Making Arrangements:

Remote proposal sequences and attendant structural phenomena in social interaction

Stuart Ekberg

A thesis submitted in fulfilment of the requirements

for the degree Doctor of Philosophy

School of Psychology

University of Adelaide

February 2011

Table of Contents

Abstract

In this thesis, I contribute to the study of how arrangements are made in social interaction. Using conversation analysis, I examine a corpus of 375 telephone calls between employees and clients of three Community Home Care (CHC) service agencies in metropolitan Adelaide, South Australia. My analysis of the CHC data corpus draws upon existing empirical findings within conversation analysis in order to generate novel findings about how people make arrangements with one another, and some of the attendant considerations that parties to such an activity can engage in:

Prospective informings as remote proposals for a future arrangement – Focusing on how employees make arrangements with clients, I show how the employees in the CHC data corpus use 'prospective informings' to detail a future course of action that will involve the recipient of that informing. These informings routinely occasion a double-paired sequence, where informers pursue a response to their informing. This pursuit often occurs even after recipients have provided an initial response. This practice for making arrangements has been previously described by Houtkoop (1987) as 'remote proposing.' I develop Houtkoop's analysis to show how an informing of a future arrangement can be recompleted, with response solicitation, as a proposal that is contingent upon a recipient's acceptance.

Participants' understanding of references to non-present third parties – In the process of making arrangements, references are routinely made to non-present third parties. In the CHC data corpus, these third parties are usually care workers. Prior research (e.g., Sacks & Schegloff, 1979; Schegloff, 1996b) explains how the use of 'recognitional references' (such as the bare name 'Kerry'), conveys to recipients that they should be able to locate the referent from amongst their acquaintances. Conversely, the use of 'non-recognitional references' (such as the description 'a lady called Kerry'), conveys that recipients are unacquainted with the referent. I examine instances where the selection of a recognitional or non-recognitional reference form is followed by a recipient initiating repair on that reference. My analysis provides further evidence that

the existing analytic account of these references corresponds to the way in which participants themselves make sense of them. My analysis also advances an understanding of how repair can be used, by recipients, to indicate the inappositeness of a prior turn.

Post-possible-completion accounts – In a case study of a problematic interaction, I examine a misunderstanding that is not resolved within the repair space, the usual defence of intersubjectivity in interaction (cf. Schegloff, 1992b). Rather, I explore how the source of trouble is addressed, outside of the sequence of its production, with a 'post-possible-completion account.' This account specifies the basis of a misunderstanding and yet, unlike repair, does so without occasioning a revised response to a trouble-source turn.

By considering various aspects of making arrangements in social interaction, I highlight some of the rich order that underpins the maintenance of human relationships across time. In the concluding section of this thesis I review this order, while also discussing practical implications of this analysis for CHC practice.

Declaration

This work contains no material which has been accepted for the award of any other degree or diploma in any university or other tertiary institution and, to the best of my knowledge and belief, contains no material previously published or written by another person, except where due reference has been made in the text.

I give consent to this copy of my thesis, when deposited in the University Library, being made available for loan and photocopying, subject to the provisions of the Copyright Act 1968.

I also give permission for the digital version of my thesis to be made available on the web, via the University's digital research repository, the Library catalogue, the Australasian Digital Theses Program (ADTP) and also through web search engines, unless permission has been granted by the University to restrict access for a period of time.

Stuart Ekberg
February, 2011

Acknowledgements

While much of this thesis involved solitary work, the shape, quality and tenor of what follows would be vastly different without the involvement of the following:

The staff and clients of three community and home care agencies. Although they cannot be explicitly named, this work would, of course, not be possible without their participation. Episodes of their 150 individual lives are the subject for this thesis, and I hope my analysis respects the integrity of those lives.

Amanda LeCouteur, the principal supervisor of this thesis, for encouraging me to work with conversation analysis during my doctoral studies. Throughout my candidature, Amanda has supported a range of opportunities for my professional development, and this study would not be the same without Amanda's guidance and support.

Shona Crabb, the secondary supervisor of this thesis, for being an excellent intellectual sounding board throughout my candidature. Shona's social and emotional support has been exceptional, and displays a keen understanding of postgraduate training as more than just an intellectual exercise.

Celia Kitzinger, for being an enthusiastic mentor in the workings of conversation analysis. Chapter 7 of this thesis is a direct result of Celia's mentoring during and beyond my visit to the University of York, and I acknowledge – with appreciation – her willingness to conduct data sessions on my behalf with Jenny Mandelbaum and Manny Schegloff, whose contributions to that chapter I also acknowledge.

Paul Drew, Merran Toerien, Sue Wilkinson, Rowena Viney, Martha Augoustinos, Jaklin Eliott, Ann Weatherall, Alexa Hepburn, Jonathan Potter, Robin Wooffiitt, Tony Liddicoat, Tanya Stivers, Traci Walker, Brian Torode, Clare Jackson, Victoria Dennington, and Kathy Fogarty. These, and no doubt others, have provided helpful suggestions or inspired words that have either directly or indirectly helped to shape the analysis within this thesis. Meeting, working with, and learning from them has been one of the richest parts of my doctoral research.

Chapter 1

Introduction: Making arrangements in interaction

Making arrangements with other people is a foundational activity in mundane and institutional forms of social interaction. In contrast with arrangements that people make for themselves, arrangements made with others allows for the possibility of a planned and shared social future. Making arrangements to divide up a day into temporally discrete portions, each allotted to particular activities, allows for coordinated, standardised, and therefore corporate social activities (Clayman, 1989). Such activities occur to the highest degrees in industrialised societies, where hours, days, weeks, months, and even years can be divided up and pre-planned. To do so, however, requires mutual agreement between arrangement-making parties. This need for agreement often entails the task of negotiation. Notwithstanding formal negotiation, the most significant of which is possibly peace talks between nation states, negotiation is more generally a mundane and commonplace activity, where parties jointly participate in making decisions about consequential matters. Many future arrangements, from peace between nations right down to decisions about where to eat, all of which are fundamentally social in nature, can require negotiation in order for a conjoint arrangement to be made (Firth, 1995b). In this thesis, I am interested in some of the details of the making mutually-acceptable arrangements.

In brief, the analytic focus of this thesis is on three discrete, and yet interrelated, interactional practices. I will first consider an action-type that can be used to make arrangements where a speaker unilaterally informs a recipient of a future arrangement in which the recipient will be implicated. However, because that future arrangement cannot transpire in the way that the speaker has just described without the agreement of the recipient, I will demonstrate how both speakers and recipients orient to this action as a negotiable proposal, rather than a unilateral informing. I will then turn to consider how speakers and recipient understand references to third parties, who are often integral to the future arrangement being made. I will provide further evidence to support prior research that shows how speakers can index acquaintance or

unacquaintance through the reference forms that they use. Finally, I will examine how a misunderstanding can both occur and be resolved during the process of making an arrangement. A detailed consideration of these three practices, and a passing examination of a few others along the way, will enable a richer appreciation of how social life is organised and sustained across time.

Before turning to the prior research that this thesis seeks to develop, I will provide a slightly more detailed overview of the interactional practices that will be examined in the analysis section of this thesis. This will allow for an appreciation of the relevance of that research to those practices. As indicated above, my initial focus within this thesis will be on an action type that is concerned with making arrangements and, by extension, with the continuity of human social relationships. The action under examination, which I term 'prospective informings,' involves one party positing an arrangement for the future and another party accepting, negotiating, or rejecting that arrangement. This action can be understood as a type of a previously studied class of actions called 'proposals for future action,' or 'remote proposals' (Houtkoop, 1987), in which a recipient is asked to commit to a future course of action. While I will question Houtkoop's claims about the breadth of remote proposals as an action type, I will show how prospective informings are a sub-type of remote proposals. I will also seek to establish, following previous research (Houtkoop-Steenstra, 1990; Houtkoop, 1987), that remote proposals are an interactional rather than a unilateral accomplishment, where the active involvement of a recipient can emerge, and be treated by participants as, a required component in the making of an arrangement.

In the process of making arrangements, including through the use of prospective informings, a whole range of attendant considerations may need to be dealt with by participants. In this thesis, I will focus on one such consideration. This is the problem of how to refer to non-present third parties. I will show how participants can make references to third parties that index acquaintance or unacquaintance between a recipient and that party. I will explore how recipients can, in turn, challenge the reference form that has been used, displaying that they too treat particular reference forms to index either acquaintance or unacquaintance. Finally, I will examine, in detail, an instance where there is a misunderstanding during a prospective informing that entails references to various third parties. I will show how participants address the

2

problems that this misunderstanding entails, in order to pursue the making of an arrangement. In the process of doing so, I will identify a previously undescribed method of re-establishing intersubjectivity, which I term 'post-possible-completion accounts,' and describe how these differ from repair.

What follows in this chapter is a review of the diverse phenomena that have been studied in relation to the matter of making arrangements in interaction. These studies all provide useful insights into both the diversity of how arrangements get made, and how arrangement-making can be studied systematically. In reviewing these studies my focus will be on how arrangements get made *in situ*, that is, in interaction. The study of this domain of social life has been led by a field of study known as conversation analysis. As detailed in §2.2, conversation analysts are interested in developing an observational and natural science of interaction. This science should account for the general ways in which people conduct themselves when they interact with one another, but should also demonstrate how the account can relevantly explain seemingly idiosyncratic details of individual episodes of interaction.

Throughout this thesis, transcribed fragments of individual episodes of interaction will be presented to illustrate both the general analytic claims that are being made, as well as to show how general practices can be adapted to suit the particulars of specific situations. The inclusion of these fragments affords readers an opportunity to verify the analytic account that is offered. Using this process, my aim in this thesis is to provide an empirical account of how participants to interaction are routinely able to arrive at a mutually-agreeable, shared arrangements for future courses of action.

1.1   Making arrangements as a special status, closing relevant topic

Researchers working in the field of conversation analysis have had a longstanding interest in how participants make arrangements. In an early conversation analytic paper, Schegloff and Sacks (1973) explain that making arrangements is an activity that can be an explicit reason for an interaction, or something that occupies the closing section of an interaction. In both positions, but especially when co-opted into the

possible termination of an interaction, making arrangements is a 'closing relevant' action. That is, an arrangement, in occasioning a future episode or episodes of interaction, can warrant the closure of a current interaction. It does so by invoking a deferred occasion, or occasions, in which a relationship can be continued, which warrants the postponing of talk about matters that might relevantly have been discussed within a current interaction.

Interactions that have the specific focus of making arrangements, at least those that are conducted telephonically, are often monotopical. Moreover, that monotopicality is often seemingly apparent to participants, who will routinely close down interactions after an arrangement has been made (Schegloff & Sacks, 1973). The making of arrangements is thought to be a 'special status topic' (Button, 1991) in conversation, as it appears often to be treated by participants as a typically last topic, following which the termination of an interaction becomes a relevant possibility[1] (Button, 1987, 1991; Davidson, 1978; LeBaron & Jones, 2002; McKenzie, 2010; Robinson, 2001; Schegloff & Sacks, 1973; West, 2006). This special status has also been found to be the case in languages other than Anglo-American English, such as Dutch (Houtkoop, 1987), Ecuadorian Spanish (Placencia, 1997), and German[2] (Harren & Raitaniemi, 2008), and has been observed in conversations between two parties who are non-native speakers of English (Firth, 1995c). Moreover, this special status is also the case with related actions that could be thought of as arriving at an arrangement, such as giving directions (Psathas, 1991), which participants can also perceive as the complete content of a monotopical conversation.

---

[1] Although, as Button (1991: 274) explains, making arrangements is closing implicative, rather than terminal elicitive. That is, making arrangements does not automatically lead to the termination of an interaction, but rather occasions the closing of an interaction as a possibly relevant next action.

[2] In German, arrangement-making appears to be a routine element of conversation closings and can extend a closing section of a conversation beyond the canonical or archetypal form that is often found in interactions made in English (Harren & Raitaniemi, 2008; Pavlidou, 1997). In German, however, the practice of referring to future contact with the phrase *bis dann*, or *til then*, has been shown to be so conventionalised that it is even used at the end of conversations, where no arrangement for future contact has been made. It appears to be similar in function to the Greek *ta leme* or the English *see ya*, which do not necessarily get produced in contexts where future contact is assured (Pavlidou, 1997). These sorts of phrases, then, may be more conventionalised formulations than specific references to prior arrangements.

In the event that an interaction does continue past a sequence of arrangement-making, that arrangement can be re-introduced at a later stage as a part of a possible closing down of the interaction. Of course, checking an arrangement is presumably important for participants, given that future social contact can depend upon parties having the same understanding of the details of an occasion for future interaction. The re-introduction of an already-made arrangement, however, appears to accomplish more than just confirmation of that arrangement. Invoking an occasion of future interaction can allow for the possibility that any 'hitherto unmentioned mentionables' (Schegloff & Sacks, 1973: 303) might be postponed and discussed on that later occasion. It does so because making arrangements presents the current conversation as a 'conversation-in-a-series' and thus presents the relationship between parties to an interaction as a 'standing' one (Button, 1987, 1991; Houtkoop, 1987; Schegloff & Sacks, 1973; West, 2006). Because there is a 'standing' relationship, there is the possibility that any unmentioned mentionables could be raised in a future social encounter. Token arrangements, like *we::ll, look, I'll talk tuh y'later* (Button, 1991: 268), are even found in conversation closings where no prior arrangements have been made in the conversation. Their power seems to come from arrangement-making as a 'special status topic' that is closing implicative. Because a future arrangement points to the possibility of further opportunities to interact and to raise unmentioned mentionables, there is a basis for terminating a current interaction (Button, 1991).

The closing implicature of arrangement-making can have consequences for institutionalised forms of arrangement-making. For instance, in calls to emergency services dispatch centres (i.e., for police, fire, and ambulance), callers and call takers must collaborate in establishing that the appropriate preconditions are present to warrant a particular emergency service, or services, to be dispatched. In the event that an arrangement for a callout is made, the possibility of closing down the interaction becomes relevant. Because of its closing implicature, making an arrangement can pose a challenge for emergency services call takers, whose institutional aim can be to keep callers on the line until a dispatch arrives. Informing callers of a decision to dispatch, such as through utterances like *help is on the way*, can therefore be problematic for call takers, whose institutional objective is not to occasion closing as a relevant next action in the conversation. Call takers can, in fact, deal with this interactional dilemma

using several devices, such as instructing callers to stay on the line (Zimmerman, 1992). Nevertheless, that they need to deal with this contingency in the first place is evidence for arrangement-making being a special status topic in conversation, which occasions closing down the interaction as a possibly relevant next activity.

1.2 Arrangements as an accountable social practice

Both the making and keeping of arrangements have consistently been found to be accountable practices. Once an arrangement has been made, the parties involved are generally expected to act in accordance with the details of that arrangement. Having an arrangement is obviously consequential for the participants involved. Any behaviour that deviates from an established expectation is something for which a party can be held accountable (Scott & Lyman, 1968). The following fragment from a meeting at a university shows how having an arrangement, and being late for keeping it, can be accountable (an explanation of the transcription conventions used in this thesis can be found in Appendix A).

```
(1.01) [Fellowship Meeting (Boden, 1997: 18)]
01 Matt:  Hi[::::.]
02 Dean:    [Ron ] co:ming?
03 Matt:  (Sorry I'm late) I thought he: wuz HE::RE!
04          (1.4)
05 Matt:  I tol' hi:m I wuz gonna be la::te I (.) assumed
06        he wuz u::h=
07 Jean:              =I've been looking for...
```

In her analytic account of this episode of interaction, Boden (1997) explains that the start of this meeting is delayed, while the Dean of the Graduate School, a representative from the Chancellor's Office (Jean), and others wait for representatives from the Financial Aid department (Matt and Ron) to arrive. When Matt arrives late and alone, the Dean asks whether Ron is coming to the meeting. In response to this, Matt initially accounts for why he is alone and, subsequently, for why he is late and had not previously informed the other members of the meeting that this would be the case. He claims that he had informed Ron of his lateness and had presumed that Ron would be at the meeting, on time, to pass on that information (this particular account gets interrupted by Jean's turn). Matt's lateness, then, is an accountable matter that comes to be accounted for. In their classic paper, Scott and Lyman (1968) explain how

social actors can come to account for unexplained or untoward behaviour. Such accounts need to be 'normal'; that is, they must be congruent with background expectations of how people should behave. Matt's account addresses expectations (at least, apparently, in his culture) that people should keep their appointments with others and that it is rude to not inform those others in the event one will be running late. A failure to meet such an expectation is something that social actors routinely account for.

1.2.1 Accounting for a particular arrangement

Research building on Scott and Lyman's (1968) work, and drawing upon recorded instances of interaction, has shown that accounting is not just a retrospective action. Accounts can also be used as a 'prophylactic,' that is prospective, antecedent to particular actions (Firth, 1995a; Houtkoop-Steenstra, 1990; Houtkoop, 1987). Because they involve two or more people, making arrangements is always a potentially accountable business in interaction. Without an account, a recipient of a particular arrangement might well wonder – as indeed Schegloff and Sacks (1973: 299) claim participants generally evaluate conduct in interaction – "why that now?" (see also Schegloff, 1998b). That is, why make this arrangement, at this time, in this way? A ubiquitous concern for participants then, is to justify why one particular course of action is more preferable than other possible arrangements, including making no arrangement at all. The following fragment of an interaction, taken from LeBaron and Jones (2002), is an instance of a course of action for which a prophylactic account is given. The episode takes place in a hairdressing salon where a customer, Katie, who is having her hair cut by Jane, is reunited with another customer, Mrs Wilcox, who was one of her school teachers many years previously. The following fragment comes after a period of reacquaintance between the two, which has disrupted the business of Katie's haircut.

```
(1.02) [LeBaron & Jones (2002: 553)]
01 Katie:   I te- I would like to get your telephone number
02 Wilcox:  Okay
03 Katie:   And your address when you have time, cause I
04          gotta get over here with Jane,
05 Wilcox:  Okay
```

There are a number of interesting elements in this instance of arrangement-making. First, by making an arrangement for a future episode of interaction, the participants warrant the closing of the current interaction. Second, by transitioning out of the current interaction, which is focused on getting reacquainted, Katie moves towards making herself re-available to the previously interrupted activity of getting her hair cut. Third, having declared an arrangement whereby she solicits Wilcox's contact details, Katie accounts for why that course of action is required (LeBaron & Jones, 2002). She displays that the making of arrangements is an accountable interactional accomplishment. Moreover, she accounts prophylactically for terminating the interaction before actually attempting to do so.

Accounts can also be produced in response to possible arrangements. For instance, Mazeland, Huisman and Schasfoort (1995) show how travel agents account for why particular arrangements that clients are inquiring about are not possible. They focus particularly upon how categorisation is co-opted into this process. For example, they show one instance where a client is inquiring about possible discounts for children. It turns out that in several instances, no discounts apply. The travel agent accounts for this by explaining that either the category 'child' is not applicable (to a 15-year old), or that it is not relevant (it only applies to the category 'hotel trip,' about which the client is not enquiring). Work like this shows that attendant interactional resources, like categorisation, can be co-opted into the making of arrangements. I will be concerned with one such attendant resource, references to non-present third parties, in Chapter 6. What is relevant at this point is that arrangement-makers can account for why a particular arrangement is warranted, and that the recipients of potential arrangements can account for why that arrangement is not viable (see also Heritage, 1988).

1.2.2 Mutual accounting for arrangements

It is furthermore possible for both participants to offer accounts to each other for arrangements that either of them could have (or perhaps should have) legitimately

made. Koester (2004) examines how what she calls 'relational sequences'[3] can be relevantly associated with making arrangements. One such instance is the following, where a university professor (Jim), who is the editor of a journal, seeks to arrange a meeting with Liz, the departmental secretary.

```
(1.03) [Journal meeting (Koester, 2004: 1419), modified]
01 Jim:   I was wondering if ((pause)) you an' I could
02        possibly this week, at about eleven o'clock on
03        Thursday morning, reinforce each other half an
04        hour on- just to look through ((name of journal))
05        and see [where we [are.
06 Liz:           [Yes      [it's=it's on my mind
07        terribl[y, in fact I've been dreaming about it all
08 Jim:          [yeah
09        night.
10 Jim:   We[ll I had a dream about it as well.
11 Liz:     [So-
12 Liz:   [I've got to get i- because it's on my mind=
13 Jim:   [It's funny
14 Liz:   =[so much I-
15 Jim:   =[a really guilty conscience about it=
16 Liz:                              =Yes, I am,
17        so I must ((pause)) get on and do it. So yes,
18        [Thursday at eleven will be fine.
19 Jim:   [Heheheh
20 Jim:   Okay, we'll just review where we are: an' ((pause))
21        what'[s ((pause)) urgent and what's um ((pause))
22 Liz:        [yeah um
23 Jim:   perhaps not so urgent [to do.
24 Liz:                         [Okay.
```

Here, the arrangement that Jim has suggested between lines 1 and 5 does not get accepted by Liz until lines 17-18 (*So yes, Thursday at eleven will be fine.*). In the intervening talk both parties display that they consider the task of meeting about the journal a matter of importance. In response to Jim's suggestion of a meeting, Liz responds that she has been thinking of that very task. Jim adds that he too has been thinking about the task. These sequences seem to display that parties share the same priorities and/or are aware of the same contingencies (Koester, 2004). Based on the instances that Koester reproduces[4], bi-party accounting is relevantly produced in relation to arrangements that either party could have initiated. It appears to be a

---

[3] For more on the conversation analytic notion of 'sequence,' please refer to §3.2.

[4] Note that there are only two instances involving the making of arrangements in Koester's (2004) paper, so these conclusions are speculative.

means by which parties can display that the arrangement is not only something that they can accept, but moreover something that they could have made themselves.

In summary, making arrangements is an accountable business for the participants involved. Accounting for arrangements can be made retrospectively or prophylactically, and also by both speakers and recipients. Because arrangements involve a change to the status quo, even if that status quo was simply having no arrangement, accounts are a commonplace occurrence during this interactional task. The role of accounting in making arrangements will be considered further in §4.1.2. I will also consider, in §7.4, how accounting can be used to resolve a misunderstanding. In both contexts, consistent with prior research on the matter, accounts function to frame some course of action as both normal and reasonable.

1.3   Context relevance in designing actions that make arrangements

Schegloff (1992a) argues that the context of an utterance should be an omnirelevant consideration in conversation analysis. He summarises two broad types of context that are often held to be relevant by social scientists more generally. The first involves social factors of the order that have traditionally been held as highly relevant in social science. These include personal characteristics such as gender, age, ethnicity, and socioeconomic status; institutional contexts, such as the law, polity, economy, family, and religion; and ecological, regional, national, and cultural settings. Such factors are understood as either ordering or constraining social conduct in distinct ways, or as manifestations of some sort of social power. Conversation analysts like Schegloff (cf. 1991b; 1992a) argue against ubiquitously making these sorts of higher-level analyses of social order, arguing that it is difficult to demonstrate how such 'macro' factors can shape particular utterances, as they are found in interaction.

Schegloff (1992a) also highlights the importance of another, more local, context of interaction, which conversation analysts have shown to be systematically analysable. Within the local context of individual episodes of interaction, recognisable orders of conduct can be found; order that can often also be located as an aggregated social

practices. Moreover, if external contextual factors are relevant for an occasion of interaction, that relevance should be made manifest in the context of the participants' conduct. In that event, analytic attention can still be directed to more immediate, rather than higher-order, contexts. Conversation analytic research on the making of arrangements has shown how the preceding interaction that has taken place between interlocutors can influence their conduct.

The impact that sequential context can have on the formulation of an arrangement can be observed by examining preliminary enquiries by would-be arrangement-makers. Such enquiries check for the availability of a recipient (Levinson, 1983: 345-348; Schegloff, 2007c: 28-34), and availability, of course, is a precondition for a projected arrangement to be viable. A speaker's preliminary enquiry both occasions a response from a recipient and projects arrangement-making as a possibility that is contingent upon a recipient's response. As these enquiries can project some specific type of action, like an invitation, recipients can respond in a way that displays their recognition of this, as in the following instance.

```
(1.05) [SB,1 (Schegloff, 2007c: 31)]
01 Jud:  Hi John
02 Joh:  Ha you doin-<say what 'r you doing.
03 Jud:  Well, we're going out. Why.
04 Joh:  Oh, I was just gonna say come out and come over
05       here and talk this evening, [but if you're going=
06 Jud:                               ["Talk," you mean get
07        [drunk, don't you? ]
08 Joh:  =[out you can't very] well do that.
```

In this fragment, John enquires as to what Judy is doing. Her response demonstrates an understanding of John's enquiry as a pre-invitation in two ways. First, her answer accounts for her unavailability. As Schegloff explains, "if the prospective invitation is to be discouraged, if (for example) it is likely to be declined, then the answer to the preliminary…should be selected accordingly" (2007c: 29-30). Judy's account, then, blocks the likelihood that any arrangement John suggests will be viable. Second, Judy continues to expand her turn to ask John why he made the enquiry. So instead of the projected invitation, in the next turn John reports the details of the arrangement that he was going to try to make. John displays an awareness that this arrangement is no longer viable. As Schegloff (2007c: 32-33) shows, responses to preliminary enquiries can lead to a 'dilution' of the form of arrangement that is eventually produced.

In recent research, Arminen and Weilenmann (2009) and Licoppe (2009) show how preliminary enquiries can be made in conversations across the medium of mobile telephony. Licoppe (2009) cites the following instance, conducted in French (an English translation is located beneath each transcribed line[5]).

```
(1.06) [Liccope (2009: 1928-1929), modified]
01 Mar:  tu es dans le coin?
         are you around?
02          (0.7)
03 Eli:  ouais:: je suis dans le coin: (.) mais là je vais
         yeah:: I am around but now I'm going to
04       à un cours de Pagès:=
         a lesson by Pagès
05 Mar:                       =ah:::::::: >très bien
                               ah::::::: >okay
06       très bien très bien<
         okay okay<
   ((14 lines omitted; topic shifts))
21 Mar:  ˚bon.˚
         ˚well.˚
22 Eli:  t'es où là toi?
         where are you?
             (.)
23 Eli:  bâtiment c?
         building c?
24 Mar:  je suis de (.) je suis devant la coupole ouais
         I'm in (.) I'm in front of the cupola yeah
             (0.5)
25 Eli:  >ah::: devant la coupole<
         >ah::: in front of the cupola<
             (.)
26 Eli:  >okay.<
27          (.)
28 Eli:  >bah je suis pas loin<
         >well I'm not far<
29          (.)
30 Eli:  bah> j'vais passer:::< (.) j'te fais un petit
         bah >I'll come over:::< (.) I'll say a quick
31       bonjour quand même
         hello to you at least
32 Mar:  okay
33          (.)
34 Mar:  à tout d'suite hhh.=
         see you right now hhh.
```

---

[5] Where available, I include a line-by-line translation of conversations conducted in languages other than English. An emerging convention in conversation analysis is for transcriptions of such interactions to be laid out over sets of three lines. The first line contains a transcription of the conversation in the original language, the second line a direct, morpheme-by-morpheme translation into English, and the third line translating the interactional sense of the original expression in English. Exemplars of this approach include Bolden (2004), Egbert (2004), and Hacohen and Schegloff (2006). Instances of interaction cited from the data that do not conform to these emergent conventions are reproductions of the way in which the original author produced them. For a discussion of different approaches to translation in transcriptions, see Nikander (2008).

```
35 Eli:                          =at (.) à tout d'suite
                                 ss (.) see you right now
36          (.)
37 Eli:  oui:::
         yes:::
38          (.)
39 Eli:  salut
         bye
40 Mar:  °salut:::°
         °bye:::°
```

Martin's enquiry, at line 1, as to whether Eline is around ('around' is taken by Eline to refer to a university campus, which has already been mentioned earlier in the call) occasions a confirming response but one that is expanded by Eline to detail that her continued presence is limited. It seems, then, that Eline has taken Martin's enquiry about her *presence* on campus as entailing her *availability* to meet. She has treated his enquiry, then, as a preliminary to some consequential suggestion, request, proposal, or invitation for the two of them to meet. Schegloff (2007c) and Levinson (1983) have shown that affirmative responses to these enquiries, tend to facilitate the production of that next, consequential, action. Here, however, Eline blocks the production of that relevant next action by responding in the affirmative to Martin's enquiry, but immediately continuing her turn to detail that they will only be in the same proximity for a brief period of time (*now I'm going to a lesson by Pagès*, lines 3-4). This blocks whatever ensuing action Martin may have produced, had he only received an affirmative response to his enquiry[6].

The matter of the duo meeting turns out to not be over there. The resonances of Martin's enquiry continue towards the closing of the call, when Eline asks a question to determine his location on campus (lines 22-23). When she receives that information, she then informs Martin that she will come by and visit him briefly. Licoppe (2009) explains that, because she is already aware of Martin's probable interest in meeting, Eline does not need to ask whether she can visit him or invite him to meet her, but can rather simply inform him of her intention. The manner in which Eline goes about

---

[6] For examples from mobile phone conversations, where an affirmative response to a preliminary enquiry *does* entail a consequential suggestion, request, proposal, or invitation, see Weilenmann (2003: 1597) and Arminen and Weilenmann (2009: 1910-1911).

making an arrangement, then, has been intricately shaped by the interaction within which the arrangement gets made.

1.4 Proposals for an arrangement

Across the chapter so far, I have discussed how making arrangements is a special status topic that can be both accountable and context sensitive. I now turn to a specific type of action for making arrangements that will be the focus of analysis in this thesis. In this section I will discuss the work on proposals for future courses of action that was carried out by Houtkoop-Steenstra[7]. In a monograph (Houtkoop, 1987) and a subsequent paper (Houtkoop-Steenstra, 1990), Houtkoop(-Steenstra) examined a practice that she referred to as 'proposals for remote action,' or 'remote proposals' for short. Houtkoop claims that, in general, proposals are "…a range of actions such as requests, invitations, offers, and the like. They all have in common that by making a proposal the speaker solicits his recipient to agree to carry out the activity under discussion" (1987: 1) That is, these proposals are a class of conversational action where a speaker attempts to co-opt a recipient to perform, or collaborate in, some future course of action in which the recipient is being implicated. Crucial to Houtkoop(-Steenstra)'s analysis is the notion that proposals are a broad action type in conversation. Lindström (1999), also examines requests, invitations and proposals that attempt to organise what she calls 'deferred actions' (i.e., an arrangement for a future course of action), but does so without claiming that requests and invitations can be subsumed within the action type 'proposals.' In this thesis, I will critique the analytic breadth that Houtkoop(-Steenstra) apportions to proposals as an action type. As Houtkoop (1987) defines remote proposals in contrast to proposals for immediate action, I will consider the latter action type first.

---

[7] At various points throughout her career, Houtkoop-Streenstra published under the surname 'Houtkoop.' When discussing portions of her work that has been published under both of these names, I will use 'Houtkoop(-Streenstra)' in reference to her.

1.4.1 Immediate proposals

Remote proposals are distinct from what Houtkoop (1987) calls immediate proposals, where a recipient can display compliance with a course of action immediately. Such proposals are usually made, according to Houtkoop, with requests. She gives examples of recipients being asked to summon someone else to the telephone. Houtkoop was primarily interested in proposals for future rather than immediate courses of action. In more recent research, Lindström (2005) and Heinemann (2006) report findings that expand upon what Houtkoop (1987) had to say about immediate proposals[8]. Lindström (2005) and Heinemann's (2006) work is also topically relevant to the data used in the present thesis, as they examine how clients of home help services – what I term 'Community and Home Care' (CHC) services (cf. §2.1.1) – request care workers to provide supportive assistance in the performance of everyday tasks.

In her study of Swedish home help visits, Lindström (2005) explores how choices between request forms like questions, imperatives, and statements can be shaped by factors like a requestor's possible entitlement to having the request granted. Imperative forms, for instance, may be heard as a way in which requestors claim that they are entitled to have their request granted. Alternatively, questions make no such claim. Requests can also be formulated as statements, which means that the utterance does not necessarily have to be treated as a request. The following data fragments illustrate these different ways of making an immediate proposal. The first is made with an imperative.

```
(1.07) [VC:1:1 (Lindström, 2005: 216-217), modified]
01 SC:  Martina du måste ge mej nånting å dricka
        Martina you must give me something to drink
02      ja e så törsti så. ((strained voice))
        I'm so thirsty so
        I'm so thirsty.
03         (0.6)
04 HH:  Va: vill du ha vatten?
        What want you have water
        What do you want water?
```

---

[8] Neither Lindström (2005) nor Heinemann (2006) explicitly define their phenomena of interest as immediate proposals, and the analysis in this thesis will contribute little, if any, evidence in support of supposing them as such. However, their work is offered here as topically-relevant examples of Houtkoop's (1987) line of analysis.

```
05 SC:   Ja:¿ ((strained voice))
         Yes¿
```

Lindström (2005) explains that the modal verb used by the client ('SC' in the transcript, for 'senior citizen') here, *måste* or *must* (line 1), conveys that the proposed action is necessary and that the helper is therefore obliged to assist the senior citizen in the way in which she has been directed. The home helper ('HH') responds in a way that also treats this request as necessary. Alternatively, question-formatted requests articulate the possibility that there might be some impediment, institutional or otherwise, to the request being granted, as in the following instance.

```
(1.08) [IIB5:1:1:0 (Lindström, 2005: 218)]
01 SC:   Hör du:: ↑ eh (1.0) hinner (.) <vattna
         Listen you eh (1.0) have time water
         Listen eh (1.0) do you have the time (.) to water
02       två bloomer åt mej (dä/där) i=
         two flowers for me (the/there) in
03 HH:                             =Javis[st,]
                                    Yeah sure,
                                    Of course,
04 SC:                                 [ i ] take.
                                        in the ceiling
                                        by the ceiling
```

Rather than formulating her request as an imperative, as in the previous data fragment, the client here asks the home helper whether she has time to water her flowers. In this instance, the client's request is granted. The third method by which Lindström (2005) claims that clients can make requests of their home helpers is to use a statement. These statements can be treated by the helper as a request, but need not necessarily be treated as such. The following is one instance. It involves a helper and the elderly husband of a home care client ('M'). M and his wife, Astrid, are having breakfast, while the helper is washing some dishes. Immediately prior to the beginning of the fragment, M walks up to the counter and begins rummaging through drawers.

```
(1.09) [IIID2:1 (Lindström, 2005: 220-221)]
01 HH:   (Jaha:) ha Astrid sovi lugnt i natt då
         PRT has Astrid slept calmly last night then
         (Right) did Astrid sleep peacefully last night then
02       elle¿
         or¿
03          (1.2)
04 M:    Ja letar efter en (.) osthyvel,
         I search after a cheeseslicer
         I am looking for a (.) cheese slicer,
05          (1.0)
06 HH:   En osthyvel,
         A cheese slicer,
07          (3.0) ((HH seems to search through the dishes))
```

```
08 HH:   Den komme här den.
         That comes here that ((HH is washing))
09          (0.2)
10 M:    Va, ((M stops searching through the drawer))
         What,
11          (0.6)
12 HH:   Du kan få en här. ((HH is still washing))
         You can have one here.
13          (0.2)
14 M:    Ja de e bra,
         Yes it is good
         Yeah that's good,
```

M does not answer the home helper's question at line 1, but rather produces a statement that could either account for his current behaviour of rummaging through a drawer and his non-responsiveness, or could be requesting the helper's assistance. It appears as though M designs his utterance as an account and not a request for assistance, as he continues to look for a cheese slicer right through to his utterance at line 10. Before this, however, possibly at line 7 but no later than line 8, the helper responds in a way that treats M's statement as a request by starting to wash a utensil for him. M's statement at line 4, then, emerges as a request in the way that it is treated by its recipient on this particular occasion.

In a study of Danish home help service visits, Heinemann (2006) specifically examines request forms, contrasting positive with negative interrogatives. Requests formulated as positive interrogatives (e.g., *would you please be kind enough to °tuck it down to me?°* [sic], pp 1085) are often mitigated in Heinemann's corpus, and are concerned with a recipient's willingness to grant the request. They do not, then, presuppose an entitlement to having the request granted. The necessity of these requests often gets challenged in Heinemann's data corpus, although they usually end up being granted[9]. In contrast, negative interrogatives (e.g., *can't you turn on the overhead light¿*, pp 1093) are typically unmitigated. They treat the requested course of action as routine and, therefore, imply that it should have been performed without having been requested in the first place. Either form can be more or less mitigated, in order to increase or decrease the sense of entitlement that is conveyed.

---

[9] For an examination of how service requests can *not* be granted (albeit in a different service context), see Vinkhuyzen and Szymanski (2005).

In summary, recent research by Lindström (2005) and Heinemann (2006) has highlighted how diverse immediate proposals, or requests as they call them, can be. Following Houtkoop's (1987) analysis, which claims that proposals can be accomplished with a range of actions, the actions that Lindström and Heinemann study can be thought of as immediate proposals as they nominate an immediate course of action for the recipient to follow. Because immediate proposals should be complied with in a position that is adjacent to their production, as a sequence of action they are over soon after responsive compliance is forthcoming. I will now turn to a method of making arrangements that is most closely aligned with those to be studied in this thesis. These actions are termed by Houtkoop (1987) 'remote proposals.' Although I will explore Houtkoop's analysis of these proposals in further detail across Chapters 4 and 5, a brief examination of her work here will aid in positioning the analysis presented in the current thesis.

1.4.2 Remote proposals

Whereas compliance with immediate proposals can be used to display that a requested course of action has been granted, proposals for a future arrangement, or 'remote proposals,' cannot occasion such demonstrative responses. Rather, the optimal outcome is for recipients to indicate that they will comply with a proposed future course of action. This difference between immediate and remote proposals, that the former can be complied with immediately whereas the latter can only be committed to, are a possible explanation for the differences that Houtkoop (1987) finds between them. The structure of remote proposals, which is also found in the data for the present thesis, can be observed in the following data fragment, which has been translated by Houtkoop from Dutch into English[10]. H is talking to P about an upcoming party.

---

[10] *Ja* can mean different things in Dutch, depending upon its context. By not translating *Ja* into English, Houtkoop allows for an appreciation of how the context of this lexical item's production is relevant. According to Houtkoop (1987), the intonational pronunciation of *Ja* is crucial to its understanding. For instance, *Ja* with a falling or slight rise in pitch can be heard as a 'continuer' (Sacks, 1992: vol 2, pp 410-412; Schegloff, 1982). Double forms of the lexeme, that is *Ja ja*, can also be heard as continuers. *Ja* with

```
(1.10) [HH:TC:5:13] (Houtkoop, 1987: 118)]
01 H:  I would like it very much if you came as well.
02 P:  Oh that's nice.
03 P:  On May the sixth?
04 H:  Ja.
05 H:  In the afternoon around three o'clock.
06 P:  In the afternoon around three o'clock.
07 H:  Ja::?
08 P:  Ja. That's nice. I'll write it down.
```

Whereas an acceptance or rejection of an immediate proposal generally leads to a close of the request as a topic for the conversation, an initial acceptance of a remote proposal tends to occasion what Houtkoop calls a 'request-for-confirmation' from the proposer. In the above data fragment, P appears to accept the invitation to the party at line 2, using a response that gets partially recycled again in a final response at line 8. Additional information is provided and receipted. The arrangement appears to be in place. However, in spite of P's apparent interest in and previous acceptance of the invitation, H nevertheless makes a request-for-confirmation at line 7. This, in turn, occasions a re-acceptance of the proposed course of action.

Houtkoop explains that in remote proposal sequences a recipient may initially express that they are *willing* to collaborate in a proposed course of action but will later express, having heard more details of the proposal, that they are in fact *unable* to collaborate. In the above instance, P may not have been able to come to a party on the particular day or time that it is scheduled. For this reason, Houtkoop regards the request-for-confirmation as providing an opportunity for discussing the details and particularities of the action that has been proposed. Moreover, whereas recipients' initial responses tend simply to *state* acceptance, their responses following requests-for-confirmation tend to *demonstrate*, with some form of evidence, that they will comply with a proposed course of action. In the above data fragment, the recipient claims that (s)he will write down the details of the arrangement, possibly in a diary or on a calendar, thus displaying to the interlocutor that (s)he intends to comply. The function of the request-for-confirmation sequence, then, according to Houtkoop, is to facilitate a recipient's move from stated to demonstrated acceptance of the proposed

---

a higher, questioning, intonation can be heard as a news receipt, much like *oh really* in English. *Ja?* can also be used a request-for-confirmation, the English equivalent of which would be *alright?* or *okay?*

course of action. Houtkoop represents remote proposals using the following schematic, where 'A' and 'B' refer to different speakers:

```
A: Remote proposal
B: Acceptance
A: Request-for-confirmation
B: Confirmation
A: Acknowledgement
```

Houtkoop(-Steenstra)'s analysis supports and develops observations made elsewhere that making arrangements is an accountable business in interaction (cf. §1.2). She explains that most of the remote proposals in her data corpus get accepted, particularly those proposals that are preceded by accounts that warrant their necessity (Houtkoop-Steenstra, 1990; Houtkoop, 1987). She explains that there are also instances where the reason for a proposal is implicit and does not, therefore, need to be accounted for. Where accounts are included with proposals, they can be positioned either before or after the proposal itself. Proposals of a relatively less demanding character, like the immediate proposals that were discussed above, tend to be followed by an account, rather than preceded by one. In the event that a remote proposal does not get accepted or is followed with what Houtkoop (1987) identifies as a 'weak-acceptance form,' then a proposer can continue to account for why the proposal is being made and/or why an arrangement is being proposed in a particular way. In this way, a proposer can treat a recipient's response as 'non-acceptance,' rather than rejection[11]. Instances where an account precedes a proposal tend to reflect that the proposal is relatively more demanding, or that the reason for its production is not readily apparent.

Broadly, then, Houtkoop (1987) characterises remote proposals as potentially accountable actions containing a structure where an initial acceptance is followed by a request-for-confirmation from the proposer that occasions a recipient's move from stated to demonstrated acceptance. The request-for-confirmation component is what

---

[11] Frith (1995a; 1995c) has made a similar observation in negotiations between commodity traders over the conditions of sale. Offers and proposals that are made as a part of these negotiations are often preceded by accounts. However, they are also found following rejections of such offers and proposals, thereby treating that particular response as temporary non-acceptance, rather than definitive rejection.

distinguishes remote proposals from immediate proposals, for which compliance can be immediately produced.

1.4.3 Requests as remote proposals

As explained earlier, Houtkoop (1987) argues that remote proposals are a broad action type in interaction that can incorporate actions such as requests. In §4.1.1 I critique this claim and argue for a working redefinition of remote proposals so as to not include requests. My basis for doing this comes from recent research on requests relating to a future course of action that do not exhibit requests-for-confirmation (Curl & Drew, 2008; Walker, Drew, & Ogden, in preparation). Without pre-empting the critique that I make in §4.1.1, I will now consider how requests can be used to make arrangements for a future course of action without the need for request-for-confirmation.

In their study of requests, Curl and Drew (2008) contrast the two most prevalent forms in their corpora of conversations: interrogatives with modal verbs and declaratives prefaced by *I was wondering if*. They argue that although there is a preponderance of the latter form in institutionalised forms of interaction, there is no necessary correspondence between the request form that is used and any institutionalised role that speakers assume. Rather, they show how modal verb requests claim the reasonableness of the course of action that has been proffered and that its granting is anticipated. Conversely, *I-wonder*-prefaced requests display the granting of a requested course of action as possibly contingent upon factors that the speaker may be unaware of. The following is an instance where this happens:

```
(1.11) [Rahman:1:2:JT 11 (Curl & Drew, 2008: 141)]
01 Dsk:  Hello Goodzwin,
02 Jen:  Ehm good morning. eh it's Missiz Rah:man here, I
03       ca:lled in on Thursday: to see: if uh I could make
04       an appointment t'see Mister Fawcett,
05           (1.2)
06 Jen:  An- I haven't heard anything'n I was wondering if:
07       uh:m >(if was possible)< to see him:(um) one day
08       next week,
```

In this fragment, Jenny displays an awareness that Mr. Fawcett may not be available to meet with her at the time that she has suggested. In the following fragment, no such display is made.

```
(1.12) [Field:May88:2:3 (Curl & Drew, 2008: 143)]
01 Ste:  ↑Could you a::sk Ski:p if-.hmh[at- when you go: to
02 Les:                                [.p.k
03 Ste:  this meeting tomorrow .hm could he give Geoff:
04       Haldan's a?pologies through sickness?
05          (.)
06 Les:  ↑Ye:s:. Yes.
```

In this fragment, Steve's modal verb request is associated with a display of there being no contingencies associated with Leslie granting the request. Indeed, as Curl and Drew (2008) note, Steve explicitly displays that, given the only contingency to granting the request – whether Skip will be at the meeting – will be met, there is no further obstacle to it being granted. What is particularly important for present considerations is that neither of the above request forms is necessarily followed by a request-for-confirmation (cf. Walker et al., in preparation).

More recently, Lee (2009) has shown how requestors can submit to questioning by institutional representatives in situations where there are a range of interrelated contingencies that need to be satisfied, in order for their request to be granted. Using recordings of calls to an airline booking service in South Korea, Lee highlights the pragmatic advantage of airline agents directing the unfolding course of action. They are best positioned to progress a service request, as it is they who understand all of the relevant institutional contingencies. For example, agents ask questions about clients' desired flight date, their departure location and destination, ideal flight times, the number of passengers, and the type of fare they would like. Based on clients' responses to these questions, agents are able progressively to shape the nature of the clients' requests in a way that moves the course of action towards granting those requests. Although this means that the details of what clients are arranging may come to be changed over the course of interaction, the approach can usually culminate in a granting of initial requests to book a flight. A similar pattern of behaviour has been observed following requests made by callers to emergency services dispatch centres (J. Whalen & Zimmerman, 1990; J. Whalen, Zimmerman, & Whalen, 1988; M. Whalen & Zimmerman, 1987; Zimmerman, 1992). The difference in that context is that callers' answers are used to determine whether to grant or reject their requests for emergency assistance. Importantly, for this thesis, in both the flight booking and the emergency services data, grantings of requests are not routinely followed by requests-for-confirmation.

What is significant in all of these studies is that a request for a future course of action, whether that is in mundane (Curl & Drew, 2008) or institutional contexts (Curl & Drew, 2008; Lee, 2009; J. Whalen & Zimmerman, 1990; J. Whalen et al., 1988; M. Whalen & Zimmerman, 1987; Zimmerman, 1992), need not necessarily be followed by the type of request-for-confirmation that Houtkoop (1987) describes as routinely following. In an argument that I will develop in §4.1.2, it seems problematic to consider requests for future arrangements as instances of double-paired remote proposals.

1.4.4 Remote proposals as a possibly broad action type

In respecifying Houtkoop(-Steenstra)'s definition of remote proposals so as not to include requests I do not want to imply that her notion of remote proposals as a broad action type is also necessarily problematic. My analysis in this thesis only examines one type of action, prospective informings, that could be part of a collection of actions that make remote proposals. A case study by Nevile and Rendle-Short (2009) shows how the making of an arrangement can be attempted with a range of action types. The following data fragment begins with Oscar informing Martin of a plan to visit him.

```
(1.13) [Nevile & Rendle-Short (2009: 79), modified]
01 Osc:   so- (.) ↑we'll be in Canberra this (.) comin'
02        weekend of cou::r[se,
03 Mar:                    [ye:::s,
04            (0.7)
05 ?:     .hh
06 Osc:   an:: (0.4) goin' t' th' game on Sat'rday ni:ght,
07 Mar:   ri::ght¿
08            (1.0)
09 Osc:   a- (.) an (0.5) and (.) we had sort of planned on
10        seeing you (0.2) on our retu:rn¿
11            (0.3)
12 Osc:   [to Sydney¿
13 Mar:   [.hhh
14            (.)
15 Osc:   on Sunday.
16            (0.4)
17 Mar:   o:ka:y¿
18 Osc:   is that (0.4) okay with you?=[or or:
19 Mar:                               [.hh eh-eh-we-we-well
20        look, uh uh (.) probably it's okay, .hh a- we-
21        we've been d'invited for a bir-a fiftieth
22        birth[da:y ah:, (0.2)] <celebra:tion:> at twelve
23 Osc:        [  *a::::h¿*   ]
24 Mar:   thirty on Sunda::[y?
25 Osc:                    [aah::.
26            (0.5)
27 Mar:   [right?
28 Osc:   [(ook) it's:::: not gonna work¿ is it.
```

As with the remote proposals that Houtkoop(-Steenstra) has studied (Houtkoop-Steenstra, 1990; Houtkoop, 1987), the proposal here is preceded by information that comes to account for the nature of the arrangement that gets proposed; that is, why it is the way that it is. In this instance, Nevile and Rendle-Short (2009) explain that the preceding information is presented as a reminder to Martin of the plans that Oscar (and possible company; see Oscar's references to 'we' on lines 1 and 9) have to visit Canberra on Saturday. Following several possible junctures where Martin could presumably have invited Martin and his company to visit (at lines 3 and 7), Oscar informs Martin of their plans to see them upon their return to Sydney on Sunday.

One the one hand, Oscar presents this course of action as an arrangement or itinerary that has been unilaterally made. He does not inquire as to whether it would be possible to visit Martin and company, but rather informs him of their intention to do so. On the other hand, however, he does present the course of action as a plan and, moreover, a plan without a specific time. In this way, he conveys that the arrangement is contingent upon his recipient. It is only a plan, and an imprecise one at that, rather than some fixed arrangement. This plan is subsequently presented to Martin as a proposal that requires his acceptance (*is that (0.4) okay with you?=or or:*, line 18). The action, then, moves from being a reminder, to an informing, to a proposal, and yet the whole time only relates to the making of a single arrangement. Ultimately this is a proposal that can be rejected, indirectly, with reference to a more precise, more important, and already finalised arrangement (lines 21-22 and 24). Importantly for a consideration of Houtkoop(-Steenstra)'s work on remote proposals, this instance offers support for remote proposals being a possibly broad action type and cautions against my critique being taken to imply otherwise.

1.5 Aims of the thesis

This thesis contributes to existing work on remote proposals by examining instances of what I call 'prospective informings,' as well as some of the attendant considerations that participants can make when using these informings to make an arrangement. Prospective informings constitute an attempt by one party to make an arrangement with another party. Moreover, that arrangement is both a future course of action and

24

one that implicates the recipient. In these courses of action, recipients are informed of an arrangement as though it has already been made. However, because the recipient is implicated in the arrangement, their complicity is a prerequisite for the arrangement to transpire in the manner that has been detailed. For this reason, the arrangement is both detailed as though it has already been made, and yet it has not been made until a recipient agrees to comply. Across Chapters 4 and 5 I will examine how this seemingly self-contradictory utterance is dealt with by both informers and recipients. Building on previous research on making arrangements, I will explore how particular arrangements are accounted for as necessary ones. I will also show how sequential context can be relevant in shaping the way prospective informings are produced. My overall aim will be contribute an understanding of how these informings function as remote proposals to make future social arrangements.

Having examined prospective informings as a type of remote proposal for making an arrangement, I will then turn to a possibly relevant and attendant feature of arrangement-making, where one party refers to a non-present third person. In Chapter 6 I will examine how these references can be formulated so as to convey a speaker's claim that a recipient is either acquainted or unacquainted with the referent. Then in Chapter 7, I make a case study of an instance where a recipient's response to a prospective informing is delayed by a misunderstanding over whether the recipient is acquainted with a particular referent. This analysis will highlight how there can be attendant considerations that parties orient to when making arrangements. The analysis in both Chapters 6 and 7 highlights the range of considerations that interlocutors demonstrably orient to when they are in the process of making arrangements with one another. In addition to exploring how remote proposals can be used for making the arrangement itself, I also focus on the ways in which participants orient to attendant considerations such as whether a recipient is acquainted with a third-party who is implicated in an arrangement. Participants must also find ways to deal with ostensible sources of trouble that can arise during the process of trying to make an arrangement. This research as a whole, then, studies the complexities of the process of arrangement-making, by examining both core and attendant phenomena.

Across the following two chapters, I will turn to position the analysis within the current thesis in terms of the data collected and methodological approach taken. In Chapter 2 I

will describe the data corpus under analysis. I will then detail conversation analysis as a methodological approach and describe the specific procedures that were adopted for the present study. I will then turn, in Chapter 3, to a review of some of the key findings that have been made within conversation analysis. These findings will be consistently utilised throughout my analysis, as a set of core interactional practices that speakers utilise when engaging in the practices that comprise that are the focus of my analysis.

Chapter 2

Data and methodological approach

In this chapter I provide an overview of the approach taken for this study, begining with an explanation of the context in which the data were collected, and a brief introduction to community and home care services in Australia and other industrialised nations. I will then consider the distinctive approach made by conversation analysts to the study of social life. I finish by explaining the specific procedures that were adopted in relation to data collection and analysis for this study.

2.1 Data source

2.1.1 The data source: Community and Home Care

This topic of this thesis can be positioned within two principal domains. On the one hand, it is a study of how people interact with one another in ways that makes their conduct interpretable to one another. On the other hand, this thesis is a study that utilises data from a care setting that predominantly services older people. With respect to this second domain, there is little question about the increasing importance of ageing populations within industrialised nations. In the Australian Commonwealth Government's 2010 Intergenerational Report (AGD, 2010), the nation's ageing population is listed as a primary policy challenge for the future. The changing population is predicted to place substantial pressure on the nation's economy and standard of living over the next 40 years. Australian government spending on aged care is predicted to rise from 0.8% of Gross Domestic Product (GDP) in 2009-2010 to around 1.8% of GDP in 2049-2050. Most of this increase will be driven by residential, or institutionalised, aged care, but Community and Home Care (CHC)[12] expenditure is

---

[12] 'Community and Home Care,' or 'CHC,' is a term used here to encompass a range of services to support people who are assessed as experiencing some sort of increased incapacity, be that physical, mental, or otherwise, to continue living in their own homes. These services assist people to continue to

also set to double (AGD, 2010). Government expenditure on CHC is already well over a billion Australian dollars per annum (DHA, 2004). And although there are almost four times as many spaces available in residential, than in community-based, care (FPAC, 2009), people utilising residential care are more likely to do so on a long-term basis. This difference can disguise the prevalence of community-based care, which tends to support a greater number of people, many on a short-term basis, across a calendar year.

The growth in ageing populations, and correspondingly in CHC, is a trend that can be observed across the industrialised world. A study of CHC services in Australia, Canada, France, Germany, Japan, New Zealand, the United Kingdom, and the United States has found that these countries have been progressively deinstitutionalising their ageing populations. This has involved increasing the proportion of people who receive assistance in their own homes rather than in a residential facility[13]. Although informal care, usually provided by family members, is more common in some countries like Japan, the proportion of older people receiving informal care was found to be progressively decreasing in all of the above-listed countries (Anderson & Hussey, 2000). As this happens, CHC becomes all the more prominent and crucial to enable older people to continue living in their own homes and communities, and for longer periods of time.

In spite of the increase in CHC in many developed nations, there has been little research on how these services are actually conducted as an interpersonal accomplishment. The provision of this type of care hinges upon a range of social practices, including some that can be difficult for researchers to access in the environment of their production. Nevertheless, the lack of a systematic account of the social practices that underpin such services means that a range of decisions about

---

live independently in their own home and community. I have chosen this term and acronym so as not to confuse my domain of study with a particular Australian CHC service package, known as 'Home And Community Care' (HACC).

[13] The proportion of older people receiving formal in-home support varies between nations, with the United States, then Canada, then Australia reporting the highest proportions of formal home and community-based care.

good policy and practice can, at best, be made on the basis of experience, feedback, and anecdotes. Examination of the actual social practices involved in CHC, rather than reports of them, allows for a more nuanced understanding of what is routinely happening in such interactions, as well as what might be possible. Although there is already work from Scandinavia that examines how CHC services are delivered in the home (Heinemann, 2006, 2007, 2009a, 2009b, forthcoming; Lindström, 2005; Lindström & Heinemann, 2009), there is no known work that examines the social practices relating to the organisation and planning of those services in the first place. This thesis, in examining how such arrangements can be made, is the first known attempt to address this topic.

In Australia, the majority of people who are eligible for CHC support sign a contract with a CHC agency to administer their funding on their behalf. CHC is a type of enterprise where making arrangements is a routine component that underpins the successful functioning of the service. Without agents of CHC agencies reaching agreement with clients as to when and how their individually-tailored programs will occur, provision of care would not be possible. In this thesis, I will examine how this aspect of CHC is underpinned by orderly social interaction. In the process, I will contribute to a broader understanding of how arrangements can be made in interaction, and of some of the attendant activities that parties routinely engage in to make arrangements with one another.

2.1.2   Community and Home Care in Australia

There are three major sources of CHC services currently available to older Australians who require assistance to continue living in their own homes. The first is the Home And Community Care (HACC) program, which is jointly funded by the Federal, State, and Territory governments of Australia. It provides support both to older people and to people experiencing temporary or permanent incapacity or disablement (AGDHA, 2008). The second major service is the Community and Aged Care Package (CACP) program, which is funded by the Federal Government and provides services that are equivalent to low-level residential aged care. The CACP program assists people with higher care requirements than can usually be provided for on the HACC program.

There is also a Transition Care Program (TCP), which provides short-term services to people who have just come out of hospital. The Federal Government also funds smaller support programs. The Extended Aged Care at Home (EACH) program delivers in-home support that is comparable to the level of care that would be provided in high-level residential care. There is also an equivalent program for people with dementia (EACH-D). The Federal Government's Department of Veterans' Affairs separately administers a home care program, for Australian war veterans and their spouses, called 'Veterans' Home Care' (AIHW, 2008).

The following statistical overview of the HACC program, by far the largest CHC program in Australia, gives an indication of the nature of this service industry in Australia. In the 2007-2008 financial year, 831,500 clients, or 3.9% of the Australian population, were reported as receiving HACC services. In South Australia, the state in which the present study was conducted, 5.5% of the population received HACC services; the highest rate of participation in the country. Although HACC packages are not necessarily designed for older people, 77% of the clients on the program were more than 65 years old. The program's principal goal is to provide assistance with daily living needs. Over 3,300 agencies (174 in South Australia) administer HACC services on the behalf of government. Among other services, in the 2007-2008 financial year, 31% of clients were provided with domestic assistance (i.e., cleaning), 18% with transport, 13% with meals prepared in their home, and 11% with personal care (that is, assistance with bathing, toilet use, eating, dressing, and grooming). The program also provides for nursing and allied health care, which was supplied to 20% of clients in the 2007-2008 financial year (AGDHA, 2008). It is the above service types that are overwhelmingly referred to in the recordings of telephone calls that constitute the data for this thesis.

