

<https://helda.helsinki.fi>

Action ascription and deonticity in everyday advice-giving sequences

Couper-Kuhlen, Elizabeth

Cambridge University Press
2022

Couper-Kuhlen , E & Thompson , S A 2022 , Action ascription and deonticity in everyday advice-giving sequences . in A Deppermann & M Haugh (eds) , Action Ascription in Interaction . Studies in Interactional Sociolinguistics , no. 35 , Cambridge University Press , Cambridge , pp. 183-207 . <

<https://www.cambridge.org/core/books/action-ascription-in-interaction/action-ascription-and-deonticity-in-everyday-ac>

>

<http://hdl.handle.net/10138/347044>

acceptedVersion

Downloaded from Helda, University of Helsinki institutional repository.

This is an electronic reprint of the original article.

This reprint may differ from the original in pagination and typographic detail.

Please cite the original version.

Chapter 8: Action Ascription and Deonticity in Everyday Advice-Giving Sequences

Elizabeth Couper-Kuhlen and Sandra A. Thompson

1. Introduction

Action ascription, according to Levinson (2013:104), is “central to the CA enterprise”, and yet “direct empirical investigations in CA are few and far between”. This chapter explicitly addresses action ascription in everyday advice-giving sequences, with a focus on those sequences in which advice has not been solicited as such. It takes the perspective of a would-be next speaker, who must ascribe an action to the prior speaker in order to determine how to respond. That is, the recipient of a complaint or troubles-telling must decide whether or not it warrants advice. If advice is given, the complainer or troubles-teller must ascribe to the advice the kind of response it projects. In unsolicited advice-giving sequences, such decision-making can be relevant, for instance, for the would-be advice-giver, who, in choosing to give advice, makes a determination that an offer of ‘help’ is relevant, but also for the advice-recipient, who, in deciding whether to accept or resist the advice, makes a determination about the nature of the advice and the strength of the stance being taken by the advice-giver.

Advice-giving has been examined in institutional settings such as medical interaction (e.g., Heritage and Lindström 1998, 2012; Heritage and Sefi 1992; Kinnell and Maynard 1996; Silverman 1997; Pilnick 2001, 2003); student counseling and tutoring (e.g., Vehviläinen 2001; Waring 2005, 2007, 2012); help lines (e.g., Butler et al. 2010; Emmison et al. 2011; Hepburn and Potter 2011; Pudlinski 2002); and expert-layperson call-in radio programs (Hudson 1990; Hutchby 1995). In these settings, asymmetries between the interactants are institutionally given: the counselor/doctor/advisor generally has greater deontic **status** (Heritage 2012a, b; Stevanovic and Peräkylä 2012) with respect to the future action than the layperson/patient/student.

There has been much less research on advice-giving in informal, everyday interactions, Jefferson and Lee (1981) being a notable exception. We return to their study below. Shaw and Hepburn (2013) and Shaw et al. (2015) explore advice-giving in mother-adult daughter interactions; in such interactions, there is a generation-based asymmetry with mothers typically treated as having the authority to advise their grown daughters, whereas in this chapter we consider everyday conversations in which there are no pre-established role asymmetries. In our data, the interactants are friends and siblings; no one interactant has a priori greater deontic status than the other based on social roles: who gives and who receives advice gets negotiated through deontic and epistemic **stance** displays that are implemented in talk (Heritage 2012a, b; Stevanovic and Peräkylä 2012).

Our understanding of ‘advice’ in this study is narrower than that of, e.g., Heritage and Sefi (1992), who speak of advice-giving sequences where “the HV (= health visitor) describes, recommends, or otherwise forwards a preferred course of future action” (p. 368). For us, advice-giving actions are a type of ‘Suggestion’ (Couper-Kuhlen 2014), involving advocating, forwarding, or naming a future action for the interlocutor to carry out that will be of primary benefit to the interlocutor her- or himself (see also Clayman and Heritage 2014). In cases where advice has not been explicitly solicited, advice-giving actions are typically produced in the context of troubles talk or complaining by an interlocutor (see also Jefferson and Lee 1981). In these situations the advice is offered as a possible **solution** to what is treated as the interlocutor’s **problem**.

The structure of the advice-giving sequences we are looking at, in its minimal form, then, is as follows:

- A: Complaint or troubles-telling turn or turns (Position 1)
- B: Advice-giving turn (Position 2)
- A: Response to advice-giving turn (Position 3)

That is, the data lead us to treating advice-giving as a responsive rather than an initiating action.¹ This perspective allows us to distinguish advice-giving from other types of Suggestion, where putatively beneficial proposals for what the other person should do are typically volunteered as first, or initiating, actions. We speak of advice-giving being located in second ‘position’ rather than being a second ‘pair-part’ because the problem that it is presented as resolving may not be succinctly formulated in a single prior turn. Indeed, as Jefferson’s (1988) work on troubles telling has shown, in advice-giving sequences, we are dealing with a ‘big package’ whose component parts often extend over more than one turn at talk.

The following extract from a telephone conversation between two sisters, Lottie and Emma, illustrates a slightly expanded version of such a sequence:

(1) “Stay down-1” (Nb 009-4)

[Lottie lives in Newport Beach south of Los Angeles, while her sister Emma lives in an urban conglomeration to the north. Emma owns a vacation rental at Newport Beach, to which she comes down regularly for rest and recreation. This conversation takes place when both sisters are at Newport Beach.]

5 LOT: it's beautiful: day I [bet] you've had a lotta smo::g=
6 EMM: [yah-]
7 LOT: =up there haven't you.
8 EMM: oh::: Lo:ttie,hh (.) you don't kno::w, Incipient complaint
9 LOT: I kno[:w.
10 EMM: [go:::d it['s been] Incipient complaint
11→ LOT: [↑why don't] you stay dow::n. Advice-giving turn
12 EMM: .hh (0.2) oh::: ↓*I know it. I: should st*ay Response to advice
13 ↓d*o:wn. hhhhhhh
14 (.)
15 LOT: Je:sus I: wu< ↓with a:ll that s:mo:g u[p there]Account for advice
16 EMM: [mye:a:]:h,
17 EMM: *I ↓r*eally should ↓st*ay d*own.↓ Reiterated response
to advice
18 let's see this is the end of the (0.8)
19 .t (0.4) w*e:ll maybe,h I'd say ne:xt week=
20 <I: haven't got too many clothes

In lines 8 and 10 Emma begins to complain about the smog she is encountering where she lives: *oh::: Lo:ttie .hh (.) you don't kno::w...go:::d it's been*. Before she can proceed any further, Lottie offers a solution for Emma’s problem: *↑why don't you stay dow::n* (l. 11), proposing that if she stays at the beach she can avoid the city smog. Note that Lottie did not have to offer advice

¹ This is not to deny that that complaints or troubles-telling turns, represented here as first-position actions, may themselves be responsive to prior actions by other.

at this point: she could easily have joined in the complaining sequence initiated by Emma by saying something like ‘I know. I’ve been reading about it in the papers – it must be awful’. However, in the event, Lottie forgoes this option and instead makes a recommendation that she proposes would alleviate Emma’s problem.

