(1)-B.2.(3) below, and one which commits recipient as, now, a troubles-recipient, as in Fragments B.2.(4)-B.2.(6) below.

B.2.(1) [NB:IV:13:2]

L: His mother's real low.  
E: - Oh really,

B.2.(2) [NB:IV:4:1]

E: Eud left me last night.  
(1.0)

E: He got- ma:d and went off uhh huh huh!  
L: ( )-  
(0.4)

L: - Did he really?

B.2.(3) [FDII:88ffR:1]

B: Oh I got hurt a little bit last night.  
C: - You did.

B.2.(4) [W:PCIII:1:2ff]

S: We got bu:rgled yesterday.  
D: - Nah: no::.

B.2.( ) [NB:II:5:2ffR]

E: God he wanted to pull a tooth [and make me] a new go:ld uh  
L: - [a h h h h !]  
E: \*hhhhhh (.) bridge for (.) EI:GHT hundred dollars.  
L: - \*Ch:: sh:i:t.\*

B.2.(6) [Pah:B:1:(11):3ff]

A: But there's only one mattress with it. They don't know where  
the other mattress is.

J: - Oh: no::.

### C. Delivery 1. Exposition

To enhance the sense of the possible tightness of the troubles-telling package, we will stay with the fragments displayed in B.2. above. In four of the six instances we find a strict progression from B.1. Announcement to B.2. Announcement Response to C.1. Exposition.

C.1.(1) [NB:IV:13:2-3]

L: His mother's real low.

E: Oh really,  
(0.6)

L: - His dad wants him to come ba:ck and gosh Earl doesn't know  
what to do you know it's a- kind of a problem? if you're  
gonna stay there, and- 'hh you gotta go back, anyway=

E: -[[Mm hm,

L: -[[You know it's- an::d poor Dad's all by himself,

## C.1.(2) [NB:IV:4:1-2]

E: Bud left me last night.  
(1.0)

E: He got- ma:d and went off uhh huh huh!  
L: ( )-  
(0.4)

L: Did he really?

E: - Yeah, 'hh We were supposed to have gone out to dinner with Phil and Martha we were over there watching the game and, 'hhh he had a beer, and I had a m-martini, and then we came over here and un-lee I had your thing th-thawing out you know, that ri:ce stuff. And I thought well if we don't go out I'll have that and- 'hh he says well you know, you've gotta put that back in the rih- 'hh you don't put it back in the freezer,hh when you- take it out, and I said...etc.

## C.1.(3) [FDII:88ffR:1-2]

B: Oh I got hurt a little bit last night.

C: You did.

B: Yeah,

C: What happened to you.

B: - Well I (.) like to lost my little finger they had me in surgery for about three and a half hours setting ( ).

## C.1.(4) [W:PCIII:1:2ff]

S: We got bu:rgled yesterday.

D: Nah: no:::  
(0.8)

S: - \*Ye:h,\* 'hh (Claire) the girl at the back fla:t. So I've been at the police station all dinner ti:me, (0.4) trying to identify this ma:n. (0.3) Cause he, I answered the door fir:st you see,

In Fragment B.2.(5) the Exposition follows, but not immediately. That it does not follow immediately may have in part to do with the emergence of a priority activity generated by the particular Announcement Response which occurs in this case; i.e., "\*Oh:: sh:i:t.\*" In general, cursing and obscenity can be used as a display of intimacy. Such an item is recurrently followed by recipient affiliation; i.e., recipient confirms that it is appropriate to use such language in this interaction.<sup>1</sup> In Fragment B.2.(5)

-----

1. For a consideration of obscenity as an invitation to intimacy, see G. Jefferson, H. Sacks and E. Schegloff, "Notes on Laughter in the Pursuit of Intimacy," in J. Schenkein, ed., Studies in the Organization of Conversational Interaction, Vol II, Academic Press, forthcoming.

it appears that recipientship of and affiliation with an obscenity is given priority over a move into the Exposition. And this momentary priority may have consequences for the sequence. Specifically, we noted that the Announcement Response is in the first place of a particular sort, one which is especially troubles-receptive (see page 19). As such, it may tend to converge with a component of, not the Arrival segment, but the Delivery segment; i.e., with a C.2. Affiliation which recurrently follows an Exposition. (see pages 24ff below). Troubles-teller's own affiliation may then constitute a sequentially appropriate next move to a C.2. Affiliation; i.e., a C.3. Affiliation Response, whereupon troubles-recipient can properly understand that the announcement of an exorbitant price in itself comprised the Exposition; that the sequence is now ready to move on to the D. Work-Up segment, an appropriate component of which she now provides ("That's a big: that's a big uh::: gimmick.").

As it happens, such a condensed version of a troubles-telling is not to be. At a recurrent locus of 'interruption' of one utterance by another, i.e., as troubles-recipient's utterance goes into a 'search' (that is, at "uh:::"), troubles-teller launches the Exposition, thus putting to rights a sequence which we may now see as having gone temporarily awry.

C.1.(5) [NB:II:5:2-4R]

E: God he wanted to pull a tooth [and make me] a new gold uh  
 L: [a h h h h !]  
 E: 'nhhhh (.) bridge for (.) El:GHT hundred dollars.  
 L: - \*Oh:: sh:i:t.  
 E: - [Shit. (.) is right.  
 L: - That's a big: that's a big uh:::=  
 E: - = 'hhh He won't try to save this tooth. This is a new dentist=  
 L: [gimmick.]  
 E: =He says it's got to- deh doesn't hurt me at a::ll you know and he took all my extra::ys and then I awg I go: and I 't 'nhhhh he wanted to pull it and I said God no I:'m not ready to have my tooth pulled toda:y, (.) Edith went with me and (1.0) we were gonna go to lu:nch and I wasn't ready you know go in and have my tooth pulled

In Fragment B.2.(6) it appears that we are losing the candidate sequence altogether. The Announcement Response is followed by an item which qualifies as an E.Ø.a. Close-Implicative Optimistic Projection, "It'll turn up I expect." It turns out that what has been understood by troubles-recipient to be 'the trouble' and strongly responded to as such with "Oh: no:" is but one of several aspects of a multi-faceted trouble. The Optimistic Projection closes down attention to that aspect of the trouble and is followed by Approach to and Arrival at a next aspect. Further, that the multi-faceted trouble is being delivered in just this way; i.e., by an Optimistic Projection for an initial aspect and a re-introduction procedure for a next aspect may in part have to do with the nature of the Announcement Response. Again we note that it is especially troubles-receptive and may converge with a C.2. Affiliation. In this case, the Optimistic Projection which follows it may be dealing as much with the interactional implications of such an item as its sequential implicativeness. This issue is considered in detail at pages 26ff below.

C.1.(6) [Rah:B:1:(11):3ff]

- A: But there's only one mattress with it. They don't know where the other mattress is.
- J: - Oh: no:.
- A: - So anyway weh- It'll turn up I expect. 'hh So we've been sort of trying this: rearranged bedroom, 'hh and it was What I'd forgotten was they're (.) six inches wider than the others. 'h So the room looks (.) so cluttered now.

The foregoing consideration of element C. Delivery 1. Exposition in its recurrent and proposedly designed relationship with elements B. Arrival 1. Announcement and 2. Announcement Response stands as a capsule version of the sort of argument we are developing. Specifically, we are arguing that instances in which the elements do not occur in strict order are not to be understood as counter-cases, nor is the fact that there are many of them to be understood as evidence for a vague, loosely organized sequence.

Rather, we are arguing that each instance in which the elements do not follow in strict order is to be treated as an accountable disordering of a tightly organized sequence, and to be examined in detail for specific, perhaps systematic, sources of such disorder. Such an argument is readily enough made when there are also many instances of a strict ordering, as is the case for the B.1.- B.2.- C.1. series. It is problematic when there are no available instances of a strict ordering, as is the case for the proposed sequence of which this series stands as a component. And it is possible that, for example, 'big packages' may be adequately characterized as a collection of tightly organized sequential nodes which themselves are loosely linked and interchangeably positioned over the course of the talk.

C. Delivery 2. Affiliation - 3. Affiliation Response

Following the C.1. Exposition we recurrently find a series in which the troubles-recipient exhibits Affiliation (with an expression of 'empathy' and/or an affiliative formulation), and troubles-teller's subsequent talk appears to be produced specifically in response to that exhibited affiliation; i.e., we find troubles-tellers producing emotionally heightened talk; 'letting go' and/or turning to or confiding in the troubles-recipient. To get a sense of the reciprocity which seems to be involved in these two elements we show them in tandem. And to get a sense of the 'emotional heightening' of the C.3. Affiliation Response, as well as the potential for a tightly ordered sequence, we show these two elements as they follow a C.1. Exposition component.

C.2.- C.3.(1) [NB:IV:14:2]

E: I have to take two tub baths with tar in it every hhhhhh da:y?

L: Yea:h?

E: 'hhhhh And I have to have ointment oy put on four times a da:y and I'm under:: violet ra:y for a few seconds, a:nd I got a shot in the butt of vitamin: (0.2) A::: ski:n.

(0.5)

L: - Jee:sus.

E: - Lo:ttie, honest to Go:d you know, I just broke out terribly a:uh- hkw when I le-eit ho:me. An:d, I just- just my le:gs

## C.2.- C.3.(2) [JG:I:19:1:Gold Trans]

- M: I been taking antibiotics ever since Sunday.  
 S: Ohh.  
 M: And uh I w-h-h-en I lie down or when I get up it feels like the m::flesh is pulling off of my bones.  
 S: - How awful.  
 M: - Oh I have listen I was in such excruciating pain yesterday and the day before that I really I just didn't know what to do I just pulled my hair.

## C.2.- C.3.(3) [HG:2]

- N: But he just like o:pened up, (0.6) a lo:t you know of (0.4) the pimples I ha:ve?  
 H: - =Eoh::,  
 N: - It (just) hu:rt so bad Helen I was cry:::ing,

## C.2.- C.3.(4) [NB:IV:4:2]

- E: Isn't this ridiculous, and, and Phil and Martha waiting out there to go out to dinner, and I had to go tell them- Isn't he ridiculous,  
 (0.9)  
 L: - He's crazy.  
 (0.6)  
 E: - Oh:: God dammit. I said it's too bad the boat didn't sink yesterday, and that-'n-guh-tha-I shouldn't've said tha:t. But, (0.4) 'tch'nhhh Lottie, I can't do anything ri:ght, honest to God, I can't.

## C.2.- C.3.(5) [Fr:NB:II:6]

- J: It happened within: minutes. 'nhh Within a half hour the house was gone I guess,=  
 P: - =Ohh:: Ghod,  
 J: So it's just l[i:ke,] we wouldn't, we just wouldn't've been=  
 P: [ 'nhhh ]  
 J: =here.hh You know,  
 P: - 't! O h : : : : : : : : b a : b y . ]  
 J: [ There's no way it was ] it was jus't, we're just lucky I guess:,  
 P: - 'nhhh Okay wait a minute I don't know if you're cryi-ing but=  
 J: [ So,  
 P: - =I hhh(h)a [ hhhm uh hm: ] 'nhh=  
 J: [ (hhhhh hum) ]  
 J: - 'h I was guh- I- middle of the night la-ast night I wantekh  
 hhto hhc(h)all (h)y(h)ou 'nhhh!

A review of the three segments of the proposed troubles-talk package shown so far reveals a serial shifting of alignment as between teller and recipient; roughly, a movement from distance to intimacy. Likewise, across the three segments there appears to be a serial shifting from an engagement



with the proper procedures of ordinary conversation to a focussing on the trouble in its own right. When the package is run off in order, then, it provides for a series of moves across which participants to a troubles-telling can mutually achieve a locking in, to the trouble and to each other, and likewise a disengaging from the topical and relational proprieties of business as usual. By reference to such a progression this third segment constitutes the topical and relational heart of troubles-talk, an intense focussing upon the trouble and upon each other.

Given the above characterization of the C.2.- C.3. pair, the array of instances raises an issue of some possible interest. On reviewing the array we realized that all of its instances are taken from American data, whereas each of the other arrays comprise a mixture of American and British data. A check through the corpus from which the array was culled revealed that in the current British corpus of troubles-talk there are no instances of this paired-utterance phenomenon; no instances of troubles-recipient Affiliation followed by a troubles-teller 'letting go'. As with the discovery of no instances of a tightly organized troubles-telling sequence, we treat the fact of no instances of the C.2.- C.3. pair in British troubles-talk as accountable and research generative. We therefore undertook a brief examination of the British materials on this issue.

That we do not find the C.2.- C.3. pair is not to say that we do not find recipients exhibiting affiliation or tellers producing materials intensely focussed on a trouble. We do. What we do not find is the emotional reciprocity of the American materials. So, for example, in the following fragment, a recipient recurrently exhibits empathy, and the materials are quite excruciating.



## (2) [Campbell:4:5-7]

- B: I think it was food poisoning (last night) cause I was [ ( ) ],  
 A: [ ( ) ],  
 B: I'm still gettin:g you know, hh 'hh stomach pains I spewed  
 last ni:ght, and  
 A: Yeuh  
 B: 'hnhhh  
 (0.3)  
 B: hh=  
 A: =Yeuh proh- it's=  
 B: =chronic diarrhea as we-e-ll, = ((sounds very ill))  
 A: [That's what]  
 B: =ju<sub>st</sub> before I went to bed and 't'h<sub>hnhhh</sub>  
 A: [Sounds like it] [Yea:]<sub>h</sub>

And in the following fragment a display of empathy is followed by a prototypic E.β.a. Close-Implicative Optimistic Projection (cf. Fragment C.1.(6) page 23).

## (3) [Rah:B:1:(11):6]

- A: there's mi:d from the front doo:r ri:ght up. to the 'hh  
tra:led up and down to the garage with screwdrivers and,  
 J: → [God knows what ( ) :]  
 A: → [Oh h : : : d e a : r : ]  
 A: → Never mind it'll all come right in the end,

Such configurations do show up in the American materials. For example, in C.2.→ C.3.(5) page 25, we find a troubles-teller producing talk which does not acknowledge or overtly respond to troubles-recipient's several displays of empathy until troubles-recipient literally calls a halt and announces her empathetic tears. And in the following American fragment we find a troubles-teller both talking across a recipient's protestations of empathy, as in Fragments (1) and C.2.→ C.3.(5) above, and following one such protestation with an instance of an E.β.b. Close-Implicative Invokation of the Status Quo; i.e., proceeding in a fashion similar to that of Fragment (3) above.

## (4) [MC:II:4:1]

- N: Oh I was just tired and exhausted and,  
 L: Mm-hm  
 N: [And I had too much water Lila.]

L: We::ll,  
 N: [And I just uh thought I was gonna die, (with it).  
 L: - [Oh d e a : r  
       [darling,  
 N: - [A n d I, couldn't breathe you know.  
 L: Mmhm::,  
 N: If they hadn't've brought me that ambulance with the oxygen  
       I don't know whether I'd've been here or not.  
 L: - Oh no hh Oh, I'm so sorry to hear this-sweetheart,  
 N: - [Well it's alright now  
       they got rid of the water

A possible pattern emerging from the current corpus of British and American troubles-talk is that in the American data intense material, the topical 'heart of the matter' can be and recurrently is occasioned by and/or serves as an occasion for a mutually achieved reciprocal exhibition of intimacy, with a troubles-teller observably 'letting go', specifically in response to a recipient's display of empathy. We do not find such a configuration in the British data. There we find what might be a topical 'heart of the matter', independent of a relational 'heart of the matter'. Intense materials are produced which are neither occasioned by nor serve as an occasion for an exhibition of intimacy, a troubles-teller's 'letting go'. On occasion we find in our corpus that American coparticipants are using the 'British option'. But so far we do not find British coparticipants using the 'American option'. The closest we come to a C.2.-C.3. reciprocity in the current British corpus are the following fragments.

(5) [Rah:I:4]

J: I can't leave him for [two hours if I'm if he's crying when=  
 V: [n:No.  
 J: -I've left him for one.  
       (.)  
 V: - Oh: dear me.  
 J: So: I euh you know as I say I didn't get t[o t y p i n g , ]=  
 V: - [Oh:::: you're ]=  
       well tie:d down aren't [you.  
 J: - [Well I am rea:lly:]°Yah,°  
 V: [°Ye:]h,°

Note in this case that an empathetic display, "Oh: dear me" is not reciprocated by the troubles-teller (cf. Fragments (1) and (4) above).

It is a more measured display, a formulation, which is, equally measuredly, reciprocated. And in the following fragments, we find a series of measured reciprocals.

(6) [W:PC:1:(1):4:S]

J: Her doctor never called again you (know?)  
 M: [NO:: aren't they funny.h  
 J: Ye:s\*( )\*  
 M: [It's ridiculous really you know,  
 J: [I mean it's no't good enough.=  
 M: =It isn't. It isn't.  
 J: No::.

(7) [O'Hare:B:JPCpSS:1-2]

N: There's no: shame.  
 G: No shame oh::: no,  
 N: Shame is go:ne.  
 (0.4)  
 G: And then  
 N: [Isn't i:t.  
 G: (they) Oh it's go:ne  
 N: Oh::: lon:g ago:.  
 G: [Go:ne,  
 N: Shame is go:ne 'hh and it gives it u ha:rd to tho:se that eh  
 (. ) bee:n brought up properly  
 G: It does  
 N: Doesn't i:t.  
 G: [Ye::s it does

It appears that there are two distinctive procedures whereby 'reciprocity' in troubles-talk can be achieved. One procedure employs expressions of troubledness, the other formulations of troublesomeness. And if the patterns emerging from our current corpus hold, then it appears that, first of all, participants to American troubles-talk recurrently orient to achieving reciprocity while participants to British troubles-talk seem to be not so strongly oriented to this feature. Secondly, participants to American troubles-talk achieve reciprocity by means of the 'expressive' device, while participants to British troubles-talk, on those occasions when they do move to achieve reciprocity, do so by means of the 'formulative' device (specifically declining to activate the 'expressive' alternative option although it may be available, as in Fragments (1), (4) and (5)

above). In short, in contrast to much of the American data in which co-participants recurrently can be seen to be oriented to emotional 'release', in the British data coparticipants can be seen to be oriented to emotional 'restraint'.

However, the corpus is much too small to entitle us to a claim of this sort. At this point we will leave open what is to be made of the skewed distribution across our current corpus. It may be that each instance of a non-occurrence of the C.3. component ought to be treated as problematic, to be accounted for by means of single-instance analysis, the results of such analysis possibly yielding some general, cross-instance sources of non-occurring C.3. components. Or it may turn out that the current corpus is in fact catching an instance of cultural difference, such that a somewhat different sequential design will have to be developed for British as opposed to American troubles-talk, specifically in terms of the C. Delivery segment and its components and functions.

#### D. Work-Up

We have done no detailed analysis of this segment. We simply note that it is recurrent in troubles-talk, and that it can consist of a range of activities, including diagnoses, reports of relevant (similar or contrastive) experiences, 'relationalized' remedies and prognoses. Such elements are found, singly or in various combinations, in the following fragments.

#### D.(1)[NB:IV:13:6ff]

- E: Marian said I looked like a mess you know I've had a dress on and 'hhhhhh
- L: Uh huh,
- E: - But uh, uh since I been eating that damn TURKEY, I HAVE NO ITCHING? I HAVE NO PRO::BLEMS AT ALL. and- some of those SCALES are just dropping off and no itching no NOTHING.  
'hh'hh [hhhhhh
- L: - [Maybe your problem is, mea:t.
- E: YEAH THAT'S WHAT I TOLD EUD. I THINK I'LL JUST EAT TURKEY.  
- 't'hhh A girl told me that the other day in the apartment that she read where a doctor cured uh 'hh psoriasis with uh:: with turkey?

(0.5)  
 E: 'hhh lot of law-aw- It's got a lot of oil in it, and uh it's good you know,  
 L: - Yah well see I didn't have that on my diet. I mean you know,  
 E: Yeah.  
 L: - I can eat that 'hh But you know uhr:remember, (0.6) Oh God I can't think of her name, Dorothy  
 .  
 . ((ca 9 lines omitted, memory search))  
 .

E: OH I REMEMBER HE:R.  
 L: - Well she had migraine headaches.  
 E: Yeah.

(0.6)  
 L: 't'hhh and they found out that every time she ate a hamburger she had- uh:: she got a headache.  
 E: Isn't that something.  
 L: So, she g-just quit eating uh hamburgers.

D.(2)[JGI(S):X15:4-5]

M: Aw::: Jesus.=  
 P: =But you can't find anythin:g. Mar(vin)  
 M: [We:ll. [I didn't (.) realize that- eh  
 that was going o:n. But u h] [Oh the:ll.]  
 P: 'hh=  
 M: =H-m.  
 P: [Uh: u(h) I- (.) I: uh:: work for this company and there  
 M: - were for ty two salesmen and I'm the only one left.  
 [Ye:ah-  
 P: I'll be da:med.  
 (0.3)  
 M: It's rough.  
 (0.4)  
 P: Good for you:.  
 M: Ye:ah but i't's rough  
 P: [hhh hnh  
 (0.2)  
 P: I KNOW it i:s.  
 M: \*Jesus Christ\*  
 P: Ye:ah-I know u  
 M: [I didn't realize that Pete,  
 P: Oh: it's he:ll.  
 (0.2)  
 P: Yeah.  
 M: - But uh: (.) I do fee:l (.) from: (.) indications that things  
 are starting to: (0.4) stir a little bit,=  
 P: - We:ll that's what I heard the other day that they were getting  
 to pick up a little [e bi:t,]-  
 [y e a h,]-  
 M: =But u certain: (.) things wi:ll do that you know they're- ru-  
 P: they're BOUND to. 'hhh in certain industry.  
 M: [Yah.

## D.(3)[Fr:TC:I:1: ff]

- S: 't'hhh So she's very very upset.  
 G: - Well how long did they give her.  
 S: Get this. Fifty percent chance of three years.  
 (0.7)  
 G: Well that's not bad at a::ll.  
 S: -I know.  
 G: - I mean my(g)Go:d. Some people find out and they've only got like six mo::nths.  
 S: - 'hhhhhhh hOh: I was talking to this friend of Wendy's the other day. 'hh whose father, (.) collapsed. They found out he had a brain tumor. And he died the next da:y.  
 (1.0)  
 G: - 'tch'hhhh Well (.) I mean there's reason to be upset on her part,  
 S: [S:]u[:re,]  
 G: [But-] (.) there's also reason to (.) feel very lucky.  
 S: - 'hhhhhhhhh Well I look at it this way. . . . etc.

## D.(4)[Rah:I:3]

- J: 'hh And I came home. We::ll he was in tears: 'hhh So:: that was it.  
 V: Oh:::  
 J: - [I don't know why:: I don't know what had upset him I'm sure=  
 V: =Oh: dear.=  
 J: =But I hadn't been gone that long I was back=  
 V: [No::: : : :]  
 V: =[[N o , ]  
 J: =[[here before six,  
 V: Oh::: heck,  
 (.)  
 V: - And I rang Joy:ce up last night thinking she was having her teeth out you know John had gone to London for an interview to see how she was. 'hh She was out at the club wasn't she and left Su:san who is only te:n.  
 J: Ye::s,  
 V: uh:: on her own. She'd be on uh 10:- own til about half past ele:ven. \*\* (That is really) \*\*  
 J: Oh: well this is it

## D.(5)[SML:1:1:1:7-8]

- B: He does the things he needs to- the errands-  
 T: -[[Mm hm, mm hm,  
 B: and things like that. Once in awhi- I think one day a week he plays golf,  
 T: Uh huh, ( )  
 B: [And other than that, why uh he-  
 T: -Yes. But uh you see no improvement.  
 (2.0)  
 B: Ohh,  
 T: in her condition.



B: It's uh in ways, yes, uh and, and uhm,  
 T: [Mm hm,  
 T: - Well that means she could go on for a long, long time.  
 B: Unfortunately.  
 T: uh without really completely recovering.  
 B: Yes.  
 T: I mean in her condition.  
 B: Yes.  
 T: - Uh huh. Well, 'tch my that man has really a challenge doesn't  
 he.  
 B: [Oh, indeed. ( )-  
 T: - [She probably doesn't really know what's going on.  
 B: No.  
 T: Or does she.  
 B: No, I don't think so.  
 T: - No:::. Well, we never know dear, that's what uhm uh marriages  
 bring sometimes,  
 B: [Mm hm,  
 T: [But we just never know.  
 B: Mm hm,  
 T: - Well, it's a good thing he has money dear to uhm do the right  
 thing.  
 B: Yes.  
 T: And the thing he wants to do.  
 B: Yeah.  
 T: I'm sure he does.

At least it can be noted about these fragments that while they may start out focussed on the trouble they do not end up that way. In contrast to the C. Delivery segment with its intense focus on the trouble, the D. Work-Up seems recurrently to position the trouble by reference to more general circumstances. If the segments proposed so far are considered in terms of a trajectory with C. Delivery having altogether disengaged the trouble from the proprieties of business as usual, treating it in isolation and in its own right, recurrently (at least in the American data) the interactional apex of the trajectory, then the D. Work-Up may stand as a re-articulation of the trouble with the world at large, a re-engagement with the proprieties of business as usual, and (at least in the American data) a return to a more conversation-standard interactional distance.

In short, whatever else the D. Work-Up segment and its elements may be designed to do, it recurrently appears to be preparing for closure of the troubles-talk. Whatever else may be achieved by the proferring of a remedy,

the introduction of relevant other experiences, diagnoses, prognoses, etc., the occurrence of such items may be recognizably invoking the relevance of, now, a move towards closure.

And indeed, several of the above fragments are closely followed by a move out of troubles-talk.

D.(1)[NB:IV:13:6ff]

- E: Isn't that something.  
 L: So, she g-just quit eating uh hamburgers.  
 E: 't'hhhhh Well I tell you Lottie, I slept so beautifully last night, God we took a lo:ng long walk and came back, and we went to bed at eight thirty cause it was a long trip for Bud up and down let's face it there was hardly any traffic-  
 L: [Yea::h,  
 E: -yesterday morning, 'hhh but God we left at six then he had to go to wo:rk, and you know and then ba:ck down here, but- Ghod there was hardly any traffic muh- a lot of people were off yesterday.  
 L: Yeh we went home Thursday ni:ght.

D.(2)[JGI(S):X15:4-5]

- P: but u-certain: (.) things wi:ll do that you know they're- ru- they're BOUND to. 'hhh in certain industry.  
 M: [yah.  
 (0.2)  
 M: Yah,  
 P: Different things'll pick up when it- begins to be Spring of the yea:r and everythi:ng.  
 M: 'Yah.'  
 P: 'hhh But I think it'll iron itself out,  
 M: I sure hope so.  
 P: - [I'll see you Tuesday.

D.(5)[SEL:1:1:1:7-8]

- T: Well it's a good thing he has money dear, to uhm do the right thing.  
 B: Yes.  
 T: And the thing he wants to do.  
 B: Yeah.  
 T: I'm sure he does.  
 B: Mm hm  
 T: - Well listen Bea, I'll probably see you Sunday then.

And in Fragment D.(3), an elaborately extended Work-Up is brought to a close and followed by exit from the troubles-talk.

## D.(3)[Fr:TC:I:1:6ff:Extended]

S: 'hhhhhhhhh Well I look at it this way. you know, her mother, is over sixty.

.  
 . ((ca. 51 lines omitted; Work-Up))  
 .

S: You know why: for three years should she be miserable. 't'hh when she can have a few months of reasonable (.) contentment.  
 (1.2)

S: You know,

G: We:ll,  
 (0.3)

S: You know I teh- Anyway it's a hunk of shit goes on I don't have to tell you.

(0.7)

S: - 'hmhhh't'hhhhhhh BU:::T?hhh SO HOW ARE YOU:?

In Fragment D.(4) we do not find an exit from the troubles-talk. We do, however, find the introduction of what can either be another aspect of the trouble or a topic in its own right. In another conversation, with another coparticipant, the story of Danny's chess match is used as an exit from talk about this same trouble, focussing on a cliff-hanger decision which everyone is anxiously awaiting. (data not shown). In Fragment D.(4) the fact of the chess tournament is announced, and then there is a momentary silence. We take it that this may constitute a delicate instance of a Where-Are-We-Now Topical Negotiation (see page 8). Specifically, having arrived at a place where closure of the troubles-talk has become relevant, should coparticipant topicalize this item in its own right (see, e.g., the topicalization of a Lead-Up item in Fragment (3) A.2.c.(8) page 16), then that might well be the direction the talk would take. In the absence of response by coparticipant, troubles-teller may be entitled to take it that the item has been seen as, indeed, a Lead-Up item to some next aspect of the trouble. In her next utterance she produces a next Lead-Up component, now clearly fitted to the troublesome situation, and an Announcement.

## D.(4)[Rah:I:3:Extended]

- V: She was out at the club wasn't she and left Su:san who is  
only te:n.
- J: Ye::s,
- V: uh:: on her own. She'd be on uh lo:- own til about half past  
ele:ven. \*\* (That i's really) \*\*
- J: [Oh: well/this is it']  
(.)
- J: - Well eh- uh- in fa:ot uh Danny was playing in the chess  
tournament,  
(.)
- J: - 'hhh And he didn't get in so I didn't go: typing last ni:ght, -
- V: -Didn't you::

Note that the troubles-talk is not simply continued or returned to but is re-engaged. That is, we find a sequence of A. Approach 2.c. Lead-Up followed by B. Arrival 1. Announcement and 2. Announcement Response. This may have to do with the sub-topical character of this next aspect of the trouble, or it may have to do with its sequential displacedness, or perhaps may specifically be oriented to the near brush with closure.

That the troubles-recipient did not take up the potential new topic may be due in part to the fact that while the troubles-talk had arrived at a place where closure was becoming relevant, it had not yet reached a point where closure was imminent. Bringing troubles-talk to a point of imminent closure appears to be the work of a discrete unit, in which we find a range of Close-Implicative elements.

### E. Close-Implicature

We find a range of close-implicative elements which may occur singly or in combination. These include such items as Optimistic Projections, Invocation of the Status Quo (i.e., a re-engagement of the trouble with ordinary everyday activities), and Making Light of the Trouble. An array of each of these element-types is shown. To get a strong sense of their close-implicature, fragments were selected for the arrays in which a candidate Close-Implicative element is closely followed by a move out of the troubles-talk.

E. Close-Implicature a. Optimistic Projections

E.β.a.(1) [JGI(S):X15:6]

P: → 'hhh But I think it'll iron itself out,  
M: → I sure hope [so.  
P: → [I'll see you Tuesday.

E.β.a.(2) [Rah:B:1:(11):6]

A: → Never mind it'll all come right in the end,  
J: → Yeh. Okay you go and get your clean trou-sers on-  
A: → Yes.  
A: → -[[ ( )  
J: → [ehh hhhhh(h) I'll see you in a few minutes  
A: → [See you then]

E.β.a.(3) [NB:I:6:13fFR:3]

E: → I think I'll make it.  
L: → [[Oka:y,  
E: → hhhhhhh Alri:ght.  
L: → I'll see you next week then.

E.β.a.(4) [Rah:MB:2:4-5]

R: → He'll recover.hhhhe h 'hehhh  
B: → [Yeh well he- he said he'd give us a  
ti[n(kle)?  
R: → [Yeh he mi:ght come later so.  
B: → Oh: fair enough mate yeh, 'hh[h  
R: → [tch  
B: → Ye[h, ( )-  
R: → [See you later then

E.β.a.(5) [MDE:60-1:2:2-3]

M: → So: in the long run, 'hhh it (.) probably's gonna save a  
little time an:d energy.  
T: → Okay,  
M: → But Doree:n probably (0.8) is either at the airport or  
waiting to hear from him he's  
(0.7)  
T: → O:kay.  
M: → 'hhhh So: you're ba:ck.  
T: → Yah.

E.β.a.(6) [NC:II:4:3] ((Also includes E.β.b. Status Quo))

N: → Well honey I'm gonna be alright the doctor says I'm doing  
fine.  
L: → 'hh Well listen as far [as I'm-  
N: → [And I think I can go home now in a  
few days, as long as Pauline's there. you see,  
L: → [Yeah.

L: Well I would think so, 'hh-  
 N: (If I had to do the shopping,  
 L: - And honey you'll be a lot more comfortable at home than you  
 will be there.  
 N: Oh:: definitely. Definitely.  
 L: - Oh::, 'hh Well listen dea:r, I think I'm coming in Tuesday

E.Ø.a.(7) [Fr:HB:II:11-12]

J: - So: m-everything'll be good and=  
 P: -That's good.  
 J: - M: maybe 't'hh maybe next weekend if you and Freddy  
 want to come up,

E. Close-Implicature b. Invoking the Status Quo

E.Ø.b.(1) [Rah:A:1:(2):1-2]

I: You're not in bed are you.  
 J: - No: ?no: no I'm- I'm going shopping, eh<sub>h</sub> heh<sub>h</sub> heh  
 I: [Oh: have I disturbed y o u.] [Pardon?  
 J: - I'm just going shopping I'm late actually, [th<sub>h</sub> heh<sub>h</sub>  
 I: [Yeh well I  
 wondered whether you were still in bed or (0.2) or going  
 (.) out shopping? or what. 'hhh Well there's eh: few things  
 arrived for you,

E.Ø.b.(2) [NB:II:3:10ffR:2-3]

E: Mine's on the outside of the nail down by the cuticle just be  
 a little tiny brow:n spot then it'll grow up through I've  
 got nail polish on no:w so:,  
 (.)

L: "Yeah"  
 E: - [[hi:- hide it.  
 (.)

L: Ye:ah,  
 E: - 'hhhhhhh Okay honey well I'll talk with you next week

E.Ø.b.(3) [W:FCIII:1:2-3]

S: Oh: God we had the (.) police round all (0.2) all ni:ght,hh  
 - It was hectic. 'hhh So, I hardly got any wo:rk done.

S: - So: consequently I didn't get any wo:rk done hardly.  
 (0.6)

S: Anyway.  
 (2.0)

D: - So you think- Can you come out for a drink tonight.

E.Ø.b.(4) [W:FCIII:2:9]

S: I spe:nt (.) a long time talking to this: C.I.D. man at the  
office. He was really ni:ce, 'h<sub>h</sub>  
 M: [Ye:s,

S: Cause he s- he had to ask me occupa:tion you know and I said  
 M: [Ye:h  
 S: - 'hh I'm a student sociology in crime and de:viance believe it  
 o:r not. So he was: 'hhh really chatty you know,  
 M: [He was really ni:ce,  
 M: Ye::s  
 S: [He was really ni:ce,  
 M: Oh:::.  
 S: - So it was quite entertaining afternoo:n rea(h)lly,  
 M: - Yeh- your da:d's he:re,  
 S: Oh:,h  
 E: Hello love,

E.Ø.b.(5) [NB:IV:10:10-11]

E: - I'm not gonna have this thing with Bu:::d, and and uh 'hhhh  
 uh dah-you know uh:: whatever's to be's to be that's all  
 L: [Yeah.  
 E: - If this Thanksgiving thing doesn't turn ou:t, I've got the  
 turkey and I'll cook the damn thing, and freeze part of it  
 and give you some of it or,  
 (1.0)  
 L: Oh.  
 (0.4)  
 L: - Uh, no I don't want any, No. I- that's okay, I din't, I don't  
 really want any, Oh well you gonna- ge- uh fix the:: thing  
 for Thanksgiving anyway aren't you?  
 E: - Why sure I'm gonna fix the turkey. I'm getting it thawed ou:t,  
 so I thought I'd just go ahead up to that Balboa Market,  
 L: [Yeh.  
 E: They deliver, and I went up and put my order there at 'hhhhhh  
 kruh hh quarter of nine. They didn't open til nine, it was  
 such a beautiful morning. So I just-  
 [This morning?  
 E: Oh God Lottie it was beautiful down here,  
 L: - Ih- I g-it was wa:rm? It felt rih- Well it was real warm-  
 E: [Mm hm::  
 L: - [down at Palm Springs. Gee it was gor-'hh but it was-  
 E: [The wind blew  
 didn't it,  
 L: Yea:h. Toda:y. And last night it really blew.  
 (0.5)  
 E: Mm hm,  
 (0.7)  
 L: - And yesterday we went down to- town, see they're about  
 eighteen miles from uh, Palm Springs.

In Fragment E.Ø.b.(5) we note, for one, the presence of a recurrent  
 'substitute Optimistic Projection', "Whatever's to be's to be". Secondly, in  
 the movement out of troubles-talk we note a candidate instance of a Where-  
 Are-We-Now Topical Negotiation (see page 36 and page 8), in this case, by

reference to talk about the weather. Specifically, while weather-talk may constitute a 'transition topic', it may not stand as a topic in its own right, and, as Sacks points out, may operate as a version of a How-are-you sequence; i.e., in the ways that people talk about the weather, they can be, and can be understood to be, exhibiting how they feel.<sup>1</sup> Thus, in Fragment E.ϕ.b.(5), it may be unclear, and negotiable, that the weather-talk constitutes an exit from the troubles-talk or that it is part of an elaborated closing segment of the troubles-talk.

