

Extraction and aggregation in the repair of individual and collective self-reference



Discourse Studies
 Copyright © 2007
 SAGE Publications.
 (Los Angeles, London,
 New Delhi and Singapore)
 www.sagepublications.com
 Vol 9(4): 526–557
 10.1177/1461445607079165

GENE H. LERNER

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, SANTA BARBARA

CELIA KITZINGER

UNIVERSITY OF YORK

ABSTRACT On some occasions of self-reference there can be two equally viable forms available to speakers: individual self-reference (e.g. 'I') and collective self-reference (e.g. 'we'). This means that selection of one or the other in talk-in-interaction can – akin to the selection of terms for reference to non-present persons – be guided by such considerations as recipient design and action formation. As a strategy for investigating the selection of self-reference terms, this article examines repairs to self-reference that change the form of reference from individual to collective and vice versa. We first identify two repair operations found in the domain of self-reference: aggregation (of an individual to a collectivity) and extraction (of an individual from a collectivity) and then we track the use of both operations across a range of positions in the repair initiation opportunity space (and as embedded correction). Finally we consider some of the interactional uses of aggregation and extraction repairs in resolving (and thereby exhibiting) sources of troubles associated with speaker epistemic authority and responsibility for described actions.

KEY WORDS: *conversation, conversation analysis, epistemics, first-person reference, footing, identity*

Speaker self-reference at least in English talk-in-interaction is ordinarily realized through the use of a set of individual self-reference terms ('I', 'me', 'my', 'mine').¹ Occasionally, a speaker will use a collective self-reference term ('we', 'us', 'our', 'ours') for individual self-reference (the so-called 'royal "we"') or for recipient reference (as in 'how are we feeling today') or even as an indeterminate form of reference (as in 'love is all we need'), but ordinarily these collective self-reference terms are reserved for references to collectivities of which the speaker is a member. These collectivities can be organizational (as in speaking on behalf

of a beauty salon), relational (as in speaking on behalf of an engaged couple) or circumstantial (as in speaking on behalf of persons who happened to be together in a car). In his *Lectures on Conversation*, Harvey Sacks (1992) describes some of the ways speakers can position themselves through the use of individual self-reference (e.g. pp. 1: 344, 1: 404) and collective self-reference (e.g. pp. 1: 148–9, 1: 333, 1: 441) and he also considers criteria that can inform the selection of one or the other (pp. 1:568–71). Sacks's pioneering work shows that the selection of a self-reference term is intimately tied to a speaker's situated identity because these terms reveal on whose behalf (or authority), or in what capacity, a participant speaks and thus what stance they are taking up towards the action implemented through their turn at talk. In addition, as Drew and Heritage (1992: 31) note, 'These observations [of Sacks], in turn, open up a rich vein of analysis which can focus on the use of "we" and "I" by incumbents of institutional roles'.

In an intersecting vein, Goffman (1974, 1981) later put forth the widely adopted concept of 'speaker footing' which has been employed across a range of disciplines (e.g. sociology: Clayman, 1992; anthropology: Hanks, 1990; linguistics: Levinson, 1988; discursive psychology: Edwards and Potter, 1992; and communication: Buttny, 2004). With the concept of 'footing', Goffman aims to 'decompose . . . the folk category [of the speaker]' (1981: 129) and through (linguistic) analysis to uncover 'the cues and markers through which such footings become manifest' (1981: 157). This concept is designed to capture the shifting relationship between the identity of the person who talks and what they say – for example, in animating the words of another versus speaking on one's own behalf, in speaking as the representative of an organization versus speaking as an individual person, in speaking as a pediatrician to a patient versus speaking as a pediatrician to the patient's parent, or to a colleague, a student, or a nurse.

Goffman (1981: 128) points out 'that participants over the course of their speaking constantly change their footing, these changes being a persistent feature of natural talk.' He notes that a shift in footing can be displayed through a pronoun shift: 'as speakers, we represent ourselves through the offices of a personal pronoun, typically "I" . . .' (p. 147). However, 'with a person active in some particular social identity or role, some special capacity as a member of a group, office, category, relationship, association, or whatever . . . Often this will mean that the individual speaks, explicitly or implicitly, in the name of "we" not "I" . . .' (p. 145). This observation prompts several analytic questions about how footing is situated within an ongoing course of action, under what circumstances one or another of these speaker footings is taken up, by what means they are changed and to what end. The present report can be understood as engaging these questions empirically for one set of practices for changing speaker footing: practices that implement a repair-based shift between individual and collective self-reference.

In this report, we concentrate on repairs to self-reference that change an individual self-reference form to a collective self-reference form and vice versa,

for example, from 'I' to 'we', and from 'we' to 'I'. Focusing on changes in self-reference produced through repair reveals participants' referring practices at points in the interaction where the formulation of a person reference is given priority over the progressive realization of a turn's talk and where one commonplace form of reference is explicitly selected over another. Although as Schegloff (1996a: 447) points out, the use of 'I' for individual self-reference 'masks' the relevance of the referent and reference for the talk (because it is a term dedicated to simple self-reference), when its use is the result of a repair operation that explicitly selects it over another form of self-reference (i.e. collective self-reference), then its local relevance may be partially unmasked (see Enfield, 2007).

We begin with a simple observation: on many occasions for self-reference either 'I' or 'we' can be employed even though the former refers to the speaker alone, while the latter ordinarily refers to a collectivity (containing the speaker). Thus, which of these forms of reference is actually employed – or employed and then replaced – cannot be dictated by correctness alone. This makes self-reference comparable to reference to non-present persons in that, when referring to a non-present person on a locally initial reference occasion (using either a recognitional or a non-recognitional form), a speaker has available various *equally correct* forms of reference (Sacks, 1972a, 1972b, 1992; Schegloff, 1996a). Selection under these circumstances may then be informed by considerations of recipient design (Sacks and Schegloff, 1979) and action formation (see, for example, Lerner, 1996a; Stivers, 2007; and Wilkinson and Kitzinger, 2003, for examinations of complaint-formulated references).

Our investigation extends this observation (concerning the availability of multiple correct forms for non-present persons) to the domain of self-reference. In research on references to non-present persons (cited above), the alternative formulations refer to the *same* referent. In the cases of self-reference analyzed here, the alternative reference forms have *differently composed* referents (i.e. individual or collective).² Because, for self-reference, there can be two alternative ways of formulating a simple (or so-called 'unmarked') self-reference (e.g. 'I' or 'we'), the initiation of repair on either self-reference term can be thought of as discretionary insofar as the original form of self-reference (i.e. the one that is subsequently targeted as a trouble source) may on many occasions not constitute an 'error' independently of the repair operation that treats it as such. As Schegloff et al. (1977: 363) point out for talk-in-interaction more generally, 'repair/correction is sometimes found where there is no hearable error, mistake, or fault.' Therefore we can ask under what circumstances are such self-reference repairs employed, and what else – if not error correction – might such self-reference repairs be used to accomplish on those occasions? Concentrating on self-reference repair allows us to focus on occasions in which selection of a self-reference form is explicitly oriented to by a participant. In what follows we first describe two types of repair operations in the domain of self-reference and then we examine how these two self-reference repair operations are employed in interaction.

Self-reference and self-repair

This report is based on the analysis of our collection of about 100 instances of self-reference repairs involving changes from individual to collective self-reference and vice versa. As would be expected given the range of practices that underwrite a 'preference for self-repair' in talk-in-interaction (Schegloff et al., 1977), the vast majority of self-reference repairs are same-turn self-initiated self-repairs, that is, the speaker both initiates the repair and produces the repair solution, and does so in the same turn and often the same turn-constructional unit (TCU) as the trouble source. And not surprisingly, the vast majority of these same-turn repairs are produced through simple word replacement (Jefferson, 1974), in that the speaker replaces 'I' with 'we' (as in Extract 1) or 'we' with 'I' (as in Extract 2). In Extract (1) Mum is complaining about the telephone company.

(1) [Holt X(C).1.1.6]

- | | | | |
|---|----|------|--|
| | 01 | Mum: | hI've never <u>had</u> any service from them. ↑Ne↓ver. |
| | 02 | Les: | <u>No</u> :. No:. |
| | 03 | | (.) |
| → | 04 | Les: | Oh [I ha: (.) <u>we</u> ha:ve, |
| | 05 | | [(c)lok) |
| | 06 | Mum: | °H <u>a</u> [ve yo [u° |
| | 07 | Les: | [.hhh [Becuz they're <u>a</u> :lways going wrong |
| | 08 | | here [at Galhampton, |
| | 09 | Mum: | [Th <u>a</u> :t's it, yes. |

In Extract (2) a beauty therapist is telling a client about a trip she took to another city with her fiancé.

(2) [Toerien Beauty Salon 7]

- | | | | |
|---|----|------|---|
| | 01 | | (2.0) |
| → | 02 | BTh: | We went- I went to do some serious shopping but (.) |
| | 03 | | it was all like the designer top notch shop you know. |

Replacement repairs are common across talk-in-interaction, and are not specific to self-reference. In their groundbreaking article on 'The Preference for Self-correction in the Organization of Repair in Conversation', Schegloff et al. (1977) include the following two instances of replacement repair, only the second of which is a person reference repair (but not a self-reference repair):

(3) [GTS:5:6]

- | | | | |
|---|----|------|--|
| | 01 | Ken: | He siz uh (1.0) W'l then what'r |
| → | 02 | | you so <u>ha</u> - er wuh unhappy about |

(4) [TG]

- | | | | |
|---|----|------|--|
| | 01 | Bee: | nYeah,.hh This feller I have- (nn) |
| → | 02 | | 'felluh'; this ma:n (0.2) t!.hhh |
| | 03 | | He ha::(s)- uff- eh- who who I have |
| | 04 | | fer <u>Linguistics</u> is really too much. |

In both Extracts (3) and (4), a speaker produces a word or part of a word that is subsequently withdrawn, and then replaces it with another word. In these cases the replacement is either an antonym (i.e. a word of the same type but with opposite value: 'unhappy' replaces 'happy' in (3)) or a synonym (i.e. another word with roughly the same meaning: 'man' replaces 'feller' in (4)).

