

# Actions in practice: On details in collections

Discourse Studies  
2018, Vol. 20(1) 90–119

© The Author(s) 2018

Reprints and permissions:

[sagepub.co.uk/journalsPermissions.nav](http://sagepub.co.uk/journalsPermissions.nav)

DOI: 10.1177/1461445617734344

[journals.sagepub.com/home/dis](http://journals.sagepub.com/home/dis)



**Rebecca Clift**

University of Essex, UK

**Chase Wesley Raymond**

University of Colorado, USA

## Abstract

Several of the contributions to the Lynch et al. Special issue make the claim that conversation-analytic research into epistemics is ‘routinely crafted at the expense of actual, produced and constitutive detail, and what that detail may show us’. Here, we seek to address the inappropriateness of this critique by tracing precisely how it is that recognizable *actions* emerge from distinct *practices* of interaction. We begin by reviewing some of the foundational tenets of conversation-analytic theory and method – including the relationship between position and composition, and the making of collections – as these appear to be primary sources of confusion for many of the contributors to the Lynch et al. Special Issue. We then target some of the specific arguments presented in the Special Issue, including the alleged ‘over-hearer’s’ writing of metrics, the provision of so-called ‘alternative’ analyses and the supposed ‘crafting’ of generalizations in epistemics research. In addition, in light of Lynch’s more general assertion that conversation analysis (CA) has recently been experiencing a ‘rapprochement’ with what he disparagingly refers to as the ‘juggernaut’ of linguistics, we discuss the specific expertise that linguists have to offer in analyzing particular sorts of interactional detail. The article as a whole thus illustrates that, rather than being produced ‘*at the expense of actual, produced and constitutive detail*’, conversation-analytic findings – including its work in epistemics – are unambiguously *anchored in* such detail. We conclude by offering our comments as to the link between CA and linguistics more generally, arguing that this relationship has long proven to be – and indeed continues to be – a mutually beneficial one.

## Keywords

Conversation analysis (CA), epistemics, methodology

---

## Corresponding author:

Rebecca Clift, Department of Language and Linguistics, University of Essex, Colchester CO4 3SQ, UK.

Email: [rclift@essex.ac.uk](mailto:rclift@essex.ac.uk)

## Introduction

In a position article examining what he and others (e.g. Lynch et al., 2016b) understand to be the ‘Epistemics Program’ [*sic*], Michael Lynch (2016a) refers, with evident distaste, to ‘a recent trend (indeed, a juggernaut) in conversation analysis (CA), involving a rapprochement with linguistics ...’ (p. 18).<sup>1</sup> To cast the relationship between CA and linguistics as a ‘rapprochement’ – and a recent one, at that – is to misunderstand both this relationship and its history. In the first instance, as Schegloff (1991: 46) describes it, CA exists ‘at a point where linguistics and sociology (and several other disciplines, anthropology and psychology among them) meet’,<sup>2</sup> and indeed its outward orientations from the early days have been linguistic.<sup>3</sup> Nowhere is this more apparent than in the appearance of the two foundational CA articles by Sacks et al. (1974) and Schegloff et al. (1977) in the most prominent linguistics journal, *Language*.<sup>4,5</sup>

A more accurate description would be that the interest of linguists in CA has been gathering pace over the last 20 years; that is, the momentum is surely in the direction of linguistics toward CA, rather than the other way around (see e.g. Clift, 2016). This, then, is a perspective from linguistics: an attempt to throw some light on why CA – including its work in epistemics – provides for linguistics some of its most compelling discoveries and most innovative insights.

In what follows, we address the general charge of Lynch et al., namely that what they misleadingly call the ‘Epistemics Program’ – but which we describe here as work in epistemics – is cognitivist in its methods and in its analyses. We take as our starting point an assertion made by Macbeth and Wong (2016), which they pose as a puzzle:

A central and recurrent puzzle for our reading of the Epistemic Program [*sic*] is how occasioned production features of turn and sequence ... are rendered expressions of a durable formal structure operating in the background. Transcript is animated on behalf of an omnipresent engine of ‘epistemic order’ (Heritage, 2008: 309). These renderings are programmatic achievements, generic in their terms and operations, and treated as causative of what order may be found on any actual occasion. This would seem to be the central aim and achievement of the EP’s animations, notwithstanding that generalisations such as these are routinely crafted at the expense of actual, produced and constitutive detail, and what that detail may show us. (pp. 585–586)

In the first place, we find ourselves entirely at one with Macbeth and Wong in their disavowal of ‘generalisations ... crafted at the expense of actual, produced and constitutive detail’. Indeed, in her commentary on Heritage (2012b, 2012c), Clift (2012) cites with approval Evans and Levinson’s (2009) observation that we are all ultimately in search of the highest-level generalizations with ‘empirical bite’ (p. 475), and thereafter sets out the reasons why work in epistemics has indeed achieved this (Clift, 2012:69). The dominant paradigm in linguistics for the last half-century has, after all, centered on Chomsky’s (1965) ‘ideal speaker-listener’ (p. 3), producing exactly those generalizations at the expense of ‘bite’ from which we, along with Macbeth and Wong, are in flight. Given that the Chomskyan paradigm is an inherently cognitive one, as linguists we are inclined to recognize cognitivism where we see it. The puzzle for *us* here is to reconcile Macbeth and Wong’s characterization of work in epistemics with our experience of it.

Before turning to epistemics in particular, let us retrace our steps to track how generalizations in CA emerge from ‘actual, produced and constitutive detail’. In so doing, we suggest that the puzzle may be solved by revisiting how recognizable *actions* emerge from distinct *practices* of interaction. The inextricable link between the details of talk and the actions that the talk is effecting is made clear in Schegloff’s (2007) insistence that analysts must show how a specific action has been ‘recognized by co-participants as that action by virtue of the practices that produced it’ (p. 7). As we will demonstrate, while several of the articles in the Lynch et al. Special Issue echo Schegloff’s sentiment (e.g. Lindwall et al., 2016: 519), their claim to analyze action is nonetheless severely undermined by their disregard for the practices that constitute it. Such an approach risks occluding the fact that actions are tethered in the details of practices; an account that floats free of the practices that produced it cannot, by definition, be an empirical account of action.

Thus we start with a basic methodological principle in CA – that which relates the composition of a turn-at-talk to its position in sequence – and then discuss a basic methodological practice: that of assembling collections. These preliminaries then provide the foundation from which to show what the ‘actual, produced and constitutive detail’ of talk may show us. It is from these details that generalizations emerge, thereby allowing us to see cognition not as a ‘hidden’ order (Lynch and Wong, 2016), ‘operating in the background’ (Macbeth and Wong, 2016: 585–586), but rather as lodged firmly – and *publicly* (Garfinkel, 1967) – in sequences of interaction. Finally, we consider the contribution that linguists, with their distinct perspectives on and management of interactional detail, are particularly able to make to conversation-analytic work.

### *Methodological preliminaries*

*On ‘position’ and ‘composition’.* Linguistic theory, at whatever level of description – phonetic, morphological, syntactic or semantic – has overwhelmingly concentrated on the compositional elements of language. Even in the cases where sentences or utterances are not invented, but naturally occurring, claims about language use have tended to be based on single, decontextualized sentences or utterances. What CA method exhorts us to remember is the *position* in composition (Clift et al., 2013), specifically, Schegloff’s (1993) observation that ‘... both position and composition are ordinarily constitutive of the sense and import of an element of conduct that embodies some phenomenon or practice’ (p. 121).

To take a simple example, the phrase ‘thank you’, with stress on ‘thank’, inherently announces itself as *initiating* thanks; the phrase ‘thank *you*’ announces itself as *responding* to a prior expression of thanks. In such a case, the prosodic practice of stressing either ‘thank’ or ‘you’ marks the turn as, respectively, initiating or responding. In a similar vein, Schegloff (2002: 374, fn. 21) cites Sacks’ early observation that repeats – for example, second summonses – are ‘distinctively done as “repeats”’, such that ‘even if the first was not heard, the second can be heard as a “repeat”’ due to its ‘upgraded’ design (Schegloff, 2007: 52). So, doing something ‘as a repeat’ is a practice that is implemented in various ways; and so powerful is the link between position and composition that the design of the turn can indicate its position for a hearer, *even when the hearer has not heard the first attempt.*

In the examples just mentioned, positionality was indicated at the prosodic level; but of course, interactional resources may differ from language to language. In Arabic, the distinction between an initial and responsive greeting, for example, is marked lexically and morphosyntactically. The following are some exemplars taken from Saudi Arabic data:<sup>6</sup>

- (1)
- 1 A: marḥaba  
**Hello**
- 2 B: marḥabte:n  
hello (dual pronoun)  
**Two hello(s)**
- (2)
- 1 A: ʔssalamuʕalaykum  
The peace on you (pl)  
**Peace (be upon) you**
- 2 B: ʕalaykumessalam  
On you (pl) the peace  
**(Upon) you the peace**
- (3)
- 1 A: ʕabaḥelxe:r  
Morning the good  
**Good morning**
- 2 B: ʕabaḥennw:r  
Morning the light  
**Bright morning**

In each case in (1)–(3) above, the initiating greeting is met by a turn that is lexically/morphologically formatted as responsive; the response retains a component of the initial greeting, but returns this through the recurrent practice of modifying the original – whether in (1) by means of pluralization, in (2) by modified word order<sup>7</sup> or in (3) by modifying the assessment item. These exemplars capture a basic general observation that position is inherently indexed in composition. But arriving at this generalization is not by means of ‘crafting’, nor has the transcript been ‘animated’ in any way. Such observations are only possible because they are grounded in collections of exemplars. On the well-known principle that two may be a coincidence but three (or indeed more) is a pattern, the collections tell their own story. It is thus *collections* of cases that, to quote Heritage (2018), *force* us to our conclusions.

Failure to acknowledge the normatively intertwined relationship between position and composition appears to be the source of much confusion in the Lynch et al. (2016b) Special Issue. For instance, Macbeth et al. (2016: 562) claim that Heritage’s (2002a) analysis of *oh*-prefaced responses to assessments uses ‘a very different arrangement and a very different deployment’ of sequence organization. They are puzzled by Heritage’s argument that, like second assessments (see Pomerantz, 1984), first assessments too can be upgraded or downgraded. The authors attempt to dismantle Heritage’s analysis by asking ‘upgraded *from what?*’ (Macbeth et al., 2016: 562, emphasis in original). Nonetheless, the early observations by Sacks and Schegloff, cited above, clearly invoke a normative order to the *particular* design of actions in *particular*

positions in interaction, with first-position utterances being no exception. Moreover, it should be made clear that while Macbeth et al. (2016: 563) cite Pomerantz as evidence for the claims they put forth regarding positionality and upgrading/downgrading, Pomerantz's work clearly distances her from the perspective taken by Macbeth et al. (see, e.g., Pomerantz 1986 on extreme case formulations; see also Jefferson, 1980; Pillet-Shore, 2004). In the same way that an address term can be produced in an 'upgraded' (Schegloff, 2007: 52) fashion vis-à-vis an unmarked design (and will be heard *as* upgraded by virtue of that marked composition), so too can an initial reference to a person be done markedly or unmarkedly (Fox, 1987; Jackson, 2013; Schegloff, 1996c; Stivers, 2007), and, as Heritage (2002a) demonstrates, so too is the case for first assessments. Macbeth et al.'s (2016) critique suggests a perspective that first actions cannot themselves be upgraded/downgraded, which amounts to a claim that participants do not orient to a normative order of position and composition in interaction. Such a misguided view would, *ipso facto*, deny that any speaker producing a first-position utterance could ever accomplish any sort of non-normative or otherwise marked first action. And yet – as anyone who has had someone *scream* their name to get their attention, instead of just *speak* it, can tell you – this is plainly not the case.