E.ϕ.c. Making Light of the Trouble

E.ϕ.c.(1) [NB:II:5:3R]

E: Go:ld's at a pre:mium no:w, 'h h h h and my God I'm not even the  
 †go::ld is just sitting in my mouth it's not in any too:th  
 you know what I mea:n the tee-th are just  
 L: → [Who's gonna] see(h)ee it is  
 anybody gonna look up the(h)re to see if you go t gold or no:t?  
 E: → [eHHHHhhhhhhhhhh  
 E: → hargh hargh agh agh agh 'hh hh  
 L: [†\*Mm: : : : :  
 E: → [WHY DON'T YOU COME DO:WN  
 FOR A MINUTE SOME TIME TODA::Y.  
 L: Yeh I wi:ll I was just  
 E: [AND LOOK AT YOUR BEAUTIFUL, SWEATER.

E.ϕ.c.(2) [Campbell:4:6]

A: °Oh dear.°  
 B: But uh, (0.3) °tsk (sti:ll.)  
 A: → Well you probably got at least a week.  
 (0.4)  
 B: What of thi:s:.  
 (0.3)  
 A: No a week before you die:.  
 (0.7)  
 B: → Ohhh yhhch heh beh uh- 'h h h [hh  
 A: [It's a rare disea:se.see.  
 B: Yeh yeh yeh.  
 A: (Y-eh yeh.)  
 B: [Anyway.  
 (.)  
 B: [(We'll see)  
 A: → [[Yeh I'll see you later.

1. See Harvey Sacks unpublished Lecture 5, February 13, 1970, pages 8-9, for a consideration of weather-talk as a 'transition topic' and as a version of a How-are-you sequence.



## E.β.o.(3) [MC:II:4:8-9]

- L: And I wanna tell you Nora, you and I don't need, any of this sadness. at all.  
(0.5)
- N: Not a bit. We've had enough for ( )
- L: [No darling. And-and you know I,  
I'm very happy and nutty as they come. And how can you improve on it. hh-hheh
- N: ( )
- L: → HEH! 'hh Listen sweetie I missed you, 'hh I been hoping you'd come up but not while it's quite so hot

## E.β.o.(4) [JGIII:16:2:Gold Trans]

- K: I think I'm going through withdrawal though  
(0.5)
- M: → hehhehhehhehhehhehheh
- K: → ha ha=
- M: = 'hh Oh Go:d you're too much 'hh-h
- K: [But it's wearing off
- M: Yea:h
- K: → So let's see. I ought to get out of Saint Mark's about -- two thirty (1.0) I ought to be at your place by a quarter of three to three
- M: Okay hon

## E.β.o.(5) [Fr:HB:II:11] ((Also E.β.b. Status Quo and E.β.a. Op. Proj.))

- J: (h)I mean really 'if you' called this morning I don't know what I whould(h)'ve do:ne,
- P: [wuhhhheh (h)yeh ri [g h t .] 'hhh
- J: [But I was even able
- to A(h)my called befhhore, 'hhh and she even made me laughheh-heh!
- P: [And she mehh-huh
- J: [ 'nhhhh e-hheh a [ehh!  
th(h)in(h)gs. [bout shoo(h)oo(h)l of a(h)a(h)ll
- ((ca. 16 lines omitted re. incident at school))
- J: And she ha-she had to lie to Missiz Se:lvin. I said oh that's wondher [fu(h)u(h)l
- P: [That's w(h)onderfhhul [ r i g h t
- J: → [ 'hh! Said I'm] glad to see things are the s(h)a [me, [ehh!
- P: 'nh!-
- J: → = 'hhh Nothing's changed uhhhh-h
- J: [neh hhm- hhm
- P: [ 'hhh
- J: → 'nhhh So: m-everything'll be good and=
- P: → -That's good.
- J: → [M:aybe 't'hh maybe next weekend if you and Freddy wanna come up,

As we noted in the introduction to the E. Close-Implicature arrays, fragments were chosen in which we could see a move out of troubles-talk closely following a candidate close-implicative element. Although that talk is, for the most part, specifically recognizably not troubles-talk, there may be good reason to include it in a consideration of how people talk about their troubles, and indeed, to include it as an integral part of the troubles-talk package. Rather than treating the talk which follows troubles-talk as some, any next activity, topic, or business, we take it that there are good grounds to treat it as a Troubles-Talk Exit Device. The substantial space we devote to this phenomenon, in which people are not talking about a trouble, reflects our sense of its importance in a consideration of the sequential organization of troubles-talk, and indeed, its bearing on such a general issue as the 'overall structural organization of conversation'.

#### F. Exit a. Boundarying Off

Overwhelmingly in the current corpus, the procedure used to achieve exit from troubles-talk is to start some altogether new activity, topic, or business. We have isolated several distinctive devices by which troubles-talk is boundaryed off. These are arrayed below.

#### F. Exit a. Boundarying Off 1. Conversation Closure

The most frequently used device in our current corpus is that of boundarying off and exiting from the troubles-talk by entering conversation Closing.<sup>1</sup> Following are but a few instances, selected for clarity from among those in which the conversation is terminated following an

- - - -

1. For considerations of the systematics of conversation Closings, see E. Schegloff and H. Sacks, "Opening up Closings," Semiotica, Vol 8, 1973, and G. Button, "No-Close Closings," in M. Atkinson and J. Heritage (eds.), Structures of Social Action (tentative title), Oxford, MacMillan (forthcoming, 1980).

entry into Closings.

F.β.a.1.(1) [NB:IV:7:5-6]

E: Will you help me out of this,  
 M: [ 'hh I'll call him toni:ght, .  
 (0.4)  
 M: [[And you-  
 E: [[Alright dear, [ 'h h h h  
 M: [And you call me at nine tomorrow mor:ning.  
 E: [Alright  
 darling, I appreciate it.  
 M: Okay,  
 E: Eye bye,  
 M: Euh-bye,

F.β a.1.(2) [NB:IV:9:3]

E: I've just released myself of everything I'm just going along  
 with the ti:de.  
 P: heh heh huh? 'h h h h  
 E: 'hh and the wind blows and I'll go where the wind blo:::ws  
 P: Well I'll tell-  
 P: eh! h h u h h Oka(hh)y heh heh  
 E: 'h h h I'll be down in a few minutes  
 P: O::kay.  
 (0.4)  
 P: O:kay. I'll see you.  
 E: A::lright dear,  
 P: [Eye bye,  
 E: Bye bye,

F.β.a.1.(3) [JGI(S):X15:6]

P: But I think it'll iron itself out,  
 M: I sure hope so.  
 P: [I'll see you Tuesday.  
 (0.4)  
 M: Ri:ght.  
 P: O [kay] Mar:vin  
 M: [You-] [You're alright. You can get there.  
 P: [ (Y-)  
 P: YA:h.  
 M: Okay.  
 P: Oka:y,  
 (.)  
 P: Thank you, ]  
 M: [S e e y ou Pete. Bye.

## F.β.a.1.(4) [Rah:B:1:(11):5]

A: Never mind it'll all come right in the end,  
 J: Yeh. Okay you go and get your clean trousers on-  
 A: [Yes.  
 A: -[[ ( )  
 J: [ohh hhahh(h) I'll see you in a few minutes-  
 A: [See you then]  
 J: -O [kay love-  
 A: [Bye:.  
 J: -Buh bye:.

## F.β.a.1.(5) [NB:I:6:13ffR:3]

E: I think I'll make it.  
 L: [Oka:y,  
 E: [hhhhhhhhh Alri:ght,  
 L: I'll see you next week then.  
 E: Bye bye,-  
 L: -Eye bye,

## F.β.a.1.(6) [Rah:MB:2:3-5]

R: He'll recover.hhhhe-h 'hehhh  
 B: [Yeh well he- he said he'd give us a  
 tin(kle)?  
 R: [Yeh he mi:ght come later so.  
 B: Oh:: fair enough mate yeh, 'hhh-h  
 R: [toh  
 B: Ye-h, ( )-  
 R: [See you later then:]  
 B: [Yeh ( ) gonna wait for you to  
 come mate,  
 R: Ohka:y ye:h.  
 B: (Alright )  
 R: [Byera:.,  
 B: Ta ra mate,

## F.β.a.1.(7) [JGIII:16:1-2:Gold Trans]

K: But it's wearing off  
 M: Yea:h  
 K: So let's see. I ought to get out of Saint Mark's about -- two  
 thirty (1.0) I ought to be at your place by a quarter of three  
 to three  
 M: Okay hon  
 K: Okay  
 M: Mmm bye bye  
 K: Bye (now)

And in the prior arrays, Fragments D.(5), E.β.c.(2) and E.β.b.(2), of which only the entry into Closings is shown, also go to termination of the conversation. Massively, then, troubles-talk is treated by interactants

as a topic after which there is nothing more to be said. For one, this may constitute an index of deference to the phenomenon of 'troubles'. Whatever other (relatively 'trivial') matters might have been introduced are set aside. Further, that troubles-talk massively has such a consequence for the course of an interaction may be used as an organizational device by participants. So, for example, we find materials in which we get a sense that talk about a trouble is specifically introduced in order to bring the conversation to a close; i.e., as a 'last' topic, a topic after which no more matters should be introduced. A transparent instance may be seen in the following fragment, in which, in the course of a very long telephone call (in which the caller has earlier declined an offer to close by reference to the expense being incurred by the call), the caller inquires into a trouble she has reason to believe has "cleared up".<sup>1</sup>

(1) [W:PC:1:(1):43-44]

M: Course this is the state I'm in at the mo(h)m(h)ent  
 [hh hih heh huh huh 'hh. Ca:n't remember things 'hh  
 J: [y:Yea:h.  
 M: [But it ca:me to me.h  
 J: - [[How is your back any] way.  
 M: Pardon?  
 .  
 . ((ca. 8 lines omitted; sorting out the inquiry))  
 .  
 M: - Oh: yes that cleared up Ja[net,h [thank goodness,  
 J: - [Did it. [They- Mildred ]said.yi:h  
 J: - They rang you: didn't [they.  
 M: [Ye::s::? Oh she did ye:s::.  
 J: [Ye:s::.  
 M: - [And,h she said that i-e it cleared u[:p,  
 J: [Ye:s::.'hhh  
 M: [Mm::.  
 J: So I was lucky the:[:re,  
 J: [Ye:s::.

1. 'Past trouble' is a phenomenon in its own right, one which we have done some analysis on, but will not be considering in this report. One recurrent, perhaps oriterial feature of 'past troubles-talk' is that it is very short. And one recurrent locus of reference to a 'past trouble' is in the course of Closings, as a version of what G. Button, op cit., talks of as 'Solicitudes'.

M: Mn:n. t' hhhh hh  
 J: ← [We:ll  
 M: [So at the mo:ment I'm not so bad apart from  
 J: → being d-very tired hh [heh [heh [hn\* ] huh huh]-  
 M: → -'hh [hhh  
 J: → [Oh well have a rest.  
 M: eYe::s I will,  
 J: Ye::s,  
 M: [eYes:.  
 J: ← †O:kay then,  
 M: [Yes [hhh  
 M: Ri::ght Janet, h  
 J: [Have a good ti:me and ( )  
 M: [hh [hh:: Thank you:  
 .  
 . ((ca. 40 lines omitted; making arrangements))  
 .  
 M: Ahhrrhh(h)l(h)gh t' hhhh  
 J: [Ri:ght (h [ave a good time,) ( )  
 M: [R i : g ht] Thanks for ringin:  
 J: Janet,  
 M: [Alri [ght]  
 J: [R i : ght, †bye:, ( )

Following the occurrence of what might stand as an E. Close-Implicative element; i.e., "So I was lucky the::re," troubles-recipient cum closer of the conversation produces a Close-relevant utterance, "We:ll".<sup>1</sup> This, however, is overlapped by talk in which it appears that troubles-teller might be introducing further troubles-talk ("So at the mo:ment I'm not so bad apart from being d-very tired") whereupon troubles-recipient cum closer of the conversation produces two specifically troubles-resistant utterances: 1) laughter,<sup>2</sup> and 2) a bit of troubles-trivializing advice,<sup>3</sup> and subsequently initiates entry into a Close-sequence with "†O:kay then,".<sup>4</sup> That is, in a

- 
1. For the Close-relevance of "We:ll" (and "Okay") see E. Schegloff and H. Sacks, op. cit., page 306.
  2. For the Troubles-resistant character of troubles-recipient laughter, see the Progress Report, Section III, pages 77ff.
  3. For the problematic character of 'advice' in a troubles-telling, see this report, Section II, sub-section B.3. pages 158-171.
  4. For a consideration of "Okay" as specifically the initial component of a Close-sequence, see G. Button, op. cit.

range of ways, including the inquiry into a known past-trouble, although it is not formed up as such, a participant can be seen to be in pursuit of conversation closure.

Again, then: Massively, exit from troubles-talk is, for all practical purposes, exit from the conversation itself. There are, however, a range of Troubles-Exit devices which do provide for further conversation. Following are several of these.

F. Exit a. Boundarying Off ii. Conversation 'Restart'

This device may be seen as indexing the same sort of deference to 'troubles' as does the device of Conversation Closure. In effect, the conversation in which a trouble was talked about is terminated and a fresh new conversation is begun. The product is not, then, a single conversation in which troubles-talk is followed by other matters, but two juxtaposed conversations.

F.Ø.a.11(1) [Fr:TC:I:1:12]

S: You know why: for three years should she be miserable. \*t'hh when she can have a few months of reasonable (.) contentment.  
(1.2)

S: You know,

G: We:ll,  
(0.3)

S: You know I teh- Anyway it's a hunk of shit goes on I don't have to tell you.  
(0.7)

S: - \*hnhhh't'hnhhhhh BU:::T?hnh SO HOW ARE YOU:?

F.Ø.a.11(2) [W:PC:1:(1):3]

J: I mean it's not good enough. ( )-  
M: [t'hh [It isn't.  
M: It isn't.  
J: No:::  
M: - \*hnhhh And what've you been doing this last week

F.Ø.a.11(3) [JGII(a):3-4]

M: But anyway I figure that maybe he can, hh give me something to: uh (.) you know bring this do:wn. Cause God I can't afford to you know. (0.2) get like tha:t?  
(0.3)

S: \*Ye:ah\*  
(0.6)

## F.β.a.11(4) [TCI(b):7:1-2]

- C: 't Ogh:: my God I been 'hhh running the highest temperatures  
you ever sa:w.
- L: Oh my go:sh well let me hang up and let you get back to be:d-
- C: -eh huh,uh hhh,h h h u- h h u-
- L: [So:rry] I disturbed you.]-
- C: - How you doing hon

## F.β.a.11(5) [NB:IV:14:5ff]

- E: Yeah it's just scaling o:ff, and and uh it's just, every time  
I take a bath and, soak why they just come o:ff. you know and  
then that ta:r, I don't know what the-'hhh I have to have two  
tablespl- s- my tub is really beautiful at home you ought to  
see it. Looks like a nigger: s: 'khh
- L: Oh it's bla:ck hu:h,
- E: [Yeahhhh
- L: And you just soak in tha:t, huh,
- E: [Yeah,
- (0.5)
- E: 'tlh How've you been.

We note that the Conversation Restart device is recurrently used to exit from, not troubles-talk per se, but from talk which has become interactionally problematic. And in the above array we see a convergence of the two matters; i.e., detailed analyses of Fragments F.β.a.11(1), (3) and (5) shows them to be an exit from not only talk about a trouble, but talk in which the participants are having various interactional troubles. The analyses on which these claims are based will not be shown. We simply assert that convergence in the above array.

F. Exit a. Boundarying Off iii. Introduction of Pending Biographicals

Although closely related in its form and function to the Conversation 'Restart', the Introduction of Pending Biographicals does not start the conversation off afresh, but introduces an especially warranted new topic. That the topic chosen to follow troubles-talk is of this particular sort may again stand as an index of deference to 'troubles'.

## F.β.a.111(1) [NB:IV:14:7]

- E: 'hhhhh But hell if it costs five hundred bucks I'm gonna  
get- wa:ll,
- L: Well don't you have insurance on that? [Huh?]
- E: [Yeah. [Yeah]::Yeah.



L: Oh:.

(0.3)

L: - So you're coming down in Ma:rch hu:h?

F.β.a.111(2) [HG:2-6:4]

N: We:::ll, (0.3) he made me feel bet<sub>[</sub>ter anywa(h)y<sub>]</sub>.  
H: <sub>[</sub>n h h h.h h h<sub>]</sub>. k'hhhhh

(0.3)

N: - So:, What time, eh hnh<sub>]</sub>-  
H: <sub>[</sub>(Now what)<sub>]</sub>. hhhhh

N: - -Oh so we- we: get the tickets when we get there <sub>[</sub>right,<sub>]</sub>  
H: <sub>[</sub>Yeah,<sub>]</sub>

F.β.a.111(3) [Rah:A:1:(2):1-2]

I: You're not in bed are you,

J: No?:no I'm- I'm going shopping eh<sub>]</sub> heh<sub>]</sub> heh

J: <sub>[</sub>Oh: have I disturbed y o u<sub>]</sub> <sub>[</sub>Pardon?<sub>]</sub>

J: I'm just going shopping I'm la:te actually, <sub>[</sub>heh<sub>]</sub> heh

I: <sub>[</sub>Yeh well I

wondered whether you were still in be:d or (0.2) or going  
(.) out shopping? or what. 'hh Well there's eh: few things  
arrived for you,

F.β.a.111(4) [MDE:60-1:2:2-3]

M: So: in the long run, 'hhh it (.) probably's gonna save a  
little time an:d energy.

T: Okay,

M: But Doree:n probably (0.8) is either at the airport or  
waiting to hear from him he's  
(0.7)

T: O:kay.

M: - 'hhhh So: you're ba:ck.

F.β.a.111(5) [W:FC:1:(1):35]

M: 'hh Well you never kno:w do you somet<sub>i</sub>:mas yo<sub>u</sub> feel as if-

J: <sub>[</sub>No:<sub>]</sub>

M: -you don't want to stay in the sa:me pla:ce, 'hh  
J: <sub>[</sub>(pla:ce.)<sub>]</sub>-

M: -th<sub>at</sub> where you've been with your pa:ren<sub>t</sub>s: 'hh

J: <sub>[</sub>Ye:s.<sub>]</sub>  
<sub>[</sub>Ye:s.<sub>]</sub>

M: (.)

M: Mm::: 'hh

J: <sub>[</sub>But uh::: anyway,<sub>]</sub>

(0.3)

J: 'mptlk ( )

M: - By the way Janet did you get my annive:rsary ca:r:d.

J: <sub>[</sub>Oh ye:s<sub>]</sub>

F.Ø.a.111(6) [Rah:II:3]

J: 'hh That'll teach hi:m hkeh he<sub>[h-he]</sub>  
 I: <sub>[That will teach him]</sub> yes,  
 J: 'hh Hey<sub>[lis]</sub> ten:- 'hh <sub>[hhh he-eh]</sub>  
 I: <sub>[Yeh]</sub>  
 J: - When are you getting your: dining room suite.

F.Ø.a.111(7) [NB:IV:4:4-5]

E: I'm just a ma:ss of b-little p(h)imp(h)les::heh heh  
 L: <sub>[hhh]</sub>  
 E: Oh tha:t's from uh:: (.) <sub>[ne:rves.]</sub>  
 (0.4) <sub>[ne::rve]s.hhuhh</sub>  
 E: - Are you goin down the desert?

To get a sense of the distinctiveness of Pending Biographical from other sorts of possible next topics, we show what we take to be two contrast cases.

(1) [Fr:TC:I:1:17-18]

G: That one week had to be, the worst week in my, h (0.2) whole  
 academic li:fe.  
 S: <sub>[AH-HA-HA-HA-HA: HA-HA]</sub> ha, <sub>[.khhh]</sub>  
 G: <sub>[as a stud]ent.</sub>  
 S: <sub>[Really.</sub>  
 G: <sub>[at Cal State Corona.</sub>  
 S: Really,  
 G: It twas.  
 S: <sub>[I believe you.]</sub>  
 G: <sub>[I mean there wa]sn't nuh- anything that didn't happen. that  
 could've happened.  
 S: Right,  
 G: 'hhh  
 (0.2)  
 G: So,  
 S: - I'm not surprized. 'hhh Listen, u-something very very: cute  
 happened last night at the Warehouse.  
 (.)  
 G: What.</sub>

(2) [NB:II:4:1OR]

E: A:nd uh I just am not gonna walk around a lot be <sub>[.cause uh::.</sub>  
 N: <sub>[n::No::.</sub>  
 (.)  
 N: No:::. Hah-ah.-  
 E: -Ah::, (0.2) it's not worth it to be on my fee:t.you know  
 N: Ri:ght. <sub>[Ye:ah.]</sub>  
 N: (.)  
 N: Ah hah?

(0.2)

N: - 'h Oh I was just ou:t wa:shing window:ss: e-a:nd ah (.)  
 my mother ca:llled so I came in I thought well while I'm in  
 here and I looked at the clo:ck and it's eleven thirty and  
 I thought well: (.) they're 'h
 they're U:P. you know I knew it was kind of a::<sub>Yeh</sub> sleep in-

E:  
 N: - -da:y but uh I didn't get home til 'h
 met a very, h very, n:ni:ce gu:y.  
 E: Di:d you:..:

In these two fragments the one introducing talk which is no longer attending a trouble neither refers to a matter which is of prior concern to them both (as in Fragments F.Ø.a.iii.(1)-(7)) nor specifically addresses concerns of the new topic's recipient (as in all but F.Ø.a.iii.(2)). Rather, they start to tell of an event in which the current recipient was not involved; an event in the storyteller's life (as is available in Fragment (2) above, and which we assert to be the case in Fragment (1), the relevant data not shown).

These two are the only fragments in the current corpus in which we find this juxtaposition of troubles-talk with a self-attentive story by the former troubles-recipient. They are grossly quite different. In Fragment (1) the troubles-recipient is transparently troubles-resistive and the self-attentive new topic is produced as a contiguous disjunct ("I'm not surprized. 'hI was just out washing windows" might well follow such an Inquiry as "What have you been doing?" Secondly, it contains some displays of concern for the prior troubles-teller, current topic's recipient ("and I thought...surely they're U:P. you know I knew it was kind of a sleep in day").

In various of their details they are quite similar. For one, in

each, the trouble has a dubious status (again, transparently so in Fragment (1) with its protestations of facticity and belief, and in Fragment (2) we note that the trouble, a toe operation, is apparently not serious enough to keep troubles-teller from contemplating a shopping trip, albeit with minimal walking) and thus may not warrant the customary deference. And we note that in each, although the new topic is arrived at differently, it is announced almost identically. In Fragment (1) with "something very very: cute happened last night", in Fragment (2) with "...last night I met a very, h very, n:ni:ce gu:y." For one, they are being marked for their absolute currency; as first-opportunity tellings, and are thus exhibited as especially warranted. Secondly, the use of "very very" may constitute a version of a recurrent story-introductory device, the 'superlative assessment', which, again, stands as a special warrant for a telling.<sup>1</sup>

That these two topically inappropriate subsequents to a troubles-telling, dubious as the 'trouble' may be, are doubly marked as especially warranted, may exhibit an orientation to, and stand as an attempt to deal with, that inappropriateness. By contrast to these two fragments with their self-attentive stories, the troubles-exit device arrayed in Fragments F.β.a.iii.(1)-(7) clearly involve the selection of a matter which engages this coparticipant in particular. The matters being introduced are, that is, 'biographically intimate'. Thus, as an alternative to closing the conversation altogether, or starting it afresh, we find an invocation of intimacy as a recurrent, and perhaps systematic, sequel to troubles-talk.

And indeed, among the range of troubles-exit devices is one which can be characterized as explicitly 'intimate'. Simply enough, talk which

1. See G. Jefferson, "Sequential aspects of storytelling in conversation," in J. Schenkein, ed., Studies in the Organization of Conversational Interaction, Academic Press, Inc., 1978.

follows troubles-talk recurrently makes reference to 'being together'. We are not intending to point to the massively recurrent 'arrangements' which occur in the massively recurrent post-troubles entries into conversation Closings (see F.β.a.i. above). However, the contiguity of Troubles-Talk and Closings may provide interactants with access to a virtually automatic opportunity and procedure for invoking the appropriate post-troubles 'intimacy'. And, equally automatically, the 'Restart' device (see F.β.a.ii. above), with its conversation-initial "How are you?" provides opportunity and procedure for the appropriately invoked 'intimacy'. With the title 'post-troubles references to being together' we wish to point to a particular type of device, instances of which are arrayed below.

F. Exit a. Boundarying Off iv. Getting Together

F.β.a.iv.(1) [NB:II:4:1]

E: It wasn't any fun, but I'm better I was: lying on the couch out in front.  
 N: [Oh::]:: I:'m so:rry E:]mma::?  
 E: [Ah:-]  
 E: - ((cutesy)) I am too. Why don't you come and see me.  
 N: - =h h h Well I was go:na call and ask you if you- Bud was playing golf this afternoon if you wanted to go over to Robinson's with me.

F.β.a.iv.(2) [NB:II:5:2-4R:3]

L: Who's gonna see(h)ee it is anybody gonna look up the(h)re to see if you got gold or no:t?  
 E: eHHHHhhhhhh  
 E: hargh hargh agh agh agh 'hh<sub>hh</sub>  
 L: [Mm: [i:::°  
 E: - [WHY DON'T YOU COME DOWN  
 L: FOR A MINUTE SOME TIME TODA::Y.  
 E: Yeh I wi:ll I was just  
 E: [AND LOOK AT YOUR BEAUTIFUL SWEATER.

F.β.a.iv.(3) [W:PCIII:1:3]

S: Oh: God we had the (.) police round all (0.2) all night, hh it was hectic. 'h h h h So, I hardly got any wo:rk done.  
 S: So: consequently I didn't get any wo:rk done hardly. ((beep beep beep beep 13 X))  
 (0.6)  
 S: Anyway.  
 (2.0)  
 D: - So you think- Can you come out for a drink tonight.

## F.β.a.iv.(4) [Fr:HB:II:12]

J: So: m-everything'll be good and--  
 P: -That's good.  
 J: - [M: maybe 't'hh maybe next weekend if you and Freddy  
 want to come up,

## F.β.a.iv.(5) [NB:IV:10:49ff]

E: 'hh It hurts when it's coming in. 'hh It's just th:ick with  
 that heavy-'hhh( ),  
 L: [Yeah?  
 E: Well I'll get that tomorrow.  
 L: [You get tha:t,-  
 E: -[[I'll go up to the drugstore totomorrow.  
 L: -[[Yeah. [And yeh- you-you-sure you don't want me to come  
 down and get you and take you down and-  
 E: [N o sweetie,-  
 L: -[[the byoo-beauty parlor?  
 E: -[[I'll-'hhh-'hhhh You-  
 E: - No, you go get your hair fixed if you want to drive down see  
 me I'd love to see you,

## F.β.a.iv.(6) [SEL:2:1:4:7]

N: I wasn't tired my arm wasn't tired when I got down there.  
 B: Well that's good.  
 N: Yeah.  
 B: Well I'm awfully glad to hear it,  
 N: [Well-  
 B: - Well I've been thinking of you, and I think it was Monday  
 evening that I came by to see you,  
 N: Yeah,  
 B: And uh-  
 N: Well suh- I'm soh- I'm sorry I wasn't home,

## F.β.a.iv.(7) [TCI(b):7:2]

L: I'm walking I can't walk real good you know but I'm walking  
 [so (that's a )]  
 C: ['hh[You s o u : n d] so good on the phone I never hear nobody  
 from the Sou:th.  
 (0.3)  
 L: eh h h h h eh eh-  
 C: -h [hh!  
 L: [eh eh h (ha ha)  
 C: [And I lo::ve it.  
 L: 'hhh! 'hhhh Yeah you sound just like me I gue:ss,  
 C: - Ye:h 'hhh Why don't you come over and see me someti:me.

In Fragment F.β.a.iv.(7) we find explicit intimating following some  
 talk about a trouble. This may have to do with the status of the troubles-  
 talk itself at the point the approach to a getting-together is begun; i.e.,

troubles-teller has produced a possible E.β.b. Close-Implicative Invokation of the Status Quo ("I can't walk real good you know but I'm walking") but it is a downgraded version marking persistence of the trouble. While an offer of a visit by troubles-recipient might be appropriate, constituting in this environment an offer of company for an invalid, the request for a visit by troubles-teller might be problematic, and thus alternative grounds for getting together are proffered. It is also possible that while troubles-talk provides a ripe environment for reference to getting together, coparticipants to such talk must in the first place be in an adequate relationship, and these two are not (Cora occasionally babysits Lily's son). The explicit intimatizing following the troubles-talk may be working to invoke a relationship adequate for post-troubles reference to getting together.

Across the F. Exit a. Boundarying Off arrays, we are struck by a combination of features: These troubles-talk exit devices are both topically disjunctive and interactionally cohesive/affiliative. Further, when a next topic is introduced, as in F.β.a.iii. Pending Biographicals and F.β.a.iv. Reference to Getting Together, it carries a special warrant; specifically, it may stand as a carryover or product of the intimacy generated in the troubles-talk.

This particular combination of features may stand as a solution to the problem posed for topical movement by talk about a trouble. Most roughly, it appears that 'trouble' has a status which provides that not any next matter is appropriate, which selects from among a range of possible next topics those which are specifically 'entre nous'. And in Fragments (1) and (2), pages 51-52 above, it appears that inappropriate post-troubles matters which do not carry the 'entre nous' warrant are being proffered as otherwise especially warranted.

To get a sense of a combination of topic and warranting which might well be excluded from post-troubles-talk occurrence, we show the following two fragments, which we take to be commonplace non-troubles-talk materials.

(3) [Rah:B:2:(14):8]

V: Well keep it Jessie cause I'll see you before the twenty second I've got some more books here to take back, you see,  
 J: Oh; right.  
 J: Well ah no I was gonna take it in for you and get the ticket.  
 V: -Oh no- it doesn't matter Je-ah actually I think it's one on Vera's ticket any rate I think it's in the name of Manners-  
 J: [O h : : : .]  
 J: -[[Oh ye- hhhh [heh heh eh:-: [hhhhhhhh]-  
 V: -[[but I'm not sure, but one of them are: [you know,]-  
 J: -This is th-  
 V: [So- I'll take them all in, and uh:m  
 J: [Ye:s::.  
 J: Mm,

(0.3)

V: [check them  
 J: - [[I'm gonna do some spaghetti and (.) n-eh::m meatballs for tea for this lot now,  
 V: Oh lovely.  
 J: Cause they didn't have u they only had fish fingers and chips for dinner,

(4) [TCI(b):16:63-64]

J: 't But I thought well I'll go ahead, and, 'hh and pay for it when it comes and 'he'll never know,  
 L: -'Ye:h, '-  
 J: -'(we, [got anything]) 'heh-heh-huh-huh e-huh huh huh [hhhhhhhh] 'hhhhhh  
 L: [hheh huh ehuh] [uhhhh 'uhhhhhhh] hh [hhhh  
 J: Except when Christmas co:mes a-a- and 'hhhh-  
 L: [..Oh.. [ye a hh  
 J: -he says where'd you get all thahheh heh [hn huh]-  
 L: [mehheh]-  
 J: -huh hu [h huh 'huh'] 'hn  
 L: [h h h h h] Santa Claus. hhhch-h-eh,  
 J: [hh ↑ Santa Claus  
 brought it. (in his sle::d). hn [hjh] [hn-hn- [heh huh-  
 L: [ye] : a h. [hh  
 L: -Uh:::m,  
 J: [hhhhhhhhhh] '( )'.  
 L: - [I found a recipe: that I'm gonna  
 try:,

(0.5)

L: I think,  
 (.)  
 J: [[ 'Uh huh, '  
 L: [[It's u h':, for popcorn balls that you make it with 'hh-'hh you melt butter: an:::d miniature marshmallows.



In these two fragments the new topic is disjunctive with the prior talk, as in the F. Exit a. Boundarying Off arrays, but specifically are not marked as especially 'entre nous'-warranted. They are the sort of 'self-attentive' matters we considered in Fragments (1) and (2), but again, without the special warrant proffered by the 'superlative assessments' in those materials (although we note some proposal of 'currency' in Fragment (3) with "now", and in Fragment (4) with "that I'm gonna try").

In summary, it appears that a standard, massively occurring procedure for continuing conversation while exiting from troubles-talk is to produce a next item which is both topically disjunctive and interactionally cohesive/affiliative. We do, however, find an alternative troubles-exit device, one which is not topically disjunctive and thus does not boundary off the trouble, but which gradually disengages from it over a span of talk. This device moves in what Harvey Sacks talks of as Stepwise fashion:

A general feature for topical organization in conversation is movement from topic to topic, not by a topic close followed by a topic beginning, but by a Stepwise move, which involves linking up whatever is being introduced as a new topic to what has just been talked about, such that, as far as anybody knows, a new topic has not been started, though we're far from wherever we began; i.e., the talk flowed.

(from Spring 1972 Lecture 5 pages 15-16 edited)

#### F. Exit b. Stepwise Transition into Other Topics

The following three instances of stepwise transition from troubles-talk were selected from among several to show a particular sort of work which this device can accomplish. Specifically, while each fragment begins in the course of talk about a trouble, it ends up with a report of a very good time.

Sacks notes that Stepwise movement can specifically be exploited to introduce topically disjunctive matters. So, for example, he proposes: "If you have some topic which you can see is not connected to what is now being talked about, then you can find something that is connected to both,

and use that first." (From a lecture of February 19, 1971, pages 15-16). In the following fragment we may be seeing just such an exploitation of Stepwise movement. Here, a troubles-recipient who may, in the first place be alert to the possibility of a topical chaining, inquires into the status of someone mentioned in passing in some ongoing troubles-talk (see arrow 1). The response to that inquiry permits of the introduction of a recurrent troubles-talk component, a D. Work-Up element, a report of a relevant other experience (see Fragments D.(1)-(4) pages 31-33 above) (see arrow 2). It just so happens that this troubles-relevant other is one of the people with whom troubles-recipient spent her holiday, from which she has just returned, and about which she had earlier been talking.<sup>1</sup> Reference to this troubles-relevant other entrains a move into talk about various aspects of the holiday, arriving at reference to a rather scandalous incident which had been earlier talked about (see arrow 3).

F.β.b.(1) [NB:IV:10:18ff]

- E: I'm not gonna plan things anymore. I mean this is ridiculous,  
 O→ course I know Mister Cole's sick, let's God let's hope he  
 gets well, but 'hhhhh I know the problem hhh you know, hh
- L: 1→ What does he ha:ve.
- E: 'hh Oh he's got this gallbladder, and uh, they- he's vomiting  
 and everything they took him to the hospital and I don't know  
 how long he's gonna be in or what the t- well he's gonna be  
 eighty fou:r,  
 (1.0)
- L: Yea:h. Well-
- E: And he's quite a playboy, you know,
- L: 2→ Yeah, you just got to be caref-well, see, 'hh Dwight only has-  
 one gall bladder?  
 (1.0)
- E: Mm hm,
- - - -

1. It appears that troubles-teller recognizes the topical implications of this particular troubles-relevant reference to another's experience. We may have here another instance of a Where-Are-We-Now Negotiation (cf. Fragment E.β.b.(5) page 40 and Fragment D.(4) pages 36-37). As in E.β.b.(5), troubles-teller may, by producing a 'continuer' ("Mm hm") and thus marking a shift from speakership to recipientship, be relinquishing claim to continuation of the troubles-talk and accepting entry into the other, recognizably imminent, topic.

- L: He had- and then he has to be careful what he eats, he can't eat anything greasy or anything you know,
- E: Mm hm,
- L: Go:d what a ma:n. He was out there this morning and he- they have these great big olive trees all over you know,
- E: Mm hm,
- L: And the wind was so bad that the-the-th- the branches were hitting the house, and God, (0.3) uh, I got up about well, it was about eight o'clock,
- E: Mm hm,
- L: and here he's up there sawing those off, you know,
- E: Mm::: wonderful.
- L: M a n he's ( )-
- E: God he's about sixty seven or eight.
- L: Yeah. Sixty seven.
- E: God love him.
- L: But man, I mean they really. They've really got ul- oh: God what a house. You have no idea.
- .
- .
- ((ca. 11 lines omitted re. the house))
- .
- E: 'h h h h eh: Is the swimming pool enclosed with the the gl:as bit?-
- L: =No:::, it's uh: ou:ts- (.) eh no outside the big (.) [uh::::
- E: [Mmhm, .
- L: gl:as doors.
- E: [Ah: hah, .
- L: u-I got that wro:ng,
- E: Oh that's, that's okay, 'h h h h h h h h
- L: [mBut] the water is, eighty fi:::ve.] [Oh I kno] w it.-
- E: =Isn't it gorgeous, =
- L: =But you know when you get out it's kind of co:ld. =
- E: =(Oh: oh:) ya:h. [two o'clock in the morning and [then
- L: =Well it was,] [huh] =
- E: = [haw h [awh ha]:w. \*Oo I(h) bet that was (fu:n.)
- L: } - [last [night] n h h h h [hn-hn-hn] with no:] c- hh hh
- E: [clothes on God it's good. ] hu-uh huh-huhh 'hh
- L: [hh [aaaaa:::]] I s n t that exciting,
- E: Uh: [::?
- E: [Oh: that's wonderful,
- L: [Oh:: God we had. we, I never had so much fun in my li:fe.

