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1 Introduction

The British health-visitor service is the largest single element of the UK community-nursing program, comprising some 9,300 qualified nurses (Cumberlege Report 1986: 10). The health visitor’s role, as described by the Health Visitors’ Association (1985), is to be “fully and completely involved in the giving of advice and support but only indirectly in the treatment of illness, environmental control and the provision of practical help.” As this broadly worded description suggests, health visitors have very wide-ranging professional responsibilities comprising the following: the detection and prevention of ill-health in the community; the identification of health needs in the community; health teaching; and advice and guidance in cases of illness and in the care and management of children (Council for the Education and Training of Health Visitors 1977). These responsibilities – in which advice giving plays a primary role – are necessarily discharged through verbal interaction with members of the community.

In this chapter, we examine the management of advice giving in interactions between health visitors and first-time mothers (primiparae) during the course of visits to the mothers’ homes. In particular, we will focus on the first of these visits, which normally takes place about ten days after the birth of the baby and which is widely believed to be particularly significant for the subsequent relationship between mother and health visitor. Our objective is to describe
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some basic aspects of the advice-giving sequences that occur in these first visits. Specifically, (a) we will sketch the main ways in which advice giving is initiated with a particular focus on how the parties arrive at the point where advice giving is begun. (b) We will discuss the main ways in which advice is received over its course, focusing on the ways in which the advice may be accepted or resisted.

We emphasize that this chapter offers a relatively gross overview of the basic features of these advice-giving sequences and does so with reference to a particular social context – first visits to the homes of first-time mothers. More detailed analyses of the design and trajectory of advice-giving sequences will be dealt with in subsequent studies as will comparisons of the initiation, design, trajectory, and reception of advice in these visits with those occurring in later visits to the same first-time mothers and in visits to mothers who have already had at least one child. Finally, while the health visitors exhibited significant individual differences in their approach to advice giving, individual comparisons are also beyond the scope of the present chapter. Below, after a description of our data base, we begin our discussion with a brief overview of the health-visiting service.

### 1.1 The data base

The data on which the present chapter is based are drawn from a substantial corpus of self-administered audio-tape recordings by health visitors in a large industrial city in central England. The health visitors recorded their first six visits to a range of mothers evenly divided between first-time mothers and mothers who had previously had one or more children. In all some seventy-five visits were recorded. This chapter is based on data from eight initial or primary visits to first-time mothers conducted by five different health visitors and occupying a total of 4.5 hours. These data contain some seventy instances of advice-giving sequences and, although any indications of a distributional kind should be treated with caution, we are confident that many of the main ways in which advice giving is managed in home visits are represented in the observations that follow.

### 1.2 The health visitor service: a brief overview

Health visitors, as Dingwall (1977: 21) has observed, “are a uniquely British contribution to the delivery of public health services.” They are fully trained nurses who work in association with general practitioners and community health centers. However, unlike community nurses in other advanced countries, health visitors do not perform routine nursing tasks and concentrate instead on illness prevention, giving advice on health and social problems and case finding for other more specialized agencies (ibid.). Although their range of responsibilities is, as noted above, exceptionally large, in practice they presently tend to concentrate their work in two main areas of need: families with children aged under five, who absorb about three-quarters of their time, and the elderly, who occupy another 10 percent. Their work is conducted through two major types of activities: (a) clinics focused on preventative aspects of health involving developmental assessments and immunization; and (b) visits to the homes of persons in some kind of need. As far as home visits are concerned, the largest proportion are made to mothers of new-born children, and it is these visits which are the subject of this chapter.

The British health-visiting service is distinctive in that, unlike other medical services in the United Kingdom and elsewhere, its provision is supply- rather than demand-driven. This characteristic is particularly prominent in relation to the health visitor’s work with children. Health visitors have a statutory obligation to perform routine visits to all mothers with children under five regardless of whether these visits are requested or not. The supply-driven character of the service reflects the origins of the health-visiting service in the municipal sanitation movement of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Strongly interventionist and directed towards working-class homes, this movement culminated in the development of a national sanitary inspectorate during the early decades of the twentieth century. The following quotation from the rule book of the Manchester and Salford Sanitary Association (c 1880) gives a flavor of the women inspectors’ duties:

They must visit from house to house, irrespective of creed or circumstances, in such localities as their superintendents direct. They must carry with them the carbolic powder, explain its use and leave it where it is
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accepted; direct the attention of those they visit to the evils of bad smells, want of fresh air and impurities of all kinds; give hints to mothers on feeding and clothing their children; where they find sickness, assist in promoting the comfort of the invalid by personal help ... they must urge the importance of cleanliness, thrift and temperance on all possible occasions. They are desired to get as many as possible to join the mothers’ meetings of their districts: to use all their influence to induce those they visit to attend regularly at their places of worship, and to send their children to school.

(Clark 1973: 11)

Today, long after her incorporation into the national health service and with a statutory obligation embracing the health needs of children of all social classes, the modern health visitor still carries at least a whiff of that interventionist carbolic into the houses of contemporary mothers and their babies. Although the health-visitor organizations downplay this aspect of their role, the health visitors’ access to the homes of young children gives their visits an unavoidable dimension of surveillance and social control.

The general significance of this surveillance role, which is widely oriented by mothers, may be inferred from the fact that health visitors are the largest single source of information and referral in cases of child abuse and neglect in the United Kingdom (Dingwall, Eckelaar, and Murray 1983).

1.3 The home visit

Home visits occupy between a quarter and a third of health visitors’ time (Clark 1981; Dunnell and Dobbs 1982). They begin when the new-born is about ten days old and the midwife has formally relinquished responsibility for the mother and baby. For the first month or so, and especially in the case of first-time mothers, they tend to occur on a weekly basis, subsequently diminishing in frequency in succeeding months.

The home visit is an aspect of health-visitor (henceforth HV) practice that is largely hidden from public view. Its content and procedures have not been a focus of sustained social-scientific research in the past, nor have systematic principles of home-visiting practice been elaborated and taught as part of HV training programs. Insofar as specific interactional procedures for the conduct of visits are acquired in the course of initial training, they are largely learned tacitly through apprenticeship to more experienced practitioners (Dingwall 1977).

Robinson (1982) has proposed that the knowledge base on which HVs rely – incorporating clinical and nutritional principles, epidemiology, child development, and psychological and sociological views of the person and the family within social processes – could sustain two alternative models of HV practice:

The first model is founded on a clinical, problem oriented base. The health visitor engages in a search for health problems through an “identification, diagnosis and treatment” process. Students are taught that a good relationship with clients is essential in order to gain acceptance for their special expertise in preventive health care ... The second model is founded on a relationship centred base. The client is enabled to engage in self-identification of factors operating against his health and well-being and is encouraged to join with the worker in a programme of help.

(Robinson 1982: 24)

To date, however, no empirical studies have been developed to assess the extent to which these models influence HV practice.