Although there is a great deal of variation in service provision, due to HACC packages being tailored to suit individual client's needs, 44% of clients receive only one type of assistance through the program. The most common single type of service is domestic assistance. There is a moderately high turnover of clients, with 261,600 clients (or 31% of the total number of clients) leaving the HACC program in the 2007-2008 financial year. The main reasons given for cessation of services were: (1) that clients no longer needed assistance (35%), (2) clients had died (14%), and (3) clients had moved to an institutional facility (13%) (AGDHA, 2008).

2.1.3 Sites of data collection

All data were collected within metropolitan Adelaide, the capital city of South Australia, which has, in 2010, a population of approximately 1.1 million people. A single CHC organisation provided access to conduct research within three of its service agencies. The principal collection site, 'Agency A,' was located in the outer suburbs of Adelaide. Seven employees whose work involved coordinating individualised care packages were recruited to record calls with clients. Calls were recorded over two time periods: between January and February 2008, and between May and September of 2008. At the beginning of September 2008, Agency A managed a total of 309 clients; 174 on the HACC program, 125 on the CHCP program, and 10 on the EACH program. 105 clients were invited, and agreed, to participate in the current project. Seven clients were recorded as declining the invitation to participate, resulting in a 94% participation rate. A total of 300 calls were recorded between these seven coordinators and 106 clients.

Additional smaller collections of calls were recorded at two other service sites in metropolitan Adelaide. At both of these sites, two coordinators were recruited to invite their clients to participate in the project. The first of these sites, 'Agency B,' managed a total of 110 clients at the beginning of September 2008; 40 on the HACC program, and 70 on the CHCP program. 15 clients were invited and agreed to participate in the current project. Two clients were recorded as declining the invitation to participate, resulting in an 88% participation rate. A total of 33 calls were recorded between these two coordinators and 15 clients.

The final data collection site, 'Agency C,' managed a total of 104 clients at the beginning of September 2008; 36 on the HACC program, and 68 on the CHCP program. 19 clients were invited and agreed to participate in the current project. Four clients were recorded as declining the invitation to participate, resulting in an 81% participation rate. A total of 42 calls were recorded between these two coordinators and 19 clients.

Table 1: Participation rates across the three data collection sites.

	Participating employees	Participating clients	Calls recorded
Agency A	7	105	300
Agency B	2	15	33
Agency C	2	19	42
Total	*11*	*139*	*375*

As Table 1 indicates, the study utilises a data corpus of 375 calls, incorporating recorded interactions between eleven coordinators and 139 clients. A total of thirteen clients were reported as declining to participate, resulting in an overall participation rate of 91%. Most, but not all, clients could be described as being of 'older age.' In the CHC industry from which this is taken, people over the age of 65 years of age are typically classified as being of 'older age' (cf. AGDHA, 2008; AIHW, 2008). In my analysis, I will not treat age as a 'social fact' that can be unquestionably operationalised as a variable to be relevantly observed or measured (Nikander, 2009). Following the standard procedure in conversation analysis, I will approach age as a factor that is ultimately contingent upon being realised in particular episodes of interaction (Schegloff, 1999b). As will become evident throughout the analysis in this thesis, I find no apparent reason to invoke age (or any other sociodemographic variable for that matter) to examine or explain the phenomena that I study.

2.2 Conversation analysis as a research methodology

Making arrangements is a detailed interactional accomplishment. As this thesis will demonstrate, parties attend to a range of relevant exigencies in order to arrive at a consensual arrangement. In this thesis, I use the methodological approach of conversation analysis to explicate some of the structural properties that can be observed in interactions where parties make arrangements with one another. Here, and in Chapter 3, I review conversation analysis in a way that conveys my understanding of the field and how I apply its methodological approach in this thesis.

Although little of this review will be new to readers that are familiar with conversation analysis, it nonetheless positions the specific analytic approach that has been taken to generate the analysis that is presented within this thesis.

2.2.1 Studying naturally-occurring talk-in-interaction

Conversation analysis involves the study of naturally-occurring talk-in-interaction (Hutchby & Wooffitt, 2008). 'Naturally-occurring' is taken to mean that the data that are used for this type of research come from actual instances of interaction, and not those that have been solicited in a laboratory, or generated as hypothetical or typified utterances by a researcher. They therefore contain the richness and variety that can be found in the way that people conduct themselves in the natural environment of their social world. 'Talk-in-interaction' refers to a variety of ways in which speech can be produced as a social activity. This incorporates, but is broader than, conversation (Schegloff, 1987b), which can be understood to be the primordial form of talk-in-interaction (Schegloff, 1999a). In this understanding, conversation refers to more than informal 'chit chat.' It is the most basic and familiar format through which humans communicate with one another. It is the locus of a range of commonsense practices that people can use to interact in a meaningful way with one another.

'Talk-in-interaction' incorporates the transformations of practices used in mundane (i.e., everyday) conversation that can be made within specified 'speech exchange systems' (Sacks, Schegloff, & Jefferson, 1974). Such systems include those found in courtrooms in session, ceremonies, business meetings, psychotherapy, interviews, debates, and didactic settings like classrooms and lecture halls (Schegloff, 1991a). For example, when courtrooms are in session, there is a highly circumscribed speech exchange system whereby particular speakers take turns at talk (cf. Atkinson & Drew, 1979). Different speech exchange systems can exhibit differences in how speakers take turns at talk, organise sequences of action, repair sources of trouble, and structure overall interactions (Schegloff, 1999a).

Because social behaviours like talk-in-interaction are observable and, in principle, recordable, it is possible to develop a natural study of such phenomena; and moreover

a study that is a science (Sacks, 1992). From the outset, conversation analysts have reacted against data collection methods like interviewing, which typically engender an analysis of how people describe, account for, or conceptualise their social behaviour, rather than an understanding of how they actually produce and perform that behaviour. The data for conversation analysis, therefore, result from a direct engagement with talk-in-interaction in the environment in which it 'naturally' occurs. Furthermore, conversation analysts work with recordings of naturally-occurring interaction in order to gain repeated access to their data. In this way, it is possible to develop a detailed, empirical, and verifiable account of how people produce recognisable actions when they interact with one another.

There are two common reactions to this analytic approach, both of which I will address in turn. The first relates to the way in which data are sampled. Conversation analysts tend to gather data opportunistically, in a way that does not appear to generate a representative sample of the broader population of subjects or phenomena from which it was drawn. However, in order to generate a representative sample, it is necessary to have an understanding of how homogenous or heterogenous a population might be, and along which possible dimensions. Conversation analysis involves an attempt to identify what is relevant in social life. Because it does not start with theorised understandings of phenomena, it is difficult to determine the potential difference within a population and, therefore, how diverse a sample is necessary.

The issue of sampling is furthermore a distraction from the primary analytic goal in conversation analysis, which is to start by identifying the order that can be found in interaction. As a natural and observational social science, conversation analysts seek to advance an understanding of social life that is fundamentally based on the analysis of individual specimens. This approach is justifiable by the observation that developing children do not need systematic exposure to a diverse sample of interaction in order to learn how to interact with a wide variety of people. From the limited range of 'specimens' they are exposed to, children can learn methods of conduct that they can generalise to a wide range of interactions involving diverse interlocutors in an innumerable number of contexts (Schegloff, 1999a; ten Have, 1999). Moreover, examples from history of travellers to totally foreign lands, populated by people speaking previously unheard of languages, being capable of interacting with those

34

people in some way, highlights that there are foundational sense-making practices that the vast majority of children acquire from exposure to a limited range of interactions (Schegloff, 1991b). It is not, then, just anatomy and physiology that unites humanity, but also the basic formal organisations of interaction. Conversation analysts attempt to explicate those basic formal organisations (Schegloff, 1999a).

Although conversation analysts start their study of interaction with single instances, they also recognise that people enter episodes of interaction with commonsense practices for how they will take turns at talk, formulate references, and so on. They use these practices to conduct orderly interaction that makes sense to one another. However, these practices are also routinely modified, again in an orderly way, in order to suit the exigencies of a particular situation. Conversation analysts are interested in determining how those commonsense practices work, both in general and in single instances. With all this in mind, conversation analysts attempt to elucidate the order of interaction by starting (and sometimes ending) their analysis with single specimens, or episodes, of interaction.

The second common reaction to the analytic approach of conversation analysis is that in studying people interacting in their natural environment, the very process of observing their behaviour somehow changes the social dynamic, and renders the environment under study no longer natural. Nowadays at least, conversation analysts must obtain the informed consent of participants before they can record their interactions with one another. Having done this, there is usually some sort of recording equipment involved in the data collection, which can be obtrusive. This is thought to have a possible impact on the manner in which people interact, rendering the interaction no longer totally natural. The apparent impossibility of studying naturally-occurring social behaviour is what Labov (1972) calls the 'observer's paradox.' That is, the aim of this type of research is to try to understand how people behave when they are in a natural social environment and are not being systematically observed, and yet the data for such an enterprise can only be gathered through systematic observation.

Although the observer's paradox cannot be dismissed, its impact upon the analytical integrity of conversation analytic accounts is argued to be negligible. Drew (1989) points out that although being recorded may affect participants' conduct, the focus of

conversation analytic research is on how participants conduct themselves in an orderly way that makes sense to one another; an imperative that remains even in the context of being studied for research purposes. Consider, for instance, the presence of recording equipment, which can be referred to and discussed by the participants in an interaction under study; something that is surely the result of systematic observation. Schegloff (1996c) discusses an episode of interaction where one participant asks another to tell the gathered group a story but to tell it for 'the benefit of the tape.' Irrespective of this, Schegloff is able to study that fragment of talk for how turns at talk are constructed. The point is that even if people are affected by the presence of recording equipment, they still need to behave according to the commonsense principles of interaction, in order for their interlocutors to make sense of what is happening. Because those commonsense principles are the topic of interest for conversation analysts, there is no major concern about the impact of systematic observation upon participants.

An associated problem resulting from the observer's paradox might be that participants, knowing that their interaction is being recorded for an analytic audience, *perform* their interaction in such a way that it makes sense to that analytic audience, as well as to their interlocutor(s). A common naturally-occurring context where the effects of this can be observed is that of media interviews. Such interviews have an 'overhearing audience' to the interaction that is taking place. The interaction, therefore, needs to be conducted in such a way that it makes sense to that audience (Heritage, 1985). One practice by which interviewers can ensure that the interaction makes sense is to explain any obscure references that interviewees might make (Schegloff, 1999a). Practices like this, that indicate the perception of an overhearing audience, do not appear in the calls that have been collected for this corpus. Rather, there is a regular use of references that are not part of common parlance but are rather utterances that are only understood by members of a particular group. For instance, in the CHC data collected for this study, participants regularly use acronyms like 'HACC' and 'CACP' (cf. §2.1.2), without explaining what those acronyms mean. The very presence of such references suggests that participants are not orienting strongly to an overhearing analytic audience.

Research from a conversation analytic perspective refrains from making theoretical assumptions about what relevantly impacts upon the conduct of people when they interact with one another. Rather, by working with naturally-occurring instances of interaction, conversation analysts attempt to understand how an interaction is orderly, makes sense, and is 'procedurally consequential' (cf. Schegloff, 1992a) for the participants involved within it. This means grounding an analysis in the 'reality' of the participants involved (Schegloff, 1996a). This is not to say that conversation analysts claim only to study participants' experiences in 'their own terms' (Billig, 1999). Rather, the aim in conversation analysis is to show how a proffered analysis is demonstrably relevant to those participants (Schegloff, 1999c). This can sometimes involve the terms that participants use, particularly in the case of topic talk or formulation, but an analysis need not utilise the terminology of participants (cf. Schegloff, 1996a). The grounding of an analysis in the reality of participants, although not necessarily in their own terms, will become clear throughout the review of foundational conversation analytic findings in Chapter 3.

2.2.2 'Unmotivated examination' of participants' methods

Conversation analysts operates with the presumption that it may be possible to find 'order at all points' of interaction (Sacks, 1992: Vol 1, pp 484). They view social action as a methodical process and that it is therefore possible to study participants' methods for interacting with one another. In an attempt to find order, conversation analysts work on the basis of examining data in a process of 'unmotivated examination' (Sacks, 1992). This is a practice by which analysts attempt to make 'noticings' of initially unremarkable aspects of interaction (Schegloff, 1996a). The examination is unmotivated in the sense that a researcher does not bring a specific research question to the activity of examining the data. According to Sacks,

> *"When we start out with a piece of data, the question of what we are going to end up with, what kind of findings it will give, should not be a consideration. We sit down with a piece of data, make a bunch of observations, and see where they will go"* (1984: 27).

By approaching data in this way, it becomes possible to generate data-driven observations about routine social conduct, what Sacks' (1992) referred to as the underlying 'machinery' of conversation, rather than opportunistically selecting instances that can be used as evidence for some pre-existing theory of conduct. In so doing, conversation analysts are interested in finding mechanisms that can be located in single cases but which also yield some observable orderliness than can be additionally located as an aggregated social practice (cf. Schegloff, Jefferson, & Sacks, 1977). However, because these practices are produced to make sense in the locus of a single episode of interaction, conversation analysts retain an interest in articulating their empirical accounts relative to single episodes of interaction.

It is important to be able to demonstrate that an account is not just an analytic gloss on a range of instances, but that it is locatable within single instances. In essence, the analytic goal of conversation analysis is to find a system of conduct that people exhibit in interaction that is both context-free and context-sensitive (cf. Sacks et al., 1974). This system might be described as comprising participant rules, techniques, procedures, methods, maxims, and the like (cf. Sacks, 1992: Vol 2, pp 339). The system is context-free in the sense that parties can use it to make sense of what is going on around them. However, the system is also context-sensitive because 'rules' of conduct can be adapted to suit the local demands of any given social occasion. The conduct of social actors, then, is rule-oriented rather than rule-governed (Edwards, 1995). As an analytic response to this, to paraphrase ten Have (1999), conversation analysts look for general rules that are used in specific instances.

The dual interest of conversation analysts in context-free practices and their context-sensitive application makes a variety of different empirical enterprises possible. In a recent paper, Schegloff and Lerner (2009) argue that although both components of interaction are available for study, the examination of context-free resources that speakers use, what Schegloff and Lerner call the 'organisational formality' of talk-in-interaction, has the most potential to make a broad and influential contribution to the study of human social life. This thesis is an attempt to contribute to that study of the organisational formality of interaction. In this section as a whole, I have reviewed my understanding of the unique approach that conversation analysis as a field takes for

the study of human social life. That understanding leads, in this thesis, to a study of the context-free resources that speakers use.

While the data that I study contains talk of a specific institutional genre, with regular references to things like showering, care workers, and HACC packages, I will show that the interactional practices that underpin such talk are those that can also be located as part of the 'organisational formality' of interaction more generally. I will examine practices for making arrangements, referring to people, and addressing sources of trouble. Taking data from a specific institutional context – CHC service calls – the empirical observations and analysis will be related to the broader conversation analytic literature, in an attempt to contribute to an understanding of what underpins routine conduct in interaction.

2.3 Project procedures

Conversation analysts seem to agree that there is no fixed or prescriptive way of going about the study of talk-in-interaction (Drew, 2005; Hutchby & Wooffitt, 2008; Maynard & Clayman, 1991; Pomerantz & Fehr, 1997; Sidnell, 2010; ten Have, 1999). This is not to say, however, that 'anything goes' in conversation analysis. No matter how the analysis is conducted, a conversation analytic account of talk-in-interaction will, following Schegloff (1996a), typically exhibit the following three features. First, it should formulate what is being accomplished in the phenomenon of interest in a way that specifies the phenomenon as a recognisable 'domain' of behaviour (many of these 'domains' are discussed in Chapter 3). Moreover, any analytic formulation that is arrived at should be grounded in actual instances of interaction.

Second, the analytic account that is offered should contain evidence that the participants involved are understanding some behaviour (whether verbal or physical) as possibly[14] accomplishing a particular type of action. This type of 'proof criterion'

---

[14] Behaviour can be understood to be 'possibly' accomplishing a particular type of action because participants' understandings can turn out to be misunderstandings (cf. Schegloff, 1987c; 1988).

(Sacks et al., 1974) has become a hallmark of conversation analytic research and the most common criterion is the 'next turn proof procedure' (Hutchby & Wooffitt, 2008: 13-15). The idea is that, in their responses, interlocutors display to one another, and to analysts, their understanding of what some prior utterance was accomplishing. It may be the case that the account generated contradicts theoretical or commonsense understandings of how people interact. For example, the turn-taking model for conversation that was generated by Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson (1974) is different from many intuitive or even theoretical understandings of how people coordinate turns at talk (Schegloff, 1997b). Indeed, an analysis may not even fit within the usual vernacular for describing social actions. Whatever the case may be, rather than generating an analytical or commonsense gloss of interaction, an analytic account must be shown to be relevant to the participants involved and to be procedurally consequential within the interaction, as it progresses (Schegloff, 1987b).

The third feature that a conversation analytic account should exhibit is an explanation of how the observed behaviour accomplishes the action that the analyst claims has been produced. This explanation should detail the methods that underpin the construction, deployment, and recognition by the participants of the phenomena of interest (Schegloff, 1996a).

The aim to generate an account of this type has shaped the analytic procedure that I have used in some specific ways. The description of the conversation analytic process that most closely matches the approach I have adopted in this study is provided by ten Have (1999). Across the remainder of this chapter, I will summarise a version of ten Have's account that has been modified, where appropriate, to reflect the particular approach that I have taken for the present study. According to ten Have, conversation analysts broadly conduct their studies by first recording data, then transcribing it in way that captures as much detail as the analyst thinks is necessary to identify features that are relevant to the interaction. Following this, they will analyse select episodes of interaction on a case-by-case basis, before finally articulating a formal analysis of the observations that have been made (ten Have, 1999). I will discuss each of these stages in turn.

2.3.1 Data collection

Data collection for the CHC study was designed to reflect the research goal of 'unmotivated examination' by not utilising any particular sampling method. To do so would have required some sort of specific research question. The motivation for collecting this type of data was something altogether different. In general, conversation analysts are interested in gaining access to naturally-occurring episodes of interaction and, over time, they have gathered data from different contexts, cultures, and languages. The current project, in collecting data from a previously unexamined context, CHC service calls, contributes to this methodological principle.

In collecting data for this thesis, I aimed to capture as much as possible of the details of the interaction that are available to the participants involved. Unlike in co-present (i.e., 'face-to-face') interaction, where a range of physical behaviour can be relevant to the interaction, participants involved in telephone conversations only have access to each other's verbal utterances. And ultimately, while the recording may not capture everything that is relevant to the participants involved, at least what has been captured has occurred and therefore could be relevant (Sacks, 1992).

The data were recorded by employees at CHC agencies, who were recruited both to participate in the project and also to recruit clients of the service to participate. Employees were introduced to the project in briefing sessions. They were then individually approached and shown an information sheet (see Appendix B) and consent form (see Appendix C). If they were willing to participate, they were asked to sign the consent form. All 11 employees who were approached agreed to participate.

The procedure for recruiting clients was arrived at through negotiation with the collaborating agencies and is an approach that has been successfully used by other researchers of talk-in-interaction (e.g., Hepburn & Potter, 2004). The procedure was approved by the ethics committees of both the University of Adelaide and the data source. Participating employees had their telephones connected to their desktop computers via a telephone recording adaptor. The freeware audio recording and

editing program *Audacity*[15] was installed on their computers. This gave employees the technical infrastructure to record telephone conversations at their discretion. Employees were trained in using the recording equipment and in negotiating the informed consent of clients to participate by having their conversations with the employee recorded for several months. Employees were provided with an instruction sheet to which they could refer to throughout the project (see Appendix D). For those clients where consent had been obtained, employees could then record and save conversations. The following is an example of how informed consent was negotiated for this project.

```
(01) [CHC238, 0:01-0:27]
01 E02:   >g↑ood mo:rning Suburban Home< Care.=>this is<
02        Ti:na,=
03 C085:        =ohh! Tina it's A:nn Hamilton again.=I: am
04        (.) s:o: stu:pih[d,]
05 E02:                  [th]at's oh[kay A:nn.] befo:re]=
06 C085:                            [ .h h h h] hehhh! ]=
07 E02:   =y' go o::n,=[wer-] >we're i-< (.) >I don't know
08 C085:              [yep,]
09 E02:   if< I've a:sked you=we're doing a (.)
10        communica:tion study with: (.) the: Adelaide
11        U:ni:, .hhh which invo:lves peeple having: (.)
12        the:ir telephon:e ca:lls reco::rded¿ .hhh >would
13        you be< ohkay with tha:'?
14 C085:  o::h ye:ah. [  shu:re.   fi:ne.  ]
15 E02:              [>ohkay< e:xcellent=s]o it'll [it'l]l
16 C085:                                          [(mm)]
17 E02:   go: on for about a month or so:.=
18 C085:  =ye:[ah  fine.  ]
19 E02:      [.hh excelle]nt. ohkay how can I help,
```

Recorded calls were routinely transferred from the data collection sites to the University. Each call was given a discrete code (ranging from CHC001 to CHC375). Employees were participant-coded (ranging from E01 to E011), as were clients (ranging from C001 to C139). All identifying names in the calls, including the names of employees, clients, and the organisation itself, were replaced with pseudonyms. As a part of the anonymity protocol that was negotiated with the organisation from which the data was collected, audio files were digitally masked for public presentation. This involved modifying the pitch of the recording and reversing the pronunciation of utterances that might identify a participant or the data source.   As with the above

---

[15] Downloadable from: http://audacity.sourceforge.net/

instance, fragments of data are identified by their call code, as well as with a time stamp that indicates the segment of the recording from which the fragment has been taken.

2.3.2 Transcription

As is standard in conversation analytic research, analysis of the data for this study was aided by an impressionistic and typographical representation of the data known as 'Jeffersonian transcription.' This transcription method involves the enrichment of standard orthographic transcripts with a range of symbols that can be found in word processors (and before that, on typewriters) and have come to denote specific production and distributional features of speech that conversation analysts have found to be relevant to participants in interaction. A glossary of the transcription conventions that have been used for this thesis, which are based on Jefferson (2004) and Hepburn and Bolden (forthcoming), is presented in Appendix A. Where particularly pertinent to an analytic claim, the accuracy of a transcript was assessed by having a segment of data independently transcribed by another researcher.

Particular speakers are identified down the left-hand side of the transcripts by the discrete code that was allocated to each participant in the study (cf. §2.3.1). Although there is no strict convention governing how participants should be identified in transcripts, a common practice is to use an identifier that participants themselves use in the data. In contemporary English-speaking conversation the most common identifier is a referent's given name (cf. Schegloff, 1999c). In this thesis, I have adopted one of the alternative approaches available, which is to use codes to identify different speakers in any given interaction. There is no specific theoretical basis for this, but it does allow for the possibility, which is often observed in the CHC data corpus, of clients being interchangeably referred to with an honorific and their family name or with their given name. In that sense, following Sacks (1972), I leave it to the participants involved to display how they will identify each other. Following on from this, in my analytic accounts I refer to the speakers as either 'client' or 'employee.' This is not to imply that any particular institutional role is necessarily relevant in these

interactions, but is rather used in an attempt to avoid the confusion of having to associate particular names with particular codes in the transcripts.

2.3.3   Analysis: Single episodes of interaction

Having collected and transcribed a corpus of interaction, the first stage in my general analytic strategy was to work through arbitrarily or purposively selected sequences of action. This was done both individually and in 'data sessions' with colleagues. Even when initial analysis involved examining a collection of possibly-related instances, instances were examined on a case-by-case basis. As described in §2.2.1, case-by-case analysis is a foundational component of conversation analysis. It is the best way in which some instance can be ruled in or out of a collection of a related phenomenon.

Fragments of data were examined on a moment-by-moment basis, in order to track the unfolding interaction for domains of organisation that have been previously identified by conversation analysts. These domains can be used as 'keys' to understanding the organisation of a stretch of talk (cf. Sidnell, 2010: 30-31). Ten Have (1999) suggests examining domains of organisation like how participants manage the task of taking turns at talk, designing their turns to accomplish specific actions, organising coherent sequences of action, and repairing any sources of trouble. This analytic practice allows for an appreciation of how different types of organisation come to be integrated in particular instances (cf. Sacks, 1992: Vol 2, pp 561-569). Some of the principal domains of organisation in talk-in-interaction will be discussed in Chapter 3. They comprise the empirical bedrock of findings that this thesis seeks to develop and can additionally be utilised as evidence in support of analytic claims. For instance, in the analysis of person reference forms in Chapter 6, I use an analysis of repair sequences to show that participants understand specific reference forms to be accomplishing particular actions.

The aim, according to ten Have (1999), of systematically examining fragments of interaction in relation to known forms of organisation is to generate an 'analytically informed description' of that piece of interaction. Having reached this stage, the description can usefully be used either to constitute a case study or to help decide

whether a specific instance can be included in a collection as an example of some phenomenon of interest. Chapter 7 of this thesis is an instance of a single case study. It follows the approach of published single case analyses (e.g., Schegloff, 1987a) by both applying the existing empirical findings of conversation analysis in the study of a single episode of interaction, while also using the opportunity to identify new phenomena that could be other components of the 'organisational formality' of interaction.

2.3.4 Analysis: Collections of interactional phenomena

Chapter 7 is a single case study of a relatively extended sequence of interaction. Because of its length, it is likely that other sequences of similar instances would exhibit a great deal of variation, in addition to an underlying similarity. Phenomena that can be located in smaller fragments of talk, alternatively, tend to exhibit relatively less variation and, for this reason, it is possible for conversation analysts to make collections of phenomena for comparative study (ten Have, 1999). This is the approach taken in Chapters 4 to 6, where I first examine a particular sequence of action and then practices for referring to non-present third parties. Such work opens up the possibility of elucidating context-free practices that can be observed in interaction. It is an account, of course, that could be refined in relation to any additional data that came to hand and which contradicted that account. Indeed, my analytic aim in Chapters 4 and 5 is to refine an existing analytic account in response to the data that I have collected.

My aim, in conducting the analysis in Chapters 4 to 6 has been to make a comprehensive and generally inclusive collection of focal phenomena. Of course, this task has been restricted to the 375 recorded conversations that I had available. However, the collections that I have made and studied are comprehensive and inclusive in the sense that they incorporate 'deviant cases' (Schegloff, 1968); that is, instances that appear to challenge the validity of a nascent empirical account. They also included 'boundary cases' (Schegloff, 1997a) that could either be ruled in or ruled out of being an instance of a phenomenon as an empirical account developed. The overall aim of working with collections is to formulate 'rules' or 'principles' that participants demonstrably orient to as relevant in their interactions with one another. As detailed above, this is initiated by analysing single instances for their local order.

Accounts of this order are then 'tested' for their generalisability through comparison with other cases (ten Have, 1999). What is crucial is that conversation analysts do not analyse data that has already been aggregated, but rather aggregate *findings* that have been made from collections of specimens, each of which have been analysed as single, coherent, episodes of interaction (Schegloff, 2010). Both single-case and collection-based analyses are a means to elucidate the same common interest that conversation analysts have in the structural properties of interaction. In the following chapter, I review some of these properties.

Chapter 3

Foundational findings in conversation analysis

In Chapter 1, I discussed some of the different ways in which people can go about making arrangements with one another in interaction. That research reflects a central interest of conversation analysts in understanding how people accomplish recognisable actions in interaction; an interest that I elaborated in Chapter 2. In this chapter, I want to examine some of the foundational findings made by conversation analysts concerning a range of actions that are ubiquitous in interaction. The findings reviewed in this chapter are utilised as the basis for the analyses made throughout this thesis. I will review here aspects of turn-taking organisation, sequence organisation, preference structure, and repair organisation. In addition to these foundational findings, throughout the analytic section of the thesis I will introduce additional findings that relate specifically to the analysis being conducted at that particular point.

3.1 Turn-taking organisation

Taking turns in conversation, and indeed in many forms of talk-in-interaction, constitutes a basic level of organisation in human interaction. Indeed, the very notion of interruption requires that there is some sort of turn-taking order that can be disrupted or transgressed (Schegloff, 1997b). Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson (1974) highlight how flexible this organisation needs to be. They list 14 features of turn-taking that are observable and that therefore should be accounted for in any explanation of how turn-taking works as an orderly social practice. One such feature is how speaker change takes place. Another is that turns at talk are not of a fixed size. These are two basic observations that will need to be accounted for in the data examined in this thesis. In this section, I will review research concerning how people coordinate taking turns at talk, and also research that concerns the organisation of turns of varying lengths.

In §2.2.2, I discussed that conversation analysts attempt to account for how the forms of organisation in talk-in-interaction can be both context-free and context-sensitive. This analytic goal originates in Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson's (1974) paper on the organisation of turn-taking in conversation. They reasoned that whereas individual episodes of interaction might be customised for the moment of their occurrence, there must nevertheless be some formal apparatus for an activity like taking turns at talk. Otherwise, people would have to work out how to take turns anew, each time they interacted with someone. The turn-taking system is an 'interactionally constituted social structure of conversation,' and is not simply the result of analytic parsing (Lerner, 2002). This means that Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson's model is one that participants themselves demonstrate to be relevant in their conduct. Moreover, evidence suggests that this model has a universal application to turn-taking practices in a variety of different languages and cultures (Stivers et al., 2009).

Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson (1974) identify the 'turn-constructional unit' as one basic mechanism that allows for turn-taking in conversation[16]. Turn-constructional units are utterances that can be heard, in context, to be recognisably complete turns at talk. Using examples from American English conversation, they show how turn-constructional units can range in size from a lexeme to a sentence. These units, then, are syntactic. However, this is not their only relevant quality; a point I will return to shortly. Speakers orient to the first possible completion of a turn-constructional unit as a point where transition to another speaker is a relevant possibility; a point that Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson call a 'transition-relevance place.' At such places, speaker change may, but need not, occur. Given that turn-constructional units can be as short as a lexeme, some additional organisation is required in order for transition-relevance places to be withheld in the case of longer units, such as sentences. This level of organisation also allows for the possibility of recipients to project where a current speaker's turn might be possibly complete, and therefore where they might take a turn at talk. Evidence for the projectability of transition-relevance places comes from the

---

[16] Another identified mechanism allows for different ways of allocating turns, but will not be discussed here.

common observation of either a slight amount of overlap or no gap between the ending of one speaker's turn and the beginning of another's (cf. Jefferson, 1973). The turn-taking system, then, is ordered to avoid gaps between speakers' turns at talk. The issue, then, is how the varying lengths of turn-constructional units are projectable to recipients in talk-in-interaction.

Schegloff (1996c), developing the account of Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson (1974), explicitly names and describes three components of turn-constructional units that are features of turn completion and, therefore, indicators of transition-relevance places. These features apply to the full range of unit types; that is, from lexemes to sentences. First, a possible transition-relevance place can be perceived by recipients when a speaker's turn-constructional unit is 'pragmatically' complete. That is, a turn is possibly complete when it has accomplished some recognisable action that makes sense in the proximal context of a conversation. Second, speaker change is a relevant possibility when a unit can also be heard to be syntactically possibly complete. What constitutes syntactical completeness can vary. In some contexts, a single lexical item might constitute a complete turn syntactically, while in others it may not. This is evident in the following two fragments of interaction. In the first, the clausal unit (in boldface) is treated as possibly complete by an interlocutor. In the second fragment, a virtually identical clausal unit (also in boldface) is not treated as possibly complete.

```
(3.01) [CHC035, 0:57-1:02]
01 E07:    >well< [Gwen's] coming toda:y a:nyway.=
02 C011:          [ m m. ]                        =w[ho ihs?]
03 E07:                                             [ .hhh ]
04         e:r her name's Gwen:.

(3.02) [CHC127, 2:38-2:50]
01 C040:   [i::s To]ni coming in tomorrow?
02             (.)
03 E01:    yes=should [be.]
04 C040:              [oh.] goohd. [good.] good.
05 E01:                           [ yep.]
06 C040:   [eh hah hah hah ha]
07 E01:    [yep. no she sh'ld] be: az same as no:rmal.
08 C040:   u:h ri:ght. a:n' (.) who's coming F:ri:day.=
09 E01:                                         =u::h
10         don't know if we've got that yet...
```

In the instances above, at line 2 in fragment 3.01, and at line 8 in fragment 3.02, a speaker utters the clause *who is* (which is contracted in fragment 3.02). In fragment 3.01, this clause constitutes a recognisably complete turn at talk and is indeed treated

as such by the employee, who responds at line 4. In fragment 3.02, however, the client's turn cannot possibly be complete at *and who's*. Speakers produce turn-constructional units and recipients parse them in relation to their place in a sequence of talk, in order to determine where possible completion might be. In fragment 3.01, the participants can determine that *who ihs?* is a possibly complete turn at talk by examining the local context in which it is produced. There is, therefore, a complex relationship between 'pragmatics' and syntax in determining possibly complete turns at talk.

The third feature that Schegloff (1996c) describes as aiding in the determination of the possible completeness of turns is intonation. For instance, in English-speaking interaction, rising or falling intonation can be used to indicate a possibly complete unit of talk. This again depends upon the action (the 'pragmatics') of a turn. For this reason, the intonational contour of talk is regarded as supporting the pragmatic and syntactic completion of a turn-constructional unit (Schegloff, 1998a). There are a variety of ways in which two or more turn-constructional units can be combined within a single turn at talk, some of which I will deal with at some length in §4.4. For now, I will move to consider how turns at talk are related to one another in talk-in-interaction.

3.2 Sequence organisation

A distinct empirical finding that conversation analysts have contributed to the understanding of talk-in-interaction is that turns at talk are not just serially ordered, but are organised into sequences of action. Research into this phenomenon, which has occupied conversation analysts since the inception of the field (eg., Schegloff, 1968; Schegloff & Sacks, 1973), has been comprehensively summarised and extended by Schegloff (2007c). Building on the turn-taking model that was devised by Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson (1974), next turns are an opportunity for a recipient to display an understanding of preceding material. Most commonly, this material is the content of the immediately preceding turn. This is the basis for understanding 'adjacency pairs' (Schegloff & Sacks, 1973) as the basic form of sequential organisation in talk. These pairs are comprised of a first turn, which is referred to technically as a 'first pair part,' and a responsive and adjacently placed second turn, or a 'second pair part,' in which

50

recipients can display their understanding of the first pair part. First pair parts establish a relatively restricted range of responses as 'conditionally relevant' (cf. Schegloff, 1972) for second pair parts. For instance, a greeting makes a return greeting a conditionally relevant next action. Without conditional relevance, it would not be possible to notice that some type of specific response, such as a return greeting, was missing.

A second pair part can display what type of action a recipient took the prior turn to be implementing. For instance, Drew and Heritage (1992) discuss an instance where there are two different responses, by a mother ('M') and a father ('F'), to a noticing that is made by a health visitor ('HV'). The health visitor is in the process of checking on how they are adjusting to the birth of their baby.

```
(3.03) [HV:4A1:1 (Drew & Heritage, 1992: 33)]
01 HV:  He's enjoying that [isn't he.
02 F:                      [°Yes, he certainly is=°
03 M:                                      =He's not
04      hungry 'cuz (h)he's ju(h)st (h)had 'iz bo:ttle .hhh
05         (0.5)
06 HV:  You're feeding him on (.) Cow and Gate Premium.
```

At line 1, the health visitor notices some behaviour that the baby is apparently engaging in and comments upon it. The parents of the baby respond to this noticing quite differently and, in doing so, display that they regard this noticing as accomplishing different types of actions. The father, who responds first, treats the noticing as a benign contribution to their conversation by agreeing with it. Immediately following this, the mother responds by rebutting an inference that could be made from the observation, and then accounting for that rebuttal. By responding in this way, the mother indicates that she takes the noticing to be an indirect criticism of how she and her partner are caring for their baby. This example illustrates how sequential organisation is closely related to the recognisable achievement of actions in talk-in-interaction. Indeed, sequential placement can often help determine what action is actually being accomplished (and, as discussed in §3.1, when a turn is possibly complete). For instance, an utterance following a question can be understood as an answer, whereas the same utterance could be a statement or a proposition if located elsewhere (Schegloff & Sacks, 1973). The content of turns, then, is understood by participants on the basis of a turn's sequential location.

It is important to clarify that the concepts of action and sequence should not be conflated. The above data fragment illustrates why. Two turns can both be a second to a single first pair part and yet they can accomplish very different actions. The following example illustrates two different ways of analytically parsing turns at talk; the first based on the organisation of turns into coherent sequences, and the second based on the actions being accomplished in those turns. 'FPP' refers to 'first pair part' and 'SPP' to 'second pair part.'

```
Sequential analysis
HV:  He's enjoying that [isn't he.                (1) FPP
F:                      [°Yes, he certainly
     is=°                                          (2) SPP
M:     =He's not hungry 'cuz (h)he's ju(h)st
       (h)had 'iz bo:ttle                          (3) SPP


Action analysis
HV:  He's enjoying that [isn't he.            (1)  NOTICING
F:                      [°Yes, he certainly
     is=°                                      (2) AGREEMENT
M:     =He's not hungry                        (3)  REBUTTAL
       'cuz (h)he's ju(h)st (h)had 'iz bo:ttle     + ACCOUNT
```

In the first characterisation, the turns by the father and mother both share the property of being second pair parts. Under this sequential analysis, then, these turns are of the same order. However, the second characterisation, of the action being produced by each turn, identifies responses of a different order. So while it is appropriate to say that talk is organised into sequences *of* action, it is also the case that an analysis of sequence and action will often rely upon distinct terminology and that they will be described in separate ways. This will become particularly apparent in the analysis in Chapter 7, where I will primarily rely upon sequence organisation to provide an analytic account of how a source of misunderstanding is addressed.

Adjacency pairs can be understood as the basic way in which sequences of turns are organised in talk-in-interaction. However, adjacency pairs are also expandable. For instance, Schegloff (1990) discusses an instance where there are some 45 intervening turns at talk between one first pair part, *I was wondering if you'd let me borrow your gun.*, and its responsive second pair part, *yeah, you can use it*. In spite of their gross non-adjacency, that second pair part can be heard by participants and analysts alike as a response to the earlier request. This is partly because that request had yet to be

responded to, and also because the intervening material was concerned with the possible granting or refusing of that request. For this reason, Schegloff (2007c) terms the underlying adjacency pair that organises instances like the above request-granting as a 'base pair,' containing a 'base first pair part' and a 'base second pair part.'

Base adjacency pairs can be expanded in many ways, and at a variety of locations. They can be expanded before the base first pair part ('pre-expansion'), between the base first pair part and the base second pair part ('insert expansion'), or after the base second pair part ('post-expansion'). These expansions can often be sequences themselves and in such circumstances are referred to as 'pre-sequences,' 'insert sequences,' and 'post-expansion sequences.' Insert sequences are the principal form of sequential expansion that is discussed in this thesis. The two main types of insert sequences are pre-seconds and post-firsts. Pre-second insert sequences are type-specific ways of dealing with matters that are preliminary to the production of a base second pair part. For instance, if one party asks for directions, a recipient might reply by asking where that person is starting their journey from. This clearly does not address the matter that was initiated in the first turn, but it is, rather, preliminary to such a task. Once this information has been provided, the base second pair part, that is the giving of directions, re-emerges as the relevant next turn. Post-first insert sequences, alternatively, are addressed towards the remedy of some ostensible trouble in a first pair part (Schegloff, 2007c). They do this exclusively through a locus of order known as 'repair,' which will be discussed in §3.4. Before turning to this, however, there is another locus of order that relates to the organisation of sequences to be considered.

3.3   Preference structure

As detailed above, sequences are the means by which some interactional accomplishment, or action, is made. Whereas some first pair parts occasion only one type of second pair part (for example, a greeting occasions a return greeting), most first pair parts occasion a range of conditionally relevant responses. Those responses can be distinguished by how they contribute to the structure of a sequence of action. For instance, if one party summons another party's attention, there are two

conditionally relevant ways of responding. One response is to display an availability and willingness to interact. Alternatively, a recipient can block the summons to interact. Both of these next actions are relevant second pair parts, but they are clearly not equivalent actions. This difference is explained by the concept of preference. A response to a summons that leads to interaction is the structurally preferred response. It aligns with the broader goal of interaction that a first speaker was trying to attain by using a summons. Alternatively, although blocking the summons still responds to it, it does not contribute to the broader goal of that summons. For this reason it is structurally dispreferred (Schegloff, 2007c).

The concept of preference specifically refers to structural features that are locatable in interaction (Schegloff, 2007c). It is not intended to claim some psychological disposition that participants have in relation to choices available to them in interaction, but is rather a set of practices that are oriented to by parties to interaction (Sacks, 1987)[17]. Preference structures are optimal or default courses of action. There are two principal uses of preference as a concept in conversation analysis. Both are broadly underpinned by a notion that there is a normative form of conduct, which is structurally preferred, and departures from that, which are dispreferred (Schegloff & Lerner, 2009). The first form of preference shapes how participants formulate first pair parts, and will be discussed in Chapter 6 in relation to how speakers formulate references to third parties. The second form reflects how participants respond to turns that occasion opposing response types, such as the two responses to summons that were discussed above. Generally, preferred responses are done simply, directly, and without delay. Dispreferred responses, alternatively, often exhibit various features of being structurally suboptimal courses of action. They can be delayed either by a gap before the response begins, or by a turn-initial delay (e.g., with hesitation or search markers like *uhm*). Dispreferred responses can include palliatives like appreciations,

---

[17] Lynch and Bogen (1994: 96) suggest that the conversation analytic notion of preference, which was developed initially by Sacks, may have arisen from his reading of Kaufmann (1944). Kaufmann explained how games are governed by 'basic rules' that define the boundaries of the game in a context-free way and 'preference rules' that cover the options that become available to players in a game and can guide the selection of the most optimal option. In a similar way where there might be various conditionally relevant responses to a given first pair part, there is generally an optimal, or structurally preferred, response.

apologies, token agreements, and the like. Accounts can be included that explain or justify the response being given. Finally, pro-forma agreement can be used to preface a dispreferred response. The classic use of pro-forma agreement prefacing a dispreferred action is the *yes but* response (Pomerantz, 1984; Sidnell, 2010).

There are many type-specific preferred responses. For instance, the preferred response to an offer is an acceptance, whereas the dispreferred response would be a rejection. In addition to these type-specific preferences for second pair parts, there are more general preferences as well. In a lecture that Sacks gave in 1973 (published in 1987), he argued that a general preference for agreement exists in conversation (see also Pomerantz, 1984; Schegloff, 2007c)[18]. In addition to being more frequent, Sacks showed that agreements tend to be produced as a part of the beginning of a responsive turn, and that the response itself is not delayed. In contrast, disagreements tend to be delayed within a responsive turn and there can be a gap before the response is produced[19]. Resources like repair can even be co-opted into being "...harbingers of dispreferred base second pair parts" (Schegloff, 2007c: 102); a resource that will be discussed in the next section.

Preference is a complex, yet important, concept within conversation analysis, and an interactional phenomenon that will shape both the first and second pair parts that are studied throughout this thesis. It is also a useful way of appreciating how the forms of organisation that conversation analysts study do not constitute rules that participants automatically follow. Rather, there are choices that are available to participants when they engage in social interaction with one another. What the concept of preference shows is that there can be consequences to the ways in which people choose to conduct themselves.

---

[18] Although preferred responses can be to *disagree* with self-deprecations (Pomerantz, 1984) and in instances where parties are disputing some matter (Kotthoff, 1993).

[19] There is evidence that this preference has universal qualities that are locatable across a diverse range of languages and cultures (cf. Stivers et al., 2009).

3.4 Repair organisation

Talk-in-interaction is vulnerable to trouble, both internal and external, at any point. Such trouble can be articulatory, memory, sequential, syntactic, auditory, ambient, and so on (Schegloff, 1979). Repair refers to a general practice in interaction for dealing with such trouble when it becomes apparent. Because trouble is not limited to errors, the generic term 'repair' is more appropriate than 'correction' (Schegloff et al., 1977). An understanding of the organisation of repair has been a key area of research within conversation analysis, as it has shown how participants to an interaction are able to defend and maintain an intersubjective, or shared, understanding. The format of repair operations are shaped by which party initiates the repair and at what position (Schegloff, 2000). As previous findings about repair are foundational for the analysis contained in the Chapters 6 and 7, I will address the matters of repair initiation and position in some detail below.

Repair can be initiated by either the speaker of a turn containing some source of trouble, in which case it is referred to as 'self-initiated repair,' or by a recipient of a trouble-source turn, where it is referred to as 'other-initiated repair.' The inclusion of the term *initiation* highlights that the party who identifies a source of trouble is not necessarily the one to remedy it. It is thus possible for self-initiated self-repair, other-initiated self-repair, self-initiated other-repair, and other-initiated other-repair. Each of these divisions of labour engender further diversity in the way that repair can be accomplished (Schegloff et al., 1977). Self-initiated self-repair and other-initiated self-repair are the most pertinent to the analysis contained in this thesis and I will therefore limit my discussion to these two types.

Self-initiated self-repair is the most common type of repair in talk-in-interaction and there is a structural reason for this distribution. Speakers of a turn-in-progress, because they have a warrant to produce at least a single turn-constructional unit (cf. §3.1), have an opportunity to initiate repair within the same turn as a source of trouble. They can initiate repair through some sort of speech perturbation, like cutting off the pronunciation of some word, stretching out the pronunciation of a syllable, or using a 'search utterance' like *uhm*. This can indicate to a recipient that whatever comes next may be disjunctive with the immediately preceding talk. This ultimately

56

aids in the possible recognition of what comes next as a 'repair outcome,' or 'repair solution,' as in the following instance.

```
(3.04) [CHC025, 0:33-0:54]
01 E01:    =s(h)orry(h) to inter[rupt  your  other  cal]l.
02 C009:                        [(no, that's alright.) ]
03 E01:    >and it's only going to take a< minute cos um
04         tch=.hh normally u:m: Ren-nae comes tomorrow? .hhhh
05         but she's on holiday:s normally she comes to do the
06         cleaning?
07 C009:   ye[ah. ]
08 E01:      [.hhh] u::hm, and we'll- (.) w- we can send a
09         girl in Vickie in but it will be at eleven forty in
10         s[tead o]f half past one. is that alright?
11 C009:   [  mm  ]
```

In this fragment, the employee is on track to say *we'll send a girl in* (*we'll*, of course, is a contraction of *we will*, a detail which proves to be important). However, in the boldface section of the transcript she cuts off her pronunciation of *we'll* (the dash following *we'll* in the transcript indicates a cut-off in the pronunciation of the last syllable of the word). This speech perturbation indicates to her interlocutor that some syntactically disjunctive course of action may follow. Indeed this is what happens, following a brief pause, as the employee returns to the first word of the contraction, *we*, and uses it as a pre-frame for a 'replacement repair' (Fox et al., 2009) of *can* for *will*. The employee's turn, then, goes from being an informing of what the service *will* do, to an informing of what they *can* do. Self-initiated self-repair can also be produced in transition space, which is found following the end of a trouble-source turn and before the beginning of a response to that turn (Schegloff et al., 1977). This is particularly likely if the trouble source is located towards a transition-relevance place.

In the event that a turn containing an ostensible source of trouble is brought to completion without the speaker having repaired that trouble themselves, recipients can engage in a sequential move that was discussed in §3.2, where they seek to deal with that source of trouble before they produce the conditionally relevant second pair part. That is, recipients can launch a post-first insert sequence that interpolates the first and second parts of an otherwise adjacent pair of utterances. They can do so in order to repair a source of trouble. The most common way in which this is accomplished is for recipients to initiate repair, but then to leave it to the first speaker to produce a repair solution, in what is known as other-initiated self-repair (Schegloff et al., 1977). The following instance contains an example of this repair type.

```
(3.05) [CHC030, 0:56-1:07]
01 E08:    y:e::ah=so >what sort of< je:w'lries do they
02         make=necklaces an:' .hhh (0.6) things like tha:'¿
03             (0.6)
04 C010:   beg y' pa:rd'n,
05 E08:    do they make necklace:s:: an' thing- an'=
06 C010:                                         =ye:s
07         [bra:c]elets(eh)
08 E08:    [ye:h ]
```

This fragment begins with a question by the employee about a jewellery making class in which the client has recently enrolled. Instead of answering that question, the client asks a question of her own. This question, by treating the prior turn as a source of trouble, defers the answering of the first question until the source of trouble has been addressed. Once this occurs, at line 5, the client is able to answer the original question, which she does at line 6. These repair types were initially referred to as a 'next turn repair initiators' but have since come to be referred to as 'other-initiated repair'; reflecting that, although recipients can initiate repair in next turn, there are reasons why this might come to be delayed (cf. Schegloff, 2000). There are a variety of forms that other-initiated repair can take. Some of these will be discussed in Chapter 6.

The above discussion has introduced the notion that *who* initiates repair can shape the type of repair operation that gets produced. It has also intimated that *where* repair is initiated can be relevant. There are many positions from which repair can be initiated on a trouble-source turn; what Schegloff, Jefferson and Sacks (1977) refer to as the 'repair-initiation opportunity space.' Subsequent work, particularly by Schegloff (1992b), has demarcated the limits of this opportunity space. In addition to same turn and transition space repair, speakers can also initiate repair in the third turn relative to their trouble-source turn (i.e., in the turn following a responsive turn by an interlocutor). Although an analysis of 'third turn repair' was proffered by Schegloff, Jefferson and Sacks (1977), this has come to be refined and modified by Schegloff (1992b), who introduces the concept of 'third *position* repair,' and distinguishes it from third *turn* repair. Third turn repair, which tends to take a form similar to transition space repair, is not occasioned by the contents of an intervening turn from an interlocutor. The source of trouble, then, is unilaterally identified by the speaker of the trouble-source turn, as in the following instance, where the client is informing the employee about an appointment for an EEG (electroencephalogram).

```
(3.06) [CHC251, 0:06-0:32]
01 C092:   I haf:ta go:: in ta to:wn (at/an') (.) one oh'clock
02         t' have a (0.2) a:n- (.) eee (.) ee gee.=
03 E03:                                           =yeap.
04         (0.3)
05 E03:    >at the< clinic do you,
06         (0.2)
07 E03:    .hh
08         (.)
09 C092:   >no no no no< no:: [at ] at the ps- (0.2) ah a:t
10 E03:                       [no-]
11 C092:   the psychi:atris'.=
12 E03:                       =yeap. mmhm,
13         (.)
14 C092:   well (.) not a:t the psychi:atrist but wone of
15         his: (0.3) you know
16 E03:    yeap.
17         (0.3)
18 C092:   a:ndch a:nd u::hm:, ...
```

The employee's response to the client's turn at lines 9 and 11 does not display any problem with the prior turn. In continuing her informing at line 14, however, the client initiates self-repair by rejecting her previous characterisation (*well (.) not a:t the psychi:atrist*, line 14). In the third turn relative to an initial turn, then, the client repairs a source of trouble contained within that initial turn. What is crucial for the definition of third *turn* repair is that an interlocutor, in this case the employee, does not display a problematic understanding of a preceding turn. In the case of third *position* repair, alternatively, the intervening talk by an interlocutor displays that some first turn has occasioned a misunderstanding. The speaker of that trouble-source turn then seeks to repair the source of that misunderstanding, as in the following fragment of interaction from a group therapy session.

```
(3.07) [GTS,I,37 (Schegloff, 1992b: 1303)]
01 Dan:     Well that's a little different from last week.
02 Louise:  heh heh heh Yeah. We were in hysterics last week.
03 Dan:     No, I mean Al.
04 Louise:  Oh. He...
```

At line 2, Louise treats Dan's preceding observation about the dynamics of the discussion (which he refers to with *that*) as relating to more than one person. She displays this through her use of *we*. This reveals to Dan a misunderstanding of his prior turn, which he had intended to relate to a single person, and he repairs this in his ensuing turn (at line 3). An important observation about third position repair is that a misunderstanding need not necessarily be positioned in the turn following a trouble-source turn. Therefore, unlike third *turn* repair, which is always found in third turn,

third *position* repair can be located in third turn but could also be located later, if an apparent misunderstanding becomes manifest. This is the case in the following fragment.

```
(3.08) [CHC020, 0:00-0:16]
01 E01:    h:ello Loui:se it's [Kim.]
02 C008:                       [ HEl]lo[:, ]
03 E01:                               [.hh] how are you
04         fee:ling,
05            (0.4)
06 C008:  ooohh te:rrible.
07 E01:   >ARE< YOU:?
08            (0.4)
09 C008:  ye::hs
10 E01:   o:h that's no good. why did they letchyou out of
11        hospi[t'l then]
12 C008:       [o:h no I] mean I- no: I just had bad news:.
13 E01:   O::H [I'm s:-]
14 C008:       [ m y ] brother pa:ssed away.
```

Here, the employee misunderstands what the client intends when she reports that she is feeling terrible. However, the employee's first response (at line 7), which treats this as news, does not convey this misunderstanding. It is not until she takes another turn, to ask why the client was released from the hospital if she is still feeling unwell, that the client can realise that her earlier turn has been misunderstood. Her repair initiation to address this misunderstanding (at line 12), while located five turns from the source of trouble, is of the same structural type as the previous example, and is therefore also understood as an instance of third *position* repair, although it does not occur in the third *turn* relative to the source of trouble.

Third position repair is a resource for speakers to deal with a misunderstanding that has resulted from a source of trouble that is located in one of their own turns at talk. A similar repair device to deal with misunderstandings within an earlier turn of another speaker is also available, which Schegloff (1992b) calls 'fourth position repair'. It is best explained with reference to an example. This one comes from a call by Colonel Lehroff, who is a director of civil defence, to the home of the manager of a municipal truck yard.

```
(3.09) [CDHQ, 15; Openings, 299 (Schegloff, 1992b: 1322)]
01 Phil:     Hello?
02 Lehroff:  Phil!
03 Phil:     Yeh.
04 Lehroff:  Josh Lehroff.
05 Phil:     Yeh.
06 Lehroff:  Ah:: what've you gotten so far. Any requests to
```

```
07              dispatch any trucks in any areas,
08 Phil:        Oh you want my daddy.
09 Lehroff: Yeah, Phi[l,
10 Phil:              [Well he's outta town at a convention.
```

If we examine this fragment of interaction retrospectively, we can determine that the source of trouble is Lehroff's presumption that there is only one Phil living at the house he is calling. It turns out that both the father and son who live there are called Phil. However, at the point of Lehroff's identification of 'Phil' at line 2, neither party is aware of a source of trouble. Phil treats Lehroff as having successfully identified his voice. Phil then, in turn, does not display any recognition of Lehroff, who self identifies at line 4. Following Phil's confirmation of this at line 5, there is no reason for Lehroff to presume that he might not have secured his intended interlocutor. At this point he initiates the business of his call (at lines 6-7), which indicates to Phil that a mistake has been made; that the wrong Phil has been identified. His response to that realisation, an initiation of repair (at line 8), occurs in what is known as 'fourth position' (Schegloff, 1992b). Phil could have initiated repair at line 3 or 5. Rather, at both locations, his turn indicated no problem with Lehroff's identification at line 2, which allows the misunderstanding to be maintained.

Notice also that, like third position repair, which need not be located in the third turn relative to the source of trouble (see the analysis of fragment 3.08), fourth position repair need not be located in a fourth turn. Phil's repair is located six turns from the trouble-source turn. A misunderstanding only becomes apparent via the contents of the prior turn. This is further evidence of the turn-taking model that was described in §3.1; particularly for the notion that participants display an understanding of an interaction to one another on a turn-by-turn basis. In instances of third and fourth position repair, initial responses can propagate a misunderstanding, which may only be revealed at a later stage. Fourth position repair is the last structurally available position for which *repair* can be used to address sources of trouble in conversation (Schegloff, 1992b). In Chapter 7, I will examine one way in which a source of trouble can be addressed outside of the repair space.

This is a partial review of some of the foundational findings that have been made within conversation analysis. More systematic and comprehensive reviews have been produced by Liddicoat (2007) and Sidnell (2010). I have restricted this review to

findings that relate specifically to the analysis that will be developed over the ensuing chapters. In those chapters, I introduce additional findings from the literature that relate to the present analysis within this thesis.

Chapter 4

Prospective informings as proposals for remote action

Many of the telephone conversations in the Community and Home Care (CHC) data corpus centre on one party attempting to make a modification to an otherwise ongoing service arrangement. The calls are usually monotopical. This is to say that, in addition to the tasks of opening and closing the interaction, the explicit 'business' of the call is usually limited to making arrangements for future service provision. This makes sense in the context of interactions between a service agent and a client, for whom the purpose of an interaction is likely to be task-related. If multiple tasks are not projected at the outset of an interaction, following the recognisable completion of some task, the possible termination of the interaction becomes a relevant possibility. It is on the usual, singular business of these monotopical calls – making arrangements – that the next two chapters will specifically focus.

In the ensuing analysis, I will focus on the most pervasive method by which *employees* attempt to make arrangements with clients. The typical way in which this gets done in the corpus is for employees to inform clients of the arrangement being made. The typical response to these informings is for clients to accept the arrangement (although rejection is a conditionally relevant alternative). I will argue that these informings are instances of a broader action type that Houtkoop (1987) refers to as 'proposals for remote action,' or 'remote proposals' for short. These are a class of conversational actions where a speaker attempts to co-opt a recipient to perform or collaborate in some future course of action. The following fragment is just one instance that will be examined in this chapter and illustrates the type of phenomenon that will be discussed.

```
(4.01) [CHC007, 0:23-0:35]
01 E07:   =now I just wanted to let you know that um:: tch
02        tomo:rrow night Tammy's not working .hhh so
03        Laura's going >to be coming=b't i's a liddle
04        bit< later.=it's going to be about quarter to
05        seven:.
```

My analysis will focus specifically on how such informing sequences are produced and responded to, within episodes of interaction, as remote proposals. I will examine these sequences as a resource for making service arrangements that are both recipient-implicated and future courses of action. Speakers detail such courses of action as though the arrangement has already been made. In the above instance, the client is *informed* that they will be having a replacement care worker coming to them on the following day, and is *informed* that the service is at a time that is later than usual. This informing of a recipient-implicated future course of action appears, under scrutiny, to be self-contradictory. The arrangement is detailed to a recipient as though it has already been made (and it is indeed possible that it *has* already been made), and yet the arrangement cannot actually transpire in the way that it has been detailed without acceptance from the recipient to the informing[20]. Acceptance is vital in the above fragment because if the client is not going to be at home at the stated time, then the service will not be able to take place. The arrangement, then, is simultaneously *described* as finalised and is *not yet in a position* to be finalised. While, under analysis, this manner of making an arrangement appears to be self-contradictory, in practice participants display no trouble in using or responding to it.

