

University of New Hampshire  
University of New Hampshire Scholars' Repository

---

Honors Theses and Capstones

Student Scholarship

---

Spring 2012

# The Delicacy of Social Relationships: How Seemingly Small Choices In Formulating Talk Can Have Large Consequences For Relationships

Paige Clairmont

*University of New Hampshire - Main Campus*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholars.unh.edu/honors>

 Part of the [Interpersonal and Small Group Communication Commons](#)

---

## Recommended Citation

Clairmont, Paige, "The Delicacy of Social Relationships: How Seemingly Small Choices In Formulating Talk Can Have Large Consequences For Relationships" (2012). *Honors Theses and Capstones*. 38.

<https://scholars.unh.edu/honors/38>

This Senior Honors Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Student Scholarship at University of New Hampshire Scholars' Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Honors Theses and Capstones by an authorized administrator of University of New Hampshire Scholars' Repository. For more information, please contact [nicole.hentz@unh.edu](mailto:nicole.hentz@unh.edu).

The Delicacy of Social Relationships:  
How Seemingly Small Choices In Formulating Talk Can Have  
Large Consequences For Relationships

By Paige Clairmont  
Spring 2012  
CMN Honors Thesis  
Advisor: Danielle Pillet-Shore

Table of Contents

Introduction 3

Method & Data 4

Literature Review 6

Analysis

    Video A 12

    Video B 21

Conclusion 30

Works Cited 32

Appendix 35

Transcripts

    Video A 36

    Video B 37

## Introduction

Small choices in formulating talk can have large consequences for social relationships. In every moment of interaction, we are putting our relationships on the line. As Goffman (1967) classically said, “when a person volunteers a statement or a message, however trivial or commonplace, he commits himself and those he addresses, and in a sense places everyone present in jeopardy” (37). In daily life, we work to select our words and design our social actions specific to the recipients with whom we are interacting. The topic of talk varies as well, as we may not speak to our best friend about the same topic as we speak to an acquaintance. Moreover, the social knowledge we gain from past interactions with others is used to understand and participate in future interactions.

This thesis demonstrates that relationships are constantly being reproduced in every moment of interaction. Talk is the way relationships are reproduced, thus both relationships and talk are dependent on one another. This explains why participants treat certain topics of talk as ‘delicate,’ to protect and preserve their relationship during interaction. A lack of sensitivity could potentially weaken what was once a strong relationship. One interactive moment has the ability to change everything.

The following analysis discusses four distinct aspects of social action: (1) preference organization, (2) taboo talk, (3) laughter, and (4) repair. Preferred and dispreferred actions show how a speaker and recipient organize their social actions by keeping consistent with “face” (Goffman, 1967: 12). Taboo talk and laughter show how any word during interaction can be treated as improper in its context. Laughter can be used to introduce taboo talk in conversation or can also be a way to react to the inappropriateness of taboo talk. Lastly, repair combines both preferred actions, as well as taboo talk as speaker and recipient work to correct

misunderstandings, conflicts, and problems of speaking or hearing. This study uses the methods of Conversation Analysis and autoethnography to analyze examples of all four phenomena, including the effects and impacts on social relationships that result.

### Method And Data

In the Fall of 2011 I was enrolled in Pillet-Shore's class, 'Openings of Everyday Interactions.' I worked on a semester long research project collecting video data of roommates and friends at my UNH apartment and then used the tools learned throughout the course to analyze that data. I gathered over forty minutes video footage across six recording occasions. The videos became the raw data I needed in order to start researching and working with my primary method of analysis, Conversation Analysis (CA). The CA objective "is to describe the procedures and expectations in terms of which speakers produce their own behaviour and interpret the behaviour of others" (Heritage, 1984: 241). CA methodology consists of collecting real, naturally occurring data of conversational participants creating natural social actions. Once the data is collected, the recordings are taken into further examination through processes of transcription. Transcriptions work to unravel "organized patterns of stable, identifiable structural features" (Heritage, 1984: 241) within the actual words, body movements, and social actions that occur within the recorded interaction per instance.

Transcription is the next necessary step to doing CA by providing the researcher with detailed access to organized processes of communication. Patterns, themes, and overlapping effects of interaction are revealed. As Pillet-Shore (2008) explains, "the goal of this method is to uncover and document systematic practices through which participants accomplish social actions" (Pillet-Shore, 2008: 7). Throughout my data collection and transcription processes, I

was looking for reoccurring patterns of social action that relate to one another in some fashion. I hoped to find how certain locally, initially, and recurrently social actions produced subsequent responses.

All of my recordings were collected on the UNH campus. I had the benefit of knowing the participants involved. Thus, to supplement CA methodology, I also incorporated autoethnographic methods (Ellis & Adams, 2010). As defined by Ellis (2010), “autoethnography is an approach to research and writing that seeks to describe and systematically analyze (‘graphy’) personal experience (‘auto’) in order to understand cultural experience (‘ethno’).” Autoethnography was developed to move away from the processes of facts and truths, and instead, accommodate “subjectivity, emotionality, and the researcher’s influence on research” (Ellis & Adams 2010) to create unique, individual narratives through experience. I had the advantage of background understanding of the social relationships of the participants recorded, which was beneficial in determining the potential reasoning for the way various social actions occurred. In addition, I became a part of my own research in an instance of social interaction between my roommate and I. In this case, I was able to analyze the interaction with insider knowledge of my thoughts, feelings, and motives.

My data consist of various social situations in which two to six people are interacting in the same room. For the videos occurring within my apartment living room, there are up to four roommates. These roommates, including myself, have the identities as hosts of the apartment while the two newcomers are guests who join the interaction. These guests are friends to at least one roommate in the apartment and all participants have knowledge about who the other participants are. However, not all participants are equally familiar with one another or can be considered friends, as the types of relationships vary.

Video A takes place in my UNH apartment living room. My roommate, Jen (J), is about to arrive home from work. Jen is a vegetarian and I (P) was anxiously awaiting her arrival because I had made veggie burgers for us to cook once she came home. It was about 6:30pm and I was already hungry. Our other roommate, Elizabeth (E), was in the kitchen cooking dinner for her boyfriend, Aaron (A).

Video B takes place during homecoming and Halloween weekend, October 2011, at UNH. My roommates Elizabeth (E), Fiona (F), and myself, Paige (P) are hanging out at our apartment for the evening. Roommate Jen (J) has been getting ready to go out to a Halloween party with her friend Gloria (G). Our other friend Adam (A) is waiting to leave with them so he can go out to a party as well. Adam and Gloria both graduated in May 2011, but are visiting for the night.

While interacting, these participants engage in activities such as greeting, cooking, meal sharing, hanging out, getting ready to leave, celebrating UNH Homecoming and Halloween weekend, and saying goodbye for the evening. My primary targets for analysis became clear when I found reoccurring themes of preferred and dispreferred actions, taboo talk and laughter, and acts of repair.

## Literature Review

### I. Preferred Actions

Actions in interaction can be done as either ‘preferred’ or ‘dispreferred.’ According to Heritage (1984: 267), preferred actions are performed straightforwardly delay. Delayed actions that are stated with accounts and qualifications are termed dispreferred. Face-work (Goffman, 1967: 12) is defined as “the actions taken by a person to make whatever he is doing consistent

with face.” Face-work has an important role in establishing preference organization within interaction (Lerner, 1996: 304). Goffman (1967) argues that most acts are modified under the considerations of face. Positive face wants represent the desire to be approved of and liked in support of social relationships (Brown & Levinson, 1987: 13). Positive face wants tend to be satisfied through actions often constructed with agreements. Face-threats are dispreferred and often constructed with disagreements (Pomerantz, 1975: 84). Turns-at-talk that do not agree with the previous turn may be seen as face-threatening. These disagreeing turns are constructed as dispreferred actions including delays, weak arguments, and hesitations (Lerner, 1996: 304).

