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1. Introduction

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

(1) (VIYMC 1:4)

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

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

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

(2) (SBL:2.2.-2)

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

The work presented in this chapter is deeply indebted to the research carried out by the late Harvey Sacks. An earlier version of some of the materials presented here was submitted as part of a Ph.D. thesis (University of California, Irvine, 1975). Emanuel Schegloff and Michael Moerman have given extensive comments and suggestions on various drafts.
(3) (SBE:2.2.-1)
A: How is Aunt Kallie.
B: Well, I (suspect) she's better.
A: Oh that's good.
B: Last time we talked the mother she was uh
better.
B: Uh Allen, (she wants to know about )
(2.0)
A: No, Allen doesn't know anything new out there
either.\footnote{1}

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

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

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

(4) (JS:II:41)
J: \[1\] I -n then I tasted it \[2\] it w'z really
horrible ...

(5) (SBE:2.1.7.-1)
B: \[1\] I just saw Wengreen outside \[2\] an' she's an
she's in bad shape.

(6) (JS:II:61) (J and L are husband and wife.)
J: \[1\] We saw Midnight Cowboy yesterday -or
suh-Friday
E: \[Oh?\]
L: Didju s- you saw that, \[2\] it's really good

(7) (NB:VIII.-3)
A: \[1\] We're painting like mad in the kitchen and,
\[2\] Oh ev'rything's workin' out so pretty here
with our-

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

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

2. Second assessments

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

(9) (NB:IV.7.-44)
\(A_1\)
A: Adeline's such a swell gal
\(A_2\)
P: Oh God, whadda gal.
\(\text{You know it!}\)

(10) (JS:II:28)
\(A_1\)
J: T's- tsuh beautiful day out isn't it?
\(A_2\)
L: Yeh it's jus' gorgeous ...
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(21) (NB:IV:1.6-6)
A: ... 'hh fabre tell its me too Portia. Ih i'm come a titl's milk.
(0.6)
A: Oh: tell yer easy toh get along with, ...

(22) (NB:IV:11.1-1)
A: God is it dreary.
(0.6)
A: Y'know I don't think-
A: 'hh- it's warm though.

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

(15) (NB:VII:2-2) (Pat is M's friend whom E recently met.)
Pat: e-that Pat isn's she a do.:11?
M: Yeh isn's she pretty,

(16) (NB:VII:13-13)
Pat: ... yihknow he's a goodlooking fel'n eez got a beautiful wife.=
M: =Ye:s::: Ge:orgeus girl- ...

(17) (SEL:2.2.3.4-6)
A: Well, it was fun Claire,
A: Yeah, I enjoyed every minute of it.

(18) (MC:1) ('He' refers to a neighborhood dog.)
B: Isn't he cute
A: O::h he::s a::DORable

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

(20) (MC:1.45)
L: ... I'm so dumb I don't even know it.
A: yh! -- heh!
W: Y-no, y-you're not du:mb, ...

(21) (NB:IV:1.6-6)
A: ... 'hh fabre tell its me too Portia. Ih i'm come a titl's milk.
(0.6)
A: Oh: tell yer easy toh get along with, ...

(22) (NB:IV:11.1-1)
A: God is it dreary.
(0.6)
A: Y'know I don't think-
A: 'hh- it's warm though.

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

(15) (NB:VII:2-2) (Pat is M's friend whom E recently met.)
Pat: e-that Pat isn's she a do.:11?
M: Yeh isn's she pretty,

(16) (NB:VII:13-13)
Pat: ... yihknow he's a goodlooking fel'n eez got a beautiful wife.=
M: =Ye:s::: Ge:orgeus girl- ...

(17) (SEL:2.2.3.4-6)
A: Well, it was fun Claire,
A: Yeah, I enjoyed every minute of it.

