

Radboud University



Faculty of Arts
International Business Communication
Bachelor's Thesis LET-CIWB351-IBC
Bachelor's Thesis
Supervisor: Eniola Boluwaduro

Identifying Forms of Advice Delivery and the Impact of Authority in Advisory Interaction (A Conversation Analysis)

Abstract: Utilising conversation analysis, this paper investigates advice delivery formats and the impact of authority in televised advisory interactions between academic colleagues. Analyses of nine advisory sequences from a single-case televised interview identified four different formats of advice; declarations, non-agentives, agentives, and conditionals. Authority was found to impact the advice recipient's response; low-authority responses followed high-authority assertions by advice givers, while high-authority responses occurred with low-authority advice. These findings expand previous CA studies on the influence of authority in advice interactions and offer new insights into academic advisory contexts. Furthermore, this study calls for research to expand on advisory interactions across diverse mediums, genres, and institutional contexts.

Keywords: Advice, Authority, Advice Formats, Conversation Analysis, Televised, Academia

Name: Tieryn Ott

Student number: s1078616

Date: 6/6/2024

Word count: 7,273

Table of Contents

1. Introduction	2
2. Theoretical Framework	4
2.1 Concept of Advice	4
2.2 Advice Delivery Formats	5
2.3 Authority in Advisory Interactions	6
3. Present study	9
3.1 Aims	9
3.2 Research Questions	9
4. Method and Data	11
4.1 Method	11
4.2 Data	11
5. Data analysis	13
5.1 Advice Delivery Formats and Advice Reception	13
5.1.1 (Declarative)	14
5.1.2 (Non-agentive)	20
5.1.3 (Agentive)	23
5.1.4 (If/then conditional)	25
5.2 Impact of Authority	27
5.2.1 High Epistemic Authority	28
5.2.2 Low Epistemic and Deontic Access	30
5.2.3: High Epistemic and Deontic Authority	31
6. Discussion	33
References	36
Appendix	43
Ethical Assessment	44

1. Introduction

“Have you considered removing a class to make more time?”, “You have to go to Diablos, it’s the best!”, “If you like spicy food, then go to Bhalu.”. All of these are examples of advice that can be formed in various ways, such as a question, imperative, or an if/then conditional sentence. These various forms of advice have been found to occur in different interactions such as daily conversations, interviews, and consultations. Furthermore, these forms of advice have been studied using conversation analysis (CA) in different institutional contexts like academia, business, healthcare, and psychology. CA aims to study everyday instances of human social interaction identifying verbal and nonverbal features of communication that may go unnoticed during an interaction by using transcription (Limberg & Locher, 2012).

For example, in an academic context, Limberg (2010) used CA to analyse advisory interactions between teachers and students and found that advice was given as recommendations, assessments, or expressions of intended actions. Conversely, in an online healthcare context, multiple studies have used CA to analyse advisory interactions over the phone and discovered questions, assessments, and if/then conditional sentences were common forms of advice delivery (Butler et al., 2009; Moore, 2009; Bloch & Leydon, 2019). These studies show that advice delivery formats can differ depending not only on the context but also on the medium through which they occur. However, there is a lack of research investigating the impact of the medium on advice delivery formats or the use of different advice delivery formats across mediums.

Extensive research has analysed advisory interactions and formats of advice in a healthcare context. This can be attributed to the nature and importance of medical professionals advising individuals on future courses of action beneficial to their health. For example, using CA, Connabeer (2021) found that primary care doctors commonly used imperatives, advice implicative questions, and if/then conditional sentences to give lifestyle advice to patients. This study highlights the importance of how medical professionals deliver advice to their patients, as well as how advice is received, implemented, or resisted by the patient (Senjen & Austin, 1993; Harrison & Barlow, 2009; Morgan, 2013). When studying healthcare advisory interactions, the influence of authority has become a significant point of research (Harrison & Barlow, 2009; Boluwaduro, 2021). In studying how healthcare advice is

delivered by medical professionals, Pilnick and Zayts (2015) analysed the impact of authority within doctor and patient advisory interactions. Using CA, the study revealed that doctors often evoked authority to advise future courses of action to the patient and to assert their expertise in advising such actions.

Although these studies have identified advice delivery formats and the potential influence of authority, the focus has been primarily on advisory interactions in a healthcare context and overlooks the importance of similar investigation in a workplace context. Findings from such an investigation would be valuable to build a fundamental understanding of how advisory interactions occur in the workplace to best manage social and professional relations during such encounters. Furthermore, this research could contribute evidence of effective advice-giving strategies in internal and external work practices. For these reasons, this study aims to address these research gaps regarding investigating contexts, mediums, and impacts of authority in advisory interactions.

2. Theoretical Framework

2.1 Concept of Advice

Due to the ambiguity regarding advice, its definition, its features, and its implications, advice has become a flourishing yet complex research topic in the scholarly community (Cutrona & Suhr, 1994; Feng & MacGeorge, 2006; Graf et al., 2014; Hutchby, 2014). This is why it is important to establish an overview of how advice can be defined and identified. In this research, the definition by Sefi and Heritage (1992) will be used as the foundation to investigate the concept of advice. They define advice as communication that “describes, recommends or otherwise forwards a preferred course of future action” (p. 368).

This definition provides a general overview of what advice can be, however, it does not describe how advice can be identified. For this research, advice will be identified using the features of advice described by Shaw et al. (2015) CA of advice delivery, namely: normativity and knowledge asymmetry. The normativity of advice relates to proposing a beneficial future course of action that the recipient should follow or see as the preferred action. This feature reflects the definition of advice above by Sefi and Heritage (1992) as it posits that advice recommends future action to be taken. Knowledge asymmetry indicates that in an advice interaction, depending on the subject of conversation, one party holds less knowledge while the other party holds greater knowledge. This position of knowledge is context-dependent, meaning for one subject area, a person may assume the position of greater knowledge, but in another subject area, they now hold the less knowledgeable position (Ong, 2021).

Consider the following example of advice given by a doctor to a patient, “Based on your gluten allergies, I advise using two separate silverware sets to prepare food. This reduces the risk of cross-contamination with glutenous foods as cross-contamination can cause anaphylactic shock”. Following the features of advice by Shaw et al. (2015), advice is given here as normativity can be identified in the suggestion to utilise two silverware sets (future action), and the advice giver (doctor) possessing special knowledge and precautions regarding the specific medical condition shows knowledge asymmetry.

2.2 Advice Delivery Formats

Now that an overview of the concept of advice has been established, ambiguity remains regarding various formats in which advice can be delivered, and through what mechanisms they can be identified. Shaw et al. (2015) CA of mundane conversations explains two ways of delivering advice, namely; interrogatives and assessments. An interrogative format means that question-based syntax is used to imply a preferred future course of action or behaviour for the recipient. This means that one question or multiple follow-up questions are given by the advice-giver to implicitly motivate the recipient to follow a desired future course of action. For example, Butler et al. (2010) analysed online helpline advisory interactions where in one interaction, the call-taker (counsellor) offered advice using an interrogative such as “Do you think it would be worth trying to have a talk with them?”. The advice recipients' response is then influenced by the degree they accept the recommended future course of action from the advice giver. On the other hand, assessments posit an opinion on what is good and bad, specifically what the preferred and alternative courses of action imply to guide the advice recipient. Take this example of an assessment advice format given by a mother to her daughter “I think that the agency’s a good way to go” (Shaw et al., 2015). The initial assessment is communicated via the advice-giver (mother), allowing the recipient (daughter) to evaluate the advice as a future action instead of immediately accepting or rejecting it. This allows the daughter to assess if pursuing the agency is a good or bad course of action.

Other than assessments and interrogatives proposed by Shaw et al. (2015), Limberg and Locher (2012) give five additional forms of advice delivery, namely; imperatives, declarations, conditional sentences, and agentive or non-agentive sentences. Imperative advice forms invite action and self-reflection from the advice recipient (e.g. “Start a regular exercise routine and set achievable goals¹”). “The university suggests completing a Bachelor’s degree before pursuing an internship²”, is an example of a declarative form of advice as it directly proposes a future action the recipient should take based on facts or opinions. If/then conditional forms of advice make the advice relevant to the targeted recipient while still implying future actions to be taken (e.g. “If you haven’t tried spicy food before, then don’t go to Steven’s restaurant³”). Agentive sentences are similar to conditional

¹ Advice from doctor to patient.