We know that Lottie’s turn in line 11 is being taken as offering advice because of the way Emma responds: in a creaky voice (indicated by the asterisks), she admits to knowing that this is what she should do: *oh:: I know it. I: should stay dow:n* (line 12).² When Lottie provides an account for her recommendation: *Je:sus I: wu< with a:ll that s:mog up there* (line 15), Emma reiterates that she should stay down (line 17). However, from the way she continues this turn, we can surmise that she probably will not act on Lottie’s advice, at least not over the weekend in question, because among other things, she claims not to have enough clothes with her (lines 17-19).

Our collection consists of 70 cases of such everyday advice-giving sequences from video and audio recordings of British and American face-to-face and telephone conversations among friends and family members. We will focus on action ascription at two different positions in these sequences. First, at position 2, the recipient of **a troubles telling or complaint** must decide whether the prior turn makes the provision of ‘help’ or assistance relevant. This allows the troubles recipient to decide whether to offer advice in next turn or not.³ Second, at position 3, the recipient of **a piece of advice** must decide how exactly it was meant: As a binding prescription or injunction, or as a mild suggestion for a possible way forward? This is relevant for the advice-recipient in deciding how to deal with the advice: whether to accept or reject/resist it, or to join the other in brainstorming about how to remedy the situation. Our data suggest that for action ascription at both second and third positions, the design (‘composition’) and the sequential location (‘position’)⁴ of the prior turn are crucial factors.

We begin by examining position two, where the recipient of a troubles telling or complaint must decide what to do next, that is, whether to offer advice or not.

2. Second Position: To Advise or not to Advise

Not every troubles-telling or complaint action is responded to with advice. As Jefferson and Lee (1981) point out, in a troubles-telling episode, with its mutually established roles of troubles teller and troubles recipient, moving too abruptly into suggesting a remedy for a ‘problem’ can transform the situation into something akin to a service encounter, where the interlocutor becomes a ‘service-seeker’ and the speaker a ‘service-supplier’ (p. 410). Troubles tellers may, initially at least, be expecting emotional reciprocity, that is, a display of empathy from the other, rather than a practical solution for how to resolve their ‘problem’. In extract (2) we see an occasion, another telephone call between Emma and Lottie one week after that in (1), on which Emma again complains to Lottie, this time about the heat in the urban conglomeration where she lives. But on this occasion Lottie, rather than immediately proposing that she stay down at the beach, responds with displays of empathy:

² Emma’s creaky voice may be displaying a kind of groaning admission that this is what she should do, but that circumstances make it difficult for her to do so.

³ Although our collection consists primarily of sequences in which advice is ultimately given, for the purpose of comparison we have included several instances of troubles telling and complaining where advice-giving is absent, e.g., extract (2).

⁴ On ‘composition’ and ‘position’, see Schegloff 1993: 121.

(2) “Heat” (Nb 011-5)

1 EMM: [WELL] we played go:lf? Tuesday at (.) and we didn't tee o:ff
2 til la:te `cause they had a t:ournament, a:nd it was so↑: smo:gy
3 (0.3)and it wz ↑SO: HOT.h .hhh and I: uh: I said to the girls
4 I said God I can hardly stand to finish playing because
5 I was so red in the face and my eye:s were burning
6 it was ↑jus:t THICK (.) you know you c[ould taste it.].hh].hh
7→ LOT: [°Oh::::↓ *o]h:°
8 EMM: so I had to come home wash my hair and go with Bud to something
9 and I said oh my God I got home my face was so: red I thought
10 I was gonna die:.
11 (0.3)
12 EMM: so[u it's terr:]ible up
13→ LOT: [°o h : : : °]
14 (.)
15 EMM: ↑t's TERR:IBLE up .hhh ↑ we lie:- (0.4) we absolutely lie:
16 star:k naked on the be:d,
17 (0.2)
18 EMM: .hh with ↑MAYbe a sheet o:n about two o'↓clock.
19 (0.6)
20→ LOT: **it's that ho:t h[u : h ?]**
21 EMM: [tha:t's] that ho:t.
22 (0.4)
23 EMM: be[lieve it or] no:t and] and we got the air conditioning=
24→ LOT: [°o h_ : :] : : : .°
25 EMM: =go:ing .hhhh ↑ we'll see HOW things come out Lottie
26 .hh[hh

At numerous points in Emma’s telling, there are opportunities for Lottie to respond (marked with arrows in the transcript). At each of these moments Lottie could offer the kind of advice she does in Extract (1) (e.g., *Why don’t you stay down?*), which – if Emma were to follow it – would allow her to escape the heat in the city. But Lottie opts instead for lengthened and prosodically marked *ohs* and a candidate understanding *it’s that hot huh?*. These are empathic displays that show Lottie’s appreciation of Emma’s situation without claiming to have experienced it herself (Heritage 2011). Each one provides Emma with a warrant for continuing her troubles telling by adding another complainable detail. This contrasts sharply with Extract (1), where Lottie’s advice-giving (line 11) puts an abrupt end to Emma’s complaining.