Notwithstanding its importance, there have been relatively few attempts to study the home visit in any detail. Previous studies of HVs’ activities have largely been based on diary keeping and other self-reporting methodologies and have concentrated on how HVs allocated their time among their different responsibilities and on statistical analyses of the topics and activities of the home visit (see e.g. Clark 1973; Watson 1981; Dunnell and Dobbs 1982). These essentially cross-sectional studies give little access to the interactional processes of health visiting and there is almost no published information that deals in detail with the events of the home visit.

Studies of client perspectives on health visiting have tended to be small scale and present results which are piecemeal and fragmentary. In general, however, they indicate that mothers tend to prefer home visiting rather than clinics as a site for interaction with their HVs (see Bax, Hart, and Jenkins 1980; Orr 1980; Foxman et al. 1982), but, predictably, dislike it when visits occur unannounced (Orr 1980; McIntosh 1986). At the same time however a substantial proportion of mothers, particularly in social classes IV and V, see the HV service largely in terms of social control and surveillance and attempt to minimize contact with its representatives (ibid.). Most surveys suggest declining levels of satisfaction with the
HV service over time (Graham and McKee 1979; Field et al. 1982; Moss, Bolland, and Foxman 1982; McIntosh 1986) and indicate that mothers tend to remain unclear about the role and value of HVs (Hunt 1972; Moss, Bolland, and Foxman 1973; Orr 1980; McIntosh 1986). A number of studies have found that mothers evaluate their HVs largely in terms of personality characteristics and interpersonal style. These studies also indicate that mothers have a strong preference for friendliness and informality in HV conduct and that HVs are quite commonly perceived as excessively authoritarian and didactic (Political and Economic Planning 1961; Wilson and Herbert 1978; Blaxter and Paterson 1982; Foxman et al. 1982; McIntosh 1986).

Although advice giving has been a central feature of health visiting throughout the existence of the service, there has been relatively little systematic study of its provision. A study by Davison (1956) argued that, in contrast with social-service case workers, HV advice “is offered by her, not requested by her clients,” and this view has been somewhat reinforced by anecdotal evidence from clients. As one of the latter, in an article published in World Medicine, observed, “they never really listen to you. Oh they appear to listen – but inside they have already pigeon-holed you and are just waiting for a gap in the conversation in which to give the appropriate advice” (Clark 1973: 6). Clark’s time study of HV activities (ibid.: 69–73) found that advice giving was more frequent and more assertive in relation to physical health-care topics and where the subject was a young child. Finally, two studies of working-class mothers have dealt with reactions to advice giving. The mothers in Orr’s (1980) study saw advice as something that should be “done without pushing,” and this view was strongly reinforced in McIntosh’s (1986) study of first-time mothers in Scotland, in which unsolicited advice was viewed as patronizing and was associated with considerable hostility. The mothers reported that they simply ignored much of this advice, particularly if it was associated with conflict of any kind (McIntosh 1986: 25–8).

1.4 The general character of the first visits

Of the visits that make up our data base, most represented the first occasion on which the mother and HV had met one another and, although the mothers were expecting a visit from the HV at some time during the week of the first visit, all were unannounced.¹ In a number of cases, third parties – husbands, grandmothers, or female friends – were present during the course of part or all of the visit and in some of these they were significant participants. The visits varied in length from fifteen minutes to just under an hour.

Although the visits are quite diverse, their content contains a number of common features. A large majority of topics were initiated and terminated by the HV in a basically ‘segmented’ process of topical progression (Button and Casey 1984; Seif 1988). In visits where no third parties were present, the HVs usually began with inquiries about the mothers’ experience of the birth and its immediate aftermath. Where third parties were present, they began by admiring the baby and dealing with topics that could be an appropriate focus of third-party participation.

Substantial parts of these first visits were occupied with three bureaucratic tasks: (a) getting face-sheet data about the mother and baby for the records of the clinic to which mother and baby will be attached; (b) getting consent signatures for immunization injections for diphtheria, whooping cough, tetanus, polio, and measles; and (c) explaining clinic procedures and the various subsequent health checks that mothers and babies will go through in the ensuing months and years. In a number of cases, explicit form filling for the creation of bureaucratic records formed a “backbone” to the visit: it was initiated early and was intermittently departed from in a range of topical excursions and returned to as the topical content of these excursions was exhausted. In others, the face-sheet data gathering was confined to a specific segment of the visit. The visits were substantially diverse in terms of their overall trajectories, the type and ordering of the topics raised and in terms of the “tone” or “rapport” achieved between the parties.

1.5 Advice giving and the problem of competence

There is ample evidence, both from survey data and from the materials that form the basis of this study, that during these first visits mothers primarily orient to their HVs as “baby experts” – persons with particular expertise on the health and treatment of babies – rather than as “befrienders” with whom they can share problems or
troubles that are not directly connected with problems of baby management. Moreover, HVs characteristically comport themselves as “baby experts” during these visits. Thus, insofar as the initial visits can come to involve more than a simple initiation of contact together with the collection of face-sheet data, both mothers and HVs treat its possibilities primarily in terms of a “service encounter” (Jefferson and Lee, this volume).

However, in these visits it is also clear that, to a greater or lesser extent, the mothers saw their knowledge, competence, and vigilance in baby care as an object of evaluation and, moreover, by a person with officially accredited competences to judge their conduct. This orientation emerged in a wide range of contexts but is transparently visible in the mothers’ responses to comments in which the HV raises something that is apparently untoward, as in (1): 11

(1) [5A1:2]
1 HV: ‘hh She likes it on her back does she.
2 M: I j’st put ’er on there while I was
3 gettin’ [the] pram out.
4 HV: [ ( )
5 HV: Yeh. ‘Cos sometimes they can uh
6 (0.5)
7 M: choke. Yeh.
8 HV: [ Well
9 M: she does like it on her back.
10 HV: Yeh. I think when it- when you’ when you’re
11 leaving her
12 ( )
13 M: Yeh
14 HV: You ought to put her on her tummy
15 really.
16 M: Yeah, oh yeah

At the beginning of this sequence, the HV comments on the baby’s posture using a question design (statement + tag question) that is built towards the supposition that the baby generally prefers to lie this way. Although the question does not overtly treat the baby’s posture as problematic, it is noticeable that the mother’s initial response (lines 2–3) downplays its significance. She depicts it as a brief and incidental part of her own earlier course of action and, by implication, not as evidence of the baby’s general preference. She then exhibits an awareness of a potential danger associated with this posture through her collaborative completion (line 7) of the HV’s next turn (line 5). Thus it is only after the mother has displayed an alertness to the dangers implicitly raised in the HV’s initial question that she then produces a revised response to it (lines 9–10) that acknowledges that the baby does in fact prefer lying on her back. Here then, the mother defers dealing with the HV’s question “at face value” in favor of an initial response that shows her awareness of the dangers implicitly raised by it.

