



Webb, J., Lindholm, C., & Williams, V. (2020). Interactional strategies for progressing through quizzes in dementia settings. *Discourse Studies*, 22(4), 503-522. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1461445620914673>

Peer reviewed version

Link to published version (if available):
[10.1177/1461445620914673](https://doi.org/10.1177/1461445620914673)

[Link to publication record in Explore Bristol Research](#)
PDF-document

This is the author accepted manuscript (AAM). The final published version (version of record) is available online via Sage Publications at <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/1461445620914673?journalCode=disa>. Please refer to any applicable terms of use of the publisher.

University of Bristol - Explore Bristol Research

General rights

This document is made available in accordance with publisher policies. Please cite only the published version using the reference above. Full terms of use are available: <http://www.bristol.ac.uk/red/research-policy/pure/user-guides/ebr-terms/>

Paper for Discourse Studies

Interactional strategies for progressing through quizzes in dementia settings

Version 2 (after being accepted) 05.02.20

Joseph Webb (first author – see below for address for proofs and off-prints)

Norah Fry Centre for Disability Studies,
University of Bristol,
8 Priory Road,
Bristol
BS8 1TZ,
Joseph.webb@bristol.ac.uk
+44 (0) 117 3314539

Camilla Lindholm (second author)

Tampere University,
camilla.lindholm@tuni.fi
+358 50 318 2500

Val Williams (third author)

University of Bristol
Val.williams@bristol.ac.uk
+44 (0) 117 331 0971

Short title: Interactional strategies for progressing through quizzes

Joseph Webb is research fellow at the University of Bristol. His work focuses on people with communicational impairments and the people who support them, health and social care encounters, and how policy and practices are enacted through talk.

Camilla Lindholm is a Professor of Nordic Languages at Tampere University, Finland. Her main research areas are interaction in institutional settings, and asymmetric interaction involving participants with communication impairments.

Val Williams is a Disability Studies professor, who combines disability research with the systematic analysis of talk. She has previously published accounts of the fine-grained detail in conversations between people with intellectual disabilities and their support workers.

Interactional strategies for progressing through quizzes in dementia settings

Abstract

People with early-to-mid stage dementia frequently attend groups that provide opportunities for socialising and engaging in activities, such as quizzes. This article uses conversation analysis to investigate the interactional strategies that the staff use in order to initiate and keep these quizzes ‘on track’, and what they orient to as impediments and facilitators of quiz progression. Specifically, we outline how staff deal with incorrect or ‘non answers’, and what happens when players have their own goals or ‘projects’ that do not align with staff members’ orientations to the overarching activity completion. We reflect on the tensions that arise between doing interactional work to progress through the quiz, and how that goal can conflict with attending to the needs or wishes expressed by the person living with dementia, resulting in threats to the ‘face’ of the quiz players. Data are taken from a corpus of ten quizzes recorded in four different group settings in England.

Keywords: conversation analysis; face work; dementia; quiz ; games ; asymmetries in talk; support practices

Introduction

Quizzes are a competitive game-like activity in which multiple players (in teams or competing individually) attempt to correctly answer questions posed by a ‘quiz master’. Previous research on quizzes for people living with dementia has predominantly focussed on the benefits of including quizzes as part of a wider set of activities in ‘cognitive stimulation therapy’. There has been markedly less of a focus on how quizzes are actually *enacted* in practice, and the issues that both staff playing the role of quizmaster/leading quiz teams and players with dementia may face in talking them into being (see Lindholm, 2008; Lindholm & Wray, 2011, for exceptions). Many quizzes are enacted as a *social activity*, not a therapeutic intervention, intended to promote interaction in social care settings such as day centres and activity groups (e.g. Graty, 2013). Where the interactional enactment of quizzes *has* been the focus of research, the setting has typically been the classroom (e.g. Hellerman, 2005).

Quizzes rely on memory and cognition and impose a strict interactional framework that limits acceptable (or rather ‘task-based/task-fulfilling’) contributions, and so may work against the competencies of people living with dementia (see Lindholm & Wray, 2011). For example, previous conversation analysis research has outlined difficulties people with dementia may have in answering certain types of questions (Jones et al., 2016; Williams et al., 2019). This may require interactional work to ensure people are included at an appropriate level, that the activity is completed, and that threats to the ‘face’ of players are ameliorated or managed in situ. In this article we examine the interactional strategies used to keep interactions within the quiz ‘on track’ and commensurate with completing the overarching activity. We then explore the impact that progressing through the quiz, and the interactional limitations framework imposed in quizzes, has for managing the ‘face’ concerns of players.

‘Face work’ is central to the organization of social interaction, motivated by the individual’s desire for face preservation/restoration (Goffman, 1967) and all interactions carry the risk of face threatening acts (Brown & Levinson, 1987). We take the view that face is ‘the relationship two or more persons create with one another in interaction’ (Arundale, 2010,

p.2078) and is an emergent phenomenon, negotiated between participants in interaction. Arundale's focus is on the initiation of repair strategies, and how these might threaten the face of one or more speaker, depending on their sequential placement. The concept of 'face' as emergent in interaction has been explored in the preference structure of talk-in-interaction (Lerner, 1996), and in context specific situations such as vivas (Izadi, 2017), being rude whilst calling 911 (Tracy & Tracy, 1998) in online counselling (Stommel & Van der Houwen, 2014), and in establishing interpersonal relationships (Svennevig, 1999). We build on this work here in our focus on the interactional strategies employed by staff members to move through quizzes. We then consider in our discussion how the concept of 'face' might be a relevant theoretical lens through which to analyse these data.

Data

The data were collected as part of a larger study about disabling and enabling social practices. We draw on video data from a corpus of 10 hours of naturally occurring interactions between 28 people living with dementia and staff, which included 10 quizzes led by staff members for people living with dementia, held in 4 settings (2 memory cafes, an activity group and a day centre). The quizzes were filmed by the first author in UK social care and dementia support settings.

The study followed a strict protocol approved by [ethics committee] to ensure that people assessed as lacking capacity to consent had personal consultees who could advise on their behalf. Each quiz was transcribed according to the detailed conventions common in conversation analysis (Jefferson, 1984). All names are anonymised.