*The biting point: Collections and eventful absences.* It is not, however, only in what these data explicitly display that we may find these conclusions; the particular methodological power of collections is located just as much in what they throw into relief. In a search for 'empirical bite', the biting point for CA is not solely in the empirical skewing that emerges through collections of practices, but also in the deviant case: the exception that proves the rule. Schegloff's (1996a) account of describing a hitherto undiscovered action – confirming an allusion – is a masterclass in identifying the deviant case, and instructive for examining how generalizations emerge through collections of particular practices.<sup>8</sup> In (4), (5) and (6) below, we see an initial stage: selections from a database of exemplars displaying, at the arrowed turns, the practice – repetitions of a prior turn by the speaker of a current turn:

(4) (Schegloff, 1996a: 183. Interview with Susan Shreve on US National Public Radio concerning her recent novel. E = Bob Edwards, interviewer; S = Susan Shreve)

- 1 E Why do you write juvenile books.  
 2 (0.5)  
 3 E ['s that- b- (0.?) [hav]ing [children? ]  
 4 S [Because I love child[ren]. [I really do:]=  
 5 =.hh I enjoy children:, .hh I started writing: (. )  
 6 juvenile books fer entirely pra:ctical reasons, .hh  
 7 (. )  
 8 S [u- u-  
 9 E [Making money:..  
 10 S→ Making [money  
 11 E [yes ((+laughter))  
 12 S that- that practical reason hhh  
 13 (. )  
 14 S I've been writing juvenile books for a lo:ng..

(5) (Schegloff, 1996a: 174. E = Evelyn; R = Rita. Evelyn has been called to the phone)

- 1 E =Hi: Rita  
 2 R Hi: Evelyn:. How [are y'  
 3 E [I hadda come in another room.  
 4 R Oh:. Uh huh.=  
 5 E =I fee:l a bi:ssel verschickert.  
 6 (0.2)  
 7 R W- why's 'a:t,  
 8 (0.4)  
 9 R uh you've had sump'n t'drink.=  
 10 E→ =I had sump'n t'dri:nk.  
 11 R Uh huh.

(6) (Schegloff, 1996a: 175; E = Evelyn; R = Rita)

- 1 R . . . y'know we: went to the mo:vies.=  
 2 =We went to:uh:m. uh to: (m)u(h):  
 3 What's \*the name of ( ) ((off-line))  
 4 E (Sh'beau)?  
 5 R (\*\* \*\*) (Millbrae) ((off-line))  
 6 Millbrae. which is over past Burlingame.  
 7 (0.2)  
 8 E Yeah th[at's 'n far away.  
 9 R [(and-)  
 10 R→ That's far away. And- there were two good movies . . .

In each of these sequences, the data (at line 10 in each case) show us the same practice of repeating the prior speaker's turn:<sup>9</sup> not a generalization 'crafted', but a methodical interactional device, *publicly and observably present*. Also distinctly observable, in each case, is the prior sequence. Now if it is evident that the repetitions in each instance are doing agreements, it is only by examining this prior sequential context that the *particular form* of agreement being done becomes clear. Schegloff notes that in each case what is repeated is a candidate observation of a prior characterization made by the recipient: in (4) 'Making money', in (5) 'you've had sump'n to drink' and in (6) 'that's far away'. That candidate observation can, on further inspection of the prior talk, be seen to have its origins in what the recipient has herself said – an allusion to circumstances that are explicitly formulated in that observation. So when, in (4), Susan Shreve says 'I started writing: (.) juvenile books fer entirely pra:ctical reasons' (lines 5–6), she alludes to, but does not formulate explicitly, the objective of 'making money'. In (5), Evelyn's claim to feel 'a bissel verschickert' ('a little tipsy') leads to Rita's candidate understanding that 'you've had sump'n t'drink' (line 9); and in (6), Rita's formulation of Millbrae as 'over past Burlingame' (line 6) can be heard to be characterizing it as 'far away'. And it is the recipient who, in the practice of repeating the utterance in next turn, confirms this candidate observation offered by the other.

In the course of discovering 'confirming an allusion' to be a distinct action, accomplished through this practice of repeating a prior turn, Schegloff (1996a) notes that 'the apparently petty "who is agreeing with whom" [...] *can* and *does* matter' (p. 194). In so doing, he makes analytically salient a *demonstrably relevant distinction* that is central

to work in epistemics, that between confirming and agreeing. It is precisely this distinction that Heritage and Raymond (2005) build on in their collections-based analysis of the practices participants use in assessment sequences, for instance (see also Heritage, 2002a). Temporality is key, with the choice to do a confirmation over an agreement demonstrably indexing prior orientation to knowledge, a point to which we will return in the next section.

While neither the scope nor the subtlety of Schegloff's (1996a) account can be conveyed here, the methodological upshot is clear. Not only does the repeating turn respond explicitly to the immediately prior turn, it also thereby references the one prior to that: the speaker's *own* prior turn. So for one thing, displayed understandings are not simply confined to proximate turns-at-talk. Moreover, it is only the identification of ostensibly the 'same' practice or action across a range of exemplars that makes it possible to specify 'environments of relevant possible occurrence' (Schegloff, 1993: 104). With these established, it is then possible to undertake a search for environments that display '*the eventfulness of its absence, or an orientation to avoiding it as well as achieving it*' (Schegloff, 1996a: 192, emphasis in original). As such, an integral part of the evidence that Schegloff adduces for his account is a case of avoidance – an observable withholding of the practice by means of a repair away from it – and a case of relevant non-occurrence. In both cases, there is evidence in the data that implementing the practice would have been hearably self-serving. Of these two eventful absences, Schegloff (1996a) remarks that

... it is virtually certain that nothing of interest would have been seen at all were we not already familiar with ... confirming allusions and its environments of possible occurrence. Here then we may have some of the most distinctive fruits of inquiry in rendering what would otherwise be invisible visible in its very absence. (p. 199)

The evidence provided by the 'deviant case' – a methodological precept in CA since it formed a pivotal part of Schegloff's (1968) study of phone call openings – is thus fundamental in nailing down the analysis. Indeed, a deviant case plays a pivotal role in Heritage's (1984) original examination of *oh* as a 'change-of-state' token (p. 310), an analysis that Wootton (1989) presents as a paradigmatic example of conversation-analytic methodology. The generalizations thereby made possible are about as far from 'crafted' as it is possible to get.

In their introduction to the Special Issue, Lynch and Macbeth (2016) claim to 'neither ignore nor criticize the value of collections in the CA literature' (p. 495). This is revealed to be nothing more than mere lip service, however, as the authors immediately go on to assert, 'our primary focus is on treatments of singular sequences in the EP [Epistemic Program, *sic*] publications we examine' (p. 496). The justification offered for this is that such an approach supposedly adheres to one of CA researchers' principal tasks, namely, 'not to sacrifice the detailed examination of single cases on the altar of broad claims' (Schegloff 2010: 42, cited in Macbeth and Wong, 2016: 581).

While the contributors to the Lynch et al. Special Issue direct their line of critique at research in epistemics in particular, we agree with Steensig and Heinemann (2016: 604) that this criticism is revelatory of 'a more general skepticism towards the collection method'.<sup>10</sup> For Lynch et al., the examination of a single case seemingly purports

to remedy what they view to be inherent deficiencies in the making of collections. However, for conversation analysts, as will be demonstrated more explicitly in the next section, even – and perhaps especially – in the analysis of single cases, collections provide the means to disambiguate between what initially may appear to be ‘equally correct’ alternative analyses. Looking solely at case (4) above, for instance, would not reveal the practice or the action that ‘making money’ is being designed to implement, let alone the scope thereof. On the basis of the single case, devoid of comparison to any sort of collection, an infinite number of alternative analyses could be posited to explain Susan’s responsive turn. And indeed, many of those alternative explanations might appear equally defensible in the ignorant bliss of what else is out there. It is only upon situating this *particular* case within a *collection* of comparable cases – comparable in that they are similar or in that they are different (e.g. a deviant case, a type-conforming ‘yeah’, etc.; see next section) – that the import of the practice and its action becomes clear, both in terms of its relevance to this *particular* moment between *these two participants*, as well as with regard to the scope of the action’s deployment more generally.

Thus, conversation-analytic findings are certainly answerable ‘to the details of single episodes of action’ (Schegloff, 1987: 102); but from a CA perspective, those details are altogether unanalyzable without reference to other instances. This is due to the fact that the examination of a single case *unavoidably* brings to bear, on that single case, *the findings and observations from examinations of collections*.<sup>11</sup> And thus, for practitioners of CA, collections are as analytically essential as they are unavoidable. Schegloff (1997) reflects on the centrality of collections to the CA method in discussing what he calls ‘boundary cases’ of phenomena (in his case, other-initiated repair). Of instances which at first glance appear to be the target phenomenon but which, upon analysis, appear not to be so, he remarks that:

In specifying what *makes* them ‘look like’, we learn about our phenomenon; and in specifying why nonetheless they ‘*are not*’, we learn as well. And in specifying why some instances which look *unlike* our initiating instances belong nonetheless ... we do the same.

Boundary cases are on *both* sides of the boundary, and in specifying the boundary, they help specify what belongs inside it and what does not. They also help us convert mere *interpretation*, based on what something seems or appears to be, into *analysis*, where that ‘seeming’ is empirically grounded in analytically formulated features of the conduct, features by which it does what it is designed to do, and gets so understood by co-participants. (p. 502)

Collections are thus the *sine qua non* of analysis; without them, all that remains is interpretation.<sup>12</sup>

### *On ‘actual, produced, and constitutive detail’ in practice: The case of epistemics*

Work in CA takes as its starting point the theoretical and methodological foundation just described, and conversation-analytic research on epistemics is no exception, beginning from the perspective that rights and obligations to knowledge are visibly made relevant and lodged firmly in the details of talk.