A concern for the judgmental possibilities inherent in these first visits is still more vividly illustrated by (2) below. Here an apparently casual observation by the HV “He’s enjoying that isn’t he” (presumably referring to some sucking or “mouthing” behavior by the baby) elicits contrastive responses from the baby’s father and mother. While the father takes the remark at face value and responds with an agreement, the mother’s response is notably defensive:

(2) [4A1:1]
1 HV: He’s enjoying that isn’t he.
2 F: Yes he certainly is=
3 M: =He’s not hungry ’cuz (h)he’s ju(h)st (h)had
4 ‘iz bottle ’hh

Here the mother’s initial response treats the HV’s observation as implying that the baby may be hungry and, by extension, as possibly indicative of some failure on her part. She denies that the baby is hungry and goes on to produce an account that justifies her claim. Her response is one that treats the HV as someone who, whatever other functions she may have, is evaluating her competence as a mother.

This orientation towards the HV as someone who may stand in judgment on the mother’s competence in child care suggests, and our data confirm, that requesting and giving advice during these first visits can be highly problematic activities. Any request for advice constitutes an admission of uncertainty about an appropriate course of action. Such a request may, further, imply or display that its producer lacks knowledge or competence concerning the issue at hand or is unable to cope with a problem without external
assistance. By the same token, it constitutes the recipient of the request as the knowledgeable, competent, and authoritative party in the exchange. Concerns with these issues of knowledgeable, and the "face" considerations they raise, 12 may be compounded when the requested advice concerns a baby for whom a mother has a direct responsibility to care in a knowledgeable and competent way and when the requestee may be viewed as someone who stands in judgment on her knowledge and competence in this matter.

Similar issues concerning the implications of advice giving for judgments of mothers' knowledgeable and competence in child care and related matters may also inhabit contexts where advice giving is volunteered or occurs unrequested. For the volunteering of advice may carry with it an assertion of the very same implications about the relative authority and competence of the advice giver and advice recipient that are acknowledged in contexts where the recipient requests advice. And such implications may be the more unwelcome because they are produced by persons whose claims - to knowledge and to rights to judge - may be effectively unchallengeable.

1.6 Advice giving during the first visit: preliminary observations

In examining patterns of advice giving during these visits we have focused on sequences in which the HV describes, recommends, or otherwise forwards a preferred course of future action. Our concern is with sequences in which the HVs were engaged in activities having an essentially normative dimension which, we propose, is central to advice giving as an activity.

In the majority of our advice sequences, advice was explicitly future oriented and was delivered in strongly prescriptive terms. 13 This prescriptiveness emerged in a number of ways:

First, it appears in the language of overt recommendation:

3A1:15 "I would recommend giving her a bath every day."

4B1:16 "The hospital recommended that she shouldn't start solids until she's (.) four months."

1C1:31 "Well my advice to you is that ... you firmly put her down."

Second: advice was often couched in the imperative mood:

3A1:24 "No always be very quiet at night."

1C1:13 (The reference is to an eye infection)

"If you think they're pussies then you must use boiled water."

Third: advice was often expressed using verbs of obligation:

1C1:5 "And I think you should involve your husband as much as possible now."

5A1:2 "When you're leaving her you ought to put her on her tummy really."

Less commonly, advice could be expressed as a "factual generalization," as in the following case, in which a mother's enthusiasm for disposable nappies (or diapers) is met with a generalization about the practice of other mothers, which amounts to a recommendation of reusable ones:

(3) 1C1:6 (Readers should note that the term 'terries' refers to a reusable cotton towelling nappy or diaper).

1 HV: And uh disposable nappies are quite easy
2 aren't they really now.
3 M: =They're a lot easier than the umm (0.4)
4 terries ( ) aren't they yeah.
5 HV: Yes.
6 M: They're easier to put on and quite simple=
7 HV: =Mm
8 M: You know.
9 (0.2)
10 HV: → Lots of mums do progress to thuh (0.8)
11 terries when they're a bit older.

In general, though, the HVs delivered their advice explicitly, authoritatively and in so decided a fashion as to project their relative expertise on health and baby-management issues as beyond doubt.

In examining patterns of advice giving during the first visit, we will first consider the main procedures by which advice giving is initiated in these visits and subsequently turn to look at some aspects of its reception.
2 The initiation of advice giving

In looking at initiations, it is useful to begin with advice which was directly or indirectly requested by mothers.

2.1 Mother-initiated advice

2.1.1 Requests for advice

Mother-initiated requests for advice are, in principle, the most straightforward in our data base. A request for advice establishes the relevance of subsequent advice giving in three important respects: first, it establishes the problem area for which advice is requested; second, it establishes the requester's uncertainty about some aspect of that problem area and her view of it as problematic; third, a request establishes her alignment as a prospective advice recipient and thereby legitimizes the subsequent delivery of advice.

Mother-initiated requests for advice can take the form of simple question-answer sequences. Thus in (4) below, the mother designs her request for advice as a straightforward "open" question, thereby acknowledging ignorance as to how to proceed:

(4) [SB1:21] (The inquiry concerns the management of breast feeding)

1 M: → How long should I leave him on the other
2 Side
3 HV: Until he's finished.
4 M: Gazzling away.
5 HV: Mm: Till he's had that side really.
6 M: mYeah.

However, even in their direct requests for advice, mothers were rarely prepared to acknowledge complete ignorance about an appropriate course of action.

More commonly, they managed their requests so as to display a measure of knowledge or competence in the management of their activities and thus to circumscribe the scope of the advice requested. One common procedure for achieving such displays involves embedding a proposal about an appropriate course of action within a question. This procedure was normally managed as a "closed" (yes/no) question – a format that was generally used to solicit support for the proposed course of action – as in (5) below:

(5) [IC:29]

1 M: Shall I let her tell me when
2 she's hungry.
3 HV: Yes well that's sensible.

Here, rather than using a question format (e.g. "How often should I feed her") that would overtly acknowledge a lack of knowledge about how often to feed her baby, the mother's inquiry is one through which she portrays herself as having independent knowledge or understanding of how to proceed. The issue is thus treated as only residually problematic and the HV is merely invited to confirm the viewpoint embedded in the mother's inquiry.14 In this case, the HV's advice is limited to a fleeting confirmation.

However, this course of action carries a significant risk that the HV will reject the mother's viewpoint and thereby deny the competence and knowledge that is proposed with it. This risk is realized in (6):

(6) [SA1:15]

1 M: → I haven't bathed her yet. Is once a week
2 enough.
3
4 HV: We'll (0.2) babies do: sweat a loit. (0.3) So
5 (0.3)
6 HV: So I would recommend giving her a bath
7 every day

Here the mother's inquiry describes a past course of action and proposes an appropriate interval for bathing her child. However, the HV's response indicates not only that the mother's proposal about how often a baby should be bathed is incorrect, but also that she has already failed to bath her child with a frequency that the HV judges to be appropriate. Notwithstanding these risks, however, most requests for advice were packaged as requests for confirmation of proposed courses of action.

In most cases, including the above, mother-initiated advice sequences emerged within topical environments that had already been established by HVs' questions. These contexts afforded a wide range of opportunities for mothers to display their knowledge and ability to cope with the problems for which they sought advice. Thus in the following case, rather than asking for advice outright, the mother details a problem connected with the taking of iron
tablets, expresses uncertainty about whether to continue with them, and offers a candidate solution to her problem.

