"I'm Trying to be Supportive but...":

Identity and Epistemic Authority as Warrants for Advice Giving

Dr. Timothy Halkowski

Dr. Rhonda Sprague

Dr. Tobias Barske

Abigail H. Ferrell

University of Wisconsin – Stevens Point

May 2019

A Thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the

requirements for the degree

Master of Arts in Communication

University of Wisconsin – Stevens Point

Stevens Point, Wisconsin

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank all of my professors, family, and friends who helped me along this journey. Without everyone's support and encouragement, I never would have had such an amazing last two years.

First, thank you to my thesis committee. Thank you, Dr. Barske, for taking precious time to assist a student outside of your program. Your help and keen eye are greatly appreciated. Thank you, Dr. Sprague, for the energy and joy that you bring to academia. Your confidence and passion inspire me to believe in myself. Finally, thank you, Dr. Halkowski, for truly making this thesis possible. Your guidance, support, and belief in me were my inspiration to complete this thesis. Thank you for continuously reassuring me and encouraging me to move forward. Your passion and dedication to the program and your students is noticed and appreciated.

I would also like to thank my family. You continuously recognize my strengths, even when I don't see them. Thank you, Mom, for always making me feel that I am enough, just the way I am. Thank you, Dad, for never placing limits on what I can do. You both inspire me to work my hardest but still enjoy life. Thank you for never questioning my choices and always believing in me. Thank you to Em, Max, and Wyatt for always making me laugh and reminding me not to take things too seriously. A weekend at home with you is the best way to stay grounded and remember what's important. And, a special shout-out to Em for answering my millions of phone calls, even when you were busy writing lengthy papers for nursing school.

And most of all, thank you Jimmy for supporting my dreams. Thank you for patiently putting up with my many moods, listening, and always being there for me without a single complaint. Your patience, positivity, and complete faith in me allowed me to not only finish school, but to truly enjoy it. I am very blessed to have you in my life.

Abstract

While a large body of research about advice-giving in institutional settings exists, much less has

been done regarding advice in mundane conversation. Studying advice sequences in mundane

conversation differs because participants do not hold an institutional warrant to deliver advice,

making the establishment of one relevant. Using conversation analysis, this study focuses on a

single-case analysis of an advice sequence in a portrayal of mundane talk between friends. After

transcribing and analyzing the data, the findings revealed two main areas that participants draw

upon to establish a warrant. The first is the enactment of the 'friend' identity, in which

participants demonstrate traits often associated with the role of a friend. The second is epistemic

authority. Participants utilize accounts, emotions, and personal experience to claim epistemic

authority, establishing it as a warrant. Overall, these findings are useful in expanding the current

literature on advice giving and providing ideas for future research.

Keywords: advice, warrant, epistemic authority, identity, friend

Table of Contents

Introduction

Advice plays a prominent role in many professional contexts and everyday talk. From a therapist delivering advice to a patient, to a mother giving words of wisdom to her daughter, advice is a meaningful part of conversation. Not only can the study of advice help scholars describe the intricacies of human interaction, but it can also provide best practices for real, consequential interactions in which people socially support one another through advice giving.

Although advice giving has garnered greater scholarly research over the last couple of decades, there is still a lack of focus on advice in everyday talk. This thesis will, therefore, examine a largely ignored aspect in the corpus of literature: advice giving in mundane conversation, focused on peer-to-peer interaction. Utilizing conversation analysis, this investigation will use a single-case analysis from reality television to examine an advice sequence between two friends. Specifically, the establishment of a warrant to deliver advice will be studied.

Advice in a conversation between friends is particularly interesting because (a) neither is officially in the role of 'professional,' and (b) there is no clear warrant to deliver advice. The findings from this analysis will help diversify the current research on interactional management of advice because friends, as assumed equals, may deliver and orient to advice differently than in previously studied contexts. For example, advice giving in an institutional setting comes with the clear roles of 'advice giver' and 'advice recipient.' Even in recent studies of mother-daughter interactions (see Shaw and Hepburn, 2013), there are still interactionally relevant epistemic differences assumed with the roles of 'mother' and 'daughter.' The aim of this thesis, then, is to examine a different kind of relationship, peer-to-peer, and how advice is interactionally warranted when there is no clear epistemic difference or warrant for advice.

To begin, an overview of the conversation analytic literature regarding advice will be provided. This includes a synopsis of the dimensions of advice, advice giving, responses to advice, and broadcast advice sequences. Each section will first discuss mundane conversation, followed by institutional variations. Then, a brief section on broadcast discourse will be presented, in preparation for the use of reality television as the data for this thesis. Next, the data and research methodology will be discussed, followed by the guiding research question for this thesis. The analysis of the data will then be presented, complete with the discussion. Finally, implications and future directions will comprise the conclusion.

Literature Review

Dimensions of Advice

Advice is prevalent in both mundane and institutional interactions. Whether it be professional or peer-to-peer, advice sequences are built through turn design that incorporates two central elements: 'normativity' and 'knowledge asymmetry' (Heritage & Sefi, 1992). These key elements, as well as the assumption that the advice is in the best interest of the recipient (Searle, 1969), provide a foundation to identifying advice sequences. By focusing on these features, the issues that advice givers and receivers take into consideration can be identified. The following section will cover the interactional dimensions and broad definition of advice.

Using an interactional lens, Heritage and Sefi's (1992) research about British health visitors' conversations with new mothers is most commonly used to define advice. Through their research, they concluded that advice "describes, recommends or otherwise forwards a preferred course of future action" (Heritage & Sefi, 1992, p. 368). As part of this study, Heritage & Sefi (1992) also noted that advice is normative and asymmetric. Normative implies that the talk is forwarding an idea as to what *should* happen in the future, but not that it necessarily will be completed (Shaw, 2013). Future actions are identified with the inclusion of a moral element; in other words, they are healthy and appropriate (Hepburn & Potter, 2011a). Advice is asymmetric because the advice giver is positioning themselves as more knowledgeable than the recipient. Epistemically, the receiver is in a 'K-' position and the giver is in a 'K+' position (Heritage, 2010), creating an asymmetrical balance between the two. The asymmetric element of advice can be especially problematic because it may call into question the recipient's competence and moral judgment (Heritage & Lindstrom, 1998).

Although Heritage and Sefi (1992) provide a framework for advice, the explicit term "advice" is rarely found in interaction. Instead, it is often implicit and similar to actions such as 'suggesting' or 'directing' (Shaw, Potter & Hepburn, 2015). In some institutions, the giving of advice may not even be permitted (Pilnick, 1999), meaning that speakers must find ways to subtly deliver discreet advice. Therefore, talk can only be classified as advice through participants' orientation towards each turn (Shaw et al., 2015). Rather than strictly adhering to advice as a technical term, researchers can focus on actions that are hearable as advice (Shaw & Hepburn, 2013).

It is important to note that advice sequences are enacted differently, depending on the situation and setting. Mundane discourse sets the basis for advice practices. These practices, however, are manipulated for institutional contexts. In mundane interactions, the epistemic difference and warrant to give advice are not always obvious (Shaw, 2013). On the other hand, institutional settings provide a clear warrant for the "professional" to give advice to the recipient, and interactions both fit and form the guidelines and roles of the institution. Finally, broadcast advice differs in the sense that it is designed for an 'overhearing' audience (Heritage, 1985) and combines elements of both mundane and institutional talk (Hutchby, 2005).

To begin, advice in mundane conversation is less subject to the interactionally enforced constraints of institutional talk. A vast array of norms, rules and frameworks are used by participants to reach social goals (Drew & Heritage, 1992). Advice delivery and seeking are not inherently central in mundane conversation. Therefore, it is not always clear why advice is occasioned (Shaw, 2013). The epistemic difference is not as defined in mundane conversation as in institutional conversation, meaning that there is no official "professional" with a clear warrant

to give advice. Roles of advice giver and receiver are not clear-cut as they are in institutional

settings (Shaw, 2013).

Jefferson and Lee's (1992) research on 'troubles-telling' and the 'service encounter' in

mundane conversation exemplifies the sentiment that advice is not inherently central to this type

of talk. In their study, they observed that in a 'troubles-telling' sequence, the troubles-teller

sought 'emotional reciprocity,' and in a 'service encounter,' the advice seeker sought advice

(Jefferson & Lee, 1992). When the two environments intersect, it could be potentially

problematic, depending on the placement of the advice (Jefferson & Lee, 1992). A 'troubles-

telling' may be cause for advice, but, if given too early, that advice may not heed the necessary

'emotional reciprocity' (Jefferson & Lee, 1992). This careful placement of advice demonstrates

one of the issues that is more likely to arise in mundane conversation than an institutional setting.

On the other hand, participants in institutional settings may inhibit their interactional

practices, and situational restrictions may be enacted (Drew & Heritage, 1992). Institutional

advice giving is more specialized and defined based on the institution's requirements (Shaw,

2013) and follows a service encounter framework (Shaw et al., 2015). Likewise, there is a clear

warrant for the "professional" to give advice to the recipient. For example, Kinnell and Maynard

(1996) studied institutional advice sequences in pretest counseling for HIV and AIDS. They

found that counselors often utilize a strategic informational approach that allows for sensitivity

regarding safer sex by making it less personally relevant (Kinnell & Maynard, 1996). Kinnell

and Maynard (1996) suggest that, in this institutional context, goals of the organization that go

beyond the advising session should be considered. Recommendations given by the counselors

were often oriented to the organization's goals, even when the advice was irrelevant to the client

(Kinnell & Maynard, 1996). This demonstrates how institutional constraints are oriented to in advice sequences.

Lastly, the broadcast context blurs the line between mundane and institutional talk. The structure of discourse in broadcast radio and television, especially in talk and reality shows, begins with the basic frameworks of everyday talk. However, even in spontaneous, face-to-face interactions, there are still underlying constraints that exhibit institutional features (Hutchby, 2005).

To conclude, interactions can be hearable as advice under the framework set forth by Heritage and Sefi (1992). Their definition, that advice "describes, recommends or otherwise forwards a preferred course of future action" (p. 368), includes two key dimensions. The first, normativity, insinuates that the proposed action is something that *should* be done. The second, knowledge asymmetry, refers to the imbalance of knowledge that is created when a speaker positions themselves as more knowledgeable than the recipient. Although this definition and framework are used to identify advice, it is important to note that advice is not a bound category. Research in mundane, institutional, and broadcast discourse reveals that advice sequences are oriented to differently, depending on the context. Therefore, using an interactional lens to study advice requires studying the sequential order of utterances between participants.

Advice Giving

Advice is constructed in various ways to reflect the dimensions of normativity and asymmetry. Depending on the situation, advice may be given explicitly or implicitly. Explicitly, using verbs of obligation (such as 'should') or responding to a direct request for advice displays a strong normative stance (Shaw et al., 2015). Implicitly, advice delivered as information (Silverman, 1997), interrogatives (Butler et al., 2010), and assessments (Pomerantz, 1984; Shaw

et al., 2015) create greater ambiguity over the intention of the information and allow the recipient

to claim their own knowledge. Interactional difficulties may emerge during advice sequences

because of the assumed knowledge asymmetry, but the formation of implicit advice can work to

avoid potential resistance, soften the asymmetry, and respect the sensitivity of a topic (Kinnell &

Maynard, 1996). To understand how recipient responses are made relevant, construction of

advice must first be studied. This section will further expand on literature regarding the

construction and delivery of both explicit and implicit advice.

Moving forward, this literature review will continue to use an interactional lens and the

definition set forth by Heritage and Sefi (1992, p. 368), stating that advice is something that

"describes, recommends or otherwise forwards a preferred course of future action." Of particular

emphasis in both delivery and response are the dimensions of normativity and asymmetry. The

proposed course of action should also be in the best interest of the recipient. To identify advice

sequences then, the following criteria is proposed by Shaw (2013):

- A future action is forwarded

- The action is in the interest of the recipient

- The action's normativity is imposed

- A knowledge asymmetry is invoked between the speaker and recipient

- An accept/reject response is provided for (p. 49).

Once these dimensions have been used to identify an advice delivery, the construction of that

advice can then be investigated.

Beginning an advice giving sequence requires that the advice giver is warranted to deliver

that advice. Without a warrant, interactional problems are prone to arise. In Heritage and Sefi's

(1992) research about health visitors (HVs) and new mothers, they identified a 'step-wise' entry

approach that addresses the issue of initiating an advice sequence. The majority of the time, HVs

initiated the advice. By following the 'step-wise' entry, they could co-construct the need for

advice by following the subsequent steps (Heritage & Sefi, 1992, p. 379):

Step 1: HV: initial inquiry.

Step 2: M: problem-indicative response.

Step 3: HV: focusing inquiry into the problem.

Step 4: M: responsive detailing.

Step 5: HV: advice giving.

The following example, from Heritage & Sefi (1992, p. 379) demonstrates 'step-wise' entry:

Extract 2.1: Heritage & Sefi (1992, p. 379)

```
 1   HV:    1→  And you feel-(0.3) you're alright ba:thing
 2                 (.)her?
 3   M:     2→  I haven't bathed her ye:t.
 4   HV:        Haven't you real[ly.
 5   M:     2→                  [No:. She had a bath when she
 6          2→  came home from hospital (0.2) but I top and
 7          2→  tail her.
 8   HV:        Ye:h=
 9   M:     2→  =but uhm: me mum's coming over tomorro:w (.)
10          2→  and I'm gonna ba:th her in front of me mum
11          2→  'cos I'm (still) a little bi:t (.) you
12          2→  kno:w [(  )
13   HV:    3→        [Did they show you how to bath
14          3→  her[°(when you were in)°
15   M:            [They di::d but(0.9) I: |(.) still
16          4→  wasn't- I said to me mum you know wuh- when
17          4→  you come over tomorrow would you sort'v give
18          4→  me a ha:nd you know if I nee:d it.
19                 (.)
20   HV:    5→  The main thing is: that you have the things
21          5→  all together before you sta:rt.
22                 ((advice giving continues))
```

This step-by-step strategy allows for the HVs to: (1) establish relevance of the advice, (2) discover the problem, (3) create a solution, and (4) package the advice so as not to appear criticizing of the mother (Heritage & Sefi, 1992). Line 1 (HV) first initiates the inquiry, followed by the mother's response at line 3, which establishes that there is a problem (not bathing the baby). Line 13, in which the HV asks if the mother was shown how to bath the baby, accomplishes step 3 of inquiring about the problem. After the mother provides a detailed response (lines 15-18), the HV proceeds to give her advice at line 20. Overall, this interaction does not place blame on the mother, but rather manages the sequence to build off the mother's responses.

Although the 'step-wise' entry method is effective in co-constructing the advice sequence, it is not the only design that is used to deliver advice. Variations of advice-giving range in the strength of normative push and the level of implied epistemic asymmetry. Further, the moral dimension and implication of judgment can be identified in the selection of advice packaging. Delivery of utterances vary, based on the situational context. Thus, it is important to examine advice giving in both mundane and institutional discourse. These differences will be discussed as part of the following advice delivery formats.

Imperatives. The strongest forms of advice include the use of imperatives and verbs of obligation. In the imperative form, advice is packaged as "do x" (Shaw & Hepburn, 2013). Verbs of obligation, such as 'must,' 'need,' and 'have to' are often used in this format and clearly invoke a strong normative push (Shaw, 2013). The advice is straightforward and leaves little room for contingencies (Shaw, 2013). Brown and Levinson (1978) describe this clear and concise delivery as "bald" (p. 69). When delivering a message baldly, the circumstances are usually as follows ('S' symbolizes the speaker, 'H' symbolizes the addressee):

(a) S and H both tacitly agree that the relevance of face demands may be suspended in the interests of urgency or efficiency; (b) where the danger to H's face is very small, as in offers, requests, suggestions that are clearly in H's interest and do not require great sacrifices of S (e.g., 'Come in' or 'Do sit down'); and (c) where S is vastly superior in power to H, or can enlist audience support to destroy H's face without losing his own (Brown & Levinson, 1978, p. 69).

For example, the following extract from Shaw and Hepburn (2013) includes a "bald" form of delivery:

Extract 2.2: Shaw & Hepburn (2013, p. 352)

```
 1   Lucy:      So we [were-  ] (0.3) dancing and singing to that, an:
 2   Mum:            [(cough)]
 3   Lucy:      °ha°- Eva was getting a little bit fright(h)e(h)ned
 4              (.) hu he=
 5   Mum:       =ehh heh heh heh
 6   Lucy:      But [urm: °but° yeah I think she liked it,
 7   Mum:           [ .HH
 8              (0.7)
 9   Mum:  A→   Okay well you have to just keep doing it until they
10              get [used to it.  ]
11   Lucy:          [ <Yeah>     ]
12   Lucy: R→   I know heh huh .h [h It's    [pretty-  ]
13   Mum:                         [Are you-  [>are you ]going to<
14              rhyme time again next week.=
```

Here, mum is commenting on Lucy's daughter's fear of a nursery rhyme DVD. Her advice to Lucy (line 9) is imperative because it is straightforward, including the phrase "have to." Mum is able to deliver this bald advice because the advice is not particularly face-threatening, and it does not take much effort for Lucy to allow her daughter to continue watching the DVD. Finally, the advice is in the best interest of both Lucy and her daughter.

In institutional talk, examples of this "bald" form of delivery can frequently be seen in doctor-patient or nurse-patient interactions. For instance, Leppanen (1998) studied interactions between Swedish nurses and patients, finding that nurses often delivered advice in the imperative format when a patient understood that there was a problem. The following excerpt from Leppanen's (1998) data displays a nurse using the imperative form to deliver advice to a potentially diabetic patient (lines 19 & 22):

Extract 2.3: Leppanen (1998, p. 221)

```
17    P:     °mm hm,°
18           (.)
19    N:     so that (.) you have to be very (.) careful (.) about
20           which shoes you wear.
21           (2.0)
22           and you should inspect your feet every day.
```

Using Brown & Levinson's (1978) concept of "bald," it can be concluded that (a) the patient's face demands can be suspended in the best interest of his health, (b) the advice is clearly in the best interest of the patient, and (c) the nurse is in greater power. Therefore, the imperative format is used to address an observed medical problem.

Overall, imperatives are a direct way to deliver advice in both mundane and institutional talk. Verbs of obligation are often used to deliver such advice. However, this can lead to potential interactional problems because the recipient's competence and morality are at stake, and no attention is given to recipient contingencies (Shaw, 2013). The knowledge asymmetry is vast in this type of delivery because the giver claims to be in a 'K+' position (see Heritage, 2010). To soften this epistemic gradient, speakers can use claims of uncertainty with words like 'probably,' 'maybe,' 'might,' and 'I think' (Shaw, 2013). Though the advice may still be straightforward,

these words mitigate the epistemic authority by allowing the recipient to interject with their own

knowledge (Shaw, 2013). For example:

Extract 2.4: Shaw (2013, p. 78)

```
1    Mum:          That's probably what you n↑eed=>A [bit of<
2    Katie:                                         [HHH
3    Mum:          t̲i̲me together.
```

In this example, "Mum" uses the word 'probably' to lessen the epistemic gradient and allow for

the recipient (her daughter) to propose their own idea. Beyond using claims of uncertainty to

lessen the epistemic difference, advice givers may also select a softer, or more disguised format,

to deliver advice in.

   Advice-as-information. Advice can be presented as information in both mundane and

institutional conversation. However, it can be difficult to draw the line between what counts as

advice and what is purely information. Couture and Sutherland (2006) suggest that information-

giving is different that advice because it shares relevant information while still allowing the

recipient to make the final decision. On the other hand, Goldsmith and Fitch (1997) propose that

"information is never just information" (p. 461), and that it may provide a solution to a problem

and assistance with decision making. Heritage and Sefi's (1992) research draws the distinction

by noting that information is purely factual and presented in a non-normative way, whereas

advice follows a normative framework. Though the most commonly cited research on advice as

information comes from Silverman's research on institutional advice giving, advice-as-

information can also be seen in mundane talk.

   Recipients may orient differently to advice-as-information in mundane talk. Goldsmith and

Fitch (1997) completed an ethnographic study of advice-giving episodes between university

students and found that advice recipients may receive the advice as either helpful or butting in.

As helpful information, advice may aid in decision-making or problem solving (Goldsmith &

Fitch, 1997). However, as unwanted information, advice could be viewed as butting in.

Delivering advice-as-information positions the giver as having more expertise in the matter than

the recipient (Goldsmith & Fitch, 1997). For example, some spouses report resenting advice

from one another because of the power imbalance it creates (Goldsmith & Fitch, 1997). Because

there is no clear expert, epistemic asymmetry can cause tensions in advice giving sequences

when the advice giver positions themselves to be more knowledgeable.

On the other hand, roles in institutional contexts denote the expert. Thus, it is more common

to see advice-as-information in these settings. The most commonly cited research on advice-as-

information comes from Silverman (1997) and his work on HIV counseling. Silverman (1997)

coined the term "Advice-as-Information Sequence" (AIS), referring to when advice is packaged

as information that may or may not directly pertain to the recipient (p. 168). By delivering advice

in this manner, recipients are not required to accept or reject the advice. Instead, they may orient

to it purely as information and provide minimal response tokens. This is especially powerful

when the situation is potentially sensitive, and difficulties are prone to occur in the uptake of the

interaction (Silverman, 1997). The recipients are not required to respond, and the deliverer does

not necessarily need to pursue a response because the information can be oriented to as 'general'

(Silverman, 1997).

The AIS provides an ambiguous delivery, made even more impersonal with pronouns such as

'we' and 'our' (Silverman, 1997). By beginning with an impersonal situation, the advice giver

can cautiously move closer to the recipient's own situation to create more personalized advice

(Kinnell & Maynard, 1996). The example below (Silverman, 1997) illustrates how advice can be formatted as general, impersonal information:

Extract 2.5: Silverman (1997, p. 172)

```
 1   C:    THE RECMMENdation is: (0.2) uh: fo:r people: (0.8)
 2         who have been been at risk any time=
 3   P:    =mmhmm=
 4   C:    =regardless of: (0.4) uh::m (0.6) their (1.2) sexual
 5         ac[tividy] whether it being-going from you know=
 6   P:       [mmhmmm]
 7   C:    =z:ero to very active .hhh ah the recommendation is
 8         still that everyone be retested once a yea:r=
 9   P:    =yeah
10         (0.4)
11   C:    until there is actually a test for the virus itself=
12   P:    =right
13         (1.6)
14   P:    (tch)okay=
15   C:    =okay^(.) any other questions?=
```

In this example, the counselor (C) does not refer to the patient (P) directly. Rather, the counselor discusses the "people" and "their" sexual activity, referring to "the recommendation" and "everyone." By doing so, the counselor is packaging the advice as general and impersonal information. Notice that the patient is not required to accept or reject, and minimal continuers and response tokens are acceptable. Thus, the information is delivered to the patient in an ambiguous, undemanding way.