² Advice from a counsellour to a student.

³ Advice from a friend to a friend.

sentences of advice in that the advice highlights the targeted advice recipient and directs the future actions they should take (e.g. “Well, you can volunteer outside of your field to expand your network⁴”). In contrast, non-agentive sentences are less directive than agentive sentences in that they direct the advice to a broader audience and mitigate the active advice-seeker or recipient (e.g. “Taking Vicodin after wisdom teeth removal is no longer recommended for several reasons⁵”).

As the introduction of this thesis has identified various formats of advice across different contexts such as academia, business, and healthcare, it is important to investigate both the delivery methods of advice-givers and the responses of the advice recipients. This is shown in the CA study of authority in network meetings by Ong (2021). This analysis explained that using recommendation formats that require approval by the recipients (e.g. questions) or that provide options to the recipients (e.g. conditional verbs; may or could) invites a more equal distribution of knowledge and downgrades the presence of authority. This observation highlights the significant influence of authority and perceived knowledge asymmetry in the analysis of advisory interactions, aspects that this research aims to analyse and elaborate on further.

2.3 Authority in Advisory Interactions

As previously mentioned, there has been extensive study into the impact of authority within advisory interactions. It is vital to note that authority is not given or assumed to a participant in an advisory interaction, rather authority is created or achieved by the recipient's response design and the acknowledgement or rejection of the epistemic or deontic status that the advice giver possesses (Harrits & Larsen, 2021). Furthermore, the CA research of deontic authority in interactions by Stevanovic and Peräkylä (2012) suggests that authority is achieved by the acknowledgement or rejection of the epistemic or deontic status that the advice giver possesses.

Numerous studies have depended on the conceptualisation of epistemic and deontic authority by Stevanovic and Peräkylä (2012) as a framework to analyse the influence of authority in advisory interactions using CA (Mondada, 2013; Pilnick & Zayts, 2015; Caronia, 2023). Stevanovic and Peräkylä (2012) define epistemic authority as possessing knowledge of how

⁴ Advice from a teacher to a student.

⁵ Advice in a medical pamphlet to readers.

the world is in reality. This can be shown for example by a doctor expressing their epistemic knowledge of the availability or possibility of certain treatments to realistically advise future medical treatment which is then negotiated through the turn of talk sequences and concludes in the recipient validating or rejecting the epistemic authority of the doctor via their response design. It is important to highlight that authoritative status is not stated in one fact or expression of knowledge of how the world works, but is negotiated through the turn of talk design between interactants (Clifton et al., 2018). These sequences can then be analysed using CA to show a participant's acceptance, rejection, or challenge of epistemic authority in a particular domain. Additionally, a second source of authority is deontic authority meaning possessing the knowledge to determine the future actions of others (Stevanovic and Peräkylä, 2012). In contrast to epistemic authority, deontic authority is often negotiated implicitly and subjectively, making analysing deontic modal verbs like *must*, *could*, and *should*, vital to investigate deontic authority in advisory interactions (Svennevig & Djordjilovic, 2015).

In describing how knowledge claims are delivered and negotiated in interactions, Raymond (2018) makes a notable distinction between the stance and status of epistemic and deontic authority. Epistemic status is defined as a person's knowledge level in a particular domain, while epistemic stance is a person's position on knowledge meaning. For example, Ong (2021) explains that an epistemic stance can be unknowing by asking a question (implies no/limited possession of knowledge) or can be knowing by asserting a statement (implies possession of knowledge). Conversely, deontic status is the right to determine future actions in a specific domain while deontic stance is how deontic authority is delivered in an interaction (Clifton et al., 2018). The distribution of epistemic and deontic status is not binary, with one party possessing all authority and the other none. Instead, the distribution is asymmetrical, varying by domain and context. Recognizing the asymmetrical distribution of epistemic and deontic status connects to how knowledge asymmetry identifies advice within interactions, highlighting that authority and expertise are context-dependent rather than binary.

Although Stevanovic and Peräkylä (2012) framework of epistemic and deontic authority has been widely used to investigate authority in advisory interactions, it has not focused on the impact of authority on the advice recipient's response. However, Boluwaduro (2021) has thoroughly investigated this aspect by analysing the degree of authority that is evoked by the advice giver and endorsed by the advice recipient. This measurement was used

in the conversation analysis (CA) by Boluwaduro (2021) investigating patients' acceptance and resistance to doctors' medical authority, emphasising the use of directives in advisory interactions. Directives, as noted by Ong (2021), assume a high deontic stance in the delivery of, in this case, medical authority. In this conceptualization of authority, the study found that patients endorsed a higher level of authority when the doctor's deontic status aligned with their epistemic knowledge claims. The studies of Stevanovic and Peräkylä (2012) and Boluwaduro (2021) have both brought unprecedented findings on the influence of authority in advisory interactions. Combined, these studies provide a robust framework to analyse the impact of authority on the recipient's response design. It is important to highlight that the work of Boluwaduro (2021) and previously mentioned studies (Harrison & Barlow, 2009; Pilnick and Zayts, 2015) showcase the imbalance of literature investigating the influence of authority outside of a healthcare context. This creates a substantial research gap which the present investigation aims to address.

3. Present study

3.1 Aims

As previously mentioned, the aims of the present study are related to applying the method of conversation analysis (CA) to uncover patterns of advice delivery in televised interactions and examining the influence of authority on recipients' responses in advisory interactions. Specifically, the research will focus on utilising CA to analyse televised advisory interactions, identify different forms of advice delivery within televised advisory interactions, and investigate how authority can affect a recipient's response in televised advisory interactions. These aims are motivated by previously identified research gaps in analysing the impact of the medium on advisory interactions and the influence of authority in advisory interactions outside of a healthcare context. The justification for selecting the particular analytical method of CA will be detailed below.

3.2 Research Questions

To achieve the aims of this study, two research questions have been created to effectively guide the analysis. The first research question aims to address the research gap of the impact of the medium on advisory interactions by analysing advisory interactions within the medium of television.

RQ1: How is advice delivered in televised advisory interactions?

In addition to the previous research question, two hypotheses have been created specifically regarding the impact of the medium on advisory interactions. Based on previous literature suggesting specific formats of advice are used in varying mediums of advisory interactions, this study hypothesises that:

H1: Declarations and imperatives are found in televised advisory interactions.

H2: Interrogatives are not found in televised advisory interactions.

These hypotheses are motivated by findings in telephone advisory interactions, where advice formats of interrogatives, assessments, and if/then conditional sentences were found to be commonly used (Moore, 2009; Butler et al., 2009). Additionally, in face-to-face advisory interactions, imperatives and agentive sentences were found as commonly utilised advice delivery formats (Connabeer, 2021; Limberg, 2010). Analysing televised advisory

interactions addresses the current research gap on how different mediums impact advisory patterns, while also demonstrating diverse possibilities for investigation using CA.

The second research question aims to contribute unique literature on the influence of authority in advisory interactions using CA by investigating in what ways authority may impact the course of advisory interactions and influence the advice recipients' response.

RQ2: How does an adviser's authority impact the receiver's response when administering advice?

4. Method and Data

4.1 Method

The analytical method of conversation analysis (CA) will be used to investigate this study's aims and research questions. As aforementioned, CA aims to study and describe everyday instances of human social interaction by transcribing spoken speech into written text as accurately and immersively as possible for readers (Huitfeldt & Sperberg-McQueen, 2008). This means CA allows for customizable investigation into verbal (e.g. intonation, pitch, speed, loudness), nonverbal (e.g. gestures, gaze, body movement), and interactional features of conversation (e.g. turn taking/sequences, topic initiation or avoidance, verbal repairs). Nonverbal features of interactions do not motivate the current research questions, however, this research does focus on verbal conversational characteristics of how advice is delivered and how authority can influence a recipient's response in televised advisory interactions.

