Communication Faculty Scholarship   Communication

1-1-1984

Agreeing and disagreeing with assessments: Some features of preferred/dispreferred turn shaped

Anita Pomerantz
University at Albany, State University of New York, apomerantz@albany.edu

Recommended Citation

Pomerantz, A., & Heritage, J. (2012). Preference. In J. Sidnell & T. Stivers (Eds.), The Handbook of Conversation Analysis (pp. 210-228). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley-Blackwell Publishing.

4. Agreeing and disagreeing with assessments: some features of preferred/dispreferred turn shapes

ANITA POMERANTZ
University of Oxford

1. Introduction

When persons partake in social activities, they routinely make assessments. Participating in an event and assessing that event are related enterprises, as the following excerpt illustrates:

(1) (VIYMC 1:4)

     J: Let's feel the water. Oh, it ...
     R: It's wonderful. It's just right. It's like
            bathtub water.

In response to J's suggestion to "feel the water," R proffers a series of assessments that are purportedly derived from her participation in feeling the water. The references within those assessments ("It's wonderful. It's just right. It's like bathtub water.") refer to the water that R claims, via the assessments, to have experienced. Assessments are produced as *products* of participation; with an assessment, a speaker claims knowledge of that which he or she is assessing.

The feature of the connectedness between (1) a speaker's proffering an assessment and (2) that speaker's presumed access to, and knowledge of, the assessed referent is visible in declinations to assess. In each of the following fragments, an assessment that is requested in a prior turn is not proffered. A declination is accomplished with a claim of no access to, or insufficient knowledge of, the particular referent in question:

(2) (SBL:2.2.-2)

     A: An how's the <u>dresses</u> coming along. How d'they <u>look</u>.
     →B: Well uh I haven't been uh by there- ...

57

(3)   (SBL:2.2.-1)

    A: How <u>is</u> Aunt Kallie.
    B: Well, I (suspect) she's <u>better</u>.
    A: Oh that's good.
    B: Las' time we talked tuh mother she was uh
        better
    B: Uh Allen, (she wants to know about   ),
        (2.0)
→ B: No, Allen doesn't know anything new out there
        either.[1]

The speakers' claiming insufficient knowledge serves as a warrant for their not giving assessments because assessments are properly based on the speakers' knowledge of what they assess. One of the ways of warranting a declination, then, is to deny the proper basis, that is, sufficient knowledge, for its production.[2]

Although assessments may be seen as products of participation in social activities, the proffering of them is part and parcel of participating in such activities. That is, they are occasioned conversational events with sequential constraints, where one major locus of their occurrences is on the occasions of participation. Recall excerpt (1), in which J suggests that he and R feel the temperature of the water. While participating in that activity R proffers the assessments "It's wonderful. It's just right. It's like bathtub water." Part of participating includes proffering assessments.

A second locus of assessments occurs within speakers' reports of their partaking in activities. The connection between participating and assessing may be seen in such reports. Each of the following excerpts has a sequence of two parts. In the first part, a speaker references an occasion in which he or she had direct experience, for example, "We saw Midnight Cowboy yesterday." The depiction of the event in question is not complete with the referencing alone. A conclusion or point is needed: a summary of the actor's sense or experience of the event. In the second part, then, the speaker indicates a sense of his or her experience by giving an assessment.

(4)   (JS:II:41)

    J: [1] I -n then I tasted it [2] it w'z really
        horrible ...

(5)   (SBL:2.1.7.-1)

    B: [1] I just saw Wengreen outside [2] an' she's an
        she's in <u>bad</u> shape.

(6)   (JS:II:61)   (J and L are husband and wife.)

    J: [1] We saw Midnight Cowboy yesterday -or
        ⌐suh-Friday
    E: ⌊Oh?
    L: Didju s- <u>you</u> saw that, [2] it's really good

(7)   (NB:VIII.-3)

    A: [1] We're painting like mad in the kitchen and,
        [2] Oh ev'rything's workin' out so pretty here
        with our-

(8)   (FD:1)

    C: Uh what's the condition of the building.
    D: Well, I haven't made an inspection of it.
        [1] but I've driven by it a few times, [2] and
        uh it doesn't appear to be too bad, ...

A third locus of assessments is in next turns to initial assessments. Recall that proffering an assessment is a way of participating in at least some activities; for example, assessing the water is a way of participating in "feeling the water." Persons also have ways of coparticipating in activities. One way of coparticipating with a co-conversant who has just proffered an assessment is by proffering a second assessment. It is a description of some features of second assessments that is the aim of this paper.

2. Second assessments

Second assessments are assessments produced by recipients of prior assessments in which the referents in the seconds are the same as those in the priors. A sample of a larger corpus of assessment pairs – initial assessments followed by second assessments – is presented here. Initial assessments are notated with A_1, second assessments with A_2.

(9)   (NB:IV.7.-44)

A_1 A: Adeline's such a swell ⌐gal
A_2 P: ⌊Oh God, <u>whadda</u> gal.
        You know it!

(10)   (JS:II:28)

A_1 J: T's- tsuh beautiful day out isn't it?
A_2^1 L: Yeh it's jus' gorgeous ...

(11)   (NB:1.6.-2)

A₁   A: ... Well, anyway, ihs-ihs not too co:ld,
A¹₂   C: <u>Oh</u> it's <u>warm</u> ...

(12)   (VIYMC: 1.-2) (J and R are in a rowboat on a lake.)

A₁   J: It's really a clear lake, isn't it?
A¹₂   R: It's wonderful.

(13)   (M.Y.)

A₁   A: That (heh) s(heh)sounded (hhh) g(hh)uh!
A¹₂   B: That soun' -- that sounded <u>lovely</u> ...

(14)   (SBL:2.2.4.-3)

A₁   A: Oh it was just <u>beautiful</u>.
A¹₂   B: Well <u>thank</u> you Uh I thought it was quite
            <u>nice</u>,

(15)   (NB:VII.-2)

A₁   E: e-that <u>Pa:t</u> <u>isn</u>'she a do:⌐:ll?
A¹₂   M: ⌊iYeh <u>isn</u>'t she
            pretty,

(16)   (NB:VII.-13)

A₁   E: ... yihknow <u>he's</u> a goodlooking <u>fel</u>'n eez got
            a beautiful <u>wi:fe</u>.=
A₂   M: =<u>Ye:s:</u>:. <u>Go:rgeous girl</u>- ...

(17)   (SBL:2.2.3.-46)

A₁   B: Well, it was fun Cla⌐ire,
A¹₂   A: ⌊Yeah, I enjoyed every
            minute of it.

(18)   (MC:1) ("He" refers to a neighborhood dog.)

A₁   B: Isn't he cute
A¹₂   A: O::h he::s a::DORable

(19)   (JK:3)

A₁   C: ... She was a nice lady--I liked her
A¹₂   G: I liked her too

(20)   (MC:1.-45)

A₁   L: ... I'm so dumb I don't even know it.
            hhh! -- heh!
A₂   W: Y-no, y-you're not du:mb, ...

(21)   (NB:IV:1.-6)

A₁   A: ... 'hhh Oh well it's <u>me</u> too Portia,
            hh yihknow I'm no bott<u>le</u> a' milk,
            (0.6)
A₂   P: Oh:: well <u>yer</u> easy tuh get along with, ...

(22)   (NB:IV:11.-1)

A₁   A: God izn it <u>dreary</u>.
            ‾(0.6)
      A: ⌐Y'know I don't think-
A₂   P: ⌊'hh- it's <u>warm</u> though,

When a speaker assesses a referent that is expectably accessible to a recipient, the initial assessment provides the relevance of the recipient's second assessment. That relevance is particularly visible when initial assessments have a format to invite/constrain subsequence, for example, as interrogatives:

(15)   (NB:VIII.-2) (Pat is M's friend whom E
                           recently met.)

→E: e-that <u>Pa:t</u> <u>isn</u>'she a do:⌐:ll?
 M: ⌊iYeh <u>isn</u>'t she
       pretty,

(18)   (MC:1) ("He" refers to a neighborhood dog.)

→B: Isn't he cute
 A: O::h he::s a::DORable

or with interrogative tags:

(10)   (JS:II:28)

→J: T's- tsuh beautiful day out isn't it?
 R: Yeh it's jus' gorgeous ...

(12)   (VIYMC: 1.-2) (J and R are in a rowboat on a lake.)

→J: It's really a clear lake, isn't it?
 R: It's wonderful.

That relevance, however, does not rely for its operation upon an interrogative format; initial assessments that are asserted also provide for the relevance of, and engender, recipients' second assessments:

(13)   (M.Y.)

            (A and B both participated in the performance which
            is referred to.)

→A: That (heh) s(heh) sounded (hhh) g(hh)uh!
 B: That soun' -- that sounded <u>lovely</u> ...

(17)   (SBL:2.2.3.-46)

       (A and B both attended the bridge party which is
       referred to.)

   →B: Well, it was fun Cla⌐ire,
    A: ⌊Yeah, I enjoyed every
          minute of it.

The discussion thus far may be summarized as follows. One systematic environment in which assessments are proffered is in turns just subsequent to coparticipants' initial assessments. Just as the proffering of an initial assessment is the first speaker's claim of access to the assessed referent, the proffering of a second is the second speaker's claim of access to that referent.[3] The description of assessment pairs as serial claims of access, however, leaves unexplicated the procedures used to coordinate the assessments: the initial one with an anticipated next and a subsequent one with the just prior. This analysis now turns to some of the features of the coordination of second assessments with their priors.[4]

Second assessments have been described as subsequent assessments that refer to the same referents as in the prior assessments. This feature may be restated as a speaker's procedural rule: A recipient of an initial assessment turns his or her attention to that which was just assessed and proffers his or her own assessment of this referent.