However, it can be difficult to distinguish between information delivery and advice- giving, as Pilnick (2003) argues in her research regarding pharmacist patient counseling. Pilnick's (2003) research took place in a hospital pediatric oncology clinic, dealing with mainly the parent or caretaker of the patient. Therefore, advice giving was a delicate matter by producing an epistemic difference between the pharmacist, who is knowledgeable in the medical aspect, and

the parent, who has epistemic priority in the situational and lifestyle context. During their

interactions, Pilnick (2003) found that pharmacists often provided information to address parent

questions or proposals, or they instructed the parent on dosing and medication information. This

type of information delivery, Pilnick (2003) asserts, is different than advice. She argues that,

because only minimal uptake is required by the patient/parent and little normative push is

involved, information and instructions are not considered an advice sequence. Out of the patient

counseling approaches studied, Pilnick claims that only one, the stepwise approach, can be

considered advice (2003).

Overall, advice-as-information can be considered advice depending on different factors, such

as the context and recipient response required. In Silverman's (1997) research, AIS were

established based on the fact that the information may or may not pertain to the patient, only

potentially calling for a response. However, in Pilnick's (2003) research, the information

delivered by pharmacists was clearly relevant to the patient as instructions, calling for a 'receipt

marking' from the recipient (p. 840). Because of the lack of a clearly defined recipient response,

it can be difficult to determine what exactly constitutes advice as information.

Dependent upon the interactional sequence, advice-as-information can provide an ambiguous,

impersonal manner to deliver advice in (Heritage & Lindstrom, 2012; Kinnell & Maynard, 1996;

Silverman, 1997). Because the information is presented as potentially being irrelevant to the

recipient, it lessens the knowledge gradient and does not require an acceptance or rejection.

Compared to the imperative format, advice delivered as generalized information is less

normative and epistemically asymmetrical.

Advice-implicative interrogatives. Although questions are often categorized interactionally

as a way to ask and receive information, they can also be used to forward advice. Questions

imply that one person has knowledge that someone else is lacking (de Ruiter, 2012), invoking an epistemic difference that is also present in the dimensions of advice giving. Furthermore, questions are devised to elicit a preferred or dispreferred answer (Pomerantz, 1984), meaning that a particular response is expected (Heritage, 2010). Using these two dimensions, advice-implicative interrogatives (AIIs) can be seen to construct advice by a) creating a knowledge asymmetry, and b) forwarding a preferred course of action.

In mundane conversation, advice-implicative interrogatives may be designed in both simple and complex ways. First, they may be framed as yes/no or 'wh' questions that project a future action (Shaw, Potter & Hepburn, 2015). By packaging an interrogative as advice-implicative, the advice giver displays epistemic authority by raising the issue as something the advice recipient should be thinking about (Shaw, Potter & Hepburn, 2015). An AII also makes relevant an acceptance or rejection and constrains the recipient by specifying the importance of the subject (Shaw, Potter & Hepburn, 2015). However, unlike explicit advice, the recipient has the opportunity to resist the course of action in ways other than accepting or rejecting (Shaw, Potter & Hepburn, 2015).

Interrogatives can also be viewed as pre-sequence to proceeding with more explicit advice (Shaw et al., 2015). After initially asking if the action has been completed, the advice giver may or may not move forward with a preferred course of action. This can be observed in the following example from Shaw et al. (2015):

Extract 2.6: Shaw et al. (2015, p. 327)

```
24    Mum:        Have you ordered your: glasses?
25                (0.5)
26    Katie:      <Ur:m: not yet no.=
27    Mum:        =tch↑aghhh
28                (.)
29    Katie:      Well no °it's just°- its 'c↑ause I went in
30                there:, an then I had to l↑eave an I didn't
31                (.) couldn't get the voucher so .hhh urm:
32                (0.4) >but I'll< see what I can do about that
33                tomorrow.
34                (0.4)
35    Mum:        Need to get on with that one,
36                (0.3)
37    Katie:      °Yeah.° .HHHH
```

In this example, Mum's question about Katie's glasses (line 24) displays an expectation that the action should already be complete (Shaw et al., 2015). A 'yes' response is strongly preferred, leaving Katie little room for contingencies (Shaw et al., 2015). It can be concluded that line 24 is an advice-implicative interrogative because Mum positions herself as "knowing best," and Katie orients to it as normative and relevant for her to do. The 0.5 second delay, "urm" (line 26), and following account display an orientation towards the dispreference of her answer (Shaw et al., 2015). Further, after receiving Katie's account, Mum moves into delivering straightforward advice (line 35). Overall, this example illustrates how asymmetry and normativity can both packaged into an advice-implicative interrogative.

A different type of question, the tag question, recasts the epistemic gradient by relinquishing greater epistemic authority to the recipient (Heritage & Raymond, 2005). In this way, the recipient is treated as already possessing knowledge about the topic (Hepburn & Potter, 2011a). That being said, the tag question also posits agreement to be the preferred and expected response

(Heritage & Raymond, 2015). For example, "You're going to school today, aren't you?" prefers an agreement from the recipient. The recipient of such a question can either confirm or disconfirm, but disagreement is more difficult (Hepburn & Potter, 2011a). So, while tag questions position the recipient as competent, they also restrict responses by treating them as already aligning with the declarative.

In institutional settings, advice-implicative interrogatives may be used when the expert or professional is mandated to withhold giving explicit advice. Butler et al.'s (2010) research identified AIIs in their analysis of an Australian children's helpline. In their data, they examined calls between counselors and children seeking help. Although Kids Helpline is built to help children dealing with problems, counselors were expected not to provide advice. Butler et al. (2010) demonstrated that, although they could not deliver specific advice, counselors used questions to forward an action. These interrogatives were presented as both advice-implementing and advice-relevant interrogatives (Butler et al., 2010).

Advice-implementing interrogatives refer to interrogatives that "inquire into the capacity of the client to undertake a particular course of future action and can be heard as suggesting or proposing that the client undertakes this action" (Butler et al., 2010, p. 271). Normatively, the action being put forth is one in the best interest of the client and an action that they *should* do. Epistemic asymmetry is evoked because the counselor has specialized knowledge. However, advice-implementing interrogatives allow for the recipient to respond with their own knowledge, softening the epistemic gradient. The following sample from Butler et al. (2010, p. 271) illustrates how an advice-implementing interrogative can function as advice:

Extract 2.7: Butler et al. (2010, p. 271)

```
11    Couns:      HHhh e-She's really a:ngry isn't she.
12    Caller:     Yeh ah know. An ah don't know what to do.
13    Couns:      N:y:eah::.
14                (0.2)
15    Couns:      .Hhh (0.7) Is there any way that- (0.7) dthat you can:
16                uhm: maybe replace it with an eyeliner th't (.) you
17                can affor:d?
18                (0.7)
19    Caller:     I doh' have any money.
20                (0.2)
21    Couns:      Don't ↑you?
22                (0.2)
23    Caller:     Nao,
24                (0.2)
25    Couns:      Mm:kay, =ye don' get pocket money?
26                (0.6)
27    Caller:     Nup,
28                (0.3)
29    Couns:      A:h::.
```

In the example above, the counselor (lines 15-17) enquires about the capability of the caller to purchase new eyeliner, forwarding a future action. By asking about the potential for the caller to complete the action, the counselor is allowing for the caller to claim their own knowledge. This, therefore, softens the normativity and knowledge asymmetry. As can be seen at line 19, the caller demonstrates their own epistemic authority by stating that they are not capable of following that course of action because they do not have any money. Acceptance or rejection of advice is not required, and recipients do not have to orient to the interrogative as advice (Butler et al., 2010).

Another form of an AII identified by Butler et al. (2010) is the advice-relevant interrogative. This type of interrogative focuses on "whether the client has tried a particular course of action in the past" (Butler et al., 2010, p. 275), or whether a solution has been attempted (Pudlinski, 2009). For example, "Have you ever talked to anyone about that stuff?" (Butler et al., 2010, p. 275) can be heard as a proposal because, if the caller has not "talked to anyone about that stuff," it can be

deduced that they should consider doing so in the future (Butler et al., 2010, p. 275). Compared to advice-implementing interrogatives, advice-relevant interrogatives more ambiguously propose an action agenda (Butler et al., 2010). Questions may or may not be oriented to as a proposal for a future action, allowing for less interactional pressure on the recipient to respond by accepting or rejecting (Butler et al., 2010).

In conclusion, advice-implicative interrogatives function as advice but mitigate the epistemic asymmetry and normative push present in the imperative format. Advice-implementing interrogatives suggest a possible future action, contingent upon the recipient's capabilities. Epistemically, recipients have the space to claim their own knowledge. Advice-relevant interrogatives focus on whether the recipient has tried a certain action or solution in the past. In these instances, recipients are not required to orient to the question as advice, creating a more ambiguous nature. Questions may also be used as a pre-sequence to deliver advice, potentially implying that the action should already be complete. Finally, tag questions redistribute the epistemic authority to the recipient, yet limit contingencies in answering. Next, advice-implicative assessments will be considered.

Advice-implicative assessments. Advice-implicative assessments function as a disguised method of delivering advice as a positive or negative assessment. Because of this, they may involve less normative push. However, because the advice giver is claiming equal access to the recipient's assessable matter, the epistemic gradient varies (Mikesell et al., 2017). When a speaker is assessing, they are claiming knowledge of what is being assessed (Pomerantz, 1984). For example, in the following data from Shaw (2013), Mum's shared assessment from Dad (line 5) normatively portrays going to the sunbed as a poor choice and positions Mum and Dad as

knowing more about the situation (p. 71). By citing "Dad" as the opinion-holder, Mum softens

the assessment.

Extract 2.8: Shaw (2013, p. 71)

```
1    Sin:         .hhh An I think I'll also start going for some
2                 sunbeds like twice a [week*k.]
3    Mum:                              [.hh?   ]
4                 (.)
5    Mum:         Ow:: (0.4) Dad's not happy about tha:t.
6    Sin:         ↑Why?
7                 (0.7)
8    Mum:         Becau::s:e (0.4) in cas:e it's dangerous [:     ]
9    Sin:                                                  [Oh we]ll.=
10               I'm >still gonna do it.< huh=
11   Mum:         =Yeah,=
12   Sin:         =.hhh Yeah.
13   Sin:         <Just (0.5) so then I can get a proper tan on
14               holiday.
15               (0.8)
16   Mum:         Yeah
```

It is clear that Sin orients to this assessment as advice because she responds with her future plan

(line 10) and knowledge as to why she needs to tan (line 13). However, Sin is not directly told to

avoid sunbeds, which removes her agency and allows her to share her own knowledge, rather

than accept or reject advice (Shaw, 2013).

The favorability of future actions can be embedded in assessments, allowing for recipients to

go beyond accepting or rejecting (Shaw, 2013). Recipients may agree or disagree and are

allowed a second assessment. This turn design allows for the recipient to claim independent

knowledge (Heritage & Raymond, 2005). Because the recipient's agency is not necessarily clear,

they may provide a second assessment while, at the same time, not acknowledging that the action

is relevant to them (Pomerantz, 1984; Shaw et al., 2015). This is especially true in mundane

conversation, where advice is not a central feature or the purpose of the conversation. In an institutional context, help may be expected, meaning that the assessment is more likely to be heard as advice (Shaw et al., 2015).

To conclude, advice-implicative assessments soften normativity and shift the epistemic gradient. Because the recipient is not necessarily central to the assessment, they may provide possible contingencies, rather than responding to only one possible future action (Shaw et al., 2015). Second assessments allow for recipients to agree or disagree, granting them the power to either respond to the assessment itself or the implicit advice (Pomerantz, 1984; Shaw et al., 2015). Therefore, recipients are not required to affiliate with the assessment as advice at all (Shaw, 2013). Thus, advice-implicative assessments are made relevant through interactional choice.

Other forms of advice delivery. Beyond the imperative form, advice-implicative interrogatives, and advice-implicative assessments, scholars have noted additional formats that participants recognize as advice delivery. These designs may be used in institutional settings, where advice is mandated against, or in mundane conversations to soften the delivery.

For example, the 'I would do X' construct allows for advice delivery in a way that removes agency from the recipient (Hudson, 1990). By stating what they would normatively do, the advisee insinuates that it is in the best interest of the recipient to do so, as well (Shaw, 2013). However, because the focus is on the advisee, the recipient is not required to respond by accepting or rejecting. In institutional settings, this can function as a way for officials, who are instructed not to deliver advice, to navigate around requests for advice. For example, in Raymond and Zimmerman's (2007) research regarding 9-1-1 calls made during the Mountain

Glade Fire, call-takers can be seen to avoid officially delivering advice by using the 'I would do

x' construct. This is illustrated in the following extract from Raymond and Zimmerman (2007):

Extract 2.9: Raymond & Zimmerman (2007, p. 55)

```
 9          C:    [(okay) are we supposed to evacuate
10          CT:   I: don't think they've- ((to another CT)) Have they given
11          CT:   any evacuation orders f- forTwo Thirty Five an uh- no
12          C:    Old San Pedro Road?
13                (.)
14          CT:   Old San Pedro?
15          C:    Yes.
16          CT:   Yeah=why don't you. (.) Yeah. There- we haven't (.) had
17                any evacuation notices er- (.) Oh- ((to other CT)) Rob?
18                ((to caller)) >Hold on uh second<
19                (0.3)
20    →     C:    It's blowin' (.) serious[ly
21    →     CT:                          [Yeah I know sir=
22          C:    =Eh- ect (I-)=
23    →     CT:   =You might- take that under consideration,
24    →     C:    Ok- so[eh-
25          CT:        [Ok=
26    →     C:    We're packin< I'm out [ (          )=
27    →     CT:                          [I would    =If it were me:
28                I would.=
29          C:    [(              )
30    →     CT:   [I'm not tellin' you to evacuate. Bu[t uh
31          C:                                        [Ok 'cause the winds
32                are real bad up here=
```

In this example, the caller is requesting advice on whether they should evacuate (line 9).

However, the call taker does not have the authority to issue evacuation orders. To get around this

limitation, the call taker uses the 'I would do x' form (lines 27-28) to discreetly package advice.

Raymond and Zimmerman (2007) describe this as "virtual advice," in which the recipient can

infer advice from material that is not necessarily delivered as advice (p. 57). The caller

recognizes the virtual advice in the form of 'I would do x' because they view it as

encouragement of what a reasonable person would do (Raymond & Zimmerman, 2007). This demonstrates how advice is created interactionally.

Similarly, personal experiences may be used as a vehicle to deliver advice. In mundane conversation, the advice giver may use personal experience to establish expertise (Goldsmith & Fitch, 1997). Similar personal experiences may qualify the advice giver as more expert on the matter (Goldsmith & Fitch, 1997). Likewise, dissimilar experiences can qualify the advice giver (Goldsmith & Fitch, 1997). For example, Goldsmith & Fitch (1997) observed that, in some situations, males sought advice from a female point-of-view, or vice-versa.

Institutionally, Pudlinski's (1998) research on a consumer-run warm line found that working consumers incorporated their own problems in calls with clients. This allowed them to establish commonalities and work towards sharing their solution (Pudlinski, 1998). Sharing their solution could then be perceived as advice as to what the client should do. By sharing personal problems and solutions, the normativity and epistemic asymmetry is softened.

Although not face-to-face, it is interesting to note that personal experience is frequently used in online, anonymous forums. For example, in online, peer-run health communities, sharing personal experience and stories is a common way to deliver advice (Lindholm, 2017; Sillence, 2013). Experiential information, such as *"I can't tell you what to do but this is the decision I made and why"* (Sillence & Mo, 2014, p. 245) functions as way to establish credibility and acknowledge that there is more than one option. This way, the advice giver allows the recipient to make their own decision based on the outcome of a similar situation (Sillence, 2013). Stories of personal experience help frame the argument as to why or why not a person should follow a particular plan of action, legitimizing the credibility of the advice (Lindholm, 2017). Though

online forums are not face-to-face, it is beneficial to consider the tools that users implement to establish expertise and deliver advice.

Finally, the 'if-then' construct has been proposed by Hepburn and Potter (2011b) to function as advice by providing a future action that is contingent on the advice recipient's actions. Unlike threats, the 'if-then' format removes agency from the speaker (Hepburn & Potter, 2011b). Therefore, the advice giver does not participate in the outcome or completion of the action (Shaw, 2013). Unlike a threat, the outcome proposed is favorable, invoking the normative dimension by proposing an action worth completing (Shaw, 2013). However, the 'if' allows for recipients to provide alternate actions, mitigating the force of the normative dimension (Shaw, 2013). Recipients do not need to accept or reject; rather, they have the option to pursue alternate paths.

For example, the following extract from Shaw (2013) illustrates the use of an 'if-then' format to deliver advice:

Extract 2.10: Shaw (2013, p. 59)

```
1    Mum:        .HHH ↑I think if you: straighten it (0.3) an:d (0.3)
2                have it- (0.4) >in a ponytail< .hh (0.5) I kno:w it
3                would have made you feel better to have it (.)
4                trimmed but .hh (0.7) I think it will be fine.
5                (.)
6    Mum:        e# I think what you're wearing is more important.
```

Prior to this sequence, Mum's daughter Pat expressed that she was worried about the appearance of her hair for an interview because she could not afford to have it cut (Shaw, 2013). In response, Mum uses the 'if-then' to forward the notion that if her daughter straightens her hair and wears it in a ponytail, then it will be okay. Thus, a favorable outcome is forwarded, contingent upon Pat completing a certain action. The positive outcome may be clear (as it is in this example), or it

may be left for the recipient to infer (Shaw, 2013). However, present in all 'if-then' formations are alternative options that the recipient may choose to follow (Shaw, 2013).

To conclude, this section has provided an overview of different interactional forms used to deliver advice. The normative and epistemic dimensions vary, based on the advice design. Explicit advice, such as the imperative format, provides a strong normative push and exemplifies the knowledge asymmetry. Implicit advice, including advice as information, advice-implicative interrogatives, advice-implicative assessments, personal experiences, and the 'if-then' construct deliver advice in a softened format that mitigates the normative and epistemic dimensions. In order to denote advice sequences, the interaction's turns must be studied as a whole. This is because advice is built interactionally, meaning that in order to define a sequence as "advice," the recipient must first orient to the talk as advice. Therefore, the next section will present a broad overview of advice responses.

Responses to Advice

Advice is co-constructed through turn-taking. Depending on the speaker's orientation to the piece of talk, the sequence may or may not be categorized as advice. Further, recipients of advice may reflect a varying degree of perceived normative push and knowledge asymmetry in their response. In examples of straightforward advice, recipient response may function as a way to reclaim competency or avoid the accept/reject answers (Shaw, 2013). This section will discuss varying degrees of advice acceptance and rejection in both mundane and institutional settings.

Acceptance. To begin, acceptance establishes that the recipient orients to the action as advice and accepts it as such. The recipient is both affiliating with the advice as the proper future action and aligning with the position of advice recipient (Stivers, 2008). In both mundane and institutional settings, recipients are hesitant to fill the role of 'advice recipient' (Shaw, 2013).

Frequently, acceptance comes when the recipient has already placed themselves in the role of 'advice recipient' (Heritage & Sefi, 1992). By doing so, the recipient has already established that they lack some piece of knowledge, therefore lessening the chances of a loss of face (Heritage & Sefi, 1992). In these situations, there may be less at stake for the recipient in accepting the advice (Shaw & Hepburn, 2013). The recipient's competence is not threatened, as they align with either 'already knowing' or as someone who is not expected to know (Shaw, 2013).

For example, Shaw's (2013) research on mundane conversation between mothers and daughters displayed that advice was most commonly accepted when the recipient's competence was not threatened. This is demonstrated in the following extract:

Extract 3.1: Shaw (2013, 125)

```
1    Mum:        I wouldn't check- (.) I've just started
2                the engine up to mo:ve it.=So I'd give it
3                another: half hour before you o- (0.3) t-
4                undo the s- top.
5                [(0.5)
6    Mum:        [.hhh
7    Lottie:     Okay,<
```

Here, Lottie accepts the advice with an "okay" at line 7. Because Mum's advice (lines 1-4) is not pertaining to something that Lottie would necessarily know or be expected to know, Lottie's competence is not in question. Therefore, it is less compromising to accept the advice.

Institutionally, Heritage and Sefi's research (1992) suggests that recipients most often accept advice through 'marked acknowledgments' (p. 391). Marked acknowledgments, such as 'oh right,' demonstrate that the recipient orients to the advice as news, in which the 'oh' signifies that the advice is news, and the 'right' signifies that the recipient accepts it (Heritage & Sefi, 1992, p. 394). Partial repeats may also function as a form of marked acceptance, in which the

recipient repeats a key element of the advice (Heritage & Sefi, 1992). For example, the following

extract from Heritage and Sefi (1992) illustrates both a marked acknowledgment and partial

repeat:

Extract 3.2: Heritage & Sefi (1992, p. 393)

```
    1    M:            I haven't ba::thed her yet. Is once a week
    2                  enough.
    3    HV:           We::ll (0.2) babies do: sweat a lo:t.
    4                  (0.3)
    5    HV:           So I would recommend giving her a ba:th
    6                  every da:y.
    7    M:      1→    Every da::y,
    8    HV:           So that she gets used to it an sh-that's her
    9                  little pl:aytime for he[r.
   10    M:      2→                          [Oh ri::ght.
```

Here, the mother (M) can be seen to accept the advice with a partial repeat of "every day" in line

8 and a marked acknowledgment of "oh right" in line 11 (Heritage & Sefi, 1992, p. 393).

In more recent research, Waring (2007) proposes that "simple advice acceptance" may be

accomplished through 'okay' (p. 116). In his study regarding peer tutoring sessions, he found

that 'okay' was used as an acknowledgment of understanding and alignment (Waring, 2007).

Further, 'okay' was often combined with tokens such as 'right' and 'got it,' resembling Heritage

and Sefi's (1992) notion of a 'marked acknowledgment' (Waring, 2007).

To conclude, advice is most frequently accepted when the recipient's competence is not

threatened. Though these straightforward forms of acceptance are not frequently found, they are

usually present when the recipient has already accepted the role of 'advice recipient' (Heritage &

Sefi, 1992; Shaw & Hepburn, 2013). In this role, the recipient is less likely to lose face and their

competence is not at stake (Heritage & Sefi, 1992; Shaw & Hepburn, 2013). However, if there is

more at stake, or the recipient's competence is being questioned, there are more complex ways of navigating acceptance.

Partial acceptance. Beyond simple acceptance of advice by marked acknowledgments, advice may be accepted partially in a more complex manner. These response forms often align with the advice but resist the position of advice recipient. Epistemically, this positions the recipient as knowledgeable and the advice as unnecessary. This section will cover the ways in which a speaker acknowledges the future action is appropriate but resists the role of advice recipient.

