Natural & Applied Sciences Faculty Publications   Department of Natural and Applied Sciences

2017

What Went Right: Interactional Strategies for Managing Crisis Negotiations during an Emergency Service Call

Angela Garcia
Bentley University, agarcia@bentley.edu

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholars.bentley.edu/nas_facpubs

Part of the Interpersonal and Small Group Communication Commons, and the Other Communication Commons

Recommended Citation

What Went Right:

Interactional Strategies for Managing Crisis Negotiations

During an Emergency Service Call

Angela Cora Garcia

Bentley University

agarcia@bentley.edu

INTRODUCTION

Previous research on crisis negotiations has identified a wide repertoire of skills and techniques that are seen as effective tools for professional crisis negotiators. For example, a number of studies of crisis negotiation recommend the use of active listening techniques such as short utterances "to indicate that he/she is listening: (OK, I see...), paraphrasing, emotion labeling, mirroring, open-ended questions, and the use of 'I messages'" (Royce 2005:10); as

well as tag questions and statements which are "used to draw out some kind of verbal or emotion response in the [subject]" (Royce 2005:23; see also Vecchi 2009). Hasselt and Romano (2004:13) describe methods for teaching active listening skills to negotiators to enable them to create "rapport with subjects and [defuse] strong emotions in high-risk crisis situations" (see also Hatcher et al. 1998; Vecchi, Hasselt and Romano 2005).

Regini (2002:2) writes that "[crisis negotiation team] leaders must be experienced, knowledgeable, and articulate supervisors or senior investigators." They must have knowledge of behavioral sciences and human behavior and work effectively with other team members (Regini 2002). The ability to defuse intense emotions is also an important skill for crisis negotiators (Vecchi et al. 2005). Speaking in a calm voice and avoiding judgmental or confrontational utterances can help calm down emotions and avoid escalation into arguing (Charlés 2008; Regini 2002; Vecchi 2009).

It is recommended that crisis negotiators create a bond with subjects to help them perceive the negotiator as being on their side (Charlés 2008; Mullins 2002; Vecchi 2009). A negotiator can create a believable bond with a subject by sharing his or her own experiences to show sympathy for the subject (Charlés 2008; see also Vecchi 2009). Negotiators can also work to create a bond by using a collaborative approach, for example by using the word "we" whenever possible and serving as a liaison between the subject and the police (Charlés 2008). Charlés (2008) also found that matching the subject's vocabulary when possible, and repeating parts of the subject's utterances in their replies can help to create connections between the negotiator and the subject and display that the negotiator is listening and responding to the subject.

While some previous research used transcripts of actual negotiations as their data (e.g., Charlés 2008; Royce 2005), much of the previous research on crisis negotiation does not involve the analysis of actual interactions between negotiators and subjects. Instead, researchers have subjects respond to hypothetical vignettes or scenarios (e.g., Dewa, Ireland and Gredecki 2011; Waring et al. 2013), or code frequencies of specific behaviors or words used in actual negotiations (e.g., Giebels and Taylor 2009; Rogan 2011; Rogan and Hammer 1994). These types of studies ignore how these negotiation techniques are used in their interactional context.

Conversation analysis can fill some of the gaps in these prior studies by using naturally occurring data and exploring the interactional procedures through which participants conduct such negotiations. It is important not only to describe the techniques that are used in successful negotiations but to understand how they are embedded in the sequential context of the ongoing interaction. In this paper I use a conversation analytic approach to study a successful emergency service call in order to investigate how the caller succeeded in reporting an urgent and unfolding emergency involving crisis negotiation.

This paper is a single case analysis of an emergency service call related to an incident that occurred in Atlanta, Georgia in 2012. After a young man entered a public school with a gun, the police were called and gathered outside the building. The intruder entered the front office and interacted with a school employee while she conveyed his demands and concerns to the emergency service call taker. The call taker in turn instructed the police about how to handle the emergency. Although the intruder did fire his gun, he did not cause any injuries. Through the collaborative work of the caller and the call taker his peaceable surrender to the police was negotiated (Botelho et al. 2013). Although the caller was not trained as a crisis negotiator (Tuff 2014), during this incident she acted as a de facto crisis negotiator, spontaneously using many of

the techniques professional crisis negotiators are trained to use, including active listening

techniques, emotional self-control, and the expression of empathy.

Previous conversation analytic research on the use of reported speech (e.g., Holt and Clift

2007) is important for understanding this call since the ways in which the caller framed and

produced her direct and indirect quotes of the intruder's and the call taker's utterances were

critical to its success. Goffman's (1981) analysis of participation statuses and footing shifts is

also critical to understanding how the work of this call was done. Participation statuses have to

do with the speaker's relationship to the utterances they are producing and receiving. For

example, a participant may be the author of the utterance they are producing or may be

animating the utterance of another. They may be an addressed recipient or an overhearing

audience member (Goffman 1981). Footing shifts have to do with the way speakers mark

transitions in their talk to indicate their relationship to the utterance they are producing (Goffman

1981). For example, Clayman (1992) described how television news interviewers used footing

shifts to display a neutral stance by attributing controversial information to others. The

interviewer may identify confrontational information as being authored by another by attributing

the statement to a third party or a group or category of people (Clayman 1992; Clayman and

Heritage 2002).

The interactional organization of this call differed from typical emergency service calls in

that rather than being a two-party exchange between a caller and a call taker, it was a mediated

interaction between three people. The caller acted as an intermediary between the intruder and

the call taker, who in return conveyed their concerns to the police. The caller was therefore

required to make repeated shifts in footing as she communicated directly with both the intruder

and the call taker, and also animated their utterances to each other.

In this paper I will first describe the data and methods used, discuss previous conversation analytic research relevant to this topic, and then analyze the transcript of the emergency service call. The concluding section of this paper will discuss the implications of this analysis for how we study and understand crisis negotiations in the context of emergency service calls.

DATA AND METHODS

In this paper I analyze the school employee's emergency service call using the techniques and findings of conversation analysis (Heritage 1984; 1987; Heritage and Clayman 2010; Sacks 1984; Schegloff 2007; Schegloff and Sacks 1973). Conversation analysts study talk in its sequential context in order to discover the common-sense understandings and procedures people use to shape their conduct in particular interactional settings (Garcia 2013; Heritage 1984; Heritage and Clayman 2010; Hutchby and Wooffitt 2008; Liddicoat 2007; Sacks 1984; Schegloff 2007; ten Have 2007). Members' shared interactional competencies not only enable them to produce their own actions but also to interpret the actions of others. Because participants display their orientation to the procedures they use in the utterances they produce (see also Heritage and Atkinson 1984; Schegloff and Sacks 1973), analysts are able to discover conversational procedures by analyzing the talk itself. The conversation is assumed to be a context within which participants shape their own utterances and interpret the utterances of others (Goodwin and Duranti 1992; Heritage 1987). Thus the sequential context--the immediately prior utterances, the interactional context, and physical and temporal contexts are all assumed to be potentially relevant to the participants as they structure their talk (Heritage and Atkinson 1984).

Roles do not just affect behavior by providing a set of rights, obligations and expectations; people instantiate their roles by their actions (Halkowski 1990).

While the speech exchange system of ordinary conversation (whether conducted in a work place or in an informal context) provides for maximum flexibility in terms of the organization of turns at talk, types of turns produced by participants, and topics of talk, among others things (Sacks et al. 1974), talk in work place settings is often more highly structured or constrained on these types of dimensions (e.g., Antaki 2011; Boden and Zimmerman 1991; Clayman and Heritage 2002; Drew and Heritage 1992; Heritage and Clayman 2010; Heritage and Maynard 2006; Sacks 1992; Sacks et al. 1974). Emergency service calls differ from ordinary telephone calls in the construction of the opening sequence, the organization of the body of the call, and the performance of the roles of the participants (Cromdal et al. 2012; Larsen 2013; Whalen and Zimmerman 1987; Zimmerman 1984; 1992a; 1992b). Whalen and Zimmerman (1990) found that callers must construct their description of the event they are reporting to convey its status as a "policeable problem" (see also Cromdal et al. 2008; Sharrock and Turner 1978; Tracy and Anderson 1999).

Single Case Analysis. The purpose of a single-case analysis is to use findings from previous conversation analytic research to understand a particular event (e.g., Clayman and Whalen 1998/9; Garcia and Parmer 1999; Osvaldsson et al. 2012; Psathas 1992; Schegloff 1987; Whalen et al. 1988). Schegloff (1987) first explains the goals of conversation-analytic studies of collections of data:

"[T]he effort is to elucidate and describe the structure of a coherent, naturally bounded phenomenon or domain of phenomena in interaction, how it is

organized, and the practices by which it is produced. For this, one ordinarily

works with a collection of fragments of talk (or other conduct) which instantiate

the phenomenon and its variants, or which exemplify the range of phenomena

composing the domain." (Schegloff 1987: 101).

