Pursuing a Response by Repairing an Indexical Reference
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Prior conversation analytic research has demonstrated that when, following a sequence-initiating action, a response is relevantly missing (or is forthcoming but is apparently inadequate), speakers may use a range of practices for pursuing a response (or a more adequate response). These practices—such as response prompts, preference reversals, or turn extensions—treat the missing (or inadequate) response as indicative of some problem, and they may either expose or mask the response pursuit and the problem they attempt to remediate. This article extends this prior research by showing that speakers can also use repair technology—specifically, repair of an indexical reference—as a resource for pursuing a response. It demonstrates that speakers can use repair of indexicals, particularly when no uncertainty as to the referent seems possible, in order to pursue a response while obscuring some other possible source of trouble. Initiating repair on an indexical reference in transition space claims that a missing response is due to a problem of understanding or of recognizing the reference, and by repairing it, the speaker makes available another opportunity for a response without exposing recipient disinclination as the possible source of the trouble. Likewise, repairing an indexical reference in the third turn can pursue a more adequate response, while avoiding going on record as doing so, by treating the sequence-initiating turn as the source of the trouble. We show that, by ostensibly dealing with problems of reference, repairs on indexicals manage (covertly) other more interactionally charged issues, such as upcoming disagreement or misalignment between interlocutors.

Conversation analytic research on repair has shown that repair practices can accomplish actions beyond managing troubles in speaking, hearing, or understanding: for example, adumbrate disalignment, disaffiliation, or disagreement (e.g., Drew, 1997; Schegloff, 1997a; Schegloff, Jefferson, & Sacks, 1977), indicate newsworthiness or surprise (Jefferson, 1981; Wilkinson & Kitzinger, 2006), or display the relevance of categorical memberships (e.g., Lerner, Bolden, Hepburn, & Mandelbaum, 2012/this issue) and collectivities (Lerner & Kitzinger, 2007). In this
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In general, initiating actions (first pair-parts in adjacency pair sequences) make responding relevant (Schegloff, 2007). Prior conversation analytic research (e.g., Davidson, 1984; Heritage, 1984; Jefferson, 1981; Pomerantz, 1984b; Schegloff, 2000; Stivers & Rossano, 2010) has demonstrated that when, following a sequence-initiating action, a response is relevantly missing (or delayed or inadequate), speakers may use a range of practices for pursuing a response. The way in which response is pursued may reveal the speaker’s analysis of what the trouble in providing a response might be. For instance, as Pomerantz (1984b) showed, pursuits may deal with the lack of (immediate) response as indicative of problems of reference, problems of understanding or knowledge, or of upcoming disagreement. As illustrated in Extracts 1–5, a response may be pursued more or less overtly: Pursuing a response may or may not be the focal action of the turn, and methods used to pursue a response can either expose or mask the lack of (immediate) response as the problem the speaker sets out to redress.

In Extracts 1–3, speakers of initiating actions make use of sequence-organizational resources (Schegloff, 2007) in that they reissue (a version of) the initiating action after the recipient has failed to produce a response. In Extract 1, the first speaker (A) asks a question (the status inquiry “Is there something bothering you?,” line 1), but—despite the strong conditional relevance of an answer—this question is met with silence (at line 2). Speaker A then self-selects (Sacks, Schegloff, & Jefferson, 1974) to pursue a response: first by reissuing the question in the form of two alternative candidate answers (“Yes or no,” line 3), and then (when these are met with more silence), by producing a response prompt (“Eh?” in line 5). The recipient finally responds at line 6.

Extract 1: Heritage, 1984, p. 248

01 A: Is there something bothering you?
02 (1.0)
03 A: Yes or no
04 (1.5)
05 A: Eh?
06 B: No.

In this instance, an initial turn is extended with two further whole turn constructional units (or TCUs—Sacks et al., 1974) wholly dedicated to the task of pursuing a response. Furthermore, the speaker pursues a response in a way that exposes the absence of a relevant response as problematic and, quite explicitly, holds B accountable for producing an answer (see Heritage, 1984).

Extract 2 also shows response pursuit that relies on sequence-organizational resources. In this case, the form the pursuit takes reveals the speaker’s analysis that the recipient’s hesitation in providing a response is indicative of incipient disagreement. The inquiry at line 1 prefers an agreeing “yes” answer (Sacks, 1987; Schegloff, 2007). When there is no immediate response forthcoming, the first speaker (A) reformulates the question (in a whole new TCU) so as to reverse its preference, backing down from the expectation of an agreeing response (that there is a “good
cook” there) and reversing his position (“nothing special”). By thus reformulating the inquiry, the speaker attributes the lack of a timely response to a problem of agreement.

Extract 2: Pomerantz, 1984, p. 77

01 A: D’they have a good cook there?
02 (1.7)
03 A: Nothing special?
04 J: No. Every- everybody takes their turns.

Extract 3 shows another instance of a speaker extending her turn in pursuit of a response by producing a whole new TCU. Here, however, the speaker reasserts her position in a way that simply renews the relevance of a response, without orienting to a possible problem a delay in responding might adumbrate. When Emma’s assessment that “some of these kids need a good JO:B” is met with silence from Nancy (line 4), she self-selects to produce another TCU, proffering what is analyzably the same assessment (“Get ou:t’n: do a liddle wor:k,” line 51). This creates another opportunity for Nancy to respond and to do so contiguously (i.e., without delay) (Sacks, 1987).