The construction of talk enables the recipient to mark the upcoming disagreement (Pomerantz, 1975: 84). Delays, or pausing in the middle of talk, further provide that disagreement is a dispreferred alternative to agreement. An alternative action is to avoid disagreement. Avoiding disagreement can be accomplished with delayed completion of talk. This avoidance reverts to an overall dodging of threats to the face of ‘self’ and ‘other’ (Lerner, 1996: 309). Thus, sequence organization practices may be sensitive to identities of ‘self’ and ‘other.’

Interaction is also structured to prefer offers over requests and self-correction over other correction (Lerner, 1996: 305). Particularly, “‘self’ and ‘other’ are two classes of participants in interactive social organizations –in particular those which characterize the sequential organization of conversation, specifically its turn-taking systems” (Schegloff et al, 1977: 361-362). Similar to agreements and disagreements, self and other are not valued equally, but organized with preference of self-correction over other-correction (Schegloff et al, 1977: 362). Correction will be discussed later under ‘repair.’



Self and other also relate to who knows more in interaction, known as the epistemic of social relations (Raymond & Heritage, 2006: 678). Self and other use conversational “methods for managing rights to identity-bound knowledge in self-other relations” (Raymond & Heritage, 2006: 678). Participants often come to disagreement when determining who has the rights to certain knowledge and information. By virtue of status, participants police the boundaries of knowledge to which one “can claim special rights” to know (Raymond & Heritage, 2006: 700). Participants may work to subordinate the epistemic authority of the other, claiming all knowledge rights to themselves. Territorial issues of knowledge and ownership may then interrupt self-other relations, causing disagreement during interaction (Raymond & Heritage, 2006: 701).

## II. Taboo Talk & Laughter

At times speakers may treat various phrases or words as ‘delicate.’ Delicacy represents a type of sensitive talk that derives from an impropriety in conversation (Lerner, frth: 1). Speakers do regular things in their talk to show that they are treating it as ‘taboo.’ Taboo talk becomes ‘taboo’ strictly through the way it is treated by the participants in interaction. If the conversational standards are crossed and an offensive or inappropriate topic must be discussed, one can voice the delicacy within their talk (Lerner, frth: 1). The delivery of the delicate matter will be framed with caution. One type of delivery is *sotto voce*, otherwise explained as whisper voicing (Lerner, frth: 2). Whisper voicing provides the recipient with the choice of determining whether the following term is offensive.

Lerner explains the uses of speaker hesitation in delicate formulations, claiming that there are two distinct types. The first type of hesitation occurs when a speaker is word searching for the precise formulation of a word or term (Lerner, frth: 12). A hesitation is delivered when the

term due next is suspended for a pause and then projected. This shows that the speaker is engaged in a word searching process (Lerner, frth: 12). The delayed term is eventually projected, “indicating the speaker’s commitment to continue speaking and therefore – at least in the first place – a continued commitment to resuming and (regularly enough) completing the in-progress turn-construction unit with that item” (Lerner, frth: 13). The word search is completed, term delivered, and turn completed.

The second type of hesitation occurs just prior to the delicate term or terms that are a part of the turn-constructural unit of formulating the taboo talk (Lerner, frth: 13). During this pre-delicate pause, the recipient is able to treat this hesitation as a warning for trouble. Thus, the recipient has the opportunity to say something or even assist the speaker by offering a solution (Lerner, frth: 15). Hesitation can cause uneasiness among participants, especially when the speaker demonstrates reluctance in voicing a delicate matter (Lerner, frth: 16). An ‘error avoidance format’ may be used by the speaker in order to provide that the speaker is currently producing an appropriate formulation of context for the current environment and recipient (Lerner, frth: 16). This further enables the speaker to let the recipient know that they are deciding how to put together what they are about to say next.

In contrast to hesitation and formulating delicacy, Jefferson claims taboo talk is also constructed as improper talk that is used to initiate moves into intimate interaction. A speaker may introduce improper talk in order to propose an upgraded level of intimacy with recipients. If accepted, this invitation enables participants to laugh and construct intimacy together (Jefferson, 1987: 160). Laughing together is “the status of an official conversational activity,” as well as an achievement through conversational sequences (Jefferson, 1987: 158). Accepting the invitation with laughter is preferred because acceptance supports social solidarity that strengthens the

social relationship. When declining the invitation, laughter is often substituted with equivocal sounds such as breathiness or throat clearing (Jefferson, 1979: 90). Furthermore, laughter can be completely terminated by the recipient using counter-talk and changing the subject completely with new topic (Jefferson, 1979: 93).

In social situations when the speaker of the taboo talk is not using laughter, the recipient may use laugh tokens as a conversational tool. Haakana (2001) writes about doctor-patient interaction in which the doctor informs the patient of unwanted, tragic, or embarrassing news. Solo laughing pursues purposes other than entertainment (Haakana, 2001: 196). As Haakana describes, “most commonly laughter occurs as a sign of and remedy for various kinds of delicate activity” (Haakana, 2001: 196). Although the doctor speaks with seriousness, the patient uses laughter as a remedying feature to show the delicacy of the matter (Haakana, 2001: 197). The ways in which patients show embarrassment through laughter holds consistent through Pillet-Shore’s (2012) research in teacher-parent interaction. Teachers laugh when directly praising the ‘job’ parents are doing as parents and parents recurrently laugh in sensitive situations in response to teachers’ praise of their own children. Laugh tokens enable the parent to pass on the opportunity to accept or agree with the praise (Pillet-Shore, 2012: 9).

### III. Repair

Schegloff, Jefferson, and Sacks (1977) collaborated to explain that “an ‘organization of repair’ operates in conversation, addressed to recurrent problems in speaking, hearing, and understanding” (Schegloff et al, 1977: 361). When there is a source of trouble in conversation, such as taboo talk and delicate formulation, repair is necessary to address these repairable sources (Schegloff et al, 1977: 363). Repair can be initiated by the speaker of trouble source or

by the other. Schegloff argues that the speaker him/herself may initiate repair in the same turn as the trouble source, during that turn's transition space before the other has a chance to speak, or immediately after the other has completed their turn (Schegloff et al, 1977: 366). In contrast, another may initiate repair immediately following the trouble source turn (Schegloff et al, 1977: 367).

Schegloff, as well as Lerner (1996), and Drew (1997) provide evidence that self-initiation is preferred over other-initiation, as the opportunity for the speaker of the trouble source to fix the trouble source occurs first (Schegloff et al, 1977: 376). Most often, opportunities for self-correction are taken by the speakers of the trouble source (Schegloff et al, 1977: 376). Speakers use a recognizable set of features to display that they are doing same turn self-repair on their own talk, including non-lexical speech perturbations, such as pausing, sound stretching, and stuttering (Schegloff et al, 1977: 376).