For Extract (3) it seems enough to say that an error was made and corrected, that is, at first an incorrect term was voiced and then it was replaced with a correct term. The replacement of one word for another in this case can be understood as treating the trouble source as having been incorrect. However, in Extract (4) it does not seem to be enough to say that the original term was in need of repair because the reference was wrong. The problem here seems to be not simply an 'error' of reference, but the selection of an inappropriately informal term. The original term is revealed *through the repair solution* as an inappropriate manner in which to formulate – for this recipient in this sequential environment voiced by this speaker – a reference to someone who is apparently both some years the speaker's senior and her college professor. Here the categorical person reference term selected can implicate the categorizer's stance toward or putative relationship with the person so categorized, and the replacement repair can be understood to be addressed to this matter and not to a straightforward problem of erroneous reference.

All four of the repairs in Extracts 1–4 operate to replace one word with another in the production of the turn-so-far. However, these repairs can also be understood to operate in terms of the actions they implement. So, as we have shown, for example, in Extract (3) the word replacement implements a reversal of the valence of a reported assessment, while in Extract (4) the word replacement operates in the domain of person reference to implement a more formal or impersonal form of reference for the same referent.

In the domain of *self-reference*, replacement repairs operate on the trouble source in two systematically specifiable ways which are found in Extracts (1) and (2). In Extract (1), the speaker's repair from 'I' to 'we' adds in another recipient of service (presumably the speaker's husband) without deleting her own claim to have received such service, but now producing her own service reciprocity as part of a collectivity. In such instances the replacement of an individual reference form (such as 'I') with a collective one (such as 'we'), can be understood to broaden the reference by *aggregating* an individual to a collectivity. In Extract (2) the speaker's repair from 'we' to 'I' selects her in particular out of a relational collectivity. In such instances, the replacement of a collective reference form (such as 'we') with an individual one (such as 'I'), narrows the reference by *extracting* the speaker from a collectivity.

Aggregation and extraction are two repair operations – in the domain of self-reference – that can be realized through same-TCU replacement. However, these self-reference repair operations are not implemented solely through same-TCU replacement. In the next sections we first survey the range of ways these two operations are implemented through explicit repair procedures. We then go on to describe their implementation through embedded correction

(Jefferson, 1987). We show that extraction or aggregation can be accomplished with terms other than 'I' and 'we' (and their grammatical variants) and through forms of repair other than same-TCU replacement.³ In this way, we establish that these operations are organizationally distinct repair operations for (at least) the domain of self-reference.

Varieties of extraction repair

Extracts (5) and (6) – like Extract (2) – contain instances of same-turn replacement repair used to extract the speaker from a collectivity. In each case a collective self-reference term ('we') is replaced with an individual one ('I').

(5) [SBL:1:1:11]

- | | | |
|------|------|---|
| 01 | Din: | t hhh En <u>on</u> the way ho:me we <u>ga:w</u> ↑the: (0.5) |
| 02 | | most <u>gosh</u> u-awful <u>WRE:ck</u> |
| 03 | Bea: | <u>Oh</u> :::: |
| 04 | | (0.4) |
| → 05 | Din: | we have e (.) I've <u>ever</u> <u>seen</u> . |

(6) [Holt: X(C)1:1:3]

- | | | |
|------|------|---|
| → 01 | Les: | .hhhh We were going t- <I wz going t'ring |
| 02 | | <u>yesterday</u> but.hh ↑unforch'n we had a slight <u>acciden:t</u> . . . |

Self-repair can also be used to extract the speaker from a collectivity referred to with the generic 'you', as in Extract (7).

(7) [SJF]

- | | | |
|----|------|--|
| 01 | Car: | You get it <u>d</u> rummed into:- Well <u>hh</u> ! I felt I |
| 02 | | had it sort'v like drummed in.hhh to me when |
| 03 | | I was younger you know like.hhh like- like- |
| 04 | | (↑whatever you do) >you think< you know you |
| 05 | | shouldn't be a prick tease. |

Here the extraction contributes to a repair that also restarts and revises the turn's beginning.

This operation can also be realized in the transition space. In Extract (8) the speaker comes to possible completion at the word 'lousy' and only subsequently adds an additional element to his turn that extracts him as an individual ('at least mine') from the generic statement he has already produced (dealing with the effect of eating their pineapples) about people in general as a collectivity ('yer', line 1).

(8) [SN4]

- | | | |
|----|------|---|
| 01 | Mar: | Don't eat their pineapples. They make yer stomach |
| 02 | | <u>im</u> me:diately after dinner <u>r</u> eally feel lousy.<'t least m i:ne.= |

Here Mark initiates and completes an extraction repair in the transition space after possible completion of a TCU.

Other-initiated repair of a previous speaker's self-reference form is also possible, as in Extract (9) where initiation is followed by a repair solution doing extraction in next turn.

(9) [GTS:5:9 from Schegloff et al., 1977: 371]

- 01 Ken: B't I d'know- it seems thet- when Roger en I came in I d-
 02 I d'know if it wz u:s er what. B't we- the group seem'
 03 tuh disba:nd af [ter we got here.]
 → 04 Roger: [U:s? it wz me:.] hheh.hh hhi.hh

The speaker of the turn succeeding the one containing the trouble source ('us', line 2), initiates repair on it (by repeating it with questioning intonation, line 4) and then produces, with contrastive stress, the repair solution that extracts him as an individual ('me', line 4) from the 'us' (composed of current and prior speakers as a collectivity) in the previous turn.

Thus far all the specimens we have shown (across same-TCU, transition space and next-turn positions) display instances of *self*-extraction: that is, a speaker extracts themselves ('I', Extracts (5)–(6); 'mine', Extract (8); 'me', Extract (9)) from the previously voiced collectivity ('we', Extract (5), (6) and (9); the generic 'you', Extracts (7) and (8)). However, extraction can also take the form of *other*-extraction in which the extracted reference is to a person other than the speaker. As the following data extracts reveal, the person extracted from the collectivity can be the addressed recipient (10), or a third person (or persons) who may or may not be present (11 and 12).⁴ In Extract (10) Bill is explaining to his mother-in-law (who has Alzheimer's and cannot remember) how she has come to be living in a residential home. Using a transition space repair, Bill replaces 'we chose' with 'you chose', thereby extracting from the collective 'we' not himself as speaker, as in the previous cases, but his recipient.

(10) [ALZ01:07]

- 01 Bill: Yeah it's not fa::r.
 02 May: No:.=
 → 03 Bill: =That's why we cho::se it.= Or you chose it.
 04 .hhh But we went-whhhh we went round a::ll of them.
 05 May: Did we Bill.=
 06 Bill: =We did. yeah [huh huh huh]
 07 May: [°I'm sorry°]
 08 Bill: 'N y- you said that one was the huh was the ni(h)cest one

Other-extraction (in this case extraction of a recipient) is implemented here by a type of repair initiation not previously reported in the literature – an 'or'-initiated repair (here, in transition space) whereby 'we' is replaced with 'you', and marked as a replacement by the contrastive stress on 'you' and by post-framing ('chose it'). Note that 'we' at line 3 is inclusive of the recipient. The local context (not shown) makes apparent that 'we' refers to the speaker and his wife as well as to his recipient. His recipient treats it as such (at line 5) when she checks her understanding, asking 'did we' and not 'did you'.

In Extract (11), the speaker replaces ‘we’ (which refers to herself and her husband, Bud) with ‘Bud’, thereby extracting from the collective ‘we’ neither the speaker, nor her recipient, but a non-present person (her husband).

(11) [NB7:3:24]

01 Edn: .hhh B’t anyway we played golf et San or Bud played
02 et San Ma:rcus so I went down with ‘im yihknow

Here other-extraction is again implemented by an ‘or’-initiated repair (here in same TCU) – by abandoning the voicing of a two-part name (‘San Marcus’), producing a contrastive token (‘or’) in place of the second part of the name and then post-framing the replacement by repeating a post-position word from the initial saying (‘played’).

Interestingly, a ‘negative’ form of self-extraction can also be employed. In the following extract the speaker removes herself from a collective reference that otherwise remains intact by shifting from ‘we’ to ‘they’.

(12) [NBIV:10]

01 Lottie: .hhhh But we wen’ in: uh the Des:si Arne:z place
02 onna way ba:ck en: uh had (.) uh: they had’n
03 a:fter d:nner d:ri:nk God there wasn’t a soul en
04 we were the only ones et the bar. . .

Here Lottie begins to produce the second action in a description of a sequence of actions that tacitly refers to ‘we’ in this turn-constructural position (Oh, 2006), but then makes explicit that this action only concerns her companions and not herself. As Sacks (1992, Vol. II) notes about this case, Lottie is as much removing herself from a collective self-reference by inserting ‘they’ in place of the implicit ‘we’ as she is now only referring to her companions. He proposes that the shift to ‘they’ is designed to make it explicit that she did *not* drink.

In sum, we have shown here: (1) that repairing self-reference can be used to extract an individual from a collectivity; (2) that extraction can occur in a variety of positions in the repair initiation opportunity space (i.e. same-TCU, transition space and next turn) and can be implemented through a variety of repair practices; and (3) that it can be used to extract the speaker, the recipient, or another person (or persons) from a collectivity.⁵ This shows that extraction (as we will next show for aggregation) is a robust repair operation for the domain of self-reference – and more generally for the domain of reference to persons.⁶

Varieties of aggregation repair

Extracts (13) to (14) – like Extract (1) – show instances of same-turn replacement used to aggregate the speaker into a collectivity. In both cases an individual self-reference term (‘I’) is replaced with a collective one (‘we’).

(13) [Toerien Beauty Salon 7]

01 Cli: Well it’s your wedding=it’s a bit different [to Christmas isn’t it.
02 Bth: [Yea::h

- 03 (0.2)
 → 04 BTh: I've got- We've got the option of bringing it sort of
 05 forwards by about a month but uhm (0.2) that's
 06 about as much as we can do to bring it forward cost wise. . .