The single case analysis approach, on the other hand, has a different goal:

"[T]he resources of past work on a range of phenomena and organizational

domains in talk-in-interaction are brought to bear on the analytic explication of a

single fragment of talk... using [conversation analysis's] past results, to analyze

one of the sorts of data which, in this view, it (and social science more generally)

should be able to analyze." (Schegloff 1987: 101)

This approach enables us to compare the single case with published findings about routine

emergency telephone calls and routine interactions in other settings, in order to gain new

understandings of how the interaction in this particular case unfolded, and ultimately learn more

about potential causes of communication failure or success during emergency phone calls.

   Transcription Conventions. The audio recording of the call was transcribed using the

conventions of conversation analysis (Jefferson 1984; 1985; 2004). Pseudonyms are used for all

identifiers. Transcribing conventions are in the Appendix. Because these are naturally occurring

data, some utterances are inaudible. In particular, many of the intruder's utterances are inaudible

because he was not speaking into the phone. However, there is evidence in the data which

provides information on what he said. First, many of the intruder's utterances were audible or at

least partially audible. Second, the caller's quotes or paraphrases of many of the intruder's inaudible and partially utterances were apparently successful (since they were not repaired by the intruder [Osvaldsson et al. 2012]). The caller's repetitions and paraphrases convey at least the gist of many of the intruder's inaudible utterances.

Previous Conversation Analytic Research on Emergency Service Calls. Emergency telephone calls play a key role in the provision of help from police, fire and ambulance services and have been fruitfully studied by previous researchers using the conversation analytic method (e.g., Larsen 2013; Monzoni 2009; Paoletti 2009; 2012; Tracy and Tracy 1998a; Whalen and Zimmerman 1990; Zimmerman 1984). However, emergency service calls do not always unfold in these routine ways. Previous studies have investigated emergency phone calls in which a failure of communication led to a delay in the provision of service (e.g., Garcia and Parmer 1999; Osvaldsson et al. 2012; Svennevig 2012; Whalen et al. 1988). Whalen et al. (1988) analyzed a problematic emergency service call in which an argument emerged between the caller and the call taker. Garcia and Parmer (1999) analyzed a call in which the caller's production of unresolved disjunctures and unwarranted topic shifts, along with his failure to produce a narrative description of the events he was reporting, led the call taker to doubt the veracity of his call. Svennevig (2012) analyzed a series of three emergency service calls about the same critically ill patient. In these calls escalating conflict between the call taker and the callers prevented them from reaching a shared understanding of the severity of the patient's condition. Garcia (2015) analyzed a call in which the way the call taker developed the interrogative series was problematic in a way that obscured how specific details fit into a "big picture" of the incident.

The successful emergency service call analyzed in this paper differs from the problematic calls described above in that the call involved three participants rather than just a caller and a call

taker. The caller served as an intermediary between the intruder and the call taker and helped

negotiate his peaceable surrender. The caller successfully met the call taker's need for information

and timely responses while at the same time reassuring the intruder and showing him that she was

conveying the information he wanted conveyed. The caller successfully developed a rapport with

the intruder and negotiated his peaceable surrender with the help of the call taker who served as a

liaison with the police. The purpose of this paper is to investigate how these actions were

accomplished.

ANALYSIS OF THE EMERGENCY SERVICE CALL

The analysis of this emergency service call will show how the caller was able to serve as an

intermediary between the intruder and the call taker, maintain the autonomy of the intruder,

express empathy and create a bond with the intruder to build trust, negotiate and carry out his

surrender to the police. This work was done through a variety of actions and interactional

techniques. In this analysis I focus on the techniques used by the caller, in particular her nimble use

of footing shifts, reported speech, and format tying, her creation of trust by judicious and timely

sharing of personal experiences, expressions of empathy, and control of the display of emotions.

The call taker acted to support the caller's efforts, asking questions or giving instructions when

necessary and remaining silent otherwise, quickly answering the caller's requests and relaying

this information to the police stationed outside the school. This single case analysis shows us how

a successful outcome was achieved in this instance and how the successful use of the interactional

techniques recommended for crisis negotiators are effective because of their placement and timing

within the ongoing interaction. This analysis thereby demonstrates the usefulness of conversation

analysis for understanding how the work of crisis negotiation can best be done.

Serving as an Intermediary

Whalen and Zimmerman (2005) note that emergency service calls should not be conceived of as merely interactions between the caller and the call taker. These calls also involve the call taker's work in entering information into the computer, interactions between the call taker and colleagues in the call center, and the subsequent work of dispatching personnel (Whalen and Zimmerman 2005). The call taker thus serves as an intermediary between the caller and the police.

In the school intruder call analyzed here the caller is also serving as an intermediary. She participates in a face-to-face interaction with the intruder while also engaging in a telephone conversation with the call taker. The call taker in turn communicates with the police and transmits the intruder's instructions to them (as evidenced by their subsequent performance of these requests). The caller also communicates the call taker's utterances to the intruder. This call differs from routine emergency service calls in that the caller and the call taker are both performing for an overhearing audience (the intruder), rather than solely being involved in a direct dyadic exchange.

Conversation analytic research on interactions in which talk is directed to both addressed and overhearing audiences has been conducted in a variety of ordinary and institutional settings. This research demonstrates the ways in which participants' actions are altered to accommodate the overhearing audience. Constructing utterances for overhearing audiences is done differently than constructing utterances solely for the addressed party. For example, Arminen and Weilenmann (2009) examine the techniques used by a group of friends to simultaneously manage cell phone calls and face-to-face interactions. The communication on the cell phone is

formulated to address the caller on the other end of the line at the same time it conveys the

identity of the caller to the co-present persons. They describe techniques used to convey the

identities of the two sets of interactants to each other without explicitly naming them. Heritage

(1985) shows how television news interviewer's questions are designed to address not only their

own concerns but also the potential concerns of the overhearing audience (see also Clayman and

Heritage 2002). For example, Heritage (1985) notes that participants in televised news

interviews typically refrain from producing continuers such as "um hm", because through the use

of continuers "questioners identify themselves as the primary addressees of the talk they elicit"

(Heritage, 1985, p. 100). Omitting continuers thus works to frame the talk as produced for the

overhearing audience. He makes the same point for court room talk, where the judge and jury

may be the overhearing audience for an attorney's questioning of a witness.

Some of the main techniques for managing performing for an over-hearing audience are

the use of footing shifts (Goffman 1981), and the use of reported speech. Previous conversation

analytic research on reported speech explores the use of direct and indirect quotes and the

interactional contexts and uses to which reported speech is put (Holt and Clift 2007). Much of

this previous research focuses on the reporting of speech originally produced on another

occasion, rather than reporting one participant's utterance in another's subsequent utterance in

the same interaction. While reported speech occurs frequently in the call analyzed here, it is

limited to quoting or paraphrasing one participant's speech in order to immediately transmit it to

another participant. Since the caller is serving as the intermediary between the intruder and the

call taker, she often quotes, directly or indirectly, the speech of the intruder and the speech of the

call taker. At times she directly repeats what the prior speaker said, animating their utterance for

the third participant without explicit attribution, while at other times she marks her utterance as a

quote or paraphrase. The precise techniques or combinations of techniques she uses vary with the immediate interactional context.

The caller has to work to make clear when she is communicating the intruder's utterances to the call taker as opposed to speaking on her own behalf, and must work to distinguish between those of the call taker's utterances that are designed for the caller's ears alone and those which are to be communicated to the intruder. While it may be in the intruder's interest that his utterances be conveyed to the call taker, it is not always to the caller's interest that all of the call taker's utterances be directly conveyed. Part of the work being done by the caller is therefore determining which of the call taker's utterances to convey to the intruder, and which not to convey.

The analysis of Excerpt 1 below illustrates how performing for an overhearing audience is consequential for the interaction in this call. The caller uses several techniques to serve as an intermediary between the intruder and the call taker as she conveys his demands to the call taker, communicates information received from the call taker to him, and works with both to accomplish the resolution of the crisis. Excerpt 1 occurs very early in the call, shortly after the intruder fired several shots outside the school. The intruder then returned to the office and communicated to the caller that he wanted the police who were outside the building to "stop all movement" (line 42).

Excerpt 1: School Intruder 911 Call, lines 42+

42   I: Tell them to stop all movement

43   (0.1)

44   C: Okay, (0.3) oka:y.

45		(0.1)
46	I:	Stop <u>all</u> movement now.
47		(0.2)
48	C:	Stop ALL MOVEMENT NOW ON THUH GROUND. STOP
49		ALL MOVEMENT ON THUH GROU:ND.
50		(0.6)
51	I:	(not emergency not thuh radio)
52	C:	IF IT'S NOT AN EMERGENCY PLEASE DO <u>NOT</u> USE THUH
53		RADIO IF IT'S NOT AN EMERGENCY (0.2) <u>DO</u> <u>NOT</u> USE
54		THUH RADIO.
55		(0.6)
56	CT:	Are you talking to thuh <u>shoot</u>er?
57		(0.4)
58	C:	That's what he's telling me to tell them on thuh radio.
59		(.)
60	CT:	Okay
61		(0.2)
62	C:	Now what did you want me to <u>tell</u> <u>her</u> sir
63		(4.5)
64	I:	( ) call thuh news and put her on hold call thuh news
65	C:	Okay he told me to put you on hold and call thuh news ma'am
66		(0.2)
67	CT:	Okay

When the intruder instructs the caller to "stop <u>all</u> movement" (line 42), she quickly agrees to this command (line 44). The intruder then repeats his demand (line 46), adding "now" to convey urgency. As Osvaldsson et al. (2012) found in their case study of an emergency call, this caller displays her receipt of the intruder's command by repeating his utterance to the call taker (lines 48-49). This use of reported speech is an example of format tying. Goodwin and Goodwin (1987) define format tying as the repetition of all or part of a prior speaker's utterance in the current utterance. They described the use of format tying in oppositional utterances in arguing sequences, but it can also be used in non-arguing contexts. In the current situation the caller's use of format tying serves to display to the intruder that she has heard his command.