(18) (MC:1) ('He' refers to a neighborhood dog.)
B: Isn't he cute
A: O::h he::s a::DORable

or with interrogative tags:

(10) (JS:II:28)
J: T's- tsuh beautiful day out isn't it?
R: Yeh it's jus' gorgeous ...

(12) (VIYM:1.2-2) (J and R are in a rowboat on a lake.)
R: It's really a clear lake, isn't it?
R: It's wonderful.

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

(13) (M.Y.)
(A and B both participated in the performance which is referred to.)
expression of approval, incorporating the positive descriptor "gorgeous." The initial assessment invites a subsequent agreement; the second assessment is proffered as an agreement.

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

(22) (NB:IV:11.1)

\begin{verbatim}
A1 A: God izn it dreary.
    (0.6)
A2 A: Y'know I don't think-
   B: hh- It's warm though,
\end{verbatim}

A’s initial assessment is a complaint about the weather, incorporating the negative descriptor "dreary." In proffering the complaint, A invites the recipient, P, to coparticipate in complaining about the weather— to agree with her by proffering a subsequent complaint assessment.

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

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

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

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

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

Agreements (agreement preferred)

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

One type of agreement is the upgrade. An upgraded agreement is an assessment of the referent assessed in the prior that incorporates upgraded evaluation terms relative to the prior. An upgrade is stronger than the prior, depending on the context and the prior.

Two common techniques for upgrading evaluations are:

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

(10) (JS:11:28)

\[ J: \] T's- tuh beautiful day out isn't it?
\[ L: \] Yeh it's just gorgeous ... 

(13) (M.Y.)

\[ A: \] That (heh) s(heh) sounded (hhh)
\[ g(hh)uh! \]
\[ B: \] That sound' ---- that sounded lovely ... 

(18) (MC:1)

\[ A: \] Isn't he cute
\[ B: \] O:he::s a:::DOrable

2. An intensifier modifying the prior evaluative descriptor is included:
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(23) (CH:4.-14)
M: You must admit it was fun the night we went down
→ J: It was great fun ...

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

or include proterms indicating same as prior:

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

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

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

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

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

(6) (JS:II:61) (E is L’s mother. J and L are husband and wife.)
E: ... 'n she said she f- depressed her terribly
L: [1] Oh it's depressing.
E: Very
J: [2] It's a beautiful movie
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(30) (NB:IV:4)

P: I wish you were gummuh stay
damm much tub do. I really, I've gotta get
home fer- hh I may stay next week.

In that at least some same evaluations are regularly selected as disagree
tment prefices, they may be considered a kind of weak agree-
ment.10
A third type of agreement is the downgrade. A downgraded agreement
is an assessment of the same referent as had been assessed in the prior
with scaled-down or weakened evaluation terms relative to the prior.

(31) (GJ:1)

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

(15) (NB:VII:2)

E: e-that Palt isn'she a do;':ll?
→ M: Yeh isn't she

(14) (SEL:2.2.4.-3)

B: An I thought that uh (1.0) uhm Gene's (1.0)
singing was --
A: Oh, was lovelv.
B: fairly much like hisself, if
→ A: Yes, uh huh,
it's- Oh it was wonderful

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

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

(32) (KC:4:10)

F: That's beautiful
→ K: Isn't it pretty

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

(31) (GJ:1)

A: She's a fox.
L: Yeh, she's a pretty girl.
→ A: Oh, she's gorgeous!
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B: No, they take working at. But on the other hand, some people are born with a sense of humor, I think it is something you born with. 
A: Yes. Or it's c- I have the- eh yes, I think a lotta people are, but then I think it can be developed, too.

(+) (1.0)

(D) B: Yeah, but there's-
A: Any of those attributes can be developed.

(37) (TG:3)

A: ... You sound very far away.

(-) (0.7)

B: I do?
A: Ymehm.
(D) B: mNo I'm no:t,

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

(38) (MC:1:30)

L: Maybe it's just ez well Wilbur,
(*)
W: Hm?
L: Maybe it's just ez well you don't know.

