THE REJECTION OF ADVICE: MANAGING THE PROBLEMATIC CONVERGENCE OF A 'TROUBLES-TELLING' AND A 'SERVICE ENCOUNTER'

GAIL JEFFERSON * and JOHN R.E. LEE

A recurrent phenomenon in talk about a 'trouble' is the rejection of advice. This phenomenon is explored as a possible consequence of a convergence between two closely-related but distinctive environments for talk about a 'trouble', the Troubles-Telling and the Service Encounter. Each of these has its own appropriate activities and its own appropriate relationships between participants; only one of these, the Service Encounter, may have advice-giving as a proper component. The rejection of advice in a Troubles-Telling may, then, constitute an attempt to counteract the environmental shift, and the attendant shift of activities and relationships, implicated thereby.

1. Introduction

Over the past two years we have been engaged in a project funded by the British Social Sciences Research Council on the analysis of conversations in which 'troubles' are expressed. Our data consists in transcriptions of taperecorded conversations in 'ordinary' settings, plus a small collection from 'institutional' settings. Our basic concern is the ways in which 'troubles' are talked about in the everyday world, in ordinary interaction.

The methodology we follow attempts to ground its analytical categories, its descriptions and formulations of procedure, upon the observable orientations of the coparticipants themselves [1]. A constraint upon our research, then, is that our formulation of a phenomenon emerge from the data, rather than being imposed upon it as a pre-established theory or a pre-set operational definition. Indeed, it was only after months of consultations with the data that we felt secure in proposing that such a thing as 'talk about a trouble' is a robust phenomenon, a specific organization of talk.

In the course of our first year's work, various aspects of talk about a trouble came to light in an unmotivated scan of the materials. We were not pursuing any

---

* Mailing address: Gail Jefferson, Dept. of Sociology, University of Manchester, Manchester
M13 9PL, Great Britain.

[1] See Sacks 1968: ch. 2.

particular aspect of troubles-talk; rather, we made ourselves available to whatever might emerge as a possibly systematic feature. As we examined the range of conversations which constitute the current corpus, we began to get a sense that, although many of the conversations were long and multifaceted, they were not amorphous. There seemed to be a shape to them; a shape which recurred across the range of conversations; a shape which could be sensed to be rather well formed in some of the conversations and distorted or incomplete in others.

Furthermore, a series of utterance-types were found again and again across the corpus, which seemed to 'belong' in various positions within that, as yet dimly perceived, shape. And our work had already yielded a set of categories relevant to and generated in 'troubles-talk' interaction; a set of categories to which coparticipants could be seen to be orienting: a Troubles-Teller and a 'properly aligned' Troubles-Recipient [2]. Thus, we had a strong, if vague sense of troubles-talk as a sequentially-formed phenomenon, a seed collection of elements which might constitute the components out of which a troubles-telling 'sequence' could be constructed, and a set of categories which might distribute the components across appropriate speakers. In short, we had the basis for a Troubles-Telling Sequence.

The prospect of gaining some analytic control over large chunks of conversation such as those we were confronted with was exciting, and we proceeded to direct our attention to an investigation of troubles-talk as a coherent, sequentially organized unit. And indeed, a scan of the corpus yielded a series of recurrent, positioned elements which could be grouped into a rough segmental sort of order, on the basis of which we developed a candidate Troubles-Telling Sequence. However, a detailed examination of the materials did not yield a single instance of troubles-talk in which the candidate sequence was present, element by element, or even segment by segment, in order. The actual instances of troubles-talk comprised very messy versions of the candidate sequence.

Clearly, troubles-talk did not occur as a consecutive sequence of ordered elements. On the other hand, the talk does tend to run off within a constrained set of elements; i.e., the elements which were proposed to constitute the components of a Troubles-Telling Sequence could be understood as recurrently present, but occurring in a 'disordered' fashion. Secondly, although the elements might be 'disordered', there is nevertheless a very gross sort of observable order; i.e., the data tend to start off with elements which 'belong' to early parts of the candidate sequence, and close with elements which 'belong' to the latter parts of the candidate sequence. That is, our initial vague sense of a set of components occurring in order was not, as we supposed, vague because we had not yet carefully enough inspected the data; i.e., the shape was not "dimly perceived", but, as it were, dimly manifested in the talk.

Inasmuch as it is our aim to locate, describe and then analyze objects which actually occur, our findings were problematic. A question was, is this vague shape

[2] See, e.g. Jefferson 1980, and Jefferson forthcoming.

a design feature of the 'sequence', perhaps as a technique for managing the long stretches of talk it organizes, a flexibility which preserves coherence while absorbing a range of contingencies liable to develop over large chunks of conversation? Alternatively, is the design rather more strict, but on any given occasion of its use — as is so in occrsional or frequent actual instances of the use of other strictly designed sequence-types — something is happening in that interaction which is producing a 'disruption' or 'disordering' of a precisely-ordered sequence?

Coming to terms with these possibilities required close analysis of talk about a trouble on a single instance by single instance basis. The results of those analyses suggest that in case after case a potentially strict sequence is encountering problems, and is thus becoming disordered. Further, it appears that the problems encountered by the sequence are not best characterized by reference to a particular interaction and its personnel and events, but by reference to general problem-types which recur acrcss the corpus of troubles-talk.

At this point, then, we find ourselves provisionally treating the candidate Troubles-Telling Sequence as a 'template' for the production of any given interaction in which 'troubles' are talked about; a template which is massively subject to disordering or disruption as the result of specifiable and generalized problem-types.

This formulation is reminiscent of the methodological position Max Weber puts forth in his classic *The Methodology of the Social Sciences* (Weber 1949). While he was principally concerned with understanding large scale socio-historical movements rather than day to day social interaction in fine-grained detail, his epistemological arguments can equally well be posed for the latter.

In his program for the social sciences, Weber proposes that social organization should be studied via the construction of 'ideal types' which, while not existing in the world, constitute a framework for the production of particular courses or sequences of action. And among his conditions for the construction of an 'ideal type' were (1) that it be a logically possible course of action, which (2) adequately represents those actual instances indicated by it. Real life 'departures' from such a model do not necessarily disqualify the model, but may themselves be accounted for by an understanding of how the model has been departed from.

However, while akin to Weber's 'ideal type', our 'template' was not pre-formulated, but was grounded in and constructed from the data under inspection, in contrast to Weber's methodological program, we did not set out to find/construct a non-actual but representative model. Indeed, such a procedure is at variance with oui own program which insists upon the description and analysis of actually-occurring events in the very details of their occurrence. The notion of a 'model' in this case is tentative and problematic; we are far more committed to its analytic sequelae [3].

[3] The similarity, unsought and recognized after the fact, may not be altogether coincidental in that Harvey Sacks, who developed the methodology which we follow, was both a scholar, and critic, of Weberian methodology (see Sacks 1963). In effect, by enjoining us to avoid 'ideal types', 'model', *etc.*, he made us familiar with them.

Our investigation of 'disorderings' of, or 'departures' from the candidate Troubles-Telling Sequence yielded a range of phenomena which, singly or in combination, could be seen to be causing deep problems for the sequence. The various phenomena could be grouped into two major types: Interactional 'Asynchrony', and Activity 'Contamination'.