The caller first directly quotes the intruder's command, and then adds "on thuh ground" (lines 48-49). The addition of "on thuh ground" appears to be a way of handling the indexical nature of "them" in the intruder's initial formulation of the command (line 42). He is looking out a door or window and observing the actions of the police who are gathered outside the school. The "them" therefore refers to the police. When the caller animates his command for the call taker, she first repeats his utterance exactly in line 46, but adds "on thuh ground" which clarifies for the call taker whose movement is to be stopped. The caller speaks loudly and uses a stern and commanding tone of voice while conveying this command to the call taker (shifts in tone will be discussed below). Her repetition of the command serves to further emphasize its importance.

The intruder's next command is partially inaudible (line 51). However, the success of the caller's repetition of it (lines 52-54) is evidenced by the intruder's lack of repair of her utterance (Jefferson 1974; Osvaldsson et al. 2012; Schegloff et al. 1977). Note that in lines 52-54 the

caller again speaks loudly and uses repetition to present this command authoritatively. She again acts as an intermediary between the intruder and the call taker, simultaneously displaying to the intruder that she has heard him and is doing what he asked, while communicating his command to the call taker.

Note that the call taker has remained silent during this exchange. Her skill at knowing when to speak and when to remain silent is one of the reasons for the success of the call. After the completion of this second command, the call taker rejoins the interaction. Her utterance in line 56 works to repair a potential ambiguity in the participation status of the call taker's prior utterance. She requests confirmation that the caller is animating the intruder's commands rather than speaking on her own behalf ("Are you talking to thuh shooter?"; line 56).

While a simple "yes" would have sufficed as an answer to this question, such an answer would not have made the topic of talk between the two of them visible to the intruder. The intruder can overhear the caller's part of the conversation, but not the call taker's. The caller's response in line 58 provides the confirmation requested by the call taker while displaying what is being discussed for the intruder. In line 58 the caller thus clarifies that in her prior utterance she was animating the intruder's commands rather than speaking on her own behalf (Goffman 1981). Note that in contrast to her utterance in lines 48-49 and 52-54 in which the caller directly repeats and animates the intruder's utterances, in line 58 the caller explains that she was directly quoting the intruder rater than animating her own utterance ("That's what he's telling me"). This use of reported speech fulfills the additional purpose of maintaining trust between her and the intruder, by avoiding making it appear that she is having a private exchange with the call taker. The call taker's "Okay" on line 60 displays her understanding of the caller's explanation.

The caller prefaces her utterance in line 62 with the discourse marker "Now" to mark a shift from addressing the call taker to addressing the intruder. Previous research has shown that there are many possible uses for discourse markers (e.g., Bolden 2009; Naoko 2002; Schiffrin 1987). Nor (2012) found that in some interactional contexts, turns beginning with the discourse marker "now" are used to initiate interruptive utterances. In this context, the caller's use of "now" may serve to indicate an interruption of her exchange with the call taker and a resumption of her exchange with the intruder. She goes on to address this utterance to the intruder rather than the call taker by using the pronoun "her" to refer to the call taker and by addressing the intruder as "sir".

After a 4.5 second silence, the intruder can be heard speaking again in line 64. While this and several other utterances produced by the intruder are partially or completely inaudible on the recording of the call, the caller appears to have had no trouble hearing him as he spoke to her in the office. He instructs the caller to put her phone on hold and call a television news station. The caller again quickly acknowledges the intruder's utterance with "Okay" (line 65), and then performs a footing shift (Clayman 1988; 1992; Goffman 1981). Her use of "he told me" marks this utterance as directed to the call taker rather than to the intruder. She displays both to him and the call taker that this utterance is directed to the call taker by referring to the intruder as "he" and the call taker as "you" and "ma'am" (line 65).

Throughout the call, such footing shifts are used to efficiently manage the caller's role of intermediary between the intruder and the call taker. The caller effectively shifts between directly animating the intruder's commands, and authoring her own utterances. She clearly indicates which utterances are directed to the intruder and which to the call taker, and she animates the call taker's utterances for the intruder when necessary and strategically viable. She

uses phrases such as "he told me", "he said", or "she said" to accomplish these footing shifts and to display when she is reporting the speech of another, thus successfully managing the performance of her dual role as caller in an emergency service call while participating in the face-to-face interaction with the intruder, who is an overhearing audience as well as a participant.

Maintaining the Intruder's Autonomy

As noted in the introduction to this paper, crisis negotiators are often advised to support the subject's autonomy (sometimes referred to as "dignity") during the negotiation process (Charlés 2008; Slatkin 2015; Vecchi 2009). In this call, the caller and the call taker work together to maintain the autonomy of the intruder.

One way of maintaining the intruder's autonomy is through promptly conveying his commands to the emergency call taker (as discussed above in regards to Excerpt 1). Another way in which the autonomy of the subject can be maintained is through how the negotiator's utterances are constructed. Several previous conversation analytic studies illustrate how formulation of utterances or the words used to describe events can impact the interaction in a wide range of interactional contexts. Atkinson and Drew (1979) and Drew (1992) describe how the formulation of utterances or the words chosen to describe events can affect the impact of utterances in legal settings. Antaki, Walton and Finlay (2007) analyze how staff at a residential home for disabled people take care in how they construct proposals or invitations for participation in activities to maintain the autonomy of the residents and construct their identities. Garcia (2015) notes how word choice can have an affect on the success of an interaction; in an unsuccessful 911 call the use of the term "weird" to describe events being reported was not strong enough to convey that a potentially dangerous situation was unfolding (see also Heritage

and Clayman 2010; Zimmerman 1992b). Excerpt 2 illustrates how word choice and the

formulation of utterances can work to create and display the autonomy of the intruder. In

Excerpt 2 the call taker asks the caller to convey a request to the intruder.

Excerpt 2: School Intruder 911 Call, lines 142+

142   CT: °°Okay?,°° (0.3) Okay, ask him if he's willing to give his name?

143   (0.8)

144   C: She said are you <u>will</u>ing (.) to give your NA:me?

145   (0.5)

146   I: (No   )

147   C: He said <u>no</u>.

148   (0.1)

149   CT: Okay

In line 142 the call taker asks the caller to ask the intruder if he is "willing" to give his

name. The use of the word "willing" displays the call taker's orientation to the intruder's

autonomy. She does not demand that he give his name, nor does she simply ask him to give his

name, instead she asks if he is willing to give his name. Acting as an intermediary, the caller

then uses a footing shift ("She said"; line 144) to mark this utterance as an animation of an

utterance authored by the call taker. As the caller conveys the call taker's question to the

intruder, she also uses the word "<u>will</u>ing", adding emphasis on the word. The caller's voice in

line 144 is calm but serious as she relays the call taker's question to him. The intruder's

response in line 146 is largely inaudible, but the word "No" is clearly heard. After listening to

the intruder's response in line 146, the caller concisely conveys his refusal to the call taker (line 147). Again, she accomplishes a footing shift by framing this quote with "He said" to indicate that the word "no" is a direct quote of the intruder rather than an utterance that she is authoring. The caller's quote of the intruder's reply to this question uses stress on "no" to convey the definitiveness of his refusal ("He said no."; line 147).

In sum, the caller and call taker work to maintain and support the autonomy of the intruder in a variety of ways, including the prompt execution of his commands and the use of words and phrases which display an orientation to his autonomy.

Creating and Maintaining Connection with the Intruder

While maintaining the autonomy of the intruder is important and is one way of gaining the trust of the subject of a crisis negotiation, successful negotiation also typically involves the creation of a bond between the subject and the negotiator. As mentioned in the introduction, techniques for creating a bond include showing sympathy, sharing their own experiences, and using active listening techniques (Charlés 2008; Mullins 2002; Vecchi 2009). Stokoe (2013) found that in calls to a mediation program's intake line, those call takers who were able to convey empathy and affiliation with callers were more successful in getting them to agree to participate in mediation. The techniques used to create affiliation with the caller included the use of continuers and other active listening techniques, along with the expression of sympathy.