This study focuses on how advice is delivered and how authority can influence a recipient's response in televised advisory interactions. Verbal conversational characteristics such as intonation, pitch, loudness, silences, turn sequences, etc. will be transcribed in CA using the Gail Jefferson transcription conventions (Jefferson, 2004; see Appendix A for details). The forms of advice will be classified using examples and definitions from one of the seven advice formats previously explained by Shaw et al. (2015) and Limberg and Locher (2012). From the identification of conversational nuances and formats of advice, CA will be used to analyse the degree of authority (high/low) invoked by the advisors' delivery and endorsed in the recipient's response design, following the framework in the work of Boluwaduro (2021). Furthermore, from the degree of authority identified, the epistemic and deontic status and/or stance will be analysed using the framework conceptualised by Stevanovic and Peräkylä (2012). This facilitates a detailed examination of the authority's impact on recipients' responses in advisory interactions.

4.2 Data

The data is from a 2016 Canadian Broadcasting Corporation televised news interview published on YouTube lasting approximately sixteen minutes. The topic of the interview regards a workplace dispute on the use of preferred pronouns between two university

professors (Prof. J. Adaway and Prof. C. Blake). For privacy reasons, identifiers of the participant's or institution's names have been replaced with pseudonyms following literature noting the importance of participant consent in publicly accessible data (Gholami et al., 2015). The dispute was initiated by Professor Adaway, who refuses to use people's preferred pronouns stating that it restricts his freedom of speech. Professor Blake, a non-binary and transgender member of the trans community and colleague of Professor Adaway, advocates for the use and respect of people's preferred pronouns.

The interview turns into a debate between the interviewers, making this data unique and impactful as, contrary to popular belief, advisory interactions are rarely found in debate interactions, enabling a focused data analysis on advisory sequences (Housley & Fitzgerald, 2007; Wodak & Krzyzanowski, 2017). Nine extracts containing nine sequences of advisory interactions, totalling eight minutes, were identified and transcribed for data collection based on Shaw et al. (2015) definitions of features of advice (normativity and knowledge asymmetry). A sub-corpus of three extracts showing features of authority was created to analyse the impact of authority. All advisory interactions are unsolicited, meaning there is no request for advice from either participant (Vayreda & Antaki, 2009). Each sequence was transcribed using the system of transcription convention by Gail Jefferson (Jefferson, 2004; see Appendix A for details). This collection of interaction-specific sequences (advisory interactions) from one data source was chosen as this qualitative study focuses on analysing participants' talk and how speaker orientation can be accounted for within an interaction. As shown in previous literature (Jones et al., 1993; Ledford & Gast, 2018), this can be investigated extensively within a single interaction rather than a larger corpus or a comparative study. With this analytical method and unique data, this research aims to contribute to CA literature and provide societal insights into advisory interactions and workplace structures.

5. Data analysis


To answer the proposed research questions, the data analysis first shows findings of advice delivery formats and the reception of advice (Extracts 1-9) followed by observations of the impact of authority in televised advisory interactions between academic colleagues (Extracts 10-12).

5.1 Advice Delivery Formats and Advice Reception

The data comprising nine advisory interactions show four different advice delivery formats identified following the classifications of Shaw et al. (2015) and Limberg and Locher (2012). The advice formats identified in the data include declarations, agentives, non-agentives, and if/then conditional advice. To relate the advisory interactions to the previously stated participants, Blake delivers eight of the nine advisory interactions identified, using four declarative, two agentive and two non-agentive advice delivery formats. Adaway delivers one if/then conditional advice format. To answer RQ1, H1 and H2, all examples of each advice delivery format identifying the advice format and reception have been analysed below.

5.1.1 (Declarative)

Extract 1 "So I think" declarative (2:46, 1:05 minutes)


1 Blake >The Adaway drama:< has done:<
2 real harm; to real people on campus;
3 >He's made it<
4 hharder to be, transgender or non-binary
5 .hhh (0.5)
6 ((umm))I know this from: (0.3) personal experience
7 I'm: (0.4) non-binary a:nd, transgender.
8 ((raises eyebrows))
9 and >[I] know how it's felt>.<
10 to be on the UGA campus
11 >for the last month.<
12 (3.0 seconds omitted: additional information on campus affiliation)
13 Blake You know >in New Zealand where I grew up<
14 .hh (0.7)
15 ((uhh)) academics have a statutory role
16 and trained: in the Education Act to be
17 a critic and conscience of society.
18 .hhh (0.5)
19  so: I think that's
20 o- an idea of worth exporting. to Canada
21 >so I'd like< (.)<to (.) give (.) Adaway:
22 .hh (0.5) about a B plus, for (.) his (0.4)
23 critic; (.) role:. recently?
24 .hhh (0.3)
25 and a-an E for:
26 the conscience part.>
27 Blake Umm. (.) >A student<(.)
28 uhh (0.3)
29 once said to me
30 <when I finally obtained tenure>
31 "Now professor that -
32 ((Changes tone to simulate storytelling the student talking in the past))
33 the now that you have
34 obtai:ned superpowers,you must
35 agree to use them for go:.od;
36 .hhh (0.7)
37 for peace and justice."
38 .hh (0.9)
39 >so I invite ((uh)) Adaway<
40 to start doing more. of that
41 (0.3)
42 Anchor Those who are asking for this
43 alternate use of- use of rather
44 alternate pronouns they a:r,e saying it
45 boils down .hh (.) to respecting their: human rights
46 How do you respond to that?
47 Adaway (.) >I don't think<
48 it boils down to respecting their human rights
49 (0.4) *.hh*
50 I think that it's an imposition o:n
51 freedom of speech: that's being
52 implemented >at a legislative level.<

In this extract, the preface to the advice interaction in lines 1-11 gives an accusation and negative assessment of Adaway's behaviour, laying a polarised floor to deliver unsolicited advice. In line 1, Blake labels Adaway's position and attitude towards the subject of talk as "the Adaway drama". This is an example of candidate understanding which is usually offered as a response to other initiated repairs (e.g. "sorry?", "you did?") to seek better understanding between conversation participants (Sidnell & Stivers, 2012). However,

this candidate understanding rejects to seek shared understanding by negatively assessing Adaway's actions implied through the exaggerated intonation of "drama:".

Following this polarised prefacing, advice is delivered in lines 19-20 in a declarative format. Following Limberg and Locher (2012), Blake bases his advice on a fact about academics' role in his home country (lines 13-17). The Anchor uses a footing shift to organise turn-taking in the advisory interaction (line 42), avoiding ownership of the controversial statement and initiating Adaway's turn of talk (Garcia, 2023). Advice is ignored by Adaway, possibly due to the indirect addressing of a general advice recipient via the declarative advice format. Instead, Adaway responds to a question posed by the Anchor in lines 47-52, taking control of the conversation and claiming his own stance.

Extract 2: "Listen more" declarative (6:14, 40.0 seconds)


```
1   Blake   .hhh one thing I'd like you
2           to reall:y look a:t (0.3)
3           in regard; to this (.)controversy;;
4           .hh is t;o watch out, f:or; who::'s getting centered
5           (0.4).hh
6           <in a discussion>
7           ((15.5 seconds deleted: discussion of legislation bill))
8   Blake   so-
9   Adaway   - and -
10  Blake    >you know<
11   we should have people learning
12          to >listen mo, re:.<
13  Blake    (([both hands poin]t to ears))
14          <w[e have two ears]
15          (0.4).hh
16  Blake    (( points to mouth))
17          an[d one mouth]
18          f:or a very good reason
19          (0.4).hhh
20          when things get political I:, like to ask .hhh
21  Blake    (([beat gesture])           [[(beat) gesture])
22          [who] benefits: (.) and (.) [whho:] gets: to
23          decide the rules: of the game.?
24          ((24.0 seconds omitted: comparison of "Adaway controversy" to drama))
25  Adaway   >yeah well-< kindness:.
26          (.) is the: (.) excuse
27          that social justice warriors use
28          when they want> to exercise control
29          over what other people think and say,
```

In lines 11-12 advice in a declarative, proposing a future action based on fact or opinion (Limberg & Locher, 2012). Blake bases his advice on the fact that “<w[e have two ears] and one mouth” (lines 14-17), which is accompanied by physical hand gestures pointing to the evident, mentioned body parts. Liu et al. (2020) found that teachers use gestures in a classroom to direct teaching content and enhance attention to the learning content (Pi et al. 2019). In this extract, Blake utilises visual gestures to assert his academic authority and imply the audience’s lack of basic knowledge, exemplifying his teaching role. Additionally, the declarative advice is based on Blake’s precautionary opinion in line 4, indicating what the audience should identify as a problem to solve through his advised future action. The modal verb “should” in the advice emphasises the prefaced warning and implicitly demonstrates Blake’s deontic authority, supporting the findings of deontic modal verbs by Svennevig and Djordjilovic (2015).

