9-2018

How to Begin

Danielle M. Pillet-Shore
University of New Hampshire, Durham, danielle.pillet-shore@unh.edu

Recommended Citation

Pillet-Shore, Danielle (2018). How to begin. Research on Language and Social Interaction, 51(3), special issue "Opening and maintaining face-to-face interaction" (Pillet-Shore, ed.), available online at: www.tandfonline.com/hrls

How to Begin

Danielle Pillet-Shore
Department of Communication, University of New Hampshire
Horton Social Science Center, 20 Academic Way, Durham, NH 03824, United States
Danielle.Pillet-Shore@unh.edu

Abstract

This article introduces the special issue of *Research on Language and Social Interaction* organized around the theme "Opening and Maintaining Face-to-Face Interaction." The contributions to this special issue collectively consider "how to begin" – either a new encounter, or a new sequence after a lapse in conversation. All articles analyze naturally-occurring, videorecorded episodes of casual and/or institutional copresent interaction using multimodal conversation analytic methods. Though the opening phase of a face-to-face encounter may elapse in a matter of seconds, this article shows it to house a dense universe of phenomena central to sustaining our human sense of self and our social relationships in everyday life. Before introducing the individual contributions to this special issue, this article elucidates state-of-the-art findings from conversation analytic research on how people begin encounters, delineating the modular components that people regularly use to constitute the copresent opening phase of interaction. Data in American English.

How to Begin

Though the opening phase of a face-to-face interaction elapses in a matter of seconds, it houses a dense universe of phenomena central to sustaining our human sense of self and our social relationships in everyday life. In this article, I introduce the special issue of *Research on Language and Social Interaction* organized around the theme "Opening and Maintaining Face-to-Face Interaction" by elucidating state-of-the-art findings from conversation analytic research on how people begin encounters.

The articles in this special issue collectively consider "how to begin" – either a new encounter, or a new sequence – providing insights into two empirical questions that, though analytically distinct, also have points of convergence:

- Question 1: How do people open face-to-face interaction?
- Question 2: How do people maintain or continue face-to-face interaction after a lapse in talk?

There are six original empirical studies constituting this special issue: the first four studies address Question 1, and the last two studies address Question 2. All contributions to this special issue analyze naturally-occurring, videorecorded episodes of direct/unmediated copresent interaction using multimodal conversation analytic (CA) methods, in some cases complementing CA methods with other qualitative and quantitative methods. Across the six contributions, the authors analyze video data showing interactions between participants speaking Catalan, Estonian, Finland Swedish, Finnish, French, Italian, Swiss German, and UK and US English.

To contextualize these contributions, it is helpful to appreciate that copresent conversational openings attract interest from a wide range of disciplines – including anthropology, communication, ethology, linguistics, psychology and sociology. This is because openings constitute a specific site for examining some intrinsically interesting issues that can be, and have been, explored using theoretical, experimental, and/or naturalistic approaches. Among these issues are how people: form "first impressions" (e.g., Chaplin, et al. 2000; Kleinke, 1975; Taylor, Peplau & Sears, 2000); forge new social relationships, doing "getting acquainted" and "self-presentation" during initial interactions (Haugh & Carbaugh, 2015; Svennevig, 1999; 2014); and launch introduction sequences, choosing how to identify self and/or other (Pillet-Shore, 2011). Moreover, the study of openings reveals how people find conversational topics that establish common ground (e.g., Altman & Taylor, 1973; Haugh, 2011; Maynard & Zimmerman,

1984; Pillet-Shore, 2011; Svennevig, 1999; 2014), often topicalizing aspects of the situated environment to mobilize joint attention (Hoey, 2018/this issue; Keevallik, 2018/this issue; Maynard & Zimmerman, 1984; Pillet-Shore, 2008; 2017a; 2017b); and relatedly, how people perform information regulation work (e.g., Sacks, 1975; Youssouf, Grimshaw & Bird, 1976), controlling others' access to biographical facts about the self (Goffman, 1971; cf. Pillet-Shore, 2018/this issue).

        And on the issue of access, openings provide a site for exploring how people start talking to a stranger through a "pick-up line" (Sacks, 1992:49; Sidnell, 2010:197-198), a "ticket" which provides a reason (Sacks, 1975; 1992, I:553), or "street remarks" that may be oriented to as "street harassment" (Bailey, 2017; Duneier, 1999; Duneier & Molotch, 1999); and also how people snub or rebuff one another, avoiding meeting an acquaintance's eyes to deny a face engagement (Goffman, 1963:91-95). Indeed, research on face-to-face openings not only describes how people: display availability or unavailability for collaborative action (Goffman, 1963; Goodwin, 1981; Kendon, 1990; Robinson, 1998; Harjunpää, Mondada & Svinhufvud (2018/this issue); enter into mutual gaze and coordinate their spatial, embodied trajectories (e.g., Goffman, 1963; Mondada, 2009; Mortensen & Hazel, 2014; Pillet-Shore, 2008; De Stefani & Mondada, 2018/this issue); and prepare for and produce the reason for their encounter (Robinson, 1998; Harjunpää, Mondada & Svinhufvud, 2018/this issue; Kidwell, 2018/this issue); but also illuminates how people: include or exclude newcomers who display interest in joining an already-in-progress interaction (Corsaro, 1979; Pillet-Shore, 2010); show how they are doing/feeling as they start an interaction (Pillet-Shore, 2018/this issue); and display a stance toward the current state and character of their social relationships (Pillet-Shore, 2012; Schegloff, 1998).

        Clearly, these issues are not merely compelling, but rather are crucial to understanding human sociality. And while all of the above is relevant to how *people* open interaction, it can be productive to consider how other social species open encounters – what ethological studies term "greeting behavior" (e.g., Eibl-Eibesfeldt, 1968; 1971; Kendon & Ferber, 1973). Despite the surface differences, there are important similarities between the greeting behaviors of humans and other social animals (Kendon & Ferber, 1973:657), including baboons (Whitham & Maestripieri, 2003), domestic dogs (Smuts, 2002), and marmots (Barash, 2000). Indeed, as Goffman (1971:73) observes, greetings "appear to be found in every human society and not a

few animal ones"; thus "there could hardly be a better argument for there being common ground between animal and human studies than that provided by greeting behavior."

This article synthesizes conversation analytic findings on how people begin encounters. Because most of the contributions to this special issue deal with how people open face-to-face interaction, and because extant literature on the openings of encounters has often used inconsistent terminology resulting in somewhat disparate strands of findings, this article empirically delineates an answer to the question "What is an opening?" In the next section, I describe the modular components that people regularly use to constitute the copresent opening phase of interaction, making reference to the articles in this special issue as they become relevant. This article then concludes with an overview of the contributions to this special issue, which collectively advance knowledge not only of how people open interaction, but how they organize interaction, providing cumulative and interlocking findings upon which future research can build.

What Is an Opening?

Some of the earliest CA work demonstrates that interactions do not simply begin. Rather, participants actively and collaboratively open their conversational encounters through an *opening phase* of activity (Pillet-Shore, 2008; Robinson, 2013; Schegloff, 1968; Sidnell, 2010). When people open an interaction, they (re)constitute their social relationship (Pillet-Shore, 2008; 2012; Schegloff, 1986). Openings are a locus of important interactional work, including marking interpersonal access (Goffman, 1971), presence validation and threat denial (Youssouf, Grimshaw & Bird, 1976), as well as establishing the nature of the encounter and its organization (e.g., what will be done and/or talked about, in what order).