To initiate self-repair, the other may locate a problem in what the speaker has said, but may also leave it for the speaker to correct him/herself in the next turn. The other may repeat the repairable using the techniques of Next Turn Repair Initiators (NTRI) (Drew, 1997: 70). Repetition with particular emphasis placed on the trouble source enables the speaker to easily correct himself. A subset of NTRI is 'open' class repair initiators, which present a weaker form of initiation. 'Open' initiators reproduce the environment of the trouble source without locating exactly where the trouble is, by using words such as 'what?', 'pardon', and 'sorry?' (Drew, 1997: 72). "Matters of comprehension and repair shade into matters of accord or (mis) alignment between speakers" (Drew, 1997: 73). Rather than a lack of understanding of what the speaker has said, 'open' initiators suggest that the trouble source is the reasoning why the speaker may have initiated the topic in weak form.

## Analysis

I will thoroughly analyze Videos A and B separately, beginning with Video A.

### Video A

As stated earlier, Video A was recorded when Paige's vegetarian roommate Jen came home from work for the veggie burger dinner that Paige had been preparing. Paige assumed Jen would be home at her usual time of 6:30pm, but she was a little late and Paige was getting hungry. In order to receive a response of where she was, Paige sent her a text message, "Things are looking yummy!" By doing so, Paige was working to create an 'adjacency pair' (Heritage 1984: 246) which includes paired and exchanged actions. Paige's text to Jen was a first pair part (Heritage, 1984: 246) announcement and assessment that Paige sent expecting a second pair part response in return. According to the rules of adjacency pairs a second pair part should accountably come immediately after, as well as originate from the first pair part (246). Jen did not respond to Paige's text message before arriving to the apartment. Consequently, there was no second pair part that was accountably due next, so Paige repeated her first pair part verbally as Jen walked through the door. Excerpt 1 shows newcomer Jen walking through the door. Paige repeats her first pair part at line 04 with ".hh >said £things are lookin' y\_ummy?<." Paige reissues the text message verbally to repair the problem of Jen not responding. At line 05, Jen produces an account for why her second pair part has been previously missing, saying "Literally just got that te[xt when I walked in the door."

In the first few seconds of Jen's arrival, the interaction particularly involves just Jen and Paige. Elizabeth jumps into conversation, announcing at line 07 with "[Paige made veggie burgers" and then retreating as if she jumped in too soon claiming, "Sorry I spoiled it for you I

was-” at line 10. As pre-present participants at the apartment, Elizabeth and Paige offer Jen a previous activity formulation (Pillet-Shore, 2010: 154) of what has been happening. Through the action of previous activity formulating, “speakers summarize the activities or conversational topics in which they were engaged before establishing co-presence with arrivers, telling newcomers ‘what you’re coming into’” (Pillet-Shore, 2010: 154). Elizabeth even tells Jen what she is cooking for her boyfriend’s dinner. By doing this early, based on the indexical information offered at line 04 after Jen walks inside, Jen can interact as a co-participant immediately. Next, Elizabeth and Paige completely decipher the context of what we have been cooking, enabling her to interact right away (Pillet-Shore, 2010: 155). The preferred action in this situation is for us to include newcomer Jen. By line 09 she is completely involved, gasping with excitement that the veggie burgers are made.

**(1)** [Video A]

01 ((door closes))  
 02 E: What  
 03 ((movement in room))  
 04 P: .hh >said fthings are lookin' y:ummy?<  
 05 J: Literally just got that te[xt when I walked in the=  
 06 E: [Paige made veggie burgers  
 07 J: =door  
 08 P: °it's in the fridge°  
 09 J: ((gasp))((places keys on table))  
 10 E: Sorry I spoiled it for you I was-  
 11 J: I already knew.=it's fine  
 12 E: =and we have chick\_::en=and pota\_::toes  
 13 J: ya:\_:y  
 14 E: >Oh I should have just made all the potatoes< and you  
 15 guys could have som\_e (.)have if you want  
 16 J: °That's okay°  
 17 E: Or there might be leftovers anyways.

Jen prepares to settle into the apartment with unilateral actions, such as emptying the contents of her bag onto the table and organizing her purse in Excerpt 2 (Pillet-Shore, 2009: 32). As she is doing this, Paige contemplates the easiest cooking method to heat up our veggie burgers. When Paige is at home with her parents, she uses the gas grill to cook the veggie

burgers. The closest method to grilling inside the apartment is the George Foreman electric grill. From the moment Paige began planning to use that grill, Paige was immediately aware that the only other food that has been grilled at the apartment is meat. Through autoethnographic analysis, Paige assumes Jen's potential subjectivity against the meat grilling machine (Ellis & Adams, 2010). Over the past several years since Jen became a vegetarian, Paige has grown accustomed to Jen's eating rules regarding meat. Paige was unsure whether or not Jen would allow her veggie burger to be cooked on a grill that has only been used for meat.

(2) [Video A]

26 P: I need to u:m  
27 (0.8)  
28 we:ll I guess I'm using the °George  
29 (0.5)  
30 P: Cuz that's what I usually use (.) the grill°

By the way Paige formulates her speech at line 26, it is clear that Paige is treating her utterance as delicate. Here, Paige displays that she is self-initiating self-repair (Schegloff et al, 1977: 366). According to Gene Lerner, the phrase “um” plays a very relevant role in the speaker's talk (Lerner, frth: 9). In this case, Paige is the speaker and Paige has stopped the progression of her talk prematurely with “u:m” followed by a 0.8 second pause at line 27, showing speaker hesitation. Speaker hesitation represents a continued commitment to the currently suspended talk, but also indicates that Paige has paused in order to delicately formulate what she is about to say (Lerner, frth: 10). Paige's pausing gives Jen the opportunity to jump in and say something before Paige completes her sentence.

With a history of rejecting specific pans and oven dishes that have been used to cook meat, Jen is selective when deciding vessels in what to cook her vegetarian meals. Paige has experienced Jen to be reluctant to use any pan that has been used to previously cook meat, even when these pans have been thoroughly cleaned. Therefore, Paige's delay in speech projects that the talk she is about to articulate next will be delicate (Lerner, frth: 8).

The reasoning behind speaker hesitation varies. The first type of hesitation occurs when a speaker is word searching for the precise formulation of a word or term (Lerner, frth: 12). Within the context of “u:m” at line 26 and then sentence completion at line 28, the hesitation can not be treated as a word search. If it were a word search, the delayed term following “u:m” would project “a continued commitment to resuming” the sentence (Lerner, frth: 13). As seen at line 28, there is a lack of continued commitment to the talk because Paige completely re-starts her utterance with “we:ll I guess I’m using the °George” while disregarding what she previously said before the pause.

The second type of hesitation occurs prior to delicate talk. The pause at line 26 and continuing to 27 represent this type of hesitation used to formulate the upcoming ‘taboo talk’ that will follow (Lerner, frth: 13). The pause occurs before implementing a delicate action of using the George Foreman grill to cook the veggie burgers at line 28 (Lerner, frth: 13). The mentioning of the grill becomes a delicate action that is very delayed before being said. The pause at line 27 also shows how Paige restrains her speech just as the delicate term in line 28, “the °George” is due.

Restraining speech before the next due term is referred to as a ‘cut off’ (Lerner, frth: 19). This restrain provides even more support that Paige is not word searching, but suppressing her speech just before announcing the ‘George’ (Lerner, frth: 19). When Paige continues her talk at line 28, her voice becomes more quiet as she mentions “the °George.” This is a ‘*sotto voce*’ delivery, otherwise explained as whisper voicing (Lerner, frth: 2). Whisper voicing provides the recipient with the choice of determining whether the following term is offensive. In addition to line 28’s delicacy, “the °George” can be observed as a form of taboo talk. Taboo talk is also known as improper talk, which is considered improper by the participants involved. Anything in



interaction can be treated as taboo, depending on how the involved participants treat the talk within any moment in context.