Analysis

We used Conversation Analysis (hereafter CA) to identify and explore the interactional strategies staff members use to enact and progress through quizzes in dementia care settings. CA is a well-established approach to the study of talk in interaction, with an extensive history of application to interactions involving atypical language use (Wilkinson, 2019). We shall show that the staff's professional status (or "deontic status" Stevanovic and Peräkylä, 2012)

gives them rights to direct the course of action, and usually in the service of the overarching activity. Where there is no impediment to this objective, the talk progresses smoothly. However, moments at which staff intervene in order to progress through the quiz are often occasioned by the players themselves (the person does not want to play, they do not understand the question, they instigate ‘non-quiz’ talk, etc.) and herein lies the potential to introduce a trouble source which potentially could be repaired by the staff member. The collection of 22 sequences on which this article is based are all points at which staff members attempt to restore, reinstate or repair interactions in order to complete the quiz and keep it ‘on track’.

1. Interactional strategies for dealing with incorrect answers and ‘non-answers’

Schegloff & Sacks (1973) observed that answers are conditionally relevant following a question, and that there are two primary ways in which this conditional relevance could be satisfied; a recipient can provide an answer, or as Heritage (1984a) discusses, a recipient could provide an account for not answering, or ‘non-answer response’. Here we will see that even where there is a fitted ‘non answer’ response (e.g, ‘*I don’t know*’), or a grammatically and interactionally fitted incorrect answer to a question, staff consistently display a preference for correct answers by a selected person to be given in order for the quiz to be completed.

The following extract comes from a ‘crime and community safety’ quiz in a memory café. The extract features Sue and Pam. Sue is a woman living with dementia, and Pam is her daughter. Players had been split into small groups of 2 to 4 players to complete a quiz sheet.

Extract 1

1

1 SUE: What precautions can I take when meeting
2 friends in coffee shops or a bar?
3 (2.1)
4 PAM: Don't know the answer to that one
5 SUE: So what would you do with your personal
6 things? you don't really carry a handbag mum
7 d[o you] =

8 PAM? [No]
 9 SUE: but what would what would you suggest I do
 10 with my handbag?
 11 (2.6)
 12 PAM: .hh .tch Take - take it out of ↑view
 13 SUE: Sorry?
 14 PAM: Take it out of ↑view
 15 SUE: Or keep it i:n view I would think really you
 16 know if you are in a shop in a coffee shop or
 17 a [ba:r] yeah?
 18 PAM: [Yeah]
 19 (2.1)
 20 SUE: So keep hold of personal belongings yeah.
 21 ((Players move on to next question))

On lines 1-2 Sue poses a ‘*wh* question’ read from the quiz sheet relating to precautions one could/should take when out at a coffee shop or bar. After a lengthy gap, Pam gives a ‘non answer’ response (Heritage, 1984a); ‘Don’t know the answer to that one’. Pam frames her non-answer as contingent; it is only *this* specific question which she cannot answer, and she therefore frames her non-answer response as linked to this specific instance. For context, it is worth noting this was a common response from Pam, and so presumably a useful interactional strategy in managing an activity that she found difficult.

Line 4 is not only a transition relevant place, but also a transition-possible action, as it would be perfectly conceivable to move on to a subsequent quiz question. However, on lines 5-6, Sue utilises a ‘so-prefaced’ turn initiates a sequence (Bolden, 2009) that attempts to frame the question as within Pam’s epistemic domain (Heritage, 2012), simultaneously locating Pam’s ‘Don’t know’ response as a source of trouble. Thus, this sequence like many others in our data shows that the task facing the quiz player is not just to offer any response to a question, but to participate with appropriate answers on the terms set in the quiz. Sue’s turn on lines 5-7 is an attempt to help Pam answer the question via providing additional information which is further refined on lines 9-10 (but what would what would you suggest I do with my handbag?). Thus, Sue increases the specificity of the content and context of the question, delimiting the interactional framework and making the question easier to answer; in particular she draws upon their membership categories ‘mother’ and ‘daughter’, where the former may be expected to give safety advice to the latter. Reformulating, or ‘redoing’, a question after a non-answer response, or a response which is treated as not adequate, is a way of promoting intersubjectivity by attempting to make the question more understandable or easier to answer

(Antaki, 2002; Gardner, 2004; Kasper & Ross, 2007). However, it once again reopens a precarious and potentially face threatening situation for Pam; she has already outlined her K-position in relation to the posed question (Heritage, 2012).

After a silence of 2.6 seconds (line 11), Pam gives a grammatically and topically fitted answer for how to keep the handbag safe: ‘.hh .tch Take - take it out of ↑view’. After a brief other initiated repair (lines 13-14) where Pam repeats her answer, Sue reformulates Pam’s answer, changing the answer from ‘keeping the handbag out of view’, to ‘keeping it *in* view’. One could argue it is both important to keep one’s bag *out* of view of potential thieves, or to keep one’s bag *within* one’s line of sight. At line 15 Sue frames her answer as an explicit repair of Pam’s answer through her ‘or’ prefaced turn (Meyer, 1992) and her ‘so-prefaced’ gist formulation, or ‘candidate reading’ (line 20) confirms her own acceptance of the answer she repaired and reshaped. This has a flavour of pedagogical classroom interaction, where students’ answers are reformulated to be more accurate (Hauser, 2006). Here we see that progressivity at the turn level is trumped by orientation to the completion of the activity: it is not enough to give a ‘non-answer response’ or a fitted, but deemed incorrect, response; Pam’s response is treated as interim only, and she is given hints and tips to help her answer the question adequately. However, Sue does not accept an answer promoting Pam’s perspective, but gives one that promotes her own. Completing the quiz ‘correctly’, at least from Sue’s point of view, is given precedence over allowing Pam to give her own answer.

The following extract from a different setting also demonstrates that orientation to fulfilling the overarching activity can trump the forward movement of talk at the sequence level, creating a situation which participants orient to as ‘face threatening’. Here we see Richard (RIC) asked a question by a staff member (STA) in a mediated turn allocation quiz in a day centre. The extract also features other quiz players living with dementia: Julie, Jennifer, and Tim.