I propose to term these phenomena 'prospective informings,' in order to capture that the conditions for a future arrangement are not necessarily met at the time that the informing is made. Principally, a recipient's acceptance of the arrangement is yet to be secured. My analytic goal will be to offer an account of how prospective informings function successfully, in interaction, as a type of remote proposal.

---

[20] An exception to this would be in instances where a speaker can be confident that a recipient will comply with their informing. For instance, within relationships of obligation, such as that of an employer and employee, one party (in this case, the employer) might be confident that the other will comply with an arrangement that they are simply informed of. This is rare in the CHC data corpus, although see §5.2.4 for a description of service modifications that only incorporate a change of care worker.

4.1 Background

The analysis in this chapter develops previous research on remote proposals. As explained in §1.4, Houtkoop(-Steenstra) uses the term 'proposal' to refer to a broad class of conversational actions that attempt to co-opt a recipient to perform or collaborate in some immediate or remote course of action. 'Remote proposals' differ pragmatically from 'immediate proposals' in that they relate to some action in the future. They also differ structurally in that they exhibit a double adjacency pair structure, where an initial response to the proposal is followed by a 'request-for-confirmation.' Houtkoop(-Steenstra) argues that this request occasions an opportunity for a recipient to move from stated to demonstrated acceptance (Houtkoop-Steenstra, 1990; Houtkoop, 1987).

Although Houtkoop(-Steenstra) draws upon Dutch telephone conversations that were predominantly mundane interactions between family or friends, I will be analysing institutional telephone conversations conducted in Australian English for my analysis. This contrast will help me to identify, across the next three chapters, interesting convergences and differences between the two data corpora. This will enable me to develop the existing understanding of how remote proposals might function as a broad action type. While I have reviewed some of her work on remote proposals in §1.4, I want to now focus on the components of Houtkoop(-Steenstra)'s analysis that will be specifically developed in this chapter.

4.1.1 Remote proposals as an action type

Many of the remote proposals examined in Houtkoop's (1987) monograph are formulated by participants as requests. Houtkoop claims that, in general, proposals are "...a range of actions such as requests, invitations, offers, and the like. They all have in common that by making a proposal the speaker solicits his recipient to agree to carry out the activity under discussion" (pp 1)[21]. Her ensuing analysis on *remote* proposals,

---

[21] This definition is repeated in a subsequent publication: "In my thesis 'Establishing agreement; An analysis of proposal-acceptance sequences' (Houtkoop, 1987)), I have studied the structure of proposal-

which argues for a sequence composed of two adjacency pairs, uses many requests as evidence for her analytic claims. A prevailing problem with the data fragments that Houtkoop relies upon, however, is that an insufficient number of ensuing turns are provided in many data fragments to determine the precise function of the second adjacency pair that is supposedly a part of this remote proposal sequence. This is a problem because at one point, Houtkoop acknowledges that *Ja?*[22] can be used as a "…proposal to close the conversation" (1987: 158); what Schegloff and Sacks (1973) call a 'possible pre-closing.' The second adjacency pair following requests, consisting of a *Ja?*-composed turn as a first pair part, could therefore be a pre-closing sequence and not a request-for-confirmation that is part of the remote proposal sequence. By ending her data fragments at the end of an apparent remote proposal sequence, it is impossible for a reader to determine whether a *Ja?*-composed turn is indeed a request-for-confirmation, a possible pre-closing, or both (if, indeed, that is possible). Due to this ambiguity, I will use Jefferson's (1981b) more analytically neutral term 'response solicitation' to refer to the turn that Houtkoop (1987) identifies, perhaps mistakenly, as requests-for-confirmation.

There is good reason to include a transcription of turns that follow a request-for-confirmation. It is possible for speakers to separate the actions of response solicitation and a possible nomination to terminate the interaction. A data fragment from Schegloff and Sacks' (1973) paper on closing interactions show this to be the case:

```
(4.02) [Schegloff & Sacks (1973: 318, modified)]
01 B:  Well that's why I said I'm not gonna say anything, I'm
02     not making any comments [about anybody
03 C:                          [Hmh
04 C:  Ehyeah
05 B:  Yeah
06 C:  Yeah
07 B:  Alrighty. Well I'll give you a call before we decide
08     to come down. Okay?
09 C:  Okay
10 B:  Alrighty
11 C:  Okay
```

---

acceptance sequences in Dutch telephone conversations. By proposals, I refer to actions such as requests, offers, invitations, suggestions, etc., which have as their preferred response an acceptance" (Houtkoop-Streenstra, 1990: 111).

[22] Houtkoop's (1987) rationale for not translating *Ja* into English can be found in footnote 10.

```
12 B:  We'll see you then
13 C:  Okay
14 B:  Bye bye
15 C:  Bye
```

Across lines 7 and 8, B informs C of a course of action that (s)he intends to take. This course of action will impact upon C personally. At the conclusion of his/her informing, which is transcribed as having a falling intonation, B expands his/her turn to include a tag-positioned response solicitation (a phenomena I will consider in detail in §5.2.1). C then produces the solicited response at line 9, before B takes a turn to produce a possible pre-closing device (line 10). This gets ratified by B and the conversation is terminated soon after[23]. What is necessary, then, for an evaluation of whether responses that come after apparent remote proposals are related to those proposals, is a sufficient amount of ensuing talk to determine how the conversation develops; that is, whether the topic shifts or the conversation closes.

Very few of the data fragments that are used in Houtkoop's (1987) monograph include the same amount of detail as the above data fragment, and therefore do not allow for consideration of whether a *Ja?*-composed turn is a response solicitation or possible pre-closing. There are, however, exceptions that raise questions about Houtkoop(-Steenstra)'s claim concerning the sort of actions that can accomplish remote proposals. The following fragment is one such instance.

```
(4.03) [HH:TC:18:88 (Houtkoop, 1987: 136)]
01 R:  Well, listen,
02 K:  Ja.
03 R:  do tell her (...) ((that she)) must call me before
04     Friday.
05 K:  Ja:.
06 R:  Just to make an appointment.
07 K:  Okay.
08 R:  Ja:?=
09 K:      =Ja.=
10 R:          =Okay:.=
```

---

[23] Schegloff and Sacks (1973) also comment on how arrangements that have been made within a conversation can be re-invoked during the terminal sequence of a conversation. It is thus possible that what Houtkoop (1987) analyses as demonstrations of agreement could actually be part of conversation closing, rather than a second adjacency pair in a remote proposal sequence that moves from stated to demonstrated agreement. Although Houtkoop acknowledges that the second adjacency pair can also function to nominate the termination of a conversation, she does not include a sufficient number of ensuing turns to see whether another separate sequence gets produced that is dedicated to negotiating the termination of the conversation.

```
11 K:                   =Ok[ay.
12 R:                      [Well, see you uh?=
13 K:                                       =By[e:.
14 R:                                          [Bye.
```

This remote proposal is launched with an action that is similar to the informings in the CHC data corpus: *do tell her (…) ((that she)) must c<u>a</u>ll me before Fr<u>i</u>day.* (lines 3-4). Follow weak-acceptance from K (*Ja:.*, line 5), R expands his/her prior turn with the incremental addition *just to make an app<u>oi</u>ntment.* (line 6). This recompletion of R's prior turn occasions another response to his/her informing from K. On this occasion, K replies *Okay.* (line 7). This is followed by *Ja?*-composed turn (line 8) that solicits yet another response to the informing. K's response (*Ja.*, line 9) is not upgraded to demonstrate acceptance, but merely reiterates his/her prior acceptance. There is, then, an adjacency pair in this sequence that is singularly concerned with pursuing and providing a response (lines 8-9), even though a response has already been provided. This is then followed by an adjacency pair that is concerned with closing down the conversation. The first part (*Okay:.*, line 10) is a possible pre-closing, while the second part (*Okay.*, line 11) passes the opportunity to continue talk on the current topic or to initiate another topic of talk (Schegloff & Sacks, 1973). This is evidence, then, that the adjacency pair at lines 8-9 is *not* concerned with closing down the conversation, but is rather addressing the prior talk, in the way that Houtkoop (1987) describes. It is possible confidently to conclude, then, that this is indeed an instance of a remote proposal with a double-paired sequential structure.

In contrast, with the amount of data that Houtkoop (1987) provides, it is difficult to determine whether many of the instances that she cites are indeed remote proposals with response solicitations, rather than proposals that are followed by possible pre-closing devices. This is particularly the case with the examples she provides of requests. As I do not have access to Houtkoop's original data, I will adopt a tentative re-definition of remote proposals as double-paired sequences that are initiated with an *informing* as the first pair part of a first adjacency pair. This reflects the near uniform manner in which remote proposals are launched in the CHC data corpus. Moreover, there is no evidence currently available suggesting that requests for future arrangements launch double-paired sequences. Indeed, inspection of the data fragments published in more recent research suggests that this is not the case (cf. Curl

& Drew, 2008; Walker et al., in preparation). It may be that remote proposals are a general class of actions that can be initiated in a variety of ways. However, I will leave that conclusion to future research in order to concentrate on instances that are currently available for analysis.

4.1.2 Accounting for remote proposals

Houtkoop(-Steenstra) explains that unless the reason for making a proposal is readily apparent to both parties from the context or situation, then that proposal is accountable. These accounts can come to be produced in a variety of ways. Proposers can precede their proposal with an account for its necessity. They can alternatively account for a proposal that they have just made, in the event that their recipient has not satisfactorily accepted that proposal (see also Davidson, 1984, 1990). It is also possible for recipients themselves to solicit an account for why the proposal has been made (Houtkoop-Steenstra, 1990; Houtkoop, 1987).

Instances where a proposal is preceded with an account for its necessity are routinely found in the CHC data corpus. Houtkoop-Steenstra (1990) demonstrated that proposals that are *followed* by an account tend to be of a relatively less demanding nature. She cites examples like proposing to 'call right back' (i.e., to terminate the current telephone call and to return the call in the imminent future). The service arrangements in the CHC data corpus do not appear to be of this order. In line with Houtkoop(-Steenstra)'s analysis, they appear to be relatively more demanding and are *prefaced* by an account of the necessity for the proposal.

Even amongst those proposals that Houtkoop (1987) identifies as relatively more demanding, acceptance as the preferred response is also the overwhelming response that is produced. In her words: "…in my data it hardly ever happens that proposals are rejected. This may be so since proposals tend to be preceded by a pre-proposal, in which the potential proposer makes sure whether it will make sense to come up with the intended proposal at all" (1987: 77). In this chapter, I will develop Houtkoop(-Steenstra)'s existing work on accounting for and detailing proposals. I will do so by examining the predominant type of remote proposals that are found in the

CHC data corpus; which I call 'prospective informings.' Many of these informings entail a proposer preceding their remote prospective informing with an account for its necessity. Both parties to the interaction routinely *do not* display any problems in appreciating that emergent prospective informings require a 'multi-unit' turn at talk (cf. Schegloff, 1982). My interest across this chapter, therefore, will be in how speakers are able to retain the turn space that is needed both to account for, and then propose, some course of action.

4.2 Initiating and outlining prospective informings

My first aim is to examine how prospective informings are initiated and how this relates to Houtkoop(-Streensta)'s account of what happens before remote proposals in mundane Dutch interaction. It is important to evaluate the degree to which the initiation of the sequence relates to the accomplishment of that sequence as a multi-unit turn at talk. I will argue that these sequences are not initiated in such a way that pre-establishes the necessity of a multi-unit turn at talk. Having established that this is the case, I will then turn to an analysis of how these multi-unit informings are accomplished.

4.2.1 Some ways of initiating prospective informings

The informing sequence is a new topic for the conversation and, as such, can be introduced at any point of the interaction where this is a relevant possibility. In practice, however, informing sequences in the CHC data corpus are typically the first topic of the conversation and are therefore produced just after the call opening[24]. Minimally, the sequence can be initiated with a formulation or word search (Schegloff et al., 1977); some examples of which are highlighted in the data fragments below.

---

[24] In many data instances collected for this project, the modification was postponed as the first topic of talk because of the ethics exchange needed for the call to be recorded. There were comparatively few instances where the modification was postponed in the conversation in favour of another topic of talk.

```
(4.04) [CHC074, 0:00-0:15]
01 E01:    how a:re you Pa:m,=
02 C021:                  =I'm good thank you.
03 E01:    g(h)o(h)o:d. .hh u:hm tch (0.2) in the mo::rnin:g
04         co::s Penny's working in the:: (0.2) ohfi?c::e
05 C021:   ye:[ah.]
06 E01:       [.hh]
07            (.)
07 E01:    for a whi::le u:m tch (0.4) Linda'll come. >a
08         girl c'l'd Linda.< bu' it'll be eight o'clock.
09         [  . h h  ]
10 C021:   [that'll b]e [fi:ne.]

(4.05) [CHC311, 0:00-0:16]
01         ((ethics exchange))
02 E09:    a:h yeah so you're okay with the call being
03         recorded. [ yep? ]
04 C108:             [that's] okay.
05 E09:    yep. .hhhh u::hm:, today you've got (.) the scrap
06         bhooking?
07 C108:   yeahb.
08 E09:    .hhh so: Sandra's gonna take you¿
09 C108:   aha,
10 E09:    .hhh and I:'ll be in that area myself at around one
11         so I'll pick you up oh[ka:y? ] .hhh[h h        ]
12 C108:                         [ohkay.]     [thank you.]
```

These formulation searches, while a common way of beginning a reason for initiating an interaction (cf. Schegloff, 2010), are rarely the only prefacing material to these particular informing sequences. More commonly, employees hint at the very outset of the sequence something of the nature of what they are about to do.

```
(4.06) [CHC138, 0:18-0:33]
01 E02:    hi: it's Ti:na from Home He:lp he:re.=>how are you<
02         t'da:[y,]
03 C044:        [he]llo da[:rli]ng=
04 E02:                   [.hhh] =I'm jus' calling to let you
05         kno:w tha' (.) because Sue won't be working
06         t'morro:w, .hhh a l:ady named E:mma will come to do
07         your cle:aning for you. [.hhh >and it-<]
08 C044:                           [ ye:s  I've  ]
09            (.)
10 C044:   I:'ve already been t[o:ld sweet heart.]

(4.07) [CHC234, 0:08-0:27]
01 E02:    hello Ne:ll it's Tina from Home He:lp here how are
02         [you,]
03 C081:   [ I'm] good [thanks] love.
04 E02:               [ .hhh ]
05 E02:    goo:d. .hh >I'm< jus' calling about tomorro::w,
06            (0.4)
07 E02:    um to let you kno:w that Sarah's acshully u:m o:::n
08         not working tomorrow, [ .hhh  ]
09 C081:                         [ri:ght.]
10 E02:    so a lady named Ann will come instead. .hh[h and]
11 C081:                                            [yeah.]
12 E02:    she'll be there at twelve o'clo:ck.
13            (0.5)
```

```
14 C081:  alright [(dear/then).]
```

An initial observation is that the beginnings of many of these informing sequences (the beginnings are in boldface) project an upcoming action. For instance, in fragment 4.06 the employee says *I'm jus' calling to let you kno:w* (lines 4-5), which projects that an informing (or some similar action) is going to follow. However, this property is not universal. For instance, in fragment 4.07 the same employee says *>I'm< jus' calling about tomorro::w,* (line 5), which reveals next to nothing about the type of action that is to follow. For this reason, it does not seem that these turn-initial utterances routinely project a particular type of action, but rather have some other interactional function.

4.2.2   The function of 'outlining' prospective informings

It seems to me, based on available data, that the turn-initial utterances above, in fragments 4.06 and 4.07, function to preface a reason for calling that has not been established in a prior interaction. In a footnote to their paper on topic nomination, Button and Casey (1985) note a topic nomination technique that is prevalent near conversational openings, where a party 'outlines' what they intend to talk about. Since that paper, no systematic attention has been given to how outliners function as an interactional phenomenon. I consider them here particularly in relation to their possible function of establishing a multi-unit turn at talk. As already discussed, these outliners can, but need not necessarily, name or project the action that is to follow. I want to suggest that these outliners are designed to occasion topical relevance in situations where potential reasons for the conversation are disjunct from previous talk or are altogether unanticipated. This accounts for their overwhelming presence at the beginning of conversations (Button & Casey, 1985), where a vast range of reasons for interacting may be unexpected. They are particularly prevalent in those instances in the CHC data corpus where arrangements involve a modification to an otherwise ongoing service arrangement.

The possibility that outliners aid in establishing the relevance of a potentially unanticipated action can be heard when actions that are introduced with outliners are compared to those where they are not. The following is an instance in which an

outliner is *not* produced (the talk transcribed in boldface is the informing that might have been prefaced with an outliner). This fragment, which is an extended transcription of fragment 4.05, comes from early within the call, just after the call opening and after consent for participation in the research project has been negotiated.

```
(4.08) [CHC311, 0:00-0:23]
01           ((ethics exchange))
02 E09:   a:h yeah so you're okay with the call being
03        recorded. [ yep? ]
04 C108:           [that's] okay.
05 E09:   yep. .hhhh u::hm:, today you've got (.) the scrap
06        bhooking?
07 C108:  yeahb.
08 E09:   .hhh so: Sandra's gonna take you¿
09 C108:  aha,
10 E09:   .hhh and I:'ll be in that area myself at around one
11        so I'll pick you up oh[ka:y? ] .hhh[h h      ]
12 C108:                        [ohkay.]    [thank you.]
13 E09:   so::: yeh >jus' need to be< ready and all the rest
14        of ↑it. oh[khay, ]
15 C108:            [ohkay.]
16 E09:   u:hm, .hhhhhh yehp. a:n:(d) >as I said
17        yesterday<... ((topic shifts))
```

The employee in this fragment begins to initiate a new sequence at line 5 with a formulation search (*u::hm:,* line 5), but does not produce an outliner. Rather, he reminds the client of a social activity (scrap booking) that she has scheduled on that day. Following the client's response, in which she acknowledges that she is going to be attending the activity, the employee informs her that a particular care worker will be 'taking' (i.e., driving) her there. In this fragment, informing the client of a transport arrangement is made relevant by introducing into the conversation a piece of mutually-shared knowledge (that the client is going to a scrap booking group). No outliner is required, as topical relevance is achieved via a different means.

Establishing particular actions as a reason for an interaction can also be accomplished without the use of an outliner in instances where a prior conversation has established a particular action as something that might be relevantly introduced in future interactions. This is the case in the following two data fragments, which represent conversations that occur two days apart, involving the same conversational dyad.

Towards, the end of the first conversation[25], the client asks the employee for some details regarding some future services that have not been discussed so far.

```
(4.09) [CHC127, 2:39-3:01]
01 C040:   [i::s To]ni coming in tomorrow?
02             (.)
03 E01:    yes=should [be.]
04 C040:              [oh.] goohd. [good.] good.
05 E01:                         [ yep.]
06 C040:   [eh hah hah hah ha]
07 E01:    [yep. no she sh'ld] be: az same as no:rmal.
08 C040:   u:h ri:ght. a:n' (.) who's coming F:ri:day.=
09 E01:                                         =u::h
10         don't know if we've got that yet but I'll
11         c:ertainly let [you know clo:s]er to the da:y.
12 C040:                  [o : : : h w :.]
13 C040:   ye:s::.
14 E01:    a:lr[i:?ght]
15 C040:       [ yeh. ] ye(h)h heh he
16 E01:    .hh[h h   [ o  h ]kay. NO WOrries Ka:th.
17 C040:      [that's [ohkay.]
18 C040:   £ohkay thanks al[ot.£]
19 E01:                    [ tah] ca:re [bye bye]:.=
20 C040:                               [ ri:te.]  =ohkay.
21         <bye by:e.>
```

What is relevant for an examination of why an outliner is not necessary in the subsequent call two days later is that the client has asked the employee which care worker will be delivering the client's service on the coming Friday (on line 8). At the time, the employee is not in a position to answer that question and proposes to defer the matter to a later call (cf. lines 9-11). In the next call, the employee is able to inform the client which care worker will deliver the Friday service. Because of the content of the prior call, the employee's reason for calling – to inform the client of a future arrangement – is anticipatable. This can be heard in the following fragment, which begins immediately after the call opening.

```
(4.10) [CHC128, 0:07-0:30]
01 E01:    .hhh you enjoying the fi:ne wethah?
02             (0.4)
03 C040:   ↓yes. e-
04             (.)
05 C040:   mmm,
06             (0.2)
07 E01:    yes:.=
08 C040:       =it's lovely.
09 E01:    goo:hd.
```

---

[25] The client has been periodically chuckling throughout this call and continues to do so in this fragment.

```
10 C040:   mm.=
11 E01:        =no:w tom[orrow mo:h-]
12 C040:              [(er)  I've] got a lolly. hehm
13              [h m    h m    h m:    ]
14 E01:    [GOOD ON YOU. half your] luck.
15         I [wish you could pa]ss it down the pho[:ne.]
16 C040:      [  e h    h e h  ]                  [hehm] hem
17         hm [h↑e]
18 E01:       [u::]hm tch (0.2) thomorrow mo:rning,
19 C040:   mh[mm?]
20 E01:       [u:h] Te:ammy will be the:re .hhh at about ten to
21         ni:ne.
22             (1.0)
23 C040:   *h(h)ave* I met Tammy?
```

When the employee comes to introduce the first major topic for the conversation at line 18 (there is also an initial attempt to do so at line 11[26]), she does so without the use of an outliner. The employee can relevantly introduce into the conversation an informing of who will be coming on Friday because this information was requested by the client two days earlier, in a prior conversation. The relevance of this action as a reason for calling has therefore been established in a previous conversation. As such, it can apparently be introduced into the conversation without having to mark its disjuncture.

From the outset of informing sequences in the CHC calls, we can hear these sequences as designed with recipients in mind, in a way that considers how expected a particular arrangement might be. Given that service modifications are often likely to be unexpected, it is not surprising to find a consistent deployment of outliners, which function to introduce a reason for calling where its relevance is not already established. These outliners do not necessarily, however, project a particular action type. Without securing the turn space to produce details that are preliminary to some action like a proposal, it is unclear to this point how a proposer can engage in a multi-unit prospective informing. It is to this issue that I turn next.

---

[26] This attempt is aborted when the client interrupts, presumably to account for why her turns at talk to this point have been delayed. She accounts for her delay by informing the employee that she is sucking on a lolly. 'Lolly' is the Australian English word for a type of confectionary that is referred to as a 'sweet' in British English and 'candy' in American English.

4.3 The components of prospective informings in the CHC data corpus

The aim of this section is to detail some of the components that routinely comprise prospective informings in the CHC data corpus. It is important to emphasise that these 'components' are not being forwarded as a participant's resource. That is, informers do not appear to orient to these components as being procedurally necessary. Rather, the aim here is to highlight the range of elements (that is, components) that *can* be found in these informings. This is important, because when these components are combined they can comprise of multiple turn-constructional units and, as explained in §3.1, the basic organisation of turn-taking in conversation only allocates one turn-constructional unit to a current speaker before speaker transition becomes a relevant possibility. Having identified the components that can comprise prospective informings, I will, in §4.4, turn to the issue of how these units come to be arranged into a cohesive turn at talk; a turn which is not substantively responded to by recipients until the conclusion of an informing. For simplicity, I will largely constrain my analysis to arrangements that are a modification to an otherwise ongoing service arrangement. However, the analysis that I detail here, with reference to service modifications, is consistent with the broader examination of prospective informings in the CHC data corpus from which this analysis is drawn.

4.3.1 Accounting for arrangements

Overwhelmingly, employees account for the impracticability of a usual service arrangement before informing clients of a substitute arrangement. There are usually two pieces of information that an employee formulates in relation to the service that is being modified: the occasion of the service that is to be modified, and the reason or need for its modification. This information can be formulated in either order. That is, the occasion can be formulated first and followed by an account of why a modification

is needed (as in data fragments 4.11 and 4.12), or the converse can be the case (as in fragments 4.13 and 4.14)[27].

```
(4.11) [CHC006, 0:42-0:49]
01 E07:    .hhh no:w.=um, I just want'd t' let you know that
02         <tomorrow,> .hh a:hm (.) Tammy's not wo:rking:

(4.12) [CHC074, 0:02-0:10]
01 E01:    .hh u:hm tch (0.2) in the mo::rnin:g co::s Penny's
02         working in the:: (0.2) ohfi?c::e
03 C021:   ye:[ah.]
04 E01:       [.hh]
05            (.)
06 E01:    for a whi::le

(4.13) [CHC009, 0:43-0:49]
01 E07:    .hhh um >and then the< second thing is, we've got
02         (.) um Renee is on holidays,=
03 C004:                              =mm h[m.]
04 E07:                                    [so] she can't
05         come tomorrow

(4.14) [CHC153, 0:44-0:51]
01 E01:    Jenny um: tch (0.2) Cin:dy's s:till:: not
02         working, [.hh]
03 C049:            [ ye]ah.=
04 E01:                  =s:o tomo:rrow...
```

In the first two fragments, the employee formulates the usual arrangement first using a reference to the service time (*<tomorrow,>*, line 2 of fragment 4.11; *in the mo::rning*, line 1 of fragment 4.12). This 'temporal formulation' (Boden, 1997; Schegloff, 1972) is followed by an account of the impracticability of the service (*Tammy's not wo:rking:*, line 2 of fragment 4.11; *Penny's working in the:: offi?c::e for a whi::le.*, lines 1,2 and 6 of fragment 4.12). In the next two fragments, the converse is the case: an account of the impracticability of a service precedes a temporal formulation that specifies which particular service is impracticable. In these instances, the account takes a similar format to that found in the first two fragments (*Renee is on holidays,* line 2 of fragment 4.13; *Cin:dy's s:till:: not working,* lines 1-2 of fragment 4.14). It appears, then, that the overall ordering of these two elements is free to vary, and does not impact upon the intelligibility of the informing.

---

[27] Note that the timestamps (cf. §2.3.1) are not reliable indicators of the topical 'terrain' that has been covered in the call-so-far. In the case of fragment 4.11, the preceding talk has been concerned with negotiating the client's informed consent to participate in the research project. In fragment 4.14, the delay is caused by the client being summoned to the phone by another person who answered the call.

4.3.2 Informing the client of a substitute arrangement service

Having negated the usual service arrangement, the employee is now in a position to inform the client of the details of a substitute service. As in the previous component, where the client was informed of the impracticability of the usual service arrangement, there are again two formulations that are repeatedly used in informing the client of a substitute service: the identity of the replacement care worker (this may, in fact, be the same care worker who performs the service that is being replaced) and the occasion of the replacement service. However, unlike the previous component, in which the temporal formulation of the usual service and the account of its impracticability are apparently free to vary, there is an order in which information about substitute service arrangements is delivered. In this corpus, formulations of the replacement care worker always precede formulations of the time that the substitute service will take place.

The first formulation produced in relation to the replacement service is a reference to the substitute care worker. There are two principal types of formulations that the employee can produce. The following data fragments illustrate these.

```
(4.15) [CHC007, 0:23-0:32]
01 E07:    =now I just wanted to let you know that um:: tch
02         tomo:rrow night Tammy's not working .hhh so
03         Laura's going >to be coming

(4.16) [CHC087, 0:16-0:22]
01 E04:    u::m:, (0.2) j'st ring- j'st (.) ↓remi:nding you
02         that Cindy's off still.=a:hm, and it will be
03         Ro:sie again.

(4.17) [CHC009, 0:43-0:52]
01 E07:    .hhh um >and then the< second thing is, we've got
02         (.) um Renee is on holidays,=
03 C004:                              =mm h[m.]
04 E07:                                    [so] she can't
05         come tomorrow >so we've got a< care worker called
06         Sue who's going to come,

(4.18) [CHC234, 0:12-0:24]
01 E02:    .hh >I'm< jus' calling about tomorro::w,
02            (0.4)
03 E02:    um to let you kno:w that Sarah's acshully u:m
04         o:::n not working tomorrow, [ .hhh  ]
05 C081:                               [ri:ght.]
06 E02:    so a lady named Ann will come instead.

(4.19) [CHC074, 0:02-0:13]
01 E01:    .hh u:hm tch (0.2) in the mo::rnin:g co::s Penny's
02         working in the:: (0.2) ohfi?c::e
```

```
03 C021:   ye:[ah.]
04 E01:       [.hh]
05           (.)
06 E01:   for a whi::le u:m tch (0.4) Linda'll come. >a
07        girl c'l'd Linda.<
```

In the first two data fragments (4.15 and 4.16), both the usual care worker and the
substitute care worker are referred to as though they are known to both the employee
and the client. The employee produces nothing more than the substitute care worker's
name. However, in the next two data fragments (4.17 and 4.18), the production of the
substitute care worker's name is preceded by a description of that person (*a care
worker called*, line 5 of fragment 4.17; and *a lady named*, line 6 of fragment 4.18). In
fragment 4.19, the employee repairs her reference in order to insert a description of
the care worker (*Linda'll come. >a girl c'l'd Linda.<*, lines 6-7). The relevance of these
different types of person references for replacement care workers will be discussed in
detail in Chapter 6.

Following the formulation of the substitute care worker, employees proceed to inform
clients of when the substitute service will take place. This formulation involves a lot of
variation across the data. The following fragments illustrate this variation.

```
(4.20) [CHC006, 0:42-0:54]
01 E07:   .hhh no:w.=um, I just want'd t' let you know that
02        <tomorrow,> .hh a:hm (.) Tammy's not wo:rking:=so:
03        a care worker c'll::'d Leslie is going to
04        come.=>and [she's goi]ng to< be there around
05 C002:             [ really¿ ]
06 E07:   about the same ti:me.

(4.21) [CHC074, 0:02-0:14]
01 E01:   .hh u:hm tch (0.2) in the mo::rnin:g co::s Penny's
02        working in the:: (0.2) ohfi?c::e
03 C021:  ye:[ah.]
04 E01:      [.hh]
05          (.)
06 E01:   for a whi::le u:m tch (0.4) Linda'll come. >a
07        girl c'l'd Linda.< bu' it'll be eight o'clock.

(4.22) [CHC087, 0:16-0:26]
01 E04:   u::m:, (0.2) j'st ring- j'st (.) ↓remi:nding you
02        that Cindy's off still.=a:hm, and it will be
03        Ro:sie again. but it's: I've (.) >got down here<
04        it's not til: (0.2) about eleven o'clockis[h:.

(4.23) [CHC007, 0:23-0:35]
01 E07:   =now I just wanted to let you know that um:: tch
02        tomo:rrow night Tammy's not working .hhh so
03        Laura's going >to be coming=b't i's a liddle
04        bit< later.=it's going to be about quarter to
05        seven:.
```

Fragment 4.20 is an instance in which the client is informed that there will be a change in care worker but that the replacement care worker will deliver the client's service at the normal time. A change of care worker, however, often also entails a change in the service delivery time. For instance, in fragment 4.21 it is evident from the use of the conjunction *but* in line 7 that the ensuing formulation will be in contrast to something else. That contrast is evidently a difference in the time at which the replacement care worker will visit the client. In this formulation, the informing of the time of the substitute service is similar to the informing of the replacement care worker in that the relevant information is produced in a straightforward manner. However, it is often the case that employees will expand on this component of the sequence in order to qualify the temporal formulation in some way. One way in which this expansion can be produced is to mark the time formulation as an approximation. For instance, in fragment 4.22, the employee informs the client that the replacement service will not be until *about eleven o'clockish* (line 4).

The difference between the time formulation for the substitute service and that for the usual service can also be minimised. This is often, but by no means routinely, observable in the CHC corpus. In one instance, in fragment 4.23, the employee informs the client that the replacement service will be *a little bit later* (lines 3-4). Ten Have (1995) has noticed similar mitigations when general practitioners inform patients of a course of treatment. The significance of these qualifications awaits detailed examination but could be an indicator that a speaker is engaged in a dispreferred first pair part (cf. §3.3 for an introduction to the concept of preference) in producing a prospective informing. Schegloff (2007c) discusses how requests can be oriented to as dispreferred by speakers of first turns, who can preface their requests with accounts, mitigations, excuses, and so on. This delays the production of the request proper until later within a turn, and allows for a recipient to produce the preferred response, which is to pre-empt the request with an offer of the same. If the minimisation that we find in these prospective informings is a way of mitigating a future course of action, this could be indicative of a dispreferred first pair part. If this were the case, however, it would not be of the same order of dispreference as Schegloff discusses: with prospective informings, there are no pre-emptive responses, such as offers, that a recipient can make. The informer, as a planner of a future course of action, is the party

that will have to detail that course of action. The use of minimisation, accounting, and so on, however, may nevertheless be devices that function to improve the likelihood that a dispreferred action will be accepted.

4.4 Accomplishing a multi-unit prospective informing

To this point in the interactions, the prospective informings that we have been considering have relayed a considerable amount of information to their audience. Often, at least three pieces of discrete, yet related, pieces of information have been produced: the impracticability of some usual service arrangement, the name of a substitute care worker, and the time of a replacement service arrangement. Although it has previously been established that the turn-taking system in conversation only minimally allocates a single turn comprised of a single sentential, clausal, phrasal, or lexical unit (Sacks et al., 1974), in these prospective informings the employee gets space to produce at least three such units. Between their production, there is often either a minimal response from clients, or no response at all. A minimal response might take the form of a continuer (Sacks, 1992: vol 2, pp 410-412; Schegloff, 1982), or a newsmark that encourages elaboration[28] like *really* (Maynard, 2003). Both of these are a means by which a recipient can display their understanding that there is more relevant information to come. The issue for the present analysis is to determine how chunks of information can be delivered so that they are not treated as the culmination of an informing. To do so requires that both parties contribute to a suspension of the usual rules of turn-taking. As I shall demonstrate, this suspension is accomplished, at least in part, through the use of pragmatic and prosodic resources.

---

[28] This is not to say that all newsmarks encourage elaboration (cf. Maynard, 2003).

4.4.1 A pragmatic resource: Informings of consequential occurrences

The problem[29] of how speakers gain a compound turn-constructional unit or multi-unit turn to accomplish some action has been noted previously (Lerner, 1991; Schegloff, 1982). This previous research highlights how multi-unit turns at talk are an interactional accomplishment. In another context, Terasaki (2004) has considered how both announcers and recipients are able to coordinate the maintenance and culmination of a multi-unit announcement *without* having negotiated the space for a multi-unit turn at talk. In the following example, announcing a death – presumably a notable event – is here *not* treated as notable:

```
(4.24) [NB:-2 (Terasaki, 2004: 174)]
01 B:  So, Elizabeth'n Will were s'poze tuh come down
02     las'night but there was death 'n the fam'ly so they
03     couldn' come so Guy's asked Dan tuh play with the
04     comp'ny deal, so I guess he c'n play with'im. So,
05 A:  Oh good.
```

In this conversation, B's announcement of a death in Elizabeth and Will's family is not treated as newsworthy by A[30], whereas Dan's availability to play golf is assessed as good news. The mention of a death, which itself comprises a possibly complete turn, is not treated as a complete announcement. In much the same way, employees' informings of care workers being unavailable are not usually treated as newsworthy by clients, whereas subsequent informing of a replacement service arrangement does get assessed. Terasaki's (2004) conjecture is that certain pieces of information are not responded to in conversation as news because they are presented as an informing of an *occurrence* and are not marked by the deliverer as an announcement of news. The aim of the present analysis is to come to terms with how prospective informing turns are produced so as to delay a response to an arrangement until after all of the relevant information has been produced. I will argue that both parties to these informings make

---

[29] Schegloff (1972) explains that this use of 'problem' is intended to highlight speakers' utterances as the solutions to practical problems that they face in coherently interacting with others. They are not problematic in an explicit sense, or even in the sense that they necessarily require conscious addressing by a speaker. For example, if one party faces the 'problem' of needing a potential recipient's attention, then the 'solution' is to use a summons to attempt to gain that attention.

[30] See fragment 3.08 for an instance where a death in the family is treated as newsworthy.

use of a range of pragmatic and prosodic features that convey the completion (cf. Schegloff, 1996c), or non-completion as it may be, of a turn at talk in which prospective informings come to fruition.

Like the above example of a death that is not treated as news, there are instances in the CHC data corpus where an informing that a client's care worker is ill is also not treated by the client as news. The following data fragment is one such instance.

```
(4.25) [CHC360, 0:33-0:49]
01 E11:    .hhh no:w the reason I'm ringing is because
02         Kimberley is not well toda:y, (.h)
03 C130:   ye:s,
04 E11:    s:o: a lady called Kerry's coming instead.
05 C130:   o:h yes.
06 E11:    alri:¿
07 C130:   that'll be alright.=
08 E11:                        =she'll be there at about
09         <twenty to ten> though.
10            (0.3)
11 C130:   ri:ghto:, [(y-)]
12 E11:              [ is ] that okay?
13            (.)
14 C130:   ye:s.
```

In this fragment, the employee's informing of Kimberley's illness, in her turn at lines 1-2, is not assessed as bad news by the client. Rather, she merely acknowledges that piece of news, displaying an understanding that she is passing an opportunity of treating the information as newsworthy in order to treat the prior turn-constructional unit as a component of a larger, ongoing informing (cf. Schegloff, 1982). In passing up an opportunity to take a fuller turn at talk, the client allows the employee to take another turn to continue that informing. This continues until the client is specifically asked by the employee, at line 6, and then again at line 11, to accept the arrangement that has been made. While the employee can use continuation markers, like 'so' at the beginning of line 4, to tie her talk[31] to preceding components of her informing and thus generate 'syntactically cohesive continuation' (Selting, 2005), such techniques do not themselves address the problem of securing turn space to do this in the first place.

---

[31] See Sacks (1992) for more on how tying techniques contribute towards topical coherence in conversation. See especially pp 376-381 and pp 716-721 of Volume 1. See also Schegloff (1996c) on the related concept of 'anchoring.'

It seems that in the above 'death in the family' and the 'sick care worker' conversations, neither of these pieces of information, even though they are presumably news to the recipients, are heard as a complete action. In the case of the telling of death, it does not appear that A is either very well acquainted, or acquainted at all, with Elizabeth and Will's family. Whoever it is that has died is not identified by name and is not, therefore, presented by B as someone that A might know. However, that a death in Elizabeth and Will's family has occurred can be *consequential* to A. Here the consequence is contained in B's continued informing. It is this consequence that leads to a positive assessment of an informing that began with an announcement of a death. It seems to be the case, then, that the informing of a consequential occurrence is a pragmatic resource for informers that enables them to produce a multi-unit turn in which they can deliver the composite elements of their informing. It is of a similar order to Lerner's (1991) observation that, in compound turn-constructional units, the preliminary element that projects a compound unit also projects the type of component that will be necessary to bring the unit to possible completion. For example, a turn-constructional unit beginning with *if* projects that the unit's end will incorporate a detailing of some consequence. The above instance is a multi-unit turn, rather than a compound turn-constructional unit. Unlike an *if/then*-constructed turn, an initial informing and its consequence cannot be easily detailed within a single turn-constructional unit. Nevertheless, a recipient can rely upon a similar resource to project where transition to them as a next speaker will be a possibility. That resource is when the consequence of a first piece news has been heard.

In the same way that a death in the family can have a consequence for A and is therefore not treated as news by A, the illness of a care worker can likewise be treated as consequential by a client. A care worker's illness is typically not a sufficient reason for an employee to be ringing a client[32]. Employees are unlikely to telephone clients to tell them of a care worker's illness, just as it is unlikely that someone would telephone their acquaintances to tell them about a death of a person whom those acquaintances

---

[32] Although see Chapter 7, where an employee's informing of a consequential occurrence is designed to launch a second remote proposal but is seemingly heard by the recipient as nothing more than an update on a mutual acquaintance.

did not directly know. However, if a care worker is sick and an employee is telephoning a client to inform them, this must have some consequence for that client. If that consequence is to be heard, the employee will require additional turn space to inform the client. So here, the production of a complete sentential unit, the full limit of what the turn-taking system allocates to a single speaker before speaker change becomes a relevant possibility (Sacks et al., 1974), is the space where an employee can inform the client of some news that is consequential. Because it is consequential, that unit projects the requirement of further units in which that consequence can be told[33].

The power of informing a recipient about consequential occurrences can be seen in the following fragment, where the client withholds treating an occurrence as a piece of news until after the consequence of that occurrence has been detailed.

```
(4.26) [CHC289, 0:55-1:19]
01 E06:    .hhh [no:w-] I'm jus' ringing t' let you know you
02 C100:        [yeah.]
03 E06:    know on Mo:nda:y, [ah A:n]nemarie won't be
04 C100:                     [yeah, ]
05 E06:    the::ah, .mp[hh uhm] b't Meli:nda's going to
06 C100:               [ no:. ]
07 E06:    be theah.=
08 C100:        =Me[l i]:nda now that's a new name.=
09 E06:           [tch]                           =tch
10         u:::hm o:h you mightn't know Mel.=she's been with
11         us a long ti:me. .h[h h ]
12 C100:                      [ye:a]h b't=
13         =[ I : [haven't ha[(d her.)]
13 E06:    =[ye:h [  .h h   [ no: b't] you  mightn't hav'
14         met her.=so she's gonna be there about eight
15         oh'clo[:ck.  ]
16 C100:         [that's] a:lr↑ight [eigh]t
17 E06:                            [ an-]
18         oh'clock'[s fi:ne. ]
19 E06:             [a:lri::t?]
20 E06:    e:x[cellent.]
21 C100:       [ y e : ]s:. and- (.) you don't know what's
22         wro:ng with A:nnemarie,
```

In this fragment, the employee begins her turn by informing the client that her care worker Annemarie will not be coming as usual on the following Monday (lines 3 and 5). The client does not treat this as news. Rather, she produces a minimal response (*no:.,*

---

line 6), which allows transition of speakership back to the employee, who can then detail the consequence of that occurrence. It is only after that consequence has been discussed – the name of the replacement care worker, whether the client is acquainted with the care worker (see Chapter 6 for more on this), the time of the substitute service, and the client's acceptance of the arrangement – that the client returns to the matter of Annemarie being off work and enquires about it as a piece of news (cf. lines 21-22). Because that original piece of information, which could have been treated as news, was consequential, the matter of dealing with it as news was postponed until after the consequence had been heard. The informing of a consequential occurrence, then, can be a resource that occasions a multi-unit informing.

4.4.2 Prosodic resources

An attendant resource available to informers that enables a multi-unit turn at talk is prosody (Local & Walker, 2004; Schegloff, 1998a; Selting, 2005; Wells & Macfarlane, 1998). In the CHC data corpus, prosodic resources that are regularly found in multi-unit turns include 'rush-throughs' (Schegloff, 1982), and rising intonation. Rush-throughs involve speakers speeding up the pace of their talk as they approach a point of possible completion and, therefore, of possible speaker transition. They withhold a drop in pitch that is usual at the end of turns at talk and do not take a breath between the end of one unit and the beginning of another. In this way, speakers are able to 'rush-through' the transition space (Schegloff, 1982). The following fragment is an example of an employee rushing through from one turn-constructional unit to another, in order to complete her informing.

```
(4.27) [CHC007, 0:23-0:35]
01 E07:    =now I just wanted to let you know ↑that um:: tch
02         tomo:rrow night Tammy's not working .hhh so
03         Laura's going >to be coming=b't i's a liddle
04         bit< later.=it's going to be about quarter to
05         seven:.
```

In this interaction, as the employee approaches a place where transition to another speaker is possibly relevant (at the end of *coming* in line 3), she speeds up the pace of her talk until she is well past the point where speaker change could legitimately occur.

86

In all, the speed of production is increased across the utterance: *to be coming but it's a little bit* (lines 3-4). This stretch of talk is produced at a pace that sounds at least twice as fast as the employee's surrounding talk[34]. The pace is so fast that the words *but it's a little bit* sound as though they have been lexicalised into a single component (cf. Schegloff, 1998a), and the utterance includes lexical components that have been compressed and are not completely pronounced (*b't i's*, line 3). Furthermore, there is no final falling intonation at the culmination of the turn-constructional unit that ends with *coming* (line 3). Rather, the employee compresses the usual 'beat' of silence that transpires between words to begin producing another component of her turn. All of these resources are coordinated to enable the employee to rush-through a space in which transition to another speaker (i.e., the client) could legitimately occur.

The second prosodic feature that can aid a speaker in producing a multi-unit informing is upwards shifts in intonation. There are two principal types of rising intonation that are usually transcribed by conversation analysts: continuing and questioning (cf. Schegloff, 1998a). As their names suggest, these shifts in intonation serve different functions. In the case of continuing intonation, the shift in pitch is routinely treated as conveying that a speaker has more to say, which can be a particularly useful resource if that speaker has come to a place where transition to another speaker is a relevant possibility. The rise in pitch that produces the sound of continuing intonation is not as high as that which produces questioning intonation. With questioning intonation, again as its name suggests, the rise in pitch can sound as though a speaker is asking a question (although they need not necessarily be asking a question). Asking questions can, paradoxically, be a useful resource for retaining control of the trajectory of a conversation. Once a recipient has answered a question, transition to another speaker, in this case back to the questioner, becomes a relevant possibility (Schegloff, 1980). This provides an informer with a position from which to continue their informing. I will show that by producing an utterance with a particular type of questioning intonation called 'try-marking' (Sacks & Schegloff, 1979), informers can occasion nothing more than a minimal response from a recipient. Both continuing and try-marked intonation

---

[34] Electronic measurement of the speed of production supports this hearing.

are useful resources for informers to continue the action they have launched. This is because, regardless of whether a rise in pitch sounds like questioning or continuing intonation, in the context of ongoing prospective informings, both occasion only a narrow range of relevant responses from recipients, enabling the ongoing production of the action underway.

Before continuing with this analysis, I will digress briefly in order to note that there can be some problems in distinguishing between hearing rising pitch as continuing or questioning intonation. Roberts and Robinson (2004) have shown that experienced transcribers can have less inter-observer agreement over types of rising intonation than they do over some other production features that are relevant to conversation analysts[35]. Given that this problem reveals itself to analysts as an audience to conversations, it is likely that recipients face the same issue. Furthermore, in the context of the CHC data corpus, recipients of prospective informings that contain a rise in intonation at transition-relevance places consistently respond by either receipting the information-so-far, or by allowing the informer to continue without interpolation. Consider, as examples, the following two data fragments. The first contains what sounds like continuing intonation (at line 2 of fragment 4.28; transcribed with a comma), whereas the second contains a rise in intonation that sounds questioning (at line 2 of fragment 4.29; transcribed with a question mark). In both instances, the recipient of the informing takes a responsive turn at talk to acknowledge the information-so-far, but does not attempt to respond to it in any further way.

```
(4.28) [CHC153, 0:45-0:57]
01 E01:   Jenny um: tch (0.2) Cin:dy's s:till:: not
02        working, [.hh]
03 C049:           [ ye]ah.=
04 E01:                   =s:o tomo:rrow Rita will be
05        coming at ab't <quarter to eleven>=instead of
06        half past te:n¿ [  .hhhh    that    be    alri]ght
07 C049:                  [yeah that('ll) be alright.]
08 E01:   w[ith you?]
```

```
(4.29) [CHC074, 0:02-0:14]
01 E01:    .hh u:hm tch (0.2) in the mo::rnin:g co::s Penny's
02         working in the:: (0.2) ohfi?c::e
03 C021:   ye:[ah.]
04 E01:       [.hh]
05            (.)
06 E01:    for a whi::le u:m tch (0.4) Linda'll come. >a
07         girl c'l'd Linda.< bu' it'll be eight o'clock.
```

In both data fragments, the employee's first turn is used to inform the client of the impracticability of their usual service arrangement. However, the rules of turn-taking mean that speakers are only allocated one such unit before transition to another speaker is a relevant possibility (Sacks et al., 1974; Schegloff, 1982, 1996c). In both these cases, this transition is indeed what happens. However, in both instances the recipient of the informing only responds minimally with *yeah*[36], receipting the information that has been delivered so far and allowing for the possible production of more.

It is not surprising that the continuing intonation at line 2 in fragment 4.28 proclaims that more is to come. However, the questioning intonation that is produced in line 2 of fragment 4.29 accomplishes a similar outcome. In it, the employee 'try marks' (Sacks & Schegloff, 1979) the pronunciation of *office*. Her questioning intonation seeks the client's confirmation that she understands what the employee means. Having received this confirmation at line 3, the employee is then in a position to continue her informing from line 6. It appears then, that regardless of whether a rise in pitch is generating try-marked or continuing intonation, its presence towards a transition-relevance place in prospective informings can operate as a resource for informers to continue their informing. Along with rush-throughs, these prosodic features represent some resources by which employees can produce a multi-unit informing.

Informings are also brought to a close, at least partially, through intonation. Most commonly, this involves final falling pitch, as in at the end of line 6 in the following data fragment.

---

[36] Other minimal responses that are found midway through the prospective contingent informing in the CHC data corpus include *mm hm* (as well as variations on this form, like *aha*), *right*, and *yes*.

```
(4.30) [CHC006, 0:42-1:02]³⁷
01 E07:    .hhh no:w.=um, I just want'd t' let you know that
02         <tomorrow,> .hh a:hm (.) Tammy's not wo:rking:=so:
03         a care worker c'll::'d Leslie is going to
04         come.=>and [she's goi]ng to< be there around
05 C002:              [ really¿ ]
06 E07:    about the same ti:me.
07             (.)
08 C002:   yes I:yum (0.2) I ah had to tah my hus:band
09         [from the: ah] Chest'rton House >and when I<
10 E07:    [ .h h h h h ]
11 C002:   brought him back I ducked across th[e :]re ta fi:nd
12 E07:                                       [tch]
13 C002:   that [out.]
14 E07:         [ h h]hhho[u h]
15 C002:              [heh] he [hou]
```

In this conversation, the employee produces a prospective informing across lines 1 to 6. Within that turn, there are several places where transition to another speaker is possible. Here, I will focus on the last two of these occasions: after the production of *Leslie is going to come* (lines 3-4), and after *she's going to be there around about the same time* (lines 4 and 6). Both contain some form of falling pitch and both contiguously precede another speaker taking a turn at talk. However, on the first of these occasions, following *come* on line 4, it transpires that the employee has not designed her turn to be finished at that point. Without a 'beat' of silence between words, she continues speaking to produce a time formulation, some of which is in overlap with the client's responsive turn at talk. Furthermore, her intonation does not sound like it has a 'full fall' in pitch. On the second occasion where the employee uses what does sound like final falling pitch, it results in a transition of speakership to the client, with no overlap, in which she assesses the information that has just been produced (line 6). These two outcomes represent the way in which a fall in intonation is used within prospective informings in the CHC data corpus. In the first instance, where falling pitch is produced but the speaker has not designed her turn to be complete at that point, she immediately begins producing the next component of her turn so that it is latched to the end of the previous component. When falling pitch comes at the end of a prospective informing, this works as a signal to enable speaker transition.

---

³⁷ 'Chesterton House,' as with the other potentially identifying names in these transcripts, is a pseudonym.

Transition to another speaker, following prospective informings, to produce anything more than a continuing response, is consistently delayed until the overall act of informing is complete. This was heard to be the case in fragment 4.30, where the client herself delayed informing the employee that she already knew of a replacement care worker until after the employee had finished her multi-unit prospective informing. This is also the case in the following conversation, where the client withholds producing anything more than a minimal response until the employee brings her prospective informing to completion. Throughout the informing, the client bypasses opportunities to take a turn at talk, and allows the employee to continue. It is only when the prospective informing is complete that the client takes a more extended turn at talk to inform the employee that she is physically unable to have her service delivered today.

```
(4.31) [CHC342, 0:11-0:56]
01 E10:   jus' want to let you kno:w Flo that toda:y=whe:n we
02        pick you ↑up from the ha:irdresser,
03 C123:  ye:h,=
04 E10:       =it will be a ca:re worker ca:ll'dt .hhh u:hm
05        Jan, instead of Ann.
06 C123:  m[m m, ]
07 E10:    [just-]=jus' for toda:y.
08 C123:  u:hm w'l I: wz gonna (.) get e- ah Carol to ring
09        you and .hhhh coz I ca:n't walk.
10 E10:   ↑o:h dear. what's up Flo,=
11 C123:                      =my le:gs h've ah .hh I'm
12        havin' trouble with 'em.
13 E10:   o:h goodness [me:.]
              ((7 lines omitted))
21 E10:   [ohka]:y w'l >look< I'll=I'll ca:ncel the girl
22        then.
```

In the transition-relevance space that she utilises in line 3, the client is in a position to be able to inform the employee that she cannot go to the hairdresser. Regardless of whatever change is going to take place, the employee has already confirmed that the service will be delivered today. This means that there is no reason for the client to hold off responding, in case, for example, the employee were to continue to inform her that the service has been moved to another day (when the client might be physically recovered and able to visit her hairdresser). Rather than producing an informing of her inability to go to the hairdresser, however, the client receipts the information that has been delivered so far and allows the employee to continue. It is only after the employee brings her informing to apparent completion at the end of line 7 that the client informs her that she is physically unable to visit her hairdresser (line 9).

We have explored here how employees and clients both participate in the production of multi-unit prospective informings, allowing the informing to culminate even in the event that the client has a reason for demonstrating its redundancy. I have argued that multi-unit informings are accomplished through the combination of different resources. The first of these is the pragmatic function of the utterance overall. In informing the client of a usual service's impracticability, employees are able to imply that there is a consequence to this that will require additional turn space to detail. A second resource is the prosodic production of the units that comprise prospective informings. Rises in pitch, such as continuing and try-marked intonation, project that more is to come, whereas final-falling intonation is a means by which employees can display that their informing is complete. These resources, and possibly others, are a means by which employees can communicate, and clients comprehend, when a prospective informing is still underway and when it is complete.

4.5 Contributions to the existing understanding of remote proposals

Remote proposals are a class of conversational action in which a speaker attempts to co-opt a recipient to perform or collaborate in some future course of action (Houtkoop-Steenstra, 1990; Houtkoop, 1987). In this chapter, I have been interested in a type of remote proposal that I have called 'prospective informings,' and have shown how these are used to make substitute arrangements in CHC service calls. A particular problem that informers must overcome in making these prospective informings is to detail several pieces of relevant information without their recipient taking their informing as being complete and initiating a response to it.

One major component of information that is relevant in prospective informings is an account for why the proposal is necessary. Previous research on remote proposals has identified how they can be accounted for in a range of ways. First, a proposer can, at the outset, account for why the proposal is necessary. Second, in the event that a recipient does not satisfactorily accept a proposal, a proposer can then account for the necessity of that proposal. Third, a recipient can themselves solicit an account for why

the proposal is necessary in the form that it has been made (Houtkoop-Steenstra, 1990; Houtkoop, 1987).

It is the first option, where proposers account for the necessity of their proposal at the outset, that is routinely found in the CHC data corpus. As the first substantive topic in what is often a monotopical call, prospective informings are often prefaced with an outlining expression like *I'm jus' calling to let you kno:w* (lines 4-5 of fragment 4.06). These can, but do not necessarily, project the type of action that is to follow (*i.e.,* an informing). I argued that, instead, these outliners are a way for speakers to mark topics that a recipient should not be able to anticipate. Their function does not seem to incorporate the negotiation of the extended turn space that will be required for a prospective informing.

There are at least two features of prospective informings that appear to contribute to maintaining the turn space that is required for their completion. The first of these is an account of an occurrence that it is inferably consequential for the recipient. This accounting conveys to a recipient that a speaker's current turn is not pragmatically complete. In the case of CHC service modifications, this can take the form of employees informing clients of some usual care worker's unavailability. This type of information is not treated as news by recipients, who display an understanding that this information is, rather, consequential for them, and that the employee will need to continue their turn to detail that consequence. It is only once that consequence has been detailed that the turn is pragmatically complete. An attendant resource for maintaining a multi-unit prospective informing is the prosody of the unfolding turn. A rise in pitch, such as continuing and try-marked intonation, projects that more is to come. Final-falling intonation displays that an informing has come to completion.

My analysis develops an explanation of how remote prospective informings can be accomplished as a multi-unit turn at talk. The turn space for accounting for, and then detailing, remote proposals can be maintained through the use of pragmatic and prosodic resources. This analysis shows how a multi-unit turn can be a progressive accomplishment as well as a pre-negotiated one. I will now turn to consider the ways in which eventual responses to prospective informings are accomplished; responses which can be understood to respecify prospective informings as remote proposals.

Chapter 5

Responding to remote proposals

In this chapter I examine how prospective informings are responded to in interaction. It is in their reception that the most interesting feature of these informings becomes apparent. Recipients have just been informed of an arrangement in which they will be involved. However, even though they have just been *informed* of this, they respond as though they have some discretion in the matter. That is, they treat these informings as proposals for remote action, or 'remote proposals.' Moreover, both the informer and the recipient have resources that they can deploy to ensure that an accepting response gets produced. For this reason, I will address the propositional nature of these informings that makes them instances of remote proposals. Before addressing the Community and Home Care (CHC) data, I will review Houtkoop's (1987) analysis of responses to remote proposals.

5.1 Background

5.1.1 Previous research on responding to remote proposals

Houtkoop (1987) distinguishes between two types of proposals: those that request a recipient to perform or collaborate with some immediate action, which she calls 'immediate proposals,' and those that relate to some future action, which she calls 'remote proposals.' Both immediate and remote proposals occasion acceptance or rejection as conditionally relevant responses, with acceptance being preferred (see also Davidson, 1978; ten Have, 1995).

A major difference between the two types of proposals is that recipients of remote proposals cannot tangibly *display* acceptance right away but can only *claim* that they commit to cooperate, at a later stage, with some arrangement. This, according to Houtkoop, impacts upon the way in which the two sequences of action unfold. Immediate proposals are over when a recipient complies with, and thereby shows

acceptance of, the proposed course of action. Proposers can acknowledge the acceptance and the interaction will proceed past the proposal and onto some next matter. This is not the point at which remote proposal sequences end. When a recipient initially accepts a proposed future course of action, the proposer typically responds with a 'request-for-confirmation' (Houtkoop, 1987) that the recipient will indeed cooperate in performing that course of action. Houtkoop explains that the inclusion of this confirmation adjacency pair creates a double pair structure within remote proposal sequences, as can be seen in the following instance from the CHC data corpus.

```
(5.01) [CHC018, 0:12-0:32]
01 E01:    [.hhhh] u::hm: (0.4) tch=n:ow. S:u:nda:y, we've
02         gotta sho:wer for you on S:unda:y, in>stead of<
03         M:onda:y?
04 C008:  oh righ[t. (so that-)]
05 E01:          [yep. and it's] >gonna be< with Tr:a:ce:y,
06              (.)
07 E01:   .hh[h ]
08 C008:     [Tr]:a:cey,=
09 E01:                =y:ep.=
10 C008:                   =oh[k  a  y.]
11 E01:                      [and it w]ill be f:a:irly
12         e:arly ahbout ten past ei:ght.
13 C008:  (oh) that'd be oh:k[ay.]
14 E01:                     [a :]lri::?gh:t[:.]
15 C008:                                   [ye]:h that'll be
16         fi:ne thank [you.]
17 E01:                 [ oh ]kay. you- you have a lovely
18         weekend.=
```

Across several turns at talk, the employee informs the client of the details of an upcoming service arrangement. With the exception of the insert sequence (Schegloff, 1972, 2007c) at lines 8 and 9, where the client checks, and the employee confirms, the care worker's name, these turns all contribute to the base sequence of an informing about a service arrangement. This constitutes the first (and, in this case, an expanded, multi-unit) adjacency pair in remote proposal sequences. The client accepts that arrangement at line 13, displaying that she understands the informing to be complete. Following this, at line 14 the employee produces a 'request-for-confirmation,' which the client provides at line 15. This is the second adjacency pair that Houtkoop identifies as distinguishing remote from immediate proposal sequences, claiming that it creates a double pair structure for this action type. It is the second adjacency pair that is of primary interest in this chapter.