(14) [CTS03]

- 01 Sta: I wa- we were waiting for them for a::ges
 02 at the Met stop as we:l

In each of these cases the aggregation takes the form of a *collective* self-reference ('we'). However, collective self-reference is not the only form an aggregated person reference can take. A speaker can also change from an individual self-reference to an aggregation that takes the form of an *enumeration* as in Extracts (15) and (16) in both of which 'I' is changed to 'my husband and I.'

(15) [HB05]

- 01 Den: . . .And I'm uhm at the moment certainly uhm **my**
 02 **husband and I** are both very very keen on a home (.) birth

(16) [BIRTH CRISIS CALL 506]

- 01 Cla: And I was (.) you know able to: >I mean **my husband 'n I** were
 02 able< to: sort'v resume things 'n (.) get back to norma
 03 six: sort'v (.) six weeks after the bir:th.

Here, a reference to the speaker alone is reformulated as a reference to a relational collectivity (i.e. not 'we' but speaker plus another).

Before continuing to show for aggregation – as we showed for extraction – that it can be accomplished with collective reference terms other than 'we' and that it is not limited to same-TCU repairs, we want briefly to discuss the interactional import of there being two different forms of aggregation (i.e. 'we' or an enumerated reference). Speakers' selection of one or the other can depend upon the 'local reference context' (Schegloff, 1996a: 450) and this means that although the distinction between 'locally initial' and 'locally subsequent' reference does not seem to be consequential for *individual* self-reference (which is 'I', 'me', 'my', etc., irrespective of whether it is being used for the first or nth time), this distinction can be consequential for *collective* self-reference. In addition to its use as a locally subsequent reference form, the collective self-reference term 'we' can also be used as a locally initial form of reference when the membership of the collectivity is (assumed to be) apparent from the context (Kitzinger, 2005b) – a context that in the case of self-reference always includes some connection to speaker. However, when the *other* members of the collectivity may not be easily gleaned from the context, enumeration (because it contains an explicit reference to another person – or persons) can be used for locally initial reference instead of 'we'.

There are both explicit and tacit ways of constituting a collectivity that can then subsequently be referred to as 'we'. In Extract (17) the speaker first

explicitly enumerates the members of a collectivity ('Ruth Henderson and I' at line 2), subsequently referred to collectively as 'we' (at line 5).

(17) [SBL:1:1:11]

- 01 Din: ^Say didju see anything in the paper las'ni:ght er
 → 02 hear anything on the loc'l radio hh **Ruth Henderson en I**
 03 drove dow:n: to: h Ventura yester_da:y.
 04 Bea: Mm hm?,
 → 05 Din: t hhh En on the way ho:me **we** sa:w _the: (0.5) most gosh
 06 u-awful WRE:ck
 07 Bea: Oh_:::

Because 'we' ordinarily connects another person (or persons) to the speaker, there is always a 'referential starting point' for working out who the other member of a relational collectivity is (at least categorically, if not recognitionally). For instance, in Extract (18) there is a locally initial use of 'we' that relies on a *tacit* way of constituting the collectivity – Mum's knowledge of who Lesley might be 'lying in' with in the morning.

(18) [Holt X(C)1-1-1]

- 01 Les: Well I'm teaching tomorrow so:.,
 02 Mum: Oh: goody:. [hee!
 → 03 Les: [we:'ll be up [e- aa-
 04 Mum: [heh heh eh-eh h=
 → 05 Les: **We'll** be able to LIE: I:N:. Becuz U:SUALLY **WE'RE UP**
 06 at SIX 'n toMORROW is eh **we'll** be able t' l get up at six
 thirty.
 07 (0.6)
 08 Mum: Oh. u-Why:.,
 09 (.)
 10 Mum: he he hn- [Why are]you why: six thirty.
 11 Les: [Becuz]
 12 Les: Becuz I always do when I'm teaching.
 13 (0.3)
 14 Mum: Oh I see:.,
 15 (0.4)
 16 Mum: An' you usually get up at si:x.
 17 (0.7)
 18 Les: Well ye:s, cz Mark has: (.) does 'n (.) hour's overtime
 19 befo:re sk- work starts.
 20 (1.0)
 21 Mum: Oh:-:.

As 'get up' and 'lie in' can be understood as activities bound to – and thereby as making relevant – the team-type MCD (Sacks, 1972b: 334) of married couple, 'we' can be and is here understood as referring (despite there being no locally prior reference) to the particular team to which the speaker is known by her recipient to belong. It is this situated relevance that constitutes the tacit cultural resources for using an ordinarily locally subsequent collective

self-reference form in a locally initial position. That these actions are bound to certain collectivities – of which the speaker is one member – is treated as a known-in-common resource for using ‘we’ as a locally initial form of collective self-reference.⁷

These recipient design considerations can also sometime result in two successive repairs (see Schegloff, 1979: 277): first aggregating an individual to a collective reference (‘we’) and then repairing the ‘we’ to an enumerated reference (e.g. ‘me and my partner’). This two-stage repair can be seen in Extracts (19) and (20).

(19) [HB54]

01 Hol: . . . hh cause like originally when I first fell pregnant
 → 02 I’ve been tryin- we’ve been- me and my
 → 03 partner’ve been tryin’ for two an a half yea:rs. . .

(20) [BIRTH CRISIS CALL100]

01 Clt: . . .You know this do you.
 → 02 Ann: Yea- I have- We- We’ve- Tamsin and I have
 03 been looking up some research [on thee]=
 04 Clt: [Yes hhh]
 05 Ann: =internet and uhm (.).hhhh yeah. . .

In both cases a speaker first refers to herself as an individual, then aggregates herself with another person in a collective ‘we’, and finally enumerates the referents to whom ‘we’ is intended to refer (see the ‘Sacks substitution’, Schegloff, 1989: 146).

Just as we found that replacement repairs sometimes *extract* the speaker from a collectivity referred to with the generic ‘you’, so they can *aggregate* the speaker with a generic collectivity referred to with the generic ‘you’ as in Extract (21).

(21) [BP05]

→ 01 Ger: I look on- well you do look on the bright
 02 side really don’t you.

As expected, the vast majority of aggregations (like the vast majority of extractions) in our data are same-turn – and more specifically same-TCU – repairs, but aggregation can also be accomplished by repair initiated in next turn by the recipient of the trouble source turn, as in Extract (22).

(22) [Chicken Dinner]

01 Viv: One guy thet I wanna caw:ll he usually comes out.
 // ((intervening lines deleted))
 → 03 Sha: One: gu::y you usually ca(h)a(h)ll?
 04 What [is this.
 05 Mic: [mm-hm-m-h [m
 06 Viv: [No we [c a: ll.]
 07 Sha: [W’d is this]:.
 08 (0.5)
 09 Sha: Oh:. Okay it wz: friend a’mine too. Awright.

Over a chicken dinner shared by two heterosexual couples, Vivian is describing how she wants to call a guy, using the individual self-reference form, 'I' (line 1). Her male partner, Shane, displays an explicit orientation to this use of 'I' by challenging her to account for her behavior in a manner that seems (apparently jokingly) to embody masculine possessiveness and feminine betrayal. (The male partner of the other couple chuckles appreciatively at Shane's histrionic objections, line 5.) In response (and without any displayed appreciation of the 'joke') Vivian repairs her prior talk, replacing 'I' with 'we', thereby aggregating herself and Shane as a collectivity; the calling of the guy is transformed to a joint activity and the guy produced as a friend of the couple. This case of other-initiated aggregation can be compared to the other-initiated extraction ('U:s? It was me.') displayed in Extract (9).

Finally, in the same way that extraction can take two forms (*self-extraction* or *other-extraction*), so too can aggregation take two forms. Thus far all the specimens we have shown display instances of self-aggregation: that is, a speaker aggregates themselves to a collectivity (e.g. 'I' to 'we' as in many of our earlier cases). However, aggregation can also take the form of *other-aggregation* in which the initial reference is to a person other than the speaker. As the following data extracts show, the person aggregated to a collectivity can be the addressed recipient (23) or a third person (or persons) who may or may not be present (24).⁸

In Extract (23) the speaker replaces 'you' with 'we', thereby creating a collectivity composed of his co-conversationalist (the driver who is 'picking up . . . some other people') and himself (as a passenger accompanying the driver on his pick-ups). This repair aggregates the *recipient* to a collectivity that now also includes the speaker.

(23) [Land YU9]

→ 01 Ben: . . . I'm staying at yours and **you're** picking up- **we're** gonna
02 pick up some other people from East London in the
morning

In Extract (24) the speaker replaces the individual third-person reference term 'he' (a locally subsequent reference to her husband) with the collective person reference term 'we' (referring to herself and her husband), thereby formulating a collectivity composed of a third person and herself. Here 'training' refers to birth preparation exercises.

(24) [BIRTH CRISIS CALL01]

01 Clt: I suppose he felt in a very difficult position.
02 Do you think.=
03 Amy: =Well he- he did 'cau- He- he- read books 'n
→ 04 **he- we** did all (.) training by ourselves at home
05 but (0.2) I just think (0.5) ultimately they
06 think the nurses know the best. . .

In sum, we have shown here that: (1) repairing self-reference can be used to aggregate an individual to a collectivity; (2) that there are two forms aggregation

takes, a collective form ('we') and an enumerated form, which can be differentially selected in accordance with recipient design considerations; (3) that aggregation can occur in a variety of positions in the repair-initiation opportunity space and can be implemented through a variety of turn-constructural repair practices; and (4) that it can be used to aggregate the speaker into a collectivity with others, or to aggregate the recipient, or a third person, into a collectivity that includes the speaker. This shows that aggregation (like extraction) is a robust repair operation for the domain of self-reference – and more generally for the domain of reference to persons.⁹

Embedded extraction and aggregation

In addition to the range of repairs that operate to extract or to aggregate self- (and other-) reference in an exposed fashion, both extraction and aggregation can also be realized *without repair* through embedded correction (see Jefferson, 1987). Here correction is embedded in the ongoing action of a turn and its sequence and does not suspend the action of the turn to initiate repair. This can be seen in Extracts (25) and (26). Extract (25) is a case of other-extraction in which a male caller to a helpline extracts his pregnant wife ('she') from the collective 'you', designed by the call-taker as a collective reference.