Though speakers do coordinate their second assessments with the prior ones by assessing the same referents, there are finer ways in which they coordinate their talk. Consider the following sequence of assessments:

(10)   (JS.II.28)

    J: T's- tsuh beautiful day out isn't it?
    L: Yeh it's jus' gorgeous ...

J's initial assessment is an expression of approval, incorporating the positive descriptor "beautiful." In proffering a praise assessment, he invites the recipient to coparticipate in praising the referent, that is, to agree with him by proffering a subsequent praise assessment.

In a next turn to an assessment that invites agreement, a recipient may, and often does, elect to agree with the prior. In datum (10) above, L's second assessment is a second praise assessment; it is a second

expression of approval, incorporating the positive descriptor "gorgeous." The initial assessment invites a subsequent agreement; the second assessment is proffered *as* an agreement.

While a recipient may elect to agree with a prior assessment that invites agreement, the recipient may alternatively elect to disagree. The following excerpt illustrates this option:

(22)   (NB:IV:11.-1)

    A₁ A: <u>God</u> izn it <u>dreary</u>.
             ⎺⎺(0.6)
     A: ⌐Y'know I don't think-
    A₂ B: ⌊·hh- It's <u>warm</u> though,

A's initial assessment is a complaint about the weather, incorporating the negative descriptor *"dreary."* In proffering the complaint, A invites the recipient, P, to coparticipate in complaining about the weather – to agree with her by proffering a subsequent complaint assessment.[5]

P's second assessment is proffered as a partial disagreement with A's prior complaint. The inclusion of "though" does the work of claiming to agree with the prior while marking, and accompanying, a shift in assessed parameters which partially contrasts with the prior. It contrasts insofar as it is not proffered as a subsequent complaint assessment.[6]

It was proposed earlier that the proffering of an initial assessment to a recipient who may expectably claim access to the referent assessed provides the relevance of the recipient's second assessment. It was also suggested that this proposal, as it stands, leaves unexplicated the ways in which the parts of the assessment pairs are coordinated one with the other. A refinement of the earlier proposal is now in order.

In proffering an initial assessment, a speaker formulates the assessment so as to accomplish an action or multiple actions, for example, praise, complain, compliment, insult, brag, self-deprecate. In the next turn to the initial proffering, an action by the recipient is relevant: to agree or disagree with the prior. Agreement/disagreement names alternative actions that become relevant upon the profferings of initial assessments. Such agreements and disagreements are performed, by and large, with second assessments.

The proffering of an initial assessment, though it provides for the relevance of a recipient's agreement *or* disagreement, may be so structured that it invites one next action over its alternative. A next action that is oriented to as invited will be called a *preferred next action;* its alternative, a *dispreferred next action.*

Agreement is a preferred next action across a large diversity of initial

assessments.[7] Agreement is not *invariably* – across all initial assessments – a preferred next action. What is the preferred next action is structured, in part, by the action performed with the initial assessment. For example, subsequent to a self-deprecation, the usual preference for agreement is nonoperative: An agreement with a prior self-deprecation is dispreferred. (See Section 4).

An import of the preference status of actions is that it bears on how those actions are performed. Isolatable turn-and-sequence shapes provide for different kinds of actualizations of the actions being performed with and through them. Two types of shapes are of interest for this study: One type is a design that maximizes the occurrences of the actions being performed with them, utilizes minimization of gap between its initiation and prior turn's completion, and contains components that are explicitly stated instances of the action being performed. The other type minimizes the occurrences of the actions performed with them, in part utilizing the organization of delays and nonexplicitly stated action components, such as actions other than a conditionally relevant next. The respective turn shapes will be called *preferred-action turn shape* and *dispreferred-action turn shape.*

The thesis of this chapter is that an action, by virtue of how the participants orient to it, will be housed in and performed through a turn shape that reflects their orientation. That is, there is an association between an action's preference status and the turn shape in which it is produced.

This chapter describes the kinds of organizations that bear on the productions of second assessments. To show the relevance and operation of preference status on second-assessment productions, two environments with differing preferences are examined: (1) second assessments that are produced when agreements are preferred, and (2) second assessments produced when agreements are dispreferred.

3. Second-assessment productions: agreement preferred

Subsequent to initial assessments that invite agreement, recipients' agreements and disagreements, respectively, are performed in differently organized turns and sequences. In general, agreement turns/sequences are structured so as to maximize occurrences of stated agreements and disagreement turns/sequences so as to minimize occurrences of stated disagreements. Some overall features of the respective turn and sequence shapes are summarized in the points below:

1. Agreements have agreement components occupying the entire agreement turns; disagreements are often prefaced.
2. Agreements are accomplished with stated agreement components; disagreements may be accomplished with a variety of forms, ranging from unstated to stated disagreements. Frequently disagreements, when stated, are formed as partial agreements/partial disagreements; they are weak forms of disagreement.
3. In general, agreements are performed with a minimization of gap between the prior turn's completion and the agreement turn's initiation; disagreement components are frequently delayed within a turn or over a series of turns.
4. Absences of forthcoming agreements or disagreements by recipients with gaps, requests for clarification, and the like are interpretable as instances of unstated, or as-yet-unstated, disagreements.

Agreements (agreement preferred)

For a recipient to agree with a prior assessment, he or she should show that *his or her* assessment of the referent just assessed by the prior speaker stands in agreement with the prior speaker's assessment. Different types of agreements are produced with second assessments. As will be shown, the types are differentiated on sequential grounds, particularly with respect to their capacities to occur in disagreement turns and sequences.

One type of agreement is the *upgrade.* An upgraded agreement is an assessment of the referent assessed in the prior that incorporates upgraded evaluation terms relative to the prior.[8] Two common techniques for upgrading evaluations are:

(1) A stronger evaluative term than the prior, given graded sets of descriptors, is selected:

(10)   (JS:II:28)

    J: T's– tsuh beautiful day out isn't it?
 → L: Yeh it's just gorgeous ...

(13)   (M.Y.)

    A: That (heh) s(heh) sounded (hhh)
         g(hh)uh!
 → B: That sound' ––– that sounded lovely ...

(18)   (MC:1)

    A: Isn't he cute
 → B: O::h he::s a::DORable

(2) An intensifier modifying the prior evaluative descriptor is included:

(23)   (CH:4.-14)
```
    M:   You must admit it was fun the night we
         we nt down
 →  J:        [It was great fun ...
```

(24)   (SBL:2.1.8.-5)
```
    B:   She seems like a nice little  lady
 →  A:                                [Awfully nice
         little person.
```

(25)   (JS:I:11)
```
    E:   Hal couldn' get over what a good buy that
         was,  (Jon),
 →  J:         [Yeah That's a r- e (rerry good buy).
```

Upgrades following assessments may be considered strong agreements on sequential grounds. When they occur, they occur in agreement turns and sequences and not in combinations with disagreements.[9] Upgraded agreements often occur as parts of clusters of agreements, or agreement series, for example:

(25)   (JS:I:11)
```
    E:   Hal couldn' get over what a good buy that was
         (Jon),
    J:   [Yeah That's a r- a (rerry good buy).
    E:                          [Yea:h,      Great bu:y,
```

(18)   (MC:1)
```
    A:   They keep 'im awful nice somehow
    B:   Oh yeah I think she must wash 'im
         every  week
    A:         [God-che must (h) wash 'im every day the
         way he looks  to me
    B:               [I know it
    A:   He don't get a chance to roll in the dirt
         even
    B:   [Right,
    B:   (Yeah)
```

Another type of agreement is *same* evaluation. In this type, a recipient asserts the same evaluation as the prior speaker's evaluation. To assert the same evaluation, a recipient may repeat the prior evaluative terms, marking it as a second in a like series with, for example, "too":

(19)   (JK:3)
```
    C:   ... She was a nice lady--I liked her
 →  G:   I liked her too
```

(26)   (J & J)
```
    A:   Yeah I like it (      )
 →  B:                        I like it too ...
```

or include proterms indicating same as prior:

(27)   (GTS:4:6)
```
    R:   Ohh man, that was bitchin.
 →  J:   That was.
```

(28)   (GTS:4:15)
```
    K:   ... He's terrific!
 →  J:   He is.
```

(29)   (SBL:2.1.8.-5)
```
    B:   I think everyone enjoyed just sitting around
         talking.
 →  A:   I do too.
```

Same evaluations, of course, occur in agreement turns and agreement sequences. But they also, importantly, occur as components within disagreement turns and sequences. The following data show that same evaluations, indicated by (1), may preface disagreements, indicated by (2).

(26)   (J & J)
```
    A:   Yeah I like it  (      )
    B:                  [[1] I like it too [2] but uhh
         hahheh it blows my mind.
```

(6)   (JS:II:61)   (E is L's mother. J and L are husband and wife.)
```
    E:   ... 'n she said she f- depressed her terribly
    J:   [1] Oh it's  terribly depressing.
    L:              [[1] Oh it's depressing.
    E:   Ve ry
    L:     [[2] But it's a fantastic  film.
    J:                              [[2] It's a
         beautiful movie
```

(30)   (NB:IV:4)

    P: I wish you were gunnuh sta:y
    A: [1] I do too. [2] But I think Oh I've got suh
         damn much tuh do. I really, I've gotta get
         home fer- hh I may stay next week.

In that at least some same evaluations are regularly selected as disagreement prefaces, they may be considered a kind of weak agreement.[10]

A third type of agreement is the *downgrade*. A downgraded agreement is an assessment of the same referent as had been assessed in the prior with scaled-down or weakened evaluation terms relative to the prior.

(31)   (GJ:1)

      A: She's a fox!
    → L: Yeh, she's a pretty girl.