(7) [5B:114]
1 HV: Have you got some iron tablets left.
2 M: 'hmm We'll yes I have (.) 'cos uh 'hh umh (0.5) I wasn't able to take them in pregnancy because they made me constipated.
3 HV: Yes.
4 M: =And I have had a few over the last few days and it's happening again.
5 HV: Is it.
6 M: → So I don't know whether to carry on or not=.
7 HV: =Maybe have one every now and again.
8 M: Yes (.) I mea(n) i- you're ten point four which isn't too bad.

Similarly in the next case, after the HV has raised the topic of family planning and suggested various sources of help including herself, the mother indirectly requests some advice about when to restart the pill (arrow 2) but only after she has shown that she has independently dealt with the family-planning issue (arrow 1):

(8) [4B:7]
1 HV: 'hmm And family planning you know you can get pregnant straight away so if you wouldn't (.) like any (.) help in that score you can always ask me or see the G.P. or go to the family planning clinic=.
2 M: 1→ =Well I've got some (0.4) things upsai. 'rs.
3 HV: Oh well done.
4 M: 2→ But (.) when I've got to take them I don't know.
5 HV: Well (.) uhm if you're not breast feeding there's no reason why you shouldn't start them when (.) she's four weeks.

In sum, the significant feature of requests for advice is that they directly and overtly establish a context in which advice can be relevantly given and they do so in advance of its actual delivery. Through requests, mothers can display an orientation to a state of affairs as problematic, describe the state of affairs and establish themselves as requiring some advice or direction about the course of action they should take. However, this procedure, which involves an overt acknowledgment of some limitation in the mother's knowledge or competence as a carer, was not often adopted. Direct or indirect requests for advice amounted to no more than seven cases (approximately 10 percent of the total) in a set of interactions that, in total, occupied nearly 4.5 hours. Moreover, these requests were most commonly managed so as to preserve – as far as possible – the appearance of competence in baby management and related issues. Both the infrequency of these requests and their characteristic design suggest that mothers may be reluctant to request advice for fear that adverse judgments may be made about their knowledge or competence in baby management or mothering skills.

2.1.2 Soliciting advice by describing an "untoward" state of affairs

An alternative and more "cautious" procedure which mothers employed for soliciting advice was substantially more indirect. It consisted simply of detailing an untoward state of affairs which, without overtly requesting advice, they treated as potentially problematic. The following case, in which a mother and grandmother depict a condition of the new baby is prototypical in this respect:

(9) [4B:22]
1 HV: Bonnets are worth having.
2 G: hhh Her hair:- it seems a bit grea:- y
3 M: Yeah.
4 G: Yeah.
5 Every time we've washed it=
6 M: =Yeah:
7 G: =Yeah.
8 when we give her a little bath:- it looks lovely 'hmm=
9 M: =By the end'v.
10 G: and by the end of th' da:y
11 M: by.
12
13 ()
14 M: by three o'clock in the afternoon it's all greasy on the top:=
15 HV: =Is it?
16 M: Yeah she's a real sweat:-uh.
17 HV: → D'ju think she's hot.
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may be a concern for the baby’s welfare, there is also the possibility that the daughter does not like walking in the rain, or that she is anxious about her new baby carriage which, she has asserted a few turns earlier (data not shown), “goes funny” in the rain.

(10) [4B1:22]

1 G: ‘huh When she starts off walking out of it it
2 always seems to rain.
3 HV: 1→ noO:oh=
4 M: =Yeah.
5 G: =Ge is half way and as to come back.
6 M: 
7 HV: 2→ Oh what a pity.
8 M: Yeah myeah.
9 HV: 3→ But if she’s wrapped up well it won’t do her
10 any harm
11 M: (harm)
12 G: No.
13 M: No; that’s what they (Babies lose a lot
14 HV: 4→ of heat through their heads
(continues with advice))

The HV’s response to the grandmother’s initial observations is one of simple affiliation: a sympathetically intoned “Oh” (arrow 1) in response to the grandmother’s account of the rain and a subsequent empathetic assessment (arrow 2) in response to her account of its consequences. Subsequently, however, she shifts to a “baby relevant” treatment of the reported events (arrow 3) and continues by describing the baby’s head as a major source of heat loss, an observation which culminates in the advice that “bonnets are worth having.” Here, then, a general, and at best opaquely motivated, description of the irritations of the British weather is responded to in terms of its implications for the health of the baby and engenders advice giving as its outcome.

And in the following sequence, a minimally problematic reference also attracts advice giving.

(11) [3A1:14]

1 HV: Listen to your ‘ticcups. Just listen to your
2 ‘ticcups.
3 B: (thiccups)
4 M: I know what cures those.
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possible responses and may represent a course of action that is unlooked for or undesired (Jefferson and Lee, this volume). In our data, the HVs tended to deal with such descriptions in terms of their relevance for health or baby-management issues and to respond with advice. Thus the report – or even mention (see (11) above) – of some problematic state of affairs may be sufficient to entrench the delivery of advice even in circumstances where it is unlikely that the report is being offered in search of advice. The readiness with which the HVs in our sample responded to such reports and mentions with advice indicates both their concern with any potential problem situation that may arise and their orientation to advice giving as a central task of these interactions.

2.2 Health-visitor-initiated advice

The vast majority of advice giving in our data base was initiated by HVs. Much of it arose from routine inquiries about baby- and health-related matters. In contrast to the mother-initiated advice sequences in which, by requesting advice, the mothers established both its relevance and its object, advice giving in the HV-initiated sequences often emerged prior to any clear indication that it was desired.

Below we show a range of the sequences through which the HVs initiated advice. These vary from relatively elaborate attempts to establish a “problem” – and thereby to construct a context in which advice could relevantly be offered – to cases in which no such attempt was made and advice was delivered to a completely unprepared recipient.

2.2.1 Stepwise entry in advice giving: developing a problem

We begin with cases in which a relatively complete series of steps in the construction of a “problem-requiring advice” are present. In (12) below, the mother’s response to the HV’s initial inquiry is indicative of a residual problem:

(12) [1A1:10-11]
1     HV:  1→ Is the cord ehmm (1.0) dry now.
2     M:  2→ Yes it’s (.) it weeps a little bit.
3     HV:  3→ And what do you do.
4     M:  4→ (n:Yeah.)
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procedure which culminates in advice giving. The relevant steps may be summarized as follows:

Step 1: HV: initial inquiry.
Step 2: M: problem-indicative response.
Step 3: HV: focusing inquiry into the problem.
Step 4: M: responsive detailing.
Step 5: HV: advice giving.