One of the central claims of the contributions to the Lynch et al. (2016b) Special Issue is that conversation-analytic work in epistemics is ‘disengaged from the details of the transcript’ (Lynch and Wong, 2016: 539), that it is based on assumptions other than ‘on an inspection of the detailed materials in the fragment’ (Lindwall et al., 2016: 512).<sup>13</sup> In what follows, we target and unpack various components of this claim, with the objective of demonstrating that, rather than being produced ‘*at the expense of* actual, produced and constitutive detail, and what that detail may show us’ (Macbeth and Wong, 2016: 585–586, our emphasis), epistemic findings are unambiguously *anchored in* such detail; and indeed, it is precisely our attention to these details which, to once again invoke Heritage (2018), *force* us to draw certain conclusions about participants’ moment-by-moment negotiations of rights and obligations to knowledge.

*On ‘writing metrics’.* To begin, it is relevant to clarify further the distinction between *actions*, on the one hand, and the *practices* used to achieve them, on the other, as the inappropriate conflation of these two terms seems to be the cause of confusion in the Lynch (2016b) Special Issue.

The action in excerpts (4)–(6) – confirming an allusion – is seen to be rooted in the particular practice of repeating a prior turn. This is crucial to note because, without attending to the details of the practice, it would be impossible to distinguish this particular action from other forms of what might otherwise be called simply ‘agreement’. After all, in each case the speaker of the target turn (line 10) is certainly ‘agreeing’ in one sense of the term, and therefore could have done so within the sequence with a simple *Yes* or *Mm hm* (Raymond, 2003; Stivers, 2010). Likewise, they might have provided agreement with a particle-prefaced *Oh yes* or *Well yes* (Heritage, 1998, 2015), or perhaps by way of a marked interjection like *Of course* or *Absolutely* (Stivers, 2007), or maybe with some sort of phrasal upgrade, downgrade or transformation (e.g. ‘uh you’ve had sump’n t’drink’ in (5) responded to with *Have I ever!* or *Just a little bit*) (e.g. Mikesell et al., 2017; Stivers and Hayashi, 2010). And yet, while all of these may be ‘agreements’ at one level of analysis, none of these ‘alternatives’ was produced. The conversation analyst’s task in addressing the omnirelevant inquiry ‘Why that now?’ (Schegloff and Sacks, 1973) is thus necessarily a comparative one that is based in collections of phenomena: Schegloff seeks to discover what makes the specific practice he has uncovered distinct from these (and other) forms of ‘agreement’ with respect to the particularized action it delivers.

Macbeth and Wong (2016) take issue with Heritage’s argument that a particular utterance produced by a speaker in one excerpt achieves a ‘simulacrum of agreement’ (Heritage, 2011: 160; Heritage and Raymond, 2005). They assert that ‘to find a “simulacrum of agreement” here is to write a metric of “kinds of agreements” and then declare what kind this one is. It is an over-hearer’s measure entirely’ (Macbeth and Wong, 2016:579). But if agreements do not come in different ‘kinds’, and there is no metric among them, are participants’ uses of the widely differing practices of *Yes* versus *Mm hm* versus *Oh yes* versus *Of course* versus *Have I ever* versus *Just a little bit* and so on – in addition to Schegloff’s repetition-enacted confirming allusions, for that matter – then to be viewed as simply random and inconsequential? It would appear that Macbeth and Wong would be content to label this range of responses simply as ‘agreements’ and move on. Nonetheless, research in CA takes as its point of departure Sacks’ (1984: 22)

fundamental assumption that there is ‘order at all points’, and in so doing has produced countless studies – both qualitative and quantitative – that robustly demonstrate not only the existence, but also the systematic deployment of various different sorts of agreement and confirmation cross-linguistically (see e.g. Bolden, 2016; Enfield et al., 2017; Raymond, 2003; Raymond, 2015; Stivers et al., 2010).

To offer but one example, consider the following case from Lao. Speakers A and B are discussing a new colleague of B’s. A asks whether the woman has a beautiful figure. B launches a turn concerning the woman’s hair, but drops out in overlap with A. In the clear, then, following A’s post-position tag question *bóó3* ‘right?’, B produces an affirmative response – ‘not with *qee5* “yes”, but with repetition ...’ (Enfield, 2010: 2662), thereby constituting a nonconforming response (Raymond, 2003):

(7) (Enfield, 2010: 2662)

```

01 A:  lèø  hun1    laaw2    [ngaam2    mèn1    bóó3]
      PRF  figure  3SG.FA  beautiful COP   QPLR
      'And her figure is beautiful, right?'
02 B:                                     [phom3 niø-   ]
                                          hair TPC
                                          [the hair   ]
03      (0.5)
04 B:  hun1    ngaam2
      figure  beautiful
      'Her figure is beautiful'

```

As with Schegloff’s study of confirming allusions, the practice B deploys here (repetition) involves confirming and hence an implied epistemic independence or even primacy – in this case, with respect to what her new colleague looks like.

This is but one exemplar of an already substantial and growing, cross-linguistic, cross-cultural body of research that has its origins in Schegloff (1996a) and Heritage and Raymond (2005). As it clearly illustrates, neither Heritage nor any other analyst has a need to ‘write metric[s]’ for interactional phenomena because the participants – in and through the ‘actual, produced, and constitutive detail’ of their different ways of, for example, providing agreement and confirmation – are already writing the metrics themselves.

*On ‘alternative’ analyses.* Given the accusation that conversation-analytic work in epistemics is ‘disengaged from the details of the transcript’ (Lynch and Wong, 2016: 539), contributors to the Lynch (2016b) Special Issue attempt to ‘re-analyze’ (Lindwall et al., 2016: 500) the excerpts included in prior work with the goal of ‘question[ing] the solidity of the empirical support thus far presented’ (Lindwall et al., 2016: 520) for epistemic claims (e.g. status and stance). The claim of these authors, of course, is that *they* are attending to the details of the talk that Heritage and others have either actively ignored or inadvertently overlooked, and that in so doing, readers will quickly recognize that ‘more detailed accounts can be produced without recourse to epistemic status’ (Lindwall et al., 2016: 517), for example. As Lynch and Wong (2016: 528) succinctly put it, ‘Our data are

transcripts-under-analysis, and we shall use our re-analyses of these data to call into question the general claims and interpretive strategies that we have found to be characteristic of the EP [*sic*].

But are the ‘re-analyses’ offered by Lynch et al. plausible? Do they actually attend to the minute details of the talk in the way that they claim to? Or do the details of the talk, and situating such details within collections thereof, in fact reveal these analytic ‘alternatives’ to be not alternatives at all?

Let us interrogate just one example of ‘re-analysis’, the very first offered by Lindwall et al. 2016 with respect to the following fragment (8):

(8) [Rah:12:1:ST]

- 1 Jen: °Hello?, °  
 2 (0.5)  
 3 Ida: Jenny?  
 4 (0.3)  
 5 Ida: It's me:,  
 6 Jen: Oh hello I:da.  
 7 Ida: → Ye:h. .h uh:m (0.2) ah'v jis rung tih teh- eh tell you (0.3)  
 8 → uh the things ev arrived from Barkerr'n Stone'ou[:se,  
 9 Jen: → [Oh:::.....  
 10 (.)  
 11 Jen: O[h c'n ah c'm rou:nd,h[h  
 12 Ida: [An' [Yes please that's w't=

Given that declarative utterances can be used to *request* information as well as to *give* information, Heritage (2012b: 8) uses this case to illustrate the role that epistemic *status* plays in distinguishing between these. Here, Ida's knowledgeable (K+) status regarding the information at hand allows Jenny to interpret her lines 7–8 as an informing action, receipting it with the change-of-state token *Oh* in line 9 (Heritage, 1984).

Nonetheless, about this case, Lindwall et al. (2016: 508) contend the following:

Here one could note that the phrase is preceded by ‘ah'v jis rung tih teh- eh tell you’ (line 7). This means that the lexical and syntactical construction alone provides an evident and unequivocal packaging of the declarative as an informing action. An account of the turn's recognizability can thus be constructed without reference to epistemic matters.

Lindwall et al.'s ‘alternative’ account of this case, then, is that because the phrasing of Ida's turn projects to ‘tell’, Jenny will ‘unequivocal[ly]’ understand what comes next as *giving* information rather than *requesting* it. As a single case, devoid of the illustrative power of collections, such an analysis indeed seems plausible. But does it stand up to scrutiny?

Consider extract (9) next in which Ginny, similar to Ida above, produces a turn that projects to ‘tell’ (lines 7–8). And yet the result of this is not an informing action at all, but rather a request for confirmation – ‘You haven't eaten yet?’ (line 8)<sup>14</sup> – confirmation which Millie immediately provides in line 9 with ‘No wir jist now eating’.

## (9) SBL 3.5.R

- 01 Mil: I've (0.2) prayed abaht it'n evryone e:lse ez prayed about  
 02 't for me? a:n' uh p tch khhhhhhhhhh<sup>o</sup> EN THEY SAY PRAYER  
 03 CHA:NGES EVRYTHING en (.) e- SO IT'S J'S WO^:NDERF' l UHhh  
 04 HU[hh  
 05 Gin: [Tha::t's right[ °Mill]y°  
 06 Mil: [ ^uhh! ]hh-huh hu[h  
 07 Gin: → [hhh We:ll 'ee wil hh I  
 08 → tell you wha: ' wu- (.) eh-ihHe (.) You haven't eaten yet?  
 09 Mil: → No wir jist[now]eating. ]  
 10 Gin: [W'l]why don' cb]u go ahead Milly hh  
 11 (0.2)  
 12 Gin: En u-Ah: 'Il sto:p o:n my way down en:nif you feel like (.)  
 13 coming with me fi:ne'n:d if y' [do:n't w h y]  
 14 Mil: [Yer still go] \*ing.  
 15 (0.3)  
 16 Gin: hh Yeh I think ah'll go o:n.=

Here, then, we have a direct comparison with the case that Heritage analyzes (and Lindwall et al. 're-analyze'): the beginning of a turn constructional unit (TCU) with the lexeme 'tell', followed by a pause and a few hitches, followed by a clause produced with declarative morphosyntax and response-mobilizing (Stivers and Rossano, 2010) intonation. How is it, then, that Jenny understands Ida's declarative as *giving* information in (8), whereas Millie understands Ginny's declarative as *requesting* information in (9)? Despite what Lindwall et al. would have us believe, the answer cannot be based in the 'tell you' part of the turn; as these data show, that does not disambiguate between the two action ascriptions in question, as it is common to both cases. What does disambiguate them, though, is epistemic status: in (8), the speaker (Ida) has K+ status regarding the delivery, and so is heard to be informing, whereas in (9), the speaker (Ginny) has K- status regarding her interlocutor's having eaten or not, and so is heard to be asking.