(15)   (NB:VII:2)

      E: e-that Pa:t isn'she a do:[:11?
    → M: [iYeh isn't she
           pretty,

(14)   (SBL:2.2.4.-3)

      A: Oh it was just beautiful.
    → B: Well thank you uh I thought it was quite nice.

(32)   (KC:4:10)

      F: That's beautiful
    → K: Is'n it pretty

Downgraded agreements frequently engender disagreement sequences. One response that conversants make when disagreed with is to reassert the positions that they have previously taken. In response to downgraded assessments, participants often reassert stronger assessments.

(31)   (GJ:1)

      A: She's a fox.
      L: Yeh, she's a pretty girl.
    → A: Oh, she's gorgeous!

(15)   (NB:VII:2)

      E: e-that Pa:t isn'she a do:[:11?
      M: [iYeh isn't she
           pretty,
           (.)
    → E: Oh: she's a beautiful girl.

(33)   (AP:1)

      G: That's fantastic
    → B: Isn't that good
      G: That's marvelous

(14)   (SBL:2.2.4.-3)

      B: An I thought thet uh (1.0) uhm Gene's (1.0)
           singing was --
      A: Oh, was lo[vely.
      B: [pretty much like himse[lf
    →A: [Yes, uh huh,
           it's- Oh it was wonderful

On the basis that at least some downgraded agreements regularly engender disagreement sequences, they, like same evaluation agreements, may be considered a kind of weak agreement.

When an initial assessment is proffered, agreement/disagreement is relevant upon the completion, or more accurately, upon a possible completion point, of the proffering.[11] The temporal coordination of the recipient's second assessment relative to the prior assessment's possible completion is a feature that bears on the accomplishment of the agreement/disagreement. When agreements are invited, strong or upgraded agreements are performed with a minimization of gap (in fact, frequently in slight overlap):

(34)   (NB:PT:19:r)

      L: God it's good.=
    → E: =Isn't that exci:ting,

(35)   (JS:I:17)

      B: Isn'at good?=
    → E: =It's duh::licious.

(24)   (SBL:2.1.8.-5)

      B: She seems like a nice little [lady
    →A: [Awfully nice
           little person.

(25)   (JS:I:11)

```
     E:    Hal couldn' get over what a good buy that was
           (Jon)
  →  J:    └Yeah That's a r- a (rerry ┌good buy).
  →  E:                        .      └Yea:h,      Great bu:y,
```

(18)   (MC:1)

```
     A:    They keep 'im awful nice somehow
     B:    Oh yeah I think she must wash 'm┌every week
  →  A:                                    └God-che must(h)
           wash 'im every day the way he looks ┌to me.
     B:                                         └I know it
```

Disagreements (agreement preferred)

When conversants feel that they are being asked to agree with co-conversants' assessments, they may nonetheless find themselves in the position of disagreeing with them. A substantial number of such disagreements are produced with stated disagreement components delayed or withheld from early positioning within turns and sequences. When a conversant hears a coparticipant's assessment being completed and his or her own agreement/disagreement is relevant and due, he or she may produce delays, such as "no talk," requests for clarification, partial repeats, and other repair initiators, turn prefaces, and so on. Incorporating delay devices constitutes a typical turn shape for disagreements when agreements are invited.

One type of delay device is "no immediately forthcoming talk." Upon the completion of an assessment that invites agreement or confirmation, a conversant, in the course of producing a disagreement, may initially respond with silence. In the fragments below, gaps are notated with (→), disagreement turns with (D).

(22)   (NB:IV:11.-1)

```
     A:    God izn it dreary.
(→)        (0.6)
     A:    ┌Y'know I don't think-
(D)  B:    └·hh It's warm though,
```

(36)   (SBL:2.1.7.-14)

```
     A:    (            ) cause those things take working at,
(→)        (2.0)
(D)  B:    (hhhhh) well, they ┌do, but
     A:                       └They aren't accidents,
```

```
     B:    No, they take working at, But on the other hand,
           some people are born with uhm (1.0) well a
           sense of humor, I think is something yer born
           with Bea.
     A:    Yes. Or it's c- I have the- eh yes, I think a
           lotta people are, but then I think it can be
           developed, too.
(→)        (1.0)
(D)  B:    Yeah, but ┌there's-
     A:              └Any-
     A:    Any of those attributes can be developed.
```

(37)   (TG:3)

```
     A:    ... You sound very far away.
(→)        (0.7)
     B:    I do?
     A:    Ymeahm.
(D)  B:    mNo I'm no:t,
```

Another class of delay devices includes repair initiators. In the course of producing a disagreement, a recipient may request clarification with "what?" "Hm?" questioning repeats, and the like. In the following excerpts, clarification requests are marked with (*), disagreements/ disconfirmations with (D).

(38)   (MC:1:30)

```
     L:    Maybe it's just ez well Wilbur,
(*)  W:    Hm?
     L:    Maybe it's just ez well you don't know.
           (2.0)
(D)  W:    Well./ uh-I say it's suspicious it could be
           something good too.
```

(39)   (TG:1)

```
     B:    Why whhat'sa mattuh with y-Yih sou┌nd=
     A:                                      └Nothing.
     B:    = HA:PPY, hh
(*)  A:    I sound ha:p┌py?
     B:                └Ye:uh.
           (0.3)
(D)  A:    No:,
```

(37)   (TG:3)

```
     A:    ... You sound very far away.
           (0.7)
(*)  B:    I do?
     A:    Meahm.
(D)  B:    mNo? I'm no:t,
```

Disagreement components may also be delayed within turns. Conversants start the turns in which they will disagree in some systematic ways. One way consists of prefacing the disagreement with "uh's," "well's" and the like, thus displaying reluctancy or discomfort.[12] Another way is to preface the disagreement by agreeing with the prior speaker's position. Agreement prefaces are of particular interest because agreements and disagreements are, of course, contrastive components. When they are included within a same turn, the agreement component is conjoined with the disagreement component with a contrast conjunction like "but." An apparent puzzle regarding the agreement-plus-disagreement turn shape is *why* recipients agree with assessments when they will shortly disagree with them.

Agreement components that occur as disagreement prefaces regularly are weak agreements. They are primarily agreement tokens, asserted or claimed agreements, same evaluation agreements, and qualified or weakened agreements:

Tokens

(40) (JG:II.1.-15)

    C: ... you've really both basically honestly
          gone your own ways.
→ D: Essentially, except we've hadda good
         relationship et home.
→ C: 'hhhh Ye:s, but I mean it's a relationship
         where ...

(41) (MC:1.-13)

    W: I sew by hand (　), -- (uh huh), I'm
         fantastic (you never ⌜saw anything like it)
→ L: ⌞I know but I, I-I still say
         thet the sewing machine's quicker,

(42) (JG:II:1.-27)

    C: ... 'hh a:n' uh by god I can' even send my
         kid tuh public school b'cuz they're so god
         damn lousy.
    D: We::ll, that's a generality.
    C: 'hhh
    D: We've got sm pretty ⌜(good schools.)
→ C: ⌞Well, yeah but where in
    the hell em I gonna live.

Asserted agreements

(43) (GTS 4:32)

    R: Butchu admit he is having fun and you think
         it's funny.
→ K: I think it's funny, yeah. But it's a
         ridiculous funny.

(36) (SBL:2.1.7.-14)

    A: ... cause those things take working at,
         (2.0)
→ B: (hhhhh) well, they ⌜do, but-
    A: ⌞They aren't accidents,
→ B: No, they take working at but on the other
         hand, some people ...

(44) (SBL:2.1.7.-15)

    A: Well, oh uh I think Alice has uh:: i- may- and
         maybe as you say, slightly different, but I
         think she has a good sense ⌜of humor
→ B: ⌞Yeh, I think she
    does too but she has a different type.

Weakened and/or qualified agreement assertions

(45) (SBL:1.1.10.-9)

    B: I think I'll call her and ask her if she's
         interested because she's a good nurse, and I
         think they would like her don't you?
→ A: Well, I'll tell you, I haven't seen Mary for
         years. I should- As I remember, yes.
    B: Well do you think she would fit in?
→ A: Uhm, uh, I don't know, What I'm uh
         hesitating about is uh -- uhm maybe she would.
         (1.0)
    A: Uh but I would hesitate to uhm --

(41) (MC:1.-13)

    L: I know but I, I-I still say thet the sewing
         machine's quicker.
→ W: Oh it c'n be quicker but it doesn' do the jo:b,

(36) (SBL:2.1.7.-14)

    B: ... well a sense of humor, I think is something
         yer born with Bea.

→ A:'   Yea. Or it's c- I have the- eh yes, I think a
       lotta people <u>are</u>, but then I think it can be
       de<u>ve</u>loped, too.

(46) (MC:1.-22)

   W: ... The-the way <u>I</u> feel about it i:s, that as
         long as she coope<u>ra</u>tes, an'-an'she belie:ves
         that she's running my li:fe, or, you know, or
         directing it one way or anothuh, and she feels
         <u>ha</u>ppy about it, I do whatever I please (h)any
         (h)wa(h) ·HHH! ⌈( )
   L: ⌊Yeah.
→ L: We::ll - eh-that's true: - I mean eh-that's
        alright, -- uhb-ut uh, ez long ez you do::.
        But h-it's-eh-to me::, -- after anyone ...

Just as the agreement components that preface disagreements are characteristically weak, so are the disagreement components that follow.

Disagreement types may be differentiated as strong or weak on sequential grounds: They differ in their relative capacities to co-occur with agreement components.