Interactional 'Asynchrony' involves, roughly, that coparticipants can be characterized as improperly aligned by reference to the categories provided for by and crucial to the orderly progression of the sequence. Following is a single, dramatic-to-the-point-of-pathological, instance.

(1) [JG:I:21:1–3] (F is caller, M is wife of intended call-recipient)

Marge: 'h We:ll uh may I: ha:ve about two minutes of your ti:me'
                (0.8)

Marge: I: would like to tell you that one of your: 'h uh brother
       er hu- you kno:w the Ma:sons down at your clu:b 'hhh
       uh::m::,h 'tlk 'hhh introduced my husband to a lady

       .   (ca. 20 lines omitted; straight monologue)
       .

Marge: 'hhhh An:d so when he went awa:y on Mother's da:y and 'hh
       he went away on Saturday evening of (0.3) Mother's Da:y
       'hh and he spent the night (.) with he:r and all: day
       Sunday and came home around about nine o'clock Sunday ni:ght
       'hhhh uh he didn:'t sa:y u-one word he just came in put his
       pajamas o:n 'hhh a:n:d uh sat on the couch for about five
       minutes and then he went in: to his bedroom and went to be:d.
       'hhhhh an:d uh u-so: uh then I,hh well you know I was
       questioning about what was go [i n g o : n?   ]
Frank: →   [Well do you h]appen to have
       his phone number?
                (0.2)
Marge: 'hhh u[No::? I do not have his [phone>number<he: will-
Frank: [( )-   [Do you know where I might
       reach him?

We simply note, but do not explicate here, that a coparticipant is observably not moving into alignment as a Troubles-Recipient. Other materials collected as candidate instances of 'trouble-talks', yielded far more delicate versions of Interactional 'Asynchrony'.

As to Activity 'Contamination', we find that there are ranges of activities which converge with a Troubles-Telling; activities which have rather different treatments of the event/situation which might constitute a 'trouble', and rather different components and trajectories from those of a Troubles-Telling, per se. Among the range of 'contaminants', we initially located three recurrent types: (1) Building a Case, in which the possible 'trouble' constitutes a possible 'misdeed' (or its consequence), (2) Negotiating a Plan, in which the possible 'trouble' constitutes a possible 'obstacle', and (3) Dispute, in which the possible 'trouble' constitutes a 'source of contention'.

Simply enough, talk about a circumstance or event which might constitute a 'trouble' and thus proceed in certain ways; *i.e.*, as a Troubles-Telling, may be very little, or not at all, a Troubles-Telling, and very much or altogether the building of a case, the negotiating of a plan, or engagement in dispute. And it may, further, be ambiguous as to which is occurring.

Earlier we mentioned our concern as to whether or not 'talk about a trouble' is a robust phenomenon. The alternative was that it is no more than a matter of 'content', and otherwise no more than a 'story', or a 'topic', *etc.*, like any other. The considerations of Activity 'Contamination' were particularly informative on this issue. Specifically, 'content' which might be pre-classified as 'a trouble' occurs in talk which is not at all, or only partially, or ambiguously, a Troubles-Telling, and in which, indeed, whether or not some event or circumstance *is* a 'trouble', and whether or not the interaction *is* a Troubles-Telling, is under negotiation. That is, it is not the 'content' *per se*, but the organization of the talk which provides for a Troubles-Telling; that same 'content' may also be talked of in ways which provide for other specifiable activities.

So, for example, in the following fragment, an instance of Building a Case with the possible 'trouble' as a possible 'misdeed', absence from work may be an index of a 'trouble' or may constitute malingering. An announcement that "I got a real bad stomach ache" occurs in the course of building a case for all good intentions to go to work, and for the absence from work as warranted; *i.e.*, an 'excuse'. On its occurrence, the event may be specifically offered as a 'trouble', but it is not received as such, and is re-embedded into the ongoing production of an 'excuse', which, eventually, is received and accepted as such.

(2) [TCI(b):9:2]

John:	I just called to make sure you were you know, (0.2) 'hh I didn't know whether you'd gone to work or what you kno⌈w.
Marcia:	⌊I was going to go: to wor:k,hh 'hhhh I got a:fter you left I thought well I'll eat some breakfast and then I will go: to wor:k.hh
	(0.3)
Marcia:	'hhhh A:nd so: I: a:te a muffin?hh 'hhhh and chee:se.hh (0.7) 'hhhhh And then I went to the bathroo:m? (1.5) 't 'hhh There was,h (1.6) a::nd I had a spoonful of cer.al,
John:	Mm hm,
Marcia: →	'hhh And then I got a real bad stomach ache.
	(1.7)
Marcia:	Like (.) when: (.) someone tied a knot in my stomach.
	(0.2)
Marcia:	'hhh So I lay dow:n and the next thing I know it was eleven o'clo:hh-hh
John:	heh-heh-heh-heh-heh-hih-hih-heh=
Marcia:	=So I didn't go:.
John:	Ah,
	(0.3)

John:	→ No that's: okay,
	(0.5)
John:	Mh,
	(1.2)
John:	They can get along without you for a day or two,

In this case, the coparticipant is perhaps a properly aligned 'excuse-recipient', but not a 'troubles-recipient' And we note that in subsequent talk he does some 'interrogation', "You been laying down on the couch or in the bedroom", and still later, some 'accusatory talk, "Are you gonna do anything? or you just gonna: (2.3) lay arou:nd." The focus here is not on the troublesomeness to teller of a circumstance or event, but on whether it constitutes an adequate excuse for absence from work, or a case of malingering.

And, for example, in the following fragment, an instance of Negotiating a Plan, with the possible 'trouble' as a possible 'obstacle', a recurrent mid-point element of the candidate Troubles-Telling Sequence, a heightened description of the 'trouble', "Oh:: my God I been 'hhh running the highest temperatures you ever sa:w", is followed by an offer to close the conversation altogether.

(3) [TCI(b):7:1–2] (Opening unrecorded; L is caller and is identifying herself to C, the call recipient)

Lily:	['m] Jo:dy s mothe:r?
	(0.6)
Cora:	Oh ye ┌h ((very hoarse, here and throughout the talk)
Lily:	└Jo:dy Lih- tempi,
Cora:	Oh: yeh,
	(0.2)
Lily:	Are you si::ck,
Cora:	→ 'tch u-Yeh I got the flu.
Lily:	Aoh::::.uh ┌hnh ┌hnh ha ┌ha-ha-ha ┐
Cora:	└h- └hhhhhh └hh-hh-hk┘
	(.)
Cora:	┌┌'hh
Lily:	→ └└Well that ni:ps it in the bu:d, 'hh I was gonna ask you if
	you could keep Jo:dy for a c(h)ouple hours but you can't
	if you got the flu::.
Cora:	'tch I wouldn't want him around me ho:n, 't ┌'hhhhhh ┐hh=
Lily:	└nNo::::, ┘
Cora:	=cause uh: I've really got it.
	(.)
Lily:	y:Yo ┌u sure-
Cora:	└I-
	(.)
Cora:	But I'd be glad to do it if I wasn't sick.
Lily:	e-You sure sound aw:ful. ┌(hoarse.) ┐
Cora:	→ └t Oh:. my God┘I been 'hhh running
	the highest temperatures you ever sa:w.

```
Lily:    →  Oh my go:sh well let me hang up and let you get back to bed=
Cora:    =eh huh┌uh uhh┐h h h u-   h h u-┐=
Lily:          └So:rry ┘I disturbed you.┘
Cora:    =How you doin hon=
Lily:    =Oh just fi:ne.
```

In this case, the coparticipant may be properly aligned as the proposer of an inauspicious plan, and a intruder upon someone's 'trouble', but certainly not as a 'troubles-recipient'. As with the single dramatic instance of Interactional 'Asynchrony', these single instances of two types of Activity 'Contamination', Building a Case, and Negotiating a Plan respectively, are transparent for the problematic effect on a Troubles-Telling. Again, other materials yielded far more delicate, and ambiguous versions.