(2.0)

(D) W: Well, uh-I say it's suspicious it could be something good too.

(39) (TG:1)

B: Why wht'sa mattuh with y-Yih sound=
A: Nothing.
B: = HA:PPY, hh
(*)
A: I sound ha:p,py?
B: Ye:uh

(0.3)

(D) A: No:

(37) (TG:3)

A: ... You sound very far away.

(0.7)

(*)
B: I do?
A: Mhn hm.
(D) B: mNo I'm no:t,
Disagreement components may also be delayed within turns. Conversants start the turns in which they will disagree in some systematic ways. One way consists of prefacing the disagreement with "uh's," "well's," and the like, thus displaying reluctance or discomfort. Another way is to preface the disagreement by agreeing with the prior speaker's position. Agreement prefases are of particular interest because agreements and disagreements are, of course, contrastive components. When they are included within a same turn, the agreement component is conjoined with the disagreement component with a contrast conjunction like "but." An apparent puzzle regarding the agreement-plus-disagreement turn shape is why recipients agree with assessments when they will shortly disagree with them.

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

**Tokens**

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

C: ... you've really both basically honestly gone your own ways.
→D: Essentially, except we've had a good relationship at home.
→C: 'hnhn Vegas but I mean it's a relationship where ...

(41) (MC:1.-13)

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

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

C: ... 'hn a:n' uh by god I can't even send my kid tuh public school b'cuz they're so god damn lousy.
D: We'll, that's a generality.
C: 'hnh
D: We've got sm pretty (good schools.)
→C: 'Well, yeah but where in the hell am I gonna live.

**asserted agreements**

(43) (GTS 4:32)

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

(36) (SBL:2.1.7.-14)

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

(44) (SBL:2.1.7.-15)

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

**Weakened and/or qualified agreement assertions**

(45) (SBL:1.1.10.-9)

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

(41) (MC:1.-13)

L: I know but I, I-I still say that the sewing machine's quicker,
→W: Oh it c'nt be quicker but it doesn' do the jobb,

(36) (SBL:2.1.7.-14)

B: ... well a sense of humor, I think is something yer born with Bea.
A:  Yea. Or it's c- I have the- eh yes, I think a lotta people are, but then I think it can be developed, too.

W:  ... The-th way I feel about it i:s, that as long as she cooperates, an'an'she believes that she's running my life, or, you know, or directing it one way or another, and she feels happy about it, I do whatever I like (h)any (h)we(h) HHH! (    )

L:  Yeah.

W:  ... I'm so dumb I don't even know it hhh! -- heh!

L:  Y-no, you're not dumb, ...

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

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

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

(20) (MC:1-45)

L:  ... I'm so dumb I don't even know it hhh! -- heh!

W:  Y-no, you're not dumb, ...

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

R:  ... well never mind. It's not important.

D:  Well, it is important.

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

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

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

These turn/sequence shapes not only house disagreements when agreements are invited, but constitute part of the apparatus for accom-
plishing disagreements as dispreferred. That the set of devices used in these turn/sequence shapes may be oriented to as disagreements in the course of production provides for the possibility and actualization of minimizing the occurrences of overtly stated disagreements in these environments.

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

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

(48) (SBL: 3.1.8)
B: ...an' that's not an awful lotta fruitcake.
   (1.0)
→ B: Course it is. A little piece goes a long way.

(49) (SBL: 3.1.6)
A: Un livers 'n- gizzards 'n stuff like that, makes it real yummy.
   (1.6)
→ A: Makes it too rich fer me::, but--makes it yummy.

(50) (JS: II: 48)
L: D'they have a good cook there?
   (1.7)
→ L: Nothing special?

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

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

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

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

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

4. Second-assessment productions: agreement dispreferred

When a speaker produces a self-deprecatating assessment, the recipient's agreement or disagreement is relevant in the next turn. An agreement
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...some a' them are really great. But tuhn I-my, taste in art is for the more uh: uh it-t-reh-it tends tuh be realistic.