In this sense, the George Foreman grill may represent an inappropriate or offensive term in discussion (Jefferson, 1987: 160). Together, the voicing at line 28, followed by a 0.5 second pause at line 29, isolates the delicate term (Lerner, frth: 3). Lerner writes that the way speech is formed reflects the surrounding interpersonal relationships (Lerner, frth: 24). The delays at line 27 and 29 operate to ensure “interpersonal harmony” (Lerner, frth: 25) or rather, to ensure appropriate formulation of context for the current environment and recipient (Jefferson, 1974: 194).

As there was prior uncertainty of Jen’s compliance with using the grill, Paige was reluctant to bring the topic to conversation. Lerner further claims “exhibiting reluctance by hesitating takes a form that permits, by its very structure, the pursuit of a more agreeing or aligning relationship between sequence-initiating and sequence-responding actions” (Lerner, frth: 25). In hopes of persuading Jen to agree, at line 30 Paige continues in *‘sotto voce’* claiming the significance of using the George Foreman grill “Cuz that’s what I usually use (.) the grill°.” In addition, line 30 marks a transition relevant repair (Schegloff et al, 1977: 366). The repair is finally stated after two separate lines of previous pausing, at the transition space following line 29 into line 30 (Schegloff et al, 1977: 366) before saying “Cuz that’s what I usually use (.) the grill°.

Excerpt 3 shows how Jen and Paige solve their potential interpersonal trouble. Repair sequences are the practices used to address and resolve hearing and/or understanding problems that occur during speaking (Sidnell, 2010: 110). Paige had previously initiated self-repair in Excerpt 2, anticipating resistance with her talk about using the grill. Paige had already expected

the grill to be a trouble source in conversation. By initiating repair, Paige was monitoring her prior talk “not necessarily for something that was not heard but, more generally, for something potentially problematic from the recipient’s point of view” (Sidnell, 2010: 121). The use of the George Foreman grill could potentially be the problem for Jen. Rightfully so, Paige hears Jen say at line 31 say “not mi:ne” in response to Paige’s proposal about using the grill. Paige may have inferred from the context of their previous delicate talk that Jen would respond in disagreement (Sidnell, 2010: 127). Only a few weeks had gone by since the last encounter in which Jen favored to keep a particular pan for vegetables only.

**(3)** [Video A]

28           we:ll I guess I’m using the °George  
 29           (0.5)  
 30 P:       Cuz that’s what I usually use (.) the grill°  
 31 J:       Not mi:ne  
 33 P:       well you=we can use the pan  
 34           instead.  
 35           ((background chatter))  
 36 J:       A[ll’s I was saying  
 37 P:       [cuz=I can’ [t put the George down thou\_:gh  
 38 J:                   [>No=but you can-<  
 39 P:       I can’t put it down anyway=because it’ll °smoosh them  
 40           to death°

The preferred action to Paige’s request of using the grill is for Jen to accept. Paige prefers that Jen accept her suggestion because burgers are normally grilled and it would be the easiest way to cook them. Thus, the most convenient situation for Paige is for Jen to grant her permission to use the grill to cook all of the veggie burgers. However, line 31 in Excerpt 3 shows Jen’s response of refusal. But line 31 can be interpreted in two possible ways: although Jen later displays that she means her utterance at line 31 to convey “not my grill,” Paige understands Jen as having said “not my burger” here (i.e., ‘Don’t cook my burger on that grill’). A refusal to use the grill is a dispreferred action because Jen is rejecting the easiest way to cook (Heritage, 1984: 269), and this act threatens Paige’s negative face wants (the desire to be unimpeded in one’s actions (Brown & Levinson, 1987: 13). Even though Paige wants Jen to agree to use the grill

with her, Jen rejects in a preferred format without delay, account, or apology (Heritage, 1984: 269).

In this moment, a large misunderstanding unfolds. Paige's thoughts and understanding in this exact moment are as follows. Paige, on one hand, is annoyed that Jen refuses to use the grill, especially because she seems to do so straightforwardly, and without mitigation. Regardless of Paige's prediction that Jen would refuse the grill, all hope of disconfirming that was gone once she rejected it. In Paige's mind, she heard Jen say "not mine" and confirmed the fact that Jen would not use the meat-laden grill for her veggie burger.

Through the transcription we can see Jen's understanding of what is going on throughout Excerpt 3 as well. As Paige goes on with alternative options to cook the burgers, Jen is unable to talk over her. We later realize the misunderstanding. At line 28 Jen hears "well, I guess I'm using *your* George" not what Paige understood she said as "*the* George." Jen repeatedly tries to contribute to conversation at line 36 with "A[ll]s I was saying" and again at line 38 with "[>No=but you can-<." Their individual talk overlaps one another's talk in order to find ways to avoid conflict.

At line 33 Paige acknowledges Jen's refusal by offering that "well you=we can use the pan instead." We can also see that Paige was about to tell Jen '*you*' could use the pan instead, right before immediately switching to '*we*.' By suggesting the use of a pan to cook the veggie burgers, it is clear that Paige would rather avoid or abandon the trouble source of the grill than confront Jen about it. Paige could have immediately fought back by questioning Jen. Instead, Paige made it sound like a better idea not to use the grill at line 37, "cuz=I can'[t put the George down thou\_gh" then continue to line 39, "I can't put it down anyway=because it'll °smoosh them to death."

Jen and Paige are both using Goffman's concept of facework in order to not compromise positive and negative face wants for one another through their talk. Through the details of talk, relationships are reproduced in every given moment, thus both relationships and talk are dependent on one another. To re-create and maintain their close friendship in this interactive moment, they do not want one another to feel bad. We can see how Jen and Paige reproduce their relationship through the design of their talk when Paige devises an alternative plan of using a pan instead at line 33. By coming up with an alternative, Paige is showing Jen that they do not have to use the grill if Jen does not want to. Again, Jen shows she is cautious to disagree because she does not aggressively speak up at lines 36 or 38 enough to talk over Paige. Throughout these lines, they both work to portray positive images for one another and their relationship (Goffman, 1967: 5). Positive face wants represent the desire to be approved of and liked in support of social relationships, while negative face wants represent the desire to be unimpeded in one's actions (Brown & Levinson, 1987: 13). If the grill is not used, Paige's negative face wants are compromised due to the inconvenience of using a pan or the oven. If the grill is used, Paige displays concern that this compromises Jen's negative face wants because she does not want to inconvenience Jen by having to use a grill that has previously cooked meat. By protecting Jen's face, Paige is accepting her wish not to use the grill rather than arguing or getting angry with her. To protect Paige's face, Jen is not explicitly disagreeing with or insulting Paige for wanting to use the grill.

There are two ways to correct a misunderstanding within the context of an interaction. Neither interactant wants to be corrected in conversation. Self-initiated correction is structurally preferred (Schegloff et al, 1977: 362). Jen and Paige both delay in solving the 'trouble source' precisely because they are both also working to not disagree with each other or threaten each

other's face. They are both satisfying their preferences not to be corrected by the other. They have been best friends for years and both manage to keep their opinions to themselves when arguments arise. Jen has a difficult time with confrontation and Paige has learned to respect that. By reproducing their friendship in this moment, they protect one another's face to avoid confrontation and argument. At line 38, Jen stops unpacking her bag and stands completely facing Paige displaying closer attention to their interaction.