(25) [Birth Crisis Call 532]

- | | | | |
|---|----|------|---|
| | 01 | Cl: | .hhh And you 're now twenty two: weeks did you sa:yç |
| | 02 | | (.) |
| → | 03 | Mic: | No- no she 's: she's twenty weeks on Monday.hh |
| | 04 | Cl: | Twenty weeks. [.hhh] So you need to act= |
| | 05 | Mic: | [()] |
| | 06 | Cl: | =very quickly I think. |
| | 07 | Mic: | Ri:ght. Sha- I'd probly b'er ri:ng toda:y. |

In this case at line 1 the call-taker checks her understanding of the state of the pregnancy. Here 'you' is clearly referring to the male caller and his wife, and formulates them collectively as 22 weeks pregnant. In disconfirming and correcting this proposed candidate understanding, the caller, extracts his wife ('she') rather than use the collective self-reference (i.e. 'we') made relevant by the collective other-reference ('you') in the prior turn. (Note that the turn-initial 'no' at line 3 is a type-conforming response [Raymond, 2003] and thus will be understood in the first place as disconfirming the candidate understanding and not as rejecting the reference form.) This extraction is not a repair since there is no suspension of the progressivity of the action of the sequence. A repair here would be realized as a turn at talk in which, instead of confirming or disconfirming the call-taker's understanding check, he would have explicitly corrected the call-taker's person reference in some manner (e.g. something like, 'Us? You mean her' – compare Extract 9). Instead he simply produces an appropriate sequence-responding action, using an individual pronominal reference to his wife alone, rather than a collective self-reference ('we') that would have been consistent with the collective formulation in the call-taker's sequence-initiating action.

Extract (26) is a case of embedded other-aggregation in which the call-taker prompts the caller to restart her problem presentation after having interrupted her to gain ethics clearance for recording.

(26) [Birth Crisis Call 515]

- | | | |
|------|------|---|
| 01 | Cl: | Alright start again with 'I've got a woman' huh huh huh |
| → 02 | Una: | Ye(h)s. We've got a woman who::: (.) had her fir:rst |
| 03 | | baby::: >°I can't remember when it was ago°< |
| 04 | | (.) uh (.) anyway she had a caesarian for that. |

In this case the call-taker attributes an individual self-reference ('I') to the caller in prompting her to continue. However, in picking up where she left off, the caller aggregates the self-reference to an organizational collectivity (an alternative birth center). Again, this is not a repair since there is no suspension of the progressivity of the sequence. Instead she simply recycles the beginning of the problem presentation (as prompted by the call-taker), but uses a collective self-reference in place of the individual one made relevant as part of the call-taker's prompt. Note that both of these cases target a reference in the just prior turn that was proffered on the next speaker's behalf and thus make authoritative self-correction a relevant option (see Lerner, 1996b for a comparison of 'self-as-speaker' correction and 'self-as author/owner' correction).

Extraction and aggregation as interactional resources

We turn now to an exploration of how extraction and aggregation are used in talk-in-interaction and what they can accomplish in the particular sequential environments in which they are employed. It is important to remember that extraction and aggregation are not simply employed to do error correction. Although replacement (the turn-constructive operation through which extraction and aggregation are most commonly done in our dataset) is commonly understood as implementing 'correction' (that is 'the replacement of an "error" or "mistake" with what is "correct"', Schegloff et al., 1977: 363; Jefferson, 1974), the self-reference repairs discussed here do not seem to constitute obvious 'errors' independently of the repair operation that locates them as such.¹⁰

On many occasions either an individual or a collective self-reference form could be employed correctly, and so the matter of correct reference form need not be the only consideration in selecting the reference term. In other words, if a speaker had not initiated repair, it would not have been apparent to the recipient (or to us as analysts) that anything was awry. For example, there is nothing self-evidently erroneous with 'We were going to ring yesterday' (unrepaired version of (6)); 'I've got the option of bringing it sort of forwards by a month' (unrepaired version of (13)); 'I was waiting for them . . .' (unrepaired version of (14)). Thus when a speaker halts the progressive realization of a turn at talk to extract an individual self-reference or to aggregate a collective self-reference one can ask what is referring being

used to do here – and indeed one can ask what about referring takes precedence over the progressive realization of the turn's talk, when obvious error is not involved. This section of the report shows that speakers can select a self-reference term so as to fit the referent to the kind of action (or personal state) formulated within the turn.

We now turn to an examination of some occasions on which extraction and aggregation are employed. First, we examine occasions on which *extraction* is employed to narrow authority for an action from a collectivity to an individual. Second, we examine occasions on which *aggregation* is employed to expand authority for an action from an individual to a collectivity.

EXTRACTING INDIVIDUAL (EPISTEMIC) AUTHORITY

Participants in conversation with others have been found to orient to their own entitlements to knowledge and experience and to the entitlements of their co-participants (see Drew, 1991; Goffman, 1974; Goodwin, 1981; Heritage and Raymond, 2005; Kamio, 1997; Kitzinger, 2005a, 2005b; Labov, 1972; Labov and Fanshel, 1977; Lerner, 1992, 1996a, 1996b, 2004; Pomerantz, 1980; Raymond and Heritage, 2006; Sacks, 1992; Schegloff, 1996b). In line with this growing body of research into the organization of entitlement, we show that extraction is employed to narrow authority in matters of knowledge, experience and action formulation that are thereby treated (reflexively) as properly involving individual authority for what is being asserted. We will show this for both relational and organizational collectivities.

1) *Relational extraction*

In this sub-section we examine instances in which a member of a just-referred-to relational collectivity (friends and 'couples' in our data) is extracted from the collectivity by reference to what the speaker can properly 'know' (i.e. assert they know) about the experience of another. In Extracts (27) and (28) extraction is used to narrow the speaker's epistemic authority from that of a relational collectivity of which they are a member to just themselves. In both these instances, this epistemic extraction is done for categorical or 'extreme-case' assessments of something that has been experienced by members of a collectivity (see Pomerantz, 1986). In these cases an event or experience is formulated categorically as the 'best ever' or the 'worst ever' such event or experience, and it is here that a speaker halts the progressive realization of their turn and shifts from collective self-reference (which asserts epistemic authority for the collectivity) to individual self-reference (which limits the purview of the categorical assessment to the speaker alone).

In Extract (27) Dina has called Bea to report on a multi-car accident that she and a friend witnessed while driving home from another city.

(27) [SBL:1:1:11]

- | | | |
|----|------|---|
| 01 | Din: | <↑Say didju see anything in the paper las'ni:ght er |
| 02 | | hear anything on the loc'l radio.hh Ruth Henderson en I |
| 03 | | drove dow:n: to: h Ventura yesterda:y. |

- 04 Bea: Mm hm?,
 05 Din: t hhh En on the way ho:me we sa:w the: (0.5) most gosh
 06 u-awful WRE:ck
 07 Bea: Oh↓:::
 08 (0.4)
 → 09 Din: we have e- (.) I've ever seen. I've never seen a ca:r
 10 smashed intuh
 11 Bea: Mm
 12 Din: such a sma:ll spa:ce.
 13 Bea: °Oh:::°
 14 Din: Ih wz smashed.hh (0.2) from the fro:nt en the ba:ck
 15 both it musta been i:n (0.2) caught in: (.) betwee:n
 16 two ca:: [rs
 17 Bea: [Mm h [m <Uh h [uh,]
 18 Din: [Must'v [run] in: to a car'n then another
 19 car smashed into it.= 'nthere w'r people laid out'n
 20 covered over on the pavement 'n.hh
 21 (0.8)
 22 Din: We were s:-: (.) pa:rked there fer °quite a° whi:le but I wz
 23 going to (.) listen t'the local:: (.) ne:ws'n haven't done it.

Dina begins the report with a locally initial enumeration of the members of an occasioned collectivity ('Ruth Henderson and I', line 2). It is then this collectivity ('we') who is described as seeing the accident ('we saw the most gosh awful wreck', lines 5–6). Here Dina is speaking in her capacity as a spokesperson for the collectivity in describing and assessing what they both saw. Collective reference seems appropriate here insofar as she is describing what anyone could see and report – a very bad accident. She treats its very observability as unproblematic. What she saw is what Bea also saw and she can be confident in assessing it for them both (see Sacks, 1986). Bea then shows her appreciation of the report as bad news by issuing a reaction token (Wilkinson and Kitzinger, 2006) ('Oh::', line 7). To use a collective reference here – to speak for Ruth as well as for herself – would put her in the position of speaking authoritatively not only about Ruth's assessment of the accident, but comparatively about every accident Ruth has ever seen. This is the 'extreme case', to use Pomerantz's (1986) formulation. It is at this point that extraction is employed to narrow the epistemic authority for the categorical component of the assessment from collective to individual self-reference (from 'we have ever seen' to 'I have ever seen', line 9). The speaker again uses individual self-reference when she goes on to make a second categorical statement about the accident ('I have never seen a car smashed into such a small space'). However, she shifts back to a collective self-reference when returning to a description of an element of their joint participation in the events – and one not formulated as an extreme case ('we were parked there for quite a while', line 22).

Extract (28) also concerns the categorical assessment of reported events, but in this case the extreme case formulation is positive. Lottie has been reporting on a trip to a resort community she took to visit a friend. Her recipient then

produces a pair of very positive assessments ('Isn't that exciting' and 'Oh that's wonderful'). In overlap with the second of these, Lottie begins her own assessment of the visit.