We come now to the third type of Activity 'Contamination', that of Dispute, in which the 'trouble' becomes a source of contention. We had constructed an array of materials in which disputes, which were in various ways disruptive of what might otherwise constitute a Troubles-Telling, occurred. The array was simply designed to point up the recurrent 'dispute' outcome of the introduction of a possible 'trouble'. It was out of an inspection of the arrayed fragments that the issue with which we are concerned in this paper emerged.

2. A precursor of dispute: the giving of advice

A recurrent feature of materials in which a possible Troubles-Telling turned into a Dispute was there were greater or lesser degrees of 'asynchrony' present; *i.e.*, recurrently a coparticipant could be seen to be declining to properly align as a 'troubles-recipient' prior to the onset of dispute. And, recurrently, attendant to that 'asynchrony' was the giving of advice. So, for example, in the following fragments, selected initially as simple instances of the onset of dispute in what might otherwise be a Troubles-Telling, we see the combination of asynchrony, advice-giving, and dispute. The arrows indicate advice or advice-relevant utterances, the asterisked arrows indicate the onset of dispute.

(4) [Frankel:US:1:57ff]   (V is talking to someone other than J at the very start of this fragment)

```
Vic:     Cause that-that's (his policy).
James:   Hey Victor,
Vic:     So I (have to say)
James:   The next time you see me I'm gonna be looking ike he:ll
         you know why,
                 (0.7)
James:   Cause e:very damn one of these teeth coming out.
(   ):   (          ).=
James:   =bottom and top.
                 (0.7)
```

Vic: → Doesn't matter you still be you wo:n't you James,

James: s-uh::::::, Yeh I guess so-MAYBE (   ) when I see that
          dentist (come at me) with that damn needle I'm ready to r:run
          like he:ll. (.) I don't mind eh pulling them but he coming at
          me that needle's what I can't stand.HAH⌈HAH HAH HAH!⌉

Vic: →   ⌊(Use)- Tell him ⌋gas.

James: 'hh Huh?

Vic: → Tell him gas.
                (0.4)

James: Uh- No I don't (want no ga⌈s, no) I wi-I wil take it.

Vic: →   ⌊Well let me ask you this question.

James: You know?

Vic: Let me ask⌈you o n e ques⌈tion.

James: ⌊I'll take it. ⌊Yeh righ⌈t

Vic: ⌊Let me ask you this
          question.

James: Yeh.

Vic: → Are you getting toothaches?
                (0.4)

James: ↦ NO!
                (0.2)

Vic: → ⌈⌈(Then don't   )-
James: ↦ ⌊⌊But I got cavities!

(5) [NB:1:6:13ff:r]

Lottie: How:'s your foo:t.=

Emma: ='t'hh Oh: it's healing beautifully:.

Lottie: Goo:⌈d.

Emma: ⌊The other one may have to come o:ff on the other toe
          I've got it in that but it's not infected.
                (0.8)

Lottie: → Why don't you use some stuff⌈on it.

Emma: ⌊'t I've got peroxide I put o:n
          it but uh 'hhhh the other one is healing very we:ll: I
          looked at it the other day I put a new ta:pe on it every
          da:y so 'hhhh⌈hhh

Lottie: →   ⌊Why don't you get that nay-uh::: Revlon
          nai⌈l::::

Emma: ↦   ⌊'hhh Well that's not therapeutic Lottie really it says
          on the (0.4) thi:ng e-th-when you g-ah this pero:xide is:
          uh: kind of uh,hh 'hhh⌈hh

Lottie: ↦   ⌊What do you mean uh th-u do:ctors
          use it,

(6) [SBL:2:1:8:2]

Faye: I was thinking this morning, I was having a little trouble
          in the bathroom, and I thought oh, boy, I-n-I-uh uh this
          business of getting up at six o'clock and being ready to eat,
          is uh- is not for me,⌈heh heh

Bea: →   ⌊Uh huh, Well, uh th-((clears throat))

Faye: Somehow you endure it.
Bea: → ⌈There's an- there's an answer to that too.
(2.0)
Bea: hhhh A physical answer t(hh)o hhh
Fay: You mean taking laxative at night.
Bea: → No, suppositories. ⌈That takes-
Faye: →→ ⌊Well, it doesn't always work for me Bea,
Bea: No?
Faye: It didn't work this <u>morning</u>.

(7) [TCI(b):9:1] (Opening unrecorded; J is caller)
John: [How are you] feeling now.
Marcia: Oh::? (.) pretty good I gue:ss, ⌈hh- hh⌉
John: ⌊Not so⌋hot?
(0.8)
Marcia: I'm just so:rt of: waking u:p,
(0.2)
John: Hm:m,
(3.6)
Marcia: Muh- ((hiccup)) (0.9) My: (   ),
John: Huh?
Marcia: My: (   ) doesn't hu:rt, (0.4) My head feels (.) better,
John: °Uh huh,°
(1.5)
Marcia: ukhhh ⌈uh ukhh
John: ⌊Well that's goo(h)d,
(1.4)
John: → Take (.) you kno:w make sure you're tak ing (.) plenty of vitamins and
(0.7)
Marcia: Ye:h?
John: → you know drink plenty of wa:ter.
(1.0)
Marcia: →→ 't'hhhh Can't drink water when you're slee:ping,

In the four above fragments, the giving of advice occurs very early in talk about a 'trouble'. And according to our candidate Troubles-Telling Sequence, the advice was specifically occurring 'prematurely'. That is, in our examination of the corpus we had found a recurrent latter segment which we called the 'Work-Up' component, in which a range of diagnostic, prognostic, *etc.*, considerations of the 'trouble' were produced, in which it seemed to us 'advice' might properly be introduced. This segment not only occurs late in the sequence but is strongly close-implicative and is recurrently followed by closure of the Troubles-Telling. Thus, it seemed to us that in the above fragments an element of a latter and close-implicative segment is introduced before a Troubles-Telling has really gotten started.

It seemed to us reasonable to wonder if the advice is being resisted as much for its prematurity and close-implicature as for, *e.g.*, the quality, applicability, *etc.*, of the advice itself. We noted that various sorts of advice, suggestions, recommenda-

tions, of remedies, recipies, machinery, holiday venues, shortcuts, *etc.*, *etc*, may be accepted, the details copied down in great detail, although a recipient has no intention of using them. That is, acceptance or rejection may be in great part an interactonal matter, produced by reference to the current talk, more or less independent of intention to use it, or actual subsequent use.