Extract 2

1

1 STA: Moving on, **Rich**:ard. Can you think of a
2 food, beginning with **R**:.

3 (1.8)

4 JUL: Radish (.) huh huh ↑ha hugh huh

5 (1.7)
6 RIC: .hh hh #Po↑tatoes
7 (2)
8 STA: Not quite have a[nother go,]
9 JEN: [()]
10 TIM: h↑mm #rump steak
11 STA: Food beginning with R::
12 ((Staff member draws an R in the air with his finger))
13 RIC: Oh ↑sorry [huh huh huh huh huh]
14 STA: [That's alright car]ry on?,
15 JUL: O:hh [me back]
16 ? [()]
17 (8)
18 ?: O:h ↑woo ↑woo ↑↑woo
19 (2.1)
20 ?: ((clears throat))
21 (2.2)
22 TIM: Come ##o:n
23 RIC: [ehuh huh huh] [huh huh] huh
24 TIM: [Huh huh] [rice]
25 JUL: Huh huh huh
26 (0.6)
27 RIC: No=
28 STA: No? Okay th:en let's move on to ↑Sa::l

The staff member selects Richard as the next player (line 1) and issues the question: Can you think of a food, beginning with R:.'. The modal verb 'can' projects the possibility (and ability) that Richard has of completing the task, and it is built to display a 'yes' preferring answer. The staff member emphasises the two salient characteristics of the question by putting intonational stress on 'food' and 'R'. There is silence immediately following the question in which another participant, Judith, gives a correct answer ('radish'). However, her answer is not acknowledged by the staff member. Judith produces a number of laughter particles after her answer in Richard's allocated interactional space (see Glenn, 2003), to mark her unsanctioned stepping into Richard's space as a retroactively non-serious answer, or at least one that acknowledges its 'out-of-place-ness' within the interactional order.

Richard produces an answer on line 6, 'potatoes', that satisfies only one of the question criteria: he names a food, but *not* one beginning with R. This is met with a two seconds silence on line 7, indicating trouble with his answer, confirmed in line 8 where the staff member says 'Not quite have a[nother go,]'. 'Not quite' softens the blow and potentially face threatening act of indicating a wrong answer (Goffman, 1967) and also refers

to the answer meeting half of the question's criteria. Immediately after, another participant produces a 'correct' answer that is *again* ignored, coming directly after Richard's turn has been allocated. Here, as in many other examples in our data, non-sanctioned turns taken outside of allocated turns are ignored as if they were not spoken. As in the previous extract, the questioner once more reformulates the question and gives the player another turn. The conditions of the question are reiterated (line 11), removing all linguistic packaging ('*food beginning with R::*') to aid comprehension of the task. Indeed, the 'missing' part of the answer (the correct first letter) is emphasised prosodically, and physically; the staff member draws an R in the air with his finger, signalling the letter as the trouble source.

Richard's 'oh' prefaced turn on line 13 acknowledges the new information (Heritage, 1984b) (that the answer must begin with R); his apology acknowledges the misunderstanding of the original question, and therefore the perceived transgression of a 'wrong answer', whilst the laughter likely relates to the understanding of the trouble source. The placement of laughter matters, and can index or reframe the content of the previous turn (Jefferson, Sacks and Schegloff, 1977, p. 12). In this case, it comes after an apology and apparent recognition of a misunderstanding. It is noteworthy here that Richard laughs *alone*; his laughter is not reciprocated or treated as an invitation. As Sacks (1992, p.571) notes, when one interlocutor laughs and the other does not, perhaps they are committing a violation. Here, the violation is of an intersubjective nature; Richard either did not hear or understand the quiz master's instructions. The staff member's lack of laughter in response aligns to the delicacy of the situation. To laugh in response to Richard could be construed as laughing *at* Richard, and risk producing a face threatening action; even if occasioned by Richard himself. As in Haakana's work on laughter in medical consultations (2001), Richard's laughter is delivered to deal with the delicate interactional slot of acknowledging the incorrect answer and the misunderstanding, or mishearing, of the rules. Thus, Richard's laughter can be seen as a face-saving device as it occurs in a situation that has the potential to cause embarrassment or anxiety (see Glenn, 2003). The 'oh' (line13) in particular casts this as new information, and therefore a wrong answer occasioned by not being in full knowledge of the question conditions, as opposed to an inability to answer.

Richard's apology is met with a preferred response (Robinson, 2004) and an invitation to have another guess now that the trouble source has seemingly been identified. However, Richard's long silence (lines 14 – 23) shows that answering the question remains difficult.

Richard sits motionless for 15 seconds, in which time the silence is punctuated by an off-topic interjection from Julie (line 15). Silences in response to questions are normatively treated as accountable (Sacks et al, 1974). This may explain Tim's utterance ('*come on*') which is hearable as a rebuke for Richard holding up the game. This elicits Richard's laughter particles in response (line 23) which can be seen as managing his inability to supply an appropriate response, and how that might seem to his interlocutors (see also Partington, 2006). Again, Richard laughs alone to deal with a delicate interactional slot (Haakana, 2001); this time after an admonishment highlighting a perceived transgression; Richard has taken too long with his go and held up the game for others. Laughing as a means to deal with a delicate interactional slot has much in common with Lindholm's (2008) work on elderly patients, whose recurrent laughter in second position showed an awareness of their potential non-competency. Here, Richard's inability to answer the question is foregrounded and he manages this by producing laughter in the space an answer should come. Hereafter he cedes his turn (line 27).

Whilst Richard's turn was 'safeguarded' as other responses were elided by the staff, this mediated turn allocation system also carries with it the possibility of the player failing to respond adequately, and thus losing his turn. This system of mediated turn allocation also effectively forestalls social interaction; other players stepping into Richard's turn space are not acknowledged, which shows that the preference for a response from the selected speaker trumps progressivity of the *activity*. This corresponds to work by Stivers and Robinson (2006) who show that non-selected co-participants will provide answers when they are not forthcoming from selected speakers. In contrast, the answers in our dataset are mostly not orientated to by staff members when another person has been selected to answer, and are thus not treated as expediting the completion of the overarching activity; completing the quiz.

Here we have shown how staff actions in response to players' 'non answer responses' work towards completing the quiz by reformulating the question, repairing answers, and giving repeated turns to players. These actions display a preference for correct answers to be given in order to move forwards with the quiz. However, this orientation to completing the overarching activity, and answering each question (despite the fact that it could be seen as a kindness to give players multiple goes at answering the question) can engender additional face-work for players. In the previous examples, players have given fitted responses to quiz questions, even if those actions were treated as insufficient by the staff to some degree. Next

we will see how staff orient to keeping the overarching activity on-track in response to actions which do not work towards activity completion.

2. Keeping the activity 'on track'

'Topically relevant' versus 'task relevant' talk

Quizzes impose an overarching interactional agenda, characterised by a base question and answer sequence. As such, turns that do not expedite the progress of the quiz face being treated as 'off topic' and/or 'off track'. Talk can be categorized as being on-topic or topic-shifting (Crow 1983). Here we examine talk that is both 'on topic' *and* 'topic shifting'.

In the following extract a group of six players (Janet, Gina, Fred, Barbara, Staff member, and Mary) are sitting round a table playing a team quiz. As in Extract 2, players must give answers to different categories that all begin with the same letter (e.g., if the letter is T, and the category is 'modes of transport', players could say 'train'). Fred uses his turns to accomplish a different kind of activity to quizzing: storytelling. The staff member is in the position of potentially having to satisfy both the role of story recipient, and her role as quiz member and 'team captain'. Here, we examine how that interactional dilemma plays out.