This “step-by-step” approach to the initiation of advice giving is further illustrated in (13):

(13) [HC:39]

1 HV: 1 → And you feel- (0.3) you’re alright bathing.
2 (.) her.
3 M: 2 → I haven’t bathed her yet.
4 HV: Haven’t you, yet.
5 M: 2 → No. She had a bath when she
6 2 → came home from hospital (0.2) but I top
7 2 → tail her.
8 HV: Ye-h.
9 M: 2 → =but uh-um: me mum’s coming over tomorrow (.)
10 2 → and I’m gonna bath her in front of mum
11 2 → ‘cos I’m (still) a little bit (.) you
12 2 → know f (.)
13 HV: 3 → Did they show you how to bath
14 3 → (when you were in)
15 M: 3 → They did but (0.9) [ (. )] still
16 4 → wasn’t I said to me mum you know wuh- when
17 4 → you come over tomorrow would you sort’v give
18 4 → me a hand you know if I need it.
19 (.)
20 HV: 5 → The main thing is: that you have the things
21 5 → all together before you start.
   ((advice giving continues))

Here the HV’s initial inquiry is built towards an affirmative, “no problem” response. However, the mother’s reply indicates a potentially problematic state of affairs and the beginning of her – subsequently abandoned – account for not bathing her baby (lines 11–12) implies some uncertainty or lack of confidence about how to do it. The HV’s focusing inquiry topicalizes this issue by asking whether the mother has been shown the procedure. It is noticeable that although the initial component of the mother’s response
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contracted or departed from – in a variety of ways. In what follows, we show an ordered series of such contractions and departures. Within this series, each contraction or departure involves a reduction in the amount of preparation for the consummatory advice-giving phase of the sequence and increases the risk that the advice, when it is finally delivered, may be redundant and/or undesired.

Variation 1

A minimal form of contraction in the sequence arises when a general inquiry gets a response from the mother that both indicates a problematic state of affairs (step 2) and volunteers some account of how she has dealt with it (step 4). In these sequences, the mothers’ accounts of how they are dealing with the problem, while designed to display their competence and capacity to cope, nonetheless consolidate their view of the state of affairs they describe as a problem. Moreover, because they topologicalize the manner of how to deal with the problem, these accounts establish interactional environments that are ripe for advice giving. The following instance is typical in this respect:

(14) [1C:13]

1  HV:  1→ Her eyes’re okay.
2     (0.7)
3  M:   2→ They ge- th- they get a bit weepy sometimes.
4  4→ but that’s normal isn’t it. And I swab th’em
5  4→ with wool with cotton wool.
6     (0.3)
7  HV:  5→ Yes if they- if they: (0.2) if you think
8  5→ they’re pussie.
9     (0.8)
10 M:   Yeah.
11 HV:  5→ then you must use boiled water
       (advice giving continues)

Here the HV’s initial inquiry (arrow 1) gets a response that details a baby problem (arrow 2). Subsequently, the mother describes what she did to deal with the problem (arrow 4) and the HV initiates a course of advice in response to this account. In contrast to the “full” step-by-step sequence displayed in (12) and (13) above, the shortened sequence runs as follows:

Step 1: HV: initial inquiry.

2.2.2 Variations on the stepwise entry into advice giving

While (12) and (13) above represent a relatively extended step-by-step movement into advice giving, the sequence may be varied –
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(16) [1C1:33-34]
1 HV: 1→ Are you doing your exercises.
2 M: 2→ Well I've started to do them ( ) now.
3 2→ If I didn't do them 'til I come home me
4 4→
5 M: 2→ You know I uh
6 HV: 5→ I think it's quite important to uh
7 5→ particularly yer jail exercises which you can
8 5→ do when yer just sitting down
((advice giving continues))

Here the mother’s response apparently indicates insufficient commitment to the postnatal exercises and creates sufficient doubt for advice about the exercises to be initiated. The HV’s advice is designed to underscore their importance.

By contrast with the sequence types discussed previously, this
contraction significantly reduces the chance that the relevance of advice giving can be appropriately established prior to its delivery. First, since no description of how she is dealing with "the problem" is volunteered by the mother or requested by the HV, it may not be clear from the mother’s initial response that she regards the circumstances she describes as significantly problematic. For example, in (17) the mother may have described an approach to her exercises which is, from her point of view, perfectly adequate. Thus what is treated as a "problem in need of advice" by the HV, may not be regarded in the same way by the mother.19

Second, in the absence of a description of the mothers’ responsive measures, the HV has no assurance that the advice she gives may not be already known, and indeed acted upon, by the mother and her advice stands a serious risk of appearing inappropriate or redundant.

The choice between moving to a step 5 advice giving or a step 3 focusing inquiry is nicely illustrated in (18) below. Here, the sequence opens with a problematic noticing by the HV of the baby’s jaundice that is strongly confirmed by the mother. At line 9, the HV begins a turn with "Well I think eh" and abandons this beginning in favor of a focusing inquiry about where the baby has been during the day.

(18) [3A2:1-2]
1 HV: We'll I think her (. ) jaundice has faded a
2 little bit but it hasn't (. ) h isn't
3 M: Gone
4 HV: gone yet.=
5 M: =No: her eyes especially if you notice her
6 eyes when she opens them.
7 HV: Oh.
8 M: You can tell.
9 HV: Well I think eh- Has she been outdoors
10 he- getting plenty of light.
11 (0.3)
12 M: Well she’s (. ) been outdoors but I mean (.5)
13 I wrap her up so well and I always keep the
14 hood up so that she doesn’t get wind (.).
15 HV: Yes
16 M: 'm on her.=So: (. ) not really.
17 HV: I think you (know) (. ) keep her near the
18 window.=
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19 M: =Okay.=
20 HV: =Keep her in light because um 'hh I thought it
21 really would have gone this week.

A comparison of the beginning of line 9 with the HV’s subsequent advice delivery (line 17) strongly suggests that the HV was beginning a step 5 advice giving which she then abandoned in favor of a step 3 focusing inquiry. Insofar as the HV intended to recommend what she subsequently inquired into (that the baby be placed outdoors), the inquiry enabled her to avoid proposing a course of action which, it turns out that the mother has been cautious about (see lines 12–16). She was thus able to design her final advice in a way that was fitted to the mother’s account and the weather conditions that the account details. Here then it is likely that the HV’s reversion to a focusing inquiry served to avert the proposal of a contestable or inappropriate course of action.

Notwithstanding the various contractions of steps 3 and 4 of the movement into advice giving, all the HV-initiated advice sequences examined thus far have been developed after at least a possibly problem-indicative response (step 2) to a HV inquiry. In these cases, an initial problem-indicative response has provided for the relevance of the subsequent move into advice giving.

Variation 3

In a variety of cases in our data base, however, advice giving was initiated in the absence of a problem-indicative "step 2" response. In a small subset of these cases the HV sustains a "problem orientation" as the basis for advice giving by herself, detailing a possible or potential problem and then going on to offer advice on how to deal with it. For example, in the following instance, the HV follows a "no problem" response to her initial inquiry by first describing a problem that "might" arise (lines 8–14) and then offering advice on it (lines 14–15).