Although Schegloff (1967; 1968) consistently uses the term "conversational openings" to refer to this phenomenon, much of the early literature on face-to-face openings uses "the lay term 'greeting'" (Goffman, 1971:80) in its broadest sense, at times using "greeting" either interchangeably with an entire encounter (e.g., Youssouf, Grimshaw & Bird, 1976), or as synonymous with "opening" or "salutation" at the beginning of an encounter (e.g., Goffman, 1971; Firth, 1972; Kendon & Ferber, 1973). Thus, investigations into "greetings" have included actions as diverse as summons-answer sequences, introduction sequences, body contact, and question-answer sequences (cf. Firth, 1972; Kendon & Ferber, 1973; Youssouf, et al., 1976;

Duranti, 1992; 1997). In contrast, a more recent conversation analytic body of work (e.g., Schegloff, 1986; Heritage, 1984:245-247; Pillet-Shore, 2008; Mortensen & Hazel, 2014), including all of the contributions to this special issue, uses the term "greeting" in a more refined sense, reserving it for reference to discrete vocal/verbal and embodied actions that parties deploy to compose greeting adjacency pair sequences in the very first moments of encounters. Thus, *greeting* is but one action that participants regularly deploy to build a larger *opening phase* of copresent interaction.

Constituting the Opening Phase of Face-to-Face Interaction: Regular Components

This subsection provides an empirical inventory of the regular components that people use to constitute the opening phase of copresent interaction. While I initially developed this inventory based upon my analysis of situations showing parties arriving to a variety of residential and institutional settings in which at least one participant is already-situated (Pillet-Shore, 2008), I have continued to update and refine it sensitive to analyses of other situations, such as those in which mobile people enter into interaction in public space (e.g., Mondada, 2009; De Stefani & Mondada, 2018/this issue).[1]

Analysis of visible and audible aspects of face-to-face openings (including talk/speech, prosody, gaze, and bodily orientation, movement, gesture and contact) shows participants to regularly use the following modular components to build the copresent opening phase, each of which I explicate below:

- *Becoming copresent*
- *Greeting*
- *Touching*
- *Introducing*
- *Personal state/Previous activity managing*
- *Registering*
- *Settling in*
- *Bridging time*

Though I outline these opening phase components discretely and in a rough linear order, parties deploy these in a way that is more continuous than discrete, and linear ordering is an unavoidable byproduct of the written page. Some components are concurrently accomplishable with others and/or transition into others. Two features that transcend these components (often pervading much if not all of the opening phase) are: audible and/or visible *smiling* (cf. Kendon & Ferber,

1973) – a principal way parties do "displaying a positive stance" toward encountering recipients (Pillet-Shore, 2012:385-390); and *body position re-setting* – parties who were previously situated recurrently reset their body positions during copresent openings to facilitate coming together (often moving toward one another) as a means through which they make other opening phase components easier to do and enable themselves to spatially and territorially begin again once they are together (Goodwin, 1981; Kendon & Ferber, 1973; Mortensen & Hazel, 2014; Pillet-Shore, 2008).

Becoming copresent.

Becoming copresent captures a cluster of preparatory activities that necessarily precede the publicly recognizable moment when two parties mutually ratify social copresence (often via *greeting*; see below) – in other words, how participants physically make their way into social interaction (De Stefani & Mondada, 2018/this issue; Harjunpää, Mondada & Svinhufvud, 2018/this issue; Kendon, 1990; Kendon & Ferber, 1973; Kidwell, 2018/this issue; Mondada, 2009; Mortensen & Hazel, 2014; Pillet-Shore, 2008). This includes the actions parties use to become physically copresent, moving within range of mutual perceptibility.

Involved participants can become copresent around physical/social thresholds, commonly doors. In such situations, parties make choices about how they will manage arrivers' admission through the door sensitive to its state (e.g., closed and locked, closed and unlocked, ajar, mostly or fully open). Arrivers can move to *gain admission* from already-present, or "pre-present" persons (Sacks, 1992) using a summons (e.g., a knock, doorbell ring, and/or utterance), or they can move to *self-admit* with or without an accompanying warning summons (e.g., turning the doorknob and starting to push the door open as they also knock on it).

On a continuum, arrivers who choose to do a warning summons as they self-admit display less territorial deference than arrivers who issue a summons and wait for a pre-present party's answer, but more territorial deference than arrivers who self-admit without any form of accompanying summons.[2] Arrivers use the door and its associated apparatuses (knockers, bells/buzzers) as instruments of their summonses, exerting control over how they do the summons by varying speed (how fast/slow each successive knock or doorbell ring is done), duration (e.g., how many knocks, how long they press a doorbell) and pattern (how uniform or rhythmic the knocking/ringing is done). They can choose to do their summonses in designedly

unmarked, non-patterned ways, or they can do them in marked, patterned ways (e.g., the knocking pattern that mimics "shave and a haircut, two bits"). Arrivers' choice of how they do their summonses claims and projects a more or less familiar social relationship with the pre-present party, evidence that participants can start doing identification/recognition work during copresent summonsing actions. And, perceiving another's at-the-door summons, pre-present parties also make choices (e.g., if they will answer the summons, and if so, by deploying an utterance and/or by moving to open the door).

Involved parties can also become copresent when not around door-like thresholds, using *visual, aural, and tactile summonsing actions* to coordinate sighting and entry into mutual gaze (e.g., in a large, open space, calling out another's name or delivering another form of greeting-summons, Pillet-Shore, 2008; De Stefani & Mondada, 2018/this issue; police officers activating a car siren to summon a citizen driver to pull over on a roadway; Kidwell, 2018/this issue). The articles in this special issue support the notion that the methods participants use to become copresent, including sighting, summonsing and coordinating an approach – also termed "pre-beginning" (Schegloff, 1979; Kidwell, 2018/this issue) or "pre-opening" (De Stefani & Mondada, 2018/this issue) – are not separate from, but rather an integral part of, the opening phase of encounters, for the choices parties make about how they become physically and then socially copresent reflect and propose the state and character of their social relationships (e.g., implicating identification and/or recognition; degree of familiarity; territoriality/access).[3]

Greeting.

Greeting refers to discrete audible and visible (vocal, verbal/lexical, and embodied) actions that participants deploy to publicly mark the moment when they ratify another's social copresence (Pillet-Shore, 2012). This includes prototypical greeting utterances (e.g., *Hi, Hello, Hey, Good morning*) and gestures (e.g., hand wave, palm display, head toss/bow, eyebrow flash; cf. Kendon & Ferber, 1973) that people regularly use to compose the greeting adjacency pair sequence in the early moments of encounters (Pillet-Shore, 2012; cf. Heritage, 1984; Schegloff, 1986).

In a detailed analysis of how people prosodically produce their very first vocalized utterances, Pillet-Shore (2012) shows that participants to emergent encounters visibly hold off doing the action of greeting until they see "who's there," displaying their orientation to identification/recognition via visual inspection as prerequisite to producing a copresent greeting.