Extract 3: [NB:II:2]

01 Nan: [Yeah[“most’v’m° ]
02 Emm: [I THINK SOM]E a’these kids need a
good JO:B though too:
03 (0.5)
04 Emm: Get ou:t’n: do a liddle wor:k.
06 (.)
07 Nan: Well of course all the kids in this:
08 p’ticular cclass yih know,h are ee:ther full
time stud’nts or they work during
09 th’day en go tuh school et ni:ght,

In these instances (Extracts 1–3), response is pursued using sequence-organizational resources in that the speaker of the initiating action issues another version of the action as a complete new turn constructional unit. As we show in the following, turn-constructional resources can also be exploited to pursue a response. Schegloff (2000) noted that increments—when initiated postgap—can be seen to address “the absence so far of ensuing talk and the possible import of that absence” (see also Ford, Fox, & Thompson, 2002). This is what can be observed in Extract 4, which instantiates the use of turn-constructional resources for response pursuit. Guy is asking Jon for the phone number of a golf course (“Seacliffs,” line 1). When this request is met with silence (line 2), he adds a grammatically fitted increment to his possibly complete TCU (“by any

1Note that the second proffered assessment deploys “zero anaphora” to refer to the sentential subject (“some of these kids”), which is a practice for marking the current TCU as a second saying (Oh, 2005).
chance?” at line 3), thereby displaying an orientation to the possibility that Jon may be about to reject the request (note the use of the “negative polarity marker” “any”—Heritage, 2002; Koshik, 2002).

Extract 4: [NB:1:1:R]

01 Guy: ‘Av ↑you go(.)t uh: ↑Seaciffs phone number?h
02 (1.1)
03 Guy: by any chance?
04 (0.3)
05 Jon: Yeeah?
06 (2.6)
07 Jon: .k.hhh hh’s uh: < (.) .t.h FITE THREE SIX::

By adding an increment to his TCU, the speaker converts an inter-TCU gap into an intra-TCU pause, which masks the lack of an immediate answer as a problem. Extending the TCU with an increment refreshes the relevance of a response without making pursuing a response the overt business of the talk.

In each of these instances (Extracts 1–4) then, a sequence-initiating turn (or “first”) reaches possible completion and, when a responsive turn (“second”) is not immediately forthcoming in a place where speaker transition is relevant, the speaker self-selects to pursue a response. Speakers can use sequence-organizational resources (as in Extracts 1–3) and turn-constructional resources (as in Extract 4) in pursuing a response. The main finding presented in this article is that self-initiated self-repairs—and especially repairs to indexical expressions—can also be used to pursue a response. While the use of sequence-organizational resources for response pursuit (as in Extracts 1–3) exposes the lack of a response as a problem, extending the host TCU with an increment (as in Extract 4) or initiating a transition space repair on its indexical component (as in Extract 5, for instance) obscure the turn transition problem by purporting to fix some inadequacy in the turn’s construction. As we will see, in proposing—by initiating repair on an indexical reference term—that the problem may have been one of understanding a reference, a speaker can effecuate a pursuit of a “missing” (or in some way problematic) response without making pursuing a response the overt business or the focal action of the talk. Repairing an indexical in pursuit of a response may thus be seen as a “covert,” “off record” (cf. Brown & Levinson, 1987), or “indirect” (cf. Searle, 1975) method for accomplishing pursuit in that it purports to do one action (fixing a reference) while “smuggling in” another (pursuing response).

Extract 5 provides an initial example of this phenomenon. It comes from the closing segment of a helpline call, in which the call-taker is asking a series of prespecified monitoring questions—here, the caller’s source of information about the service. The call-taker formulates her question (line 1) with the indexical reference term “us” (“And how did you hear about us”). When no response is immediately forthcoming, she repairs the indexical reference, in the transition space, to “the helpline.” The self-repair specifies the referent of “us” as “the helpline” (rather than, possibly, the organization that runs it). In fixing the reference, the speaker displays an orientation to the possible inadequacy of the indexical reference form (“us”) and, at the same time, refreshes the relevance of a response from the caller. (The caller subsequently provides an account for her delayed response: She is trying to recall where she heard about the service.)
Extract 5: [6] Helpline

[SW:FM:D003]

01 Clt: Okay. And how did you hear about us.
02 (.)
03 Clt: The helpline.
04 Clr: Uh:::m hhh I’m just tryin’ to thi-
05 <oh well I think it was through uh::m
06 (.) uh: Christine Craggs-Hinton:’s book.

The repair of the indexical, in purporting to clarify the referent, re completes the speaker’s TCU and renews the relevance of a response from the recipient. Repairs launched in the transition space like this one, or in the third turn (Schegloff, 1992, 1997b) (see Extracts 13–14), can be seen as “covertly” pursuing a response by providing the recipient with another opportunity space in which to respond.