The four above fragments suggested that the presence of 'asynchrony' and 'sequential prematurity' at least in part might account for resistance to the advice, and was predictive of the emergence of dispute. And in the following fragment, we find advice being introduced in a way that exhibits an orientation to both those features; *i.e.*, a coparticipant can be seen to be working to set up an interactional and sequential context which, according to our considerations, specifically would foster acceptance. Here we find advice being positioned in what would seem to be an appropriate Troubles-Telling Sequence segment; *i.e.*, in a Work-Up initiated by the troubles-teller, and emerging as the logical outcome of a diagnosis offered by the troubles-recipient and concurred in by the troubles-teller; *i.e.*, the advice is sequentially appropriate and the talk is interactionally 'synchronous'. However, the advice, when it is delivered, is disputed.

(8) [Rahman:II:12—13]

```
Gwen:    You know he's a funny little in rsecu:re 1 little boy:=
Myra:                                  LeeY e : h
Gwen:    =isn r't    he:.
Myra:         LBeh-uh b Jut the poin: is Gwennie don't forget no:w. h
         (0.3)
Myra:    Eh:m (.) He was so: close to °Gordon° wa:sn't he.=
Myra:    =He wa rs v e r y : : .
Gwen:         Lo Well this is it Jyou see r:,°    rMm:,
Myra:                                  LAnd no Lw he's t o:ne. And
         he thinks tyou're gonna go as well you s ree:.
Gwen:                                           LWell I think this
         is it r(but it- it's)
Myra: →       LWell ih- S o : J=
Gwen:       rOh r::
Myra: →  =[[ Lh Lbe patient with him course we:: don't mi:nd,
Gwen: ·→ But it gets me down a bit you know rl: mean I ca:n't
Myra:                                        L(Loo:k.)
Gwen:    I ca:n't mo:ve? you know he rsays where you goi: rn g,l=
Myra:                                L(What)              LWellJ
Gwen:    =[[(        )
Myra: →      LI've t o : l d y Jou:.
         (.)
Gwen:    Mm r:?
Myra: →     LJust tsend him rour d here for a rcouple of: hou: rrs.
Gwen: ·→                                      Lehh! 'hh     LBut then
         (tha-) But ryou know tMy:ra l rnever go tanywhere rdo I::.
Myra:              L(          )           LI:: tkn Jow=
Myra:    =Ye:ah
```

The disputed advice is abondoned, and reissued at a next appropriate place; *i.e.*, again after some diagnostic talk . iitiated by the troubles-teller and participant in by the advice-giver.

(8.a) [Rahman:II:13—14]

Gwen:	But he's alright if there's somebody else he::re,
	(.)
Myra:	°Ye[s y e s°] b e c a u s e
Gwen:	[Bit it's jus:t] u when he's on]his ow[n he d]oesn't like]=
Myra:	[h e][ha : tes]
Gwen:	=[[being on]his ow:n]
Myra:	=[[that]house o]n his ow:[n.
Gwen:	[iYe::ah,
Myra:	He ha:tes it. 'h[h
Gwen:	[I supp [o:se you know: i[t
Myra:	[Well [Yeh-
	(.)
Myra:	→ Ih-ih-it Let him cause I mean it's not all that long you
	kn[ow [Jus:t
Gwen:	*→ [Yeh'h [Well you see it's different for me:.(eh for (.)
	the other boy:s be[cause they alway; had each othe:r.
Myra:	[Yeh
Myra:	E:xactly.

On this round, the advice is utterly minirially acknowledged with "Yeh" and the diagnostic talk returned to with "'h Well you see it's different for me:.<eh for (.) the other boy:s because they always had each othe:r". The advice-giver again participates in this next round of diagnostic talk, and yet again offers the advice, which is, again, disputed.

(8b) [Rahman:II·14—15]

Gwen:	be [cause they always had each othe:r.
Myra:	[Yeh
Myra:	E:xactly.[Where Tho[mas-]
Gwen:	[(But) [Ye:s,]
	(.)
Myra:	[[Well h e]
Gwen:	[[Well there's o]:nly Da:nny and they fight like the (devil)=
Myra:	=uWell thi[s is i:t. [E[x]a c]tly, ya[s.
Gwen:	[ehl.hhu hh]=[heh]heh] [hhhh
Gwen:	An[d u h]
Myra:	[So just](.) ulittle patience with him cause I: don't mind
	you know tha:.
Gwen:	*→ Yeh but ih-ih [t's]=
Myra:	[Yas.]
Gwen:	*→ =You know it's I try. I try to be patient h1[a ha ha My]:ra]=
My:a:	[I kn::ow,]and]=
Gwen:	=[[eh!
Myra:	=[[it's easy for me to say th[is,
Gwen:	[hhhe:hhh Oh::[: dearie m]e:,
Myra:	[ee: Y a h.]

In fragments (4)–(7) advice is profferred which has not been conversation-locally processed to promote acceptar. e. And in those fragments, the advice is rejected. But in fragment (8)–(8.b) the advice is, repeatedly, conversation-locally processed to promote acceptance, and is, repeatedly, rejected. That is, whether or not the advice is processed to promote acceptance, it gets rejected. And we note again; current acceptance or rejection of advice can have little to do with the quality, relevance, etc. of the advice itself, or with the advice-recipient's intentions to use it, and rejection is certainly not an automatic outcome of an advice-giving.

We are, therefore, led to wonder if perhaps the problem lies in the particular environment into which the advice in these cases is being introduced; i.e., that of a possible Troubles-Telling.

In that regard we can notice that while the relevant local categories Troubles-Teller and Troubles-Recipient constitute a fitted pair, not only do the categories Troubles-Teller and Advice-Giver not constitute such a fitted pair, but in terms of the general conversational categories, Speaker and Recipient, both occupy the same category, that of Speaker, with each Speaker's coparticipant as the intended Recipient. Upon the proffering of advice by a prospective or to-this-point Troubles-Recipient, a Troubles-Teller is shifted into incumbency in the appropriate paired category vis-à-vis an Advice-Giver, that of Advice-Recipient, and in more general terms, is transformed from a Speaker to a Recipient in the current interchange.

Thus, the accepting of advice may bring with it removal from the category Troubles-Teller ar d loss of whatever perquisites that troubles-relevant category and its attendant conversation-general category, Speaker, may entail. Correlatively, the delivering of advice may bring with it removal from the category Troubles-Recipient and acquittal from whatever obligations that troubles-relevant category and its attendant conversation-general category, Recipient, may entail.

3. The convergence of a troubles-telling and a service encounter

The proffering of advice in the course of a Troubles-Telling, with its new, and reversed, set of categories and their attendant rights and obligations, may implicate an altogether different form of talk; i.e., not a Troubles-Telling, but that which various interaction analysts call the Service Encounter, in which the criterial categories are, say, Service-Seeker and Service-Supplier (the relevant subcategories in this case being Advice-Seeker and Advice-Giver).