Display and Management of Emotions. Previous research has shown that the management of callers' emotions during 911 calls can have a critical impact on their ability to communicate and on the success of the call (e.g., Tracy and Tracy 1998a; 1998b; Whalen and Zimmerman 1998). When reporting an urgent emergency such as a shooting or a fire, some

callers can control their emotions and communicate clearly in spite of the seriousness of the situation. For example, Whalen and Zimmerman (1998:150) provide the following excerpt: "It's my brother he had a b<u>omb</u> an' it blew up in=h=hand=hh". Other callers are so overcome by their emotion that they can not articulate the problem or the type of help they need without intervention and assistance from the call taker (e.g., "HUHHHHHH .HHHHHH HHHHHHH .HHHHH HUHHHHH .HHH ((loudly gasping/out of breath))" (Whalen and Zimmerman 1998:148).

In the school intruder call the caller is able to manage her display of emotions, even in very stressful circumstances, without impeding her ability to communicate with the call taker and the intruder. In this section I will show how the caller works to create a connection or bond with the disputant through the control and display of emotions. In Excerpt 3 the caller uses shifts in tone of voice and the display of emotion to help convey the import of the intruder's commands to the call taker. These shifts in style and tone also help accomplish footing shifts as the caller makes transitions between addressing the intruder, addressing the call taker, or formulating her utterances for one or the other as an overhearing audience.

Excerpt 3: School Intruder 911 Call, lines 150+

```
150    I:     (                                    )
151    C:     He said no he know= he- he knows that-  .h (0.2) if he gives his
152           name he's going away for uh lo~ng ti~me ((tears in voice))
153    I:     (                              long time      long time)
154    C:     And he says he knows he's going away for uh long time he's on
155           probation?
```

156   ((long pause—phone on hold?; 26 seconds))

157   I: (   ) tell them to stand=

158   C: =Tell them to <u>STAND</u> <u>DOWN</u>

159   <u>NOW</u>!=

160   CT: =Okay=

161   C: =Tell them to <u>stand</u> <u>down</u> <u>now</u> he said

162   (0.2)

163   CT: Okay tell him I'm <u>giv</u>ing them thee instructions

164   (0.3)

165   C: She said she's giving thuh instructions

The caller paraphrases the intruder's inaudible utterance (lines 151-152). Her voice starts breaking as if she was about to cry as she repeats the intruder's fears that he will be sent to prison (tears in voice at "lo˜ng ti˜me"; line 152). This display of emotion can show sympathy for the intruder while at the same time the caller does not allow her emotions to overflow. She maintains control and therefore is able to continue communicating clearly as she conveys his utterances to the call taker (lines 154-155).

After a long silence the intruder produces a command "(   ) tell them to stand" (line 157). The caller immediately responds to this command, latching her utterance to the intruder's, and shifting her tone to a strong and emphatic delivery as she conveys this command to the call taker. She uses loudness and stress on each word to convey the seriousness of this instruction ("=Tell them to <u>STAND</u> <u>DOWN</u> <u>NOW</u>!="; lines 158-159). The caller's ability to fluidly shift

emotional tone, loudness, and emphasis contributes to the effectiveness of her performance by displaying her responsiveness to the intruder's wishes.

The call taker also responds immediately to this command as soon as it is relayed to her ("=Okay="; line 160). She communicates in line 163 that she is giving the instructions to the police. She directs the caller what to say to the intruder ("tell him...").

Becoming "Someone to Turn To". Previous conversation analytic research has shown how interactants can work to convey a connection with others. Harvey Sacks (1987) studied calls to a suicide hotline and found that one of the main problems facing callers was having no one to turn to in their time of need. In the school intruder call there is evidence of affiliation work being done by the caller which could facilitate creating and maintaining such a bond. The caller in the school intruder call may have helped the intruder back down from his violent intent by using a range of interactional techniques to become someone he could turn to in his time of need.

In Excerpt 4 the intruder's utterances are largely inaudible, but the caller's responses display the upshot of his remarks. She responds to his statements by comparing his situation to hers. She also discloses personal information about her own life which reveals the struggles she has gone through. For example, in line 259 the caller reveals that "my husband just left me after thirty three years".

Excerpt 4: School Intruder 911 Call, lines 257+

257   I: (my parents   not nobody)

258   I: [(

)]

259   C: [Well don't feel bad baby my husband just left me after thirty three

260		years]
261	I:	( )
262	C:	but-
263	I:	( )
264	C:	Yes you do! I mean I'M sitting here with you and talking to-
265		talking to you about it!?
266	I:	( )
267	C:	I got uh son that's multiple disabled.

In the caller's next response to one of the intruder's inaudible utterances she first contradicts what he has said ("Yes you do!"; line 264) and then presents herself as some one he can turn to. She explains that she is "sitting here with you and talking to- talking to you about it!?"; lines 264-5). In sum, there are a variety of techniques the caller uses to create a bond or alignment with the intruder, including the control and display of emotions to facilitate communication and display sympathy with him, and sharing personal information which shows the commonalities of her experiences with his. By these means she works to become "someone he can turn to".

Creating Alignment through Telling "Second Stories". Sacks (1992) has shown that interactants in ordinary conversation often respond to one speaker's story with a second story which is related to the first. These second stories can be one way interactants display affiliation with each other (Ruusuvuori 2005). However, in talk in institutional settings, a second story may be an inappropriate response to a story or troubles-telling. For example, in the doctor/patient consultations that Ruusuvuori (2005) analyzed, in only one of 228 sequences did the doctor respond to a patient's troubles-telling with a second story. Ruusuvuori's (2005) study of doctor/patient

consultations revealed a number of ways doctors worked to show affiliation with patients. The routine ways doctors in Ruusuvuori's (2005) study conveyed empathy and sympathy included affiliative sentence-completions and summaries of patient's stories which highlighted the problem the patient was experiencing.

When Jefferson and Lee (1981) compared "troubles-telling" in ordinary telephone calls and service calls, they found differences in responses to these stories. Call takers in service encounters typically responded to stories with advice, while story recipients in ordinary telephone calls typically conveyed sympathy and "emotional reciprocity." One institutional setting in which second stories may be useful is that of psychotherapy sessions. Leudar, Antaki and Barnes (2006) analyze the interactional procedures used to accomplish self-disclosure in psychotherapy sessions and found that therapists use reciprocal self-disclosure to accomplish "experiential matching." The therapist would reveal information or tell a "second story" which served to express agreement with the client or to present the doctor's advice in a way that connects it to the client's experience.

Since the caller in the school intruder call is a lay person rather than a call taker, she constructs her interactions with the intruder using the framework of ordinary conversation. She takes advantage of the flexibility of the speech exchange system of ordinary conversation (Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson 1974) to use a variety of techniques to align with the intruder, express empathy and sympathy, and help him negotiate his surrender to the police. For example, in Excerpt 5 the caller uses self-disclosure at a point in the interaction where it is directly relevant to what the intruder has just communicated to her. Her self disclosure both displays empathy with the intruder's situation and creates an affiliation between them. It provides a "second story"

in response to what he has told her about his situation, and works to display empathy and understanding of him.

Excerpt 5: School Intruder 911 Call, lines 419+

419   I: (   )

420   C: It's going to be all right sweetie I just want you to <u>know</u> that I <u>love</u>

421   you though okay?, and I'm <u>PROUD</u> of you that's uh good thing

422   you're just giving up and don't worry about it. (0.2) we A:LL go

423   through something in <u>LIF:E</u>.

424   (0.2)

425   I: (suicide   )

426   C: No, you don't want that. (0.2) You're going to be okay.

427   I: (   )

428   C: <u>I</u> thought thuh same thing, you know I tried to commit suicide la:st

429   yea:r? after my husband left me? (0.3) £but look at me now!,£

430   £I'm <u>still</u> working and everything is <u>okay</u>!£ ((raised pitch on

431   "okay!"; "happy" sound in voice))

432   I: (Martin Hall   on)

433   C: Your name is what Martin <u>what:</u>?

434   I: (Hall)

435   C: Martin Ha:ll?

In lines 420-423 the caller expresses her love for the intruder, and uses "we" to connect him to the experience of herself and others. In lines 426 and 428 the caller responds to the intruder's inaudible utterances by treating them as a statement that he wants to commit suicide. First, she disagrees with him and says "No, you don't want that." (line 426). After a brief pause, she provides optimistic reassurance ("You're going to be okay."). The intruder's response is inaudible (line 427), but the caller apparently has no trouble hearing it. She begins her response quickly with "I thought thuh same thing," (line 428), thus indexically referring to his prior utterance and stating that her own experience matched it. She goes on to say "you know I tried to commit suicide la:st yea:r?" (lines 428-9). She thereby displays her interpretation of his utterances in lines 425 and 427 as expressing a desire to commit suicide. Her utterance in lines 428-9 serves as a story preface (Goodwin 1984). She continues the story by giving the reason she wanted to commit suicide ("after my husband left me?"; line 429). After a brief pause she begins the climax of her story (Goodwin 1984), which is marked by the use of a very different tone of voice. Here she speaks with what Ruusuvuori (2005) calls a "smiley voice" (see also Cromdal et al. 2008). The climax of the story begins with "£but look at me now!,£,". Her happy sounding voice and use of "but" to initiate the story climax projects a contrast to her earlier desire for suicide, and a happy ending to her story. She goes on to describe her current situation as "£I'm still working and everything is okay!£" Her second story is constructed to suggest that his story will have a positive ending as well.