Our point in comparing these two possible sequential trajectories is to draw attention to the decision-making that is observable at position 2, when a recipient is called upon to respond to an interlocutor’s troubles-implicative turn or complaint. In Extract (2) Lottie repeatedly orients to Emma’s complaints as having made empathy relevant next, thereby encouraging Emma to expand the telling, while in Extract (1) Lottie orients to Emma’s incipient complaining as an opening for her to provide ‘help’. By proposing a solution to what she treats as Emma’s ‘problem’, Lottie in (1) reflexively transforms Emma’s prior turn into a recruitment (Kendrick and Drew 2016), which she can now accommodate by proposing a remedy.⁵ This leads to a

⁵ Among the various methods of recruitment identified by Kendrick and Drew (2016) are “reports of needs, difficulties or troubles”, which “create an opportunity for the other to volunteer assistance” (p. 6).

curtailment of the complaining, because, as we shall see below, the advice-giving raises issues of its own about how to deal with what has been proposed.⁶

Together, then, Extracts (1) and (2) illustrate the choice that recipients have in responding in second position to a troubles-telling or complaint. While the complaint in Extract (1) is responded to with advice, the complaints in Extract (2) receive empathic displays. What happens in second position thus reveals how the prior turn was interpreted. If advice-giving takes place, this shows that the recipient of the complaint treats what the prior speaker has said as having made an offer of help relevant. We note that in our data, there is no evidence that the advice-giver presumes that the advice was sought; indeed it is sometimes not even welcome, as we shall see (e.g. (5), (11), (12), (14)). If empathic displays are made instead, this reveals that the action ascribed to the prior speaker was seeking affiliation in a troublesome situation.⁷

3. Third Position: How to Deal with Advice

If, in the event, advice **is** delivered in second position, as in Extract 1 above, the advice-giving action can be implemented in different ways, which in turn influences how the advice is dealt with in the third-position next turn.

There is a complex interplay of factors that enter into what happens in third position. Normatively speaking, advisees are expected to positively evaluate the recommendation they have been given. This is what we see Karen doing in the story that her former schoolmate Clacia tells about her:

(3) “Pack it away” (Clacia, 9:30)

[Clacia is telling her friend Diane a story about a former schoolmate named Karen, who has recently married and moved close by. Clacia reports that she decided to call her up one day “just for the hell of it”.]

- 1 CLA: I called her and she said, Oh we got all this horrible
2 Steuben glass. so I-stop me if I told you this.
3 (0.5)
4 CLA: She said we got all this horrible Steuben glass and
5 I just can't stand it as wedding gifts.and I just
6 don't know what to do with it I just:: 'hh and I
7→ said **why don't you pack it awa:y, and save it to give**
8→ **away to other people for wedding gifts** and she said
9→ **hey that's a great idea.**
10 (0.4)
11 CLA: But I saw her once for lunch (and that was:,)

In Clacia's story, her advice to Karen, who is complaining about having received too much 'horrible' Steuben glass as wedding gifts (lines 4-6), is that Karen should stash it away and give it to others later on the occasion of their own weddings (lines 7-8). Karen's reported response is *hey that's a great idea* (line 9), implying that this is what she will do.

⁶ On complaining sequences, see Couper-Kuhlen (2012), Drew (1998), Heinemann and Traverso (2009), and Selting (2012).

⁷ In our discussion of Extract (2), we do not wish to imply that Lottie is wholly oblivious to the fact that there is a remedy for Emma's 'problem'. In fact, she does subsequently go on to deliver a piece of advice, *well:- (.) You ought to stay down ↓ and::: get a little....* But she breaks off her turn when Emma comes in in overlap with *yeah I didn't even bring a dre:ss.*

Indeed, having been given a piece of advice, recipients are normatively expected to indicate an intention to take it up in the future, or to provide an account for not doing so. Commitment to following the advice is, for instance, what happens at the end of the following advice-giving sequence:

(4) “Leave off the meat” (Nb 014-10)

[Emma has been complaining to Lottie about her psoriasis and is now telling her about a report that eating turkey will cure it.]

1 EMM: .hnff and this girl in the apartment came up the other day and
2 told me that (0.2) you know she read this?
3 (0.3)
4 EMM: hh.hhhhh whe:re? a ↓doct↑or ↓cures ↑this ↓pa↑tients by eating
turkey
5. (0.4)
6→ LOT: well now **why don't you leave off the mea:t.=**
(approx. 20 seconds later)
19→ LOT: **I::'d uh leave o:ff the mea:t.**
20⇒ EMM: °I think I ↑wi:ll.° I haven't had a piece of mea:t since I
21 been down here.

In line 6 Lottie suggests that Emma should stop eating meat, by which she means ‘red’ meat, implying that Emma should just eat turkey. Once it has been established that Emma could also eat chicken (lines 7-18, not shown here), Lottie repeats her advice (line 19), whereupon Emma signals that this is what she intends to do: *I think I will* (line 20).

Alternatively, if recipients of advice do not wish to take up the advice, they are normatively expected to account for their lack of willingness to do so. Candidate accounts may include subjective judgments concerning the reasonableness or feasibility of the proposal and/or reports of objective states of affairs in the world that prevent them from carrying out the recommended action. Numerous instances of such accounts will be seen in the extracts discussed below.

Yet independent of personal proclivities and even of objective states of affairs, recipients have a **choice** as to whether to introduce these as reasons for not accepting the advice, or instead to leave them unmentioned and declare an intention to follow up on the advice regardless. It is here where how a piece of advice is given, and specifically how strong the deontic stance taken by the advice-giver, enters in. Stance, as we know, is conveyed, among other things, by linguistic means. We argue here that the linguistic format with which a piece of advice is given is one of the cues that advice recipients use to ascribe a deontic stance to the advice-giving turn, which in turn is relevant for how they respond to the advice.

In the following we will first briefly review the five most frequent linguistic formats for giving advice in our everyday conversational data and then turn to an examination of how advice delivered with these formats is dealt with in next turn.

3.1 Linguistic Formats for Advising in English

The five most frequent formats for giving advice in our data collection are these,⁸ in decreasing order of strength (see below):⁹

<i>Do ... !/Don't ...!</i>	(IMP) (<i>well wash them ou::t</i>)	[Imperative]
<i>Why don't you...?</i>	(WDY) (<i>why don't you stay dow::n</i>)	[Interrogative]
<i>You should/ought to...</i>	(S/O) (<i>you should make stencils</i>)	[Declarative]
<i>I'd/I would/I wouldn't....</i>	(I'D) (<i>I::'d leave o:ff the mea:t</i>)	[Declarative]
<i>You can/could</i>	(C/C) (<i>you can get him an album or something</i>)	[Declarative]

We note that these formats represent different grammatical clause types, as indicated in the square brackets. While this may seem at first glance to be merely a grammatical noticing, we shall see that it plays a significant role in action ascription in third position.

Each of the five formats displays a distinct deontic stance, that is, each format carries advice that advocates in one way or another an action that the speaker is claiming the interlocutor should carry out to the advisee's benefit.¹⁰ Stevanovic and Peräkylä (2012) propose that such formats imply an 'obligation' for the recipient to do the action in question (p. 316); we suggest that these formats **recommend** the action named in the advice-implicative turn. However, as we will show, they do so with varying degrees of strength, or deontic authority.¹¹

The deontically strongest advice-giving format is the use of a bald imperative (IMP). With such a format the advice-giver assumes a stance of high entitlement, i.e., unmitigated authority, to tell the other what to do, with no hint of doubt about this being the right course of action. Advice delivered with a bald imperative does not allow for there being any contingencies that might prevent its implementation: it expects full and immediate compliance (Curl and Drew 2008, Craven and Potter 2010, Sorjonen et al. 2017). This is the form that Lottie uses in (5) below to propose a solution for another of Emma's 'problems'.