Research regarding advice sequences in mundane conversation has shown that recipients of advice may resist the role of advice recipient by displaying their prior knowledge (Shaw & Hepburn, 2013). Shaw (2013) terms this "claiming prior commitment," by which she means that recipients may commit to completing a future action, while still resisting that the advice was the catalyst for that commitment (p. 97). According to Shaw (2013) there are three ways this may be done: (1) displaying established intent, (2) elaborating on the action component, and (3) claiming 'firstness' (p. 98).

Displaying established intent involves a recipient response claiming to have arrived at the advised action independently (Shaw, 2013). An "already-established-commitment" may be made through the use of present-tense words, such as 'am' rather than 'will' (Shaw, 2013, p. 98). This can be seen in the following example from Shaw (2013):

Extract 3.3: Shaw (2013, p. 98)

```
1   Mum:        Ow you are tired. You need to [go to be:d.]
2   Gen:                                      [(Got our  ]frie-)?
3               (0.3)
4   Gen:   →    Yeah: I am in a minute,
```

In this extract, Gen displays established intent in line 4 by using the present-tense 'am,' instead

of saying that she 'will' go to bed. By doing this, she is not straightforwardly accepting the

advice (Shaw, 2013), but she is aligning with the advised action.

Elaborating or reformulating the action component of the advice allows the recipient to align

with the action but also claim ownership of it (Shaw, 2013; Shaw & Hepburn, 2013). For

example, in the following extract from Shaw (2013), 'Mum' reformulates Gen's advice:

> **Extract 3.4: Shaw (2013, p. 103)**
>
> ```
> 1   Gen:        =<You been to the doctors about it.=Have you?=
> 2   Mum:     → =>Well I've gotta go- I've gotta go to the< doctors
> 3                on Thursday anyway. So I'll [ask her about] it then.
> 4   Gen:                                    [Oh: right.   ]
> ```

By affiliating with the action of going to the doctors, but rewording it, 'Mum' displays

competence in the matter and resists the role of advice recipient.

Finally, Shaw (2013) suggests that "claiming 'firstness' in agreement" functions as a way to

affiliate with the action but also claim knowledge and prior commitment (p. 104). When a

speaker responds second in an interaction, they may go to great lengths to declare that they

already knew the advice being put forth (Shaw, 2013). This may be completed by providing an

upgraded agreement to an assessment (Pomerantz, 1984; Shaw & Hepburn, 2013). For example,

in the following extract from Shaw and Hepburn (2013), 'Pat' and 'Mum' are discussing Pat's

housing situation:

Extract 3.5: Shaw & Hepburn (2013, p. 356)

```
1    Pat:        I wanna go with a clean sla:te.
2    Mum:        Yeah.
3                (.)
4    Mum:     ᴀ→But- (0.2) but it would be a great position if: if:
5                you had some savings: (0.3) you know, (0.2) to
6                [add to    ]
7    Pat:     ʀ→[    Abso]l↑utely.
8    Mum:        to add to while you're away.
9    Pat:     ʀ→I kn↑o:w.=°I know.°<Imagine if we could put lik*e
10               (0.2) .hhh ↑because the cost of↑ living's so low and
11               we're not paying rent,
12   Mum:        >M[m.<]
13   Pat:          [We ] could- we could realistically put five
14               hundred pounds a month,=In savings,=
15               [At lea]s:t*.=[Ea ]sily.
16   Mum:        [↑Mm.  ]      [↑Mm]
```

Here, Mum provides the assessment that it would be a good idea for Pat to have some savings (line 4). Pat claims 'firstness' by providing an upgraded agreement in line 7, then providing the details of her plan to demonstrate her knowledge (lines 9-11). By doing so, she avoids the position of advice recipient but affiliates with the proposed future action.

As can be seen above, claiming 'firstness' is often a response to an advice-implicative assessment. Research on assessments by Pomerantz (1984) offers insight as to how claiming 'firstness' is made relevant. By offering an initial assessment, the deliverer presumes access to the recipient's knowledge (Pomerantz, 1984). In doing so, an agreement or disagreement is made relevant to the recipient (Pomerantz, 1984). Second assessments provide a vehicle for the recipient to agree or disagree (Pomerantz, 1984), and it is through these second assessments that 'firstness' is claimed. By upgrading an agreement and referring to prior access to the assessment,

a recipient may reclaim epistemic authority through claiming 'firstness' (Pomerantz, 1984;

Shaw, 2013).

Claims of 'firstness' may also be made through the phrase 'I know' (Shaw, 2013). By

responding with 'I know,' the recipient claims their own knowledge and rebalances the epistemic

asymmetry imposed by advice-implicative assessments (Mikesell et al., 2017; Shaw, 2013). In

responding with 'I know,' a recipient accepts the grounds for the advice but rejects the role of

advice recipient (Mikesell, et al., 2017). Essentially, the recipient is proposing that the advice is

unnecessary (Mikesell et al., 2017). Therefore, the epistemic incongruence is resisted through

claiming 'firstness.'

Similarly, 'I know' is often used in 'assertions of knowledge or competence,' as identified by

Heritage and Sefi (1992) in institutional talk. In such assertions, the recipient of advice aligns

with the content but strongly resists the role of advice recipient. This may be completed with

phrases like 'I know' or 'I do,' claiming competency, and 'no,' resisting the newsworthiness of

the advice (Heritage & Sefi, 1992). By strongly resisting the role of advice recipient, the speaker

rejects the notion that they may be ignorant or unable to deal with the situation (Heritage & Sefi,

1992). This is especially clear in Heritage and Sefi's (1992) research regarding first-time mothers

and health visitors, because of the epistemic difference. Health visitors have the medical

knowledge, whereas the mother is knowledgeable about her baby. Furthermore, advice from the

health visitor may imply judgment or criticism of the mother's caring abilities.

The following extract from Heritage and Sefi (1992) illustrates an assertion of knowledge at

line 11:

Extract 3.6: Heritage & Sefi (1992, p. 405)

```
1    HV:          Listen to your 'iccups. Just listen to your

2                 'iccups.

3    B:           ((hiccups))

4    M:           I know what cures those.(.) More milk [o

5    HV:                                                  [More

6                 [mi:lk is-

7    M:           [heh heh heh heh

8    HV:          Huh

9                 (0.5)

10   HV:    1→    Don't worry about (h)iccups.

11   M:     2→    Ye:eah [I kno:w (.) she ha[s them nearly every,

12   HV:            [(  )            [(  )

13   HV:          Does sh[e.

14   M:     2→           [fee:d.
```

In response to the health visitor's (HV) advice not to worry, the mother (M) responds with an assertion of knowledge by stating that she knows, and, further, her baby has them often. This response aligns with the advice but strongly resists that it is news to her by asserting that she is already aware that hiccupping is okay. By doing this, the mother is resisting the potential implication that she is unknowledgeable about her baby's actions.

Research on the institutional context of tutoring sessions exhibits that recipients may accept advice using "complex advice acceptance" (Waring, 2007). This term, proposed by Waring (2007), refers to methods that do more than simply accept. While acceptance tokens are still present, the recipient reconfigures the epistemic asymmetry by resisting the role of advice recipient. Waring (2007) suggests that there are two ways this is accomplished. The first, accepting with 'claims of comparable thinking,' includes an acceptance token, followed by a 'claim of comparable thinking' (Waring, 2007). This combination treats the advice as non-news, which lessens the epistemic asymmetry (Waring, 2007). For example, the following extract illustrates a 'claim of comparable thinking' at line 4:

Extract 3.7: Waring (2007, p. 118)

```
1    H:            A:n' em >I was wondering< if you could
2                  collapse community and caring [relationships.
3    Le:   1→                                    [.hhh I think I can.
4          2a→   [Yes. I thought the same thing.=
5    H:           [Okay.
6    Le:   2a→   =[Uh exactly. [Yes.
7    H:            [Okay.      [Okay.
```

Here, a conversation is taking place between Heidi (H), the tutor, and Lena (Le), the student. After Heidi delivers her advice in a downgraded format, Lena responds with a 'claim of comparable thinking' (line 4) that accepts with a "yes" and immediately claims that she thought the same thing. Rather than orienting to the role of advice recipient, Lena's 'claim of comparative thinking' positions the advice as validating her own thoughts, rather than changing her mind (Waring, 2007).

Similarly, Waring (2007) suggests that recipients may accept advice with an account. By accepting with an account, a recipient may justify their selected course of action over the advised course of action (Waring, 2007). In this format, the recipient may accept the advice but downgrade the epistemic asymmetry by sharing the process they used to reach their decision (Waring, 2007).

Finally, both mundane and institutional talk encompass a moral element. Shaw and Hepburn (2013) expanded on the moral implications of advice in their research regarding mother and adult-daughter conversations. They suggest that a judgment may be packaged within advice, leading to strong assertions of knowledge from the recipient (Shaw & Hepburn, 2013). This is especially true when the critical dimension relates to a social responsibility, such as being a mother (Shaw & Hepburn, 2013). When advice regarding the recipient's actions is morally compromising, such as their parenting skills, it is not surprising that they strongly resist the role

of advice recipient through claims of competence. This is similar to Heritage and Sefi's (1992)

institutional research, in the sense that the advice is regarding a mother's ability to care for her

new baby. Interestingly, but perhaps not surprisingly, Shaw and Hepburn's (2013) findings on

claims of knowledge all concerned "the recipient's conduct in relation to another person" (p.

353). In these situations, the resistance to the role of advice recipient and clear assertion of

knowledge may be enacted to preserve the recipient's reputation.

To conclude this section, speakers may respond to advice in a way that both aligns with the

content of the advice yet rejects the role of advice recipient. Without the use of acknowledgment

tokens, Shaw (2013) suggests that speakers may resist the role of advice recipient by 'claiming

prior commitment.' They may do this by displaying established intent, elaborating on the

proposed action, or claiming 'firstness' (Shaw, 2013). Heritage and Sefi (1992) proposed that the

role of advice recipient may be strongly resisted through 'assertions of knowledge and/or

competence,' which display that the recipient is already knowledgeable about the advisable

action. Waring (2007) demonstrated that recipients may use acknowledgment tokens to accept

the advice but provide 'claims of comparable thinking' or accounts to display prior knowledge.

Overall, these response methods work to affiliate the speaker with the future action but resist

conceding epistemic authority by accepting the role of advice recipient.

Unmarked acknowledgments. In the previous examples, advice was either fully or partially

accepted. Unmarked acknowledgments differ from these because, by providing little

acknowledgment, recipients implicitly resist advice (Heritage & Sefi, 1992). This form of

response functions as passive resistance through minimal response tokens, such as "yeah" or

"mm" (Heritage & Lindstrom, 2012; Heritage & Sefi, 1992; Shaw, 2013). The response tokens

do not (a) register the advice as news, or (b) offer any commitment to follow through on the

advised action (Heritage & Sefi, 1992). Rather, they work as continuers for the sequence to progress (Heritage & Sefi, 1992; Pilnick, 2003). Therefore, unmarked acknowledgments do not actually acknowledge the talk as advice (Heritage & Sefi, 1992).

In both mundane and institutional talk, unmarked acknowledgments can be categorized as implicit resistance based on the interaction that unfolds after it. This is because, upon receipt of advice, a recipient's appropriate response would be marked acknowledgment (Heritage & Sefi, 1992). By withholding a marked acknowledgment, the recipient neither aligns with the content of the advice or the position of advice recipient. This can be seen in the following extract from Heritage and Lindstrom (2012):

Extract 3.8: Heritage & Lindstrom (2012, p. 176)

```
1    M:    →   What about ehm
2              (0.6)
3    HV:       Vitamin drops[::.
4    M:                      [Yes when [do you start giving th'm
5    HV:                                [Yes
6    M:        those.
7    HV:       Well you can start no:w.=In face the next time you
8              come to clinic (.h) if you ehm buy one of the
9              little bottles a:nd it's five drops a da:y.
10        →   (0.7)
11   HV:   →   Just once a day give her tho:se.
12        →   (1.0)
13   M:        (*Yeah*)
14   HV:   →   Mm .hh and ehm (0.2) pt .hh if you ^stopp:ed
15             breast feeding *.hh* and she went on to bottle (.)
16             feeds you stop the vitamin drops.
17   M:        Cause they've got it in them.
18   HV:       pt Because they've got it in,
19             (0.2)
20   HV:       But ehm as she i:s being breastfed.
21             (0.3)
22   HV:       (You give ['em)
23   M:                   [Ehm: if I give her a bottle feed how
24             many ounces do you think I should give her
```

In this example, also between a mother and health visitor (HV), the mother can be seen to offer little to no acknowledgment to the advice. After the HV delivers advice in lines 7-9, the mother is silent at line 10. The HV then recompletes her advice in line 11, eliciting a quiet "yeah" from the mother (line 13). The mother's unmarked acknowledgment is treated as resistance because it does not register the advice as news or offer commitment to follow the advice. The HV orients to it as such, by continuing on with an extended version of her advice (lines 14-16).

In Heritage and Sefi's (1992) research concerning new mothers and health visitors, they found that unmarked acknowledgments were commonly present in sequences where advice was initiated by the health visitor. Similarly, Kinnell and Maynard's (1996) research about safe sex counseling found that unmarked acknowledgments and silence were the most frequent type of response. This may be because, in an institutional setting, the advice giver has interactional "rights" to deliver advice on their subject of expertise, and the recipient can do little to stop it (Heritage & Sefi, 1992).

On the other hand, Shaw and Hepburn (2013) suggest that unmarked acknowledgments in mundane conversation occur when there is little at stake for the recipient. For example, in advice regarding headache medication from a mother to adult-daughter, an unmarked acknowledgment does limited harm because there is little at stake regarding the daughter's competence (Shaw & Hepburn, 2013, see p. 358). However, if the conversation were about the adult-daughter's parenting skills, unmarked acknowledgment may be avoided because there is more at stake in terms of the daughter's competence and mothering abilities (Shaw & Hepburn, 2013). Therefore, the adult-daughter may respond with a more explicit claim of competence or rejection. Thus, it can be concluded that participants utilize unmarked acknowledgments differently, depending on the context.

Overall, unmarked acknowledgments function as implicit resistance through minimal response tokens (Heritage & Lindstrom, 2012; Heritage & Sefi, 1992). By providing little acknowledgment, recipients do not align with the content or the advice, nor the role of advice recipient. However, they do not explicitly reject the advice, either. Therefore, it is dependent upon the participants as to how they orient to the unmarked acknowledgment in an advice-giving sequence.

Rejection. While unmarked acknowledgments provide passive resistance, rejection is the only response that explicitly rejects the content of the advice. In rejecting the advice, the recipient is providing a dispreferred response to an action in which acceptance is preferred (Silverman, 1997). Therefore, advice givers and recipients manage their utterances in a way that manages the rejection in order to prefer agreement (Silverman, 1997). This section will cover the ways in which rejection is stated, how and why rejection is interactionally relevant, and the ways an advice giver may respond to rejection.

Because rejection is the dispreferred response to advice, it may be delivered in a mitigated fashion (Shaw, 2013; Silverman, 1997; Riccioni et al., 2014). This can occur through dispreference features such as lexical markers, such as 'well,' and delays (Heritage, 1984; Silverman, 1997). Alignment with the content of the advice may be hedged with pauses and contrastive words, such as 'but' (Shaw, 2013). Likewise, accounts or exceptional circumstances may be provided to mitigate a rejection (Heritage, 1984; Shaw, 2013). Or, rejection may take place in a stronger format by using the word 'no' (Shaw, 2013). For example, in the next extract from Shaw (2013), Pat rejects advice from her Mum on what to wear for an interview:

Extract 3.9: Shaw (2013, p. 115)

```
1    Mum:         You're gonna have to wea::r (0.2) a jacket an:=
2    Pat:     →=.hh ↑Well no because↑ (.) Suzzie was saying that-
3                  (0.6) urm: (0.4) don't go as formal. =Because it's
4                  (0.5) .hhh <Thailand,>
```

Here, Pat begins her response with a 'well,' signaling dispreference and then explicitly rejects the advice with a 'no' (line 2) (Shaw, 2013). Finally, her account solidifies why she does not agree with the advice.

The rejection of advice may unfold differently depending on the context of the conversation. Jefferson and Lee (1981) propose that rejection in mundane conversation may occur in a "troubles-telling" encounter, in which the recipient wants to remain in the troubles-telling role. In this situation, the recipient may reject the content and role of advice recipient because they want the focus to remain on their telling of the trouble (Jefferson & Lee, 1981). Further, the troubles-teller may value "emotional reciprocity" more than the delivery of advice (Hepburn & Potter, 2011; Jefferson & Lee, 1981). If advice is produced too early in the sequence, the troubles-teller may reject it out of feeling as though their "emotional reciprocity" was not attended to (Hepburn & Potter, 2011; Jefferson & Lee, 1981).

Rejection of advice may present differently in institutional settings, and, henceforth, be dealt with differently. For example, in a service encounter, advice may be produced as an alternative to a service or good (Hepburn & Potter, 2011). Hepburn and Potter (2011) provide an example of a physician offering advice, rather than the parents' sought-after antibiotics. This may provoke rejection from the parents, upon not receiving what they came for. Similarly, Hepburn, Shaw, and Potter (2018) found that callers to a child protection helpline may reject advice after

requesting a different type of service, such as Social Services. Thus, it can be concluded that

advice rejection may occur interactionally when the recipient did not ask for advice.

Rejection may also occur because of the epistemic difference between client and professional.

For example, in the child protection help-line calls, the caller has epistemic access to their life,

whereas the call-taker has the professional knowledge (Hepburn & Potter, 2011; Hepburn et al.,

2018). This is illustrated in the following extract from Hepburn et al. (2018):

Extract 3.10: Hepburn et al. (2018, p. 162)

```
1    CPO:        R:ight.= [would it not be possible for you to]
2    Caller:            [.h h h h h h  h h h h h      ]
3    CPO:        maybe take some lea:ve while-while she's
4                Livin [wiv you.]
5    Call:            [ .shih]  I:'ve only jus' started this
6                jo:b.=I [ mean ] er i' possible but you
7    CPO:                [Ri:gh'.]
8    Call:        know I'd be unpaid 'n I'm [just st]artin a
9    CPA:                                   [ Mm:.  ]
10   Call:        new mhor(hh)tghage (hh)an [I-]
11   CPO:                                   [Ri]:ght.
12                Ri[ght. ]
13   Call:          [Ye kn]ow it's::
14                (0.6)
15   CPO:  →     °°k (.) °°tk Yerh:.=.hh I mean- ye know at
16         →     the end of the day i-it's about priorities
17         →     isn' it.=an [ye know o]bviously she:'s got
18   Call:                   [I know::.]
19         →     to come fir:st in all of this.=
20   CPO:        =[because she's (the-)]|
21   Call:        =[Yeah but if I've got] nowhere
22                        to li(hh)ve then she sh- .hh
23   Call:        [ye know,]      [.hh]
24   CPO:        [NO::.. ] =But    [y'kn]ow I mean social
25                services would be sayin to ↓you:, y-ye know
26                that th-the job would have to come secondary.
27                =I mean ultimately [( as I said)]
28   Call:                           [But it ~ca:n]t.~
29                (.)
```

In this conversation, the caller wants her teenage daughter to be taken in by Social Services. However, the call-taker (CPO), unable to provide that service, suggests that the caller take some time off to be at home with the daughter. The caller provides rejection in the form of an account (line 5) that, epistemically, only she would know. Throughout the sequence, the caller continues to reject the advice by stating issues that she has privileged access to. However, the call-taker responds with her own epistemic insight as to how Social Services would respond (line 24). This example exemplifies the rejection of advice when (a) a service is requested, and (b) there is an epistemic difference between the recipient and deliverer.

In responding to rejection, advice givers may employ two strategies that make further advice hard to resist. First, they may utilize an idiomatic formulation (Hepburn et al., 2018). Idioms can interactionally minimize resistance because they are hard to directly counter and often transition into a new topic (Hepburn & Potter, 2011). For example, in the previous extract from Hepburn et al. (2018), lines 15-17 from the call-taker provide the idiomatic formulation "at the end of the day i-it's about priorities" (p. 163). This phrase is difficult to reject because the "it" and "priorities" are not specified, and by defining them, there may be more trouble for the caller (Hepburn et al., 2018).

Second, advice givers may use tag-questions to minimize resistance (Hepburn et al., 2018; Hepburn & Potter, 2011). Tag-questions treat the recipient as knowledgeable and agreement as expected and preferred (Hepburn & Potter, 2011; Heritage & Raymond, 2005). They sequentially position the recipient as already supporting the advice (Hepburn & Potter, 2011). Also in the extract above, the call-taker uses a tag-question (line 16-17, "i-it's about priorities isn't it"), which functions as a question that the caller can confirm (Hepburn et al., 2018, p. 162).

By confirming the question, the caller is therefore confirming the advice she had been previously resisting (Hepburn et al., 2018).

To conclude, rejection is uncommon in advice sequences. However, recipients may reject the content of advice for different reasons, including that they want to remain in the troubles-teller role (Jefferson & Lee, 1981), were seeking a service, or have epistemic knowledge that the deliverer does not. Rejection is viewed as the dispreferred response to advice (Silverman, 1997), meaning that mitigation phrases, delays, and accounts are often incorporated in rejection responses. After rejection, advice givers may attempt to continue on with the sequence using idiomatic formulations or tag questions. Overall, these turns display that both advice giver and recipient orient to the preference organization of advice sequences by managing rejection to preserve the agreement preference (Silverman, 1997).

Advice in Broadcast Talk

Advice sequences in broadcast talk come with their own unique characteristics. Unlike typical mundane or institutional discourse, broadcast talk is oriented not only to the participants in the conversation, but also to an overhearing audience (Hutchby, 2005). Talk is designed in a way that addresses both the private and public sphere (Hutchby, 1995). In doing so, broadcast talk exhibits features of both mundane and institutional talk.

Broadcast talk closely follows the patterns of mundane conversation, yet certain variations are present as understood in institutional talk. First and foremost, the structures and patterns of interpersonal, mundane conversation are the building blocks for broadcast discourse (Hutchby, 2005). However, participants produce the broadcast context by organizing turns of talk that exhibit an awareness of their role and understanding of the situation (Hutchby, 2005).

Drew and Heritage (1992) distinguish that, within institutional talk, there are two types of speech exchange systems: formal and non-formal. Formal settings display an embodiment of the institutional role in a way that notably differs from mundane conversation (Drew & Heritage, 1992). For example, classrooms, legal proceedings, and news interviews follow a distinctive turn-taking structure that would be considered formal (Drew & Heritage, 1992). Non-formal settings do not result in role asymmetries due to pre-allocated turn-taking procedures (Drew & Heritage, 1992). Talk is more likely to resemble conversation, and the lines between mundane and institutional talk are permeable (Drew & Heritage, 1992). Rather than exhibiting an orientation to the context through turn-taking, participants do so through a variety of interactional practices, including opening and closings, information exchange, and expressions (Drew & Heritage, 1992). Because this analysis focuses on a non-formal exchange, non-formal broadcast interactions will be the focus of this section.