Covert practices like this one are, by their very design, difficult to ground in the details of participants’ conduct (e.g., Jefferson, 2003). In order to present the best possible evidence, in what follows we focus on a rather narrow subset of candidate cases of repair-implemented response pursuit. Specifically, we only examine instances in which (unlike Extract 5), the referent of the indexical is analyzably clear in its context and should, therefore, be accessible to the recipient, thus making repairing it superfluous. Given interlocutors’ orientation to progressivity (Heritage, 2007; Schegloff, 2007), the demonstrable transparency of the indexical reference targeted by the repair raises the question about what the speaker might be doing by the repair. We will show that following a first pair-part that has not been immediately or adequately responded to, the repair action of fixing referential ambiguity is analyzably a vehicle for pursuing a missing or more adequate response. In the following, we first examine some further instances of transition space repairs of indexicals doing pursuit following a sequence-initiating action before any response has been produced (i.e., “postfirst” response pursuit). Second, we discuss a range of practices—including repairs of indexicals—for pursuing a response after a response has been produced but where that response is treated as insufficient or inadequate (i.e., “postsecond” response pursuit). Finally, we briefly show that other forms of self-repair—beyond repairs of indexical expressions—can also be used in pursuit of a response.

POSTFIRST PURSUIT OF RESPONSE BY REPAIRING AN INDEXICAL REFERENCE

In this section, we discuss cases in which a sequence-initiating action (a first pair-part) containing an indexical reference is not immediately responded to, and in which, following a gap, its speaker repairs the indexical expression. The provision of the repair solution again makes the answer (turn) relevant on its completion.

Extract 6 is from a child protection helpline call, in which the caller reports problems with her 15-year-old son, who has been drinking and getting into trouble with the police. At lines 1–4, the Child Protection Officer (or CPO) inquires into the details of the son’s drinking. She
formulates the question using the indexical “it” (at line 3), having immediately before produced a full-form reference (“his drinking” also at line 3). This is a standard locally subsequent usage of an indexical form that unproblematically locates (in the prior TCU) the locally initial form “his drinking” as its referent (Schegloff, 1996a).

Extract 6: [148] The drinking

[HC Boy in Trouble; audio 4:43; AH]
01 CPO: .Hhhhh Okay.:=so let’s llook at this::
02 (0.2) this:: (0.4) this; uhm issue now
03 with his drinkin:ng .hhh w-When did it
04 sta:rt.
05 (1.2)
06 CPO: The [drinking].
07 Caller: [W’ll la ] (0.2) last year ah would
08 say, last summer,
09 (0.2)
10 CPO: Rart so it’s about twelve months ago
11 no[w,
12 Caller: [Mhm,

The question (a first pair-part) makes a response from the caller conditionally relevant (specifically, some sort of a temporal formulation is due). However, the caller fails to respond and a long silence ensues (at line 5) (cf. Jefferson, 1989). Finally, the CPO pursues a response by repairing the indexical reference “it” in her question at line 3 to the full-form reference, “The drinking” (line 6). The repair solution modifies the locally initial full-form reference “his drinking” (line 3) to “the drinking” (line 6), which avoids producing a hearable repetition of the trouble source and is also perhaps a way to objectify or depersonalize this delicate issue. Note that the caller starts answering the question (at line 7) in overlap with the repair solution, in fact, almost simultaneously with the CPO’s talk, and before the repair solution can be recognized. This shows that the question—including the indexical reference—was, in fact, understandable to the caller. The delay in providing a response appears to be related to the difficulty in finding an appropriate temporal formulation. Note the epistemic downgrade “I would say” and the recalibration repair (see Lerner et al., 2012/this issue) from “last year” to “last summer” (lines 7–8).

In Extract 7, Karen is giving a disparaging review of a TV program (about women warriors) that she and her friend Ben had watched. (“She” in line 2 refers to the narrator of the program.) Following Karen’s negative assessment of the language used in the program (at lines 2–4), an agreeing (or disagreeing) response is conditionally relevant from Ben (Pomerantz, 1984a). Ben, however, does not provide any response, and (at line 5) a silence develops. Karen chooses to treat the problem in getting uptake as a problem of understanding (rather than a problem of affiliation) and repairs the indexical reference “that” (line 3) in transition space to the full-form reference “girl on girl sex” (line 6). The indexical “that” is unlikely, however, to be unclear to her recipient, given her immediately preceding use of the full-form reference “girl on girl sex” (line 2) in the speaker’s report of the offensive language used by the TV program narrator. This suggests that the repair is initiated in order to pursue a response from Ben.
Extract 7: [66] Sex

[Land:NE1]
01 Kar: .hh I mean when
02 she said girl on girl sex=I thought w’ll
03 that’s= that’s t’kind of language you’d
04 hear in a bloody men’s magazine anyway.
05 (0.5)
06 Ben: Oh: ri:ght
07 Kar: Y’know girl on girl sex.
08 Ben: Oh ri:ght
09 Kar: [Y’know I thought well (0.5) even
10 that’s like not doin’it- (0.2) giving it-
11 don’t respect really.
11 (1.5)
12 Kar: ° I di’n’t think anyway.°

The repair here is initiated with “y’know,” which holds Ben responsible for knowing what Karen is talking about (Kitzinger & Mandelbaum, 2007). Following the repair, Ben responds with “oh ri:ght” (line 7), which treats the repair solution as informative, but does not align or agree with Karen’s complaint about the program. As Karen continues with her negative assessment of the program (lines 8–10), Ben still withhold alignment (line 11), and Karen eventually backs down from her position (line 12).