In the following fragment, with the same participants on a different occasion, we find a mirror-image of the above, the troubles-recipient/good-time reporter of F.β.b.(1) now being troubles-teller, and the troubles-teller of F.β.b.(1) now being troubles-recipient/good-time reporter. Again we can notice a troubles-recipient taking up a troubles-relevant matter

which has topic-chaining potential. In this case the trajectory is more immediate from uptake (arrow 1) to entry (arrow 2) to arrival (arrow 3).

F.Ø.b.(2) [NB:IV:14:13ff]

- L: But eh-it's-it's terrible to keep people alive and,  
 E: [[Right.  
 L: [[you know, and just let them suffer day in and day out,=  
 E: r:Right.  
 L: -it's-  
 E: -They don't do that with an animal, ((sniff))  
 (0.5)  
 E: (You know::w,)  
 L: Yeah.  
 E: Oh well, bless his heart well, we don't know what it's all-  
 L: [((sniff))  
 E: -about I g-I- ((sniff)) Don't, don't get yourself-  
 L: -Oh I'm not. I just- you know I wish I'd-  
 E: -Honey you've got to get ahold of your (I know) I'd-  
 L: 0- I'd kind of liked to gone out there but I was afraid of the  
 fog I was gonna drive him in:- l-'hhh last night, but,  
 E: 1- [.'hhh Oh it was  
 terrible coming down even this morning. ((sniff))  
 L: [But-  
 L: But San Diego? I c- I couldn't believe it last night. We  
 left there about, 'hh eleven thirty (.) and it w- (.) it  
 was clear all the way up until we hit, (1.0) u-uh:: the,  
 E: [((sniff))  
 L: the uh Fashion Square here in Balboa. [I couldn't believe it-  
 E: [((sniff))  
 E: -[ ( )  
 L: -[and we went into, you couldn't even see:.  
 E: 2- Oh God it's terrible. ((sniff)) That's why well we didn't  
 get home til two o'clock. God it's-  
 (0.2)  
 E: [[beautiful-]  
 L: [[It was terrible in to:wn?  
 E: 'hhh'hh  
 L: [((snort))  
 E: 3- 'h Oh we just got into bed at two:. I wasn't gonna (.) go down,  
 wait let me turn this fa-uh: (0.5) you know we w- this par:ty  
 and then we went to another little party a:fterwards and oh I  
 met so many f:fa::bulous pees- (.) people and danced with my  
poor old toes with no t(h)oenails and I was in-  
 L: [hnh'hnh  
 E: [.'hhhh hh(h)high  
 (h)h(h)eels and 'hahhhh and oh: we (.) just had a (.) beautiful  
 time.

The following fragment yields a similar pattern to that of the prior two. Here, however, troubles-recipient's exploitation of the topical chaining potential of a troubles-relevant item does not appear to be working

towards a report of a good time. On a roughest analysis, troubles-recipient appears to be working towards a more generalized analog of a reported good time; i.e., towards 'light conversation'. Again, a troubles-relevant matter with chaining potential is taken up (arrow 1) and topicalized (arrow 2). Subsequently we find, not a placement of a report of a good time, but a use of the developing materials as the source of a joke and laughter (see asterisked arrows). In this case it is troubles-teller who, having collaborated in the movement out of troubles-talk and having participated in the joke and laughter, finalizes the topical shift by herself offering a report of a good time (arrow 3).

F.Ø.b.(3) [Rah:I:4-6]

J: Well I can't leave him for two hours-  
V: [n:No.  
J: -if I'm if he's crying when I've left him for one.  
(.)  
V: Oh: dear me.  
J: So: I euh you know as I say I didn't get t<sub>o</sub> t y p i n g . ]  
V: well tie:d dow:n aren't you [Oh::: you're ]  
J: [Well I am rea:lly: "Yah,"  
V: [Ye:h,  
J: Ye:s you know [cause he do:esn't he hates being in on his-  
V: [ye e a : h? ]  
J: -ow:n for [some pec:uliar reason and I mean-  
V: [ye : h? ]  
J: -he always kno(h)ws: where I'm going and [okh! 'hh  
V: [y: [Ye:s.  
V: [[Yes:.  
J: [you know approximately what time I'll be, ]  
V: [ye s . ]  
J: Cause Norman said in the morning would I take him to Saltbern  
O- and I said well uh 'hih hi don't know the roads are so ba-ad  
I(h) mi(h)ght not (.) makes i:t.-  
V: 1- -No:?? No- Were they very ba:d, Jess ie, ( )  
J: [Ehm- no ] it wasn't it's  
just that you can't go: so fas:t you kno [w-you-You know you  
V: [N o : : : : ] No . ]  
J: -just have to: be that little bit more ca:reful.  
V: 2- [I think it's that  
little bit wa:rmer toni:ght-  
J: [Oh it is i:t's not so bad it's:: really n o t . ]  
V: -[i:sn't it ] [It's not quite] as se] vere-  
J: [M m : . ]  
V: -[toni:ght, n ] o : : .  
J: [No, but it's it's eh (.) melted, but I th-

J: If it free:zes tonight it'll be wo:rse tomorro:w mor:ning]-  
V: [·h]tomorrow,  
J: -[I think,]  
V: that's the only thing, y[e:s,  
J: [Ye:h,  
V: \*-> Well [I think I] 'll stay in bed in the mor:ning  
J: \*-> [Y e : h] hHAH!-  
J: -I do n't bla:me you? · h h  
V: \*-> [nhh hnh hnh] heh [heh he] h·hk  
J: 3-> Hey listen 'hhh You should have  
V: come on Tue:sda:y,  
V: Was it goo:d,  
J: [·hh Oh it was ↑mar:velous=  
V: -[Oh]: [w a s i t .]  
J: -[I] [↑thoroughly en]jo:yed it.

We note that former troubles-teller's report of a good time is markedly formatted as an F.a.iii. Pending Biographical and is introduced as a disjunctive new topic ("Hey listen 'hhh You should have come on Tue:sda:y,"). We also note that the reported good time is one in which its current recipient was not involved, save by her formulatedly relevant absence, and that the report itself (data not shown) is of teller's own experience of the event. That is, the report is 'substantively' of the type which occurs in Fragments F.β.b.(1) and (2) above, post a stepwise movement out of troubles-talk, and/but is formatted as an instance of a type which occurs directly adjacent to the troubles-talk; see in particular Fragment F.β.a.iii.(6) page 51, in which an E.β.c. Close-Implicative Making Light of the Trouble is followed by a markedly disjuncted F.β.a.iii. Pending Biographical.

This hybrid instance of a troubles-talk exit device may stand as product and index of its speaker's relationship with the Stepwise movement which has preceded and arrived at it. For one, its speaker, the troubles-teller, did not initiate the Stepwise movement. Secondly, the movement is done across talk about the weather, a matter which, in an earlier consideration (page 41) we noted as possibly ambiguously an exit from troubles-talk or part of an elaborated closing segment of that talk.

It is at least possible that troubles-teller, not having initiated the move out of troubles-talk, is treating the transitional weather-talk as still part of talk about the trouble, where, then, the joke and laughter stands as an E.β.o. Making Light of the Trouble, for which the markedly disjunctive Pending Biographical format is an appropriate F.β.a.iii. troubles-exit device. However, the transitional talk, which operates by providing materials by reference to which next topics may be introduced, seems to have done its work. That is, troubles-recipient's reference to staying in bed in the morning may have generated the mention of the last time she opted out; i.e., on Tuesday. Thus we may be seeing a hybrid which has been Stepwise-generated and/but is Adjacency-formatted.

Earlier we noted that on a roughest analysis, troubles-recipient appears to be working towards nothing more specific than 'light conversation' (page 62). A finer analysis, on a slightly extended sweep of talk, yields the possibility that the troubles-recipient is not merely working towards 'light conversation', but through that, towards the introduction of just the sort of blandly non-affiliative materials introduced in Fragments (3) and (4), page 57 ("I'm gonna do some spaghetti and meatballs for tea for this lot now", and "I found a recipe that I'm gonna try:"). The utterance in question is "We didn't go to have our hair done by the way", which is introduced just post the report of a good time which has itself been introduced just post the troubles-talk.

F.β.b.(3) [Rah:I:4-6:Extended]

J: it en:ded with a great big †bang eh hh he h hn I jumped=  
V: [Oh-huh:::]

J: =out of the e seat I jumped  
(V): [(seat),

(.)

J: e shot about three feet in the air I think †he h beh  
V: [O h :::::] [y e s]::  
V: - 'hh Eh::m, we didn't go to have our hair done by the wa:y,

We want to argue the possibility that the matter introduced in this slot; i.e., into what is now recognizably troubles-independent 'light conversation', was provided for by an utterance in the troubles-talk itself. However, unlike a stepwise transition segment which relies upon the here and now, local occasioning of one matter by another, troubles-talk is not an environment in which some, any topic which has been occasioned by prior talk is properly introduced. In troubles-talk, one properly produces troubles-relevant utterances. Therefore, the matter occasioned by an item in the troubles-talk is withheld and/but from that point worked towards by means of a stepwise movement out of troubles-talk into 'light conversation', an environment in which the utterance in question is properly introduceable.

Specifically, it is possible that "We didn't go to have our hair done" was 'triggered' or 'touched-off' by the troubles-talk utterance "I didn't get to typing." That is, the mention of something troubles-teller did not do brings up something troubles-recipient did not do, which, in other circumstances, might be mentioned then and there.<sup>1</sup> The similarity between the two utterances alerted us to such a possibility, and the details of the talk support it. Following the candidate 'trigger' utterance ("I didn't get to typing"), the troubles-recipient produces an assessment, "You're well tied down aren't you." In general, assessments tend to be close-implicative, and the occurrence of an assessment here may be a deployment of that feature. So, for example, in the following fragment taken from Institutional troubles-talk, a very similar sort of assessment precedes an interruption of the troubles-talk.

1. For some considerations of the phenomenon of 'touched-off' talk, see the lectures of Harvey Sacks, e.g., Fall 1967 Lecture 5 page 11, April 17 1968 pages 1-8, Winter 1969 Lecture 1 pages 4-7. See also Jefferson, "Sequential aspects of storytelling in conversation," op. cit.



(1) [SFC:10:3:9] ((re. a possibly suicidal child))

M: Cause this little guy will stand in the railroad tre-uh track  
and holler (.) where's the trai:n where is the trai:n.  
(0.3)

K: Ah-ha<sup>h</sup>,

M: [And that's what he's done before is stand there (he's)  
standing at the last minute and jumps awa:y.  
(0.7)

K: - Oh:. Well that that that's serious kind of uh behavior and it  
could be extremely dangerous. 'hh 'hhh Do you want to hold on  
about half a minute? ((to locate a phone number))

In each case a troubles-recipient can be characterized as proposing that he thoroughly grasps and acknowledges the seriousness of the trouble. In Fragment (1) that display is transparently preparatory to interrupting the conversation. In the case at hand we propose it is preparatory to moving out of troubles-talk. While in Fragment (1) the troubles-recipient removes himself from the conversation altogether, in the case at hand the troubles-recipient may be seen to be disengaging from the troubles-talk. Specifically, following the display of a sufficiently-expounded trouble, the troubles-recipient produces a flurry of acknowledgment tokens and nothing more ( "Ye:h," "Yea:h", "Ye:h?" "y::Ye:s.", "Yes:.", "Yes° Ye:s."). We assert but do not attempt to argue that such flurries constitute attempts to hasten a coparticipant's talk to its close. The flurry continues until the point at which troubles-teller produces an utterance with topic-chaining potential which is taken up by the troubles-recipient and turned to the stepwise movement out of troubles-talk into 'light conversation' considered above.

That is, having, by similarity between two utterances occurring at a distance from each other, located one as a possible 'trigger' of the other, we are in a position to track the talk in such a way as to see that immediately following the candidate 'trigger' utterance, procedures are initiated which can a) promote rapid occurrence of the 'touched-off' materials, and b) set up an appropriate environment for that occurrence.

That the worked-toward utterance does not appear as the environment becomes ripe may be a product of the very ripeness of the environment. That is, in fine detail, just as troubles-recipient as adding a few more particles of laughter to this bit of 'light conversation', troubles-teller, having completed her cheery riposte, takes a preparatory inbreath and then launches the good-time report which was itself possibly triggered by the immediately prior utterance and is, in the current environment, properly introduceable then and there.

V: Well I think I'll stay in bed in the mor:ning  
 J: [hHAH!]-  
 J: -I do n't bla:me you? [nhh hnh hnh [heh]-  
 V: [h h Hey] listen 'nhh You should have come on Tue:sdai:y,  
 J: - [heh he [h'hk]-

In as much as the good-time report preserves the environment of 'light conversation', the preemptive launch does not foreclose, but (again) displaces the introduction of the touched-off matter. And into that environment the now doubly-displaced materials are introduced. The method by which it is introduced is strikingly similar to one of the two fragments we proposed to be excluded from post-troubles-talk occurrence, whose new topics we proposed to be similar to that in the case at hand; i.e., to Fragment (4) page 57, with its "I found a recipe: that I'm gonna try:". In that fragment, and in the extended version of the case at hand, page 64, we find that the introduction of new, blandly non-affiliative materials into an environment of 'light conversation' is effected with an identical series of components produced in an identical order. Just as a current speaker starts to laugh (arrow 1), coparticipant produces an acknowledgment token (arrow 2); i.e., intersects a laughing appreciation of prior talk with an item which stands as an alternative response-type and may shift the trajectory initiated by the joke and its attendant laughter.<sup>1</sup> This is followed by

1. See Jefferson "A technique for..."

an object which may specifically be deployed in these particular circumstances to alert coparticipant to this speaker's intention to take the floor; i.e., "hh Uh:::m," and "hh Eh:::m," (see arrow 3). And thereafter the new materials are produced (arrow 4). That is, what might be developing into extended merriment by reference to prior talk is out short for and by the introduction of new materials.

## (1) [TCI(b):16:63-64]

J:        °hh ↑Santa Claus brou:::ght it. (in his sle:d).  
 J: 1→    hn[h<sup>h</sup>i<sup>h</sup>], [hn-hn]-  
 L: 2→    = [y e], [a h] -  
 J:        = [heh huh] [Uh:::m, : hhhheh hhh  
 L: 3→    = [°hh        [Uh:::m,  
 J:        = °(        )°  
 L: 4→        [I found a recipe: that I'm gonna try:,

## (2) [Rah:I:4-6:Extended]

J:        I jumped (.) e [shot about three feet in] the air I think-  
 V:        ° [° h : : : : : : : : : : ]  
 J: 1→    = [the h heh]  
 V: 2→    = [y e s] : :  
 V: 3→    °hh [Eh:::m, =  
 J:        [° h h h h  
 V: 4→    = We didn't go to have our hair done by the way,

The topic-introductory procedures in these two fragments, one American and one British, are virtually identical. Our analysis of Fragment (2) and its surrounding talk has suggested that the utterance introduced via this procedure has been pending for a while (withheld and worked towards in the troubles-talk from which it was 'triggered', and preempted by coparticipant's good-times report). This led us to examine the surrounding materials of Fragment (1) for a similar circumstance; i.e., the presence of a pending, 'touched-off' matter. And indeed, it is quite transparently available as such. The recipe introduced just post reference to Christmas and Santa Claus is for popcorn balls cemented with melted marshmallow and sprinkled with raspberry Jello powder; i.e., a Christmas candy, an edible analogue of a Christmas-tree ornament.

A major difference between the two sets of materials is that in the Fragment (1) data the environment permits immediate introduction of a touched-off matter, while in the materials attendant to Fragment (2) the environment, that of troubles-talk, may specifically preclude such an activity. The withholding of introduction of touched-off materials and the gradual working towards a disengagement from troubles-talk and establishment of an appropriate environment for introduction of those materials, and indeed, the deployment of Stepwise Transition towards the range of counter-troubles materials shown in the F.Ø.b. arrays, constitutes an index of deference to troubles-talk analogous to those observed in the several F.Ø.b. Boundarying Off arrays.

In that regard, we refer to an extended fragment which was given substantial consideration in the Progress Report (pages 110-120) as an instance of a strongly troubles-resistive troubles-recipient at work. Among the range of troubles-resistive activities, we observed the intersection of what we can now identify as a C.1. Exposition element with a Minus C.2. response; i.e., instead of the sequentially appropriate C.2. Affiliation we find a strong index of Disaffiliation, laughter, which is subsequently accounted for as, not ridicule, but a response to a conversation-external event. (The materials have been retranscribed.)

(1) [SEL:IV:6:19R]

A: but eh: what happened to me:, uh it started up u-at  
 Christmas you know the second ( )  
 M: - [ehh heh heh 'hhh heh=  
 M: - [[ 'hkhkhkh ]  
 A: - [S o i t] (.) couldn't be uh emphysema or anything like  
 that or it wouldn't (do a [uh]).  
 M:  
 M: - 'hhh [I wasn't lau:ghing at you my kitty was 'hnhh  
 A: [uh [heh (That's alright)  
 A: Aw:;  
 M: u-uh my kitty climbed up- (.) and was hitting me on the-  
 A: [Is-  
 M: -ba:ck like somebody ta:pping me on the ba::ck, hhh hhh  
 A: [Oh(h) how c u : t e, ]

We take the activity 'response to a conversation-external event' to be a version of 'introduction of touched-off materials'; i.e., another sort of emergence which is properly withheld in the environment of troubles-talk. While the beginning and end of Fragment (1) above is very similar to the beginnings and ends of the F.ø.b. Stepwise Transition fragments (1), (2), and (3) (see pages 59-60, 61, and 62-63 respectively); i.e., they all begin in the course of talk about a trouble and end up with happy-talk, the interior is very different. In the three F.ø.b. fragments the troubles-talk has been gradually exited. In Fragment (1) above, it has been aborted. That is, the introduction of activities constrained by troubles-talk has brought about a termination of troubles-talk and thus a cancellation of its constraints.

In the Progress Report we noted that while troubles-talk might be no more than some particular type of 'content' slotted into specifiable standard conversational organizations, it appears that although the procedures for interaction in general certainly operate within and upon it, troubles-talk is a discrete organizational domain, shaping the interaction in distinctive ways. The foregoing exploration of talk which is specifically not addressed to 'trouble'; i.e., the troubles-talk exit devices and the attendant discussions of such general phenomena as 'topic' and 'touch-offs', powerfully enhances our understanding of troubles-talk as discretely organized and consequential for the shape of interaction. Crucially, we are now in a position to see that troubles-talk may constrain certain occurrences in its course, and systematically shape the talk that occurs thereafter; talk which we would otherwise treat as utterly irrelevant to a consideration of the phenomenon of 'troubles-talk'.

### Summary

We have arrayed a series of recurrent Troubles-Talk elements in terms of a progression through a template ordering, and given some consideration to the sequential logic, the topical/interactional work made possible by that ordering of elements. We proposed that this particular ordering constitutes an elegant and effective machinery by which the polar and competing relevancies of attention to business as usual and attention to the trouble can be managed. Roughly, we found that by progressing through the template ordering the talk moves from an engagement with business as usual to a focussing upon the trouble and then to a reengagement with business as usual. Likewise, the relational distance of coparticipants moves from some conversational standard to varying degrees of intimacy and back again. In short, we offered a system and a function.

However, the template ordering is more or less an artificial one. It is artificial in that we find no actual instances of that ordering. It is artificial more or less, in that we do find a rough tendency to that ordering. The template ordering might, then, constitute an over-refined characterization which ought to be relaxed; i.e., this rough ordering might be, not an index of problems in the running off of the sequence, but the way the sequence ought to run. Such roughness might be a feature of Troubles-Talk in particular, or perhaps a feature of 'big packages' in general.

In that regard we notice that the sequences which massively run off in template order are the small conversational machineries, many of which have been described as highly 'ritualized'.<sup>1</sup> A feature of ritual is that everyone knows precisely what to do, and there are known consequences for not doing what ought to be done. And for such interactional particles as, e.g.,

-----

1. The anthropologist Erving Goffman consistently and incisively talks of the 'ritual' aspects of ordinary interaction. See, e.g., Interaction Ritual, 1967.

Greetings, Closings, Question-Answer, Compliments, Thankings, etc. etc., we find that interactants have experienced explicit, overt training; i.e., they have been repeatedly instructed on the proper procedures, and there is a one to one relationship between not doing one of the proper actions and being instructed, admonished, reprimanded (e.g., "Didn't you hear the lady say hello? Well you know you should say hello back.", e.g., "You didn't answer my question.").

It is possible that, especially for 'big packages', and for those big packages which are not used N times a day each and every day; i.e., such big packages as that by which Troubles-Talk might be organized, no one has had step by step explicit, overt training in the proper procedure, nor has anyone experienced a one to one relationship between not doing some action and being instructed, admonished, reprimanded (e.g., no one has been told "Didn't you hear the lady say I went to the doctor? well you know you should say yea:h?", e.g., no one has been told "You didn't empathize with my exposition."). In short, it may be unreasonable to demand of any but those 'ritualized' small elements that there be a strictly ordered progression; unreasonable to propose that if they are not running off that way then we are seeing a sequence going wrong.

We recall Harvey Sacks' remark that "information about utterances and their organization for smaller units might . . . not tell us anything about some such larger package as we might try to get at," and that "indeed, [such information] might be misleading." It is altogether possible that we are attempting to force an organization, which works for small units, onto units which are not organized in that way. The fact that people are not from infancy trained to produce such talk can indicate that the talk is not required to proceed that way; i.e., at best the strict ordering is optional.

On the other hand, we might yet be seeing, not a rough ordering, but a recurrent disordering of an elegantly designed package. So, for example, various investigations show unscripted 'spontaneous' storytellings to be highly structured.<sup>1</sup> However, it is also massively the case that a story told in ordinary conversation is, if not significantly disrupted, in various ways characterizably (mis)shaped by a range of interactional contingencies.<sup>2</sup>

In that regard, we return to the notion of 'ritual' and note that 'ritual' can handle enormously long sequences with each component in its proper order, and that people can be trained to perfectly reproduce 'big packages' which occur only occasionally. That is, such a package as we propose for Troubles-Talk has a potential for strict production, just as do the small recurrent sequences. The difference appears to be that participants to a troubles-telling have not been socialized to a ritualized, step by step performance of this activity. Thus, we might be studying a Culture which has gotten control of small interactional units, but is not yet able to properly cope with large units. Such an image projects an evolved-to future in which the proper positioning of some Nth component of an occasionally-activated large package is insisted upon to any child and lapses thereof are complained of by any coparticipant. Conversely, we might be seeing, in the ritualized elements, remnants of a more primitive, rigid version of interaction, from which the Culture has been in the process of devolving as it becomes more interactionally sophisticated. The projection, then, is of a future in which it is no

-----

1. See, for example, W. Labov and J. Waletzky, "Narrative Analysis: Oral Versions of Personal Experience" in J. Helm, ed., Essays on the Verbal and Visual Arts, U. Washington Press, Seattle, 1966, pp. 12-44
2. See G. Jefferson, "Sequential Aspects of Storytelling in Conversation" *op. cit.*, pp. 219-248



bother or issue as to whether someone returns a Greeting, answers a Question, now, later, or at all; where, upon the occurrence of such a strictly ordered pair, a participant might remark upon the coincidence that just last week something similar occurred.

We have, then, two alternative, and we think viable approaches to the encountered actual roughness of the troubles-talk sequence: 1) It is a design-feature of the troubles-talk package and must/can be built into an adequate characterization of the troubles-talk package; where, then, any encountered roughness in the ordering is already accounted for and need not be inquired further. 2) It is an artifact of disordered production and must/can be accounted for in an adequate analysis of any actual instance of troubles-talk.

We do not, at this point, attempt to choose between these alternatives. We do, however, note that the single-instance analyses of troubles-talk yielded again and again indications that we were not seeing a vaguely organized package in which the talk flowed along, taking up this or that option as the participants might see fit, but that we were observing evidence of disruption. Specifically, again and again we were confronted with circumstances which were strongly problematic for the telling of a trouble. In Section II we examine some of these matters.

## Section II. Some Sources of Disruption of the Candidate Sequence

A scan of the current corpus yielded a range of phenomena which, singly or in combination, could be seen as sources of disruption of the candidate troubles-telling sequence. The various phenomena could be grouped into two major types:

A. Interactional 'Asynchrony'. Roughly, coparticipants could be characterized as improperly aligned by reference to the categories provided for by and crucial to the orderly progression of the sequence.

B. Activity 'Contamination'. Roughly, the talk is not strictly constituted by the series of activities provided for by and crucial to the orderly progression of the sequence, but is partially constituted by other types of activities, with alternative components and trajectories. Included among these 'contaminant' activities are:

1. Building a Case: The 'Trouble' as a Possible 'Misdeed'
2. Negotiating a Plan: The 'Trouble' as a Possible 'Obstacle'
3. Dispute: The 'Trouble' as a Source of Contention

This section of the report is concerned with some detailed consideration of instances of the various sequence-disruptive phenomena. For each, we start with gross instances, to provide a sense of the phenomenon and its potential disruptiveness, and then turn to rather finer instances in which the presence of the phenomenon and its consequences for the orderly progression of the sequence might be rather more obscure.

### A. Interactional 'Asynchrony'

In each of the following fragments a trouble is introduced by a teller but is not taken up, as such, by a recipient; i.e., a coparticipant is not aligning as a Troubles-Recipient. (See Section I, pages 69-70 Fragment (1) as a gross instance of this phenomenon.) We note that in Fragment A.(1) below, a version of 'contamination' is present; i.e., the talk is very

heavily loaded with features of 'accusation' and 'complaint'. We point to a candidate C.I. Exposition component here, and the utterance which follows it (see arrows) as grossly instancing 'asynchrony'.

A.(1)[JG:I:21:1-3] ((F is caller, M is wife of intended call-recipient))

M: 'h We:ll uh may I: ha:ve about two minutes of your ti:me?  
(0.8)

M: I: would like to tell you that one of your: 'h uh brother er hu- you kno:w the Ma:sons down at your clu:b 'hhh uh::m::, h 'tik 'hhh introduced my husband to a lady

.  
. ((ca. 20 lines omitted; straight monologue))  
.

M: - 'hhh An:d so when he went awa:y on Mother's da:y and 'hh he went away on Saturday evening of (0.3) Mother's Da:y 'hh and he spent the night (.) with he:r and all: day Sunday and came home around about nine o'clock Sunday night 'hhh uh he didn't sa:y u-one word he just came in put his pe:jas o:n 'hhh a:n:d uh sat on the couch for about five minutes and then he went in: to his bedroom and went to be:d. 'hhhhh an:d uh u-so: uh then I, hh well you know I was questioning about what was go[ing o:n?]

F: - his phone number?  
(0.2) [Well do you happen to have

M: 'hhh u.No::? I do not have his [phone >number< he: will-]  
F: [( )- [Do you know where I might reach him?

Note in the first place that the caller has specifically been offered and has declined an opportunity to align as a recipient of some projected further talk; i.e., with "may I have about two minutes of your time?" and the subsequent (0.8) silence. In Section I we considered the workings of the A.3. Premonitor Response (pages 17ff). The co-occurrence in this case of a declined opportunity to align as recipient of some projected further talk and a subsequent powerful 'asynchrony' alerts us to the possible significance of such apparently trivial utterances as "Yeah," etc., both in a particular position in the course of Troubles-Talk and in possibly characterizable positions in other forms of talk.

So, for example, in the following two fragments we see a similar opportunity for, and declination to produce, a display of recipientship.

Each of these fragments will be considered subsequently; Fragment (1) below in the discussion of B.1. Building a Case, where it appears as Fragment B.1.(1), pages 89-95, and Fragment (2) below in the discussion of B.3. Dispute, where it appears as Fragment B.3.(1) pages 159-160. Here we simply assert that the absence of alignment bodes ill for the troubles-telling. (See also Section II, Fragment B.1.(3) pp. 103-104, and p. 152.)

## (1) [JGIII(a):3:2]

S: Kelly may I help you?=  
 M: -Yeah Sorrell this is Ma:ggie, 'h hhh  
 S: [Hi:.  
 M: → Listen I: 'm going to try and go down to Doctor Steele  
 today.  
 → (0.7)

## (2) [Fr:USI:57ff] ((V is finishing up a story))

V: Cause that-that's (his policy).  
 J: Hey Victor,  
 V: So I (have to say)  
 J: → The next time you see me I'm gonna be looking like he:ll  
 you know why,  
 → (0.7)

The following gross instance of 'asynchrony' may also be seen as partially 'contaminated'. In this case a possible Troubles-Telling is, combinedly or alternately, a message-giving with the 'trouble' as an 'excuse'. Here, we point to a candidate B.1. Announcement and the utterance which follows it (see arrows) as grossly instancing 'asynchrony'.

## A.(2) [MC:II:9:1-2]

L: 'hh Will you tell her I called and I like her 'hh just as  
 much as ever but tell her I can't get in, til next Monday  
 → or Tuesday because, 'hhh I'm having to go to the doctor  
 with my hip you know I, I had a fall and hurt it.  
 P: → Uh huh.  
 L: So 'hh It's nothing serious don't alarm her,  
 P: Uh huh.  
 L: But just- tell her that I'm just going in for uh therapy  
 treatments.  
 P: Uh huh.  
 L: [But I won't be able to come in til next week.

In this case, a 'housekeeper' is 'taking a message'. That is, a

candidate troubles-recipient may be specifically relying upon and invoking her status in the occupational category 'housekeeper' and the activity category 'message taker' to remain aloof from the proffered troubles-talk. While the caller is combinedly/alternatingly 'leaving a message' and 'telling a trouble', the coparticipant is consistently and only 'taking a message'. In this regard we can notice that in Fragment A.(1), page 76, a candidate troubles-recipient invokes incumbency in the activity-category 'caller' to remain aloof from the troubles-talk. That is, in each case, the declination to align as a troubles-recipient is observably warranted, and thus may be seen as accountable in the first place; i.e., one does not freely decline recipientship of a trouble.

The following fragment permits us to see another source of 'asynchrony'. Here the mis-alignment appears to be 'topical' rather than 'categorical'. In the course of discussing the plans of one participant for matching a pair of shoes to a new dress, the other attempts to piggy-back an entry into talk about her trouble.

A.(3)[NB:IV:3:2-3]

E: 't'hhh Even the bone kid wouldn't be bad with it Lottie,  
 L: I've got a pair of bone kid, but I still think that uh, the  
 other would- I mean God shoes, you know you can get ( ),  
 E: [I know it.  
 L: [[I can-  
 E: [I've got so many, and I eh and I can't wear hardly any of  
 them for a long length of time, with this toe bit, so,  
 L: - Yea:h,  
 E: "hhhhhhh Well, OKAY, I just finished my uh, VA::CUMMING,

Here we notice a version of a B.1. Troubles-Announcement followed by, not a B.2. Announcement Response,<sup>1</sup> but an acknowledgment token which is

---

1. Specifically, reference to "this toe bit" in the course of talk on another topic constitutes an in-passing mention which recurrently, and perhaps properly, is taken up by the coparticipant with an A.1.a. Inquiry such as "How is your toe anyway." We do not include a consideration of this device in our report, but a version of such an occurrence can be seen in Section I, Fragment (1) page 46, where a reference to "the state I'm in at the moment" is followed by "How is your back anyway."

at best an A.3 Premonitor-Response (see arrows). Such an item in such a position might indicate that something more than mere reference to the trouble will be required to engage this coparticipant as a troubles-recipient; for example, a new troublesome development. In terms of the talk in progress, with "this toe bit" as a component of talk about shoes, the acknowledgment token preserves the relevance of the ongoing topic, declining to isolate and 'topicalize' this candidate shift in topic.

In contrast to A.(1) and A.(2) above, in which the troubles-tellers pursue the possibility of a troubles-telling across a declination by a coparticipant to align as a troubles-recipient, the troubles-teller in this case appears to be drastically sensitive to such a declination. Specifically, the post-troubles acknowledgment token is followed by an absolute abandonment of the troubles-talk; indeed, by a move into closure of the conversation itself.<sup>1</sup> That is, the abandonment is done with what, in a troubles-talk package, constitutes F.β.a.i. Exit via Conversation Closure.

That the abandonment is done in this way may indicate, both for analyst and coparticipant, that indeed, the prior mention of "this toe bit" was not just a topical en passant, but in fact an attempt to enter troubles-talk, that attempt now observably displayed as frustrated by an action of the coparticipant (i.e., by the non-troubles-receptive "Yea:h"). Further, the entry into Closings terminates not only the candidate troubles-talk, but the topic to which it was piggybacked; i.e., the

- - - -

1. The loud "OKAY" inaugurates a Terminal Sequence which may be expanded by the introduction of such items as the report of 'what I was just doing' which occurs here. While such an item has rich potential for a return to conversation, it may, on its occurrence, stand as an expansion component of a Terminal Sequence, still on the way to closure, rather than a return to the conversation proper. For a consideration of such features of the Terminal Sequence, see G. Button, op. cit.

discussion of coparticipant's shoes. The observable 'sensitivity' might not unfairly be characterized as a 'sulk'; i.e., if you won't talk to my trouble, we won't talk at all. And in that regard we might note the possible 'mitigating' work done by the cutesy/intimatized pronunciation of "VA::CUMMING".

And it appears that the 'mitigated sulk' is understood and accepted by the candidate troubles-recipient who counters the entry into Closings with a topic-initiatory query "You walked home huh?" (see Expanded A.(3) below) which, if not explicitly addressed to the "toe bit", provides ample opportunity for troubles-expositional talk. On the other hand, coparticipant's prior declination to align as a troubles-recipient, and the under-duress character of the subsequent inquiry may be seen to be taken into account by the candidate troubles-teller. Provided with an opportunity to talk about the troublesome toe by reference to the walk home, she declines to take up such matters and produces a positive assessment of the walk, "Oh yeah it's delightful."

A.(3) [NB:IV:3:2-3:Expanded]

- L: I've got a pair of bone kid, but I still think that uh, the other would- I mean God shoes, you know you can get ( ).
- E: I know it.
- L: [[I can-
- E: [[I've got so many, and I eh and I can't wear hardly any of them for a long length of time, with this toe bit, so,
- L: Yea:h,
- E: \*hhhhhhh Well, OKAY, I just finished my uh, VA::CUMMING,
- L: → You, you walked home huh?
- E: → Oh yeah it's delightful. But a lot of people out.

This fragment, which is so topically and sequentially deranged, can be seen to be enormously interactionally coherent by reference to a negotiation as to the telling or not of a trouble and the grounds upon which a non-telling will be based. Over a series of moves, a trouble which it appeared would not be told due to lack of recipient receptiveness becomes transformed, as it were, to a trouble which will not be told due to the

sufferer's turning to a salubrious alternative.

Further, it is possible that the 'turning to a salubrious alternative' is systematically available as just that, in contrast to doing trouble-free talk. Specifically, "Oh yeah it's delightful", in its particular environment, may be a recognizable device for 'talking positively about a negative matter'. In the following fragment a similar utterance follows an inquiry into what was very likely a troublesome event (a compulsory family dinner on Thanksgiving day, during a time when the host couple are having difficulties, see Section I, Fragments C.1.(2) page 21, C.2.-C.3.(4) page 25, E.β.b.(5) page 40, B.1.(6) pages 110-111 and fn.1.(a) page 113.

(1) [NB:IV:13:1]

E: So they came dow:n and had dinner,hh  
 L: Uh hu:h,  
 E: 'hh 'hh-hh  
 L: → Was it ni:ce?  
 (0.6)  
 E: → Oh ye:h the turkey was deliciou:s.  
 L: Oh goo:d.  
 E: They stopped by to see Mister Cole on the way down. So they  
 left kind of early but, she said the beh-huh-the bus  
 schedules were so, 'hhh,hard on Sunday to get Grayhou:nd,  
 L: Yeah,

That is, "the turkey" appears to be a substitute, chosen for its positive assessability, by reference to which it can be understood that the primary assessable (i.e., the gathering itself) does not lend itself to positive assessment; i.e., was troublesome. Something similar may be available in the reply to the inquiry about the possibly troublesome walk home, "Oh yeah it's delightful."<sup>1</sup> Specifically, the "it" being assessed is not the walk itself, but the route which "is" subject to positive

-----

1. In each of these candidate instances of 'talking positively about a negative matter' we find the turn-initial "Oh yeah" which seems to be acknowledging the thrust of the utterance to which it is obliquely responding. This is one feature of the phenomenon we refer to as Pregnant Confirmation, which we are investigating in its own right (see Introduction, page 8).



assessment, independent of this particular occasion of walking; i.e., we note that the report does not propose that it "was" delightful on that particular occasion of walking (on the troublesome toe). Thus, we may be observing a systematic distinction between talk which is recognizably 'trouble-free' and that which is recognizably a 'trouble-substitute', the latter specifically invoking the trouble and providing for recognizable 'being positive in the face of trouble'.

Fragments A.(1)-A.(3) above are gross instances of 'asynchrony', in which one participant altogether declines to participate in the troubles-talk proffered by the other (in Fragment A.(3) that declination is subsequently negotiated). Following is one of several rather more delicate instances. In this case both participants (the same as in Fragment A.(3)) suffer from a fungus of the nails, one of them more acutely than the other. The less-acutely suffering one has just returned from a holiday, with a new-found remedy recommended by the friend with whom she stayed on holiday, who also suffers from the malady, and apparently suffers it just as acutely as the returning holiday-maker's coparticipant. The introduction of the remedy marks the similarity, e.g., "You know Isabel had her nail taken off, like you had your toenail taken off? and it just about killed her you know, she nearly died a thousand times and I was telling her about you." and, e.g., "It kept 'hh getting like you:rs.you know on your toes? bunching up? you know? 'hhh and, d-uhn-en underneath? and it- and it really hurt her". The upshot being that "she got that and ih- and it's never bothered her." We join the conversation just post the 'upshot' utterance.