(28) [NBIV.10]

- 01 Emm: I: s n't]that exc i:ting.
 02 (.)
 03 Lott: Uh[↑:
 04 Emm: [Oh: that's wonderf'[1 °*ah-*a]h°1
 05 Lott: [O h : :] Go:d we had (.) u-
 → 06 We, I never had so much fun m[uh life.]
 07 Emm: [Oh: I]'m gladju went ↑GOD
 08 LOTTIE AH WISH you c'd meet somebuddy li:ke that.h

At line 5 Lottie begins what seems to be a collective assessment ('We had' [so much fun]). She cuts this off and then restarts by first repeating the collective form 'we' and then replacing it with 'I'. This may be another type of two-step repair (see Extracts 19 and 20). First, she aims to repair 'We had so much fun' with 'We never had so much fun . . .'. Once the second 'we' is produced and an upgraded assessment is due, she then extracts an individual self-reference from the collectivity in order to limit the categorical assessment to herself alone. Whatever the basis for the two-step repair, here again an extreme-case assessment is made to apply to only the speaker, while three previous mentions (not shown here but see Jefferson et al., 1987) that formulate only the activity are produced with collective self-reference).¹¹

In Extract (29) a beauty therapist and one of her regular clients (the same participants we have already met in Extracts (2) and (13)) are chatting during a depilation session about the beauty therapist's recent trip to Edinburgh with her fiancé. The repair at line 12 replaces a collective 'we' with an individual 'I' (post-framed with 'went'), thereby extracting the speaker from a relational collectivity.

(29) [Toerien: Beauty Salon 7]

- 01 Cli: Did you like it.
 02 BTh: ()
 03 Cli: Oh did you huh huh
 04 BTh: It was just so busy as we::ll.=I think that
 05 didn't help.
 06 (0.2)
 07 BTh: There was just nowhere to pa::rk, (you) sort
 08 of driving out to go and get a parking and
 09 then get the bus back in to Edinburgh city
 10 itself.
 11 (2.0)
 → 12 BTh We went- I went to do some serious shopping
 13 but (.) it was all like the designer top notch
 14 shops you know [don't wa]lk in unless you've=
 15 Cli: [Ri::ght]

- 16 BTh: =two hundred pound to spare [on a top]=
 17 Cli: [Right]
 18 BTh: =or something. Which is just [ridiculous.]
 19 Cli: [A::: w]
 20 BTh: So I was a bit disappointed with it considering
 21 all the hassle we had getting up there.

In this case epistemic extraction acts not so much to limit the purview of an extreme case formulation to the speaker alone, as it limits the purview of what motivated the (collective) trip to the speaker alone ('I went to do some serious shopping'). Segregating this personal motive then sets up the basis for what is later formulated as her personal disappointment ('I was a bit disappointed with it') beyond the collective transportation 'hassle we had getting up there.'

This repair reflects a solution to the problem of ascribing motives both to and on behalf of others; and, perhaps, in this case ascribing this particular motive ('serious shopping') to this particular (known-to-be-male) member of a relational collectivity in a culture in which 'real men don't shop.' Here the extraction may guard against producing an inadvertent characterization of her fiancé as a man motivated by an interest in womanly matters. This 'interpersonal' facet of self-reference repair is taken up in Kitzinger and Lerner (forthcoming).

In our final case of relational extraction we examine a self-reference repair used in the formulation of an account for a delayed condolence phone call.

(30) [Holt: X(C)1:1:3]

- 01 Les: Oh hello Philip it's Lesley here,
 02 (.)
 03 Phi: Yes Lesli[e].
 → 04 Les: [.hhhh We were going t- <I wz going t'ring
 05 yesterday but.hh unforch'n we had a slight acciden:t and
 06 the phone got cut off.
 07 (0.3)
 08 Les: [huh-uh!]
 09 Phi: [O h:. .] dear. Wuh d'you chop a wire off?
 10 (0.5)
 11 Les: Uh:m no: £not exactl[y£ we f'got] (.) fwe got- f'got=
 12 Phi: [ekhh he:h]
 13 Les: =to op'n the (0.3) telephone bill eh heh heh _ .hn
 // ((some talk not shown))
 14 Les: . h h But we were ↑very ↓sorry to hea:r (.) that uh
 15 (.) *your mother* had (.) died is that ri:ght Phi[↑lip?
 16 Phi: [Yeah.
 17 Phi: nYeah that's right yesterday morning. Yeah.

In this case the self-reference repair from 'we' to 'I' (at line 4) constitutes the preface to the account as a (thwarted) personal intention to make the condolence call she is now making on behalf of the couple. Note that she nonetheless formulates responsibility for the delay as collective by returning to a collective self-reference in the second component of her turn. Lesley goes on to report that service had been discontinued for non-payment of the bill, and in selecting

'we' (at line 5) she treats herself and her husband as a couple as collectively responsible.

Lesley's initial extraction of herself from a collective self-reference reformulates the intention to call as personal, thereby suggesting that the delay should not be considered a measure or indicator of lack of personal concern on her part, but an unavoidable consequence of an unrelated collective failure. What she seems to be doing is extracting a 'personal intention' – that is, a matter of personal self-knowledge – while retaining collective responsibility for the delay.¹² Note that Lesley then goes on to offer condolence in her capacity as a spokesperson for the collectivity ('We were very sorry to hear . . .') at lines 14–15.

2) *Relational disaggregation*

In the prior sub-section we examined the use of extraction to change relational self-reference to individual self-reference in matters of self-knowledge found in extreme case declarations of experience as well as in declarations of intentions and motives, thus steering clear of speaking on behalf of another person's experiential history, intentions and motives. One question that might be asked here is whether there are circumstances in which an individual self-reference is aggregated into a relational self-reference in epistemic formulations such as these. The answer is 'yes'; this does occur in our data. But interestingly the *form* aggregation takes in these circumstances actually seems to sustain the personal or individual character of epistemic formulation rather than to override it, and so we examine it in this part of the report. Here we do not find individual extraction from a collectivity, but rather the in-tandem *disaggregation* of a relational collectivity (see Turk, this issue).

In the following extract a caller to a birth crisis hotline changes an individual self-reference to one form of collective self-reference (an enumerated collectivity). Here self-reference aggregation is achieved through a repair solution that colligates (Jefferson, 1986) references to the speaker and her husband, thereby implicating her husband as well as herself in the desire to have a home birth.

(31) [HB05]

01 Den: . . . And I'm uhm at the moment certainly uhm **my husband**
02 **and I** are **both** very very keen on a home (.) birth

In this case Denise is expressing a strong (but not extreme case) desire as a member of a collectivity. However, she is not so much speaking on behalf of her husband and herself *as a couple* as she is speaking on behalf of a collection of individuals: she is formulating their individual (but corresponding) desire to have a home birth. This is accomplished through the addition of 'both' to the person reference formulation. Doing so, rather than emphasizing the collectivity – as it might seem to do on semantic grounds – in practice is used to *differentiate* the members of a collective reference. 'Both' recurrently operates in this way in environments in which *disaggregation* of the members of a referenced collectivity is relevant or required (see Lerner and Kitzinger, 2007

for a fuller development of this phenomenon). In this case there is a good local reason to do so: to show the call-taker that the caller's husband desires a home birth independently of the fact that she, herself, is 'very very keen' on it.

So, here a case of aggregation nonetheless sustains a repair-enabled preference for individualized epistemic authority. Epistemic extraction directly enables this preference by halting the progressive realization of a turn's talk mid-course to move from 'we' to 'I', while even epistemic aggregation, which on the face of it would seem to be a practice that runs counter to such a preference, can be composed so as to sustain the preference even when the local context calls for a collective self-reference. The addition of 'both' to the aggregated self-reference disaggregates the collectivity and thus preserves the integrity of the members of the collectivity as individual actors while nonetheless referring to them as a collectivity (in this case through the colligated enumeration of its membership).

3) *Organizational extraction*

Self-reference extraction from an organizational collectivity is employed in Extract (32). Here a psychologist first begins describing the purpose of a 'Quality of Life' scale to his interviewee using an organizational self-reference ('what we're tr-') and then replaces this with an individual self-reference ('what I'm trying . . .').

(32) [Quality of Life Interview, see McHoul and Rapley, 2002]

- | | | |
|------|----|---|
| 01 | | (1.0) |
| 02 | B: | Er >sh'we sh'we< make a start then |
| 03 | M: | Yep |
| 04 | | (.) |
| 05 | M: | okay |
| 06 | | (1.0) |
| 07 | M: | Uhm= |
| 08 | B: | =((slurping tea drinking noise)) |
| → 09 | M: | What we're tr- what I'm trying to do is find out (.) |
| 10 | | what people think about (0.2) <u>life</u> |

In Extract (32) the interviewer personalizes a formulation of the goal or purpose of the interview by shifting from speaking with an organizational voice to speaking with his own voice (albeit as the agent of an organization). This occurs at a point where both 'motive' and 'knowing' are relevant ('I'm trying to find out . . .'). Motives, knowing and methods of knowing seem bound to individual persons even when an organizational self-reference might otherwise seem acceptable.

Here, then, we have examined a case of epistemic extraction in which the progressive realization of a turn's talk is delayed to extract an individual self-reference that is employed in connection with formulating an action in terms of individual direct sensory experience or personal motive, rather than in terms of institutionally held knowledge and goals.

AGGREGATING COLLECTIVE (RESPONSIBLE) AUTHORITY

We now turn to aggregation repairs that are employed to accomplish what can be understood as something like 'a shift of responsible authority' from an individual to a collectivity. We begin by examining *relational* aggregation (overwhelmingly couples in our data) and then conclude with a discussion of *organizational* aggregation.

1) *Relational aggregation*

In Extract (33), a phone call from a clergyman to a parishioner, the speaker is aggregated to a collectivity that includes a non-present person. Here aggregation is employed on two separate occasions to shift responsible authority for a delicate request from the speaker alone to a relational collectivity (the speaker and his wife). The clergyman (Ron) is asking Lesley (Les) to befriend a woman who (like her) has had a young adult child die.