Extract 8 is from a face-to-face conversation between Yana, Greg, and their adult son Gena. They are all about to go on a cruise ship together, but Yana is reluctant (due, primarily, to health concerns). Gena has already told her that it is too late to cancel the trip (data not shown) and is now listing various attractive features of the ship in order to reassure or encourage her about it. At line 1, Gena informs Yana (his primary addressed recipient) that the ship is twice as big as the one they had gone on for another trip. In order to support this claim, Gena produces another turn constructional unit in which, using an extreme case formulation (Pomerantz, 1986), he informs Yana that the ship has celaja agromnaja ulica magazinav/ (“a whole huge street of stores,” lines 1–2). In this turn constructional unit, Gena uses the indexical tam (Russian for “there”) to refer to the ship they are about to go on. The place indexical tam (“there”) is hearable as a locally subsequent reference to karabl’ (“the ship”) in the previous TCU.

Extract 8: [201] Inside the ship (Russian)

[I2a; video 14:50; GB]
01 GENA: Karabl’ v dva raza bol’she/tam:=eh:: tam
ship in two times bigger there there
The ship is twice as big/ There eh there
02 celaja agromnaja ulica magazinav/
whole huge street stores
they have a whole huge street of stores
03 (1.8)
Gena’s turn (at lines 1–2) sets up relevancies for a response from Yana. A piece of news has been delivered, which makes relevant a news receipt (e.g., da?/“really?”) and, possibly, an assessment of the news. Moreover, this piece of information has been provided in the service of a larger interactional project—reassuring or encouraging Yana about the upcoming trip. Within this course of action, then, a response from Yana that would display or claim her having been reassured (or not) is relevant. However, Yana does not respond (see the gap at line 3). During the long silence, Gena looks at Yana (who is looking back at him), as if waiting for a response (cf. Stivers & Rossano, 2010). At the same time (line 3), Greg, the unaddressed recipient of Gena’s turn, shifts his gaze from Gena to Yana, which is evidence that he (Greg) expects Yana to provide a response. Gena then takes a turn to repair the indexical tam (“there” from line 1) to a full form reference vnutri karablja/ (“inside the ship” at line 4). Even though the indexical appears to be unambiguous, the repair treats the lack of uptake as attributable to a problem of understanding (rather than, say, affiliation). By repairing the indexical reference, Gena extends his turn, and, once the repair solution (vnutri karablja/ “inside the ship”) is produced, the turn is again response ready. In this way, repair enables Gena to pursue a response from Yana covertly. At line 5, in overlap with the repair solution, Yana takes a turn to respond to Gena. She provides a nonaligning and nonaffilative response (see Stivers, 2008) that rejects the newsworthiness of Gena’s informing (by claiming that the other ship she was on also had stores) and, thereby, displays not having been reassured.

We have seen then that in Extracts 7 and 8, the problem in providing a response was one of disaffiliation or disagreement, while in Extract 6, it was apparently one of “remembering” or of formulating an answer. In repairing an indexical expression, however, the speaker chooses to treat the lack of response delicately as indicative of a problem of understanding a reference (i.e., a problem in turn construction and thus the speaker’s problem) rather than a problem of alignment/affiliation. Unlike cases such as Extract 2, in which the speaker modified the character of the initiating action by reversing its preference organization, in the instances presented in this section, the speaker renews the relevance of a response to essentially the same initiating action by “simply” repairing an indexical to a full-form reference.
PURSUING A RESPONSE AFTER INADEQUATE UPTAKE

So far we have examined how transition space repair of an indexical expression may be deployed to pursue a response when one is not forthcoming. Next, we show that repairing an indexical can also be used to pursue a response after one has been provided, as a third turn repair (Schegloff, 1992, 1997b). Faced with a second pair-part turn by another, the recipient of that turn can assess it for its adequacy as a response to the initiating action. When the recipient of a second pair-part finds it to be in some way inadequate, there is a range of ways in which a “better” (i.e., more fitted or more elaborated) response can be pursued. As shown above with regard to pursuing a response when one is due, but has not yet been provided, pursuit can be accomplished more or less overtly (Extracts 1–5). Similarly, practices for pursuing a response after an inadequate response can range from those that overtly mark the inadequacy of the response while seeking further elaboration, to those that seek further response but do not overtly make the inadequacy apparent. As Jefferson (1981) notes, the more overtly the inadequacy is marked, the more interactionally charged the pursuit of a more adequate response may become.