In line 20, Blake concludes his advice with an account of his personal experience, asserting his epistemic status of advising a future action based on his opinion. The beat gestures that accompany the repetition of “who” in line 22 emphasise the discourse structure (Theune & Brandhorst, 2010), additionally highlighting Blake's teaching role, the audience's lack of knowledge, and the relevance of his advice.

Using the plural pronoun “we” in line 11, Blake addresses the advice to the entire audience, implicitly including Adaway. This indirect targeting through the declarative advice format may explain why Adaway’s response does not mention the delivered advice. Furthermore, as there was no request for advice in this interaction, the unsolicited declarative advice could explain the non-response reception to advice.


Extract 3: "We should be aiming for..." declarative (9:08, 30.0 seconds)

1 Adaway >so this< automatic assumption
2 that the <people on the social justice warrior
3 Side of the equation are motivated
4 only by kindness when they're a,lso.
5 Clearly motivated by power
6 is >something I find completely. untenable.<
7 ((42.0 seconds omitted: evaluation of advice in Extract 2))
8 Blake (...) I think that (.)
9 ((Beat gesture))
10  **we should be aiming for [pluralism.]**
11 .hhh (0.5)
12 this means: recognizing
13 Blake ((counts one on thumb))
14 [more, th]an one set of fundamental principles.
15 Blake ((Counts 2 with thumb and index finger))
16 [Fostering: (0.6) .hh independent> cultural traditions of minorities?]
17 .hhh (0.5) AND (0.4)
18 Blake ((Counts 3 with thumb, index, and middle finger))
19 [Being willin]g to share power:
20 with people <who are different than you:.]>
21 .hh (0.3)
22 Blake I think- if you just: stop>
23 centering this whole controversy on yourself.
24 And how <ha:,rd. it is for you
25 to accommodate genderqueer people.
26 .hh (0.3)
27 >well: have a little bit< of sympathy.

In line 10, Blake delivers advice in a declarative format. This advice has no response from an advice recipient and only showcases the advice delivery format. This advice is prefaced by a closed opinion statement by Adaway in line 6, not soliciting any further discussion or advice. However, Blake continues to deliver advice in lines 11-20, providing a clear demonstration of unsolicited advisory interactions between academic colleagues.

Blake advises aiming for “pluralism.” as the future course of action. He bases this recommendation on his opinion, but also asserts it as a fact, providing evidence and explanation in lines 12-20. This evidence consists of three points defining the meaning of pluralism. Each point is accompanied by a counting hand gesture indicating the point being explained (lines 13, 15, and 18). These gestures depend on the concrete ideas being communicated in the spoken speech as they emphasise the evidence supporting the fact that the declarative advice is based on (Liu et al., 2020). This showcases Blake’s exertion of deontic authority assuming his academic role to guide the audience in learning about pluralism and enhancing the attention towards his advice delivery.

Extract 4 (see Extract 3): "Have a little bit of sympathy" declarative (9:20, 7.0 seconds)

```
22 Blake I think- if you just: stop>  
23 centering this whole controversy on yourself.  
24 And how <ha:,rd. it is for you  
25 to accommodate genderqueer people.  
26 .hh (0.3)  
27  >well: have a little bit< of sympathy.
```

In line 27, Blake delivers advice as a declarative directly targeting Adaway by the personal pronoun “you” in line 24. Blake addresses Adaway’s identified problems as self-centering and accommodating genderqueer people (lines 23-25), attacking and negatively assessing Adaway’s expression of his experiences and opinions on the “controversy”. As the main function of advice is often to propose a solution to a problem (MacGeorge et al., 2015), Blake’s declarative advice in line 27 is based on his opinion of how to resolve Adaway’s issues. The advice uses the quantifier "little bit< of sympathy" to make it seem more attainable and easy to implement, thereby belittling Adaway's abilities and struggles to follow the suggested action. Additionally, Blake elicits a candidate understanding by labelling the topic of discussion as controversial (line 23), implying different and usually polarising opinions, turning the discussion into a debate (Chen & Berger, 2013). All of Blake’s prefaced talk directly addresses Adaway, using the personal pronouns “yourself” and “you” to attack Adaway’s behaviour and struggles. These pronouns isolate Adaway, implying that he is the only individual who finds the advised action of “have a little bit< of sympathy.” difficult. As this extract is referenced from Extract 3, there is no advice response to be analysed and demonstrates the advice prefacing and delivery format.

5.1.2 (Non-agentive)

Extract 5: "I'd like.../ Be kind" non-agentive (5:41, 50.3 seconds)

1 Anchor when you look at those alternate pronouns
2 I:--I think it's fair to say that
3 some people will see that
4 <at home> and see that as very .hh (0.3)
5 uh- unwie:ldly. if you will .h
6 What do you say to those types of criticisms
7 <including the one/_ you
8 just heard from Professor, Adaway?>
9 (0.4)
10 Blake ↑Umm (.) well (.)
11 → I'd like to encourage people:
12 (0.3) struggling with this:
13 >to be< <ki::nd (0.4) as their first impulse.>
14 ((1.20 minutes omitted: advice Extracts 2, 6, & 7))
15 Adaway >yeah well-< kindness:.
16 (.) is the: (.) excuse
17 that social justice warriors use
18 when they want> to exercise control
19 over what other people think and say,
20 (0.7) so (0.3) you know
21 if we're banding: back and forth
22 ((uh)) (0,7)
23 our- our differences in values. "You know"
24 I-I would say that
25 <the highest possible value is truth
26 ((6.0 seconds deleted: request for protection of freedom of speech))
27 and I think that that's: than-(.)
28 huh-a value much higher
29 Adaway ((Raises eyebrows))
30 [than ki:nd]ness for example.

In lines 11-14, Blake delivers non-agentive advice, directing it towards the general audience of “people”, mitigating an active advice recipient (Limberg & Locher, 2012). This advice attempts to solve the prefaced problem by the Anchor in lines 3-5, supporting the claim by MacGeorge et al. (2015) that advice is administered to give solutions to resolve problems. Blake’s attempt to encourage his advice in line 11 fails as Adaway responds negatively by evaluating the advice of kindness as an excuse to control others in lines 15-19. Furthermore, Adaway asserts his opinion of truth as “the highest possible value” in line 25, making a direct comparison between his and Blake’s opinion, which is concluded by Adaway explicitly placing his opinion hierarchically above Blake’s (lines 27-30). This results in Adaway explicitly rejecting Blake’s advice by challenging the given advice in an attempt to demonstrate epistemic authority.

Extract 6: "A great little tip" non-agentive (5:44, 1:17 minutes)


1 Blake You <know we ca:ll somebody
2 what they want to be ca:lled in our society:
3 for instance,?
4 .hhh (0.7)
5 ((raises an eyebrow))
6 umm I don't call somebody [Ju]↑lie
7 if: they prefer to be (.) called Jordan
8 .hh (0.6)
9 uhh tha:t's just
10 basic hhuman courtesy:
11 Blake (0.3) Uh h↑ere's a
12 **→** >great little tip< for people
13 who:(.04) are despai:ring at the (.)
14 possibillity of remembering some -all those pronouns
15 >What I do:< is just program in the pronoun. (.)
16 next to the person's na:,me in my smart↑phone↓
17 (0.3).hh
18 So when-(.)ever I'm about-out and about and I've: forgotten
19 whether one of my trans: friends:
20 uses Zee or zer or they or them, or something else
21 .h (0.4)
22 <I just look it up↑ and it's really super easy:>
23 ((40.0 seconds omitted: Advice of aiming for pluralism))
24 Blake So (.) you know <mo:stly> with this (.)
25 Adaway: (0.4) controversy
26 >which is really just a small< dra::ma:: a- (0.4) tempest in a teapot
27 you know> he could- >just-/> <get< over:
28 lear:ning to program a few pronouns into his phone,
29 <by the way I only have half a dozen or so that I actually use on a-
30 .hh (0.4) everyday basis .h (0.4)
31 so >it's not all that difficult.<
32 Blake .hh >and I think,<
33 Anchor Professor Ada-w.
34 sorry-
35 Blake (you know/no.-) (nods, pursues lips)
36 Anchor Professor Adaway
37 (if/I'm gonna) >jump in here<
38 because I think Professor Adaway
39 wants to- to get in↑ on that.
40 ((59.7 seconds omitted: Adaway responds to previous advice about kindness))
41 Adaway (.) >and I don't< think that
42 .hh (0.3)
43 Blake's s:olution (.)
44 to program my cellphone
45 >so that I can< remember what
46 .hh (0.5)
47 names people need to be called
48 is a .hh (0.3)
49 >reasonable< solution at <all?