Extract 3

1 STA: Okay let's move on then number ten. A weapon.
2 A weapon beginning with tee.
3 ((Staff member signs the letter T using her hand
4 and a pen))
5 BAR: Ooh umm=
6 STA: =Mmm
7 ((Staff member taps pen on table))
8 (4)
9 STA: °A weap[on°
10 [((Staff member taps pen on table))
11 (3.4)
12 BAR: °I can't think of one°
13 STA: No:::.
14 JAN: A torped(h)o(h): heh.
15 STA: Ye[ah
16 JOE: [Yeah
17 ?: A [tee]
18 STA: [Exc]ellent Ja↑[net]
19 GIN: [Which]
20 (0.3)

21 STA: A tor↑pe↓do
 22 GIN: ↑Oh ↑↑[yeah
 23 STA: [Tor]↑pe↓do
 24 ((CAT writes on the pad of paper))
 25 (0.6)
 26 FRE: My- my brother [was in the na]vy.
 27 STA: [Oh well done].
 28 ((CAT is looking at DEB))
 29 (Good [answer])
 30 FRE: [He w]as torpedoed,
 31 STA: Wa[s he?]
 32 FRE: [In the] m↑ed
 33 STA: Oh [wo:w.]
 34 GIN: [Mmm]
 35 (0.6)
 36 STA: That must have been ↑frightening Fred?
 37 (1)
 38 FRE: Yeah he was interned in Tun↑isia.
 39 STA: Yeah?
 40 (1.5)
 41 STA: And was [that in the war?]
 42 FRE: [A-a- a (W]later convoy)
 43 STA: Yeah. Yeah.
 44 (0.7)
 45 STA: Wo:w.
 46 (0.8)
 47 STA: That's a↑mazing yeah,
 48 It's a↑mazing ↑isn't it what people,
 49 you know, (0.8) ha-have done.
 50 (0.5)
 51 STA: .HH >Alright okay number eleven<. .tch ↑Things
 52 that are ro:und.

Lines 1-24 make up the recognisable base sequence of a quiz: question – possible answer/response – confirmation/disconfirmation of response/answer. This structure marks a similarity with prototypical classroom sequences (question, answer and evaluation (McHoul, 1978). On lines 1 -25 the staff member asks the players to name a weapon beginning with T (lines 1 and 2), which Janet does (line 14), and the answer is confirmed by the staff member (line 18). Gina then initiates a sequence to repair understanding/intersubjectivity, as she apparently did not hear the answer (lines 19-24).

Following the answer of ‘torpedo’, Fred launches a story telling sequence (My- my brother [was in the na]vy). Upon receiving no response to his turn, Fred produces an increment (*he was torpedoed.*) with continuing intonation forecasting further talk. Goffman (1971, p. 95) notes that the act of speaking expresses not only a right to speech, but a corresponding obligation to listen. Fred’s increment can therefore be understood as an attempt to gain access to the interactional floor, after receiving no response to his initial turn. Once the link between

the quiz answer and Fred's turn has been established, the staff member treats Fred's turns for the action they were seemingly intended to accomplish; a story announcement. This casts the staff member in the role of story recipient (Jefferson, 1978), and she duly attends to her recipient role ('was he?'). Fred adds a turn increment, ('In the m_↑ed), further specifying the location of the torpedo attack in the Mediterranean sea, which the staff member responds to with a news receipt + high grade assessment ('Oh wo:w.') (Goodwin, 1986). The staff member's turns in second position (high grade assessments, continuers, yes preferring follow up questions) attend to her role as story recipient, and in doing this interactional work, she steps momentarily out of the part she has played in progressing the quiz itself. It is worth noting that there is space to do this in this context, since speakership is less prescribed and more fluid than in mediated turn quizzes (see extract 2 for example).

The staff member then prompts further information with an 'and-prefaced' turn (line 41), over which Fred talks in overlap giving further information (line 42). The staff member produces an agreement continuer (Yeah. Yeah., line 43), followed by a 0.7 second gap. Likely because Fred does not continue his story, the staff member produces a high-grade assessment common at the climax of a story (Antaki et al., 2000). Following another silence (line 46), the staff member again reiterates her high-grade assessment of the story, followed by a kind of non-specific summary/gist formulation of Fred's story (line 47 to 49). This demonstrates receipt and understanding of the story, provides a closing-third summary action, and moves towards the termination of her role of 'story recipient'.

After a further silence of 0.5 seconds, the staff member produces a first pair part action which reinstates the activity of the quiz. She does this by prefacing her turn with 'alright' and 'okay', both single lexical items which show a readiness to shift to subsequent matters (Beach, 1992), followed by the declaratively formed next quiz question ('*things that are round*'). Thus, the staff member draws on her deontic stance and status (Stevanovic & Peräkylä, 2012) to move the group on to the next question and reinstate the business of doing the quiz. Here then, the staff member faces how to deal with *on* topic, but *off* track, talk and the way that progress of the overarching action is still accomplished. Fred's turns are validated and attended to; it is only when no further increments or talk are forthcoming that the staff member reinstates the interactional framework of the quiz. The staff member aligns with Fred to maintain him as a storyteller, before drawing on her deontic status to reinstate the overarching activity via a gist summary of Fred's story and a single lexical item prefaced

turn to shift topics/activities. We will see how attending to this institutional imperative to progress through the quiz is accomplished, despite off-track talk and side sequences.

Side sequences and topic expansion

Analysis of the data further revealed other interactional impediments to the completion of the base 'question-answer-evaluation' sequence and keeping the quiz 'on track'. For instance, players breaking off into side sequences and engaging in talk that expands on the topic, but does not work to further the quiz completion (Jefferson, 1972).

The following extract is from the same quiz as the previous extract. Here the group had been asked to 'name a fruit beginning with T', to which Gina answered 'tomato', which was affirmed as a 'good answer' by the staff member. We join the players at the point Fred produces a non-minimal post-expansion (Schegloff, 2007) from the Q&A base pair.