(33) [Holt SO88(II)-2-2]

- 01 Ron: And ↑one a'the ↑thin:gs that u-uhm: they mention:ed uh:m
 02 la:'s time when I called last week.hhh was that.h they
 03 wondered if ih- I could think of anyone::u- uh:m u-who
 04 per↑haps has passed throu:gh a similar experien[ce
 05 Les: [iYes:.
 06 Ron: An:d who would (.) m:may be able to ta:lk with he:r with
 07 Noe:l.hhhh (.) ukhu:h jus:t sort of sha:re something of
 08 the: of,h the experience 'n how one °oo::° sort of works
 09 your way through it.
 10 Les: eeYes.
 11 (.)
 → 12 Ron: An:d uh:m I must admit I th- uh:m that (.) I talk't'Eva
 13 about this 'n we thought'v your good se:lf.=
 14 Les: =.hhh Oh:.
 15 (.)
 16 Les: Right.h Yes..hh n-
 17 (0.2)
 18 Ron: Uh is this something you feel you could take on: u-ah-ah
 19 (.) I [- I don' know w't wh]at it would invo:lve but uh:m
 20 Les: [eY e s cert'nly.]
 21 Ron: .hh [hh
 22 Les: [Oh yes we've u- we've done: quite-
 23 (0.2) e-quite a bit of this:
 // [Some talk omitted]
 24 Ron: She didn't e soh-sort ot stetyeh-uh:m e-it was her
 25 sister when I w'z talking to th'm bo:th (.) s- 'oo said
 26 it would be lovely if.hhh if Noel could meet someone
 27 who: (0.3) who has somehow had a sim'l'r experience 'n
 28 (0.4) uh:m I said well I would like t'think about that
 29 'n an-:' maybe get back to them uh-on it 'n then
 → 30 I thought well (0.5) we thought of yourse:lf. an:d

- 31 a [n:d she]: eh:m.hhhhhh (0.3) If you could make=
 32 Les: [iYes.]
 33 Ron: =contact tha' w'd be wo[nderful.]

First, responsible authority (for choosing Lesley for a difficult request that Ron has begun to assign to himself ('I th-')) is reassigned to a collectivity (at line 12). (Note that the impetus to make such a request in the first place had already been assigned to others at lines 2–3.) In this case of relational aggregation a collectivity is first made known and relevant ('I talked to Eva about this') before the shift from 'I th[ought]' to 'we thought of your good self [as someone who could talk to her]' is completed. So, here we do not have a simple replacement repair, but a more complex repair operation that has the same result in the domain of self-reference. Shortly thereafter (at line 30), Ron reproduces the same aggregation from individual to collective self-reference while elaborating his explanation of how he has come to make the request ('I thought well (0.5) we thought of your self'). In both cases we again see aggregation employed to broaden the responsible authority for what can be understood as a delicate and rather difficult request.¹³

This extract shows that aggregation repair (and embedded aggregation) can shift responsible authority from the speaker alone to a couple even when the action does not require it, thus broadening the scope of responsibility – and thereby perhaps attenuating individual responsibility.¹⁴ Attenuation of personal responsibility can be taken even further by simply removing oneself from the collectivity altogether. An instance of this type of 'negative extraction' was seen in Extract (12) where a speaker employed a self-reference repair to remove herself from those who 'had a drink'.

2) *Organizational aggregation*

In Extract (34) a beauty therapist replaces an individual self-reference ('I') with an organizational self-reference ('we') at line 12.

(34) [Toerien: Hair removal session 8]

- 01 BTh: .hhhh I mean (.) nor:mally if s'mbody's
 02 s:tartin' to have (0.4) ch- you know
 03 switch an' go into waxing (0.2).hhhh
 04 normally sa:y (0.2) uh:: (.) between four
 05 and six weeks come back an' have it done.
 06 (0.5)
 07 BTh: U:m:: (0.8) it depends=in Winter your
 08 hair grows much slower than in Summer
 09 because of the lack of sunli:ght,
 10 Cli: mm hm
 11 BTh: .hhh U:h so:: (0.6) it u:sually (.) it's quite short yours.=
 → 12 Normally I w- we would've said come back in a wee:k.
 13 ['Cau]se in a week you'd've had a bit more gro:wth.
 14 Cli: [Okay]
 15 Cli: Yeah

The beauty therapist is informing someone who is new to waxing (as a method of hair removal) that, although she (the beauty therapist) has agreed to do the waxing now, the client should really have waited another week before coming in. Here we have a somewhat delicate judgment (which reveals ignorance on the part of the client) transformed from an individual opinion to an organizational policy based on professional judgment.¹⁵ This case parallels the earlier one of relational aggregation (in Extract 33, the case of the clergyman's request) used to attenuate personal responsibility by formulating a delicate action as that of a relational collectivity.

Concluding remarks

Based on empirical investigation of repairs to self-reference, we have shown how the selection of even the most straightforward forms of reference – those virtually dedicated to individual and collective self-reference – can be a matter of explicit speaker concern and can be carefully fitted to the action of a turn. In the domain of self-reference, a speaker's selection of 'I' as opposed to 'we' (or vice versa) is in many cases 'optional' in the sense that either could be used without its selection being remarkable in any way. These repairs exhibit speakers' (and recipients') orientations to consequential differences between the alternatives 'I' and 'we', and expose the considerations of recipient design and action formation that can inform the selection of self-reference terms. It is through the initiation of repair that an initially selected self-reference form can be revealed as a source of trouble and it is through extraction and aggregation that the very possibility of there being a choice is made apparent.

Because we have shown that selection between self-reference terms matters to participants, this research offers explicit empirical evidence that the deployment of 'I' and 'we' when not subsequently withdrawn may also be scrutinized on a case by case basis *by participants* for their fit for this speaker, this recipient and the action of this turn at talk. This investigation then offers grounding for other work in this area which has presumed this to be the case. By using the organization of repair as an investigative tool, we strengthen the general 'lexical choice' claims first proposed by Sacks (1992: I, 713) and echoed by others who have invoked 'we' as showing relational (Stanley and Billig, 2004) or institutional responsibility (e.g. Maynard, 1984; Silverman, 1987; Whalen and Zimmerman, 1990).

Previous research (Schegloff et al., 1977) has shown that repair is not dependent on error. Here we have begun to specify what else beyond error (and ambiguity) repair can be mobilized to accomplish. In particular, *we have shown how what is accomplished through repair can be 'action specific' to the trouble source*. We showed that repairing 'I' (and its grammatical variants) to 'we' (and its grammatical variants), or vice versa, although most often implemented in our data through replacement repair, is unlike replacement repairs which reverse an assessment (as in Extract 3, 'happy' to 'unhappy') or which retain what is being

referred to while referencing it differently (as in Extract 4, 'fellow' to 'man'). Instead, where the term 'I' replaces the term 'we', speakers extract themselves from a collective reference term that *did initially include them*; and where the term 'we' replaces the term 'I', speakers aggregate others to a referent that *is retained* in the replacement reference term. Our first finding, then, is that replacement repair can be used in the domain of reference to persons to implement the extraction of a referent from a collectivity, or to aggregate a referent to a collectivity. Second, we have shown that these operations are not only implemented by same-TCU replacement, but through other turn-constructional repair procedures and at other locations within the repair initiation opportunity space. Thus, we have identified extraction and aggregation as formal repair operations in (at least) the domain of reference to persons.

We then considered what might occasion these extractions and aggregations interactionally, given that for many of them neither error correction nor disambiguation seemed an adequate explanation. The cases presented in this report show that speakers can orient to extreme case assessments as not extending to the collectivities they are speaking on behalf of. In Labov's (1972) terms these self-reference repair practices can be understood as enabling or enforcing a practical distinction between shared knowledge (so-called AB-events) and unshared knowledge (so-called A-events) and as showing that extreme case assessments are not formulated as shared experiences. Here we also see 'territories of information' (Kamio, 1997) in action (albeit without the need for the spatial metaphor) in that these cases can be understood as exhibiting members' orientation to the limits of such territories and as showing the maintenance of their boundaries to be a priority concern (see Raymond and Heritage, 2006).

Thus we have shown how a feature of a culture's social organization is directly consequential for – and an emergent component of – the organization of talk-in-interaction, and that participants can be explicitly oriented to matters of formulating responsibility/authority for described actions, experiences, motives or feelings. One might say that in this way these practices constitute an aspect of a culture-in-action insofar as the emergent 'norms' of conduct are here localized (i.e. situated) and practice-specific (and thus practice-dependent) in their constitution. It is not that 'I' and 'we' do 'more than referring' (as e.g. 'alternative recognitionals', Stivers, 2007, can be seen to be doing), but rather we have shown that it is possible to uncover what *situated* referring itself can accomplish as part and parcel of the organization of talk-in-interaction – that is, as part and parcel of situated social life.

We have also shown that authority or responsibility for an action can be formulated as personal, relational or organizational, and that speakers can move between individual and collective (relational/organizational) responsibility for different types of action, using repair to reallocate responsibility even when the initial reference would be unremarkable except for the initiation of repair on it. Here same-turn repair furnishes a mechanism for speakers to change their footing and thereby their stance toward an action they are about to formulate –

either to take sole responsibility for it, or to give themselves the 'collective cover' of speaking for a couple or an organization. Formulating 'responsibility' or 'authority' for an action is a priority matter for these participants: they halt the progressivity of their turn's talk and repair an otherwise passable reference to get this right for the practical purpose at hand. Here, as with the pursuit of recognitional reference (Sacks and Schegloff, 1979) and elsewhere in talk-in-interaction, it is the progressive realization of a turn's talk that gives way.

For many authors the concept of 'footing' is invoked to shed light on the nature and in-flux character of speaking. But there has been little concern with how such changes in footing are situated within an ongoing course of action and are constitutive of specific actions in specific circumstances (but see Clayman, 1992, for a discussion of the interactional aspects of footing and Lerner, 1996b, for an examination of interaction practices used to pre-empt the voicing of one's views by another in order to voice one's own views). Although changes in footing such as a change from individual self-reference ('I') to collective self-reference ('we') and *visa versa* may result in a shift of the 'frame' or context for understanding the ongoing activity, such changes in self-reference are primarily orderly as – and best understood as – actions situated within a course of action. That is, they are not primarily (for the participants who produce and respond to such shifts) indicators of changes in activity context, but specific practices that are employed to accomplish particular actions in the emerging turn at talk and ongoing sequence of actions.