For one example of an overt pursuit of a more adequate response, see Extract 9, taken from a dinnertime conversation. Dad has been attempting to get his 10-year-old daughter, Cindy, to tell about a school field trip (see, for example, lines 1, 4, and 24/27). When Cindy finally responds with “It was fun?” (line 28), Dad first rejects this answer (“No,” line 30) and then negatively assesses it, claiming its inadequacy (“You’re gonna have to do a lot [better ‘an that,”’ line 32). After more prodding from Dad (data not shown), Cindy eventually launches a telling about the trip (line 60).

Extract 9: Claim Jumper (Stew Dinner)

01 DAD: So [C:]n (0.2) tell me about your day.
02 (0.5)
03 CIN: Uh: (.)
04 DAD: Wha’d you l:earn.
05 (1.0)
06 CIN: [U:h:m]
07 DAD: [ O: :H ye ah we went to thuh- (.) we went to uh: (.)
08 CIN: Claim Jumper.
09 DAD: Claim Jumper tod[y].

(lines omitted)

24 DAD: Come on
25 (.)
26 CIN: Y[eah. ]
27 DAD: [ Desk]cribe this thing to me,
28 CIN: Uhm_ >.h< It was fu:n?
29 (0.2)
30 DAD: No.
31 (.)
32 DAD: You’re gonna h(h)af[a do a lo[t [better ‘an that:]
33 MOM: [>Well< she’s::=sh]e’ll’s- she’s-
In this case, then, pursuit of a more adequate response is done in such a way as to expose—and criticize—the inadequacy of the provided response.

Less-egregious methods for pursuing a “more adequate” response include turn-constructional resources, such as increment elicitors. Lerner (2004) described how one-word TCUs (such as “at,” “to,” “for,” “as,” “at,” “with,” “about,” etc., p. 152), produced by the recipient of a second pair-part, can function as “increment elicitors” or “stand-alone prompts.” He showed how these prompts treat the prior turn as containing “incipiently projectable but undelivered items” (p. 172). Thus, by targeting what is missing, and prompting its delivery, increment elicitors expose the inadequacy of the provided response and call for the production of that which is missing—as in Extract 10 (also discussed by Schegloff, 1996b, p. 76):

Extract 10: Lerner, 2004, p. 163

01 Therapist: What kind of work do you do?
02 Mother: on food service
03 Therapist: At
04 Mother: uh post office cafeteria downtown
05 main point office on Redwood.
06 Therapist: “Okay”

Using prompts with this format shows “not only that more is needed but that more should have been forthcoming” (Lerner, 2004, p. 172). Further, the stand-alone prompt provides the form that the elaboration of the inadequate turn should take: a continuation (and thus an expansion) of the targeted turn. In this way, the increment elicitor indicates explicitly that the targeted turn was not adequate and provides resources for redressing the inadequacy.

Jefferson (1981) documented two less-overt ways of pursuing a response after a response has already been produced: via a response solicitation (such as “right?”) and via recompletion of the responded-to turn (with “right” or with an increment). A “Right?” produced after the possible completion of a response may treat the response as inadequate, pursuing further talk. In the following case (Extract 11), Roger produces a minimal “Mm hm” (line 3) in response to Dan’s attempt to get him to acknowledge that he has accomplished something during therapy. Jefferson (p. 61) suggested that Dan’s next turn, “Ri:ght?” (line 4) recompletes his original turn, prompting a more elaborate response, thus treating the turn to which it is responding as inadequate:

01 Dan: Your only basic problem as far as direction: (0.6) as
02 Originally state, was getting you into Art Center.
03 -> Roger: Mh hm,
04 -> Dan: Right?
05 Roger: =That still is the thing.

Jefferson (1981) noted that there may be some ambiguity as to whether such post-response-completion response solicitation is operating as a turn-exit device, analogous to the tag-positioned response solicitation, or is pointing to the inadequacy of the initial response and attempting to occasion some revision (p. 72). In this way, it does not target a specific problem with the prior turn: It informs a recipient that his/her response is inadequate but provides no further materials from which the recipient might construct an “improved” analysis (p. 75).

Jefferson (1981) also shows that response pursuit via recompletion (a more common and less interactionally charged alternative to response solicitation) takes the stance that the TCU that appeared to be (or has been produced as) “response-adequate” is, in fact, not—and that some sort of “clarification” is needed (though, of course, more than simply seeking “clarification” may be accomplished when further response is pursued in this way), as Extract 12 indicates:

Extract 12: Jefferson, 1981, p. 77

01 Nancy: And apparently he just simply hasn’t, been, interested
02 [in
03 Emma: [Mnhm,
04 Nancy: doing a lot of dating, and, he said now I might have
05 A, a reason to, you know [get down there.
06 Emma: [Gee wouldn’t that be nice?
07 Nancy: Yah he said they really treat you real nice.
08 -> Emma: Well goo:sd.
09 -> Nancy: at those places.
10 -> Emma: Oh:: I’m glad.

Nancy’s recompletion of her turn at line 9 (via an incremental extension) re-relevances a response from Emma by adjusting slightly the initial TCU, without going on record as seeking a further (and more “adequate”) response. Similarly, as we show subsequently, repairing an indexical recompletes the turn that received the apparently inadequate response, re-relevancing a response, by treating the indexical expression as a possible trouble source underpinning the inadequacy of the response.