A.(4) [NB:IV;10:48-49]

L: 'hhhh And get it in the tube Emma.  
 E: Alright dear,  
 L: Get the tube and now, tonight I- I took a toothpick and I-

- L: 'hhh and I put the-eh stuff down in my-uhm my nails-  
 E: [Mm:hm,  
 L: -you know,  
 E: [Isn't this funny you and I would have it.  
 (0.4)  
 E: This is ri[diculous.  
 L: [Everybody's got- 'hh Isn't that funny we were in  
 a p- uh:::  
 E: - [Oh God it's terrible Lottie, my toenails- 'hhh they  
 just look so sick those big toenails it just makes me sick.  
 you know, they're jus- dead. Everything's dead. I-I sat out  
 today and I said my God am I just dying. It's- like I'm  
 ossified.  
 L: - No at- we were in some place, I don't know if it was Bullock's  
 or some place, (0.5) I guess it was Bullock's. And, somebody  
 was talking about it, and I bet there were 'hhh ten people  
 around there, and they all started to say well they had the  
 same thing

A rough scan of the fragment shows that the 'asynchrony' here involves that while both participants are producing troubles-relevant talk, they are moving in drastically different directions (see arrows). The remedy-recipient suddenly launches into some highly emotional reportage which is followed by a rather bland report by remedy-deliverer on the prevalence of the malady.

In slightly finer detail we can notice that the report which follows the emotional outburst was started prior to that outburst and was interrupted by it.

- L: - Everybody's got- 'hh Isn't that funny we were in a p-uh:::  
 E: [Oh  
 God it's terrible Lottie, my toenails- 'hhh they just look  
 so sick . . . it's like I'm ossified.  
 L: - No at- we were in some place, I don't know if it was Bullock's

Where, then, the outburst which interrupted the start on the report is 'sequentially deleted' by a recycle of the report. And we note that such deletion is a not uncommon fate of 'interruptive' or otherwise improperly coparticipant-attentive talk, at the level of single- and multi-sentence utterances, and rather large blocs of talk such as stories.<sup>1</sup>

1. For a consideration of this phenomenon, see Jefferson, "Sequential aspects of storytelling in conversation," op. cit.

A close examination of the fragment permits us to understand how the 'asynchrony' was generated; specifically, how the 'interruptive outburst' might have come to be so precariously (mis)positioned. We start by noticing that the remedy-recipient produces what can constitute a D. Work-Up component; i.e., a commentary on the trouble, similar to the reports of Relevant Other Experiences (cf. D.(1)-(4) pages 31-33), "Isn't this funny that you and I would have it." However, the announcing of something as 'funny', 'strange', etc., recurrently serves as a preface to some expository talk, as in the following fragment from a troubles-telling. "funny" prefaces a detailing of the trouble.

(1) [Rah:II:10-11:3]

J: But he's a funny ki:d. 'hhh He- He was so upset k- He w-  
You know he'd been crying when I got back

And we can notice a partitioning of sufferers, the two relevant ones being, not, e.g., "Isabel and I"; i.e., not the two most sorely afflicted, but "you and I"; i.e., the two current interactants. Such a partitioning may be designed to achieve a receptive alignment by the current coparticipant for the talk to which "funny" is serving as a preface; i.e., the "you and I" is working as a troubles-relevant intimating device.

Further, no response immediately forthcoming (i.e., post an (0.4) silence), remedy-recipient appends an assessment, "This is ridiculous."

In a fragment from another conversation between these two participants, we find "ridiculous" occurring in an utterance which specifically solicits, and gets, an affiliative response; i.e., a C.2. Affiliation, post which a C.3. Affiliation Response, a letting go, is appropriately positioned.

(2) [NB:IV:4:2]

E: Isn't he ridiculous,

(0.9)

L: He's crazy.

(0.6)

E: Oh: God dammit. I said it's too bad the boat didn't sink

In a range of materials it appears that "ridiculous" operates as a restrained, troubles-resistive gloss for such specifications as "crazy", "terrible", etc.. The proffering of the gloss may initiate a sequence in which an expectable appropriate next event is the coparticipant affiliation which will, in turn, unleash the matters which the gloss has presented in restrained fashion.

In a range of ways, then, remedy-recipient may be working to set up an environment in which a C.3. Affiliation Response, a Letting Go, can appropriately occur. And we note that the program can have been triggered by, and thus have been in process since, remedy-deliverer's strong descriptions of the friend's sufferings, posed by reference to prior-known sufferings of the remedy-recipient (i.e., "she nearly died a thousand times", "you know on your toes? bunching up?", etc.).

So, there are two possible readings of remedy-recipient's talk: as a D. Work-Up component, or as a C.2.-C.3. initiator; i.e., as an approach to a Letting Go. Remedy-deliverer selects the D. Work-Up reading, perhaps specifically in as much as it touches on matters for which she has an incident to relate. That is, the reference to the strangeness of "you and I" having the trouble may bring to mind and provide a place for the telling of an incident in which it turned out that of some random collection of people, many of them share that trouble. That is, the talk with which remedy-recipient may be working towards a Letting Go, just happens to set up a ripe environment for a report of Relevant Experiences of Others.

There are features of remedy-deliverer's talk which might alert the coparticipant to the alternative reading being made and the alternative direction being taken; for example, the (0.4) gap and the "Everybody's got-" which undercuts the "you and I" intimatizing. However, as in Fragment (2) page 84 above, an even longer gap does not necessarily

make for problems in the sequence, and the unintimate "Everybody's got- occurs in overlap and is abandoned; i.e., stands as a non-occurrence. Crucially, the work by which remedy-deliverer exhibits the here and now appropriateness of her forthcoming report; i.e., the marking of that part of coparticipant's talk which elicited it, constitutes very nearly a straight repeat of that talk; i.e., in the environment of "Isn't this funny you and I..." we find "Isn't that funny we...".

As it happens, the "we" is not the same pairing as "you and I" (the "we" consisting of, not the two current coparticipants, but this speaker and the co-suffering friend). And the "funny" is not, e.g., an affiliative 'echoing' but a preface to this speaker's own forthcoming report. But in terms of its observable features, the utterance is very similar to the prior. Remedy-recipient may be monitoring the talk by reference to the expectable occurrence of an affiliative item which will take its proper place in the sequence leading up to a Letting Go, and thus may be hearing the near-repetition "Isn't that funny we..." as the actualization of that expectation.

One final detail. The positioning of the Letting Go, in the course of coparticipant's story introduction can be seen, as we have initially characterized it, as an 'interruption'. Specifically, it finds a 'weak link' in the talk and breaches it at that point; i.e., it starts up just as the utterance has broken off and gone into 'search'.

L: 'hh Isn't that funny we were in a p- uh:::

E: [Oh God it's terrible

But there is an alternative characterization by which this activity stands not as an interruptive exploitation of a weak link, but as relieving coparticipant of the necessity of formally completing an utterance which is understandable prior to completion. So, for example, in the following fragment we find a slight hitch prior to some touchy materials, after which,

s well.

simultaneously, speaker finds an idiomatic item with which to complete the utterance, and recipient displays that the utterance need not be completed to be fully understood and affiliated with.

(1) [NB:IV:10:22R]

E: - He can make me so da:mn mad I could-

L: - (.)  
[[Well that's the way with me: too.

E: bop him

Again, given a working towards a C.2.-C.3. pair in which coparticipants exhibit their affiliation with each other, and given the susceptibility of remedy-giver's introductory "Isn't that funny we..." to a hearing as an affiliative echoing of troubles-teller's exposition-introductory "Isn't it funny you and I...", the intersection of the possible affiliation at a faltering point can constitute a 'response to' rather than an 'interruption of' that utterance; an understanding and uptake of the thrust which is available in the material so far in that utterance if it is monitored as a possible affiliation in the first place.

Briefly: Each participant finds herself with something to deliver, generated out of the ongoing talk (remedy-recipient with an update on her suffering occasioned by the report of a third party's suffering, remedy-deliverer with a report of an incident occasioned by remedy-recipient's comment on the distribution of the malady). Each is producing talk directed to arriving at her own delivery and hearing the other's talk by reference to that program; i.e., each is aligned as a candidate 'teller' with the other as 'recipient'. A range of features of the talk provides for sufficient ambiguity to permit each party to see that the other is aligned as 'recipient' of herself as 'teller', until the point of actual delivery, when each finds herself confronted with an utterly misaligned coparticipant.

We take it that, at least in part, a source of the misalignment here

is that the interactants are dealing with a (more or less) shared trouble. Several other fragments in the current corpus yield this phenomenon, and it appears that talk about a (more or less) shared trouble is, in general, susceptible to interactional 'asynchrony', and thus to disruption of the candidate troubles-telling sequence.

The foregoing array has instanced a recurrent source of disruption of the candidate Troubles-Telling sequence, the phenomenon of 'Interactional Asynchrony', a misalignment of coparticipants by reference to the categories Troubles-Teller and Troubles-Recipient. Following is a consideration of a second major source of disruption of the candidate sequence.

#### B. Activity 'Contamination'

In our consideration of Interactional 'Asynchrony' we noted the presence of 'contaminant' activities; for example, in Fragment A.(1) above a 'trouble' is delivered in part as a 'complaint' and in Fragment A.(2), as an 'excuse'. We find that there are ranges of activities which can converge with a troubles-telling; activities which have rather different treatments of the event/situation and rather different components and trajectories from those of a troubles-telling, per se. Among the range of 'contaminants' we find three recurrent types: 1) Building a Case, in which the 'trouble' constitutes a possible 'misdeed' (or its consequence), 2) Negotiating a Plan, in which the 'trouble' constitutes a possible 'obstacle', and 3) Dispute, in which the 'trouble' becomes a source of contention. We will consider instances of the three types, in turn.

##### B. 1. Building a Case: The 'Trouble' as a possible 'Misdeed'

A dramatic use of the convergence of 'trouble' and 'misdeed' was shown in the ITV documentary Medic 1-6 which followed the activities of a general practitioner in Bridlington. An emergency case comes in, an elderly man with a hemorrhaging ulcer. There is blood all over the sheets.

Of what might constitute a thoroughly terrifying aspect of a 'trouble', the practitioner makes a teasing 'misdeed', saying to the hemorrhaging patient, "Don't let the laundry lady see this!"

Here, the teasing formulation of a 'trouble' as a 'misdeed' can serve to reassure the patient. Far better to be treated as misbehaving than as bleeding to death. In contrast to this instance, in which 'misdeed' works as a relief from 'trouble', the current corpus of troubles-talk yields instance after instance in which 'misdeed' is a serious, consequential formulation, to which 'trouble' stands as the 'relief' alternative. So, for example, of an incident we will be considering below it might be said, far better to be afflicted with high blood pressure than to have been plain drunk at a wedding reception.

We show two fragments drawn from two different conversations by reference to the same incident. The first occurs the day after the incident, the candidate troubles-recipient having been witness to the event. We note another 'contaminant' here: The candidate trouble is generating an absence from work, and that issue is also being dealt with.

B.1.(1) [JGII(a):3:2]

S: Kelly may I help you?=  
M: -Yeah Sorrell this is Ma:ggie, 'h<sub>h</sub>hh  
S: [H1:.  
M: - Listen I: 'm going to try and go down to Do:ctor Stee:le  
to:da:y.  
(0.7)  
M: ((swallow)) And Sally's at the sto:re.  
S: Ye:ah no she's already gone cause Mae's there.  
(0.3)  
M: Oh: (.) Mae came in?  
S: Ye<sub>h</sub>ah.and she says no problem she'd work to:da:y so,=  
M: [°o h : °okay, ° ]  
S: -we're all se:t.  
M: Oh fi:ne,  
(0.2)  
M: °hh Becau:se I(c) (.) you know I told mother what'd  
ha:ppened yesterday there at the party,h<sub>h</sub> a : :nd uh,  
S: [°Yeah. ° ]  
M: - °hhhhhh (0.2) Uh you know she asked me if it was because I'd  
had too much to dr:ink and I said no because at the t\_i:mc=  
S:



- M: -I'd only ha:d,h you know that drink and a ha:lf when we  
 were going through the receiving line.  
 S: Right.-  
 M: - "hhhh So whatever it is it's go:t to (.) probably be my  
 blood pressure.  
 S: - That's what it sounds like.

Most roughly, we can note that the trouble is initially dealt with in terms of its consequence for the work situation. In finer detail it appears that the fact that it is the work situation which is initially dealt with may be the product of a negotiation. Specifically, the candidate troubles-teller produces an item which is ambiguously an Absence- Relevant Report or an A.2.c. Troubles-Lead-Up; i.e., "I:'m going to try to go down to Doctor Stee:le to:da:y." (cf. Section I, Fragments A.2.c.(1) and A.2.c.(2), page 15). The ambiguity is left to be resolved by the co-participant and a slot is provided in which such work can be done (i.e., the (0.7) silence which follows the ambiguous utterance).

It is possible that the 'options' are not equivalently weighted; i.e., attention to the work situation may have priority over attention to the trouble (cf. the pressure towards 'business as usual'), unless some move is made to undercut that priority; unless coparticipant indicates that, between us and/or for this trouble, it is the trouble which will on this occasion be granted priority. If that is so, then the fact that the coparticipant says nothing, but leaves it up to prior speaker to decide which direction to take, does not mean that the choice is 'open'. Rather, the prior speaker is referred to the standard priorities, from which on this occasion there will be no reprieve; i.e., prior speaker is to understand that there is nothing between us or about the trouble which warrants an undercutting of the priority of attention to business over attention to the trouble. Whereupon, the candidate troubles-teller addresses business, "((swallow)) And Sally's at the sto:re."

Again, roughly, we can note that once the business is out of the way,

the trouble/misdeed is taken up. And again in finer detail, we might note that the way in which it is taken up is rather special. For one, following the conclusion of business there is a brief (0.2) silence. One possibility is that although coparticipant opted for the priority of business over troubles-talk, now that the business is concluded, the lower-priority matter will be taken up by the coparticipant with, e.g., some form of A.I.a. Inquiry. No such utterance occurring, the candidate troubles-teller volunteers a turning to the trouble.

Note that this unsolicited troubles-telling is formatted as somehow tied to the prior talk, as an explanation of something; i.e., as a "Because"-related item, "hh Because I(g) (.) you know I told mother what'd ha:ppened yesterday there at the party". Although unsolicited, the telling is not introduced as a matter of sheer choice but is formatted as 'called for'.<sup>1</sup>

1. Such formatting may constitute a device for the introduction of unsolicited materials. In the following fragment an unsolicited 'praiseworthy' is prefaced with 'because'. This fragment required and rewarded intensive analysis the results of which are not shown. We simply note that the 'because'-prefaced 'praiseworthy' is an unsolicited, volunteer offering.

The utterance is produced at a Civil Defense Headquarters in the state of Louisiana during a flood, by a civilian/stranger to the state. During a lull in the activities the civilian/stranger and the son of the Civil Defense Commander get into a conversation during which the boy turns to a wall map of the area and puts the civilian/stranger to a test.

(a) [CDHQ:II:276R]

- C: Could you- um show- Do you know where we are right now,  
M: n-Ye:ah? I'm gonna show you just where we a:re now let me see, we're right up here.  
C: Yeah,  
M: on:: four six six two Parkin- Parkinson. Right around the re.  
C: Yeah.  
M: Right?  
C: Right.  
M: → Cause I was out- Cause I been ferrying back and forth between he::re an::d Dickson Barrack.

That is, an information-bit which the civilian/stranger might well want to announce, which exhibits his usefulness, perhaps his courage, as well as his expertise. is introduced as 'called for' by prior talk.

The formatting of this volunteered talk about the trouble/misdeed as 'called for' by the talk in progress may constitute a solution to a general problem characterized by Harvey Sacks as a question which might be put to any item: "Why did you say that?" or "Why did you say that now?" (or, as my mother poses it, "Why are you telling me this?"). According to Sacks (Lecture, March 9, 1967, pages 4-5):

In so far as you can be seen as talking to a raised topic, then to some very considerable extent, that persons come to see your remark as fitting into the topic at hand provides for them the answer for how come you said it now. That is, the possible question is solved automatically. Upon hearing the statement, a hearer will come to see, directly, how you came to say that.

Sacks further notes that such a procedure can be used to "slip something in" without raising the issue of "Why this?" or "Why this now?"

In particular, the materials which are introduced as 'called for' by the talk in progress constitute the building of a case against overindulgence in alcohol, and for high blood pressure, as the source of "What'd ha:ppened yesterday there at the party". Introduced as they are, they may pass as not especially motivated; i.e., they are not to be seen as making a special point of getting this thing said, where its availability as especially motivated could raise the issue "Why are you telling me this?" (both "why this?" and "why to me?").

In fact, it appears that the talk is quite especially motivated. For one, speaker has good reason to suppose that coparticipant is talking about last night's incident. Just prior to this conversation she has been processed through the central switchboard and has been asked by one of the operators "Are you dying?" (included as an instance of A.l.a. Inquiry, Section I, A.l.a.(4) page 12). So the story is going the rounds. The issue is, what story? Speaker may be combinedly attempting to discover which story is being told, and to urge for the morally innocuous version; i.e., high blood pressure, without making that the official business of

the interaction; i.e., without explicitly asking "What have you been saying?" and without explicitly proposing "This is what to say." The formatting of this matter as 'called for' by, and thus as an embedded component of, the prior talk may be accomplice to such a program. "Accomplice to such a program, as well, may be the fact that the case is not addressed to the coparticipant but is embedded into a story in which the case is addressed to someone else.<sup>1</sup> That third party may be serving as a surrogate for this coparticipant; i.e., the crucial question is asked ("she asked me if it was because I'd had too much to dri:nk") and the crucial answer is given ("and I said no because at the ti:me I'd only ha:d,h you know that drink and a ha:lf..."), but not officially, explicitly, as between thee and me.<sup>2</sup>

The coparticipant produces talk which, on rough analysis, can be seen to be indicative that what she has been saying and will be saying selects the innocuous alternative. She rejects the alcohol theory, producing a "No::::" in the environment of the storied inquiry about too much drink, and goes on to concur with both the report of minimal drinking ("Ri:ght") and the proposed blood-pressure theory ("That's what it sounds like"). While concurrences are weak and unreliable indicators, the rejection of the alcohol theory, as a product of some independent assessment of the incident, might be strong.

In finer detail, however, it appears that the 'rejection' is also

- 
1. That it is the candidate troubles-teller's own mother who asked the crucial question may stand as a strong index of what can be expected from others and may, in part, have motivated the exercise in which this speaker is currently engaged.
  2. The distinction between 'embedded' and 'exposed' conduct of activities is a general phenomenon. It is considered by reference to one particular conversational activity-type in Jefferson, "On exposed and embedded correction in conversation, in J. Schenkein, ed., Studies in the Organization of Conversational Interaction, Vol II,

best seen as 'concurrence'. Specifically, the "No::::" does not follow the storied inquiry, but chimes in with the storied rejection. It is not until, and precisely upon, teller's self-quoted rejection of the alcohol theory, that recipient produces her own 'rejection' item,

M: she asked me if it was because I'd had too much to drink  
and I said no  
S: [N o : : : .

This configuration is powerfully reminiscent of materials we considered earlier, in which a troubles-recipient was characterized as 'taking a cue' from a troubles-teller, for the production of an interactionally reciprocal expression of empathy (see Section I, page 27, Fragment (1) and footnote 1).

R: if it's (.) just conjunctivitis but oh:  
M: [o h h : : : : : °

Likewise, recipient's rejection of the alcohol theory may be recognizably 'taking a cue' from prior speaker; i.e., an 'interactionally generated' display rather than an independently forged conviction, and thus specifically, systematically, unstable and unreliable.<sup>1</sup>

- 
1. We take the formulation 'interactionally generated' from Sacks, who considers the phenomenon by reference to a particular activity, the making of 'invitations'. He proposes that a crucial feature of 'interactionally generated' activities is that they are, recognizably, 'spur of the moment' matters which do not have the same status as recognizably independently-generated matters. In the case of invitations in particular, in the lectures, Spring 1968 May 29 pages 9-11 and Winter 1970 Lecture 5 pages 17-18, Sacks notices that recurrently interactionally-generated invitations are followed by such utterances as "Don't prepare very much", or "No, you come over here"; i.e., are treated as mutable and negotiable, a very different treatment from such invitations as might themselves generate an interaction (i.e., those for which someone phones to make the invitation).

In a later lecture, Spring 1972 Lecture 6 pages 8-10, Sacks points to another feature of 'interactionally generated' activities, again by reference to 'invitations'; that they can be seen as "the use of [that activity] to do something that is itself sequentially appropriate." That is, an interactionally generated activity may not only be recognizably spur-of-the-moment, mutable and negotiable; i.e., unstable, but may be recognizably produced to fulfill some local conversational requirement, and thus not necessarily indicative of the position its speaker might otherwise proffer; i.e., unreliable.

From the positioning of recipient's own 'rejection' item, we get a sense that recipient is awaiting the outcome of the storied interchange; is waiting to see which way the teller moves before committing to a position. Such behavior is altogether common, and we find instances of it at this very precise level of detail in a range of matters, from exhibiting 'recognition' to deciding whether a prior utterance ought to be greeted with laughter. However, in this case, the fact that such behavior can be produced by reference to this particular issue with its particular alternatives, may be deeply problematic, revealing that for this recipient the possibility of alcohol-overindulgence is perfectly viable.

In that regard we note that teller produces an 'override', pursuing the intersected utterance across the overlap and increasing in amplitude as the overlapping 'concurrency' persists.

M: I said no because at the t<sub>1</sub>:m3 I'd only ha:d,h-  
 S: [N o : : : : . ]  
 M: -you know that drink and a ha:lf . . .

That is, we find teller not merely disattending the problematic concurrence with the storied rejection of the alcohol theory, but pressing on with the storied rebuttal of that theory and thus, embeddedly presenting it, insisting upon presenting it, to the current coparticipant/past and future carrier of one or another version of the incident.

In this fragment, shown as a gross instance of a 'contaminated' troubles-telling, we see almost nothing of a Troubles-Telling, per se. With the ambiguous Absence-Report/Troubles-Lead-Up we have a potential troubles-telling, a possible initiation of a troubles-telling sequence. But it is preempted by two higher-priority matters (business and reputation), matters which are deeply implicated in the everyday business-as-usual world which we see again and again contraposed to attention to a trouble.

The second fragment by reference to the same incident occurs two weeks later, in a conversation between the candidate troubles-teller and a friend from outside the work situation. Teller has been recounting a recent holiday trip she took with the coparticipant of Fragment B.1.(1), in which they both competed for the same man and apparently teller won. As we join the conversation, teller is commenting upon the loser's circumstances.

B.1.(2) [JGII(a):1:ex:1-3]

- M: And it's a tremendous frustration you see.  
 J: [Ye:ah:::.\*  
 M: 'hh Because you know even like (.) oh two Sundays ago she and I went to a wedding of a very (.) dear little girl that we've both worked with. 'hhhh  
 J: [Ye:ah?  
 M: - A:nd uh: of course you know me and my blood pressure the minute I get (.) you know, (0.3) WHEE:::, and there it goes:=-  
 J: =Yea(h)h,  
 M: 't'hhhh O:kay so one of my girlfriends had told me that uh she had been threatened with being fired  
 .  
 . ((ca. 55 lines omitted re. threatened girlfriend))  
 .  
 M: So anyrate this got me upse:t and then a couple of other things got me upset, and so I passed the first round of drinks at (0.2) a:t lunch, 'hhhh a:nd uh I went and I got a (.) drink for myself on a second round of drinks.=  
 J: =Yea-h,  
 M: [Well this is a:bnormal for me anywa:y? so: (.) 'hhh I had that drink and then we all got in the recei:ving line. Well all I had a chance for was like (0.2) a thir:d of a second dri:nk,=  
 J: =Yeah,  
 M: which I had put down,  
 J: Yeh.  
 M: [not to drag it through the recei:ving line.  
 J: [Ri:ght.  
 M: 'hhhh So we went to the table? I had a fruit cup, (.) I had a glass of champagne and immediatly blacked ou:t. (0.4)  
 J: nYou're kidding.  
 M: M-mm. 'khkh So whether it was the blood pressu:re that had built up because I was=  
 J: =Are you prone to do that?  
 M: Yah.  
 (0.3)  
 J: Oh you are.  
 M: Ya::uh

- (0.2)
- M: Very hypertensive=  
 J: =°Oh::: gee.°  
 M: [This kind of thing. Course Rick checked me la:st Sunday and said nah you don't have any high blood pressure I said well then you know kiss my mm::.=
- J: =°Oh (G:o:d.)°  
 M: [°h h h h be:cau:se (.) well something did it whether it was like a to:xic reaction to the fresh fruit I had I don't really know what it was but all of a sudden I was (.) blacked ou:t.  
 J: °Gosh:::°  
 M: So I say to the man sitting next to me I said would you get the lady at the next table and have her go with me to the ladies room. I said I really feel very ba:d.  
 J: Ya:h,  
 M: °t°h h h h So we went to the ladies room well of course immediately they called a doctor that was at the party and he said do you want me to call you an ambulance and I said no I'm fine if you'll just leave me alone and let me re:st. °h h h h Alright now I was in a cold sweat, I couldn't get my brea:th.  
 J: °Oh:h ( )°  
 M: [°h h h Alright first of all you do:n't do this when you've got too much boo:ze.  
 (0.3)  
 M: You get the co:ld sweats when you come ou:t. of having been pa:ssed out from too much boo:ze.  
 J: [Yeah.  
 J: But not before you go: d-  
 M: [°h h h h  
 (.)  
 J: ( )  
 M: [↑NO::: NEver.  
 (1.2)  
 M: We:ll? what was the word on Monday at the sto:re? (0.2) Mm: Go with Maggie. (0.3) °h h Sha gets flapped out and can't make it.  
 J: °Oh wo:::w.°  
 M: °t°h h h h We:ll you see during the interim. of waiting for the marriage ceremony to take pla:ce Sorrell had said to me, have you ever heard from Bo:n. °h h h And I said yes as a matter of fact I said I had a (.) da:rling letter from him . . .

Again, this fragment is very much an instance of Building a Case, and adequate analysis of the fragment requires an analysis of that phenomenon, which we are not prepared to provide. The fragment is shown in the first place simply as a gross instance of the 'contamination' phenomenon. We will, however, consider some of its features.

For one, we note a version of an A.2. Trouble-Premonitor followed by



a version of an A.3. Premonitor Response (see Section I pages 17-18).

M: A::nd uh: of course you know me and my blood pressure the  
minute I get (.) you know, (0.3) WHEE:::, and there it  
goe:s,=  
J: -Yea(h)h,

Roughly, this can be seen as an inversion of the standard A.2.-> A.3. configuration; i.e., a candidate trouble is posed as familiar and lightly-treatable (in contrast to the 'serious news' projected by many of the A.2. elements), and is received as such, recipient laughingly concurring. Such a configuration may process something which might otherwise constitute a 'trouble', as a projected incident in the forthcoming story, specifically not to become a source of troubles-talk, per se.

However, when the matter emerges, it is met with a B.2. Announcement Response; i.e., is treated as an Arrival at a to-be-talked-of trouble.

M: I had a glass of champagne and immediately blacked out.  
(0.4)  
J: nYou're kidding.

We can note that the trouble referred to in the 'inverted A.2.-> A.3' processing is rather different than the trouble which emerges; i.e., high blood pressure is one thing, a blackout is another. And indeed, as the talk unfolds, it appears that the distinction is relevant; recipient pursuing the blackout as consequentially different from high blood pressure, teller working to undercut the distinction. Specifically, recipient, who has concurred in a display of familiarity with the phenomenon of high blood pressure as an attribute of teller, exhibits unfamiliarity with the phenomenon of blackouts as such an attribute, inaugurating an inquiry with "Are you prone to do that?" What follows is a delicate interrogation sequence in which the blackout becomes ambiguously replaced by, or added-to with, something akin to high blood pressure; i.e., 'hypertension'.

- M: - I had a glass of champagne and immediately blacked out.  
(0.4)
- J: nYou're kidding.
- M: M-mm. 'khkh So whether it was the blood pressure that had built up because I was-
- J: - Are you prone to do that?
- M: Yah.  
(0.2)
- J: Oh you are.
- M: Ya::uh  
(0.2)
- M: - Very hypertensive-
- J: - "Oh::[:: gee."
- M: [This kind of thing.

While it seems clear enough that the matter which recipient is delicately pursuing is the blackout, it is not at all clear what the teller is so unforthcomingly confirming.<sup>1</sup> This may be due to a possible ambiguity generated by the fact that recipient's interrogation does not follow the announcement of the blackout, but intersects an in-progress accounting for the blackout which has included a reference to "the blood pressure which had built up". Thus, the inquiry "Are you prone to do that?" might conceivably be 'responding to' that utterance and addressing the blood pressure build-up rather than 'interrupting' that utterance to address the prior-mentioned blackout (cf. the 'response' versus 'interruption' ambiguity in Fragment A.(4), pages 82-83, considered on pages 86-87). Teller may be exploiting the possible ambiguity, confirming that which is in good faith confirmable; i.e., a tendency to high blood pressure, while perhaps seeming to confirm without actually doing so, that which cannot in good faith be confirmed; i.e., a tendency to sudden blackouts.

At one point in the interrogation, teller proffers an item, "Very

-----

1. The acknowledgment tokens in this series constitute various forms of the phenomenon Pregnant Confirmations which we are undertaking to study (cf. page 8, and page 81 footnote 1. re. Fragment A.(3) page 80 and Fragment (1) page 81).

hypertensive", which might stand as that which is, and has been, being confirmed; i.e., a 'clarification' now locating what it is, specifically, that teller has a tendency to, and thus replacing 'blackout' as the matter to which they are talking. And it is possible that the recipient is, with the affiliative "Oh::: gee", accepting the substitution without explicitly addressing the fact of substitution, and acknowledging its status as a trouble in its own right, independent of the problematic and now abandoned issue of a tendency to sudden blackouts.

However, the talk which teller goes on to produce is ambiguous for the abandonment of a tendency to sudden blackouts. Specifically, teller produces an instance of a 'generalized list completer', "This kind of thing."<sup>1</sup> This device, which has its home as last of a series of adjacent items, can operate on a range of items mentioned at various points in some ongoing talk, assimilating them as co-members of a list although they have not occurred in the prototypical list format; i.e., adjacently. Thus, the talk which has been capped with a 'generalized list completer' can have been confirming the presence of a series of aspects of a trouble, collected as candidate list co-members; i.e., a tendency to sudden blackouts, high blood pressure, and hypertension. On the other hand, in as much as these items have not been produced adjacently but are to be list-assembled from various points in the talk, it is not clear which are being invoked as list co-members, where perhaps the more distal and dissimilar candidate; i.e., the tendency to blackouts, was not intendedly assimilated.

Further, it is not at all clear what sort of event the 'blackout' was. In particular, the minimal acknowledgment token "M-mm." which follows the

-----

1. For a consideration of a range of features of lists, see Jefferson, "List construction as a task and resource," a paper presented at the First German-British Research Colloquium on Ethnomethodology and Conversation Analysis, Konstanz, April, 1980.

B.2. Announcement Response and is itself followed by a D. Work-Up element, both invokes and replaces the sequentially appropriate next element; i.e., a C.1. Exposition, a version of which shows up on a recycle of the introduction of and response to the event.

M: but all of a sudden I was (.) blacked out.  
 J: "Gosh:::"  
 M: - So I say to the man sitting next to me I said would you get the lady at the next table and have her go with me to the ladies room. I said I really feel very bad.

However, this version of a C.1. Exposition refers to post-'blackout' events and does not focus on the 'blackout' itself. And as the exposition continues, we find reference to post-blackout symptoms ("now I was in a cold sweat, I couldn't get my breath") posed as specifically not those which follow "having been passed out from too much booze."

The combination of a deleted exposition of the blackout itself, and subsequent invoking of a crucial distinction between 'blacking out' and 'passing out' leaves it altogether unclear what had actually occurred. We do, however, get a sense that teller did not lapse into unconsciousness, and that the minimal acknowledgment token "M-mm." which follows the Announcement Response ("nYou're kidding." which, we take it, is addressed to a strong sense of 'blackout'; i.e., a lapse into unconsciousness) is being deployed to permit recipient to retain that understanding of the event while the teller has not actually claimed that such was the case.

In a range of ways, then, the talk is deeply ambiguous. These ambiguities may be accomplice to teller's managing talk about the event as combinedly a Trouble and a component of a Case Building, where the unresolved ambiguity as to its seriousness is addressed to the former aspect and the unresolved ambiguity as to its status as an instance of an illness-induced tendency is addressed to the latter. The unresolved ambiguities seem to be managing to preserve the possible facticity of a lapse

into unconsciousness and a tendency to such lapses across talk which is in various ways drastically undercutting just those candidate facts.

In an earlier consideration of an instance of Interactional 'Asynchrony' we noted the phenomenon of intersecting a faltering affiliative utterance with a 'response to' that utterance; an understanding and uptake of the thrust which is available in the material so far. (see pages 86ff). In the materials we are now considering, we note an instance of that phenomenon at a very delicate moment in the Case Building procedure. Recipient, who has just been confronted with an utterance which provides that either the lapse into unconsciousness which was invoked earlier did not occur, or else the circumstances now being described by teller perfectly fit the very thing teller is in the course of denying, is struggling to produce some kind of affiliation with teller's current proposal.

M: 'hhh Alright first of all you do:n't do this when you've got too much boo:ze.

(0.3)

M: You get the co:ld sweats when you come ou:t. of having been pa:ssed out from too much boo:ze.

J: [Yeah.

J: → B-ut not before you go: d-

M: [·hhhh

→ (.)

J: ( )

M: → [↑NO:::. NEver.

Teller, who has started to produce a next utterance; i.e., has taken a 'pre-speech inbreath', who has dropped out of the overlap in deference to recipient's talk, finding the developing affiliation now beginning to falter, launches a high-pitched, high-amplitude 'uptake', exhibiting that the affiliation-so-far was perfectly adequate and need not be brought to formal completion.

One feature of this fragment, which turns out to be recurrent for the Troubles-Talk/Case-Building convergence is what, for a Troubles-Telling, constitutes an enormously protracted and elaborated A.2.c. Lead-Up.

M: \*t'hhhh O:kay so one of my girlfriends had told me that uh she had been threatened with being fired  
 .  
 . ((ca. 55 lines omitted re. threatened girlfriend))  
 .

M: So anyrate this got me upse:t and then a couple of other things got me upset, and so I passed the first round of drinks at (0.2) a:t lunch, 'hhhh a:nd uh I went and I got a (.) drink for myself on a second round of drinks.=

J: -Yea-h,

M: Well this is a:bnormal for me anywa:y? so: (.) 'hhh I had that drink and then we all got in the recei:ving line. Well all I had a chance for was like (0.2) a thir:d of a second dri:nk,=

J: -Yeah,

M: which I had put down,

J: Yeh.

M: [[not to drag it through the receiving line.

J: [Ri:ght.

M: 'hhhh So we went to the table? I had a fruit cup, (.) I had a glass of champagne and immediatly blacked ou:t.

Roughly, there is a wealth of detail about the circumstances leading up to the troublesome event. One thing we can note is that the details are selected for their relevance to the trouble. So, for example, we find a detailed tracking of the number of drinks consumed, but also what appears to be a tracking of everything and anything consumed; i.e., we also find reference to a "fruit cup". But we can notice that the fruit cup appears later as a candidate cause of the 'blackout' ("whether it was like a to:xic reaction to the fresh fruit I had I don't really know") and we can notice that another candidate for such detailing is glossed as "lunch"; i.e., we do not get a list of what was eaten at that point.

The phenomenon, then, is selective detailing/glossing by reference to the trouble being told and/or the case being built. Following are several instances of this glossing/detailing phenomenon in Troubles-Talk 'contaminated' by Building a Case.

B.1.(3) [TCI(b):9:2]

J: I just called to make sure you were you know, (0.2) 'hh I didn't know whether you'd gone to work or what you know.

M: was going to go: to wor:k, hh 'hhhh I got a:fter you left I

- M: thought well I'll eat some breakfast and then I will go:  
to wor:k.hh  
(0.3)
- M: → 'hhhhh A:nd so: I: a:te a muffin?hh'hhhh and chee:se,hh  
(0.7) 'hhhhh And then I went to the bathroo:m? (1.5) 't  
'hhhh There was,h (1.6) a::nd I had a spoonful of cereal,  
J: Mm hm,  
M: → 'hhh And then I got a real bad stomach ache.  
\* (1.7)  
M: \* Like (.) when: (.) someone tied a knot in my stomach.  
\* (0.2)
- M: 'hhh So I lay dow:n and the next thing I know it was eleven  
o'clock:hh-hh  
J: heh-heh-heh-heh-heh-hih-hih-heh-  
M: -So I didn't go:.  
J: Ah,  
(0.3)
- J: No that's: okay,  
(0.5)
- J: Mh,  
(1.2)
- J: They can get along without you for a day or two,

In this case a trouble ("a real bad stomach ache") is offered as part of an accounting for absence from work. As in Fragments B.1.(1) and B.1.(2) it appears that the trouble is being offered for attention in its own right. Dramatically in this case, recipient declines to topicalize the trouble, per se, over the course of an offering and a re-offering (see asterisks), whereupon teller returns to the accounting narrative (cf. 'silence bodes ill', page 77).