(19) [4B1:3]
1 HV: 1→ 'hh And has your discharge lessened.
2 M: 2→ Yeah.
3 HV: Smashing. And it’s sort of pinky brown.
4 M: 2→ Yeah there’s hardly anything the:re
5 no w.
6 HV: 1 Lovely.=
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Variation 4
In our final variation on the basic sequence, even the warrant for advice giving found in (19) and (20) may be dispensed with. In the following cases, neither the HV's initial inquiry nor the mother's response to it is overtly problem oriented. The advice giving that ensues is thus delivered to an unprepared recipient – as in (21) below:

(21) [4B:16]
1 HV: 1→ 'hh Now this (.2) uh:mm she started bottle
2 1→ feeds from birth.
3 M: 2→ Yeah.
4 (2.2)
5 HV: 5→ The hospital recommanded that she shouldn't
6 5→ start solids until she's (.) four months.
7 M: 4 m onths.
8 HV: 5→ At least.
9 (.)
10 HV: 5→ 'hh Some babies don't even need to start
11 5→ before six months (.02) 'hh and really the
12 5→ longer you can fob off solids the better for
13 5→ he:.:

And in (22), a mother's "no problem" response to an inquiry about her baby's sleeping is accompanied by an elaborate description of her procedure for feeding the baby at night.

(22) [3A:24]
1 HV: 1→ We'll whu- uhh what is she: uh like at night.
2 M: 2→ Uh:mm (.04) she's alright she kno:ws the
3 2→ difference between night and day (.) and I
4 2→ don't tend to stimulate her at all in (.) at night
5 2→ time I just get straight into the little
6 HV: 5→ room (.) in the bed the re and (.) put her in
7 5→ Yes
8 HV: 5→ Room
9 M: 2→ with me: (.02) and (.) she feds and that's
10 2→ it=Not much (.) chatting or anything or
11 HV: 5→ 'hh No always be very very quiet at
12 5→ night:
13 5→ 'hh
14 M: 5→ Mm
15 (.)
16 HV: 5→ Always uh:mm (.01) on- have a dim light,
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17 M: Yeah.
18 HV: 5→ And uhm (1.0) be very quiet don't chat her
19 5→ up at all 'hh when you change her (. ) change
20 5→ as quickly as possible, without any
21 M: [Yeh
22 (. )
23 M: Yeah.
24 HV: 5→ palgver.
((advice giving continues))

Here, notwithstanding the fact that the mother's account of her night-feeding procedures is, as it turns out, substantially identical with the HV's preferred procedure, the HV nonetheless elaborately advises her about appropriate practice and in terms that are very similar to those already used by the mother. In these last cases, advice giving is initiated on a unilateral basis without any basis in a previously depicted problem and, in (22) at least, it is clearly redundant.

2.2.3 Summary

We have now seen a variety of ways in which advice giving may be initiated in these first encounters between mothers and HVs. First, and relatively infrequently, mothers may request advice, thereby establishing the relevance of advice giving and their own prospective orientation as advice recipients. In overt requests for advice, identification of a problem area, the character of the problem, and a prospective alignment of the local roles of advice recipient and advice giver are usually achieved in a straightforward and natural way. As we have seen, the requests for advice that achieve these objectives are most commonly shaped as requests for confirmation of a proposed course of action. By this means, mothers display their own putative competence and capacity to cope with the problem for which they seek help and avoid the appearance of ignorance or incompetence which might arise from a simple request for information.

Second, the predominant form of advice initiation arises from HVs. In HV-initiated advice giving, by contrast with mother-initiated requests for advice, both the need for advice – and with it the prospective alignment of the mother as advice recipient – and the problem for which advice is sought are often less clearly established. Most commonly, HVs initiate advice giving in the context of routine inquiries into a range of health and baby-management issues. These inquiry sequences may be arrayed on a continuum in terms of the degree to which a need for advice and its associated problem area are established prior to the initiation of advice giving. Within this continuum, the bulk of advice giving is initiated without an extended preparatory sequence. Indeed, the bulk of advice initiatives falls close to the "unilateral" end of our continuum, in which the HV's initial question serves primarily to topicalize the issue for which advice is subsequently developed.

Across all these environments, the HV defines herself as a knowledgeable and authoritative "expert" vis-à-vis an advice recipient who is relatively ignorant or noncompetent. Although, as we have argued, HV-initiated advice sequences are almost always initiated without the mother's desire or need for advice having been definitively established, there is a wide range of variation in the degree to which advice giving is prepared for in advance of its actual delivery. However, a substantial majority of advice giving is initiated with only minimal preparation. The extent of this preparation, however, may strongly influence the subsequent reception of advice, to which we now turn.

3 The reception of advice

As we have already proposed, the initiation of advice giving carries problematic implications about the knowledge or competence of the intended recipient. A concern for these implications shapes both the design of requests for advice and mothers' conduct in sequences in which HVs move towards the initiation of advice. This concern is equally manifest in the reception of advice where, as we shall see, mothers tend to minimize the extent to which they acknowledge that advice has been "informative."

3.1 Receiving information

In ordinary conversation, the parties have a range of resources with which to receipt informing statements. Prominent among these are acknowledgment tokens (such as mm hm, uh huh, yes, etc.), which are normally used as "continuers" (Jefferson 1984b; Schegloff
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While this kind of variegated, segment-by-segment receipt of an informing rarely occurs in HV–mother interactions, the acknowledgment tokens deployed in (23), together with others detailed below, play a predominant role in the receipt of advice, to which we now turn.

3.2 Receiving advice

We begin by noting three main ways in which advice may be received.

1 Marked acknowledgment: Here mothers respond to advice in ways that acknowledge its character as advice and its informativeness for them. Marked acknowledgments normally convey acceptance of the advice offered.

2 Unmarked acknowledgment: Here mothers respond to advice in ways that avoid acknowledging it as informative and that avoid overtly accepting it. Although they do not involve the overt rejection of advice, we shall argue that unmarked acknowledgments represent a response form that is resistant to advice giving and that may imply rejection of the advice that is given.

3 Assertions of knowledge or competence: Here mothers respond to advice by asserting that they already know and/or are undertaking the advised course of action. While these assertions, like unmarked acknowledgments, do not reject the advice to which they respond, they are also resistant to its delivery and achieve this resistance by indicating that the advice is redundant.

Below, we consider each of these three main forms of advice reception in turn.

3.2.1 Marked acknowledgments

The pro forma “marked” advice receipt in our data base is ob right – the first ob component treating the prior advice as “news” for the advice recipient and adumbrating its acceptance (Heritage 1984b), the subsequent “right” component overtly marking its acceptance, as in (19):
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negatively formulated turn component “Well (. . .) uhm if you’re not breast feeding there’s no reason why you shouldn’t start them when (. . .) she’s four weeks.” The same basic information is then immediately re-presented in an affirmatively packaged turn component as positive advice. In the course of this second turn component, the mother acknowledges the specific advice element that responds to her previous inquiry with an overlapped repetition of “four weeks” (arrow 1) and a subsequent accepting “Right” (arrow 2) at the completion of the HV’s turn.  

A similar pattern of response also emerges in (6) below:

Here, the HV’s contrastive recommendation of a bath “every day” is acknowledged by the mother with a repeat (arrow 1) and her elaborative continuation is receipted with a subsequent “Oh right” (arrow 2).

In only one case in our data base is “corrective” advice giving followed by an overt acknowledgment of error. This sequence is a continuation of (9) above and we pick it up at the point where the HV raises the question of whether a sweating baby may be too hot.