Advice is delivered in a non-agentive format in line 12 as it does not target a specific advice recipient, but a general audience; people who are doubtful of remembering people's preferred pronouns (Limberg & Locher, 2012). Using an adjective and quantifier in line 12 ("great little") explicitly modifies the size and function of the advice, implying that the future course of action is effective and easy to implement. Furthermore, this advice is followed by a personal account of Blake using this solution (lines 18-22), providing epistemic evidence of its effectiveness and emphasising that his advice is "really super easy:>".

In line 33, the Anchor interrupts Blake's turn to give the floor to Adaway, demonstrating control over turn organisation in this televised advisory interaction. In lines 41-49, Adaway explicitly rejects the advice by challenging Blake's assertion that the advice is easy and argues against the proposed solution as not being ">reasonable<". Moreover, Adaway's rejection demonstrates that he finds difficulty in this solution, providing evidence that justifies Blake's previous attempts to minimise the advised action.


5.1.3 (Agentive)

Extract 7 (see Extract 6): "He could/ just get over..." agentive (6:13, 48.0 seconds)

```
24 Blake So (.) you know <mo:stly> with this (.)
25 Adaway: (0.4) controversy
26 >which is really just a small< dra::ma:: a- (0.4) tempest in a teapot
27  you know> he could- >just- <get< over:
28 lear:ning to program a few pronouns into his phone,
29 <by the way I only have half a dozen or so that I actually use on a-
30 .hh (0.4) everyday basis .h (0.4)
31 so >it's not all that difficult.<
32 Blake .hh >and I think,<
33 Anchor Professor Ada-w.
34 [sorry-]
35 Blake [you know/no.-](nods, pursues lips)
36 Anchor Professor Adaway
37 if/I'm gonna >jump in here<
38 because I think Professor Adaway
39 wants to- to get in on that.
40 ((59.7 seconds omitted: Adaway responds to previous advice about kindness))
41 Adaway (.) >and I don't< think that
42 .hh (0.3)
43 Blake's s:olution (.)
44 to program my cellphone
45 >so that I can< remember what
46 .hh (0.5)
47 names people need to be called
48 is a .hh (0.3)
49 >reasonable< solution at <all?
```

Previously in Extract 6, advice was delivered in a non-agentive format addressing a general audience, however, in this extract, an agentive format of advice delivery is used to target a specific advice recipient. In this extract, advice is prefaced by a candidate understanding by Blake labelling Adaway's position on the subject of talk as the "Adaway controversy" (line 25). Advice is delivered in line 27 in an agentive format as it targets Adaway as the specific advice recipient, referring to his identification in the candidate understanding (Limberg & Locher, 2012). In line 27, the interjection "you know", the pronoun "he" and the modal verb and adverb "could just" directly attack and overlook Adaway's struggle with implementing this solution (line 28), implying its simplicity. Blake further minimises the task's difficulty by using the quantifier 'a few' in line 28, again suggesting that the advised action should not be challenging for Adaway. Blake concludes his advice by giving a personal account of his experience with the proposed solution, asserting his epistemic authority. In lines 41-49, Adaway rejects Blake's proposed solution and negatively assesses its effectiveness in real life. The response to advice has been analysed in detail in the previous extract as the response to this advice is the same (see Extract 6).


Extract 8 (see Extract 1) "I invite..." agentive (3.07, 48.0 seconds)

27 Blake Umm. (.) >A stu:dent<(.)
28 uhh (0.3)
29 once said to me
30 <when I finally obtained tenure>
31 "Now professor that -
32 ((Changes tone to simulate storytelling the student talking in the past))
33 the now that you have
34 obtai:ned superpowers,you must
35 agree to use them for go:od†
36 .hhh (0.7)
37 for peace and justice."
38 .hh (0.9)
39  >so I invite ((uh)) Adaway<
40 to start doing more. of that

In lines 38-39, an agentive format of advice is delivered as Blake highlights the targeted advice recipient by name "Adaway" (line 38) and directs the action he should take by using a demonstrative pronoun "that" (line 39) to refer to the premised story delivered in lines 26-36. This story gives an account of why Blake invites Adaway to start using his "superpowers" in a specific way. In line 32, the advice giver alters his tone to sound like the person who this account is from. This can indicate to the advice recipient what information is important in the story and how the recipient should respond to this account (Sidnell & Stivers, 2012). According to this account, Adaway's previous actions are not justified as he has not used his "superpowers" for good, peace, and justice. In line 40, Blake indicates there is a lack of this action by inviting Adaway to "start" his advised action; using Adaway's assumed superpowers for good, peace and justice.

5.1.4 (If/then conditional)

Extract 9: "If... then" conditional (13:29, 32.5 seconds)

1 Adaway if you read the Ontario Human Rights Commission
2 policies on such things
3 you'll see very rapidly
4 .hh (0.3) that (0.4) .hh
5 that (0.4) .hh
6 utilization of preferred pronouns is
7 part of the legislative package
8 [so that's just=
9 Blake [AAnd-ANd there actually-
10 Adaway [= that's disingenuous]
11 Blake if you re::ad the [legislation Adaway].
12 You will find out that they're actually
13 called correct, pronouns.
14 .hh (0.4)
15 There's-there's n:o (.) preference:
16 about this:
17 Adaway [there is in the Ontari-
18 Blake [=it's about what's [c-or] re:ct
19 Adaway [there is in the Ontari-
20 Blake for a person]
21 Adaway >There is::<
22 on the Ontario Human Rights Commission website
23 where the policies laid out_ <and,
24  >if people< do:n't believe that
25 they can just go look themselves::
26 ((10.0 seconds omitted: Anchor initiates turn via language use question))
27 Blake Well (.) <I sha::re>
28 a number of Adaway's
29 >concerns:< about freedom of speech
30 a::nd academic freedom on campus.

In this extract, advice is prefaced by a heated exchange of interjections by Adaway and Blake in lines 9-21. In line 9, Blake interjects Adaway's turn to correct what he perceives as an inaccurate statement of a legislative fact (lines 11-16). This is argued and refuted by Adaway three times in lines 17,19, and 21, leading to advice being delivered in an if/then conditional format in lines 24-25. Following Limberg and Locher (2012), Adaway's if/then conditional advice format makes the advice relevant to the audience by prefacing the advice with a fact (lines 21-23), stating a conditional invitation and explicitly implying that future action is needed to find this information he refers to.

This closed statement of advice does not solicit any further discussion from the advice recipients, explaining why Blake's response does not refer to the given advice. However, in lines 27-30, Blake highlights a shared concern with Adaway, framing it as if it had not been recognized as common until he stated it. Blake explicitly labels Adaway's concerns and expresses agreement with them, possibly demonstrating his institutional authority as a

professor to provide feedback and validate Adaway's concerns, aiming to reach a common understanding on the subject of talk (Mäkitalo et al., 2002).

5.2 Impact of Authority

The previous section analysed advisory formats and reception, finding four different types of formats delivered in 9 advisory interactions. The following analyses investigate the impact of authority following Stevanovic and Peräkylä (2012) conceptualisation of epistemic and deontic authority, Raymond (2018) distinction of epistemic or deontic status and stance, and identifying the degree (high/low) of authority demonstrated through the framework of Boludarow (2021). Each of the following sections analyses one example of advice delivery with high epistemic authority, low epistemic and deontic authority, and high epistemic and deontic authority.