POSTSECOND PURSUIT OF RESPONSE BY REPAIRING AN INDEXICAL REFERENCE

In the following we show that repairing an indexical provides a rather “covert” method for pursuing a more adequate response. Extract 13 takes place at a dinner between two couples—Vivian
and Shane, and Michael and Nancy—in California, on the warm West Coast of the United States. Shane and Vivian report on extreme cold weather on the East Coast and its impact (lines 1–17).

Extract 13: [62] The weather

[CDII 14–25 p 27; JM]
01 VIV: [They js had three feet a’ sn: w.
02 (0.2)
03 MIC: Whg:[re.
04 VIV: [back East: t.[n u h ];,=
05 NAN: [‘Yeah.’ ]
06 MIC: =Nih Yo:r:k?
07 VIV: Noo- Noo Yo:rk hadd(a)b- big blizz:ard all the ai- both
08 airports er clo:sed,=
09 SHA: =Both airport[s Newar:k]’s the only w’n thet’s open,
10 NAN: [Rilly? ]
11 VIV: En ther only having flights -out.
12 (0.4)
13 VIV: No (.) no arr: va:ls.
14 (0.7)
15 MIC: mnYg:[ah.
16 SHA: [Cars ih stra:ned ‘bout thir:dy sump’n
17 people’v die[d,
18 MIC: ]((eyebrow flash))
19 (0.7)
20 NAN: Wo:w.
21 (0.4)
22 SHA: °Becuz a’th[at°
23 MIC: ]((eyebrow flash))
24 (0.3)
26 SHA: =C’ss the wea: ther.
27 VIV: Wir gunnuh call[ u p ]
28 SHA: [ ‘T’s in][a]:: n e .]
29 VIV: [Wir g’n]n:uh
30 [call up sm friends]=
31 MIC: [ (s’p thA::d’). ]=
32 SHA: =hih-hh[Wz -eigh][y degrees here the oth]uh ]=
33 VIV: [ en say ] [eighty d’ e g r e e s ]hh]=
34 MIC: =[day. ih hıh] [he

Throughout Shane and Vivian’s report, uptake from Nancy and Michael is somewhat minimal: eye brow flashes from Michael after the first bad news delivery (“Cars ih stra:ned ‘bout thir:dy sump’n people’v die:d,” at lines 16–17) and again after Shane recompletes the turn with “because of that” (line 22). However, note that in line 20, Nancy produces a verbal show of surprise, “Wo:w” (Wilkinson & Kitzinger, 2006). At this point, then, Shane’s announcement about
the stranded cars and the large number of deaths has received a minimal response from Michael and a fitted response from Nancy (albeit a somewhat delayed one). However, after a 0.4-second gap (line 21), Shane extends his turn (from lines 16–17) with “Becuz a’that” (line 22), addressed to Michael via gaze, recompleting it by apparently making more explicit the connection between the deaths and the snow as the reason for the deaths. His extension of his turn suggests that the eyebrow flash Michael has produced in line 18 may not be a sufficient response for this news, and that he may be seeking Michael’s uptake in addition to (or instead of) Nancy’s. It may be that the minimal response embodied in the eyebrow flash is not calibrated to the “extreme” character of the news, and/or that it is specifically Michael from whom Shane is seeking a response (insofar as the recompletion of the turn disattends Nancy’s response). The recompletion that is apparently designed to pursue a fuller response from Michael elicits the same minimal response (another eyebrow flash from Michael at line 23). After another gap (line 24), and an agreement or confirmation from Vivian (line 25), Shane again recompletes his turn (line 26), this time expanding his turn (from line 22) by replacing the indexical “that” with the full form reference “the weather.” The preframing of the repair with “c’ss” (line 26) makes it hearable as replacing “that” (in line 22). In line 27, Vivian begins a new activity, and no additional response from Michael is produced in response to Shane’s pursuit. Thus, after Shane has received a response from Nancy (one member of the recipient party), he nonetheless pursues a response from the other member, Michael (cf. Lerner, 1993). This produces an interesting by-product of segregating Nancy and Michael as recipients of Shane’s report, rather than treating Nancy’s “Wow” (line 20) as a response on behalf of the recipient party, and the repair of the indexical provides a rather covert and delicate method for doing so.

Extract 14 is from a face-to-face conversation involving a grandmother and her visiting granddaughter, Lena. They are both at the table while the grandmother is having coffee. Lena has just refused the grandmother’s offer of a sandwich (data not shown), and, at line 1, the grandmother offers another food item: candy from a box of chocolates on the table.