This is because participants recipient design their greetings on the level of prosody – the "musical" aspects of speech (e.g., pitch, loudness, duration). Participants tailor greetings to each addressee to display a stance toward the current state and character of their social relationship, including the basic consideration of whether the present occasion "is a first for these parties or involves a next encounter with a history to it" (Schegloff, 1986:113). If the present occasion is a next encounter, participants design their greetings sensitive to the amount of time that has elapsed since their last contact. Pillet-Shore (2012) demonstrates that participants observably fine-tune the design of their greetings along a prosodic continuum, using a regular cluster of "large" prosodic features (sound lengthening, audible smiling, increased volume, high onset pitch and a wide pitch span) to do "displaying a positive stance" toward encountering the addressed-recipient. Participants can also use a regular cluster of "small" prosodic features (producing their greeting utterances to sound shorter, softer, with a narrower pitch span, lower onset pitch, and without audible smiling) to do "displaying (no more than) a neutral stance" toward encountering the recipient.

Analyzing telephone conversation openings, Schegloff (1979; 2007:82) observes participants to orient to a "preference" for recognition (if possible and relevant) over self-identification.[4] Complementing Schegloff's findings, Pillet-Shore (2008; 2012) demonstrates that copresent participants also orient to this preference, using prosodically "large" greetings as a fast-and-frugal way to claim recognition, and treat the encounter as special (due to the participants' orientation to the amount of time elapsed since last contact as significant, and/or the current occasion as an unexpected pleasure, cf. De Stefani & Mondada, 2018/this issue). Pillet-Shore's (2012) study also establishes that copresent acquainted participants orient to a preference for doing greetings together (Pillet-Shore, 2012:390) – a state-of-affairs that is preferred because it enables involved persons to display approval and recognition of one another at the same time (Pillet-Shore, 2017a), thereby moving to satisfy – during the nascent moments of an encounter – parties' "positive face wants" (Brown & Levinson, 1987).

Touching.

Touching refers to the actions involved in bilaterally coordinating physical touch or body contact between two previously acquainted or unacquainted parties – actions that participants often do concurrent with other verbal/vocal and embodied conduct. (A unilateral form of touching is self-

grooming; Kendon & Ferber, 1973.) Touching actions include handshaking (e.g., Chaplin, et al., 2000), embracing/hugging (e.g., Forsell & Åström, 2012), and kissing (lip-to-cheek; lip-to-lip; cheek-to-cheek; Firth, 1972; Kendon & Ferber, 1973). These forms of touching are not necessarily mutually exclusive: parties can combine forms, choosing to move from one form to another. With multiple forms of touch available, participants observably use *pre-touching moves* (Pillet-Shore, 2008:266-268) as local methods for jointly achieving a common form of body contact – patterned and recognizable movements of the hands and arms (and in some cases, movements of the entire body, particularly its vector) that project a particular form of touch.

For example, participants in my data corpus visibly prepare their right hands for a handshake by (if necessary) shedding any items they are holding (Fig.1.1 to Fig.1.2), placing their right hands onto the right side hip/buttock area to "holster" the right hand (Fig.1.2) in a position from which they can draw on it quickly at the moment (and not before) they see that their recipient is ready to reciprocate with an extended hand (Fig.1.3). Such hand-holstering also enables participants to pat the palm of the hand dry (Fig.1.2) in preparation for the presentation-of-the-tactile-self that occurs during a handshake.

(1) [Election04a-2]

Fig.1.1   Fig.1.2   Fig.1.3

To project and proffer an embrace/hug as the incipient form of contact, parties do pre-hugging moves (Fig.2.1 and Fig.2.2) by splaying arms upward, outward and/or forward toward target recipients as they move toward them.

(2) [S09CC-2]   [LMG11-27-04a-1]

Fig.2.1   Fig.2.2

In cases when participants proffer mismatched pre-touching moves (e.g., when one person does a pre-hugging move by splaying two arms forward, while the other does a pre-handshaking move by extending one hand/arm; Fig.3.1), they must repair and resolve the mismatch, because these mismatches inhibit progressivity and jeopardize "face" and social solidarity.

(3) [Thanksgiving04d]

Fig.3.1

In the wake of such a mismatch (where one person visibly proposes/invites a greater level of intimacy only to discover his/her interlocutor proposing/inviting a relatively downgraded, lesser degree of intimacy), participants deploy accounts (e.g., "I have a bad cold") and laughter, thereby displaying their orientation to their mismatched pre-touching moves as delicate.

Introducing.

Introducing refers to the sequence of actions through which involved participants explicitly identify self and/or other. Closely analyzing naturally occurring videorecorded introductions between English-speaking persons, Pillet-Shore (2011) describes how participants recognizably bring off a sequence as an introduction by coordinating displayed attention between unacquainted parties, formulating persons treated as introducible, and ratifying the relevance of an introduction (instead of a name-reminding sequence) to display that they agree that the introducible parties are persons who have *not* previously met.

Parties observably distinguish between two types of introduction initiation: three-party mediator-initiation, and two-party self-initiation. When a known-in-common person is present, parties treat *mediator*-initiated introductions as preferred over *self*-initiated introductions. When mediators initiate introductions, they do so straightforwardly and without delay – as close as possible to the moment that the two unacquainted parties enter into one another's presence. Mediators' immediate launch of introductions is one way that parties display their orientation to a social norm that, if present, a known-in-common person should initiate an introduction between two unacquainted parties. (Mediators give introducible parties license to look at each other by pointing and directing their gaze toward one another; and mediators can use their knowledge of both introducible parties to recipient design their person reference formulations, helping them quickly establish common ground.) Another way parties display orientation to this norm is that, when unacquainted parties *self*-initiate an introduction in the presence of a person they know-in-common, they do so after some delay – after they have been in each other's presence for some time.

In addition, Pillet-Shore's (2011) analysis shows three other findings: when launching introductions, participants treat offers of identifying information as strongly preferred over requests for recipients to identify themselves (e.g., "Who are you?" or "What's your name?"); in formulating introducible persons, speakers make choices about which names to use and which social categories/identities to call out, revealing their assessment of what forms of identification will help recipients make sense of unfamiliar persons; and parties observably hold themselves accountable for a display of remembering persons with whom they have worked through introductions.

Personal state/Previous activity managing.

In face-to-face interaction, participants observably orient to interlocutors' *present personal states* – how a person is doing/feeling – as intertwined with their *previous activities/experiences* – what a person has been doing (Pillet-Shore, 2018/this issue). *Personal state/previous activity managing* thus refers to sequences of action through which participants offer, request and/or or otherwise exchange information about their present personal states vis-à-vis their respective previous activities/experiences.

Personal state sequences.

During the personal state sequence, participants enact self- and/or other- attentiveness to an interlocutor's current psychophysiological state, including that person's displayed affective/emotional and physical states. As elucidated by Sacks (1975), Schegloff (1986) and Pillet-Shore (2018/this issue), a participant may display a personal state that is either *neutral* or *non-neutral* (negative, humorous, positive; see Pillet-Shore, 2018/this issue).