5.2.1 High Epistemic Authority

Extract 10 (see Extract 6): Rejection of high epistemic authority

1 Blake You <know we ca:ll somebody
2 **→** what they want to be ca:lled in our society: **High epistemic authority**
3 for instance,
4 .hhh (0.7)
5 ((raises an eyebrow))
6 **→** umm I don't call somebody [Ju]lie **High epistemic authority**
7 if: they prefer to be (.) called Jordan
8 .hh (0.6)
9 uhh tha:t's just
10 basic hhuman courtesy:
11 Blake (0.3) Uh h;ere's a
12 >great little tip< for people
13 who:(.04) are despai:ring at the (.)
14 possibilitl of remembering some -all those pronouns
15 **→** >What I do:< is just program in the pronoun. (.) **High epistemic authority**
16 next to the person's na:me in my smart↑phone!
17 (0.3).hh **High epistemic authority**
18 **→** So when-(.)ever I'm about-out and about and I've: forgotten
19 whether one of my trans: friends:
20 uses Zee or zer or they or them, or something else
21 .h (0.4)
22 **→** <I just look it up↑ and it's really super e↑asy:> **High epistemic authority**
23 ((40.0 seconds omitted: Advice of aiming for pluralism))
24 Blake So (.) you know <mo:stly> with this (.)
25 Adaway: (0.4) controversy
26 >which is really just a small< dra::ma:: a- (0.4) tempest in a teapot
27 you know> he could- >just- <get< over:
28 lear:ning to program a few pronouns into his phone,
29 **→** <by the way I only have half a dozen or so that I actually u:se on a-
30 .hh (0.4) everyday basis .h (0.4) **High epistemic authority**
31 so >it's not all that difficult.<
41 Adaway (.) >and I don't< think that
42 .hh (0.3)
43 Blake's s:olution (.)
44 to program my cellphone
45 >so that I can< remember what
46 .hh (0.5)
47 names people need to be called
48 is a .hh (0.3)
49 >reasonable< solution at <all?

In this extract, the advice giver, Blake, delivers six displays of epistemic authority. In lines 1-2, Blake demonstrates high epistemic status exerting knowledge in a specific context, this context being how people in society want to be called (Raymond, 2018). In lines 5-10, a high epistemic stance is shown as Blake gives an example of his position towards how people in society want to be called, giving evidence to support his higher epistemic knowledge status. As Clifton et al. (2018) state, deontic authority holds a right to direct future actions, and as Blake does not administer future actions between lines 5-10, this demonstrates epistemic authority.

In lines 15, 18, and 22, a high epistemic stance is shown as all instances give personal accounts of Blake's use of the prefaced advice in lines 12-14. This epistemic stance gives evidence to support the effectiveness of the advised future action in the real world,

demonstrating Blake's higher epistemic knowledge. In line 29, Blake uses a quantifier of "half a dozen" and explicitly negates the difficulty of the advised task to minimise and provide evidence of the advised future action's ease of implementation. Adaway's rejection demonstrates that he finds difficulty in this solution, contradicting Blake's assumption that the advised future action is "really super e↑asy: and justifying Blake's previous attempts to minimise the advised action. This response challenges the proposed advice, taking a position against Blake's knowledge and demonstrating low epistemic authority. Here, high epistemic authority causes the advice recipient to assume a defensive position and reject the advice giver's knowledge claims.

5.2.3: High Epistemic and Deontic Authority

Extract 12 (see Extract 1): No-response to high epistemic and deontic authority

1 Blake >The Adaway drama:< has done::
 2 real harm; to re:al people on campus;
 3 >He's made it<
 4 hharder to be, transgender or non-binary
 5 .hhh (0.5)
 6 **→** ((umm))I know this from: (0.3) personal experience **High epistemic authority**
 7 I'm: (0.4) non-binary a:nd, transgender.
 8 ((raises eyebrows))
 9 and >[I] know how it's felt>.<
 10 to be on the UGA campus
 11 >for the last month.<
 12 (3.0 seconds omitted: additional information on campus affiliation)
 13 Blake You know >in New Zealand where I grew up< **High epistemic authority**
 14 .hh (0.7)
 15 ((uhh)) academics have a statutory role
 16 and trained: in the Education Act to be
 17 a critic and conscience of society.
 18 .hhh (0.5)
 19 **→** so: I think that's **Declarative advice**
 20 o- an idea of worth exporting. to Canada
 21 **→** >so I'd like< (.)<to (.) give (.) Adaway: **High deontic authority**
 22 .hh (0.5) about a B plus, for (.) his (0.4)
 23 critic; (.) role:. recently?
 24 .hhh (0.3)
 25 and a-an E for:
 26 the conscience part.>
 42 Anchor Those who are asking for this
 43 alternate use of- use of rather
 44 alternate pronouns they a:r,e saying it
 45 boils down .hh (.) to respecting their: human rights
 46 How do you respond to that?
 47 Adaway (.) >I don't think<
 48 it boils down to respecting their human rights
 49 (0.4) .hh*
 50 **→** I think that it's an imposition o:n **Low epistemic response**
 51 freedom of speech: that's being
 52 implemented >at a legislative level.<

Blake, the advice giver, asserts high epistemic authority by accusing Adaway's opinions and actions of bringing “real harm; to re:al people on campus;” (line 2), including himself (lines 9-11), thereby leveraging his epistemic authoritative status in experiencing the consequences of Adaway's actions and possessing the right to advise. Furthermore, Blake, a non-binary transgender individual (line 7), emphasises his epistemic status above Adaway's, demonstrating high epistemic authority. In lines 19-20, Blake delivers declarative advice based on a fact from his country of origin, stating his membership to this country by using the first-person pronoun “I”. This demonstrates his epistemic status in advising the future action to adopt the fact, assuming a superior knowledge position due to his membership.

In lines 21-26, Blake grades Adaway's performance on the advised future action. The assessment of Adaway's conscience, given a grade F, degrades his knowledge stance and asserts Blake as possessing the higher knowledge position. Sun and Cheng (2013) state that evaluating a student's performance is a part of an academic's institutional role. Blake is seen

as treating Adaway as a student needing to be educated through his advice and epistemic knowledge. This shows that in this interaction between academic colleagues, institutional deontic authority is not assumed at an equal level, but must still be negotiated and granted to each academic colleague. This demonstrates Blake's assertion of higher deontic authority by negatively evaluating and attacking Adaway's deontic authority as an educator.

Adaway responds to the Anchor's posed question in lines 42-46 by displaying a low epistemic stance as he states a position to knowledge in lines 50-52 ("I think"), not the status of possessing the knowledge, therefore not having the right to advise future action. This low epistemic stance could explain Adaway's ignorance towards Blake's proposed advice. In this advisory interaction, the advice giver, Blake, demonstrated high epistemic authority in prefacing advice by explicitly stating his relevant membership and experience. In addition, Blake exhibited high deontic authority by evaluating the advice recipient's behaviour and attacking their deontic authority. However, the advice recipient ignored Blake's display of both epistemic and deontic authority, resulting in no authority being negotiated.

6. Discussion

This research has used CA robustly to provide unique findings of advice delivery formats and the impact of authority in televised advisory interactions between academic colleagues. The data analysis answers RQ1 by finding declarative, non-agentive, agentive and conditional advice formats given in televised advisory interactions between academic colleagues. From these findings, H1 is partially supported as declarative advice formats were identified, however imperatives were not. This could be due to the channel of discussion being televised and not face-to-face where Connabeer (2021) identified imperative advice formats. The data analysis supports H2 as no interrogative advice formats were identified. Interrogatives are commonly found in solicited advisory interactions and in the healthcare context between doctors and patients, as the advice recipients seek and request advice (Shaw et al., 2015; Goldsmith, 2000). Since the current data is of unsolicited advisory interactions and in the institutional context of academia between colleagues, this can explain the absence of interrogative advice formats.