Further, we can note that there is both elaborate detailing (the list of activities leading up to the introduction of the trouble) and some glossing which in part may be relevant to the Case-Building aspect of the talk. Specifically, the description "So I lay dow:n and the next thing I know it was eleven o'clock:hh-hh" is a gloss. For one, teller did not "lay down", she went back to bed. That is, stricken with a stomach ache, teller did not stretch out on the couch, still committed to the possibility of a routine day, but went into the bedroom and prepared for sleep; i.e., committed herself to a day away from work. For one, the distinction between couch and bed vis-a-vis commitment to the trouble is

recurrently found in troubles-talk (see, e.g., Section I, page 54, Fragment F.β.a.iv.(1), "but I'm better I was: lying on the couch out in front.") And in this case, in subsequent talk, recipient specifically formulates an inquiry by reference to this distinction.

J: 'hhh You been laying down on the couch or in the bedroom<sup>1</sup>  
 M: In the bedroo:m sleeping,  
 J: (Uh huh)

Secondly, the description-component "and the next thing I know it was eleven o'clo:hh-hh" turns out to omit details which would tend to focus off of the trouble and which is possibly skipping an initial wakening and return to bed. In subsequent talk we find that teller had been awakened by the cat and got up to let it out (data not shown). The talk is opaque as to whether or not that was the 11:00 wakening, perhaps specifically being rendered opaque by reference to the case which had been built earlier; i.e., the case for the stomach ache having occasioned an intendedly brief lie-down before going to work, that intention defeated by an illness-induced plunge into oblivion (cf. the ambiguous lapse into unconsciousness in Fragment B.1.(2), pages 100-101).

Thus, in concert with the general issue being negotiated here, that of the candidate 'trouble' as a possible 'misdeed', in this case, malingering, is the specific matter of sleep as a 'symptom' or 'indulgence'.

In the following fragment we find both detailing and glossing which

- 
1. At the conversation's close we find recipient invoking the distinction between a 'lie-down' and a return to bed. A standard troubles-attentive close component, "Get back to bed" is initiated and then abandoned for the local, problematic terminology.

J: Well listen. Get ba- You lay back down

Several utterances later, the distinction is given its full weight.

J: Are you gonna do anything? or you just gonna: (2.3) lay arou:nd.

A simplest distinction between 'couch' and 'bed' is that while one may or may not be fully dressed when lying on the couch, one is very likely not dressed when one is in bed. Such a commitment to going to



are accomplice to the building of a case.

B.1.(4) [Rah:I:1-3]

- V: Where did you get to last night,  
(1.0)
- J: Last- I dit (0.2) I didn't go anywhere?  
(0.4)
- V: Well Thoms rang to see if you were here,  
(0.7)
- J: 'hh 'Ohh:>:::.' hh Well ih was it last night. (.) Yes it w=  
-That's right it was last ni- 'hhh No I'd taken No:rman:::  
eh::m 'tlk to the uh (.) Sport Center in=  
V: -[hOhh:>:::>::: he'd [forgotten]  
J: -[Saltbern.'hhh [And I left]t a no:te.  
J: No I left a note for Thomas saying em 'hhh eh- I le-eh (.)  
because I know he's a little devil you kno:w, 'hh so I bahh!  
I (had) left a note to sa:y that (.) I'd be ba:ck. soo:n, 'hh  
And I put the ti:me on it. I said I've just taken Norman to  
the: (0.3) Center.  
(.)
- V: Yes.  
J: The Sport Center.  
V: 'Ahhh:>:::.'  
(.)
- J: And, (0.7) Well uh (.) 'What ti:me was it, 'h I left you at  
about twenty to fi:ve.  
(0.4)
- V: I don't know what time it was Jessie I can't remember really,  
J: [Ye:s, 'I left here at twenty ]  
to five and there was nobody i:n. Now I thought he would have  
come with me you see, 'hhh-  
[Ye:s,  
V: -Yes,  
V: [And Norm and I picked Norman up at te:n to:,  
J: (1.0)  
And then it tu- Well I had to go sfairly slo:w to Saltbern  
with the roads being ba:d,  
V: [It- Yes it would be: [Ye : s, ]  
J: [hhh [An:d th]en I got  
back and I (.) stopped in town just to buy some butter,  
(0.3)
- J: Cause [a- I was ou:t of butter,  
V: [Y : a : h , ]  
J: - 'hh And I came home. We:ll he was in tears: 'hh So:: that was  
it.  
V: Oh::.  
J: I don't know why:. I don't know what had upset him I'm sure-  
V: -Oh: dear.-  
J: -But I hadn't been go:ne that long I was ba:ck-  
V: [N o : : : : ]  
V: -[N o , ]  
J: -[here b]efore six,

Again, we find not only fine-grained detailing (e.g., the very brief

stop in town "just to buy some butter", which is itself treated as an accountable and gets warranted with "cause a- I was out of butter"), but some glossing which may be accomplice to the shape of this defensively designed building of a case which also has features of a 'complaint'. That is, we have a report of due care and attention to the boy's possible anxiety at his mother's (unavoidable but only slightly extended) absence, and a report of a somewhat hectic, elements-braving day at the services of the family, capped by arrival at home only to encounter this child who is crying for no discernable reason. That is, the telling is both a defense against teller being responsible for the child's tears, and a complaint about the fact that the child was in tears.

The glossing in question occurs in "'hh And I came home. We:ll he was in tears: . . . I don't know why:. I don't know what had upset him I'm sure." To get a sense of the glossing accomplished in this utterance, we show a conversation which occurs the next day between this teller and another coparticipant, who, it turns out, was also recruited by the boy into his search for his mother. In this conversation, the matters glossed in the above utterance are addressed rather differently.

B.1.(5) [Rah:II:11-12]

- J: → You know he'd been crying when I got back but=  
 I: = [H a - d h e :.]  
 J: = I was back before six.h'hh [I mean all I di:d, was  
 I: [Had he really.]  
 (.)  
 J: pick (No: rman up)  
 I: [Well I s]:said to him now(d) you let me know eh  
 Thomas are you alright, you(h)know,=  
 J: = [Mm:  
 I: = [hh Cause I thou:ght 'h well has he done something and- he  
 he's fri:ghtened to †sa[:y you k n o w,]  
 J: → when I came in I could s[ee he'd been ↓ crying]=  
 I: [Yass.°  
 J: =He said he hadn't.°  
 (0.2)  
 I: \*Ya:s:s:°  
 J: → [But- ee-ee \*two police ca:rs had\* stopped outside.=

I: -ecYe::s?  
 J: - [h And that whether he thou:ght that I had an  
 ac[ident or (some)th,ing I don't kno:w. but 'h  
 I: [I:: kno:w] [n+No:::..

Most roughly, the initial reference to the boy's circumstances is itself something of a gloss, carrying an information bit, "he'd been crying" but ambiguating it with a subsequent phrase which implicates, not an encounter with the aftermath of tears, but with then-and-there crying; i.e., "when I got back" (in contrast to, e.g., "before I got back" or "while I was gone", which would be consonant with and focus on the aftermath aspect).<sup>1</sup> Not only is the utterance itself ambiguous for its 'content', but it is immediately re-embedded into the current project, the building of a case, with "but I was back before six.h 'hh I mean all I di::d, was (.) pick No:rman up". Whatever richness there might be in such a report as that the child recognizably had been crying at some point and/but was no longer crying, is suppressed by the initial ambiguity and the subsequent re-embedding.

The utterance is strongly susceptible to a hearing as a version of "He was crying when I got back". That is, the gloss in the fragment at hand, like the gloss in Fragment B.1.(3) may implicate conditions contrary to the facts of the matter; in B.1.(3) teller's proposal that she "lay down" implicating 'on the couch', in the fragment at hand, teller's "when I got back" implicating that the child's crying was current. And, like B.1.(3), the facts of the matter emerge in response to activities of the coparticipant; in B.1.(3) in response to interrogation (see page

1. The analysis which treats the initial reference to the boy's circumstances as a 'gloss' and not, say, a sheer grammatical fault, and which seeks to account for the use of a glossed reference to an encounter with the aftermath of tears in this conversation, in contrast to a direct encounter with tears in the prior conversation, will not be shown here.

105), in the fragment at hand, in response to a powerful turning of attention to the boy's circumstances.

Specifically, the coparticipant competes with teller's case-building to topicalize the mentioned crying.

J: You know he'd been crying when I got back but  
 I: → [I was back before six.h 'hh I mean all I di:d,] [Had he really.]  
 [H a - d h e :.]

That is, a component of a case-building is specifically greeted as a B.1. Troubles-Announcement with a B.2. Troubles-Announcement Response. And subsequently, specifically when it is clear that teller is continuing with the case-building, coparticipant herself moves to produce some troubles-relevant talk; i.e., reports her own attention to the boy's observable distress and appends a diagnosis.

I: [[Had he really.]  
 J: [[I mean all I di:d, was  
 (.)  
 J: → pick (No: rman up)  
 I: → [Well I s':said to him now(d) you let me know eh  
 Thomas are you al:right, you(h)know, =  
 J: = [Mm:  
 I: → = [hh Cause I thou:ght 'h well has he done something and- he  
 he's fr:ightedened to tsa:y you know,

It is then, and perhaps specifically only then that teller offers her own attentions to the boy, and the diagnoses thereby generated. That is, teller may find herself called to account for her so-far apparent lack of concern for the boy's observable misery, and/or may discover that for this coparticipant his behavior is a resource for conversation (other than an inquiry into her whereabouts on the night). In any event, it is following coparticipant's strong and competitively-produced attention to the boy that teller, perhaps specifically reciprocally, offers a very different approach to the boy's tears from that in the prior conversation. In contrast to the defense/complaint-designed "We:ll he was in tears . . . "I don't know what had upset him I'm sure", we get "The o:nly thing I

could think of when I came in I could see he'd been ↓ \*crying he said he hadn't.\* . . . But \*two police ca:rs had\* stopped outside. 'h and that whether he thou:ght that I had an accident or something I don't know." And, whereas in the fragment at hand, we can see coparticipant aligning as a Troubles-Recipient by reference to the child's distress, we note that in the conversation from which Fragment B.1.(4) was extracted the coparticipant at no time offers reference to the boy's distress or her response to it. His telephone search has become a resource for an inquiry into the mother's whereabouts and no more. In this sense, then, each version of the events may have been, in no small part, shaped by reference to activities of the coparticipant.

In that regard, we offer one more fragment as an instance of glossing/detailing in Troubles-Talk 'contaminated by', converging with, the Building of a Case. Here, an initial glossing of some delicate materials is followed by a detailing, specifically in response to an aligning by coparticipant which recurrently does, and may specifically/<sup>be</sup> designed to, elicit such materials; i.e., the detailing occurs in a C.2. Affiliation- C.3. Affiliation Response configuration.

B.1.(6) [NB:IV:4:1-2]

E: Bud left me last night.  
(1.0)

E: - He got- ma:d and went off uhh huh huh!

L: ( )-  
(0.4)

L: Did he really?

E: Yeah. 'hh We were supposed to've gone out to dinner with Phil and Martha we were over there watching the ga:me and, 'hhh he had a beer, and I had a m-martini, and then we came over and uh-lee I had your thing th-thawing out you know, that ri:ce stuff. And I thought well if we don't go out I'll have that and- 'hh he says well you know, you've got to put that back in the rih- 'hh you don't put it back in the freezer,hh when you- take it out, and I said well I know tha:t,  
(0.3)

E: You know, 'hhhh And then when he kh- came in when ah- uh from fishing and I said gee lookit I did all the,hhhh

- E: things with aw-vacuum cleaner I've been all over the v-f-well, he says well how could you do it- uh:: did you do a good jo:b,hh 'hnh Well that teed me o:ff,lhh
- L: 'hnhhuhh hnhh [huhh?]
- E: -- [hnhh So he packed his clothes, and he went, and he says he won't even be down for Thanksgiving. So I think I'll call Marian and cancel the whole thing.hhm  
(2.0)
- E: Isn't this ridiculous, and, and Phil and Martha waiting out there to go to dinner, and I had to go tell them- Isn't he ridiculous,  
(0.9)
- L: \*-> He's crazy.  
(0.6)
- E: \*-> Oh:: God dammit, I said it's too bad the boat didn't sink yesterday

For one, we notice a detailed tracking of alcohol consumption ("he had a beer, and I had a m-martini"). In this case it appears that teller is exploiting the Primary Account status of alcoholic consumption vis-a-vis troublesome events, that status which, in Fragments B.1.(1) and (2), the teller is attempting to undercut.<sup>1</sup> That is, something which is built

1. It is not only that alcohol consumption may stand as a general Primary Account, but that for these coparticipants it is recurrently invoked. For example, in the following fragment, a conversation is reported in which things rather got out of control. To unravel the maze of names and relationships here, Isabel and Dwight are newly-married. Bob is a friend. Joe is the name of Isabel's deceased prior husband, as Beth is the name of Bob's deceased wife. At one point in the conversation Bob, perhaps inadvertantly, addresses Isabel with his deceased wife's name, whereupon Isabel retorts by addressing Bob with her deceased husband's name.

(a) [NB:IV:10:16]

- L: -- They had quite a few drinks at home and then when we went down there to eat they had quite a few drinks=
- E: [Mm-hm,
- L: --and this fella, Bob that owns the place, he goes to, down to Rancho Las Madrinas, so we had a lot in co<sub>m</sub>mon you know,
- E: [Mn: :hm,
- L: -- 'hnhhh So he was kind of feeding them drinks and so finally (hh)he- 'hh his uh, wife that died's name is Beth (hh)you(h) know'hh(h)and hnh'h'h so he says well now Beth? uh you just (hh)be quiet and sh(h)e sa(h)ys Isabel (h)you know and she's so funny 'hhh she says okay Joe,hhh-hah ha:h!'lhh
- E: [She-Oh did she,
- L: And Dwight is a gentleman you know Oh he doesn't like anything like that=
- E: [n:No.
- L: --[Course Isabel, she- she watches her Ps and Qs you know,

into the report as, say, mentioned because it was there, is in fact a matter of causal import, cf. the mention in Fragment B.1.(2), page 103, of the fruitcup which is subsequently explicitly proposed to have possible causal import ("whether it was like a toxic reaction to the fresh fruit"). In the case at hand, the relationship of alcohol consumption to the reported trouble is left implicit.

In contrast to the detailing of a possible cause, we find a glossing of a possible precipitating factor which is serially uncovered. Note that initially the situation is formulated as "Bud left me"; i.e., as an action undertaken possibly on his own initiative (cf. Fragment A.(1) page 76, in which a husband has left his wife for another woman). The leave-taking is subsequently revealed to be possibly locally- interactionally-generated; i.e., "He got mad and went off". As the Exposition develops, it turns out that, that he got mad and went off had to do with the fact that a range of objectionable things he happened to be doing got teller mad; i.e., "Well that teed me o:ff".

What is emerging, then, is not an abandonment, but the consequences of a row, and a row in which teller may have made the 'initial move' (i.e., the husband might with perfect justice report "All I said was . . . and she got mad!"). However, "Well that teed me o:ff" is at best an obscure carrier of an information bit (cf. Fragment B.1.(3) "So I lay dow:n" and Fragment B.1.(5) "He'd been crying when I got back", the consideration of this issue on page 108). That is, it is one thing to get angry, another to direct that anger at a coparticipant, and the utterance does not select on that score. The report of events leading up to the departure is closed off with teller's contribution still obscure; i.e., following "Well that teed me off" we get "So he packed his clothes, and he went".

It is only subsequently and, as in Fragments B.1.(3) and (5), specifically in response to recipient's activities, that the glossed anger becomes detailed. In this case, the detailing emerges in a C.2.-C.3. configuration, in response to a display of affiliation by the recipient.

L: He's crazy.  
(0.6)

E: Oh:: God dammit, I said it's too bad the boat didn't sink<sup>1</sup>

What emerges, then, and what may specifically be defended against in this combined Troubles-Telling and Case-Building is that a series of objectionable behaviors which, in circumstances other than the hectic comings and goings and alcohol imbibings and preparations of a holiday just slightly less important and demanding than Christmas, might be tolerated are, under these circumstances, found to be intolerable and are responded to with anger which itself is responded to with anger, the ensuing row resulting in a walkout. That is, teller may have, on this particular occasion, made a fight out of what might otherwise be recurrent and acceptable or at least tolerable behaviors of her husband.

This particular troubles-telling converges with and is 'contaminated by' the gradual emerging of and defending against, or at least

1. The sort of talk which occurred in the reported row, instanced and represented by this utterance, turns out to have been consequential. In a subsequent conversation, teller reports a conversation with her daughter, in which she was attempting to organize the family's Thanksgiving dinner despite the current troubles.

(a) [NB:IV:10:6]

E: [She says] if you and Dad are having a fight, why, Hugh and I don't want to be involved, I said well we're not fighting, and she says well Dad says you want to kill him, and-'hhhhh and I'd said a couple of things you know I hoped he dropped dead and uh:::

L: Yeah,

E: And he said he wanted to kill me and all, you know how you talk,

E: I'd never said I wanted to kill him, or anything like that, I said I hoped the sank or something



the excusing/warranting of, a possible 'misdeed'; i.e., that it was the teller who started a fight which resulted in her husband's walking out.

The following fragment is of particular interest with regard to the issue of how and where something may be seen to have started. So, for example, in several of the fragments in this current array, that an 'accounting' is relevant, is made evident by the candidate troubles-recipient. In Fragment B.1.(1) we have the report of the mother's inquiry, "She asked me if it was because I'd had too much to dri:nk and I said no because...". In Fragment B.1.(4) we have the soliciting of an account, "Where did you get to last night," and in Fragment B.1.(3) we have an eliciting of an account, "I didn't know whether you'd gone to work or what."<sup>1</sup> Similarly, in the materials from which Fragment B.1.(5) was extracted, the business is initiated when the coparticipant produces an account-elicitor, "Eh::: when was it Thur:sday, 'h eh: Thomas rung to see if you were he:re." Fragment B.1.(7) below is rather more delicate. In this case, the relevance of accounting emerges from an intense C.2.-C.3. Affiliation sequence (see Section I, C.2.-C.3.(5) page 25 for the C.1. Exposition materials preceding the exchange of empathies).

B.1.(7) [Fr:HB:II:6-8]

P: I don't know if you're cryi-ing but I hhh(h)a<sub>hhhm</sub> uh hm: ]  
 J: = "hhh" ]  
 P: = "hhh"  
 J: = "h I was guh- I- middle of the night la-ast night I  
 want<sub>hh</sub>hed<sub>hh</sub> to<sub>hh</sub> c(h)all (h)y(h)ou "mhhh! I s a i d Oh: I=  
 P: [Uh hh- ]  
 J: =wish I was at lunch so I could go talk to Penn(h)y hh=  
 P: =Righ(h)heh "h-hhh  
 J: =hh "hhh [(Cause) that's what I was rea:lly,

1. Anita Pomerantz talks of such objects as 'fishing devices', "where the telling of an experience serves as a possible elicitor of information." Specifically, she proposes that such a report can be "heard as a matter to account for." For a consideration of this phenomenon, see Pomerantz, "Telling My Side: 'Limited Access' as a Fishing Device", in Sociological Inquiry 50:3-4, 1980.

- (0.2)  
 J: [(Dut-)  
 P: [Ohhhh,  
 (0.3)  
 J: n-I don't know. I really do feel better now. 'hh hhh  
 P: [You d-Okay.-  
 J: -I really really do so don't (0.2) hh don't be upset for me  
 hhh [hnh 'hh  
 P: [u-huh-ah-Well I (h)a:m.-  
 J: -[hhhh - h i h] 'hhhh  
 P: - [But- you know] it-uh- 'hh I said to myself, I tried you all  
 morning long and it was really busy. 'hhhh hhh an:::d  
 J: - [Yea]h, [Yeh I  
 was sleeping my mother was answering, hh hh  
 P: [hh So-  
 P: Alri:ght. Then, 'right, ' that's good. That's good. 'hh But so  
 I've been trying all along and I thought maybe that you  
 took the phone off the hook. so it wouldn't (.) be too busy  
 'hhhh but any- It's t-good that I didn't get to you this  
 morning cause I just would've, (0.2) you know. I would've  
 been more upset than you wehhere Ihh thh [h i n k , ] 'hh]-  
 [huh-huh-h]uh  
 J: -[hnh: 'hnh 'hhhhh]  
 P: -[Not more upset, but] you know what I mean.-  
 J: -Yhea(h)hh(h) I(h) do (hnh)  
 P: [And then I said to myself this  
 afternoon that (.) uh:m, 'pt 'hhhh (0.7) ((swallow)) You know?  
 she's gonna do it. It's gonna be a-alri-ight.  
 (0.2)  
 J: (mYeh) I that's that's ex:actly how I feel right now.

In the course of this enormously affiliative troubles-talk we suddenly find a prototypic instance of an account-elicitor followed by an accounting (see arrows).<sup>1</sup> This rather drastic departure from affiliative talk is specifically produced as an embedded insert; i.e., an utterance is started with "I said to myself," that utterance is abandoned for the account-elicitor, and the accountings are followed by a return to that utterance, "And then I said to myself..." which debouches in an intense display of affiliation. That is, the accountings are oriented to as problematic, are initiated in such a position as will provide for their being followed by a return to an exchange of affiliations.

1. For an array of instances similar to the arrowed utterances in Fragment B.1.(7), see Pomerantz, *ibid.*

A question is, why the sudden (and problematic) appearance of accountings in an otherwise intensely affiliative interchange? It is possible that this business has been generated by something which occurs in the initial C.2.→C.3. pair. Specifically, it is possible that the C.3. element, teller's Affiliation Response, a reference to an urgent wish to talk to this troubles-recipient ("Middle of the night last night I wanted to call you I said oh: I wish...I could...talk to Penny") has set up as accountable the fact that this troubles-recipient has not made contact until the following evening.

In his lecture of May 29, 1968, pages 10-11, Sacks notes that an activity may be 'interactionally generated'; i.e., may be produced to accomplish some local conversational task. "Once, however, that activity has been done, then it gets dealt with on its own terms, and not by reference to how it came to be done; i.e., independently of the sort of thing it was directed to accomplishing." The result, he proposes, can be a series of activities which appear to be "tangential" to each other.

This characterization appears to handle the occurrences in the fragment at hand. That is, the item generated out of and directed to the business of a C.2.→C.3. pair is then dealt with on its own terms, independent of how it came to be done in the first place. And in its own terms, reference to troubles-recipient's deeply felt absence on the night of the incident readily invokes the relevance of and elicits an accounting for her unavailability over the entire next day. And it is transparently the case that in subsequent talk, troubles-recipient is accounting for and rationalizing the delayed contact (e.g., "I tried you all morning long and it was really busy", "I've been trying all along," "It's t-good that I didn't get to you this morning cause I just

would've, (0.2) you know. I would've been more upset than you wehhere").

However, that the troubles-recipient was defeated in her attempts to reach troubles-teller, itself constitutes an utterly standard accountable event, and troubles-recipient's accounting of her delayed contact with troubles-teller constitutes a prototypic instance of an account-elicitor, which gets a prototypic account (i.e., the arrowed utterances). Again, then, an item directed to accomplishing one sort of business (an accounting for delayed contact) is then dealt with on its own terms (as an account-elicitor), independent of how it might have initially come to be done and what it might have initially been directed to accomplishing.

And there are further complications. While troubles-teller's account, "I was sleeping my mother was answering", might be directed to accounting for the line being engaged when troubles-recipient tried to phone, it raises problems for troubles-recipient's proposal that "I tried you all morning long"; i.e., others were getting through. Troubles-recipient had observably not made it a primary business to get through; i.e., had not simply sat down at the phone and kept dialing and redialing as one must do to break through on a "really busy" line.

And troubles-recipient now specifically acknowledges and deals with the occasioned relevance of that fact; i.e., accounts for her failure to make a project of getting through to troubles-teller by offering a candidate alternative account, "I thought maybe that you took the phone off the hook." In the Progress Report we gave some consideration to the phenomenon of reported 'first thoughts', specifically as assertions of 'things as they should be'. Here we find a rather similar phenomenon, a reported conjecture on some matter, delivered after a proposed state of affairs by reference to which the conjecture stands as inaccurate.

It appears that a locus of such a configuration is when the proposed 'actual' state of affairs implicates a problematic account of a coparticipant's activities. So, for example, in the following fragment, an account elicited in similar fashion to that of Fragment B.1.(7), itself raises problems of a similar sort (in B.1.(7), that troubles-recipient did not make numerous enough attempts, in Fragment (1) below, that a coparticipant did not let the phone ring long enough on a single attempt; i.e., "by the time I got out here it had stopped ringing.").

(1) [NB:IV:11:2]

- E: I was over to see you yesterday, but you must've been taking a nap I rang the bell, and then I ca:lled you later in the evening,  
(0.7)
- E: I don't know where you were. [May-  
M: - [Oh I'll tell you uhm:: 'hh I  
- uhm 'hh heard the phone I was watching television, by the time I got out here it'd stopped ringing.  
E: [Yah.  
E: - Yeah well I let it ring about ten times I thought well now maybe you're in the bathtub.  
M: [No no::,  
M: No, uh [with the tele-vision on you know half [the time you-  
E: [hhhah heh [hhhh [Yea::ah.  
M: -don't hear it.

The two reported 'conjectures' are similarly formatted, each following a recycled version of the initial formulation of the attempt to make contact. In Fragment (1) the initial formulation is "I ca:lled you", the recycled version plus reported conjecture is "I let it ring about ten times I thought well now maybe you're in the bathtub". In B.1.(7) the initial formulation is "I tried you all morning long", the recycled version plus reported conjecture, "I've been trying all along and I thought maybe that you took the phone off the hook".

In Fragment (1) the recycled formulation of the attempt tends to counter the possible proposal that the phone did not ring long enough, and the reported conjecture tends to support the counter-proposal. In

recycled formulation of the attempt tends to concur with the possible proposal of insufficiently numerous attempts, invoking a now-and-then tapping in, and the conjecture tends to support the initial possible proposal, accounting for the now-and-then tapping in.

However, while tending to support the possibility that insufficiently numerous attempts were made, the reported conjecture also proposes this fact as, not a possible inadequacy; i.e., not a 'misdeed', but a sensitivity to the trouble. That is, the innumerable attempts are now posed as a response to the possibility that troubles-teller is denying access to callers, in which case repeated attempts would be futile, and, crucially, would be persisting in attempts to achieve just what troubles-teller is being proposed to have been protecting herself against; i.e., unwanted intrusion on her privacy. In effect, then, the reported conjecture poses the current troubles-recipient as having found her attempts at contact rejected, and having had the sensitivity to accommodate to that rejection by not persisting in repeated attempts to "get to" the troubles-teller.<sup>1</sup>

In Fragment B.1.(7), then, an enormously intricate series of accountings and case-buildings is generated out of a component of an

1. Despite this work, in a subsequent reference by troubles-teller to the delayed contact, we find that it nevertheless constitutes a 'failure', now in two observable ways. For one, it is formulated as, "if you'd called this morning", where an acknowledgment of the (warrantedly sparse) attempts might use a formulation similar to that used by troubles-recipient; i.e., not "if you'd called", but "if you'd got to me" or "if you'd reached me". Secondly, it turns out that someone else has gotten in ahead of this troubles-recipient (again, then, access was not denied, this one just did not try hard enough), and has accomplished something which this troubles-recipient has not.

(a) [Fr:HB:II:11]

J: (h)I mean really \*if you\* called this morning I don't know what I whould(h)'ve do:ne,

P: [wuhhheh(h)yeh ri [ g h t . ]  
[But I was]even

J: - able to A(h)amy called befhhore, 'hhh and she even made  
- laughhhheh-heh!

orderly-progressing series within a troubles-talk segment. That is, not only do candidate troubles seem to be enormously susceptible to 'contamination by' other types of activities, as in Fragments B.1.(1)-(6), but talk about a trouble, and the various coparticipant alignments, obligations, etc., involved therein can specifically generate activities which tend to disrupt the step by step progression of a troubles-talk sequence, as in Fragment B.1.(7).

The phenomenon of Building a Case, as a 'contaminant' to Troubles-Talk, although it generates a tension as between 'trouble' and 'mis-deed', is essentially uni-valent, with a particular set of circumstances as its focus. The second major type of 'contaminant', Negotiating a Plan, generates a tension between 'trouble' and 'obstacle', but also introduces a competing set of circumstances. A series of instances will be considered.

### B.2. Negotiating a Plan: The 'Trouble' as a possible 'Obstacle'

We start with a gross instance of the phenomenon, in which someone phones with a project in mind and discovers that the intended coparticipant in that project has a trouble which may be consequential for the project.

B.2.(1) [TCI(b):7:1-2] ((Opening unrecorded; L is caller and is identifying herself.))

L: Jo:dy's mothe:r?  
(0.6)

C: Oh ye<sup>h</sup> ((very hoarse, here and throughout the conversation))

L: [Jo:dy Lih- tempi,

C: Oh: yeh,  
(0.2)

L: - Are you si::ck,

C: - 'tch u-Yeh I got the flu.

L: Aoh:::uh [hnh, hnh ha ha-ha-ha]

C: [h- [hhhhh] ]h-hh-hk]

(.)

C: [[<sup>h</sup>

L: - Well that ni:ps it in the bu:d, 'hh I was gonna ask you if you could keep Jo:dy for a c(h)ouple hours but you can't if you got the flu::.

C: 'tch I wouldn't want him around me ho:n, 't [ 'h h h h h h h h h h ]  
L: [ n'ho: : : : , ]  
C: -cause uh: I've really got it.  
(.)  
L: y:Yo-u sure-  
C: [ I-  
(.)  
C: But I'd be glad to do it if I wasn't sick.  
L: e-You sure sound aw:ful. [ ( hoarse. ) ]  
C: [ 't Oh: : : my God ] I been 'h h h running  
the highest temperatures you ever sa:w.  
L: Oh my go:sh well let me hang up and let you get back to ba:d=  
C: -eh h u h - u h h h h h u - h h u - ]  
L: [ So:rry ] I disturbed you. ]=  
C: -How you doin hon=  
L: -Oh just fi:ne.

Most roughly, we note that the trouble is talked about by reference to its consequence for the project; i.e., will the fact that teller has the 'flu' stand in the way of her minding recipient's little boy. The presence of a symptom (hoarseness) and the announcement of 'flu' does not in itself terminate the possibility that the project can be carried out; a feature of the term 'flu' is that it is applied to almost anything, and may here be naming something quite mild, and a feature of hoarseness is that it might be residual and not at all debilitating. So, for example, in the following fragment, a hacking cough which is treated by recipient as possibly very serious, turns out to be residual, and specifically no obstacle whatsoever to the daily routine of the candidate troubles-teller.

Although this fragment was selected for the issue of a non-debilitating symptom, it happens that here, as well, the candidate troubles-recipient has phoned to transact some business which will require the candidate troubles-teller's coming in to take delivery on some goods; i.e., the business is dependent on the candidate troubles-teller's being able to carry out the daily routine and thus the possible trouble constitutes a possible obstacle to that project.

B.2.(2) [Rah:A:1:(2):1]

J: - k h h h - h u h k h h - h u h k h h 'h h h Hello there I [ da: 'h h h  
I: [ Oh: dea:r me: . ]



J: kh  
 I: =A re=You still've got i:t.  
 J: [kh  
 J: Oh yes. I was pretty bad y(h)esterday. [hhh-  
 I: [Oh::: dih-  
 I: - You're not in bed are you,  
 J: - No: ?no :no I'm- I'm going shopping] eh h eh [eh  
 I: - [Oh: have I disturbed y o u] [Parion?  
 J: - I'm just going shopping I'm late actually, [theh eh  
 I: [Yeh well I  
 - wondered whether you were still in be:d or (0.2) or going  
 (. ) out shopping? or what. 'h h Well there's eh: few  
 things arrived for you, ]  
 J: [ekh-huh ekhh  
 J: Well goo:d.

Further, it appears that a locus of 'unprocessed'; i.e., non-downgraded, references to a trouble is following such recipient-solicitations and elicitation as are found in Fragments B.2.(1) and (2) respectively; i.e., following "Are you si::ck," we find "'tch u-Yeh I got the flu." and following "You still've got i:t." we find "Oh yes. I was pretty bad y(h)esterday." Thus, the sheer assertion of 'flu', as well as the presence of a possible symptom, are in a range of ways unreliable indices.

And in a range of ways, it appears that although the candidate troubles-recipient in B.2.(1) announces absolute withdrawal of the project, "Well that ni:ps it in the bu:d," she is allowing for and perhaps specifically pursuing its carrying out. For one, there is available an alternative direction, which is taken subsequently; i.e., further talk to the trouble itself ("You sure sound aw:ful"). Instead, the project is presented. And in its presentation we find details which may tend to promote the project. First of all, there is a mention of the briefness of the intended period of babysitting ("for a c(h)ouple hours "). And in transparent cases of negotiation vis-a-vis a project, that it will only take a little while is a standard component. Secondly, the proposed reason for abandoning the project ("but you can't if you got the flu:::") may be operating as a proposal offered for possible confirmation or

disconfirmation. Further, the proposed grounds for abandonment of the project are specifically disattentive to what ought to be a crucial concern, if the 'flu' is being treated seriously; i.e., it ought not to be that the candidate troubles-teller "can't" take on the job, but that if she is sick, the child ought not be exposed to her. Thus, in this utterance which announces itself as abandoning the project, we find a minimizing of the task (only a couple of hours) and of the candidate obstacle (not serious enough to generate concern about contagion), leaving it to the troubles-teller, now having heard the nature of the job, to confirm or disconfirm that she "can't" take it on.

And in the utterance which confirms that the project ought to be abandoned, teller seems to be addressing the seriousness of the 'flu' by reference to possible contagion ("I wouldn't want him around me ho:n"). We note, however, that the utterance is ambiguous. It is at least conceivable that what is being addressed is the child as a nuisance to a sick person rather than (or as well as) the sick person as a source of contagion to the child. To understand it as a display of concern for the child we must refer to and rely upon our knowledge of the conventional proprieties and assume that the troubles-teller does have those proper concerns. The utterance itself is ambiguous, as are the subsequent elaborations ("Cause uh: I've really got it" and "but I'd be glad to do it if I wasn't sick").

In another fragment we find a very similar sort of ambiguity and a very similar series of elaborations. In contrast to the above, however, in Fragment (1) below, the final elaboration is unequivocal. The situation is this. The adolescent son of divorced parents has driven down to visit his mother. At some point in the visit his car was vandalized. He has left the car with his mother and is now flying home, unbeknownst

to his father who is expecting his arrival by car, has phoned the mother to find out the E.T.A., and is given the news. What we see emerging in the talk is, not a concern for the boy, but for the car; where a possible issue is, has the boy been irresponsible, simply abandoning a problem as adolescents are wont to do; i.e., is the boy's status that of someone with a trouble, or the perpetrator of a misdeed?

(1) [MDE:60-1:2:1-2]

- M: 'hhh So I took him to the airport he couldn't buy a ticket.  
(.)
- M: 'hhhh bee- he could only get on standby.  
(0.3)
- T: Uh hu:~h,  
M: [And I left him there at about noon.  
(0.3)
- T: Ah ha:h.  
(0.2)
- M: And uh,h  
(0.2)
- T: → What's he gonna do go down and pick it up later? or something like ( )=
- M: [H i s friend]  
T: → [Well that's awful.  
M: Yeh h<sub>i</sub> is friend Stee-  
T: → [That really makes me w:d.  
(0.2)
- M: 'hhh Oh it's disgusting as a matter of fact.  
T: → [P o o r J o e y.]

The initial assessment ("Well that's awful") may be an attempt to repair what, interactionally, might constitute a display of more interest in the car's return than in the boy's circumstances, and what, sequentially, might constitute a move into a D. Work-Up segment in the absence of an appropriate next item to a C.1. Exposition. Specifically, some form of C.2. Affiliation might be appropriate in the vicinity of the description of the boy's problems at the airport, that description having been received as sheer 'information' (cf. Fragment A.(?) page 77 with its non-troubles-receptive "Uh huh"s). The result, however, is the juxtaposition of a generalized assessment with the statement of concern for the

car's return, an environment in which that assessment might conceivably be heard as directed to the boy's abandonment of the car.

The subsequent assessment ("That really makes me ma:d") may be an attempt to repair that possible hearing. The subsequent assessment may be specifically 'type fitted' to such a trouble as vandalism and to such perpetrators as vandals; i.e., selected to clearly exclude the boy as its referent. As it happens, however, this assessment is also applicable to the problematic alternative; i.e., to the boy's abandonment of the car. The circumstances described here may be analogous to a problem Sacks addresses himself to in Lecture 27, Spring 1966, that of "hearing or not the correct word where a possible homonym is used," in an environment which provides strongly for hearing the homonym. Sacks refers to E. R. Leach's "Animal categories and verbal abuse" in Lenneberg, ed., New Directions in the Study of Language, which points out that "one can in routine talk, use a set of words which are more or less unprintable epithets, and they're not heard that way at all." Sacks proposes:

The tabooing of the hearing of obscene homonyms is extraordinarily interesting, in that when one has opened up the situation of obscenity, it is virtually unavoidable to hear almost anything that could be heard as obscene as, indeed, obscene. Once there is the possibility of an obscenity having been done, it takes rather a while to return to a non-hearing of the obscene possibility of the words used.