Finally, the concept of 'identity' has long been employed in explaining human conduct. For the most part, one or more identity terms are gleaned from the actions of the parties, or from biographical information, and then those identity terms are used to make sense of those self-same actions. We have shown how an examination of self-reference can re-specify the study of identity as an investigation of identity practices. In this way, we ground our understanding of identity in its moment-by-moment realization in and as the actual interactional practices employed by participants. Similarly, we have examined the relevance of 'collective identities' (such as married couples and businesses) not as ethnographic facts to explain what is done in interaction, but as situated accomplishments that are in part constituted through the practices of collective self-reference employed in interaction. By restricting our investigation of self-reference to the participants' displayed interest in it, we reveal how a speaker's formulation of themselves (as individual or member of a collectivity) can become a matter of practical importance.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We are grateful to Sue Wilkinson, John Heritage and Manny Schegloff for their helpful comments on earlier versions of this article, and to Danielle Jones, Victoria Land, Clare Stockill and Merran Toerien for permission to use extracts from their data.

NOTES

1. See Land and Kitzinger (this issue) for a discussion of the use of 'third-person' reference forms in connection with self-reference, and Schegloff (2007) for a discussion of self-reference forms used to convey who the speaker is (principally in the opening section of American telephone calls).
2. Although the focus of this report is on *self*-reference term selection, it should be noted that on some occasions for reference to non-present persons both individual and collective reference forms can also be relevant alternatives and the self-reference repair operations described here can also be employed in those cases as seen later in notes 6 and 9.
3. Of course one can also find changes in self-reference that are part and parcel of changes in the action of the turn from, for example, a collective action ('why don't we [go]') to an individual action ('why don't I take you and Mom') as in the following case (at lines 2–3).

[NB:V:4:SO]

- 01 Margy: We'll have to do tha [t more] o: f t e n.]
 → 02 Emma: [.h h h h] [Well w]hy don't we: uh-m:
 03 Why don't I take you and Mom up there to: Coco's.=
 04 someday for lu:nch.=We'll go, buzz up there t[o,
 05 Margy: [Goo:d.
 06 Emma: Hu:h?
 07 Margy: That's a good deal. ·hh-·hh=
 08 Emma: =Eh I'll take you bo:th[up
 09 Margy: [No::: we'll all go Dutch.
 10 =But [let's do that.]
 11 Emma: [No: we wo:n']t.

Here Emma reformulates a proposal for an outing with her recipient into an invitation that makes explicit she will bear the cost of the outing for her recipient (and Mom). In this case it is not only self-reference that is reformulated, but that change is part of a broader reformulation of the action of the turn. For the most part we examine cases in which there is a change in the formulation of self-reference when there does not seem to otherwise be an explicit change in the action of the turn – and thus any change in the action import of the turn accrues to the change in self-reference – and to the fact that a change occurs. That is, the action is formulated in the same manner, but now the referent associated with that action is different – and thus what is accomplished through the turn is changed only by the reformulation of the self-reference.

4. Here we use 'self-extraction' and 'other-extraction' to refer to the result of the operation. Cross-cutting this distinction is a separate matter that concerns who initiates the repair (self or other). So there can be self-initiated self-extraction repair (Extracts 5 and 6); self-initiated other-extraction repair (Extracts 10 and 11); other-initiated self-extraction repair (Extract 9); and an instance of other-initiated other extraction done as an embedded correction (Extract 25).
5. Speakers can also extract an indeterminate person from a collectivity as in the following case where the speaker replaces 'we' with 'one of us' as arrangements are being made to drop off a dog at its owner's house.

[Heritage 1.3]

- 01 Ile: eeYah. B'gz ah'll tell you what I:- uh.hh
 02 I've got Meals on Wheels in the morning
 03 b't Edgizn might do that for me.
 04 Lis: .h Oh don't worry abou:t that if we came we'd
 05 leave her en go:.
 06 (0.3)
 → 07 Ile: Oh well no we:h **one**'v **us**'d be here anywa:yç
 08 (0.4)

6. The practices of extraction are employed beyond the domain of *self*-reference. Thus, in the following case (at line 2), Betty extracts a reference to a single person ('she') from a collective reference to a collectivity of non-present persons ('they').

[IM030402 Coffee Chat:6]

- 01 Han: Wut is that cam:era setupfor?
 → 02 Bet: Well **they- she** came over and she ask'd
 03 if we minded if she took (.) our conversation
 04 <they're jist doing it for a school proj:ect.

7. The action of the turn in Extracts (1) and (30) can also be seen to make clear which relational collectivity is being referred to by a locally initial use of 'we.' In Extract (1) this relies on Philip's knowledge of both who might share a landline with the speaker and subsequently on whose behalf a speaker may offer collective condolences, and in Extract (30) it relies on Mum's knowledge of who might share a landline with the speaker.
8. As with extraction, so here we use 'self-aggregation' and 'other-aggregation' to refer to the result of the operation. Cross-cutting this distinction is a separate matter that concerns who initiates the repair (self or other). So we see in our data instances of self-initiated self-aggregation repair (Extracts 14–16, 19–20); self-initiated other-aggregation repair (Extracts 23 and 26); other-initiated self-aggregation repair (Extract 22) and an instance of other-initiated other-aggregation done as an embedded correction (Extract 26).
9. The practices of aggregation, like that of extraction, are also employed beyond the domain of *self*-reference. Thus,

[Holt X(C).1.1.1]

- 01 Les: An' if **he** gets-e-if **they** get'n awa:rd uh:m
 02 he has to make a speech.

In this case the speaker aggregates a singular *third*-person reference ('he') to a collective *third*-person reference ('they').

10. Of course on some occasions extraction and aggregation can be understood as correcting an error as in the following case at line 4. Here 'we' is replaced by 'I' in a very sleepy child's request to delay going to bed once the family car arrives home.

[Post-Party]

- 01 Deb: Kin you wait til we get home? We'll be home
 02 in five minutes.
 03 Ann: Even less than that.

- 04 Nao: But c'd **we**- c'd I stay u:p?
 05 (0.2)
 06 Nao: once we get home.

In this case 'could **we** [stay up]' would be heard as a self-reference mistake by the adults in the car because such permission is only relevant for the speaker – the sole child in the car.

11. Here is another case heard (but not recorded) on a live radio program. It is included because the basis for the extraction is made explicit in the talk. In this extract the host of the program is referring to a suggestion sent in by a listener for how to prepare lamb for gyro if you don't have a spit: cube the lamb and barbecue. Gina was the caller who had originally asked how to do this.

[GL:FN 9–30–06 'Food News']

- 01 Host: **We** love that idea, meaning I love that idea,
 02 but I'm sure Gina will love the idea too.

Here the host, hearing her collective 'we' referencing a caller on whose behalf she is not entitled or able to speak authoritatively first extracts herself with a transition-space replacement repair (with 'meaning' as a repair initiation) and then displays an orientation to the epistemic basis of the repair by reporting Gina's views with an epistemic downgrade ('I'm sure').

12. A number of readers have suggested that the shift from 'we' to 'I' in this case is simply a matter of conforming to the fact that only one person can (or could at the time of this conversation) actually 'make a call.' However, there is ample empirical evidence that formulating the action of 'making a phone call' can include 'we' as the caller – including the following case in which the formulation is produced unproblematically by the same speaker as the one in the extract we are examining.

Holt:X(Christmas)1: Side 2: Call 2

- Les: and-ah- **We rang up** t'Paul hospital last week'n were told
 that she'd come: to you:.

13. We are not suggesting that speakers always avoid personal responsibility. So, for example, in the following case (at line 9) a speaker uses extraction to take personal responsibility for making it easy for a burglar to enter her home even though 'we' could have been employed here unproblematically.

[Holt X (Christmas)2: Side 2: Call 2]

- 01 Les: .h **We**ll you see they're on th'windowsill.
 02 (0.6)
 03 Art: .p **A**h:: ih so 'e came: oh 'e came in a window I
 04 see(h)ee.hhh [Dih-
 05 Les: [Y e: [s
 06 Art: [Break a window or something to get
 07 in did'e.
 08 (0.2)
 → 09 Les: **N**o::, **we**'ve (0.3) **I**: left it open slightly h [eh heh he] h=
 10 Art: [Qh dear]

14. Speakers also seem to treat some activities as properly relational in their use of relational aggregation – that is, as properly bound to categories of collectivities and not to individual members of those collectivities even though individual self-reference is a possibility. This is seen most clearly in the case of (heterosexual) couples and the actions bound to them as in the cases of wedding planning and sexual intercourse as seen in the following extracts.

[Toerien Beauty Salon 7:58]

- 01 Cli: Well it's your wedding=it's a bit different[to Christmas isn't it.
 02 BTh: [Yea::h
 03 (0.2)
 → 04 BTh: I've got- We've got the option of bringing it sort of
 05 forwards by about a month

[Birth Crisis Call 506]

- 01 Cla: Uhm and I was fully better. And I was (.) you know
 02 able to: >I mean **my husband 'n I were** able< to:
 03 sort'v resume things

This theme is developed (and these extracts are examined) in Kitzinger and Lerner (forthcoming). In the extracts examined in this report, aggregation does not so much seem to be connected to an action that is properly relationally bound, as it seems to be a method for dealing with interpersonally delicate matters (see Lerner, 2001).

15. Bull and Fetzer (2006: 32) report a similar finding (based on what we would call embedded aggregation) for politicians' answers to interviewer questions in which politicians use 'pronominal shifts [to an organizational "we"] in order to deal with personal criticisms, to avoid awkward choices, and to downplay their own personal role.'