In such an environment, someone with a 'trouble' may conduct her- or himself as a Recipient-Elect until such time as the Advice-Giver is prepared to deliver the sought-for advice, whereupon the Advice-Seeker assumes full recipientship. In effect, the Advice-Seeker delivers the particulars of his conditions only until he or she need no longer d) so, only until the Advice-Giver is prepared to start delivering advice.

And it may be that environment, and not the environment of a Troubles-Telling,

in which the emergence of advice as a logical outcome of description and diagnosis properly and harmoniously resides. Clearly, there is a strong convergence between a Troubles-Telling and the Service Encounter. But that convergence may be problematic in just the ways that the convergence of a Troubles-Telling with Building a Case, and the convergence of a Troubles-Telling with Negotiating a Plan are problematic; *i.e.*, it may provide for 'contamination' of a Troubles-Telling with components and procedures of the convergent business, and thus for disruption of a Troubles-Telling Sequence.

The recurrently found rejection of advice in talk about a trouble may, then, be accomplice to an attempt by Troubles-Teller to preserve the status of the talk *as* a Troubles-Telling, with its particular structural and interactional properties, and to maintain incumbency in the category Troubles-Teller, with its particular and general perquisites.

Similarly to Building a Case, in which the 'trouble' alternates with 'misdeed', and Negotiating a Plan, in which the 'trouble' alternates with 'obstacle', the Service Encounter's business may be characterized as Solving a Problem, in which, then, the 'trouble' alternates with 'problem'. Attendant to this alternation, it might be seen that while in a Troubles-Telling the focal object is the 'teller and his experiences', in the Service Encounter, the focal object is the 'problem and its properties'.

A glimpse of this distinction may be found in the following fragment. In this case, just after the announcement of a candidate 'trouble', "My toenails are falling off", the prospective Troubles-Recipient launches into a story of a third party's trouble which is relevant to, and exhibited as brought to mind by, the announcement. The outcome of the story is the recommendation of a remedy. In this case, perhaps in part because of its method of introduction, the recommendation is accepted. But it can be noticed that the Advice-Recipient/intending Troubles-Teller thereafter raises the issue of efficacy of the remedy for herself as compared to the third party (*i.e.*, if not actually disputing the recommendation, at least providing for its status as rejectable), and uses that talk to reintroduce her own circumstances, "Well, my toenails are getting bad Lottie...". This second attempt is countered by an utterly bland, continuing attention to the remedy by the Advice-Giver.

(9) [NB:IV:10:31–34]

Emma:	˙hhh Well honey I'm glad you had a guu- I thought about you and I m:missed you, but I been r- I've really had a very nice time. Sunday was kind of a long day, but uh, ˙hh ⌈hhh
Lottie:	⌊Yeah,
Emma:	I'm used to everything no:w, an::d,
	(0.6)
Lottie:	Yeah.
Emma:	I'm brea- hhh I- my toenails are falling off, I ⌈don't know,
Lottie:	⌊Oh::. Wait
	a minute. That's- I'm glad you mentioned that. You know Isabel had her nail taken off, like you had your toenail=

```
Emma:       =[[Yeah?
Lottie:        [[taken off? a id it just about killed her you know,=
Emma:       =[[Yeah,
Lottie:        [[she nearly di d a thousand times and I was telling her about
            you,
Emma:       Yeah,
Lottie:  →  'hhhh So anywa r, she got this, Vi:dafoam, and, I bought some
            down  here and   put some on my nails last night and I put
            on some tonight, 'hh And she said that was the only thing
            that healed them.
Emma:       Vi:dafoam.
Lottie:     Yeah. And I- I payed a dollar:: u i- eighty three for it but
            then it might be a little cheaper here. in some,
            drug[store there.
Emma:           ['hhhhh-
            (1.0)
Lottie:     [[Vidafoam.
Emma:    →  [[I- I w- I wanna[get some.
Lottie:             ['Wuh- Wait a m nute, let me, uh, let me I
            got it right here, I know it's Vid foam.
            (4.2)
Lottie:     Yea:h, (0.8) Viafoam. It's V-i-o, f-o-r-m. Ointment.
            (0.9)
Emma:    ◆→ v:Viaform, Did she have the ba :d big thick thing like
            [my toenail,
Lottie:     ['Oh:::::. Go:::d, Ye:::s.[And how.
Emma:    ◆→          ['hh hhh But she did.i't break out
            on her body,hh 'hhh
Lottie      No? but- course that's v- cou se she breaks out on her in
            her ha:nds.you know.
Emma:       She always did have those- 'l hh No, but this goes with the
            toenail bit I think some of t is- goes with the toenail-
         →  Well. my toenails are getting bac Lottie, those two big
            toenails, but ah- 'hhh
Lott e:  →  It says, uh, soothing, antibi :: (0.8) oh something, and
            fungi, dayo preparation fo the treatment of inflamed
            condition of the skin such as eczema, 'hhh athletics foot
            and other fungus, 'hh infe tion. Your physician may, 'hh
            prescribe Vidafoam for ot er conditions and other direction
            differing from those that ippeared on this package. 'hh Now
            this uh Doctor Allen gave this to he:r, 'hh[and uh, uh::,
Emma:                          ['Mm hm,
Lottie:     she uses it on her, uh har ds too. you know,=
Emma:       =[[Yeah,
Lottie:       [[like, uh yih-uh-yih- t h, well you have that and she said
            for you to use on th - on your uh psoriasis.
```

And when, later in the conversation, the Troubles-Teller produces a description of her circumstances, it is met again with an utterly bland attention to a 'problem and its properties'; in this case, its distribution and possible causes. (And at this point we find the onset of dispute.)

(9.a) [NB:IV:10:48—49]

Emma:	→	Oh God it's terrible Lottie, my toenails- 'hhh they just look so sick those big toenails it just makes me sick. You know, they're jus- dead Everything's dead. i-I sat out today and I said my God am I just dying. It's- like I'm ossified.
Lottie:	→	No at- we were in some place, I don't know if it was Dane's or some place, (0.5) I guess it was Dane's. and, somebody was talking about it, and I bet there were 'hhh ten people around there, and they all started to say well they had the same thing? And I know, like Doctor Compton says it's from the damp- detergent.
		(1.6)
Lottie:		It really is.
Emma:	*→	I, gotta believe it Lottie, but how would it be on your toes though ho:ney.

What emerges from such materials as fragments (4)—(9) may be characterized as the Advice-Giver's 'essential interest' in the problem and its properties, and 'essential indifference' to the Troubles-Teller and his experiences. To bring home this distinction, we turn to a phenomenon which made its appearance 15 years ago and has been lying around in a notebook since.

The phenomenon was noticed in the course of transcribing tapes from an emergency ambulance service. Throughout these conversations there was a general sense of the 'essential indifference' of the service agency to the troubled person, which became crystallized in an utterly recurrent sort of interchange between agency personnel and various parties phoning on behalf of a stricken person. The callers recurrently found themselves confronted with what we are calling the Cargo Syndrome. Specifically, the agency wanted particular information about the caller and did not want that same information about the sick or injured person, who was simply the item being transferred.