(Lecture 27 Spring 1966 page 5 edited)

In general, he points out that a given ongoing context may have a "linear extension in which it is perfectly reasonable to use what has been developed so far to understand a current item; i.e., to control what one hears," such that a "shift" in the direction of the talk will be heard by reference to the context so far; i.e., 'incorrectly'.

It is such a problem with which the speaker in Fragment (1) above may be grappling. Specifically, the juxtaposition of a statement of concern for the car's return and a generalized assessment which, by its

positioning, may be heard as directed to the boy's abandonment of the car, sets up a context in which the attempted "shift" of focus becomes, at best, ambiguated, and in which a remedially-deployed next assessment, intendedly 'type fitted' to the new matter, emerges as, again at best ambiguously also hearable by reference to the initial matter. Further, under the auspices of the persistent bi-valence of the talk so far, the recipient's concurrence "Oh it's disgusting", which does not explicitly disambiguate, may be heard as at least possibly concurring with the prior as an assessment of the boy's behavior and not the vandalism. As with the obscenity problem, once the context has been set, it is "virtually unavoidable to hear almost anything that could be heard as [blaming the boy] as, indeed, [blaming the boy]."

For "That really makes me ma:d" and the concurring "Oh it's disgusting to be unequivocally understood as addressing the vandalism and not the boy's behavior, requires application of a very similar sort of conventional proprieties to those we mentioned by reference to the ambiguous "I wouldn't want him around me ho:n" and its ambiguous concurrence, "nNo::::" in Fragment B.2.(1).

In contrast to B.2.(1), in which the ambiguous concurrence is followed by further ambiguity, in Fragment (1) we find the deployment of an utterly explicit, uni-valent item which resolves the ambiguity, and which we take to have been produced for just that purpose; i.e., we suspect that "Poor Joey" would not have occurred but for the emergence of the ambiguity problem. Roughly, this final assessment appears to be mis-fitted both to the talk this speaker has been producing throughout the interchange, and to the specific trouble-type it is addressing. In its context, it stands as out of place and over-solicitous. In psychological terms, the item may be seen to have been generated by the father's



ambivalence towards the boy; i.e., he does in fact blame the boy, is in fact angered by his abandonment of the car, and thus hears his own talk and his coparticipant's talk as, at best, not clearly enough not blaming the boy, and thus possibly as doing the very thing he is attempting to be heard as not doing. In that regard, the "Poor Joey," stands as a prototypic instance of the oversolicitousness which accompanies, and is an index of, ambivalence and denial of anger.

In Fragment B.2.(1), however, the ambiguity between concern for the child and concern for the troubles-teller is left unresolved. And it is possible that the troubles-teller is producing intendedly bi-valent talk; i.e., is indeed promoting an attention to the trouble while not explicitly saying "Poor me" and the devil take the child. On the other hand, the ambiguity may be a byproduct of an attempt to avoid being seen as instructing the mother on the conventionally proper grounds for abandoning the project; i.e., that it's not that teller "can't" but that the child should not be exposed to her, and that that ought to have been the mother's first concern. In that case, teller's "I wouldn't want him around me hon", etcetera, might be characterized as referring to while specifically not explicating those conventional proprieties, where a coparticipant who is properly aligned by reference to the conventions will properly understand the thrust of that utterance and thus come to see that, and how, her own prior utterance, "but you can't if you got the flu:", was improperly oriented.

In any event, the ambiguity in B.2.(1) is left unresolved, in contrast to the rather glaring resolution we find in Fragment (1). Further, in B.2.(1) the two ambiguous elaborations ("Cause uh: I've really got it" and "But I'd be glad to do it if I wasn't sick") are followed by a strong attention to the trouble by the candidate troubles-recipient cum

pursuer of a project; i.e., "You sure sound aw:ful. ( hoarse)." It is possible that this speaker, who had not in the first place attended the issue of possible contagion, simply was not oriented to that as an issue, being firmly oriented to the hope of finding a babysitter. In subsequent talk we find that she already had attempted to recruit someone else, but that one was going shopping. That this one has the 'flu' may be heard as a version of 'going shopping'; i.e., by reference solely to the issue of availability/unavailability. In such a context, under such an orientation, the issue of possible contagion may simply not arise, may not be heard as present in the ambiguous responses to her confirmable/disconfirmable proposal that the candidate babysitter "can't" undertake the task.

If that is so, what she will be hearing and concurring with is the child-as-nuisance to the candidate babysitter; i.e., a strong attention to the trouble and not an attention to the child, per se. Thus, her own subsequent attention to the trouble may be intendedly reciprocal to the troubles-teller's; specifically-accepting and acknowledging as warranted, the refusal to babysit and the otherwise improper reference to the child; i.e., as a nuisance. Her strong attention to the trouble, and its response, closely resemble a C.2.-C.3. configuration of recipient Affiliation followed by teller Affiliation Response; i.e., 'letting go' (cf. Section I, Fragments C.2.-C.3.(1)-(5) pages 24-25).

L: e-You sure sound aw:ful. ( hoarse.)  
 C: [t Oh: my God] I been 'hhh running the highest temperatures you ever sa:w.

However, in the environment of negotiations vis-a-vis a project for which the trouble constitutes a possible obstacle, the exchange becomes bi-valent. Specifically, the C.2. Affiliation constitutes a possible checkout as to the 'real' seriousness of the candidate trouble (here,



in contrast to the possibility of merely "sound[ing] awful"), and the C.3. Affiliation Response constitutes a possible offering of evidence of 'real' seriousness.

In other materials we find such exchanges clearly addressed to the 'real' versus merely apparent seriousness of a trouble. So, for example, in the following fragment, that distinction is transparently being addressed.

(1) [Fr:USI:57ff] ((J has announced he's having all his teeth removed))

V: Let me ask you this question.  
 J: Yeh.  
 V: - Are you getting toothaches?  
       (0.4)  
 J: - NO!  
       (0.2)  
 V: - [(Then don't )-  
 J: [[But I got cavities! You know e:very damn one of these teeth  
       in my mouth I can (move them)?  
 V: I a:s\_ked you-  
 J: [I've got, ]=  
 V: =I asked you a question.=  
 J: =Yeh affecting my::=  
 V: =Are you getting,  
 J: [stomach and my eyes.  
 V: - [Are you getting pai:n.  
 J: Yeah.  
       (0.7)  
 J: In here? (0.7) I get I-I feel a little pain here, (0.5) my  
       eye:s run water and I-I done had a friend of mine that we  
       [experienced the same thing.]  
 V: [I ain't talking] wait a min-] wait a minute no:w=  
 J: =My eyes run water which is ]threatening my eyesight=  
 V: =will you listen (to me). ]You got influenced-  
 V: =Listen.  
       (0.2)  
 V: - You got influe<sub>n</sub>ced, by some people.  
 J: [Yeh. ]eghhh!  
 J: eghhYeah.  
 V: Your stomach is bothering you and your eye:::s,=  
 J: =is running wa:ter,=  
 V: =are running wa:ter,  
 J: [And they're getting a little ba:d? (.) too,  
 V: - Now somebody told you tha:t's, (0.4) was your teeth.  
 J: [eghhh!  
 J: It's from my teeth I know damn well it's from my teeth. I got  
       bad teeth.  
 V: - Are you getting pai:n from your teeth.  
       (0.7)

- V: That's (what I asked you.)  
 J: - [Far as I know, I'm getting pain- As far as I know  
 I'm getting pain from my teeth.  
 V: - Well then take them out.

We find what might be called 'indices of real trouble', oriented to in troubles-talk as criterial for deciding the seriousness of a proposed trouble. 'Pain' is one of them. 'Temperature' appears to be another. So, for example, in the following fragment we have a delicate instance of troubles-talk 'contaminated by' the negotiation of a project for which the trouble constitutes a possible obstacle. In this case, however, there is no explicit connection made between the trouble and the project. The fragment begins just as the coparticipants are concluding arrangements for a gathering that evening.

B.2.(3) [Campbell:4:5ff]

- A: So I'll get round there about seven.  
 B: 't'hh Yea:h.  
 A: P:robably, (.) you know, give or take, (0.3) a few minutes  
 You feeling better now.  
 B: Uh:m mNo:.  
 A: \*Oh you poor cunt,\* 'hh  
 (0.4)  
 B: ee I think it was food poisoning (last night) cause I  
was  
 A: [ ( ) ],  
 B: I'm still gettin:g you know, hh 'hh stomach pains I spewed  
last ni:ght, and  
 A: Yehh  
 B: 'hhhhh  
 (0.3)  
 B: hh=  
 A: -Yeah proh- it's=  
 B: -chronic diarrhea as we-e-ll,= ((sounds very ill))  
 A: [That's what]  
 B: -ju-st before I went to bed and=  
 A: [(Sounds like it)  
 B: -'t'h [hhhh]  
 A: [Yea:h ( )  
 B: this morning (well) I've had this bad stomach.  
 B: - So I guess the same's gonna happen tonight.  
 A: \*Fucking hell.\*  
 (0.8)  
 B: [[But anyw,hh  
 A: - [(Have you) have you got a temperature,  
 (0.4)  
 B: - n:No:.. Not that I know of. But I've been getting funny  
things in front of my eye:s actually.

In Fragment B.2.(3) we get a sense that the troubles-teller is attempting to beg off from the gathering without saying so in so many words, and that troubles-recipient is checking out the status of the proposed trouble as a 'mere excuse' versus a 'real reason'; i.e., we get a sense that they are negotiating the seriousness and warranted consequence of a proposed trouble. And we find two features in this fragment which also occur in the transparent negotiation of Fragment (1) pages 129-130, features which suggest that Fragment B.2.(3) is, indeed, an obscure, ambiguous, implicit version of Fragment (1). For one, we find in each fragment that the response to the inquiry into the presence of an 'index of real trouble', which in each case happens not to be present, is followed by, not merely an answer-token (Yes/No) but by an answer-token plus a 'replacement trouble-index'. In Fragment (1):

V: Are you getting toothaches?

(0.4)

J: - NO!

(0.2)

V: - [(Then don't )-

J: - [But I got cavities!

And in Fragment B.2.(3):

A: Have you got a temperature?

(0.4)

B: - n:No:. Not that I know of. But I've been getting funny things in front of my eye:s actually.

Roughly, troubles-teller appears to be oriented to a trajectory set up by such a question as initiates these fragments. That trajectory is possibly partially actualized in Fragment (1), post a "NO!" which, on its occurrence, appears to be 'free-standing'; i.e., is followed by an (0.2) silence. The possible actualization which follows the silence and occurs simultaneously with the 'replacement trouble-index' is the utterance fragment "(Then don't)" which we take to be a start on "Then don't take them out", the alternative to which is fully actualized in

subsequent talk; i.e., to, now, a confirmation of "pain" we find "Well then take them out." That is, such questions as "...pain?", "...temperature?" are understood by the troubles-teller to be setting up a trajectory the outcome of which will be some decision with regard to the seriousness of the trouble.<sup>1</sup> Such a trajectory stands in contrast to a possible alternative trajectory, in which the question would be, say, a specified version of "How are you feeling?", the outcome of which might be, for a reported absence of the symptom, "Oh good." That is, the inquiry is, and is seen to be, consequential for the status of the trouble and its attendant activities. The inquiry is, therefore, 'answered to', the possibility of the trouble being seen as 'not serious' is defended against with the proffering of an alternative symptom.<sup>2</sup>

And specifically with regard to the issue of 'defense', we note a second cross-instance feature. In each case, troubles-teller produces a 'knowledge constraint' marker. In Fragment B.2.(3):

A: Have you got a temperature?

(0.4)

B: - n:No: . Not that I know of.

- 
1. In a lecture of May 24, 1971 pages 9-12, Sacks considers a related phenomenon in which features of a question permit its recipient to see that "the question is part of a line of direction" by reference to which the answer is distinctively shaped.
  2. By contrast, in Fragment B.2.(2) pages 121-122 above, to a checkout of the possible seriousness of a candidate trouble we get, not "No but..." and an alternative symptom, but a negative followed by an index of the non-seriousness of the trouble, "No: ?no: no I'm- I'm going shopping." In the light of this phenomenon; i.e., of inquiries understood by troubles-tellers as checkouts of the seriousness of a trouble, we can re-examine the 'delicate interrogation sequence' in Fragment B.1.(2) considered at pages 98-100 above, treating recipient's inquiry into the 'blackout', "Are you prone to do that?" as a possible checkout of real trouble, where, then, the teller's ambiguous addition/substitution "Very hypertensive" may be seen as the proffering of an alternative symptom without explicitly formatting it as such; i.e., without explicitly acknowledging the inquiry as such a checkout and without explicitly 'answering to' that inquiry and 'defending against' its thrust; i.e., without saying in so many words, "No but I'm very hypertensive."

And in Fragment (1):

- V: Are you getting pain from your teeth.  
(0.7)
- V: That's (what I asked you.)
- J: - Far as I know, I'm getting pain- As far as I know  
I'm getting pain from my teeth.

An instance of such a device was considered by Anita Pomerantz in her discussion of telephone calls in which parents of possibly truant children are being questioned by a staff member of the school's attendance office. In this case, the staff member specifically elicits such an item in the formatting of the question itself.<sup>1</sup>

(2) [Medeiros:JPP:2:1-2]

- M: - 'h h h h And uh:::, 'h h h h't you don't know that she's been  
home ill hu:h,
- F: - n: no::? not to my knowledge I (.) I'm (.) stay at home  
so:,h  
(0.3)
- M: Mm hm, 't 'h h h
- F: I would know if she was out,

The appearance, in Fragments (1) and B.2.(3) above, of a marker which is attendant to transparently 'defensive' interaction, may be seen as further indication that such questions as "Are you getting pain?" "Have you got a temperature?", etc., are not simply specified versions of "How are you feeling?" but are, and are understood by troubles-teller to be, discovery procedures by reference to the possible seriousness or non-seriousness of a candidate trouble

Returning to Fragment B.2.(1) we note that in the exchange which is ambiguously a C.2.-C.3. Affiliation pair and/or an inquiry into the 'real' seriousness of the trouble followed by evidence of 'real' seriousness, the troubles-teller produces what may be one of the prototypic

1. See Pomerantz, "Catching Them Truants", a paper presented at the First German-British Research Colloquium on Ethnomethodology and Conversation Analysis, Konstanz, April 1980.

'indices of real trouble'; i.e., 'temperature'. It is, however, embedded into a format via which the very opposite of 'defending against' is done; i.e., the troubles-teller constructs the utterance as a 'letting go' in response to what she is to be seen as taking to be, not coparticipant's suspicions, but coparticipant's concern.

And what recipient produces is an item fitted to both valences of the sequence now in progress, one which is both an 'outcome' of a trajectory established by a checkout of the 'real seriousness' of a trouble (cf. "Well then take them out" in Fragment (1) page 130 above), "Well let me hang up and let you get back to bed", and an 'affiliation' with the sufferer (cf. "Jeesus" et al, Section I Fragments C.2.-C.3.(1)-(5) pages 24-25 above), "Oh my go:sh". Whatever ambiguities may have resided in the talk prior to the announcement of 'high temperature' are now utterly resolved. The pursuit of the project is abandoned with a troubles-attentive offer to close the conversation. Features of the talk suggest that the offer to close may be primarily being deployed here as a way to acknowledge the seriousness of the trouble (which was earlier in doubt) and to close off the negotiation.

- L: e-You sure sound aw:ful. ( ( hoarse , )
- C: [ t Oh:; my God ] I been 'hhh running the highest temperatures you ever sa:w.
- L: - Oh my go:sh well let me hang up and let you get back to be:d=
- C: -eh huh-uh uh-h h h u- h h u- ]=
- L: - [ So:rry ] I disturbed you. ]=
- C: =How you doin hon=
- L: =Oh just fi:ne.

It is not merely that the prior troubles-teller immediately re-opens the conversation, but that the prior troubles-recipient, who has just offered to close the conversation, immediately participates in the conversation's reopening, with not a hitch or a missed beat. We notice this feature because our investigation of conversation in general shows that recurrently sudden introductions of new matters, sudden switches in

direction, etc., are problematic; are accompanied by hitches, gaps, etc., by speaker and/or requests for recycle by recipient (e.g., "Pardon?" "Huh?", etc.),<sup>1</sup> or generate such ambiguities as we considered by reference to Fragment (1) pages 124-127 above. It is possible, then, that the orientation to the talk so far, the orientation which has generated the offer to close, is an orientation which is prepared for and immediately receptive to a move to stay in conversation. That is, in this case, the offer to close may specifically be produced by reference to the possibility of further conversation and, specifically, to a shift away from the negotiations-contaminated troubles-talk. Indeed, the offer to close may constitute an 'invitation' to just such a shift (cf. Fragment A.(3) page 80, in which an offer to close appears to be working by reference to the current talk and not by reference to actual closure, and where we find a similar no-hitch immediate uptake of a return to conversation proper).

In the following fragment we find a rather similar configuration. In this case, however, it appears that a candidate troubles-recipient is pursuing the possible seriousness of a merely apparent trouble (again, indexed by hoarseness), while the candidate troubles-teller is working to exhibit the mere apparentness of trouble. And in this case what may be 'contaminating' the troubles-talk is a negotiation as to whether the candidate troubles-teller will be fit enough to go on a planned shopping trip the next day. As in Fragment B.2.(3), there is no explicit connection made between the project for which the trouble might constitute an obstacle, and the trouble. As in Fragment B.2.(3) the project is talked of, and then the trouble is talked of, each in isolation. In contrast to that fragment, however, the troubles-teller is proposing fitness.

We join the conversation as the arrangements for the shopping trip

are being concluded. As it happens, there has been a 'coincidence'. One participant has phoned the other to invite her along on a shopping trip to Middlesbrough, and the candidate invitee has announced that she was just about to phone the inviter with an invitation to the identical jaunt. That matter is taken up as the arrangements are being concluded.

B.2.(4) [Rah:C:1:(16):6-8] ((J very hoarse from "Cause funnily...")

- J: That'll be fi:ne yes. That'll be lov ely.  
 I: [l : : L o v ely.]  
 (.)  
 J: - [[.O:<sup>h</sup>ka:y th e : n .] h Oh that's that's I-hhh Cause funnily I th- I: thought<sup>h</sup>hh  
 I: [Yes.  
 J: I wonder if I:da'd fancy a run to Middlesbrough-  
 I: [Ye:h  
 J: -in the mor:ning.  
 I: [Ye(h)eh  
 J: 'hh Mm:.  
 I: Yeah.  
 J: Cause I was goi- I've been (.) going to go but I:- (0.2)  
 today I couldn't be bothered [hh:heh]heh [unh]hheh  
 I: [n: [No.] [No.]  
 I: - Your voice is sti:ll croaky.  
 J: [eh  
 J: 't It's not- I don't feel bad though it's not eh  
 I: [No. [But it's still  
 J: very croaky. ]  
 [It was a bit tight last night. But my chest is better  
 to day.  
 I: [Goo:d.  
 (.)  
 I: That's good.  
 J: [An:d my voice isn't as bad as it was.  
 I: n:No.  
 (.)  
 I: [No.  
 J: - [[And I'm- I lost it completely last night after y(h)ou(h)'d  
 g(h)o(h)ne hnh-h u h-huh ]  
 I: [Well this ]is it] I could hear it going [you know, ]  
 J: [hhe:h i]hh  
 J: Y(h)es:.  
 I: - So I'll get off now or else ih- it'll be going again tonight.  
 J: [h  
 J: - Oh no I've been cleaning be:drooms and things so:  
 I: [Yes I've done  
 the bedrooms and the living room,  
 J: Ye:s.  
 I: And I've dusted the sitting room and just Hoovered- I never  
 move things ou:t. You know.  
 J: No:.  
 I: Course there's nothing there really (0.3) eh: the-eh-the  
sitting room wasn't bad at all. . . etc. etc.



Most briefly, we note that the device by which the troubles-talk cum negotiation re. a possible obstacle to a project is closed off, is a version of F.b. Stepwise Transition (see Section I pages 58ff). In this case we find a single utterance operating as a 'pivot'. An 'answering to' the proposed seriousness of the trouble declines, indeed disattends the offer to close with a display of perfect fitness, a return to everyday chores, "Oh no I've been cleaning bedrooms and things so:". <sup>1</sup> It is taken up as a 'new topic', an exchange of domestic accomplishments, with "Yes I've done the bedrooms and the living room". This procedure may be seen as a classic instance of what Sacks describes as a "linking up of whatever is being introduced as a new topic to what has just been talked about, such that, as far as anybody knows, a new topic hasn't been started, though we're far from wherever we began." (See page 58). A moment ago they were talking about a trouble and now they're talking

- 
1. It is possible that the report of a return to everyday chores was almost introduced a bit earlier with "And I'm-", which occurs after a series of 'improvement markers' ("But my chest is better today. And my voice isn't as bad as it was. And I'm-"); i.e., the "And I'm-" may be a start on "And I'm cleaning bedrooms and things", in which case it would stand as a volunteered index of non-seriousness of the trouble (cf. Fragment B.2.(2) pages 121-122, "I'm going shopping", considered as such an index in footnote 2 page 132). That the possible index is abandoned for a report of the zenith of the trouble might be a matter rather similar to that proposed by reference to Fragment B.1.(7) pages 114-115; i.e., it is being positioned in such a way as to provide for a return to the proposal of fitness and thus an embedding of an otherwise negotiations-problematic index of serious trouble. The possibly immediate return is, however, preempted by activities of the recipient (cf. Fragment F.Ø.b.(3) pages 62-63, the preemption issue considered on page 67), and the initially abandoned volunteered index of non-seriousness is reissued as an 'answering to' recipient's proposal of serious trouble. We take it that on its own, "And I'm-" is altogether too fragmentary to warrant such a consideration. It is this shard of talk which generated the data-search for, and collection of, instances of Abandoned and Re-positioned Utterances (see page 8), and the work done so far on that collection indicates that the "And I'm-" and its sequelae may be operating as we have described.

about household chores. There has been no topic completion and no topic-initiation. As Sacks has it, "the talk flowed."

With regard to the utter smoothness of the flow, present in Fragment B.2.(1) and characterized in the consideration thereof as an indication that an offer to close may specifically orient to and perhaps invite further conversation which shifts away from a prior topic (in that case troubles-talk cum obstacle negotiation, see pages 134-135), we note that in Fragment B.2.(4), the case at hand, which is also a candidate instance of troubles-talk cum obstacle-negotiation, the offer to close is followed by continuation of the conversation, and that continuation is equally smoothly taken up by the one who made the close-offer.

I: - So I'll get off now or else ih-it'll be going again tonight.  
 J: [hnt  
 J: Oh no I've been cleaning be:drooms and things,so;  
 I: - the bedrooms and the living room, [Yes I've done

That is, again without a hitch or a missed beat, the new trajectory is taken up. Specifically, the "Yes" is positioned precisely upon a completion point of the 'pivotal' utterance (as in Fragment B.2.(1) the [-] equal signs indicate absolutely no break between completion of "How you doing hon" and "Oh just fi:ne."). It is in this sense that we talk of the offer to close as a 'device'. It appears, that is, to be a methodic topic-shift procedure, specifically oriented to the possibility of a shift in topic, specifically prepared to participate in the new topic, instantly.

And most briefly with regard to the troubles-talk as an implicit negotiation re. troubles-teller's possible unfitness for the planned shopping trip, we note first of all that the 'noticing' of the hoarseness does not follow the first dramatic appearance of hoarseness, which occurs in the utterance referring to the coincidence.

J: Cause funnily I th- I: [thought 'hh  
 I: [Yes.  
 J: I wonder if I:da'd fancy a run to Middlesbrough-  
 I: [Ye:h  
 J: -in the m<sub>or</sub>ning.  
 I: [Ye(h)eh  
 J: 'hh Mm:.  
 I: - Yeah.

Rather, the 'noticing' follows the announcement of an abandoned plan to make that shopping trip today.

J: Cause I was goi- I've been (.) going to go but I:- (0.2)  
 today I couldn't be bothered [hh,heh,heh,unh'hheh  
 I: [n:[No.] [No.  
 I: - Your voice is sti:ll croaky.

In Fragment B.2.(1) we find a similar configuration of concurrence followed by a 'noticing'. In that case, a project is being rejected on the grounds of ill health. And in that case we find the troubles-recipient 'concurring' ("nNo:::,") and thereafter producing a 'noticing' ("You sure sound aw:ful. ( hoarse.)" see page 121). In Fragment B.2.(4), the case at hand, this configuration of 'concurrence' ("n:No. No.") followed by a 'noticing' ("Your voice is sti:ll croaky"), is produced by reference to a project abandoned on what are proposed as no particular grounds (i.e., "I couldn't be bothered").

It is possible that the 'noticing' in Fragment B.2.(4) is operating similarly to that of Fragment B.2.(1); i.e., is focussing upon and inquiring into the significance of an observable index of possible illness. The difference between the two fragments is that in Fragment B.2.(1) the 'noticing' follows a strong assertion of illness ("Cause uh: I've really got it") while in Fragment B.2.(4) the 'noticing' follows a proposal of abandonment on no particular grounds, where, however, an index of possible particular grounds for abandonment (i.e., ill health) is available in the talk (i.e., the observable hoarseness).

And in that regard we note that the troubles-teller herself may be

dealing with the possible relevance of the hoarseness to the report of an abandoned plan. In the announcement of the abandoned plan to go shopping today we find a repair: "Cause I was goi- I've been (.) going to go." We take it that this is a start on "...I was going to go today but...", and that such a proposal implicates a definite plan and thus perhaps a definite reason for its abandonment. That proposal is aborted and is replaced by a proposal of a weaker, more generalized, one-of-these-days intention "I've been (.) going to go." For such an intention, one can find that on any particular day one hasn't happened to get around to it.

It is possible that the replacement of a developing announcement of a definite plan with its possible implication of a definite account for abandonment, by a generalized intention and its appropriately generalized account ("but today I couldn't be bothered") constitutes an attempt by troubles-teller to undercut a connection which she herself sees as becoming available in the juxtaposition of item (reported prior intention to go shopping) and delivery (in a hoarse voice). That is, that a connection is in fact available between the abandoned prior intention to go shopping today and the hoarse voice, can be seen in the work that troubles-teller does to undercut that connection.

Secondly, we note a proposal of possible recurrence.

- J: I lost it completely last night after y(h)ou(h)'d
- I: g(h) [o(h)ne hnh] h u h ] huh
- J: [well this ] is it ] I could hear it going you know, ]
- J: [ 'hhe:h 1 ] hh
- J: Y(h)es:..
- I: - So I'll get off now or else ih- it'll be going again tonight.

We find a similar occurrence in Fragment B.2.(3); i.e., an exposition of a trouble followed by a proposal of possible recurrence.

- B: [vomiting, diarrhea] and 't'hhhhh this morning (well) I've had this bad stomach. So I guess the same's gonna happen tonight.

About Fragment B.2.(3) we proposed that the troubles-teller is attempting to be excused from a gathering planned for tonight, without saying so in so many words, by raising the possibility of recurrence of last night's symptoms. In Fragment B.2.(4) we take it that the troubles-recipient is doing some version of warning the troubles-teller that unless she gives the trouble its due care and attention she might not be able to go shopping tomorrow (as she was unable to go today), again, without saying so in so many words; again, by raising the possibility of recurrence of last night's symptoms.

A major difference between the two fragments is that in Fragment B.2.(3) the relationship between symptoms (vomiting, diarrhea, etc.) and projected course of action (the gathering) is transparent; i.e., the symptoms which might recur tonight are of a sort which plainly constitute an obstacle to such an activity as participation in tonight's gathering. In Fragment B.2.(4) the relationship between symptoms (hoarseness, loss of voice) and projected course of action (a shopping trip) is obscure; i.e., such symptoms are not necessarily debilitating, and that last night's loss of voice had any bearing on this morning's abandonment of an intended shopping trip is in the first place not at all obvious (indeed, it appears that troubles-teller has specifically done work to undercut such a connection), and thus, that a reference to a possible recurrence of voice-loss tonight is invoking possible consequences for tomorrow's shopping trip, becomes altogether problematic.

In Fragment B.2.(3), then, the talk is managed such that one could not say with certainty that the troubles-teller is invoking a connection between symptoms, recurrence, and projected course of action, but one could say with certainty that such a relationship is available for the invoking. In Fragment B.2.(4) the talk is managed such that, not only

could one not say with certainty that such a connection is being invoked (in this case by the troubles-recipient), but one could not say with certainty that such a relationship is available for the invoking, in the first place.

In that regard, we offer a fragment in which, like Fragments B.2.(3) and B.2.(4) above, that a trouble might constitute an obstacle to a project is not available in the troubles-talk itself.<sup>1</sup> Further, in this case it is not at all clear that a coparticipant is aligning as a troubles-recipient beyond some initial inquiries, one of which is weighted towards the eliciting of a report of improvement ("You getting over i:t?") and may be accomplice to the implicit issue of the trouble as possible obstacle (cf. the similarly-weighted inquiry in Fragment B.2.(3), "You feeling better now", which in that case is placed immediately adjacent to the arrangements for tonight's gathering).

B.2.(5) [Campbell:7:1ff] ((Opening unrecorded))

A: (Ayer  
I'm) fari:ght?  
M: (Aye:?)  
A: hHow are you ↓feeli:ng.  
M: Oh: not so ba::d?  
A: You getting over i:t?-  
M: -Ye:ah bit  
A: Uh- hh  
M: bit empty you kno:w,

1. In Section I we observed a possible distinction as between British and American troubles-talk; i.e., a tendency in the former towards 'restraint' and a tendency in the latter towards 'release' (see pages 26-31). We here note another possible distinction, by reference to Fragments B.2.(3), B.2.(4) and B.2.(5). These are all taken from the British corpus, and we find nothing quite like them in the American corpus. We might characterize this 'British option' as a matter of implicit negotiation-via-adjacency rather than explicit relating of the competing issues, which is what we find in the American corpus (see e.g., B.2.(1) pages 120ff, and B.2.(6) pages 147-158 below. We note that in B.2.(6) there may be an initial attempt by the troubles-recipient to negotiate the project as an independent matter, without referring to the possibly competing trouble, but very soon an explicit relationship is proposed.

- A: Ye:h.Well what are you gonna have for your tea:.-  
M: =I don't know ye:t,  
(0.7)
- A: hOh:::  
M: [Gotta watch me step.hh  
(0.4)
- A: Yeh I'm just wondering hh (0.3) 'hh I: don't know, weh I  
don't know what to give you.  
M: You don't know what to give me,  
A: nNo(h)o.  
M: khuh huh \*( )  
A: [I'll give you a little bit of chicke:n.  
M: Y-eh: ha-u Mm:,  
A: ( ) little breas:t of chicken.-  
M: -No [:::::]  
A: [heh i]hh huh huh huh huh.  
M: nh hnh=  
A: = 'hhh Wha::t?  
M: No:::  
A: Oh:: well what do you wa::nt, hh  
M: I don't know,  
A: 'hhh Oh we::ll, have some tu:rk(h)ey  
M: nNo:::  
A: 'hhh (.) eh hh-huh 'hh Have some sausag[es.]  
M: [n-]Nuh-  
A: Oh:: ye-e-eh,  
M: [heh hehh, heh heh, heh he [h heh] heh 'hheh  
L(hhh) [h e h]
- A: Ooo my god well what've you been doing. ((smile voice))  
M: Ah::n not- (n)I ain't been doing much? (all day) I been  
you know (to get) a few things, (0.5) I had a hai:rcut  
(0.3) got me slippers,  
(.)
- A: Ye::h,  
(.)
- M: Got me pants,  
(0.2)
- A: Ye:h,  
M: Took me clothes in this morning,  
A: 'Yea:h?  
(0.5)
- M: And eh::, (0.5) He's bringing me a pair of shoes along  
tomorrow,  
(.)
- A: Ye:h?  
M: Cause he's going out ( ) the morning,  
(0.3).
- A: Mm:mn?=  
M: -An::d the best train we can catch is quarter past twel:ve.

It is only after the troubles-talk is well behind them that we find reference to a journey in preparation (subsequent data makes it clear that it is these two participants who will be traveling together). As

in Fragments B.2.(3) and B.2.(4) above, there is no explicit connection made between troubles-teller's condition and its possible consequences for the project. And in this case, in contrast to Fragments B.2.(3) and B.2.(4), it appears that the troubles-recipient is not prepared to attend the trouble as even potentially serious.

It is, however, possible, but systematically no more than merely possible, that the troubles-recipient is offering aid to recovery. That is, the attention to troubles-teller's eating might be troubles-relevant. It might also be a standard business between these two. Thus, the references to food might be in response to indices of trouble, or might constitute a shift in topic, specifically disattending the indices of trouble. We focus on the problematic section.

- M: - bit empty you know,  
 A: - Ye:h.Well what are you gonna have for your tea:=-  
 M: - I don't know ye:t,  
                     (0.7)  
 A: - hh::: [:::  
 M: - [Gotta watch me step.hh  
                     (0.4)  
 A: - Yeh I'm just wondering hh (0.3) 'hh I: don't know, weh I  
       don't know what to give you.

Twice we find an index of trouble ("bit empty..." and "Gotta watch me step.hh") followed by an acknowledgment token plus reference to food. The initial reference is formed as an inquiry into troubles-teller's plans and is responded to as such. The second reference indicates that troubles-recipient plans to feed the troubles-teller.

As it happens, this series is a not uncommon procedure whereby such activities as 'offers', 'requests', 'invitations', etc., get done without explicitly producing 'an offer', 'a request', 'an invitation'. Also not uncommon is that the recipient of the initial reference treats it at 'face value'; i.e., does not take it up as what it is not (yet) explicitly shown to be, as troubles-teller's "I don't know yet" can be talking about



the state of his own plans for feeding himself, as inquired into by the troubles-recipient's "What are you gonna have for your tea:" And we find this phenomenon occurring independently of, e.g., shared biography via which a recipient of one of these objects ought to know what it is doing.<sup>1</sup> Thus, the data is obscure as to whether this is new, troubles-relevant behavior, or a standard business between them; i.e., whether the troubles-recipient is addressing or disattending the indices of trouble.

A most troubles-resistive characterization of recipient's activities by reference to troubles-teller's preferred indices of trouble is that the materials which follow the acknowledgment tokens are references to a standard business between these two, such that following an index of trouble we are finding a shift to mundane, troubles-free matters; i.e.,

- - - -

1. Following are two fragments in which, shared biography to the contrary notwithstanding, interactionally delicate matters (a 'request' and an 'invitation' respectively) are produced without explicitly being made, and are taken initially at 'face value'. In Fragment (a) below, a little boy phones his mother at work and produces what might be an inquiry into her concerns, is treated as possibly such an inquiry, and then becomes clearly a matter of his own concerns.

(a) [JG:IV:1]

R: - What do you want to eat for dinner.

M: - I don't know sweetie I haven't even given it a thought I've been busy.-

R: - -(Nebooshee)- I'll get a Ninety Niner.

M: Oh no honey no no no no no. No I have to go to the store anyway and get stuff for your lunch and all.

And in Fragment (b), following some cozy gossip, one participant announces a forthcoming party and subsequently talks by reference to coparticipant's ability to attend; i.e., gets an invitation done without explicitly doing 'inviting'. In this case, the coparticipant offers no response to the 'announcement' component, producing an enthusiastic 'announcement receipt' when unequivocal 'invitation' occurs.

(b) [Kam:III:4]

A: - Uh next Saturday night's a surprize party here for p-Kevin.

- (0.2)

A: - 'p! And if you can make it.

S: OH REALLY!!!!,

That is, the enthusiastic response is withheld until it is made utterly explicit that the announcement's recipient is being invited. Further, the silence is understood for its import by the inviter, who thereupon appends the so far absent qualification

troubles-recipient is declining altogether to address the indices of trouble. However, some details of the utterances which follow the indices of trouble seem to be attending the prior talk in a particular way. Roughly, the indices are possibly being 'dismissed' via a format which consists of an acknowledgment token plus a warrant for no further talk in the direction posed by the prior utterance.

Following are three instances of what we take to be one format for doing 'dismissal'.<sup>1</sup> In Fragment (1), that an 'urging' is being dismissed is warranted by a display that the coparticipant is already perfectly willing. In Fragment (2), the dismissal of an expression of 'concern' is warranted by an exhibit that the recipient is, in principle, not upset by the candidate source of upset (and in this case we find an explicit 'dismissor', "So what"). And in Fragment (3), the dismissal of a coparticipant's show of commitment to a task on current speaker's behalf is warranted by an assertion of the triviality of the task itself, with an explicit 'dismissor', "It's not that big a deal".

(1) [JG:I:8:6]

M: I do wish that you would uh: go along with him, ]  
 C: - [Ye:ah. [Well tel-] tell him  
tell him I:'m Ready Andy.