This exemplar, drawn from a mini-collection of just 20 instances, serves to illustrate a simple point, namely that the inclusion of 'tell' in a turn-at-talk – especially when preceded and followed by hitches, filled pauses and the like – does not *a priori* guarantee that what comes next will be a telling. And thus, the 'alternative' analysis that something like 'tell' is – in and of itself – a sufficient resource for a recipient to 'unequivocal[ly]' interpret a subsequent declarative as giving information is revealed to be empirically unsupported.<sup>15</sup> The response to Lindwall et al.'s (2016: 508) question – 'Is the invocation of epistemic status necessary, is it helpful, and does it do justice to the demonstrable orientations of the participants?' – then quickly becomes a resounding 'Yes'. Nonetheless, this disambiguation between what initially appeared to be equally plausible analyses is only made possible by situating case (8) *within a collection of instances*. Without such a collection, as Schegloff (1997) notes, one is not producing '*analysis*', but rather '*mere interpretation*' (p. 502, original emphasis).

The issue of ‘alternative’ analyses makes relevant clarification of a related point. Heritage’s (2012b: 6) assertion that ‘relative access to particular epistemic domains is treated as a more or less settled matter in the large bulk of ordinary interaction’ is a source of much difficulty for the contributors to the Lynch (2016b) Special Issue. Indeed, Lindwall et al. (2016) describe this as ‘one of the most central and problematic moves of the epistemic program [*sic*]’, and they ask, ‘If the recognizability of social action depends on the recognizability of relative knowledge, who is to decide?’ (p. 514). Nonetheless, the very posing of this question suggests that such decisions are static and wholly unproblematic, when in reality no such claim has been made in the epistemics literature. Indeed, Heritage (2012b) is designedly cautious with his wording in arguing, for example, that

*interactants must at all times be cognizant of what they take to be the real-world distribution of knowledge and of rights to knowledge between them as a condition of correctly understanding how clausal utterances are to be interpreted as social actions.* (p. 24; italics in original, bolding added)

What this means, of course, is that participants, in their claims and attributions of knowledge, can and do miscalculate their respective statuses, as occurs in (10) below:

(10) Frankel: TC:1:1

- 1 Shi: → In any eve::nt?hhhhh That’s not all thet’s ne:w.  
 2 Ger: W’t e:lse.  
 3 Shi: .t.hhhhh W’l Wendy’n I hev been rilly having problems.  
 4 Ger: M-hm,  
 5 Shi: (voice becomes confiding) .hh En yesterday I talk’tih  
 6 her. .hhhh A:n’ (0.3) apparently her mother is terminal.  
 7 (0.5)  
 8 Ger: → .tch Yeh but we knew that befo[:re].  
 9 Shi: [.hhh Ri:ght. Well, (.)  
 10 now I guess it’s official.  
 11 Ger: Mm-hm.  
 12 Shi: .t.hhh So she’s very very upset.

Here, Shirley claims a knowledgeable position vis-à-vis some piece of news in line 1. Nonetheless, in line 8, Geri challenges the legitimacy of this epistemic claim, which Shirley attempts to reassert in her subsequent turn (lines 9–10). The relevant point here is that, in Heritage’s work, how an interactant’s K+ position is generated is not of import – as long as it is honored – as the precise origin of one’s K+ position does not affect the fundamental claim that it will nonetheless shape how declarative and interrogative utterances are understood in action terms (see next section; see also Heritage, 2018).<sup>16</sup>

Rather than being ‘disengaged from the details of the transcript’ (Lynch and Wong, 2016: 539) then, the details are precisely what provide the empirical grounding for concepts such as stance and status in conversation-analytic work in epistemics. In short, for Lindwall et al. (2016) to claim that, in work on epistemics, ‘sequentiality and other

potential resources seem to be taken out of the picture' (p. 504) or that it 're-introduces the notion of extra-interactional context' (p. 519) is a baffling misunderstanding of a central tenet of such work, asserted in the face of all evidence to the contrary.

*On 'craft[ing] generalizations' and 'generaliz[ability]'*. In the same vein as the critiques by Macbeth and Wong, and Lindwall et al., discussed above, Lynch and Wong (2016: 535) claim that research in epistemics 'refers to abstract gradients and scales', presumably referring to the distinction, for example, between declarative and interrogative syntax in question formulation. Elsewhere, the authors refer to 'an imagined alternative in a formal cognitive "space"' (p. 540). But as seen earlier, these alternatives do not have to be imagined; they are regularly deployed by participants themselves, who, in so doing, expose their hearable orientations to epistemic matters. In the following extract (11), Leslie moves from declarative to interrogative syntax, thereby demonstrating her orientation to the distinction between them:

(11) [Field SO(II):1:3:1-9]

1 Les: .hhhh I RANG you up- (.) ah: think it wz la:s' night.  
 2 → **But you were-** (.) **u-were you ou:t?** Or: was it the night  
 3 before perhaps.

About this case, Drew (2013: 133) writes,

Leslie discontinues a declaratively-formatted turn, *You were out*, and changes it instead into an interrogative, *Were you out?*; which is a more cautious construction, since all she may know (from 'her side'; Pomerantz, 1980) is that Hal did not answer the phone (notice that she continues more cautiously).

Cases such as this illustrate that there is no need to 'craft' 'abstract', 'imagined alternatives' 'at the expense of actual, produced and constitutive detail' – conversation-analytic inquiries into epistemics are unambiguously *anchored in* such detail.

Here again, the distinction between actions and practices becomes relevant as one considers the generalizability of conversation-analytic claims regarding epistemics: while action types extend cross-linguistically and cross-culturally as of universal import, the specific practices used to implement those actions can vary significantly. We already saw cross-linguistic variation in our initial examples of Arabic and English responsive utterances: the action of returning a greeting, for instance, remains constant across languages and cultures as a sequentially normative expectation (see Kendrick et al., 2014), yet the particular linguistic resources available to second speakers with which to *design* that action can vary. With regard to polar questions, the distinction between interrogative and declarative syntax, which is unambiguously relevant to speakers of English (as we just saw in (11)), is obviously not available (and therefore cannot be relevant) to speakers of 16% of the 842 languages surveyed by Dryer (2008) that do not possess interrogative syntax. And indeed, Heritage does not make any claim to the contrary. Rather, what he offers in his discussion of morphosyntax is effectively

a case study of the specific practices that *English* speakers routinely deploy in producing epistemically distinct actions.<sup>17,18</sup>

Of course, various practices relevantly mobilized to deal with epistemic matters have been found to pattern similarly across languages (e.g. on turn-prefacing and change-of-state tokens, see Heinemann and Koivisto, 2016; Heritage and Sorjonen, 2017; Kim and Kuroshima, 2013; on question–answer sequences, see Bolden, 2016; Enfield et al., 2017; Raymond, 2015; Stivers et al., 2010, inter alia), but this is not always the case. Take as a case in point the turn-final particle in Mandarin Chinese, ‘-a’, which Wu (2004: 128) argues exhibits a contrast-invoking property: ‘it is used to mark a discrepancy in knowledge, expectation or perspective regarding some state of affairs between the -a speaker and the prior speaker’. The epistemic implications of this particle are clearly seen in answers to questions that address presuppositional aspects of prior talk (Wu and Heritage, 2017). In the following case, the availability of barbecue in Northeastern China is presupposed in A’s comment in line 2, but B nonetheless asks whether there is barbecue in the Northeast in line 4. A’s answer to this question in line 5 includes a turn-final -a particle:

(12) (CMC\_01\_01)

- 01 A:        ruguo wo xinyun dehua>neng chi dao,=  
              if I lucky if can eat eat  
              ‘If I am lucky enough >(I’ll) be able to eat (the buns),’=  
02        =.hhh ranhou wo rang ta:: dai wo qu chi::: kaorou.=  
              then I let her take I go eat barbecue  
              =‘Then I’ll ask her:: to take me to eat::: barbecue.’=  
03        =wo bu zhidao ta- tongyi bu tongyi.  
              I N know 3sg agree N agree  
              =‘I don’t know whether or not she’d- agree.’  
04 B: → dongbei you kaorou a.  
              northeast have barbecue PRT  
              ‘There is barbecue in the Northeast?’  
05 A: → dui a.  
              right PRT  
              ‘(That’s) right A.’

As Heritage (1998) finds with *oh*-prefaced responses in English, here too a resource is deployed to mark that a prior question is unexpected and inapposite due to its questioning something that was already presupposed in prior talk (Wu and Heritage, 2017). The resource itself is of course distinct; English, unlike Mandarin, does not have turn-final particles. But practices in these typologically distinct languages appear to be managing the same distinctive epistemic issue. The general methodological point is this: that identifying a systematic interactional contingency in data from one language or speech community makes it possible to establish whether other languages have practices for managing the very same contingency. Herein lies the power and reach of CA methodology.

With respect to cross-linguistic research and issues of generalizability, our goal as conversation analysts is to uncover findings

about apparently omnipresent organizational issues and contingencies of interaction, and the practices of conduct and organization of such practices ... which can be formulated in more abstract ways that transcend different particularized embodiments in different languages and cultures but which accommodate their specifications ... (Schegloff, 2009: 373)

The growing number of cross-linguistic studies in CA all point to epistemic positioning as being a lively concern to participants engaging in social interaction. As has been repeatedly documented, the specific practices for dealing with epistemic issues can certainly vary across languages, but what remains constant is the fact that participants are deploying them *for that very purpose* – to deal with epistemic issues. Our understanding of this has not emerged through ‘crafting generalizations’, but rather has developed, again, through close examination of the ‘actual, produced, and constitutive detail’ of turn-by-turn talk.

### *On actions through practices: What linguistics does for CA and CA for linguistics*

For linguists, work in epistemics has proven attractive precisely for what it has revealed about relative knowledge as a *sequential* phenomenon. The ‘omnipresent engine of epistemic order’ invoked by Lynch and Wong 2016, as they would recognize, gives us generalization, but no bite. The irony here – that CA is often criticized by theoretical linguists for being all bite and no generalization – is not lost on us. A central attraction for those of us who work in CA has been how, starting from the bite, it has massively expanded the scope of study to include phenomena that were formerly (and, for many, still are) beyond the linguistic pale. From the earliest days, laughter has been an object of analytic interest: Sacks’ (1992) Lecture 2, from Fall 1964, entitled ‘On suicide threats getting laughed off’ (which of course predates the appearance, in 1965, of Chomsky’s ‘ideal speaker-listener’), and Jefferson’s (1979, 1984, 1985, 2004a) subsequent work on laughter opened up whole seams of interactional research for linguists, whatever their subdisciplinary affiliations, from semantics to phonetics. Jefferson’s (2010) later discussion of ‘a frog in the throat’ paved the way for further work on other sorts of vocalizations; for example, Hoey (2014) shows how sighing accomplishes specific work in interaction and that ‘the variable positioning and delivery of sighs [are] responsive to and relevant for ongoing, incipient, and concluding units of action’ (p. 196).