Although past CA work uses the term "personal state sequence", many studies rely on the term "how are you" to refer to this phenomenon. While "how are you" may be a vernacularly recognizable metonymy for the entire personal state sequence, this phrase and its lexical variants are dispensable: Pillet-Shore's (2018/this issue) analysis demonstrates that, in face-to-face interaction, no personal state inquiry need occur for participants to recognizably launch a personal state sequence. Indeed, participants recurrently self-initiate personal state sequences by conveying self-attentive information about their personal states. Thus, one advantage of the term "personal state sequence" is that it does not presuppose an inquiry-based launch.

Of course, participants can initiate a personal state sequence through an inquiry. But speakers use a variety of other-attentive utterances to do this, ranging from the *generic and unspecified* (e.g., *How are you, How ya doin', How's it goin', How was your day, What's up, What's goin' on, What are you doing*) to the more *specified and recipient-designed* (e.g., *How was work, How was coffee, How was your game*), with the latter displaying shared contextual knowledge about the recipient's (probable) previous activity/experience.[5] Thus, another advantage of the term "personal state sequence" is that it embraces the empirically diverse lexical designs with which speakers constitute personal state inquiries.

Moreover, built into the term "how are you" is an expectation that a "proper" response is one that provides a "value state descriptor" (e.g., *good/fine/great/lousy*; Sacks, 1975:69). But during face-to-face openings, when speakers design their personal state inquiry responses to *not* include a lexical(ized) assessment of their personal states, participants do not treat this as missing (cf. Schegloff, 2007:20). Pillet-Shore (2018/this issue) shows that parties orient to a speaker's invocation of a selected previous activity/experience as a "proper" response to a personal state inquiry. Excerpt 4-line 4 shows an arriver (M) responding to a pre-present participant's personal state inquiry not with a lexical value state descriptor or assessment, but rather by invoking a selected previous activity/experience:

```
(4) [PT13]
01 T:     Come on (h)i(h)n.=
02 M:     =hhuhh!
03 T:     How a:re you¿
04 M: ->  I'm right after thuh book fa(hh)ir.hh
```

Due to the affordances of copresence, participants need not lexically assess their value states; rather, they can deploy stance-marking embodiments (e.g., gestures, audible out-breaths) to audibly/visibly enact a value state as either non-neutral (thereby moving for sequence-expansion) or neutral (thereby moving for sequence-closure). In fact, copresent participants recurrently treat neutral, nothing-to-report responses as not providing enough information. When a participant initially delivers such a response, s/he recurrently rushes-through a transition-relevance place (TRP) to produce a second turn-construction unit (TCU) which invokes a previous activity/experience, as shown in Excerpt 5-line 4:

```
(5) [F11AG-1]
01 C:     He::[y,
02 E:         [↑Hi babe;
03 C:     What's u:p,
04 E: ->  Not >much=Just got outta< Portuguese class:
```

And when a participant produces a response that only provides a neutral value state, the personal state inquiry speaker often produces a follow-up utterance that pursues a previous activity/experience disclosure, as shown in Excerpt 6-lines 3-4:

```
(6) [PT23] (simplified)
01 T:     So how are yo:u:?=
02 M:     =↑I'm good.=[How are you,=
03 T: ->             [Ya just-
04 T: ->  =Go:od.=Jus' come from work¿
05 M:     Um yeah.Bit (.) °uh°I had Jesse's at one forty fi::ve,=
06 T:     =O[:    :    :    h.
```

```
07 M:        [>So then we jus' hung out.We 'ent tih thuh book<
08           fair:, an' we: were playing.
09 T:        ↑Oh: goo:d.=
```

Likewise, in Excerpt 7 arriving Peg (P) produces a response at line 5 that only provides a neutral value state, thereby moving for sequence closure. Notice after a small beat of silence, Peg's friend Dan (D), who knows that Peg has just had coffee with her ex-boyfriend, yells Peg's name to sanction her for not being forthcoming, thereby moving to elicit more information regarding her previous activity/experience:

```
(7) [S09AC-2] (simplified)
01 D:     Peggy how was coffee.
02        (0.6)
03 P:     OH MY GOD=>I left my diet coke in the car<=Huh?
04 D:     How was c(h)offe[e.
05 P:                     [>Coffee was go:od<
06        (.)
07 D:     PE::G?
```

To pursue Peg in this way, Dan is claiming entitlement to more self-disclosure from her – proposing that he has a right to ask and be granted access to this information. Copresent participants recurrently offer or request information about their previous activities/experiences because this can provide a substantive first topic allowing for sequence expansion.

Previous activity formulating sequences.

While invoking a previous activity/experience is often a regular part of the copresent personal state sequence – particularly when arrivers choose to display a non-neutral state (Pillet-Shore, 2018/this issue) – pre-present parties also regularly explicitly formulate their previous activities during the opening phase of face-to-face interaction. Examining openings showing a newcomer arriving to a social scene where two or more pre-present persons are actively engaged in an activity, Pillet-Shore (2010) analyzes how and when pre-present speakers use the practice of *previous activity formulating,* delivering utterances dedicated to summarizing an activity or conversational topic in which they were engaged before establishing copresence with the newcomer. Speakers launch their previous activity formulating utterances with a regular format or frame involving a person reference (e.g., a pronoun), plus a conjugated form of the verb *to be*, (the optional adverb *just*), and then an *–ing* form of a verb, as exemplified by the arrowed utterances in Excerpts 8 and 9:

```
(8) [PT05]
01 T: ->   >We were just sharing: (.) um:
02         (0.3) Justin's math:, ((T showing D document))
03 D:      ptch! °Okay,° ((D gazing at document))

(9) [Poker Party]
01 Brad: ->   She was catching up to me in gin.=So it's a good
02            thing yer:
03 Gabe:      (Ah/Oh).
04 Brad:      You're he:re. ((Gabe visibly smiling))
05 Glen:      ↑Hm hm
```

Once a pre-present speaker has launched a previous activity formulation, fellow participants can allow that formulation to stand as is, thereby treating it as providing the newcomer with sufficient contextual resources to understand and (if relevant) participate in the formulated activity/topic. Alternatively, participants can operate on the initially-proffered formulation or formulation-in-progress, thereby treating it as somehow lacking in information that the arriving newcomer needs (e.g., factual details, affective valence) to be able to make sense of and merge into the interaction, as in Excerpt 10. Shortly after Dad (D) arrives late to Teacher's (T) classroom to join Teacher and Mom's (M) already-in-progress parent-teacher conference, Mom addresses a previous activity formulation to Dad starting at line 1:

```
(10) [PT33] (simplified)
01 M: ->   .hh *£She('s/w's) asking if we have any=
02         ((*M shifts gaze to D and touches D's shoulder))
03 M:      =concerns.=
04 T: ->   =Ye[:ah.Any   ques:tions  or::
05 M:         [(about/or what) her progress (has-) her pro:gress
06         has bee[n an' (stuff/so).
07 T:             [Things you've noticed, an' even growth.=If
08         you'[ve observed I love to hea[r in terms of paren[t(al)=
09 M:          [ptch! .hhh              [ptch! .hh          [pt! .h
10 T:      =pers°pective.°
```

Latched to the end of the first TCU of Mom's formulation, Teacher operates on Mom's initially-proffered formulation starting at line 4, adding the comparatively neutral "ques:tions" and positively-valenced "growth" to Mom's negatively-valenced "concerns" (line 3) as further contextual information that she treats as important for Dad to be able to make sense of and merge into the interaction from this point forward.