(2) [NB:IV:4:13]

L: Gee I'm sorry to hear that.  
 E: Well don't let it upset you.  
 L: - hYeh, well I have this all the ti:me, so wh(h)at

1. These instances are taken from a collection specifically directed to a slightly different object; i.e., to "Yeah well" (see page 8); i.e., to a turn-initial unit rather than a response plus a new start. A few of these latter were included as possibly related, but we do not yet have a comprehensive collection. (See also Fragment F.β.u.(1) page 59 for "Ye:ah. Well-" as an attempted sub-topical shift, Fragment (1) page 118 for "Yeah well" as a preface to a 'dismissive' counter-proposal, and Fragment B.3.(6) pp.166-167 for "Yeh 'h Well..." as 'dismissive' of some unsolicited advice.)

(3) [TCI(b):16:39] ((J is searching for a toy for one of L's children))

J: We're still trying to find a parkhhhhhhhhhhhh lo(h)o(h)ot,  
(.)

J: 'hhhhhh 'Gonna look (.) see if [we can find one,]  
L: - [Ye:ah, Well it's not that]

big a deal if I don't find one

The fact that "Ye:h.Well what are you gonna have for your tea:" and "Yeh I'm just wondering hh (0.3) 'hh I: don't know, weh I don't know what to give you" might constitute warranted dismissals of indices of trouble, provides for a more troubles-attentive characterization than does an utter declining to address those indices. That is, this device may be recognizably being deployed to provide for a warranted non-exercise of the topical possibilities of the prior utterances. Specifically in this case, troubles-talk is being discouraged. And that treatment of it can be understood to be warranted by materials which exhibit that the troubles-recipient is already attending to the trouble without need of further exposition (cf. Fragment (1) page 146, an 'urging' dismissed by reference to its recipient's already being perfectly willing and thus in no need of further urging).

In Fragment B.2.(5), then, not only is the possibility that the trouble might stand as an obstacle to their plans altogether unavailable in the troubles-talk, but that a candidate troubles-recipient is doing any but the most minimal attention to the trouble is problematic; i.e., beyond the initial inquiries, we find that the possibility for troubles-talk is being at worst disattended, at best dismissed.

We turn to one final instance of troubles-talk 'contaminated by' negotiations with regard to the trouble as a possible obstacle. In it, we note a possible attempt to produce a tacit negotiation (cf. Fragments B.2.(3), pages 130ff, B.2.(4) pages 135ff, and B.2.(5) pages 142ff, and footnote 1., page 142).

B.2.(6) [NB:II:4:1ff] ((Opening unrecorded; N is caller))

E: Hi: honey how are you.  
 N: [Fine how're you.  
 E: \*khhhhhhhh. Oh:: I'm pretty good I had a little operation on my toe this week. I had to have (.) toenail taken off.  
 (0.2)  
 N: ↑Why [:::  
 E: [hh'hh Oh:: I have a fungus and I had an infection, (.)  
 E: It's a hell of a (s:-)  
 N: [Oh::: : : : : ↑E:mma:::  
 E: ((nasal)) Isn't that awful,  
 N: \*hhhh Well what a shame. Did you have to go in the hospital?=  
 E: -nNo:: I just had a local deal and uh it wasn't any fun but I'm better I was: lying on the couch out in front. [Oh:::]=  
 N:  
 N: - =I:'m so:rry E:mma:::?  
 E: [Ah:-]  
 E: - ((cutesy)) I am too. Why don't you come and see me.=  
 N: - \*hhhh Well I was gonna call and ask you if you- Bud was playing golf this afternoon if you wanted to go over to Robinson's with me. I've got to uh \*hhhh I have go:t.hh  
 t\_o\_g\_e\_t.h-  
 E: [Ah:ha-]  
 N: \*hhhh a couple of things to wear Emma I (.) just don't have enough clothes to: to go to work in.  
 E: \*Mm-mm.\*  
 N: [p'hhhh at a:ll.  
 N: \*-- \*hhhh Can you wa::lk?h  
 (0.2)  
 N: \*It'd be too hard for you?  
 E: \*Oh::::: darling I don't know\* uh it's bleeding a little...

The introduction by troubles-recipient of a plan to go shopping together may qualify as an F.β.a.iv. Exit from Troubles-Talk via Reference to Getting Together. And, similarly to Fragment B.2.(4), it may be using a troubles-relevant prior utterance as a topical 'pivot' (see page 137). That is, following a C.2. Affiliation, "Oh:::: I:'m so:rry E:mma:::?", we find a version of a C.3. Affiliation Response, "I am too. Why don't you come and see me" (cf. Fragment C.2.- C.3.(5) Section I, page 25, in which a C.2. Affiliation is followed by reference to a prior wish to be with the current empathizer, "Middle of the night last night I wanted to call you"). In this topical-sequential context, troubles-teller's 'invitation' may be strongly weighted towards, not just any routine visit, but

a 'sick call'.

However, the invitation is treated by its recipient as altogether exclusive of 'trouble'; as the inauguration of new matters, as is the 'pivotal' utterance in Fragment B.2.(4). If any attention is given to the sequential situatedness of the invitation, it is to its recognizably 'interactionally generated' character which, for one, provides for its mutability, and secondly for the propriety of a standard response to such objects; i.e., a 'counter invitation' (see footnote 1, page 94). Otherwise its situatedness in troubles-talk is disattended. Specifically, the counter-invitation is offered as conditional upon the routine contingency as between these coparticipants ("Well I was gonna call and ask you if you- Bud was playing golf this afternoon..."). That is, the proposed project is not, now, shaped by reference to the trouble, does not, now, become contingent upon whether or not the trouble is debilitating, but is shaped by reference to the ordinary run of affairs; i.e., as usual, is contingent upon whether or not coparticipant's husband is out for the day.

We take it that what is being proposed here without saying so in so many words is that, having heard the report of the trouble, the troubles-recipient takes it that the trouble will not interfere with the plan. And this proposal may be warranted by features of the troubles-talk. For one, we note a version of a checkout as to the seriousness of the trouble, followed by a version of a disconfirmation plus alternative index of seriousness (cf. pages 131-133). In this case the checkout is done with "Did you have to go in the ho:spital?" and the disconfirmation plus alternative index with "nNo:: I just had a lo:cal dea:l and uh it wasn't any fu:n". Not only is the 'alternative index' exceedingly weak, but it is followed by an 'improvement marker' plus an

index of commitment to business as usual, "but I'm better I was: lying on the couch out in front" (see pages 104-105). Secondly, troubles-teller has, in a range of ways, produced recognizable 'past-trouble' talk; e.g., brief and downgraded (see page 46, footnote 1). That is, in a range of ways, troubles-teller may have been recognizably using the trouble for its 'intimacy' feature; i.e., as a way to occasion and promote acceptance of the invitation, in the first place (see pages 46-48 for another sort of exploitation of a feature of troubles-talk; i.e., to close the conversation).<sup>1</sup>

Independent of the ways in which the troubles-talk is being shaped, the way the talk, in general, is being shaped may be accomplice to the initial invitation. Specifically, a telephone conversation can be instrumental to setting up an in-person conversation. And a recurrent feature of such 'instrumental' telephone conversation is that brief versions of matters that will be talked of at length in person are produced;

-----

1. Another instance of possible exploitation of the 'intimacy' feature to occasion and promote an invitation may be seen in the following fragment, again by reference to a possible 'past trouble'.

(a) [TCI(b):7:2]

- C: How you doing hon=  
 L: -Oh just fi:ne.  
 C: - 'h h h h [We:ll I:]: heard about your accident=  
 L: [ ( ) ]  
 C: -I'm sorry to hear that.  
 L: Oh::: tha:nk you it's sure been the most painful (.) of all my li:fe put together a:ll my: rain does not compa:re to this foo:t. [eh heh-heh,] ha (ha)  
 C: [C a n you] [Can you wa:lk good now?  
 L: I'm wa:lking I can't walk real goo:d you know but I'm wa:lking so (that's )  
 C: - ['hh [You s o u : n d] so good on the phone I never hear nobody from the Sou:th.  
 (0.3)  
 L: eh h h h h e h h e h h e h (ha ha)  
 C: [h [hh! [And I lo::ve it.  
 L: 'h h h! 'h h h h Yeah you sound just like me I guc:ss,  
 C: - Ye:h 'h h h Why don't you come over and see me somti:me.

a 'preview', as it were, of the forthcoming in-person interaction. Conversely, lengthy elaborated versions of matters being talked about occur in and exhibit that this is, or is to be, a telephone conversation which is non-instrumental, but in and of itself constitutes 'the visit'. So, for example, in the following fragment, in a conversation which opens with "I was just eh ringing up to say I'll be coming down in a moment," caller at one point initiates some gossip, which is explicitly proposed as curtailable by reference to the impending in-person visit.

(1) [Rah:I:9]

J: 'h What's happening next †doo:r they moving †in or moving  
 out I couldn't de<sub>ci:de</sub>, †heh heh]  
 V: - [(Oh: †no.) u-e]h::m I'll tell you all  
 the news when you come down.

Thus, in a range of ways, troubles-teller's shaping the talk about the trouble to occasion and promote acceptance of an invitation to a visit provides a warrant for troubles-recipient's assessment of the trouble as no obstacle to the planned shopping trip. And, as noted, no reference to the trouble is made in the proffering of the 'counter-invitation'. And thus, at its outset, the negotiation as between attention to the trouble versus an ordinary day is being conducted in a fashion similar to Fragments B.2.(3)-(5). However, as the talk progresses, the relationship of the trouble to the plan is made explicit.

N: if you wanted to go over to Ro:binson's with me. I've got  
 to uh 'hhh I have go:t.hh t<sub>o</sub> g\_et.h=

E: [Ah:ha-]

N: -'hhh a couple of things to wear Emma I (.) just don't  
 have enough clothes to: to go to work in.

E: \*Mm-mm.\*

N: [p' hhhh at a:ll.

N: - 'hhhh Can you wa::lk?h  
 (0.2)

N: - \*It'd be too hard for you?\*

E: - \*Oh::: darling I don't kno:w\* uh it's bleeding a little...

Most briefly, we note that the making explicit of the relationship between the trouble and the plan may be brought about by an observable

reticence on the part of the troubles-teller, including a recognizable absence of response at a point where, although talk is still going on, the invitation has for all practical purposes been adequately delivered; i.e., after "Ro:binson's".<sup>1</sup>

Once the trouble is given explicit attention, there is a return to troubles-talk, per se. Although troubles-teller initiates her talk about the trouble as a consideration of the shopping invitation (i.e., with "Oh:::: darling I don't kno:w"), she very rapidly moves into sheer exposition, and the talk continues along those lines for several minutes (data not shown). And in this case, we may see that the lengthy exposition is produced once it has become clear that the troubles-recipient will not be making an in-person visit; i.e., that this telephone conversation will, in and of itself, constitute 'the visit'.

We further note that the fact that the troubles-recipient will not be making an in-person visit is made utterly clear without saying so in so many words. And on this issue we find both parties doing tacit negotiation. For one, following the 'counter-invitation' and the observable

1. The observable absence of response to the invitation may start a bit earlier, at a 'recognition point' in "Ro:binson's". So, for example, in the following fragments we find responses initiated at a 'recognition point' in the course of a key word.

(a) [FD:IV:44fFR:7]

H: I don't know if you know Marvin Ha:binson.  
L: Yeah I know him,

(b) [CDHQ:II:100ff]

J: Alright now, in- in getting, calling for your brother,  
his name is also Ro:berts.  
R: No.

(c) [G:AD:63R] ((at a joke's punchline))

B: and took mhy t(h)y c(h)e(h)ents  
C: hnn-hnn-hnn-h a h-ha:h-ha:h

For a consideration of 'recognition placement' as a systematic device, see Jefferson, "A case of precision timing in ordinary conversation," Semiotica, Vol IX, 1973, pages 56-69.



absence of immediate uptake by the troubles-teller, the troubles-recipient produces talk which exhibits the shopping trip as an 'imperative'; i.e., not just a pleasant way to spend an afternoon, and specifically ties it to the requirements of her job ("I have go:t.hh to get.h 'hhh a couple of things to wear Emma I (.) just don't have enough clothes to: to go to work in").<sup>1</sup> As a work-related imperative, it is not open to negotiation; i.e., it is not a matter of here is some free time, shall it be spent shopping or visiting an invalid friend. The choice will be, either they go shopping together or they do not get together. That this is the choice, and that this means that they will not be getting together is exhibited without saying so in so many words, by both parties in the subsequent talk; i.e., in troubles-teller's lengthy and elaborate expositional talk, and in troubles-recipient's responses which are talk-encouraging and occasionally soliciting of further talk (data not shown).

At one point, however, the initial invitation to a 'sick call' is re-raised and re-declined, this time utterly tacitly. In this case, the matter is referred to in a similar position to that in which the initial invitation occurred; i.e., post a C.1. element worthy of C.2. Affiliation, simultaneously with the occurrence of that item; i.e., at an especially ripe position in a troubles-telling sequence.

B.2.(6.a.) [NB:II:4:6-7]

E: Then he gives you those (0.2) codiene tablets and you're

-----

1. The formulation of the shopping trip as a work-related imperative may specifically be selected for the local negotiations. It appears that in fact the 'imperative' is of a rather different nature. As part of the exhibiting that this telephone call will constitute 'the visit', the former troubles-recipient produces an enormously long and elaborate story of her meeting with a "very, h very, n:ni:ce gu:y" (see Section I. Fragment (1) pages 51-52 for the arrival at this announcement). That the alternative 'imperative' is being selected utterly locally may be seen in the slight hitch prior to its production; i.e., "to: to go to work in."

E: - like on L.S. } D. and I was vo:mi ti:ng, and  
 N: [Yeah mm hm, ] [Yeah, ]  
 (.)  
 E: 'tch!  
 N: - [[Oh::::[: go::sh(  
 E: - [hhhhh[So everybody's been nice in the apart]ment just like  
 with my le:g ihh[hh heh heh fhuh]  
 N: [Yee::::a::uh::,  
 N: Well you- people should be nice to you Emma, you're a,  
 thoroughly nice person to be nice to.  
 E: [Oh:: well it was-  
 E: - They all come up and see how I am and I had to have my foot-  
 N: [Well su:re.  
 E: -up on a pillow for two days, you know, and- hhhmhhh  
 N: [Yah?  
 E: But honey it's gonna be alright I'm sure,  
 N: Oh I'm sure it's gonna be alri:ght,  
 E: Yeuh,  
 N: Oh:: do:ggone. I thought maybe we could-  
 E: [I'd like to get ] some little-  
 N: -[Yeah.  
 E: -slippers but uh, .  
 (1.0)  
 E: 'hhhhh I just don't think I'd better walk it's bleeding a  
 tiny bit . . .

Briefly, troubles-teller's reference to the activities of her neighbors is a proposal of troubles-appropriate behavior, and stands in contrast to the proposed activities of the current troubles-recipient. And while recipient offers lavish appreciation of the warrantedness of that behavior, the warrant proposed by troubles-recipient is an in-general entitlement ("you're a, thoroughly nice person to be nice to"); i.e., makes no reference to the trouble as an entitlement to attention (cf. the 'as usual' contingency proposed in the initial round of negotiations, page 149, no reference being made to the trouble as the possible obstacle). Again, then, the possibility of an in-person visit is raised and declined, this time with both parties undertaking tacit negotiation.

Immediately upon the tacit declination of the tacit invitation, the prolonged troubles-exposition is exhibited to be available for closure with a prototypic E.Ø.a. Optimistic Projection, "But honey it's gonna be alright I'm sure". That close-implicative utterance is immediately

followed by a return to explicit negotiations regarding the 'counter-invitation'; i.e., the shopping trip. That is, both rounds of troubles-talk have the same outcome, debouching in negotiations by reference to the shopping trip.

We say that the close-implicative utterance is followed by a return to explicit negotiations "immediately", advisedly. Most roughly, the utterance which follows the Optimistic Projection; i.e., the 'reassurance' "Oh I'm sure it's gonna be alright" may be pointing to the fact that such a matter as the prospect of longterm recovery is not the issue, but, rather, the issue is troubles-teller's immediately local situation; i.e., the possibility of her going shopping this afternoon. That, and how this utterance is operating in such a way remains to be explicated. At this point we leave as an undeveloped assertion that it is possibly invoking the relevance of the shopping trip.

Following this possible invocation of the shopping trip we find an utterance for which we do have some grounds to propose it as recognizably moving into talk about the shopping trip; i.e., troubles-recipient's "Oh:: do:ggone." We propose it as an analog of caller's receipt of the announcement of trouble in Fragment B.2.(1) pages 120ff; i.e., a version of "Well that ni:ps it in the bu:d". Both utterances belong to a class of, say, 'disappointment markers' referring to the project for which the trouble constitutes an obstacle. And in Fragment B.2.(1) as well as the fragment at hand, the 'disappointment marker' is immediately followed by an explication of the possibly defeated project; in B.2.(1):

L: Well that ni:ps it in the bu:d, 'hh I was gonna ask you if you could keep Jo:dy for a c(h)ouple hours

and in B.2.(6), simultaneously by both parties:

N: Oh:: do:ggone. I thought maybe we could-  
 E: [I'd like to get] some little-  
 N: = [Yeah.  
 E: = [self-narrative

Specifically, the troubles-teller is perfectly oriented to the work of the 'disappointment marker' and immediately addresses the matter to which it refers, while, however, maintaining the relevance of the trouble, now specifically posed as grounds for undertaking the shopping trip; i.e., to get some slippers for her painful feet. We note the alacrity with which the troubles-recipient, having abandoned her own reference to the project, takes up teller's proposal, the "Yeah" occurring by reference to whatsoever it might be that teller might want to get; i.e., not awaiting the specific, and as it happens, troubles-relevant item, "slippers". At this fine level of detail we can again see the shopping trip as being treated by troubles-recipient as utterly independent of the trouble.<sup>1</sup>

In the following fragment we find another 'disappointment marker' preceding, and understood by its recipient to be invoking, the plan for which the trouble stands as a possible obstacle. In this case, troubles-recipient is about to leave on vacation, and has been informed that her coparticipant's husband just walked out on her.

(1) [NB:IV:4:4ff]

L: Will you be DOWN HERE MONDAY AND TUESDAY (ALL BY-)  
 E: Yeah.

(1.2)

L: - Oh sh::oot.  
 E: - Well you go on and go now-  
 L: - You want me to can\_cel it?  
 E: hh NO::..  
 E: Oh God no Lottie, for heaven sake . . .

Most briefly we note that the initial query may be perfectly transparent as addressing the possible competing status of the trouble and the projected trip (i.e., if troubles-teller will be "down here Monday

-----

1. Once a troubles-relevant version of the purpose of the shopping trip has been introduced by the troubles-teller, it is seized upon and put to work by the troubles-recipient. As the negotiations continue we find her offering "We'll do you want me to be to just pick you- can uh- you get into Robinson's so you can buy a little pair of slippers?"

and Tuesday (all by [herself])" then perhaps the trip ought to be abandoned. The point is that troubles-teller can and does treat it as no more than a question to which a simple factual answer, "Yeah", is appropriate. While the "Yeah" may specifically be designed to not discourage a possible outcome of that inquiry; i.e., an offer of abandonment of the trip, at 'face value' what has occurred is a factual inquiry and a factual answer. By contrast, the 'disappointment marker' is immediately taken up for its implications, and may be unavoidably takeable up; i.e., the 'face value' of a 'disappointment marker' may be to urge that something possibly being foregone be carried out.

Thus, in Fragment B.2.(6), the 'reassurance' may be not only cooperating in a closure of the troubles-talk in which the implicit negotiation by reference to a 'sick call' had been embedded, but may be pointing to the relevance of its 'counter proposal'; i.e., the shopping trip. And clearly, the 'disappointment marker' constitutes a return to explicit negotiations.

Which is to say that the long Troubles-Exposition (data not shown) turns out to be boundaried on both sides by the invitation and its counter-invitation. That is, the Exposition had been initiated when it became clear that the troubles-recipient will not forego a shopping trip to make a 'sick call' (and thus will not be participating in an in-person troubles-telling session). And it eventually arrives at what we take to be a tacit negotiation by reference to the 'sick call', now embedded into the Exposition segment (where perhaps such a visit will now be seen by troubles-recipient to be warranted by the reported sufferings included in the exposition, those matters not available in the brief, 'instrumental' version delivered initially). When the embedded, tacit negotiation yields the same result as the initial, explicit version, the

troubles-telling itself is brought to possible closure. That the troubles-telling is structured in this way suggests that it is strongly accomplice to the elicitation of a visit by troubles-recipient, in the first place; i.e., that the candidate Troubles-Telling Sequence is in a range of ways being subordinated to, what in this case constitutes a priority matter.

A crucial feature of the phenomenon, Negotiating a Plan which has a 'trouble' as a possible 'obstacle', is that the trouble can be seen as irrevocably answerable to the ongoing, ordinary concerns of ordinary troubles-recipients. The following array of instances of another major source of disruption of the candidate sequence suggests that the problem does not reside in the category 'ordinary troubles-recipient' with its attendant 'ordinary concerns', but that the trouble may find itself answerable to the specialized concerns of 'experts', as well. The problematic troubles-recipients in these instances are not 'professionals', but can be seen to be in various ways exhibiting expertise by reference to the trouble, where that exhibiting of expertise is disruptive of the troubles-talk and generates dispute. We note that the instances were not collected for the 'expertise' feature, but simply as cases in which dispute emerged out of troubles-talk. A review of the fragments yielded this other feature.

### B.3. Dispute: The 'Trouble' as a Source of Contention

In an earlier consideration of inquiry into 'real' versus merely apparent seriousness of a trouble, pages 128ff, we showed a fragment which we take to be an instance of Dispute in Troubles-Talk (Fragment (1) pages 129-130). A study of this 'contaminant' necessarily requires consideration of 'dispute', 'argument', 'disagreement', etc., in its own right, as the consideration of Case-Building in Troubles-Talk required

analysis of aspects of 'case-building', 'defense', 'accounting', etc., and a discussion of Negotiations in Troubles-Talk engaged us in considerations of 'counter-proposals', 'invitations', etc. We are not at this time in a position to do such work on the phenomenon of 'dispute', nor do we take it that an appropriate procedure would be to show candidate instances without supplying analyses. As a sort of compromise we will show a few fragments from a point at which recognizable troubles-talk is occurring to a point at which recognizable dispute is occurring, and thus at least provide a glimpse of the phenomenon.

B.3.(1) [Fr:USI:57ff] ((V is finishing a story))

V: Cause that-that's (his policy).  
 J: Hey Victor,  
 V: So I (have to say)  
 J: The next time you see me I'm gonna be looking like he:ll  
 you know why,  
 (0.7)  
 J: Cause e:very damn one of these teeth coming out.  
 ( ): ( ),=  
 J: -bottom and top.  
 (0.7)  
 V: → Doesn't matter you still be you wo:n't you James,  
 J: S-uh:::::, Yeh I guess so-MAYBE ( ) when I see that  
 dentist (come at me) with that damn needle I'm ready to r:run  
 like he:ll. (.) I don't mind eh pulling them but he coming at  
 me that needle's what I can't stand. HAH HAH HAH!  
 V: → [Use]- Tell him gas.  
 J: 'hh Huh?  
 V: Tell him gas.  
 (0.4)  
 J: Uh- No I don't (want no ga-s, no) I wi-I will take it.  
 V: → [Well let me ask you this question.  
 J: You know?  
 V: Let me ask you o n e question.  
 J: [I'll take it. [Yeh right.  
 V: [Let me ask you this  
 question.  
 J: Yeh.  
 V: → Are you getting toothaches?  
 (0.4)  
 J: NO!  
 (0.2)  
 V: → [(Then don't )-  
 J: [But I got cavities!

Although we take it that the 'dispute' starts with troubles-teller's

"NO! But I got cavities!" we can notice that from the start of the troubles-telling there is a rather strong 'asynchrony'. Specifically, we find the candidate troubles-recipient declining to participate in the A. Approach segment, remaining silent post an A.2.c. Lead-Up although opportunity has been provided for an A.3. Premonitor Response, and again declining to produce a B.2. Announcement Response, eventually denegrating the trouble ("Doesn't matter you still be you wo:n't you James"), and again, post the C.1. Exposition we get, not a C.2. Affiliation, but some advice which undercuts the whole thrust of the Exposition ("Tell him gas"). And when it appears that the troubles-teller finds the prospect of gas even more problematic than the needle, the candidate troubles-recipient proceeds to check out the need for the whole business in the first place; i.e., troubles-teller is treated as making an unnecessary fuss about an unnecessary operation.

While this thoroughly troubles-resistant alignment, by a candidate troubles-recipient who ends up generating a dispute, is dramatic, it turns out to be a version of a range of pre-dispute alignments we find in other materials. So, for example, in the following fragment, prior to the emergence of dispute we find a troubles-recipient in various ways exhibiting an 'asynchronous' relationship to the trouble and its teller.

B.3.(2) [HG:2ff:S]

N: He really hurt me he goes I'm sorry, 'hh wehh'hh I ghho  
 th(h)at doesn't make i(h)t a(h)n(h)y better you know he  
 was just (0.4) so, e-he didn't mean to be but he was  
 really hurting me.  
 H: - [t Well does it- look all marked u:p?=  
 N: -nNo:, it's alr- it's alright, just in a couple places  
 but I can cover it u:p,-  
 H: -Yea:h,  
 N: But he goes, (.) he:- he goes you have a really mild case  
 he goes,  
 H: - Of wha:t.]  
 N: [You]sh- A:cne-e,-  
 H: -Oh: : , hhh  
 N: [said]you shouldn't even worry about it.



- (0.4)
- N: And that made me feel good he- I guess he sees some pruddy  
bad ca:ses=
- H: -Y<sup>e</sup> a h .]
- N: [come i:]n or something you know,  
(.)
- N: So he gave me these pills to ta:ke?-
- H: -What.Tetracyclene?
- N: 'pt No: cause I used to take that and it didn't he:lp so he  
gave me something e:lse.-
- H: -Hm:.
- (0.2)
- N: He sai:d- you know, (0.2) sometimes Tetracyclene just  
doesn't he:lp.
- (0.4)
- N: Also he said that (0.3) 't what you ea:t, (0.2) and how you  
wash your face has nothing to do with it,  
(0.8)
- H: You're kidding.
- N: [nNo:]
- (0.4)
- N: He says it's all inside you it's an emotional thing and, 'hhh  
a[:nd,]
- H: - [Yeah]but what you ea:t if you eat greasy foo:d

For one, we note a place for a C.2. Affiliation occupied by an inquiry into what, for them, might be the real, consequential seriousness of the trouble. These are two young women who are going to the theatre tonight. There is always the possibility of meeting eligible young men. If troubles-teller is "all marked up" their combined chances are drastically reduced. In response to a report of 'pain', troubles-recipient inquires into the important issue; i.e., what consequences will this trouble have for her.

A subsequent display of disorientation ("Of wha:t"), while it may or may not be legitimate at this point in the talk, is recurrently an index of recipient resistance. And the requirement that the "case" be specified may be an exhibit of an orientation to expertise, knowledgeability, etc.

Further on, when the display of knowledgeability ("What.Tetracyclene?") turns out to be wrong, we can see troubles-recipient thereafter

recognizably 'reserving judgement' on the advisability of the "something else"; i.e., in the "hm:" and the silence which follows troubles-teller's invocation of the doctor's assertion that "sometimes Tetracylene just doesn't he:lp" there is no concession to the possible unhelpfulness of the medication with which troubles-recipient has initially aligned.

We want to note a phenomenon which appears in this fragment, as well as in others. Although we set ourselves the task in this report to be as economical as possible, we beg indulgence for a lapse, and introduce a phenomenon for a feature which, if physicists can invoke it, surely we sociologists may; i.e., its charm. We take what is occurring in this fragment to be a version of what Harvey Sacks calls Practical Mysticism. In a lecture of March 5, 1969, Lecture 9 pages 14-16, Sacks is considering various features of a fragment in which one woman is recommending a book on Extrasensory Perception to another; a book which the recommender has borrowed from a third party and thus cannot lend to the current co-participant. Following is an excerpt of the conversation.

(1) [SBL:2:1:7:7ff]

B: Actually- this book is a uh manual practically, he tells you how.

M: - See, uh:: I wonder if they don't have that in uh:: is it an expensive book?

B: I would guess it is, but the- the price has been clipped off of the cover, you know,

M: Mm hm,  
(1.0)

B: Cause someone else asked me that.

M: Mm hm,  
(2.0)

M: Cause I thought I might-

B: [So I looked, and the corner's been clipped off.

M: Uh huh, I thought perhaps I wouldn't mind getting eh the- or perhaps I could get it from the library.

Sacks makes the following observations.

A lot of people are amazed at other people's gullibility. "Imagine all these people who believe in E.S.P." Now, one has to come to appreciate the way in which people believe in E.S.P. I want to introduce a term, and it is not to be heard in the way,

for example, a title of a book would be heard. The term is Practical Mysticism. What I mean when I say that people are 'practical mystics' is captured in this conversation. For one, at one point one of them asks, "Is it an expensive book?"

Now, imagine yourself a really serious believer in E.S.P. and then consider the sorts of uses that E.S.P. would have. For example, obviously you could use it in the stock market. Now suppose I came to you and said, "You really believe in E.S.P. Well, here's a book. I guarantee it. I want \$50,000 for it." Whatever I asked, it would only set up the task of getting the money.

Now, it's routinely the case for people who believe in E.S.P., in the sense that they operate with it, they use it all the time, that their belief in E.S.P. has a special character as compared to their belief in other things. For them, a book about E.S.P. is still a book, and you'd just as soon wait two weeks to borrow it than buy it, even if it was \$2.95. If it costs \$8.00 you'll get it out of the library.

The lesson is that when you go about disparaging people who believe in E.S.P. you have to try to figure out what does it mean to believe in E.S.P. It's probably quite different than believing, for example, that the car that is bearing down on you doesn't see you. You don't then figure, for example, "Well, what is it going to cost for an operation?" but you jump. And I'm sure that these ladies would jump. That is, for things that anybody knows are practical things, they'll behave practically. And indeed, they behave practically with respect to E.S.P. Which is to say that while they say they believe in it and they talk a good deal about it and they go to meetings and they use it all the time, they're not staking any money on it.

We find a similar phenomenon in Fragment B.3.(2) above. That is, while the doctor has introduced his patient to this theory of the emotional basis of acne, which troubles-teller formulates as "something new they're discovering", nevertheless the doctor has prescribed, and the patient has accepted, medication. The medication is treated in utter independence of the emotion theory. And we can note that this partitioning between, say, the 'wonderful' and the 'practical' is preserved by the thoroughly resistive recipient who, throughout the interaction has been seeking and finding ways to pick at and undercut teller's presentation. Specifically, the troubles-recipient does not herself propose the incongruity of troubles-teller's espousal of the 'wonderful' (data not shown) and reliance on the 'practical'.

Fragment B.3.(2) may be seen to instance Sacks' proposal about 'practical mysticism', posed in terms of E.S.P., that "they're not staking any money on it." In B.3.(2) we can see that, for the emotion-theory of acne, they're not staking her complexion on it. The following instance of Practical Mysticism in Troubles-Talk is taken from the conversation from which Fragment A.(4) pages 82-83 was excerpted, in which a new-found remedy is being introduced.

(1) [NB:IV:10:32ff]

L: She nearly died a thousand times and I was telling her about you.

E: Yeah,

L: 'hhhh So anyway, she got this, Vi:dafoam, and, I bought some down there and I put some on my nails last night and I put on some tonight. 'hh And she said that was the only thing that healed them.

E: Vi:dafoam.

L: - Yeah. And I- I payed a dollar:: uh-eighty three for it but then it might be a little cheaper here.

As Sacks proposes about 'practical mystics', "for things that anybody knows are practical things, they'll behave practically." In this case, a 'wonderful' new remedy, announced as "the only thing that healed" an ailment from which a coparticipant is intensely suffering, is also, most 'practically', proposed as a probable relative bargain for a prospective purchaser.

Returning to our consideration of Dispute in Troubles-Talk, in the following three fragments a troubles-recipient aligns as an advice-giver (cf. Fragment B.3.(1) "Tell him gas", "(Then don't [take them out])") and 'dispute' emerges.

B.3.(3) [NB:I:6:13ffR]

L: How: 's your foo:t.-

E: = 't 'hh Oh: it's healing beautifully:-

L: Goo: d.

E: [The other one may have to come o:ff on the other toe I've got it in that but it's not infected.  
(0.8)]

- L: - Why don't you use some stuff on it.  
 E: [t I've got peroxide I put on:  
 it but uh 'h h h h the other one is healing very well: I  
 looked at it the other day I put a new ta:pe on it every  
 da:y so 'h h h h h h h  
 L: - Why don't you get that nay-uh::: Revlon  
na:l l:::  
 E: [h h h Well that's not therapeutic Lottie really it says  
 on the (0.4) thi:ng e-th-when you g-ah this pero:xide is:  
 uh: kind of uh, h h 'h h h, h h  
 L: - What do you mean uh th-u do:ctors  
use it,

## B.3.(4) [SBL:2:1:8:2]

- F: I was thinking this morning, I was having a little trouble  
 in the bathroom, and I thought oh, boy, I-n-I-uh- uh this  
 business of getting up at six o'clock and being ready to  
 eat, is uh- is not for me, heh heh.  
 B: - Uh huh, Well, uh th-((clears throat))  
 F: Somehow you endure it.  
 B: - There's an- there's an answer to that too.  
 (2.0)  
 B: h h h h A physical answer t(hh)o h h h  
 F: You mean taking laxative at night.  
 B: No, suppositories. That takes-  
 F: - Well, it doesn't always work for me Bea,  
 B: - No?  
 F: It didn't work this morning.

## B.3.(5) [TCI(b):9:1] ((J has offered an A.l.a. Inquiry))

- M: My head feels (.) better,  
 J: "Uh huh,"  
 (1.5)  
 M: uk h h h, ih uk h h  
 J: [Well that's goo(h)d,  
 (1.4)  
 J: - Take (.) you know make sure you're taking (.) plenty of  
vitamins and  
 (0.7)  
 M: - Ye:h?  
 J: - you know drink plenty of wa:ter.  
 (1.0)  
 M: - 't'h h h h h Can't drink wa:ter when you're slee:ping.

In the three above fragments and in Fragment B.3.(1), the alignment of a troubles-recipient as an advisor occurs very early in the troubles-talk, the submitting of remedies occurring perhaps specifically 'prematurely'; i.e., an element of the D. Work-Up segment which has strong close-implicature (see pages 34-37) is introduced before a troubles-telling

has really gotten started. And it is possible that the advice is being resisted as much for that feature as for the nature of the advice itself, where we note that various sorts of recommendations, e.g., of remedies, recipes, machinery, holiday venues, shortcuts, etc. etc., may be accepted and taken down in great detail although recipient has no intention of using them; i.e., acceptance or rejection may be in great part an interactional matter.

And it appears that 'interactional matter' names something other than proper sequencing and sheer cross-participant accord. So, for example, in the following fragment, we find advice being positioned in what would seem to be an appropriate troubles-telling segment; i.e., in a D. Work-Up segment initiated by the troubles-teller, and emerging as the logical outcome of a diagnosis offered by troubles-recipient and concurred in by troubles-teller. Nevertheless, the advice, when it is delivered, is disputed.

B.3.(6) [Rah:II:12-13]

- J: - You know he's a funny little in<sub>[secu:re l]ittle boy:-</sub>  
 I: <sub>[eeY e: h,]</sub>  
 J: -isn't he:.  
 I: <sub>[Beh-uh b'ut the point is Jessie don't forget no:w.'h</sub>  
 (0.3)  
 I: Eh:m (.) He was so: close to 'Gordon' wa:sn't he.-  
 I: -He wa<sub>[s v e r y : : .]</sub>  
 J: <sub>[\*well this is it]you see</sub> <sub>[Mm:,</sub>  
 I: - <sub>[And no<sub>[w he's fgo:ne. And</sub></sub>  
 J: - he thinks ↑you're gonna go as well you see:  
 I: - is it <sub>[but it- it's) Oh::</sub> <sub>[Well I think this</sub>  
 I: - <sub>[Well ih- S o : : h]be patient with him course we::</sub>  
 don't mi:nd,  
 J: - But it gets me down a bit you know <sub>[I: mean I ca:n't</sub>  
 I: <sub>[(Loo:k.)</sub>  
 J: I ca:n't mo:ve? you know he <sub>[says where you goi:n g,]-</sub>  
 I: <sub>[(What) Well]</sub>  
 J: - <sub>[I've t o : l d y]ou:.</sub>  
 (.)  
 J: Mm[:?]  
 I: - Just ↑send him round here for a couple of: hou:rs.  
 J: - <sub>[ehh! 'nh</sub> <sub>[But then</sub>

J: - (tha-) But you know ↑I:da I never go ↑anywhere [do I::.]  
 I: [I:: ↑kn]ow=  
 I: -Ye:ah.

The disputed advice is abandoned, and reissued at a next appropriate place; i.e., again after some diagnostic work initiated by the troubles-teller and participated in by the candidate advisor.