In this sequence, the mother requests advice about when to restart the pill. The HV’s advice, “four weeks,” is initially presented in a
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The recipient accepts and is prepared to act on. It is striking that
these marked acknowledgments of advice are primarily found in
environments in which the advice recipient has already cast herself
in the role of prospective advice recipient by directly (e.g. [8] and
(6) above) or indirectly (e.g. [9] above) requesting advice. In these
cases, a request for advice – with its explicit or implicit acknowledg-
ment of some deficiency in competence or knowledge – can permit marked acknowledgment and acceptance of the advice
which follows without further loss of “face.” Moreover, such marked acknowledgment may be required from a recipient who,
having requested advice, has now had that request fulfilled.24
Marked acknowledgments of advice, however, are comparatively
rare in the environment of HV-initiated advice. In the latter, the
predominant form of receipt is unmarked acknowledgment.

3.2.2 Unmarked acknowledgments

Unmarked acknowledgments of advice giving characteristically
involve such receipt objects as mm hm, yeh, and that’s right. These
objects stand in contrast to marked acknowledgments (such as
partial repeats, oh, etc.) in two main respects. (a) They do not
acknowledge advice giving as “news” for the recipient – indeed,
receipts like that’s right specifically propose that the recipient was
already aware of the information offered as “advice,” while objects
such as mm hm and yeh are, as already noted, primarily “continua-
tive” in character (Jefferson 1984b; Schegloff 1982). (b) These
objects do not constitute an undertaking to follow the advice
offered. In short unmarked acknowledgments, while receiving the
talk that constitutes an advice giving over its course, do not
acknowledge or accept that talk as advice.

The use of this pattern of receipting was widespread in our data
base. The following case shows the development of a sequence of
advice giving from (22) above, in which the HV’s advice largely
repeated the mother’s own account of her actions in feeding the
baby at night.

(22 cont.) [3A:124]

1 HV: hh No always be very quiet at
2
3 M: → Mm

Across the sequence of HV inquiries the mother and grandmother
acknowledge the possibility that the baby may be too hot (lines 3–
19). However, after the HV’s recommendation that the house tem-
perature be reduced and the mother’s and grandmother’s brief
acknowledgment of the advice, the grandmother accounts for their
actions in terms of the risk of the baby catching cold (arrow 1). It is
only after the HV moves towards a further reassertion of her position
that the grandmother interjectively acknowledges that they
may have been in error (arrow 2).21

The significant feature of these marked acknowledgments of
advice is that they overtly receipt the talk to which they respond as
advice. In different ways, their component elements – oh receipts,
repetitions of key advice elements in prior utterances, right accept-
ances, and acknowledgments of error – respond to prior informings
as “news” for the recipient and as containing information which
Dilemmas of advice

This association between unmarked acknowledgments of advice giving and subsequent resistance is not particular to this datum. In (24) below, an extended pattern of unmarked acknowledgment is followed by a turn (line 37) that implies that the advice being delivered is redundant. The mother's initial turn in this datum represents the renewal of an earlier telling about problems in getting her baby to sleep. After a minimal affiliation with the trouble (line 3) the HV inquires into how she handled the problem—an inquiry which is a standard precursor to advice (cf. (12) above).

(24) [1A:7]

1 M: B't last night she j'st wouldn't go off: =1
2 think she'd about two hours till six o'clock.
3 HV: O:h poor you. =So what did you do:
4 ...
5 ((17 lines of data omitted in which Mother and
6 Father describe being up all night))
7 ...
8 HV: I think there's a danger when you are breast
9 feeding that (. . .) especially at night when
10 you're all sort of nice and cozy and warm,
11 'hmmm that you do: (0.4) uhmm (0.8) you know
12 the baby feels so compf- comfortable and so
13 content.
14 M: ...
15 HV: Hmmm:
16 ...
17 HV: Uhmm being cuddled an' (0.6) and sucking at
18 your breast (0.4) that she falls asleep (. . .
19 she forgets about feeding
20 M: Uhmm:
21 HV: and falls to sleep without actually taking
22 her hhhhh
23 M:
24 HV: uh required quantity =
26 HV: =1 and therefore you've got to (0.5) do your
27 best to keep her awa: ke when she's actually
28 M: 1→ feeding.
29 HV: ...
30 M: ...
31 HV: 'hmmh Uhnn (0.2) in hospital we encourage
32 babies khhhh khh to keep awake by: sort of
33 M: tickling the ba: ck of their neck or 'hh
34 M: tickling the soles of their feet.

In this datum, the mother receipts recognizably redundant advice with a series of unmarked acknowledgment tokens (arrowed). At the completion of the HV's advice giving, however, the mother permits a full three second pause to develop (line 22) without verbally acknowledging its completion and then proceeds with remarks (beginning at line 23) that indicate that the problem on which the HV's advice has been focused (the baby’s sleeping at night) is not a significant one. In this case, then, unmarked acknowledgments over the course of an advice-giving sequence adumbrate a form of “passive resistance” to the advice-giving episode that is ultimately expressed as an implicit rejection of the relevance of the advice that was given.
In the advice delivery that follows (beginning at line 24), the mother responds with a series of unmarked acknowledgments (arrows 1–3) and then indicates (arrow 4) that she is already thoroughly aware of the advised procedure. Subsequently, she retreats once more into (delayed) unmarked acknowledgment (line 41) as the HV continues. Shortly thereafter the HV shifts topic (lines 45–6). In this sequence, then, the mother’s series of unmarked acknowledgments culminates in a response that, while confirming that she has heard and understood the substance of the HV’s advice, specifically avoids treating it as “news” for her.

While we have so far proposed that unmarked acknowledgments are associated with subsequent resistance to advice, we may now note that they may be analytically treated as forms of resistance in themselves. Insofar as a would-be adviser shapes their talk as advice, then an appropriate form of receipt will involve the use of marked acknowledgments that treat the talk as advice. Unmarked acknowledgments, which do not involve such a treatment, are inherently resistant to the advice giving to which they respond regardless of what they adumbrate. This contrast between the two forms of acknowledgment is very apparent in the following sequence. The sequence opens with the HV’s introductory remarks, which are hearably prefatory to the advice giving which follows. These remarks (lines 1–20) are appropriately “continuation” receipted (at lines 14, 18, and 20). Subsequently, however, a series of components of a lengthy advice sequence which generally favors immunization against whooping cough receive unmarked acknowledgments or no acknowledgments (arrowed 1), but the subsequent mention that the parents may defer making a decision about the

immunization receives marked acknowledgment (arrowed 2). The HV’s later remarks in support of vaccination yield a return to unmarked acknowledgment (arrowed 3). Here the forms of acknowledgment are consistent with the tacit expression of the parents’ resistance to making a quick decision about their child’s vaccination. After this renewal of unmarked acknowledgment, the HV shifts the topic (arrow 4).
repeated advice about keeping the baby on milk for the first four months, the HV shifts towards a position that suggests that the parents may wish to start the baby on solids earlier than this (arrowed 2). Unlike (25) above, however, this shift does not attract any marked acknowledgment and the HV subsequently shifts topic (arrowed 3). It may be noted that the sequence opens with a presequence about grandmothers that is later clumsily employed to preemptively discount them as an alternative source of advice about weaning babies.26