Initial acceptances to remote proposals should take what Houtkoop (1987) calls a 'full-acceptance form.' Examples from Houtkoop's data include *fine*, *okay*, *ja*[38] *fine*, *no problem*, and *ja sure*. Responses like a singular *Ja* responses, *oh* responses, and partial or full repeats are not treated by either proposers or recipients as full-acceptance forms. In the event that a full-acceptance form *does not* get produced, proposers can account for their proposal (see also Davidson, 1984, 1990). Alternatively, if a gap emerges in the talk, a recipient can take this as an indication that no further details for the proposal are to be forthcoming, and can elect to continue their turn at talk to develop their response into a full-acceptance form (for further details, see Houtkoop 1987: 69-101).

Although the analytic term 'full-acceptance form' might suggest that the business of a proposal sequence has been brought to a close when recipients use these full-acceptance forms, according to Houtkoop they have displayed *willingness*, but not yet an *ability*, to carry out the proposed course of action. It may be the case that, following a recipient's display of willingness to comply with a remote proposal, a proposer will provide further details that may render the recipient unable to comply with what is being proposed. This is why, according to Houtkoop, proposers will typically include requests-for-confirmation in remote proposal sequences; requests that follow recipients' 'full acceptance.' This gives recipients an opportunity to move from stated acceptance, which was their initial response, to demonstrated acceptance in their second response. This demonstration can be made by recipients through upgraded responses that display that a fixed arrangement has been made and that they intend to comply, such as making a note in a diary.

In sum, a double adjacency pair structure is necessary in remote proposal sequences, according to Houtkoop, in order to facilitate a recipient's move from stated to demonstrated acceptance. She describes the double pair structure of remote proposals in the following way:

---

[38] Houtkoop's (1987) rationale for not translating *Ja* into English can be found in footnote 10.

"The sequence is structured in such a way that first recipient's willingness is under discussion, and only when recipient displays he is prepared to do what is proposed, may conversationalists proceed to discuss further details and particularities of the action. I will refer to this second aspect of the proposal sequence as recipient's ability to carry out the action" (1987: 113).

"Recipients first respond to the proposal with respect to their preparedness to go along with it. Since it may turn out that they are not capable to comply after all, once the details of the action have become clear the recipients need to re-accept the proposal when they stay with the initial acceptance, after having learned what is really proposed. So after having 'in principle' accepted in second sequence-position, recipients re-accept in fourth sequence-position (by means of confirming the earlier acceptance), after which the speaker may close the sequence" (1987: 115-116).

Although most of the conclusions that Houtkoop(-Steenstra) reaches about remote proposals through her study of Dutch data (Houtkoop-Steenstra, 1990; Houtkoop, 1987) can be supported by examining Australian English data from the CHC corpus, some of her claims about what she calls the 'request-for-confirmation' component of the sequence are not supported. Certainly, the adjacency pair itself is routinely found in the CHC data corpus, and this engenders a double pair structure for prospective informing sequences (which I take to be a type of remote proposal). However, this component rarely results in recipient's moving from stated to demonstrated forms of acceptance.   A close examination of the CHC data will show that requests-for-confirmation have a more general role of displaying a proposer's understanding, over and above any recipient's understanding, of the necessity for a recipient to accept an overtly *proposed*, future arrangement (i.e., a 'remote proposal'). The analysis in this chapter will present a re-specification of Houtkoop's analysis in a way that reflects both her observations with Dutch data and the current observations using Australian English data.

5.1.2 Terminology

Before moving to examine the responses to remote proposals in the CHC data corpus, I will discuss the need for a re-specification of some of Houtkoop's terminology. What Houtkoop refers to as 'request-for-confirmation' I will here refer to as 'response solicitation'; an abbreviated form of Jefferson's (Jefferson, 1981a; 1981b)[39] term 'post-response completion response solicitation.' My main reason for doing so is to avoid making any commitment, at the outset of my analysis, to the action that these turn-constructional units engage in, other than to highlight their role in soliciting a response from recipients.

A principal aim of this chapter is to account for why prospective informers can produce response solicitations, even immediately after a recipient has produced an accepting response. Houtkoop regards response solicitations (what she calls 'requests-for-confirmation') as attempts by proposers to move recipients from stated to demonstrated acceptance. Alternatively, I will argue that these response solicitations are a means by which proposers can convey to recipients that their informing, whether comprised of a single or multiple turn-constructional units, should now be responded to *as a proposal*.

I also want to update some of the terminology Houtkoop uses to explain proposals, in order to bring her description into alignment with current conversation analytic parlance. She claims that *immediate* proposals exhibit a three-turn structure, which she represents schematically as:

```
A: Immediate Proposal
B: Acceptance
A: Acknowledgement
```

As discussed above, Houtkoop shows how *remote* proposals contain an additional adjacency pair, in which the proposer requests a recipient's confirmation of the arrangement being made. She represents remote proposals schematically as:

---

[39] Jefferson's (1981a) paper is an expanded version of the analysis contained in her (1981b) book chapter.

```
A: Remote Proposal
B: Acceptance
A: Request-for-confirmation
B: Confirmation
A: Acknowledgement
```

In both cases, Houtkoop argues that there is an 'adjacency triplet' involved. She argues that these adjacency triplets are structural phenomena that are sequentially relevant in conversation in much the same way as adjacency pairs. This is a different understanding to that put forward by Schegloff (1986; 2007c: 115-148), who treats the third turn of Houtkoop's adjacency triplet as a post-expansion of a base adjacency pair. This is a subtle but important difference. Whereas Houtkoop argues that the third turn is *part* of a sequence, Schegloff argues that it is an *expansion* of a sequence that is already, in itself, sufficiently complete. Moreoever, Schegloff describes the content of these types of third turns as 'minimal post-expansions.' This is meant to convey that although this turn is sequentially related to the prior two turns, it does not, in itself, project any further expansion of the sequence. Schegloff includes utterances like free-standing *oh*, *okay* (or variants like *alright*), assessments, and composites thereof, as instances of minimal post-expansions. Hootkoop's description implies that if a third turn were absent, it would be 'noticeably absent' (cf. Schegloff, 1968) for the participants involved, whereas Schegloff's (1986; 2007c) description allows for the possibility that third turns might routinely be found in particular sequence types but that, if they are absent, they are not *noticeably* so.

In addition to the sequential differences in Schegloff's and Houtkoop's accounts, there is also a different emphasis in the pragmatic function that each claims these third turns are performing. Whereas Houtkoop(-Steenstra) generally parses the third turn of her adjacency triplet as 'acknowledgement,' Schegloff describes his minimal post-expansions as 'sequence-closing thirds.' That is, not only do minimal post-expansions not project any further expansion of sequences, they actually function to propose the closure of those sequences[40]. They do so in qualitatively different ways. Free-standing *oh* displays a 'change-of-state' (Heritage, 1984), treating the prior turn – that is the

---

[40] At points, particularly between pages 136 and 138, and in her schematic on page 148, Houtkoop (1987) does acknowledge the role of the fifth turn in her remote proposal sequences as possible pre-closings. This claim, however, is not consistently made throughout her monograph.

second pair part of the sequence – as informative. *Okay* (or variants like *alright*) can mark or claim acceptance of the contents of the prior turn. Composite forms, like *oh okay*, can additionally claim an understanding of an import that some information might have. And assessments take a stance on the content of the prior turn. Minimal post-expansions like sequence-closing thirds can often be the first turn-constructional unit of a multi-unit turn that 'interlocks' the closing of one sequence and the beginning (with another turn-constructional unit) of a new sequence (Schegloff, 1986, 2007; see also Beach, 1993, 1995). Although Houtkoop observes the Dutch equivalents of the above third-turn forms, in typically describing them as acknowledgements she fails to highlight the role that such utterances play in closing down sequences.

Whereas Houtkoop's account of three-turn sequences often details how third-turn acknowledgements can work towards sequence-closing, Schegloff's account specifically highlights this role. In order to bring Houtkoop's account into line with Schegloff's widely used terminology and with Jefferson's (1981b) more analytically neutral concept of 'response solicitation,' I propose that the following schemata are useful ways of characterising immediate proposal and remote proposal sequences respectively:

```
A:   Immediate Proposal
B:   Acceptance
A:   Sequence-closing third

A:   Remote Proposal
B:   Acceptance
A:   Response solicitation
B:   Re-acceptance
A:   Sequence-closing third
```

Having re-specified some of Houtkoop's terminology to suit my current purposes, I want now to turn to the practices of responding to remote proposals.

5.2   The function of responses to prospective informings as proposals for remote action

With prospective informings, acceptance is a conditionally relevant and preferred response (rejection is a dispreferred alternative) that agrees with a future course of action. Although in Houtkoop's (1987) Dutch data, there is a uniform way in which

remote proposals sequentially progress (represented schematically above), in the CHC data corpus there are three possible sequential trajectories. Exploring and comparing each of these trajectories will allow for a new appreciation of the role that the response solicitation phase plays in these sequences of action.

5.2.1 Three possible sequential trajectories

The first possible outcome, which is the most common in the data corpus, and the same as that noted in Houtkoop's data, involves the recipient self-selecting to accept a prospective informing as a proposal for a remote course of action. This results in the informer taking another turn to solicit another response to the proposal. However, there are also instances where informers move to actively solicit acceptance from recipients, through a response solicitation that is tagged to the end of their informing turn. In these instances, there is no ensuing solicitation for a second response to the proposal; a single response from the recipient proves to be sufficient. Because both the recipient's self-selected acceptance and the informer's tag-positioned response solicitation come at the same juncture in these prospective informing sequences (following the recognisable culmination of a prospective informing turn), a third possible outcome involves both parties simultaneously (or near simultaneously) moving into the acceptance or responsive phase of the informing. The recipient self-selects to accept the arrangement and the informer pursues that very same response. The following are schematics for each sequential trajectory:

```
Recipient self-selects to accept
  A:  Informing / Proposal
  B:  Acceptance
  A:  Response solicitation
  B:  Re-acceptance
  A:  Sequence-closing third

Informer pursues acceptance
  A:  Informing / Proposal + Response solicitation
  B:  Acceptance
  A:  Sequence-closing third

Both parties simultaneously move into the acceptance phase
  A:  Informing / Proposal [+ Response solicitation
  B:                       [Acceptance
  A:  Sequence-closing third
```

The two resources that are available following a prospective informing – self-selected acceptance from a recipient or a solicitation of the same by an informer – occur at a point in interaction where transition to a different speaker is a relevant possibility. The employee has produced a recognisably complete action in informing the client of a future arrangement that is inferably contingent upon their complicity. It is now relevant for the client to respond and indicate whether they will indeed cooperate in the course of action that has just been detailed. The following data fragments illustrate the three different ways in which the acceptance phase of prospective informing sequences can transpire.

```
Recipient self-selects to accept
(5.02) [CHC007, 0:23-0:43]
01 E07:    =now I just wanted to let you know that um:: tch
02         tomo:rrow night Tammy's not working .hhh so
03         Laura's going >to be coming=b't i's a liddle
04         bit< later.=it's going to be about quarter to
05         seven:.
06            (0.2)
07 C003:   quarter to seven. th[at'll b]e
08 E07:                        [↓yeah. ]
09 C003:   alri:[ght.]
10 E07:         [ yeh]=alRI::ght?
11 C003:   (yeah/ye:s) [that'll] be fine.=
12 E07:                [ okay. ]           =alright.
13 E07:    okay. .hh how you getting on with the to:ilet
14         surround is it a[lright?]

Informer pursues acceptance
(5.03) [CHC009, 0:43-0:59]
01 E07:    .hhh um >and then the< second thing is, we've got
02         (.) um Renee is on holidays,=
03 C004:                            =mm h[m.]
04 E07:                                 [so] she can't
05         come tomorrow >so we've got a< care worker called
06         Sue who's going to come,
07         [.hhhh so it's a little bit la]ter >it's around
08 C004:   [    S u e,    o k a y.    ]
09 E07:    about< three o'clock is that oka:y?=
10 C004:                            =>oh that's
11         okay<.=
12 E07:          =oh thank you very much.
13 C004:   no problem.
14 E07:    thanks missus Ch[arlton.]

Both parties simultaneously move into the acceptance phase
(5.04) [CHC153, 0:45-0:59]
01 E01:    Jenny um: tch (0.2) Cin:dy's s:till:: not
02         working, [.hh]
03 C049:            [ ye]ah.=
04 E01:                  =s:o tomo:rrow Rita will be
05         coming at ab't <quarter to eleven>=instead of
06         half past te:n¿ [  .hhhh    that    be    alri]ght
07 C049:                   [yeah that('ll) be alright.]
08 E01:    w[ith you?]
```

```
09 C049:    [  ye:h. ]
10 C049:    ye:h that's fine.
11 E01:     o:hkay tha[nks    Jen]ny.
12 C049:              [thank you.]
```

Fragment 5.02 is an example of the most common sequential trajectory following a remote proposal in the CHC corpus. Following the possibly complete production of an informing, the client self-selects to take a turn at talk, first to repeat a part of the information just formulated (*quarter to seven*, line 7), and then to accept the arrangement (*that'll be alri:ght*, lines 7 and 9). Although the repeat component of the client's response is not routinely present in responses to prospective informings, the acceptance that follows is. This is consistent with Houtkoop's (1987) analysis of repeats as an insufficient acceptance form, as the client continues her turn to provide overt acceptance to the arrangement. This response type is also consistent with Lindström's (1999) analysis of attempts to organise, in Swedish conversation, 'deferred actions' (i.e., future courses of action), where accepting responses routinely include indexical expressions, which refer to the content of a prior turn, and favourable assessments of that indexed content.

In fragment 5.03, an alternative sequential trajectory transpires in which the employee does not conclude her turn at talk after the prospective informing. Rather, she continues in order to produce a tag-positioned response solicitation (*is that oka:y?*, line 9) that relates to the proposal that she has just formulated as an informing[41]. This response is indeed what happens in the client's next turn (>*oh that's okay.<*, lines 10-11)[42]. Pomerantz (1975; 1984) has previously noted that assessment components can be used by informers to signal the end of their informing turn. These assessments can be produced as declarative statements or can be produced as a part of an interrogative. When phrased as an interrogative, as is the case in these tag-positioned

[41] Tag-positioned response solicitations in the CHC data corpus do not follow gaps in the conversation as a way of re-occasioning a response, although both Houtkoop (1987) and Jefferson (1981b) show instances where this can be the case. In addition to this, ten Have (1995) shows how responses can be re-occasioned, following proposals that are not initially agreed to.

[42] The client's initial response at line 8, *Sue, okay.*, does not prove consequential to the interaction. The employee continues to expand her turn at talk in overlap with that initial response and, by using a response solicitation at the end of her turn at line 9, moves the conversation away from the client's first response. In this sense, the employee 'sequentially deletes' (cf. Lerner, 1989) the client's turn at line 8.

response solicitations, these assessment components function as a candidate assessment that seeks acceptance from the recipient, as well as making an exit from a turn at talk (C. Goodwin, 1986; Jefferson, 1981b; Sacks et al., 1974).

Fragment 5.04 is an example of the overlapping talk that can transpire when both parties have a resource that can be produced in the same sequential position. Following the employee's prospective informing (line 6), she immediately inhales and then produces a tag-positioned response solicitation (.*hhhh that be alright with you?*, lines 6 and 8). However, at the very same moment that the employee is inhaling, and then making this solicitation, the client takes a turn at talk to produce the very response that the employee is seeking (*yeah that('ll) be alright.*, line 7).

Across the three trajectory types, recipients of prospective informings produce the same types of response, whether that response be self-initiated or follows a tag-positioned or post-response-positioned response solicitation. In these responses, recipients consistently display an understanding that, although they have just been informed of an arrangement, the course of action that they have heard can only take place if they accept it (rather than, say, merely acknowledge that it will be the case). Recipients consistently, then, treat these informings about a prospective event as a proposal that is contingent upon their acceptance. The following instance is a good example.

```
(5.05) [CHC143, 0:11-0:28]
01 E07:   hi: Cassandra it's Laura again. [.hhhh]
02 C045:                                  [yeah?]
03 E07:   u:hm tch I was jus' letting you know that o:n:
04        M:onday I said Gwen was coming,
05 C045:  [y e : a h,]
06 E07:   [.h she's a]csh'lly on holid(h)ays for t(h)wo
07        weeks.
08 C045:  [ o::h  right. ]
09 E07:   [.hhhh >so it's] going to be< There:se.=I think you
10        know Therese.=[Therese's been in a f]oracouple of
11 C045:                [ y e s  I  d o : : , ]
12 E07:   weeks.=so she'll she'll be there >around about<
13        ni::ne.
14 C045:  a:l[ri]ght [(then)]
```

Throughout this fragment of an informing, the client, as recipient, makes four different types of responses to it. Each displays a different understanding of what the employee's prior talk has accomplished. The first response (*ye:ah,* line 5) displays an understanding that more talk is to come. It functions as a 'continuer' (Schegloff, 1982)

104

by passing up an opportunity to take a fuller turn at talk. Her next response (*o::h right.*, line 8) treats the prior information as news (Heritage, 1984; Maynard, 2003; Terasaki, 2004; Wilkinson & Kitzinger, 2006). The client's third response (at line 11) is a response to an incidental sequence (Schegloff, 2007c) that the employee has initiated to solicit the client's recognition of Therese (see Chapter 7 for further analysis of incidental sequences). Her final response (*a:lright (then)*, line 14) displays an understanding that the employee's informing is complete. None of the client's previous responses displayed this property. In responding to this apparently complete action, the client does not indicate that the informing is newsworthy, as was the case with her second response (and as is the case with many other types of informings that are not concerned with prospective events that will implicate a recipient; cf. M. H. Goodwin, 1996; Heritage, 1984; Maynard, 2003; Pomerantz, 1975; Terasaki, 2004). Rather, she displays an understanding that, although she has been unilaterally informed of this arrangement, it is nonetheless a course of action that cannot proceed without her explicitly accepting it.

Across the three trajectories that can transpire in prospective informing sequences, recipients consistently display an understanding that they need to actively accept arrangements about which they have been unilaterally informed. What differs is the position in which an *informer* can display an equivalent understanding[43]. In the event

---

[43] Although the instances cited in this analysis concentrate on employee-initiated informings, it is also possible for clients to initiate the same, as in the following:

```
(5.06) [CHC208, 0:33-1:00]
01 E07:   no:w >I wz jus' double checking< the dates that
02        you're going awa:y that's a:ll.
03 C071:  o:h right. .hh we le:ave F:riday com:e ba::ck:<we
04        leave Friday a:fte- a:fter sh:ower an' we come back
05        .hhhh u::h Tu:esday.
06            (0.2)
07 E07:   com[e bac' Tchu-]
08 C071:     [an:' Mumma h]ad wanted a sh:ower_ (.) on
09        We'n's:day.
10            (.)
11 E07:   on We'n'sday.=th:at's right >that's what I<
12        couldn't remember. .mphhh n::ot a pro:blem.
13        a:lright I'll: I'll get that ˚e˚- get that in: the
14        pipeli:ne.
15 C071:  is th[at al]ri:ght?
16 E07:       [ tch ]
17 E07:   y↑ehp >that'll be< fi::ne.
18 C071:  o:h that'd be [great.]
19 E07:                 [ohkay.] alright. ohkay. thanks
20        Gabriella.
```

that a recipient accepts the arrangement detailed in the prospective informing *without there being a tag-positioned solicitation of such a response*, this predominantly occasions a response from the informer that extends the sequence in order to solicit another response. This response solicitation is produced in the manner that Houtkoop described, prompting a recipient to again accept the course of action about which they have just been informed and to which they have just expressed acceptance. The difference is that, in this position, acceptance follows an informer's display of the informing as a proposal. Fragment 5.02 is an example of this, where the client accepts the proposed arrangement without there first being a tag-positioned solicitation of such a response. The employee responds to the client's acceptance (*that'll be alright*, lines 7 and 9) with a solicitation of a similar response (*alRI::ght?*, line 10), to which the client responds by re-accepting the arrangement (*(yeah/ye:s) that'll be fine.*, line 11). The client's first response was to an informing of an arrangement. Their second response was still made in relation to an arrangement, but an arrangement that has been recompleted as a proposal, though the use of response solicitation.

In addition to the post-response response solicitations that Houtkoop describes, in the CHC data corpus there are other instances where an informer can display an understanding of the contingent nature of the informing before a recipient can do so[44].

In this fragment, the client's daughter, who lives with the client and routinely interacts with the employee on the client's behalf, informs the employee about her mother's wish to have a shower on Wednesday (lines 8-9). The employee accepts this course of action and commits to making a specific arrangement (lines 11-14). This informing-acceptance adjacency pair is followed by a response solicitation pair in which the client's daughter pursues, and the employee provides, a re-acceptance of the arrangement that has just been agreed upon (lines 15 and 17).

[44] In fact, the following instance of a tag-positioned response solicitation is presented in Houtkoop's (1987) monograph, but is not identified as being distinct from the other forms in her corpus. In it, Irene ('I') has called a dentist's office and is talking with the dental assistant ('D'). (The tag-positioned response solicitation is in boldface.)

```
(5.07) [HH:TC:29:280-296 (Houtkoop, 1987: 122)]
01 I:  I would like to make a:n appointment with (doctor )
02 D:  That's alright. At what time would you like to come?
03 I:  U:::h (          ) is there any time left for today?
04 D:  Sure.
   ((5 lines omitted; time arranged for Irene's appointment))
10 I:     [And (.) my boyfriend would like to come too.=
11 D:                                            =And
12     your boyfriend too?
13 I:  Ja:.=
14 D:      =Well, he can come at twelve. Is that alright with
15     you?=
```

This results in a comparatively truncated sequence. Such instances involve an informer tagging a response solicitation to the end of their prospective informing, thus circumventing the possibility of an initial response from a recipient before a second response is solicited. So although Houtkoop's description of a double adjacency pair structure in remote proposal sequences can be consistently located within the CHC data corpus, it is not the only way in which remote proposal sequences can transpire.

The presence of response solicitations in a variety of positions within remote proposals is noteworthy. Pomerantz (1975) observed that preferred responses like acceptance tend to result in sequence termination and topic shift (see also Schegloff, 2007c). Here, however, the client's positive evaluation of the arrangement generates further talk about it, unless acceptance follows a tag-positioned response solicitation. The response solicitation itself, then, appears to be of greater import to remote proposal sequences than the production of two responses by recipients. It is not clear why proposers might utilise different positions from which to solicit a response. This matter awaits further study. However, the very presence of response solicitations, irrespective of their occurrence in a variety of positions within remote proposals sequences, is interesting and worthy of close examination. The function of these response solicitations and, indeed, of remote proposal sequences more generally, is the concern of the next segment.

5.2.2 Types of responses to remote proposals

Houtkoop's (1987) principal claim about response solicitations, what she calls 'requests-for-confirmation,' is that they occasion a response from recipients that moves from their previously stated acceptance of the proposal to a demonstrated acceptance. She claims that the double adjacency pair structure of remote proposal sequences, where a remote proposal and its response is followed by a confirmation solicitation and its response, allows for recipients to express an *initial willingness* to perform a proposed action, but also to reveal a *subsequent inability* if more details

```
    16 I:      =Ja. Fi:ne.=
    17 D:              =Alright then.=What's his name?
```

about the proposal happen to emerge that are in some way incompatible with the recipient. The response solicitation turn, then, reveals that no more details of the proposal are to be forthcoming and that a final *demonstrated* acceptance of the proposal should now be made. A summary glance at the fragments that have been presented so far indicates that this is clearly not the case in the CHC data corpus. These fragments reflect the general character of responses to prospective informings in the CHC corpus in that it is rare to find a move from stated to demonstrated acceptance.

Instances can be found in Houtkoop's own monograph that belie her claim that response solicitations are universally geared towards moving recipients from stated to demonstrated acceptance. In the following fragments, the first is an example that reflects Houtkoop's analysis. The second is an instance where there is no shift from stated to demonstrated acceptance.

```
(5.08) [HH:TC:12:9 (Houtkoop, 1987: 67)]
01 F:  But come over here, so we can all talk about it in
02     peace.=
03 M:        =Fine.
04        (0.5)
05 F:  Ja?=
06 M:    =I'll be there in a minute.=
07 F:                              =O:kay.

(5.09) [HH:TC:18:88 (Houtkoop, 1987: 136)]
01 R:  Well, listen,
02 K:  Ja.
03 R:  do tell her (...) ((that she)) must call me before
04     Friday.
05 K:  Ja:.
06 R:  Just to make an appointment.
07 K:  Okay.
08 R:  Ja:?=
09 K:      =Ja.=
10 R:        =Okay:.=
11 K:            =Ok[ay.
12 R:               [Well, see you uh?=
13 K:                              =By[e:.
14 R:                                 [Bye.
```

In the first instance, M initially responds to F's proposal with what Houtkoop classifies as a full-acceptance form (*Fine.*, line 3). Following a response solicitation from F (*Ja?*, line 5), M upgrades his/her response with acceptance which demonstrates that (s)he has accepted the proposal, by making a commitment to come and visit F within a specified time frame. There is no such demonstrated acceptance, however, in the second instance. Here, R proposes to K that (s)he should tell a third person to call and make an appointment (cf. lines 3-4 and 6). The recipient's response, again using a full-

108

acceptance form (*Okay.*, line 7), is followed by a response solicitation (*Ja:?*, line 8). On this occasion, the response solicitation does not occasion a response that *demonstrates* acceptance. Indeed, R's response (*Ja.*, line 9) is in a form that Houtkoop describes as making weak-acceptance when used as an initial response to a proposal. However, this response appears to be sufficient for R, who produces a sequence-closing third (*Okay:.*, line 10); thus displaying a readiness to move away from the remote proposal sequence[45].

Possible modified versions of Houtkoop's analysis, such as that response solicitations occasion semantically stronger forms of acceptance, also do not account for the CHC data. The following fragment is an example of how a strong acceptance form is nonetheless followed by a response solicitation.

```
(5.10) [CHC005, 0:12-1:10]
01 E04:   .hhhh (.) now. what I was going to talk to you
02        ab(h)ou:t (.) was: (.) Ja:nic::e (.) f:rom this
03        week is g- actu- she sh- she should be there as
04        normal tomorro:w, .hhh
   ((8 lines of background details omitted))
13 E04:            =so I have a very nice lady .hh (.)
14        called Carman .hhh who will come in and do the
15        cooking for you.=
16 C002:              =ohkay.=>what was< that na:me
17        again, will you spell iht?
   ((15 lines omitted))
33 E04:   tch and she: can come there pro- (.) proximately
34        twelve fiftee:n.=something like that.=[if tha]t's
35 C002:                                        [o : h ]
36 E04:   ohkay.
37 C002:  great. ye:s.=
38 E04:             =on the Fri:day.
39           (.)
40 C002:  that's w:onderful.
41 E04:   alri:ght?=
42 C002:          =yes that's really good.
43 E04:   and I think you will get on pretty well with her.
44        [she's pretty pop]ular.=
45 C002:  [  okay   then. ]    =t[hanks very mu]ch for (y-)
46 E04:                          [ .h h h h h  ]
47 C002:  doing all that for me.
```

---

[45] This actually turns out to be more than just a sequence-closing third. It is also a possible pre-closing device (Schegloff & Sacks, 1973), which gets ratified by its recipient and leads to the termination of the conversation. I discuss this matter in further detail below.

In response to the employee's informing, the client produces a strong and then exulted assessment, (*great. ye:s.*, at line 37; then *that's w:onderful.* at line 40)[46]. The presence of such strong forms of acceptance is not, however, sufficient for the employee to treat the proposed course of action as being settled[47]. She nevertheless produces (at line 41) a response solicitation to occasion a second response to the proposed course of action (which comes at line 42). So these response solicitations do not appear to be geared towards occasioning upgraded response forms.

An even weaker possible version of Houtkoop's analysis, that response solicitations are aimed at generating a semantically different type of response, is not supported with reference to the CHC data corpus. For example, some but not all response solicitations (particularly post-response solicitations) occasion overt acceptance, from the recipient, to the arrangement. It is often the case that initial responses by clients will contain an assessment but that, following a post-response response solicitation, clients go on to produce overt acceptance forms, such as *yes*, in turn-initial position, as well as a re-assessment. This compound response is consistent with Lindström's (1999) observation, made in her study of Swedish conversation, that affirmative response tokens alone are insufficient in order to accept arrangements for future courses of action (what Lindström calls 'remote actions'). The following instance, previously considered in fragment 5.02, is an example of how response solicitations can occasion overt acceptance.

---

[46] This data fragment contains two response solicitations; one that is tagged onto the employee's informing turn (lines 34 and 36) and another that is produced following a response from the client (at line 41). This support's Houtkoop's (1987) observation that an initial proposal turn can be followed by additional pieces of information. In this case, an additional piece of information, *on the Fri:day.* (line 38), is a detail that has not been made explicitly clear in the preceding talk. Although, the call occurs on a Thursday and the employee mentions that the service takes place *tomorro:w,* (line 4), the production of this somewhat novel piece of information is apparently sufficient to warrant another response solicitation. I discuss this matter further in §5.2.4.

[47] It should be noted that these types of exulted assessments are rare in responses to remote proposals in the CHC data corpus. Consistent with the findings of Lindström and Heinemann (2009), assessments overwhelmingly involve a relatively lower degree of evaluation, thus displaying that a task just performed, in this case a service modification, was routine and a part of the employee's role. It is not treated by the recipient as something that is particularly fortuitous, or as having involved the employee going 'beyond the call of duty.' Fragment 5.10, of course, is an exception to this, and shows how recipients can display appreciation.

```
(5.11) [CHC007, 0:23-0:43]
01 E07:   =now I just wanted to let you know that um:: tch
02        tomo:rrow night Tammy's not working .hhh so
03        Laura's going >to be coming=b't i's a liddle
04        bit< later.=it's going to be about quarter to
05        seven:.
06            (0.2)
07 C003:  quarter to seven. th[at'll b]e
08 E07:                        [↓yeah. ]
09 C003:  alri:[ght.]
10 E07:       [ yeh]=alRI::ght?
11 C003:  (yeah/ye:s) [that'll] be fine.=
12 E07:               [ okay. ]           =alright.
13 E07:   okay. .hh how you getting on with the to:ilet
14        surround is it a[lright?]
```

The client's initial response to the employee's prospective informing is to receipt a part of the information conveyed (*quarter to seven.*, line 7) and then to assess as acceptable the arrangement (*that'll be alri:ght.*, lines 7 and 9). However, following a post-response response solicitation (*alRI::ght?*, line 10), the client's response includes an overt acceptance (*(yeah/ye:s)*, line 11) before her re-assessment (*that'll be fine.*, line 11). So, modifying Houtkoop's claim, it could be the case that post-response response solicitations somehow highlight a need for clients to produce a different type of response.

If it were the case that post-response response solicitations are resources for prompting particular types of responses from recipients of prospective informings, then they should routinely be found following responses that do not conform to this required response. However, there are a variety of response forms to prospective informings in the CHC data corpus, and this diversity does not systematically occasion post-response response solicitations. This is particularly the case in instances like the following (previously considered in fragment 5.03), where recipients produce responses to tag-positioned solicitations.

```
(5.12) [CHC009, 0:43-1:01]
01 E07:   .hhh um >and then the< second thing is, we've got
02        (.) um Renee is on holidays,=
03 C004:                              =mm h[m.]
04 E07:                                    [so] she can't
05        come tomorrow >so we've got a< care worker called
06        Sue who's going to come,
07        [.hhhh so it's a little bit la]ter >it's around
08 C004:  [    S u e,    o k a y.      ]
09 E07:   about< three o'clock is that oka:y?=
10 C004:                                     =>oh that's
11        okay<.=
```

```
12 E07:          =oh thank you very much.
13 C004:  no problem.
14 E07:   thanks missus Ch[a r l t o n.     ]
15 C004:                 [see you darling.]
16 E07:   okay. by:e.
17 C004:  bye bye love.
18             (1.0)
19             ((call ends))
```

The assessment of the prospective informing in this data fragment does not contain overt acceptance[48]. In spite of this, the employee does not produce a post-response solicitation for another response. If she had done, this might have signalled to the client that something more was required in her response. However, the participant's conduct here indicates that this is not the case. The employee in this data fragment immediately moves on to close down the conversation. The client's response, it seems, was adequate[49]. This is consistent with Jefferson's (1981b) observation that response solicitations are not an efficient way of getting recipients to modify their type of response. What seems to be crucial, rather, is that a proposer produces a response solicitation at some point within a remote proposal sequence.

All of the prospective informings in the corpus concern the detailing of a future arrangement that will affect the recipient of the information. However, even though the arrangement has been introduced as though it were fixed and finalised, it can only come to fruition with the complicity of that recipient. For instance, if the client is not at home, is not in a state to receive a care worker, or so on, the service arrangement cannot transpire in the way that the employee has informed the client that it will. If the client's response functions to accept the details of the informing, the employee will have achieved the aim of making an arrangement that is mutually convenient. It is crucially important, then, to the action underway, that the client as recipient produces some sort of acceptance. And indeed, as I established earlier, clients' unprompted responses show that they are aware of this exigency.

---

[48] Rather, it contains one of the few instances in the CHC data corpus where a prospective contingent informing is responded to with an 'oh'-prefaced assessment. This may be a resource by which recipients can independently assert the suitability of the information that they have just received (cf. Heritage, 2002).

[49] Conversely, in fragment 5.10, an initial response containing overt acceptance (cf. lines 35 and 37) is nonetheless followed by a response solicitation.

If clients are capable of determining that arrangements detailed in prospective informings are contingent upon their acceptance of them, and can respond accordingly, this does not account for why employees routinely prompt clients for a response, *even in the event that clients have already done so*. It may be the case that such solicitations can function as a topic-closing technique. Such devices 'bound off' a topic and are often found in monotopical conversations, immediately prior to possible pre-closing sequences (Schegloff & Sacks, 1973). In response to a topic-closing technique, a recipient can either collaborate with the closing or continue talking on the topic of the arrangement. However, if a recipient has shown an understanding that a proposal is complete, as is often the case in the CHC data corpus, then this does not account for why a topic-closing device is then necessary. Topic-closing sequences are not a general requirement, in interaction, for participants to mutually appreciate that a particular sequence or topic of talk has come to a close. Parties are typically able to determine when some action has come to a close. This appears also to be the case with the remote proposals that we have been considering.

Schegloff and Sacks (1973) observe that topic-closing techniques are routinely utilised following the making of arrangements. However, while they are routinely found in the CHC data corpus, response solicitations are not *necessarily* made following prospective informings, which undermines the analysis that they function specifically as topic-closing techniques. The context in which response solicitations are most commonly not found is following prospective informings where a recipient's complicity in the arrangement can be presumed. The following is just one instance. There is no response solicitation produced following the client's acceptance at line 32.

```
(5.13) [CHC350, 0:04-0:49]
01 E10:   =.hhhh u:hm missus Ca:mmiss, t'da::y u:m We:nsday
02        you w'ld no:rmally .hhh have Tami:ka come an an:dum
03        >do your< cle:aning for you,
04 C126:  oh yes,
05 E10:   BUT JUs:' for toda:y it will be a ca:re worker
06        call'd Kerry:,
     ((12 lines omitted; talk about Kerry))
19 E10:   .hhhh a:nd Kerry will be: there at the s:a:me ti:me
20        th't Tamika is. so she'll be there at- about u:hm
21        .hhhhhh u::hm bout one oh'clo:?ck.=
22 C126:                            =wone oh'clock.
23 E10:   yes:.
24 C126:  ye[s.]
25 E10:     [ y]es:. [u : h m ]
26 C126:            [she's ju]st here for an ho::ur i:sn't
```

```
27          she,=
28 E10:         =u::h (0.3) that's ri:ght [ y:]es she is.
29 C126:                                 [yes]
30 E10:     yes:=so she'll be able to help you and that's just
31          for toda:y.
32 C126: ohkay.=
33 E10:          =good. th↑anks very much [for that.]
34 C126:                                  [ o : h ] thank
35          you for [  £letti]ng me kno:[w.£ huh-heh-he(h)]
36 E10:             [°right.°]           [  £ohk(h)a(h)y£  ]
37 C126: .hhh [ bye ] by:e,
38 E10:        [good.]
39 E10:   bye,
40           (0.6)
41        ((call ends))
```

In this fragment, the client is informed that her usual care worker Tamika will be replaced by a care worker called Kerry (lines 1-3 and 5-6). She is subsequently informed that Kerry will be coming at the same time that Tamika was scheduled; that is, no modification of the service time will be involved. Because the client was previously available to receive Tamika at one o'clock, the employee can safely presume that she will also be available to receive Kerry at the same time. For this reason, it seems, a response solicitation is not necessary. The client's acceptance of this arrangement (*ohkay.*, line 32) does not get followed by a response solicitation from the employee, who rather moves into closing down the conversation. This shows, then, that topic-closing techniques are not necessary following attempts at making arrangements, and that when they are present they may be performing a different or, at least, additional function.

Alternatively, if not a topic-closing technique, it may be the case that such solicitations function as turn-exit devices that display to interlocutors that speakers' turns at talk have come to an end and that it is now relevant for them to respond (Jefferson, 1981b; Sacks et al., 1974). Under this line of analysis, informers can bring their possibly multi-unit turn to completion and convey that a response is now relevant from recipients. Again, however, if a recipient has shown an understanding of a proposal to be complete then this does not account for why such an utterance would be necessary.

Although it is certainly the case that response solicitations are found to occupy the terminal phase of these arrangement-making sequences, there are reasons for supposing that they are more than just topic-closing techniques or turn-exit devices. My suggestion, based on instances in the CHC corpus where prospective informings

114

are followed by tag-positioned response solicitations, is that these solicitations also occasion a particular type of response: acceptance of a future course of action that is now explicitly presented as a proposal. When an equivalent response solicitation is made in a post-response position, a speaker respecifies their informing as a proposal. In order to make this point clearly I need first to consider Jefferson's (1981b) work on response solicitation.

5.2.3 Prior research on response solicitation

Jefferson's (1981b) research on post-response-completion response solicitation is concerned with instances where apparently complete turns are responded to with responses that could be construed as continuers. These are followed with response solicitations (effectively delayed tag questions), which pursue responses that can no longer be heard, by recipients, to function as possible continuers. Her work is of general interest to my current analytic task in that the instances that she considers exhibit the same sequential structure as the response solicitations in the CHC data corpus.

Jefferson shows that response solicitations do not necessarily occasion a new syntactic response from a recipient. The same observation can be made within the CHC data corpus, where the client responds to both the informing and subsequent response solicitation with the same lexical item: *okay*.

```
(5.14) [CHC056, 0:16-0:28]
01 E01:    =.hh now Fra::nk's: u:hm ˚e-˚ pe:rsonal ca:re on
02         the S:unda::y, [ .hhh ]
03 C017:                 [y:eah?]
04 E01:    w'l be quarter to te::hn?
05 C017:   yeas,
06 E01:    wi:th Tr:a:ce:y.
07 C017:   o:hkay.=
08 E01:        =tch=a:lri::gh?t: [.hhhh ]
09 C017:                        [ohkay,]=
10 E01:                              =ohkay th(h)anks
11         E:d(h)na.=
```

Rather than occasioning new syntactic responses, Jefferson argues that the most benign way of understanding response solicitations, is to regard them as turn-exit devices. That is, this device circumvents the possibility that a recipient might take some course of action to be uncompleted. But Jefferson goes on to argue that there is

more to response solicitations than simply exiting a turn. She argues that it marks a point to be taken and occasions an opportunity for a recipient to make an unambiguous response to that point. The following is just one such instance:

```
(5.15) [Frankel:TC:1:27:S (Jefferson, 1981b: 60)]
01 Shi:  Look it's an apartment with a bedroom a kitche:n,
02       a:nd, (.) a bathroom just like a hundred other
03       apartments.
04 Ger:  Yeah.=
05 Shi:      =Right?h
06 Ger:  Yeah
```

In her analysis of the above data fragment, Jefferson argues that it is possible that Geri's response at line 4 (*Yeah.*) is a continuer, which would display an understanding that Shirley possibly has more to add to her turn. However, following Shirley's response solicitation (*Right?h*, line 5) there can be no mistaking that the previous transition-relevance place was indeed a location from which a response could have, and indeed should have, been launched. She displays that she had finished making her point in her prior turn. At the juncture where Geri responded with a possible continuer, Shirley had intended for the upshot of her talking to be heard. Although Geri's next response is comprised of the same lexical item that she used in her prior turn (*Yeah*, line 6), following a response solicitation it cannot possibly be understood as a continuer, but now unambiguously, as a response to the upshot of Shirley's talk. As Jefferson explains,

> *"…Post-Response-Completion Response Solicitation can be accomplice to some rich and intricate interactional negotiations. And in such materials we find recurrently that negotiation which can be expressed, and thus accounted for, in turn-taking terms as [Completed Turn → Continuer → Turn Exit Device] can be expressed in interactional terms as [Point-Laden Utterance → Mere Acknowledgement → Pursuit of the Point]"* (1981b: 66).

To summarise, Jefferson's (1981b) analysis contains two observations that are of particular relevance to our consideration of how prospective informings function in interaction. First, response solicitations can be used to mark the 'pointedness' of a prior utterance. Second, response solicitations mark that the turn is over and that the contents of a recipient's next turn will be heard to be their final or definitive response (and not, for instance, as a continuer, as a recipient's previous response might have

116

been). These utterances, then, exhibit a retrospective-prospective property (Jefferson, 1981a). Irrespective of whether a semantically different response is occasioned, that response is qualitatively different from the initial response. Whereas the initial response followed some sort of telling turn, the revised response follows a question that specifically solicits some final response to the preceding content.

5.2.4 Response solicitation following remote proposals

Whereas Jefferson's (1981b) analysis of response solicitations is based on solicitations following continuers, the response solicitations in the CHC data corpus follow either some sort of acceptance, or are tagged on to the end of an informing turn to solicit that same type of acceptance. I want momentarily to set aside the latter category of cases in order to compare Jefferson's post-response-completion response solicitations directly with those in the CHC corpus.

Based on Jefferson's description as detailed above, I have generated the following schematic for her post-response-completion response solicitations:

```
A:  Possibly complete turn
B:  Possible continuer, possible response
A:  Response solicitation
B:  Response (can no longer be a continuer)
```

A similar schematic, adapted to suit the different action type, can be proposed for the remote proposal sequences that are found in the CHC data corpus. In these instances, the response to an informing is more than mere acknowledgement. It is, in fact, acceptance of the course of action as a proposal:

```
A:  Possibly complete informing
B:  Acceptance (displaying an understanding of the informing
       as a proposal)
A:  Response solicitation (displaying an understanding of the
       informing as a proposal)
B:  Acceptance of the proposal
```

Recipients' responses to the prospective informings in the CHC data corpus are not ambiguous, like the responses considered by Jefferson (1981b)[50]. Neither is it the case that the response solicitations occasion a response that *demonstrates* acceptance, as is Houtkoop's (1987) claim about remote proposals (cf. §1.4.2). In the CHC data corpus there is a collection of response solicitations that do not occasion qualitatively different responses from recipients. There is also the possibility of response solicitations being tagged on to the end of prospective informing turns. And in the event that this happens, response solicitations for re-acceptance do not occur. However, no matter what position they are initiated from, recipients display in their responses to these informings an understanding that they must accept the arrangements in order for them to be made (cf. §5.2.1). Response solicitations, it seems, are an informer's resource for doing the same.

Recent research by Stivers and Rossano (2010) has suggested that questions are particularly powerful at mobilising a recipient's response due to several turn-design features: interrogative lexico-morphosyntax (i.e., an utterance that has the linguistic format of a question), interrogative prosody, recipient-focused epistemicity, and speaker gaze (the last of which is, of course, not relevant in telephone conversations)[51]. Their third observation, of recipient-focused epistemicity, is particularly relevant for our current consideration. Turns that are about states of affairs that are asymmetrically within a recipient's epistemic domain, such as whether a particular arrangement is suitable for them, should be addressed by that recipient. Failure to do so can be accountable. This can explain why recipients to prospective *informings* will respond in a way that displays their discretion in the matter. They exercise discretion because the matter is within their epistemic domain and therefore should be commented upon. However, an ensuing question with interrogative lexico-

---

[50] As shown above, recipients can produce continuers to display that they understand that an informing has not yet come to completion. In the CHC data corpus, this displayed understanding is overwhelmingly correct. Response solicitations are therefore not typically used, in the CHC corpus, in response to continuers.

[51] However, this list is critiqued by Couper-Kuhlen (2010), who argues that these features are not of the same order and may not be culturally universal (particularly in the case of gaze). She also questions whether these features are independent of one another and constitute an exhaustive list.

morphosyntax and prosody, and which again makes recipient-focused epistemicity relevant, highlights to an even greater degree that the recipient's discretion should be exercised. Moreover, through formulating a question, a speaker can display that their informing should be treated as a proposal.

The role of response solicitations following prospective informings, then, is for an informer to display to a recipient that their informing is over and that the recipient's acceptance of the course of action *as a proposal* is a necessary condition for that arrangement to transpire. The only occasions in which response solicitations are used more than once in remote proposal sequences are those instances where some additional information is added, following an original response solicitation.

```
(5.16) [CHC360, 0:33-0:52]
01 E11:   .hhh no:w the reason I'm ringing is because
02        Kimberley is not well toda:y, (.h)
03 C130:  ye:s,
04 E11:   s:o: a lady called Kerry's coming instead.
05 C130:  o:h yes.
06 E11:   alri:¿
07 C130:  that'll be alright.=
08 E11:                      =she'll be there at about
09        <twenty to ten> though.
10           (0.3)
11 C130:  ri:ghto:, [(y-)]
12 E11:            [ is ] that okay?
13           (.)
14 C130:  ye:s.
15           (.)
16 E11:   what ti:me's your appointment [at the F:li]nders,
17 C130:                                [ a : : h : ]
```

Following the first response solicitation (at line 6), which occasions the client's acceptance of the employee's proposed course of action (at line 7), the employee adds further information about the proposed arrangement (at lines 8-9). Having introduced new details, it will now be necessary for the client as recipient to accept the additional element of the proposal, in order for the entire arrangement to transpire. In light of this, the employee produces another response solicitation (at line 12).

Instances where prospective informings are not followed with response solicitations, such as fragment 5.13 in §5.2.2, are further evidence of solicitations transforming informings into proposals. Response solicitations are often *not* found following prospective informings of service modifications that only entail the change of a care worker and not of the service time. Given that the service time remains the same, an

employee can be more confident that a client is already complicit with a service taking place at that time. Consequentially, such arrangements do not necessarily need to be proposed but clients can rather simply be informed of them. My argument is that response solicitations, where they are found following prospective informings, function to recomplete that informing as a proposal. Such a course of action, however, is only necessary in instances where a recipient's complicity in a future course of action is unknown. In fragment 5.13, since the time of the care visit has obviously already been agreed upon, the client's complicity can be assumed.

A final observation is that response solicitations are not produced by informers as simply some symbolic re-specification of an informing as a proposal with some incidental response from a recipient. In the following fragment, the recipient's re-acceptance is treated as noticeably absent and pursued by the informer. The talk preceding the beginning of this fragment has culminated in the client asking about the details of a transport service that is due to take place on the next day.

```
(5.17) [CHC029, 1:31–2:09]
01 E07:   let me >have a look,< and I'll see if I c'n tell
02        >you what< ti:me it'll be:.
   ((22 seconds omitted; E talks with someone off the phone))
09 E07:   .thh oh id'llbe just a:fter ten I thi:n:'? I rec-g-
10 C010:  yeah that's fi:ne.
11 E07:   ten twenty fi:ve. so that's pe:rfect ti:ming.
12 C010:  yep.
13 E07:   ohka:y?
14            (1.2)
15 E07:   is that okay Suzie¿
16 C010:  yeh that's fi:[ne.]
17 E07:                 [o:h]kay. is there anything ↑else I
18        can help you with¿
```

The employee's first response solicitation (at line 13) does not get responded to by the client, and a gap emerges in the conversation. The employee selects to recomplete her response solicitation at line 15, displaying to the client that a response is required. An acceptance, in turn, gets produced. So this second pair in remote proposal sequences can be treated, by informers, as a necessary requirement for an arrangement to be made and agreed upon *as a proposed course of action*.

It seems to be the case, following Jefferson (1981b), that these response solicitations are more than just topic-closing techniques or turn-exit devices. They highlight that the point of a prior *informing* was to *propose* a course of action. In this case, they display

that a speaker understands that a recipient's acceptance of a future course of action is a necessary condition for some arrangement to transpire. Response solicitations, then, display that what could be taken to be a unilaterally-made arrangement is actually a recognisably negotiable course of action. This display is so important that there are two positions from which a proposer can launch them: either in tag-position or post-response position. Regardless of the position, however, these response solicitations serve a uniform function: to mark the necessity of recipients accepting a *proposed* future course of action.

5.3 Requests in the data corpus

Having critiqued Houtkoop's (1987) inclusion of requests as remote proposals (cf. §1.4.3 and §4.1.1), I will briefly review how requests can be used to make arrangements in the CHC data corpus. Requests are not as prevalent in the CHC corpus as prospective informings. Generally, the requests that are to be found do not support Houtkoop's claim that these are remote proposals that exhibit a double-paired adjacency pair structure. That is, these requests are not generally followed by the response solicitations that are found after prospective informings. The following is one such instance.

```
(5.18) [CHC349, 0:04-0:41]
01 E10:   uh:m tch=missus Cammiss tomo:rrow when Tami:ka
02        comes to you. .hhh uh:m she no:rmally comes at: (.)
03        uh:m one oh'clock. B[ut]
04 C126:                     [ y]es.
05 E10:   I was wondering if jus for tomorrow=if it would be
06        alright with you .hhh if she came earlier and got
07        to your house at about eleven fiftee:n.
08           (0.8)
09 C126:  e:r what is tomorrow.=[>is  it-< ]
10 E10:                         [tomorrow's]
11        We::ns[day.]
12 C126:       [ Wen]sday. yes I think that'll be
13        alrIt[e.]
14 E10:        [ o]:h great.
15           (.)
16 E10:   [  o:hkay. ]
17 C126:  [no that'll] be [ w o n ]'t make much difference
18 E10:                   [>good.<]
19 C126:  [t(h)o me(h)e I don't thin]k.
20 E10:   [  r e h  h a h   ]
21 E10:   .hh [  o : h k a]y thanks missus Cammiss.=
22 C126:      [eh >heh he<]
23        =[s h e]'ll be there about eleven fiftee:n
24 C126:  =[(  -)]
```

```
25 E10:    th[en.]
26 C126:      [ ye]s [  o  h ]kay.
27 E10:               [˚rite.˚]
28 E10:    ohkay.
29 C126:   th:ank you.
30 E10:    bye.
31 C126:   .hhhh bye bye.
32            (0.4)
33    ((call ends))
```

One might suppose that the arrangement being proposed in this fragment could be problematic for the client, given that it involves a shift in service time from one o'clock to a quarter past eleven, which would mean that the care worker would be with the client at a time that she might reasonably be supposed to have her lunch. This could account for why the employee here uses a request rather than a prospective informing. As Curl and Drew (2008) explain, requests that are prefaced with *I wonder if* display an understanding that there may be contingencies associated with the granting of the request. In this case, it may be a potential clash with the client's lunchtime arrangements; it may be something else. What matters is that the employee can use a request as an alternative to a prospective informing to make an arrangement.

What is of greater interest to the current analysis, however, is that requests like these in the CHC data corpus are generally not followed by a response solicitation in the way that Houtkoop (1987) claims that requests about future arrangements are constructed. The client's acceptance at lines 12 and 13 is not followed by the response solicitation that Houtkoop claims is typical, and which she uses as a defining hallmark of a remote proposal.

While not common, there are instances where requests in the CHC corpus are followed by response solicitation. Based on the number of instances available, however, it is difficult to determine any systematic function. One possibility is that an initial request may be followed by an informing component, both being used in reference to a future event. Having started with a request in one turn-constructional unit and having then switched to informing in another, a third can then be used to re-specify that informing as a proposal. The following is a case in point.

```
(5.19) [CHC090, 0:21-0:44]
01 E01:   =u:hm tch.hhh Sa:m tomo:rro:w, .hh a::hm Be:th's
02        got a bit of- e:rm tch (.) >eh< she's had a
03        cancella:shun. and she was wondering >if it would<
04        be: .hh putt̲ing you o:uht̲.<at a:ll. .hh if she
```

```
05          ca:me e:arliah.
06             (.)
07 C028:  none at a:ll [lov]e.=
08 E01:              [.hh]  =it would be about >I think<
09        it's about te:n: fordy f::::i::[ve? ]
10 C028:                            [woul]dn't make no
11        difference to me lovey.=
12 E01:                         =is that a:'right with yo:u?
13 C028:  ye:s that's alright Ki- [yeah. yeah.]
```

The employee initially attempts to make an arrangement with the client by launching a request, which she formulates as being made on the behalf of the care worker involved. As with the previous instance, the *I wonder if* preface (adjusted to suit a third person referent) appears to be used here to check if there are any contingencies associated with the granting of the request. When the client responds to indicate that there are no impediments to this arrangement (line 7), the employee continues to detail the specifics of the arrangement. Knowing now that there are no contingencies associated with an earlier arrangement, the employee is in a position to *inform* the client of what the specifics of that arrangement will be, rather than requesting of client whether those specifics will be suitable. Indeed this is what she does, informing the client of the precise time that the care worker will visit. When the client indicates an agreement of sorts to the details of this arrangement (lines 10-11), the employee re-specifies that informing as a remote proposal, for which the client's acceptance and complicity is marked as a necessary precondition for the arrangement to transpire in the manner that has been detailed.

There are not very many instances like the above in the CHC data corpus, and those that can be found exhibit enough variation between them to make a considered analysis of them, as a collection, difficult. The status of requests as remote proposals, then, must remain equivocal and open to future research. It does not appear, however, that the matter is a simple as Houtkoop (1987) conveys. Requests for future arrangements do not tend to occasion double-paired remote proposal sequences in the same way that prospective informings have been shown to do in the analysis contained within this thesis.

5.4 Summary

My goal in this chapter has been to review and respecify Houtkoop's (1987) analysis of responses to remote proposals, based upon mundane Dutch conversation, by examining remote proposals as they occur in the Australian English conversational materials of the CHC data corpus. Having updated some of Houtkoop's terminology in order to make it consistent with common conversation analytic parlance, I demonstrated that what Houtkoop called 'requests-for-confirmation' have a less specific role as response solicitations (Jefferson, 1981b) in remote proposal sequences.

Response solicitations are a means by which proposers can indicate that a first turn, which could otherwise be heard as an informing about a future event, is actually a proposal that requires a recipient's acceptance in order for it to transpire. Response solicitations can either be tagged on to the end of an informing turn, or made following a response from a recipient. Further research is required to appreciate why these different response solicitation positions are utilised. Although recipients themselves are able to infer that an informing about a future event is propositional, this does not stop informers from producing a response solicitation. Informers can even produce (and indeed, in the CHC data corpus, most often produce) post-response response solicitations. These do not occasion a qualitatively different response from recipients, but rather display that informers themselves treat the contents of their informing as propositional. These response solicitations, then, are primarily a means by which informers can indicate that informings are to be retrospectively understood as proposals. And as proposals, these actions occasion either refusal or acceptance.

I have demonstrated how speakers can go about making arrangements with each other concerning some future course of events. In addition to requests (Curl & Drew, 2008; Walker et al., in preparation), remote proposals are a means by which speakers can seek to make an arrangement that will incorporate, and require, the acceptance and complicity of their recipient. I now turn to a relevant next component of the remote proposals in the CHC data corpus, where some proposals are followed with thanksgiving.

5.5 On thanking following remote proposals

Some prospective informing sequences in the CHC data corpus are concluded with thanking, by one or both parties, for the assistance that their interlocutor has provided in making a service arrangement. At a point where there might have been a change in the topic being discussed or a move to begin closing down the conversation, one or both parties can instead engage in the act of thanking. That is, they display some apparent gratitude at a point where they might have done no such thing. For example, they might have simply moved the conversation on (and indeed there are many instances where this transpires in the CHC data corpus), or they might have complained in some way about the arrangement that has been made (and there are a few instances in the corpus where this happens). Given that, on face value, an expression of gratitude displays that one or both participants regard that they have been the beneficiary in some arrangement, it is worth exploring the possible function, or functions, that thanking can play in these interactions. Building on existing research, I show how instances of thanking do not appear to be solely about displaying gratitude.

Thanking can serve two interactional functions. Firstly, thanking can be a means for demonstrating a particular understanding of what has preceded as something for which gratitude can appropriately be expressed. In doing this, a thanker claims to be the beneficiary of some action performed by their interlocutor (Aston, 1995; Zimmerman, 2006). As Schegloff and Sacks explain, components like thanking are those "…that seem to give a 'signature' to the type of conversation, using the closing section as a place where recognition of the type of conversation can be displayed" (1973: 318). A second notable feature about thanking is that it can often be found, particularly in monotopical calls like those found in the CHC corpus, towards the end of conversations. Thanking can contribute, then, as a recognisable component of a possible pre-closing sequence that provides a warrant for a final sequence that terminates the interaction. When thanking occurs, it is positioned after the assessment sequence and before a possible pre-closing sequence (Schegloff & Sacks, 1973; Zimmerman, 2006). Because there are two possible actions that thanking could be accomplishing, and perhaps simultaneously, it is necessary to consider each in turn.