The caller's self-disclosure of her own depression and suicide attempt as well as other challenging aspects of her own life history (elsewhere she noted that her son is disabled [Tuff 2014]), is clearly placed responsively to the intruder's self disclosures rather than being a gratuitous sharing of information. Her self-disclosures therefore works as a second story in

response to his story. It serves to display her affiliation with him as well as display sympathy and empathy for his situation.

While the intruder's response in line 432 is largely inaudible, his name is audible in his response (and in the caller's next turn in line 433: "Your name is what Martin <u>what:</u>?"). While the intruder's response to the call taker's story is inaudible, the fact that he spontaneously gives her his name at this point (which he had refused to do earlier—see Excerpt 2 above), indicates that at the very least her self disclosure has not damaged the rapport between them. His disclosure of his name at this point, after having refused to disclose it earlier, suggests that she has succeeded in gaining his trust.

In sum, one way in which the caller works to create a bond with the intruder is through the telling of 'second stories', in which she responds to his revelations of personal information with revelations of her own struggles. These stories work to show their commonalities and to display her understanding of his emotional response to his situation.

Negotiating the Intruder's Surrender

One of the results of the caller's success in serving as an intermediary and creating and maintaining a bond with the intruder is the successful negotiation of his surrender. Excerpt 6 shows the caller working to negotiate the intruder's surrender to the police. Note that in this segment of the call the intruder and the caller are engaged in a dyadic exchange, with the call taker a silent overhearing audience member.

Although several of the intruder's utterances in Excerpt 6 are inaudible, the caller's responses display her orientation to his utterances as objecting to or describing obstacles to his surrender. The exchange takes on some of the characteristics of an argument, with the caller

disagreeing with the intruder's objections, and providing reasons why the surrender could be successfully negotiated.

Excerpt 6: School Intruder 911 Call, lines 223+

223   C: >But do you- do you want me to try <u>I</u> can <u>help</u> you want me to try

224   you want me you want to talk to them? want me to talk to them

225   and try to-<

226   I: (   )

227   C: Okay but let me <u>talk</u> to them and let let's see if we can work work it

228   out so that you <u>don't</u> have to go away with them for uh long ti:me

229   (0.2)

230   I: I'm already on probation (   )

231   (0.2)

232   C: No it <u>does</u> matter! (0.8) <u>I</u> can let them know that you have <u>not</u> tried

233   to HARM ME OR DO ANYTHING WITH ME OR <u>ANYTHING</u>

234   IF YOU WANT TO=

235   I: =(

236   )

237   C: But that doesn't make any difference you didn't <u>hit</u> anybody

238   (0.2)

239   I: (I [don't] <u>know</u> that)

240   C: [(but-)]

241   C: Okay (0.2) let me ask you this ma'am (0.2) he didn't <u>hit</u> any body

This excerpt begins with the caller offering to help the intruder by talking to the police on his behalf (lines 223-225). The intruder's response to the caller's initial offer of help is inaudible (line 226), but based on the caller's next utterance, he appears to be responding to her offer to help "talk to them" for him. The caller's response first acknowledges his utterance ("Okay", line 227). She then asks him to "let" her talk to them (line 227). Note the shift from "do you want me to..." (lines 223-5) to "let me talk to them" (line 227). She has shifted from a question about what he wants to a request for him to "let her". Note that her use of the word "let" here displays an orientation to the autonomy of the intruder. Her use of the collective pronoun "we" in line 227 ("let's see if we can work work it out") shows her working to create an alignment with the intruder by displaying that she is on his side and is helping him. The caller goes on to address his concern that he will have to "go away with them for uh long ti:me" (line 228). Notice that by repeating the substance of his argument, she not only displays to him that she is listening to and understanding him, she also makes his concerns available to the call taker (the call taker can only hear the caller's side of the discussion).

The intruder's response communicates that he's "already on probation..." (line 230). While the end of this utterance is inaudible, the caller's response in line 232 is clearly a strong disagreement with his utterance ("No it does matter!"; line 232). The caller then presents an argument to support her position, offering to tell the police that he has not tried to harm her (lines 232-4). Her use of "IF YOU WANT TO=" in line 234 serves to display an orientation to his autonomy.

After the intruder's next utterance (also inaudible, lines 235-236), the caller produces a disagreement implicative turn beginning ("But") and goes on to dismiss his concern ("But that

doesn't make any difference you didn't <u>hit</u> anybody"; line 237). Based on her response, it can be inferred that in his inaudible utterance he referred to the fact that he had fired his gun. This fact supports his contention that if he surrendered, he would have to go to prison for a long time. However, the caller's response refutes this argument by pointing out that he "didn't <u>hit</u> anybody" (line 237). The intruder's partially audible response "(I [don't] <u>know</u> that)" (line 239) expresses his uncertainty that the fact that he did not "hit anybody" matters in terms of view of the legal consequences of his actions. The caller seems to be initiating yet another disagreeing utterance with "(but-)" as she overlaps this utterance (line 240). She then provides a transition-implicative acknowledgment token ("Okay"; line 241). Barske (2009) notes that "okay" can be used to indicate an impending topic shift. In this instance, it marks a transition between her exchange with the intruder to an utterance directed to the call taker. Excerpt 7 shows the continuation of this exchange. After acknowledging the intruder's last statement with "Okay" in line 241, the caller shifts to addressing the overhearing call taker instead of the intruder.

Excerpt 7: School Intruder 911 Call, lines 241+

241	C:	Okay (0.2) let me ask you this ma'am (0.2) he didn't <u>hit</u> any body
242		he just shot outside thuh door if I walk out there <u>with</u> him?,
243	I:	( )
244	C:	if I walk out there <u>with</u> him if- they so they won't shoot him or
245		anything like that he wants to give his self up is that okay they
246		won't <u>shoot</u> him?
247		(0.2)
248	CT:	Yes ma['am]

249   I: [(   )]

250   C: [And] he just want to go to thuh HOSpital?

251   (0.2)

252   CT: O:kay

253   (0.2)

254   C: She said=

255   CT: =Just hold on one moment

256   (0.1)

257   C: Okay she said hold on and we gonna- she's going to talk to thuh

258   police officer and I go out there with you

The caller's utterance in lines 241-242 shifts to talking to the overhearing call taker through the use of the address term "ma'am", followed by third person references to the intruder ("he" in lines 241 and 242). This utterance has the form of a pre-sequence (Schegloff 1980). The caller begins with an action projection "let me ask you this ma'am." (line 241) which projects a question to come. Before producing this question, the caller produces preliminary information which sets up the question. In this utterance the caller sets up a question for the call taker in which she offers to "walk out" with the intruder.

The intruder then produces another inaudible utterance (line 243). This utterance apparently supports the plan for him to give himself up, because after its production the caller continues her previous turn by first repeating the last thing she said before the intruder spoke and then continuing with "if- they so they won't shoot him or anything like that he wants to give his self up" (lines 244-5). She follows this with the projected action, a question: "is that okay they

won't <u>shoot</u> him?" (lines 245-246). The call taker promptly responds in the affirmative (line

248). As soon as she says yes, the caller adds "And he just want to go to thuh HOSpital?". The

call taker's response to this question is not as definitive as her "Yes" in line 248. In line 252 she

says "O:kay". The drawing out of the first syllable and the absence of completion intonation

displays some uncertainty. When the caller begins to speak in line 254, her turn beginning ("She

said") accomplishes a footing shift and begins to convey the call taker's response to the intruder.

The call taker quickly interrupts and asks the caller to "=Just hold on one moment" (line 255).

The caller conveys this delay to the intruder and provides an account for the delay (lines 257-8).

She states that the call taker is "going to talk to thuh police officer" and adds "and <u>I</u> go out there

<u>with</u> you" (line 258). Note that the caller's gloss of the call taker's response is different from

what the call taker actually said. She constructs a version of the response which puts a positive

"spin" on it. In short, in this exchange the caller repeatedly conveyed the intruder's concerns to

the call taker while also negotiating with him and trying to persuade him to surrender.

　　As the call continues, the intruder agrees to surrender. He puts down his gun and places

it on a desk near the caller, takes a drink from his bottle of water, and prepares to lay down with

his hands behind his back waiting for the police to enter the building. After some further

discussion, he then decides to empty his pockets and put the rest of his possessions on the desk

next to the gun. He lies down on the floor and waits, while the caller talks to him and continues

to reassure him.

　　After waiting a while for the police to come in, the intruder gets up and asks the caller if

he can get his water bottle (Excerpt 8, line 483). Excerpt 8 shows that the work of

accomplishing the surrender is not complete with his agreement to surrender. There is ongoing

crisis management work done by the caller as she continues to work to maintain his trust and his

autonomy, and communicate as necessary with the call taker as they all wait for the police to enter the building.