The data analysis also revealed that of the nine advice interactions, three received no response (Extracts 3, 4, & 9), four received rejections (Extracts 2, 5, 6, & 7), and two were ignored (Extracts 1 & 9). Advice rejection may be due to the organisation of turn sequences being controlled by an anchor in this televised interview. Garcia (2023) explains that televised discussions result in extended turns of talk, an imbalance of equal speaking times, and limited natural discussion between participants due to the presence of a moderator or anchor. This demonstrates how the medium of the advisory interaction impacts the justification of the advice, the acceptance or response to it, and the negotiation of authority in the advice interaction.

This study provides novel findings to answer RQ2 as authority functions differently in advisory interactions between academic colleagues in a televised discussion and debate. This data found that advice recipients endorsed a low level of authority in defence of the advice giver's assertion of high levels of deontic or epistemic authority (see Extracts 10 and 12). Conversely, when advice was delivered with low levels of authority, this evoked a highly authoritative response from the advice recipient (see Extract 11). This shows that authority is asymmetrical and not assumed as equal between academic colleagues, providing supporting evidence to CA studies of authority (Svennevig & Djordjilovic, 2015; Clifton et al., 2018;

Caronia, 2023). However, these findings do not support the assertion by Stevanovic and Peräkylä (2012) as authority was not achieved through acknowledgement or rejection of the advice giver's authoritative status.

This study builds on the investigation by Boluwaduro (2021) of the impact of authority in medical advisory interactions by examining advice resistance to authority within an academic institutional setting. Additionally, in Extracts 2, 6, and 7, gestures were found to assert authority, elevate the speaker's knowledge, and diminish the other's perceived lack of expertise. Future research should explore how gestures influence authority and advice response in academic advisory interactions, as adding visual cues to verbal utterances can help the target advice recipients retain the advice in their memory (Goldin-Meadow et.al, 2014).

This study has three noticeable limitations. As stated in section 5.1, advice in all but one sequence is provided by the same participant, which could result in an analysis bias of advice delivery formats and the impact of authority on one advice giver. Future research could investigate if this imbalance in academic advisory interactions between colleagues relates to Ingram and Elliott (2015) findings that teachers in the classroom spoke more frequently and for longer turns than students. This could suggest that academic colleagues in advisory interactions assume a teacher-student role when administering advice. In addition, this data is unique but limited as it only contains unsolicited advisory interactions. As Fitzsimons and Lehmann (2004) found, unsolicited advice may prompt recipients to ignore or go against advice, aligning with this study's findings of advice being rejected, ignored, or unanswered in academic advisory interactions between colleagues. Lastly, the participants in the data are all of the same gender; male, which may have limited the results of the impact of authority and distribution of turn sequencing (Boatman, 1987).

This research contributes to the body of knowledge in conversation analysis, providing new insights into how authority is negotiated and impacts advisory interactions. It provides unique CA data of unsolicited advisory interactions through the medium of television, the genre of discussion and debate, and the context of academic institutional talk. Furthermore, it addresses the research gap by investigating advisory interactions outside the healthcare context and calling for future research to expand on advisory interaction genres, mediums, and contexts. This research encourages advisory interactions in the academic

context to consider these findings, aiming to mitigate advice resistance and negotiate for successful, solicited advisory interactions, ultimately supporting career development and fostering a collaborative work environment among colleagues in academic and professional work practices.

References

- Bloch, S., & Leydon, G. (2019). Conversation Analysis and Telephone Helplines for Health and Illness: A Narrative review. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 52(3), 193–211. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08351813.2019.1631035>
- Boatman, D. (1987). A Study of Unsolicited Advice. *Scholarly Commons*, 3(1), 2. <https://repository.upenn.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1016&context=wpel>
- Boluwaduro, E. (2021). Patients' compliance and resistance to medical authority in Nigerian clinical encounters. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 171, 8–19. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2020.09.033>
- Butler, C. W., Danby, S., Emmison, M., & Thorpe, K. (2009). Managing medical advice seeking in calls to Child Health Line. *Sociology of Health and Illness*, 31(6), 817–834. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9566.2009.01179.x>
- Butler, C. W., Potter, J., Danby, S., Emmison, M., & Hepburn, A. (2010). Advice-implicative interrogatives. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 73(3), 265–287. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0190272510379838>
- Caronia, L. (2023). Epistemic and Deontic Authority in Parent–Teacher Conference: Referring to the expert as a discursive practice to (Jointly) undermine the teacher's expertise. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 002248712311530. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00224871231153088>
- Chen, Z., & Berger, J. (2013). When, why, and how controversy causes conversation. *the Journal of Consumer Research/Journal of Consumer Research*, 40(3), 580–593. <https://doi.org/10.1086/671465>
- Clifton, J., Van De Mierop, D., Sehgal, P., & Aneet. (2018). The multimodal enactment of deontic and epistemic authority in Indian meetings. *Pragmatics*, 28(3), 333–360. <https://doi.org/10.1075/prag.17011.cli>

- Connabeer, K. (2021). Lifestyle advice in UK Primary Care consultations: Doctors' use of conditional forms of advice. *Patient Education and Counseling*, 104(11), 2706–2715. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pec.2021.03.033>
- Cutrona, C. E., & Suhr, J. A. (1994). Social support communication in the context of marriage: An analysis of couples' supportive interactions. In B. R. Burleson, T. L. Albrecht, & I. G. Sarason (Eds.), *Communication of social support: Messages, interactions, relationships, and community* (pp. 113–135). Sage Publications, Inc.
- Feng, B., & MacGeorge, E. L. (2006). Predicting receptiveness to advice: characteristics of the problem, the Advice-Giver, and the recipient. *Southern Communication Journal*, 71(1), 67–85. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10417940500503548>
- Fitzsimons, G. J., & Lehmann, D. R. (2004). Reactance to recommendations: When unsolicited advice yields contrary responses. *Marketing Science*, 23(1), 82–94. <https://doi.org/10.1287/mksc.1030.0033>
- Garcia, A. C. (2023). *An introduction to interaction: Understanding Talk in the Workplace and Everyday Life*. Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Gholami, A., Laure, E., Somogyi, P., Spjuth, O., Niazi, S., & Dowling, J. (2015). Privacy-Preservation for Publishing Sample Availability Data with Personal Identifiers. *Journal of Medical and Bioengineering*, 4(2), 117–125. <https://doi.org/10.12720/jomb.4.2.117-125>
- Goldin-Meadow, S., Levine, S., & Jacobs, S. (2014) Gesture's role in learning arithmetic. In Edwards, L. D., Ferrara, F., & Moore-Russo, D. (2014). *Emerging perspectives on gesture and embodiment in mathematics*. <http://ci.nii.ac.jp/ncid/BB17465032>
- Goldsmith, D. J. (2000). Soliciting advice: The role of sequential placement in mitigating face threat. *Communication Monographs*, 67(1), 1–19. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03637750009376492>

- Graf, E., Sator, M., & Spranz-Fogasy, T. (2014). Discourses of helping professions. In *Pragmatics & beyond*. <https://doi.org/10.1075/pbns.252>
- Greatbatch, D., & Clark, T. (2018). *Using conversation analysis for business and management students*. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781529716603>
- Harrison, S., & Barlow, J. H. (2009). Politeness strategies and advice-giving in an online arthritis workshop. *Journal of Politeness Research*, 5(1). <https://doi.org/10.1515/jplr.2009.006>
- Harrits, G. S., & Larsen, L. T. (2021). Advice not safely ignored: professional authority and the strength of legitimate complexity. *Sociology*, 55(5), 1015–1034. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0038038521994029>
- Housley, W., & Fitzgerald, R. (2007). Categorization, interaction, policy, and debate. *Critical Discourse Studies*, 4(2), 187–206. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17405900701464840>
- Huitfeldt, C., & Sperberg-McQueen, C. M. (2008). What is transcription? *Literary and Linguistic Computing*, 23(3), 295–310. <https://doi.org/10.1093/lc/fqn013>
- Hutchby, I., (2014), "I mean is that right?": frame ambiguity and troublesome advice-seeking on a radio helpline", In *Discourses of Helping Professions* (Eva-Maria Graf, Marlene Sator, Thomas Spranz-Fogasy, eds.), Amsterdam / Philadelphia, John Benjamins, pp. 157–178.
- Ingram, J., & Elliott, V. (2015). A critical analysis of the role of wait time in classroom interactions and the effects on student and teacher interactional behaviours. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 46(1), 37–53. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0305764x.2015.1009365>
- Jefferson, G. (2004): Glossary of transcript symbols with an introduction. In: *Conversation Analysis: Studies from the First Generation*, Ed. Lerner, G. H. (Amsterdam: John Benjamins), 13-31.