Extract 4

16 FRED: We gro- [we grow them [in the ↑garden.] ((To staff
17 member))
18 GIN: [Tomato is a veg]etab[le in-=] ((to Janet))
19 STA: [Yeah]
20 they're ↑lovely [to grow and they're]
21 GIN: [Whatcha on about?] ((To Janet))
22 STA: nicer but [when you] grow them yourself ((To Fred))
23 FRE: [I know]
24 STA: they're much [nicer than the ones you buy in the
25 GIN: .HHH[OH:YA↑OHnly me and you could have a game [and er]
26 ((To Janet))
27 STA: superm[arket]
28 BAR: [() tomatoes?]= ((To staff member))
29 STA: [=aren't they.]Ye:ah.=]
30 GIN: [and er- and still] [keep laughin [huh huh ↑heh!]] ((To
31 Janet))
32 BAR: [=yeah I (used[to) grow them]
33 [a lot] ((To staff member))
34 JAN: [Huh huh huh] huh huh huh
35 STA: Okay then team right come on team let's pull ourselves
36 fto(h)gether [now c(h)os we're ne(h)v(h)er gu(H)n HA HA] HA
37 ? : [↑Huh ↑huh ↑huh ha ha #ha #ha]
38 JAN: [Pull yourself] together= ((To Gina))
39 BAR: [(°)]
40 GIN: =Yeah [come on m]e I'm (.) stupid ((looking at
41 Janet, points to ear))
42 STA: [↑Ha: ↑ha:]
43 STA: Right. Janet. [Janet.]
44 GIN: [Stupid] ((Looking at Janet))

45 (1)
46 STA: .tch .HH This is quite a tricky one this one.
47 JAN: O:h. d:ear.
48 STA: Yeah. Notorious people.

For the purpose of brevity, we summarise the talk from lines 1-15 (omitted here for space reasons). Following Gina's answer, there is a discussion about a) what answer was given (some players did not hear), and b) the relevance/acceptability of the answer. All the while, Gina and Janet engaged in side sequences where they were trying to understand each other, the rules of the game, and if the answer given was correct. This schism occurred in response to the staff member telling Gina her answer was a 'good one'; to which Janet turns her body posture and directs her eye gaze towards Gina, selecting her as a recipient. She then uses 'what?' as an open class repair initiator (Drew, 1997) to find out (it transpires) both what the answer was that Gina gave, and then what the question was. This reflects some of the hallmarks of a classic schism in that Janet targets a single person as recipient, and does so in the first instance via non-vocal actions of soliciting reciprocity in order to launch a new action and new sequence type (Egbert, 1997). This leads to two group discussions continuing simultaneously, one between Fred, the staff member and Barbara, and the second between Janet and Gina. All of these actions raised the volume and the number of people talking simultaneously.

Fred self-selects to talk at line 16, picking up on the topic of the quiz and expanded upon it to display his epistemic knowledge (We gro- [we grow them [in the ↑garden.]). Across multiple lines (19, 20, 22, 24, 27 and 29) the staff member responds to Fred's topically relevant turn about growing of tomatoes with a 'yeah' prefaced turn which acknowledges his turn and expands on the topic of 'growing tomatoes', which is overlapped by Fred's own claim to knowledge of the subject in response (line 23). The side sequence Fred instigated is then built upon by Barbara, who first checks the topic (line 28), then displaying her own first-hand evidence of having grown tomatoes herself on lines 32-33 (Heritage, 2012). The staff member demonstrates one way of dealing with off-track talk, in showing support for the person by agreeing with the declarative statement that Fred grows his own tomatoes (they're ↑lovely [to grow), whilst expanding it to compare the taste of home grown versus supermarket tomatoes (and they're] nicer but [when you] grow them yourself). In this way the staff member supports Fred's project, but also takes control of the topic.

Gina and Janet's side sequence continues (lines 25, 30,34), culminating in joint laughter at the ongoing difficulties to maintain intersubjectivity. It is at this point that the staff member produces an 'okay' prefaced turn to transition to subsequent matters (Beach, 1992), attempting to restore collective action to the group (lines 35, 36) with multiple lexical and phrasal items (*okay, right then team, come on team, let's pull ourselves together*) that descends into laughter, seemingly related to the multiple 'off track' side sequences. Note here that there was no initial trouble source to repair, since Gina had already supplied a correct response with 'tomato'. The laughter thus responds to the action performed by the side sequences about tomato-growing, and is *initiated* by the staff member (line 36), softening the potential understanding of her turn as 'doing admonishment'. She also uses collective pronouns, and thus including herself in the highlighted transgression. This is met with laughter echoing the staff member's (line 37). All of these facets enable the staff member to utilise her deontic authority, both by her laughter highlighting the non-seriousness of her action and including herself in the outlined transgression.

A newly instigated side sequence (lines 38 and 40) is once again initiated by Janet via reformulating the staff member's collective plea for intersubjective unity (*let's pull ourselves to(h)gether*) into a targeted jokey admonishment to Gina once again (*Pull yourself together*), but is promptly closed down by the staff member with a 'right'-prefaced turn followed by repeated speaker selection of Janet (line 43), one of the side sequence instigators. The staff member asks a declaratively formulated quiz question directed at Janet (lines 43-48), restoring one at a time speakership. Her appeal to collective, and intersubjective, restoration (lines 35 and 36), in conjunction with selecting twice selecting a next participant (line 43) who had been responsible for instigating the schism, makes the activity of doing the quiz conditionally relevant, and closes down opportunities for her or others to engage in side sequences that 1) relate to restoring intersubjectivity, or 2) build on the topic (tomatoes) but not the task (answering the quiz question and moving on to the following question).

It is worth noting, as in the previous extract, that the staff member does give space to non-activity related talk/actions before restoring/reinstating the interactional quiz framework, and thereby respects her interlocutors' topical initiations. However, her actions show that she is

constrained by a countervailing institutional force. She attends to this with clear appreciation of the potential force of her actions, ameliorated through laughter and including herself in the transgression. Nevertheless, the quiz, and the overarching activity of progressing towards quiz completion, is ultimately attended to.

3. Overriding the 'opt out' option

We have seen in the previous two extracts how people living with dementia may pursue interactional projects that do not work towards completing the quiz, and that staff routinely do work to get the quiz back 'on track'. Of course, players may opt out altogether. Here then staff are faced with a quandary; to recognise the autonomy and choice of the person, but risk leaving them out of the activity, or to override/persuade the person to join in, but disregard their choice.

The following extract took place in a day centre. There is a giant snakes and ladders board on the floor and participants are asked if they would like to either answer a quiz question or try to throw a ball in a bucket. If participants correctly answer a question, or throw a ball in the bucket, they are given dice to roll to advance their group on the board. We join the extract as Daniel is selected by the quizmaster to take his turn. S1 and S2 are male staff members. P2, P3 and P4 are service users.