For example, Hutchby (2005) compared how tasks in mundane conversation compare to the same tasks in radio phone-ins. Doing so allows for the identification of participant orientation to the constraints of radio phone-ins. In everyday phone calls, participants establish their identities and move into routine enquiries in a four-part sequence (Hutchby, 2005; see Schegloff, 1986). However, radio phone-ins are condensed to a two-part sequence that quickly move into the caller's reason for calling (Hutchby, 2005). In a mundane call, participants may be calling for a variety of different reasons and must select from a number of possible identities (Hutchby, 2005). In a radio phone-in, the caller aligns with the institutional setting by identifying with a role (caller and host) and moving quickly into the agenda (Hutchby, 2005). Although not the only way, the openings of mundane versus institutional calls demonstrate how turns are specially designed in radio phone-ins to align with the institutional properties.

As discussed above, broadcast discourse not only blurs the lines between mundane and institutional talk, but it is also designed with an overhearing audience in mind. This type of talk exhibits characteristics of both private, casual conversation and talk directed at an audience (Hutchby, 2005). Hutchby (1995) describes this as a 'generalising orientation.' In his research about advice giving sequences in a call-in radio show, he found that expert advice was designed to first address the caller's question, then address the public audience as a whole (Hutchby, 1995). This two-part format (answer plus auxiliary) goes beyond answering the caller's question to recommend general advice to the public (Hutchby, 1995).

This same phenomenon can be seen in talk-show television. Private talk is made public, meaning that it is produced for both the participants and overhearing audience (Hutchby, 2005). While an expert-caller advice dynamic often results in a two-part answer, television shows with multiple guests and a host may exhibit ambivalence towards the audience (Hutchby, 2001). In this sense, guests may confront one another in a way that it seems the audience is simply looking on (Hutchby, 2001). Shows that are apparently spontaneous and unscripted maintain a 'liveness' through frameworks that allow space for participants to confront another (Hutchby, 2001). A space is set up for the 'spectacle of confrontation' (Hutchby, 2001). For example, Hutchby's (2001) research on the *Ricki Lake* show demonstrates that the first guest is framed as 'having problems' and complaints, to which a response from the second guest is sequentially relevant. Thus, the framework allows opportunities for confrontation that the audience can overhear.

Although talk shows and reality television are considered "spontaneous," the frameworks put into place suggest that they are not simply mundane conversation being aired for the public. Rather, the management of turn-taking maximizes the opportunity for confrontation and conflict that television viewers desire (Wood, 2001). Television discourse is performed, following

discursive frameworks embedded in the institutional setting (Wood, 2001). Wood (2001)

suggests that talk shows, though considered spontaneous and unique, are actually highly rule-

governed and often repeat unoriginal ideas. Careful research goes into planning television shows,

and talk is produced with an overhearing audience in mind (Wood, 2001). Ultimately,

entertainment value is produced through careful orchestration of discourse and events.

Although the authenticity of actions and discourse on television may be called into question,

participants' talk still reflects the patterns and resources used to make sense of everyday talk

(Hutchby, 2001). Especially in the case of face-to-face confrontation in 'unscripted' television, it

is not always clear how much the overhearing audience impacts the speakers (Hutchby, 2005).

By studying broadcast discourse, the extent to which institutional frameworks are oriented to

may be revealed.

Literature Review Conclusion

To conclude, advice is created interactionally by participants who attend to it as such.

Heritage and Sefi (1992) laid the framework of advice delivery by suggesting that it is both

normative and epistemically asymmetric. Building upon these features, subsequent studies

provide a deeper understanding of how advice is managed interactionally. Delivering of advice

may take the form of imperatives, information, interrogatives, or assessments. Recipients may

respond to advice through ways that (a) accept the advice, (b) align with the advice but resist the

role of advice recipient, (c) passively resist both the content and role of advice recipient, and (d)

explicitly reject the content and role of advice recipient. Overall, participants co-construct advice

through different delivery formats and responses that display their epistemic knowledge and

level of agreement.

Because advice sequences differ in mundane, institutional, and broadcast discourse, future research should focus on how these sequences unfold differently. In institutional settings, roles often provide a warrant for the advice (Shaw & Hepburn, 2013). This is not to say that troubles do not arise, but utterances can be framed in ways to manage tension (Hepburn et al., 2018). Less research, however, has been done on mundane conversation. Advice in everyday talk is more difficult to find because it is more opportunistic, inexplicit, and contingent (Shaw & Hepburn, 2013). While advice in institutional settings is often organized around a goal, advice in mundane conversation is organized around rules that are less obvious (Hepburn et al., 2018).

Much of the research on advice in mundane interaction has been completed by Shaw and Hepburn, with their work on mother and adult-daughter interactions. Further research is needed to build upon this, especially because it could be argued that Shaw and Hepburn's research on mother-daughter interactions inhibits an institutional facet of its own, given that daughters often orient to the mother role as having epistemic authority. Therefore, participants may enact their roles through selections of advice delivery and response. Research concerning different relationships, such as peer-to-peer, will reveal further insight to advice construction in mundane conversation.

Studying advice in talk-show or reality broadcast settings also provides a challenge because of the blurring of mundane and institutional lines. On one hand, the basics of advice interactions in mundane conversation are exhibited in broadcast. However, participants still orient to the institutional constraints that are part of creating content for an overhearing audience. Thus, it is important to take this into consideration when studying advice sequences in the broadcast context.

Overall, the literature on advice through an interactional lens provides a base of research to begin from. The difficult and potentially delicate matter of giving and receiving advice is handled differently, depending on the context and content of the situation. By using these fundamentals to analyze future data, researchers can provide insight to advice giving that has implications for both professionals and everyday relationships.

Methodology

This section will cover the methodology of this analysis, as well as the data selection. To begin, the methodology and rationale will be presented.

Method

Conversation analysis (CA) will be used for this thesis, in order to analyze a piece of advice data. This method of analysis was selected because it allows exploration and the ability to notice things that may be unexpected or would have gone unnoticed. Conversation analysis aims to cultivate an understanding of participants' methods of interaction (Heritage, 1984). By closely analyzing transcribed data, situated practices can be explicated and examined. Rather than studying the opinions or emotions influencing talk, CA's focus is on how recipients treat talk through turn-taking (Sacks, Schegloff, & Jefferson, 1974). In other words, CA focuses on how participants orient to one another through turns of talk (Halkowski & Gill, 2013). Because of this focus on turns of talk, CA is grounded in data (Sacks et al., 1974).

Conversation analysis is appropriate for this study because advice is created interactionally and treated accordingly. So, in examining peer-to-peer advice sequences, interactions will reveal the relevance of participants' roles. Further, the interactional resources employed by participants to recognize talk as advice can be examined by using CA. Rather than beginning with relevant

characteristics or identity traits of peer-to-peer communication, CA allows for an inductive approach that treats the context as being interactionally constructed (Heritage, 2005). The phenomena previously studied in advice sequences may be observed in the present data, but new concepts may emerge, as well.

Data

The focus of CA is on naturally occurring interactions. Although different forms of data, such as surveys and interviews, are useful for other methods, naturally occurring interactions are essential in CA because that is the only way the performative and situated nature of talk can be captured (Shaw, 2013). Therefore, data often takes the form of audio and visual recordings that are transcribed. Recording interactions allows for coding of not only what was said, but also how it was said (Clayman & Gill, 2004). Body language is also observable, and the video can be played repeatedly to ensure complete transcription (Clayman & Gill, 2004).

This analysis will take the format of a single-case analysis (see Schegloff, 1987), in which a single clip of data will be used. As a single-case analysis, a "*range of phenomena*" from past work will be used to analyze a "*single fragement* of talk" (Schegloff, 1987, p. 101). Prior knowledge from conversation analytic studies will be used to highlight elements of the data (Schegloff, 1987). Schegloff (1987, p. 102) writes that the "locus of order" lies in a single occasion of interaction. In a single episode of talk, participants organize their talk to be orderly or adjust to lack of order, as stated by Schegloff (1987):

…social action done through talk is organized and orderly not, or not only, as a matter of rule or as a statistical regularity, but on a case by case, action by action, basis. Particular complements of participants on singular occasions of interaction proceed in, to them, orderly

ways; or, failing this, have ways of coping with the apparent lack of order which also operate

on a single case basis (p. 102).

Therefore, although this is only a single case, knowledge from prior studies can be used to

analyze the orderliness of participant interactions.

Due to time and resource constraints, a media representation of advice giving between friends

will be used. Specifically, a clip from the show *Bachelor in Paradise* will be transcribed and

analyzed. *Bachelor in Paradise*, aired on ABC, is a reality television show in which past

contestants from *The Bachelor* and *The Bachelorette* travel to "paradise" to find love.

Contestants get to know one another, and, in some cases, form relationships. The end goal is to

leave paradise in a relationship or engaged.

In this particular clip, two friends, Raven and Tia, discuss the turmoil in Tia's current

romantic relationship. It is unclear how long Raven and Tia have been friends, but they were

friends before the show began. In this scene, Raven and her boyfriend (Adam) are on a double-

date with Colton and Tia. Raven pulls Tia aside to discuss her relationship with Colton. This clip

can clearly be defined as an advice sequence because (a) Raven is presenting a strong normative

push for Tia to reconsider her relationship, and (b) Raven is positioning herself as more

knowledgeable about romantic relationships.

Although this data provides a clear example of an advice sequence, there are some

methodological issues. One is that CA focuses on naturally occurring data, and this is a media

representation. Therefore, there is concern over how 'natural' the data is. However, it is

important to remember that, while filmed for reality television, the participants' interactions still

provide an idea of the norms and tools used in everyday interaction.

Broadcast discourse is neither strictly mundane nor institutional. However, because the focus of this analysis is on mundane talk, this clip from *Bachelor in Paradise* will be analyzed as a portrayal of mundane talk, rather than institutional talk. While the conversation between Raven and Tia has been edited and shaped for entertainment purposes, it still reflects the fundamental properties of mundane talk. Further, it has been edited by members of conversation culture, for an audience of conversation culture. Both the editors and audience expect and implement conversational norms that are conveyed in this advice sequence.

Finally, this analysis will not necessarily be broadly generalizable. Because it is a single piece of data, it will not necessarily be representative of the entire population or any category. Still, orderliness of this single case may be observed, with patterns going beyond the reach of this analysis. Overall, the sequential implications of advice giving will be still be present and analyzable.

Analysis

In order to analyze the data, it will first be transcribed using the Jefferson Transcription System (Jefferson, 1983). This transcribing method was selected because it is frequently used in conversation analysis and allows the transcriber to account for laughter, overlaps, pauses, speaking volume and minute details of the conversation (Jefferson, 2004). Both what was said and how it was said are accounted for (Drew, 2005). By accounting for all the details, the intricacies of the conversation can be analyzed as relevant to the interaction.

After transcribing the data, interactions will be examined using the "unmotivated looking approach" (ten Have, 1997). Rather than approaching the data with a preformulated theory, this approach suggests exploring results with an open-mind (Psathas, 1995). Conduct of the participants is the focus when using the unmotivated looking approach (Psathas, 1995).

Assumptions about patient motivations, purpose and emotions are not taken into consideration, unless they are explicitly displayed in the conversation (Psathas, 1995). Using this approach allows the researcher to focus on what is happening and how it is happening, rather than why it is happening (Halkowski & Gill, 2013).

While analyzing the data, the core concepts of CA will be drawn upon. For example, 'turn taking' and 'turn design' establish the organization of talk and the way that responses are formed (Drew, 2005; Sacks et al., 1974). On a larger scale, turns of talk form adjacency pairs and the sequence as a whole (Drew, 2005). In this analysis, sequencing is of extra importance because advice is interactionally created through participants' turns and orientation.

Conclusion

To conclude this section on methodology, the research question will be presented. Using CA, aspects of advice giving will be examined, including advice delivery, responses, normativity, epistemics, and identity enactment. In investigating these concepts, the aim of this analysis is to identify how advice delivery is both warranted and ratified by two peers in mundane conversation. Therefore, the research question is as follows:

RQ: How is advice interactionally warranted in a media-representation of mundane conversation between two peers?

Analyzing this data will allow for an investigation into how advice sequences are managed in mundane conversation. Specifically, the establishment of a warrant by the advice giver and ratification by the recipient will be looked at. Prior to conducting the following analysis section, the conversation from *Bachelor in Paradise* was transcribed using standard Jefferson transcription conventions, as described by Hepburn and Bolden (2013).

Analysis

Advice Giving

Advice may be delivered in a variety of ways, ranging from explicit to ambiguous. Depending on the construction selected, the level of normativity and knowledge asymmetry varies. In this data, Raven delivers advice to Tia using several different formats. To identify advice sequences between Raven and Tia, elements of normativity and knowledge asymmetry are accounted for through their turns. Further, the warrant to deliver advice through identification as friends is examined in this analysis.

Prior to Raven and Tia's conversation used for this analysis, there is no footage of their discussion. Thus, it is difficult to pinpoint how the advice sequence began. Whether Raven's input was solicited or not cannot be determined from this segment. Likewise, because this is a media representation of mundane conversation, it is impossible to know if this conversation was prompted. Therefore, entry to the advice sequence cannot be examined.

However, the conversation itself holds many examples of advice delivery and response. Based on layout of the prior literature review, this analysis will be organized according to the different types of advice giving, followed by responses. To begin, examples of advice delivery through the imperative format will be examined.

Imperatives. Advice formatted as an imperative is the strongest form of advice, providing both a clear normative push and epistemic difference. This type of delivery is produced with the preferred response of acceptance or rejection, leaving little room for contingencies (Shaw, 2013). Brown and Levinson (1978) describe this as "bald" delivery, in which a number of circumstances are typically present. These circumstances include that the situation is urgent or

requires efficiency; danger to the recipient's face is small; following the advice does not demand

great sacrifices from the advice recipient; or, the advice giver is clearly in a position of greater

power (Brown & Levinson, 1978). Because the epistemic gradient in this type of delivery is

substantial, straightforward advice can attribute to interactional difficulties.

In the case of Raven and Tia, advice is delivered a number of times in the imperative format.

For example, the following extract displays Raven delivering "bald" (Brown & Levinson, 1976)

advice:

Extract 4.1 (0:39 – 0:51)

```
21    Raven:      I'm r:illy conce:rned.
22    Raven:      I do not want to see::[(.) yo:u in heartbreak.     ]
23                                      [((very slight nods from Tia))]
24                (2.4)
25    Raven:      <You ha:ve ta rilly:: se:ek(.)the true> person that Colton is.
26                (1.7)
```

Prior to this sequence, Raven shared concerns about Colton's intentions. Although Tia expressed

that she is "good at reading him," Raven persists in delivering advice.

Before giving explicit advice, it is interesting to note that Raven shares a deep sense of

concern about Tia's potential heartbreak (lines 21-22). This functions as a way for Raven to

justify her assessments and advice. By establishing herself as a 'concerned friend,' Raven builds

her warrant to give advice. Implicitly, she is also forwarding the potential that Tia's relationship

may end in heartbreak.

Prior to the advice at line 25, no explicit advice has been given. Rather, Raven has been

building a case for her concern. After notable silences from Tia, Raven delivers advice in the

imperative format by stating that Tia 'has to' search for Colton's true character. Beyond

incorporating a verb of obligation, Raven even adds "really," strengthening the force of her 'bald' claim.

In line with Brown and Levinson's (1978) explanation of circumstances in which 'bald' claims are most often found, this could be considered to fall under the category of an urgent situation. Raven is concerned about Tia moving forward in her relationship with Colton, calling for urgent intervention. However, it is interesting to consider the other situations that Brown and Levinson (1978) proposed and their relations to epistemics.

For example, 'bald' messages are stated to often occur in situations that are not face-threatening or require large sacrifices from the recipient (Brown & Levinson, 1978). Further, they often occur in situations in which the advice giver is in a position of authority compared to the recipient (Brown & Levinson, 1978). Raven's advice could certainly be face-threatening to Tia because she is alluding to the notion that Tia does not already know Colton's true character. In doing so, Tia's judgment and competence regarding relationships are in jeopardy. Likewise, Raven is positioning herself as knowing more about Colton's character than Tia. This could be potentially problematic, as Raven is stepping on Tia's epistemic domain. Participants are entitled to having greater access to their own life experiences (Heritage & Raymond, 2005; Sacks, 1984), so Raven's demonstration of epistemic rights could raise interactional difficulties.

Raven's use of an imperative also presumes normativity and forwards the action as in the best interests of Tia. There is no room for contingencies, leaving Tia to either accept or reject the advice. However, Tia does neither (line 26). After not receiving a preferred response, Raven moves on to provide advice packaged as an interrogative, perhaps in an attempt to soften the delivery.

Later, after Tia admits to being emotional and upset over her relationship, Raven delivers more

advice in the imperative format. This is illustrated in the following extract:

Extract 4.2 (1:24 – 1:44)

```
40    Raven:      =You are #↑so: #↑deser:ving Tia.
41                (1.1) ((slight nods from Tia))
42    Raven:      Like e(h)verythi:ng you've be:en throu:gh,
43                (1.1)
44    Raven:      And the perso:n that you a::re, and how beau:tifu:l you a::re,
45    Raven:      You should not settle for ANYthi:ng less than someone who
46    Raven:      mirrors the best part of you.
47                [(2.7)]
48                [((camera zooms in on Raven and Tia clutching hands))]
```

Here, Raven's imperative advice statement comes in lines 45 and 46. However, it is interesting to

note what comes before that, in lines 42 to 44. In trying to persuade Tia of her worth, Raven

produces a three-part list to support why Tia is deserving of a healthy relationship. Advice, in

and of itself, is persuasive by forwarding a preferred action. A three-part list functions as a

persuasive technique because it is linked to emphasis in mundane conversation (Heritage &

Clayman, 2011). Further, three-part lists project that the end of the turn is near (Jefferson, 1990).

By stating that Tia has been through a lot, is (presumably) a good person, and is beautiful, Raven

is projecting that her main point is coming and prepping Tia for a reaction.

Beyond operating as a persuasive tool, Raven's three-part list establishes epistemic authority

and her warrant to deliver advice. In using evidence such as "everything" Tia's been through

(line 42) and the person that she is (line 44), Raven is displaying that she has epistemic access to

her life. Likewise, this establishes Raven's role as a 'friend.' The implication that Raven is

knowledgeable about Tia's life is prominent. In using the broad, yet strong pronoun, of

"everything," Raven is implying that she knows of many struggles that Tia has been through.

Building off that, stating "the person that you are" as a justification for why Tia is deserving demonstrates that Raven knows what type of person Tia is. In this sequence, both Raven and Tia display an orientation towards "deserving" of a relationship as meaning deserving of a strong, mutually beneficial relationship. Thus, it can be inferred that Raven is implying that the Tia's character is respectable (line 44).

In establishing this epistemic insight to Tia's life, Raven is preparing for her advice delivery at line 45. This works as a pre-advice sequence, establishing Raven as the advice giver and signaling that Tia is in the role of advice recipient. The epistemic asymmetry is formed in advance of the actual delivery. However, the pre-advice sequence also functions to soften the potentially face-threatening act of delivering straightforward advice by building up Tia's character.

When Raven does deliver the advice, she delivers it with little room for contingencies, using the words "should not." Both normativity and knowledge asymmetry are clearly present in her advice. Though this imperative delivery may be perceived as questioning Tia's judgment, the prior utterances and reference to Tia's "best part" (line 46) mitigate the threat. If Raven had listed three of Tia's negative traits and followed with the advice "You should not settle for him," the threat to Tia's competence would have been much greater. By formatting her three-part list to include positive traits and delivering advice packaged in a complimenting manner, Raven navigates the potentially difficult territory of Tia's judgment in men.

To conclude, Raven utilizes the imperative form to advise Tia to reassess her relationship with Colton. In establishing a strong normative push and epistemic asymmetry, interactional difficulties may occur. However, Raven works to temper the face-threatening act of advice

delivery by highlighting Tia's favorable qualities and establishing that she is looking out for her best interests.

Advice-as-information. Advice presented as information softens the normativity and epistemic asymmetry via its formatting in an ambiguous, impersonal manner. Because the advice may be presented in a hypothetical, informational way, acceptance or rejection is not required. However, it can be difficult to define advice-as-information as advice, rather than strictly information, because it depends on how the recipient orients to the information.

In the following illustration of advice-as-information, Raven is responding to Tia's claim that she has had a "really good time" with Colton. This extract comes from near the end of the conversation, after Raven has already shared her concerns about Colton's intentions and character. Just prior to this sequence, Tia had rejected advice from Raven.

Extract 4.3

```
59   Raven:    =↑Yeah he is >incre:dibly attractive,< ye::s he (.) does sweet
60   Raven:    [things like    ]
61   Tia:      [Has all:: these] great qua:litie:s.= ((slight nodding))
62   Raven:    =Yea:h, >has these great qualities< ↑but that can a:ll be
63   Raven:    ma:sked to who you ri:lly are on the inside.
64   Tia:      ↓Yeah.
65             (1.0)
66   Tia:      Like these are thi:ngs that I just didn't even pla:n to like
67   Tia:      talk abo:ut wi:th him but it (.) °needs to happen.°=
```

Here, Raven delivers advice-as-information in lines 62 and 63, stating that good qualities "can all be masked to who you really are on the inside." In defining this as advice, the utterances before and after lines 62 and 63 are important. By examining this sequence as a whole, it can be concluded that Tia orients to Raven's information as advice.

In lines 59 and 60, Raven begins to produce a three-part list regarding Colton's positive qualities. By stating that he is "attractive" and "does sweet things," Raven displays that she has epistemic access to not only Colton's negative qualities, but also his positive ones. Thus, she is warranting her future advice by demonstrating that she has insight to his entire character, not just part of it.

However, by beginning each utterance with "yeah" or "yes," Raven is signaling that a contrast may be coming. She is demonstrating that it is a dilemma: Yes, Colton has favorable traits, but Tia should still be cautious of his intentions. In perhaps sensing the negative counterbalance to come, Tia produces a pre-emptive completion at line 61. Rather than allowing Raven to continue down a path that may return to Colton's negative qualities, Tia produces a generalized list completer by stating that he has "all these great qualities" (line 61). This demonstrates strong agreement with Raven's positive evaluations and claims epistemic access to Colton's character. Further, Tia's affiliative utterance is "produced to bring the turn to completion" (Lerner, 2004, p. 227), likely to halt the progress of Raven's projected contrast.

Raven ratifies Tia's candidate completion with a "yeah" at line 62, followed by a repeat of "has these great qualities." In doing so, Raven acknowledges and accepts Tia's completion However, she does not orient to this as a turn-completing action (Lerner, 2004). Raven signals that her turn is not complete by rushing through her utterance ("has these great qualities") and following it with a "but." She then continues to produce advice-as-information in the form of a contrast.