A strong disagreement is one in which a conversant utters an evaluation which is directly contrastive with the prior evaluation. Such disagreements are strong inasmuch as they occur in turns containing exclusively disagreement components, and not in combination with agreement components, for example:

(20) (MC:1.-45)

   L: ... I'm so dumb I don't even know it hhh! --
         heh!
→ W: Y-no, y-you're not du:mb, ...

(47) (SPC:144)

   R: ... well never mind. It's not important.
→ D: Well, it is important.

The disagreements that occur in the agreement-plus-disagreement turns are not the strong type, that is, same referent–contrastive evaluation construction. Co-occurring with agreements, the disagreement components are formed as partial agreements/partial disagreements: as qualifications, exceptions, additions, and the like.

(43) (GTS 4:32)

   R: Butchu admit he is having fun and you think
         it's funny.
→ K: I think it's funny, yeah. But it's a
         ridiculous funny.

K, after asserting an agreement ("I think it's funny, yeah"), produces a qualification of the agreement by specifying a kind of funny ("it's a ridiculous funny"). The disagreement component is formed as partial agreement/partial disagreement with the prior.

(40) (JG:II.1.-15)

   C: ... you've really both basically honestly gone
         your own ways.
→ D: Essentially, except we've hadda good
         relationship et home.

In response to C's initial critical assessment, D's turn is organized with an initial agreement token (" Essentially") followed by a favorable assessment ("we've hadda good relationship et home"). In shifting the class of evaluation from critical to favorable, D performs a disagreement. The specification of the referent ("relationship et home") in the favorable assessment permits D to claim agreement with the prior critical assessment while producing the favorable assessment/disagreement as a qualification of, or exception to, the prior. (See the material relating to note 6).

Although both agreement and disagreement components are present in the agreement-plus-disagreement turn organization, such turn shapes are used for disagreeing rather than agreeing. That is, disagreement, and not agreement, is centrally sequentially implicative in next turn.

To reiterate, when agreements are invited by initial assessments, disagreements that are proffered regularly are performed in turns and sequences that exhibit the following features: (1) the inclusion of delay devices prior to stated disagreements like silences, hesitating prefaces, requests for clarification, and/or (2) the inclusion of weakly stated disagreement components, that is, partial agreements/partial disagreements. These two features – delaying the stated components of an action being performed, and/or producing weakly stated components of that action – are partially constitutive of turn/sequence organizations associated with dispreferred actions.

These turn/sequence shapes not only house disagreements when agreements are invited, but constitute part of the apparatus for accom-

plishing disagreements *as* dispreferred. That the set of devices used in these turn/sequence shapes may be oriented to as disagreements in the course of production provides for the possibility and actualization of minimizing the occurrences of overtly stated disagreements in these environments.

When a speaker proffers an initial assessment that invites agreement, a recipient may elect to respond with actions that are neither stated agreements nor stated disagreements like silences. Inasmuch as such responses co-occur with disagreements they may be oriented to as instances of disagreements in the course of production, that is, unstated, or as yet unstated, disagreements.

Prior speakers may elect to resume talk in the emergent gap. In the resumption, they may orient to their coparticipants as disagreeing or probably disagreeing. That orientation can be seen in the modifications that they make. They assert new positions that lessen the differences between their own positions and presumed contrary positions.[13] In the following excerpts, prior speakers resume talk with reversals of and/or backdowns from, prior assessments:[14]

(48) (SBL:3.1.-8)

    B: ...an' that's not an awful lotta <u>fruitcake</u>.
        (1.0)
→ B: Course it is. A little piece goes a long way.

(49) (SBL:3.1.-6)

    A: Un livers 'n- gizzards 'n stuff like that,
        makes it real <u>yummy</u>.
        (1.6)
→ A: Makes it too rich fer <u>me::</u>, but--makes it
        yummy.

(50) (JS:II:48)

    L: D'they have a good cook there?
        (1.7)
→ L: Nothing special?

Backdowns, then, may be proffered when recipients *potentially* disagree. A disagreement is potential at such points because, though the participants seem headed toward a disagreement, there is still room to avert it. For example, a resumption which contains an appropriately modified assessment may elicit a recipient's agreement:

(48) (SBL:3.1.-8)

    B: ... an' that's not an awful lotta <u>fruitcake</u>
        (1.0)
    B: Course it is. A little piece goes a long way.
→ A: Well that's right

(50) (JS:II:48)

    L: D'they have a good cook there?
        (1.7)
    L: Nothing special?
→ J: No. -- Every- everybody takes their turns.

The combination of conversants' delaying or withholding their disagreements together with fellow conversants' modifying their positions permits stated disagreements to be minimized and stated agreements to be maximized. It is not only that what would be a disagreement might not get said, but that what comes to be said may be said as an agreement.

Just as silences may signal potential disagreement, so may hesitations, questioning repeats, requests for clarification, weakly stated agreements, and the like, do the same. In general, dispreferred-action turn organization serves as a resource to avoid or reduce the occurrences of overtly stated instances of an action.

The preference structure that has just been discussed – agreement preferred, disagreement dispreferred – is the one in effect and operative for the vast majority of assessment pairs. Put another way, across different situations, conversants orient to agreeing with one another as comfortable, supportive, reinforcing, perhaps as being sociable and as showing that they are like-minded. This phenomenon seems to hold whether persons are talking about the weather, a neighborhood dog, or a film that they just saw. Likewise, across a variety of situations conversants orient to their disagreeing with one another as uncomfortable, unpleasant, difficult, risking threat, insult, or offense.

Though sociability, support, and solidarity often involve the participants' agreeing or at least not overtly disagreeing with one another, there are nonetheless circumstances in which sociability and support are accomplished by disagreeing. After self-deprecations, conversants typically treat disagreements as preferred and agreements as dispreferred.

4. Second-assessment productions: agreement dispreferred

When a speaker produces a self-deprecating assessment, the recipient's agreement or disagreement is relevant in the next turn. An agreement

with a prior speaker's self-critical assessment amounts to the second speaker's criticism of his or her coparticipant.

Criticisms of one's coparticipants are a class of actions that often are performed in dispreferred-action turn/sequence shapes. A brief summary of evidence to that effect is provided in the two points below:

(1) A substantial number of coparticipant criticisms are performed by speakers' delaying or withholding the criticisms from early positioning within turns and sequences.

In the following datum, D is asked to assess A's newly acquired print. (+) indicates favorable assessment, (−) indicates critical assessment.

```
(51) (JS:I.-1)
      A:    D'yuh li:ke it?
  (+)D:     'hhh Yes I do like it=
  (→)D:     =although I rreally::=
      C:    =Dju make it?
      A:    No We bought it, It's a 'hh a Mary Kerrida
            print.
      D:    O:h (I k-)=
      A:    =Dz that make any sense to you?
      C:    Mm mh. I don' even know who she is.
      A:    She's that's, the Sister Kerrida, ┌who,
      D:                                        └'hhh
      D:    Oh ┌that's the one you to:ld ┌me you bou:ght.=
      C:       └Oh-                       
      A:                                  └Ye:h
      D:    ┌Ya:h.
      A:    └Right.
            (1.0)
      A:    It's worth, something,
            (1.0)
      A:    There's only a hundred  of'm
            (0.5)
      D:    Hmm
      E:    Which picture is that.
      A:    The one thet says Life.
            (1.5)
      A:    (              ).
  (−)D:     'hhh Well I don't- I'm not a great fan of this
            type of a:rt. There are certain- ones I see
            thet I like, But I like the w- =
      E:    =Is there ano┌thuh way of spelling Life?
  (−)D:                  └-more realistic-
      A:    hhmh!
      E:    That's all ┌I wd loo(hh)k fo(h),
      D:               └hh!
  (−)D:     Yih d-know why I don't go fer this type of uh::
            art,  Becuz it- it strikes me ez being the
            magazine adverti:sement ty:pe. Which some uh-uh
```

```
            some a' them are really great. But tuhm I-my,
            taste in art is for the more uh:: uh it-t-treh-
            it tends tuh be realistic.
```

A speaker's coparticipant criticism may be potential through a number of turns in which no stated criticism is produced. That is, a speaker may withhold a criticism in one sequential environment and come to state it in another. In the following datum, F asks N to evaluate the nail manicure that F did on N's nails. N's initial report is positive. Subsequently, F proffers a trouble ("·hh Well I was afraid . . .") that invites N to confirm, or alternatively to disconfirm, that trouble or similar ones. The trouble is confirmed by N, who then elaborates with critical descriptions:

```
(52) (JG:R5:6)
      F:    'hh well how did the polish work otherwise.
  (+)N:     F-eh, fi:ne, fi:ne. In fact I didn' even
            touch em up this week at all
      F:    You didn't
  (+)N:     No
      F:    'hh Well I was afraid maybe they might uhh uh
            bubble a little bit y'know they ┌kinda
  (−)N:                                       └Well they di:d.
            Tha-tha-that one thing it with the artificial
            nail bubbled some
      F:    Yeah. Well I was afraid it would
  (−)N:     (     ) the patch bubbled ...
```

Coparticipant criticisms may be withheld, that is, not said, over the course of entire sequences. Since what is not said is, obviously, unavailable in the record of what is said, instances of withholds cannot be directly pointed out. There are, however, reports of withholds. A class of talk routinely reported as withheld, or normatively withholdable, is coparticipant criticism:[15]

```
(53) (NB:IV.-30)
      ((What is reported as not said is a critical
      assessment of a restaurant which Kate, Frank's wife,
      apparently chose.))
   → P:    En I didn' wanna say-eh:: Kate said she always
           wanduh see it so, 'hhh I never said anything
           but- uh Frank said t'day he sez "wasn' that the
           dirtiest place?"
      A:   ┌Yeh.
   → P:    └En I said "Yihknow? I felt the same thing? But
```

```
       I didn' wanna say anything to yuh, but I jus'
       f elt- -dirty when I walked on the carpet."
   A:   Yah.
```

(54) (JG:4.6.-20)

```
   C:   An I said now wait till you see me get all this
        stuff on. Well you know what I looked like. I
        looked like I was thirty-six old- years old
        tryin to look sixteen.
   J:   Ohhh Go: d
 → C:           An you know everybody just sorta
        stood there an nobody wanned to say well you
        look pretty stupid h-h-h mo:ther.
```

Withholdable talk like a coparticipant criticism provides for recipients' interpreting silences.