(5) "Wash them out" (Nb 028-5)

[The occasion for this call is a hefty argument that Emma has recently had with her husband Bud, which has led to his 'walking out' on her. Now Emma is discussing with Lottie her plans for hosting a Thanksgiving dinner in Newport Beach.]

1 EMM: ... so I guess Bud's coming down tomorrow ni:ght,
2 (0.3)

⁸ The raw frequencies for these formats are as follows: IMP (25), WDY (19), S/O (7), I'D (14), C/C (5).

⁹ These formats could be thought of as 'social action formats' as described in the introduction to this volume.

¹⁰ As Shaw and Hepburn put it, "Giving advice imposes and prescribes that an action *should* be done" (italics in the original) (2013:348).

¹¹ Similar issues are taken up by Stivers et al. (2017), who investigate some of the same formats for therapy recommendations in medical consultations, and by Shaw et al. (2015), who describe interrogatives and assessments for advice-giving in mother-daughter conversations.

3 LOT: [oh:.]
 4 EMM: [.hhea]hh I: GUE:SS hi-s- but he'll be here Thursday but I
 5 guess he has to go ba:ck Friday to go to work.h
 6 LOT: ah hah,
 7 (0.3)
 8 EMM: [.t
 9 LOT: [will you stay di- oh well you[pro↓bably<]
 10 EMM: [I'M GONNA]STAY .hh
 11 YOU KNOW I ONLY HA:VE one brassiere and pair of panties Lottie,h
 12→ LOT: **well wash them ou[:t.**
 13 EMM: [that's what I(h) 'M DOING RI:GHT NOW
 14 I ↑just CA:ME in,
 15 LOT: oh:.
 16 (0.2)
 17 EMM: .hh[hh
 18 LOT: [oh:.

Emma's problem is one we have encountered before. This time she wants to stay down at the beach but does not have enough fresh underwear to do so (line 11). Lottie responds immediately by offering a piece of advice: *well wash them out* (line 12). In choosing a bald imperative for her advice, Lottie takes a strong deontic stance: she implies that she knows exactly what Emma should do to resolve her problem and that there are no contingencies that might prevent Emma from implementing this solution.¹²

Somewhat less strong than a bald imperative format for giving advice is a *why don't you X?* format (WDY). This is the format we found being used in Extract (1) above, where Lottie advises Emma on how to avoid the city smog: *why don't you stay down* (line 11). With its negative interrogative + *why* form, WDY grammatically allows that there could be contingencies preventing implementation of the action being proposed, and if there are, through its grammatical format, it asks what they are. However, conventionally this format is understood to strongly recommend the action in question. In fact, it can even imply that the solution being recommended is so obvious or natural that there must be good reason *not* to embrace it (for further discussion, see also Thompson and Couper-Kuhlen, In press).

In contrast to the imperative and the interrogative (WDY) formats, the three other formats listed above are weaker ways of giving advice. All three are **declarative** clause types and so are grammatically designed to do **informing** (Mori 2006, Thompson et al. 2015) or **asserting** (Vatanen 2018) at the same time as they forward an action proposed to be in the interlocutor's interest.

One of these formats involves the subject *you* together with the modal verb SHOULD or OUGHT (S/O). Here is an instantiation of the S/O format used to give advice in a face-to-face conversation between two sorority sisters:

(6) "Your ring" [Sorority Breakfast 2, p. 2]

[Kelly and Laurel are having breakfast in the kitchen of their sorority house. About a minute earlier both women were rinsing their hands at the sink; Kelly is now standing at the table where Laurel is seated eating.]

¹² We return to the type of response that such a format for advice-giving may encounter in §3.2 below.

1 LAU: do you leave your ring out (.) on the sink?
2 KEL: uhhuh.
3 (2.4)
4 KEL: ↓yeah. and i- (1.0) (did) it once before too?
5 and I'll be like-(0.2) mokay (0.8) like- take it off
6 wash your face and then (make sure) you're gonna put it back
7 ↑on (and I'm like ah! oh yeah I'll remember) (0.5) well I forgot.
8 (0.6)
9→ LAU: **you should get (.) like (0.7) a little holder you know**
10→ **like a carrying thing?=
11 KEL: =°yeah°. ↑usually I just- (0.3) I take it off like (0.6)
12 before I go and wash my face and stuff. but- (2.0) °°hhhh i
13 dunno°° (1.8) >I should just not take it off when I wash
14 my face.< its fine. like () you know**

In response to Kelly's story of having once taken off her ring to wash her face and forgotten to put it back on, Laurel gives Kelly a piece of unsolicited advice that would allow her to avoid the risk of forgetting her ring: she suggests, using the SHOULD/ OUGHT format, that Kelly get a ring holder box that she could carry around with her (lines 9-10). As a declarative, this advice-giving S/O format makes an assertion that displays a knowing (K+) epistemic stance vis à vis the addressee (Heritage 2012a, b). Through the subject *you* and the modal verb *should* or *ought*, it implies a recommendation for the recipient to act, but at the same time it can work as an assertion, making acknowledgement or agreement relevant in next turn. In the event, Kelly's °yeah° in line 11 acknowledges that she knows what Laurel is referring to; she then goes on to say that she usually takes off her ring before she goes to the sink to wash her face, implying that she has no need for a special holder.

The *I would X* or *I wouldn't X* format (I'D) for advice-giving is yet again weaker. This format, also declarative, mentions a solution that the advice-giver would adopt in a similar situation, but only indirectly recommends this solution for the advisee. Here is an example of the I'D format (see also Extract (4) "Leave off the meat" above):

(7) "Go to somebody else" (Nb11-3)

[Emma has just been to her dentist, who announced that he wants to pull her tooth and make a gold bridge for eight hundred dollars.]