In turn, linguists have brought their specialisms to bear on the data of interaction, not only in the comparative data of languages other than English<sup>19</sup> but also in technical areas beyond the reach of early CA work. One such area of distinct expertise, lying outside the disciplinary origins of CA, is phonetics.<sup>20</sup> So, for example, our understanding of turn-taking has been enhanced by observations made by Local and Walker (2012) regarding the role of phonetic features in projecting either more talk or turn completion in English, and by Ogden (2004) who examines non-modal voice quality (informally, ‘creaky voice’) in signaling turn-transition in Finnish. Similarly, Clayman and Raymond (2015) offer an analysis of what they term ‘modular pivots’, focusing on how the phonetic realization of these items plays a demonstrably significant role in circumventing potential turn-transfer and retaining the floor beyond a projected transition-relevance place. In addition, Ogden’s (2013) work on clicks and percussives – part of the linguistic (i.e. phonemic) repertoire of many southern and some East African languages, but not English – shows a regular interactional distribution in English, marking incipient speakership in pre-turn position or in

mid-turn position in word searches (Wright, 2011). Ogden further observes how these sounds are intricately into, and associated with, other behaviors such as breathing and swallowing, which can also display highly systematic organization (see also Hoey, 2015).

Voice quality and clicks – the sort of phenomena that phoneticians are ideally placed to investigate – embody exactly the sort of ‘actual, produced, and constitutive detail’ that Macbeth and Wong (2016: 586) would have us accountable to. But Macbeth and Wong’s (2016) evident approval of, in their words, ‘the disciplined work of writing production accounts that are faithful to the occasion’s evident detail’ (p. 592, fn. 2) sits oddly, to say the least, with their assertion that ‘The transcript we present here [at their excerpt 1a] reduces some of the detail and symbols used by Jefferson in her original transcript’ (Macbeth and Wong, 2016: 592, fn. 4). Below, as excerpt (13a), we present lines 49–59 of the original Jefferson transcript, so we can see, at the arrowed turns, exactly the ‘detail and symbols’ discarded by Macbeth and Wong (2016: 578) in their presentation of the excerpt:

(13a) NB IV:10:R:21

49 Lot:        Yih'av no idea it's right across the street from the:::  
 50        → El Dorad\*o.  
 51 Emm: → .t Oh:↑::↓::\*::.  
 52 Lot:        Ye:ah.  
 53 Emm: → Oh not near the Indian W\*e:lls.  
 54        (1.0)  
 55 Lot: → °ihYe::ah:° (0.2) It's ih-\*i-Indian We:lls? uh well it's  
 56        a:ll Indi[an We[:lls'n P]a:lm Desert now they've cha:nged=  
 57 Emm: →                    [.hhhh[ Ye\*ah.]  
 58 Lot:        =it yihkn [ow tuh P]a:lm De:sert,  
 59 Emm:        [Yeah:. ]

Table 1 shows the original Jefferson transcriptions and their corresponding simplification by Macbeth and Wong.

In addition, the alignment of the transcript in Macbeth and Wong is such that line 57 appears to be produced much later – a full syllable later – than the original shows it to be.<sup>21</sup> This is the kind of ‘detail’ that Macbeth and Wong apparently deem dispensable; and yet, as we have seen, it is in just these kinds of phenomena – voice quality, clicks, intonation and overlap placement – that conversation analysts can test the robustness of Sacks’ (1984) initial methodological assumption of ‘order at all points’ (p. 22; see Hepburn and Bolden, 2017; Jefferson, 2004).

Let us examine just one example from Table 1: the ‘Oh’ at line 51, stripped, in the transcription by Macbeth and Wong, of its prefacing, turn-initial dental click (Wright, 2011), the non-modal voice quality (Ogden, 2004) and – something which is unmistakable when listening to the audio recording – a very distinctive rising/falling intonation. The last of these features, the intonation, is precisely the subject of Local (1996), an article that investigates a variety of prosodic features of *oh*, including voice quality (with many instances of non-modal voice quality accompanying *oh*) and intonation contour. Based on a robust collection of *ohs*, Local (1996) demonstrates that the rising/falling pitch contour accompanying the production of *oh* routinely accomplishes

**Table 1.** Comparison of Jefferson, and Macbeth and Wong's transcripts.

Line	Jefferson	Macbeth and Wong	Omitted
50	<u>E</u> l <u>D</u> or <u>a</u> d*o.	El <u>T</u> orrero	Non-modal voice quality (NMVQ) Stress
51	.t Oh:↑::↓::*::	Oh:::	Turn-initial dental click NMVQ Intonation Extent of lengthening
53	Indian <u>W</u> *e:lls.	Indian <u>W</u> e:lls.	NMVQ
55	ih-*i-Indian <u>W</u> e:lls?	ih-i-Indian <u>W</u> e:lls	NMVQ Turn-final intonation
57	[.hhhh[ <u>Y</u> e*ah. ]	[.hhhh[ <u>Y</u> eah. ]	NMVQ

'displays of having been misinformed and displays of forgetfulness' (p. 205). Moreover, he goes on to show that such a contour on *oh* 'prefaces more talk from the same speaker, which has an explicit display of the previous misinformedness or forgetfulness' (Local, 1996). Examining Jefferson's transcript at (13a) earlier, it is clear that Emma's 'oh' at line 51 is followed, after a brief acknowledgment by Lottie, by more talk from Emma at line 53, which indeed has an explicit display – 'oh not near the Indian Wells' – of her previous misinformedness. This sequence yields further evidence to support Local's analysis. But, of course, position can only be informative when combined with the 'actual, produced and constitutive detail' of composition. The excerpt of the transcription reproduced below makes plain that Macbeth and Wong's omission of such compositional particulars – here, the rising/falling intonation at line 51 – would make such analysis impossible:

(13b) (Macbeth and Wong, 2016: 578)

49 Lot: Yih'av no idea it's right across the street from the:::  
 50 El Torrero.  
 51 Emm: → Oh:::  
 52 Lot: Ye:ah.  
 53 Emm: Oh not near the Indian We:lls.

Local (1996) shows that a freestanding *oh* accompanied by a terminal falling pitch movement, as presented in Macbeth and Wong's transcription at line 51, is a different interactional object from that in fact produced by these participants and originally transcribed by Jefferson: they are, in other words, distinct practices. Cavalier disregard for 'detail and symbols' cannot but have analytic implications.<sup>22</sup>

Such research produced by linguists with specific technical expertise has extended and consolidated work in CA beyond its original home base. But of course, the research territory is today broader still: *any* audiovisual conduct that accompanies or even replaces the verbal has now been brought to the analytic table; so, to give but one example, the whole realm of embodied interaction and gaze (pioneered by Goodwin, 1979, 1981) is a flourishing research enterprise (see e.g. Streeck et al., 2011).

But if CA has redefined for many the boundaries of linguistic research, it has also, just as crucially, interrogated and, in many cases, reconfigured our units of analysis. The convergence of linguistic concerns with CA methods has frequently revealed the limits of linguistic categories as descriptively adequate for interaction. So, for example, Curl et al. (2006), investigating the phonetic properties of utterance repetitions in interaction, note that:

we have found no evidence that ‘prosody’, as commonly conceived, is relevant or useful in explaining participants’ understandings of utterances. That is, the separate and individuated treatment of phonetic resources which are typically dubbed ‘prosodic’ does not seem to be warranted by the observable behaviour of participants. This is not to say that resources which might fall under the rubric of ‘prosody’ are not at work here: they plainly are. However, we have shown that these resources only form a part of the practice, which incorporates features of lexis, articulatory details, loudness, duration, syllabic make-up, and a variety of pitch characteristics. Furthermore, the part played by ‘prosodic’ resources seems no greater than that played by others. (p. 1748)

The notion that ‘prosody’ is a defensible linguistic category is here deftly dismantled because *it does not seem to be warranted by the observable behavior of participants*. And it is in investigating the *practice* (for Curl et al., of utterance repetitions) that this conclusion is reached.

This is not, of course, to claim that CA is simply dismantling linguistic categories wholesale, but to show the necessity of embedding those categories in interactional warrants. So, for example, Thompson and Couper-Kuhlen (2005) provide evidence from both English and Japanese to suggest that a grammatical entity – the clause – is indeed a locus of interactional order, even if the ways in which it affords projectability vary with the resources of the particular language. As they note, ‘in each case the *practices* used are precisely the ones which the clausal grammatical formats in the given language promote’ (Thompson and Couper-Kuhlen, 2005: 481, italics ours).

Work in epistemics has its origins in exactly the same method of starting with the practice. Heritage and Raymond’s (2005) foundational article brings together observations on the practice of *oh*-prefacing (Heritage, 2002a) with Raymond’s (2003) study of responses to yes–no interrogatives and Schegloff’s (1996a) repetition-enacted confirming allusions. From Schegloff comes the initial distinction between affirmation and confirmation, which Raymond builds on in positing a distinction between answers that are type-conforming and those that are nonconforming. From Heritage comes a particularization of *oh*’s change-of-state semantics to the sequential context of responses to assessments, the *oh* indexing epistemic independence or priority relative to a first assessment. In all three cases, we see responsive practices that are deployed systematically and ‘for cause’ by participants, with Heritage and Raymond linking these (and other, e.g. Heritage, 2002b) practices together in their examination of how social actors manage epistemic rights when making assessments. To again quote Schegloff (1996a: 194), ‘the apparently petty “who is agreeing with whom” [...] *can* and *does* matter’, and what Heritage and Raymond (2005) provide is an analysis of the means by which this is demonstrably achieved by and for interactants.

Aside from the obvious (and, in this responsive Special Issue, oft-iterated) point that this hardly constitutes a ‘program’, these origins are worth remembering for what they show us about how such work evolved: through attention, in the first place, to *practices* of interaction. The first two sections of Schegloff’s article on confirming allusions concern actions, and describing actions. The next, where he introduces the data, is entitled ‘Initial Noticings, and a Puzzle’. Having presented the excerpts (in this article, reproduced as (5) and (6) earlier), Schegloff (1996a) writes, ‘The initial puzzle was, Is something special going on here? What are these repeats doing? Or, more precisely, what (if anything) are these repeats being distinctively used to do when employed as the means for agreeing or confirming?’ (p. 175). In the discovery of action, it is thus with the eye-catching *practice* that CA inquiry begins, where epistemic research has its source, and with which linguistics is increasingly having to come to terms.

## Conclusion

While the understanding of language as action traces its origins to Wittgenstein (1953) and subsequently Austin (1962), within linguistics it has found its most influential expression in Searle’s (1975) program of Speech Act Theory. However, while Speech Act Theory in principle puts action at its center, it lacks any engagement with actual *practice* and so is correspondingly inattentive to how we come to recognize individual *actions* as such. The enterprise within Speech Act Theory of mapping functions onto forms *in vacuo* (e.g. Searle, 1975) necessarily disengages action from sequential context. With no recourse to the details of practices in context, this enterprise has inevitably stalled (on which, see Heritage, 2012b: 2).