B.3.(6.a.) [Rah:II:13-15]

J: - But he's alright if there's somebody else he::re,  
 (.)  
 I: \*Ye-s y e s \* b e c a u s e  
 J: [But it's Jus:t]u when he's on]his ow[n he d]oesn't like  
 I: [h e ]h a : t e s ]=  
 J: -[being on]his ow:n]  
 I: -[t h a t ]house o'n his ow:n.  
 J: [IYe::ah,  
 I: He ha:tes it. 'h h  
 J: [I suppo:se you know: i t  
 I: [Well [Yeh-  
 (.)  
 I: - Ih-ih-it let him cause I mean it's not all that long you  
 know [Jus:t  
 J: - [Yeh 'h [Well you see it's different for me::<eh for (.)  
 the other boy:s be[cause they always had each othe:r.  
 I: [Yeh  
 I: E:xactly.

On this round, the advice is minimally acknowledged and the diagnostic talk returned to (cf. the consideration of 'dismissors' including "Yeah. Well...", page 146).<sup>1</sup> The candidate advisor again participates in this next round of diagnostic talk and upon its closure yet again offers the advice, which is, again, disputed.

J: be-cause they always had each othe:r.  
 I: [Yeh

1. It is at least possible that not only is the type of talk which preceded the advice returned to, but the very utterance which had been abandoned by reference to some overlapping talk preceding the advice. That is, "I suppo:se you know: it" may be a start on "...it's different for the other boy:s...", abandoned in overlap and then reissued post a minimal acknowledgment of the advice (cf. the consideration of another possible instance of Abandoned and Repositioned Utterances, page 137 footnote 1).

I: Exactly. Where Tho<sub>mas-</sub>  
 J: [(But) [Ye:s,]  
 (.)  
 I: [[Well there's o<sub>nly</sub> Da:nny and they fight like the (devil)-  
 J: -uWell thi:s is i:t. ]E x a o tly, ya s.  
 J: [ehhhhh hh] [neh]neh] tly, ya s. [hhhhh  
 J: An d u h  
 I: - [So just] (.) ulittle patience with him cause I: don't  
 mind you know that.  
 J: - Yeh but ih-ih- [it's-]  
 I: [Yas.]  
 J: - You know it's I try: I try to be patient hh [a ha ha I: da]  
 I: [I kn::ow,] and ]-  
 J: - [eh!  
 I: it's easy for me to say th<sub>is</sub>,  
 J: [hhhe:h hh Oh::: dearie m]e:,  
 I: [e e : Yah.]

From an array selected simply as instancing the phenomenon of Dispute in Troubles-Talk, a rather particular source of dispute has emerged. In Fragments B.3.(1) and (3)-(5) 'dispute' appears to be a product of a combination of 'interactional asynchrony' and the 'improper sequencing' of a particular activity; i.e., a 'premature' offering of advice by a troubles-recipient. In effect, no sooner is the trouble announced than the advice is proffered. And in the B.3.(6)-(6.a.) materials we find a candidate advice-giver orienting to both those features; i.e., working to set up a proper interactional and sequential context for an advice-giving.

Specifically, over a series of recycles, the advice is 'interactionally synchronized'; i.e., is produced subsequent to displays of accord between troubles-teller and troubles-recipient cum candidate advice-giver, and is 'properly sequenced'; i.e., is produced in a latter Troubles-Talk Segment, subsequent to, and proffered as a 'logical outcome of', a standard D. Work-Up component, 'diagnosis'. Where, further, there may be an independently powerful relationship between 'diagnosis' and 'advice', the latter specifically implicated, and entrained by, the former.



However, we also find that over a series of recycles, the 'interactionally synchronized', 'properly sequenced' advice is, again and again, rejected/disputed. As we noted earlier, asserted acceptance or rejection of advice may have little to do with the nature, quality, relevance, etc., of the advice itself, or with the advice-recipient's intentions to use it, let alone whether or not, having been by-assertion accepted or rejected, the advice is actually used. That is, acceptance/rejection of advice appears to be a conversation-local phenomenon.

In Fragments B.3.(1) and (3)-(5) the advice has not been conversation-locally processed to promote acceptance. And in those fragments, the advice is rejected. But in Fragment B.3.(6)-(6.a.) the advice is, repeatedly, conversation-locally processed to promote acceptance, and is, repeatedly, rejected. That is, it appears that whether or not the advice is processed to promote acceptance, it gets rejected. Again, as we noted earlier, rejection is not an automatic outcome of advice-giving. We are, therefore, led to wonder if perhaps the problem lies in the particular environment into which the advice in these cases is being introduced; i.e., that of Troubles-Talk.

In that regard we can notice that while the categories Troubles-Teller and Troubles-Recipient constitute a fitted pair, not only do the categories Troubles-Teller and Advice Giver not constitute such a fitted pair, but in terms of the general conversational categories, 'speaker' and 'recipient', both occupy the same category, that of 'speaker', with the coparticipant as proper 'recipient'. Upon the proffering of advice by a coparticipant, a Troubles-Teller is shifted into incumbency in the appropriate paired category vis-a-vis an Advice-Giver, that of Advice-Recipient, and in more general terms, is transformed from a 'speaker' to a 'recipient' of ongoing talk.

Thus, the accepting of advice may bring with it removal from the category Troubles-Teller and loss of whatever perquisites that troubles-relevant category and its attendant conversation-general category, 'speaker', may entail. Correlatively, the delivering of advice may bring with it removal from the category Troubles-Recipient and acquittal from whatever obligations that troubles-relevant category and its attendant conversation-general category, 'recipient', may entail.

In sum, the proffering of advice in the course of Troubles-Talk, with its new, and reversed, set of categories and their attendant rights and obligations, may implicate an altogether different form of talk; i.e., not Troubles-Talk, but that which various interaction analysts call the Service Encounter, in which the criterial categories are, say, Service-Seeker and Service-Supplier (the relevant subcategories in this case being Advice-Seeker and Advice-Giver).

In such an environment, someone with a trouble may conduct himself as recipient-elect until such time as the Advice-Giver is prepared to deliver the sought-for advice, whereupon the Advice-Seeker assumes full recipientship. And it is that environment in which the earlier-mentioned "powerful relationship between 'diagnosis' and 'advice', the latter specifically implicated and entrained by the former" properly resides.

Clearly, there is a strong convergence between Troubles-Talk and the Service Encounter. But that convergence may be problematic in just the ways that the convergence of Troubles-Talk with Building a Case, and the convergence of Troubles-Talk with Negotiating a Plan are problematic; i.e., may provide for 'contamination' of Troubles-Talk with procedures and components of the convergent Service Encounter, and for a disruption of the Troubles-Talk Sequence.

The recurrently-found rejection of advice in Troubles-Talk may,

then, be accomplice to an attempt by Troubles-Teller to preserve the status of the talk as Troubles-Talk, with its particular shape and consequences for the interaction, and to maintain incumbency in the category Troubles-Teller with its particular and general perquisites.

In contrast to Building a Case, in which the 'trouble' alternates with possible 'misdeed', and Negotiating a Plan, in which the 'trouble' alternates with possible 'obstacle', the Service Encounter preserves the 'trouble' as a 'trouble'. The problematic alternation resides at a different level. It appears that in Troubles-Talk the focal object is the 'teller', while in the Service Encounter, the focal object is the 'trouble'. To bring home this distinction, we turn to a phenomenon which emerged 15 years ago and has been lying around in a notebook since.

The phenomenon emerged in the course of transcribing tapes from an emergency ambulance service. An overall sense of the 'essential indifference' of the service agency to 'person' became crystallized in an utterly recurrent sort of interchange between agency personnel and various parties phoning the agency on behalf of a stricken person. The callers recurrently found themselves confronted with the Cargo Syndrome. Specifically, the agency wanted particular information about the caller and did not want that same information about the sick or injured person. The problematically distributed information was particularly 'person-indexical', someone's name. In terms of sheer efficiency, the agency would have benefitted by requesting the sufferer's name although they had no practical use for it, because callers on behalf of sufferers in various ways insisted upon the relevance of the sufferer's name. Following is an array of instances of the Cargo Syndrome.

In the first place, the relevance of sufferer's name generated inquiries on that issue when a series of form-questions had been gone

through and the agency had not solicited sufferer's name.

(1) [A:IV:57]

A: May I have your name please,  
 C: Missuz Bradley?  
 A: First- name?  
 C: Loretta?  
 A: Oka:y?  
 ( pause )  
 A: And the phone number you're calling from.  
 C: Broadway seven, one six, three three.  
 A: Okay,  
 C: And this is for Doctor Edletack.  
 A: Okay, this is to-uh-  
 C: -  
 A: - Uh, no. <sup>1</sup> [Do you need the patient's name,

(2) [A:I:87]

A: He is landing at Merrill Field.  
 C: Right.  
 A: Okay,  
 C: - A:nd uh do you need the patient's name.  
 A: - No::, no it won't be necessary,

Recurrantly, callers volunteered the name, thus disrupting the orderly progression of the form-sheet questioning (transparently so in Fragments (4) and (5) below).

(3) [A:IV:35]

A: What's your name again please sir,  
 C: [F. T. Galloway.  
 C: - G-a-l-l-o-w-a-y, and uh it's uh:: the man's name is Bill DeMott.

(4) [A:IV:74]

A: May I have your name please,  
 C: - Yes. This is uh Missiz Lowe. L-o-w-e? and the child's name is Bartholemew, fifteen months old.  
 ( pause )  
 A: - And now your first name.  
 C: Annette.

1. The 'hesitation marker' prior to the negative response may be exhibiting an orientation to the problemativeness of that response (cf. Fragment B.2.(3) page 130 in which, to the question "You feeling better now", a problematic negative is hesitation-marked, "Uh:m nNo:." This exchange, and its problematic character, is considered in the Progress Report, page 39).

## (5) [A:I:20]

A: I'll have them out there approximately at six then.  
 C: O-kay.  
 A: [hhh]and-  
 C: - [And the employee's name is Randall.  
 A: - Uh no. May I have your name please.

In the following fragment, caller volunteers the name, and subsequently produces a pre-completion uptake of the 'thrust' of a question which has broken off ("What's the-"). The pre-completion uptake shows the question to have been heard as a request for the sufferer's name.<sup>1</sup>

## (6) [A:I:35]

C: - I have a lady who came over from next door. Missiz Effie Ellis, and her husband is on the jo:b. And I called a doctor and he say to get her to the hospital right away.  
 A: - [So-  
 C: - [What's the-  
 C: - Effie Ellis.

Finally, in the following fragments, the relevance of the sick or injured party as a nameable 'person' is consequential for the hearing of the request for caller's name. Specifically, callers are not certain that it is their name which has been requested. In the first of these fragments we find a combination of indices of an orientation to the relevance of sufferer's name; first, a checkout as to which name was requested, and subsequently a volunteering of the name, as in Fragments (3)-(6) above.

## (7) [A:I:14]

A: May I have your name please,  
 C: - My na:me?  
 A: Yes.  
 C: This is Missüz McCoughlin.  
 .  
 .  
 C: M-c-c-o-u-g-h-l-i-n.  
 A: i-n. Okay.

1. For consideration of pre-completion uptake of a prior utterance at a point of 'faltering', see pages 86ff and page 102.

A: Your first name-  
 C: - [And the lady's name is Miss uz-  
 A: - [Your first initial.  
 C: My n- my name is uh Beth, B-e-t-h,

(8) [A:IV:113]

A: What is your name please,  
 C: - My name? (.) is Ginny Selmur.hhh  
 A: S-e-l, m-u-r,  
 C: Yes sir.

(9) [A:I:98]

A: And uh, may I have your name please?  
 C: Uh, my name's Rostermann.  
 A: How you spell that,  
 C: R-o-s. T-e-r. M-a, n-n.  
 A: Okay, and uh, first name.  
 C: - Mine, Fred.hhh

(10) [A:IV:41]

A: Could I have your name and phone number in case I have to-  
 C: - [call you back, ( )  
 A: - [My name?  
 C: - ( pause )  
 C: - It's- I:: didn't hear you sir,  
 A: Could I have your name and phone number in case I have to  
 call you back,  
 C: Oh yes. Uh::m, my name is Missiz Rudd, E-u-d-d.

(11) [A:IV:3]

A: What was your first name please,  
 C: - Mi:ne? Eleanor.  
 A: Eleanor, Baxter.  
 C: - ( pause )  
 C: - My first name? (.) or her first name.  
 A: Yours.  
 C: Ya::h, Eleanor, hhh  
 A: O:ka::y,  
 C: hehh

It appears that the 'essential concern' of a Service Supplier is with the despatching of a task, and whatever activities, information, etc., are critical thereto. In the above fragments we see the agency confronted again and again with a 'non-essential matter'. We take it that the confrontation in these fragments is a fine-grained index of

a crucial distinction between Troubles-Talk and Service Encounters; i.e., the distinction between focus on 'person' versus focus on 'the trouble', respectively.

A similar sort of 'confrontation' may be occurring in Fragments B.3. (1) and (2)-(6) pages 159-168. Upon the offering of advice, an incipient or ongoing Troubles-Telling converges with a Service Encounter, with the concomitant shift of relevant categories and activities, and, as well, the concomitant shift of focus, away from the troubles-teller as 'person', to the trouble as 'a problem to be efficiently solved'. Again, then, the rejection of advice may be accomplice to a rejection of those shifts; an attempt to preserve the interaction's status as Troubles-Talk with its particular categories and activities, and its focus upon a matter to which the converging Service Encounter is 'essentially indifferent'; i.e., that of teller as 'person', in contrast to, say, a mere bearer of the object of 'essential concern', the trouble itself.

#### Summary

In the Summary to Section II we posed two viable alternative approaches to the observable roughness of the candidate troubles-talk sequence encountered in actual instances of troubles-talk: 1) The sequence is designedly rough, and accountable-for by reference to such issues as its function. 2) The sequence is designedly tight, the roughness an artifact of disordered production, and accountable by reference to problematic local or general contingencies. Detailed analyses of upwards of twenty instances of troubles-talk suggest that the latter characterization may hold.

Certainly it is the case that the talk is not flowing unproblematically from one to another element or segment in a manner which is adequately characterized as the taking up of options from among a loosely

packaged variety, as one might pick this or that particular item from a bag of licorice allsorts according to one's appetite. The materials we have examined are recurrently, characterizably problematic; grossly so and in fine-grained detail. And many of the problems lend themselves to, or become observable in the first place by, a characterization of the talk in terms of a strict sequential progression and disruptions thereof.

In the Introduction to the report we raised the alternative possibilities that the sequence might be gross but strong, or elegant but weak. In as much as we see recurrent evidence of 'disruption', it appears that the latter is the case. Certainly there is evidence of weakness, not only in the absence of 'strong local control' as between the various sequence components; i.e., the absence of the sort of powerful sequential implicativeness of a prior to a next which may be seen in the small 'ritualized' machineries such as Greetings, Closings, Question-Answer, etc., etc.,<sup>1</sup> but in the enormous susceptibility of the phenomenon to 'contamination' by converging issues and procedures.

Further, on occasion, troubles-talk appears to be, say, self-contaminatable; i.e., in the course of 'pure' troubles-talk, issues may be generated which are specifically problematic in that they introduce matters belonging to one or another of the convergent issues with its alternative procedures.

And, further, although the sequence may be designed to fluently navigate the polar relevancies of attention to a trouble versus attention to business as usual, it is constantly encroached upon, and recurrently breached, by the pressure towards business as usual, to which talk about a trouble appears to be irrevocably vulnerable, and to the concerns of

-----

1. For a consideration of the general phenomenon, Adjacency Pairs, see Harvey Sacks lectures, 1964-1972, in particular, Spring 1972, lectures 1 through 5.



which a 'trouble' appears to be irremediably subordinate and accountable.

Also in the Introduction, we raised the possibility that if the sequence is adequately characterized as occurring in a 'disordered' fashion, then that disorder might be accountable, not in terms of the particularities of a given conversation, but as a matter of a or some rather general problem-types encountered or generated by troubles-talk. We take it that the arrays of instances of 'Interactional Asynchrony' and 'Activity Contamination', this latter with its three sub-types 'Building a Case', 'Negotiating a Plan', and 'Dispute', exhibit the generality of the sources of disruption of the candidate sequence.

From the inception of this project we have asked and asked again whether 'troubles-talk' is a phenomenon in its own right, or perhaps no more than a matter of 'content' and otherwise no more than a 'story' or a 'topic', etc., like any other. And again and again, analysis of this or that aspect of troubles-talk shows it to be very much a phenomenon in its own right. The arrays of instances of 'Activity Contamination' are particularly informative on this issue. Specifically, 'content' which might be classified as 'a trouble' occurs in talk which is not at all, or only partially 'troubles-talk', and, indeed, whether or not it is a 'trouble', and whether or not this is 'troubles-talk' is under negotiation. In short, 'troubles-talk' names a specific organization.

Finally, in the course of a consideration of one of the general sources of disruption; i.e., of 'Dispute', another 'contaminant' emerged, that of the Service Encounter, in which the relevant activity might be characterized as 'solving a problem' (cf. 'building a case' and 'negotiating a plan' as converging, contaminant activity-types). This convergence is of particular interest in a study of how people talk about their troubles, in that on what, for the other contaminants is the locus of

alternation; i.e., the 'trouble' (which may alternatively constitute a 'misdeed' or an 'obstacle'), this latter contaminant remains more or less stable, the locus of alternation residing elsewhere. Thus, while a follow-through of issues raised by those contaminants leads to investigation of Building a Case, per se, and Negotiating a Plan, per se, a follow-through of issues raised in the new arrival brings one immediately back to some version of Talk about a Trouble, per se.

Specifically, the locus of alternation touches on the 'identity' of the troubles-teller. In Troubles-Talk, teller constitutes 'person'. In the Service Encounter, teller constitutes 'trouble-carrier'. That this is the locus of alternation while the 'trouble' remains more or less stable, may be particularly problematic in that in both talk-types the 'trouble' is being attended, and it may be not unreasonable to propose that in talk about 'trouble', attention to the trouble is the criterial feature, such that attention to the teller as 'person' is, if anything, a secondary feature and thus its absence in the 'problem solving' activities of the Service Encounter is of no great moment. That is, that what we are proposing as two alternative, problematically converging talk-types are, for all practical purposes, not convergant but identical. Talk about a trouble is talk about a trouble.

We take it that the alternation as between 'person' and 'troubles-carrier' matters; that indeed we are observing two altogether distinctive fields. We are not, however, in any way proposing that the Service Encounter become 'essentially concerned' with troubles-teller as 'person'. Such a concern carries with it an 'essential indifference' to the trouble, which generates a stringent requirement from which the Service Encounter may specifically offer relief.

As is abundantly evidence in the current corpus of troubles-talk

materials, both those included in this report and those which were not, a 'person' is one among others, one who participates in the ongoing everyday activities of the community; one who goes to work, joins his friends on shopping trips, listens to their stories, rejoices in their good times, tells them of his own good times, etc. etc. And the caveat to troubles-teller as 'person' is that he remain one among others, that he be answerable to the requirements of the community. If he declines to do so, he ceases to be 'person'. Thus, while the concerns of the Service Supplier may be simplistically characterized as 'repair and maintenance', the concerns of the Troubles-Recipient may be, equally simplistically, characterized as 'continued function, regardless'. Which is to say that while the Service Encounter may be deficient in 'human' terms, its alternative may be 'materially' pernicious.

Nor does there appear to be a reasonable solution. The two 'essential concerns' and their concomitant 'essential indifferences' seem to be mutually exclusive. And it appears that a 'trouble' is adequately enough managed by a shunting between the two environments. We note, finally, that sufferers of a trouble do not welcome a combining of the two distinctive environments. As we have seen in the various instances of 'Dispute' which may specifically be generated by and resistive to the 'contamination' of a Troubles-Telling by a Service Encounter, when it appears that a Troubles-Recipient is beginning to align as an Advice-Giver; i.e., as a Service Supplier, the Troubles-Teller takes counter-measures. It appears that just as the two categories, Troubles-Teller and Advice-Giver are problematically misfitted, so are the two categories, Advice-Seeker and Troubles-Recipient.

Specifically, a practitioner who responded to a B.1. Announcement with a B.2. Announcement Receipt such as "Oh: no:", or to a C.1.

Exposition component with a C.2. Affiliation such as "Jesus", might be suspected of incompetence. Further, such response-types provide for a warranted 'letting go' by the troubles-teller, and such emotional reciprocity may be unwelcome by an Advice-Seeker. So, for example, in our very small corpus of Institutional Talk about a Trouble, we find one practitioner who, in a range of ways, strikes us as 'soft'. At one point in the course of an Advice-Seeker's C.1. Exposition, he produces an utterance which is unique in our limited Institutional corpus, a mild C.2. Affiliation, "Oh my." And at that point we find an instance of an American invoking the 'British Option'; i.e., declining to produce a C.3. Affiliation Response, but rather, as in some of the British materials, simply continuing with an interactionally independent exposition (see Section I pages 26-31).

(1) [SPC:10:3:4]

- M: And he has gotten to the point now where he: (.) is so confused and everything that he gets (.) the two: people mixed u:p and he thinks this daddy's the other one.
- K: - Oh my:.
- M: - Then he doesn't want him to get close to him and that's (.) one reason why he wants ((sounds like she is fighting tears from now on)) to: uh:: 'hhh right at the ti:me when he's having an- wuh- one of these (0.2) uh: I don't know whether you'd call it spell or what (0.7) 't but when he feels like this, (0.3) that's when he wants to kill himself

It is possible that the speaker is specifically resisting a manifestation of a C.3. Affiliation Response which is, in fact, occurring; i.e., it is possible that the mild, but perhaps powerful in this environment, C.2. Affiliation "Oh my:" has brought her to the tears she is now fighting.<sup>1</sup>

1. In this regard we notice a not uncommon phenomenon, a possible pun-like invocation of what is happening, and its unwelcomeness. Just post the C.2. Affiliation by which Advice-Giver is locally aligning as a Troubles-Recipient; i.e., is becoming perhaps over-personal, speaker refers to a problematic closeness, in the utterance "Then

In short, it is from Troubles-Recipients, in an environment of a Troubles-Telling, that a Troubles-Teller properly receives and accepts affiliation, and from Service-Suppliers, in an environment of a Service Encounter, that a Service-Seeker properly receives and accepts advice. Cross-environment profferings of Affiliation and Advice turn out to be problematic and specifically, rejected.

### Conclusion

We are satisfied that there are numerous good grounds to characterize the materials we have examined as instances of an elegant, tightly organized sequence, which, in our current corpus, is never actualized, and may in general be actualized at best utterly rarely. And a gross-est account of that non-actualization is that there is no environment in which the sequence can optimally occur; no environment which is not in various ways hostile to certain elements of the sequence.

In the case of storytelling, we find one environment, that of co-conversationalists, which is hostile to an optimal telling, but we also find an environment, that of Performer-Audience, which is favorable to an optimal telling. Indeed, it appears that when a storyteller produces a story, he is orienting to that environment and relying upon Audience behavior from his co-conversationalists, where, massively, co-conversationalists decline to align as Audience, and thus, massively, story-tellings in conversation are in various ways observably mis-shapen.

For talk about a trouble, however, there is no single environment which favors optimum production of the sequence. The analog of the optimal storytelling environment; i.e., the Institutional environment, is hostile to the Affiliative component of troubles-talk. So, e.g., in our two excerpts from the same Institutional interaction, we see an Advice-Seeker resisting affiliation by Advice-Giver (Fragment (1) page

100), and somewhat later in the interaction, Advice-Giver producing a formalized, 'diagnostic' version of an Affiliative, and specifically deploying even that as a device to soften an interruption of the conversation in the interests of the trouble in contrast to the telling (Fragment (1) page 66).

It would appear that in order for the sequence to occur in its optimum form, any person with whom the Affiliative component is appropriate would also have to be an accredited Service Supplier, and any person with whom the Service component is appropriate would also have to be a proper Troubles-Recipient. In short, the sequence requires that ones friends and relatives also be practitioners.

This characterization invokes the tribal situation, in which relationships and skills are distributed throughout an enormously concentrated group, and thus a person with whom one may confidently cry, is very likely to be someone from whom one may confidently accept advice. And thus, as well, being possessed of a trouble does not tend to undercut one's status as one among others and generate pressurization towards business as usual, since many of the same people who are 'essentially concerned' with this party as 'person', are also 'essentially concerned' with the trouble of which he happens to be 'carrier'. It is equally a matter of business as usual to engage in remedial activities as it is to engage in 'personal' activities.

Recalling the fantasizing we indulged in, in the Summary of Section II, with regard to the possible transition status of the sequence, as either evolving toward total ritualization or devolving from such a condition, the same sort of issue emerges with regard to there being no single environment favorable to optimum production of the sequence. In this case, it is possible that the sequence is devolving from a:

situation which, were it to be replicated currently, would require that each person had his own friend/mechanic, mother/opthamologist, brother/veterinarian, uncle/solicitor, etc. etc. To adapt to current circumstances, the sequence may be decomposing into two distinctive sequences; one in which there is no provision for Servicing, and one in which there is no provision for Affiliating. That is, there would be no provision for a proper Troubles-Recipient to offer advice, nor would there be provision for a Troubles-Teller to induce such an activity; i.e., the D. Work-Up segment would not be a component of a Troubles-Telling sequence (the recurrent reports of Relevant Experiences being subsumed as a strictly Affiliative component of the C. Delivery segment). Likewise, there would be no provision for an accredited Service-Supplier to proffer empathetic responses, nor would there be provision for a Service-Seeker to induce such activities; i.e., the C. Delivery segment would not be a component of a Service Encounter (the C.I. Exposition being replaced by a Q-A format in which the practitioner solicits strictly relevant data).

With the sequence still in a transitional state, however, we find Troubles-Tellers and Troubles-Recipients attempting to rationalize their talk; to provide for it as more than a merely 'phatic' exchange (rather than treating such a talk-type as itself deeply remedial), with what turn out to be problematic attempts at problem-solving. And we find Service-Seekers and Service-Suppliers attempting to humanize their talk; to provide for it as more than a merely 'instrumental' exchange (rather than treating such a talk-type as itself intensely relational), with what turn out to be problematic proposals of understanding and commiseration. We close the report with an instance of what we take to be a misbegotten hybrid of Troubles-Talk and Service Encounter, with all the ugliness of a

- H: But- uhm- they won't be a definite a:ns<sub>u</sub>er. to my problem, a:nd when I stop taking them I can't see any reason why: I shan't revert to feelin:g, exactly the same as I have been feeling.
- L: No no ah- I g- I guess I can offer an a:ns<sub>u</sub>er..
- H: [( ) ]
- L: - -A different answer cause I had (difficulty with) number three:.
- H: [( ) ]
- L: - -A:nd I since had a fou::rth. 'hhhh And while I (.) that During that ti:me my weight went up to twelve stone. Now in fact I'm:: uh only five foot. 'hh h
- H: - - [Well I don't ha<sup>A : n : d</sup>ve a weight ]=
- L: - - [problem  
u h : m,  
(.) ]
- L: - - ee-Well you may not have a weight problem but that was my form of stre:ss. I mean you've got your depr(h)ession.-
- H: [ye:s.
- L: - 'hhh Uh:m:: and it- it (.) really I looked terrible I'm only five foot. Now my weight now is eight and a ha:l<sub>f</sub>. Now the way we did it . . .

The various Services being supplied here are in no way designed for this recipient, and are shown by recipient to be ill-designed; i.e., the elementary explanation of antidepressants is followed by an announcement that the recipient is "a trained nurse myse:lf", and the introduction of overweight as a Relevant Experience is argued to be irrelevant; "Well I don't have a weight problem."<sup>1</sup> The attempt to undercut the anonymity of Servicing with the intimacy of Troubles-Reciprocity results in an elephantine travesty which is effectively neither one nor the other but a worst possible version of each; i.e., unwarranted affiliation compounded by inapt servicing.

1. In response to this utterance, Service-Supplier cum Troubles-Recipient produces a device which is indexical of deeply problematic interaction. Having brought an utterance to a completion point and having lapsed into silence, she starts to talk again with a 'continuation', "A:nd uh:m". That object is introduced post a recognizable 'disagreement initiation', "Well I don't...". That is, seeing that a 'disagreement' is under way, a prior speaker produces talk which utterly disattends that a response has been initiated at all. For a consideration of this phenomenon, see Jefferson, "The abominable 'Ne?' an exploration of post-response pursuit of response" in a volume



creature observed in mid-moult.

These materials are excerpted from a B.B.C. radio broadcast recorded some years ago, in which a panel of experts offers advice to telephone callers. A woman is reporting difficulty in handling her young children, exacerbated by a tendency to depression, for which her doctor prescribes antidepressants, which she would prefer to manage without. Two of the panel respond. Each of them attempts to combine Service-Supply with Troubles-Reciprocity; the first by prefacing the advice with a formal 'sympathy' token and a Report of a Relevant Experience, the second by formatting the advice as, again, a Report of a Relevant Experience.

(1) [JRE:A:1-4]

H: 'h h h h And I want to know if there's anything that you can do:, or you can help me with uh:m (.) coping with a situation like this without ah- ( ) resorting to pills.  
(0.3)

M: - We'll Harriet. May I say you know first of all: how (.) sympathetic I am to your difficulties. Uh:: I understand them very well in fact my children were born while I was still a student. and in many ways I: spent as much time looking after the young children as m(h)y wi(h)fe did. 'h h h h And uh: (.) you know, the strength of (.) young children's demands. ever on one's time they're never satisfied with anything simple there's always some difficulty and always some problem. 'h h h h Now whilst we hear a great deal of sympathy indeed as we did from an earlier caller about men having stressful difficulties in their lives I'm sure that women have just as much if not more. 'h h Now having said that (.) let's jump a little bit further and if I can explain to you a little why people get depressed.

((ca 34 lines omitted; elementary explanation of depression and antidepressants))

M: - It's rather like a bandage round an ankle. The bandage is doing no good to the ankle at all if it's been strained. But it's giving it a bit of support.

H: what I feel: But I feel that (.) uh:m 'hh I know they will help me. I'm a:- a trained nurse myself.-  
[Ye:s: well (.) Well that's

M: - Y-ah?

H: [And I know I've seen ( ) a lot of people but (.) I know perfectly well: that if I take the tablets for a period of time (.) they will help me.

M: Mm hm

## References Cited

- Buton, G., "No-close closings," in M. Atkinson and J. Heritage (eds.) Structures of Social Action (tentative title), Oxford, MacMillan (forthcoming 1981).
- Goffman, E., Interaction Ritual, New York, Doubleday, 1967.
- Jefferson, J., "A case of precision timing in ordinary conversation," Semiotica, Vol IX, 1973.
- \_\_\_\_\_, "A technique for inviting laughter and its subsequent acceptance/declination," in G. Psathas (ed.) Everyday Language: Studies in Ethnomethodology, Irvington Press, 1977.
- \_\_\_\_\_, "Sequential aspects of storytelling in conversation," in J. Schenkein (ed.) Studies in the Organization of Conversational Interaction, Academic Press, Inc., 1978.
- \_\_\_\_\_, "The abominable 'Ne?': an exploration of post-response pursuit of response," in P. Schroder (ed.) Dialogforschung, Institut fur deutsche Sprache, Mannheim (in press).
- \_\_\_\_\_, "List construction as a task and resource", a paper presented at the First German-British Colloquium on Ethnomethodology and Conversation Analysis, Konstanz, April 1980.
- \_\_\_\_\_, "On exposed and embedded correction in conversation," in J. Schenkein (ed.) Studies in the Organization of Conversational Interaction, Volume II, Academic Press, Inc., (forthcoming 1981).
- \_\_\_\_\_, Sacks, H., and Schegloff, E., "Notes on laughter in the pursuit of intimacy," in J. Schenkein (ed.) ibid.
- Labov, W., and Waletzky, J., "Narrative analysis: oral versions of personal experience," in J. Helm (ed.) Essays on the Verbal and Visual Arts, U. Washington Press, Seattle, 1966.
- Leach, E.R., "Animal categories and verbal abuse," in Lenneberg (ed.) New Directions in the Study of Language, 1965.
- Pomerantz, A., "Telling my side: 'limited access' as a fishing device," in Sociological Inquiry 50:3-4, 1980.
- \_\_\_\_\_, "Catching them truants!" a paper presented at the First German-British Research Colloquium, op cit.
- \*Sacks, H., transcribed unpublished lectures delivered at the University of California, Los Angeles and, from 1969 on, at the University of California, Irvine, as follows.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Spring 1966 Lecture 27
  - \_\_\_\_\_. Fall 1967 Lecture 5
  - \_\_\_\_\_. March 9, 1967
- 
- \* An article by Harvey Sacks which has not been cited but is relevant to a study of 'talk about a trouble' is "The search for help: no one to turn to," in E. Schneidman (ed.) Essays in Self-Destruction, 1967.

- \_\_\_\_\_ . May 29, 1968
- \_\_\_\_\_ . April 17, 1968.
- \_\_\_\_\_ . Winter 1969 Lecture 1
- \_\_\_\_\_ . March 5, 1969
- \_\_\_\_\_ . February 13, 1970
- \_\_\_\_\_ . Winter 1970 Lecture 5
- \_\_\_\_\_ . February 19, 1971
- \_\_\_\_\_ . April 12, 1971
- \_\_\_\_\_ . May 24, 1971
- \_\_\_\_\_ . Spring 1972 Lectures 1-6

Schegloff, E. and Sacks, H., "Opening up closings," Semiotica, Vol VIII,  
1973.

## Guide to the Transcript Conventions

### I. Sequencing

[ A: A:nd the:n, Mister Nevins, 'hh  
may put his defense.  
P: Mm,

A single bracket indicates the point at which one utterance is overlapped by another.

[[ A: M-hm,  
P: [[ 'hhhhh The woman that made the  
dress I can't say to her . . .

Double brackets indicate that two utterances start simultaneously.

] P: Well the t h i n g i : s ,  
A: [that you would l]ike

A single right-hand bracket indicates the point at which overlapping utterances or utterance components end vis-a-vis one another.

- A: And you walked out of the shop  
wearing the sandals.-  
P: -Yes I did. Yes.

The equal signs indicate no interval between the end of one piece of talk and the start of a next. This convention is used as between one speaker's talk and another's and as between parts of a same speaker's talk.

A: I will the:n ask you if there-  
P: Mm  
A: -are any questions,

(0.0) P: and the date that I actually  
received them:--:..  
(0.7)

Numbers in parentheses indicate elapsed time in tenths of seconds.

A: And you walked out of the shop  
wearing the sandals.

(.) A: A:n:d, (.) you're entitled to  
call any witnesses . . .

The dot in parentheses indicates a very brief silence, say, 1/10 second or less.

### II. Sound Production

?..? D: and did you get an extension.

A: you're entitled to call any  
witnesses to support your  
clai::m? if you have any,

P: We:ll. (.) I don't know? I  
suppose . . .

Punctuation symbols are not used as grammatical markers, but for intonation. So, for example, a 'question' may be transcribed with a comma or a period while question-marks may be used for utterances which are not 'questions'. The [?] indicates not fully rising intonation.

∴ A: A:n:d, (·) you're entitled to call any witnesses to support your clai::m? if you have any,

Colons indicate that the prior sound is prolonged. The more colons, the longer the sound.

— A: A:n:d, (·) you're entitled to call any witnesses to support your clai::m? if you have any,

Underscoring indicates various forms of stressing and may involve pitch and/or volume.

—∴ A: your clai::m

The relationship between underscore and colons indicates pitch change (or non-change) in the course of a word. In "clai::m" pitch rises at the end, in "clai::m" pitch falls at the end, in "clai::m" and "clai::m" pitch does not change in the course of the word, the former being lightly stressed, the latter being heavily stressed.

H: your clai::m

H: your clai::m

H: your clai::m

- P: I've took it- uh:: I've . . .

The dash indicates a 'cut off' or 'hitch'.

P: "Yeh"

The degree signs indicate that the talk they bracket is low in volume.

↑ P: I said to her ↑what's thi:s,

An upward arrow indicates strongly rising pitch in the word or sound which follows.

↓ A: It isn't clea::r, from your statement, u-what you're clai:ming.

A downward arrow indicates strongly falling pitch in the word or sound which follows.

word A: Can we no:w (0.3) look at the: (0.2) uh:: (0.7) dispu:te . . .

A dash over a letter indicates that the sound is long; in this case, "thee".

word A: It isn't clea::r, from your statement, u-what you're . . .

A dot under a letter indicates that the sound is short.

·hhh A: ·t·hhh A:n:d, (·) you're . . .

The [hhh] indicates a breath; preceded by a dot, an inbreath, without a dot, an out-breath. The longer the [hhh] the longer the breath.

(h) B: Well that's goo(h)d,

The [h] in parentheses within a word indicates explosive breath as in, e.g., laughter and crying.

UC E: WELL. LET ME SEE HOW THE:: the ball rolls here,

Upper case indicates very high volume.

### III. Miscellaneous

( ) P: I mean why should I pay (out) for a brand new dress,

Single parentheses indicate that transcribers are not sure about the words contained therein. Empty parentheses indicate that nothing could be made of the sounds. The speaker-designation column is treated similarly.

J: Like- ( )- someone tied a knot in my stomach.

G: I jumped outta the eh seat I

(L): [jumped  
(seat),

(( )) N: Fine how'r you. ((clipped))

E: ((cutsey)) I am too.

B: ((laughs))

A: ((clears throat))

The double parentheses surround descriptions of the talk, as with "clipped" and "cutsey", or stand in place of an attempt to transcribe some utterance as in "laughs" and "clears throat".