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

(52) (JC:B5:6)

F: 'hh well how did the polish work otherwise.

(+)N: F-eh, fi-ne, fi-ne. In fact I didn' even touch em up this week at all

F: You didn't

(+)N: No

F: 'hh Well I was afraid maybe they might uhuh un bubble a little bit y'know they kinda [Well they did.

(-)N: Tha-tha-that one thing it with the artificial nail bubbled some

F: Yeah. Well I was afraid it would

(-)N: ( ) the patch bubbled ...

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

(53) (NB:IV-.30)

(What is reported as not said is a critical assessment of a restaurant which Kate, Frank's wife, apparently chose.)

→ P: En I didn' wanna say-eh: Kate said she always wanduh see it so, 'hh I never said anything but- uh Frank said t'day he sez 'wasn' that the dirtiest place?"

A: Yeh.

→ P: 'En I said Tihknow? I felt the same thing? But
I didn' wanna say anything to yuh, but I just felt-- dirty when I walked on the carpet."
A: "Yah.

(54) (JG:4.6.-20)
C: An I said now wait till you see me get all this stuff on. Well you know what I looked like. I looked like I was thirty-six old- years old tryin to look sixteen.
J: Ouhhh Go:i'd
→ C: 'An you know everybody just sorta stood there an nobody wanned to say well you look pretty stupid h-h-h mo:ther.

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

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

(26) (J & J)
((B is assessing a coparticipant's change of hair color))
B: I like it too but uhh hahhheh It blows my mind

(51) (JS:1.1-1)
E: 'hheh Yes I do like it=although I really:
.
.
.
.
.
E: 'hheh Well I don't- I'm not a great fan of this type of a:rt ...

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

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

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

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

(55) (SBL:2.2.3.-15)
A: But she doubled uh Gladyses three hearts, and uh vs Lil uh, uh mh mh gosh she led out a real small heart, a little three 'r somethin like that 'n heh I th(hh)ink I th(hh)ink Elva took it wi(hh)th a four.
A: 'hh heh heh heh heh heh heh C(hh)od I=
B: 'hheh heh heh
A: =coulda died
A: 'hh heh heh heh
B: 'hheh heh heh hh
A: 'hh This's when she had the trump all th- well I only had two an' so on, but but an' she was tryin' get- But it seem' tuh me li(hh)ke she had eh- she had ace-king left
B: 'hheh heh heh
A: =heh heh heh
B: =heh heh heh 'heh heh 'heh heh heh
A: An' then she lays down
B: has the ace, a little ol' little you know,
A: An' here-
B: =heh heh
A: =heh heh heh 'heh heh 'heh heh heh heh
A: An' she lets everybody take 'm
A: 'heh heh heh
B: 'hheh 'hheh hh hh 'hh, Well you know uh-
(SD) A: "Well, at least I feel
be- I mean I feel good when I'm playin' with her because I feel like uh her and I play alike behh

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

(21) (NB:IV:1-6)
A: 'hhhh I called las' ni- he sez "Don't call me tuh come down fer the, Thanksgiving, deal" nah-
P: 'hh Well HE DID THE SAME DAMN THING ET CHRISTMAS TIME.
A: CHRISTMAS EVE 'E LEFT ME HERE ALONE.
P: YEAH
(56) (AP:fn)
L: You're not bored (huh)?
(PR)S: Bored?
(D)S: =No. We're fascinated.

(57) (SBL:1.6-1)
B: ... I'm tryina get slim.