It is perhaps ironic that the rationalist, cognitive turn in linguistics, while resolutely non-empirical in principle, has in fact mandated a search for universals – not least in Chomsky’s (1965) postulation of a Universal Grammar. Debate concerning the existence or otherwise of such universals has been vigorous (see e.g. Evans and Levinson, 2009; Levinson and Evans, 2010). However, the most prominent such debate concerning one putative universal, syntactic recursion (see e.g. Everett, 2005; Jackendoff and Pinker, 2005, and the responses in Nevins et al., 2009) has dissolved into acrimonious disputes concerning data quality and standards of evidence (for a summary, see Pullum, 2012). Within linguistics, then, the search for universals appears to have hit a roadblock.

In the face of such a methodological impasse in linguistics, it has become increasingly clear that the empirical methods of CA are providing a way through. We have, in the preceding pages, shown how CA enables us to gain traction on the construction of action through the identification of specific interactional practices. One of the less anticipated implications of such work, albeit no less significant, is the light it has shed on the search for universals. While the pioneering work in CA was done on English, it is clear that its methods take us way beyond its original linguistic home – the Arabic, Lao and Mandarin cited in this article providing only samples of the research being conducted on other languages. Such comparative work is repeatedly revealing that universals reside not, as linguists have assumed, in the structure of languages, but rather in what Schegloff calls the ‘procedural infrastructure of interaction’ (Schegloff,

1992: 1338): the preconditions for interaction itself. So turn-taking, the organization of sequences, the organization of repair mechanisms in talk, the conversational preference for particular actions – all part of that procedural infrastructure – are proving to be empirically robust across the structural variation and diversity of languages and language groups (see e.g. Clift, 2016; Enfield et al., 2017; Kendrick et al., 2014; Stivers et al., 2010). And, of course, such cross-linguistic analysis is also able to identify the extent to which specific practices may be universal. So, to take a simple example from the domain of repair, an initial survey of 21 languages by Enfield et al. (2013) provides further evidence of some remarkable commonalities across one particular practice for other-initiated repair. English has *Huh?* as a primary interjection strategy (Bloomfield, 1933: 176). It turns out that, in the languages surveyed,<sup>23</sup> such open-class repair initiators (Drew, 1997) show a strikingly similar phonetic form: a monosyllable featuring an open non-back vowel [a,æ,ə,ʌ], often nasalized, sometimes with an [h] onset and usually with rising intonation (Enfield et al., 2013: 343). This has led Dingemans et al. (2013) to propose, on a subset of 10 languages, that *Huh?* is, in fact, a universal word.

Thus, the methods of CA – which originated with someone, of course, who was not investigating language *per se* – have been mobilized by researchers with linguistic expertise to identify the particular practices that implement actions both in and across languages. In doing so, they are illuminating an issue central to linguistics; the effect has been to throw a gestalt switch on our understanding of the origins and development of language itself. As Levinson (2000) observes,

... language is held to be essentially universal, whereas language use is thought to be more open to cultural influences. But the reverse may in fact be far more plausible: there is obvious cultural codification of many aspects of language from phoneme to syntactic construction, whereas the uncoded, low-level background of usage principles or strategies may be fundamentally culture-independent ... Underlying presumptions, heuristics and principles of usage may be more immune to cultural influence simply because they are prerequisites for the system to work at all, preconditions even for learning language. (p. xiv)

As the work of Heritage makes clear, one fundamentally culture-independent part of that universal infrastructure, ‘an object of massive orientation’ (Heritage, 2012b: 25), is located in who knows what, and who is entitled to know what. And it is just this that (to cite but one example) throws light on the form-function conundrum in linguistics, showing us how interrogative morphosyntax and prosody may be overridden by epistemic concerns.

If linguists’ understanding of what is universal is, thanks to CA, undergoing a paradigm shift, so equally has our understanding of how knowledge is constituted in interaction: as an emergent, oriented-to, *sequential* matter. It is deeply ironic that Lynch and Wong (2016) characterize what they call the ‘Epistemics Program’ as cognitivist ‘in the way it emphasizes information exchange as an underlying, extrasituational “driver” in social interaction’ (p. 526), because, for increasing numbers of linguists, conversation-analytic work in epistemics is so clearly distinctive from (Fischer, 2015) and *supercedes* the cognitivist, linguistic model of information exchange. That it does so is due, in no small part, to the ‘empirical bite’ that linguistics has been lacking.

Local (1996) notes that in 1935 the British linguist JR Firth called for a form of enquiry that treated speech forms as contextualized productions, and in doing so warned against developing nothing more than ‘a loose linguistic sociology without formal accuracy’ (Firth, 1935: 36, quoted in Local, 1996: 179). As we have illustrated here, that formal accuracy is to be located in the analysis of ‘actual, produced and constitutive detail’ in collections of cases.

This much is uncontroversial: CA is a flourishing research enterprise (see Sidnell and Stivers, 2013),<sup>24</sup> and has developed in ways utterly unforeseen in its early days. But since at least Sacks et al. (1974), there has been a strand which is distinctively linguistic. And increasingly, linguists are finding in the synergy between CA methods and linguistic inquiry insights that enrich and transform both. The truth is, plainly, that Lynch’s ‘jugernaut’, albeit a vivid and striking rhetorical device, never really existed.

### Acknowledgements

The authors are deeply indebted to Galina Bolden, Steve Clayman, Paul Drew, Barbara Fox, John Heritage, Doug Maynard and Geoff Raymond for their scrupulous reading of previous drafts of this article. Their comments have encouraged us to clarify and refine various parts of our argument. The authors alone are responsible for any remaining shortcomings.

### Declaration of conflicting interests

The author(s) declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

### Funding

The author(s) received no financial support for the research, authorship and/or publication of this article.

### Notes

1. Notwithstanding that a major contributor to their volume is an applied linguist, Jean Wong.
2. It is no accident that in the 2012 Special Issue of *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, which is the main target of Lynch et al.’s critique, the invited commentators comprised not only a sociologist (Drew), but also, by training and institutional commitment, an anthropologist (Sidnell) and linguist (Clift).
3. ‘From early on it seemed clear that some parts of the enterprise of understanding conversation would rest heavily on the contribution of linguists’ (Schegloff, 1996d: 53; see also Clift, 2016).
4. Moreover, as Joseph (2003: 463) points out, Sacks et al. (1974) is ‘by far the most cited’ article to have appeared in the journal since its inception in 1924.
5. Schegloff’s continuing engagement with linguistics is evident at all stages of his work, from earlier to later articles (e.g. Schegloff, 1979, 1988, 1996b, 1998, 2005).
6. We thank Faye Abu Abah for use of these excerpts from her data.
7. Note that the transcription of the Arabic might suggest that lines 1 and 2 consist of single words, but this of course represents the articulation of what is standardly transliterated as (in line 1) the greeting *as-salamu alaykum* and (in line 2) its return *wa’alaykumu as-salām*.
8. For a mixed quantitative/qualitative demonstration of this, regarding a particular practice for soliciting accounts from recipients, see Raymond and Stivers (2016).

9. Notwithstanding the exception, in (4), of the deictic shift from 'you' to 'I'.
10. Indeed, see Lynch and Wong (2016: 542) for more explicit evidence of the authors' distaste for – or perhaps simple lack of interest in engaging with – collections of interactional phenomena.
11. Indeed, it is relevant to note that this relationship between collection-building and single case analyses is also embodied in the history of Conversation Analysis's key publications: it was only after more than a decade of publishing on collections of phenomena – that is, after a rigorously defensible analysis of key organizational domains had been established – that Schegloff (1980) published his single case analysis, which brought precisely those collections-based findings to bear *on* a single case. We are indebted to Geoff Raymond for this observation.
12. In this respect, Button and Sharrock's (2016) reference to 'the fine details of transcript *interpretation*' (p. 612, our emphasis), rather than analysis, is revealing (see also next note).
13. Button and Sharrock (2016: 611–612) go so far as to assert that the criticism invoked in the articles 'mainly turns into disputing the fine details of transcript interpretation'.
14. Gail Jefferson, the original transcriber of this extract, included a footnote to this line of the transcript, writing the following: "'eh-ihHe" as a possible start on "eh-ih Have you eaten yet?" It appears that, like Heritage, Jefferson too was interested in the possible relevance of declarative versus interrogative syntax (see next subsection).
15. Moreover, the proposed 'alternative' analysis invites the question as to how participants go about interpreting those turns that do *not* include some sort of overt lexeme like 'tell' – which, to be sure, constitute the vast majority of declaratively formatted utterances. This is of course setting aside the fact that, in order to read the Lindwall et al. (2016) account as a critique at all, one would have to argue that an explicit claim of K+ status (e.g. via 'tell X') constitutes evidence *against* the notion that K+ status is meaningful in interaction. Such an argument strikes us as puzzling to say the least.
16. This is, of course, not to say that future conversation-analytic research cannot make this issue – that is, sources from which one's K+ status can be generated – a targeted topic of inquiry, but simply that it has not yet been fleshed out as such because it did not affect the claims Heritage was making.
17. Nonetheless, the distinction between interrogative and declarative syntax has indeed proven significant and relevant well beyond English, in other languages that possess this distinction in their grammar (see e.g. Raymond, 2015; Stivers et al., 2010).
18. Another example of cross-linguistic variation can be found in interrogative intonation: while in some languages, like English, interrogative intonation is achieved with a rising contour, in others (e.g. Icelandic, Cha'palaa) it is falling (Dingemanse et al., 2013). Thus the specific linguistic design of the practice is distinct cross-linguistically, despite similarities in what the practice is mobilized to accomplish – for example, in the case of interrogative intonation, to question, to index non-finality or uncertainty (Gussenhoven, 2004), or to mobilize response (Stivers and Rossano, 2010).
19. Clift (2016) makes reference to CA methods used in research in the following languages: †Akhoe Hai||om, Arabic, LSA (*Lengua de Señas Argentina*, Argentinian Sign Language), Bequian Creole, Bikol, Cebuano, Cha'palaa, Chintang, Danish, Duna, Dutch, Finnish, French, Garrwa, German, Guyanese Creole, Hebrew, Hungarian, Icelandic, Ilokano, Indonesian, Italian, Japanese, Korean, Kri, Lahu, Lao, Mandarin, Murrinh-Patha, Norwegian, Polish, Portuguese, Quiche, Russian, Siwu, Spanish, Thai, Tsou, Tzeltal, Tzotzil, Yéfi Dnye, Yucatec Maya and Yurakaré.
20. Which is not to claim that phenomena standardly labeled 'phonetic' had not been examined in such work; see, for example, Jefferson (1974, 1983) for explicit engagements with such matters.