If thanking is the means by which the role of beneficiary can be claimed by participants, the CHC data corpus is further evidence for Zimmerman's (2006) claim that such roles are not prescribed, but are rather established within specific interactions. Following prospective informings in the CHC calls, gratitude can be expressed through thanking by both parties, just by employees, or by neither party[52]. Most commonly, both parties will thank each other at some point following a prospective informing. The following data fragment illustrates participants' understandings of what they are offering thanks for.

```
(5.20) [CHC350, 0:04-0:54]
01 E10:    =.hhhh u:hm missus Ca:mmiss, t'da::y u:m We:nsday
02         you w'ld no:rmally .hhh have Tami:ka come an an:dum
03         >do your< cle:aning for you,
04 C126:   oh yes,
05 E10:    BUT JUs:' for toda:y it will be a ca:re worker
06         call'd Kerry:,
   ((12 lines omitted; talk about Kerry))
19 E10:    .hhhh a:nd Kerry will be: there at the s:a:me ti:me
20         th't Tamika is. so she'll be there at- about u:hm
21         .hhhhhh u::hm bout one oh'clo:?ck.=
   ((10 lines omitted; talk about the service time remaining
     the same))
32 C126:   ohkay.=
33 E10:        =good. th↑anks very much [for that.]
34 C126:                               [ o : h ] thank
35         you for [ £letti]ng me kno:[w.£ huh-heh-he(h)]
36 E10:         [°right.°]           [  £ohk(h)a(h)y£  ]
37 C126:   .hhh [ bye ] by:e,
38 E10:        [good.]
39 E10:    bye,
40            (0.6)
41         ((call ends))
```

When the client comes to accept the arrangement, the employee as the proposer responds by thanking the client. In responding *th↑anks very much for that.* (line 33), the employee displays that she is specifically thanking the client for agreeing to the arrangement (the only point of reference in the conversation *that* can tie back to). In turn, the client responds with *thank you for £letting me kno:w.£* (lines 34-35), displaying that she is thanking the employee for informing her (*£letting me kno:w.£*) of

---

a change of care worker. In the process of thanking, both parties assume the role of someone with something to be grateful for. The aspect of gratitude following prospective informings as a means for claiming the role of beneficiary is clearly one of analytic interest, particularly because this role is not pre-determined but comes to be established within interaction.

The function of thanking, however, is complicated by its possible additional role in closing down interactions. This may be particularly the case in monotopical calls, where the close of an item of business, marked by thanking, can be a resource for participants to signal that the termination of the interaction is possibly imminent. Given that most service or business interactions, including CHC calls, are monotopical (Levinson, 1983), the expectation of the interaction being terminated may be even further amplified. For example, in the following interaction, the employee's thanking seems to be taken as an indication to the client that the employee may be moving to close down the conversation. This offers the client a position in which to produce a 'hitherto unmentioned mentionable' (Schegloff & Sacks, 1973: 304). The successive talk on this topic delays the production of further thanking, which is eventually positioned prior to the close of the conversation.

```
(5.21) [CHC087, 0:16-1:12]
01 E04:   u::m:, (0.2) j'st ring- j'st (.) ↓remi:nding you
02         that Cindy's off still.=a:hm, and it will be
03         Ro:sie again. but it's: I've (.) >got down here<
04         it's not til: (0.2) about eleven
05         o'clockis[h:. is that] alri:ght?
06 C026:           [ .h h h h  ]
07 C026:  R:osie at eleven:.
08 E04:   y:ep.
09 C026:  ye:s[:,]
10 E04:      [th]ere- the:re abouts:. .h[hhh]
11 C026:                                [>oh]kay then<.=
12 E04:   =ohka:y. th:anks [very much] Su:san
13 C026:                   [  (.hhhh) ]
14 C026:  >right before you< go:,
15 E04:   yep?
16 C026:  >I'll be< up your way on M:onday. t' go to thuh:
17         .hhh (.) [ e ]r,
   ((12 lines omitted; joke made))
30 C026:  =.hhh l:isten dear, .hh (.) a::h you did o:ffer
31         me some informa:tion on the three cahtegorie:s: of
32         cka:re avaliable.
   ((16 lines omitted; an arrangement is made))
49 E04:   I'll have it o:n my des:' >so if I'm not< he:re
50         you can: (.)
51 C026:  ge[t it from there-]
52 E04:     [ can  get  it  ] someone'll give it to
```

```
53          y[ou.=ohk(a)-]
54 C026:   [ ohkay  lov]ie.
55         [th:ank yo:u,]
56 E04:    [  .hhh  th:a]nk you. bi [by:e.]
57 C024:                            [ by:e]:.
```

Having heard the employee's thanking at line 12, the client has taken the opportunity to raise an unrelated topic that is nonetheless specifically relevant for the employee and therefore mentionable: a previous offer that the employee apparently made to provide the client with some information about CHC packages. This results in the employee offering to leave this information on her office desk so that the client can collect it when she comes to the office the following week. The client accepts this arrangement (*ohkay lovie.*, line 54) before thanking the employee, presumably for making this offer. The employee's response to this, thanking the client in turn, is an inapposite display of gratitude in this position. She has just offered to perform a favour for the client; something for which she does not now need to offer thanks. It is possible then, in this position, that thanking contributes to the business of closing down the conversation[53]. The role of thanking as a device that implicates the possible closure of an interaction potentially accounts for many of the instances in the data corpus where both clients and employees come to thank each other following prospective informings.

Due to the complexities of this matter, I have not attempted a full exploration of the function of thanking here. It will suffice, for now, to observe that actions accomplished

---

[53] The following data fragment shows how thanking can almost exclusively be used to reach the terminal exchange sequence of a call closing:

```
(5.22) [CHC173, 0:25-1:01]
01 E04:   .h-.hhh u:hm, tch (0.2) jus' ringing to let you
02         kn:o::w it's going to be: >I think you had< he:r
03         (y-) (.) l:a:st ti:me >didn't you< Rosi:e? (0.8)
04         f::[or your cle:anin]g¿=
   ((8 lines omitted; remote proposal continues))
13 C056: ye:ah that's alri[ght]
14 E04:                   [o:h]kay. th:ank you. >and it we-
15         don't< kno:w >I haven't< he:ard from Ci:ndy. I
16         don't know what's happening the:re but .hhhhh
17         s:he's missed and ev'ry >wants her to< hurry
18         u:hp.=ahkh!h[hh ]
19 C056:              [a:h] huh-huh-huh .huh .huh ye:ah I:
20         ho:pe she gets bettah quic[k.]
21 E04:                             [ y]eah:s.
22         [yeah e:]verybody thinks tha:t. [.mphh]
23 C056: [.h h h ]                        [ o:h]ka:y=
24 E04:   =ohkay th:anks [very   much.    ]=
25 C056:                [thanks very much]=
26 E04:   =thank yo[:u bye b]y:e.
27 C056:           [ by:e. ]
```

with prospective informings can be responded to with thanking, but that, following Zimmerman (2006), any role of a beneficiary comes to be established within the same interaction that the informing itself is produced. The data from this corpus also seem to support prior analytic claims that thanking may be co-opted into the pre-closing sequence of conversations.

5.6 Discussion: Remote proposal sequences in conversation

At the outset of Chapter 4 I described an apparent self-contradictory action type where one party informs another of an arrangement that is both a recipient-implicated and future course of action. It is apparently self-contradictory because the arrangement gets detailed to a recipient as though it has already been made and, yet, that same arrangement cannot actually transpire in the way that it has been detailed without acceptance of the arrangement by the recipient. The arrangement, then, is simultaneously both *described* as finalised, and *not yet in a position* to be finalised. The action underway straddles the boundary of a unilateral informing and a negotiable proposal. On the one hand, it is formulated unambigiously (usually, at least) as an informing. And yet on the other hand, it is necessarily propositional until such a time as the recipient accepts the stated course of events as an agreeable arrangement. Participants address this contradiction in the way that they respond to the informing. Recipients respond as though they do have discretion in the matter. Informers respond by soliciting that same type of response, thereby showing that the arrangement was propositional after all.

This predominant way in which employees attempt to make arrangements in the CHC data corpus has striking parallels to many of the instances discussed by Houtkoop (1987) in her analysis of mundane Dutch conversation. She explains how what she calls 'proposals for remote action,' or 'remote proposals,' engender a sequence composed of two adjacency pairs; the first broaching a future course of action and the second pursuing a response from a recipient. A comparison between Houtkoop(-Steenstra)'s Dutch data and my Australian English data supports many of her findings. However, it also challenges some of the apparently universal claims that she has made about remote proposals as an action type.

Houtkoop(-Steenstra) argues that remote proposals are a broad action type that can be accomplished with requests, invitations, offers, suggestions, and so on. I have suggested a working re-definition of remote proposals as being initiated with informings. My reason for doing so is two-fold. Firstly, many of Houtkoop's (1987) examples of remote proposals do not contain a sufficient number of ensuing turns to be able to determine whether '*Ja?*-composed turns' (cf. §4.1.1) are response solicitations or possible pre-closings. Secondly, recent research contains requests about prospective events that are agreed upon without occasioning response solicitations (cf. Curl & Drew, 2008; Walker et al., in preparation). Based on the fragments of data in Houtkoop's (1987) monograph that *do* contain a sufficient number of turns to be able to determine where there are double-paired remote proposal sequences, my working re-definition is to consider remote proposals as informings about a prospective event that implicates the recipient. Response solicitations seem to be a necessary component in order for an informer to display that the arrangement they are making is actually propositional. It may well be the case that future research into requests shows that response solicitations do get produced and, on this basis, it may be necessary to reconsider at least some requests as double-paired remote proposals. However, I will leave that conclusion to future research.

Houtkoop (1987) shows that relatively more demanding remote proposals are often preceeded by an account. Such accounts warrant the proposal that is about to be made as justified and reasonable. The remote proposals in the CHC data corpus are routinely preceded by accounts that do just this. Through my analysis of these accounts in Chapter 4, I have developed Houtkoop's existing work by further explaining how these accounts work. I started out by showing how informers can begin their turns by 'outlining' what they intend to talk about. Rather than projecting a forthcoming action, which these outliners do not always do, I suggest that they may be a device for occasioning an ensuing turn as relevant in situations where potential reasons for the conversation are disjunct from previous interactions or are altogether unanticipated.

I also show how the remote proposals in the CHC data corpus, which are often preceded by an account and then by a proposed course of action that may contain multiple elements, are routinely multi-unit accomplishments. Given that the turn-

taking system in conversation only provides for one turn-constructional unit before transition to another speaker is a relevant possibility (Sacks et al., 1974; Schegloff, 1982, 1996c), I explore some of the resources that are available to proposers to make this accomplishment. First, I examine how positioning an account at the outset of a remote proposal can occasion a multi-unit informing. The account cannot usually be heard by a recipient as a piece of news, but rather as an occurence that is consequential for them. In order to learn of that consequence, a recipient must allow a speaker the turn space to continue their line of talk. Secondly, an attendant resource that enables a multi-unit informing is the prosody that gets used in the turn, particularily around transition-relevance places. One option is for speakers to rush-through such spaces by speeding up the pace of their talk and/or compressing the usual 'beat' of silence that separates turn-constructional units. Another option is to end a turn-constructional unit with rising (either questioning or continuing) intonation. Such rises in intonation project that more information is to come and therefore occasion nothing more than a minimal response from recipients. This, in turn, allows informers to continue the action underway. Final falling intonation can convey the completion of an informing.

My analysis finds general support for the double-paired structure of remote proposal sequences that Houtkoop (1987) describes (albeit confined to those proposals that are initiated with informings). However, I do not find support in the CHC data corpus, and indeed in some of Houtkoop's own data, for her claim that the response solicitations in the second adjacency pair engender an occasion for recipients to move from stated to demonstrated acceptance of the proposal. I even find that response solicitations can be made before any display of acceptance is made by a recipient, if an informer tags a response solicitation to the end of their informing turn. I do not find that these response solicitations are designed to occasion any particular type of response; whether that be a move from stated to demonstrated acceptance, or something more benign like a particular lexical response. I also do not find response solicitations to function as topic-closing devices. Rather, developing Jefferson's (1981b) work on response solicitation, I suggest that the most productive way of viewing these response solicitations might be as a display of an informer's understanding that the arrangement they have just made is propositional. It is an informer's solution to the

problem that I described at the beginning of Chapter 4; that the arrangement is simultaneously both *described* as finalised and *not yet in a position* to be finalised. It is this solution that creates an apparent contradiction, where an informing can turn out to be a proposal after all.

My claim that response solicitations are a means by which speakers can recomplete informings as proposals has a different focus from prior claims that such utterances following arrangement-making are topic-closing devices that project a possible shift into closing down current interactions (Davidson, 1978; Robinson, 2001; Schegloff & Sacks, 1973). While it is possible that both of these two analytic claims are compatible, the different focus suggests that it may be fruitful for further research to consider the role that response solicitations more generally play in interaction.

In the following chapter, I continue to explore remote proposal sequences as a means for making arrrangements, but focus on how references are made to replacement care workers. I develop existing research on two different forms that are used to refer to non-present third parties: one that indexes acquaintance, and another that indexes unacquaintance. By considering instances where recipients initiate repair on person reference forms, I provide evidence that participants themselves treat particular reference forms as indexing either acquaintance or unacquaintance.

Chapter 6

Indexing acquaintance in references to non-present third parties: An attendant consideration when making arrangements

In Chapters 4 and 5, I examined prospective informings as proposals for remote action. Instances of prospective informings, taken from a corpus of Community and Home Care (CHC) service calls, often involve employees calling clients to inform them that a usual service arrangement is impracticable. This occasions an expansion of the informing to detail the consequence of that occurrence: a substitute service arrangement. This chapter is concerned with one aspect of such informings about substitute service arrangements. I will detail how employees select from two different forms of reference to replacement care workers – 'recognitional' and 'non-recognitional' (Sacks & Schegloff, 1979: 107; Schegloff, 1996b) – in order to index a client's acquaintance with particular care workers.

This practice is what I take to be an attendant phenomenon that can be relevant in the process of making arrangements. That is, there will be occasions in which third parties are implicated in the arrangements being made. Building on existing conversation analytic research, my analysis will show that references to third parties can be treated, by participants, as indicating whether a recipient is acquainted or unacquainted with this person. As a practice of person-reference, the structural regularity of this phenomenon extends beyond the remote proposal sequences considered in Chapters 4 and 5. However, because they are routinely found to be relevant in the arrangements that are made in the CHC data corpus, a consideration of third-party references is warranted in order to highlight the complex, multi-faceted nature of arrangement-making in social interaction.

In most instances of their production, as a component of a broader sequence of action, references to replacement care workers are *not* explicitly responded to by clients. The focus of this chapter will be instances where clients *do* respond to such references. I will examine a variety of ways in which clients respond to turns containing references

to replacement care workers that displays a potential problem with the reference form employed. Although explicit responses to reference forms only occur in a minority of instances, I will show how these instances are useful forms of evidence for the standard function of recognitional and non-recognitional person references. More broadly, I will consider how these instances provide evidence that participants can sometimes (if not always) actively engage in maintaining a socially-shared nexus of acquaintances. That is, my concern will be to examine ways in which parties to an interaction can be interested to establish whether two people are acquainted or are unacquainted.

6.1 Background

Formulating references, whether to entities, places, objects, or times, is a routine and vital component of mundane interaction. Identifying and isolating a referent, whether the referent is real or imagined, allows for the possibility of a shared, or intersubjective, experience (Egbert, Golato, & Robinson, 2009). Conversation analysts are progressively demonstrating that while there are culture-specific principles that organise references to persons, there are also cross-linguistic principles (Hacohen & Schegloff, 2006; Moerman, 1988; Stivers, Enfield, & Levinson, 2007). Referencing is a dynamic process, with a range of possibilities available to a speaker. My concern, in this chapter, will be with references to non-present third parties.

6.1.1 Previous research on practices of person-reference

In making references to people like substitute care workers, participants to an interaction have access to a range of potential reference forms. One dimension along which these forms are constructed involves the indexation of a recipient's acquaintance with the referent. As Sacks first discussed in 1971 (published in 1992), a speaker should, where possible, use a reference form that enables a recipient to recognise the referent; what Sacks and Schegloff (1979) later termed a 'recognitional' person reference. That is to say, if a speaker can claim that a recipient is acquainted with a third person, then they ought to refer to that party with a recognitional person

reference. Conversely, if it is not possible to index acquaintance, because a speaker figures that a recipient is not acquainted with a referent, then the speaker ought *not* to use a recognitional reference, but rather a 'non-recognitional' reference form (Sacks & Schegloff, 1979; Schegloff, 1996b).

Sacks and Schegloff (1979) argue that there is a preference structure (see §3.3 for an introduction to the concept of preference) which guides the type of person reference form that should be used. The first preference that they claim is to design a reference to suit the recipient; what Sacks and Schegloff term 'a preference for recipient design.' It is this preference that motivates speakers, where possible, to use recognitional references. The possibility of a recognitional person reference being used requires a speaker to be aware of a series of recipient-related contingencies. Schegloff explains that these are: "a) If the speaker may (or ought to) suppose the recipient to know the referent; b) if the speaker may be supposed by recipient to have so supposed; and c) if the speaker may suppose the recipient to have so supposed" (1996b: 459). When these contingencies are satisfied, a speaker is producing a recognitional reference with respect to what Downing describes as the "…presumed cognitive status of the referent in the addressee's mind" (1996: 107). The nature of such presumptions, and the reception that they can receive from recipients, will be the focus of this chapter.

The preference for recipient design can be extended into a related preference for, where possible, using a name rather than a description of a person (Schegloff, 1996b); a preference that can be observed in the following data fragment.

```
(6.01) [SN-4, 16:2-10 (partial) (Schegloff, 1996b: 461)]
01 Mark:   So ('r) you da:ting Keith?
02             (1.0)
03 Karen:  'Sa frie:nd.
04             (0.5)
05 Mark:   What about that girl 'e use tuh go with fer so
06         long.
07 Karen:  A:lice? I [don't-] they gave up.
08 Mark:             [ (mm) ]
```

Mark's reference *what about that girl 'e use tuh go with fer so long.* (lines 5-6), even though it is a description, nonetheless implies that Karen should be able to retrieve, from amongst her acquaintances, a specific person as Mark's referent. Indeed she can do this and, in her response, we hear the preference for names over descriptions, as

she upgrades the reference, from a description, to the referent's name (*A:lice?*, line 7); an upgrade that Mark seems to support in with his response in line 8.

In addition to recipients being attentive to this preference, there is also evidence, by way of self-initiated self-repair (cf. §3.4), that speakers also attend to the preference for names over descriptions.

```
(6.02) [Trip to Syracuse, 1:10-11 (Schegloff, 1996b: 463)]
Charlie:  I spoke the the gi:r- I spoke tih Karen.
```

Here, Charlie appears on track to say something like *the gi:rl I was gonna stay with*, but suspends the smooth progressivity of his talk in order to initiate self-repair on that recognitional descriptor and to replace that reference with another, more specific, recognitional form, *Karen*.

The second preference Sacks and Schegloff (1979) claim is for minimisation in reference forms. Working with American English data, they show that reference is preferably done with a single reference form. Although there are cultural and linguistic variations in what constitutes a standard single reference form, there nonetheless appears to be a general and universal (that is, cross-linguistic) preference for using more minimal reference terms where it is possible to do so (Blythe, 2009; Brown, 2007; Hacohen & Schegloff, 2006; Levinson, 2005, 2007; Schegloff, 1996b, 2007b). Recent work has clarified that a single reference *form* should not be taken necessarily to equate to a single *word*, but can be a phrase, clause, or even an affix (Hacohen & Schegloff, 2006; Schegloff, 2007b). Moreover, gesture can be co-opted into making minimal reference forms (and, indeed, even instances of zero anaphora, or 'pronoun dropping') clear to a recipient (Brown, 2007; Levinson, 1987/1998, 2007). Hacohen and Schegloff clarify that a single reference form "...is not defined by words; it is better understood by its packaging – sometimes a recognisably complete grammatical construction, sometimes its delivery in some recognisably complete-for-now prosodic contour – whether up or down, sometimes a gestural component such as a point, and others" (2006: 1306) What is important is that the preference for minimisation guides the delivery of some recognisably complete unit of reference (Brown, 2007; Schegloff, 2007b).

Sacks and Schegloff (1979) explain that references to persons are organised by integrating the two preferences for minimisation (*where possible, use an economical reference form*) and recipient design (*where possible, use a recognitional*). At least in English, names (and most often given names) are prototypical reference forms because they are economical reference forms that are recognitional (although see Downing, 1996; and Stivers, 2007 for a discussion of the function of alternative recognitional forms). Their successful use requires that they are 'co-recognitional' to both the speaker and at least one recipient (Downing, 1996). Sacks and Schegloff (1979) show that 'try-marked' recognitionals, where a recognitional is produced with a questioning intonation and followed by a brief pause, are a means of reconciling the two preferences for minimisation and recipient design. They use the following data fragment as an example:

```
(6.03) [SBL 2:2:4 (Sacks & Schegloff, 1979: 19; Schegloff,
2007b: 127; 2007c: 239-240, modified)]⁵⁴
01 Ann:  ...well I was the only one other than- [than the uhm
02 Bev:                                          [(    )
03 Ann:  (0.7) tch Fo:rds. [Uh Missiz Holmes Ford?
04 Bev:                    [(              ),
05           (0.8)
06 Bev:  (N[ow-/No)
07 Ann:    [You know, uh [the-the cellist?
08 Bev:                  [Oh yes.
09 Bev:  She's- she's (a)/(the) cellist.
10 Ann:  Yes.
11 Bev:  Ye:[s.
12 Ann:     [Well she and her husband were there,...
```

In the midst of her telling, Ann comes to refer to a third person. From the beginning of the data fragment, she exhibits trouble in formulating that reference. When she eventually comes to produce a reference form, it is an economical reference form and, as a name (*Fo:rds.*, line 3), is moreover a prototypical single reference form. What we can hear, though, is that the preference for minimisation then gets relaxed, in order to check for recognition. She might have continued her telling along the lines of *well I was the only one other than the Fords that was there*. Rather she initiates what Schegloff

---

⁵⁴ There are a range of transcriptions available for this data fragment. The version that I have produced here is a mixture of those in Schegloff (2007b: 127) and Schegloff (2007c: 239-240), based upon my own hearing of the data. I have also made some of my own modifications. Each transcript, however, supports the overall analytic claims being made here and elsewhere.

(2007c: 237-244) calls an 'incidental sequence,' in order to check for Bev's recognition of the referent. She produces a full name (*Missiz Holmes Ford?*, line 3) and, by producing it with questioning intonation, marks her reference as an attempt to use a form that will enable Bev to recognise the referent. This is a relaxation of the preference for minimisation because initiating an incidental sequence here suspends the progress of that telling. What is now conditionally relevant is a response from Bev to confirm or deny recognition of the Fords.

When no recognition by Bev is forthcoming, Ann selects to continue her turn to provide, this time, a recognitional person *description* (*the cellist?*, line 7). Using a description involves a further relaxation of the preference for minimisation. The use of this reference roughly corresponds with a display of recognition from Bev and, following some further confirmation, the incidental sequence is brought to a close when Ann continues her telling at line 12.

Sacks and Schegloff (1979) argue that the production of try-marked recognitional forms, as in the above data fragment, is evidence of a concurrent consideration by participants of the preferences for minimisation and recipient design. Across that sequence, the preference for designing the reference to enable the recipient to recognise the referent (recipient design) is maintained. Ann does not abandon her attempt to get Bev to recognise the Fords by resorting to a non-recognitional form, like *this couple* (although that can happen if attempts at recognition ultimately fail; cf. Schegloff, 1996b). Ann's unwavering aim is to enable Bev to recognise the Fords. In order to achieve this, however, she must progressively relax the preference for minimisation. For this reason, Sacks and Schegloff (1979) claim that the preference for recipient design is stronger than that for minimisation.

There are further ways in which the preference for recipient design can influence the type of reference form that is used. For instance, Mason (2004) shows how alternative recognitional forms can be used to accomplish particular actions. Her analysis of Spanish conversations comes from covertly recorded conversations between members of a Colombian drug cartel who were under investigation for importing and distributing cocaine in the United States. Because surveillance is a distinct (and, in this case, actual) threat to drug traffickers, Mason shows how recognitional noun phrases like *el sobrino*

138

(that is, *the nephew*) can be used, in conjunction with other aliases, in order to protect the identity of referents. These noun phrases are what Stivers (2007) calls 'in the know' references, as they require a specified and shared knowledge in order to be intelligible. Alternative recognitional forms have been shown to accomplish a range of recipient-designed actions in different languages (Blythe, 2009; Brown, 2007; Mason, 2004; Stivers, 2007) and are evidence of a range of reference forms that can be used to accomplish specific goals of recipient design[55].

What is missing from the existing research on person-reference is a systematic examination of the understandings that recipients display in response to the use of 'recognitional' and 'non-recognitional' person references. Although there is a considerable body of work on these reference forms, the principal research on the topic (Sacks & Schegloff, 1979; Schegloff, 1996b) do not extensively explore how recipients can respond to such reference forms. In §6.1.3 I explore some of the reasons for why this might be the case. The remote proposal sequences in the CHC data corpus afford a possibly rare insight into recipients' treatment of recognitional and non-recognitional reference forms. Because of the relatively large volume of references to third parties, who are routinely implicated in the arrangements being made, there are more opportunities to examine the occasions on which recipients do respond to person references in a way that displays an understanding of their function.

6.1.2 Person references in the data corpus

In making arrangements, employees in the CHC data corpus are occasionally confronted with the task of informing a client that a new care worker will be coming to perform some service task. There is, then, a nexus of acquaintances that could be

---

[55] Non-recognitional descriptions have also been shown to orient to the preference for recipient design. For example, Fox and Thompson (1990) examine how the reference in the utterance *there's a woman in my class* _who's_ _a_ _nurse_ (underlining in original) describes the referent in at least two ways that are relevant for the ensuing telling: (1) an audience member in a lecture; and (2) someone with medical expertise. At the same time that this establishes the referent as an appropriate authority within a telling, the reference form used also claims that the recipient is unacquainted with the referent (or at least does not need to be acquainted with her for the purposes of the telling). See also Schegloff (2007a), for further consideration of this fragment of data.

relevant when informing clients about arrangements. To assist in this task, employees can make use of an electronic list that specifies which care workers have visited particular clients in the past. Based on this list, or perhaps in some instances upon their own memory, employees formulate references to particular care workers for particular clients.

Of the two preferences for references to persons that are discussed by Sacks and Schegloff (1979), I will be primarily concerned here with the preference for recipient design. My interest will be in two differing ways of referring to substitute care workers in the CHC data corpus. The first form, where only the care worker's name is used, seems to index the recipient's acquaintance with the referent; that is, its use implies that the recipient should be able to locate the identity of that care worker from amongst the people with whom they are acquainted. The following data fragment is an example. In it, the prototypical recognitional reference form, a single name, is used to refer to the replacement care worker.

```
(6.04) [CHC106, 0:42-1:01]
01 E04:   u:hm but I'm r↑inging yo:u >just to< let you kno:w
02        u:hm (0.2) of course Cindy's still off,
03 C033:  yep.
04 E04:   u:hm and it'll be: (.) Ca:rmen tomorrow >at about<
05        twenty past twelve.
06 C033:  that'll be fi:ne. [cos I'm going ou]t tomorrow
07 E04:                     [   o h k a y?   ]
08 C033:  mo:rning,
09 E04:   right,
10 C033:  you know what happen'd, he-heh-h .hh the kids tell
11        me that my freezer on top of my f:ridge there (0.3)
12        had gone kaput.
```

The second reference form that I will discuss involves the production of a care worker's name that is preceded by a descriptor like *a care worker called* or *a lady called*. These references are descriptions comprising an indefinite noun phrase (*a lady*), followed by a definite relative clause which specifies the referent (*called Kerry*). This formulation initially refers to an unspecified entity, contained within a particular category, before identifying that referent by name[56]. These formulations can be

---

[56] It appears that a related form, involving a definite noun phrase (such as *the care worker*), can be used to generate a *recognitional* descriptor. The following is the only example that I can identify in the CHC corpus, and is complicated by the repair that is initiated by the speaker mid-way through the person reference. Nevertheless, it hints at the differential role that articles like *a* and *the* play in formulating

thought of as 'defining descriptions' that introduce a new referent to a recipient. In so doing, these descriptions necessarily index the recipient's unacquaintance with the referent. The following fragment shows an instance of this.

```
(6.05) [CHC360, 0:33-0:54]
01 E11:   .hhh no:w the reason I'm ringing is because
02        Kimberley is not well toda:y, (.h)
03 C130:  ye:s,
04 E11:   s:o: a lady called Kerry's coming instead.
05 C130:  o:h yes.
06 E11:   alri:¿
07 C130:  that'll be alright.=
08 E11:                    =she'll be there at about
09        <twenty to ten> though.
10           (0.3)
11 C130:  ri:ghto:, [(y-)]
12 E11:             [ is ] that okay?
13           (.)
14 C130:  ye:s.
15           (.)
16 E11:   what ti:me's your appointment [at the F:li]nders,=
17 C130:                                 [ a : : h : ]      =a
18        ha' past two,=
19 E11:             =tch O::H OHkay. plenty [of time.]
```

In these two fragments from the CHC corpus, it seems that we can hear Sacks and Schegloff's (1979) preference for recipient design at work[57]. In fragment 6.04, a single name, *Ca:rmen* (line 4), is made available to the client. This seems to convey that the

---

references in talk-in-interaction. By describing the referent as *the care worker Pat*, the employee claims that the client is acquainted with the referent. By expanding the noun phrase with a name, the employee additionally selects a specific care worker out of what now appears to be a group of care workers that the client is acquainted with.

```
(6.06) [CHC334, 1:02-1:18]
01 E10:   u:hm (.) now mi:ster Sea:combe (.) uhm I'm just
02        pho:ning (.) to uhm confi:rm thet n:ext Tu::esda:y
03        .hhhh u::hm the P- ca:re worker Pa:t. who comes to
04        you on a F:ri:day,
05 C121:  yeah=
06 E10:      =she's going to start coming on a Tu:esday as
07        we:hll,
```

[57] In addition to the preferences for minimization and recipient design, discussed by Sacks and Schegloff, more recent research has argued for the existence of a preference for association. Stivers, Enfield and Levinson (2007) describe this as a preference for formulating references so that the referent is in some way associated with one or more of the conversational participants. For instance, **my** *fiancé* and **your** *daughter* could both refer to the same referent and yet the first reference associates the referent with the speaker and the second with the recipient. Within English interaction, the preference for association is thought to be most relevant to the formulation of non-recognitional person references. This preference would be relevant to present considerations were the references under examination to take the form of *so* **your** *care worker will be Karen* or *so we'll be sending* **our** *care worker Karen*. Given that this is not the case, I will not be discussing this preference any further.

client should be able to recognise the referent as an acquaintance. In fragment 6.05, the description *a lady called Kerry* (line 4) seems to convey that the client will not be able to recognise the referent because they are not acquainted. However, there is no evidence that my analytic impression of the function of those reference forms corresponds to the understanding of the recipient. In both instances, the client responds to the prospective informing and not to the person reference form that was used. This leads to the problem of evidence in the study of person-reference.

6.1.3   Locating evidence in the study of person-reference

The problem with the analysis prevented above, based on data like fragments 6.04 and 6.05, is that even if there is a 'face validity' or commonsensicality about it, there is no evidence in the above data that recipients themselves are treating these two different reference forms as indexing acquaintance or unacquaintance. This is the case for many of the CHC calls where these forms are used to refer to substitute care workers. Recipients typically produce the conditionally relevant response; that is, they accept or reject the proposed arrangement. They do no typically remark upon the person reference form that has been used, because that is not the conditionally relevant response for them to make (but see §6.1.1 and Chapter 7 for an explanation of how responding to reference forms can be made conditionally relevant in incidental sequences). In the above two instances, recipients are, at best, tacitly responding to the reference by not raising any problems with it (Heritage, 2007). However, this is a problem for conversation analysts, who must somehow locate evidence that these references are actually being produced and being responded to in the way that is consistent with an analytic explanation of them (Schegloff, 1996a).

In his study of person-reference in Lao, Enfield (2007) argues that the absence of a response from a recipient need not be an impediment to generating an analytic explanation of how person-reference functions. He writes,

> "...when we follow a default course of action...we are in one sense not 'doing' anything at all. But since it takes work to pull off the invisible appearance of ordinariness, even when our manners of behaviour are

rendered literally unremarkable by their conformity, we are nevertheless always doing something by choosing just those manners of behaviour...[D]efault practices of person reference do more than just refer. They instantiate and stabilise culture-specific views of the person. But by their very design, these practices render their own meaning difficult to detect, shrouded in the veil of ordinariness" (pp 97).

Enfield examines how the 'default' person references in Lao explicitly code kin-based and other hierarchical social relations between the speaker and the referent. He claims that these references do more than just refer to a person. One piece of evidence for this comes from the way that he is personally referred to by some of his research participants in the recordings. As an unrelated foreigner, there are no kin or social hierarchical terms that Enfield's Lao participants can use to refer to him, other than a particular reference that would mark him as being of lower social status. Therefore, when Enfield is in their presence, they refrain from using the reference that would mark him as belonging to this lower status. It is only when he is not physically co-present that speakers use the reference term. Enfield argues that this sensitivity shows that these references do more than just refer. He nominates that they also explicitly invoke the referent's social and familial standing.

Evidence that participants treat recognitional and non-recognitional reference forms as indexing acquaintance and unacquaintance, respectively, can be located in the CHC data corpus in the minority of instances where the conditionally relevant response is eschewed by a recipient. Although this occurs in a minority of instances, the overall profusion of references to third parties in the CHC data corpus (because they are routinely implicated in arrangements) means that it has been possible to make a collection of instances for systematic study. This is an opportunity that does not seem to have been available in previous research (e.g., Sacks & Schegloff, 1979; Schegloff, 1996b). In instances where a conditionally relevant response is eschewed by a recipient in order to address an apparent problem with a reference to a third party, an insert sequence (cf. §3.2; Schegloff, 1972; Schegloff, 2007c) is launched to initiate repair (cf. §3.3) on the reference form that has just been used. These insert sequences are evidence for the function of recognitional and non-recognitional forms. They show that if a reference form has not been ostensibly designed in accordance with the

143

preference for recipient design, then it can be incidentally, rather than conditionally, relevant for a recipient to respond to that reference.

In §3.4 I established that, because troubles in interaction are not limited to errors, the generic term 'repair' is more appropriate than 'correction.' In this chapter, I will examine instances where correction is specifically being initiated, as well as instances where repair more broadly is being initiated. Repair and correction are overlapping but not synonymous concepts in conversation analytic terminology. While correcting is an activity that is concerned specifically with addressing errors in talk, repair refers to a class of activities that deals with a range of troubles in interaction, which can include errors (cf. Schegloff et al., 1977). Following this distinction, I will, at points, use repair to refer to the more general practice and will, at other points, discuss correction more specifically.

Repair accomplishes a different goal when it addresses recognitional as opposed to non-recognitional reference forms. In instances where recipients of non-recognitional references initiate repair, they move to upgrade the reference form to a recognitional. Alternatively, where recipients of recognitional references initiate repair, they do so to downgrade the reference form to a non-recognitional. These repairs show how participants, or more precisely recipients, themselves analyse these reference forms. Their behaviour shows that they treat non-recognitional descriptors like *a lady called* as indexing unacquaintance, whereas they treat more minimal references like bare names as indexing acquaintance. Furthermore, their behaviour also shows that participants have an interest in maintaining a socially-shared nexus of acquaintances in interaction; a claim that I will return to at various points throughout my analysis.

Returning to the instances that I cited in §0, it is not surprising that recipients do not routinely provide analysts, or even each other, with evidence for what these reference forms are functioning to accomplish. In all instances where substitute care workers are referred to, there is a broader action, a remote proposal to make an arrangement, that is also underway. For this reason, the conditionally relevant response is not to respond to the person reference specifically, but rather to attend to the task of modifying their service arrangement. Land and Kitzinger (2005: 391-396), Kitzinger (2006), and Jefferson (2007: 450-452) have shown how erroneous person references can remain

uncorrected, in order to not delay the production of the sequentially relevant next action[58]. Unlike try-marking, which initiates a sequence that deals with the recognition of a referent (Sacks & Schegloff, 1979; Schegloff, 2007c), these reference forms do no such thing. In the above data fragments, we never hear the participants' analysis of the person reference because the recipient produces the sequentially relevant next action: a response to a remote proposal. Although these sequences are interesting to illustrate the apparently seamless way in which these references are usually deployed, I will now focus on the less common instances where repair is initiated on these reference forms, in order to elucidate the commonsense assumptions that underpin their routine use.

6.2 Repairs on person references

Examining instances where references to persons are repaired by a recipient is a particularly useful way of understanding how references generally work. As Levinson explains, "normally, first efforts at reference succeed, and then all of these competing principles are hidden from view…when things don't work the first time or even the second, our eyes are opened to the underlying sociophysics of the system" (2007: 35). His work is concerned with optimal forms of third person reference on Rossel Island in Papua New Guinea. Due to the small population of the island, most people are acquainted and so the use of non-recognitional references is rare. Therefore, Levinson concentrates on repairs of recognitional third person reference forms and what this might reveal about the design of such forms.

The focus of my analysis will be repairs on both recognitional and non-recogonitional third person reference forms. This will allow for a consideration of the broader problem of designing a reference to index a recipient's acquaintance with the referent. I will first consider the ostensibly inapposite design of *non-recognitional* person

---

[58] Note, however, that these researchers were not examining the same types of reference forms that I am considering here, and that this may impact upon the applicability of their findings to the present research. What *is* relevant, for present purposes, is that it is *possible* for errors in person reference to remain unattended to, in order to progress a broader activity in the talk.

references. Following such inapposite references, recipients can withhold the production of the sequentially relevant next action in order to correct the reference form that was used. I will then consider instances where the production of *recognitional* person references is either ostensibly or potentially inapposite. Recipients in the CHC data corpus utilise a greater range of repair types in order to address these sources of troubles, including correction, acquaintance queries, and category-constrained interrogatives. Collectively, the analysis of the data below will support my earlier claim that there are forms of third person reference that index acquaintance and that participants can exhibit an interest, in interaction, towards maintaining a socially-shared nexus of acquaintances.

6.2.1 Correcting non-recognitional person descriptions

Participants require a mechanism, or mechanisms, in conversation by which new referents can be introduced for subsequent use. Sacks and Schegloff (1979) explain that the preference for using a recognitional involves a preference for expanding the scope of possibility by introducing, where possible, novel referents that can be drawn upon for future use. Introductions, for instance, are one way by which people can become acquainted with a co-present referent. There are also ways of introducing new references that refer to non-present referents. Downing (1996) examines instances where a novel referent, which has been pre-established by means other than through a recognitional reference (e.g., *I have one sister*), can be coherently introduced by name at a subsequent point (e.g., *Sue was just a pest*, where the name *Sue* is introduced to a recipient for the first time), so long as this is done within the extant topic of talk in which the referent was first referred to. My contribution here will be to provide additional support for Schegloff's (1996b: 478-479) claim that reference forms like *a lady called* and *a care worker called* are non-recognitional descriptors, which introduce a referent for a party with whom the recipient is putatively unacquainted[59].

---

[59] In the event that recipients fail explicitly to acknowledge the introduction of a novel referent, this matter can be pursued, even after a prolonged interlude, as in the following:

```
(6.07) [CHC043, 1:00-4:04]
001 C012:  .hhh (0.2) now what are you going to tell me
```

In the following data fragment, that presumption is challenged by the recipient, confirming for us as analysts that recipients can also treat this reference as a non-recognitional descriptor that indexes unacquaintance.

```
(6.08) [CHC370, 0:32-0:49]
01 E11:    .hhh now I'm jus' ringing=I th:ink V:anessa had
02         said that I: would pick you u:p this afternoon
03         for the gro:up,=
04 C135:               =yes:
05 E11:    .mph but there's a lady called Kerry coming no:w
06         i:nstead.=
07 C135:          =I know he:r. hm
08           (0.2)
09 E11:    tch (.) a::h mi:ght be:. ther- (.) there are two
10         Kerry[s >but<]
11 C135:       [ o : h] yes. there are two:, are
12         [there]
13 E11:    [ e:i]ther w(h)a(h)y. .uh-.huh! [ y e : s .  ]
14 C135:                                   [alright then.]
15           (.)
```

```
002        abou(0.2)t er Tuesday shopping.=
003 E07:                          =yes now. um, a
004        care worker called Kristy's coming? .hhhh and
005        she'll be coming at the same time (.) as
006        Vanessa normally comes. Which is just before
007        one.
008           (0.2)
009 C012: just before [one.=I] don't suppose she could
010 E07:              [ .hhh ]
011 C012: come in the morning could she.
 ((122 lines, or 2 minutes and 41 seconds of talk, omitted))
133 E07:             [ tch .hhh ohkay.] thanks a lot
134        missus Gould.
135 C012: good.=[>so she's gonn]a be< he:re now aht=
136 E07:       =[  o h k a y-  ]               =°ehm°=
137 C012: =one o'clock on tch- >tomorrow.<=
138 E07:                          =yes. and her
139        name's Kristy.
140 C012: Kri:sty. [ g o o d. ]
141 E07:          [tch=ohkay.] .h [thanks missus Gould.]
```

In this conversation, the client does not acknowledge the name of her replacement care worker, when it is introduced by the employee. Her subsequent references to the care worker all involve the pronominal *she*. For more than two minutes, the topic shifts to discussions of other service arrangements. During this time, the client refers to two hitherto unmentioned care workers by name. As the call is coming to a close, the client confirms the time of the service. However, the client again pronominally refers to the replacement care worker (line 135). A pronominal reference form here is misplaced, given its distance from the initial reference form. Since that time, other references have been made for which the pronominal 'she' can (and were) deployed as a locally subsequent reference form. Given that a new topic is being launched here, to confirm the service time, an otherwise locally-initial reference form such as a name is an alternative here to pronominal (that is, locally-subsequent) reference forms (cf. Downing, 1996; Fox, 1987; Schegloff, 1996b). Given the client's failure to refer by name to the care worker – a name which she has been introduced to and, moreover, following the client's apparently successful references to two other care workers by name – her use of a pronominal reference at the end of the call occasions an opportunity for the employee to reintroduce the replacement care worker by name (*and her name's Kristy.*, line 139). This time she secures an acknowledgement of the referent from the client.

```
16 E11:    s:o she'll be the:re o:h a- (.) about (0.3) one
17         thi:rty quarter to two: something like that,=
18 C135:   =thank you.
19 E11:    a:lright?
20 C135:   alright then.
```

This fragment begins with the employee launching a new action: a remote proposal (see Chapters 4 and 5). Across lines 1-6, the employee informs the client of a modification to an arrangement to provide transport. Following the employee's raising of the existing arrangement, at lines 1-3, the client provides a minimal response that allows the employee to continue, and she then informs the client of the details of the new arrangement. In this instance, that arrangement appears to be fairly straightforward: Kerry will be coming to transport the client instead of the employee herself. Having detailed this, the employee's turn is possibly complete, and transition to another speaker becomes a relevant possibility. This is indeed what happens – the client takes a responsive turn.

However, as I demonstrated in Chapter 5, the conditionally relevant response following a possibly complete prospective informing is to accept or reject the hitherto informed arrangement as a proposal for a future course of action. Alternatively, if the recipient does not treat the informing as complete, then the relevant response is to produce a continuer and allow the speaker to continue. In this data fragment, neither of those conditionally relevant responses is made. Rather, at the first available juncture where speaker transition is a relevant possibility, the client produces an apparently alternative characterisation of Kerry. In saying *I know he:r.* (line 7), the client eschews the conditionally relevant response in order to respond to something else that was made incidentally relevant within the prior turn. In that prior turn, the employee indexed that the client is unacquainted with the referent by producing the non-recognitional descriptor *a lady called Kerry* (line 5). The client's response corrects an inapposite presumption that underpins that formulation: that the client is unacquainted with Kerry.

Jefferson (1987) calls corrections like the above 'exposed,' as they initiate a sequence that deals specifically with correction[60]. Specifically, the correction launches an insert sequence that initiates repair on the person reference form used by the employee. The correction itself comprises the first pair part of this repair sequence. The employee's acceptance or rejection of the correction is the conditionally relevant second pair part of this sequence (Heritage, 1984; Jefferson, 1987; Robinson, 2009) and would constitute the 'repair solution,' or 'repair proper' (Schegloff, 1992b). The employee, having accepted the possibility of the client being acquainted with the referent (*tch (.) a::h mi:ght be:.*, line 9), informs the client that there are actually two care workers called Kerry. So in addition to responding that the client's claim of acquaintance might be correct, the employee also provides evidence of how the client's claim could be incorrect. The client in turn accepts this possibility. She then displays a readiness to move on from the correction sequence. Her *alright then.* (line 14) is either a sequence-closing third (Schegloff, 2007c), or acceptance of the arrangement. In either case, the client moves to return to the base sequence of acceding to the prospective informing that has been made, proposing a future service arrangement (lines 16-20).

Exposed corrections are one of many forms of repair (cf. §3.4). Following Schegloff (1996b: 460-464; 478-479), repairs like this comprise a series of practices that can be used either to upgrade a non-recognitional person reference or to downgrade a recognitional person reference (see §6.2.2). The following data fragment is another instance where a recipient corrects a non-recognitional person description (note that the client is a non-native speaker of English, which may account for some of her hesitations and the particularities of her speech).

```
(6.09) [CHC221, 0:43-1:45]
01 C075:  Laura,
02              (.)
03 E07:   yes:.
04 C075:  a:h before a-a- (0.4) I a:sk you: something e:lse
05        now on: (0.2) Tu:esday you said the gi:rl will
06        come for the: (0.4) wh't ti:me?
07              (0.4)
```

---

[60] Other conversation analysts (Heritage, 1984; Robinson, 2009) have labeled this practice 'counter-informing,' sometimes even using the same data fragments as Jefferson for examples. Although they use different terminology, these writers make no incompatible analysis of this phenomenon.

```
08 E07:    tch u::hm [>let m-<]
09 C075:           [  wh <u>i</u>ch ] gi:rl will gum? (<u>Suzie?</u>) er
10         (Ba-) (.) **Sh:**[**<u>ari?</u>**]
11 E07:            [e:rm] I'm n:<u>o</u>t quite sure who it is
12         ye:ht?
              ((14 lines omitted; employee checks rosters))
26 E07:    are you the:re missus Bartre?[v : :] .hhh yes
27 C075:                                [ye:s.]
28 E07:    it's at n- a <u>ro</u>und about <u>ni:ne</u> <u>thi:</u>rty on the
29         Tu:esday.
30              (.)
31 C075:   <u>ni:</u>ne thirdy.=
32 E07:                =y:eah [with **a**] **ca:re worker called**
33 C075:                      [  e-  ]
34 E07:    **Sha:ri.**
35              (0.2)
36 C075:   m-
37              (.)
38 C075:   y<u>e</u>s,
39              (.)
40 C075:   **she comes every <u>Monda</u>:y,**
41 E07:    O:H <u>d</u>oes she come on <u>Monday</u> does she?
42 C075:   y<u>e</u>s.
43              (.)
44 E07:    o::h well th↓en y:<u>e</u>s it's the sa:me <u>Shari</u>. >and
45         she'll [be there<] on Tuesd[a:y.]
46 C075:          [ y e p. ]          [ a:t] ah h<u>a</u>lf
47         p↑as:' (0.4)
48 E07:    >around about< n[<u>ine</u> th<u>i</u>]:rdy. [yea]h.
49 C075:                   [ nine. ]        [mmm]
50 E07:    [o h k a y?]
51 C075:   [(.hhh) e::]r n<u>o</u>w Laura, er- (.) I th<u>i</u>nk hh .hhh
52         I h<u>a</u>ve to t<u>e</u>ll you no:w...
```

This fragment provides an additional piece of evidence for formulations like *a care worker called* functioning as non-recognitional person descriptors. Towards the beginning of the fragment, the client has asked two questions, one shortly after the other, about an upcoming service. The first question, containing a non-recognitional reference (*the gi:rl*, line 5)[61], concerns the time of the service. The second question concerns the identity of the care worker. Having asked this at line 9, the client immediately continues her turn at talk to produce a series of try-marked 'candidate answers' (Pomerantz, 1988) to her own question. Her first try (*Suzie?*, line 9) is apparently a mistake, as she attempts a second, the pronunciation of which is cut off before it is completed (*Ba-*, line 9). Her third try (*Sh:[ari?]*, line 10) is interesting for two

---

[61] Although this reference contains a description of the referent as belonging to the category 'girl,' because of its simplicity (it does little more than convey non-recognisability) it can be thought of as a non-recognitional *reference* (cf. Schegloff, 1996b: 459). A non-recognitional *description* might here take the form of *you said my usual girl will come*. Unlike *the girl*, which could apply to a range of care workers, a descriptor like *my usual girl* isolates a specific referent.

related reasons. It is particularly interesting because in it, the client shows that she has at least a familiarity (if not an actual acquaintance) with the referent that the employee later introduces with a non-recognitional descriptor. This is further evidence for the non-recognitional reference being inappositely deployed. It is unlike the prior data fragment where, although the client asserts acquaintance, it is not analytically possible to be sure that the client was actually acquainted with Kerry (and, indeed, the employee goes on to question that acquaintance). In this fragment we can be confident (if not absolutely sure; it could be a different Shari; cf. line 44) that the client is acquainted with Shari because she is able to produce her name before the employee attempts to introduce her with a non-recognitional descriptor. The second reason that the client's third try at a candidate response is interesting is because it appears that the employee does not notice it. If she did, she would have a basis for *not* deploying a non-recognitional descriptor later in the call to refer to the same referent. It may be the case that the employee has not noticed the client's reference to Shari because she herself has started talking (although C. Goodwin, 1986, has shown that people are able to talk and listen at the same time).

Once the employee has checked the rosters and has returned to the phone, she first informs the client of the service time (lines 28-29) and, following the client's receipt of that information (line 31), informs her of the care worker who will deliver the service. It seems that if the employee had noticed (or if she had noticed, now remembers) the client's reference to Shari at line 10, then she would not produce the reference form that she does at lines 32-33, which indexes the client's unacquaintance with Shari. We can know this because we can hear, in the client's response to the informing of her care worker, a correction of the presumption behind the employee's reference form. The conditionally relevant response following this informing would be to receipt the information conveyed and/or accept the arrangement that has been proposed. As in the previous example, this is not what happens here. The client instead launches an insert sequence to expose an erroneous presumption behind the inapposite reference to Shari, which evidently claimed that the client was unacquainted with the care worker. In this instance, the client provides evidence for how she knows Shari (because she comes to visit the client every Monday; see Robinson, 2009 for an analysis of providing evidence in support of a counter-informing/correction). Following another

insert sequence in which the employee checks, and the client confirms, that Shari is one of the client's regular care workers, the employee accepts the client's correction at line 44.

The client in the above data fragment has corrected a presumption that evidently underpins the person reference that was formulated. An analytic audience can be especially confident of the basis of her correction, an acquaintance with Shari, because she has mentioned the care worker's name earlier in the conversation. This indicates, firstly, that descriptors like *a lady called* index unacquaintance and, secondly, that parties to an interaction have an apparent interest in maintaining a socially-shared nexus of acquaintances. This interest is strong enough for recipients to eschew conditionally relevant responses to address inappositely designed reference forms.

The final example that I will explore here involving the correction of a non-recognitional person description is a 'boundary case' (cf. §2.3.4; Schegloff, 1997a). It is unclear whether the client's response is a correction because it is embedded within the client's acceptance of the arrangement that has been proposed by the employee (and which contained the non-recognitional description).

```
(6.10) [CHC344, 0:06-0:43]
01 E10:    .hh u:hm tch Esther I'm just letting you kno:w that
02         (.) next week on F:ri:day .hhh (0.2) Ki:mberle:y is
03         uhm (0.2) is having the day off.=
04 C124:                               =yes she was
05         telling me about it. [eheh.]
06 E10:                         [yeup.]
07 C124:   heh
08 E10:    r(h)ig(h)[h(h)t. ]
09 C124:            [>eh heh] ha<=
10 E10:                        =s:[:-]
11 C124:                          [Ki]mberley tells all.
12           (0.2)
13 E10:    ehhh [y(h)ep well (th]at's) I thought you
14 C124:       [ he   hou  h↑e. ]
15         migh(0.2)tum be wondering.=so,
16 C124:   ye[ah.]
17 E10:      [.hh] >yep.<=
18 C124:                =m[m.]
19 E10:                   [ a] a care worker called J:a::n
20         .hhh [ wil]l u:m do
21 C124:        [mmm?]
22 E10:    the service for you instead. just on that (0.2)
23         d[a:y.]
24 C124:    [arha]:¿
25           (0.2)
26 E10:    .hhh and J:a:n will (0.2) come a little bit
27         later. She'll be at your plac:e at about nine
28         o'clock.=
```

```
29 C124:          =oh:. well that'll be nice
30          [to see [Ja:n¿  ]
31 E10:     [yeap.  [heh-he.]
32 E10:     .hhhh [ yeap ]
33 C124:           [(heh.)]
34           (0.2)
35 E10:     great. now is it going okay with the cleaning
36          now¿
```

As with the previous two data fragments, the person reference here is contained within a remote proposal sequence. The employee's informing makes acceptance or rejection the conditionally relevant response from the client at line 29. In the two instances considered above, it was in this position that clients corrected the presumption that underpinned the employee's person reference: that the client was unacquainted with the referent. Here, it is not definitively clear that the same thing is happening. If this is a correction, it is not the same type of correction that was observed above. Unlike those, which were *exposed* corrections, requiring a relevant response from their recipient, the client's comment here, if it functions as a correction at all, is an *embedded* correction. This does not make relevant a response that specifically attends to the correction and, for this reason, is not a sequence of repair (Jefferson, 1987). What is important, however, is the possibility that the client's response may be correcting a presumption in the reference form used (for a related analysis on responses that produce an embedded correction of the heterosexist presumption, see Land & Kitzinger, 2005).

The client's response to the employee's prospective informing is to produce an assessment of the arrangement that the employee has proposed. In one respect, that assessment accepts the arrangement (cf. §5.2). In saying *oh:. well that'll be nice to see Jan¿* (lines 29-30), the client is indicating that she is willing to go along with the proposed course of action for her service delivery. In another respect, however, the client's assessment does more. In saying *well that'll be nice to see Jan¿*, the client is possibly indicating that she has a prior acquaintance with Jan, and that she is now looking forward to renewing that acquaintance (an inference that she would have avoided, had she said *that'll be nice to **meet** Jan*)[62]. If this is the case, then her

---

[62] Schegloff and Lerner (2009) show how *well*-prefaced responses to *wh*-questions are used as prefaces for and alerts to recipients of nonstaightforward responses. Such responses can be occasioned when

assessment contains an embedded correction of the employee's presumption that the client was unacquainted with Jan, to whom she has just referred with a non-recognitional descriptor.

There are several possibilities here. The client may not be acquainted with Jan and her assessment is merely a novel way (relative to other instances in the corpus) of accepting the proposed arrangement. Alternatively, the client may be acquainted with Jan and intends for her assessment to also correct the employee's presumption of their unacquaintance. This being the case, it is then possible that either the employee does treat this as an embedded correction, but elects not to respond in any way that accepts or challenges the correction, or that the employee is oblivious to this double meaning. Either way, on this occasion, there is little in the employee's ensuing talk that reveals how she treated the client's turn. She does not produce a post-response response solicitation for a re-acceptance which typically occurs in these prospective informing sequences following client-initiated acceptance (cf. §5.2). This may be a signal of the employee's ambivalence to the client's talk, but I cannot be certain. What can be observed, however, is that having produced three possible sequence-closing thirds (Schegloff, 2007c) – the first two in overlap with the client's talk – the employee then moves the conversation away from the arrangement. They later return to the arrangement (in data not shown here), but no explicit comment is made by either party in relation to the client's acquaintance with Jan.

Although this fragment is a boundary case of a correction to a non-recognitional person description, it is nonetheless an instance of how embedded correction *could* transpire in contexts similar to the above. Along with the two preceding fragments, it

---

questions are being used to accomplish an additional action to seeking information (such as complaining). These questions can establish dual sets of contingencies that a recipient may need to deal with. A related possibility emerges following possibly inapposite person reference forms. A recipient can produce either the conditionally relevant response or initiate repair on the reference form. Here, we may be witnessing an attempt to do both these things, by way of an embedded correction. That is, following a prospective informing containing a possibly inapposite person reference, the *well*-prefaced response may signal upcoming non-straightforwardness. Relative to other responses to prospective informings in the CHC data corpus, the client's response here is definitely not straightforward. What is unclear, however, is whether any signal of non-straightforwardness relates to an upcoming embedded correction.

shows how both parties to a conversation can treat a reference to a person that is prefaced by a description of that person, as conveying that a recipient is unacquainted with a referent. From here, I want to shift attention to a more frequent occurrence – the use of names as minimal reference forms; and the variety of ways in which these can be repaired. These repairs provide evidence for minimal reference forms like names being produced and heard as recognitional references that index acquaintance.

6.2.2   Correcting recognitional person references

If it is the case, as I have claimed above, that speakers can make references that index unacquaintance between the recipient and a third person referent (through the use of non-recognitional person descriptions), then it is probable that the converse is also the case. That is, there is the potential for references to be made that index acquaintance, where the recipient contends that no such acquaintance exists. The following is an instance where, as with the above instances, a conditionally relevant response is eschewed in order to respond to and correct a recognitional person reference.

```
(6.11) [CHC289, 0:55-1:19]
01 E06:   .hhh [no:w-] I'm jus' ringing t' let you know you
02 C100:        [yeah.]
03 E06:   know on Mo:nda:y, [ah A:n]nemarie won't be
04 C100:                    [yeah, ]
05 E06:   the::ah, .mp[hh uhm] b't Meli:nda's going to
06 C100:               [ no:. ]
07 E06:   be theah.=
08 C100:          =Me[l i]:nda now that's a new name.=
09 E06:             [tch]                             =tch
10        u:::hm o:h you mightn't know Mel.=she's been with
11        us a long ti:me. .h[h h ]
12 C100:                     [ye:a]h b't=
13        =[ I : [haven't ha[(d her.)]
13 E06:   =[ye:h [  .h h    [ no: b't] you  mightn't hav'
14        met her.=so she's gonna be there about eight
15        oh'clo[:ck.  ]
16 C100:       [that's] a:lr↑ight [eigh]t
17 E06:                           [ an-]
18        oh'clock'[s fi:ne. ]
19 E06:            [a:lri::t?]
20 E06:   e:x[cellent.]
21 C100:     [  y e : ]s:. and- (.) you don't know what's
22        wro:ng with A:nnemarie,
```

With respect to the correction of a reference form, this data fragment is a counterpart to fragment 6.08, in that it relates to a recognitional as opposed to a non-recognitional reference form. The employee launches a prospective informing that involves referring

to a substitute care worker. At the next transition-relevance place following that reference, the client rushes in to take a turn at talk (at line 8). What she says is not conditionally relevant. At this point in the informing, the relevant response for the client to make would be to receipt the information already conveyed, in anticipation of there being more to come (most likely, an informing of the substitute service time). Another relevant alternative might be for the client to respond to what she has just been informed of as a remote proposal.