(2) When coparticipant criticisms are proffered, the criticism turns frequently have weak-type criticism components. This feature may be seen most clearly with criticisms that are delivered with contrastive prefaces:

(26) (J & J)

```
   ((B is assessing a coparticipant's change of hair
   color))

   B:   I like it too but uhh hahheh It blows my mind
```

(51) (JS:I.-1)

```
   E:   'hhh Yes I do like it=although I really:::

              .
              .
              .


   E:   'hhh Well I don't- I'm not a great fan of this
        type of a:rt ...
```

With this type of construction, the prefacing favorable assessment is typically a moderately positive term (e.g. "like") and the prefaced unfavorable assessment is generally formed as an exception.

The contrastive-preface turn shape for coparticipant criticisms (favorable assessment plus critical assessment) is structurally similar to the turn shape for disagreements (agreement plus disagreement). In each case the contrastive prefacing component is a weak or token instance of

the preferred action; the prefaced component is a weak instance of the sequentially implicative dispreferred action.

Subsequent to self-deprecations, the alternative actions of agreeing or disagreeing are nonequivalent. When conversants overtly agree, they of course endorse the prior criticisms as their own. Participants may be critical, and recognized as such, even when they do not overtly agree with the criticisms. If criticizing a co-conversant is viewed as impolite, hurtful, or wrong (as a dispreferred action), a conversant may hesitate, hedge, or even minimally disagree rather than agree with the criticism. When conversants disagree with prior self-deprecations, they show support of their co-conversants. If supporting co-conversants is viewed as natural, right, and/or desirable (as a preferred action), conversants would state their disagreements with prior self-deprecations overtly.

The constraints that bear on such disagreements are specific to prior self-deprecations and not critical assessments in general or of nonpresent parties. In the following fragments the coparticipants are collaboratively criticizing nonpresent parties. In the course of criticism sequences, self-critical assessments may be engendered. (SD) marks a turn in which the speaker criticizes both a nonpresent party and herself:

(55) (SBL:2.2.3.-15)

```
   A:    But she doubled uh Gladyses three hearts, and
         uhm -- Lil uh, -- uh mh mh gosh she led out a
         real small heart, a little three 'r somethin
         like that 'n hehh I th(hh)ink I th(hhh) think
         Elva took it wi(h)th a four.
   A:    'hhh hehh heh heh  heh heh heh heh G(hh)od I=
   B:                       Hhehh heh heh
   A:   =coulda died
   A:    'hhh heh heh heh
   B:     'hhh hhh hhh hhhh
   A:    'hhh This's when she had the trump all th-
         well I only had two an' so on, but but an'
         she was tryina get- But it seem' tuh me
         li(hh)ke she had eh- she had ace-king left
   B:                                  heh heh heh=
   B:   =heh heh heh
   A:    heh heh heh 'heh heh  heh heh heh heh
   B:                         An' then she lays down
         has the ace, a little ol' little you know,
         An' here-
   A:     'heh heh
   B:    An' she lets everybody take 'm
   A:    'heh heh heh
   B:    hhh 'hhh hh hh 'hhh  Well you know uh-
(SD) A:                      Well, at least I feel
```

```
        be- I mean I feel good when I'm playin with
        her because I feel like uh her and I play alike
        hehh
  B:    No.  You play beautifully. But y- uh see, when
        we get used to people we'll just realize with
        Gladys she's gonna do this.
```

(21) (NB:IV:1.-6)

```
  A:    'hhhh I called las' ni- he sez "Don't call me
        tuh come down fer the, Thanksgiving, deal" nah-
  P:    'hh Well HE DID THE SAME DAMN THING ET CHRISTMAS
        TI:ME,
  A:    CHRISTMAS EVE 'E LEFT ME HERE ALONE.
  P:    YEAH
(SD) A: 'hhh I can't say anything, I'm stupid, er uh 'f
        I think uh- the-f-uh-sump'n about a ma:n er
        the gover'ment yihknow, I uh- 'hhh Oh well it's
        me too Portia, hh' yihknow I'm no bottle a'milk.
        (0.6)
  P:    Oh:: well yer easy tuh get along with, but I
        know he's that way. God, jist tuh go out fishin
        with im w'd- drives me up a wa:ll,
```

In each instance, the two kinds of criticisms, self and nonpresent party, are treated separately in the next turn. The self-deprecation has priority; it is addressed first with a disagreement. That unit is followed by a contrast conjunction, and the criticism of the nonpresent party is subsequently agreed with.

(55) (SBL:2.2.3.-15)

Disagreement:	No. You play beautifully.
Transition:	But
Agreement:	y' uh see, when we get used to people we'll just realize with Gladys she's gonna do this.

(21) (NB:IV:1.-6)

Disagreement:	Oh well yer easy tuh get along with,
Transition:	but
Agreement:	I know he's that way. God, jist tuh go out fishin with im w'd- drives me up a wa:ll,

The units in the prior turns with which the disagreements disagree are the self-deprecatory components. Such disagreements are specifically and selectively responsive to the prior self-deprecations. They are locally

engendered disagreements that are performed with stated disagreement components, that is, contrastively classed second assessments.

Subsequent to self-deprecations, disagreements and agreements, respectively, are performed with different turn organizations. In the next two sections, some features of disagreement and agreement turns subsequent to self-deprecations are described.

Disagreements with prior speakers' self-deprecations

When disagreements are performed, disagreement components generally occupy the entire self-deprecation response units. That is, there are routinely no contrastive components before or after the disagreements as part of the units. Some of the more prevalent disagreement components are briefly discussed below.

Partial repeats. Disagreements may include partial repeats that challenge and/or disagree with their priors.[16] They are often followed in the same turn or in a subsequent turn by other disagreement components. In the following fragments, responses to self-deprecations include partial repeats (PR) followed by stated disagreements (D):

(56) (AP:fn)

```
      L:    You're not bored (huh)?
  (PR)S:    Bored?=
   (D)S:    =No. We're fascinated.
```

(57) (SBL:1.6.-1)

```
      B:    ... I'm tryina get slim.
  (PR) A:   Ye:ah? ┌You get slim, my heavens.
      B:          └heh heh heh heh hh hh
   (D) A:   You don't need to get any slimmah,
```

(58) (JG:II.2.14a)

```
      C:    ... c(h)ept in my old age I'm: slowin down
            considera┌bly.'  ┐ 'hhhhhh        ┐=
  (PR) D:            └He:ll  ┘ Old age.        ┘
   (D) D:   =┌What'r you thirdy fi:v┐ve?
      C:    └'hheh - heh-heh-heh-heh┘e-h┘ hYhe(h)e(h)e(h)es
      D:    hh-hh hhh-hhh!
      C:    't'hhhhhhhhh┌hhh
   (D) D:              └But a young thirdy fi:ve.
```

(59) (JG:4.6.-6)

```
    C:    I have no dates.  I don't go:
          there ⌈is no sense in hanging onto the clothes.
    J:          ⌊(Are you-) ((high pitch))
(PR) J:    What do ya mean you don't have any
          da:tes ((low pitch))
    C:    Well: I just don't go out anymore that's all
(D) J:    Oh: that's ridiculous
```

Negations. Disagreements may include negations like "no," "hm-mh," "not." A "no" may occur as a first component in an answer to a self-deprecating question:

(60) (JG:2)

```
    R:    Did she get my card.
    C:    Yeah she gotcher card.
    R:    Did she t'ink it was terrible
 → C:    No she thought it was very adohrable.
```

(61) (SBL:2.1.8.-8)

```
    B:    I was wondering if I'd ruined yer- weekend
          ⌈by uh
 → A:    ⌊No.   No.  Hm-mh.  No.  I just loved to have- ...
```

(56) (AP:fn)

```
    ((L, the hostess, is showing slides.))

    L:    You're not bored (huh)?
    S:    Bored?=
 → S:    =No. We're fascinated
```

or as a first component in a response to a self-deprecating assertion:

(55) (SBL:2.2.3.-15)

```
    A:    ... I feel like uh her and I play alike hehh
 → B:    No.  You play beautifully.
```

(20) (MC:1.-45)

```
    L:    ... En I thought tuh myself- ((with a gravelly yodel))
          -gee whi:z  when do I get smart.  I'm so dumb I don't
          even know it.  hhh! -- heh!
 → W:    Y-no, y-you're yer not du:mb, my God you- you hit it
          right on the head, ...
```

A disagreement may be an assertion that contains the prior deprecating term negated with a "not":

(20) (MC:1.-45)

```
    L:    ... I'm so dumb I don't even know it. hhh! -- heh!
 → W:    y-no, y-you're not du:mb, ...
```

(62) (JK:1)

```
    G:    ... but it's not bad for an old lady.
 → C:    You're not old, Grandma ...
```

Compliments. Disagreements with prior self-deprecations very frequently include evaluative terms. Such terms are contrastively classed relative to the prior self-deprecatory formulations; they are favorable, complimentary evaluative terms:

(55) (SBL:2.2.3.-15)

```
    A:    I mean I feel good when I'm playing with her because
          I feel like uh her and I play alike hehh
 → B:    No.  You play beautifully.
```

(63) (SBL:2.2.3.-40)

```
    B:    And I never was a grea(h)t Bri(h)dge play(h)er
          Clai(h)re,
 → A:    Well I think you've always been real good,
```

(64) (MC)

```
    C:    ... 'ere Momma She talks better than I do
 → B:    Aw you talk fine
```

(60) (JG:2)

```
    R:    Did she get my card.
    C:    Yeah she gotcher card.
    R:    Did she t'ink it was terrible
 → C:    No she thought it was very adohrable.
```

(21) (NB:IV:1.6)

```
    A:    ... 'hhh Oh well it's me too Portia, hh yihknow
          I'm no bottle a' milk,
          (0.6)
 → P:    Oh:: well yer easy tuh get along with, but I
          know he's that way.
```

(61) (SBL:2.1.8.-8)

```
    B:    I was wondering if I'd ruined yer-weekend
          ⌈by uh
    A:    ⌊No.
 → A:    No. Hm-mh. No. I just loved to have- ...
```

(56) (AP:fn)

    L: You're not bored (huh)?
→ S: Bored? No. we're fascinated.