**(4)** [Video A]

37 P: [cuz=I can'[t put the George down thou\_:gh  
 38 J: [ >No=but you can-<  
 39 P: I can't put it down anyway=because it'll °smoosh them  
 40 to death°  
 43 J: Well, I dun:no (.) you wanna use  
 44 P: I usually use the real grill=°we don have-°  
 45 J: N:o we can use th[e George  
 46 A: [what  
 47 ((background chatter))  
 48 J: I thought you said your George  
 49 P: Oh=the Geo- =oh no\_: I said the George  
 50 J: >Thas=why I was like s'not mine<  
 51 P: I th[ought you said not m\_:ine  
 52 J: [hhh no:\_: .hh  
 53 P: Like al\_:right  
 54 J: O:h hh no: hh  
 55 P: But on the George I can't put it do\_:wn (0.7) Fiona came  
 56 back and went to chu:rch  
 57 J: O:h, good for he\_:r  
 58 ((unpacking bag))  
 59 P: m::h::mm

Finally, Jen initiates a repair solution in Excerpt 4. When it is Jen's turn at talk, she begins a repair solution sequence to help us solve the problem. At line 43 Jen says, "Well, I dun:no (.) you wanna use." At this point, Paige can provide from Jen's talk that there has been a misunderstanding rather than a disagreement because Paige thought she had made it clear that she wanted to use the grill. Jen does not claim a misunderstanding herself, but she displays uncertainty over their prior talk. Jen did not show any signs of misunderstanding in her previous turns at talk, but indicates in a later turn at line 43 that she does not know what Paige wants to cook with. Question words such as "what" indicate which parts of speech are repairable (Sidnell,

2010: 117). Line 43 shows Jen initiating a repair solution because she does not know *what* Paige wants to use to cook the veggie burgers.

At line 45, Jen continues a sequence of repair solution to clear up their talk. She says, “No we can use th[e George.” A few lines following at line 48, she refers back to the trouble source by stating, “I thought you said your George.” By doing so, Jen locates the prior trouble source. This line shows that in excerpt 2 at line 28 when Paige said “we:ll I guess I’m using the °George,” Jen heard her say “*your* George.” Her response at line 31, “not mi:ne,” was supposed to be heard as “it’s not mine” because the grill does not belong to her. Jen accounts for this at line 50 by saying “>Thas=why I was like s’not mine<” in order to retroactively save face and their relationship (Goffman, 1967: 12). At line 51, Paige participates in the repair solution by telling Jen “I th[ought you said not m\_:ine.” In response at line 52, Jen laughs and says “[hhh no:\_.hh” to show that it was not her intention for Paige to hear that she would not use the grill. In that moment, the misunderstanding is repaired. As soon as the repair solution is solved, their talk resumes as normal and they move on.

## Video B

Video B was recorded during the Fall weekend of UNH homecoming and Halloween. Paige, Fiona, and Elizabeth are hanging out at the apartment to stay in for the night, while Adam, Jen, and Gloria are going to go to parties. Jen and Gloria have been at the apartment getting ready to leave for around two hours. Adam has been ready to leave ever since he arrived, so he sits down to chat until the girls are ready. He displays his desire to leave increasingly as the minutes go by.

Excerpt 5 shows Adam's attempt to leave at line 03 with "[Alri::ght I'll see you gu\_ys later." Jen and Gloria are still not quite ready to go and Adam progressively displays how he is ready to leave at that moment. With nothing else to do, Adam taunts Paige, Fiona, and Gloria about how late he will be awake and what he will do when they are asleep. At line 07 Adam says, "[I'm gonna be=I'm gonna be pounding on your window at .h ridiculous ho\_urs," providing notice of expected future contact with the girls (Pillet-Shore, 2011: CMN 788 Handout). In response to Adam's taunting, at line 9 Elizabeth invites Adam into 'taboo' talk in attempt to propose an upgraded level of intimacy (Jefferson, 1987: 160).

(5) [Video B]

01 P: Fiona d'you want ta help me make that,  
 02 F: Make what wa[h?  
 03 A: [Alri::ght I'll see you gu\_ys later  
 04 F: [D'ya want me to make the cake-  
 05 P: [By:::e  
 06 J: £B[e safe every\_one  
 07 A: [I'm gonna be=I'm gonna be pounding on your  
 08 window at .h ridiculous ho\_urs  
 09 E: =Please don't [t (.2) po:und anything (.) thank you.  
 10 P: [N:o:o:o\_:  
 11 A: hh:hh  
 12 J: Ad:am wait  
 13 G: Should w[:e park-  
 14 A: ['mo:::n.  
 15 E: >Save that for n[a\_:ils<  
 16 J: [I'm waiting for my fr\_:iend (.)  
 17 Gloria  
 18 A: Save it for £what?  
 19 E: .hh save it for na\_:ils hh  
 20 A: Yo I'm quitting=I hate my job (.5) boss is a mean  
 21 jerk.

At line 07 Adam uses the word "pounding" in a non-sexual way, referencing that he will knock very hard on the girls' windows at very late hours during the night. In response, at line 09, Elizabeth turns Adam's talk into a sexual impropriety by saying "=Please don't [ (.2) po:und anything (.) thank you." Sexualization is situational in regards to context of talk." Elizabeth is "doing sexualizing" with a phrase that Adam did not intend as sexual. Joke formats and double

entendres are popular methods of sexualizing talk (Van Leuven, 1998: 79). A double entendre provides a way to interpret with two different meanings, in this case one interpretation as innocent, and one as risqué (Van Leuven, 1998: 79). Adam has an innocent meaning for ‘pounding’, which Elizabeth interprets or reproduces as risqué.

By signaling ‘pounding’ as a sexualized double entendre (Van Leuven, 1998: 83), Elizabeth is working to create an upgraded intimacy with Adam. Using ethnographic insight, I know that Elizabeth’s proposed invitation to Adam comes off as strange because they do not have a close relationship and only see one another occasionally at the apartment. Elizabeth may potentially make Adam feel uncomfortable through using language that could be considered inappropriate for their level of friendship.

Interactional participants may introduce ‘improper’ talk in order to initiate intimate interaction “from a status he perceives as non-intimate so far” (Jefferson, 1987: 160). Co-participants may be invited by the speaker in order to produce the improper talk together, so they can laugh together and construct intimacy (Jefferson, 1987: 160). In this case, Elizabeth is the speaker who invites Adam into an intimate interaction from a viewpoint that is not yet intimate in conversation. The recipient, Adam, has the choice of deciding whether to accept or decline the invitation (Jefferson, 1987: 160).

At line 10, Paige’s response overlaps Elizabeth’s improper response to Adam with “[N:o:o:o\_:.” Following at line 11, Adam displays a trace of laughter. Adam’s cause of laughter is uncertain because he could be laughing at how he made the girls nervous that he really would knock on the door late at night. Thus he may think it is funny that Paige told him not to. He could also be laughing at Jen and Gloria in the kitchen who, in that moment, are making a mess



while getting ready. Lastly, Adam could also be laughing because Elizabeth's response may have embarrassed him and he is doing "being modest" through his laughter (Pillet-Shore, 2012: 17).