21. As, for example, Jefferson (1986) makes clear, evidence from overlap yields strong evidence for speakers' fine judgment in the placement of their turns, and certainly within the range of a spoken syllable. To put this in context, Greenberg (1999), on a 4-hour phonetically transcribed sample of spontaneous talk, finds that the mean average time to produce a syllable of spoken English is 200 milliseconds (p. 170).
22. It cannot go without mention that transcription details are but one of the inconsistencies in Macbeth and Wong's work. Macbeth and Wong (2016) is unambiguously an attack on Heritage's (1984) analysis of *oh* as a token that signals a 'change of state of knowledge, information, orientation or awareness' (p. 299). Nonetheless, both of these authors have previously incorporated this very analysis in their own prior work. For instance, Macbeth (1990: 208) writes that, with *oh*, a speaker in an excerpt under analysis 'claims, finally, his understanding of the matters the teacher has been speaking of'. The author does the same in the examination of another sequence, wherein he writes that a certain utterance is 'received with the student's *Oh* in line 7, as he proceeds to answer *in light of this new understanding* of what the question was' (Macbeth 2004: 728–729, our emphasis). An even more explicit endorsement of Heritage's work is found in Wong (2004: 123) who, in a study of conversations involving second-language speakers, notes that a speaker's 'turn initial item *Oh*, which is followed by three acknowledgment tokens (*yeah:: yeah:: yeah::*), signals a change of information state (Heritage, 1984) or understanding "just now"'. It would appear, then, that the distaste with which these authors view Heritage's analysis of *oh* is as inconsistent as it is unsubstantiated.
23. The languages surveyed, with their locations in square brackets and interjection forms in round brackets, are †Akhoe Hai||om [Namibia] (hɛ), Cha'palaa [Ecuador] (a:), Chintang [Nepal] (hã), Duna [Papua New Guinea] (ẽ:/hm), Dutch [Netherlands] (hə), English [UK] (hã/hm), French [France] (ɛ̃), Hungarian [Hungary] (hm(ha)), Icelandic [Iceland] (ha), Italian [Italy] (ɛ:), Kri [Laos] (ha:), Lao [Laos] (hã:), Mandarin Chinese [Taiwan] (hã:), Murrinh-Patha [Australia] (a:), Russian [Russia] (ha), Siwu [Ghana] (hã), Spanish [Spain] (e), Tzeltal [Mexico] (hai), Yéli-Dnye [Papua New Guinea] (ẽ), Yurakaré [Bolivia] (æ/a) and LSA (Argentine Sign Language).
24. For example, the last International Conference on Conversation Analysis (ICCA) at The University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA) in 2014 took place over 5 days (plus an additional 3 days of pre-conference workshops), boasted nearly 500 attendees, and included 9 parallel sessions each day.

## References

- Austin JL (1962) *How To Do Things With Words*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Bloomfield L (1933) *Language*. New York: Holt.
- Bolden GB (2016) A simple da? Affirming responses to polar questions in Russian conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics* 100: 40–58.
- Button G and Sharrock W (2016) In support of conversation analysis' radical agenda. *Discourse Studies* 18(5): 610–620.
- Chomsky N (1965) *Aspects of the Theory of Syntax*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
- Clayman SE and Raymond CW (2015) Modular pivots: A resource for extending turns at talk. *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 48(4): 388–405.
- Clift R (2012) Who knew? A view from linguistics. *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 45(1): 69–75.
- Clift R (2016) *Conversation Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Clift R, Drew P and Local J (2013) Why that, now? Position and composition in interaction (or, don't forget the position in composition). In: Kempson R, Howes C and Orwin M (eds) *Language, Music and Interaction*. London: College Publications, pp. 211–232.

- Curl T, Local J and Walker G (2006) Repetition and the prosody–pragmatics interface. *Journal of Pragmatics* 38: 1721–1751.
- Dingemanse M, Torreira F and Enfield NJ (2013) Is ‘huh?’ a universal word? Conversational infrastructure and the convergent evolution of linguistic items. *PLoS ONE* 8(11): e78273.
- Drew P (1997) ‘Open’ class repair initiators in response to sequential sources of troubles in conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics* 28: 69–101.
- Drew P (2013) Turn design. In: Sidnell J and Stivers T (eds) *The Handbook of Conversation Analysis*. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell, pp. 131–149.
- Dryer MS (2008) Polar questions. In: Haspelmath M, Dryer SD, Gil D, et al. (eds) *The World Atlas of Language Structures Online*, vol. 116. Munich: Max Planck Digital Library. Available at: <http://wals.info/feature/116> (accessed 5 September 2009).
- Enfield N (2010) Questions and responses in Lao. *Journal of Pragmatics* 42: 2649–2665.
- Enfield N, Stivers T, Brown P, et al. (2017) Polar answers. *MS*.
- Enfield N, Dingemanse M, Baranova J, et al. (2013) Huh? What? – A first survey in 21 languages. In: Hayashi M, Raymond G and Sidnell J (eds) *Conversational Repair and Human Understanding*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 343–380.
- Evans N and Levinson SC (2009) The myth of language universals: Language diversity and its importance for cognitive science. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences* 32: 429–492.
- Everett D (2005) Cultural constraints on grammar and cognition in Pirahã: Another look at the design features of human language. *Current Anthropology* 46: 621–646.
- Everett D (2005) Pirahã culture and grammar: A response to some criticisms. *Language* 85(3): 405–442.
- Fischer K (2015) Conversation, construction grammar, and cognition. *Language and Cognition* 7(4): 563–588.
- Fox BA (1987) *Discourse Structure and Anaphora: Written and Conversational English*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Garfinkel H (1967) *Studies in Ethnomethodology*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Goodwin C (1979) The interactive construction of a sentence in natural conversation. In: Psathas G (ed.) *Everyday Language: Studies in Ethnomethodology*. New York: Irvington Publishers, pp. 97–121.
- Goodwin C (1981) *Conversational Organization: Interaction between Speakers and Hearers*. New York: Academic Press.
- Greenberg S (1999) Speaking in shorthand: A syllable-centric perspective for understanding pronunciation variation. *Speech Communication* 29: 159–176.
- Gussenhoven C (2004) *The Phonology of Tone and Intonation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Heinemann T and Koivisto A (eds) (2016) Indicating a change-of-state in interaction: Cross-linguistic explorations. *Journal of Pragmatics* 104: 83–210.
- Hepburn A and Bolden GB (2017) *Transcribing for Social Research*. London: SAGE.
- Heritage J (1984) A change-of-state token and aspects of its sequential placement. In: Atkinson JA and Heritage J (eds) *Structures of Social Action: Studies in Conversation Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 299–345.
- Heritage J (1998) Oh-prefaced responses to inquiry. *Language in Society* 27(3): 291–334.
- Heritage J (2002a) Oh-prefaced responses to assessments: A method of modifying agreement/disagreement. In: Ford CE, Fox B and Thompson S (eds) *The Language of Turn and Sequence*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 196–224.
- Heritage J (2002b) The limits of questioning: Negative interrogatives and hostile question content. *Journal of Pragmatics* 34(10–11): 1427–1446.
- Heritage J (2008) Conversation analysis as social theory. In: Turner B (ed.) *The New Blackwell Companion to Social Theory*. Oxford: Blackwell, pp. 300–320.

- Heritage J (2011) Territories of knowledge, territories of experience: Empathic moments in interaction. In: Stivers T, Mondada L and Steensig J (eds) *The Morality of Knowledge in Conversation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 159–183.
- Heritage J (2012a) Beyond and behind the words: Some reactions to my commentators. *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 45(1): 76–81.
- Heritage J (2012b) Epistemics in action: Action formation and territories of knowledge. *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 45(1): 1–29.
- Heritage J (2012c) The epistemic engine: Sequence organization and territories of knowledge. *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 45(1): 30–52.
- Heritage J (2015) Well-prefaced turns in English conversation: A conversation analytic perspective. *Journal of Pragmatics* 88: 88–104.
- Heritage J (2018) The Ubiquity of Epistemics: A Rebuttal to the “Epistemics of Epistemics” Group. *Discourse Studies* 20(1): 14–56.
- Heritage J and Raymond G (2005) The terms of agreement: Indexing epistemic authority and subordination in assessment sequences. *Social Psychology Quarterly* 68(1): 15–38.
- Heritage J and Sorjonen M-L (eds) (2017) *At the Intersection of Turn and Sequence: Turn-initial Particles across Languages*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Hoey E (2014) Sighing in interaction: Somatic, semiotic, and social. *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 47(2): 175–200.
- Hoey E (2015) Lapses: How people arrive at, and deal with, discontinuities in talk. *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 48(4): 430–453.
- Jackendoff R and Pinker S (2005) The nature of the language faculty and its implications for the evolution of language (Reply to Chomsky, Hauser and Fitch). *Cognition* 97(2): 211–225.
- Jackson C (2013) Why do these people’s opinions matter? Positioning known referents as unnameable others. *Discourse Studies* 15(3): 299–317.
- Jefferson G (1974) Error correction as an interactional resource. *Language in Society* 3(2): 181–199.
- Jefferson G (1979) A technique for inviting laughter and its subsequent acceptance/declination. In: Psathas G (ed.) *Everyday Language: Studies in Ethnomethodology*. New York: Irvington Publishers, pp. 79–96.
- Jefferson G (1980) On ‘trouble-premonitory’ response to inquiry. *Sociological Inquiry* 50: 153–185.
- Jefferson G (1983) Another failed hypothesis: Pitch/loudness as relevant to overlap resolution. *Tilburg Papers in Language and Literature* 38: 1–24.
- Jefferson G (1984) On the organization of laughter in talk about troubles. In: Atkinson M and Heritage J (eds) *Structures of Social Action: Studies in Conversation Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 346–369.
- Jefferson G (1985) An exercise in the transcription and analysis of laughter. In: van Dijk TA (ed.) *Handbook of Discourse Analysis*, vol. 3. New York: Academic Press, pp. 25–34.
- Jefferson G (1986) Notes on ‘latency’ in overlap onset. *Human Studies* 9 (2–3): 153–183.
- Jefferson G (2004a) A note on laughter in ‘male–female’ interaction. *Discourse Studies* 6(1): 117–133.
- Jefferson G (2004b) Glossary of transcript symbols with an introduction. In: Lerner GH (ed.) *Conversation Analysis: Studies from the First Generation*. Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins, pp. 13–31.
- Jefferson G (2010) Sometimes a frog in your throat is just a frog in your throat: Gutturals as (sometimes) laughter-implicative. *Journal of Pragmatics* 42: 1476–1484.
- Joseph BD (2003) The editor’s department: Reviewing our contents. *Language* 79(3): 461–463.