(65) (EB:1)

    S: ... I hope by next semester it'll be a bi(h)t
          b(h)edd(h)er heh heh heh heh 'hh
          'hh⌜heh (prob'ly not)
→ B: ⌊(   ) You're doing very great no:w

Disagreements with prior self-deprecations are performed as stated disagreements. Even in a minimal disagreement, a stated disagreement component such as "no" is employed, followed by a shift in referent and/or topic:

(66) (SBL:2.2.3.-10)

    B: And uh that poor li'l Gladys she, know she
          never did get it right about where she played
    A: hh
    B: She was heh!
    A: She was almost as bad ⌜as I was.
    B: ⌊heheh
→ B: ⌜No, but she �=
    A: ⌊heh heh hehheh
→ B: =⌜even up to the last one, they practically=
    A: ⌊heh heh
    B: =hadtuh th(h)row her outta that ⌜first ta(hhh)ble
          'heh heh ...   ⌊
    A: 'heh 'heh heh

          heh heh heh ...

(67) (fn)

    C: I'm talking nonsense now
→ A: No::
    A: but I think I'm ready for dinner anyway.

The preceding discussion of partial repeats, negations, and compliments focuses on some of the more common components used to disagree by recipients of prior self-deprecations. This description, of course, is not exhaustive of the disagreement procedures used in these environments. While some of the more prevalent disagreement components have been mentioned, self-deprecations are overtly disagreed with in quite a range of forms. Some illustrations of stated disagreements, undermines, disaffiliations, and the like follow:

(1) A speaker may disagree by proffering an assessment that claims

access to the attribute critically assessed, that is by proffering a contrastive second assessment (compliment and/or negation).

(55) (SBL:2.2.3.-15)

    A: ... I feel like uh her and I play alike hehh
→ B: No. You play beautifully.

(20) (MC:1.-45)

    L: ... I'm so dumb I don't even know it. hhh!
          - heh!
→ W: Y-no, y-you're not du:mb, ...

(2) A speaker may disaffiliate with a prior critical assessment by proffering an assessment that makes no claim of access, that is, by proffering a critical assessment of the prior talk.

(59) (JG:4.6.-6)

    C: I have no dates. I don't go:
          there ⌜is no sense in hanging onto the clothes.
    J: ⌊(Are you-) ((high pitch))
    J: Wha do ya mean you don't have any da:tes.
          ((low pitch))
    C: Well: I just don't go out anymore that's all.
→ J: Oh: that's ridiculous.

(3) A speaker may undermine a prior self-critical assessment by more favorably recategorizing or reformulating the self-deprecating attribute. Instances include:

(68) (JG:3C.-7)

    R: 'hh But I'm only getting a C on my report card
          in math.
→ C: Yeh but that's passing Ronald,

R's self-deprecatory formulation, "only . . . a C" is a member of the collection of letter grades that has other members ("A" and "B") ranked above it. C's formulation "passing" involves a shift to the collection of grades, "pass"–"fail," where the selection is the success member of the set.

(69) (MC:1.-38)

    W: Yet I've got quite a distance tuh go yet.
→ L: Everybody has a distance.

In response to W's self-deprecation, L proposes that W's condition is a general condition ("Everybody has a distance"). By proposing that it is a common and normal condition L undermines the validity of W's self-deprecation.

(70) (SBL:2.2.3.-4)

```
   B:   Well, do you remember that we could even hear the
        music. I had the hi fi playing?
   A:   Mm hm,
   B:   An' I had two table in the living room, an' you
        could almost hear a pin drop.
        .
        .
        .
        .
   A:   ... I don't remember being at yer house with Mercy,
        I was- only time I saw her was over at Jo's
       ⌐that night.
   B:   └Oh well then you must not've come to this one.
(SD) A:   Maybe that's why it was so quiet.
        (1.0)
 → B:   Well, I-I was just remembering now, they did
        plenty a' talking, an everything, ...
```

A deprecates herself by proposing that the consequence of her absence at a bridge party was that it was a quiet occasion. In response to A's self-deprecating comment, B recharacterizes the event from "so *quiet*" to "plenty a' talking." With the new characterization, B suggests that the bridge party was like their other bridge parties, not special and not needing explanation. The new characterization works to invalidate the prior self-deprecation.

(4) A speaker may undermine a prior self-deprecation by proposing that it is a product of an improper activity.

(71) (MC:1.-47)

```
   W:   And I'm being irritable right now by telling you
        so⌐,
 → L:     └Ah! ah! 'HHHH No. hehhheh!  No but- but uh-yuh-
        Wilbur agai::n.  Again.  Stop trying to do this
        of your se:lf.  (1.2)-- leave it alone en you'll
        be shown the way to overcome it.
```

(72) (JC:4.6.-26)

```
   C:   They'll take up a collection for my examination
   J:   Ha hu ⌐hu
   C:       └with the taddered stockings
```

```
   C:   ⌐an the knees torn out an the whole schmere you=
   J:   └(    ha) ha
   C:   =know. An the three inch underskirt
              ⌐on
 → J:   └Right you're a perf- ( perfectionis )
```

(73) (GTS:1:19)

```
   R:   We're mentally ill, children, run ehhehhh
 → L:   ahh ha ha ha ha hehh What's wrong with you
        today?
```

This type of undermine typically occurs subsequent to an nth self-deprecation, that is, after a series of self-deprecations. For example, the fragment below has a series of disagreements with self-deprecations prior to L's formulating W's self-deprecating activity as improper:

(71) (MC:1.-47)

```
       W:   A:nd I'm-I'm, I'm eating the right foods
            'n the right balance of foods,
(SD) W:   but, I'm still, drinking coffee.
 (D) L:   That's not (drinking).
       W:   You think so,
       L:   No::.
(SD) W:   It creates a nasty disposition.
 (D) L:   I don't believe (that ⌐at'all),
(SD) W:                       └it, makes you irritable
 (D) L:   (It does not/)
       W:   It doe:s, ⌐(It ca:n.)
       L:           └You- er you-yuh-that-s a (       )
            (      )! ⌐heh heh! hah! hah! hah! hah!
(SD) W:              └And I'm being irritable right
            now by telling you so⌐,
 → L:                            └Ah!ah! 'HHHH No, hehhheh!
        No but- but uh- yuh-Wilbur agai:n. Again. Stop
        trying to do this of your se:lf.
        (1.2)
       L:   leave it alone en you'll be shown the way to
            overcome it.
```

In the next turns to self-deprecations, the productions of overtly stated disagreements, disaffiliations, and undermines are understandable in the light of the constraints that have been previously described: that a recipient of a self-deprecation has as relevant alternative actions either to agree and endorse the prior critical assessment or to disagree and undermine its validity. Critically assessing one's coparticipant is quite regularly a dispreferred action and, as such, performed with delays, withholds, and weakly stated components. If participants exhibit hesitations, evasiveness, stalling, and the like in response to self-de-

precations, they may be interpreted as agreeing with the prior comments. To disaffiliate, they need to state their disagreements forthrightly.

Agreements with prior speakers' self-deprecations

Agreements with prior self-deprecations may be performed with stated agreement components. When they are, they are accomplished, prevalently, with weak agreement types.

One kind of agreement that occurs in response to self-deprecations is formed by the recipient proffering a second self-deprecation, formulating it as second in an agreement sequence. The deprecating attribute that the prior speaker claimed may also be claimed by the recipient:

(74) (EB:1:2)

        B: Not only that he gets everything done.
              (pause)
        B: Everybody else— not everybody else,
              I have my desk full of trash.
    → S: Me too ...

or may be upgraded by the recipient:

(75) (SBL:2.2.3.-20)

        A: And I shoulda went back tuh diamonds.
    → B: I think we were ⌈all so confused,
        A: ⌊So—
    → B: I know I wasn't bidding right. I wasn't --
              eh playing right, I wa'nt doing anything right.

With responses such as "Me too" and "I think we were *all* so confused" recipients implicitly agree with the prior self-deprecations by proposing themselves as "also" instances. The agreements are weak in that though they agree they simultaneously undermine the prior self-deprecations by proposing that the prior deprecating attributes are more generally shared (see also example [69]) and/or are less negative than prior speakers had proposed.

Another type of stated agreement with a prior self-deprecation is a confirmation of the prior. Confirmations, as well, tend to be done in weak forms. One way to weaken a confirmation is with a suppositional:

(76) (MC:1.-23)

        W: ... Do you know what I was all that time?
        L: (No).