While laughing, Adam walks toward the door to leave. Jen states "Ad:am wait" to imply that he wait for her and Gloria. Gloria begins to ask a question when Adam responds to Jen, complaining at line 14 with "[ 'mo:::n" as slang for "come on." As he complains, he walks back into the living room of the apartment. Elizabeth continues her improper talk at line 15 by saying, ">Save that for n[a\_:ils<" in reference to Adam's 'pounding.' As Adam starts to walk further into the living room, he responds at line 18 with "Save it for £what." As he says "£what," Adam not only uses a 'smile voice' but he also uses laughter. He may be using laughter because he has seen Elizabeth smiling at him, and/or possibly because he is displaying embarrassment or misunderstanding. Adam could have seen Elizabeth's face or heard her talk well enough to understand she was making a sexual innuendo. Adam's use of "what" acts as an NTRI open-class repair initiator (Drew, 1997: 70), indicating that there is a problem within the prior turn of talk. Question words do not always represent a difficulty in hearing, but depend upon the context of the surrounding talk (Drew, 1997: 72). Adam's use of "what" may not be revealing his trouble hearing as much as it is displaying inappropriateness of Elizabeth's invitation to intimacy. By framing a repeated segment of Elizabeth's talk with his use of "what," Adam reproduces the location of the trouble source for Elizabeth to indicate other-initiated repair (Drew, 1997: 71). Adam could be giving Elizabeth the opportunity to self-repair her talk to check whether or not she really meant what she just said. Elizabeth, the speaker of the trouble source, is provided with the location of trouble so she, the "other," clearly 'knows' the repair or 'correction' and could use the turn to do it" (Schegloff et al, 1977: 377). Adam leaves Elizabeth the option to decide whether to fix her talk or disregard her talk and move on.

At line 19, Elizabeth continues to initiate laughter with Adam. While laughing, she responds to him by repeating, “.hh save it for na\_:ils hh.” Rather than taking the opportunity given by Adam to self-repair her talk, she invites Adam to an upgraded level of intimacy for a third time. At line 20, it can be observed that Adam declines Elizabeth’s invitation to intimacy completely by disattending it with no uptake. In response to Elizabeth’s third invitation, Adam initiates a new topic and a new sequence at line 20 with “Yo I’m quitting=I hate my job (.5) boss is a mean jerk.” Adam uses an abrupt shift in topic (Drew, 1997: 76) to further initiate repair. Referring to his job is significant because he is a construction worker and makes a literal use of ‘pounding nails.’ He disregards Elizabeth’s impropriety and changes it from a sexual metaphorical matter into a literal matter of pounding nails for work. At this point, Adam is not smiling or laughing and Elizabeth is left laughing alone.

Jefferson (1979) explains a technique that may have been used by Adam to decline laughter. “One technique for declining a postcompletion invitation to laugh is the placement of speech, by recipient, just after onset of speaker’s laughter, that speech providing serious pursuit of topic as counter to the pursuit of laughter” (93). Elizabeth is the only one laughing because Adam declined her invitation to intimacy. Adam and Elizabeth’s sequence lasted over several turns at talk. Analyzing with Drew’s implications of sequential environments, a problem arises not through Adam’s misunderstanding of what Elizabeth said, but his difficulty in connecting what she said to the surrounding talk and relationships (95).

The conversation in the apartment carries on and a new sequence of talk begins. Gloria and Adam are UNH graduates, so they no longer have parking passes for UNH parking lots and must use the public lots available. However, due to homecoming activity the next day, A-lot is closed for the evening. A-lot is where a majority of the public parking spaces are. At this

moment, Adam is parked in section 4, the last section of A-lot, without a worry in mind. Gloria is much more concerned about getting a parking ticket and would prefer following the parking notices. As Gloria's good friend, Jen supports Gloria and tries to help lessen her concern. Jen looks to Adam for some sympathy and understanding, but he does not provide her with what she wants to hear. Fiona, Elizabeth, and Paige are still in the living room, observing the ongoing talk.

(6) [Video B]

22 J: Ad\_::am?  
 23 A: Wha::t  
 24 J: Are you parkin=in section four all night?  
 25 A: Yes=but I also don' givva fuck if I getta ticket=cuz  
 26 ittsta UNH tick[et  
 27 J: [Ur parking in section fo[ur a::ll  
 28 night.  
 29 A: [It does not  
 30 matt\_:er (.2) s'not like they're gonna=boot ur [cā r n'  
 31 tow it to the UNH impound lot.  
 32 E: [Ur  
 33 cars gonna get fuck-  
 34 G: No=I kno::w.  
 35 P: [hhh impo:un-  
 36 A: [They're gonna=they're gonna tow it to B-lot.  
 37 G: °I'll just, s:ay I checked the web\_:site°  
 38 ((laughter))  
 39 A: Or you'll jus' say fuck you I don' go ta scho:ol  
 40 here=so I don' hafta pay shit

After knowing that Adam was happily parked in A-lot, Jen interrogates him at line 24 with, "Are you parkin=in section four all night?" Prior to responding, Adam also knows that Gloria is afraid of getting a parking ticket. He shows he understands that Jen was directing her question toward Gloria's concern at line 25 by stating, "Yes=but I also don' givva fuck if I getta ticket=cuz ittsta UNH tick[et." In response, Jen displays a declarative, repetitive statement at line 27 asking Adam a second time. She places extra emphasis on "a::ll night." By doing so, she shows that she wants him to correct himself and gives him the opportunity to repair his talk. Jen is other-initiating repair by giving Adam the opportunity to self-correct his answer in his next response (Lerner, 1996: 313). Adam has a chance to repair his talk, change his mind, and tell the

girls that he will park somewhere else. Instead of taking that chance, Adam views Jen's repetition as a challenge and so he refuses to repair his talk.

There is obvious tension between Adam and Jen. Adam displays that he has knowledge over Jen. When a speaker makes a statement about something they do not know the answer to, the statement will be taken as a request for information by a knowledgeable participant (Lerner, 1996: 317). Jen made a statement to Adam, looking for confirmation in return. She received confirmation, but not confirmation relative to Gloria's worries about parking. Adam presents himself as unafraid of UNH parking enforcers, especially at the end of line 25 claiming, "=cuz ittsa UNH tick[et]." Raymond and Heritage (2006) discuss this challenge of knowledge as "a range of practices through which identities – and whatever forms of power and inequality may be associated with them – are linked to specific actions in interaction" (679). In this case, Adam's actions provide an unwillingness to move his car because he has already graduated and therefore, has more power than the average student over parking enforcement. He also provides that even if he does get a ticket, he will not have to pay the ticket, and that will not matter due to his status as a graduate.

Excerpt 7 shows how Adam switches his attention from Jen to Gloria because Gloria is the one concerned about where to park her car. Adam leaves Jen out of the conversation once he makes himself clear to her that he is a graduate and does not have to be afraid of disobeying the parking rules.

(7) [Video B]

- 41 J: You're an alumn:i (.) you paid your years  
42 G: I paid fo:ur-  
43 A: The only thing they can do with tickets=is not let  
44 kids graduate=n' guess what (.) ya already made it.  
45 G: Well I don' have my diploma ye:t actually.  
46 A: °I do:\_\_:o=how do you not have urs?  
47 G: Cuz I didn't do my exit for:ms  
48 A: hh:h=Ur Fucked if you getta ticket they're not gonna  
49 give it to you.

We can see that Jen, an undergraduate, gives in to Adam's self-proclaimed power as a graduate. Shown at line 41, Jen says to Gloria "You're an alumn:i (.) you paid your years." By "policing the boundaries of knowledge to which she can claim special rights by virtue of her status," Jen backs down as if her status is lower than Adam's (Raymond & Heritage, 2006: 700). With knowledge that Gloria has graduated, Adam assesses Gloria's current position and reassures her at line 43, "The only thing they can do with tickets=is not let kids graduate=n' guess what (.) ya already made it." Gloria responds with a critical claim that she has not actually received her diploma and from there, Adam lowers his tone of voice with provided concern. Adam then yields the discussion quite possibly to "avoid intervening too far into 'territorial preserves,'" meaning to keep away from going too deep into Gloria's feelings and apparently ambiguous status (Raymond & Heritage, 2006: 701).