Excerpt 8: School Intruder 911 Call, lines 483+

```
483   M:      =(                    of my water                )
484   C:      a:h, can- oh he wants to know can he get some of his water right
485           quick (0.3) yes uh yes Martin you said Martin Hall right?
486   I:      (                    )
487   C:      .h Okay.  £guess what Martin?£  (0.2) £.h my last name is Hall too!
488           you know my mo:m was uh Ha:ll!£ ((higher pitch; said with happy
489           enthusiastic voice))
490           (0.4)
491   I:      (        find out what they waiting for)
492   C:      He says what are you all waiting for what's taking them so long to
493           come on?  ((lower pitch; said with stern and commanding tone))
494           (0.2)
495   CT:     Okay (0.2) one moment.
496           (0.3)
497   C:      She says she's getting to them now they're coming.
```

Excerpt 8, which occurred toward the end of the call, begins with a partially audible utterance in which the intruder indicates that he wants his water bottle (line 483). The caller's response begins with a self repair (Jefferson 1974; Schegloff, Jefferson and Sacks 1977). The

caller relays his request to the call taker ("he wants to know can he get some of his water right quick"; lines 484-485). However, the caller does not wait for a response from the call taker to this request. After a brief pause she says "yes uh yes Martin" (line 485). Conveying the intruder's request served to notify the call taker that the intruder is getting his water, so that she can inform the police of this action if necessary. This information is important to the smooth accomplishment of the surrender, because if the police came in expecting him to be lying on the floor and instead saw him standing near the desk where the gun and his other possessions were lying, they might have felt threatened.

After the exchange about the water bottle, the caller immediately asks the intruder to confirm that she has got his name right (line 485). After acknowledging his inaudible response ("Okay", line 486) she switches the topic to his name. She shares that she has the same last name in her family (lines 487-488). This part of her utterance is communicated in a friendly and upbeat tone. When the intruder next speaks in line 491 he asks her to find out what is the source of the delay in the police entering the building so that he can surrender. The caller's immediate response begins with a footing shift ("He says"; line 492) which marks her utterance as addressed to the call taker rather than to the intruder, and frames it as a quote. She then produces a question which is also formulated as a complaint ("<u>what</u> are you all <u>wai</u>ting for what's taking them so long to come on?"; lines 492-3). This utterance is produced in a very different tone of voice than her previous turn about the intruder's last name. Here she uses a stern and commanding tone and speaks in a lower pitched voice. Throughout this call the caller fluently shifts tone of voice and emotional tone to accomplish a variety of different tasks. She uses a friendly and conversational tone when working to keep the intruder calm and create a bond with

him, and a stern and commanding tone when she is working to display for him that she is

accurately conveying the importance of his commands and concerns to the call taker.

In sum, the negotiation of the surrender is accomplished through a variety of techniques

(including both arguing with him and working to create a bond with him through sharing of

personal information and other techniques). However, once the intruder has agreed to surrender,

further work must be done to maintain this bond until the police actually enter the building and

the surrender is completed. The caller continues to do this emotion work and creation and

maintaining of a bond or connection with the intruder through the end of the call, and also

continues her work of transmitting important information to the call taker to ensure the safe

surrender of the intruder.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

In sum, this analysis has shown how the participants in this call worked together to

successfully deescalate the threat and negotiate the surrender of the intruder. Because of the

mediated nature of this interaction, the interactional organization of this call differed from typical

emergency service calls which are two-party interactions between a caller and a call taker. In this

call, the caller played the role of intermediary between the intruder and the call taker, while

alternately conducting an unmediated bilateral face-to-face interaction with the intruder and a

telephone interaction with the call taker. Both the caller and call taker managed the coordination of

their utterances during the call for an overhearing audience—the intruder.

In this analysis I have shown how the participants successfully managed the footing shifts

necessary to do this work. Goffman's (1981) concept of footing shifts is key to understanding how

the work of this call was done and the caller's success in accomplishing it. The caller successfully

communicated the intruder's commands and concerns to the call taker, using footing shifts to signal transitions between utterances directed at the intruder and those addressed to the call taker. She paraphrased or quoted the intruder's utterances to convey her attention to the intruder and responsiveness to his commands. She conveyed the call taker's utterances to the intruder when relevant so that he would know that this commands were being followed, and held them back when it was helpful to do so. She helped avoid escalation of the crisis by avoiding the display of hysteria. She fluently switched between paraphrases of the intruder's instructions and direct quotes in which she animated his voice for the call taker, adjusting her tone, volume and emotional intensity to convey the urgency of the intruder's utterances. In addition, the caller shared her own life challenges with him and expressed concern for his issues and problems (Botelho et al. 2013; Tuff 2014). She shared her personal history of loss and her previous suicide attempt in an effort to show him that his situation was not hopeless. She thus attended to the immediate emotional needs of the intruder at the same time as she served as an intermediary between him and the police (via the call taker). The caller's behavior thus exhibited many of the recommended techniques used by professional crisis negotiators.

The call taker also played an important role in the success of this call. She provided what was needed at each moment to meet the needs of the caller and to support her work in dealing with the intruder. The call taker's competence in understanding the multiple footing shifts and initiating repair of them when necessary was also key to the success of this call. She helped the caller communicate with the intruder by carefully articulating information that would be reassuring or helpful. She kept her utterances short, speaking only when necessary or when solicited to do so by the caller. She quickly gained an understanding of the role the caller was playing and cooperated with her by conveying the intruder's demands to the police, while at the same time giving the

caller instructions and advice when possible. Although the call taker was the professional in this interaction, she acted to support the caller's efforts and treated her as a de facto colleague.

The use of a conversation analytic approach enables us to understand how the work of this call was done successfully. While this caller used many of the techniques that crisis negotiators are taught to use, it is not sufficient to simply use the recommended techniques. In order to successfully negotiate, one has to effectively place them in the sequential context of the ongoing interaction. For example, in order to display empathy or create an emotional bond, the negotiator can not simply share a sympathetic story about them self. They have to know when to tell that story, and how to position it within the ongoing interaction.

In terms of the training provided to call takers, callers, and crisis negotiators, the most important message may be the importance of understanding the sequential and interactional context of actions. It is not just the techniques that were used, but how they were positioned and responded to during the call that led to their success. It is not enough to know that such techniques as active listening, creating rapport, and using a calm and steady tone of voice will be helpful in crisis negotiations. What is critical is to know when to use each technique, and how to transition effectively between different types of actions as necessary given the unfolding interaction between the negotiator and the subject. For example, in order for crisis negotiators to be effective it is not enough to know that they should express empathy for the subject, but to know how to accomplish this action at the appropriate time in the interaction. The use of conversation analysis to study this emergency service call and the crisis negotiation within it enables us to investigate the use of negotiation techniques in their interactional context.

While the success of this call was undoubtedly due to the high level of interactional competence of both the caller and the call taker, many of the techniques they used can be taught

to others in order to improve the likelihood of success in future emergency situations involving crisis negotiations. For both emergency service call takers and crisis negotiators, the main message of this analysis is to be flexible and responsive and to tailor one's approach to the call's changing contingencies as the interaction unfolds. When serving as an intermediary between the call taker and others, using techniques such as footing shifts and reported speech to clearly indicate the participation status of utterances is critical. Calibrating the level of emotion displayed at different points in the interaction to be most effective is also an important skill. Therefore, competence as a crisis negotiator is in many ways the same thing as interactional competence.

There are two main limitations to this study. First, since the intruder was not speaking into the phone, many of his utterances were inaudible. This limits our ability to completely examine the three-way interaction between the intruder, the caller, and the call taker. Second, the use of the single-case analysis method, while powerful in helping us to understand how a single event was successful or unsuccessful, should be supplemented by further analyzes of other instances of layman-facilitated negotiations during emergency calls. Given the relative infrequency of these occurrences, this type of data is difficult to obtain, but it is hoped that as instances are sought out subsequent analyzes can further examine these issues and provide comparisons between cases.

APPENDIX: TRANSCRIBING CONVENTIONS

This is a simplified version of Gail Jefferson's (1984:ix-xvi) transcription conventions with some additional symbols added:

Symbol	Definition
.hh hh	Inhalations and exhalations, respectively
ta::lk	Colons indicate a syllable is drawn out
that-	Dash indicates a word was cut off abruptly
lot	Underlining indicates stress or emphasis
YOU	Capital letters indicate increased volume
°cost°	Degree signs indicate decreased volume
(1.4)	Numbers in parentheses indicate length of pauses
(talk)	Words in parentheses are tentative transcriptions.
( )	Empty parentheses indicate non-transcribable talk.
.,?!	Punctuation indicates intonation, not grammatical structure.

A: [a copy of it]

B: [I have   ]   Brackets indicate simultaneous speech.

A: yeah=

B: =in order   Equal signs indicate one word is placed immediately after another without pause or overlap.

A: are yuh gonna?   Words spelled as pronounced.