Pillet-Shore (2010) demonstrates that pre-present speakers use the practice of previous activity formulating to both *make way* for the newcomer to enter into the turn-by-turn talk, providing him/her a structural opportunity to speak next; and *make sense* for the newcomer by providing the contextual resources s/he needs to be able to understand and participate in the

interaction. Previous activity formulating is thus a key method for *doing including* in everyday social life, since it: acknowledges and ratifies the arriving newcomer as a full-fledged, active coparticipant, welcoming and shepherding her/him into the interaction; spares the newcomer from having to 'break in' to the pre-present party's talk; and spares the newcomer from spending time as a bystander trying to figure out – on his/her own – 'what's going on' in the interaction.

Moreover, when and how pre-present speakers come to deliver these previous activity formulations is important. Pre-present speakers can come to deliver these formulations as: (i) *offered* – in first position, launching them spontaneously as self-initiated formulations; or (ii) *requested* – in second position, launching them after a newcomer's explicit request for a formulation (e.g., *What's this?*). But participants do not treat these offer or request alternatives as equally valued. Rather, parties treat pre-present parties' offers of formulations as preferred over arrivers' requests for formulations. Pillet-Shore (2010) shows that newcomers only explicitly request a formulation if one has not been spontaneously offered by the pre-present party, and if the newcomer's earlier tacit techniques for eliciting an 'offered' formulation have failed. This means that there is a third way that pre-present speakers can come to deliver previous activity formulations: (iii) as *a tacitly elicited 'offer'* – in first-position in terms of utterance-based actions, but in second-position relative to newcomers' body behaviors. Newcomers use embodied resources to markedly display "I'm ready and wish to join in and co-participate" as a means of tacitly eliciting formulations from pre-present parties.

Coparticipants can use previous activity formulations as interactional fulcrums – as segue utterances that help move interactants from the copresent opening phase into unified participation in some next activity (including the continuation of the previously in progress activity/topic, or the start of some new activity/topic).

Registering.

Registering refers to the linguistic and embodied ways that participants call joint attention to a selected publicly perceivable referent, audibly pointing so others shift their sensory attention to it. "Registering" is an umbrella term encompassing the often difficult to disaggregate actions of "noticing" and "announcing" (Schegloff, 2007:82; Pillet-Shore, 2005; 2008; 2017a; 2017b; Steensig, 2015; cf. Stivers & Rossano, 2010:9) as well as "setting talk" (Maynard & Zimmerman, 1984:304). Copresent openings provide a prolific site for the action of registering

since the beginning of an encounter is a time of heightened exposure to novel sensory stimuli and also a time of heightened self- and other- awareness and attentiveness. During openings, participants display that they are monitoring for diverse and distributed manifestations of "the self", including presentation of participants' bodies (e.g., how persons look, smell, sound) as well as participants' self-extensions, like living quarters (e.g., how a person's residence looks and smells) and other beings for whom one is regarded as responsible (e.g., pets, young children) (Pillet-Shore, 2017a; 2017b).

Participants produce and understand sequence-initial registering actions sensitive to the target referent's *ownership* (if a participant is regarded as responsible for it) and *value* (if participants are displaying a valenced-stance toward it). In Excerpt 11, as arriving guest Jess (J) is entering her friends' apartment, she registers Bri's (B) change in hairstyle. About 1-second after she first gazes toward Bri, the video shows Jess to do a double-take as she indexes her realization of the referent through her turn-initial reaction token at line 3:

```
(11) [S10RG-2]
01 B:    ↑H[iee:::=
02 K:     [↑Hi::=
03 J: ->  =.hh OH my God=<Yer hai:r,>= ((to B))
04 B:     =Yea:h,=[It's shorter,
05 J:            [I lo:ve it hhh=
```

Rushing to explicate her target referent ("Yer hair") and display a positive stance toward it (line 5), Jess uses her registering as a vehicle for complimenting Bri as the owner of the referent.

Participants can do a registering action in a way that either articulates, or avoids articulating, a valenced (+/-) stance toward the referent. When a non-owner registers a referent without articulating a stance toward it, participants treat that action as eliding and implying a negative/critical stance (Pillet-Shore, 2005). This orientation is observable when a non-owner's registering utterance is composed of multiple TCUs, as in Excerpt 11, and Excerpts 12-14:

```
(12) [Study Group]
01 ML: ->  °(You)° dy:e your ha:ir¿=It looks cute.
02 HA:     Yeah.huh
03 ML:     I li:ke it.

(13) [Election04]
01         (1.0)
02 J2: ->  Oh my god,=You have a million ga:mes.=I like ya arready.=
03 PA:     =h[hh!
04 TE:      [huh [huh
05 J2:           [I love games.=
```

```
(14) [Thanksgiving2001]
01 B: ->  It's good to see- Yer ha:ir is so° sho↑rt.=I lo↑ve it.=
03 J:     =Yeah?
```

In Excerpts 11-14, because the speaker's TCU explicating the target referent ("<Yer

hai:r,>";"°(You)° dy:e your ha:ir"; "You have a million ga:mes"; "Yer ha:ir is so° sho↑rt.") does

not include an explicitly lexicalized stance, that speaker rushes-through the next TRP to

specifically articulate a positive stance toward the target referent ("I lo:ve it"; "It looks cute"; "I

like ya arready"; "I lo↑ve it").

Participants' orientation to a non-owner's non-valenced registering as implying a

negative/critical stance can also be observed in Excerpt 15. As Jane (J) arrives to her friends'

apartment, her pre-present roommate Alice (A) registers Jane's all-gray outfit ("gro:utfit") at line

4:

```
(15) [F17AT-1]
01 E:     He:[:y,
02 J:        [He::y=Wha:t's up guy:s:[:?
03 K:                               [£He::[:y
04 A: ->                                  [O::+h the gro:utfit.=
                                             +fig.15.1
05 K: ->  =Gray on gra[y:,
06 E:                 [hh +hih hih hah hah+
                          +fig.15.2         +fig.15.3
```


Fig.15.1   Fig.15.2   Fig.15.3

```
07 J:     .hhh! I litera[lly?=
08 ?:                   [heh hih heh
09 J:     =was about to walk over,=>an I was like<
10        ah: no: like (.) [I need a sweatshirt.=
11 A:                      [((cough))
12 E:     =[hhah hah
13 K:     =[hah hah hah              hah   hah  hah
14 J:     =[A(h)nd th(h)is i(h)s (h)all I cou(h)ld f(h)i:nd=
15 J:     =.hh[h
16 A:         [You're [ridiculous
17 J:                 [Is it ba:d,
```

Excerpt 15 shows participants using the non-valenced registering utterances at lines 4-5 to tease Jane, criticizing her for her outfit choice (cf. Haugh & Pillet-Shore, 2018). After Jane initially responds with her 'proud display' gesture (Fig.15.2) and laughter, she accounts for her outfit (lines 7, 9-10, 14) and then asks "Is it bad" at line 17, demonstrating her orientation to her interlocutors' non-valenced registering actions as implying a negative stance.