Extract 14: [203] Candy (Russian)

[15a; video 56:50; GB]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>GRM</th>
<th>LEN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>Vaz’mi esch’e eta/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>take also this</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Take this too</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>...................x (GRM opens a box of chocolates)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.0) ((GRM and LENA look at the box))</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td><em>Ne-a</em></td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td>(1.2) ((GRM and LENA continue to look at the box))</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05</td>
<td>Kanfetku vaz’mi/</td>
<td>candy take</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>candy take</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Take some candy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06</td>
<td><em>Ja ne xachu</em> (((while yawning))</td>
<td>I not want</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I don’t want to</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
While producing the offer at line 1, the grandmother reaches over (the movement is indicated by the dots below line 1) and opens a box of chocolates on the table in front of them (see “x” on the transcript). She then holds the top of the box open while looking at its contents (from line 2 on). At line 2, Lena also looks at the box, thus showing that she is following the grandmother’s actions. At line 1, the grandmother refers to the offered chocolates with the indexical reference eta (“this”). Given the grandmother’s nonvocal conduct (at lines 1–2), eta (“this”) transparently refers to the chocolates in the box.

The offer makes an acceptance/rejection conditionally relevant from the addressee (Schegloff, 2007). Lena does not immediately respond (see the gap at line 2), which indicates the possibility that the offer may be rejected. Following a gap, Lena does respond by rejecting the offer with a quiet ne (“no,” line 3), which shows that she’d understood the offer. Rejection is ordinarily2 a dispreferred response to an offer, and dispreferred (and disaffiliative) responses are accountable actions, typically (or even normatively) accompanied by accounts or explanations (Heritage, 1984; Robinson & Bolden, 2010). While ne accomplishes the action of rejecting, it is a minimal and thus perhaps insufficient response. After a substantial gap (line 4), the grandmother reissues the offer, but this time replaces the indexical eta (“this,” line 1) with a full-form reference kanfetku (“candy” or “chocolate,” line 4).3 Note that unlike other instances of repair on indexicals we have discussed, the full-form reference (kanfetku) that replaces the indexical (eta) is incorporated into a new sentential TCU, which makes pursuit a more overt business of the talk. In this sequential environment—after the offer had been rejected with a minimal rejection token—the reissued offer that incorporates a full-form reference (in place of the indexical) appears to be a tactic for pursuing a more adequate response: either a fuller response (an account) or possibly a different response (acceptance). Note that Lena does now respond with an account (line 6), albeit one that simply asserts her unwillingness to accept the candy (cf. Heritage, 1984). (Just prior to this segment, in response to another offer, Lena said that she was full.)

Replacing an indexical with a full-form reference may, thus, provide a method for pursuing further response after a response has been provided that is less interactionally charged than pursuing a response by some other means. In targeting his/her own talk as a source of trouble, the first pair-part speaker takes responsibility for producing a full-form version of an indexical following a thereby-treated-as-inadequate second pair-part. In doing so, the speaker reissues an opportunity to respond without modifying the initiating action but simply elaborating the reference. In comparison to other methods of response pursuit that use sequence-organizational resources (e.g., rejecting the response, as in Extract 9) or turn-constructional resources (e.g., increment elicitors or response solicitations, as in Extracts 10 and 11), repairing an indexical

2Some offers (“pro forma” offers) are designed to be rejected (Schegloff, 2007, p. 60); however, there is no evidence the grandmother is doing it here. And yet, offers of food by a host might be ritualistically rejected by a guest on the first offering so that they can be then reoffered and possibly accepted. The ritualistic nature of the first (possibly pro forma) rejection sets up an expectation for a second offer. Offerers may be oriented to the possibility that the recipient may take it that the offer is to be rejected (at first), and, thus, may issue subsequent offers to counteract the supposition that the offer was a pro forma one.

3In Russian, the word order is relatively free. The new version of the offer kanfetku vaz’mi (“candy” + “take”) is not particularly marked; however, the different word order allows the speaker to avoid producing a hearable repetition of the initial offer.
reference is a rather delicate way of pursuing a (more) adequate response. Unlike some other methods, it does not expose a problem with the initial response but simply disattends it. Further, in producing an “improved” version of the initial turn (with a full-form reference instead of an indexical), the producer of the initiating action treats it as his or her “fault” that an inadequate response was produced—indicating (by replacing the indexical) that there might have been a problem that resulted in the initiating action not being fully transparent to the recipient.

OTHER FORMS OF REPAIR USED FOR PURSUING A RESPONSE

The practice of using repair to pursue a response is not limited to repairing indexicals. When the affordances of the turn-so-far in its sequence-so-far allow for it, other forms of repair can also be employed to accomplish pursuit, as illustrated by the following two cases.

Extract 15 is taken from a face-to-face conversation among three college students who are heavily involved in college athletics as members of the gymnastics team. They have been discussing a women’s basketball team at another university. Following a short lull in the conversation (not shown), Angela inquires if Cathy has heard a piece of news about “the team” (lines 1–2). Following a 2-second silence (line 3), Angela repairs her prior turn by replacing “the team” with “women’s basketball” (line 4), specifying which team is being referred to. This transition space repair renews the relevance of a response from the addressee.

Extract 15: Basketball (SW 24:30)

01 A: Didju hear about uhm: (0.2) one of their ma:nagers
02 is on the team now¿ ((to C))
03 (2.0) ((A and C are looking at each other))
04 A: On women’s basketball?
05 (.)
06 C: Oh really?
07 A: Yah, =cause they didn’t ha[:ve_
08 C: [Oh: yea::h:=
09 A: =They didn’t have enough peo:ple.