Although she does not produce a *conditionally* relevant response to the action being pursued in the prior turn, the client's response is incidentally relevant, given the content of the prior turn. In saying, *Meli:nda now that's a new name.* (line 8), the client corrects what she takes to be an erroneous presumption in the employee's reference form *Meli:nda* (line 5); that she is acquainted with the referent. The client corrects this use of a recognitional reference form by revealing that the referent is not an acquaintance of hers. The client here provides evidence for her interlocutor, and for analysts, that she treats the employee's reference form as indexing acquaintance.

The employee's response to the client's correction shows that the client's recognition of Melinda might still be possible. Following a hesitation (*u:::hm*, line 10), the employee downgrades the claim of acquaintance that underpinned her previous use of a recognitional reference (*o:h you mightn't know Mel*, line 10). However, *oh*-prefaced responses to inquiries can be used to indicate that the previous turn was in some way inapposite (Heritage, 1998) and *oh*-prefaced responses to assessments can precede disagreement (Heritage, 2002). Here, the employee's *oh*-prefaced turn accepts the possibility that the client may be unacquainted with Melinda, but also provides two pieces of information that may help the client to locate Melinda as one of her acquaintances. This could indicate that the employee still regards recognition as possible. The first piece of evidence is the employee's use of the diminutive *Mel* as an alternative, and yet recognitional, reference to the same referent. This allows for the possibility that the client may know Melinda as Mel and can use that reference form as a resource for recognising her. The employee also explains that Mel(inda) is a longstanding employee. This allows for the possibility that the client may have had Mel(inda) for a service a long time ago and that this is the reason that she does not recognise her name (and not that she is actually unacquainted with her). In this sense,
156

the employee's response can be heard as not completely accepting the client's correction.

Whatever possibilities for recognition that the employee's response to the client's correction make relevant, the client does not utilise them. Rather, she again reasserts her unacquaintance with Mel(inda), using a format that suggests that she is hearing the employee's prior turn as suggesting a possible acquaintance in the distant past (*ye:ah b't I: ha̱ven't ha̱(d her.)*, lines 12-13). This corrected version is subsequently accepted, by the employee, as possibly being the case (*no̱: b't you mightn't hav' met her.*, lines 13-14). Having resolved this matter, and come to an agreement over the client's acquaintance with Melinda (or unacquaintance as it is), the employee is then in a position to return to her base action of informing the client of an arrangement (from line 14).

In the two previous sections I have shown how recipients can respond to an incidentally relevant component of a prior turn – the person reference form that was used – in order to correct a presumption that underpinned the formulation of that component. In the case of non-recognitional reference forms, which we examined in §6.2.1, corrections could lead to the upgrading of references to recognitional forms. In this section, I demonstrated how a correction following a recognitional reference could lead to downgrading that reference form to a non-recognitional reference. Although rejecting a correction is always a possibility, the manner in which these corrections seek to address ostensible troubles with reference forms is evidence for what conversation analysts call 'recognitionals,' forms that index acquaintance, and 'non-recognitionals,' forms that index unacquaintance. Corrections following recognitional references are always attempts at downgrading the reference form. Conversely, corrections following non-recognitional references are always attempts at upgrading the reference form. This unidirectionality is evidence that recipients' treatment of these reference forms corresponds to the conversation analytic account of their function to index acquaintance. There is further evidence for this unidirectionality in other formats of repair that can follow recognitional person references.

6.2.3 Other-initiated repair of recognitional person references: Acquaintance queries

So far, I have shown how both recognitional and non-recognitional reference forms can be corrected in interaction. There is a range of other repair types available to recipients to address inappositely designed reference forms. In this section, I will examine instances where a recognitional person reference is followed by a type of other-initiated repair that involves a query, by the recipient, of their acquaintance with the referent. These repairs involve the suspension of the progressivity of the sequence in order to address a possible problem located in the prospective informing turn; namely, the person reference form used. They are constructed as questions that make confirmation or disconfirmation a relevant next action (Raymond, 2003). By suspending production of the conditionally relevant response, these acquaintance queries allow for a confirmation or reformulation of the reference form that was used and its indexed claim of acquaintance.

Although some repair initiators are formatted to request or ask for a repair solution, and others to offer a solution to be confirmed (Schegloff, 2004), these repair initiators posit a need to confirm the assumption of acquaintance that was indexed in the recognitional reference form just employed. The following data fragment is one instance where an acquaintance query is made following an informing that contains a recognitional person reference, thereby suspending the production of the conditionally relevant response. An earlier fragment of this call was examined as fragment 4.10. As the client revealed then, she is sucking on a lolly[63] while talking to the employee. At various points in the following data fragment, it appears as though this eating interferes with the client's speech.

```
(6.14) [CHC128, 0:19-0:55]
01 E01:   [u::]hm tch (0.2) thomorrow mo:rning,
02 C040:  mh[mm?]
03 E01:     [u:h] Te:ammy will be the:re .hhh at about ten
04        to ni:ne.
05   ((client rolls lolly around her mouth for 1 second))
```

---

[63] 'Lolly' is the Australian English word for a type of confectionary that is referred to as a 'sweet' in British English and 'candy' in American English.

```
06 C040:   *h(h)ave* I met Tammy?
07 E01:    Tammy? she:'s worked- she works quite a lot of
08         e:venings and weekends as well so maybe:: .hh
09         (0.2) o:n s:ome [occasions] you m:a:y [h:a:v]e,
10 C040:                   [ m m h m ]           [ ye:s]
11 C040:   I may have met 'er when ((rolls lolly around her
12         mouth for 0.4 seconds)) er when Pete w'z- Paul
13         was in hospit'[l.]
14 E01:                  [ y]e::ah [one of those] times
15 C040:                          [   m m m m   ]
16 E01:    >you know< when you had some extra sta:ff or
17         something¿ .h[hh  but  an]ywa:y u:hm you'll like
18 C040:                [(yeas/yeah)]
19 E01:    her Tammy's good fun. .hh s[o she'll be t]here
20 C040:                              [ oh   right. ]
21 E01:    a:t ten to ni:ne.
22              (.)
23 C040:   ((rolling lolly around in her mouth while talking))
24         ohkay that's good [thANK you ve]ry mu[ch.]
25 E01:                      [beau:tiful. ]     [ ↑o]hka:y:
```

As with the other instances considered previously, the employee's prospective informing (at lines 1-4) establishes acceptance or rejection of the proposed arrangement as the conditionally relevant response from the client. However, that informing has contained a recognitional person reference (*Te:ammy*, line 3), which turns out to be an ostensible source of trouble for the client. Rather than correcting the reference form, however, the client queries her acquaintance with Tammy (**h(h)ave* I met Tammy?*, line 6). Whereas corrections claim a necessary and specified source of trouble, this repair initiator does not make the same sort of commitment. Indeed, the client is treating the reference as a source of trouble, but she does so without claiming that the reference form was inappositely designed. It is nevertheless an instance of repair, because the progressivity of a sequence has been suspended in order to deal with a source of trouble.

In the above instance, there is no assertion of the source of trouble being with the employee's formulation, but rather an utterance which occasions a response that can either: (1) affirm the reference form that was used, or (2) downgrade it to a non-recognitional form. More specifically in this instance, the client's question, while generating a space within which the recognitional reference form could be confirmed or downgraded, is formulated to prefer a confirming response (Raymond, 2003). So while the query indicates a degree of trouble with the person reference that was used, it is composed in a format that prefers a confirmation of the reference that was used.

By extension, this would then confirm the acquaintance that underpins the use of a recognitional reference form.

As it happens, the client's acquaintance query is sufficient for the employee to downgrade the assertion of acquaintance that was made through her earlier use of a recognitional reference form. Firstly, she produces a 'non-type-conforming response' (Raymond, 2003) to the client's question. In questions where an operator (here, *have*) is placed before the subject (In the above instance: *have I*), relevant *grammatical* responses are constrained to *yes* and *no*. The employee's response at lines 7 to 9 clearly does not conform to that grammatical constraint and is, for that reason, a non-type-conforming response. Secondly, the employee's response is not a pragmatically preferred one either. Although the client's question preferred confirmation, the employee here goes on to provide what is, at best, a mitigated confirmation of the client's acquaintance with Tammy. The employee's response shows characteristics of a dispreferred response, such as an account of Tammy's employment arrangements and, therefore, of how the client may be acquainted with her (Pomerantz, 1984; Raymond, 2003).

What is important for current analytic purposes is that the client's acquaintance query has generated a space within which her acquaintance with Tammy can be discussed, confirmed, rejected, or mitigated. Following further talk on this, the employee eventually returns to the business of her remote proposal with an informing of an upshot across line 19 and 21 (*so she'll be there a:t ten to ni:ne.*). This reintroduces the proposed arrangement as the immediate focus of the interaction and, in reply, the client accepts the arrangement (line 24). Through the production of an acquaintance query, the client has been able to clarify her acquaintance with the referent. In this instance, the employee repairs an assertion of acquaintance that was embedded in her prior reference form. In the next instance, the employee confirms her prior indexation of acquaintance.

```
(6.15) [CHC167, 0:26-1:10]
01 E07:    .hhh no:w. (0.2) tch (.) a::rh=>let me< s:ee what
02         h've we done. what did I >ring you abou(t).<=O:H
03         u:hm your shoppi:ng:¿ you:r i:hning shift on the
04         Thu::rsday. .hhh now we've managed to get it- uhm
05         Te:ri's going to do that pe:rmanently so she'll
06         always do it on the Thu::rsda:y.
07 C053:   °n°ow have I HAd Teri before?
```

```
08          (0.3)
09 E07:   u:[h yes] she knows yo:u. yes:.
10 C053:     [(ah-)]
11           (0.2)
12 C053:  I do. [(ah)]
13 E07:        [ yes]:. .hh u::hm, (0.3) n:o:w I'll
14         t(h)ell you what ti:me it will be:h.
15           (0.5)
16 E07:   if you >just hold on a< m:inute I'm j'st flicking
17         through the ro:sters:.
18           (0.4)
19 E07:   .hhhh u:hm it'll be: 'bout 'leven oh'clo:ck.
20           (.)
21 E07:   o:n the Thu:rsda[y.]
22 C053:                  [ y]:eah. [it's alright.=(I'll] do)
23 E07:                            [t c h  o h k a : y?]
24 C053:  the i::rning anytime (you have.)
25 E07:   a:lright. ohkay. .hh and tomorro:w: I think
26         C:arla's doing the shopping and I think that's a
27         little bit later in the da:y. .hh
```

As in previous fragments, the conditionally relevant response to the employee's remote proposal (lines 1-6) is again eschewed by the client, who instead produces an acquaintance query (°n°ow have I HAd Teri before?, line 7). As in the previous fragment, the client here also initiates a negotiation of her acquaintance with the referent by asking whether Teri has previously visited her. Following an initial confirmation, the employee proffers an account of how the client will have had Teri before (she knows yo:u., line 9). The employee's account here is interesting because it does not answer the client's question in the relevant format. The client has asked whether she personally has had Teri before, to which the employee replies that Teri knows the client. The employee's answer, then, involves shifts in the subject (from the client to Teri), the verb (from had to know), and the tense (from past to present). The client in turn translates this response by referring to herself as the subject, while utilising the verb and tense of the employee's response.

By answering the client's question in an irrelevant format, the employee has avoided addressing whether Teri has ever been a care worker for the client before. In making Teri the subject of her response, she furthermore avoids having to claim who the client is acquainted with, which is presumably a domain of expertise that rests with the client. Overall, the repair initiation does not result in a downgrading of a reference form that has been used, but rather results in the employee explicitly claiming an acquaintance between the recipient and the referent; an acquaintance that had been previously indexed in the recognitional reference form that had been used. Following

some further talk on the matter, the employee continues her prospective informing (from line 13) and there is no further mention of either the ironing or Teri.

Acquaintance queries are a form of other-initiated repair that can act as a means by which an assumption of acquaintance that underpins the use of a recognitional reference form can be checked by a recipient. I have examined how such initiations of repair do not make a necessary claim that the reference has been inappositely designed. Rather, they question (but do not refute) the recipient's acquaintance with the referent. I have shown how such discussions can result in a downgrading of the reference form that was used and also in a reassertion of the initial form. I will now turn to a repair initiator that identifies the source of trouble in a different way.

6.2.4   Other-initiated repair of recognitional person references: Category-constrained interrogatives

In this section, I examine instances where a recognitional person reference is followed by another type of other-initiated repair: 'category-constrained interrogatives'[64]. It will be my interest to show that these initiations of repair can be premonitory indicators of a recipient's possible unacquaintance with the referent and, therefore, of a possibly inappositely designed person reference.

Category-constrained interrogatives are designed to locate, specifically, the part of the prior talk with which a recipient is having trouble (cf. Drew, 1997: 69-71). They are comprised of 'class-specific question words' like *who*, *where*, and *when* (Sidnell, 2010). For instance, the category-constrained interrogative *who* is a means by which recipients can display to first speakers that they understood the category from which the source of trouble came; that is, in this instance, that it was the name of a person. This raises the possibility that the speaker heard enough to comprehend that a term from a particular category was (or should have been) used, but not enough to be able to locate the specific referent. However, it also raises the possibility that the recipient

---

[64] This term is taken from Schegloff's lectures at the University of California in Los Angeles (Kitzinger, personal communication).

162

heard the reference but has a problem with the form that has been used. The following is an instance where the latter appears to be the case.

```
(6.16) [CHC035, 0:44-1:33]
01 E07:    [>I] jus' wanted t' ring to let you< kno:w that u:m
02         tch (0.3) I left a message yesterday b't I'm not
03         sure whether you got that on your pho:[ne or] not.=
04 C011:                                         [ no: ]
05 E07:    =[Gwen's  co-]
06 C011:   =[no I haven']
     ((7 lines omitted; talk about C's answering machine))
14 E07:          [ y]e::ah that's annoying >isn't
15         it=well< [Gwen's] coming toda:y a:nyway.=
16 C011:            [ m m. ]
17 C011:   =w[ho ihs?]
18 E07:      [  .hhh ] e:r her name's Gwen:. .hhh
19 C011:   [ Gw]en¿
20 E07:    [tch]
21 E07:    >Gwen.< yes. [ s h e]'ll be there >a little bit<
22 C011:                [(yes,)]
23 E07:    la:ter. I think it's about qua:rter past ni:ne
24         she'll be th[ere. ohka]y-=and she'll
25 C011:               [a:lright.]
26 E07:    do the who:le shift.
27 C011:   yep. so she's doing the cooki°ng°?
28             (0.3)
29 E07:    y:es::.
30 C011:   yeah [ me ] personal ca:re.=
31 E07:         [yep.]                  =yes:.
32 C011:   ohk[a y.    ]
33 E07:       [tch=ohk]a:y?
34 C011:   now I've not had Gwen before then so what- what
35         is she lihke?
36             (0.2)
37 E07:    she's lo:vely.
     ((14 lines omitted; talk about Gwen))
52 E07:    .tchht [oh]khay?
53 C011:          [mm]
54 C011:   yea[  h.  =  L a ]ura, (0.3) ah w:hy is it that we
55 E07:       [.tchh alrigh-]
56 C011:   keep gettin:g (.) diff'rent and n:ew ca:rers thet
57         we haven't had before.=is IT the new poliCY?
```

In the above data fragment, the client initiates repair at the first transition-relevance place following the employee's production of a recognitional person reference to a replacement care worker (*Gwen*, line 15). She initiates repair using a category-constrained interrogative (*who*, line 17). The source of trouble is more precisely located by post-framing the categorical pronoun with a repeat of the third person singular present indicative *ihs?* (line 17); a word that was contracted with the person reference in the trouble-source turn. In instances like these the source of trouble is

further located by the incorporation of a partial repeat known as a 'positioned category-constrained interrogative'[65]. This repair initiator displays that the client identified that a reference to a person was (or should have been) made, but that she is having some sort of trouble with that reference.

As I discussed above, one possibility is that the client was able to determine that a person reference was (or should have been) used, but that she could not hear enough of the reference to determine the referent. The employee's trouble-source turn contains two turn-constructional units: the first responding to the client's prior talk about her answering machine delivering her messages a day after they have been recorded (lines 14-15); the second initiating a new sequence to inform the client of a replacement care worker (line 15). Following the first turn-constructional unit, at which transition to another speaker is a relevant possibility, both parties near simultaneously take a turn at talk. The client, in responding to the employee's sympathising with her plight, comes to be talking at the precise time that the employee produces the name of her replacement care worker. It is a possibility, then, that the client has not clearly heard the pronunciation of the care worker's name (although C. Goodwin, 1986, has shown that parties can simultaneously talk and listen in conversation).

Whether or not it is the case that the client has heard the employee's pronunciation of *Gwen*, it can subsequently be observed that the employee treats the client's repair initiation as indicating a possible problem with the suitability (rather than the audibility) of the reference form used. Rather than repeating just the troublesome reference term – this would again assert acquaintance, as well as displaying an understanding that the trouble was one of hearing – the employee now introduces the

---

[65] As with 'category constrained interrogatives,' this term is also taken from Schegloff's lectures at the University of California in Los Angeles (Kitzinger, personal communication) and had been earlier discussed by Sacks in a lecture that he gave in 1967 (published in 1992: vol 1, pp 722-729). A related but somewhat different phenomenon, involving a repeat of the person reference form and a *wh*-question, was studied by Sacks in his 1967 lecture and also, with German conversational materials, by Auer (1984: 630-635). This research shows how turns like *wer is Lobkovitz* (*who is Lobkovitz*) or *who's Wayne Morse*, when made following turns containing recognitional reference forms, reveals that form was inappositely used.

client to the referent with a non-recognitional person description (*e:r her name's Gwen:.*, line 18), displaying an understanding that the client may not be acquainted with Gwen.

In this fragment there is further evidence of the apparently inappropriately designed recognitional person reference when the client informs the employee *now I've not had Gwen before then*, and immediately asks *so what- what is she lihke?*[66] (lines 34-35). This is a further demonstration of the employee's inapposite indexing of an acquaintance between Gwen and the client with a recognitional reference form, and that a category-constrained interrogative was also sufficient in initiating repair on that reference form. It can be observed how, in response to the repair initiation the employee modified, rather than simply repeated, the trouble-source turn. In so doing, she demonstrates that she too took the problem to be one of appropriateness, rather than of hearing.

Although category-constrained interrogatives can yield self-repairs of reference forms, this is not always the case. In the following data fragment, the employee merely repeats the trouble-source turn and, in so doing, reasserts an acquaintance between the client and her care worker.

```
(6.17) [CHC102, 0:04-0:20]
01 E04:   .hhh A:lan w- we have Tr:acey that c'n come and
02        see you t'morrow.
03           (.)
04 C031:  ew:?
05 E04:   Tr:acey.
06           (0.4)
07 C031:  O::H I: know Tra:cey. y[eah that's fi:n]e.
08 E04:                          [ ye:ah.   .hhh ]
09 E04:   a:lright=now she'll probly be: the::h ab- (0.3)
10        r::ound abo:uht: u::hm: (0.5) quarter to twelve
11        oh'clo:ck.
12           (0.5)
13 E04:   oh[k a : y ?   ]
14 C031:    [that's al:ri]ght yeah.
```

As with the previous instance, the client here responds to a turn containing a person reference (*Tr:acey*, line 1) with a category-constrained interrogative (*ew:?*, line 4), displaying that he understands that a person reference was (or should have been) made and that he has some sort of trouble with that reference. By only repeating the reference term (*Tr:acey.*, line 5) the employee's response, unlike in the previous instance, treats the client's trouble as one of hearing rather than of suitability. The client's subsequent response, however, indicates that this may have been an inappropriate treatment. The client's first move is not to reply at all (line 6), indicating a possible upcoming dispreferred response (Pomerantz, 1984). He then displays to the employee – and to us as his analytic audience – that his actual trouble was one of delayed recognition. His 'change-of-state' token (Heritage, 1984) *O::H* (line 7) and assertion of acquaintance displays that he previously had trouble identifying Tracey. This accounts for why he used a category-constrained interrogative at line 5. It appears that he designed that interrogative not to convey a problem of hearing but rather one of suitability. But as he now displays, the production of that repair initiator was predicated on his delayed recognition of Tracey as someone with whom he is actually acquainted. So again, the use of category-constrained interrogatives can be observed as displaying a problem with the suitability of a person reference form that has been used in a prior turn.

Although category-constrained interrogatives can convey problems of suitability, this need not necessarily be the case. In the following data fragment (and in other instances reproduced in Schegloff et al., 1977: 367-368) the source of trouble is treated as one of hearing, and no other type of problem is ever made manifest in the talk.

```
(6.18) [SBL:2:1:8:5 (Schegloff et al., 1977: 368)]
01 Bea:    Was last night the first time you met Missiz
02         Kelly?
03             (1.0)
04 Marge: Met whom?
05 Bea:    Missiz Kelly,
06 Marge: Yes.
```

Like the first instance considered for this section, Marge delays answering Bea's question by initiating repair. She does this with a positioned category-constrained interrogative (*met whom?*, line 4). Once Bea has provided a repair solution, by

repeating the source of trouble and thereby displaying an understanding that the trouble was with hearing, Marge provides an answer to Bea's initial question, displaying that the source of trouble has been adequately addressed. For both parties, this repair initiator was treated as indicating a problem of hearing.

Drew (1997) shows how repair initiators (specifically, 'open' class repair initiators) can be (but are not necessarily; see also Schegloff, 2004) produced in particular sequential positions that can indicate to participants that the problem with a prior turn may relate to its appropriateness. Drew identifies two forms of inappropriateness: turns that do not appear to connect referentially to the prior turn, and turns which, while topically connective, turn out to be an inapposite pragmatic response. Simmons (2010) has additionally shown how more targeted repair initiators, like candidate understandings and understanding checks, can be premonitory indicators of a recipient's trouble with the appropriateness of a prior turn. Using recorded cognitive behavioural therapeutic interactions, she shows how clients can use these repair initiators as a first move to resist their therapist's advice. Pomerantz (1984: 71) also shows how repair initiators, including partial repeats, can generally precede disagreement (see also Schegloff, 2007c: 100-106). Here, category-constrained or positioned category-constrained interrogatives can be (but are not necessarily) taken to indicate that a recipient is having a problem with a particular aspect of a prior turn. These repair forms, by being constrained to the category of people, can be taken as indicating a putative problem with the person reference form that has been used.

That category-constrained interrogatives can be treated as indicating a problem with either hearing or appropriateness is particularly relevant in the following instance. In it, the repair initiator is responded to in a way that could address either a problem with hearing or appropriateness.

```
(6.19) [CHC268, 0:00-0:18]
01 E06:   .hh hello Si:mon. it's Kathy. [ringing h]ere.
02 C095:                                [  ye:ah,  ]
03 E06:   nah-hah=the gi:rls in the office have had Kate
04         and I tho:roughly confu:sed, .h[h h h      ] but
05 C095:                                  [£ye:aheh.£]
06 E06:   we have discovered thet Mandy Frew will be coming
07         into you: tomorrow mo:rning,
08 C095:  ew:,
09 E06:   M:a:ndy?
10 C095:  Ma:ndy.
```

```
11 E06:    Ma:ndy.
12 C095:   a:lrigh[t then. ]
13 E06:          [tch he:r] na:me is.=>I think< she's bee:n
14         there befo[:re.=so you'll] probably
15 C095:            [ y e : a h. ]
16 E06:    recogni[se her=.hhhh] and it'll be at the s:a:me
17 C095:          [ pro:bably. ]
18 E06:    ti:me as you no:rmally have.=
19 C095:                            =ri:ght↓oh.
```

The client's repair initator (*ew:,* line 8) is responded to by the employee with a try-marked repeat of the care worker's given name (*M:a:ndy?*, line 9). The client's repeat of this name at line 10 receipts the information but does not display recognition of the referent. Once the client has agreed to this modification but still without displaying recognition (at line 12), the employee recompletes her prior turn in a way that creates a reference that is very similar to the non-recognitional references that have been considered. Taking out the client's interpolated response, the employee's reference at line 11 and 13 takes the form of *Ma:ndy. tch he:r na:me is.* Having downgraded her reference form in this way, the employee then launches an incidental sequence (Schegloff, 2007c) to assert that the care worker and the client should be acquainted. I will consider these incidental sequences in greater detail in Chapter 7. What is relevant to present considerations, however, is that category-constrained interrogatives that initiate repair following person references can be treated as possibly indicating a trouble with either hearing or appropriateness.

My observations here make two key contributions. First, they are evidence that participants can be interested in maintaining a socially-shared nexus of acquaintances in interaction. In addition to correction, recipients can also initiate repair on inapposite reference forms. Second, my observations extend existing research on repair, by showing how category-constrained repair initiators can be taken to deal with problems of appropriateness[67]. These repair initiators are different to acquaintance queries, in

---

[67] The types of inappropriateness that I considered here (that is, the inapposite deployment of either recognitional or non-recognitional reference forms) does not constitute an exhaustive consideration of such problems. Levinson (2007) considers category-constrained interrogatives that follow person reference use on Rossel Island (in Papua New Guinea), an enclosed culture of 4,000 people where, in principle, everyone is known to one another. The use of category-constrained interrogatives in this context typically follows a recognitional reference form that turns out to not be correctly designed with its recipient in mind. As it is unlikely that the recognitional reference will need to be downgraded to a non-recognitional (as everyone should be known to one another), the form will need to be altered in

168

that category-constrained interrogatives claim some necessary problem with the prior turn. However, unlike acquaintance queries, these forms can be taken to indicate one or two potential problems: hearing or understanding. Whereas corrections claim necessary and specified sources of trouble (an error), and other-initiated repair necessary and relatively-specified sources of trouble (of hearing or understanding), acquaintance queries do not make the same sort of commitment to there necessarily being a source of trouble. The existence of multiple possible repair operations that can be produced to deal with possibly inapposite reference forms is an indication of how the production of repair is a context-sensitive operation.

6.2.5 Self-initiated repair of reference forms

I have shown above how recipients can address the design of person references, in order either to upgrade non-recognitional descriptions or to downgrade recognitional references. I have shown how both recognitional and non-recognitional forms can be corrected, and how other-initiated repair types like acquaintance queries and category-constrained interrogatives can be used to initiate a possible downgrade of recognitional reference forms. Given that there are a range of resources that are available to recipients to address troubles with person reference forms, it is not surprising to find that speakers can use self-repair to address ostensibly inapposite person references (Schegloff et al., 1977). That is, having produced one reference form, a speaker can self-initiate repair in order to change that form, as in the following data fragment.

```
(6.20) [CHC074, 0:02-0:15]
01 E01:    .hh u:hm tch (0.2) in the mo::rnin:g co::s Penny's
02         working in the:: (0.2) ohfi?c::e
03 C021:   ye:[ah.]
04 E01:       [.hh]
05            (.)
06 E01:    for a whi::le u:m tch (0.4) Linda'll come. >a
07         girl c'l'd Linda.< bu' it'll be eight o'clock.
08            [ . h h ]
```

some way to accomplish recognition. Levinson identifies three general patterns. Kin terms typically get repaired with names. Recognitional descriptions tend to get repaired with kin terms. Finally, 'zero' references (that is, the use of inflected predicates) typically get repaired with names.

```
09 C021:  [that'll b]e [fi:ne.]
```

In the course of informing her client of a substitute for the client's usual care worker Penny, and having brought to completion a turn-constructional unit containing a reference to the replacement care worker, the employee initiates, in transition space (cf. Sacks et al., 1974; Schegloff et al., 1977), a repair on the reference form that she has just used. The referent *Linda* remains the same, but she has moved to respecify that referent within a non-recognitional person description. This fragment shows how speakers can be attentive, in real time, to the preference for producing recipient-designed person references. Along with try-marking (Sacks & Schegloff, 1979), this is a speaker's resource for maintaining a socially-shared and intersubjective nexus of acquaintances. Other researchers, including Auer (1984), Clark and Wilkes-Gibbs (1986: 4; 21-23), Schegloff (2007c: 237-244), Mazeland (2007), and Svennevig (2010), explore further resources that speakers have available to them to pre-empt potential problems with a reference form that they have used. In the next chapter, I will explore how the use of one resource, what Schegloff calls an 'incidental sequence' (2007c: 237-244), generates a source of trouble for the participants to an interaction.

6.3   Person-reference, indexing acquaintance and the maintenance of a socially-shared nexus of acquaintances

From the outset of conversation analytic research, it has been known that errors can occur in talk-in-interaction without being corrected (Schegloff et al., 1977). This means that it is entirely plausible that there are errors in person reference within the CHC data corpus that don't get remarked upon. In fact, Schegloff, Jefferson and Sacks claim that this is the most likely outcome. They write,

> *"When the hearing/understanding of a turn is adequate to the production of a correction by 'other', it is adequate to allow production of a sequentially appropriate next turn. Under that circumstance, the turn's recipient ('other') should produce the next turn, not the correction (and, overwhelmingly, that is what is done)"* (1977: 380).

While it is not clear to me how evidence could be located in every instance where there is an error that goes uncorrected, it is known that there are at least *some* instances where erroneous person references are made without being corrected (Jefferson, 2007: 450-452; Kitzinger, 2006; Land & Kitzinger, 2005: 391-396). However, it can also be observed, in the CHC data corpus, that there are instances where an inappositely designed person reference *is* repaired by a recipient. This shows that while person references are usually formulated as a part of a larger activity, there are occasions where recipients deem it worthwhile to suspend the onward progressivity of their sequence of conversation in order to address an ostensible problem with the reference form that was used.

The reference forms examined in this chapter are evidence for the preference for recipient design in formulating person references. There are normative functions of reference forms that both speakers and recipients can understand as indexing either acquaintance or unacquaintance. Following Sacks and Schegloff (1979), I have referred to these forms as 'recognitional' and 'non-recognitional' references respectively. In the CHC data corpus, as with other studies of referring in English-speaking cultures like those found in the United States and the United Kingdom, recognitional references are routinely accomplished through the use of a bare name. Non-recognitional references, in the CHC data corpus, are overwhelmingly accomplished with a description comprising of an indefinite noun phrase (such as *a lady*), followed by a definite relative clause that specifies the referent (such as *called Kerry*). Given that the use of either form typically leads to a progress of some broader sequence of action, it appears as though these forms are usually productive for the participants involved.

This brings me to the instances where person references are succeeded by some initiation or repair. As I have already argued, and as is supported by previous research, the very presence of an error in conversation does not necessarily lead to its repair. Repair, then, is initiated in order to accomplish some action. In the CHC calls that I have been considering, however, repairing a reference to a person appears to have little relevance to the broader action of modifying a service arrangement.

That people do address inapposite references reveals two predominant features of references to people in talk-in-interaction. First, there are normative functions of

references forms that typically allow for the construction of a reference to suit a recipient. That these references are sometimes exposed as inapposite is evidence that presumptions about acquaintance are usually productive (see Land & Kitzinger, 2005, for a discussion of how the heterosexist presumption is also usually productive in the design of references to third parties). Second, that people do address inappositely designed person references also reveals the importance, *for participants*, of maintaining a socially-shared nexus of acquaintances. Participants will initiate repair sequences in order to upgrade non-recognitional or to downgrade recognitional person references. Although it might not be possible to identify how often these inappositely designed person references get repaired (because it is not always possible for analysts to determine where a potential error has occurred), it can nonetheless be appreciated that this undertaking can be important for some participants on some occasions. What is of importance seems to be conveying to an interlocutor the state of acquaintance between the recipient of the person reference and the referent. Along with the use of recognitional and non-recognitional reference forms, attempts to upgrade or downgrade these forms contribute to an ongoing attempt, in interaction, to maintain a nexus of acquaintances that is shared between the parties to that interaction.

Previous research has hinted at the potential relevance to participants of designing reference forms to suit a recipient. In her study of proper names as a referential option in English conversation, Downing concludes,

> *"…the choice of one particular proper name from a pool containing others (e.g.* Andy *vs.* Andrew *vs.* Andrew Holmes-Watson *…) is likely to serve as a useful indicator of the speaker's assessment of the social network that encompasses the speaker, the hearer, the referent, and possibly also various other auditors and overhearers"* (1996: 153).

Where a speaker apparently fails to produce a reference form that is appropriately designed for its recipient, Schegloff (1996b: 478-479) briefly shows how recipients can initiate repair to upgrade or downgrade these inapposite forms. Levinson (2007) has since focused on repairs specifically following recognitional person references. In focusing here on repairs following both recognitional and non-recognitional

172

references, my aim has been to develop and extend existing studies on the repair of person reference forms. In showing how repairs of *non-recognitional* references consistently *upgrade* a recipient's presumed *unacquaintance* with the referent, and that repairs of *recognitional* references conversely *downgrade* a presumed *acquaintance*, the evidence that I have provided here points to the apparent importance to at least some participants of maintaining a socially-shared nexus of acquaintances in conversation.

Furthermore, my research suggests that there may be an asymmetrical distribution of resources available to a recipient following an apparently inapposite person reference form. Recipients of inapposite recognitional references in the CHC data corpus produce a range of repair types in order to address potential or actual problems with those forms. These include corrections, acquaintance queries, and category-constrained interrogatives. Alternatively, recipients of inapposite non-recognitional descriptions in the CHC data corpus only produce corrections to deal with the problematic reference form. This may reflect the confidence that underpins corrections or non-recognitional descriptions; a confidence that is not necessarily a prerequisite for initiating repair on recognitional references. A recipient may not recognise a referent that has been referred to with a recognitional reference, but this failure of recognition could be due to a lapse in memory, rather than an inability on the part of a speaker to formulate a reference that is suitable for their recipient. A range of repair resources, then, enables recipients to deal with troublesome recognitional references without necessarily having to claim a problem with the reference form that has been used. Conversely, if a non-recognitional description has been used and a recipient appraises that they are acquainted with the referent, they may have a greater confidence that the source of trouble is the speaker's design of the reference and not their (that is, the recipient's) reception of it. If this analysis holds, this would mean that recipients are not considering the possibility that there might be multiple possible and relevant referents that have the same name (a possibility that is raised by the employee in fragment 6.08). This matter requires further consideration.

In the next chapter, I sustain my focus on both remote proposals and troubles associated with person references, by conducting a case study of a relatively extended instance of trouble, involving references to third parties, that occurs within a remote

proposal sequence. I will again be interested to examine how repair is used to address this source of trouble, but will come to find that, in this instance, the source of trouble comes to be resolved outside of the repair space is structurally provided for in talk-in-interaction. I describe the method of resolving the source of trouble as a 'post-possible-completion account,' and discuss how this phenomenon can enable an appreciation of how repair may be a resource for addressing sources of trouble within the sequence of their production.

Chapter 7

Case study of trouble when making an arrangement

The telephone-based interactions between clients and employees of the Community and Home Care (CHC) service organisations that were recorded for this study usually go smoothly. Among other things, clients are coherently informed of future arrangements, and references to replacement care workers are correctly designed with their recipients in mind. In short, there are very few instances of sustained problems within the CHC data corpus. However, because of the potential impact that such problems may have for participants, they warrant some analytic attention. As with the examination of person-reference in Chapter 6, the analysis within the chapter relates to phenomena that extend beyond the remote proposal sequences that were considered in Chapters 4 and 5. It is included here in order to highlight the myriad considerations to which participants can attend to in making arrangements with one another.

Judgements about competence are an ever-present threat for both clients and employees of CHC services and constitute a relevant possible outcome of problematic encounters. If clients start to question the professional competence of employees, they may become dissatisfied with the service. Conversely, if employees start to suspect the mental competence of a client, this could have implications for the very future of that person as a client of the service and, by extension, their ability to continue living in their own home and community.

The problematic interaction I have selected to discuss in detail here seems brief. For around 32 seconds the client and employee are discussing what turns out to be different services, without realising it. The interaction that occurs within this brief period of time, however, is complex. The parties make mutually exclusive claims, which do not end up being entirely reconciled within the sequence of their genesis. Then, just as it seems as though there will be no satisfactory resolution to the matter, one party exposes a misunderstanding. This sequential trajectory is so rare that only one instance has been previously described in the published literature. It is an instance

of what can happen when the usual defences of intersubjectivity, namely repair, do not get utilised or fail to resolve a source of trouble.

Moreover, problems like the one considered in this chapter are particularly relevant to institutional concerns because they result in a temporary delay in the broader action that is underway. In this instance, this broader action is the principal institutional goal of the call: a remote proposal for a service arrangement. Because this is the very purpose of the call, there is a tension between addressing the problem and returning to the broader proposal that is underway. I will therefore use an examination of this instance from the CHC corpus to highlight some important practical implications for CHC service, as well as describing empirical contributions to conversation analysis (cf. Chapter 8).

7.1 Background to the source of trouble

It will be necessary to consider the complexities of this interaction on a moment-by-moment basis. For this reason, I have split the call up into fragments of transcribed data, in order to consider small portions of the call in succession. The interested reader can find a complete transcript of this call in Appendix E.

The source of trouble in this call does not become apparent to the participants and, by extension, to analysts, until near to the termination of the interaction. Using this evidence as a basis, I have been able to retrospectively determine, after the event, that the basis for the trouble is established around 45 seconds earlier into the call. It is for this reason that I begin our examination of the interaction from there. The following fragment comes after the call opening and the ethics exchange that was necessary to gain the client's informed consent to participate in the study.

```
(7.01) [CHC060(a), 0:12-0:33]
01 E04:   .hhh u::m tch and I'm >just ringin' just to let you
02        know< of course u::m (.) Kathleen's still off.
03        khhh!.hh now it's gonna be Mandy but the girls have
04        put it in at one o'clock is that a problem for you¿
05            (0.6)
06 C018:  it's a bit late but it doesn't mattah.
07            (.)
08 E04:   you shure you don't mind?
09            (0.2)
```

```
10 E04:   I know i- I know it's an inconvenience and thank
11        you for that and I think Kathleen should be back
12        pretty soon. .hhh-.hh
13           (0.4)
14 E04:   so thank you very much for tha:t.
```

In brief, the reason for the call is outlined by the employee at line 1 as an informing that Kathleen, the usual care worker for the client's grocery service, will be replaced for the next service by a care worker called Mandy, and that she will come at a different time. Notwithstanding the apparent inconvenience of this proposal (foreshadowed in the employee's first turn across lines 1-4, displayed in the client's response at line 6, and then explicitly acknowledged by the employee in her second turn at line 8), the sequence is treated by the employee as complete by line 14. She then launches what turns out to be a second remote proposal, in order to make another service arrangement.

There are two related points to keep in mind about this first fragment of the conversation. The first is that the two parties have been discussing one particular service arrangement and are now about to move on to another. Further into the call (fragment 7.08) it becomes evident that this first service arrangement is for grocery shopping. It is never exposed, within the context of this conversation, what the second service is for[68]. In order to ensure clarity, I will refer to the first arrangement as relating to the 'grocery service' and the second as relating to 'service B.' The second, and related, point is that eventually it becomes apparent that the client has in some way not realised (either entirely or at all) that the employee has moved on to discuss a second arrangement. This lack of realisation will create the conditions under which the two parties come to make mutually exclusive claims about a purportedly singe event that, in fact, turn out to be unrelated.

---

[68] Although the nature of the second service arrangement is never referred to in this conversation and therefore made available to an analytic audience, I take it, following Schegloff (1997a: 520), that both parties to the interaction have a shared understanding of what this service is for (e.g., cleaning, cooking, personal care, or some other type of service). That is, an understanding of what services particular care workers perform is likely to depend upon latent knowledge that participants do not necessarily need to display to one another and that analysts cannot, therefore, systematically get access to.

This brings us to the moment where the employee moves from talking about the first service arrangement to a second.

```
(7.02) [CHC060(b), 0:31-0:52]
14 E04:   so thank you very much for tha:t. .hh u::m and
15        Cindy's still off as we:ll so u:m (0.2) she's
16        >gonna be off< for a little bit.=did I tell you
17        that she'd broken 'er 'er wrist? .hhhh
18            (.)
19 C018:  yes:.
20 E04:   yep.=>I'm just [tryin' to< ((rustling paper)) s]=
21 C018:                 [      (g i v e    m y)        ]
22 E04:   =ee:, (0.4) while I've got you who it is [ com]ing.
23 C018:                                           [give]
24        [my bes]t wishes onto her. >if yo[u e]ver< (.)
25 E04:   [ .hhh ]                          [y- ]
26 C018:  t[alk-]
27 E04:    [ y e]:ah. thank you we'll give her a ca:ll.=yeah
28        it's going to be: uh E:mma again on: (.) Thu:rsday,
```

The employee's second informing is produced as a continuation of her first by associating Cindy's period of absence with Kathleen's prolonged absence. The employee had earlier indicated that Kathleen is *still off.* (line 2), and she now reminds the client that _Cindy's still off as we:ll_ (line 15). The client treats this as an afterword to the grocery arrangement and offers his best wishes for Cindy[69]. As it turns out (on lines 27-28), this reminder of an ongoing occurrence is used by the employee as an explanation of the consequential necessity of making another arrangement, and as the basis for a second remote proposal (cf. §4.4.1 on the pragmatic accomplishment made by informing of a consequential occurrence).

---

[69] As shall be observed towards the end of the call, at some point the client lost track of which service the employee was referring to. It may be at this point, as he hears the employee's talk at lines 15-17 as nothing more than a reminder of Cindy's absence and an account of that absence, that he loses track of which service is being referred to. This could indicate one utility of the outliners that are often found near call openings (cf. §4.2.2). Sacks observed in a lecture given in 1970 (published in 1992: Vol 2, pp 169-170) that reason-for-call devices appear to work against a recipient *not* realising the status of an utterance. In this particular fragment of data, the employee's segue, or pivoting, from one arrangement, which involved talk about a care worker's continued absence, to talk about another care worker's continued absence, may not be a clear initiation of another arrangement *for the client*.

7.2 Making mutually exclusive claims: An informing and counter-informing

The client's acceptance of the second arrangement comes to be significantly delayed. While the informing *it's going to be: uh E:mma again on: (.) Thu:rsday,* (lines 27-28; a base first pair part; cf. Schegloff, 2007c: 26-27) makes an accepting response relevant (cf. §5.2), the employee here expands her turn by latching on an incidental sequence (Schegloff, 2007c: 237-244) to solicit from the client confirmation of his acquaintance with Emma (*I think you had her l<u>a</u>st ti:me.*, line 29).

```
(7.03) [CHC060(c), 0:48-1:00]
28 E04:   =yeah it's going to be: uh E:mma again on: (.)
29        Thu:rsday,=I think you had her last ti:me. .mphh
30           (0.2)
31 E04:   a blonde lady. blondey coloured lady. .hhh hair I
32        mean. huh huh-huh! .hhh oka:y?
33 C018:  I had Suzanne.
```

This recognition solicit is a *second* first pair part. It is incidental to the sequence within which it is embedded because, as Schegloff (2007c) writes of incidental sequences, although they occur *within* a sequence, they are not *of* that sequence[70]. If the employee's attempt here to secure the client's recognition of Emma were successful, this recognition alone would not be sufficient to forward the action of her base first

---

[70] Jefferson (1981b) shows how turn recompletions can be used to address reference troubles in conversation *without* launching a new sequence. The following is an example:

```
(7.04) [W:PC:1:(1):41 (Jefferson, 1981b: 80)]
01 Kat:  We went (.) to: uh:m: (0.2) .tch .hh (0.6) the: uh
02       Schooner at (.) Newtonworth Sca:les.
03          (0.2)
04 Nan:  Ehh::[m::
05 Kat:       [Out the:re.
06 Nan:  .t .hh[h
07 Kat:        [Like the other si:de of Ki:rkham.
08          (0.2)
09 Nan:  yEhh::m:: .t I'm just trying to pla:ce it.
```

At line 4, Nan shows some (delayed) hesitation at recognising the place that Katie has referred to. In response to this, Katie recompletes her prior turn (at line 5). This also occasions a delayed response from Nan, in response to which Katie again recompletes her turn (at line 7). Retrospectively, her turn is *we went to uhm the Schooner at Newtonworth Scales out there, like the other side of Kirkham*. It only came to take this form because of Nan's hesitation at recognising Newtonworth Scales. Yet unlike incidental sequences, which occasion an insert sequence, Katie's turn recompletions here do not waver from the course of the base sequence: a telling.

pair part. It would still be necessary for the client to respond to the employee's informing.

These two first pair parts in the employee's turn at lines 28-29 have an ongoing relevance to the sequential unfolding of the conversation. As shorthand, I will refer to any turn-constructional unit that relates to the first (base) first pair part (the informing) as belonging to the 'base sequence' (cf. Schegloff, 2007c: 26-27). Any turn-constructional unit belonging to the second first pair part (the recognition solicit) will be referred to as belonging to the 'incidental sequence.'

Having both informed the client that Emma will be coming, and then having incidentally solicited his recognition of her on the basis of a previous encounter, the employee brings her turn to possible completion, with final falling intonation on *ti:me.* (line 29). At a point where it is relevant for the client to respond (cf. Sacks et al., 1974), he instead remains silent at line 30. In response to this silence, the employee elects to continue talking, expanding upon and pursuing the incidental sequence. In this pursuit, she contributes more information to bolster the possible resources available to the client to recognise the substitute care worker. She appears to treat the gap in the conversation as evidence that the client has not successfully identified Emma as someone that he knows, and so proceeds to provide additional information to aid that recognition (*A blonde lady. blondey coloured lady. .hhh hair I mean.*, line 31)[71].

When the client finally does speak, he does so not produce the recognition that the employee has been soliciting, but rather to correct or to counter-inform her (cf. Heritage, 1984; Jefferson, 1987; Robinson, 2009) that the care worker he last had was Suzanne. In saying *I had Suzanne* (line 33), the client contests the employee's claim of who came 'last time.' At this point in the interaction, both parties have made different and mutually exclusive claims about the same event: the employee claims that Emma came to visit the client 'last time'; the client claims that it was Suzanne. What might

---

[71] The production of the employee's recognition solicit generates a source of trouble. Her repair on *a blonde lady*, presumably so as to avoid the implication that Emma's hair is a vibrant blonde colour, leads to the trouble-source formulation *blondey coloured lady.*, which is itself repaired with *hair I mean.* Lerner, Kitzinger and Raymond (2009) have analysed this particular instance, and others, as cascading troubles within repair.

have been a routine incidental sequence to secure recognition of a care worker now needs to be expanded upon, given that the parties to this conversation have made mutually exclusive claims about an event that is referred to within it. As I will now highlight, addressing this difference delays the progressivity of the base sequence to which it is incidental.

```
(7.05) [CHC060(d), 0:59-1:04]
33 C018:  I had Suzanne.
34            (0.4)
35 E04:   °e-°
36            (0.2)
37 E04:   pard'n?
38            (.)
39 C018:  Suza:nne.
40 E04:   did you have Suzanne,
41 C018:  yes.
42 E04:   oh okay.
```

The client's response to the employee's recognition-solicit turn is not to claim (or deny) any recognition of Emma, but instead to challenge a presupposition embedded within it – that he had *Emma* last time. His challenge takes the form of a counter-informing, *I had Suzanne.* (line 33), and with its production, there are two mutually exclusive claims that have to be addressed. However, the client's minimal and unembellished counter-informing does nothing to assist the employee to resolve their difference. At this point it appears that she does not understand how she has been misunderstood by the client, nor even whether she has been misunderstood at all. As she cannot identify how her turn might have been a source of trouble, she instead treats the client's turn as in need of repair (cf. Schegloff, 1992b).

Schegloff (1987a) speculates that there are mechanisms that enable parties to an interaction to circumvent the initiation of disagreement and, for this reason, repair can be thought of as a defence of intersubjectivity in interaction (Schegloff, 1992b). What can be observed in this instance is how this practice works. Rather than making a direct challenge to the client's claim, the employee produces two successive repair initiations on the client's counter-informing turn – first, the 'open' class repair initiator (Drew, 1997) *pard'n?* (line 37), and then the understanding check *did you have Suzanne,* (line 40).

Multiple other-initiations of repair are found when a first instance does not achieve an adequate repair solution, and each successive repair initiation is typically (as here) in a

format that is stronger than in preceding attempts (Schegloff, 2000; Schegloff et al., 1977). The employee's first repair initiation (*pard'n?*, line 37) claims some problem with the entire preceding turn. Although this repair initiation could relate to a problem of hearing, Drew (1997) also shows how these 'open' class initiators can also occur in particular sequential positions that can indicate to participants that the problem with a prior turn may actually relate to its appropriateness (see also §6.2.4 for a related line of analysis). In this case, the client is contradicting the employee's claim, but he does so without providing her with evidence that might enable her to understand why he is doing so. In this sequential context, the employee's open-class repair initiator is an opportunity for the client to specify the basis for his counter-informing (see also Robinson, 2009; Svennevig, 2008). However, the client's response (*Suza:nne.*, line 39) does not attend to any possible broader problems of comprehension.

The employee's second repair initiation is more specified, providing another opportunity for the client either to account for, or back away from, his claim of who came 'last time' (Robinson, 2009; Svennevig, 2008). However, his response is simply to confirm the employee's understanding check (*yes.*, line 41). Yet again, no reconciliatory information is made available.

With her attempts at repair having failed to gain clarification, the employee is in no better position either to accept the client's counter-informing, and resolve their difference, or to reject it and maintain their difference. In spite of this, she moves to accept the claim made in his counter-informing turn, with *oh okay.* (line 42); displaying a readiness to move their conversation in a new direction (cf. Schegloff, 2007c, on sequence closing thirds). It turns out, however, that the new direction is away from using repair but not entirely away from their different claims.

7.3 Sustaining mutually exclusive claims: Evidence and qualification

To this point in the interaction, there are two sequences still relevant in the conversation. The first, base sequence – the main action in which the employee is engaged – is her informing of an arrangement. This sequence has not yet been

182

responded to by the client. The second, incidental sequence, which has been the focus of the preceding talk, has been concerned with a presumption embedded within a recognition solicit: that Emma came 'last time.' The employee and the client have made mutually exclusive claims about who visited the client 'last time.' In the ensuing talk, we will hear the employee progressively downgrading the strength of the claims she makes. At the same time, however, the presence of a difference between the two parties continues to resonate across the talk, with the client consistently resisting whatever claim the employee makes.

At the beginning of her turn at line 42, having possibly closed down the incidental sequence with *oh okay.*, the employee is now in a position where she might return to the primary action in which she is otherwise engaged: a remote proposal to modify a service that would involve Emma coming to visit the client in place of Cindy. Rather, both parties produce evidence for what they have previously said.

```
(7.06) [CHC060(e), 1:03-1:13]
42 E04:   oh okay.=they've put Emma here I thought you'd had
43        her before. .hhhh
44           (0.6)
45 E04:   so is that o[k a]:y?
46 C018:              [Su-]
47 C018:  SUzanne >was the first< e:rm (0.4) I think it's
48        the first fortnight she's been working for you.
```

After apparently closing the incidental sequence (with *oh okay.*) and returning to the revised service arrangements (reporting – presumably on the basis of the schedule she's consulting – that *they've put Emma here* (line 42), that is, for the next visit[72]), the employee reverts to the concerns of the incidental sequence with *I thought you'd had her before.* (lines 42-43). This is a modified version of the original first pair part of the incidental sequence – *I think you had her last ti:me.* (line 27). Her epistemic qualifier *I think*, at line 29, which implied a contemporary belief, has been downgraded to *I*

---

[72] While it is possible that *here* (line 42) could refer either to the records of previous services or to a schedule of future services, the former possibility is unlikely. If the employee were referring to a record detailing which care workers visited the client for previous services she would not have needed to claim, with reference to her memory, *they've put Emma here I thought you'd had her before.* (lines 40-41), but could have rather asserted something like *they've put Emma down here as coming last Tuesday for your cleaning.* Her failure to provide such details as evidence suggests that she may not have them. Importantly, however, the equivocality over what *here* refers to could be relevant for the client.

thought, by line 42, thereby indexing a belief that was previously held and which she now claims may be mistaken. Her formulation of Emma's visit as having been *last ti:me.* (line 29) has also been downgraded to a more general *before.* (line 43). In response to having their assertions challenged, participants may downgrade components of their version and only assert that which they can adequately evidence (Pomerantz, 1984b). What can be observed at lines 42-43 is a downgraded claim about the client's acquaintance with Emma, but one that still pursues a response from the client; namely, his recognition of Emma. It is, then, a continuation of the incidental sequence, and the different claims contained within it, rather than a return to the base sequence.

If the client could accept the employee's modified claim – that he had been visited by Emma 'before,' if not specifically 'last time' – then their difference could then be resolved. He does not, however, select to take a turn at talk during the employee's inhaling at line 43 and, following this, a gap emerges in the talk at line 44. This creates another impasse. The employee has reasserted the (qualified) claims of her incidental sequence and, just as occurred following the employee's claim at line 30, the client has not responded to them.

At this point, the employee moves to sidestep the problem of their mutually exclusive claims. Her utterance *so is that oka:y?* (line 45) is a return to the base sequence, and is concerned with pursuing acceptance of a remote proposal. However, at the point where the client is sequentially obligated to respond to the proposal (by either accepting or rejecting it), he instead persists in his focus on the different claims occasioned within the incidental sequence. He produces a piece of information about Suzanne which offers evidence for his claim (*Suzanne >was the first< e:rm (0.4) I think it's the first fortnight she's been working for you.*, lines 47-48). This means that at a point where the incidental sequence is abandoned by one party in an attempt to progress the base sequence, the other party persists in advancing his claim by continuing the incidental sequence.

By this point in the interaction, then, both participants have attempted to evidence or qualify claims that were initially produced as assertions. In the following turns, these resources continue to be used in relation to their different claims.

```
(7.07) [CHC060(f), 1:08-1:21]
47 C018:  SUzanne >was the first< e:rm (0.4) I think it's the
48        first fortnight she's been working for you.
49            (0.6)
50 E04:   o::h right. ohkay.
51            (0.7)
52 E04:   ˚yea:h.˚ >oh w'l< I'll look at thAt then but the- I
53        know they've put down here E:mma.
54            (.)
55 E04:   mph
56 C018:  eh ha-ha
57 E04:   is that alright?=
58 C018:                  =e:ither yes.
```

As with her response to the client's earlier counter-informing, the employee again responds at this point with a series of possible sequence-closing thirds across line 50 and at the beginning of line 52, apparently accepting the client's claim and displaying a readiness to move the conversation in a new direction. She then commits to investigating the apparent inconsistency that the client's information has revealed (*oh w'l I'll look at thAt then*, line 52), thereby deferring the complete resolution of their difference. The employee then reasserts her own evidence, prefacing it this time with a more committed epistemic qualifier 'I know' (*but the- I know they've put down here E:mma*, lines 52-53)[73]. Indeed, she suspends the progress of her turn at talk, in order to specifically insert that qualification. So while, on the one hand, the employee appears to accept the client's version, on the other hand the difference between them continues to resonate in the employee's use of evidence to support her claim.

What is particularly interesting by this point is what is no longer present in the recycling of claims. There is no longer any assertion that Emma has ever visited the client before, let alone 'last time.' Unable to counter the client's claim, which is apparently based upon his own direct experience, the employee appears to have ceded various points to him. Now, she asserts only what she knows from the records that she is apparently examining. Yet even the employee's minimal reassertion is responded to with a chuckle from the client (line 56). At a stage in the interaction

---

[73] Again, it is possible that *here* (line 53) could refer to records of previous services or the schedule for upcoming services. As argued earlier, I think that the latter is more likely. However, if the client hears it as a reference to the records of who had visited him in the past, then this is a direct challenge to his memory of the event. To accept the employee's version of events, then, would mean that the client is unable to remember who it was that visited him probably less than a fortnight before. This, then, could be treated as a challenge to the very soundness of his mind.

where the employee concedes that it is possible that her understanding may be flawed and in need of revision, the client's responsive commentary on her claim continues to make their mutually exclusive claims relevant to the conversation. According to Vuchinich's (1990) analysis of terminating disputes, the employee has offered a concession and the client should either accept that concession, or make a concession of his own, in order to ratify the termination of the dispute. The client's laughter does not produce either of these actions. Again, the effect of their mutually exclusive claims continues to resonate in their talk.

At this point, the employee again uses a response solicitation in an attempt to move out of the incidental sequence and return to the arrangement that was the goal of the base sequence (*is that alright?*, line 57). On this occasion, she is successful and the client agrees to the remote proposal. Yet even in doing so, he is able to keep their different claims relevant in the conversation by agreeing to have *either* Emma or Suzanne as the replacement care worker (line 58). Right to the close of the base sequence, the client agrees to the proposal but explicitly without accepting the employee's version of events. The client and the employee have failed to entirely resolve their mutually exclusive claims and the base sequence is brought to a close.

Unlike the employee, who progressively downgrades her claim and attempts to return to the base sequence, when the client produces an account for his claim of who came 'last time' (lines 47-48), he does so in order to continue the incidental sequence and sustain their different claims as a topic for the conversation. Right to the point where the employee begins to close and shift the topic (line 60), there is no compromise from the client over any aspect of his claim. It seems, at this point in the interaction, that discussion about the different claims will be abandoned or deferred, rather than resolved.

7.4 Resolving mutually exclusive claims: A post-possible-completion account

The difference between the parties that I have been discussing never gets resolved in the sequence within which it is occasioned. As in Goodwin's (1990) study of arguments

between children, this difference ends, even if it has not been resolved, when the parties end the sequence containing it to start a new one. As I shall show, it is only as the employee is closing down the base sequence and moving towards a new action, that the client accounts for the misunderstanding that created the *conditions* for the parties to make mutually exclusive claims, when in fact there was never an actual *basis* for this to be the case. The client's revelation of why there were different versions apparently comes out of nowhere. It also occurs outside of the repair space that is so often the means by which intersubjectivity is defended in conversation. Given that conversation analysts have never systematically examined how a source of trouble can be addressed in this position (but see Schegloff, 1992b, pp. 1334-1337 for a brief consideration of a single instance), it warrants a close examination. This focal utterance is transcribed in boldface.

```
(7.08) [CHC060(g), 1:19-1:39]
57 E04:   is that alright?=
58 C018:              =e:ither yes.
59        (.)
60 E04:   ohkay. thank you. [ ~.h]-.h-.hhh.h~ thank you an:'=
61 C018:                    [(bh)]
62 E04:   =[ e:rm ]
63 C018:  =[oh I t]hought you was talkin' about the grocery.
64        (.)
65 E04:   yeh-=oh no that's going to be Mandy. who you
66        know.=you've met Mandy:- she's the one that does
67        lots of relief work. you'll know her pretty well
68        when you see her¿ .mphh=
69 C018:                    =mm hm.
70 E04:   alri:p?
71        (0.4)
72 C018:  yep.
73 E04:   ˚okay˚. thAnk you. see ya later. bye bye.
74        (.)
75 C018:  bye
76        (1.2)
77        ((call ends))
```

The base sequence is resolved and closed by midway through line 58. This also implicitly closes off the incidental sequence that was designed in its service and which resulted in mutually exclusive claims being made by the participants. Having closed these sequences, the employee launches a possible pre-closing sequence (Schegloff & Sacks, 1973), with *thank you an:'=e:rm* (lines 60-62). If it were not for what comes next, it is likely that this conversation would have shortly come to a close. However, rather than this, the client interrupts to reveal *oh I thought you was talkin' about the grocery.* (line 63). With this, he is able to account, outside of the sequence within

which they were occasioned, for the mutually exclusive claims that he and the employee have held with reference to who last came to visit him.