Excerpt 8 takes place at the very end of the interaction when Gloria and Jen are finally done getting ready to leave. Gloria and Jen stand in the kitchen with their jackets on, gathering belongings to take with them to the Halloween party. After ending his discussion with Gloria in Excerpt 7, Adam is seen walking over to the opposite side of the room. Adam has been waiting for a very long while to get on with his night and displays determination to actually make it out of the apartment without hesitation.

**(8)** [Video B]

57 ((high five slap))  
 58 E: What are you guys maki:ng=I'm gonna make something-  
 59 A: Let's g:o  
 60 J: B:::ye  
 61 G: B:::ye  
 62 A: See::ya?  
 63 P: Have f:un  
 64 A: B:y:::e?  
 65 J: Thank yo::u  
 66 F: °bye°  
 67 A: B:y:::e?  
 68 E: °Smell yah later°  
 69 A: B:y::[:eç

70 E: [What are you making Pai:ge.  
71 P: U::hm  
72 A: Whe::eeew?

At line 57, Adam acknowledges Fiona by giving her a high five on his way toward the door as a goodbye gesture. The high five is a non-verbal body-based practice that represents touching before a farewell (Pillet-Shore, 2011: CMN 788 Handout). At line 59, Adam continues walking toward the door, looking over to Gloria and Jen at to shout "Let's g:o." For the first time after all of Adam's requests, the girls are ready and walk to the door with him. At line 60, Jen begins the sequence of farewell utterances for everyone in the living room to say goodbye.

Lines 60 to 72 illustrate the large prosodic melodies that are heard throughout Adam, Jen, and Gloria's farewells. As females, Jen and Gloria have naturally higher-pitched voices than Adam. Lines 60 and 61, as done by Jen and Gloria, demonstrate prosody as an appropriate melodic range to display a positive stance toward Elizabeth, Fiona, and Paige (Pillet-Shore, 2012: 18). These "bye" utterances are produced with prosodic features of slightly higher pitches that show the recipients approval, appreciation, and praise (Pillet-Shore, 2012: 20).

In contrast, Adam uses a melodic pitch that is way out of his ordinary range. Thus, Adam is using mimicry and sarcastic prosody in order to poke fun at the girls. Adam is the only male in the entire apartment at the time. Adam also has the deepest voice in the room and chooses to mock the co-present females by producing a sarcastic goodbye. Adam voices farewell utterances in high onset pitches at lines 62, 64, 67, and 69. In addition to this, Adam is going against the social norm of voicing one farewell and instead, says "bye" multiple times. Alex says "bye" four times without true purpose. No one asked for clarification or presented a necessary opportunity for him to self-repair. He was loud and clear each time, so he was not repeating due to a lack of volume or misunderstanding. We can make sense out of Adam's abnormal prosody due to the fact that he waited over an hour for Jen and Gloria to get ready to leave the apartment for the

night. We know that patience is necessary for waiting long periods of time, and Adam may have turned to sarcasm and mimicry for his own entertainment. The sequence concludes with a bang at line 72 when Adam cheers “Whe::eeew?” on his way through the door and continue until the door slams shut.

### Conclusion

In the analysis of Video A, Jen and Paige emerged as a pair of best friends who worked to avoid conflict about the George Foreman grill. We can see how prior social knowledge of a relationship can be beneficial, as Paige worked delicately with Jen to meet Jen’s needs. Neither of the girls wanted to hurt one another’s feelings in that moment. However, the misunderstanding may not have occurred had Paige not assumed Jen would not want to use the grill.

Video B showed a pair of acquaintances who worked separately to conclude a sequence of interaction. Elizabeth did not interpret Adam’s social actions as a hint to stop. Elizabeth did not take the opportunity, suggested by Adam, to repair her previous comments or stop inviting Adam to an upgraded level of intimacy. Due to their social relationship as acquaintances, Adam displays discomfort with Elizabeth’s invitations, however Elizabeth does not display discomfort regardless of their level of friendship.

This thesis verified how relationships are constantly being reproduced in every moment of interaction. Through close analysis of two separate video recordings, and consideration of the phenomena of preferred and dispreferred actions, taboo talk, laughter, and repair, we can see how talk and social relationships are interdependent. Yet, each phenomenon works differently among the various relationships of the interactants involved. Looking back to Goffman’s famous claim, “when a person volunteers a statement or a message, however trivial or commonplace, he

commits himself and those he addresses, and in a sense places everyone present in jeopardy” (1967: 37). As we interact, much emphasis is placed on how we deal with the potential risk of our relationships. Jen and Paige were able to repair in order to make sure they were ‘cool’ with one another. On the other hand, Elizabeth and Adam have no concluding factor as to whether or not their future relationship is unharmed.

This analysis included an assortment of relationships, in which some participants are good friends and other participants are mere acquaintances. We have seen how small choices in formulating talk can have a great impact on and possible large consequences for social relationships. The interdependence between talk and relationships becomes more clear as we see how delicate social relationships are and how social actions can make or break a relationship.



Works Cited

- Brown, P. & Levinson, S. C. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Drew, P. (1997). 'Open' class repair initiators in response to sequential sources of troubles in conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics* 28:69-101.
- Ellis, Carolyn; Adams, Tony E. & Bochner, Arthur P. (2010). Autoethnography: An Overview [40 paragraphs]. Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung / Forum: Qualitative Social Research, 12(1), Art. 10, <http://nbn-resolving.de/urn:nbn:de:0114-fqs1101108>.
- Goffman, E. (1967). On face-work. Pp. 5-45 in *Interaction ritual: Essays on face-to-face behavior*. New York: Pantheon.
- Haakana, M. (2001). Laughter as a patient's resource: Dealing with delicate aspects of medical interaction. *Text*, 1(1/2), 187-219.
- Heritage, J. (1984). Conversation analysis. Chapter 8 in *Garfinkel and ethnomethodology*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Jefferson, G. (1979). A technique for inviting laughter and its subsequent acceptance/declination. In G. Psathas (Ed.), *Everyday language: Studies in ethnomethodology*. New York: Irvington Publishers, Inc.
- Jefferson, G., Sacks, H. & Schegloff, E. (1987). Notes on laughter in the pursuit of intimacy. Chapter 6 in G. Button & J. R. E. Lee (Eds.), *Talk and social organization* (Chapter 6, pp.152-205). Philadelphia: Multilingual Matters.
- Lerner, G. H. (1996). Finding "face" in the preference structures of talk-in-interaction. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 59 (4) 303-321.

- Lerner, G. H. (forth). On the place of hesitating in delicate formulations: A turn-constructural infrastructure for collaborative indiscretion. In J. Sidnell, M. Hayashi & G. Raymond (Eds.), *Conversational repair and human understanding*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Pillet-Shore, D. (2009). Report of 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). Farewell Handout from CMN 788. Observations on some recurrent practices/actions parties use to constitute face-to-face closings.
- Pillet-Shore, Danielle. (2012/13). Greeting: Displaying stance through prosodic recipient design. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, forthcoming.
- Pillet-Shore, Danielle. (2012). The problems with praise in parent-teacher interaction. *Communication Monographs*, 79(2), 181-204.
- Pomerantz, A. (1975). Second assessments: A study of some features of agreement/disagreement. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of California, Irvine.
- Raymond, G., & Heritage, J. (2006). The epistemics of social relations: Owning grandchildren. *Language in Society* 35, 677-705.
- Schegloff, E., Jefferson, G., & Sacks, H. (1977). The preference for self-correction in the organization of repair in conversation. *Language* 53 (2) 361-382.
- Sidnell, J. (2010). Ch. 7 in *Conversation Analysis: An Introduction*. West Sussex, UK: Wiley-

Blackwell.