(58) (JG:II:2.14a)
C: ... c(h)ept in my old age I'm: slowin' down considerably. 'hhhhhh
(PR) D: [He:ll] Old age. =
(D) D: =What'r you thirsty fi:ve,?
C: 'heh - heh-heh-heh-heh'-e-h' hyHe(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)e(h)
Agreeing and disagreeing with assessments

(59) (MC:1.45)

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

(62) (JK:1)

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

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

(55) (SBL:2.2.3.15)

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

(63) (SBL:2.2.3.40)

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

(64) (MC)

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

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

(60) (MC:2.2.3.15)

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

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

(20) (MC:1.45)

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

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

(60) (MC:2.2.3.15)

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

(63) (SBL:2.2.3.40)

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

(64) (MC)

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

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

(65) (SBL:2.2.3.15)

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

(20) (MC:1.45)

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

A disagreement may be an assertion that contains the prior deprecating term negated with a “not”:
Agreeing and disagreeing with assessments

(56) (AP:fn)
L: You're not bored (huh)?
S: Bored? No, we're fascinated.

(65) (EB:1)
S: ... I hope by next semester it'll be a bi(h)t b(h)ed(b)er heh heh heh 'hh heh (prob'ly not)
B: '( ) You're doing very great no:w

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

(66) (SL: 2.2.3.-10)
B: And uh that poor li'l Gladys she, know she never did get it right about where she played
A: hh
B: She was heh!
A: She was almost as bad as I was.
B: heh
B: [No, but she ]=
A: 'heh heh heh heh
B: even up to the last one, they practically=
A: =heh heh
B: said th(h)row her outta that first ta(hh)ble 'heh heh ...
A: heh 'heh heh

(67) (fn)
C: I'm talking nonsense now
A: No:
A: but I think I'm ready for dinner anyway.

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

(1) A speaker may disagree by proffering an assessment that claims access to the attribute critically assessed, that is by proffering a contrastive second assessment (compliment and/or negation).

(55) (SL: 2.2.3.-15)
A: ... I feel like uh her and I play alike heh
B: No. You play beautifully.

(20) (MC: 1.-45)
L: ... I'm so dumb I don't even know it. heh!
   - heh!
W: Y-no, y-you're not dumb...

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

(59) (JG: 4.6.-6)
C: I have no dates. I don't go:
J: [Are you-] [(high pitch)]
J: Wha do ya mean you don't have any dates.
   [(low pitch)]
C: Well I just don't go out anymore that's all.
   J: Oh: that's ridiculous.

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

(68) (JG: 3C.-7)
R: 'hh But I'm only getting a C on my report card
   in math.
C: Yeh but that's passing Donald.

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

(69) (MC: 1.-38)
W: Yet I've got quite a distance tuh go yet.
L: Everybody has a distance.
In response to W's self-deprecation, L proposes that W's condition is a
general condition ("Everybody has a distance"). By proposing that it is a
common and normal condition L undermines the validity of W's self-

deprecation.

(70) (SBL:2.2.3.-4)
B: Well, do you remember that we could even hear the
music. I had the hi fi playing?
A: Mm hm.
B: An' I had two tables in the living room, an' you
could almost hear a pin drop.

(73) (GIS:1.19)
R: We're mentally ill, children, run ethelhh
L: ah ha ha ha ha hehh What's wrong with you
today?

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

(71) (MC:1.-47)
W: And I'm-I'm, I'm eating the right foods
in the right balance of foods.
(SD) W: but, I'm still, drinking coffee.
(D) L: That's not (drinking).
W: You think so,
L: No:.
(SD) W: It creates a nasty disposition.
(D) L: I don't believe (that at all).
(SD) W: it, makes you irritable
(D) L: (It does not/)
W: It does, (It ca:n.)
L: [You er you yuh that-s a ( )
      ( )! heh heh! hah! hah! hah!
(SD) W: 'And I'm being irritable right
by telling you so';
L: Ah! ah! 'HHHH No, hehhheh!
No but- but uh- yuh-Wilbur again: n. Again. Stop
trying to do this of your self:Y.
(1.2)-- leave it alone en you'll be shown the way to