- Kendrick KH, Brown P, Dingemanse M, et al. (2014) Sequence organization: A universal infrastructure for action. In: 4th International Conference on Conversation Analysis, Nijmegen, 25–29 June. Los Angeles, CA: University of California.
- Kim HRS and Kuroshima S (eds) (2013) Turn beginnings in interaction. *Journal of Pragmatics* 57: 267–273.
- Levinson SC (2000) *Presumptive Meanings: The Theory of Generalized Conversational Implicature*. Cambridge MA: The MIT Press.
- Levinson SC and Evans N (2010) Time for a sea-change in linguistics: Response to comments on ‘the myth of language universals’. *Lingua* 120(12): 2733–2758.
- Lindwall O, Lymer G and Ivarsson J (2016) Epistemic status and the recognizability of social actions. *Discourse Studies* 18(5): 500–525.
- Local JK Conversational phonetics: Some aspects of news receipts in everyday talk. In: Couper-Kuhlen E and Selting M (eds) *Prosody in Conversation: Interactional Studies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 177–230.
- Local JK and Walker G (2012) How phonetic features project more talk. *Journal of the International Phonetic Association* 42(3): 255–280.
- Lynch M (2016a) Radical ethnomethodology. Position paper for Meeting at Manchester Metropolitan University. Available at: <https://radicalethno.org/documents/lynchposition.pdf> (accessed 22–23 June 2016).
- Lynch M (ed.) (2016b) Special issue: The epistemics of epistemics. *Discourse Studies*.
- Lynch M and Macbeth D (2016) The epistemics of epistemics: An introduction. *Discourse Studies* 18(5): 493–499.
- Lynch M and Wong J (2016) Reverting to a hidden interactional order: Epistemics, informationism, and conversation analysis. *Discourse Studies* 18(5): 526–549.
- Macbeth D (2004) The relevance of repair for classroom correction. *Language in Society* 33(5): 703–736.
- Macbeth D and Wong J (2016) The story of ‘oh’, part 2: Animating transcript. *Discourse Studies* 18(5): 574–596.
- Macbeth D, Wong J and Lynch M (2016) The story of ‘oh’, part 1: Indexing structure, animating transcript. *Discourse Studies* 18(5): 550–573.
- Macbeth DH (1990) Classroom order as practical action: The making and un-making of a quiet reproach. *British Journal of Sociology of Education* 11(2): 189–214.
- Mikesell L, Bolden G, Mandelbaum JS, et al. (2017) At the intersection of epistemics and action: Responding with I know. *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 50(3): 1–18.
- Nevins A, Pesetsky D and Rodrigues C (2009) Evidence and argumentation: A reply to Everett (2009). *Language* 85(3): 671–681.
- Ogden R (2004) Non-modal voice quality and turntaking in Finnish. In: Couper-Kuhlen E and Ford CE (eds) *Sound Patterns in Interaction: Cross-linguistic Studies from Conversation*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pp. 29–62.
- Ogden R (2013) Clicks and percussives in English conversation. *Journal of the International Phonetic Association* 43(3): 299–320.
- Pillet-Shore D (2003) Doing ‘okay’: On the multiple metrics of an assessment. *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 36(3): 285–319.
- Pomerantz AM (1980) Telling my side: ‘Limited access’ as a ‘fishing’ device. *Sociological Inquiry* 50: 186–198.
- Pomerantz AM (1984) Agreeing and disagreeing with assessments: Some features of preferred/dispreferred turn shapes. In: Atkinson JM and Heritage J (eds) *Structures of Social Action: Studies in Conversation Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 57–101.
- Pullum GK (2012) The rise and fall of a venomous dispute. Available at: <http://www.chronicle.com/blogs/linguafranca/2012/03/28/poisonous-dispute/> (accessed 6 August 2017).

- Raymond CW (2015) Questions and responses in Spanish monolingual and Spanish–English bilingual conversation. *Language & Communication* 42: 50–68.
- Raymond CW and Stivers T (2016) The omnirelevance of accountability: Off-record account solicitations. In: Robinson JD (ed.) *Accountability in Social Interaction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 321–353.
- Raymond G (2003) Grammar and social organization: Yes/no interrogatives and the structure of responding. *American Sociological Review* 68: 939–967.
- Sacks H (1984) Notes on methodology. In: Atkinson JM and Heritage J (eds) *Structures of Social Action: Studies in Conversation Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 21–27.
- Sacks H (1992) *Lectures on Conversation*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Sacks H, Schegloff EA and Jefferson G (1974) A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation. *Language* 50: 696–735.
- Schegloff EA (1968) Sequencing in conversational openings. *American Anthropologist* 70: 1075–1095.
- Schegloff EA (1979) The relevance of repair for syntax-for-conversation. In: Givon T (ed.) *Syntax and Semantics 12: Discourse and Syntax*. New York: Academic Press, pp. 261–288.
- Schegloff EA (1980) Preliminaries to preliminaries: Can I ask you a question? *Sociological Inquiry* 50: 104–152.
- Schegloff EA (1987) Analyzing single episodes of interaction: An exercise in conversation analysis. *Social Psychology Quarterly* 50(2): 101–114.
- Schegloff EA (1988) Presequences and indirection: Applying speech act theory to ordinary conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics* 12: 55–62.
- Schegloff EA (1991) Reflections on talk and social structure. In: Boden D and Zimmerman DH (eds) *Talk and Social Structure*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, pp. 44–70.
- Schegloff EA (1992) Repair after next turn: The last structurally provided for place for the defense of intersubjectivity in conversation. *American Journal of Sociology* 95(5): 1295–1345.
- Schegloff EA (1993) Reflections on quantification in the study of conversation. *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 26: 99–128.
- Schegloff EA (1996a) Confirming allusions: Toward an empirical account of action. *American Journal of Sociology* 102(1): 161–216.
- Schegloff EA (1996b) Issues of relevance for discourse analysis: Contingency in action, interaction and co-participant context. In: Hovy EH and Scott D (eds) *Computational and Conversational Discourse: Burning Issues – an Interdisciplinary Account*. Heidelberg: Springer-Verlag, pp. 3–38.
- Schegloff EA (1996c) Some practices for referring to persons in talk-in interaction: A partial sketch of a systematics. In: Fox B (ed.) *Studies in Anaphora*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pp. 437–485.
- Schegloff EA (1996d) Turn organization: One intersection of grammar and interaction. In: Ochs E, Thompson S and Schegloff E (eds) *Interaction and Grammar*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 52–133.
- Schegloff EA (1997) Practices and actions: Boundary cases of other-initiated repair. *Discourse Processes* 23: 3499–3545.
- Schegloff EA (1998) Reflections on studying prosody in talk-in-interaction. *Language and Speech* 41(3–4): 235–263.
- Schegloff EA (2002) Opening sequencing. In: Katz JE and Aakhus M (eds) *Perpetual Contact: Mobile Communication, Private Talk, Public Performance*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 326–385.
- Schegloff EA (2005) On integrity in inquiry ... of the investigated, not the investigator. *Discourse Studies* 7(4–5): 455–480.

- Schegloff EA (2007) *Sequence Organization in Interaction: A Primer in Conversation Analysis*, vol. 1. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Schegloff EA (2009) One perspective on *Conversation Analysis: Comparative Perspectives*. In: Sidnell J (ed.) *Conversation Analysis: Comparative Perspectives*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 357–406.
- Schegloff EA and Sacks H (1973) Opening up closings. *Semiotica* 8(4): 289–327.
- Schegloff EA, Jefferson G and Sacks H (1977) The preference for self-correction in the organization of repair in conversation. *Language* 53: 361–382.
- Searle JR (1975) Indirect Speech Acts. In: Cole P and Morgan J (eds) *Syntax and Semantics*, Vol. III. New York: Academic Press.
- Sidnell J and Stivers T (eds) (2013) *The Handbook of Conversation Analysis*. Malden, MA: John Wiley & Sons.
- Steenisg J and Heinemann T (2016) Throwing the baby out with the bath water? Commentary on the criticism of the ‘Epistemic Program’. *Discourse Studies* 18(5): 597–609.
- Stivers T (2007) Alternative recognitionals in initial references to persons. In: Enfield NJ and Stivers T (eds) *Person Reference in Interaction: Linguistic, Cultural, and Social Perspectives*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 73–96.
- Stivers T (2010) An overview of the question-response system in American English. *Journal of Pragmatics* 42(10): 2772–2781.
- Stivers T and Hayashi M (2010) Transformative answers: One way to resist a question’s constraints. *Language in Society* 39: 1–25.
- Stivers T and Rossano F (2010) Mobilizing response. *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 43: 3–31.
- Stivers T, Enfield NJ and Levinson SC (eds) (2010) Question-response sequences in conversation across ten languages. *Journal of Pragmatics* 42: 2615–2860.
- Streeck J, Charles G and Curtis L (eds) (2011) *Embodied Interaction: Language and Body in the Material World*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Thompson SA and Couper-Kuhlen E (2005) The clause as a locus of grammar and interaction. *Language and Linguistics* 6(4): 807–837.
- Wittgenstein L (1953) *Philosophical Investigations* (trans. GEM Anscombe). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Wong J (2004) Some preliminary thoughts on delay as an interactional resource. In: Gardner R and Wagner J (eds) *Second Language Conversations*. London: Continuum International Publishing Group, pp. 114–131.
- Wootton A (1989) Remarks on the methodology of conversation analysis. In: Bull P and Roger D (eds) *Conversation: An Interdisciplinary Approach*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, pp. 238–258.
- Wright M (2011) On clicks in English talk-in-interaction. *Journal of the International Phonetic Association* 41(2): 207–229.
- Wu R-JR (2004) *Stance in Talk: A Conversation Analysis of Mandarin Final Particles*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Wu R-JR and Heritage J (2017) Particles and epistemics: Convergences and divergences between English and Mandarin. In: Lerner G, Raymond G and Heritage J (eds) *Enabling Human Conduct: Naturalistic Studies of Talk-in-Interaction in Honor of Emanuel A. Schegloff*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pp. 273–298.

### Author biographies

Rebecca Cliff (PhD 1996, Cambridge) is Senior Lecturer in the Department of Language and Linguistics at the University of Essex, UK. She is the author of *Conversation Analysis* (Cambridge

University Press, 2016) in the Cambridge Textbooks in Linguistics series. Her principal research interests lie at the intersection of grammar and interaction, embodied interaction, laughter and reported speech. She has published articles on these topics in *Language*, *Language in Society*, *Journal of Pragmatics*, *Journal of Sociolinguistics* and *Research on Language and Social Interaction*.

Chase Wesley Raymond (PhDs 2014, 2016, University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA)) is Assistant Professor in the Departments of Linguistics and Spanish & Portuguese at the University of Colorado, Boulder. His research interests lie at the intersection of language, grammar and (different facets of) social identity, in both ordinary and institutional interaction, with a particular focus on cross-linguistic and cross-cultural issues. Recent and forthcoming publications include articles in *Language*, *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, *Language in Society*, *Journal of Sociolinguistics* and *Patient Education and Counseling*.