Furthermore, when the owner of a target referent registers in a way that avoids articulating a valenced stance, recipients often respond by articulating a (positive) stance next, as in Excerpt 16. Sixty seconds after[6] establishing copresence with Addison (A), Lulu (L) registers how she's changed her hair since the last time they saw one another:

```
(16) [S17AD]
01 L: ->  I cho:pped my hai:r.hh*
02          (.)/((*A shifting gaze from board game to L))
03 A:      It looks so go:od¿ ((A/L in mutual gaze))
```

While the action of registering is a regular resource that participants use during the opening phase of interaction, it is a resource that participants can also use to restart talk after a lapse (Hoey, 2018/this issue; Keevallik, 2018/this issue).

Settling in.

Settling in refers to actions through which participants prepare themselves and their environment for participation in a joint activity. This includes both *bilateral settling in actions* (audible and/or visible actions that require cooperation between at least two participants, often done as part of an adjacency pair sequence), and *unilateral settling in actions* (visible actions that can be done by a single participant, often not as part of an adjacency pair sequence).

Bilateral settling in actions include:
- pre-present parties' (e.g., hosts') explicit welcoming and "come in"-type utterances to arrivers;
- parties' offers of comfort and/or consumables (e.g., presenting food/drink/flowers/gifts or other material objects; offering help offloading parcels/jackets; offering seats);
- parties' utterances that register preparation of the physical environment (e.g., closing/opening doors, making temperature or ambient noise-level adjustments); and
- parties' announcements or inquiries about other expected participants.

Unilateral settling in actions include:
- parties' self-preparation by adjusting their appearance via self-grooming (cf. Kendon & Ferber, 1973), off-loading material objects (e.g., removing extraneous clothing, setting down parcels; cf. Streeck, Goodwin & LeBaron, 2011), and getting into position (e.g., finding and taking seating; establishing a participation framework; Goodwin, 1981); and

- parties tacit preparation of the physical environment (e.g., closing/opening doors, making temperature or ambient noise-level adjustments).

Bridging time.

Bridging time refers to utterances through which speakers work to bridge the time gap between the last time their current recipient was occasioned for them and the present encounter. Acquainted parties[7] can do this through utterances that index, assess or quantify how long it has been since they were last in direct contact, as in Excerpt 17:

```
(17) [PT12] (simplified)
01 D:     Good to see yo[u. ((T and D handshaking))
02 T: ->               [Good.Nice to see yo:u. Go:sh. I can't
03        believe it's been (1.0) t- no.=°Just one year.°=
04 M:     =Yeh- A [year.
05 T:             [£Yeah. (heh) [Just a year.(hih)
06 M:                           [One year,
```

Participants can also bridge time through utterances that invoke the last time their addressed-recipient was mentioned in conversation with another and/or by following up on a topic from a previous conversation. In Excerpt 18, M does the former at lines 3-4, and the latter at line 7:

```
(18) [S18BW]
01 M:     Welcome ho::m[e?
02 L:                  [Tha(h)n(h)ks hih [heh
03 M: ->                                 [We missed you at thuh
04        Superbowl,=>but everybody said hi::[:,
05 L:                                        [Aw I know=I wish I
06        coulda come.
07 M: -> .hh I talked to um Kay about those um- coasters?
08 L:     Yeah,
```

In sum.

This section has delineated eight modular components that people regularly use to constitute the copresent opening phase of encounters. Of these components, participants recurrently use *personal state/previous activity managing, registering, settling in*, and/or *bridging time* to generate a first topic of conversation.

Participants to any one opening phase do not necessarily (or even usually) use all eight components; rather they use a subset of these modular components tailored to fit their particular needs in managing the coming together process (given who they are to and for one another on that particular occasion). Practically speaking, participants tend to use more of these components, and/or perform each for a longer duration and with greater intensity, when they

wish to display that their coming together is a big(ger) deal. Thus, we can conceptualize the overall impression that an opening phase engenders (for the participants themselves first and foremost, and then to analysts) on a continuum of *smaller* to *larger* (cf. Pillet-Shore, 2012), with *larger,* more elaborate openings indexing participants' orientation to the amount of time elapsed since last contact as significant (cf. Goffman, 1963; 1971) and/or the current occasion as special or unexpected and pleasing/welcome (cf. De Stefani & Mondada, 2018/this issue). Based upon videorecorded data, this observation lends evidence to Goffman's (1963:102) classic claim that each face-to-face "engagement tends to be initiated with an amount of fuss appropriate to the period of lapsed contact," and also to Dunbar's (2004) suggestion that we tend to greet distant acquaintances more effusively than we do those whom we see more often, thereby further bolstering the relationship due to longer time-since-last-contact. Thus, larger openings "provide a way of showing that a relationship is still what it was at the termination of the previous coparticipation… The enthusiasm of [openings] compensates for the weakening of the relationship caused by the absence just terminated" (Goffman, 1967: 41).

Articles in this Special Issue

This special issue contains six empirical articles, all of which analyze naturally-occurring, videorecorded episodes of face-to-face interaction using multimodal conversation analytic (CA) methods. These contributions explore the themes of opening and maintaining face-to-face interaction within social contexts that are describable along several continua, including:

- encounters that are more casual to encounters that are more institutional;
- settings that are residential to settings involving a workplace;
- encounters that are planned to encounters that are unplanned;
- interactions between participants primarily socializing to those between participants primarily accomplishing some specific task;
- encounters that occur in more private spaces to encounters that occur in public;
- interactions between participants who are previously acquainted to those between unacquainted persons;
- situations involving multiactivity (Haddington, Keisanen, Mondada & Nevile, 2014) to occasions in which conversation is the central activity (Schegloff, 2007:193); and
- encounters between participants who are relatively situated/sedentary to those between participants moving in space.

The first four articles offer insights into how people open face-to-face interaction. In the first article, Pillet-Shore (2018/this issue) elucidates how and when a person can show how s/he is doing/feeling when arriving to a social encounter. Examining personal state sequences during

videorecorded openings of residential and institutional interactions, this article describes arrivers' methodical multimodal resources for displaying a non-neutral (e.g., negative, humorous, positive) personal state, demonstrating that arrivers time their displays calibrated to their understanding of their relationship with fellow participants. Pillet-Shore's analysis reveals that arrivers use this action to proffer a first-hand experience as a self-attentive first topic of conversation, recognizably bidding for empathy and inviting recipients to collaborate in expanding the personal state topic/sequence.

In the second article, De Stefani & Mondada (2018/this issue) focus on how people jointly initiate chance encounters in public space. The authors compare video data showing two situations: acquainted persons 'bumping into' one another, and unacquainted persons managing itinerary requests. Combining the study of mobility with research on conversational openings, their analysis finds similarities and differences between participants' initiations of each kind of unplanned encounter, including how they accomplish sighting, identifying, and building a participation framework.

The third article, by Harjunpää, Mondada & Svinhufvud (2018/this issue), examines openings of videorecorded service encounters in food shops. Investigating participants' coordinated entry into the reason for the encounter, this article describes how the customer's trajectory of entering the shop and approaching the counter is organized with regard to the salesperson's display of (un)availability. The authors present a continuum of cases, with some showing the salesperson displaying maximal availability and reciprocally moving with the customer to meet at the "service point," while others show the salesperson displaying unavailability by being visibly occupied with another work task, delaying the customer's first request.