REFERENCES

- Bull, P. and Fetzer, A. (2006) 'Who are We and Who are You? The Strategic Use of Forms of Address in Political Interviews', *Text Talk* 26(1): 3–37.
- Buttny, R. (2004) *Talking Problems: Studies of Discursive Construction*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Clayman, S.E. (1992) 'Footing in the Achievement of Neutrality: The Case of News Interview Discourse', in P. Drew and J. Heritage (eds) *Talk at Work: Interaction in Institutional Settings*, pp. 163–98. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Drew, P. (1991) 'Asymmetries of Knowledge in Conversational Interactions', in I. Marková and K. Foppa (eds) *Asymmetries in Dialogue*, pp. 29–48. Hemel Hempstead: Harvester Wheatsheaf.
- Drew, P. and Heritage, J. (1992) 'Analyzing Talk at Work: An Introduction', in P. Drew and J. Heritage (eds) *Talk at Work: Interaction in Institutional Settings*, pp. 3–65. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Edwards, D. and Potter, J. (1992) *Discursive Psychology*. London: Sage.
- Enfield, N.J. (2007) 'Meanings of the Unmarked: How "Default" Person Reference Does More than Just Refer', in N.J. Enfield and T. Stivers (eds) *Person Reference in Interaction: Linguistic, Cultural, and Social Perspectives*, pp. pp. 97–120. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Fasulo, A. and Zuccheromaglio, C. (2002) 'My Selves and I: Markers in Work Meeting Talk', *Journal of Pragmatics* 34: 1119–44.
- Goffman, E. (1974) *Frame Analysis: An Essay on the Organization of Experience*. New York: Free Press.
- Goffman, E. (1981) 'Footing', in *Forms of Talk*, pp. 124–59. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Goodwin, C. (1981) *Conversational Organization: Interaction between Speakers and Hearers*. New York: Academic Press.
- Hanks, W.E. (1990) *Referential Practice: Language and Lived Space among the Maya*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Heritage, J. and Raymond, G. (2005) 'The Terms of Agreement: Indexing Epistemic Authority and Subordination in Assessment Sequences', *Social Psychology Quarterly* 68: 15–38.
- Jefferson, G. (1974) 'Error Correction as an Interactional Resource', *Language in Society* 2: 181–99.
- Jefferson, G. (1986) 'Colligation as a Device for Minimizing Repair or Disagreement', paper presented at the Talk and Social Structure Conference, Santa Barbara, CA.
- Jefferson, G. (1987) 'On Exposed and Embedded Correction in Conversation', in G. Button and J.R.E. Lee (eds) *Talk and Social Organization*, pp. 86–100. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Jefferson, G., Sacks, H. and Schegloff, E.A. (1987) 'Notes on Laughter in the Pursuit of Intimacy', in G. Button and J.R.E. Lee (eds) *Talk and Social Organization*, pp. 152–205. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Kamio, A. (1997) *Territory of Information*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Kitzinger, C. (2005a) 'Heteronormativity in Action: Reproducing Normative Heterosexuality in "After Hours" Calls to the Doctor', *Social Problems* 52(4) (special section: Language Interaction and Social Problems): 477–98.
- Kitzinger, C. (2005b) 'Speaking as a Heterosexual: (How) Does Sexuality Matter for Talk-in-interaction', *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 38(3): 221–65.
- Kitzinger, C. and Lerner, G.H. (forthcoming) "'We're Pregnant": Crossing the Biological Divide.'
- Labov, W. (1972) 'Rules for Ritual Insults', in D. Sudnow (ed.) *Studies in Social Interaction*, pp. 120–69. New York: Free Press.
- Labov, W. and Fanshel, D. (1977) *Therapeutic Discourse: Psychotherapy as Conversation*. New York: Academic Press.
- Lerner, G.H. (1992) 'Assisted Storytelling: Deploying Shared Knowledge as a Practical Matter', *Qualitative Sociology* 15: 247–71.
- Lerner, G.H. (1996a) 'On the "Semi-permeable" Character of Grammatical Units in Conversation: Conditional Entry into the Turn Space of Another Speaker', in E. Ochs, E.A. Schegloff and S.A. Thompson (eds) *Interaction and Grammar*, pp. 238–76. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lerner, G.H. (1996b) "'Finding Face" in the Preference Structures of Talk in Interaction', *Social Psychology Quarterly* 59: 303–21.
- Lerner, G.H. (2001) 'The Search for Delicate Formulations: A Social Convention for Collaborative Indiscretion.' Paper presented at the meetings of the American Sociological Association, Chicago.
- Lerner, G.H. (2004) 'Collaborative Turn Sequences', in G.H. Lerner (ed.) *Conversation Analysis: Studies from the First Generation*, pp. 225–56. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

- Lerner, G.H. and Kitinger, C. (2007) 'Relational Disaggregation: Some Uses of *Both* in References to Two-Person Collectivities.' San Francisco, CA: International Communication Association.
- Levinson, S.C. (1988) 'Putting Linguistics on a Proper Footing: Explorations in Goffman's Concepts of Participation', in P. Drew and A.J. Wootton (eds) *Erving Goffman: Exploring the Interaction Order*, pp. 161–227. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Maynard, D. (1984) *Inside Plea Bargaining: The Language of Negotiation*. New York: Plenum.
- McHoul, A. and Rapley, M. (2002) 'Should We Make a Start Then: A Strange Case of (Delayed) Client-initiated Psychological Assessment', *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 35(1): 73–91.
- Oh, S.-Y. (2006) 'English Zero Anaphora as an Interactional Resource II', *Discourse Studies* 8: 817–46.
- Pomerantz, A.M. (1980) 'Telling My Side: "Limited Access" as a Fishing Device', *Sociological Inquiry* 50: 186–98.
- Pomerantz, A.M. (1986) 'Extreme Case Formulations: A Way of Legitimizing Claims', *Human Studies* 9: 219–30.
- Raymond, G. (2003) 'Grammar and Social Organization: Yes/No Type Interrogatives and the Structure of Responding', *American Sociological Review* 68: 939–67.
- Raymond, G. and Heritage, J. (2006) 'The Epistemics of Social Relationships: Owning Grandchildren', *Language in Society* 35(5): 677–705.
- Sacks, H. (1972a) 'An Initial Investigation of the Usability of Conversational Data for Doing Sociology', in D. Sudnow (ed) *Studies in Social Interaction*, pp. 31–74. New York: Free Press.
- Sacks, H. (1972b) 'On the Analyzability of Stories by Children', in J.J. Gumperz and D. Hymes (eds) *Directions in Sociolinguistics: The Ethnography of Communication*, pp. 325–45. New York: Rinehart Winston.
- Sacks, H. (1986) 'Some Considerations of a Story Told in Ordinary Conversation', *Poetics* 15: 127–38.
- Sacks, H. (1992) *Lectures on Conversation*, 2 vols, ed. G. Jefferson; with an introduction by E.A. Schegloff. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Sacks, H. and 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.
- Schegloff, E.A. (1979) 'The Relevance of Repair to Syntax-for-conversation', in T. Givón (ed.) *Syntax and Semantics, Vol. 12: Discourse and Syntax*, pp. 261–88. New York: Academic Press.
- Schegloff, E.A. (1989) 'Reflection on Language, Development and the Interactional Character of Talk-in-interaction', in M. Bornstein and J.S. Bruner (eds) *Interaction in Human Development*, pp. 139–53. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Schegloff, E.A. (1996a) 'Some Practices of Referring to Persons in Talk in interaction: A Partial Sketch of a Systematics', in B. Fox (ed) *Studies in Anaphora*, pp. 437–85. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Schegloff, E.A. (1996b) 'Confirming Allusions: Towards an Empirical Account of Action', *American Journal of Sociology* 104: 161–216.
- Schegloff, E.A. (2007) 'Conveying Who You Are: The Presentation of Self, Strictly Speaking', in N.J. Enfield and T. Stivers (eds) *Person Reference in Interaction: Linguistic, Cultural, and Social Perspectives*, pp. 123–48. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Schegloff, E.A., Jefferson, G. and Sacks, H. (1977) 'The Preference for Self-correction in the Organization of Repair in Conversation', *Language* 53: 361–82.

- Silverman, D. (1987) *Communication and Medical Practice*. London: Sage.
- Stanley, S. and Billig, M. (2004) 'Dilemmas of Storytelling and Identity', in C. Daiute and C. Lightfoot (eds) *Narrative Analysis: Studying the Development of Individuals in Society*, pp. 159–76. London: Sage.
- Stivers, T. (2007) 'Alternative Recognitionals in Person Reference', in N.J. Enfield and T. Stivers (eds) *Person Reference in Interaction: Linguistic, Cultural, and Social Perspectives*, pp. 73–96. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Whalen, M.R. and Zimmerman, D.H. (1990) 'Describing Trouble: Practical Epistemology in Citizen Calls to the Police', *Language in Society* 19: 465–92.
- Wilkinson, S. and Kitzinger, C. (2003) 'Constructing Identities: A Feminist Conversation Analytic Approach to Positioning in Action', in R. Harré and F. Moghaddam (eds) *The Self and Others: Positioning Individuals and Groups in Personal, Political and Cultural Contexts*, pp. 157–80. Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Wilkinson, S. and Kitzinger, C. (2006) 'Surprise as an Interactional Achievement: Reaction Tokens in Conversation', *Social Psychology Quarterly* 69(2): 150–82.



GENE H. LERNER is Professor of Sociology and Linguistics at the University of California Santa Barbara. His research centers on language use, body behavior and very young children insofar as these (together and separately) exhibit the formal structures and local organization of practical sequential action in interaction. ADDRESS: Department of Sociology, University of California, Santa Barbara, CA 93106, USA. [email: lerner@soc.ucsb.edu]

CELIA KITZINGER is Professor of Conversation Analysis, Gender and Sexuality at the University of York. She researches basic structures of talk-in-interaction as well as exploring the reproduction of culture – including power and oppression – in mundane interaction. ADDRESS: Department of Sociology, University of York, Heslington, York Y10 5DD, UK. [email: cck1@york.ac.uk]