Van Leuven, L. (1998). 'I need a screw': Workplace sexualization as an interactional achievement. In O'Brien, J. and Howard, J. A. (Eds). *Everyday Inequalities: Critical inquiries* (73-96). Oxford, UK: Blackwell.

Appendix: Key to Transcript Notation

P: Speaker identification

[ Bracket: Onset of overlapping talk

= Equal sign: No gap of silence in-between utterances

– Hyphen: The sound preceding the hyphen is cut off

\_: The pitch turns downward at the letters preceding underlined colon

: Underlined Colon: The pitch turns upward within the word

(0.5) Timed silence: Silence measured in seconds and tenths of seconds

(.) Period within parentheses: A micropause of less than 0.2 seconds

: Colon(s): The preceding sound is stretched

. Period: Falling intonation

? Question mark: Rising intonation

  Underlining: Emphasis or increased volume relative to surrounding talk

°I dunno° Degree signs: Decreased volume relative to surrounding talk

>fast< Greater-than/less-than signs: Increased pace of talk relative to surrounding talk

<slow> Less-than/greater-than signs: Decreased pace of talk relative to surrounding talk

£ British pound sign: Smile voice

.hh Subscripted period preceding “h”s: In-breaths; the more “h”s the longer the in-breath

hh “h”s: Indicating Laughter

((door closes)) Filled double parentheses: Scenic detail/event/sound

[Video A]

01 ((door closes))  
 02 E: What  
 03 ((movement in room))  
 04 P: .hh >said fthings are lookin' y:ummy?<  
 05 J: Literally just got that te[xt when I walked in the=  
 06 E: [Paige made veggie burgers  
 07 J: =door  
 08 P: °it's in the fridge°  
 09 J: ((gasp))((places keys on table))  
 10 E: Sorry I spoiled it for you I was-  
 11 J: I already knew.=it's fine  
 12 E: =and we have chick\_::en=and pota\_::toes  
 13 J: ya:\_:y  
 14 E: >Oh I should have just made all the potatoes< and you  
 15 guys could have som\_:e (.)have if you want  
 16 J: °That's okay°  
 17 E: Or there might be leftovers anyways.  
 18 P: And the::n brussel sp[routs  
 19 A: [Laundry  
 20 J: Yeah I'll th[row those in  
 21 E: [I'm com:ing hold o\_:n  
 22 P: .h it's=fine>I didn't cook them yet<=they're in the  
 24 fr\_:idge  
 25 ((clunk))  
 26 P: I need to u:m  
 27 (0.8)  
 28 we:ll I guess I'm using the °George  
 29 (0.5)  
 30 P: Cuz that's what I usually use (.) the grill°  
 31 J: Not mi:ne  
 33 P: well you=we can use the pan  
 34 instead.  
 35 ((background chatter))  
 36 J: A[ll's I was saying  
 37 P: [cuz=I can' [t put the George down thou\_:gh  
 38 J: [>No=but you can-<  
 39 P: I can't put it down anyway=because it'll °smoosh them  
 40 to death°  
 41 E: Do you want to just go so I can make these green  
 42 beans-  
 43 J: Well, I dun:no (.) you wanna use  
 44 P: I usually use the real grill=°we don have-°  
 45 J: N:o we can use th[e George  
 46 A: [what  
 47 ((background chatter))  
 48 J: I thought you said your George  
 49 P: Oh=the Geo- =oh no\_: I said the George  
 50 J: >Thas=why I was like s'not mine<  
 51 P: I th[ought you said not m\_:ine  
 52 J: [hhh no:\_: .hh  
 53 P: Like al\_:right  
 54 J: O:h hh no: hh  
 55 P: But on the George I can't put it do\_:wn (0.7) Fiona came  
 56 back and went to chu:rch  
 57 J: O:h, good for he\_:r  
 58 ((unpacking bag))

The Delicacy of Social Relationships, Clairmont

59 P: m::h::mm  
 [Video B]  
 16:13-End  
 01 P: Fiona d'you want ta help me make that,  
 02 F: Make what wa[h  
 03 A: [Alri::ght I'll see you gu\_:ys later  
 04 F: [D'ya want me to make the cake-  
 05 P: [By::\_:e  
 06 J: £B[e safe every\_:one  
 07 A: [I'm gonna be=I'm gonna be pounding on your  
 08 window at .h ridiculous ho\_:urs  
 09 E: =Please don' [t (.2) po:und anything (.) thank you.  
 10 P: [N:o:o:o\_:  
 11 A: hh:hh  
 12 J: Ad:am wait  
 13 G: Should w[:e park-  
 14 A: ['mo:::n.  
 15 E: >Save that for n[a\_:ils<  
 16 J: [I'm waiting for my fr\_:iend (.)  
 17 Gloria  
 18 A: Save it for £what  
 19 E: .hh save it for na\_:ils hh  
 20 A: Yo I'm quitting=I hate my job (.5) boss is a mean  
 21 jerk.  
 22 J: Ad\_:am  
 23 A: Wha::t  
 24 J: Are you parkin=in section four all night  
 25 A: Yes=but I also don' givva fuck if I getta ticket=cuz  
 26 ittsta UNH tick[et  
 27 J: [Ur parking in section fo[ur a:::ll  
 28 night.  
 29 A: [It does not  
 30 matt\_:er (.2) s'not like they're gonna=boot ur [car n'  
 31 tow it to the UNH impound lot.  
 32 E: [Ur  
 33 cars gonna get fuck-  
 34 G: No=I kno::w.  
 35 P: [hhh impo:un-  
 36 A: [They're gonna=they're gonna tow it to B-lot.  
 37 G: °I'll just, s:ay I checked the web\_:site°  
 38 ((laughter))  
 39 A: Or you'll jus' say fuck you I don' go ta scho:ol  
 40 here=so I don' hafta pay shit  
 41 J: You're an alumn:i (.) you paid your years  
 42 G: I paid fo:ur-  
 43 A: The only thing they can do with tickets=is not let  
 44 kids graduate=n' guess what (.) ya already made it.  
 45 G: Well I don' have my diploma ye:t actually.  
 46 A: °I do:\_:o=how do you not have urs  
 47 G: Cuz I didn't do my exit for:ms  
 48 A: hh:h=Ur Fucked if you getta ticket they're not gonna  
 49 give it to you.  
 50 ((phone beep))  
 51 ((clearing throat))  
 52 ((Humming noises))  
 53 F: Paige what is this thing again=the pu-you want ta make  
 54 it now

## The Delicacy of Social Relationships, Clairmont

55 P: Yeah=when everyone leaves.  
56 J: Let's figure that o:ut.  
57 ((high five slap))  
58 E: What are you guys maki:ng=I'm gonna make something-  
59 A: Let's g:o  
60 J: B:::ye  
61 G: B:::ye  
62 A: See::ya  
63 P: Have f:un  
64 A: B:y:::e  
65 J: Thank yo::u  
66 F: °bye°  
67 A: B:y:::e  
68 E: °Smell yah later°  
69 A: B:y::[:e  
70 E: [What are you making Pai:ge.  
71 P: U::hm  
72 A: Whe::eeew!!