The fourth article, by Kidwell (2018/this issue), explores how pre-opening moments are consequential for the reason for the encounter in a form of institutional interaction that, rather than involving service, instead involves incipient discipline and/or coercion. This article examines police-citizen encounters during driving-infraction traffic stops, using third-party video recorded with dashboard-mounted cameras in police patrol cars. Supplementing these video data with ethnographic data, Kidwell argues that the reason for the stop is an important site for alignment between officer and citizen regarding what happened to occasion the encounter.

The final two articles in this special issue provide insights into how people maintain or continue face-to-face interaction after a lapse – a period of non-talk that develops when all participants have declined the opportunity to self-select to speak.

In the fifth article, Keevallik (2018/this issue) inspects video data excerpted from a single workday during which eleven young people manually clear a sheep stable of dung – a continuing state of incipient talk (Schegloff, 2007:193) and multiactivity situation (Haddington, Keisanen, Mondada & Nevile, 2014) in which participants' physical labor activities provide, and account for, lapses. Analyzing a collection of participant comments that register the local, material environment, this article compares comments that initiate a conversational sequence with those that emerge as self-talk. Keevallik finds that the speaker's embodied delivery, including posture, speech volume, and gaze, as well as the oddness of the target referent and the current bodily constellation of fellow workers, all contribute to attracting a response from another participant.

In the sixth and final article, Hoey (2018/this issue) examines videorecorded occasions in which casual conversation is the central activity, investigating how participants continue with turn-by-turn talk after a momentary lapse that occurs at a place of possible sequence completion. This article describes three ways that speakers may resolve a lapse and resume conversation: by moving to end the interaction (initiating a pre-closing sequence), continuing with prior talk (including the current topic, the pre-lapse sequence, or some pre-prior sequence), or starting something new (introducing unmentioned mentionables, or registering their situated environment). Hoey concludes by offering quantitative evidence suggesting a preference for continuing with prior talk.

One of the most exciting prospects of recent CA studies of face-to-face encounters is that, even though each study examines interaction among persons speaking particular language(s) within particular culture(s), analysts can increasingly attend to commonalities that may play a role in opening and maintaining *human* interaction "regardless of the semiotic system employed" (Enfield & Levinson, 2006:3,14). As the articles in this special issue attest, language and social interaction research on how to begin – a new encounter, or a new sequence – is not only productive, but promises to profoundly advance our understanding of sociality.

References

Altman, I. & Taylor, D. (1973). *Social penetration: The development of interpersonal relationships.* New York: Holt.

Bailey, B. (2017). Greetings and compliments or street harassment? Competing evaluations of street remarks in a recorded collection. *Discourse & Society*, 28(4), 353-373.

Barash, D. (1989). Descriptive anatomy of social behavior. Pp. 77-104 in *Marmots: Social behavior and ecology*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Brown, P. & Levinson, S. C. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Chaplin, W., Phillips, J., Brown, J., Clanton, N. & Stein, J. (2000). Handshaking, gender, personality, and first impressions. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology,* 19(4), 110-117.

Corsaro, W. A. (1979). "We're friends, right?": Children's use of access rituals in a nursery school. *Language in Society,* 8:315-336.

De Stefani, E. & Mondada, L. (2018/this issue). Encounters in public space: How acquainted vs. unacquainted persons establish social and spatial arrangements. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 51(3), XX-XX. doi:

Dunbar, R. (2004). Gossip in evolutionary perspective. *Review of General Psychology*, 8(2), 100-110.

Duneier, M. (1999). Talking to women. Pp. 188-216 in Sidewalk. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.

Duneier, M., & Molotch, H. (1999). Talking city trouble: Interactional vandalism, social inequality, and the 'urban interaction problem'. *American Journal of Sociology,* 104(5): 1263–1295.

Duranti, A. (1992). Language and bodies in social space: Samoan ceremonial greetings. *American Anthropologist*, 94(3), 657-691.

Duranti, A. (1997). Universal and culture-specific properties of greetings. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology*, 7(1), 63-97.

Eibl-Eibesfeldt, I. (1968). [On the ethology of the human greeting behavior. I. Observations on Bali natives Papuans and Samoans along with comparative remarks]. *Zeitschrift für Tierpsychologie*, 25(6), 727-744.

Eibl-Eibesfeldt, I. (1971). [Ethology of human greeting behavior. II. Greeting behavior and some other patterns of friendly contact in the Waika (Yanoama)]. *Zeitschrift für Tierpsychologie, 29*(2), 196-213.

Enfield, N. J. & Levinson, S. C. (2006). Introduction: Human sociality as a new interdisciplinary field. Pp. 1-35 in N. J. Enfield & S. C. Levinson (Eds.), *Roots of human sociality: Culture, cognition and interaction*. Oxford: Berg.

Firth, R. (1972). Verbal and bodily rituals of greeting and parting. Pp. 1-34 in J. S. La Fontaine (Ed.), *The interpretation of ritual: Essays in honour of A. I. Richards*. London: Tavistock Ltd.

Forsell, L. & Åström, J. (2012). Meanings of hugging: From greeting behaviors to touching implications. *Comprehensive Psychology, 1*(13).

Goffman, E. (1963). *Behavior in public places: Notes on the social organization of gatherings*. New York: The Free Press.

Goffman, E. (1971). Supportive interchanges. Chapter 3, pp.62-94 in *Relations in public: Microstudies of the public order*. New York: Harper & Row.

Goodwin, C. (1981). *Conversational organization: Interaction between speakers and hearers*. New York: Academic Press.

Haddington, P., Keisanen, T., Mondada, L. & Nevile, M. (eds). (2014). *Multiactivity in social interaction: Beyond multitasking*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Harjunpää, K., Mondada, L,. & Svinhufvud, K. (2018/this issue). The coordinated entry into service encounters in food shops: Managing interactional space, availability, and service during openings. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 51(3), XX-XX. doi:

Haugh, M. (2011). Humour, face and im/politeness in getting acquainted. In B. Davies, M. Haugh & A. Merrison (Eds.), *Situated politeness*. London: Continuum, pp.165-184.

Haugh, M. & Carbaugh, D. (2015). Self-disclosure in initial interactions amongst speakers of American and Australian English. *Multilingua,* 34(4), 461-493.

Haugh, M. & Pillet-Shore, D. (2018). Getting to know you: Teasing as an invitation to intimacy in initial interactions. *Discourse Studies*, 20(2), 246-269.

Heritage, J. (1984). Conversation analysis. Pp. 233- 292 in *Garfinkel and ethnomethodology*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Hoey, E. M. (2018/this issue). How speakers continue with talk after a lapse in conversation. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 51(3), XX-XX. doi:

Keevallik, L. (2018/this issue). Sequence initiation or self-talk? Commenting on the surroundings while mucking out a sheep stable. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 51(3), XX-XX. doi:

Kendon, A. (1990). *Conducting interaction. Patterns of behavior in focused encounters* Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Kendon, A. & Ferber, A. (1973). A description of some human greetings. In R. P. Michael & J. H. Crook (Eds.), *Comparative ecology and behaviour of primates* (pp. 591–668). London: Academic Press.