The problematically distributed information was particularly 'person indexical', someone's name. In terms of sheer efficiency, the agency might have benefitted by requesting the sufferer's name although they had no practical use for it, because callers on behalf of sufferers in various ways insisted upon the relevance of the sufferer's name. Following is an array of instances of the Cargo Syndrome.

In the first place, the relevance of sufferer's name generated inquiries on that issue after a series of form-questions had been gone through and the agency had not solicited the sufferer's name.

(10) [FD:IV:57]

Desk:	May I have your name please,
Caller:	Missuz Bradley?
Desk:	First- name?
Caller:	Loretta?
Desk:	Oka:y?
	(pause)

Desk:	And the phone number you're calling from.
Caller:	Broadway seven, one six, three three.
Desk:	Okay,
Caller:	And this is for Doctor Edletack.
Desk:	Okay, this is to ⌈uh-
Caller: →	⌊Do you need the patient's name,
Desk: →	Uh, no.

(11) [FD:I:87]

Desk:	He is landing at Orbison Field.
Caller:	Right.
Desk:	Okay,
Caller: →	A:nd uh do you need the patient's name.
Desk: →	No::, no it won't be necessary,

And recurrently, callers volunteered the name, thus disrupting the orderly progression of the form-relevant questioning (transparently so in fragments (13) and (14) below).

(12) [FD:IV:35]

Desk:	Wha's your name again please ⌈sir,
Caller:	⌊D. R. Banning. B-a-n-n-i-n-g,
Caller: →	And uh it's uh:: the man's name is Bob DeMott.

(13) [FD:IV:7+]

Desk:	May I have your name please,
Caller: →	Ye. This is uh Missiz Lowe. L-o-w-e? and the child's name is Bartholemew, fifteen months old.
	(pause)
Desk: →	And now your first name.
Caller:	Jeannette.

(14) [FD:I:20]

Desk:	I'll have them out there approximately at six then.
Caller:	O ⌈kay.
Desk:	⌊hhhh ⌈and-
Caller: →	⌊And the employee's name is Randall.
Desk: →	Uh no. May I have your name please.

In the following fragment, caller volunteers the name, and subsequently produces a pre-completion uptake of the 'thrust' of a question which has broken off ("What's th-"). The pre-completion uptake shows the question to have been heard as a request for the sufferer's name.

(15) [FD:I 35]

Caller: →	I have a lady who came over from next door, Missiz Effie Ellis, and her husband is on the job. And I called a doctor and he say to get her to the hospital right away.
	⌈No-
Desk:	⌊What's the-
Caller: –	Effie Ellis.

Finally, in the following fragments, the relevance of the sick or injured party as a nameable 'person' is consequential for the hearing of the request for caller's name. Specifically, callers are not certain that it is their name which has been requested. In the first of these fragments we find a combination of indices of an orientation to the relevance of sufferer's name; first, a checkout as to which name was being requested, and subsequently a volunteering of the name as in the above fragments (12)–(15).

(16) [FD:I:14]

Desk:	May I have your name please,
Caller: →	My na:me?
Desk:	Yes.
Caller:	This is Missuz McCoughlin.

:

Caller:	M-c-c-o-u-g-h-l-i-n.
Desk:	i-n. Okay.
Desk:	Your first ⌜name-
Caller: →	⌞And the lady's name is Miss ⌜uz-
Desk: →	⌞Your first initial.
Caller: →	My n- my name is uh Beth, B-e-t-h,

(17) [FD:IV:113]

Desk:	What is your name please,
Caller: →	My name? (.) is Ginny Selmur.hh
Desk:	S-e-l, m-u-r,
Caller:	Yes sir.

(18) [FD:I:98]

Desk:	And uh, may I have your name please?
Caller: →	Uh, my name's Rostermann.
Desk:	How you spell that,
Caller:	R-o-s. T-e-r. M-a, n-n.
Desk:	Okay, and uh, first name.
Caller: →	Mine, Fred.hh

(19) [FD:IV:41]

Desk:	Could I have your name and phone number in case ⌜I have to=
Caller:	⌞( )
Desk:	=[[⌜call you back,
Caller: →	⌞My name?
	(pause)
Caller: →	It's- I:: didn't hear you sir,
Desk:	Could I have your name and phone number in case I have to call you back,
Caller: →	Oh yes. Uh::m, my name is Missiz Budd, B-u-d-d.

(20) [FD:IV:3]

Desk:	What was your first name please,
Caller: →	Mi:ne? Eleanor.
Desk:	Eleanor, Baxter.
	(pause)
Caller: →	My first name? (.) or her first ⌈name.
Desk:	⌊Yours.
Caller:	Ya::h, Eleano:, hhh
Desk:	O:ka:: ⌈y,
Caller:	⌊hehh

It appears that the 'essential concern' of a Service Supplier is the despatching of a ask, and whatever activities, information, etc., are critical thereto. In the above fragments we see the agency confronted again and again with a 'non-essential matter'. We take it that the confrontation in these fragments is a fine-grained index of a crucial distinction between a Troubles-Telling and the Service Encounter; i.e., the distinction between a focus on the 'troubled person' versus a focus on the 'problem and its properties', respectively.

A similar sort of 'confrontation' may be occurring in fragments (4)–(9). Upon the offering of advice, an incipient or ongoing Troubles-Telling converges with a Service Encounter, with the concomitant shift of relevant categories and activities, and, as well, the concomitant shift of focus, away from the troubles-teller and his or her experiences, to the trouble itself, as a 'problem to be solved'. Again, then, the rejection of advice may be accomplice to a rejection of those shifts; an attempt to preserve the interaction's status as a Troubles-Telling with its particular categories and activities, and its focus upon a matter to which the Service Encounter is 'essentially indifferent'; i.e., that of the teller himself, in contrast to, say, the teller as a mere bearer of the object of 'essential concern', the trouble itself.

While we take it that the alternation as between 'troubled person' and 'troubles-bearer' matters, we are not suggesting that the Service Encounter become 'essentially concerned' with the troubled person. Such a concern carries with it an 'essential indifference' to the trouble, which generates a stringent requirement from which the Service Encounter may specifically offer relief. As is abundantly evidenced in the current corpus of talk about a trouble, a 'person' is one among others, one who participates in the ongoing everyday activities of the community; one who goes to work, gets together with his or her friends, listens to their stories, rejoices in their good times, tells them of his or her own good times, etc. etc. A merest glimpse of this feature is available in the materials assembled here. For example, in fragment (1) an abandoned wife is nevertheless held responsible for carrying out her routine telephone-call duties; in fragment (2) a husband presses his not-yet-recovered wife to rejoin the workforce; in fragment (3) a candidate baby-sitter in the throes of a severe flu attack inquires into her coparticipant's circumstances, and that inquiry is taken up with perfect alacrity; and in fragment (9) someone suffering a variety of troubles nevertheless provides appropriate attention

to her sister's comings and goings, and warrants a prior report of her sister's splendid vacation with a reciprocal "I've really had a very nice time."