1 EMM: .p.hhhh.h he wanted to pull it and I: said Go:d no I:'m not
2 ready to have my too:th pulled toDA::Y?
3 (0.2)
4 EMM: Edith went with me and
5 (1.0)
6 EMM: ↓we were gonna go to lu:nch 'n I wasn't ready you know go in
7 and have my tooth pu:lled my (.) .hhhhh where my bridge
8 hangs o:n so: (0.4) he says well I don't wanna even fix it.
9 becuz it's he .hh.hhh I: don't know Lottie I don't (.) trust'n
10 th:en when he said (0.3) a go::ld he wants go:::ld bridge now
11 who in the hell wants a:ll (.) ↓ go::ld ↓ bridge.h=
12 LOT: =°'n tha:t's a bunch of money-° Ei:ght hundred
13 do:ll[a r s ?]
14 EMM: [↑isn't th]at teRRIFIC?↑ h
15 (0.2)

16→ LOT: °↓oh:: sh:::oot° I:'d go to somebody e[: l s e.]
 17 EMM: [I'm going] ba:ck to
 18 my other dentist,h

When Emma complains that she doesn't want an all-gold bridge (line 11) and that eight hundred dollars is a "terrific" sum of money (line 14), Lottie responds with an expletive and the remark that if the same thing were to happen to her, she would go to a different dentist (line 16). Nominally this is an informing about what Lottie would do in a similar situation. In an advice-implicative context, however, it implies that this is what Emma should do.

Arguably the weakest advice-giving format in our data collection is *you can X* or *you could X* (CAN/COULD). Designed once again as a declarative informing, in advice-implicative environments, this format presents a future action as a possible solution, without imposing any obligation on the recipient to embrace it. This is what happens in line 7 of Extract (8):

(8) "Six shots" (Nb 014-10)

[Emma's skin condition, psoriasis, has led to a painful operation in which her doctor had to remove a toenail. Now Emma is explaining to Lottie that she does not want to go to that doctor again.]

1 EMM: ... I was going to go to my doctor up there
 2 I thought I'll go: and get a (.) you know let hi:m
 3 then I thought oh:: god he'll want to take the other toenail off
 4 and I don't want that to come o:ff so::,
 5 (0.4)
 6 EMM: .t I was a:ll set to go do:wn here though,
 7→ LOT: .t.hh **we:ll you could go dow:n every SA-er** [THEY'RE O-uh he's=
 8 EMM: [yah.
 9 LOT: =dow:n there Sa:turda[y, .hh]h
 10 EMM: [ye:ah.]
 11 LOT: and you only need s:ix::=
 12 EMM: =ye:ah,
 13 (0.2)
 14 LOT: uh sho::ts an::d uh this: (.) uh I didn't talk to Do:ctor Nagle
 15 but I talked to his hea:d nu:rse she's a
 16 (0.2)
 17 EMM: .hmhh.

((talk continues on topic of Dr. Nagle and where his office is located))

In this extract Lottie's advice to Emma for resolving her skin problem without having to have another toenail removed is that Emma come down Saturdays to the doctor in Newport Beach and get shots against psoriasis, of which she would need six (lines 7, 9, 11, 14). We see that Lottie formulates this advice as an assertion about a possibility, with *you could*. In doing so, she implies that this is one option, although there may be others.

From the perspective of advice-recipients, it is crucial in which of these formats the advice is given in determining what their options are for responding. This is because each format makes different assumptions about deontic authority and how much 'freedom' the recipient has to exercise their own agency in deciding on future conduct. Let us look now more closely at the responses documented for these formats in our collection.

Whether there is a ‘need’ for what an advice-giver is recommending is often at issue when recipients respond by displaying resistance in third position. Much as Emma does with her mention of peroxide in lines 8-9 of Extract (10), recipients may claim that they do not need to do what is being recommended because they are already putting a remedy into practice. They may even present themselves as implementing the exact remedy that they are being advised to adopt. This is what we saw happening in Extract (5) “Wash them out”, repeated here in shortened form and renumbered:

(11) “Wash them out” (Nb 028-5) [excerpt from (5)]

9 LOT: [will you stay di- oh well you[pro↓bably<]
10 EMM: [I'M GONNA]STAY .hh
11 YOU KNOW I ONLY HA:VE one brassiere and pair of panties Lottie,h
12→ LOT: **well wash them ou[:t.**
13⇒ EMM: [that's what I(h)'M DOING RI:GHT NOW
14 I ↑just CA:ME in,
15 LOT: oh:.

In line 13 Emma responds to Lottie’s strongly deontic advice *well wash them out* by claiming that she has already thought of this solution herself and is in the process of implementing it: *that’s what I’m doing right now*. That is, she aligns with the content of Lottie’s advice but resists the role of advisee that it puts her in: she rejects being told what to do, all the more so since it is something she is already doing.

Why should deontically stronger forms for advice-giving (IMP and WDY) meet with resistance? We argue that these stronger forms establish a clear ‘deontic gradient’ (on analogy with Heritage’s (2012a) ‘epistemic gradient’) between the interlocutors, with one party proposing – on the grounds of higher deontic authority – a **unilateral** resolution to the other’s problem. With the strong deontic forms these advice-givers position themselves as experts who know best what their interlocutor ‘needs’; the interlocutor is expected to embrace the solution on the advisor’s recommendation. Such formats arguably come across as face-threatening in everyday conversations where the participants’ deontic statuses are symmetric. The WDY format – by raising the issue of accountability – can even be heard to imply that the solution is so simple the interlocutor should have thought of it themselves (Couper-Kuhlen and Thompson, In press). Recipients who claim to already be doing what the advice-giver is recommending are countering such a morally tinged implication. At the same time, they are rejecting the asymmetric division of roles that strong deontic formats imply, and with it the role of advisee (Shaw and Hepburn 2013: 348).

Yet it is important to remember that third-position responses are **choices**. Even if recipients are already implementing remedies, they are under no obligation to say so. Rather they are free to choose how to respond to unsolicited advice. This is what Extract (4) “Leave off the meat” shows when we consider it in its entirety (renumbered here):

(12) “Leave off the meat” (Nb 014-10) [expanded version of (4)]

[Emma has been complaining about her psoriasis but is now telling Lottie about a report that eating turkey will cure it.]

1 EMM: .hnff and this girl in the apartment came up the other day and
2 told me that (0.2) you know she read this?
3 (0.3)
4 EMM: hh.hhhh whe:re? a ↓doct↑or ↓cures ↑his ↓pa↑tients by eating
turkey
5 (0.4)
6→ LOT: well now **why don't you leave off the mea:t.=**
7⇒ EMM: =[I A : : M.]
8→ LOT: =[**just get tur**]:key.=
9⇒ EMM: =I a:m.
10 LOT: .hh you can bu:y turkey .hh I:: do: lo:ts of ti:mes. in the
11 ja:r that Lynden ha:s that tur:[key.]
12 EMM: [ye:]ah.
13 (.)
14 EMM: .hhhh wll I'm gonna ha:ve chicken too and I love chicken
15 (1.2)
16 and I can ha:ve uh .hhhh.hhh.hhuhh (.) oh:: ↓a lot of stuff
17 Lottie like↓ that I mean I think I'll jus:(.)t [cook a]
18 LOT: [I :'d]u-
19→ LOT: **I::'d uh leave o:ff the mea:t.**
20⇒ EMM: °I think I ↑wi:ll.° I haven't had a piece of mea:t since I
21. been down here.