In lines 62 and 63, Raven produces advice-as-information, packaged as an impersonal, hypothetical situation. By including the word "can," she insinuates that the action has not occurred but may in the future. The information is made impersonal by using the pronoun "you,"

instead of Colton's name. Thus, Raven removes Tia's agency from the advice and softens the normativity. However, the normative action of considering if Colton is masking his true character is forwarded. This is demonstrated in Tia's response at lines 66 and 67, in which she states that she needs to talk to Colton. In providing a normative action, Tia displays an orientation to Raven's information as advice.

Epistemically, Raven accomplishes authority by confirming Tia's completion and adding more elements. Though Tia made a bid for ownership by producing a candidate completion (line 61), Raven reasserts her knowledge by expanding on her utterance. While Raven agrees that Colton has some good quality traits, she suggests that there is more to the story. This knowledge asymmetry suggests that Tia is lacking some knowledge regarding Colton and solidifies the information as advice. Further, by positioning herself as more knowledgeable about Colton's character, Raven warrants her role as advice giver.

In conclusion, advice-as-information can be difficult to define because the entire sequence must be analyzed to determine if the recipient orients to the information as advice. In the case of Raven and Tia, it is clear that Tia orients to Raven's information that great qualities "can all be masked to who you really are on the inside" (lines 62 and 63) as advice. In stating a normative action at lines 66 and 67, Tia demonstrates that she understood Raven's hypothetical situation as pertaining to her relationship with Colton. Though the normative push was softened in Raven's advice delivery, the epistemic asymmetry is clearly present through her use of a contrast to build onto Tia's candidate completion. Thus, advice-as-information was utilized in this conversation to soften the normative force yet maintain the epistemic asymmetry.

Advice-implicative assessments. By putting forth an assessment or description, assessments can forward advice in a discreet manner. Recipients are not emphasized as the agent, allowing

them to provide alternative future actions (Shaw, 2013). Therefore, the normativity is softened.

However, the epistemic gradient varies based on the interaction. In delivering an advice-

implicative interrogative, the advice giver is claiming equal access to the recipient's assessable

matter (Mikesell et al., 2017). In an effort to reclaim epistemic rights, a second assessment may

be provided by the recipient (Heritage & Raymond, 2005). Therefore, assessments soften

normativity, but the epistemic difference varies.

The following extract begins Raven and Tia's conversation with an assessment about Colton's

character:

Extract 4.4 (0:00 – 0:26)

```
   1    Raven:    <I'm tr:ying to be:: supporti:ve (0.2) but ↑Ti:a,>
   2              (0.7)
→  3    Raven:    I ↓just don't think his intentions ↑are good.
   4              (2.4)
→  5    Raven:    F:irst of al:l,=Col:ton's past dating hi:story has be:en(.)
→  6    Raven:    the it gurl:.
→  7    Raven:    Yur the it gu:rl ↑from yur seas:[on            and he]=
   8    Tia:                                      [((Purses lips))°Yeah.°]
   9    Raven:    =re:ached out to you (0.2)
  10                                    ((instrumental music begins))
  11              and the:n: he went on Be:cca's sea:son(.)and no::w
  12              he['s::↑ba:ck wi:th yo:u like ]
  13    Tia:         [°↓Yeah that's ri:lly:: ri:l]ly:: bad.
→ 14    Raven:    ↑°Obviously° it's rilly ((expletive bleeped out))
```

Raven's first assessment (lines 1-3) sets the tone for the rest of the conversation. To begin,

she says that she is "trying to be supportive but…" (line 1), signaling a contrast to come. In

stating that she is "trying to be supportive," Raven is declaring her intention to look out for Tia's

best interests. However, this positive statement is counterbalanced by a negative one: "I just

don't think his intentions are good" (line 3). As in many contrasts (see Heritage & Clayman, 2011), the second half is projectable based on the word "but" and the pause before delivering the second half. Furthermore, the second half in the contrast is more heavily emphasized than the first (Heritage & Clayman, 2011). This is embodied here because Raven's focus in the conversation is on Colton's intentions, rather than supporting Tia. Thus, Raven's assessment of Colton is clearly delivered as a contrast, signaling the dilemma she is facing as Tia's friend.

Raven's dilemma as a friend is navigating the delicate matter of advising Tia to reconsider her relationship with Colton. Though she wants to be supportive of Tia's happiness, Raven also wants to share her concerns. This is illustrated in her use of a contrast, including an advice-implicative assessment as the second half. Rather than deliver explicit advice straightaway, Raven offers an assessment of Colton's intentions (line 3).

In stating that she does not think Colton's intentions are good, Raven is forwarding the act of Tia reevaluating her relationship. Casting Colton's character as bad suggests that it is in Tia's best interest to move forward, potentially without him. However, Raven does not specifically reference Tia in her assessment or tell her what to do. Therefore, Tia's agency is removed, and she can orient to her own opinion. The normativity in this advice delivery is softened.

Epistemically, Raven is positioning herself as knowledgeable about Colton and his intentions. This is delicate territory because she is assuming equal, if not more, access to Colton's character. This is potentially problematic because Colton is Tia's boyfriend; thus, she has primary rights to evaluating the situation. In offering a first assessment about Colton, Raven claims epistemic primacy. However, she downgrades her epistemic authority by including "think" (line 3). In stating that she doesn't "think" Colton's intentions are good, Raven mitigates her claim and softens the epistemic gradient.

So far, Raven has established her support and provided an advice-implicative assessment. While part of Raven's warrant to give advice may come in the form of her 'doing' friendship through support, she has not expanded on why this assessment is warranted. After a prolonged pause in which agreement or disagreement from Tia was not proffered (line 4), Raven begins to build her case.

In lines 5 through 12, Raven justifies her warrant to give advice and epistemic authority through an account. After Tia's prolonged pause at line 4, Raven begins to justify her assessment that Colton's intentions are not good. Beginning with "first of all," she signals that she has more than one piece of evidence. Then, Raven describes the state of affairs regarding Colton's behavior in relation to her concern (see Pomerantz, 1984). These declarative assertions, such as "Colton's past dating history has been the it girl" (lines 5-6), display no uncertainty. Raven is positioning herself as knowledgeable about Colton's relationship history and, thus, validating her claim. In doing so, she imposes a steep epistemic gradient.

Not only is Raven justifying her assessment of Colton's character, but she also assesses Tia's character in line 7, stating that Tia is "the it girl" from her season. In claiming to know both Colton and Tia's attributes, Raven is asserting epistemic access to both their lives. In response (line 8), Tia's "yeah" does not recognize the information as news, nor does it claim any knowledge. Thus, Tia ratifies Raven's position as advice giver and allows Raven interactional rights to continue delivering her assessment.

Raven continues to provide further justification for her assessment. At line 13, Tia overlaps Raven's talk with an assessment acknowledging that Colton's behavior is bad. In doing so, Tia provides a candidate completion for Raven's utterance (see Lerner, 2004). Cutting in early demonstrates that Tia sees where Raven's turn is going, and she strongly agrees with her point.

By affiliating with Raven's account, Tia also asserts her authoritative knowledge. Stating that Colton's actions were "really, really bad" displays that Tia is already aware of the situation and has a firm grasp on the appropriateness of his conduct.

Raven ratifies Tia's pre-emptive completion by providing an upgraded negative assessment (line 14). Using the words "obviously" and an expletive, Raven pushes Tia to understand just how bad Colton's actions are. By using a confirmation and agreement token (Heritage & Raymond, 2005), Raven conveys that her view of Colton was "really, really bad" even before Tia said so. She also claims epistemic authority and steepens the knowledge asymmetry by implying that Tia does not understand that Colton's actions are beyond "really bad." Thus, she further warrants her advice-implicative assessment given in line 3.

To conclude, Raven's advice-implicative assessment softens the normativity of the advice but establishes a steep epistemic gradient. Not only does Raven provide an assessment of Colton's character, but she also provides evidence to warrant her claim. In this beginning sequence, Raven uses an assessment and evidence to expose Colton's true character to Tia. In doing so, she is automatically claiming epistemic authority by suggesting that Tia does not recognize how "bad" he is. After making her assessment of Colton's character clear, Raven delivers her advice in different formats throughout the remainder of the conversation. However, her following advice still reflects her original assessment and epistemic access to Tia's relationship.

Advice-implicative interrogatives. Interrogatives may be classified as advice when they forward a preferred course of action and invoke an epistemic asymmetry. Dependent upon the question design, an advice-implicative interrogative softens the normativity and knowledge asymmetry to varying degrees. Normativity is softened by allowing the recipient to provide contingencies. Thus, they do not have to accept or reject the advice. Epistemically, the advice

giver displays authority by raising the issue as something the recipient should be thinking about

(Shaw et al., 2015). However, the recipient can claim their own knowledge through their answer

to the question. Therefore, both the normative and epistemic force are mitigated.

   In the following extract, Raven delivers a three-part list of advice-implicative interrogatives.

This comes after her delivery of advice in the imperative format at line 25. Following a silence

from Tia (line 26), Raven expands on her direct advice through the use of interrogatives.

Therefore, it can be inferred that her questions are oriented to by Tia as advice-implicative.

Extract 4.5 (0:46 – 1:00)

```
    25    Raven:     <You ha:ve ta rilly:: se:ek(.)the true> person that Colton is.
    26               (1.7)
 ➔ 27    Raven:     Is this a ↑faça::de? Is he doin jus what >everybody el:se
 ➔ 28    Raven:     ↑wants him to[ do::?<                      ]
    29               (1.0)          [((slight nod from Tia))]
 ➔ 30    Raven:     Or is he ri:lly (1.4) into you.
```

   After advising Tia to "seek the true person that Colton is" (line 25), Raven proposes three

motives for Colton dating Tia. In doing so, she is positioning these questions as something that

Tia should be considering. The normative action being forwarded is for Tia to rethink Colton's

intentions and her relationship with him. Here, the questions are formatted as 'yes/no,' making

acceptance or rejection relevant. Because Raven is not orienting to Tia's contingencies, the

normative dimension is strong. However, Raven does not explicitly state the action she is

advising Tia to do. That, in effect, counterbalances the normative strength and softens the force.

   Raven claims epistemic authority through these interrogatives by positioning herself as

knowing these options may be a possibility for Colton. For example, in asking if Colton is

"doing just what everybody else wants him to do" (lines 27 and 28), Raven is claiming access to

knowing what everyone expects of him. Further, it is evident which questions are positioned as seeking agreement, and which question is seeking a negative answer.

In the first two questions (lines 27 and 28), Raven produces yes/no type interrogatives (YNIs) (Raymond, 2003). These questions can be categorized as YNIs because of their grammatical format (Raymond, 2003) and Raven's rising intonation (Sadock, 2012). Because they are YNIs, a "yes" or "no" answer is relevant (Raymond, 2003).

It could be argued that the format of Raven's first two YNIs prefer a "yes" response. Grammatically, these questions prefer agreement because they are both worded in an affirmative format. (Couper-Kuhlen, 2012; Quirk, Greenbaum, Leech, & Svartvik, 1985). The polarity of these YNIs prefer "yes," and the action-type preference prefers agreement (Raymond, 2003), thus seeking alignment with Raven's stance. Therefore, it appears Raven is seeking the answer "yes" to the first two questions.

However, in the third, alternative question, Raven's slowed speed, prolonged pause between "Or is he really" and "into you" (line 30), and falling intonation show that she disaffiliates with this as being a polar question. Rather, it seems to be more of a declarative, in which falling intonation is more likely (Couper-Kuhlen, 2012). Through this formation, Raven accomplishes her epistemic stance by formatting her question not as seeking an answer, but instead, making an assertion (Koshik, 2005). The pause before "into you" (line 30) shows that Raven disaffiliates with this assertion as being a likely option. Likewise, a negative answer is expected, influenced by the incorporation of the intensifier "really" (Quirk et al., 1985). Therefore, Raven's question at line 30 accomplishes epistemic authority by packaging an assertion as a question that prefers a negative answer.

Through this interrogative sequence, Raven delivers a list of three questions that can be oriented to as advice. These questions can be considered advice-implicative interrogatives because they forward a normative action (for Tia to reassess Colton's motives), and they invoke an epistemic asymmetry. Advice-implicative interrogatives are an ambiguous way to deliver advice by softening the normativity and knowledge asymmetry. However, although the normative force is softened because Raven does not advise on a defined future action, the epistemic gradient is only slightly softened. While questions allow the recipient to assert their own knowledge, Tia does not take that opportunity in this sequence. Further, in formatting the final interrogative as a dispreferred assertion, Raven makes it clear how she views the state of affairs in question. By even questioning Colton's intentions, Raven is claiming epistemic authority by raising this issue as something important Tia should be considering. Therefore, the use of advice-implicative interrogatives in this sequence functions to soften normativity but only minimally soften the epistemic gradient.

Personal experience. To establish expertise and commonalities, a speaker may deliver advice in the form of personal experience. Personal stories or examples often help frame the argument for following a particular plan of action, legitimizing the credibility of the advice (Lindholm, 2017). While the normativity and epistemic asymmetry are softened, the advice giver still projects themselves as an expert in the matter (Goldsmith & Fitch, 1997). However, the recipient can offer their own point of view, and they may or may not orient to the talk as advice.

A crucial sequence in this conversation comes after Raven has advised Tia to seek out Colton's true character. In this example, Raven uses her personal experience to clearly establish her warrant to give advice and epistemic authority, as shown below:

Extract 4.6 (1:03 – 1:1

```
32    Raven:      #I'm ↑gonna get emo(h)t(.h)°ion(al)° [hhuh ↑huh ↑↑huh] .hhh
33    Tia:                                              [Sto:::::p      ]
→  34 Raven:      #↑I want you to find someone tha:t (1.9) tre:ats you (2.0)
35    Raven:      like A:dam treats m:e.=
```

Here, the advice to "find someone that treats you like Adam treats me" draws heavily on Raven's personal experience and emotion.

To begin, Raven shows that she orients to this topic as serious by displaying her emotion at line 32. This functions as a way to signal genuine and significant advice is to come, and that her prior advice should also be taken seriously. Crying during interaction may include breaking away from the talk and focusing on the crying itself (Hepburn & Potter, 2012), as Raven does here. Tia's stretched response with rising pitch of "stop" is a typical sympathy token (Hepburn & Potter, 2012), and indicates that Tia is hearably trying to soothe Raven. This is interesting because the main issue at hand (Tia's relationship) is Tia's epistemic domain. However, she is not the one crying yet; rather Raven is expressing emotional investment in Tia's life. In turn, this display of emotion contributes to Raven's warrant to deliver advice because she is taking the problem seriously. The laugh particles interjected in the crying lessen the seriousness of the situation, but Raven's crying still displays her epistemic access and warrant to give advice.

Following her emotional declaration, Raven delivers the advice that she wants Tia to find someone that treats her the way that Adam (Raven's boyfriend) treats her (lines 34-35). Here, Raven uses her own relationship to establish expertise. Packaged within this utterance is Raven's orientation to her own relationship as successful and the idea that Tia's relationship should be similar to it. The epistemic asymmetry is very clear; Raven is in the position of 'K+' (see Heritage, 2010), because she has a boyfriend, and Tia is in the position of 'K-' because she does

not. Therefore, Raven builds her warrant to give advice by establishing herself as an expert

because she is in a 'successful' relationship.

Also of interest is that Raven begins her advice delivery with "I want." This displays her

orientation to Tia as someone who should potentially care about what she wants. She is

demonstrating her personal investment in Tia's happiness. Dependent upon if Tia's feelings are

reciprocal, the normativity of the advice may be high or low. However, based on the sequence, it

can be deduced that Tia orients to the advice as normative.

Finally, lines 32 through 35 embody elements of persuasion. Through both the reference to

Adam and the inclusion of "I want," Raven orients to a shared closeness with Tia. Further, she

has displayed that she is emotionally invested in the situation. These actions function as

persuasion by building a personal stake in Tia's relationship and drawing similarities. In using

her own experience, Raven identifies with Tia in sharing the common interest of wanting to be in

a 'good' relationship. By aligning her own relationship status with Tia's future, Raven is

persuading through identification (see Burke, 1969).

In sum, this sequence clearly demonstrates the use of personal experience as a warrant to give

advice. By referencing her own relationship, Raven positions herself as knowledgeable and

credible in giving relationship advice. Through drawing similarities between Tia and herself,

Raven also uses her personal experience to persuade. Finally, this sequence embodies Raven and

Tia's friendship through an orientation to caring about one another's wants and happiness.

'If-then' construct. The 'if-then construct' functions as way to forward a favorable outcome,

contingent upon the recipient's actions. Both the epistemic asymmetry and normativity are

softened, by allowing the recipient to provide their own insight and alternative actions. This is

illustrated in the following example:

Extract 4.7 (1:43 – 1:53)

```
49    Raven:      And if there is a dou:bt or a que:stion in your mi:nd you have
50                (0.2) to acknowle:dge ↑it [ (0.2)                          ]
51                                       [((slight nods from Tia))]
52                and liste:n to your <God (.) given> woman intuition.=
```

Here, Raven forwards the action of Tia listening to her intuition as contingent upon there being a "doubt or question" in her mind. By formatting the advice as an 'if-then' construct and hypothetical situation, Raven is allowing Tia to orient to a possible contingency and removing the favorability of a commitment or rejection of the advice. Although Raven does not explicitly connect listening to her intuition to a positive outcome, it goes unsaid that by acknowledging any doubt, Tia can remove herself from a negative relationship. Though a favorable action and outcome is forwarded, Tia still has the option of providing alternative options. Thus, the normativity is softened.

Epistemically, Raven mitigates the force of her imperative (line 49 and 50, "have to") by providing a contingency before the advice. Tia is not constricted to agree or disagree, but, rather, she can offer her own knowledge. Being as Tia's "mind" (line 49) is something only she has access to, Raven is lessening her epistemic rights. However, by positioning that there may be doubts or questions in Tia's mind, Raven is raising this as a possibility Tia should be aware of.

Although the epistemic gradient is softened, the advice is still cast as a topic of importance, especially when Raven reference's Tia's "God-given woman intuition" (line 52). This is interesting to note because a) it displays that Raven is knowledgeable about Tia's religious beliefs, and b) integrating God and intuition into the advice makes it more difficult for Tia to reject it. By incorporating a higher power into the advice, Raven is orienting to Tia's belief in

God and, more or less, saying that Tia's intuition will be solid enough to make a decision based on. Similar to an idiomatic formula, referencing "God-given woman intuition" interactionally minimizes resistance because it is hard to directly counter (Hepburn & Potter, 2011). Further, the emphasis that Raven places on "<u>God</u> (.) <u>giv</u>en w<u>om</u>an int<u>ui</u>tion.," rate at which she slows down, and falling intonation signals that she is moving towards topic closure. This is solidified by the editors' choice to cut the scene after this sequence and transition to a monologue by Tia.

To conclude, Raven's use of an 'if-then' format allows Tia to orient to contingencies by producing just one possible course of action. The normativity and epistemic asymmetry are softened, yet Raven still positions herself as knowledgeable by suggesting that there may be doubts in Tia's mind. Finally, by advising Tia to listen to her "God given woman intuition," Raven makes it difficult for Tia to reject the advice.

Responses to Advice

In responding to advice, a speaker reflects a varying degree of perceived normative push and knowledge asymmetry. Recipient response functions as a way to: (a) ratify the advice giver's position as advice giver; (b) reclaim competence; (c) accept or reject advice; and (d) provide possible contingencies. Thus, the recipient co-constructs the advice sequence through their turns and orientation to the talk. This is demonstrated in Tia's turns through her ratification of Raven's role as advice giver and, mainly, implicit resistance of the advice. However, there are also instances in which Tia accepts and rejects the advice. These responses will be examined in the following section.

Unmarked acknowledgments. Unlike accepting or rejecting, unmarked acknowledgments provide little to no acknowledgment of the advice. The speaker does not align themselves with

the content of the advice or the role of advice recipient. They also do not register the advice as

news. In doing so, unmarked acknowledgments implicitly resist advice (Heritage & Sefi, 1992).

This type of advice may present as silence or minimal response tokens, such as "yeah" or "mm"

(Heritage & Lindstrom, 2012; Heritage & Sefi, 1992; Shaw, 2013).

   Throughout Tia and Raven's conversation, Tia most frequently uses her turns to provide

minimal response tokens or silence. This is interesting because unmarked acknowledgments

often occur in situations where the recipient's morals or competence are not at stake. In the case

of Tia, her character and relationship are both at stake. Her judgment in Colton's character is in

jeopardy, making Raven's advice and evidence face-threatening. For instance, in the following

extract, Tia is silent after Raven provides a negative assessment of Colton:

Extract 5.1 (0.0 – 0.9)

```
1    Raven:     <I'm tr:ying to be:: supporti:ve (0.2) but ↑Ti:a,>
2               (0.7)
3    Raven:     I ↓just don't think his intentions ↑are good.
→4              (2.4)
```

   Here, Raven delivers an advice-implicative assessment. Although she mitigates the force of

her assessment with "think," this utterance is still negatively assessing Tia's current boyfriend.

As such, it is potentially face-threatening by questioning Tia's knowledge of Colton's intentions.

Further, it is portraying someone close to Tia in a negative light. Rather than provide a rebuttal

or claim of competence, Tia does not offer any acknowledgment.

   In an institutional setting, Kinnell and Maynard (1996) found that unmarked

acknowledgments and silence are the most frequent response. This could be because recipients

are orienting to the advice giver as an expert with interactional rights to deliver advice (Heritage

& Sefi, 1992). In this sequence, Raven opens with "I'm trying to be supportive…," establishing

her role as a friend. By not responding to Raven's advice implicative-assessment, Tia seems to be orienting to Raven's 'friend' role as a warrant to give advice. Therefore, similar to an institutional role as a warrant for advice, Raven has the right to deliver advice. Although this conversation is being analyzed as mundane, different 'roles' are still embodied in the talk, including the role of a friend.

Shortly after Tia's unmarked acknowledgment at line 4, she produces another through the "yeah" at line 8:

Extract 5.2 (0:9 – 0:17)

```
5    Raven:     F:irst of al:l,=Col:ton's past dating hi:story has be:en(.)
6    Raven:     the it gurl:.
7    Raven:     Yur the it gu:rl ↑from yur sea:[on              and he]=
8    Tia:                                     [((Purses lips))°Yeah.°]
9    Raven:     =re:ached out to you (0.2)
```

Here, Raven is providing an account and evidence for her negative assessment of Colton's intentions. Tia's "yeah" does not register Raven's account as news. Instead, it demonstrates that Tia is knowledgeable about Colton's past. However, it also ratifies Raven's epistemic stance and allows her the interactional rights to continue. This is also somewhat surprising, given that Raven is stepping on Tia's knowledge domain and claiming access to Colton and Tia's relationship. However, this could also be building off Raven's warrant to deliver advice through her role as 'friend.'