Thus, the caveat to a focus on someone with a trouble as a 'person' is that he or she remain one among others, that he be answerable to the requirements of the community. If he declines to do so, he may cease to be 'person'; *i.e.*, he may find himself abandoned by his cohort of candidate Troubles-Recipients. Which is to say that while the concerns of the Service Supplier might be simplistically characterized as 'repair and maintenance', the concerns of the Troubles-Recipient might be, equally simplistically, characterized as 'continued function, regardless'. Thus, while the Service Encounter may be deficient in 'human' terms, its alternative may be 'materially' pernicious.

Further, it appears that sufferers of a trouble do not welcome the 'humanizing' of a Service Encounter. We have noted the misfittedness of the two categories, Troubles-Teller and Advice-Giver. And we have seen, in the instances initially collected as Disputes, that various forms of resistance occur when a prospective or to-this-point Troubles-Recipient offers advice, an activity which may specifically 'belong' to the Service Encounter. Correlatively, it may be noted that the categories Advice-Seeker and Troubles-Recipient are misfitted. And, likewise, activities which may specifically 'belong' to a Troubles-Telling are resisted when they occur in the environment of a Service Encounter.

Again, a merest glimpse of this proper distribution of activities may be seen in a comparison of two fragments, one from a Troubles-Telling and one from a Service Encounter. A recurrent and ordered series in the Troubles-Telling Sequence is an Exposition of the trouble by the Troubles-Teller (see fragment (21) below, arrow 1), followed by an Affiliation by the Troubles-Recipient (see arrow 2), followed by an Affiliation Response, in which the Troubles-Teller is observably 'letting go' (see arrow 3); that activity warranted and elicited by Troubles-Recipient's prior Affiliation. As our single instance we have chosen an interchange between the participants of fragment (9). On this occasion, and in contrast to that from which fragment (9) was extracted, an optimum Troubles-Telling is in progress.

(21) [NB:IV:14:2]

Emma:	1→	I have to take two tub baths with tar in it every hhhhhh da:y?
Lottie:		Yea:h?
Emma:	1→	'hhhhh And I have to have ointment oy put on four times a da:y and I'm under:: violet ra:y for a few seonds, a:nd I got a shot in the butt of vitamin: (0.2) A::. ski:n.
		(0.5)
Lottie:	2→	Jee:sus.
Emma:	3→	Lo:ttie, honest to Go:d you know, I just broke out terribly a:uh- hhwhen I le-eft ho:me. An:d, I just-just my le:gs were just covered.hh

Such emotional reciprocity may be unwelcome by an Advice-Seeker *vis-à-vis* an Advice-Giver. So, for example, in our small corpus of Institutional talk about a trouble, we find one practitioner who, in a range of ways, strikes us as 'soft'. At one point in the course of an Advice-Seeker's 'exposition', he produces an utterance which is unique in our limited Institutional corpus, a mild version of an 'affiliation', "Oh my:", an object which stands in contrast to the ubiquitous, perhaps definitive "Uh huh" and "I see" of the Service Encounter [4]. At that point, we find the Advice-Seeker declining to produce an 'afiliation response'; *i.e.*, declining to 'let go', and instead, working to continue with interactionally independent expositional talk.

(22) [SPC:10:3:4]

Caller:	1→	And he has gotten to the point now where he: (.) is so confused and everything that he gets (.) the two: people mixed up and he thinks this daddy's the other one.
Desk:	2→	Oh my:.
Caller:	1→	Then he doesn't want him to get close to him and that's (.) one reason why he wants ((sounds like she is fighting tears from now on)) to: uh:: 'hhh right at the ti:me when he's having an- wuh- one of these (0.2) uh: I don't know whether you'd call it spell or what (0.7) 't but when he feels like this, (0.3) that's when he wants to kill himself.

By characterizing Advice-Seeker's subsequent talk as 'working' to continue with interactionally independent expositional talk, we are noticing that she may

[4] In the following fragment, a caller to a suicide prevention agency is specifically seeking the affiliation she feels she will not get from her cohort of candidate Troubles-Recipients; *i.e.*, she is soliciting and defining, alignment by a Service Supplier as a Troubles-Recipient. Not getting it, she focusses on and complains of the agency's definitive response-type: "It sounds like a real professional uh huh uh huh uh huh".

[SPC:NYE:1964:1-2:Sacks Transcript]

Caller:	I can't call any of my friends or anybody cause they're just gonna say oh that's silly or that's stupid I guess
Desk:	Uh huh
Caller:	I guess what you really want is someone to say yes I really understand why you want to commit suicide I do believe you I would too
Desk:	Uh huh. Well tell me about it
Caller:	Bou I a funny thing I know it's emotionally immature except that doesn't help
Desk:	Uh huh
Caller:	I've got a date coming in a half hour and I ((sob))
Desk:	I see
Caller:	I can't go through with it I can't go through with the evening I can't ((sniffle))
Desk:	Uh huh
Caller:	You talk. I don't want to talk
Desk:	Uh huh
Caller:	((laugh sob)) It sounds like a real professional uh huh uh huh uh huh ((sniffle))
Desk:	Well perhaps you want to tell me uh why you feel like committing suicide

specifically be resisting the 'letting go' provided for by the prior 'affiliation'; *i.e.*, it is possible that the mild, but perhaps in this environment powerful "Oh my:" has brought her to the tears she is now fighting.

Fragment (22) may constitute a delicate instance of a Service Supplier's attempt to 'humanize' the Service Encounter. A rather more elaborate attempt can be seen in the following misbegotten hybrid which tries to combine a Troubles-Telling's 'affiliation' with a Service Encounter's 'advice'. These materials are excerpted from a B.B.C. radio broadcast in which a panel of experts offers advice to telephone callers. A woman is reporting difficulty in handling her young children, exacerbated by a tendency to depression, for which her doctor prescribes antidepressants which she would prefer to manage without. Two of the panel respond. The first prefaces advice with a formal 'sympathy' token and a report of common experience, the second formats the advice as an outcome of a common experience.

(23) [JRE:A:1–4]

Caller: 'hhhh And I want to know if there's anything that you can do:, or you can he!p me with uh:m (.) coping with a situation like this withou-ah- (   ) resorting to pi:lls. (0.3)

Desk 1: → We:ll Harriet. May I say you know first of all: how (.) sympathetic I am to your difficulties. Uh:: I understand
        → them very well in fact my children were born while I was still a studen:t. and in many ways I: spent as much time looking after the young children as m(h)y wi(h)fe did. 'hhhh A:nd uh: (.) you kno:w, the strength of (.) young children's deman:ds. ever on one's ti::me they're never satisfied with anything simple there's always some difficulty and always some problem. 'hhhh Now whilst we hear a great deal of sympathy indeed as we did from an earlier caller about men having stressful difficulties in their lives I'm sure tha' women have just as much if not mo:re. 'hh Now having said tha:t (.) let's jump a little bit fu:rther and if I can explain to you a little why people get depressed.

      .

      .   (ca 34 lines omitted; elementary explanation of
      .   depression and antidepressants)

      .

Desk 1: → It's rather like a bandage round an ankle. The bandage is doing no good to the ankle at all if it's been strained. But it's giving it a bit of suppo:r⌈t.