Kidwell, M. (2018/this issue). Early alignment in police traffic stops. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 51(3), XX-XX. doi:

Kleinke, C. L. (1975). *First impressions: The psychology of encountering others*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Maynard, D. W. & Zimmerman, D. H. (1984). Topical talk, ritual and the social organization of relationships. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 47, 4, 301-316.

Mondada, L. (2009). Emergent focused interactions in public space: A systematic analysis of the multimodal achievement of a common interactional space. *Journal of Pragmatics,* 41(10), 1977-1997.

Mortensen, K. & Hazel, S. (2014). Moving into interaction: Social practices for initiating an encounter at a help desk. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 62, 46-67.

Pillet-Shore, D. (2005). Calling attention to owned mutually-perceivable referents: How registering works when opening face-to-face interaction. Manuscript. Department of Sociology, University of California, Los Angeles.

Pillet-Shore, D. (2008). *Coming together: Creating and maintaining social relationships through the openings of face-to-face interactions*. Ph.D. dissertation. Department of Sociology, University of California, Los Angeles.

Pillet-Shore, D. (2010). Making way and making sense: Including newcomers in interaction. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 73(2), 152-175.

Pillet-Shore, D. (2011). Doing introductions: The work involved in meeting someone new. *Communication Monographs*, 78(1), 73-95.

Pillet-Shore, D. (2012). Greeting: Displaying stance through prosodic recipient design. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 45(4), 375-398.

Pillet-Shore, D. (2017a). Preference organization. In Jon Nussbaum (Editor-in-Chief), *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Communication*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

DOI: 10.1093/acrefore/9780190228613.013.132

Pillet-Shore, D. (2017b). When to make the sensory social: Registering in copresent openings. Invited presentation of paper on panel (organized by Charles Antaki), "Entry and re-entry into interaction", 15th International Pragmatics Conference (IPrA 2017), Belfast, Northern Ireland. July 20.

Pillet-Shore, D. (2018/this issue). Arriving: Expanding the personal state sequence. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 51(3), XX-XX. doi:

Robinson, J. D. (1998). Getting down to business: Talk, gaze and body orientation during openings of doctor-patient consultations. *Human Communication Research,* 25, 1, 97-123.

Robinson, J. D. (2013). Overall structural organization. In J. Sidnell & T. Stivers (Eds.), *The Handbook of Conversation Analysis* (pp. 257-80). Blackwell Publishing Ltd.

Sacks, H. (1975). Everyone has to lie. Pp. 57-79 in B. Blount & M. Sanches (Eds.), *Sociocultural dimensions of language use*. New York: Academic Press.

Sacks, H. (1992). *Lectures on conversation*, Vols. 1 and 2, G. Jefferson (Ed.). Oxford: Blackwell.

Schegloff, E. A. (1967). *The first five seconds: The order of conversational openings*. Ph.D. dissertation. Department of Sociology, University of California, Berkeley.

Schegloff, E. A. (1968). Sequencing in conversational openings. *American Anthropologist*, 70(6), 1075-1095.

Schegloff, E. A. (1979). Identification and recognition in telephone conversation openings. In G. Psathas (Ed.), *Everyday language: Studies in ethnomethodology*. New York: Irvington.

Schegloff, E. A. (1986). The routine as achievement. *Human Studies*, 9, 111-151.

Schegloff, E. A. (1998). Reflections on studying prosody in talk-in-interaction. *Language and Speech*, 41(3-4), 235-263.

Schegloff, E. A. (2007). *Sequence organization in interaction: A primer in conversation analysis* (Vol. 1). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Sidnell, J. (2010). Openings and closings. Chapter 10 in *Conversation Analysis: An Introduction.* Wiley-Blackwell.

Smuts, B. (2002). Gestural communication in olive baboons and domestic dogs. Chapter 37, Pp. 301-306 in M. Bekoff, C. Allen and G. M. Burghardt (Eds.), *The cognitive animal: Empirical and theoretical perspectives on animal cognition*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.

Steensig, J. (2015). *Registering the material world*. Panel of papers presented at the International Institute for Ethnomethodology and Conversation Analysis (IIEMCA) Conference, August 5. University of Southern Denmark, Kolding.

Stivers, T. & Rossano. F. (2010). Mobilizing response. *Research on Language and Social Interaction,* 43(1), 3–31.

Streeck, J., Goodwin, C. & LeBaron, C. (Eds.). (2011). *Embodied interaction: Language and body in the material world.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Svennevig, J. (1999) *Getting acquainted in conversation*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Svennevig, J. (2014). Direct and indirect self-presentation in first conversations. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology,* 33(3): 302-327.

Taylor, S. E., Peplau, L. A., & Sears, D. O. (2000). Person perception: Forming impressions of others. In N. Roberts, B. Webber, & J. Cohen (Eds.), *Social psychology* (pp. 62-97). Upper Saddle River: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Whitham, J. C. & Maestripieri, D. (2003). Primate rituals: The function of greetings between male Guinea baboons. *Ethology*, 109, 847-859.

Youssouf, I. A., Grimshaw, A. D. & Bird, C. S. (1976). Greetings in the desert. *American Ethnologist*, 3, 797-824.

NOTES

[1] Since 2004, I've been continually collecting and analyzing videorecorded openings. I've amassed a data corpus that currently involves over 365 residential encounters (e.g., friends, family, roommates coming home or coming over) and 88 workplace encounters (e.g., in schools, break rooms, restaurants, salons, gyms) with the informed consent of participants and permission to use these data in publications. My analysis of over 92 hours of naturally occurring videorecorded data has thus far yielded 496 copresent openings between English-speaking persons (on the west and east coasts of the United States) coming together to socialize and do work.

[2] Exceptions to this are accountable: in my data set, residents who issue a summons and wait for admission to their own residences regularly account for their actions (e.g., a misplaced key) to fellow cohabitants who open the door.

[3] Though participants' entry into *social* copresence is distinct from their entry into *physical* copresence, analysis reveals that parties orient to a "preference" (Heritage, 1984; Pillet-Shore, 2017a) for entering into both near the same time (Pillet-Shore, 2008). Parties treat delays between entry into physical copresence and moves to enter into social copresence as accountable and possible grounds for negative inference.

[4] I use the terms "preference" and "dis/preferred" throughout this article in the conversation analytic sense to refer to systematic properties of turn and sequence construction (Heritage, 1984; Pillet-Shore, 2017a; Schegloff, 2007). "Preferred" actions are characteristically performed straightforwardly and without delay, whereas actions that are delayed are termed "dispreferred".

[5] Generic/unspecified personal state inquiries that transpire before the participants have established a common frame of dominant orientation (Robinson, 1998) are often treated as *pro forma*, whereas specified/recipient-designed

personal state inquiries, particularly those produced after the participants have established an engagement framework, are often treated as *bona fide* (Pillet-Shore, 2008).

[6] See Pillet-Shore (2005; 2017a; 2017b) for analysis of the timing and preference organization of participants' registering actions.

[7] Previously unacquainted parties can use a version of this action during introduction sequences when claiming preexisting knowledge about recipients (e.g., "I've heard so much about you").