Extract 5

1 S1: Dani:el (0.3) Would you like to answer a quiz question?
2 or throw the ba:ll in the bucket.
3 P2: (No) he'd r#ather whistle
4 (0.7)
5 P3: Oh ↓no
6 S: Would you like to throw the ↑ball
7 (1.8)
8 DAN: °Not really n[o°]
9 S1: [No]t [really?]
10 S2: [>UhHHHH]
11 (0.5)
12 ?: Oh
13 (0.8)
14 S1: .Hh would you like [(to)]
15 S2: [O:K]AY=

16 S1: =pass your go over to ↑Brendan
 17 ((P1/Daniel makes a hand movement))
 18 S2: Well we'll just let him have a shot at it. Here you go Daniel
 19 ((S2 drops the ball in Daniel's hands. He catches the ball))
 20 S2: Get it in the bucket s:ir
 21 P4: In the bu:rket
 22 ((Daniel throws the ball in the bucket))
 23 S2: Ye:::s easy peaz:::ay

Daniel is selected by the staff member and offered a two-option alternative (Antaki et al., 2008), presupposing selection of one of the options. Indeed, this is a strategy that staff use to attempt to secure participation; offering a choice where both options end in taking part; here one task relies on cognitive difficulty, and the other on physical ability. Of course, both put the player on the spot to some degree, but the player may ameliorate potential embarrassment by choosing the option about which they feel most confident.

On line 3, another player steps into Daniel's turn space giving an 'out of turn' dispreferred second-pair part that is not acknowledged by the staff or other players. As in other extracts, this 'out of turn' utterance receives no response; Player 3's 'oh no' (line 5) is similarly unattended to. Upon receiving no reply to the question posed (lines 1-2), the staff member reformulates the question, removing one option (answering a question) to a 'yes preferring' polar question designed to elicit uptake of throwing the ball (*Would you like to throw the ↑ball*). Note that the option that the staff member removes the option that relies the most of memory and recall. It is possible that this is a tactic to remove what could be considered the most face threatening option for a person living with dementia. However, having already placed 'throwing a ball' in second position (line 1-2) suggests that the staff member may have anticipated this option to be the most likely preferred activity or would like to foreground it as the preferred choice, as the power of contiguity imposes a preference for agreement to the last mentioned item (Sacks, 1987). However, the staff member's efforts are met with resistance. On line 8, Daniel produces a dispreferred second pair part rejecting the offer of participating in the game. Indeed, Daniel's dispreference is forecast by the 1.8 gap before answering; a common feature of dispreferred turns (Heritage, 1984a). Indeed, that it is an unexpected, and dispreferred, turn is revealed with the staff member questioning the turn itself (line 9). The staff member faces a quandary: to move forward respects Daniel's choice but leaves him out of the game, and ignoring it means including him but overriding his autonomy. In the event, the staff member attempts to move the quiz forward with a yes-

preferring polar question designed for Daniel to cede his go (.Hh would you like (to)pass your go over to ↑Brendan).

At this juncture a second staff member pushes back against Daniel's decision to self-exclude. S2 says 'Well we'll just let him have a shot at it. Here you go Daniel' and places the ball in Daniel's hands and instructing him to 'get it in the bucket sir' (line 20), with which Daniel complies (line 22). The staff member's use of the mitigating discourse marker "well" (line 18) is an example of what Goffman (1967, p.38) calls tact and diplomacy – here, a rejection of the original decision by Daniel to opt out of the quiz, and an attempt to soften the forthcoming dissonance (Schiffrin, 1987). However, his action of placing the ball in Daniel's lap and instructing him to 'throw the ball in the bucket sir' constitutes an infringement on Daniel's face, which the 'well' and polite use of 'sir' arguably attempts to mitigate. However, the staff member's action clearly is at odds with the line Daniel has taken, and therefore undermines his chosen action. We will consider later how this fits with Brown and Levinson's (1987) ideas about positive and negative face.

The staff member therefore orients to progressing the quiz by *including* Daniel, despite his stated preference. Daniel does then throw the ball in the bucket, complying with the staff member's instruction. So what are we to make of this? One way of ensuring the quiz moves forward is to weight the options in favour of taking part, removing potential face threatening options, and finally, overriding choices to opt out. This tactic goes some way towards ensuring participation, however it overtly undermines choice and autonomy. The player is offered a choice between two options, which is met with silence, typically a sign of trouble or dispreference; the staff member then reformulates the question and *removes* a choice, arguably a way of upgrading uptake by narrowing the options; when this is explicitly rejected, another staff member steps in and hands the player the ball despite the service user's mitigated declination. Inclusion, participation and the forward momentum of the game are foregrounded over the right to choose. If being 'in face' is taking a line that is supported by the actions of others (Goffman, 1955), then the staff member, despite actions that aim to include Daniel, undermines the line he has taken. We now discuss the tensions these extracts exemplify between the institutional task of progressing and completing the quiz, and the implications this can have for the face-management of the players.

Discussion

We have outlined the recurrent interactional strategies that staff members used to establish and fulfil the institutional agenda of ‘doing a quiz’. Our analysis reveals that: 1) staff orient to the overarching agenda by stepping in to fix/reinstate actions which are counter to completing the quiz; 2) they employ a variety of interactional strategies throughout, but all in the service of progressing and completing the activity; 3) because the impediments to progress are often (or are treated by staff as being) occasioned by players with dementia, attempts to reinstate progress or fix this can be face threatening. One reason for this is that they may run counter to the expressed wishes of the person living with dementia. However, another reason is that the trouble source runs the risk of being located within the incompetence of the speaker or quiz player. Thus, moving the activity forward/activity completing actions and ‘face work’ are intertwined.

Quizzes impose both an interactional framework and an overarching activity that the individual actions are supposed to work towards. We have shown that those players who performed actions that did not contribute to activity completion were treated by staff as being in need of interactional work to realign their turns with the institutional agenda. This is done by giving hints and tips by reformulating the question and keeping turns open for players who either cannot initially answer or answer incorrectly (extracts 1 and 2), using deontic stance and status to reinstate activity related talk in the face of ‘on topic, off track’ talk (extracts 3 and 4), and finally by overriding stated preferences to not join in by removing two option alternatives (extract 5). This collection of actions are unified in serving the overarching activity. This echoes work by Antaki and Webb (2019) in which support workers may find themselves in a situation where they prioritise an overarching project over a local one, or do work to get the interaction back on (the institutional) track. Here, the distinct feature is that the overarching activity is intrinsically an interactional one.