Later in the conversation, Tia provides unmarked acknowledgment at a number of transition relevance places. For example, in the following extract, Raven's utterances are consistently met with silence:

Extract 5.3 (0:35 – 1:07)

```
18    Tia:        =>it [just feels right.]<
19    Raven:         [↑All of his act:ions](.)h:ave: ↓said somethin different.
 →20               (2.0)
21    Raven:      I'm r:illy conce:rned.
22    Raven:      I do not want to see::[(.) yo:u in heartbreak.      ]
 →23                                    [((very slight nods from Tia))]
 →24               (2.4)
25    Raven:      <You ha:ve ta rilly:: se:ek(.)the true> person that Colton is.
 →26               (1.7)
27    Raven:      Is this a ↑faça::de? Is he doin jus what >everybody el:se
28    Raven:      ↑wants him to[ do::?<                    ]
 →29               (1.0)        [((slight nod from Tia))]
30    Raven:      Or is he ri:lly (1.4) into you.
 →31               (4.4) ((slight nods from Tia))
32    Raven:      #I'm ↑gonna get emo(h)t(.h)°ion(al)° [hhuh ↑huh ↑↑huh] .hhh
```

This sequence comes after Raven has delivered an advice-implicative assessment and account regarding Colton's intentions. In response, Tia claimed that she is good at reading Colton and "it just feels right" (line 18). Line 19 is where Raven cuts in to state that Colton's "actions have said something different."

In stating that "all" of his actions have told a different story, Raven is making a bold epistemic claim regarding Colton. She is claiming access to all of Colton's actions and assessing them from a point of epistemic primacy. Further, Raven overlaps Tia's talk about how it "feels right" (line 18) to get her point across. Thus, it is somewhat surprising that Tia offers no talk at line 20. Whereas she could have reasserted her claim about her feelings or initiated repair after Raven's interruption, she is silent for a full 2 seconds. Implicitly, this functions as resistance to Raven's assertion. However, it also allows Raven to maintain her role as knowledgeable.

After Tia's delay, Raven self-selects herself as speaker again, delivering advice in the 'if-then' format at line 22. Here, she ambiguously delivers advice by implying that if Tia stays with Colton, then she may end up in heartbreak. By stating her worries, Raven warrants her advice as coming from a "concerned" friend (line 21). This helps justify her delivery of assessments and advice throughout the conversation. However, by sharing her concern, Raven is positioning herself as knowing something that perhaps Tia does not.

In response to Raven's concern and implicit advice, Tia is silent for 2.4 seconds (line 24). Because Tia's competence and judgement are at stake, it is noteworthy that she does not offer any verbal feedback. By remaining silent, Tia makes no claims of competence in knowing Colton's intentions better than Raven. On the other hand, her unmarked acknowledgment implicitly resists Raven's advice. If Tia accepted Raven's concern, she would be positioning herself as an advice recipient and accepting that heartbreak is a potential. Instead, her silence does not endorse the concern as warranted or that heartbreak is a potential.

However, Tia's very slight nods at line 23 must be taken into account. While Tia's silence functions as implicit resistance, her nods counteract that resistance. This embodies Tia's orientation to Raven in the 'friend' role. While Tia may not want to align with the implicit advice, she is still acknowledging Raven's warrant to deliver it. Further, her nodding begins before Raven even finishes her sentence. This demonstrates that Tia projects Raven's concern is coming, and she is affiliating with her stance. The dilemma of positioning herself as advice recipient and acknowledging Raven's role as a 'concerned friend' is encapsulated in Tia's response.

After waiting for Tia to acknowledge her concern at line 24, Raven self-selects and delivers advice in the imperative format at line 25. Raven orients to Tia's silence at line 24 as resistance

by reformulating her advice with a stronger normative action. Further, she includes the intensifier "really" (Quirk et al., 1985), displaying that she expects a dispreferred response. In using the imperative format, Raven is no longer trying to ambiguously deliver advice. Although she has, more or less, said the same thing throughout the sequence thus far, line 25 is the first time she explicitly delivers advice. This may be because she is seeking commitment or rejection from Tia, and she has not received that yet. Further, Tia's nods at line 23 ratified Raven's role as a 'friend' and her warrant to continue. Thus, Raven is treating acceptance as the relevant next action and claiming her role as 'friend' as a warrant to continue.

After Raven delivers explicit advice, Tia's competence and judgment are at stake. Raven is forwarding the idea that Tia does not know the true person that Colton is, yet Tia remains silent at line 26. Unlike line 23, Tia does not nod or display any sign of agreement. Thus, this unmarked acknowledgement does not align with the advice or position Tia as the advice recipient. Because agreement is preferred, Tia is implicitly resisting the advice.

Raven orients to Tia's silence at line 26 as resistance, as shown in her account beginning in line 27. After hearing Tia's silence as dispreferred, Raven expands on her prior turn with possible contingencies. This allows Tia options beyond accepting or rejecting. Raven's first two questions focus on the potential of Colton having disingenuous intentions, whereas her last (line 30) contrasts the prior two with a positive option. Interestingly, Tia nods slightly during Raven's second question, in which she asks if Colton is "doing just what everybody else wants him to do" (lines 27 and 28). As before, this nod is important to analyze because it displays Tia's alignment and affiliation with Raven's talk.

Nodding is a sign of access to the teller's stance and affiliation with their perspective (Stivers, 2008). Likewise, it minimizes the risk of interfering with the telling (Stivers, 2008). In this case,

Tia's nod comes during Raven's second question (lines 28 and 29). While this can be analyzed

as Tia acknowledging Raven's stance and affiliating with her concern, it may also be because Tia

is predicting a contrast in a three-part list of questions. Nodding mid-telling can be understood as

"forecasting a likely affiliative stance" at completion (Stivers, 2008, p. 53). Thus, if Tia foresees

a contrast to the first two negative questions coming, she could be forecasting her affiliation with

the positive final question.

This is further solidified because there is a delay between Raven's second and third questions,

in which Tia could have spoken. However, by only nodding, Tia could be withholding talk in

hopes that Raven will produce a positive contrast. Sure enough, Raven ends her series of

interrogatives with the only positive option. Following that, there is a lengthy delay of 4.4

seconds (line 31), coupled with slight nodding from Tia. By not speaking, Tia may be hoping

that Raven expands on her final, positive theme.

Raven does not expand on her final point though, and, instead, self-selects after the 4.4

second pause. This comes after Tia does not verbally affiliate with any of her three

interrogatives. Rather, Tia provides a dispreferred response by only nodding (line 31). Nodding

at the end of a telling is often treated as problematic (Stivers, 2008). In fact, nodding at

completion may be treated as disaligning and disaffiliative (Stivers, 2008). Recipients orient to

nodding in the final position as problematic by either upgrading to a vocal affiliative response or

shifting to vocal assessments (Stivers, 2008). However, Tia does neither of those two things.

Thus, Raven orients to Tia's turn as problematic by self-selecting again at line 32.

Shortly after, Tia reveals to Raven that she has been emotional and upset over her relationship

with Colton. This results in the following extract, in which multiple unmarked acknowledgments

are present:

Extract 5.4 (1:23 – 1:53)

```
40    Raven:     =You are #↑so: #↑deser:ving Tia.
→ 41             (1.1) ((slight nods from Tia))
42    Raven:     Like e(h)verythi:ng you've be:en throu:gh,
→ 43             (1.1)
44    Raven:     And the perso:n that you a::re, and how beau:tifu:l you a::re,
45    Raven:     You should not settle for ANYthi:ng less than someone who
46    Raven:     mirrors the best part of you.
→ 47             [(2.7)]
48              [((camera zooms in on Raven and Tia clutching hands))]
49    Raven:     And if there is a dou:bt or a que:stion in your mi:nd you have
50              (0.2) to acknowle:dge ↑it [ (0.2)                    ]
51                                        [((slight nods from Tia))]
52              and liste:n to your <God (.) given> woman intuition.=
→ 53  Tia:       =Yeah:h.((slight nod))
```

Here, Raven delivers advice in the imperative format at line 45. Prior to that, Raven delivered an
assessment and account to support her assessment. After Raven's assessment that Tia is
deserving (line 40), Tia responds with silence and slight nods. Although her silence functions as
an unmarked acknowledgment that neither confirms or disconfirms Raven's assessment, her
nodding aligns with Raven's utterance and forecasts an affiliative stance (Stivers, 2008).
However, there is evidence that Raven orients to Tia's silence as disagreement or probable
disagreement (Pomerantz, 1984), as shown in her justification of her assessment in lines 42
through 44.

Following Tia's silence (line 41), Raven begins to expand on her assessment by referencing
everything that Tia has "been through" (line 42). Again, Tia does not assert her epistemic
authority, nor does she agree or disagree. Unlike prior instances though, this sequence is not
face-threatening to Tia. In remaining silent, her competence is not at stake. Instead, Tia's silence
may be interpreted as forecasting that Raven is going to continue with a three-part list of positive

qualities. Indeed, after Tia's silence, Raven produces two more positive qualities. Although Raven is claiming epistemic access to Tia's character by alluding to the "person" that she is (line 44), she is doing so in a complimentary way. Thus, a claim of competence is not sequentially relevant. Rather, a response to Raven's compliments is in order.

Pomerantz (1978) suggests that recipients of compliments are constrained in their response because agreement as acceptance is the preferred response, yet accepting could be viewed as self-praise. Therefore, appreciation tokens, such as "thank you," are frequently offered to accept the compliment (Pomerantz, 1978). Though agreement and acceptance are the preferred response to a compliment, rejection is more common, in order to avoid self-praise (Pomerantz, 1978). While questioning or downgrading the compliment, shifting evaluation, deflecting, or returning the compliment are common (Pomerantz, 1978), Tia does none of these actions.

In remaining silent after Raven's assessments, Tia neither accepts nor rejects the compliments, resulting in a dispreferred response. This may be because Tia is acknowledging the assessments as a pre-sequence to advice, and she is allowing Raven to continue. Likewise, Tia is orienting to Raven as friend. In the role of 'friend,' compliments and positive assessments may be more expected, therefore, not requiring a response. Finally, Tia's silence may be interpreted as implicit disagreement to avoid the role of advice recipient. If Tia were to accept Raven's compliments, she would also be accepting that she is deserving of more than Colton. Therefore, in orienting to Raven's compliments as an advice-implicative assessment, Tia's unmarked acknowledgment does not align with the content or role of advice recipient.

Following her assessments, Raven delivers advice in the imperative format at lines 45 and 46. Again, Tia responds with an unmarked acknowledgment, remaining silent (line 47). Although Raven delivers her advice in a non-face-threatening manner, Tia's competence is at stake. In

advising Tia "not to settle" (line 45), Raven is raising the possibility that Tia may be settling for

Colton. Thus, Raven is claiming to have more knowledge than Tia about her relationship.

Though this is impeding on Tia's epistemic domain, Tia does not explicitly reject the advice.

However, her silence functions as implicit resistance. In implicitly, rather than explicitly,

resisting the advice, Tia is orienting to Raven as a 'concerned friend.' Tia does not threaten

Raven's face by blatantly rejecting her advice; rather, her silence maintains her disalignment as

advice recipient and implicitly resists the advice in a non-threatening way.

Tia's silence ratifies Raven's role as advice giver, allowing Raven to expand on her utterance

by using an 'if-then' advice delivery in line 49. In formatting her advice to include contingencies

and a hypothetical situation, Raven makes it difficult for Tia to reject the advice. After the first

half of her advice (lines 49 and 50), there is a slight 0.2 second silence, in which Tia nods. In

doing do, Tia acknowledges Raven's stance and affiliates with Raven's advice to acknowledge

any doubts or questions. In affiliating with this portion of advice, Tia is agreeing to a

hypothetical and conditional normative action. If she does not have any doubts or questions, then

she has nothing new to acknowledge. Thus, although Raven is raising the issue of having doubts,

Tia is not relinquishing a great amount of epistemic authority.

In the second half of Raven's advice, she advises Tia to listen to her "God-given, woman

intuition" (line 52). Like the first half, this is difficult to explicitly reject. Because Raven makes

it vague and does not explicitly reference Colton, it is unlikely that Tia will disagree. Therefore,

it is not surprising when Tia responds to Raven's advice with "yeah" (line 53). Though this is an

unmarked acknowledgment, the implicit resistance is counteracted by Tia's nods immediately

after. While Tia does not offer any type of commitment, her nods affiliate with Raven's advice.

Finally, the last example of unmarked acknowledgment from Tia comes at the end of the sequence, after Raven suggests that Colton's "great qualities" may be masking his true self (lines 62 and 63). Although Tia initially responds with a yeah, she self-selects after a 1 second pause to further accept Raven's advice. Thus, she ends the conversation by accepting the role of advice recipient.

Overall, Tia's unmarked acknowledgments are interesting because they repetitively occur in this sequence. Normatively, she is implicitly resisting Raven's advice by not offering any commitment. However, the addition of nods mitigates the resistance. Epistemically, Tia is not accepting the position of advice recipient, but she is also not asserting her epistemic authority. Therefore, Raven is ratified in her role as advice giver and given the rights to continue.

Partial acceptance. To partially accept advice, a speaker may align with the content of the advice but resist the position of advice recipient. This positions the recipient as knowledgeable and the advice as unnecessary. Speakers can establish knowledge in a variety of ways, including "claiming prior commitment" (Shaw, 2013),

To claim prior commitment, speakers may claim 'firstness' in agreement (Shaw, 2013). This involves the speaker declaring that they were aware of the advice being put forth, even before the advice giver brought it up. This is illustrated in the following extract, in which Tia claims 'firstness' at line 13:

Extract 5.5 (0:13 – 0:25)

```
7    Raven:    Yur the it gu:rl ↑from yur seas:[on           and he]=

8    Tia:                                      [((Purses lips))°Yeah.°]

9    Raven:    =re:ached out to you (0.2)

10                                   ((instrumental music begins))

11             and the:n: he went on Be:cca's sea:son(.)and no::w

12             he['s::↑ba:ck wi:th yo:u like ]

13   Tia:        [°↓Yeah that's ri:lly:: ri:l]ly:: bad.

14   Raven:    ↑°Obviously° it's rilly ((expletive bleeped out))
```

Here, Raven is providing justification for why she thinks that Colton does not have good intentions. Before she can finish though, Tia overlaps Raven's talk in stating that Colton's actions have been "really, really bad" (line 13). By cutting in early, Tia shows strong agreement with where she sees that Raven's utterance is headed (Lerner, 2004; Pomerantz, 1984). In providing a pre-emptive completion, Tia may also be attempting to bring the turn to a close (Lerner, 2004) to avoid discussing more of Colton's negative actions.

By claiming that she already viewed Colton's actions as bad, Tia is not orienting to Raven's account as news. This accomplishes epistemic authority on Tia's behalf by claiming 'firstness.' In providing this assessment, Tia is affiliating with the account but resisting the role of advice recipient. She is demonstrating that she is aware that Colton's actions are bad, and she is knowledgeable enough to make her own decisions. Overall, Tia is showing Raven that she is competent and aware of the situation.

However, Raven counters Tia's claim to epistemic authority with an intensified, negative assessment in the form of "obviously" (line 14). Raven's "obviously" diminishes Tia's knowledge claim by insinuating that it is very clear to everyone that Colton's actions are bad. No specialized access or insight is needed to make this observation.

In response to this epistemic back-and-forth, Tia makes a claim of competence regarding Colton's actions in lines 15 through 18. This functions as a way to align with the content of the advice but reclaim epistemic authority, thus resisting the role of advice recipient. The following extract illustrates this:

Extract 5.6 (0:22 – 0:38)

```
   13   Tia:        [°↓Yeah that's ri:lly:: ri:l]ly:: bad.
   14   Raven:    ↑°Obviously° it's rilly ((expletive bleeped out))
 →15   Tia:        ↑I KNO:W: but like(.)I ho:nestly: am good at reading hi::m,
   16               (0.7)
 →17   Tia:        and at rea:ding peopl:e and #I-I ↓don't know=
 →18   Tia:        =>it [just feels right.]<
   19   Raven:         [↑All of his act:ions](.)h:ave: ↓said somethin different.
```

In line 14, Raven provides an upgraded second assessment. In doing so, she claims epistemic rights and positions her opinion as being "settled" prior to Tia's evaluation (Heritage & Raymond, 2005). Tia orients to it as such and counters with her own claim of knowledge. Lines 13 through 15 display a sort of epistemic tug-of-war, in which Tia and Raven counteract one another's epistemic claims. Tia begins with her assessment in line 13, demonstrating that she is knowledgeable about Colton's actions. However, Raven's upgraded assessment reclaims epistemic authority. Finally, Tia negates this accomplishment with a strong claim of competence in line 15.

In the utterance "I know" (line 15), Tia asserts her knowledge and rebalances the epistemic asymmetry. She is accepting the content of the advice and establishing that this is not news to her. At the same time, she is reclaiming epistemic authority and rejecting the role of advice recipient. Essentially, Tia is positioning the advice as unnecessary.

The structure of Tia's response is also telling of her orientation towards Raven's assessment. Her agreement plus disagreement, exhibited in "I know but…" (line 15) functions as disagreement overall. Further, it is constructed as a contrast, displaying Tia's inner dilemma. She knows that Colton's actions do not speak well for him, but, at the same time, she is "good at reading him" (line 15). Likewise, in explaining that she is good at reading Colton and people, Tia is providing an account to support her claim of competence. This justification for her actions embodies the dilemma that Tia is orienting to. Because Tia knows that Colton's actions are bad, she rationalizes why she is staying with him.

Providing an account also allows Tia to reclaim her epistemic authority. She does so in stating that she is not only good at reading Colton, but people in general (line 17). Tia's ability to read people is something that only she has access to, making it difficult for Raven to rebuke. Further, she strengthens her claim with the inclusion of "honestly" (line 15), emphasizing the significance of her ability and projecting her epistemic access.

In asserting that she is "good at reading him, and at reading people" and it "just feels right" (lines 15-18), Tia produces a three-part list, including a generalizer to end her account. This functions a persuasive tool in convincing Raven that Tia is making the right decision. Further, at lines 17 and 18, Tia states "I-I don't know, it just feels right." Like her ability to read people, Tia's feelings are not accessible to Raven, making it difficult for her to directly argue with. In using her feelings as evidence, Tia claims knowledge about what is "right" and what is not in a romantic relationship. She is orienting to herself as a unique case; one that Raven cannot understand. Thus, she is reclaiming epistemic authority.

After Raven's critique of Colton's actions (line 14), it is perhaps not surprising that Tia responds with an assertion of knowledge. Shaw and Hepburn's (2013) findings about the moral

element of advice giving suggest that when there is a critical dimension to the advice, recipients

are more likely to respond with a strong claim of knowledge. This is especially true when the

criticism is directed towards a social responsibility or the "recipient's conduct in relation to

another person" (Shaw & Hepburn, 2013, p. 353). Here, Tia's relationship with Colton is the

target of Raven's advice. In making a claim of competence and providing an account, Tia is

orienting to Raven's advice as questioning her judgment. Therefore, Tia's response functions as

a way to preserve her reputation.

   After discussing Colton's intentions and displaying her emotion, Raven delivers advice based

on personal experience at line 34. Here, she uses her own relationship as a warrant to give

advice. Tia responds in lines 36 through 39 with an assertion of knowledge, as illustrated below:

Extract 5.7 (1:04 – 1:26)

```
32    Raven:    #I'm ↑gonna get emo(h)t(.h)°ion(al)° [hhuh ↑huh ↑↑huh] .hhh
33    Tia:                                            [Sto:::::p      ]
34    Raven:    #↑I want you to find someone tha:t (1.9) tre:ats you (2.0)
35    Raven:    like A:dam treats m:e.=
→36   Tia:      =#↑↑°°I know:°° °and like you don't° (0.9).h you don't know
→37   Tia:      how much I've >cri:ed and been emo:tional and upse:t over that
→38   Tia:      because I know that I deserve ↑that and I know that I want
→39   Tia:      ↑that?<=
40    Raven:    =You are #↑so: #↑deser:ving Tia.
```

First, Tia asserts her knowledge with the words "I know," which accomplishes her epistemic

authority and establishes that this is not news. She is agreeing that she wants someone that treats

her like Adam treats Raven, but she is rejecting the role of advice recipient. Not only does Tia

claim her own competence, but she directly challenges Raven's epistemic access by saying "you

don't know…" (lines 36 and 37). In stating "I know and…you don't know" (line 36), Tia

provides a strong statement to reconfigure the epistemic asymmetry. For the first time in the conversation, Tia is directly addressing Raven's access to the relationship.

Further, Tia is referencing her emotions, which is her own territory of knowledge. In stating that she has "cried and been emotional and upset" (line 37) over Colton, Tia is establishing her epistemic authority by providing evidence of something that Ravens is not privy to. Tia has independent access to her emotions, and she is clear in pointing that out. In doing so, she also uses a three-part list. This could, perhaps, be evidence of Tia trying to persuade Raven of her competence regarding the situation. Tia is aware that Colton's actions have been questionable, and that is reflected in her emotion. Thus, she is displaying that she is in a position of competence, where she has access to clearly evaluate the events.

Tia also demonstrates emotion through the quality of her voice. Prior to Tia's assertion of knowledge, Raven uttered that she was "gonna get emotional" (line 32), to which Tia replied "sto:::::p" (line 33). Tia's immediate response at line 33 is stretched and typical of a sympathy token, doing little to acknowledge the content of Raven's feelings (Hepburn & Potter, 2012). However, at line 36, Tia's voice is inflected with crying. Rather than respond to Raven's crying empathically, Tia demonstrates her entitlement to the events through her own claims of emotion (Hepburn & Potter, 2012). Through her softer tone, creaky delivery, and elevated pitch, Tia interactionally signals her epistemic access to the emotion. While Raven may be emotional, Tia is establishing that she has the primary rights to being upset (see Sacks, 1984).

After stating that Raven does not know the extent of her emotional investment, Tia goes on to explain why she has felt these emotions. In line 38, Tia asserts that she is deserving and wanting of a relationship like Raven and Adam's. Here, it is evident that Tia is orienting to Raven and

Adam's relationship as successful and something to work towards. In doing so, Tia is ratifying Raven's warrant to give advice.

Although Tia is upholding Raven's warrant to deliver advice, Tia's claims accomplish epistemic authority through the repeated use of "I know" (line 38). In stating "I know that I deserve that, and I know that I want that," Tia is displaying that she is knowledgeable about relationships and her worth. Further, she is establishing that Raven's advice is not news to her. Tia was aware of her worth prior to her conversation with Raven. Overall, in lines 36 through 39, Tia is establishing that only she has epistemic access to her emotions and inner-self.

To conclude, advice may be partially accepted when the recipient aligns with the content of the advice but rejects the role of advice recipient. This is illustrated in Tia's responses through second assessments and claims of 'firstness.' Using the phrase "I know" as a claim of 'firstness' displays Tia's affiliation with the advice content but establishes that it is not new information to her. By treating Raven's utterances as non-news and non-normative, Tia is rejecting the position of advice recipient. Thus, Tia maintains her position as knowledgeable about the advisable action.