The client reveals that throughout the base sequence dealing with a replacement care worker for Cindy, which included the incidental sequence about his acquaintance with Emma, he had misunderstood the employee to be referring to his service for grocery shopping. His current claim reveals that he now understands that this must be at odds with what the employee was intending to refer to. His account explains how he could have reasonably: (1) produced a counter-informing; (2) persisted in maintaining his claim in response to the employee's multiple other-initiations of repair; (3) provided evidence in support of his claim; and (4) maintained his claim even as he produced his response to the base sequence within which the different claims were occasioned.

I have shown how, following the completion of a sequence containing different claims that do not get resolved, one party (the client) interrupts the other party's attempt to initiate a new sequence that accounts for how both parties came to speak as though they held incompatible claims. Like the post-completion musings that Schegloff (2007c: 142-148) discusses, this utterance relates to the preceding talk but without being an expansion on it. Yet unlike post-completion musings, the client's utterance does more than just reflect back on the sequence. Rather, it is a post-possible-completion account that specifies, for the benefit of all involved, how both parties could reasonably have acted in the way that they did.

The client's post-possible-completion account shares some features of fourth position repair (cf. Schegloff, 1992b, 2000). As with repair in that position, his account is an opportunity to "…formulate a proposed alternative understanding of an interlocutor's earlier utterance" (Schegloff, 2000: 211). The account itself also appears to share a similar format to fourth position repairs. From the limited number of instances that have been studied, these repair types typically get initiated with *oh*, a 'change-of-state token' (Heritage, 1984), followed by a proposed re-understanding of an earlier and misunderstood utterance made by an interlocutor. Once this re-understanding has been confirmed by the speaker of the troublesome utterance, it becomes possible for the party that initiated repair to produce a revised response to that utterance of which both parties now have a common understanding (Schegloff, 1992b, 2000).

188

Like many fourth position repairs, the client's turn at line 63 also contains a change-of-state token, followed by an account of a misunderstanding earlier in the talk. However, there are some crucial differences. Initiations of repair in fourth position re-characterise an interlocutor's trouble-source turn, but they do not necessarily account for the basis of the misunderstanding itself. The focus, rather, is on re-establishing sequential progressivity and enabling a revised response to a trouble-source turn. The client's turn is the exact opposite of this. He produces an account for the misunderstanding, but no re-characterisation of the trouble-source turn. This move does not seem preparatory to revising the overall outcome of the possibly completed sequence. Whether the client misunderstood which service was being referring to in the employee's incidental recognition solicit is ultimately inconsequential for his response to the base sequence. His move, then, appears to be less about re-establishing sequential progressivity, as in fourth position repair, than it is with preventing the perseverance of disjunct claims in the relationship.

Rather than commenting upon the basis of the client's misunderstanding, the employee instead produces a series of prompts about the substitute care worker for the grocery service, Mandy, for whom there was no previous trouble of recognition. Following the client's account of why he contradicted her claim that Emma came last time, the employee now appears to treat her earlier reference to Mandy as someone acquainted with the client (cf. Chapter 6) as equivocal. The client's failure to understand what was being referred to on one occasion may now be having consequences for the way the employee appraises his capacity to understand who she was referring to on a prior occasion.

Schegloff (1992b: 1334-1337) also examines a similar breakdown in intersubjectivity. Across two conversations on talkback radio in the late 1960s, the host and caller come to lose track of what the other is referring to. It turns out that one thinks they are talking about the Korean War, and the other, the Vietnam War, in a conversation about the involvement of the United Nations. Below is an abbreviated version of the transcript that appears in Schegloff's paper. Interested readers are recommended to consult the more expansive transcript, as well as the analysis that is contained there.

```
(7.09) [BC, Red 103-6 (Schegloff, 1992b: 1334-1335,
modified)]
01 Cal:   So if the Sie- uh South Vietnamese gov'mint doesn't
02        go along with ours. Then we just go uh say goodbye
03        'n we leave the shores.
04        [This's what- that['ll accomplish [(       ).
05 Hos:   [Ye-              [Uh,           [D'you have- D'you
06        remember a thing called "the Korean War."
07 Cal:   Oh yes.
    ((24 lines of talk about the Korean War omitted))
32 Cal:   Well yeh, Bu' that's not the conditions that prevail
33        now there [you know.
34 Hos:             [No bu' what I'm saying to you i:s, thet
35        if it got that m- ba:d, or it got necessary, our
36        primary concern, we have a concern for South
37        Vietnam's territorial integrity which is why we're
38        the:re. But our primary concern regarding our
39        personnel, any military commander has that primary
40        loyal[ty.
41 Cal:        [No? Are:n' we there because of U.N. uh –
42        doctrine?
43 Hos:   [No:::,
44 Cal:   [Aren't we there under the [the (      )-
45 Hos:                              [Where didju ever get
46        that cockeyed idea.
47 Cal:   Whaddya mea:n.
48 Hos:   U.N. doctrine.
49 Cal:   We're there, representin' the U. N. No?
50 Hos:   Wouldu- You go ask the U.N., you'll get laughed out.
51        No.
52 Cal:   We're there because- of our interests.
53 Hos:   [Yes.
    ((25 lines of debate about the role of the U.N. omitted))
79 Hos:   L'k you check it out. 'n call me.
80 Cal:   I'll do [so.
81 Hos:           [Okay?
82 Cal:   I certainly will.
83 Hos:   Mm gu'night.
```

As with the instance from the CHC corpus, here the participants proffer mutually exclusive claims about an event. The caller claims that the United States Army is 'there' (line 41) because of a mandate from the United Nations. The host rejects this claim and it subsequently emerges that he believes that the Army is 'there' because of the interests of the government of the United States (cf. lines 52-53). The parties appear to have a problem that is comparable to the CHC instance, in that it turns out that they are taking 'there' to refer to different things. Unlike the instance from the CHC corpus, this difference does not emerge until a subsequent conversation:

```
(7.10) [BC, Red 156-58 (Schegloff, 1992b: 1336, modified)]
01 Hos:   Good evening, WNBC
02 Cal:   You asked me tuh call you back, an' I did.
03 Hos:   Yessir.
04 Cal:   My reference is the World Almanac, page seven
05        hundred an' seven:tee[::n, nineteen sixty eight
06 Hos:                        [Mmmhmm?
```

```
07 Cal:  Almanac,
08 Hos:  Mmmhmm
09 Cal:  -states thet we're there, under the U.N. d- command.
10 Hos:  Where- Wai'min'. Waitamin'. Wai'min'. Wai'min'. Now
11       either we're talking about the U.- Oh yer talking
12       'bout Vietnam,
13 Cal:  I'm talking about Korea.
14 Hos:  Oh.
15            ((pause))
16 Hos:  Well now we go back an' do it all over again.
      ((12 lines omitted))
29 Cal:  [Right. Right. That's all, then we misunderstood
30       each [other.
31 Hos:       [Yeah. My apologies.
32 Cal:  Righto.
33 Hos:  Right. Gu'night sir,
```

In both the CHC and talkback instances, there is an apparent problem with tying references back to earlier formulations ('there' in the conversation about Vietnam and Korea and 'last time' in the conversation about grocery shopping and service B). In both instances, the parties end up debating the veracity of two mutually exclusive claims. In the talkback radio call, the debate gets deferred to a second conversation. In the CHC call it is abandoned. It is only outside of the sequences in which they were originally occasioned, that one party reflects back on the trouble and accounts for a misunderstanding that resulted in different claims when there was no actual basis for such a difference.

In episodes like the one that we have been considering, the optimal outcome following the closure of a sequence containing an addressed yet unresolved source of trouble is that it comes to be accounted for. The alternative, suboptimal outcome would be for each party to consider the other as making an erroneous claim about some aspect of the world. Based on sources of trouble that come to be resolved outside of the sequence within which they were occasioned, repair can be understood as a resource for restoring the progressivity of extant sequences.

To be clear, there may be attempts at repair that occur at the possible boundaries of sequences. What Schegloff calls 'post-response other-initiations of repair' (Schegloff, 2000: 219-222) would be one such type of attempt. In these instances, an other-initiation of repair is separated from the source of trouble by an initial response to the trouble-source turn. That is, a recipient has produced a second pair part response, only subsequently to review the first pair part that their response was based on (fragment 6.12 is an instance of post-response other-initiation of repair). A recipient's repair can

enable them to make a revised response to a speaker's first pair part. In such instances, however, although a response has been produced, the sequence is still open for expansion. In the instance that I have been considering in this chapter and in Schegloff's (1992b) instance from talkback radio, the progressivity of a sequence containing a source of trouble is either expired or rapidly expiring. Therefore, along with the closing of a sequence, it seems that structurally available positions from which to launch repair are also closed off to participants.

So it appears that there is a crucial difference between repair, including post-response other-initiations of repair, and the post-possible-completion accounts that I have been considering above. Although third and fourth position repairs may be the last structurally provided defences for intersubjectivity within sequences (Schegloff, 1992b), post-possible-completion accounts are a means by which intersubjectivity can be restored once sequences containing unresolved misunderstandings are over. They allow for a re-specification of what was said, which can enable the participants to move forward more amicably than they might have if an ongoing difference had been maintained between them.

It is the case, of course, that the source of trouble that was occasioned in the above CHC interaction could have been dissolved earlier through the use of repair. Schegloff (1992b) summarises a range of positions from which this might have occurred. For instance, I examined earlier how the employee's use of multiple other-initiations or repair (lines 37 and 40) might have exposed the misunderstanding of what service 'last time' referred to. If, for instance, the client had replied *I had Suzanne for grocery*, the inclusion of a direct reference to the service (*for grocery*) would have revealed to the employee that the client was referring to a different service than she was. The employee would have then been able, in a third position relative to the source of trouble, to repair her referent 'last time' and indicate that she meant it to refer to service B (and not, therefore, to the grocery service).

In the same way, there are no clues in the employee's talk that result in the client realising that they are referring to different services. If, for instance, she had said at lines 42-43 *they've put Emma here I thought you'd had her for cleaning before.*, her mention of cleaning (or whatever it is that gets done for service B) as an explicit

192

reference to the service being discussed would indicate to the client that they have not been referring to the same service. This would enable a repair in a fourth position relative to the source of trouble.

Repair may even have been produced in an earlier position and may have circumvented a misunderstanding. For instance, had the employee said something like *I think you had her la- for cleaning last time.*, her same-turn-constructional unit repair would have prevented the client from mistakenly treating her talk as referring to his grocery service. Likewise, the difference could have been avoided by repair in transition space, had the employee said something like *I think you had her last time.=for cleaning*. This is a reminder that repair is not a fixed and rigid process. Rather, where and how it is produced results from the moment-by-moment choices that speakers make in interaction. And we can now also see that once a source of trouble has passed out of the repair space, there is nevertheless a resource available to speakers to address the ongoing interactional problems posed by such sources of trouble.

7.5 Summary

In the episode examined in this chapter, a debate over different claims was occasioned by an informing and counter-informing conveying mutually exclusive claims about an event (which care worker last came to visit the client). Repair, a resource that is usually effective in defending and maintaining intersubjectivity, failed to resolve the participants' trouble. Intersubjectivity was re-established only after the sequence was over – and interruptively in the course of a new initiating action – via a post-possible-completion account.

My analysis contributes to an understanding of how intersubjectivity can be lost and restored in interaction. It shows how repair may be a resource that is limited to dealing with troubles that are located within extant sequences. In instances where some ostensible source of trouble needs to be addressed after a new sequence has been initiated, the next best option available to speakers might be to account for how the sequence transpired in the way that it did. One context where this can appear is in

addressing unresolved mutually exclusive claims. They are rare because, as Schegloff, Jefferson and Sacks (1977) explain, repair positions that are closer to a source of trouble are more likely to be utilised, and are therefore more likely to resolve any given trouble. However, post-possible-completion accounts could be a general resource for dealing with problems that have failed to be satisfactorily addressed by repair within the sequences of their production.

Chapter 8

Summary and conclusion

8.1 Overview of the thesis

This thesis began by reviewing research that has explored making arrangements as a practice that underpins the continuity of social relationships. Previous research demonstrates how arrangement-making, in focusing on the specifics of a future encounter, can make the termination of a current interaction a relevant possibility. It is thus a 'special status topic' (Button, 1991) that participants to any current interaction can use as a resource to terminate that interaction. Prior research also shows how making arrangements can be an accountable course of action. That is, parties attempting to make an arrangement will often account for, or recipients will seek an account for, the *particular* arrangement that they have chosen to proffer over other plausible arrangements that they might have made (including, making no arrangement at all). Evidence suggests that arrangements that are accounted for are more likely to be acceptable to recipients (Houtkoop-Steenstra, 1990; Houtkoop, 1987).

As I reviewed in Chapter 1, the making of arrangements has been shown to be influenced by its sequential context within an interaction. For instance, enquiries such as *what are you doing?* can be heard and responded to by recipients as preliminary to arrangement-making (Arminen & Weilenmann, 2009; Levinson, 1983; Licoppe, 2009; Schegloff, 2007c). In a similar way, knowledge of an interlocutor's location has been shown to influence the manner in which speakers make arrangements, as speakers can formulate proposed arrangements with reference to their understanding of a recipient's current location (Licoppe, 2009).

Having reviewed strands of research that detail how making arrangements is closing-relevant, accountable, and context-dependent, I then reviewed research that examines proposals as a specific type of action that can be used to make arrangements. Houtkoop(-Steenstra) argues that proposals for particular courses of actions (i.e., arrangements) are a relatively broad class of actions that can be accomplished with

requests, invitations, offers, suggestions, and the like (Houtkoop-Steenstra, 1990; Houtkoop, 1987). Moreover, Houtkoop (1987) distinguishes between proposals for immediate and future courses of action, on the basis that they involve a different sequential structure. Although both types of proposal occasion acceptance and rejection as conditionally relevant responses, acceptance is displayed differently in the two proposal types.

Following proposals for an immediate course of action, an acceptance of this course of action is accompanied by displaying compliance with the proposed arrangement. Tangible displays of compliance are not, however, possible responses to proposals for future or remote courses of action (which Houtkoop calls 'remote proposals'). Rather, a recipient can only claim that they will comply with a particular arrangement at a later time. Houtkoop shows that remote proposals occasion a 'request-for-confirmation,' which follows an initial acceptance. She claims that these requests-for-confirmation occasion a response that enables a recipient to move from the *stated* agreement of their first response, to *demonstrated* agreement in their second response. They might demonstrate their agreement, for instance, by writing down the arrangement in a diary. The request-for-confirmation and its response engender a double-paired structure for remote proposals, compared to a single adjacency pair structure for immediate proposals.

Houtkoop's research on remote proposals is conducted with reference to mundane Dutch interaction. In this thesis, I have studied a different domain, where the making of arrangements is a routine activity. In Chapter 2, I described a corpus of 375 recorded telephone conversations between clients and employees of three Community and Home Care (CHC) service agencies in metropolitan Adelaide, South Australia. As in Houtkoop(-Steenstra)'s studies and the other research detailed above, I have sought to approach the study of arrangement-making as it occurs *in situ*; that is, in interaction. This is the first known study of the organisation of CHC services that uses this approach. The study utilised conversation analysis, a methodological approach of which I describe in Chapter 2, before detailing, in Chapter 3, some of the core findings that have previously been made by working with such an approach.

196

I began my analysis in Chapter 4 with a consideration of a type of remote proposal that I call 'prospective informings.' Using, as an example of this action type, instances where an employee seeks to modify an otherwise ongoing service arrangement with a client, I showed how these informings can often require extended turns at talk in order to produce all the relevant details. As the study of turn-taking organisation shows that current speakers are typically only allocated one 'turn-constructional unit' of talk before transition to another speaker becomes a relevant possibility (Sacks et al., 1974), I considered how these multi-unit informings are accomplished. I discounted outliners as a possible resource (cf. §4.2.2), and then showed how both pragmatic and prosodic resources can be used by speakers, and attended to by recipients, in order to determine when an informing is possibly complete.

A pragmatic resource for determining possible completion is typically occasioned in prospective informings by the content of the first turn-constructional unit. In this unit, an informer will often detail some occurrence that is, in and of itself, inconsequential to a recipient. However, that occurrence can be heard as entailing some consequence for the recipient. Further turn-constructional units will therefore be required for this consequence to be heard. I show that recipients display an awareness of this consequentiality by producing continuers (Sacks, 1992: vol 2, pp 410-412; Schegloff, 1982) or newsmarks that encourage elaboration (Maynard, 2003).

Prosody is co-opted by informers as an attendant resource, which supports the pragmatic resource in accomplishing the multi-unit informings in the CHC data corpus. I explored how features like rush-throughs (Schegloff, 1982) and rising intonation can enable additional units at talk, whereas final falling intonation can be used at the conclusion of an informing. My consideration of pragmatic and prosodic resources is not intended as an exhaustive investigation of how these multi-unit informings are accomplished, but is rather an indication of some of the ordered ways in which both parties collaborate during this relatively lengthy first section of an arrangement-making sequence.

In Chapters 4 and 5 of this thesis, I developed Houtkoop(-Steenstra)'s account of remote proposals in two principal ways. First, I critiqued the analysis that underpins her claim that remote proposals are a relatively broad action type for interaction that

include requests. I explored how Houtkoop's (1987) examples of requests as remote proposals do not enable a disambiguated analysis of these as having a double-paired sequential structure (cf. §4.1.1). Moreover, data available in the CHC corpus and in recently published research (Curl & Drew, 2008; Walker et al., in preparation) show that requests to make future arrangements do not typically exhibit a double-paired sequential structure. Due to this, I suggested a tentative redefinition of remote proposals so as not to include requests. Although requests can certainly be used to make future arrangements, these do not tend to exhibit the same sequential structure as remote proposals.

Although I leave open the possibility of remote proposals as a relatively broad action type, the arrangements in the CHC corpus are overwhelmingly made though the use of prospective informings. These involve one party informing the other of a future course of action, as though the arrangement has already been made. However, because the arrangements that I study implicate the recipient in some future course of action, that arrangement cannot transpire in the manner that has been detailed unless the recipient agrees to comply. An arrangement is therefore detailed as though it were finalised but is not yet in a position to be finalised. I take participants to be pragmatically concerned with this apparent self-contradiction in a second adjacency pair that can be found in these sequences. That adjacency pair appeared to recast prospective informings as remote proposals; a matter to which I subsequently turned.

My second principal finding about remote proposals in this thesis is that, unlike in Houtkoop's mundane Dutch data, I did not find that response solicitations (what Houtkoop calls 'requests-for-confirmation') occasion a move from stated to demonstrated acceptance. Indeed, I found the accomplishment of this phase of the proposal to exhibit more variation than the instances that Houtkoop (1987) examined. In my study of remote proposals in the CHC data corpus, there are three possible sequential trajectories. Recipients can self-select to accept an arrangement, which is the format that Houtkoop describes. Another possibility, however, is that informers can tag a pursuit of response onto the end of their informing. Because these two options are found in the same position – that is, after a possibly complete prospective informing – a third possibility is that both parties simultaneously, or near simultaneously, move into the responsive phase of the sequence.

198

I showed how most of the responses to 'requests-for-confirmation' in the CHC data corpus result in responses that are similar, if not identical, to the previous response. These observations have led me to the conclusion that the second adjacency pair of this sequence is not concerned with occasioning some sort of pragmatically, or even semantically, different response. Rather, I developed Jefferson's (1981b) analysis of response solicitation – a term that I find more apt for these sequences than Houtkoop's (1987) request-for-confirmation – to show how these second adjacency pairs are an opportunity for informers to show that their prior turn, while an informing, was ultimately contingent upon the recipient's willingness to comply. That is, these response solicitations establish acceptance or rejection as a conditionally relevant response. And acceptance or rejection are responses that are relevant to *proposed* courses of action, rather than ones that are already determined. Response solicitations are an opportunity, therefore, for informers to re-complete their action as a proposal.

Response solicitations are not necessarily found following all prospective informings. For instance, in the CHC data corpus they are often not made following an informing of a service modification that only entails a change in care worker and not in service time. In such instances, an employee might be sufficiently confident that a client will comply with the arrangement that they use an informing without having to respecify it, subsequently, as a proposal. The analysis that I made, therefore, is not intended as a global study of how people make arrangements with one another. What it does show is that, in some circumstances, a party who seeks to make an arrangement with another can use a prospective informing and then, within a double-paired sequence, seek to respecify that informing as a proposal that explicitly requires a recipient's agreement.

The analysis of prospective informing sequences in the CHC data corpus includes an examination of some of the attendant considerations that participants can address within these sequences. In Chapter 4, I examined the function of 'outlining' an imminent topic for the conversation. This topic nomination technique had been previously noted in the footnote of a paper by Button and Casey (1985), but has never been, to my knowledge, systematically studied. I showed that these outliners can project a particular action type, but that they need not necessarily do so. Rather, I

suggest that their deployment seems to be associated with the launch of a reason for the conversation that either cannot be anticipated by a recipient, or is disjunct from the previous topic being discussed. The evidence to suggest that this could be the case comes from calls in the CHC data corpus where the topic clearly *can* be anticipated by a recipient. These latter reasons for the conversation are not launched with an outliner, but rather with a more minimal form, like those discussed in Schegloff (2010) and §4.2.1.

In Chapter 5, I briefly considered the practice of thanking following prospective informings. Following Zimmerman (2006), I showed that there are no prescribed beneficiaries when arrangements are made in the CHC data corpus. In this corpus, gratitude can be expressed, through thanking, by both parties, one party, or by neither party. I also considered how thanking is complicated by its possible additional role in closing down interactions (cf. Schegloff & Sacks, 1973). My brief examination of this phenomenon, as it occurs in the CHC data corpus, supports previous conversation analytic work that suggests the study of thanking is far from straightforward and simple.

Remote proposals are one way in which participants can make arrangements with one another. My analysis leaves open the possibility that there are other social practices that are available to achieve a comparable outcome. Here, I have elected to focus on some of the attendant considerations that participants can orient to when making arrangements with one another. In addition to core practices like remote proposals, which directly seek to make an arrangement, I focus on two other considerations that participants can attend to throughout this process: references to third-parties that can be implicated in arrangements, and ostensible sources of trouble that arise in the process of arrangement-making. Examining these core and attendant practices highlights the complex nature of arrangement-making as a social phenomenon.

The arrangements that are made in the CHC data corpus routinely involve making reference to third parties, usually care workers. In Chapter 6, I considered further evidence in support for there being a dimension where two different types of forms that can be used to refer to non-present third parties: 'recognitional' and 'non-recognitional' references (Sacks & Schegloff, 1979; Schegloff, 1996b). Previous

200

research has shown that the reference form that is used on any given occasion should be selected in relation to the preference for recipient design. This preference is for a speaker to select a reference form that will make sense to its recipient. Given that the two available reference forms are mutually exclusive – one indexes acquaintance, and the other unacquaintance – there are bound to be occasions where a reference form is used that is not designed appropriately for a recipient. However, there is no systematic examination of how *recipients* might respond on such occasions. For instance, a speaker might use a recognitional form to refer to someone with whom it turns out the recipient is not acquainted. In such instances, one option is for a recipient to initiate repair to downgrade the reference to a non-recognitional. Conversely, repair can be used to upgrade an inapposite non-recognitional reference to a recognitional form. Chapter 6, then, is an in-depth consideration of the relationship between repair and person-reference.

Following both inapposite recognitional and non-recognitional reference forms, recipients can withhold the production of the sequentially-relevant next action (typically, in the CHC data, the acceptance of a prospective informing) in order to initiate repair on the reference form that was used. However, repair can be initiated in different ways, depending upon the preceding reference form. Recipients in the CHC data corpus can be found to use exposed corrections (Jefferson, 1987), or counter-informings (Heritage, 1984; Robinson, 2009), to repair both ostensibly inapposite recognitional and non-recognitional reference forms. In addition to this, recipients can also respond to ostensibly inapposite recognitional references with several other types of repair initiation. One option is to use an acquaintance query, which does not claim a necessary problem with the design of the person reference, but rather generates a space in which the recipient's acquaintance with the referent can be discussed. Another option is to use a category-constrained interrogative like *who?*. Such repair initiators specifically identify a problem with the reference form that was used by identifying the class of terms from which the source of trouble came. However, they do not indicate whether the problem was one of hearing or of suitability. As with 'open'-class repair initiators (Drew, 1997), category-constrained interrogatives are often, although not necessarily, responded to as though they indicate a possible

problem with the suitability of some prior utterance; in this case, a person reference form.

That people can and do address inapposite references reveals two predominant features of person-reference in talk-in-interaction. First, that there are normative functions of references forms that typically allow for the selection of a reference that suits a recipient. That these references are only occasionally exposed as inapposite suggests that presumptions about acquaintance are usually productive. Second, that people do address inappositely designed person references also reveals the importance, *for participants*, of maintaining a socially-shared nexus of acquaintances. Although erroneous person references need not necessarily be corrected (cf. Jefferson, 2007: 450-452; Kitzinger, 2006; Land & Kitzinger, 2005: 391-396), this analysis shows how participants can attend to the importance of indicating to one another those with whom they are, and are not, acquainted.

I continued my focus on references to people and repair in Chapter 7 with a single case study of a problematic conversation. In it, two parties come to make different claims about which care worker came to visit the client 'last time.' This instance is worthy of close examination as the mutually exclusive claims do not end up being resolved by repair, the usual defence of intersubjectivity in conversation (cf. Schegloff, 1992b). Rather, the misunderstanding that occasioned the mutually exclusive claims comes to be exposed just as it seems that the matter will not be resolved. By this time, each of the structurally available positions from which repair could be initiated have passed, with one party attempting to close down the sequence of talk and possibly also the conversation. It is only as this is happening that the other party accounts for the *conditions* under which the two parties made mutually exclusive claims, when in fact there was never an actual *basis* for this to be the case. This is a conversational move that I call a 'post-possible-completion account.' Unlike with repair, this account does not occasion a revised response to a trouble-source turn. Rather, it is a means of restoring intersubjectivity once a sequence containing an unresolved misunderstanding is over. It allows for an appreciation by both parties of how each of them could reasonably have acted in the way that they did.

8.2 Contributions to conversation analysis

The previous section provides an overview of the analysis in this thesis. Broadly, this analysis makes the following empirical contributions to the field of conversation analysis:

- An examination of 'prospective informings' as a type of remote proposal;

- An examination of how prospective informings get produced within a multi-unit turn at talk;

- A refined account, based on access to new data within the CHC corpus, of the function of the double-paired sequential structure of remote proposals;

- An explanation of the possible role of 'outliners' as a topic nomination technique;

- The first systematic study of evidence to support the claim that recipients treat specific person reference forms as being either recognitional or non-recognitional;

- An examination of repair initiators that can be used by recipients of recognitional and non-recognitional reference forms;

- An explanation of how sources of trouble can be addressed outside of the repair space in conversation.

8.3 Implications for Community and Home Care practice

This thesis constitutes the first known study of the routine practices of social interaction that underpin the planning and organisation of CHC. As an exploratory study of CHC service calls, the analysis in this thesis has limited scope to provide applied recommendations. Much of the analysis has been dedicated to developing a theoretical understanding of how phenomena such as remote proposals work in interaction. The project to this point, however, has resulted in three outputs that have been supplied to the collaborating data source. These outputs are appended to this thesis, and are discussed here, as they have general implications for the CHC industry in both Australia and internationally.

The first output relates to an application of the analysis contained in Chapter 7 (and also, to an extent, the analysis in Chapter 6). This analysis can be used to inform communication practice, so as to avoid or reduce misunderstandings between clients and employees in CHC service calls. As I explain in my report to the collaborating agencies (see Appendix F) and in a presentation to CHC agency staff (see Appendix G), a source of possible misunderstandings in these calls can come from the way in which references are made to the client's services. Services are most often referred to indirectly, with the name of the care worker who conducts the service, rather than also with a reference to the service type (eg., cleaning, personal care, shopping). Although there are usually no ostensible problems with this approach, the case study in Chapter 7 shows that misunderstandings are possible. Misunderstandings of this order could be avoided through the inclusion of a reference to the service type (cf. the analysis in §7.4). This small, technical, conversation analytic claim, then, has the potential to assist CHC employees in avoiding some sources of misunderstandings in their interactions with clients; misunderstandings that have the potential to result in a range of adverse outcomes.

As I also indicate in my report to the collaborating agencies (Appendix F), the analytic process afforded an opportunity to identify some sources of client satisfaction or dissatisfaction that were not necessarily the focus of the analysis detailed in this thesis. There is now an established and widespread use of call recordings to accomplish a variety of organisational objectives; far more than the original purpose of quality assurance (cf. Klie, 2008). In the case of the CHC data corpus, it was possible to inspect the recorded calls to identify some of the problems that can arise. Although I have already discussed one such problem above – misunderstandings – there were two other general observations that I made in my study of the CHC corpus.

The first incidental observation was that some clients expressed, in a variety of ways, dissatisfaction with having too many new and different care workers come to visit them. As one client put it to an employee about having different care workers assist with her showering: "there's nothing worse than when you're stark naked having to meet new people all the time" (CHC083: 3:52-3:57; see also the complaint made at lines 56-57 in fragment 6.16). Many clients also discussed, often positively, the importance of establishing rapport with their care workers. The importance of this

type of continuity of care has been noted in a previous study of CACP packages. When surveyed, clients have indicated that relationships of familiarity and trust take time to develop with care workers and that they are unhappy when they experience staff changes, especially when there are several changes in a short space of time (Thomas, Woodhouse, Rees-Mackenzie, & Jeon, 2007). Informal observations from the current study lend support to this finding and reinforce the importance, for clients, of continuity of care in CHC services.

A second incidental finding was that some clients have difficulty comprehending the implications of insurance and service regulation limitations upon institutional practice. This was particularly the case for the spouses of clients, who sometimes struggled to understand why it was not possible for them to travel with their spouse's care worker to conduct tasks like shopping. This situation tended to arise in situations such as when a client was ill and therefore unable to leave the home. This is an issue that may be deserving of future research, with a view to formulating a policy response.

The third output from the study is a collection of transcribed calls that can be used for recruitment or training purposes. This is becoming an increasingly common practice in a variety of professional contexts that involve servicing the public and the collection available in Appendix H may be useful to the CHC industry more generally (cf. Finlay, Antaki, & Walton, 2008; Kitzinger, in press). For instance, transcripts could be presented to job applicants or trainees. They could be asked to read through and, at the point where the transcript ends, asked how they would respond to the particular situations. In the case of training, responses could be discussed and critiqued for their relative merit.

Although exploratory in nature, this thesis is an example of the importance of studying naturally-occurring institutional interaction, and the benefits of such an approach. It affords an understanding of the processes and practices that are important for the actual participants that interact with one another under the auspices of CHC services. Unlike research methods that seek to solicit participants' accounts of what leads to satisfaction with service, the conversation analytic approach affords an opportunity to answer such questions by going directly to their source.

8.4 Conclusion

In this thesis, I have dwelt amidst the rich detail of a very commonplace social activity: the making of arrangements between parties interacting with one another. I have shown how such parties can attend to a range of considerations, both in the act of making an arrangement, and also in the attendant activities that this can entail. An understanding of the phenomena that I have considered here is important, because it is through these practices, and others that conversation analysts describe, that humans accomplish socially-shared experiences. Although conducted in an institutional setting, the practices I describe are just a few components of a rich inventory of practices that people can be found to use in a variety of settings. Contributing to an understanding of how such practices are used in interaction helps to explain how humans are a social species. An understanding of how arrangements are made in interaction, an understanding that this thesis develops, contributes to a general appreciation of how social connections between humans are retained across time.

References

AGD. (2010). *Australia to 2050: Future challenges*. Canberra: Commonwealth of Australia.

AGDHA. (2008). *Home and Community Care Program Minimum Data Set 2007-08 Annual Bulletin*. Canberra: Australian Government Department of Health and Ageing.

AIHW. (2008). *Aged care packages in the community 2006-07: A statistical overview*. Canberra: Australian Institute of Health and Welfare.

Anderson, G. F., & Hussey, P. S. (2000). Population aging: A comparison among industrialized countries. *Health Affairs, 19*(3), 191-203.

Arminen, I., & Weilenmann, A. (2009). Mobile presence and intimacy - Reshaping social actions in mobile contextual configuration. *Journal of Pragmatics, 41*(10), 1905-1923.

Aston, G. (1995). Say 'thank you': Some pragmatic constraints in conversational closings. *Applied Linguistics, 16*(1), 57-86.

Atkinson, J. M., & Drew, P. (1979). *Order in Court: The Organisation of Verbal Interaction in Judicial Settings*. London: Macmillian Academic and Professional Ltd.

Auer, J. C. P. (1984). Referential problems in conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics, 8*(5-6), 627-648.

Beach, W. A. (1993). Transitional regularities for 'casual' "okay" usages. *Journal of Pragmatics, 19*(4), 325-352.

Beach, W. A. (1995). Preserving and constraining options: 'Okays' and 'official' priorities in medical interviews. In G. H. Morris & R. J. Chenail (Eds.), *The Talk of the Clinic: Explorations in the Analysis of Medical and Therapeutic Discourse* (pp. 259-289). Hillsdale: Laurence Erlbaum Associates.

Billig, M. (1999). Whose terms? Whose ordinariness? Rhetoric and ideology in conversation analysis. *Discourse & Society, 10*(4), 543-582.

Blythe, J. (2009). *Doing referring in Murriny Patha conversation.* Unpublished Ph.D thesis, University of Sydney.

Boden, D. (1997). Temporal frames: Time and talk in organizations. *Time & Society, 6*(1), 5-33.

Bolden, G. B. (2004). The quote and beyond: Defining boundaries of reported speech in Russian. *Journal of Pragmatics, 36*(6), 1071-1118.

Brown, P. (2007). Principles of person reference in Tzeltal conversation. In N. J. Enfield & T. Stivers (Eds.), *Person Reference in Interaction: Linguistic, Cultural and Social Perspectives* (pp. 172-202). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Button, G. (1987). Moving out of closings. In G. Button & J. R. Lee (Eds.), *Talk and Social Organisation* (pp. 101-151). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Button, G. (1991). Conversation-in-a-series. In D. Boden & D. H. Zimmerman (Eds.), *Talk & Social Structure: Studies in Ethnomethodology and Conversation Analysis* (pp. 251-277). Cambridge: Polity Press.

Button, G., & Casey, N. (1985). Topic nomination and topic pursuit. *Human Studies, 8*(1), 3-55.

Clark, H. H., & Wilkes-Gibbs, D. (1986). Referring as a collaborative process. *Cognition, 22*(1), 1-39.

Clayman, S. E. (1989). The production of punctuality: Social interaction, temporal organization, and social structure. *American Journal of Sociology, 95*(3), 659-691.

Couper-Kuhlen, E. (2010). Commentary on Stivers and Rossano: "Mobilizing response". *Research on Language and Social Interaction, 43*(1), 32-37.

Curl, T. S., & Drew, P. (2008). Contingency and action: A comparison of two forms of requesting. *Research on Language and Social Interaction, 41*(2), 129-153.

Davidson, J. (1978). An instance of negotiation in a call closing. *Sociology, 12*(1), 123-133.

Davidson, J. (1984). Subsequent versions of invitations, offers, requests, and proposals dealing with potential or actual rejection. In J. M. Atkinson & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Structures of Social Action: Studies in Conversation Analysis* (pp. 102-128). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Davidson, J. (1990). Modifications of invitations, offers and rejections. In G. Psathas (Ed.), *Interaction Competence* (pp. 149-179). Washington: International Institute for Ethnomethodology and Conversation Analysis & University Press of America.

DHA. (2004). *Investing in Australia's aged care: More places, better care*. Canberra: Commonwealth of Australia.

Downing, P. A. (1996). Proper names as a referential option in English conversation. In B. A. Fox (Ed.), *Studies in Anaphora*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Drew, P. (1989). Recalling someone from the past. In D. Roger & P. Bull (Eds.), *Conversation: An Interdisciplinary Approach* (pp. 95-115). Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.

Drew, P. (1997). 'Open' class repair initiators in response to sequential sources of troubles in conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics, 28*(1), 69-101.

Drew, P. (2005). Conversation analysis. In K. L. Fitch & R. E. Sanders (Eds.), *Handbook of Language and Social Interaction* (pp. 71-101). Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Drew, P., & Heritage, J. (1992). Analysing talk at work: An introduction. In J. Heritage & P. Drew (Eds.), *Talk at Work: Interaction in Institutional Settings* (pp. 3-65). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Edwards, D. (1995). Sacks and psychology. *Theory and Psychology, 5*(4), 579-596.

Egbert, M. (2004). Other-initiated repair and membership categorization. *Journal of Pragmatics, 36*(8), 1467-1498.

Egbert, M., Golato, A., & Robinson, J. D. (2009). Repairing reference. In J. Sidnell (Ed.), *Comparative Perspectives in Conversation Analysis* (pp. 104-132). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Enfield, N. J. (2007). Meanings of the unmarked: How 'default' person reference does more than just refer. In N. J. Enfield & T. Stivers (Eds.), *Person Reference in Interaction: Linguistic, Cultural and Social Perspectives* (pp. 97-120). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Finlay, W. M. L., Antaki, C., & Walton, C. (2008). A manifesto for the use of video in staff improvement and staff development in residential services for people with learning disabilities. *British Journal of Learning Disabilities, 36*(4), 227-231.

Firth, A. (1995a). 'Accounts' in negotiation discourse: A single-case analysis. *Journal of Pragmatics, 23*(2), 199-226.

Firth, A. (1995b). Introduction and overview. In A. Firth (Ed.), *The Discourse of Negotiation: Studies of Language in the Workplace* (pp. 3-39). Oxford: Elsevier Science Ltd.

Firth, A. (1995c). Talking for a change: Commodity negotiating by telephone. In A. Firth (Ed.), *The Discourse of Negotiation: Studies of Language in the Workplace* (pp. 183-222). Oxford: Elsevier Science Ltd.

Fox, B. A. (1987). *Discourse Structure and Anaphora: Written and Conversational English*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Fox, B. A., & Thompson, S. A. (1990). On formulating reference: An interactional approach to relative clauses in English conversation. *IPrA Papers in Pragmatics, 1/2*, 183-196.

Fox, B. A., Wouk, F., Hayashi, M., Fincke, S., Tao, L., Sorjonen, M.-L., et al. (2009). A cross-linguistic investigation of the site of initiation in same-turn self-repair. In J. Sidnell (Ed.), *Conversation Analysis: Comparative Perspectives* (pp. 60-103). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

FPAC. (2009). *Standing Committee on Finance and Public Administration: Residential and Community Aged Care in Australia*. Canberra: Senate Printing Unit, Parliament House.

Goodwin, C. (1986). Between and within: Alternative sequential treatments of continuers and assessments. *Human Studies, 9*(2-3), 205-217.

Goodwin, M. H. (1990). *He-Said-She-Said: Talk as Social Organization Among Black Children*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Goodwin, M. H. (1996). Informings and announcements in their environment: Prosody within a multi-activity work setting. In E. Couper-Kuhlen & M. Selting (Eds.), *Prosody in Conversation: Interactional Studies* (pp. 436-461). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hacohen, G., & Schegloff, E. A. (2006). On the preference for minimization in referring to persons: Evidence from Hebrew conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics, 38*(8), 1305-1312.

Harren, I., & Raitaniemi, M. (2008). The sequential structure of closings in private German phone calls. *Gesprächsforschung online, 9*, 198-223 [Available at http://www.gespraechsforschung-ozs.de/heft2008/ga-harren.pdf].

Heinemann, T. (2006). 'Will you or can't you?': Displaying entitlement in interrogative requests. *Journal of Pragmatics, 38*(7), 1081-1104.

Heinemann, T. (2007). Professional self-disclosure: When the home help talks about herself. In K. Kerbrat-Orecchioni & V. Traverso (Eds.), *Confidence: Dévoilment de soi dans l'intereaction / Confiding: Self-disclosure in interaction* (pp. 325-342). Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag.

Heinemann, T. (2009a). Managing unavoidable conflicts in caretaking of the elderly: Humor as a mitigating resource. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language, 200*, 103-127.

Heinemann, T. (2009b). Participation and exclusion in third party complaints. *Journal of Pragmatics, 41*(12), 2435-2451.

Heinemann, T. (forthcoming). From home to institution: Roles, relations and the loss of autonomy in caretaking of old people in Denmark. In P. Backhaus (Ed.), *Communication in Elderly Care: Cross-Cultural Approaches*. London: Continuum.

Hepburn, A., & Bolden, G. B. (forthcoming). The conversation analytic approach to transcription. In T. Stivers & J. Sidnell (Eds.), *The Blackwell Handbook of Conversation Analysis*. Oxford: Blackwell.

210

Hepburn, A., & Potter, J. (2004). Discourse analytic practice. In C. Seale, G. Giampietro, J. F. Gubrium & D. Silverman (Eds.), *Qualitative Research Practice* (pp. 180-196). London: SAGE Publications Ltd.

Heritage, J. (1984). A change-of-state token and aspects of its sequential placement. In J. M. Atkinson & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Structures of Social Action: Studies from the First Generation* (pp. 299-345). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Heritage, J. (1985). Analysing news interviews: Aspects of the production of talk for an overhearing audience. In T. A. van Dijk (Ed.), *Handbook of Discourse Analysis* (Vol. 3, pp. 95-119). London: Academic Press.

Heritage, J. (1988). Explanations as accounts: A conversation analytic perspective. In C. Antaki (Ed.), *Analysing Everyday Explanation: A Casebook of Methods* (pp. 127-144). London: SAGE Publications Ltd.

Heritage, J. (1998). Oh-prefaced responses to inquiry. *Language in Society, 27*(3), 291-334.

Heritage, J. (2002). *Oh*-prefaced responses to assessments: A method of modifying agreement/disagreement. In C. E. Ford, B. A. Fox & S. A. Thompson (Eds.), *The Language of Turn and Sequence* (pp. 196-224). New York: Oxford University Press Inc.

Heritage, J. (2007). Intersubjectivity and progressivity in person (and place) reference. In N. J. Enfield & T. Stivers (Eds.), *Person Reference in Interaction: Linguistic, Cultural and Social Perspectives* (pp. 255-280). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Houtkoop-Steenstra, H. (1990). Accounting for proposals. *Journal of Pragmatics, 14*(1), 111-124.

Houtkoop, H. (1987). *Establishing agreement: An Analysis of Proposal-Acceptance Sequences*. Dordrecht: Foris Publications.

Hutchby, I., & Wooffitt, R. (2008). *Conversation Analysis* (2nd ed.). Cambridge: Polity Press.

Jefferson, G. (1973). A case of precision timing in ordinary conversation: Overlapped tag-positioned address terms in closing sequences. *Semiotica, 9*(1), 47-96.

Jefferson, G. (1981a). The abominable "ne"?: A working paper exploring the phenomenon of post-response pursuit of response. *Manchester Sociology Occasional Papers* (No. 6), 1-81.

Jefferson, G. (1981b). The abominable *ne?*: Post-response-initiation response-solicitation. In P. Schroder & H. Steger (Eds.), *Dialogforschung: Jahrbuch 1980 des Instituts für deutsche Sprache* (pp. 53-88). Düsseldorf: Pedagogischer Verlag Schwann.

Jefferson, G. (1987). On exposed and embedded correction in conversation. In G. Button & J. R. E. Lee (Eds.), *Talk and Social Organization* (pp. 86-100). Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.

Jefferson, G. (2004). Glossary of transcript symbols with an introduction. In G. Lerner (Ed.), *Conversation Analysis: Studies from the First Generation* (pp. 131-167). Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Jefferson, G. (2007). Preliminary notes on abdicated other-correction. *Journal of Pragmatics, 39*(3), 445-461.

Kaufmann, F. (1944). *Methodology of the social sciences*. New York: Humanities Press.

Kitzinger, C. (2006). After post-cognitivism. *Discourse Studies, 8*(1), 67-83.

Kitzinger, C. (in press). Working with childbirth helplines: The contributions and limitations of conversation analysis. In C. Antaki (Ed.), *Applied Conversation Analysis: Changing Institutional Practices*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan Ltd.

Klie, L. (2008). The case for call recording. *Speech Technology, 13*(8), 26-30.

Koester, A. J. (2004). Relational sequences in workplace genres. *Journal of Pragmatics, 36*(8), 1405-1428.

Kotthoff, H. (1993). Disagreement and concession in disputes: On the context sensitivity of preference structures. *Language in Society, 22*, 193-216.

Labov, W. (1972). *Sociolinguistic Patterns*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Land, V., & Kitzinger, C. (2005). Speaking as a lesbian: Correcting the heterosexist presumption. *Research on Language and Social Interaction, 38*(4), 371-416.

LeBaron, C., & Jones, S. E. (2002). Closing up closings: Showing the relevance of the social and material surround to the completion of interaction. *Journal of Communication, 52*(3), 542-565.

Lee, S.-H. (2009). Extended requesting: Interaction and collaboration in the production and specification of requests. *Journal of Pragmatics, 41*(6), 1248-1271.

Lerner, G. H. (1989). Notes on overlap management in conversation: The case of delayed completion. *Western Journal of Speech Communication, 53*(Spring), 167-177.

Lerner, G. H. (1991). On the syntax of sentences-in-progress. *Language in Society, 20*(3), 441-458.

Lerner, G. H. (2002). Turn-sharing: the choral co-production of talk-in-interaction. In C. E. Ford, B. A. Fox & S. A. Thompson (Eds.), *The Language of Turn and Sequence* (pp. 225-256). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Lerner, G. H., Kitzinger, C., & Raymond, G. (2009, November). *Cascading troubles in the organization of repair.* Paper presented at the National Communication Association Annual Convention, Chicago.

Levinson, S. C. (1983). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Levinson, S. C. (1987). Minimization and conversational inference. In P. Bertucchelli & J. Verschueren (Eds.), *The Pragmatic Perspective: Selected Papers from the 1985 International Pragmatics Conference* (pp. 61-129). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Levinson, S. C. (1987/1998). Minimization and conversational inference. In A. Kasher (Ed.), *Pragmatics: Volume 4 Presupposition, Implicature and Indirect Speech Acts* (pp. 545-612). London: Routledge.

Levinson, S. C. (2005). Living with Manny's dangerous idea. *Discourse Studies, 7*(4-5), 431-453.

Levinson, S. C. (2007). Optimizing person reference - Perspectives from usage on Rossel Island. In N. J. Enfield & T. Stivers (Eds.), *Person Reference in Interaction: Linguistic, Cultural and Social Perspectives* (pp. 29-72). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Licoppe, C. (2009). Recognizing mutual 'proximity' at a distance: Weaving together mobility, sociality and technology. *Journal of Pragmatics, 41*(10), 1924-1937.

Liddicoat, A. J. (2007). *An Introduction to Conversation Analysis*. London: Continuum.

Lindström, A. (1999). *Language as Social Action: Grammar, Prosody, and Interaction in Swedish Conversation*. Uppsala: Uppsala Universitet.

Lindström, A. (2005). Language as social action: A study of how senior citizens request assistance with practical tasks in the Swedish home help service. In A. Hakulinen & M. Selting (Eds.), *Syntax and Lexis in Conversation: Studies on the Use of Linguistic Resources in Talk-in-Interaction* (pp. 209-230). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Lindström, A., & Heinemann, T. (2009). Good enough: Low-grade assessments in caregiving situations. *Research on Language and Social Interaction, 42*(4), 309-328.

Local, J., & Walker, G. (2004). Abrupt-joins as a resource for the production of multi-unit, multi-action turns. *Journal of Pragmatics, 36*(8), 1375-1403.

Lynch, M., & Bogen, D. (1994). Harvey Sacks's primitive natural science. *Theory, Culture & Society, 11*(4), 65-104.

Mason, M. (2004). Referential choices and the need for repairs in covertly-taped conversations. *Journal of Pragmatics, 36*(6), 1139-1156.

Maynard, D. W. (2003). *Good News, Bad News: Conversational Order in Everyday Talk and Clinical Settings*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Maynard, D. W., & Clayman, S. E. (1991). The Diversity of Ethnomethodology. *Annual Review of Sociology, 17*, 385-418.

Mazeland, H. (2007). Parenthetical sequences. *Journal of Pragmatics, 39*(10), 1816-1869.

Mazeland, H., Huisman, M., & Schasfoort, M. (1995). Negotiating categories in travel agency calls. In A. Firth (Ed.), *The Discourse of Negotiation: Studies of Language in the Workplace* (pp. 271-297). Oxford: Elsevier Science Ltd.

McKenzie, P. J. (2010). Informing relationships: Small talk, informing and relationship building in midwife-woman interaction. *Information Research, 15*(1), paper 423 [Available at: http://InformationR.net/ir/415-421/paper423.html].

Moerman, M. (1988). *Talking Culture: Ethnography and Conversation Analysis*. Pennsylvania: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Nevile, M., & Rendle-Short, J. (2009). A conversation analysis view of communication as jointly accomplished social interaction: An unsuccessful proposal for a social visit. *Australian Journal of Linguistics, 29*(1), 75-89.

Nikander, P. (2008). Working with transcripts and translated data. *Qualitative Research in Psychology, 5*(3), 225-231.

Nikander, P. (2009). Doing change and continuity: Age identity and the micro-macro divide. *Ageing & Society, 29*(6), 863-881.

Pavlidou, T. (1997). The last five turns: Preliminary remarks on closings in Greek and German telephone calls. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language, 126*(1), 145–162.

Placencia, M. E. (1997). Opening up closings - The Ecuadorian way. *Text, 17*(1), 53-81.

Pomerantz, A. (1975). *Second Assessments: A Study of Some Features of Agreements/Disagreements.* Unpublished Ph.D thesis, University of California, Irvine.

Pomerantz, A. (1984). Agreeing and disagreeing with assessments: Some features of preferred / dispreferred turn shapes. In J. M. Atkinson & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Structures of Social Action: Studies in Conversation Analysis* (pp. 57-101). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Pomerantz, A. (1988). Offering a candidate answer: An information seeking strategy. *Communication Monographs, 55*(4), 360-373.

Pomerantz, A., & Fehr, B. J. (1997). Conversation analysis: An approach to the study of social action as sense making practices. In T. A. van Dijk (Ed.), *Discourse as Social Action* (pp. 64-91). London: Sage Publications Ltd.

214

Psathas, G. (1991). Direction-giving in conversation. In D. Boden & D. H. Zimmerman (Eds.), *Talk & Social Structure: Studies in Ethnomethodology and Conversation Analysis* (pp. 195-216). Cambridge: Polity Press.

Raymond, G. (2003). Grammar and social organization: Yes/no interrogatives and the structure of responding. *American Sociological Review, 68*(December), 939-967.

Roberts, F., & Robinson, J. D. (2004). Interobserver agreement on first-stage conversation analytic transcription. *Human Communication Research, 30*(3), 376-410.

Robinson, J. D. (2001). Closing medical encounters: Two physician practices and their implications for the expression of patients' unstated concerns. *Social Science & Medicine, 53*(5), 639–656.

Robinson, J. D. (2009). Managing counter-informings: An interactional practice for soliciting information that facilitates reconciliation of speaker's incompatible positions. *Human Communication Research, 35*(4), 561-587.

Sacks, H. (1972). On the analyzability of stories by children. In J. J. Gumperz & D. Hymes (Eds.), *Directions in Sociolinguistics: The Ethnography of Communication* (pp. 325-345). Oxford: Blackwell.

Sacks, H. (1984). Notes on methodology. In J. M. Atkinson & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Structures of Social Action: Studies in Conversation Analysis* (pp. 21-27). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sacks, H. (1987). On the preference for agreement and contiguity in sequences in conversation. In G. Button & J. R. E. Lee (Eds.), *Talk and Social Organisation* (pp. 54-69). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Sacks, H. (1992). *Lectures on Conversation: Volumes I & II*. Malden: Blackwell Publishing.

Sacks, H., & Schegloff, E. A. (1979). Two preferences in the organization of reference to persons in conversation and their interaction. In G. Psathas (Ed.), *Everyday Language: Studies in Ethnomethodology* (pp. 15-21). New York: Irvington Publishers.

Sacks, H., Schegloff, E. A., & Jefferson, G. (1974). A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation. *Language, 50*(4), 696-735.

Schegloff, E. A. (1968). Sequencing in conversational openings. *American Anthropologist, 70*(6), 1075-1095.

Schegloff, E. A. (1972). Notes on a conversational practice: Formulating place. In D. Sudnow (Ed.), *Studies in Social Interaction* (pp. 75-119). New York: The Free Press.

Schegloff, E. A. (1979). The relevance of repair to syntax-for-conversation. In T. Givon (Ed.), *Syntax and Semantics, Volume 12: Discourse and Syntax* (pp. 261-286). New York: Academic Press.

Schegloff, E. A. (1980). Preliminaries to preliminaries: "Can I ask you a question?" *Sociological Inquiry, 50*(3-4), 104-152.

Schegloff, E. A. (1982). Discourse as an interactional achievement: Some uses of 'uh huh' and other things that come between sentences. In D. Tannen (Ed.), *Georgetown University Roundtable on Language and Linguistics* (pp. 71-93). Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.

Schegloff, E. A. (1986). The routine as achievement. *Sociology, 9*(2-3), 111-151.

Schegloff, E. A. (1987a). Analyzing single episodes of interaction: An exercise in conversation analysis. *Social Psychology Quarterly, 50*(2), 101-114.

Schegloff, E. A. (1987b). Between macro and micro: Contexts and other connections. In J. C. Alexander, B. Giesen, R. Münch & N. J. Smelser (Eds.), *The Micro-Macro Link* (pp. 207-234). Berkeley: University of California Press.

Schegloff, E. A. (1987c). Some sources of misunderstanding in talk-in-interaction. *Linguistics, 25*, 201-218.

Schegloff, E. A. (1988). Presequences and indirection: Applying speech act theory to ordinary conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics, 12*(1), 55-62.

Schegloff, E. A. (1990). On the organization of sequences as a source of 'coherence' in talk-in-interaction. In B. Dorval (Ed.), *Conversational Organization and its Development* (pp. 51-77). Norwood, New Jersey: Ablex.

Schegloff, E. A. (1991a). Conversation analysis and socially shared cognition. In L. B. Resnick, J. M. Levine & S. D. Teasley (Eds.), *Perspectives on Socially Shared Cognition* (pp. 150-171). Washington, D.C.: American Psychological Association.

Schegloff, E. A. (1991b). Reflections on talk and social structure. In D. Boden & D. H. Zimmerman (Eds.), *Talk & Social Structure: Studies in Ethnomethodology and Conversation Analysis* (pp. 44-70). Cambridge: Polity Press.

Schegloff, E. A. (1992a). In another context. In A. Duranti & C. Goodwin (Eds.), *Rethinking Context: Language as an Interactive Phenomenon* (pp. 193-227). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Schegloff, E. A. (1992b). Repair after next turn: The last structurally provided defense of intersubjectivity in conversation. *American Journal of Sociology, 97*(5), 1295-1345.

Schegloff, E. A. (1996a). Confirming allusions: Toward an empirical account of action. *American Journal of Sociology, 102*(1), 161-216.

Schegloff, E. A. (1996b). Some practices for referring to persons in talk-in-interaction: A partial sketch of a systematics. In B. Fox (Ed.), *Studies in Anaphora* (pp. 437-485). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Schegloff, E. A. (1996c). Turn organization: One intersection of grammar and interaction. In E. Ochs, E. A. Schegloff & S. A. Thompson (Eds.), *Interaction and Grammar* (pp. 52-133). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Schegloff, E. A. (1997a). Practices and actions: Boundary cases of other-initiated repair. *Discourse Processes, 23*(3), 499-545.

Schegloff, E. A. (1997b). Turn-taking organization. Unpublished paper. Los Angeles: University of California in Los Angeles.

Schegloff, E. A. (1998a). Reflections on studying prosody in talk-in-interaction. *Language and Speech, 41*(3-4), 235-263.

Schegloff, E. A. (1998b). Reply to Wetherell. *Discourse & Society, 9*(3), 413-416.

Schegloff, E. A. (1999a). Discourse, pragmatics, conversation, analysis. *Discourse Studies, 1*(4), 405-435.

Schegloff, E. A. (1999b). Naivete vs sophistication or discipline vs self-indulgence: A rejoinder to Billig. *Discourse & Society, 10*(4), 577-582.

Schegloff, E. A. (1999c). 'Schegloff's texts' as 'Billig's data': A critical reply. *Discourse & Society, 10*(4), 558-572.

Schegloff, E. A. (2000). When 'others' initiate repair. *Applied Linguistics, 21*(2), 205-243.

Schegloff, E. A. (2004). On Dispensability. *Research on Language and Social Interaction, 37*(2), 95-149.

Schegloff, E. A. (2007a). Categories in action: Person-reference and membership categorization. *Discourse Studies, 9*(4), 433-461.

Schegloff, E. A. (2007b). Conveying who you are: The presentation of self, strictly speaking. In N. J. Enfield & T. Stivers (Eds.), *Person Reference in Interaction: Linguistic, Cultural and Social Perspectives* (pp. 123-148). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Schegloff, E. A. (2007c). *Sequence Organization in Interaction: A Primer in Conversation Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Schegloff, E. A. (2010). Some other "uh(m)"s. *Discourse Processes, 47*(2), 130-174.

Schegloff, E. A., Jefferson, G., & Sacks, H. (1977). The preference for self-correction in the organization of repair in conversation. *Language, 53*(2), 361-382.

Schegloff, E. A., & Lerner, G. H. (2009). Beginning to respond: *Well*-prefaced responses to *wh*-questions. *Research on Language and Social Interaction, 42*(2), 91-115.