(72) (JC:4.6.-26)
C: They'll take a collection for my examination
J: Ha hu hu
C: with the tadderred stockings

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

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

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

(74) (BE:1:2)
B: Not only that he gets everything done.
   (pause)
B: Everybody else—not everybody else,
   I have my desk full of trash.
→ S: Me too ...

or may be upgraded by the recipient:

(75) (SEL:2.2.3.-20)
A: And I shouldn’t back tuh diamonds.
   (2.0)
B: I think we were all so confused.
   (2.0)
A: So—
   (2.0)
B: I know I wasn’t bidding right, I wasn’t—
   eh playing right, I wa’n’t doing anything right.

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

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

(76) (MC:1.-23)
W: ... Do you know what I was all that time?
L: (No).

Agreeing and disagreeing with assessments

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

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

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

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

(76) (MC:1.-23)
W: ... Do you know what I was all that time?
L: (No).
W: Pavlov’s dog.
   (2.0)

(77) (GTS:2.-15)
K: I couldn’t, I’m a weakling.
   (.) (hmm)
→
K: I am. I’m comin’ t’that conclusion.
   I’m a damn weakling.
   (1.0)

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

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

(76) (MC:1.-23)
W: ... Do you know what I was all that time?
L: (no).
Agreeing and disagreeing with assessments

(78) (SBL:2.1.7.-4)

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

→ A: Mm hm,

(79) (SBL:2.2.3.-27)

B: ... I wasn't understanding anybody today.

→ A: Uh huh,

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

(77) (GIS:2.15)

K: I couldn't, I'm a weakling.

() : hmm!

→ K: I am. I'm comin t'that conclusion. I'm a damn weakling.

(1.0)

→ K: No damn good.

R: Well we're not gonna stick up for ya, hehh hhh hehh hhh
A: 'hehh

(78) (SBL:2.1.7.-4)

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

→ A: Mm hm,

→ B: Uh y'know? -how it is,
A: Yeah.

When no overt disagreement is made, the self-deprecating party tends to treat the self-deprecation as implicitly confirmed by the recipient. The prior self-deprecatory assertion(s) may be referred to by the self-deprecating party as already established and accepted between the parties in productions of admissions, justifications, explanations, laughter, and the like.
alternative actions for recipients are agreement/disagreement; in the second, disagreements and agreements take the form of copartisan praise/copartisan criticism.

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

2  A: Self-deprecation  
   → B: Copartisan praise/Copartisan criticism

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

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

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

Notes

1. This utterance contains B's report to A of Allen's declination. Whatever Allen may have said to B is inaudible on the tape recording of the telephone conversation between A and B, and is treated by B as inaudible to A. In B's report to A, B incorporates a disclaimer of Allen's knowledge ("doesn't know anything new") as a warrant for not proffering the requested assessment.

2. A speaker may claim insufficient knowledge to assess on his or her own behalf, and follow with a report of someone else's assessment, A's of the referent in question:
In reporting third-person assessments, speakers may affiliate with or disaffiliate from the reported assessments. See Sacks's transcribed lectures and Pomeranz (forthcoming).

3. By proffering an assessment of the referent assessed by a prior speaker, a second speaker claims independent access to that referent. Subsequent to an initial assessment, a recipient may respond to the prior without claiming independent access to the referent assessed in the prior.

He or she may acknowledge a prior assessment:

(E: Oh I I love it.
L: Yeah.
L: I'm w'z- en' we have never seen it.

A reader may produce an assessment as a recipient of news just delivered:

(F: 'Hi how iz our fri:end
N: Oh, he's much better I'm 'fraid -- his b b b
F: Well uh that's marvelous

The sequential work that "though" does, that is, accompanying disagreements containing parameter shifts, may be seen in the following assessment series as well:

(F.N.)
A: Good shot
B: Not very solid though
A: You get any more solid you'll be terrific
fication of the initial assessment inasmuch as there is a shift in the parameter being assessed: The second specifies the solidness (or lack of which) as a feature of the shot to assess, moreover, to assess critically, that is, in contrast with the prior assessment.