By repairing her initiating action in this way, the speaker treats the lack of response as indicative of the recipient’s problem of understanding. This diagnosis turns out to be correct, as, immediately following the repair, Cathy provides a conditionally relevant response (“Oh really?” at line 6) that treats Angela’s initiating action as announcing news.

Extract 16 is taken from an interview with Lynndie England (LE), a former U.S. Army soldier, who had been convicted of torturing and abusing prisoners of war. Here, the interviewer (IR) is asking about an incident in which England was photographed with naked detainees. The interviewer uses both repair resources (line 8) and turn-constructional resources (line 10) in pursuit of a response.
Extract 16: [P12] Detainees

[BBC Radio, “Outlook”; Feb 4, 2009]

01 LE: But they >like I said< the first time I went over

02 there ins- (1.0) was on that cell block:. There was

03 already gu::ys there that- (..) were already stripped

04 down en na:ked. (.h)

05 (0.2)

06 IR: Didju no::t fee::l (0.2) sorry for the men.

07 (0.5)

08 IR: For the detainees.

09 (0.5)

10 IR: Being forced to do such humiliating things.

11 (5.5)

12 LE: I’m not gonna answer that question.

13 (1.0)

14 IR: Why no::t.

15 (2.0)

When the interviewer’s question (line 6) is not responded to (line 7), the interviewer pursues a response by treating the person reference “the men” (at line 6) as a trouble source and replacing it with “the detainees” (line 8). The repair replaces the rather generic reference “the men” with a more granular, topic-specific categorical reference “the detainees,” highlighting the men’s position in relation to the interviewee (see Lerner et al., 2012/this issue for a fuller treatment of reference recalibration repair). When England still fails to respond (line 9), the interviewer again pursues a response, this time by adding an incremental extension (line 10) to her TCU (see Bolden & Guimaraes, 2012/this issue; Ford et al., 2002; Schegloff, 2000). After an exceptionally long silence (line 11), England explicitly refuses to answer the question (line 12). We can note that although pursuit of a response is manifestly the business of the interviewer’s talk, the resources used in this pursuit (i.e., reference recalibration repair and an incremental extension of the host TCU) do not expose the lack of a response as the addressee’s problem (cf. Extract 1). In both of these extracts, then, the speaker of the initiating action, by initiating repair on it, treats her own prior talk as apparently inadequate and does not expose the lack of a response as a problem.

The extracts analyzed here suggest that, not only repair on indexical expressions, but self-initiated self-repair more generally can provide a rather delicate resource for pursuing a response. Self-initiated self-repair treats the speaker’s (or self’s) prior utterance as possibly problematic and, in doing so, suggests that resolution of the possible problem could provide for the not-yet-produced but called-for response from the recipient.

**CONCLUSIONS**

Repairs of indexicals may be designed to address the kind of problems that indexical expressions themselves can result in—indeterminate or possibly unclear reference, for instance. However, as with other types of repair, this repair technology can be exploited in the service of accomplishing
other actions. Here we have shown how it can be used in the service of pursuing a response—either because a response is relevantly missing, or because a response is judged as in some way “inadequate.” We have shown that speakers have a variety of types of resources for pursuing a response, including sequence-organizational and turn-constructional resources. We have focused here on a third type of resource: a repair-based resource, specifically replacement of an indexical with a full-form reference. Given that indexical reference is a common reference technique and one that is treated as vulnerable to misunderstanding (as other articles in the issue show), repair on indexicals is a systematically available resource for dealing with a missing or inadequate response.

Among a variety of resources speakers have available to pursue a response, repairing an indexical might be seen as a “covert” practice that obscures rather than exposes the turn transition problem. Initiating repair on an indexical expression in the transition space claims that the problem may be one of understanding a reference, and by repairing it, the speaker makes available another opportunity for a response, without making response pursuit the overt business of the talk. Likewise, repairing an indexical expression in the third turn covertly treats the provided response as in some way inadequate, while avoiding going “on record” as doing so. By repairing an indexical in the transition space, or after a possibly inadequate response, the speaker treats a transition problem—that is lack of uptake, or inadequate uptake from the recipient—as a turn-construction problem. The speaker uses an indexical repair as an opportunity to recomplete his or her turn, thereby refreshing the relevance of a response. By ostensibly dealing with problems of reference, repairs on indexicals provide a delicate method for managing other more interactionally charged issues, such as upcoming disagreement or other forms of misalignment between interlocutors. These repairs of indexicals exploit the technology of repair in the service of another action: here, pursuit. In this sense, repair-implemented response pursuit is akin to other “indirectly” accomplished actions, such as correcting errors in an “embedded” rather than “exposed” fashion (Jefferson, 1987; Lerner, 1994), eliciting information by “telling my side” (Pomerantz, 1980), or using prerequests so as to elicit preemptive offers (Schegloff, 2007) rather than asking “directly.” All of these are ways of accomplishing interactionally delicate actions in a somewhat “covert” way—i.e., without making these actions the focal action of the turn. Pursuing a response by repairing an indexical reference is another practice of this kind.
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