Quizzes impose a particular interactional framework, which can delimit the interactional scope. Although these actions are not pre-planned, they remind us that the staff have institutional roles and an overarching agenda to achieve. However, this agenda to keep the quiz ‘on track’ can clash with players other projects; to socialise, expand on topics, reinstate intersubjectivity or simply opting out of the game. The staff members’ motivations for

engaging in acts that served the completion of the overarching project are outside the scope of this analysis, but some speculation is offered here for what it is worth. If staff permit people to engage in actions which do not serve the overarching activity, then they may be said to have failed in their role, and could be viewed negatively for having not managed to engage and help people join in the activity.

The quizzes in our data were differently structured, with some imposing strict player selection, and others implying teamwork amongst participants. However, all were built on question-response pairs, with responses specified as correct, appropriate, acceptable or wrong. Thus, any quiz activity plays directly on the cognitive competence or incompetence of players, and 'impediments' could be the difficulty of answering a question, resulting in players being 'put on the spot'. Therefore, it is reasonable to expect staff members to step in and use interactional strategies to help the person participate.

What has our analysis shown about the concept of face-work, and how it is done in interaction? As Arundel (2010) points out, in everyday conversation, a trouble source is normatively repaired by the person who produced it. Thus any attempt to repair another's trouble source is 'vulnerable to being interpreted as questioning the other's competency in managing his/her own talk' (2010), and participants will do joint work routinely during such a conversation to mitigate that trouble, and to avoid a 'separation' or lack of connection between them. Of course, quizzes impose a framework for the talk which is far from the routine, everyday conversation in Arundel's excerpts, and run the risk of much greater institutional asymmetry, with staff members being in control of determining what constitutes an appropriate and a correct response from players. Repair by a staff member of an incorrect response is endemic to this type of talk.

However, even in Extracts 2 and 3, where turn selection was strictly controlled by a staff member, we have shown how the selected player, the other players, and the staff member worked jointly to reduce any threat to face. All this occurred in the to-and-fro of the quiz itself, with any signs of trouble being responded to by laughter, attempts to prompt or support one's fellow player, and by various mitigating devices or prompts offered by the staff member. Interestingly, a player could also take a turn in the conversation, as seen in extract 3, not by producing a correct answer, but by picking up the topic of a previous respondent.

Where that was followed up by the staff member, it was a useful device for softening the institutionality of the question-correct response routine on which a quiz is based. The work done to avoid face threats mark these extracts as involving at least one person who might be expected to have difficulties and to wish to mask those difficulties in public. We argue that quizzes are a particular interactional site at which face threatening acts, such as issues around cognitive processes, memory and appropriate participation, can become interactionally relevant. However, this need not be the case; two extracts where the staff member did not know the answer at the outset (extracts 3 and 4) also occasioned the most group interaction with people self-selecting to talk. Indeed, we found a low epistemic stance encoded in questions from the staff members to be an effective way of eliciting talk in general (Williams et al., 2019).

Turning back to Brown and Levinson's (1987) politeness theory, one could argue that participants are jointly attending to the *positive face* of each quiz player. However, there is also an element of *negative face* work, since there is no doubt that the structure of the quiz imposes choices onto participants, and that imposition has to be handled sensitively by all participants, as was evident particularly in Extract 5. It is the need to attend to forward progression of the quiz which creates the tension for staff members, and indeed for other participants. Should they pause to work on trouble sources to mitigate failure in the quiz, or should they press on to reach the end of the quiz itself?

In seeking ways to resolve that tension, we found it was helpful to attend not only to the micro-strategies of the talk, but also to the structure of the quiz as a social activity. Team quizzes contained fewer moments of people being put 'on the spot', and so it might be expected that fewer face threatening situations arise in that context. This is especially important given that these types of quizzes are a) put on for fun, b) intended to facilitate social interaction, and c) attended by people at different stages of dementia and with different communicational abilities and challenges. In the team quiz presented here (extract 3 and 4), the staff member is a member of the team, and so whilst the staff member in this quiz uses her deontic authority to keep the quiz on track, she was able to include herself in gentle admonishments to return to the task, and so lessened a potential face threatening act. Additionally, she asks questions to be answered by the team, to which she does not already know the answer. Thus epistemic asymmetries, and therefore threats to face, are ameliorated

as it is approached as a group activity. Lastly, because speakership is more fluid and less constrained than mediated turn allocated quiz formats, there is more space for people living with dementia to take turns (such as storytelling) that do not correspond to the overarching goal of quiz completion, but which do serve an important interpersonal function.

We have explored the interactional strategies staff use to keep the quiz task on track, often in the face of actions which they treat as needing correcting, or repairing, or redirecting, in order to complete the quiz. Staff members in our data thus faced the dilemma of achieving the goal of successfully enacting the quiz versus responding to the actions and wishes of the players, which may not correspond to this goal. In doing so they can find themselves walking a fine line between attending to the overarching activity and the face of the players, which can result in inadvertently perpetuating interactional asymmetries.

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to acknowledge the support given in analysis by our co-investigators Professors Charles Antaki and Celia Kitzinger, and to thank all the people with dementia and their supporters who took part in this research. They would particularly like to thank their co-researchers Harry Davis, Sandie Read and Roy James for their work on the project.

Funding

The author(s) disclosed receipt of the following financial support for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article: Economic and Social Research Council (ES/M008339/1).

References

- Aguirre, E., Woods, R. T., Spector, A., & Orrell, M. (2013). Cognitive stimulation for dementia: a systematic review of the evidence of effectiveness from randomised controlled trials. *Ageing research reviews*, 12(1), 253-262.
- Antaki, C., Houtkoop-Steenstra, H., & Rapley, M. (2000). " Brilliant. next question...": High-grade assessment sequences in the completion of interactional units. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 33(3), 235-262.
- Antaki, C. (2002). Personalised revision of 'failed' questions. *Discourse Studies*, 4(4), 411-428.