- Jones, E. E., Ghannam, J., Nigg, J. T., & Dyer, J. F. (1993). A paradigm for single-case research: The time series study of a long-term psychotherapy for depression. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 61(3), 381–394. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-006x.61.3.381>
- Ledford, J. R., & Gast, D. L. (2018). *Single case Research Methodology: Applications in Special Education and Behavioral Sciences*. Routledge.
- Limberg, H. (2010). *The Interactional Organization of Academic Talk: Office hour consultations*. https://openlibrary.org/books/OL32168361M/The_Interactional_Organization_of_Academic_Talk
- Limberg, H., & Locher, M. A. (2012). *Advice in discourse*. John Benjamins Publishing.
- Liu, Q., Zhang, N., Chen, W., Wang, Q., Yuan, Y., & Xie, K. (2020). Categorizing teachers' gestures in classroom teaching: from the perspective of multiple representations. *Social Semiotics*, 32(2), 184–204. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10350330.2020.1722368>
- MacGeorge, E. L., Guntzviller, L. M., Branch, S. E., & Yakova, L. (2015). Advice in Interaction: Quantity and Placement of Problem-Solving Behaviors. *Communication Research*, 46(6), 811–837. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0093650215607612>
- Mäkitalo, K., Häkkinen, P., Leinonen, P., & Järvelä, S. (2002). Mechanisms of common ground in case-based web discussions in teacher education. *the Internet and Higher Education*, 5(3), 247–265. [https://doi.org/10.1016/s1096-7516\(02\)00112-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/s1096-7516(02)00112-4)
- Mondada, L. (2013). The Conversation a Analytic Approach to Data Collection. In J. Sidnell, & T. Stivers (Eds.), *The Handbook of Conversation Analysis* (pp. 32-56). Malden, MA: Blackwell. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118325001.ch3>

- Moore, J. C. (2009). *Talk in mind : the analysis of calls to a mental health information line*.
<https://ethos.bl.uk/OrderDetails.do?uin=uk.bl.ethos.516306>
- Morgan, S. (2013). Miscommunication between patients and general practitioners: implications for clinical practice. *Journal of Primary Health Care*, 5(2), 123.
<https://doi.org/10.1071/hc13123>
- Ong, B. L. (2021). *Authority and Agency in Open Dialogue Network Meetings: A Conversation analysis*. <https://ses.library.usyd.edu.au/handle/2123/25902>
- Pi, Z., Zhang, Y., Zhu, F., Xu, K., Yang, J., & Hu, W. (2019). Instructors' pointing gestures improve learning regardless of their use of directed gaze in video lectures. *Computers and Education/Computers & Education*, 128, 345–352.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2018.10.006>
- Pirainen–Marsh, A., & Jauni, H. (2012). Assessments and the social construction of expertise in political TV interviews. *Text & Talk*, 32(5).
<https://doi.org/10.1515/text-2012-0030>
- Pilnick, A., & Zayts, O. (2015). Advice, authority and autonomy in shared decision-making in antenatal screening: the importance of context. *Sociology of Health and Illness*, 38(3), 343–359. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9566.12346>
- Prass, M., Ewell, A., Hill, C. E., & Kivlighan, D. M. (2020). Solicited and Unsolicited Therapist Advice in Psychodynamic Psychotherapy: Is it Advised? *Counselling Psychology Quarterly*, 34(2), 253–274.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/09515070.2020.1723492>
- Raymond, G. (2018). Which epistemics? Whose conversation analysis? *Discourse Studies (Print)*, 20(1), 57–89. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1461445617734343>
- Sefi, S., & Heritage, J. (1992). Dilemmas of advice: Aspects of the delivery and reception of advice in interactions between health visitors and first-time mothers. *Cambridge*

<http://emcawiki.net/bibtex/browser.php?key=Heritage1992&bib=emca.bib>

- Senjen, R., & Austin, P. (1993). Characterizing advisory interactions between statisticians and entomologists. *International Journal of Man-machine Studies*, 38(2), 331–345. <https://doi.org/10.1006/imms.1993.1015>
- 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. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1461445615571199>
- Sidnell, J., & Stivers, T. (2012). *The Handbook of Conversation Analysis*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Stevanovic, M., & Peräkylä, A. (2012). Deontic authority in interaction: the right to announce, propose, and decide. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 45(3), 297–321. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08351813.2012.699260>
- Sun, Y., & Cheng, L. (2013). Teachers' grading practices: meaning and values assigned. *Assessment in Education*, 21(3), 326–343. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0969594x.2013.768207>
- Svennevig, J., & Djordjilovic, O. (2015). Accounting for the right to assign a task in meeting interaction. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 78, 98–111. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2014.12.007>
- Theune, M., & Brandhorst, C. J. (2010). To beat or not to beat: Beat gestures in direction giving. In *Lecture notes in computer science* (pp. 195–206). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-12553-9_17
- Vayreda, A., & Antaki, C. (2009). Social support and unsolicited advice in a bipolar disorder online forum. *Qualitative Health Research*, 19(7), 931–942. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1049732309338952>

Wodak, R., & Krzyzanowski, M. (2017). *Qualitative Discourse Analysis in the Social Sciences*. Bloomsbury Publishing.

Appendix

Appendix A: Transcription Convention

↑	Sharp uptake in pitch.
↓	Sharp downward shift in pitch.
<u>Yes</u>	Underlining indicates emphasis.
.	A dot at the end of an utterance shows strongly falling intonation.
,	A comma at the end of an utterance indicates slightly rising intonation.
;	A semicolon at the end of an utterance indicates falling intonation.
?	A question mark at the end of an utterance indicates strongly rising intonation.
.hh	The letter “h” preceded by a dot represents audible inbreath. The number of h’s indicates the length of the inbreath.
(.)	Micropause of less than 0.2 seconds.
:	Colons indicate prolonged or exaggeration of the immediate prior sound.
(0.0)	Measured pause or silence in seconds.
(><)	Stretch of talk is rushed.
(<>)	Stretch of speech is slowed.
<to	The less-than symbol by itself represents that the immediate following talk sounds earlier than it is.
[]	Overlap talk.
(())	Transcriptionist’s descriptions or notes.
-	A hyphen indicates a cut-off.
((...))	Omission of data in transcript.
°now°	A word enclosed by two degree signs is marked quiet or soft.
ı	A medium falling-rising intonation; a dip and a raise.

Checklist EACH (version 1.11, September 2023)

You fill in the questions by clicking on the square next to the chosen answer

After clicking, a cross will appear in this square

1. Will you be collecting data from social media platforms?
- Yes → consult the [guidelines](#). If in doubt, contact the EACH to see if assessment is necessary
- No → continue with questionnaire

2. Will you use an existing dataset?
- Yes → continue with questionnaire
- No → go to question 4

3. When using an existing dataset, do you comply with the EACH guidelines**?
- Yes → continue with questionnaire
- No or in doubt → contact the EACH to see if assessment is necessary

** Guidelines: ethics approval is obtained for the original data collection, participants have consented to the reuse of the research data, or the reuse fits within the original research purpose. Or: dataset is completely anonymous

4. Will you be collecting data from participants?
- Yes → continue with questionnaire
- No → end of questionnaire

5. Is a health care institution involved in the research?

Explanation: A health care institution is involved if one of the following (A/B/C) is the case:

- A. One or more employees of a health care institution is/are involved in the research as principle or in the carrying out or execution of the research.
- B. The research takes place within the walls of the health care institution and should, following the nature of the research, generally not be carried out outside the institution.
- C. Patients / clients of the health care institution participate in the research (in the form of treatment).
- No → continue with questionnaire
- Yes → Did a Dutch Medical Institutional Review Board (MIRB) decide that the Wet Medisch Onderzoek (Medical Research Involving Human Subjects Act) is not applicable or does the research comply with one of the [standard research methods](#) described by the EACH
- Yes → continue with questionnaire