Caller: ⌊Ye:s: well (.) Well that's what I fee:l:. But I feel that (.) uh:m'hh I know
  *→ they will help me. I'm a:- a trained nurse myse:lf.=

Desk 1: =Y⌈ah?

Caller: ⌊And I know I've seen (   ) a lot of people but (.) I know perfectly we:ll. that if I take the tablets for a period of time (.) they will help me.

Desk 1: Mm hm

Caller: But- uhm- they won't be a definite a:nswer. to my problem,
            a:nd when I stop taking them I can't see any reason why: I
            shan't revert to feelin:g, exactly the same as I have been
            feeling.

Desk 2:   No no ┌ah- I g- I guess I can offer an a:nswer.=
Caller   └( )
Desk 2: → =A different answer cause I had (difficulty with) number
            three:.
                    (.)
Caller: ┌┌( )
Desk 2:   └└A::nd I since had a fou::rth. 'hhhh And while I (.) that
         → During that ti:me my weight went up to twelve stone.=Now in
            fact I'm:: uh only five foo:t. 'hh ┌h
Cal er: ↦   └Well I don't ha ┌ve a weight
De sk 2:   └A : n : d
Cc ller: =┌┌problem
D esk 2:   └└u h : m ,
                    (.)
Desk 2: → ee-Well you may not have a weight problem but that was my
            form of stre:ss. I ┌mean you've got your depr(h)ession.=
Caller: └Ye:s.
Desk 2:   ='hh.h Uh:m:: and it- it (.) really I looked terrible I'm
            only five foot. Now my weight now is eight and a ha:lf. Now
            the t way we did it ...

The various Services being offered here are in no way designed for this recipient, and are shown by recipient to be ill-designed; i.e., the elementary explanation of antidepressants is followed by an announcement that the recipient is 'a trained nurse myse:lf', and the introduction of overweight as an experience-in-common is argued to be irrelevant, "Well I don't have a weight problem" [5]. Inasmuch as the

[5] In response to this utterance, the Service-Supplier cum Troubles-Recipient produces a device which is indexical of problems in an interaction. Having brought an utterance to a completion point, she starts to talk again with a 'continuation', "A:n:d uh:m". That object is introduced post a recognizable 'disagreement initiation', "Well I don't ...". That is, seeing that a 'disagreement' is under way, a prior speaker produces talk which utterly disattends that a response has been initiated at all. For a consideration of this phenomenon, see G. Jefferson, "The abominable 'ne?': an exploration of post-response pursuit of response", a brisk version in P. Shroder (ed.), Sprache der Gegenwart, Mannheim (in pr ss), an expansive version in P. Halfpenny (ed.) The University of Manchester Occasional Papers (forthcoming). Having noticed the work of this object at this rather dramatic point in the conversation, we can notice the only other occurrence, just after Desk 1 has made a little joke, "I: spent as much time looking after the young children as m:(h)y wi(h)fe did", which he follows by "'hhhh A:nd uh: (.) you kno:w". One thing which it is not followed by is Caller's laughter. Analysis has shown that the insertion of laugh-particles in some ongoing talk can serve to 'invite' a coparticipant to join in a 'laughing together', and thereupon, laughter by coparticipant is relevant until/unless some work is done to revise the current relevancies. (See Jefferson 1979: 82ff.) That article concentrates on some work a coparticipant might do to revise the current relevancies. Here we see a device used by the one who had invited laughter and has received no uptake, to revise the current relevancies; i.e., to provide that laughter by coparticipant is not due and, in fact, the utterance was not designed to achieve a 'laughing together', as it might have appeared upon its initial completion, but was simply a privately enjoyed parenthetical on the way to further, 'serious' talk. Thus, the two occurrences of "A:nd uh:" in this segment are deployed to manage an Advice-Seeker's rejection of affiliative work by Advice-Givers.

advice turns out to be ill-designed and inappropriate for this recipient, the affilia-tion work is revealed as presumptuous. The attempt to undercut the anonymity of Servicing with the intimacy of Troubles-Recipiency results in an elephantine travesty which is effectively neither Troubles-Telling nor Service Encounter but a worst possible version of each; *i.e.*, unwarranted affiliation compounded by inapt servicing.

4. Conclusion

In short, it appears that it is from appropriate Troubles-Recipients, in the environ-ment of a Troubles-Telling, that a Troubles-Teller properly receives and accepts emotional reciprocity, and from appropriate Advice-Givers, in the environment of a Service Encounter, that an Advice-Seeker properly receives and accepts advice. Cross-environment profferings of reciprocity or advice turn out to be problematic.

Unless, as in the archetypal tribal situation, the Advice-Giver one is consulting happens also to be a proper Troubles-Recipient (*e.g.*, a friend or relative), it appears that adequate management of a 'trouble' must be achieved by a shunting between two distinctive but problematically convergent environments. And the occurrence of elements of one environment in talk appropriate to the other may constitute attempts to repair perceived inadequacies of each. Thus we find participants to a Troubles-Telling attempting to rationalize their talk; to provide for it as more than a merely 'phatic' exchange, with what turn out to be problematic attempts at problem-solving. An alternative might be to recognize and enhance the deeply remedial potential of emotional reciprocity. Correlatively, we find participants to a Service Encounter attempting to humanize their talk; to provide for it as more than a merely 'instrumental' exchange, with what turn out to be problematic attempts at reciprocity. An alternative might be to recognize and enhance the intensely rela-tional potential of the instrumental colloquy.

References

Atkinson, M. and J. Heritage, eds. Forthcoming. Structurs of social action. Cambridge: Cam-bridge University Press.

Jefferson, G. 1979. 'A technique for inviting laughter and its subsequent acceptance/declina-tion'. In: G. Psathas, ed. pp. 82–86.

Jefferson, G. 1980. On "trouble-premonitory" response to inquiry. Social Inquiry 50 (3/4): 153–185.

Jefferson, G. Forthcoming. 'On the organization of laughter in talk about troubles', In: M. Atkinson and J. Heritage, eds.

Psathas, G. 1979 Everyday language: studies in ethnomethodology. New York: Irvington.

Sacks, H. 1963. Sociological description. Berkeley Journal of Sociology 8: 1–16.

Sacks, H. 1968. Aspects of the sequential organization of conversation. Unpublished MS.

Weber, M. 1949. The methodology of the social sciences. New York: Free Press.

Gail Jefferson (b. 1938). B.A. (dance): University of California (Los Angeles); Ph.D. (social sciences): University of California (Irvine).

Formerly research associate, Center for Urban Ethnography, University of Pennsylvania, lecturer, University of Massachusetts (Amherst) and University of California (Santa Barbara, Irvine and Los Angeles). Currently research associate, University of Manchester.

Related publications: 'On trouble-premonitory response to inquiry', Sociological Inquiry, 0(3–4): 153–185 (1980), and 'On the organization of laughter in talk about troubles', in I. Atkinson and J. Heritage (eds.), Structures of social action (Cambridge University Press, forthcoming).

John R.E. Lee (b. 1938). B.A. (philosophy/sociology): University of Hull; M.A. (economics): University of Manchester; Ph.D. (sociology): University of Manchester.

Formerly lecturer in Sociology, University of Salford. Currently lecturer in Sociology, the University of Manchester.