Rejection. Unlike partial acceptance and unmarked acknowledgments, rejection of advice includes explicitly rejecting the content of the advice. Because this is a dispreferred response, rejections are often mitigated (Silverman, 1997). This is illustrated in the following extract:

Extract 5.8 (1:43 – 2:29)

```
49    Raven:     And if there is a dou:bt or a que:stion in your mi:nd you have
50               (0.2) to acknowle:dge ↑it [ (0.2)                          ]
51                                        [((slight nods from Tia))]
52               and liste:n to your <God (.) given> woman intuition.=
53    Tia:       =Yeah:h.((slight nod))
54               ((Unknown length of pause. Camera shot goes to Tia monologue))
55    Tia:       >And I know where you're comi:ng fro:m,< it's jus: har:d (.)
56               because I have had a-a rill[y:::              ]good ti:me=
57    Raven:                                [>°really good time.°<]
58    Tia:       =↑with him,=
```

In lines 55 through 58, Tia responds to Raven's advice to follow her "God-given woman intuition" (line 52). Though Tia does not reject the advice with a "no," she also does not affiliate with the content or role of advice recipient. However, she mitigates the rejection by hedging and providing an exceptional circumstance (Heritage, 19884). By rejecting the advice with an exceptional circumstance, Tia is still orienting to the value of Raven's advice.

First, Tia hedges her response by clearly acknowledging Raven's stance in saying "I know where you're coming from" (line 55). This softens the epistemic gradient and Tia's rejection of the recipient role. Then, Tia provides an account in stating that "it's just hard" because she has had a good time (lines 56 and 57). Providing this exceptional circumstance works to reject the content of the advice. Still, Tia mitigates the force of her account. By using the word 'just,' she minimizes the impact that "hard" carries (Shaw, 2013). In stating that she has had a good time, Tia is also affiliating with Raven's concern regarding the negative impacts of being in a relationship with Colton. Thus, Tia is not taking a firm stance in her rejection.

Though rejection is uncommon, this example demonstrates how it can be mitigated and implicitly delivered. Tia does not explicitly reject the advice, but she also does not align with the

content of the advice or the role of advice recipient. She accounts for an exceptional

circumstance to implicitly reject Raven's advice. Overall, Tia manages her rejection to preserve

the agreement preference by using hedging and an account.

   Acceptance. Acceptance in advice sequences involves the recipient orienting to the proposed

action as advice and accepting it as such. In doing so, they place themselves in the role of advice

recipient. Often, speakers are hesitant to fill the role of 'advice recipient' because, in doing so,

they are acknowledging that they lack a piece of knowledge (Heritage & Sefi, 1992; Shaw,

2013). Thus, advice is most commonly accepted when the recipient's competence is not

threatened or when they have already established that they are lacking a piece of knowledge

(Shaw, 2013).

   In Raven and Tia's conversation, Tia does not accept the content of the advice and role of

advice recipient until the end of the sequence. After Raven shares her concerns and delivers

advice in multiple formats, Tia commits to Raven's proposed normative action. This can be seen

in the following extract:

Extract 5.9 (2:29 – 2:52)

```
   59   Raven:    =↑Yeah he is >incre:dibly attractive,< ye::s he (.) does sweet
   60   Raven:    [things like   ]
   61   Tia:      [Has all:: these] great qua:litie:s.= ((slight nodding))
   62   Raven:    =Yea:h, >has these great qualities< ↑but that can a:ll be
   63   Raven:    ma:sked to who you ri:lly are on the inside.
   64   Tia:      ↓Yeah.
   65            (1.0)
→  66   Tia:      Like these are thi:ngs that I just didn't even pla:n to like
→  67   Tia:      talk abo:ut wi:th him but it (.) °needs to happen.°=
   68   Raven:    =Yo:u ha:ve to Ti:a=
→  69   Tia:      =°You're right, you're always right.°((expletive bleeped out))
```

After Raven delivers advice-as-information (lines 62 and 63), Tia's immediate response is an

unmarked acknowledgment (line 64). However, after a brief pause, she accepts the advice,

beginning at line 66. She does so by providing an account first, then committing to the future

action.

First, Tia acknowledges that she previously had no plans to discuss Colton's intentions with

him. Opposite of 'claiming prior commitment,' she is claiming to have had no such commitment.

Epistemically, this widens the knowledge gradient between Raven and Tia by putting Tia in a

'K-' position. By stating that she did not plan to talk about these things with Colton, Tia is

putting her competence in jeopardy. Previously, Tia acknowledged that she knew where Raven

was "coming from" (line 55), referring to Raven's discussion about Colton's intentions and

potential doubts. This demonstrates that Tia is affiliating with Raven's concerns. Though

separate from the conversation, Tia's monologue at line 54 also solidifies this because she claims

to have questioned her relationship. Thus, although Tia acknowledges the potential doubts, she is

admitting that she had not planned on talking about them.

After establishing that she had no prior intent to talk to Colton, Tia offers normative

commitment at line 67. Using an imperative in "it needs to happen" (line 67) establishes

agreement and affiliation with the action. In doing so, Tia further ratifies Raven's epistemic

authority and warrant to give advice. She is placing herself fully in the role of advice recipient.

At the same time, using the passive voice in stating that "it needs happen" (line 67), mitigates the

level of commitment on Tia's behalf. Further, the softness with which it is spoken, micropause

before it, and vagueness of what "it" is softens the normativity. Therefore, although Tia is

accepting the advice, she is still hesitant in offering full commitment to the future action.

Immediately after committing to the future action, Raven responds with "You have to Tia"

(line 68), emphasizing the necessity of the conversation. In potentially orienting to Tia's claim of

not planning to talk with Colton (lines 66 and 67) as a contingency to not following her advice, Raven utilizes an imperative to expunge any other possible courses of action. Unlike Tia's use of the passive voice in "it needs to happen" (line 67), Raven upgrades to using an active voice in saying "You have to Tia" (line 68). This accomplishes epistemic authority. She is reiterating the advice she has given thus far and disallowing any contingencies on Tia's behalf.

Tia then relinquishes epistemic authority to Raven in stating "You're right, you're always right" (line 69). This very clearly warrants Raven's role as advice giver, as well as solidifies her epistemic authority. Further, this statement displays Tia's orientation to Raven as a frequent advice giver. Not only is Raven right this time, she is "always" right. This may also be evidence of Tia orienting to Raven in the 'friend' role. The word "always" indicates that Raven has given advice multiple times. Therefore, Tia and Raven may have the roles of advice giver and receiver built into their friendship. This would further solidify Raven's warrant to give advice.

Finally, Tia's ending utterance is an expletive. This may be evidence that although she does not want to accept Raven's advice, she is accepting the role of advice recipient. Swearing also reflects Tia's orientation to Raven as someone similar in status. Treating expletives as appropriate depends on the setting (Stapleton, 2010). For example, swearing during a job interview is often oriented to as inappropriate. However, in groups of peers, it may not only be viewed as appropriate, but as a form of social bonding (Stapleton, 2010). Thus, Tia exhibits that she is orienting to Raven as a 'friend' and peer by swearing. Further, she is equalizing the epistemic asymmetry. Though she said that Raven is "always right" (line 69), Tia's expletive reflects that she is not treating Raven as someone higher in status.

To conclude, acceptance of advice includes the speaker aligning with the content of the advice and accepting the role of recipient. Acceptance is uncommon because it puts the speaker's

competence in jeopardy. This example illustrates how Tia's acceptance established an epistemic asymmetry and offered normative commitment through acceptance. Notably, this sequence is at the end of the conversation, after Tia has resisted the advice.

Advice in Broadcast Talk

As noted previously, this data is being analyzed as a media representation of mundane talk. This particular scene is from *Bachelor in Paradise*, meaning that the conversation has been edited and shaped for entertainment purposes. While the conversational norms used throughout the talk are reflective of mundane conversation, it is still important to note some key editorial directions and changes.

First, although Raven and Tia's conversation is analyzed as spontaneous and authentic, the parameters for the conversation to occur were put in place by directors. For both women to be in the same place and spontaneously discussing Colton's motives in front of cameras is unlikely. Instead, a space for the 'spectacle of confrontation' (Hutchby, 2001) was set up for Raven and Tia. Though their discourse appeared natural, careful planning went into maximizing their conversation for entertainment purposes.

For instance, instrumental music picked up as Raven revealed that she does not think Colton's intentions are good. This adds a layer of drama, forecasting that potential conflict or bad news is to come. The camera shots selected also display that the editors have an overhearing audience in mind. Very rarely are both Raven and Tia's faces shown at the same time. Rather, the camera zooms into their faces to show their reactions. This is interesting, especially on Tia's behalf, because many of Tia's responses are in the form of silence. Yet, the camera still focuses on her reaction to Raven's advice. This may be because the editors anticipate the audience wanting to

see Tia's reactions to a potentially face-threatening conversation. While this is clearly planned, it demonstrates the editors' and audience's orientation towards the act of advice giving: When a speaker is receiving advice, their reaction may reflect varying degrees of agreement or rejection.

The camera shots and editorial cuts are also apparent at the 1:41 mark, in which the scene cuts to Raven and Tia holding hands. Through this edit, the producers focus on the portrayal of friendship through hand-holding. Again, although this is an edit, it depicts the role of 'friends' that has been embodied through Raven and Tia's conversation. The media production team is simply laminating an element that was already present in Raven and Tia's actions and magnifying it for the audience (see Goffman, 1974). Likewise, using their understanding of conversational norms, the audience knows to interpret the hand holding as a symbol of friendship.

Another element of production to note is the focus on emotions portrayed by Raven and Tia. For example, whenever either is crying, the shot focuses on their face. Typically, crying is an action that is done privately or with those in close relationships. Here, it is being filmed for an overhearing audience. In capturing this emotion, the shots appear to be more 'genuine,' as though Raven and Tia are disregarding the cameras.

Likewise, the inclusion of expletives demonstrates a presumed disregard of the cameras on Raven and Tia's behalf. They are certainly aware that swearing will not be broadcast on television; yet, they still do it. Further, they do not treat the expletives as slips or accidental. While the editors could have cut scenes with profanity or advised participants not to swear, they chose to include it. This choice may have been to add to the authenticity of the scene, or to illustrate the close relationship that Raven and Tia have. Because profanity is an indication of spontaneous, relaxed, and intimate interaction (Jefferson, Sacks, & Schegloff, 1987), the

decision to include bleeped-out language adds to the level of intimacy between Raven and Tia, as well as the 'naturalness' of the scene.

Finally, the inclusion of Tia's monologues[1] is important to note. Though not included in this transcript or analysis (see Appendix D), the editors' choice in filming and including them demonstrates that they believe the audience needs supplemental information. In response to Raven's advice, Tia often remains silent. Thus, the use of a monologue allows viewer access to more of Tia's talk. The first monologue is heavily focused on Tia's friendship with Raven and her doubts about Colton. This shapes audience orientation to the relationship between Raven and Tia as best friends. By sharing that she has thought about Colton's intentions, Tia also has the chance to establish her competence. The second monologue is brief, but further establishes Tia's normative commitment to talking to Colton. Overall, both monologues direct audience orientation to Tia in the role of advice recipient and friend to Raven.

To conclude, this data is being analyzed as a media representation of mundane conversation. However, it is still important to be aware of editorial changes that impact the 'naturalness' of the discourse. Though these directions shape the conversation for entertainment purposes, the choices made by production reflect an orientation to advice giving in peer-to-peer talk. Thus, while Raven and Tia's talk is not strictly mundane conversation, the interactional tools that they utilize embody norms that both the production team and audience orient to as normal, natural discourse.

---

[1] An interesting comparison is the use of soliloquies by Shakespeare. Historically, soliloquies have been used to address the audience in a way that only the playgoers may hear. Like Tia's monologues, audience-addressed soliloquies treat the audience as a confidant to the character (Hirsh, 2003). Characters in Shakespearean literature often used audience-addressed soliloquies to convince audience members to adopt their view-point by using narratives and rhetorical strategies aimed at the public (Hirsh, 2003). As stated in Hirsh (2003), "Instead of *showing* a character in the act of struggling with a decision, for example, or coming to terms with an emotion, a character *tells* a large group of people *about* these matters" (p. 14).

Discussion

The purpose of this analysis was to examine how advice is interactionally constructed in a media-representation of mundane conversation between two peers. In doing so, the following findings emerged: Participants establish a warrant to give advice through the accomplishment of identity and epistemic authority. In orienting to the role of 'friend,' both advice giver and receiver warrant the delivery of advice. To warrant one's epistemic authority, participants draw upon accounts, emotions, and life experiences. Rhetorical devices are also used by participants to deliver and respond to advice. These elements will be examined here.

Unlike advice giving in institutional settings, advice in mundane conversation is not warranted. There is no clear role difference in epistemic authority. Thus, one participant is not institutionally entitled over the other to deliver advice. Participants must interactionally establish their warrant to deliver advice. It is not enough for the advice giver to simply position themselves as such; the recipient must ratify that role, for an advice sequence to occur.

In building a warrant to deliver advice, the identity of 'friend' may be interactionally accomplished by the advice giver. This is done in a variety of ways. For example, in this data, Raven demonstrates that she is orienting to Tia as a friend in the very first line, stating that she is "trying to be supportive." Later, she also places herself in the role of 'friend' by sharing her concern, as shown below:

Extract 6.1 (0:39 – 0:46)

```
21    Raven:      I'm r:illy conce:rned.
22    Raven:      I do not want to see::[(.) yo:u in heartbreak.      ]
23                                      [((very slight nods from Tia))]
24               (2.4)
```

In stating that she is "really concerned" (line 21) and does not want to see Tia in heartbreak,

Raven is justifying her warrant to give advice as a friend. Like wanting to support Tia, claiming

concern is typically an action that a friend would do. Although Tia does not verbally affiliate

with Ravens' concern, her very slight nods at line 23 affiliate with Raven's role as a 'concerned

friend' (Stivers, 2008). This ratifies Raven's position as advice giver.

    Beyond establishing her support and concern, Raven establishes herself as a friend by

demonstrating that she is knowledgeable about Tia's life and character (see Goffman, 1972). The

role of friend often warrants access to life events. This justifies the delivery of assessments, as

demonstrated below:

    Extract 6.2 (1:23 – 1:42)

```
40    Raven:      =You are #↑so: #↑deser:ving Tia.
41                (1.1) ((slight nods from Tia))
42    Raven:      Like e(h)verythi:ng you've be:en throu:gh,
43                (1.1)
44    Raven:      And the perso:n that you a::re, and how beau:tifu:l you a::re,
45    Raven:      You should not settle for ANYthi:ng less than someone who
46    Raven:      mirrors the best part of you.
47                [(2.7)]
48                [((camera zooms in on Raven and Tia clutching hands))]
```

These assessments not only establish epistemic authority, but also portray Raven's role as a

'friend.' In claiming to know that Tia is deserving and has been through a lot, Raven is implying

that she knows many of Tia's past struggles. This accomplishes friendship by positioning Raven

as someone who has been there for Tia in the past. Further, by using "the person that you are" as

a justification for why Tia is deserving, Raven demonstrates that she knows what type of person

Tia is. Presumably, only someone close to Tia would know the kind of person that she is.

Therefore, Raven is claiming access to Tia's past and character, which are traits of friendship.

The use of contrasts as a rhetorical device also interactionally demonstrates Raven enacting the 'friend' role. Throughout the conversation, she is caught between acting as a supportive friend and the delicate act of advising Tia to leave Colton. For example, Raven's dilemma as a friend is embodied in her use of a contrast in lines 1-3. In stating that she is "trying to be supportive" but does not think Colton's "intentions are good," Raven displays the dilemma she is caught in as a friend to Tia. In not responding to this contrast, Tia ratifies Raven's role as a friend and advice-giver. Her silence gives Raven the interactional rights to continue delivering advice.

Throughout the conversation, many of Tia's responses to Raven are in the form of unmarked acknowledgments, particularly silence. This is interesting because unmarked acknowledgments are most commonly present when there is little at stake for the advice recipient (Shaw & Hepburn, 2013). However, Tia's romantic relationship is at stake in this conversation. Institutionally, Kinnell and Maynard (1996) found that unmarked acknowledgments are frequently present because the recipient orients to the advice giver as having expertise and interactional rights to deliver advice. In placing an institutional lens on this mundane conversation, it could be argued that Tia is frequently silent because she is orienting to Raven's 'friend' role as an interactional warrant to give advice. This is further exemplified in discussing epistemic authority.

Not only does Raven establish her identity as a friend to warrant advice delivery, but she also uses epistemic authority as a warrant throughout the sequence. Again, in placing an institutional lens on mundane conversation, this may explain why Tia is frequently silent. In orienting to Raven as a friend with relationship expertise, Tia is granting her the interactional rights to deliver advice. Likewise, some components of the conversation, such as compliments, may be more

typical in 'friend' conversations, thus not requiring a response. Tia's frequent silences ratify

Raven's role as 'friend' and her epistemic authority.

Examining epistemic authority throughout this sequence reveals that participants often draw

upon life experience and emotions. This is perhaps not surprising, considering they are

discussing a personal relationship. Neither Raven nor Tia are "certified" relationship experts, but

they do have their own relationships and feelings to use as evidence. Further, the use of accounts

and assessments establish epistemic authority by demonstrating access to the situation.

This can be witnessed near the beginning of the conversation, when Raven discusses Colton's

dating history:

Extract 6.3 (0:05 - 0:20)

```
3    Raven:      I ↓just don't think his intentions ↑are good.
4                (2.4)
5    Raven:      F:irst of al:l,=Col:ton's past dating hi:story has be:en(.)
6    Raven:      the it gurl:.
7    Raven:      Yur the it gu:rl ↑from yur seas:[on              and he]=
8    Tia:                                        [((Purses lips))°Yeah.°]
9    Raven:      =re:ached out to you (0.2)
10                                           ((instrumental music begins))
11               and the:n: he went on Be:cca's sea:son(.)and no::w
12               he['s::↑ba:ck wi:th yo:u like ]
13   Tia:          [°↓Yeah that's ri:lly:: ri:l]ly:: bad.
14   Raven:      ↑°Obviously° it's rilly ((expletive bleeped out))
```

In providing an account of Colton's past dating patterns, Raven justifies her assessment (line 3)

and establishes epistemic authority. In doing so, she builds her warrant to give advice. By

demonstrating that she has noticed Colton's actions, she is claiming enough access to advise Tia.

Although Tia attempts to reclaim epistemic authority (line 13), Raven ultimately maintains her

stance by further upgrading Tia's assessment (line 14). In other words, Raven is positioning herself as knowing more than Tia, thus, warranting her role as advice giver.

Accounts as a warrant to give advice seem to function in place of expert knowledge. Unlike an institutional role, such as a counselor or therapist, Raven does not inherently possess expert knowledge. Her role is not accompanied by the credentials needed to interactionally warrant advice. Though the role of 'friend' certainly functions as a warrant, more work is needed to establish that Raven is knowledgeable about Colton. That is where account-giving is conducive to establishing her rights. Demonstrating that she is aware of Colton's actions and potential motivations to date Tia (see lines 27-30) strengthens Raven's claim to epistemic access and warrants her advice delivery.

Similarly, it seems that emotional evidence can be utilized to establish a warrant for advice. This differs greatly from institutional settings, in which emotional appeals frequently are not a part of advice delivery. Raven, however, uses her emotional investment to justify her advice. For example, when Raven stated that she is "really concerned" (line 21) and does not want to see Tia "in heartbreak" (line 22), she not only established her role as 'friend,' but she also accomplished epistemic authority by: a) claiming an emotional stake, and b) raising this concern as something Tia should be aware of. This epistemic claim serves as a warrant to deliver advice.

Crying also functions as an emotional tool to warrant advice in this sequence. For example, Raven and Tia both inflect crying into their talk in lines 32-39:

Extract 6.4 (1:04 – 1:24)

```
32   Raven:    #I'm ↑gonna get emo(h)t(.h)°ion(al)° [hhuh ↑huh ↑↑huh] .hhh
33   Tia:                                          [Sto:::::p      ]
34   Raven:    #↑I want you to find someone tha:t (1.9) tre:ats you (2.0)
35   Raven:    like A:dam treats m:e.=
36   Tia:      =#↑↑°°I know:°° °and like you don't° (0.9).h you don't know
37   Tia:      how much I've >cri:ed and been emo:tional and upse:t over that
38   Tia:      because I know that I deserve ↑that and I know that I want
39   Tia:      ↑that?<=
```

It would be highly unusual for an expert in an institutional setting to claim they were getting emotional and cry during advice delivery. However, Raven uses this emotion to warrant her advice by portraying how invested she is. Tia orients to it as such by asserting her entitlement to the emotion in lines 36-39. Thus, it could be proposed that displays of emotion in mundane conversation function to claim epistemic access and, therefore, warrant advice delivery.

Beyond emotional appeals, using personal experience as evidence frequently appeared in this analysis. While personal experience is sometimes used in institutional settings to establish commonalities and soften delivery (Pudlinski, 1998), it is often used in mundane conversation to establish expertise (Goldsmith & Fitch, 1997). This is the case in Raven and Tia's conversation. Both women frequently draw upon personal experience to establish their epistemic authority.

For example, in the extract above, Raven tells Tia the following: "I want you to find someone that treats you like Adam treats me" (lines 34-35). This utterance is notable for a number of reasons. First, Raven is warranting her advice through the reference of her own relationship. By orienting to her relationship with Adam as ideal, Raven positions herself as knowledgeable and credible in giving relationship advice. Second, Raven's orientation to Tia as someone who cares about what she (Raven) wants demonstrates the embodiment of friendship. Finally, Raven is persuading through identification (see Burke, 1969) by comparing herself to Tia. In citing her

own relationship, Raven establishes epistemic authority, friendship, and persuasion. These elements attribute to her warrant to deliver advice.

Using accounts, emotions, and personal experience, Raven establishes her warrant to give advice through epistemic authority. In response, Tia ratifies or rebukes Raven's claims. By doing so, she is orienting to Raven's utterances as a warrant for advice delivery. Thus, it can be concluded that these different types of claims are used by Raven to establish expertise to deliver advice.

Overall, this analysis had two main findings. First, interactionally enacting the role of 'friend' serves as a warrant to deliver advice. Second, demonstrating epistemic authority through accounts, emotional appeals, and personal experience provides a warrant for giving advice. Also noted throughout this analysis was the use of rhetorical devices. Although not a new finding, it is important to note that elements of persuasion are present in this peer-to-peer advice sequence.

These findings are important because, unlike institutional settings, participants in mundane conversation do not hold a warrant to give advice. The roles of 'advice giver' and 'advice recipient' are not assigned to roles in mundane talk, as they are with institutional roles. Thus, participants must interactionally establish and ratify the role of advice giver. This involves building of a warrant to deliver advice in the first place.