In the assessment pair

(NB: IV: 11. - 1)

A:  "God isn't dreary..."

B:  'N em it's warm though

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

7. The prevalence of agreements that are organized as preferred actions is clearly, not confined to assessment sequences. Research documenting that preference includes: Sacks (1973c) and Davidson (Chapter 5 herein).

8. The upgraded-agreement type being described is an upgraded assessment with no referent shift relative to the prior. In the corpus, one apparent exception is a second assessment that contains an upgraded evaluation and a rather subtle referent shift:

(1.S: 11. 137)

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

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

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

(1.S: 11. 137)

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

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


10. Some-evaluation second assessments may be strengthened or upgraded with intensifiers:

(KC: 4.35)

K:  'N that nice
R:  Yah. It really is

Notes

(SBL: 1.1.10. - 5)

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

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


12. Some illustrations of turns containing pre-disagreement prefaces are provided:

(MC: 1. - 30)

L:  Maybe it's just ez well you don't know.
B:  And that went wrong.
A:  Well, uh --
B:  That surgery, I mean.
A:  I don't--

(MC: 1. - 27)

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

(SBL: 2.1.7. - 14)

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

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

(JO: II: 2.33)

D:  If y'go t'uhn Switzerland yer payin about fifty percent a' yer money in taxes.


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

(TE:1)
B: ... Yih sound HA:PPY, hh
A: I sound ha:ppyy?
B: ^Ye *uh.
(0.3)
A: No.
B: No?
A: No.
(0.7)
→ B: 'hh You sound sorta cheerful?

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

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

[MC:x]
A: How wz the trip?
B: Oh it was nice.
(0.5)
→ B: U:::h It was very nice indeed.

(MC:1.-10)
L: ... they're robbing themselves blind.
(1.0)
→ L: Jus' robbing themselves blind ...

(MC:1.-42)
W: ... somebody came along and just didn't, like me.
(1.0)
→ W: They j(h)u(hh)st didn't.

15. There are sequential differences between performing an action with a "withhold" like a silence and with a stated component. When a withholdable is not withheld, such as a party stating a criticism, that talk may initiate a sequence in which subsequent withholdables may likewise be stated. Criticizing a coparticipant may engender a return criticism. This sort of exchange is alluded to by F as an account for "not making any comments":

(NB:1B:14) (T has just told F a 'fat joke' - purportedly said to him on an earlier occasion - that he jumped into the ocean and caused huge waves over the pier.)
F: I won't say anything. I may come down.
[eh-ha-ha:ha:-ha:]
T: Oh(n)sidha(n)ay
T: -hih huh huh.
F: ^huhhhhh,huh
→ B: 1Bring yer suit.
T: =Ah-ee Well that's why I said I'm not g'mmh say anything I'm not making any comments about anybody.

16. For a discussion of forms and functions of some repeat types, see Jefferson (1972).
17. The range of actions that are oriented to as preferred and dispreferred and how these actions are performed and recognized in turns and sequences constitute a promising research area. For example, refusing an invitation may risk offending the inviting party. A dispreferred-action turn shape, prefacing, may be used when speakers refuse invitations. Refusals are often prefaced with appreciative person assessments:

(SBL:1.1.10.-14)
B: Uh if you'd come over and visit a little while this morning, I'll give you a cup of coffee.
→ A: heh! Well that's awfully sweet of you. I don't think I can make it this morning uh, I'm running an ad in the paper and-and uh I have to stay near the phone.

(NB:2.-14)
B: Wanna come down 'n have a bite a' lunch with me?
I got some beer en stuff.
→ A: Wul yer real sweet hon, uh, let=
B: Dyou have sumpt else?
A: "I have-
A: No, I have to us call Bill's mother ...