A: I do~n't kno~w   Tilde used to indicate quavering voice; sounds like person is about

to cry. (Garcia and Parmer 1999; Hepburn 2004; Hepburn and

Potter 2012; Maynard et al. 2002; Cromdal et al. 2008)

A: £that's funny£   Indicates talk between symbols spoken with "smiley voice"

(Cromdal, et al. 2008; Ruusuvuori 2005).

A: @that's great@   Indicates talk between symbols spoken with "animated

voice" (Ruusuvuori 2005).

A: ((stern voice))   Double parentheses contain descriptions of vocalizations, manner

of speaking, or descriptions of context (e.g., Antaki and Jahoda

2010; Leudar, Antaki, and Barnes 2006; Maynard et al. 2002)

REFERENCES

Antaki, Charles (Ed.). 2011. *Applied Conversation Analysis: Intervention and Change in*

Institutional Talk. Basingstoke: Palgrave-MacMillan.

Antaki, Charles, and Andrew Jahoda. 2010. "Psychotherapists' Practices in Keeping a Session

'On-Track' in the Face of Clients' 'Off-Track' Talk." *Communication & Medicine* 7:11–

21.

Antaki, Charles, Chris Walton, and W. M. L. Finlay. 2007. "How Proposing an Activity to a

Person with an Intellectual Disability can Imply a Limited Identity." *Discourse &*

Society 18(4):393-40.

Arminen, Ilkka, and Alexandra Weilenmann. 2009. "Mobile Presence and Intimacy-Reshaping

Social Actions in Mobile Contextual Configuration." *Journal of Pragmatics* 41(2009):

1905-1923.

Atkinson, J. Maxwell, and Paul Drew. 1979. *Order in Court: The Organization of Verbal Interaction in Judicial Settings*. London: MacMillan Press.

Barske, Tobias. 2009. "Same Token, Different Actions: A Conversation Analytic Study of Social Roles, Embodied Actions, and OK in German Business Meetings." *Journal of Business Communication* 46(1):120-49.

Boden, Deborah and Don H. Zimmerman (eds.). 1991. *Talk and Social Structure: Studies in Ethnomethodology and Conversation Analysis*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Bolden, Galina. 2009. "Implementing Incipient Actions: The Discourse Marker "So" in English Conversation." *Journal of Pragmatics* 41(2009): 974-998.

Botelho, Greg, Vivian Kuo, and J. Levs. 2013. "Antoinette Tuff Hailed as 'True Hero' for Handling Georgia School Gunman." *CNN.com*. Thursday, August 22, 2013.

Charlés, Laurie L. 2008. *When the Shooting Stopped: Crisis Negotiation at Jefferson High School.* Lantham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, Lantham.

Clayman, Steven E. 1988. "Displaying Neutrality in Television News Interviews." *Social Problems* 35(4):474-92.

Clayman, Steven E. 1992. "Footing in the Achievement of Neutrality: The Case of News-Interview Discourse." Pp. 163-198 in *Talk at Work: Interaction in Institutional Settings,* edited by Paul Drew and John Heritage. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Clayman, Steven E., and John Heritage. 2002. *The News Interview: Journalists and Public Figures on the Air*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Clayman, Steven E. and Jack Whalen. 1988/89. "When the Medium Becomes the Message: The Case of the Rather-Bush Encounter." *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 22:241-272.

Cromdal, Jakob, Karin Osvaldsson, and Daniel Persson-Thunqvist. 2008. "Context that

  Matters: Producing "Thick-Enough Descriptions" in Initial Emergency Reports."

  Journal of Pragmatics 40(5):927-959.

Cromdal, Jakob, Hàkan Lanqvist, Daniel Persson-Thunqvist, and Karin Osvaldsson. 2012.

  "Finding Out What's Happened: Two Procedures for Opening Emergency Calls."

  Discourse Studies 14(4):371-397.

Dewa, Lindsay H., Carol A. Ireland, and Neil Gredecki. 2011. "The Interpersonal Style and

  Complementarity between Crisis Negotiators and Forensic Inpatients." *Journal of*

  Family Violence 26: 277-283.

Drew, Paul. 1992. "Contested Evidence in Courtroom Cross-Examination: The Case of a Trial

  for Rape." Pp. 470-520 in *Talk at Work: Interaction in Institutional Settings,* edited by

  Paul Drew and John Heritage. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Drew, Paul and John Heritage. 1992. *Talk at Work: Interaction in Institutional Settings*.

  Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Garcia, Angela Cora. 2013. *An Introduction to Interaction: Understanding Talk in Formal and*

  Informal Settings. London: Bloomsbury Press.

Garcia, Angela Cora. 2015. "'Something Really Weird has Happened': Losing the Big Picture in

  Emergency Service Calls." *Journal of Pragmatics* 84:102-120.

Garcia, Angela Cora, and Penelope A. Parmer. 1999. "Misplaced Mistrust: The Collaborative

  Construction of Doubt in 911 Emergency Calls." *Symbolic Interaction* 22 (4):297-324.

Giebels, Ellen, and Paul J. Taylor. 2009. "Interaction Patterns in Crisis Negotiations:

  Persuasive Arguments and Cultural Differences." *Journal of Applied Psychology*

94(1):5-19.

Goffman, Erving. 1981. *Forms of Talk*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Goodwin, Charles. 1984. "Notes on Story Structure and the Organization of Participation." Pp.

    225-246 in *Structures of Social Action: Studies in Conversation Analysis*, edited by J.

    Maxwell Atkinson and John Heritage. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Goodwin, Charles and Alessandro Duranti. 1992. "Rethinking Context: An Introduction." Pp.

    1-42 in *Rethinking Context: Language as an Interactive Phenomenon*, edited by

    Alessandro Duranti and Charles Goodwin. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Goodwin, Marjorie H., and Charles Goodwin. 1987. "Children's Arguing." Pp. 200-248 in

    Language, Gender and Sex in Comparative Perspective, edited by Susan Philips, Susan

    Steele, and Christine Tanz. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Halkowski, Timothy. 1990. "'Role' as an interactional device." *Social Problems* 37(4):564–77.

Hasselt, Vincent. B., and Stephen J. Romano. 2004. "Role-Playing: A Vital Tool in Crisis

    Negotiation Skills Training." *FBI Law Enforcement Bulletin*, February, 2004:12-17.

Hatcher, Chris, Kris Mohandie, Jim Turner, and Michael G. Gelles. 1998. "The Role of the

    Psychologist in Crisis/Hostage Negotiations." *Behavioral Sciences and the Law* 16:455-

    472.

Hepburn, Alexa. 2004. "Crying: Notes on Description, Transcription, and Interaction."

    Research on Language and Social Interaction 37(3): 251-290.

Hepburn, Alexa, and John Potter. 2012. "Crying and Crying Responses." Pp. 195-211 in

    Emotion in Interaction, edited by Anssi Peräkylä, and Marja-Leena Sorjonen. Oxford:

    Oxford University Press.

Heritage, John. 1984. *Garfinkel and Ethnomethodology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University

    Press.

Heritage, John. 1985. "Analysing News Interviews: Aspects of the Production of Talk for an Overhearing Audience." Pp. 95-119 in *Handbook of Discourse Analysis, Volume 3: Discourse and Dialogue,* edited by Teun A. Dijk. London: Academic Press.

Heritage, John, 1987. "Ethnomethodology." Pp. 224-272 in *Social Theory Today*, edited by Anthony Giddens and John H. Turner. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Heritage, John and J. Maxwell Atkinson. 1984. "Introduction." Pp. 1-17 in *Structures of Social Action: Studies in Conversation Analysis*, edited by J. Maxwell Atkinson and John Heritage. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Heritage, John, and Steven E. Clayman. 2010. *Talk in Action: Interactions, Identities, and Institutions*. Boston: Wiley Blackwell.

Heritage, John and Douglas W. Maynard. (eds.). 2006. *Communication in Medical Care: Interaction between Primary Care Physicians and Patients*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Holt, Elizabeth and Rebecca Clift. 2007. *Reporting Talk: Reported Speech in Interaction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hutchby, Ian and Robin Wooffitt. 2008. *Conversation Analysis, Second Edition*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Jefferson, Gail. 1974. "Error Correction as an Interactional Resource." *Language in Society* 13(2):181–99.

Jefferson, Gail. 1984. "Transcription Notation." Pp. ix-xvi in *Structures of Social Action: Studies in Conversation Analysis*, edited by J. Maxwell Atkinson and John Heritage. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Jefferson, Gail. 1985. "An Exercise in the Transcription and Analysis of Laughter." Pp. 25-34 in *Handbook of Discourse Analysis, Vol. 3: Discourse and Dialogue*, edited by Teun A. Van Dijk. London: Academic Press.

Jefferson, Gail. 2004. "Glossary of Transcript Symbols with an Introduction. Pp. 43-59 in *Conversation Analysis: Studies from the First Generation*, edited by Gene H. Lerner. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Jefferson, Gail, and John R. E. Lee. 1981. "The Rejection of Advice: Managing the Problematic Convergence of a 'Troubles-Telling' and a 'Service Encounter'." *Journal of Pragmatics* 5:399-422.