Using a WDY format *well now why don't you leave off the meat* (line 7) and a bald imperative *just get turkey* (line 9)¹³ – both strong deontic formats – Lottie proposes a simple solution to Emma's problem. Yet Emma resists being given this advice when she declares, once in overlap and once in the clear, *I am* (lines 8 and 10). That is, leaving off 'meat' and just eating turkey are things she claims she is already doing. Moreover, Emma goes on to display autonomy by specifying that in addition to turkey she can also have chicken and a "lot of stuff" (lines 14-17). That is, in response to Lottie's deontically strong injunctions, Emma presents herself here as an agent, the master of her own fate. However, Lottie goes on to reiterate her advice in a much weaker form: *I'd uh leave off the meat* (lines 18-19), asserting what she would do if she were in Emma's situation. Tellingly, in response to this weaker format, Emma now displays a willingness to commit to what Lottie is recommending (line 20). She no longer insists that this is what she is already doing, but instead indicates that she will embrace the solution on Lottie's recommendation. This sudden 'change of heart', we would claim, is brought about by Lottie's use of a deontically weak format, one which does not take an authoritarian stance towards knowing what Emma should do, but instead merely describes what Lottie would do in similar circumstances. Such a stance does not threaten Emma's autonomy or agency in determining her own future actions in the same way as a WDY format, as in line 6.

So we see that unsolicited-advice givers in everyday conversations undergo a social risk when they advise someone to do something using deontically strong forms. The risk is that they can be heard as implying that the other is incapable of helping themselves: this deprives the other of autonomy and agency in deciding on a future course of action that concerns themselves. The following extract provides evidence that would-be advisors are sensitive to this:

(13) "Christmas dress" (Nb 023-3)

¹³ Alternatively *just get turkey* could be thought of as a continuation of the prior *why don't you leave off the meat*; (*why don't you*) *just get turkey*.

[Emma and Lottie have just returned from a shopping trip and are now discussing issues related to Lottie's wardrobe.]

1 EMM: you're all set now you don't have to worry about the gr:ay la:=:ce
2 or (.) .t.h[hhh]
3 LOT: [aw:]: ↓no::[::.] I-]
4→ EMM: [.h A] ND]TAKE uh: take th-
5 are you gonna take that little Christmas dress down to Adeline
6 see what sh[e si-]
7 LOT: [yeah:] I think I wi↓:ll.and see:,
8 (.)
9 EMM: and then maybe we can ↓fix *it.↓
10 (1.2)
11 LOT: ye::ah:.
12 (.)
13 LOT: yeh I'll see what she says a↓bout it↓ you kno:w and uh:
14 (.)

Rather than telling Lottie what to do, namely take her Christmas dress down to Adeline, Emma thinks better of it, and breaks off her imperative format *and take uh: take th-* (line 4) in favor of inquiring first whether Lottie intends to do as much: *are you gonna take that little Christmas dress down to Adeline see what she (says)* (lines 5-6). This choice turns out to be the better one, as Lottie declares *I think I will* (line 7). Emma can now frame the matter as something they can do together: *and then maybe we can fix it* (line 9), whereupon Lottie declares *yeh I'll see what she says about it you know* (line 13). Had Emma pursued the unilateral advice-giving launched in line 4, she would arguably have met with resistance from Lottie in next turn, e.g., something like 'That's exactly what I'm going to do'. As it is, the bilateral framing allows enough freedom for Lottie to formulate the solution as her own project (line 13), thereby preserving her autonomy and agency.¹⁴

The deontically weakest formats for unsolicited advising (I'D, CAN/COULD) meet with less resistance because, as we have noted, they do not mandate commitment. They are declarative in form, allowing the advisee the option of merely acknowledging or agreeing with the assertion in next turn. In (7) "Go to somebody else" we saw that Emma declares of her own accord that she intends to go back to her other dentist: this is not presented as a commitment to something Lottie has recommended but rather as an autonomous decision that she has made on her own. In (8) "Six shots" Emma merely acknowledges Lottie's suggestion (*you could go down every Sat(urday)*) as a possibility with *yah* (line 8) and *ye:ah* (lines 10 and 12). She does not take any position on whether she intends to do so, nor does Lottie pursue the matter. Lottie's advice thus remains simply something that the participants agree on as being a possible course of action for Emma in dealing with her problem.

In sum, the deontically weakest formats for advice-giving call on the recipient not so much to accept or reject the advice given as to acknowledge or agree that the action in question would be a possible course of action with beneficial effects. These formats then allow the

¹⁴ We note that extract (13) is a boundary case (Schegloff 1997) for our generalization that advice actions typically occur as seconds to complaints or troubles-telling, in that it is not apparent what problem or complaint of Lottie's Emma's advice initiation in line 4 is responsive to. We surmise, but cannot prove, that there is a problem with Lottie's Christmas dress and that having Adeline work on it had been discussed in an earlier conversation.

advice-giver to avoid the strong deontic gradient implied in turns formatted with IMP and WDY forms. They put advice-giver and advice-recipient on more equal terms, allowing recipients to exert their agency over what they intend to do in the future. Often it is the recipients themselves who go on to find their own solutions to the problem.

The S/O format for advice-giving assumes an intermediary position between the deontically strongest and the deontically weakest forms. This is reflected in how recipients deal with such advice in third position. In (6) “Your ring”, for instance, Kelly responds to Laurel’s *You should get get (.) like (0.8) a little holder, you know like a carrying thing?* by first acknowledging that she knows what Kelly is referring to (°yeah°, line 11), and then explaining that she usually takes her ring off before going to the sink, implying that she has no need for a ring holder that she could carry around (lines 11-12). She then goes on to propose her own remedy: *I should just not take it off when I wash my face* (lines 13-14). This response combines features like those found in responses to deontically strong forms (‘I don’t need it’, as in lines 8-9 of Extract (10) “Revlon nail”) and those found in responses to deontically weak forms (‘I’ll find my own solution’, as in lines 17-18 of Extract (7) “Go to somebody else”).