- Antaki, C., Finlay, W., Walton, C., & Pate, L. (2008). Offering choices to people with intellectual disabilities: an interactional study. *Journal of Intellectual Disability Research*, 52(12), 1165-1175.
- Antaki, C., & Webb, J. (2019). When the larger objective matters more: support workers' epistemic and deontic authority over adult service-users. *Sociology of Health & Illness*, 41(8), 1549-1567.
- Arundale, R. B. (2010). Constituting face in conversation: Face, facework, and interactional achievement. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 42, 2078-2105.
- Beach, W. A. (1993). Transitional regularities for 'casual' "Okay" usages. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 19(4), 325-352.
- Bolden, G. B. (2009). Implementing incipient actions: The discourse marker 'so' in English conversation. *Journal of pragmatics*, 41(5), 974-998.
- Brown, P. and Levinson, S. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Crow, BK. (1983), 'Topic shifts in couples' conversations', in Craig, TT & Tracy, R (eds.), *Conversational coherence: Form, structure & strategy*, Sage Publications, Beverly Hills.
- Drew, P., and Heritage, J. (eds). (1992) *Talk at Work: Interaction in Institutional Settings*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Drew, P. (1997). 'Open' class repair initiators in response to sequential sources of troubles in conversation. *Journal of pragmatics*, 28(1), 69-101.
- Egbert, M. M. (1997). Schisming: The collaborative transformation from a single conversation to multiple conversations. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 30(1), 1-51.
- Gardner, R. (2004). On delaying the answer: Question sequences extended after the question. In R. Gardner & J. Wagner (Eds.), *Second language conversations* (pp. 246–266). London, UK: Continuum.
- Glenn, P. (2003). *Laughter in Interaction. Studies in Interactional Sociolinguistics*. Cambridge University Press
- Goffman, E. (1955). On face-work: An analysis of ritual elements in social interaction. *Psychiatry*, 18(3), 213-231.
- Goffman, E. (1967). *Interaction ritual: Essays on face-to-face interaction*. Oxford, England: Aldine

- Goffman, E. (1971). *Relations in Public: Microstudies of the Public Order*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Goodwin, C. (1986). Between and within: Alternative sequential treatments of continuers and assessments. *Human Studies*, 9(2–3), 205–217
- Graty, C. (2013). *Taking part: Activities for people with dementia* (Vol. 14). Alzheimer's Society.
- Haakana, M. (2001). Laughter as a patient's resource: Dealing with delicate aspects of medical interaction. *Text–Interdisciplinary Journal for the Study of Discourse*, 21(1-2), 187-219.
- Hauser, E. (2006) Teacher reformulations of students' answers during an episode of pedagogical talk. *Bulletin of the University of Electro-Communications*, vol.19, p.93-99.
- Hayano, K. (2013). Question design in conversation. In J.Sidnell & T.Stivers (Eds.), *The handbook of conversation analysis* (pp. 395–414). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.
- Hellermann, J. (2005). The sequential and prosodic co-construction of a 'quiz game' activity in classroom talk. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 37(6), 919-944.
- Heritage, J. (1984a), *Garfinkel and Ethnomethodology*, Cambridge, Polity Press.
- Heritage, J. (1984b). *A change-of-state token and aspects of its sequential placement*. In Atkinson & Heritage (eds.), 299-345.
- Heritage, J. (1997). Conversational analysis and institutional talk: Analyzing data. In D. Silverman (Eds.), *Qualitative research: Theory, method and practice* (pp. 161-182). London: Sage.)
- Heritage, J. (2012). Epistemics in action: Action formation and territories of knowledge. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 45(1): 1–29.
- Izadi, A. (2017). Turn-Taking, Preference, and Face in Criticism Responses. *Research in Applied Linguistics*, 8(1), 72-88.
- Jefferson G. (1972) Side sequences. In *Studies in Social Interaction* (ed Sudnow D. N.), pp. 294–338. New York: MacMillan/The Free Press.
- Jefferson G. (1978) Sequential aspects of storytelling in conversation. In: Schenkein J (ed.) *Studies in the Organization of Conversational Interaction*. New York: Academic Press, pp. 219–248.
- Jefferson G. (1984) Transcription notation. In: Atkinson JM, Heritage J, editors. *Structures of social action*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Jones, D., Drew, P., Elsey, C., Blackburn, D., Wakefield, S., Harkness, K., & Reuber, M. (2016). Conversational assessment in memory clinic encounters: interactional profiling for differentiating dementia from functional memory disorders. *Aging & mental health*, 20(5), 500-509.
- Kasper, G., & Ross, S. J. (2007). Multiple questions in oral proficiency interviews. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 40, 2045–2070.
- Lerner, G. H. (1996). Finding "face" in the preference structures of talk-in-interaction. *Social psychology quarterly*, 303-321.
- Lindholm, C. (2008). Laughter, communication problems and dementia. *Communication & medicine*, 5(1), 3-14.
- Lindholm, C., & Wray, A. (2011). Proverbs and formulaic sequences in the language of elderly people with dementia. *Dementia*, 10(4), 603-623.
- McHoul, A. (1978). The organization of turns at formal talk in the classroom. *Language in Society*, 7, 183-213.
- Meyer, C. C. (1992). *Apposition in contemporary English*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Partington, A. (2006). *The linguistics of laughter: A corpus-assisted study of laughter-talk*. Routledge.
- Robinson, J. D. (2004). The sequential organization of "explicit" apologies in naturally occurring English. *Research on language and social Interaction*, 37(3), 291-330.
- 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). Academic Press.
- Sacks, H. (1992). In: Jefferson, G. (Ed.), *Lectures on Conversation*, vol. 2. Blackwell, Oxford
- Sacks, H. (1987) 'On the Preferences for Agreement and Contiguity in Sequences in Conversation', in Button, G. & Lee, J.R.E. (eds) *Talk and Social Organisation*, pp.54 – 69. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters
- Schegloff, E. A., & Sacks, H. (1973). Opening up closings. *Semiotica*, 8(4), 289-327.
- Schegloff, E. A. (2007). *Sequence organization in interaction: A primer in conversation analysis I* (Vol. 1). Cambridge University Press.
- Schiffrin, Deborah, (1987). *Discourse Markers*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Stevanovic, M., & Peräkylä, A. (2012). Deontic authority in interaction: The right to announce, propose, and decide. *Research on Language & Social Interaction*, 45(3), 297-321.

Stivers, T., & Robinson, J. D. (2006). A preference for progressivity in interaction. *Language in society*, 35(3), 367-392.

Stommel, W., & Van der Houwen, F. (2014). Complaining and the management of face in online counselling. *Qualitative Health Research*, 24(2), 183-193.

Svennevig, J. (2000). *Getting acquainted in conversation: A study of initial interactions* (Vol. 64). John Benjamins Publishing.

Tracy, K., & Tracy, S. J. (1998). Rudeness at 911: Reconceptualizing face and face attack. *Human Communication Research*, 25(2), 225-251.

Wilkinson, R. (2019). Atypical Interaction: Conversation Analysis and Communicative Impairments. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 52(3), 281-299

Williams, V., Webb, J., Dowling, S., & Gall, M. (2019). Direct and indirect ways of managing epistemic asymmetries when eliciting memories. *Discourse Studies*, 21(2), 199-215.