Larsen, Tine. 2013. "Dispatching Emergency Assistance: Callers' Claims of Entitlement and Call Takers' Decisions." *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 46(3):205-230.

Leudar, Ivan, Charles Antaki, and Rebecca Barnes. 2006. "When Psychotherapists Disclose Personal Information about Themselves to Clients." *Communication & Medicine* 3(1):27-41.

Liddicoat, Anthony J. 2007. *An Introduction to Conversation Analysis*. London: Continuum Press.

Maynard, Douglas W., Hanneke Houtkoop-Streenstra, Nora Cate Schaeffer, and Johannes van der Zouwen. 2002. *Standardization and Tacit Knowledge: Interaction and Practice in the Survey Interview*. New York: Wiley.

Monzoni, Chiara M. 2009. "Direct Complaints in (Italian) Calls to the Ambulance: The Use of Negatively Framed Questions." *Journal of Pragmatics* 41: 2465-2478.

Mullins, Wayman C. 2002. "Advanced Communication Techniques for Hostage Negotiators." *Journal of Police Crisis Negotiations* 2(1): 63-81.

Naoko, Taguchi. 2002. "A Comparative Analysis of Discourse Markers in English Conversational Registers." *Issues in Applied Linguistics* 13(1): 41-69.

Nor, Siti Nurbaya Mohd. 2012. "Discourse Markers in Turn-Initial Positions in Interruptive Speech in a Malaysian Radio Discourse." *Multilingua* 31(2012): 113-133.

Osvaldsson, Karin, Daniel Persson-Thunqvist, and Jakob Cromdal. 2012. "Comprehension Checks, Clarifications, and Corrections in an Emergency Call with a Nonnative Speaker of Swedish." *International Journal of Bilingualism* 17(2):205-220.

Paoletti, Isabella. 2009. "Communication and Diagnostic Work in Medical Emergency Calls in Italy." *Computer Supported Cooperative Work* 18:229-250.

Paoletti, Isabella. 2012. "The Issue of Conversationally Constituted Context and Localization Problems in Emergency Calls." *Text & Talk* 32(2):191-210.

Peräkylä, Anssi, and Marja-Leena Sorjonen. 2012. *Emotion in Interaction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Psathas, George. 1992. The Study of Extended Sequences: The Case of the Garden Lesson. Pp. 99-122 in *Text in Context: Contributions to Ethnomethodology*, edited by Graham Watson and Robert M. Seiler. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Regini, Chuck. 2002. "Crisis Negotiation Teams: Selection and Training. *FBI Law Enforcement Bulletin* November (2002):1-5.

Rogan, Randall G. 2011. "Linguistic Style Matching in Crisis Negotiations: A Comparative Analysis of Suicidal and Surrender Outcomes." *Journal of Police Crisis Negotiations* 11:20-39.

Rogan, Randall G., and Mitchell R. Hammer. 1994. "Crisis Negotiations: A Preliminary Investigation of Facework in Naturalistic Conflict Discourse." *Journal of Applied Communication Research* 22:216-231.

Royce, Terry. 2005. "The Negotiator and the Bomber: Analyzing the Critical Role of Active Listening in Crisis Negotiations." *Negotiation Journal* 21(1):5-27.

Ruusuvuori, Johana. 2005. "'Empathy' and 'Sympathy' in Action: Attending to Patients' Troubles in Finnish Homeopathic and General Practice Consultations." *Social Psychology Quarterly* 68(3): 204-222.

Sacks, Harvey. 1984. "Notes on Methodology." Pp. 21-27 in *Structures of Social Action: Studies in Conversation Analysis*, edited by J. Maxwell Atkinson and John Heritage. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sacks, Harvey. 1987. "You Want to Find Out if Anybody Really Does Care." Pp. 219-225 in *Talk and Social Organisation,* edited by Graham Button and John R. E. Lee. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Sacks, Harvey. 1992. *Lectures on Conversation, Volume II*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Sacks, Harvey, Emanuel A. Schegloff, and Gail Jefferson. 1974. "A Simplest Systematics for the Organization of Turn Taking for Conversation." *Language* 50(4): 696-735.

Schegloff, Emanuel A. 1980. "Preliminaries to Preliminaries: 'Can I Ask You a Question?'" *Sociological Inquiry* 50: 104-152.

Schegloff, Emanuel A. 1987. "Analyzing Single Episodes of Interaction: An Exercise in Conversation Analysis." *Social Psychology Quarterly* 50(2):101-114.

Schegloff, Emanuel A. 2007. *Sequence Organization in Interaction: A Primer in Conversation Analysis, Volume 1*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Schegloff, Emanuel A., Gail Jefferson, and Harvey Sacks. 1977. "The Preference for Self-
Correction in the Organization of Repair in Conversation." *Language* 53:361–82.

Schegloff, Emanuel A., and Harvey Sacks. 1973. "Opening up Closings." *Semiotica* 8:289-327.

Schiffrin, Deborah. 1987. *Discourse Markers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sharrock, Wesley W., and Roy Turner. 1978. "On a Conversational Environment for
Equivocality." Pp. 173-197 in *Studies in the Social Organization of Conversation,* edited
by Jim Schenkein. New York: Academic Press.

Slatkin, Arthur. 2015. *Crisis Negotiation for Law Enforcement, Corrections, and Emergency
Services: Crisis Intervention as Crisis Negotiation*. Springfield, Illinois: Charles C.
Thomas, Publisher.

Stokoe, Elizabeth. 2013. "Overcoming Barriers to Mediation in Intake Calls to Services:
Research-Based Strategies for Mediators." *Negotiation Journal* 29(3):289-314.

Svennevig, Jan. 2012. "On Being Heard in Emergency Calls: The Development of Hostility in a
Fatal Emergency Call." *Journal of Pragmatics* 44:1393-1412.

ten Have, Paul. 2007. *Doing Conversation Analysis: A Practical Guide*. Los Angeles, CA:
Sage.

Tracy, Karen, and Donald L. Anderson. 1999. "Relational Positioning Strategies in Police Calls:
A Dilemma." *Discourse Studies* 1:201-225.

Tracy, Sara J., and Karen Tracy. 1998a. "Emotion Labor at 911: A Case Study and Theoretical
Critique." *Journal of Applied Communication Research* 26:390-411.

Tracy, Karen, and Sara J. Tracy. 1998b. "Rudeness at 911: Reconceptualizing Face and Face
Attack." *Human Communication Research* 25(2):225-251.

Tuff, Antoinette, with Alex Tresniowski. 2014. *Prepared for a Purpose*. Laredo, Texas:

Bethany House.

Vecchi, Gregory M. 2009. "Conflict and Crisis Communication: A Methodology for

Influencing and Persuading Behavioral Change." *Annals of the American Psychotherapy Association, Spring 2009:*34-42.

Vecchi, Gregory M., Vincent B. Van Hasselt, and Stephen J. Romano. 2005. "Crisis (Hostage)

Negotiation: Current Strategies and Issues in High-Risk Conflict Resolution."

Aggression and Violent Behavior 10(2005):533-551.

Waring, Sara K., Laurence J. Alison, Sean Cunningham, and Kate C. Whitfield. 2013. "The

Impact of Accountability on Motivational Goals and the Quality of Advice Provided in

Crisis Negotiations." *Psychology, Public Policy, and Law* 19(2):137-150.

Whalen, Jack, and Don H. Zimmerman. 1998. "Observations on the Display and Management of

Emotion in Naturally Occurring Activities: The Case of "Hysteria" in Calls to 9-1-1."

Social Psychology Quarterly 61(2):141-159.

Whalen, Jack, and Don H. Zimmerman. 2005. "Working a Call: Multiparty Management and

Interactional Infrastructure in Calls for Help." Pp. 309-346 in *Calling for Help: Language and Social Interaction in Telephone Helplines*, edited by Caroline D. Baker, Michael

Emmison, and Alan Firth. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Whalen, Jack, Don H. Zimmerman, and Marilyn R. Whalen. 1988. "When Words Fail: A

Single Case Analysis." *Social Problems* 35(4):35-362.

Whalen, Marilyn R., and Don H. Zimmerman. 1987. "Sequential and Institutional Contexts in

Calls for Help." *Social Psychology Quarterly* 50(2):172-185.

Whalen, Marilyn R., and Don H. Zimmerman. 1990. "Describing Trouble: Practical Epistemology in Citizen Calls to the Police." *Language in Society* 19:465-492.

Zimmerman, Don H. 1984. "Talk and its Occasion: The Case of Calling the Police." Pp. 210-228 in *Meaning, Form, and Use in Context: Linguistic Applications,* edited by Deborah Schiffrin. Washington, D. C.: Georgetown University Press.

Zimmerman, Don H. 1992a. "Achieving Context: Openings in Emergency Calls." Pp. 35-51 in *Text in Context: Contributions to Ethnomethodology*, edited by Graham Watson and Robert M. Seiler. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Zimmerman, Don H. 1992b. "The Interactional Organization of Calls for Emergency Assistance." Pp. 418-469 in *Talk at Work: Interaction in Institutional Settings*, edited by Paul Drew and John Heritage. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.