Here is another case in point:

(14) “All the kanji” [Before Bed: 7]

[Steffi and her boyfriend Oli are about to move to Japan and Steffi is worrying about how her friends will manage to address their letters to her in kanji.]

1 STE: i found out all the kanji for where we live
 2 OLI: [((sneeze))
 3 STE: cause- cause my friend warned me
 4 (.)
 5 OLI: we [(speak different types/cuts)
 6 STE: [we're a small-
 7 we're a small enough town
 8 but the postmaster (.) might not: (.)
 9 get (.) writing in English
 10 so we're gonna have to give it to everyone in English
 11 and in Japanese and they have to write both
 12→ OLI: **you should make STENCils**
 13⇒ STE: actually i was just g(h)onna l(h)ike hhh
 14 .hh se(h)nd it to them on the computer
 15 and then they can print it u(h)p!

The problem Steffi is worrying about concerns the fact that a small-town Japanese postmaster may not be able to deal with an address written in English (lines 7-9). She presents herself as having to ask their friends to write the address in Japanese as well, using kanji (lines 10-11).¹⁵ Oli now offers a suggestion which would simplify the process: *you should make stencils* (line 12). The format he uses is deontically weaker than *why don’t you make stencils?*, but deontically stronger than either *I’d make stencils* or *you could make stencils*. Steffi could respond with resistance by saying ‘That’s too much work!’ or she could signal an intention to commit with ‘I think I will’. Just as we saw Kelly doing with the advice about a holder for her ring, Steffi does

¹⁵ Kanji are the Chinese characters used in Japanese orthography.

display that what the other has said was taken as an occasion to offer assistance.¹⁶ If instead they co-complain or otherwise position themselves as a troubles recipient, they treat the other's actions as an occasion to offer empathy and affiliation.

Furthermore, our data show how third position actions either accept or resist the advice and/or the role of advisee, or acknowledge or agree on a desirable or possible course of action. In choosing how to respond to the advice, recipients thus cast the prior advice-giving turn as either imposing a solution unilaterally or inviting a bilateral search (brainstorming) for problem resolution. Both these action ascriptions treat the prior turn as proposing a suggestion with implications for recipients' future actions, but they entail different deontic positionings with respect to what this means for a recipient's agency and autonomy.

The sequential properties of environments in which advice-giving emerges is thus yet another arena within which we can see participants drawing on grammatical resources to assess a prior turn for its deontic strength in recommending a certain action. In fact, given the environment of third position in advice-giving sequences, it is as much the strength of this stance as an action that the recipient must ascribe to the prior turn. We have shown that the strength of the deontic stance they impute varies with the grammatical form of the advice: advice given with the stronger forms is treated as a unilateral command allowing no role for the recipient in determining their own future action, and may be responded to with resistance. Advice formulated with the weaker forms, in contrast, is treated as inviting the recipient to share in a joint problem-solving project. Participants' behavior in advice-implicative contexts thus involves not only lexical choices and assessing the location of the advice-giving within sequences, larger projects, and ongoing activities, but also evaluating the relative deontic strength of each recurrent grammatical format.

What our examination of action ascription in everyday unsolicited advice-giving sequences shows is that indeed more is at stake than the ascription of action categories such as "complaint" or "advice" when participants must decide on the fly what to do next and how to do it. These data show how 'action ascription' involves both 'ascribing an action' to a prior speaker's turn and choosing among more than one appropriate response types. As Sidnell and Enfield (2014) point out, recipients "can know how to respond quite reliably by working up from turn components and finding a token solution, and not by having to assign the whole turn to an action category" (p. 442). In our discussion of third position we have pointed to some of the "turn components" that contribute to "know(ing) how to respond" to a piece of unsolicited advice. More generally, we hope to have demonstrated the delicacy of a recipient's task in both second and third position of unsolicited advice-giving sequences as that recipient works to determine (a) what next actions their interlocutor's troubles telling or complaint occasions and (b) what the deonticity of the grammatical form deployed for advice-giving implies about agency in finding a solution for the just-articulated problem or uncertainty.

Acknowledgments

Two anonymous reviewers and the series editor Paul Drew gave us valuable comments on an earlier version; we appreciate their input, and absolve them of any responsibility for the final form of this chapter.

¹⁶ Once again, however, note that we are not suggesting that the complainer or troubles-teller was *seeking* assistance.

References

- Butler, Carly W., Jonathan Potter, Susan Danby, Michael Emmison, and Alexa Hepburn. 2010. Advice-implicative Interrogatives: Building "Client-centered" Support in a Children's Helpline. *Social Psychology Quarterly* 73.3: 265-287.
- Clayman, Steven E. and John Heritage. 2014. Benefactors and beneficiaries: Benefactive status and stance in the management of offers and requests. In: *Requesting in Social Interaction*, edited by Paul Drew and Elizabeth Couper-Kuhlen. Amsterdam, Benjamins: 55-86.
- Clift, Rebecca. 2001. Meaning in interaction: The case of 'actually'. *Language* 77(2): 245-291.
- Craven, Alexandra and Jonathan Potter. 2010. Directives: Entitlement and contingency in action. *Discourse Studies* 12(4): 419-442.
- Couper-Kuhlen, Elizabeth. 2012. Exploring affiliation in the reception of conversational complaint stories. In Anssi Perakyla and Marja-Leena Sorjonen, eds., *Emotion in interaction*, 113-146. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Couper-Kuhlen, Elizabeth. 2014. "What does grammar tell us about action?" *Pragmatics* 24(3): 623-647.
- Couper-Kuhlen, Elizabeth and Sandra A. Thompson. In press. Ratschläge in der Alltagskommunikation: Zur Verwendung einer sedimentierten Form im Englischen ('Advice in everyday talk: On the use of a sedimented form in English'). In: *Verfestigungen in der Interaktion – Konstruktionen, sequenzielle Muster, kommunikative Gattungen*, edited by Beate Weidner, Wolfgang Imo, Katarina König, and Lars Wegner, pp. 299-322. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Curl, Traci S. and Paul Drew. 2008. Contingency and action: a comparison of two forms of requesting. *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 41.2: 1-25.
- Drew, Paul. 1998. Complaints about transgressions and misconduct. *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 31.3-4: 295-325.
- Emmison, Michael, Butler, Carly W., and Danby, Susan. 2011. Script proposals: A device for empowering clients in counselling. *Discourse Studies*, 13(1), 3–26.
- Heinemann, Trine and Véronique Traverso. 2009. Complaining in interaction. *Journal of Pragmatics* 41.12: 2381-2384.
- Hepburn, Alexa and Jonathan Potter. 2011. Designing the recipient: Some practices that manage advice resistance in institutional settings. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 74, 216–241.
- Heritage, John. 1984. *Garfinkel and Ethnomethodology*. Cambridge, Polity Press.
- Heritage, John. 2011. Territories of knowledge, territories of experience: Empathic moments in interaction. In: *The Morality of Knowledge in Conversation*, edited by Tanya Stivers, Lorenza Mondada and Jakob Steensig. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press: 159-183.
- Heritage, John. 2012a. Epistemics in action: Action formation and territories of knowledge. *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 45.1: 1-29.
- Heritage, John. 2012b. The epistemic engine: Sequence organization and territories of knowledge. *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 45: 30-52.
- Heritage, John and Anna Lindström. 1998. Motherhood, medicine, and morality: Scenes from a medical encounter. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 31(3/4), 397–438.
- Heritage, John and Anna Lindström. 2012. Advice giving—terminable and interminable: The case of British health visitors. In: *Advice in Discourse*, edited by Holger Limberg and Miriam A. Locher. Amsterdam, John Benjamins: 169-194.