Although this is a portrayal of mundane talk and a single case, the findings still provide some insight as to how warrants for advice delivery are interactionally created. Raven and Tia's orientation towards one another in the friend 'role,' along with the negotiation of epistemic authority, are telling as to how assumed equals manage advice in interactions.

Conclusion

Theoretical Implications

While prior studies have acknowledged institutional roles and step-wise entry (Heritage & Sefi, 1992) as warrants to deliver advice, very few have examined the interactional establishment of warrants in mundane conversation. In fact, little research has been done regarding the advice sequence itself in mundane conversation. The most frequently cited research focuses on mothers and daughters (see Shaw, 2013; Shaw & Hepburn, 2013; Shaw, Potter, & Hepburn, 2015), in which it could be argued there is already a warrant associated with the role of 'mother.'

Thus, this research will add to the study of advice giving in mundane conversation by providing an analysis of a different type of relationship: friends. Unlike prior studies, this analysis differs because of its focus on two, assumedly equal, friends. The warrant to deliver advice is not treated as being inherent to either friend. By examining two equals, a new outlook on establishing expertise and justification to deliver advice is provided. At the very least, the ideas presented here will spark a greater interest in examining how advice is interactionally warranted and managed in mundane talk.

Practical Implications

Advice is a part of everyday life. Between family members and friends, advice can be both serious and lighthearted. In navigating these sometimes-delicate interactions, it can be difficult to know what to say. Studying advice in mundane conversation provides a small window into these conversations. While this analysis does not provide a guide on how to successfully deliver advice, it does highlight how friendship, feelings, and experience are brought to life in talk. In examining advice, these interactions can provide fascinating insight into the social construction that constitutes everyday life.

Limitations and Future Directions

A major limitation of this analysis is the data featured. While the focus of this examination is on mundane talk, time and resources limited the data to a portrayal of mundane conversation. Though the interactional tools utilized in mundane talk were present, variables such as the television crew and entertainment constraints certainly influenced the 'naturalness' of the talk. It is also highly likely that Raven watched prior seasons, meaning she had more access to topicalized information than participants typically do in natural conversation. Thus, future research should focus on 'natural' conversations to further the legitimacy of these findings. There is a large space for research regarding advice in mundane talk, and studying advice sequences between family and friends could be an intriguing area to explore.

Further, this study was limited to a single-case analysis. Consequently, the findings of this analysis are not necessarily generalizable. To notice trends and patterns, many more conversations must be analyzed. Focusing on peer-to-peer relationships would be of value, considering this has been a largely ignored set in advice-giving literature. However, future research may be extended to include a variety of relationships, such as father-son, father-daughter, mother-son, etc. There are many possibilities for comparing and contrasting advice giving sequences when different roles are enacted.

Similar to warrants in advice delivery, an interesting area of study would be to analyze how participants in mundane conversation discredit themselves in advice giving. So, instead of interactionally building a warrant to deliver advice, the focus would be how participants soften their epistemic authority to make it clear that they are not an expert. This has already been documented in online health forums (see Lindolm, 2017 and Sillence, 2013), in which users often begin advice delivery with phrases like "I can't tell you what to do" (Sillence & Mo, 2014).

However, it would be interesting to see how participants in face-to-face communication establish that they are not necessarily warranted to deliver advice.

Shifting beyond examining warrants for advice giving, different elements of the advice sequence in mundane talk could be analyzed for future research. For example, investigating talk surrounding the advice sequence would be of interest. In the data used for this analysis, the talk surrounding the advice sequence was not available. However, with a greater corpus of data, the surrounding talk could be analyzed. Heritage & Sefi (1992) discussed 'step-wise' entry as a method to easing into an advice sequence, but this warrants further research in mundane talk. Further, examining how participants bring the advice sequence to a close and move onto discussing different matters would be an intriguing area of study.

References

Antaki, Charles, ed. *Applied conversation analysis: Intervention and change in institutional talk*.
Springer, 2011.

Burke, K. (1969). *A rhetoric of motives* (Vol. 178). Univ of California Press.

Butler, C. W., Potter, J., Danby, S., Emmison, M., & Hepburn, A. (2010). Advice-implicative
interrogatives: Building "client-centered" support in a children's helpline. *Social
Psychology Quarterly*, *73*(3), 265-287.

Butler, C. W., Danby, S., Emmison, M., & Thorpe, K. (2009). Managing medical advice seeking
in calls to Child Health Line. *Sociology of health & illness*, *31*(6), 817-834.

Clayman, S. E., & Gill, V. T. (2004). Conversation analysis. In *Handbook of Data Analysis* (pp.
589-606). SAGE

Couper-Kuhlen, E. (2012). Some truths and untruths about final intonation in conversational
questions. Questions: Formal, functional and interactional perspectives, 123-145.

Couture, S. J., & Sutherland, O. (2006). Giving advice on advice-giving: A conversation analysis
of Karl Tomm's practice. *Journal of Marital and Family Therapy*, *32*(3), 329.

De Ruiter, J. P. (Ed.). (2012). Questions: Formal, functional and interactional perspectives (Vol.
12). Cambridge University Press.

Drew, P. (2005). Conversation analysis. *Handbook of language and social interaction*, 71-102.

Drew, P., & Heritage, J. (1992). Talk at work: Interaction in institutional settings. Cambridge
Univ Pr.

Drew, P., & Holt, E. (1988). Complainable matters: The use of idiomatic expressions in making
complaints. *Social problems*, *35*(4), 398-417.

Emmison, M., & Firth, A. (2012). Requesting and receiving advice on the telephone: An analysis of telephone helplines in Australia. *Advice in discourse*, 213-232.

Goffman, E. (1974). Frame analysis: An essay on the organization of experience. Harvard University Press.

Goffman, E. (1972). *Relations in public; microstudies of the public order.* (Harper Colophon Books CN276). New York: Harper & Row.

Goldsmith, D. J., & Fitch, K. (1997). The normative context of advice as social support. *Human communication research*, *23*(4), 454-476.

Halkowski, Timothy, and Gill Virginia Teas. (2013) "Conversation analysis and ethnomethodology: The centrality of interaction." *Salute e società*, 203-224.

Hepburn, A., & Potter, J. (2012). Crying and crying responses. *Emotion in interaction*, 195-211.

Hepburn, A., & Potter, J. (2011a). Designing the recipient: Managing advice resistance in institutional settings. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, *74*(2), 216-241.

Hepburn, A., & Bolden, G. B. (2013). The conversation analytic approach to transcription. *The handbook of conversation analysis*, 57-76.

Hepburn, A., & Potter, J. (2011b). Threats: Power, family mealtimes, and social influence. British Journal of Social Psychology, 50(1), 99-120.

Hepburn, A., Shaw, C., & Potter, J. (2018). Advice Giving and Advice Resistance on Telephone Helplines. In *The Oxford Handbook of Advice* (p. 153). Oxford University Press.

Hepburn, A., Wilkinson, S., & Butler, C. W. (2014). Intervening with conversation analysis in telephone helpline services: Strategies to improve effectiveness. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, *47*(3), 239-254.

Heritage, J. (2005). Conversation analysis and institutional talk. Handbook of language and social interaction, 103, 47.

Heritage, J. (2012). Epistemics in action: Action formation and territories of knowledge. *Research on Language & Social Interaction*, *45*(1), 1-29.

Heritage, J. (2012). Epistemics in conversation. *The handbook of conversation analysis*, 370-394.

Heritage, J. (1984). Garfinkel and ethnomethodology. John Wiley & Sons.

Heritage, J. (2011). Territories of knowledge, territories of experience: Empathic moments in interaction. *The morality of knowledge in conversation*, *29*, 159-183.

Heritage, J. (2012). The epistemic engine: Sequence organization and territories of knowledge. *Research on Language & Social Interaction*, *45*(1), 30-52.

Heritage, J. (2010). Questioning in medicine. *Why do you ask?: The function of questions in institutional discourse*., 42-68. Oxford University Press.

Heritage, J., & Clayman, S. (2011). *Talk in action: Interactions, identities, and institutions* (Vol. 44). John Wiley & Sons.

Heritage, J., & Lindström, A. (2012). Advice giving—terminable and interminable: The case of British health visitors. *Advice in discourse* (Vol. 221), 169-194. John Benjamins Publishing.

Heritage, J., & Lindstrom, A. (1998). Motherhood, medicine, and morality: Scenes from a medical encounter. *Research on Language & Social Interaction*, *31*(3-4), 397-438.

Heritage, J., & Raymond, G. (2005). The terms of agreement: Indexing epistemic authority and subordination in talk-in-interaction. *Social psychology quarterly*, *68*(1), 15-38.

Heritage, J., & Sefi, S. (1992). Dilemmas of advice: Aspects of the delivery and reception of

      advice in interactions between health visitors and first-time mothers. *Talk at work:*

      Interaction in institutional settings, *359*, 417.

Hirsh, J. E. (2003). Shakespeare and the History of Soliloquies. Fairleigh Dickinson Univ Press.

Hudson, T. (1990). The discourse of advice giving in English:" I wouldn't feed until spring no

      matter what you do.". *Language & Communication*.

Hutchby, I. (1995). Aspects of recipient design in expert advice-giving on call-in radio.

      Discourse processes, 19(2), 219-238.

Hutchby, I. (2001). Confrontation as a spectacle: the argumentative frame of the Ricki Lake

      Show. Television talk shows: Discourse, performance, spectacle, 155-172.

Hutchby, I. (2005). Media talk: Conversation analysis and the study of broadcasting. McGraw-

      Hill Education (UK).

Jefferson, G. (2004). Glossary of transcript symbols with an introduction. Pragmatics and

      Beyond New Series, 125, 13-34.

Jefferson, G. (1983). Issues in the transcription of naturally-occurring talk: Caricature versus

      capturing pronunciational particulars. Tilburg Univ., Department of Language and

      Linguistics.

Jefferson, G. (1990). List construction as a task and resource. *Interaction competence*, 63-92.

Jefferson, G., & Lee, J. R. (1981). The rejection of advice: Managing the problematic

      convergence of a 'troubles-telling' and a 'service encounter'. *Journal of pragmatics*, *5*(5),

      399-422.

Jefferson, G., Sacks, H., & Schegloff, E. A. (1987). Notes on laughter in the pursuit of intimacy.

      Talk and Social Organisation, 152-205.

Kinnell, A. M. K., & Maynard, D. W. (1996). The delivery and receipt of safer sex advice in

    pretest counseling sessions for HIV and AIDS. *Journal of Contemporary*

    Ethnography, *24*(4), 405-437.

Korobov, N., & Thorne, A. (2007). How late-adolescent friends share stories about relationships:

    The importance of mitigating the seriousness of romantic problems. Journal of Social and

    Personal Relationships, 24(6), 971-992.

Koshik, I. (2005). Beyond rhetorical questions. John Benjamins.

Lerner, G. H. (2004). Collaborative Turn Sequences. In G.H. Lerner (Ed.) *Conversation*

    Analysis: Studies from the First Generation. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Lindholm, L. (2017). "So now I'm panic attack free!": Response stories in a peer-to-peer online

    advice forum on pregnancy and parenting. Linguistik online, 87(8).

Lindström, A., & Weatherall, A. (2015). Orientations to epistemics and deontics in treatment

    discussions. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *78*, 39-53.

Mikesell, L., Bolden, G. B., Mandelbaum, J., Robinson, J. D., Romaniuk, T., Bolaños-Carpio,

    A., ... & Angell, B. (2017). At the intersection of epistemics and action: Responding with

    I know. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, *50*(3), 268-285.

Pilnick, A. (2003). "Patient counselling" by pharmacists: four approaches to the delivery of

    counselling sequences and their interactional reception. *Social Science &*

    Medicine, *56*(4), 835-849.

Pomerantz, A. (1984). Agreeing and disagreeing with assessments: Some features of

    preferred/dispreferred turn shaped. In J. Atkinson (Ed.), *Structures of Social Action*, pp.

    57-101. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Pomerantz, A. (1978). Compliment responses: Notes on the co-operation of multiple constraints. In Studies in the organization of conversational interaction (pp. 79-112). Academic Press.

Pomerantz, A. M. (1984). Giving a source or basis: The practice in conversation of telling 'how I know'. *Journal of pragmatics*, *8*(5-6), 607-625.

Pudlinski, C. (1998). Giving advice on a consumer-run warm line: Implicit and dilemmatic practices. *Communication Studies*, *49*(4), 322-341.

Psathas, G. (1995). *Conversation analysis: The study of talk-in-interaction* (Vol. 35). Sage.

Quirk, R., Greenbaum, S. L., & Leech, G. G. & Svartvik, J.(1985). *A comprehensive grammar of the English language*, 806-825. Longman.

Raymond, G. (2003). Grammar and social organization: Yes/no interrogatives and the structure of responding. *American sociological review*, 939-967.

Raymond, G., & Zimmerman, D. H. (2007). Rights and responsibilities in calls for help: The case of the Mountain Glade fire. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, *40*(1), 33-61.

Riccioni, I., Bongelli, R., & Zuczkowski, A. (2014). Mitigation and epistemic positions in troubles talk: The giving advice activity in close interpersonal relationships. Some examples from Italian. *Language & Communication*, *39*, 51-72.

Sacks, H. (1984). On doing 'being ordinary'. *Structures of social action: Studies in conversation analysis*, 413-429.

Sacks, H., Schegloff, E. A., & Jefferson, G. (1974). A simplest systematics for the organization of turn taking for conversation. In Studies in the organization of conversational interaction (pp. 7-55).

Sadock, J. (2012). Formal features of questions. *Questions: Formal, functional and interactional perspectives*, 103-122. Cambridge University Press.

Schegloff, E. A. (1987). Analyzing single episodes of interaction: An exercise in conversation analysis. Social psychology quarterly, 101-114.

Schegloff, E. A. (1996). Confirming allusions: Toward an empirical account of action. *American journal of sociology*, *102*(1), 161-216.

Schegloff, E. A. (1986). The routine as achievement. Human studies, 9(2-3), 111-151.

Searle, J. R., & Searle, J. R. (1969). *Speech acts: An essay in the philosophy of language* (Vol. 626). Cambridge university press.

Shaw, C. (2013). *Advice giving in telephone interactions between mothers and their young adult daughters* (Doctoral dissertation, © Chloe Shaw).

Shaw, C., & Hepburn, A. (2013). Managing the moral implications of advice in informal interaction. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, *46*(4), 344-362.

Shaw, C., Potter, J., & Hepburn, A. (2015). Advice-implicative actions: Using interrogatives and assessments to deliver advice in mundane conversation. *Discourse Studies*, *17*(3), 317-342.

Sillence, E. (2013). Giving and receiving peer advice in an online breast cancer support group. Cyberpsychology, Behavior, and Social Networking, 16(6), 480-485.

Sillence, E., & Mo, P. K. (2014). Communicating health decisions: an analysis of messages posted to online prostate cancer forums. Health Expectations, 17(2), 244-253.

Stapleton, K. (2010). 12. Swearing. Interpersonal pragmatics, 6, 289.

Stivers, T. (2008). Stance, alignment, and affiliation during storytelling: When nodding is a token of affiliation. Research on language and social interaction, 41(1), 31-57.

Stivers, T., Mondada, L., & Steensig, J. (2011). Knowledge, morality and affiliation in social

interaction. *The morality of knowledge in conversation*, 3-24.

Ten Have, P. (1997, June). In the presence of data: Conversation-analysis as 'empirical

philosophy'. In *conference on Ethnomethodology, an improbable sociology, Cerisy-la-*

Salles, France.

Waring, H. Z. (2007). Complex advice acceptance as a resource for managing asymmetries. *Text*

& Talk, *27*(1), 107-137.

Waring, H. Z. (2005). Peer tutoring in a graduate writing centre: Identity, expertise, and advice

resisting. *Applied Linguistics*, *26*(2), 141-168.

Waring, H. Z. (2012). The advising sequence and its preference structures in graduate peer

tutoring at an American university. *Advice in discourse*, 97-118.

Wood, H. (2001). "No, YOU rioted!": the pursuit of conflict in the management of "lay" and

"expert" discourses on Kilroy. In Television talk shows (pp. 79-106). Routledge.

Appendices

Appendix A: Video information

Appendix B: Transcript

Appendix C: Transcription conventions

Appendix D: Tia's monologues

Appendix A: Video information

Bachelor Nation on ABC. (2018, August 22). *Raven gives advice to Tia – bachelor in paradise*

    [Video file]. Retrieved from https://youtu.be/OvbC3jkS5Ks

Link to video: https://youtu.be/OvbC3jkS5Ks

Appendix B: Transcript

```
1    Raven:      <I'm tr:ying to be:: supporti:ve (0.2) but ↑Ti:a,>

2                (0.7)

3    Raven:      I ↓just don't think his intentions ↑are good.

4                (2.4)

5    Raven:      F:irst of al:l,=Col:ton's past dating hi:story has be:en(.)

6    Raven:      the it gurl:.

7    Raven:      Yur the it gu:rl ↑from yur seas:[on            and he]=

8    Tia:                                       [((Purses lips))°Yeah.°]

9    Raven:      =re:ached out to you (0.2)

10                               ((instrumental music begins))

11               and the:n: he went on Be:cca's sea:son(.)and no::w

12               he['s::↑ba:ck wi:th yo:u like ]

13   Tia:          [°↓Yeah that's ri:lly:: ri:l]ly:: bad.

14   Raven:      ↑°Obviously° it's rilly ((expletive bleeped out))

15   Tia:        ↑I KNO:W: but like(.)I ho:nestly: am good at reading hi::m,

16               (0.7)

17   Tia:        and at rea:ding peopl:e and #I-I ↓don't know=

18   Tia:        =>it [just feels right.]<

19   Raven:           [↑All of his act:ions](.)h:ave: ↓said somethin different.

20               (2.0)

21   Raven:      I'm r:illy conce:rned.

22   Raven:      I do not want to see::[(.) yo:u in heartbreak.     ]

23                                     [((very slight nods from Tia))]

24               (2.4)

25   Raven:      <You ha:ve ta rilly:: se:ek(.)the true> person that Colton is.

26               (1.7)

27   Raven:      Is this a ↑faça::de? Is he doin jus what >everybody el:se

28   Raven:      ↑wants him to[ do::?<               ]

29               (1.0)        [((slight nod from Tia))]

30   Raven:      Or is he ri:lly (1.4) into you.

31               (4.4) ((slight nods from Tia))
```

```
32    Raven:    #I'm ↑gonna get emo(h)t(.h)°ion(al)° [hhuh ↑huh ↑↑huh] .hhh
33    Tia:                                          [Sto::::::p     ]
34    Raven:    #↑I want you to find someone tha:t (1.9) tre:ats you (2.0)
35    Raven:    like A:dam treats m:e.=
36    Tia:      =#↑↑°°I know:°° °and like you don't° (0.9).h you don't know
37    Tia:      how much I've >cri:ed and been emo:tional and upse:t over that
38    Tia:      because I know that I deserve ↑that and I know that I want
39    Tia:      ↑that?<=
40    Raven:    =You are #↑so: #↑deser:ving Tia.
41              (1.1) ((slight nods from Tia))
42    Raven:    Like e(h)verythi:ng you've be:en throu:gh,
43              (1.1)
44    Raven:    And the perso:n that you a::re, and how beau:tifu:l you a::re,
45    Raven:    You should not settle for ANYthi:ng less than someone who
46    Raven:    mirrors the best part of you.
47              [(2.7)]
48              [((camera zooms in on Raven and Tia clutching hands))]
49    Raven:    And if there is a dou:bt or a que:stion in your mi:nd you have
50              (0.2) to acknowle:dge ↑it [ (0.2)                     ]
51                                        [((slight nods from Tia))]
52              and liste:n to your <God (.) given> woman intuition.=
53    Tia:      =Yeah:h.((slight nod))
54              ((Unknown length of pause. Camera shot goes to Tia monologue))
55    Tia:      >And I know where you're comi:ng fro:m,< it's jus: har:d (.)
56              because I have had a-a rill[y:::                  ]good ti:me=
57    Raven:                              [>°really good time.°<]
58    Tia:      =↑with him,=
59    Raven:    =↑Yeah he is >incre:dibly attractive,< ye::s he (.) does sweet
60    Raven:    [things like    ]
61    Tia:      [Has all:: these] great qua:litie:s.= ((slight nodding))
62    Raven:    =Yea:h, >has these great qualities< ↑but that can a:ll be
63    Raven:    ma:sked to who you ri:lly are on the inside.
64    Tia:      ↓Yeah.
```

```
65                  (1.0)
66   Tia:           Like these are thi:ngs that I just didn't even pla:n to like
67   Tia:           talk abo:ut wi:th him but it (.) °needs to happen.°=
68   Raven:         =Yo:u ha:ve to Ti:a=
69   Tia:           =°You're right, you're always right.°((expletive bleeped out))
```

Appendix C: Transcription conventions

[ ]	Brackets	Overlapping talk
(1.0)	Number of seconds	Length of silence in tenths of a second
(.)	Micropause	Brief pause that is untimed but perceptible
=	Equal sign	Absence of ordinary, brief silence between turns
.	Period	Falling intonation
?	Question mark	Strong rising intonation
,	Comma	Slight rising intonation
te<u>xt</u>	Underlined text	Indicates emphasis or stress
°	Degree signs	Talk that is quiet
t<u>e</u>:xt	Underline followed by colon	Up-down contour
te<u>:</u>xt	Underlined colon	Pitch sliding up
↑	Up arrow	Significant upward change in pitch
↓	Down arrow	Significant downward change in pitch
>text<	Greater/less than symbols	Enclosed speech sped up
<text>	Less/greater than symbols	Enclosed speech slowed down
TEXT	All capitalized text	Significantly increased volume
:	Colon	Sound prior to colon is prolonged
(-)	Hyphen	Word or utterance is cut-off
#	Pound sign	Speaker appears upset
(hhh)	Letter h	Hearable exhalation
(.hhh)	Period, then letter h	Hearable inhalation
(text)	Parentheses	Transcriptionist is unclear on what was said
((text))	Double parentheses	Transcriptionist's description of non-verbal events

Jeffersonian Transcription Notations from: Hepburn, A., & Bolden, G. B. (2013). The conversation analytic approach to transcription. The handbook of conversation analysis, 57-76., and Jefferson, G. (2004). Glossary of transcript symbols with an introduction. Pragmatics and Beyond New Series, 125, 13-34.

Appendix D: Tia's monologues

Tia monologue #1 (1:55 – 2:13)

A best friend is the one who makes you consider all the hard things that you don't necessarily want to face. And that's who Raven is to me, and these are things that I have thought about. But, I don't want to ruin the good time that Colton and I were having by introducing all of the doubts in my head to Colton.

Tia monologue #2 (2:54 – 3:03; end of sequence)

I need to talk to Colton about his intentions, to truly know where he's coming from and to truly know how I feel about him, because I want this to actually work.