        W: Pavlov's dog.
              (2.0)
    → L: (I suppose),

The productions of weak agreement components subsequent to self-deprecations may be seen to be an artifact of the dispreferred status of the action, criticizing one's coparticipants. Given the relevance of coparticipant criticism in the position of responding to self-deprecations and the norms constraining it, responses that exhibit dispreferred-action turn shape, like weakly stated agreements, constitute a way of performing coparticipant criticism and are interpretable as such (see Section 4).

A recipient of a prior self-deprecation may produce a response that is neither an agreement nor a disagreement. Two frequently occurring classes of such responses include (1) silences, that is, no immediate forthcoming talk, and (2) acknowledgments.

(1) When a speaker producing a self-deprecation reaches a possible turn completion point and stops talking, a recipient may respond with no immediate forthcoming talk. When both parties are silent, a gap emerges.

(76) (MC:1.-23)

        W: ... Do you know what I was all that time?
        L: (No).
        W: Pavlov's dog.
    →   (2.0)

(77) (GTS:2.-15)

        K: I couldn't, I'm a weak⌈ling.
        ( ):   ⌊hmh!
    →   (1.0)
        K: I am. I'm comin t'that conclusion.
              I'm a damn weakling.
    →   (1.0)

Recipients' silences after prior speakers' self-deprecations are responses that exhibit dispreferred-action turn shape. They constitute a turn shape associated with coparticipant criticism, that is, delaying (or withholding) potential agreements with prior self-deprecations.

After a gap, a potential agreement may be actualized by a recipient. That is, the recipient may terminate the emergent gap by producing an agreement [A].

(76) (MC:1.-23)

        W: ... Do you know what I was all that time?
        L: (no).

```
(SD) W:   Pavlov's dog.
   →      (2.0)
 (A) L:   (I suppose),
     W:   D'you remember that ⌐story?
     L:                        ⌊Yes, I do.
     W:   Yah.  She, was brainwashing me Lila,
     L:   Oh yes!
   →      (0.7)
 (A) L:   ⌐'N you were pickin' it up like mad.
     W:   ⌊And-
```

L's delayed weak agreement ("I suppose") is strengthened in a later turn ("'N you were pickin' it [the ball] up like mad") which is also delivered after a gap.

Rather than wait out a recipient response, the prior speaker quite frequently will resume talk if a recipient silence (or gap) begins to emerge. These alternatives after a gap are contrasted:

Potential Agreement Is Actualized

```
    A:   [Self Deprecation]
         [Gap]
 →  B:   [Agreement]
```

Potential Agreement Is Unactualized

```
    A:   [Self Deprecation]
         [Gap]
 →  A:   [Resumption]
```

If a potential agreement by a recipient is delayed with silence, the prior speaker has an opportunity to talk in a turn that might otherwise contain an agreement. At the point of the prior speaker's resumption, no agreement has been stated. With the prior speaker's resumption, further negotiations are possible. A recipient's silence after a self-deprecation, then, is a response that makes an opportunity for minimizing stated coparticipant criticisms.

(2) When a speaker producing a self-deprecation reaches a turn completion point, a recipient may produce an acknowledgment in response such as "uh huh" "mm hm." Acknowledgments are different from agreements. With agreements – for example, assessments – recipients of prior assessments claim access to the referents assessed; with acknowledgments they acknowledge prior deliveries but make no claims of independent access (see material relating to note 3).

(78) (SBL:2.1.7.-4)

```
    B:   Weh- Bea, uh it's just wuh- uh as I say
         uh I- sometimes feel I'm too critical of these
         people, an' I have to restrain myself, an'
         I-cause I think "How do I know.  I-I dunno
         what their mind works like,"
 →  A:   Mm hm,
```

(79) (SBL:2.2.3.-27)

```
    B:   ... I wasn't understanding anybody today.
 →  A:   Uh huh,
```

When a self-deprecation is neither overtly confirmed nor denied, as in recipient silence or acknowledgment, the self-deprecating party often will extend the sequence, the extensions providing subsequent turn spaces for recipient's disagreements/agreements:

(77) (GTS:2.15)

```
    K:   I couldn't, I'm a weak⌐ling.
    ():                        ⌊hmh!
         (1.0)
 →  K:   I am.  I'm comin t'that conclusion.
         I'm a damn weakling.
         (1.0)
 →  K:   No damn good.
    R:   Well we're not gonna stick up for ya, hehh hhh
         ⌐hehh hhh
    A:   ⌊hehhh
```

(78) (SBL:2.1.7.-4)

```
    B:   Weh-Bea, uh it's just wuh- uh as I say uh I-
         sometimes feel I'm too critical of these people,
         an' I have to restrain myself, an' I-cause I
         think "How do I know.  I-I dunno what their
         mind works like,"
    A:   Mm hm,
 →  B:   Uh y'know? -how it is,
    A:   Yeah.
```

When no overt disagreement is made, the self-deprecating party tends to treat the self-deprecation as implicitly confirmed by the recipient. The prior self-deprecatory assertion(s) may be referred to by the self-deprecating party as already established and accepted between the parties in productions of admissions, justifications, explanations, laughter, and the like.

(80) (SBL:2.2.3.-7)

```
     B:      I like 'er very much.
     B:      But she still has that silly chatter about 'er.
     A:      Mm hm,
     B:      That is like a
             (1.0)
(SD) B:      Oh, I'm not much of a teaser
(gap)        (1.0)
  → B:       Well now this is my fault.  I don't like teasing.
     A:      Mm hm,
     B:      And I know people love it.
```

(79) (SBL:2.2.3.-27)

```
(SD)  B:     ... I wasn't understanding anybody today.
(Ackn) A:    Uh huh,
   → B:       Course I was bidding poorly.
   → B:       And uhm I couldn't remember, and I know
              it's just because I've had so much on my
              mind.
      A:      Yeah,
   → B:       And uh I have fer the last two 'r three months,
              you know, if I c'n get things settled Claire,
              then I c'n start think-w(hh)at I(h)'m do(hh)ing.
```

(81) (SBL:2.2.3.-13)

```
(SD)  B:     ... course I shouldn' be s'damn nosey either.
(Ackn) A:    Mm,
   → B:       Heh heh heh ⌈heh heh heh 'hh
      A:                  ⌊Well I know  she musta thought ...
```

When conversants agree with prior self-deprecations, the turns and sequences are shaped the same as when agreements are preferred and conversants disagree. For example, one turn/sequence shape associated with each of these actions in their respective environments is no immediate forthcoming talk by a recipient of the prior assessment. When an initial assessment invites agreement and the recipient is silent, the silence is a way of performing (and is interpretable as such) an unstated, or as-yet-unstated disagreement. When a recipient of a self-deprecation is silent, that silence is a way of performing (and is interpretable as such) an unstated, or as-yet-unstated agreement/coparticipant criticism. A question arises as to what the actions have in common if a silence is interpretable as an instance of disagreement in the one environment and of agreement/coparticipant criticism in the other.

An answer to this question may be found in the preference/dispreference statuses of these actions. In the first environment, the relevant

alternative actions for recipients are agreement/disagreement; in the second, disagreements and agreements take the form of coparticipant praise/coparticipant criticism.

1

```
     A:      Initial assessment that invites agreement
  → B:       Agreement/Disagreement
```

2

```
     A:      Self-deprecation
  → B:       Coparticipant praise/Coparticipant criticism
```

Within each set of alternatives, one of the actions is normatively oriented to as offensive, compromising, wrong, or for some other reason uncomfortable to perform. As dispreferred actions in their respective environments, both disagreeing and criticizing one's coparticipants may be delayed, downplayed, or withheld. If a participant produces something that is not an *overt* instance of either of the two alternatives, such as a silence, it is interpretable as the dispreferred alternative: disagreement over agreement, criticism over praise.

The actions of praising a coparticipant subsequent to a self-deprecation and agreeing with a prior initial assessment that invites agreement also exhibit similarities. Both actions in their respective environments constitute ways of supporting and ratifying the interactants and interaction. Both actions in their respective environments are routinely performed as stated instances of the actions, have priority positioning, that is, are first actions performed by recipients, and occupy the entire turn unit with no contrastive prefaces.

The above discussion suggests that at least some features of turn/sequence organization operate with respect to the preference/dispreference status of actions – that diverse actions, by being preferred or dispreferred, may be performed in turn/sequence shapes specific to that status.[17]

Notes

1. This utterance contains B's report to A of Allen's declination. Whatever Allen may have said to B is inaudible on the tape recording of the telephone conversation between A and B, and is treated by B as inaudible to A. In B's report to A, B incorporates a disclaimer of Allen's knowledge ("doesn't know anything new") as a warrant for not proffering the requested assessment.
2. A speaker may claim insufficient knowledge to assess on his or her own behalf, and follow with a report of someone else's assessment, A_r, of the referent in question:

```
                    (JS:II:61)

no access  →   E:   No I haven't seen it
    A_r    →        Mae sed it 'n she said she
                    f- depressed her terribly


                    (SBL:2.2.-1)

qualified      A:   How is Aunt Kallie
access     →   B:   Well, I (suspect) she's better
               A:   Oh that's good.
    A_r    →   B:   Las' time we talked tuh mother
                    she was uh better
```

In reporting third-person assessments, speakers may affiliate with or disaffiliate from the reported assessments. See Sacks's transcribed lectures and Pomerantz (forthcoming).
3. By proffering an assessment of the referent assessed by a prior speaker, a second speaker claims independent access to that referent. Subsequent to an initial assessment, a recipient may respond to the prior without claiming independent access to the referent assessed in the prior.
   He or she may acknowledge a prior assessment:

```
         (JS:II:61)

     E:   Oh I I:loved  it.
  →  L:                 Yeah.
     L:   Ih w'z- en' we have never seen it.


         (SBL:2.1.7.-1)

     B:   Well her niece is  here, and she's a lovely=
     A:                      Yeah
     B:   =person.
  →  A:   Uh huh
```