- Heritage, John and Sue Sefi. 1992. Dilemmas of advice: Aspects of the delivery and reception of advice in interactions between health visitors and first time mothers. In: *Talk at Work*, edited by Paul Drew and John Heritage. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press: 359–419.
- Hudson, Tom. 1990. The discourse of advice giving in English: 'I wouldn't feed until spring no matter what you do'. *Language & Communication* 10(4): 285-297.
- Hutchby, Ian. 1995. Aspects of recipient design in expert advice-giving on call-in radio. *Discourse Processes* 9.2: 2 19-238.
- Jefferson, Gail. 1988. On the sequential organization of troubles-talk in ordinary conversation. *Social Problems* 35(4): 418-441.
- Jefferson, Gail and John R. E. Lee. 1981. The rejection of advice: Managing the problematic convergence of a “troubles-telling” and a “service encounter.” *Journal of Pragmatics*, 5, 399–421.
- Kendrick, Robin H. and Paul Drew. 2016. Recruitment: Offers, requests, and the organization of assistance in interaction. *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 49(1): 1-19.
- Kinnell, Ann Marie K. and Douglas W. Maynard. 1996. The delivery and receipt of safer sex advice in pre-test counseling sessions for HIV and AIDS. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography*, 35, 405–437.
- Levinson, Stephen C. 2013. Action formation and ascription. In: *Handbook of Conversation Analysis*, edited by Jack Sidnell and Tanya Stivers. Malden MA, Wiley-Blackwell: 103-130.
- Mori, Junko. 2006. The workings of the Japanese token *hee* in informing sequences: an analysis of sequential context, turn shape, and prosody. *Journal of Pragmatics* 38: 1175-1205.
- Ogden, Richard. 2013. Clicks and percussives in English conversation. *Journal of the International Phonetic Association* 43: 299-320.
- Pilnick, Alison 2001. The interactional organization of pharmacist consultations in a hospital setting: A putative structure. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 33.12: 1927–1945.
- Pilnick, Alison. 2003. “Patient counselling” by pharmacists: Four approaches to the delivery of counselling sequences and their interactional reception. *Social Science & Medicine*, 56(4), 835–849.
- Pudlinski, Christopher. 2002. Accepting and rejecting advice as competent peers: caller dilemmas on a warm line. *Discourse Studies* 4.4: 481-500.
- Schegloff, Emanuel A. 1993. Reflections on quantification in the study of conversation. *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 26: 99–128.
- Schegloff, Emanuel A. 1997. Practices and actions: Boundary cases of other-initiated repair. *Discourse Processes* 23: 499-545.
- Selting, Margret. 2012. Complaint stories and subsequent complaint stories with affect displays. In: *Journal of Pragmatics* 44: 387-415.
- Shaw, Chloe and Alexa Hepburn. 2013. Managing the moral implications of advice in informal interaction. *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 46.4: 344-362.
- Shaw, Chloe, Jonathan Potter, and Alexa Hepburn. 2015. Advice-implicative actions: Using interrogatives and assessments to deliver advice in mundane conversation. *Discourse Studies* 17.3: 317-342.
- Sidnell, Jack and N. J. Enfield. 2014. The ontology of action, in interaction. *The Cambridge Handbook of Linguistic Anthropology*, edited by N. J. Enfield, Paul Kockelman and Jack Sidnell. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press: 423-446.

- Silverman, David. 1997. *Discourses of counseling: HIV counseling as social interaction*. London, England: Sage.
- Sorjonen, Marja-Leena, Liisa Raevaara, Elizabeth Couper-Kuhlen, eds. 2017. *Imperative turns at talk: The design of directives in action*. Amsterdam, Benjamins.
- Stevanovic, Melisa and Anssi Peräkylä. 2012. Deontic authority in interaction: The right to announce, propose, and decide. *Research on Language & Social Interaction* 45:3, 297-321.
- Stivers, Tanya, John Heritage, Rebecca K. Barnes, Rose McCabe, Laura Thompson, Merran Toerien. 2017. Treatment recommendations as actions. *Health Communication* 33.11: 1335-1344.
- Thompson, Sandra A. and Elizabeth Couper-Kuhlen. In press. English *why don't you X* as a formulaic expression. In *Fixed expressions: Building language structure and action*, edited by Tsuyoshi Ono and Ritva Laury. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Thompson, Sandra A., Barbara A. Fox and Elizabeth Couper-Kuhlen (2015). *Grammar in everyday talk: Building responsive actions*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Vatanen, Anna. 2018. Responding in early overlap: recognitional onsets in assertion sequence. *Research on Language & Social Interaction* 51(2): 107-126.
- Vehviläinen, Sanna. 2001. Evaluative advice in educational counselling: The use of disagreement in the “stepwise entry” to advice. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 34(3), 371–398.
- Waring, Hansun Zhang. 2005. Peer tutoring in a graduate writing center: Identity, expertise, and advice resisting. *Applied Linguistics* 26(2): 141-168.
- Waring, Hansun Zhang. 2007. The multi-functionality of accounts in advice giving. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 11(3): 367-391.
- Waring, Hansun Zhang. 2012. The advising sequence and its preference structures in graduate peer tutoring in an American university. In: *Advice in Discourse*, edited by Holger Limberg and Miriam A. Locher. Amsterdam, John Benjamins, 87-118.