Schegloff, E. A., & Sacks, H. (1973). Opening up closings. *Semiotica, 7*(4), 289-327.

Scott, M. B., & Lyman, S. M. (1968). Accounts. *American Sociological Review, 33*(1), 46-62.

Selting, M. (2005). Syntax and prosody as methods for the construction and identification of turn-constructional units in conversation. In A. Hakulinen & M. Selting (Eds.), *Syntax and Lexis in Conversation: Studies in the Use of Linguistic Resources in Talk-in-Interaction* (pp. 17-44). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Sidnell, J. (2010). *Conversation Analysis: An Introduction*. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.

Simmons, K. (2010). *Resisting behavioural change: Proposal-resistance sequences in Cognitive Behavioural Therapy sessions for clients with depression.* Unpublished Ph.D thesis, University of Adelaide, Adelaide.

Stivers, T. (2007). Alternative recognitionals in person reference. In N. J. Enfield & T. Stivers (Eds.), *Person Reference in Interaction: Linguistic, Cultural and Social Perspectives* (pp. 73-96). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Stivers, T., Enfield, N. J., Brown, P., Englert, C., Hayashi, M., Heinemann, T., et al. (2009). Universals and cultural variation in turn-taking in conversation. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America, 106*(26), 10587-10592.

Stivers, T., Enfield, N. J., & Levinson, S. C. (2007). Person reference in interaction. In N. J. Enfield & T. Stivers (Eds.), *Person Reference in Interaction: Linguistic, Cultural and Social Perspectives* (pp. 1-20). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Stivers, T., & Rossano, F. (2010). Mobilizing response. *Research on Language and Social Interaction, 43*(1), 3-31.

Svennevig, J. (2008). Trying the easiest solution first in other-initiation of repair. *Journal of Pragmatics, 40*(2), 333-348.

Svennevig, J. (2010). Pre-empting reference problems in conversation. *Language in Society, 39*(2), 173-202.

ten Have, P. (1995). Disposal negotiations in general practice consultations. In A. Firth (Ed.), *The Discourse of Negotiation: Studies of Language in the Workplace* (pp. 319-344). Oxford: Elsevier Science Ltd.

ten Have, P. (1999). *Doing Conversation Analysis: A Practical Guide*. London: SAGE Publications Ltd.

Terasaki, A. K. (2004). Pre-announcement sequences in conversation. In G. H. Lerner (Ed.), *Conversation Analysis: Studies from the First Generation* (pp. 171-219). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Thomas, M., Woodhouse, B., Rees-Mackenzie, J., & Jeon, Y.-H. (2007). Use of and satisfaction with Community Aged Care Packages in the eastern suburbs of Sydney. *Australasian Journal on Ageing, 26*(1), 8-14.

Vinkhuyzen, E., & Szymanski, M. H. (2005). Would you like to do it yourself? Service requests and their non-granting responses. In K. Richards & P. Seedhouse (Eds.), *Applying Conversation Analysis* (pp. 91-106). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Vuchinich, S. (1990). The sequential organization of closing in verbal family conflict. In A. D. Grimshaw (Ed.), *Conflict Talk: Sociolinguistic Investigations of Arguments in Conversation* (pp. 118-138). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Walker, T., Drew, P., & Ogden, R. (in preparation). *Linguistic Resources for Social Action*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Weilenmann, A. (2003). "I can't talk now, I'm in a fitting room": Formulating availability and location in mobile-phone conversations. *Environment and Planning A, 35*(9), 1589-1605.

Wells, B., & Macfarlane, S. (1998). Prosody as an interactional resource: Turn-projection and overlap. *Language and Speech, 41*(3-4), 265-294.

West, C. (2006). Coordinating closings in primary care visits: Producing continuity of care. In J. Heritage & D. W. Maynard (Eds.), *Communication in Medical Care: Interaction between Primary Care Physicians and Patients* (pp. 379-415). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Whalen, J., & Zimmerman, D. H. (1990). Describing trouble: Practical epistemology in citizen calls to police. *Language in Society, 19*(3), 465-492.

Whalen, J., Zimmerman, D. H., & Whalen, M. (1988). When words fail: A single case analysis. *Social Problems, 35*(4), 335-361.

Whalen, M., & Zimmerman, D. H. (1987). Sequential and institutional contexts in calls for help. *Social Psychology Quarterly, 50*(2), 172-185.

Wilkinson, S., & Kitzinger, C. (2006). Surprise as an interactional achievement: Reaction tokens in conversation *Social Psychology Quarterly, 69*(2), 150-182.

Zimmerman, D. H. (1992). The interactional organization of calls for emergency assistance. In P. Drew & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Talk at Work: Interaction in Institutional Settings* (pp. 418-469). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Zimmerman, D. H. (2006). *How closings matter in emergency telephone calls.* Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Sociological Association, Montreal.

Appendix A

Overview of the Jeffersonian transcription system

This transcription conventions for this thesis have been adapted from Jefferson (2004) and Hepburn and Bolden (forthcoming). Line numbers are included down the left-hand side of a transcript to act as a point of reference. These numbers are followed by some sort of code to identify particular parties to an interaction. In the CHC data corpus this is either E00 (E01-E11), to indicate an employee, or C000 (C001- C139), to indicate a client. These codes are followed, to the right, by a transcript of that party's conduct. In these calls, that conduct is usually speech. The particular details of conduct have been transcribed using the following conventions:

[
A left square bracket indicates overlap onset.

]
A right square bracket indicates overlap offset. It can also be used to parse out segments of overlapping utterances, in order to aid analytic clarity.

Word=Word
An equal sign indicates no gap between the end of one turn and the beginning of another, or between two parts of a single turn. The latter case is often indicative of a 'rush-through' (cf. §4.4.2).

(0.6)
Numbers within parentheses indicate an impressionistic timing of the time that has elapsed between utterances, to the nearest tenth of a second.

(.)
A period within parentheses indicates an impressionistic timing of a brief silence of less than two-tenths of a second.

Word
Underscoring indicates that some form of stress is being indicated on the underlined syllables.

Wo::rd	Colons indicate a stretching of the immediately preceding sound that has been transcribed. The number of colons can be increased to represent longer stretching.
Wo:rd	Underscoring a colons is used to indicate an intonation contour in which the pitch rises within a word.
Wo:rd	Underscoring before colons is used to indicate an intonation contour in which the pitch falls within a word.
↑Wo↓rd	Arrows indicate shifts into particularly high or low pitch. These shifts occur in the syllable(s) that succeed the arrows.
.	A period is used to mark falling or final intonation.
,	A comma is used to mark continuing or slightly rising intonation.
¿	An inverted question mark is used to mark moderately rising intonation.
?	A question mark is used to mark strong rising, or questioning, intonation.
Word_	An underscore is used to specifically mark that the transcriber heard the intonation as level at the end of a word.
WORD	Uppercase lettering is used to indicate that the pronunciation of these sounds is loud, relative to a speakers' surrounding talk.
°Word°	Degree signs are used to bracket utterances that are softer, relative to a speakers' surrounding talk.
<Word	A pre-positioned left carat is used to indicate a 'left push' or 'jump start,' where a speaker is making a hurried start to the transcribed utterance.
Wor-	A dash indicates a cut-off in the pronunciation of the transcribed utterance.

221

>Word<	Utterances enclosed within right and then left carats are pronounced in a speedier fashion than a speaker's surrounding talk.
<Word>	Utterances enclosed within left and then right carats are pronounced in a slower fashion than a speaker's surrounding talk.
.hhh	A period-prefaced row of h's indicates audible inhalation. The greater the number of h's, the longer the inhalation.
hhh	A row of h's that is not prefaced with a period represents audible aspiration. The greater the number of h's, the longer the aspiration.
tch	This represents a dental click, which is made by placing the tip of the tongue against the alveolar ridge of the upper teeth, and then removing the tongue with sufficient speed to produce a click sound.
mph	This represents a lip-smacking sound, where there is an audible parting of a speaker's lips.
.mphh	A period-prefaced 'mp' and row of h's indicates an audible lip-smacking sound, followed by an inhalation. The greater the number of h's, the longer the inhalation.
Wor(h)d	Parenthesized h's are used to indicate that a transcribed utterance is interspersed with plosive aspiration. This may be indicative of laughter, crying, etc.
£Word£	The pound sterling mark is used to enclose utterances that are produced with a 'suppressed laughter' quality, which is sometimes referred to as 'smile voice.'
~Word~	Tilde signs are used to enclose utterances that are produced with a tremulous voice.
( )	Empty parentheses indicate that a transcriber was unable to hear what was said. The length of the space provides an impressionistic measurement of the length of the unheard talk.

222

(Word)	Utterances within parentheses indicate that the transcriber has recorded an uncertain hearing of what was said.
(Word/Word)	Utterances within parentheses and separated by a solidus represent two possible hearings of what was said.
((coughs))	Double parentheses are used to contain a transcriber's description of some feature of the interaction.
Word	Boldface is used to draw attention to the focus of analytic attention

Appendix B

Employee information sheet

A Study of Telephone Use to Negotiate Service Provision to Independently Living Older South Australians
An invitation for staff to participate

What is the purpose of the study?
This study is looking to discover how clients make requests for information and services over the telephone, when they interact with community and home care service staff. The study will be conducted by Stuart Ekberg who is undertaking doctoral research within the School of Psychology at the University of Adelaide.

What does the study involve?
The study involves recording talking on the phone between the staff and clients *who have offered their informed consent to participate*. The calls will be recorded, as well as being transcribed for the purpose of analysing the broad patterns identifiable in the nature and form of clients' requests for services. We *are not* interested in the details of what you say, but rather the broad and general ways in which people organise the provision of services.

How will I be involved?
Please rest assured that the practice of recording a sample of calls will not impact upon the conditions of your employment or your contract of employment *in any way*. This study is not a performance review but is rather a study of the sorts of requests that clients make of staff and how staff respond to them. Your anonymity will be protected, as no names or identifying information will be made available as a result of the study. Recordings will be stored in a secure site at the University of Adelaide. Short extracts from some of the recorded calls may be used in presentations and reports resulting from the research, but all identifying details (for example, names, or any other information that could identify participants) will be removed prior to this. In addition, the sound of any recorded voices will be digitally altered in any audio presentations to ensure that all participants remain anonymous.

If you agree to participate in the project, you will be involved in the recording of the phone calls. Recording is a straightforward process, and appropriate training and support will be provided.

What happens to the results?
Your involvement in the study will contribute to a better understanding of how service provision is carried out to enhance the satisfaction of both clients and staff. This knowledge can be then be incorporated into policies, practices and staff training protocols. The work will also contribute to an understanding of how people go about doing their job successfully in dealing with a variety of people and their needs.

224

How long will the study last?
It is anticipated that the recording of interactions will take place for several months in 2008.

What happens if I don't want to participate?
Nothing at all. The nature of your employment remains unchanged. If you do agree to participate, your employment conditions also remain unchanged.

What happens if I wish to withdraw from the study?
Your participation in this study is entirely voluntary and you retain the right to withdraw your involvement in the study at any stage. If you wish to withdraw, please notify the researcher, Stuart Ekberg.

What if I have further questions about the study?
If you have any further questions concerning the nature of the proposed study, in the first instance please contact the researcher, Stuart Ekberg. His research supervisor at the University of Adelaide, Associate Professor LeCouteur can also be contacted in this regard.

Researcher:
Stuart Ekberg
0424 454 527
stuart.ekberg@adelaide.edu.au

Principal Supervisor:
Associate Professor Amanda LeCouteur
8303 5557
amanda.lecouteur@adelaide.edu.au

Convenor of the School of Psychology's Human Ethics Committee:
Associate Professor Paul Delfabbro
8303 4936
paul.delfabbro@adelaide.edu.au

Appendix C

Employee consent form

School of Psychology
Faculty of Health Sciences

CONSENT FORM

For People Who Are Participants in a Research Project

---

1. I, …………………………………………………………………. *(please print name)*
    consent to take part in the research project entitled:

    "A Study of Telephone Use to Negotiate the Provision of Services to
    Independently Living Older South Australians: Identifying Good Practices"

2. I acknowledge that I have read the information sheet that describes the
    above study

3. I have had the project, so far as it affects me, fully explained to my
    satisfaction by the information sheet and, where necessary, the researcher.
    My consent in freely given.

4. Although I understand that the purpose of this research is to improve the
    quality of service and support, I understand that my involvement in this
    project may not be of any direct benefit to me.

5. I have been informed that, while information gained during the study may be
    published, I will not be identified and my personal details will not be divulged.

6. I understand that I am free to withdraw from the project at any time, without
    prejudice.

7. I am aware that I may request to retain a copy of this Consent Form, when
    completed, and that I should retain this along with the provided Information
    Sheet.

    ……
    (signature)   *(date)*

Appendix D

Employee instruction sheet

Employee Instructions for Recording Calls with Clients

Ethics Script

At the beginning of the call (after hellos but before the main topic of the call):

"Can I just interrupt you for a second? We're doing a communication study with the University of Adelaide at the moment where we record our calls. Although the call is recorded, the University will mask all revealing details so you will remain anonymous. Regardless of whether you participate, your service provision will remain the same. Are you happy to participate?"

If the client says '**yes**':
"The study is going to continue for a couple of months, so is it okay if we record all your calls to us, just to save me asking you every time we speak?"

If the client says '**no**':
Stop the recording but make a note of client's name for Stuart's consent records

---

What is the aim of the study?
- Broadly, the study is about trying to understand how it is that community-care organizations use the phone to organise services for people when they are not in the same room as each other
- The researcher is a social psychologist who specialises in communication. He will collect a large number of these phone calls and examine them for common elements.

What happens once the call is recorded?
- The call is recorded onto a computer.
- All of the recordings are stored at the University of Adelaide. They are not kept at [THE AGENCY].
- The researcher will make transcripts of the phone calls. Most of his work will involve these transcripts. No revealing details (your name, address, etc) will be included. Where actual recordings are to be used, special modifications will be made to them:
  - o Names of people and places and other identifying features of the call will be deleted
  - o The voices will be masked
- The calls will be analysed until at least 2010. Presentations will be made to [THE AGENCY] and the University community.

What happens if I don't want my call to be recorded?
- Nothing. It is your right to privacy and we respect that.
- Regardless of whether you choose to participate in the study or not, your service provision will not be changed *in any way*.

- You can ask to have the recording stopped at any stage of the call

What if I have more questions?
- Please call the School of Psychology on 8303 5693
- Ask to leave a message for Stuart Ekberg
- Leave your name and phone number
- He will return your call within a day or two

Appendix E

Transcript for case study

```
   ((ethics exchange))
01 E04:   .hhh u::m tch and I'm >just ringin' just to let you
02        know< of course u::m (.) Kathleen's still off.
03        khhh!.hh now it's gonna be Mandy but the girls have
04        put it in at one o'clock is that a problem for you¿
05            (0.6)
06 C018:  it's a bit late but it doesn't mattah.
07            (.)
08 E04:   you shure you don't mind?
09            (0.2)
10 E04:   I know i- I know it's an inconvenience and thank
11        you for that and I think Kathleen should be back
12        pretty soon. .hhh-.hh
13            (0.4)
14 E04:   so thank you very much for tha:t. .hh u::m and
15        Cindy's still off as we:ll so u:m (0.2) she's
16        >gonna be off< for a little bit.=did I tell you
17        that she'd broken 'er 'er wrist? .hhhh
18            (.)
19 C018:  yes:.
20 E04:   yep.=>I'm just [tryin' to< ((rustling paper)) s]=
21 C018:                 [    (g i v e    m y)        ]
22 E04:   =ee:, (0.4) while I've got you who it is [ com]ing.
23 C018:                                          [give]
24        [my bes]t wishes onto her. >if yo[u e]ver< (.)
25 E04:   [ .hhh ]                         [y- ]
26 C018:  t[alk-]
27 E04:    [ y e]:ah. thank you we'll give her a ca:ll.=yeah
28        it's going to be: uh E:mma again on: (.)
29        Thu:rsday,=I think you had her last ti:me. .mphh
30            (0.2)
31 E04:   a blonde lady. blondey coloured lady. .hhh hair I
32        mean. huh huh-huh! .hhh oka:y?
33 C018:  I had Suzanne.
34            (0.4)
35 E04:   °e-°
36            (0.2)
37 E04:   pard'n?
38            (.)
39 C018:  Suza:nne.
40 E04:   did you have Suzanne,
41 C018:  yes.
42 E04:   oh okay.=they've put Emma here I thought you'd had
43        her before. .hhhh
44            (0.6)
45 E04:   so is that o[k a]:y?
46 C018:              [Su-]
47 C018:  SUzanne >was the first< e:rm (0.4) I think it's the
48        first fortnight she's been working for you.
49            (0.6)
50 E04:   o::h right. ohkay.
51            (0.7)
```

```
52 E04:   ˚yea:h.˚ >oh w'l< I'll look at thAt then but the- I
53         know they've put down here E:mma.
54             (.)
55 E04:   mph
56 C018:  eh ha-ha
57 E04:   is that alright?=
58 C018:                    =e:ither yes.
59             (.)
60 E04:   ohkay. thank you. [ ~.h]-.h-.hhh.h~ thank you an:'=
61 C018:                     [(bh)]
62 E04:   =[ e:rm ]
63 C018:  =[oh I t]hought you was talkin' about the grocery.
64             (.)
65 E04:   yeh-=oh no that's going to be Mandy. who you
66         know.=you've met Mandy:- she's the one that does
67         lots of relief work. you'll know her pretty well
68         when you see her¿ .mphh=
69 C018:                        =mm hm.
70 E04:   alri:p?
71             (0.4)
72 C018:  yep.
73 E04:   ˚okay˚. thAnk you. see ya later. bye bye.
74             (.)
75 C018:  bye
76             (1.2)
77         ((call ends))
```

230

Appendix F:

Report to collaborating agencies

Arranging care from a distance: Practical observations from a study of home care service calls

Stuart Ekberg
Doctoral Candidate
School of Psychology
University of Adelaide

August 2010

Overview

This summary details the following findings and research outputs:

1. Problems associated with practices of referring to care workers

2. Importance of continuity of care

3. Client confusion about institutional requirements

4. Resources for recruitment and training

Introduction

The study involved an exploration of the day-to-day administration and organisation of the Home And Community Care (HACC), Community Aged Care Packages (CACP), Extended Aged Care at Home (EACH), and the Transition Care Package (TCP) programs. The data for the study were telephone conversations between clients of these services and employees who organise the ongoing provision of care that is tailored to suit the individual needs of clients.

A total of 375 conversations were recorded between consenting clients and employees in 2008, across three service sites. These conversations were closely and repeatedly

studied, with the aim of identifying some of the commonsense practices that underpin routine activities, such as making service modifications. The findings will be detailed in a thesis, as well as publications in scholarly journals, which will be forthcoming from 2011.

As home care service calls have never been studied before, many of the findings in the forthcoming thesis are foundational or theoretical. For this reason, much of the analysis within the thesis cannot be applied to inform policy and practice. This report summarises the findings from the study that *can* have an application. The first section details the applied findings of the research project that was conducted between 2008 and 2010. The second section contains some additional observations that have been made during the analytic process.

Applied finding: Referring to particular services

This project was exploratory research of a domain of interaction that has never been systematically studied before. The aim of the research was not to critique existing practices in this area, but rather to understand how these practices make sense to the clients and employees involved. To service this goal, an account was generated, based on an analysis of around 100 instances, of how employees make service arrangements with clients. This practice was found to be an adaptation the way in which people make arrangements with one another in everyday conversation. There is a real strength in using everyday conversational practices to achieve institutional goals. This reduces the need for clients to learn the 'lingo' of a service that they utilise.

A similar observation was made about how employees refer to care workers that will be coming to visit clients. Employees were observed to use references that convey whether they think that the client is acquainted with a particular care worker. For instance, referring to a care worker only by their first name implies an acquaintance between the client and that care worker. Alternatively, referring with an expression like 'a lady called Ann' implies unacquaintance. This is a practice that is also routinely observed in non-institutional conversations. The following is an example where a employee shifts from using one reference form, which conveys an assumption of

232

acquaintance, to another that conveys an assumption of unacquaintance (these references have been placed in boldface):

> "Uhm, in the morning, cos Penny's working in the office for a while, **Linda** will come, **a girl called Linda**, but it'll be eight o'clock."

The two lines of inquiry discussed above – the making of arrangements and references to care workers – have a particular applied aspect when it comes to the recorded conversations that proved to be problematic for the client and employee involved. For the most part, the conversations that were studied went very smoothly. However, occasional misunderstandings were observed and these were studied to determine their cause.

Some misunderstandings arose from the way in which employees referred to care workers, in the process of trying to modify an otherwise ongoing service arrangement. Employees were observed routinely to identify a particular service with the name of the care worker who usually delivered that service, rather than with reference to the type of service that is provided. The following is an example:

> "I'm just ringing to let you know of course Kathleen's still off. Now it's going to be Mandy, but the girls have put it in at one o'clock. Is that a problem for you?"

In this instance, no reference is made to what the usual service is (e.g., cleaning). Rather, the service is indirectly referred to by naming the care worker that usually performs it (Kathleen). It seems that under these conditions, clients can sometimes find it difficult to determine which service is being referred to. This occasionally leads to misunderstandings in the calls that were studied. These misunderstandings often take considerable time to address. Moreover, they could also pose a threat to the client's satisfaction with the service that they are receiving, particularly in instances where the misunderstanding leads to a disagreement over which care workers come for particular services.

One problem in addressing the situation above is that previous research has suggested that 'overbuilding' references can be heard by recipients as patronising (Stivers, 2004).

Overbuilding involves the use of a reference form that contains more information than is necessary for a recipient to understand the reference. So while there would be a benefit to making references to services more clear, this needs to be done in a way that does not 'overbuild' whatever reference is used. One possible remedy is to trial the following type of practice, where the service being altered gets explicitly referred to:

> *"I'm just ringing to let you know of course Kathleen's still off. Now it's going to be Mandy* <u>for your shopping</u>*, but the girls have put it in at one o'clock. Is that a problem for you?"*

The inclusion of a service reference would make explicit which service is being discussed, without the possible inference that the employee is being patronising (as could come from a reference like "Kathleen's still off. You know, she's the one that comes to do your shopping"). This is a small observation, and yet it is one that has the potential to avoid a range of misunderstandings in these interactions.

Additional observations: Sources of client (dis)satisfaction

The above finding has arisen from a close study of how clients and employees actually interact with one another. Such a study allows for an identification of problems that arise within actual episodes of interaction, rather than, say, from surveys of the service. In surveys, it is possible for clients to offer *possible* or hypothetical shortcomings or problems with the service. In recorded interaction, it is possible to gain access to *actual* problems and the specific details that these problems can entail. Although misunderstandings and problems were not often observed in the calls that were recorded for this study, there were two institutional practices that were problematic for several of the 139 clients that were involved in the study.

The first incidental finding was that some clients expressed dissatisfaction (in a variety of ways) with having too many new and different care workers. As one client put it to her employee about having different care workers for her showering: "there's nothing worse than when you're stark naked having to meet new people all the time." Many

clients also discussed (often positively) the importance of establishing rapport with their care workers. The importance of this type of continuity of care has been noted in a previous study of CACP packages in Sydney (Thomas et al., 2007). Observations in the current study lend support to this finding.

A second incidental finding from the study was that some clients struggled to understand the implications that insurance and service regulation limitations can have upon institutional practice. This was particularly the case for the spouses of clients, who sometimes struggled to understand why it was not possible for them to travel with their spouse's care worker to complete tasks like shopping. This situation tended to arise when a client was ill and therefore unable to leave the home. It might be worth considering whether there is some pragmatic solution that could be applied to deal with such instances.

Resources for recruitment and training

Another outcome of the study was the opportunity to identify the recorded calls that posed challenges to the employee involved. Transcripts of these calls can be used for training and recruitment purposes and can be obtained from the General Manager for Health and Community Aged Care. As Kitzinger (in press) shows, it can be useful to present 'real life' instances of interactions with clients to applicants/trainees, and to ask them how they would respond in that particular situation.

For further information about the study, please email:

stuart.ekberg@alumni.adelaide.edu.au

References

Kitzinger, C. (in press). Working with childbirth helplines: The contributions and limitations of conversation analysis. In C. Antaki (Ed.), *Applied Conversation Analysis: Changing Institutional Practices*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan Ltd.

Stivers, T. (2004). No no no and other types of multiple sayings in social interaction. *Human Communication Research*, 30(2), 260-293.

Thomas, M., Woodhouse, B., Rees-Mackenzie, J., & Jeon, Y.-H. (2007). Use of and satisfaction with Community Aged Care Packages in the eastern suburbs of Sydney. *Australasian Journal on Ageing,* 26(1), 8-14.

Appendix G

Running sheet and slides of presentation to agency employees

A presentation of some of the findings contained within this thesis and their possible implications for CHC practice was made in May 2010 to a gathering of the agency staff that participated in the study. The following is a combination of the slides and running sheet that was used in the presentation, and gives an indication of the type of practical feedback that was provided to the collaborating CHC agencies.

<u>Slide 1</u>

Today's session is an opportunity for us to use the methods of conversation analysis to be able to reflect upon everyday work practices that you probably don't have the time to normally give a second thought to.

Along the way, I will introduce some of the findings from my study, but much of this session is actually an opportunity for *you* to examine how some of these practices work.

In roles like yours, where you spend a significant amount of time interacting with clients on the phone, it can be difficult to self-assess how you are going, because you don't have a direct record of what you've been doing.

Recording and listening back to calls, however, allows us to stop and consider what routinely happens in this work, on a moment-by-moment basis.

Hopefully what we'll gain out of this session is an understanding of how tiny components of talk can have massive implications for the direction in which conversations progress, and that this has implications for how you might interact with your clients.

Before we go any further, I really need to emphasise that this is a reflective, rather than a critical, exercise. None of these calls have been selected because I think that they are bad. Some of them certainly contain challenges, and that's why they've been chosen. And while we'll be considering alternative courses of action, I think you'll come to agree with me that there is nothing specifically wrong with the way that the calls originally did transpire.

Part1:
A stop-frame reflection on practice

THE UNIVERSITY
OF ADELAIDE
AUSTRALIA

Aims:

- Listen to a single call, a segment at a time

- Reflect upon what progressively gets said and to consider
alternative courses of action

- Consider implications that this might have for policy and
practice

Today, we're going to predominantly focus on a single call between a client and
employee. I'll initially play it in small chunks, which will give us an opportunity to
consider what has been said, what else might have been said, and whether that
actually matters.

After playing each section of the conversation for you to hear, I will put a transcript of
that talk up on the screen. That transcript has a lot of technical notation in it. Some of
it I might explain along the way, but please ask me if you have any questions. Hopefully
this notation won't make reading the transcripts too difficult.

You will also hear that I have tried to anonymise the recordings by changing the pitch
of the voices and by reversing the pronunciation of any names.

Are there any questions at this stage? If not, let's dive in.

A stop-frame reflection on practice

```
Ann:    .hhh u::m tch and I'm >just ringin' just to let
        you know< of course u::m (.) Kathleen's still off.
        khhh! .hh now it's gonna be Mandy but the girls
        have put it in at one o'clock is that a problem
        for you¿
        (0.6)
Bob:    it's a bit late but it doesn't mattah.
        (.)
Ann:    you shure you don't mind?
        (0.2)
Ann:    I know i- I know it's an inconvenience and thank
        you for that and I think Kathleen should be back
        pretty soon.  .hhh-.hh
        (0.4)
Ann:    so thank you very much for tha:t.
```

The call that I am about to play you lasts for around a minute and a half. It is between a female coordinator, who I have called Ann, and her male client, who I have called Bob.

Throughout this call, Ann tries to make modifications to two of Bob's services. Both of these are because his usual care worker is temporarily unavailable.

As I play each section, I want us to place ourselves in the position of Ann, as she interacts with Bob. Think of this as something like a role play exercise but, because it actually happened, this will be much more gritty and authentic than any role play that I could have dreamed up.

We'll begin listening early into the call, just after Ann has asked for Bob's consent to record the call.

   Play segment01, then click to display transcript

I know this is early on, but does anybody have any impressions about the way in which Ann has framed this question?

Given Bob's response, what do you think are some of the ways in which you might next proceed?

Could say: you can bear in mind that I've already told you that Ann is in a position to discuss a second service modification.

Okay, let's hear what Ann actually does say

Does anybody have any thoughts about the effectiveness of checking with the client as to whether he minds?

Notice that the transcript shows a slight gap in the conversation after Ann's turn here. Let's hear what happens next

So evidently, Ann has taken Bob's silence as an indicator that he *does* mind. Her response to this is to acknowledge the inconvenience, thank him for being accommodating and to promise that his service arrangements will soon be back to normal.

So out of all of the options that we have discussed, do you have any thoughts of which option would have been the most optimal to use in this situation? Why?

```
A stop-frame reflection on practice        [THE UNIVERSITY OF ADELAIDE AUSTRALIA]

Ann:    .hh u::m and Cindy's still off as we:ll so u:m
        (0.2) she's >gonna be off< for a little bit.=did
        I tell you that she'd broken 'er 'er wrist? .hhhh
         (.)
Bob:    yes:.
Ann:    yep.=>I'm just [tryin' to< ((rustling paper)) ]
Bob:                   [       (g i v e      m y)      ]
Ann:    see:, (0.4) while I've got you who it is
        [ com]ing. [ .hhh ]
Bob:    [give]     [my bes]t wishes onto her. >if
        yo[u e]ver< (.) t[alk-]
Ann:      [y- ]          [ y e]:ah. thank you we'll give
        her a ca:ll.=yeah it's going to be: uh E:mma
        again on: (.) Thu:rsday,=I think you had her last
        ti:me. mcht
```

I'm now going to play another section of the talk. At the end of this fragment, I'd like to again consider the position that Ann finds herself in.

   Play segment05, then click to display transcript

So Ann has now introduced the second service modification. Does anyone have anything to reflect upon about the way in which Ann does this?

   Reflect

Before we move on, I'd like to point your attention to the last thing that Ann says here; the little clue that she provides Bob about Emma ("I think you had her last time"). This is going to be relevant.

A stop-frame reflection on practice

```
Ann:   I think you had her last ti:me. mcht
          (0.2)
Ann:   A blonde lady. blondey coloured lady. .hhh hair I
       mean. huh huh-huh! .hhh oka:y?
Bob:   I had Suzanne.
          (0.4)
Ann:   °e-°
          (0.2)
Ann:   pard'n?
          (.)
Bob:   Suza:nne.
Ann:   did you have Suzanne,
Bob:   yes.
```

Play segment06, then click to display transcript

What is going on here!?

Reflect: may wish to point out that Bob does not respond to Ann's first recognition solicit, so she produces further information to aid in his recognition.

Alright. So let's hear how Bob does eventually respond to this.

Play segment07, then click to display transcript

Right. Did anyone see that coming? Does anyone have a sense of what might have caused that?

Reflect

What do you think Ann can do now?

Reflect: Point out that Bob has not provided evidence for how his version of events is the correct one, or, conversely, how Ann's version of events is incorrect.

Let's listen to what Ann does say.

Play segment08, then click to display transcript

Ann here initiates what we call 'repair' on Bob's prior turn at talk. Her first attempt at repair could display to Bob that she experienced a problem in hearing what he said. However, these repair initiators can also be taken as displaying a problem with the suitability of what was said. Bob could treat her turn as indicating that he hasn't provided evidence for his version of events. However, he doesn't do this.

So Ann initiates repair again, this time with a more targeted form. This only results in confirmation from Bob.

So this leaves Ann in a tricky position. Presumably she has good reason for knowing that Emma came last time. Her client is claiming otherwise, but hasn't explained why he is doing so. Do you have any thoughts on where she could go next?

Reflect

Slide 6

A stop-frame reflection on practice

THE UNIVERSITY OF ADELAIDE AUSTRALIA

Ann has claimed:

Kathleen, who usually comes for 'service A', is unavailable Mandy will replace Kathleen

Cindy, who usually comes for 'service B', is also unavailable Emma, who Bob has last time, will replace Cindy

Bob has claimed:

That he had Suzanne (last time, rather than Emma)

Now let's just remind ourselves what's happened so far.

Firstly, Ann has claimed:

Kathleen, who usually comes for 'service A,' is unavailable. Mandy will replace Kathleen.

Cindy, who usually comes for 'service B,' is also unavailable. Emma, who Bob has last time, will replace Cindy

Bob has claimed:

That he had Suzanne (last time, rather than Emma).

So we have two seemingly incompatible versions of a single event. Ann has tried twice to get more information out of Bob and it hasn't worked. Let's see what happens next.

<u>Slide 7</u>

Play segment 09, then click to display transcript

What do you think of Ann's attempt to get things back on track with her question: "so is that okay"?

> *Reflect: Might want to point out that Ann only asks this question after a gap in the talk where Bob has not responded to her prior claim that he's had Emma before. Might also want to note that this is different from Ann's earlier claim that Bob had Emma 'last time.'*

Alright, well let's hear how Bob responds to Ann's attempt to get the conversation back on track.

> *Play segment10, then click to display transcript*

Right. So Ann has attempted to move the conversation back to modifying a service arrangement and yet Bob persists with accounting for how he knows that he had Suzanne last time. Where might Ann go from here?

> *Reflect: Point out that there is a gap in the talk, so it appears that Ann is having trouble in either making sense of this comment or in deciding where to go next.*

When she does respond, Ann says this.

> *Play fragment11, then click to display transcript*

Does anybody have an opinion on what Ann has said here?

> *Reflect: Might want to explore "oh well I'll look at that then." Notice how Ann treats what Bob is talking about as a separate or side issue by referring to it as 'that.' She then goes on to return to what she regards as the pertinent issue: who is coming as a particular replacement care worker.*

Let's hear how Bob responds.

> *Play fragment12, then click to display transcript*

So first, we get a chuckle from Bob. He seems to think its bemusing that Ann may still be maintaining that he had Emma last time and that his claim to have had Suzanne is mistaken.

When Ann pursues the acceptability of the arrangement, Bob accepts the arrangement but he does so explicitly without accepting her version of events. He expresses a willingness to have *either* Suzanne or Emma.

<u>Slide 9</u>

A stop-frame reflection on practice

THE UNIVERSITY OF ADELAIDE AUSTRALIA

```
Ann:   ohkay. thank you. [ ~.h]-.h-.hhh.h~ thank you
Bob:                     [(bh)]
Ann:   an:' [ e:rm ]
Bob:        [oh I t]hought you was talkin' about the
       grocery.
          (.)
Ann:   yeh-=oh no that's going to be Mandy. who you
       know.=you've met Mandy:- she's the one that does
       lots of relief work. you'll know her pretty well
       when you see her¿ .mphh=
Bob:                          =mm hm.
Ann:   alri:p?
          (0.4)
Bob:   yep.
Ann:   ˚okay˚. thAnk you. see ya later. bye bye.
          (.)
Bob:   bye
```

So Ann has eventually negotiated two service modifications. Kathleen's been replaced by Mandy, for what we've been calling 'service A,' and Cindy's been replaced with Emma – albeit after some debate over whether Bob had Emma or Suzanne to visit him last time.

It is not until all of this is over that Bob drops a bombshell of sorts – as much of a bombshell that you can get in this type of talk. Let's hear what happens.

Play segment13, then click to display transcript.

So as Ann starts to close down the call, Bob interrupts to display a realisation that when Emma was talking about one service, he was in fact talking about another. Bob thought that the grocery service, which we have been describing as 'service A,' was the single topic of this conversation.

247

You might remember that Ann described Kathleen, the usual grocery care worker, as being 'still off' from work. She later said "and Cindy's still off as well." It appears that Bob did not hear this reference to Cindy as the launch of a second service modification. He appears to have only heard it as an update about Cindy's wellbeing. This could explain why at the time he asks Ann to give Cindy his best wishes. Whatever the precise case might be, what we have here is a misunderstanding. And of course misunderstandings can have consequences.

<u>Slide 10</u>

Given that Bob and Ann's disagreement was over which care worker last came to visit him, I want to now focus specifically on how care workers can be referred to in calls. In fact, what we will be discussing are broader conversational practices that we all engage in, no matter who we are talking to.

There are two basic ways of referring to people that can depend on whether the speaker thinks that the recipient is acquainted with the person being referred to. For instance, if I ring up and say "Hi, my name is Stuart," this conveys to the recipient that I

think they don't know me. However, if I ring up and say "Hi, it's Stuart," this conveys that I expect my recipient to be able to recognise me.

This same principle works when you refer to third parties, like care workers. We can hear both reference options produced in this fragment of conversation.

Play data, then click to display transcript

In this fragment, Jo starts out by using a form that implies that May will know Linda, but then goes on to correct herself and use a form that now implies that May does not know Linda. We'll expand on why this might be the case shortly, but for the meantime let's proceed knowing that there are these two forms of referring to people: one that conveys acquaintance, and another that conveys unacquaintance.

<u>Slide 11</u>

Part 2:
References to care workers in conversation   THE UNIVERSITY OF ADELAIDE AUSTRALIA

```
Jan:    .hhh now I'm jus' ringing=I th:ink V:anessa had
        said that I: would pick you u:p this afternoon
        for the gro:up,=
Dot:                    =yes:
Jan:    .mph but there's a lady called Kerry coming no:w
        i:nstead.=
Dot:             =I know he:r. hm
          (0.2)
Jan:    tch (.) a::h mi:ght be:. ther- (.) there are two
        Kerry[s >but<]
Dot:         [ o : h] yes. there are two:, are
        [there]
Jan:    [  e:i]ther w(h)a(h)y. .uh-.huh! [  y e : s .  ]
Dot:                                     [alright then.]
```

Now it turns out that how you refer to someone in conversation can really matter. I want to show you that by examining fragments of two different conversations. Here's the first.

249

Play audio, then click to display transcript

Having heard, here, of a service modification, it is the client's role to now assent to that modification. What we find, however, is that her assent is delayed. The reason for the delay is the person reference form that is used. I claimed earlier that this form implies unacquaintance.

Play audio, then click to display transcript

So here, in a position where it was relevant for Dot to assent to the service modification that Jan has made, she instead elects to correct the reference form that Jan has used in relation to Kerry. Dot informs Jan that she knows Kerry and that it was therefore mistaken for her to use a reference form that implied that she did not.

As it happens, we then find out that Dot may not know this particular Kerry after all. But what is important is that, at the time, it was important enough for Dot to delay her assent to Jan's service modification, in order to correct a person reference.

Slide 12

Now the same thing can happen in reverse. That is, a coordinator can imply that a client will be acquainted with a care worker, only for the client to point out that they are mistaken. The following call fragment is an example of this.

Play audio, then click for transcript

Again, the client's assent to the service modification is postponed, in order to correct a presumption in the coordinator's reference to a care worker. In this case, the reference form implied acquaintance and the client then countered that she was in fact <u>un</u>acquainted with the replacement care worker.

Slide 13

So evidently, the way we refer to third parties can be really important. It can be so important that people will suspend a particular course of action in order to deal with an apparently incorrect reference form.

So how do we get into this trouble? Well the truth is, most of the time we don't. Most of the time whatever reference form gets used appears to be appropriate. And this appears to be aided by two preferences for referring to people in conversation.

Now when I say 'preferences,' I need to be clear to emphasise that I don't mean rules. People aren't so simple that they just follow rules in conversations. But there do appear to be certain kinds of norms of conversation that get oriented to.

In terms of person references, there are two major preferences. The first is for minimisation. Essentially this means, if at all possible, use a briefer reference form. For instance, it's better to say 'Howard' than 'the previous Prime Minister of Australia.'

However, I can only use the form 'Howard' if I think whoever I'm talking to will understand that reference. With people in this room, that is likely. With a room full of Americans, however, I may need to relax the preference for mimimisation in order to make sure that they understand who I'm referring to. This is our second preference for recipient design.

Essentially it means, design a reference form so that your recipient will be able to locate what it is that you are talking about. And this is the preference that is crucial to the data that we've been considering.

Click to display transcript

Now the data that we examined earlier is an example of how the preference for recipient design can be stronger than that of minimisation. It seems to be the motivation behind Jo changing her reference for from "Linda" to "a girl called Linda." She was making sure that the reference that she used was appropriate for her recipient; or recipient designed.

So what we can take from this is that people tend to do their best to use the smaller reference forms that are nonetheless suitable for their recipients.

Part 2:
References to care workers in conversation

Paediatric Consultation

```
Doc:   Now you're::
          (0.2)
Mum:   Sawy:er.
          (0.3)
Doc:   Ye:[s.]
Mum:      [Ro]ber[t Sawyer.  ]
Doc:              [Yes yes ye]s yes:: yes::.
          (0.4)
Mum:   A very bad cough.=I had ta call the
       doctor...
```

Source: Stivers, T. (2004) '"No no no" and other types of multiple sayings in social interaction', *Human Communication Research*, 30(2): 260-293.

There is another interactional motivation behind designing references to people appropriately. That is, if you use an inappropriate form that under-supposes a recipient's ability to recognise who you are referring to, this can be treated as condescending.

Click to display transcript

This fragment of a conversation, recorded in a paediatric clinic, is an example of where this happens. The doctor asks the child's mother of her son's name. She responds by giving his surname. The doctor in turn receipts that information as adequate. As he is doing this, however, the mother begins to give her son's full name. She has barely finished saying his given name before the doctor comes in with a multitudes of yeses.

Multiple repeats of this kind are a way that a recipient can convey to a speaker that sufficient information has been provided for the action at hand and that the current information is, in fact, superfluous.

In summary, there are some really important preferences behind how we refer to people in conversation. On the one hand, we want to be confident that a recipient knows what we are talking about. On the other hand, we don't want to come across as condescending. If we do so, they might even point this out!

I think these conflicting preferences create a problem in the call that we considered earlier. Now that we've discussed these preferences, I want to return to that call in full to consider how these problems might have been avoided, while also considering the preferences behind person references.

<u>Slide 15</u>

I want to go back over the call that we considered in pieces before and look at it now as an entire call.

Hand out copies of transcript (cf. Appendix E).

So we know now that there was a misunderstanding in this call. What I would like us to do here is to focus on how that misunderstanding might have been avoided. I think

that we'll see that the ways in which people get referred to is important and that this might have implications for practice.

Let's start out by listening to the entire conversation. You might like to follow along on the transcript.

Play full call recording

Now first of all, you'll notice that I've numbered each of the lines. I'll try to let you know of the lines on which relevant practice occur.

The first thing I want to revisit is to consider how the client may have become confused in the first place. Now I can't be sure, but it seems to me that it happens around lines 21 to 24. Before this, Ann has told Bob that Mandy's still away from work and that she is going to be replaced by Kathleen. (We later find out that this is for grocery shopping). Following this first modification, Ann immediately continues to inform Bob that Cindy's still off from work as well. She does this from line 14.

Now based on what we know about this call, the client does not appear to hear this comment as the basis for a second modification, but rather as an update about Mandy's wellbeing. This explains why, at lines 21, 23 and 24, he asks Ann to wish Mandy well.

However, this is <u>not</u> what Ann intends when she brings up Mandy. She moves now to announce a replacement care worker. She does this at lines 28 and 29. Notice however, that at no point does she point out that Emma will be replacing <u>Mandy</u>. She takes it for granted that Bob is following her. In actual fact, Bob is <u>not</u> following her. He takes her to mean that Emma will be replacing <u>Kathleen</u>. This is a problem because Ann says that Bob had Emma 'last time.' But Bob did not have Emma last time to replace Kathleen; he had Suzanne. Thus, the seed of their misunderstanding is sown.

So in the rapid moment-by-moment flow, is there any way of avoiding misunderstandings like these? I think there is, and I think it has something to do with the way that we refer to people in conversation.

You'll remember that I discussed some preferences for referring to people. 1: Make your reference form as small as possible. 2: Design your reference form with your recipient in mind. And 3: Don't be condescending, or else your recipient might point this out!

I think that these references to care workers can be designed to avoid misunderstandings like the one in this call. But I think it will need to be done with those three preferences in mind. After all, the last thing you want is your clients thinking that you're talking down to them.

I think there are 4 occasions in this conversation where the disagreement could have been either avoided or resolved. The first one is at line 29. If Ann had said "I think you had her last time for cleaning," it would not have been possible for Bob to continue to think that they were discussing the grocery shopping service for which Suzanne came last time.

Likewise, at line 37, had Ann said "did you have Suzanne for cleaning?", the inclusion of 'for cleaning' would have revealed to Bob that they were talking about different services. This would have brought the misunderstanding to a close much sooner.

There are two other locations at which a reference to the service type would have made clear who Ann is talking about. At line 42, if she had said "they've put Emma down here to do your cleaning" or at lines 52 and 53 she had said "I know they've put down here Emma for your cleaning," the misunderstanding could have been brought to a close.

Part 4:
Implications for practice

- Using service-type references (e.g. 'for cleaning') to clarify references to service time or service care worker
- Considering the different expectations in these calls:
  - Coordinators: to secure a service modification
  - Clients: to find out more about their care worker (if they are unacquainted)

Now including a reference to the service type along with a replacement care worker's name involves a relaxation of the first preference for using smaller reference forms. But this is okay if it's done to aid the second preference for designing reference with your recipient in mind. And what is crucial, is that I think this all works without coming across as *condescending*.

Think what it would be like if, from line 27, Ann had said "yeah it's going to be Emma again on Thursday. Now you remember Emma don't you? She was the worker that came to you last time." I would imagine that most people would find that sort of talk condescending.

Referring to the service type along with the replacement care worker's name does not do this. It is a way that a coordinator can better ensure that they are on the same page as a client, without talking down to them.

So my small suggestion would be that being slightly clear when interacting with clients could head off the range of potential problems that misunderstandings like these can cause.

I want to finally return to another one of the examples that I presented and to discuss another observation that I've made from the data.

You'll remember the instance where the coordinator Jan used a reference form that implied that the client Dot should be unacquainted with the replacement care worker Kerry.

Dot responds by claiming an acquaintance.

Jan counters this by pointing out that there are two Kerry's that work for the service. She then dismisses the matter, chuckling as she says "either way," and returns to the broader service modification.

For the coordinator here, whether Dot knows Kerry is not of prime importance. Getting a service organised is. What I routinely noticed throughout the calls, however, was that client's display a fairly constant interest in whether they know a care worker that is coming to them. For many clients, there seems to be a preference for having

care workers that they are already acquainted with. As one client says, "it's difficult to get to know someone when you're naked in the shower."

Now with the approach that I've taken, I can't provide any concrete recommendations around this. But it seems to me that as community aged care grows as an industry, there could be an increasing tension between allocating client's care workers that they are familiar with and with running a productive service. An issue like this might be a determining factor in deciding such questions as what an optimal size for a community aged care service centre might be.

As I said, this is speculation on my part and I'm interested to know what thoughts you might have about our discussion in general.

Click for final slide

Part 4:
Implications for practice

THE UNIVERSITY OF ADELAIDE
AUSTRALIA

Any further suggestions

comments

or questions?

Appendix H

Resources for recruitment and training

CLIENT: Hello?
EMPLOYEE: Hello Mrs Gould it's Laura again sorry to keep bothering you.
CLIENT: That's okay.
EMPLOYEE: Now we've got a shift on a Tuesday morning, be from nine to ten. However it's on the opposite week to what you go now. Would that be a problem?
CLIENT: Oh the opposite week,
EMPLOYEE: Yeah.
CLIENT: Well that does make it a bit awkward.
EMPLOYEE: It does?
CLIENT: Yes it does because um er that is a week that I'll always go out with a friend on that particular day.
EMPLOYEE: Could you swap that day and go with a friend when you do the shopping. Could you just swap the two around? Maybe?
CLIENT: Well I doubt that I could. Er no that really doesn't suit me at all not that not the same week.
EMPLOYEE: Right. Okay. Well it will have to be in an afternoon then. That's the last of my morning shifts I'm sorry.
CLIENT: Mm hm.
EMPLOYEE: Okay so it'll have to be an afternoon and um it might have to- I'm I'm really having trouble finding the shift and I know it's hard but couldn't we do it for a while and then we could swap it when another spot comes up or
CLIENT: Well I'd try it for a week or so you know one or two times but really it doesn't suit me at all. Not that week.

EMPLOYEE: Now I was just ringing about your shopping you can have someone do it at 12:15 on Wednesday afternoon. Would that be okay?

CLIENT: No it would not ((chuckles))

EMPLOYEE: Oh okay. But I had a note that you said Wednesday afternoon was okay.

CLIENT: Yes I did until last night our son phoned to say they are coming up on Wednesday.

EMPLOYEE: Oh okay. Um so what other times were okay?

CLIENT: Thursday morning - would that be okay?

EMPLOYEE: No I don't think we have got anyone Thursday morning. Tuesday afternoon?

CLIENT: No we are going to our luncheon tomorrow morning.

EMPLOYEE: Okay. Well the only time we had available was a Wednesday afternoon and unfortunately that was the time you said that you were available.

CLIENT: I was until last night.

EMPLOYEE:	How was your trip?
CLIENT:	Oh love I had a lovely time.
EMPLOYEE:	Oh that's good.
CLIENT:	A lovely time thank you.
EMPLOYEE:	I'm pleased for you.
CLIENT:	You know those days I had off - I still have to pay my weekly don't I?
EMPLOYEE:	Um I think you do. I think you used up your social leave but I'll find out for you.
CLIENT:	Am I entitled to have those girls back here? You know, while I've been away.
EMPLOYEE:	Sorry I missed that.
CLIENT:	You know the days I've had off?
EMPLOYEE:	Yes, Monday and Wednesday wasn't it?
CLIENT:	I'm not allowed to have them another day am I?
EMPLOYEE:	Um
CLIENT:	I'm a bit behind. I'm just wondering whether I can have them, you know, I have Linda Wednesday afternoon for an hour, but I just thought I wonder whether I can fit another hour in somewhere to help me.
EMPLOYEE:	What to clean up and that do you mean?
CLIENT:	Yeah dear, to help me.

EMPLOYEE:	How are you today?
CLIENT:	I'm not well at all.
EMPLOYEE:	Oh dear.
CLIENT:	I was wondering whether I could get a little more help today.
EMPLOYEE:	What is it you need Rose?
CLIENT:	Well I mean I can't do anything. I had a bad asthma turn last night and had to go out to the hospital.
EMPLOYEE:	Oooh really?
CLIENT:	And I'm not supposed to get around very much at all because I can't er I can't breathe that good.
EMPLOYEE:	Okay. Now you've got is it Megan in today?
CLIENT:	Yes whoever cleans.
EMPLOYEE:	Er lets have a look here. She'll be in about lunch time so I'll see if we can make you a bit of lunch in that as well while she's there shall we?
CLIENT:	I don't know. It's just that I can't do the things dear.
EMPLOYEE:	What is it that you want help with Rose?
CLIENT:	Yeah well like, oh I don't know love. I can't get around to do anything.
EMPLOYEE:	Okay. Well look she'll be in then and I'll have a word with her and ask her to perhaps make you and Edward some lunch and do your bed and that sort of thing for you as well while she is.
CLIENT:	Well she always does the beds and that but
EMPLOYEE:	Do you need to see the doctor today?
CLIENT:	Oh I went up to the hospital about 4 o'clock this morning.
EMPLOYEE:	Did you?
CLIENT:	Yes and they said I had to keep quiet.
EMPLOYEE:	And just take it easy.
CLIENT:	Yes and be very careful otherwise it won't clear up.
EMPLOYEE:	Okay.
CLIENT:	It's a bad case of asthma.
EMPLOYEE:	Yeah. Oh it's the weather today.
CLIENT:	I'm sorry to worry you.
EMPLOYEE:	No that's okay. Um so what are you doing now? Are you just sitting there? What's Edward doing today?
CLIENT:	Well see I can't put too much on him because he's doing the washing because that had to be done.
EMPLOYEE:	Yes of course. So what is it you are asking for? What help is it you are wanting?
CLIENT:	Er well if someone could come in before lunchtime like to do a little bit get lunch ready or something.
EMPLOYEE:	Yes Megan will be there about half past twelve so that is right bang on lunch time.
CLIENT:	No well for us it isn't because we're earlier.
EMPLOYEE:	Okay.
CLIENT:	Seen as we've got nothing better to do.

EMPLOYEE: Hello Nell. How are you?
CLIENT: Oh I'm not too bad today.
EMPLOYEE: Good.
CLIENT: Um, Jenny wasn't really happy with Mandy on Thursday.
EMPLOYEE: She wasn't? What was wrong?
CLIENT: Well she wasn't confident in her driving.
EMPLOYEE: Oh okay. Oh. Okay. Mandy's been with us for a long, long time. I've never had anybody complain before. Um look, that's okay. Was there anything specific?
CLIENT: Well she would like somebody younger if she can get them.
EMPLOYEE: Okay. Look, what I'll do is I'll have a look but as I explained to you when you signed the contract, it really is a matter of finding people that fit in with the times that you want.
CLIENT: Right.
EMPLOYEE: So if she's happy for me to - well not happy but if she's okay with I'll have a look and see what I can do.
CLIENT: Yeah.
EMPLOYEE: But until I can change it um if
CLIENT: She said she would rather not go than go with Mandy.

EMPLOYEE:	I've just had a call from Belinda. She said that you wanted to tell me something about yesterday.
CLIENT:	Oh well how do I go about it?
EMPLOYEE:	Just spit it out, that's fine.
CLIENT:	Well, the lass comes in with a coffee with a straw in her mouth,
EMPLOYEE:	Mm hm.
CLIENT:	Sits down in the chair and I said to her "here's the list." Oh I said "do you know around here." And she said, oh she said she knew where Foodlands were. She said "right, who's coming shopping with me?" I said "oh the girls do it on their own." I said "I let them do that because I think it's quicker."
EMPLOYEE:	Mmmm.
CLIENT:	But when she come in the door - oh you don't smoke do you?
EMPLOYEE:	No I don't.
CLIENT:	No. Well, it was overpowering.
EMPLOYEE:	Yes.
CLIENT:	And John's
EMPLOYEE:	With his asthma
CLIENT:	He's asthmatic.
EMPLOYEE:	Yep.
CLIENT:	So anyway she did the shopping that was okay but I kinda smelt – I don't know whether it got up my nose by that time or what – but I kind of smelt it on the wrappings on the food.
EMPLOYEE:	Oh okay.
CLIENT:	It might have been my imagination. Probably got up my nose by then.
EMPLOYEE:	Yep.
CLIENT:	Anyway, I wanted to get her outside so I asked her would she sweep the verandah. She never helped me put things away like the other girls do. I asked her a couple of times.
EMPLOYEE:	Okay.
CLIENT:	I said "oh that goes there" or "that goes there." And um so she swept the back verandah and I said - I couldn't tolerate the smell anymore.
EMPLOYEE:	That's fine Kay, that's fine.
CLIENT:	Don't think I'm exaggerating but
EMPLOYEE:	No I don't think that at all.
CLIENT:	Belinda smokes.
EMPLOYEE:	Yes.
CLIENT:	But she makes sure that um - and some of the girls that have been where people who smoke well we accept that you can smell it on their clothes but this was overpowering.
EMPLOYEE:	Was it?
CLIENT:	I was frightened John was gonna have an asthma attack there and then.

EMPLOYEE: Um, today you've got the scrap booking?
CLIENT: Yes.
EMPLOYEE: So Sandra's gonna take you.
CLIENT: Uh huh.
EMPLOYEE: And I'll be in that area myself at around 1 so I'll pick you up. Okay?
CLIENT: Okay. Thank you.
EMPLOYEE: Alright. now you should be wearing a pad today when you go out.
        (silence)
EMPLOYEE: You know that?
CLIENT: No.
EMPLOYEE: Yeah well that's our request that you do because I think you had a
                 little accident when you were at the scrapbooking last time when
                 you couldn't get to the loo on time.
        (silence)
EMPLOYEE: Do you remember that?
CLIENT: Yep.
        (silence)
EMPLOYEE: Alright so can you do that for us?
CLIENT: I haven't got any pads.
EMPLOYEE: Haven't you?
        (silence)
EMPLOYEE: I thought you had some.
CLIENT: No.
EMPLOYEE: Alright. Okay. Well we'll have to try and get you some won't we
                 hey?
CLIENT: No.
EMPLOYEE: Hey?
CLIENT: No.
EMPLOYEE: You mean no? You don't want us to get you any?
        (silence)
EMPLOYEE: Is that what you said?
CLIENT: No, I don't want any.

EMPLOYEE:	The next lot of questions I'll ask you is just how you cope in your day to day life with different things. How about um how do you go like moving around and getting up and down out of chairs and so forth?
CLIENT:	Erm, you see I've got a back problem.
EMPLOYEE:	Yes.
CLIENT:	And I'm taking pain killers.
EMPLOYEE:	Oh okay. Sure.
CLIENT:	That's three times a day, each time two tablets, and that helps me.
EMPLOYEE:	Yes. Yes.
CLIENT:	Right?
EMPLOYEE:	That helps you.
CLIENT:	On the side of getting around you know you can't go out very far today because I can't walk and er, petrol is too expensive.
EMPLOYEE:	Yes. That's right. And what about personal care? Like showering and shaving?
CLIENT:	Oh I have to do all that myself.
EMPLOYEE:	That's okay yeah. Oh good. And what about hanging out laundry?
CLIENT:	Oh I have to do that myself too.
EMPLOYEE:	Oh okay. Sure. And Shopping? You do a lot don't you?
CLIENT:	Yes I do that myself.
EMPLOYEE:	Sure yeah. Uhm, and cooking up meals?
CLIENT:	No, I don't cook.
EMPLOYEE:	No you don't cook?
CLIENT:	No.
EMPLOYEE:	So what do you do for food?
CLIENT:	Erm, you see I go to Coles and buy er potato salad.
EMPLOYEE:	Oh yeah.
CLIENT:	That jumbo container.
EMPLOYEE:	Yes. Yes.
CLIENT:	That's for four meals.
EMPLOYEE:	Yes.
CLIENT:	And when I've finished with that I erm get coleslaw for four meals.
EMPLOYEE:	Yes.
CLIENT:	And then I go back to potato salad and then I get some sausages.
EMPLOYEE:	Oh sure.
CLIENT:	Yeah, I mean that's for lunch.
EMPLOYEE:	Sure, sure.
CLIENT:	Right? And then the morning I've got only Cornflakes.
EMPLOYEE:	Yes.
CLIENT:	Right? And then in the evening I've got er two sandwiches with salami and one with cheese.
EMPLOYEE:	Oh sure. Sure. So basically you just buy easy, convenience foods.
CLIENT:	Yes.
EMPLOYEE:	So you can prepare meals but just simple meals.
CLIENT:	Yes.
EMPLOYEE:	And what about medications are you managing everything?