He or she may produce an assessment as a recipient of news just delivered:

```
         (JG:R:1)

     F:   `hh how iz our fri::end
     N:   Oh: he'z much better I'm 'fraid --
            hh h h h
  →  F:    Well uh that's marvelous


         (Coliseum call 71)

     S:   Is there something going on down north there (   )
     D:   Yeah the Coliseum blew up.
     S:   It did?
     D:   Yeah, it's killed a bunch of people and I don't
          know how many's injured.  It's a hell of a mess.
  →  S:   Oh, that's too bad.

 (SBL:I:11.-2)

     B:   Say didju see anything in the paper last night
          or hear anything on the local radio, hh Ruth
```

```
          Henderson and I drove down, to, Ventura
          yesterday.
     A:   Mm hm,
     B:   And on the way home we saw the -- most gosh awful
          wreck.
            .
            .
            .
            .

     B:   Boy, it was a bad one, though.
  →  A:   Well that's too ba:d.
```

He or she may proffer a qualified assessment of the referent assessed in the prior, marking the assessment as based on other than direct access:

```
        (NB:PT:3:r:ca)

    L:   Jeeziz Chris'shu sh'd see that house E(h)mma
         yih av no idea h hhmhh
 →  E:                    I bet it's a drea:m ....


        (JG:II.1.-4)

    D:   ... oh I gotta n- I don'know th' las' time I
         talked t'yuh=I'm out here et Taft High School
         now, -- In the uh West Valley not too far frm
         home=I'm the boys' Dean out there, so I gotta
         new jo:b 'n=
    C:   =Yeah?
    D:   So it's a pretty good setup yihknow,
 →  C:   W'l my God it sounds marvelous Don,
```

For a fuller discussion, see Pomerantz (1975), chap. 2.
4. How second assessments are coordinated with initial assessments are intricately bound up with how initials are coordinated with anticipatable nexts. In this chapter, however, features of initial assessments remain, by and large, unexplicated. References to some aspects of initial assessments are included only insofar as the analysis to date requires.
5. Whereas it is being argued that the initial complaint assessment invites agreement or a subsequent complaint assessment, it also should be mentioned that negative assessments, as a class, often are converted by one party or the other in a subsequent turn to positive assessments.
6. The sequential work that "though" does, that is, accompanying disagreements containing parameter shifts, may be seen in the following assessment series as well:

```
    (F.N.)

    A_1   A:   Good shot
    A_2   B:   Not very solid though
          A:   You get any more solid you'll be terrific
```

A's initial assessment is a praise assessment, incorporating the positive descriptor "good." The second assessment is proffered as a *qualification* of the prior: With the "though," B claims to accept the prior while proffering a critical assessment ("not very solid"). The second may be formed as a quali-

fication of the initial assessment inasmuch as there is a shift in the parameter being assessed: The second specifies the solidness (or lack of which) as a feature of the shot to assess, moreover, to assess critically, that is, in contrast with the prior assessment.

In the assessment pair

(NB:IV:11.-1)

A_1 A: God izn it dreary.

  .

A_2 P: ˙hh- it's warm though

P's assessment is proffered as a qualification in that it contrastively assesses a shifted parameter; A critically assesses the weather appearance, B non-critically assesses the weather temperature.

7. The prevalence of agreements that are organized as *preferred* actions is, clearly, not confined to assessment sequences. Research documenting that preference includes: Sacks (1973c) and Davidson (Chapter 5 herein).
8. The upgraded-agreement type being described is an upgraded assessment with no referent shift relative to the prior. In the corpus, one apparent exception is a second assessment that contains an upgraded evaluation and a rather subtle referent shift:

(JS:II:137)

A_1 A: They look nice together.
A_2 B: Yes they're lovely.

In the second assessment, the evaluation term "lovely" is upgraded relative to the prior term "nice." The referent however is slightly altered relative to the prior. In A_1, "how they look together" is assessed. In A_2, the objects ("they") are assessed with an appearance assessment.

The modification in referent in A_2 relative to the prior can be seen to anticipate that speaker's partial disagreement with the prior speaker's assessment:

(JS:II:137)

A: They look nice together.
B: Yes they're lovely. But I particularly like
    the blue en gray, ⌈en white,
A: ⌊Yeah
B: What's so nice about this is you get two
    nice pieces.

A's initial assessment is of the objects "together" – B's subsequent assessment separates them, formulating them as *"two nice pieces."*

9. See note 8.
10. Same-evaluation second assessments may be strengthened or upgraded with intensifiers:

(KC:4:35)

   K: 'n that nice
→ R: Yah. It really is

(SBL:1.1.10.-5)

   B: Isn't that sad.
→ A: Mm it really is.

Asserted agreements with intensifiers exhibit sequential features that are similar to those displayed by upgraded agreements – they do not normatively co-occur with disagreements.

11. Turn-taking apparatus is described in Sacks, Schegloff, & Jefferson (1974).
12. Some illustrations of turns containing pre-disagreement prefaces are provided:

(MC:1.-30)

   L: Maybe it's just ez well you don't know.
        (2.0)
→ W: Well, uh-I say it's suspicious it could be
        something good ⌈too
   L: ⌊Mmhm mmhm
        (1.0)
→ L: Well-- I can't think it would be too good, ...

(SBL:1.1.10.-4)

   B: Oh, how sad.
   B: And that went wrong.
        (1.0)
→ A: Well, uh --
   B: That surgery, I mean.
   A: I don't-

(MC:1.-27)

   L: Maybe, en maybe by instinct, she took over
        from there, not really realizing, the extent
        of it?
→ W: Uh:: hh
   L: You think that's possible with her?
        (1.5)
→ W: Uh well/ I'll tell you,

(SBL:2.1.7.-14)

   A: ... cause those things take working at,
        (2.0)
→ B: (hhhhh) well, they do, but-

13. A pattern that is observable in a large number of disagreement sequences is a movement from disagreement to agreement. Within those sequences, turns that occur subsequent to stated disagreements are modifications of prior assertions that partially concede to the coparticipants' discrepant positions.

(JG:II:2:33)

   D: If y'go tuh Switzerlnd yer payin about
        fifty percent a' yer money in ta:xes.

```
C:    Not in Swi:tzerl'nd.
D:    (No) I think it i:s.
C:    'hhhh ((fri)) No::,
      (0.7)
→ D:  Well you pay awful high ta(h)axes over
      there,
```

In D's modified assertion, the assessment "awful high ta(h)xes" replaces the prior estimate "about *fifty* percent." The replacement is a partial concession to the disagreement inasmuch as the assessment admits not only the original estimate but lower ones as well.

```
(TG:1)

B:    ... Yih sound HA:PPY, hh
A:    I sound ha:p py?
B:              Ye:uh.
      (0.3)
A:    No:,
B:    N:o:?
A:    No.
      (0.7)
→ B:  'hh You sound sorta cheerful?
```

Subsequent to B's disconfirmation, A modifies her initial assessment ("Yih sound HA:PPY"), restating it in a weaker form ("You sound sorta cheerful?"). The modified assessment is weakened via the inclusion of the qualifying descriptor "sorta" as well as having a question format.

14. Reversals and backdowns are rather special objects. They should not be accounted for as post-completion objects per se. Post-completers include "repeats" that are regularly *slightly* altered, and often upgraded, relative to the repeated prior:

```
[MC:x]

A:    How wz the trip?
B:    O:h it was nice.
      (0.5)
→ B:  U:::h  It was very nice indee:d.


(MC:1.-10)

L:    ... they're robbing themselves blind.
      (1.0)
→ L:  Jus' robbing themselves blind ...


(MC:1.-42)

W:    ... somebody came along  and ju:st, didn't,
      like me,
      (1.0)
→ W:  They j(h)u(hh)st didn't.
```

15. There are sequential differences between performing an action with a "withhold" like a silence and with a stated component. When a withholdable is not withheld, such as a party stating a criticism, that talk may initiate a sequence in which subsequent withholdables may likewise be stated. Crit-

icizing a coparticipant may engender a return criticism. This sort of exchange is alluded to by F as an account for "not making any comments":

```
(NB:ITB:14) (T has just told F a 'fat joke' - purportedly
said to him on an earlier occasion - that he jumped into
the ocean and caused huge waves over the pier.)

F:    I: won't say anything.  I may come do:w:n.
       eh-ha-ha:ha:-ha ]=
T:    [Oh(h)okhha(h)ay]
T:    =hih hu:h hu h,
F:                  [ 'huhhhhhh ,hhh
T:                              'Bring yer sui:t,=
→ F:  =Ah-ee-Well that's why I said I'm not g'nnuh
      say anything I'm not making any comments
      about anybu:ddy.
```

16. For a discussion of forms and functions of some repeat types, see Jefferson (1972).

17. The range of actions that are oriented to as preferred and dispreferred and how these actions are performed and recognized in turns and sequences constitute a promising research area. For example, refusing an invitation may risk offending the inviting party. A dispreferred-action turn shape, prefacing, may be used when speakers refuse invitations. Refusals are often prefaced with appreciative person assessments:

```
(SBL:1.1.10.-14)

B:    Uh if you'd care to come over and visit a
      little while this morning,  I'll give you a
      cup of coffee.
→ A:  hehh! Well that's awfully sweet of you.  I don't
      think I can make it this morning uh, I'm running
      an ad in the paper and-and uh I have to stay
      near the phone.


(NB:2.-14)

B:    Wanna come down 'n have a bite a' lunch with me?
      I got some beer en stuff.
→ A:  Wul yer real sweet hon, uhm, let-=
B:     D'you have sumpn else?
A:    [I have-
A:    No, I have to uh call Bill's mother ...
```