(26) [AA:13-14]

1 HV: And did you breastfeed him at all?
2 M: No;=
3 HV: =No he went straight on to the bottle.
4 (5.2)
5 HV: At this stage I don’t know whether you’ve got grannies nearby.
6 (1.0)
7 HV: have you?
8 M: One yeah;=
9 F: =One (near Whiston Close)
10 HV: Yes.
11 (5.2)
12 HV: Uhm (0.2) ‘hh The hospital at the moment recommend that you don’t start solids () until (0.4) four months.
13 (5.2)
14 HV: and that’s a long way off.
15 F: 1→ =Mm.
16 M: 1→ Mm hm.
17 M: 1→ Mm hm.
18 HV: ‘hh But you might well- somebody might recommend that you do; () and indeed if he- if he () becomes a big baby you might well need to give him a little bit before ().
19 four months but ‘hh if it can be avoided=
20 F: 1→ =Mm.
21 HV: milk is the only thing he needs really (0.2)
22 or water between feeds.
23 M: 1→ Mm hm.
24 HV: And (1.0) he can have (0.7) uh juice
25 M: 1→ Mm hm.
26 HV: about six weeks on.
27 (0.7)
28 HV: Uhm (0.3) but I think just milk is all he needs really.
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that the mother is ignorant or otherwise unable to cope with the matters raised in the delivery of advice. The mothers’ preoccupation with these implications is vividly illustrated by a number of sequences in our data base in which the mothers respond to advice giving with some assertion of knowledge or competence.

A preliminary sense of this preoccupation may be developed from the following datum, which is a continuation of (14) above:

(14 cont.) [1C1:13]

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33

3.2.3 Assertions of knowledge and/ or competence

Earlier in this chapter, we proposed that during these visits from the HV, mothers are concerned to display their knowledge, competence, and capacity to cope with matters concerning their babies’ health. We proposed that this concern may underlie the relative infrequency of overt requests for advice during these first visits and that it informed the design of their requests for advice. We also suggested that similar issues may inhabit sequences in which advice is initiated by HVs. For the HV’s initiation of advice may imply

As already noted, unmarked acknowledgments, in the way that they avoid receipting advice as advice, constitute a form of resistance to its delivery. However, the resistance which they offer is essentially “passive.” Unmarked acknowledgment does not involve the rejection of advice. Moreover, the fact that the advice is resisted is not stated outright, nor are the grounds on which it is resisted made overt. As we have seen, some, but not all, advice-giving sequences that involve unmarked acknowledgments culminate in some rather more overt expression of resistance at their conclusion. Unmarked acknowledgments are common in sequences in which advice has been initiated by the HV, and we suggest that they are well fitted to a social context such as these home visits, in which a mother may be able to do little or nothing to stem the flow of advice, where the HV is treated as having “rights” to advise on aspects of health and where the mother may not overtly reject the advice that is offered.
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knows what to do. Thus the first possible completion of the HV’s advice – which ends at the recommendation “then you must use boiled water” (arrow 1), is met by an assertion of knowledge (arrow 2). By contrast, the continuation of this advice that incorporates the reference to salt and an instruction as to quantity (arrow 3) is responded to with a marked acknowledgment and an undertaking to follow the advice (arrow 4). The final component of the HV’s advice, which concerns using a separate swab for each eye (arrow 5), is initially met with an acquiescent “Alright,” which is then revised by the mother’s subsequent assertion that this is what she does already (arrow 6). Across the segments of this advice giving, then, the mother deals with each segment in terms of an underlying concern to display her knowledgeability wherever possible.

A similar concern to display knowledgeability or competence emerges in the next several cases where, in each case, after an initiation of advice giving (arrow 1), the mother responds by indicating that she is already aware of and/or has already dealt with the matters that are in the course of being raised (arrow 2). In the first three of these cases in particular, it may be noted that the competence assertions occur very “early,” that is, at or near the first point at which advice is recognizably being initiated.

(15 cont.) [1C1:19-20]

1 HV: What are her motions like.
2 M: Uh: uh:m they’re softer now because she was a little bit constipated (0.2) a few days ago.
3 HV: Mm hm.
4 M: and the midwife advised me to put a teaspoon of uh:m
5 (1.0)
6 HV: brown sugar
7 M: brown sugar in alternate feeds
8 HV: I see.
9 M: and that helped her an’ they’re a lot softer now.
10 (0.6)
11 HV: 1→ Oh I don’t think you need (1.2) you know=
12 M 2→ = (1) stopped doing it now=
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(11 cont.) [3A1:14]

1 HV: Listen to your ‘icups. Just listen to your ‘icups.
2 B: (hicups)
3 M: I know what cures those (. ) More milk,
4 HV: ‘more
5 M: heh heh heh heh
6 HV: Huh
7 (0.5)
8 HV: 1→ Don’t worry about (h)icups.
9 M: 2→ Yah I know (. ) she ha’s them nearly every,
10 HV: ( )
11 HV: Dose she have
12 M: 2→

(10 cont.) [4B1:22]

1 G: ’huh When she starts off walking ou(t) it always seems to rai:n.
2 HV: 403
3 M: =Yah.
4 G: Ge, is half way and ’as to come back.
5 M: ( )
6 HV: Oh what a pity.
8 HV: But if she’s wrapped up well it won’t do her any ha,:r
9 M: (harm)
10 ( )
11 G: No:
12 M: No: that’s what they ( ) B Babies loose a lot
13 HV: 1→ of heh- heat through their head
15 1→ of heh- heat through their heads
16 (0.3)
17 HV: 1→ ’hh so:=-
18 G: 2→ =Well she’s always got a hat on ( )

(16 cont.) [1C1:30-31]

1 HV: And you’re able to put her down in between feeds are you,.
2 (1.0)
3 M: Ng::: (0.4) She screams.
4 HV: uhhhh hah hah hah ’uhhhhhhhhh
5 M: if I put her in the re.
6 ( )
7 Fr: heh
8 HV: =hah ‘hah
9 F: =eh hhnh
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22 M: 5→ anyw ay
23 HV: 6→ Yes because uh (.) there's always the
24 6→ danger they might be attracted uh (.) 'hh and
25 6→ sit on the (1.0) sit in there for warmth.
26 M: 7→ That's it when I go upstairs I put it on
27 7→ you know .=
28 HV: 8→ Mm.
29 M: 7→ But I mean< I when I'm in the kitchen I can
30 7→ sort'v see you know.
31 (1.0)
32 HV: 20 What a lot of cats= How did you get three cats
33 then.

Here, after the mother's third attempt to establish the fact that she has a cat-net (arrow 5), the HV develops her advice with an account of why cat-nets are necessary (arrow 6) and this is met by the mother with an elaboration of her earlier claim that she has the matter in hand (arrow 7). Subsequently, the HV initiates a shift of topical line.

In a number of these sequences, what starts as HV-initiated advice giving ends as a competence struggle. It is notable, in our database at least, that once the HV has committed herself to a course of advice giving she may be reluctant to abandon it. In each of the following instances, which exhibit continuations of the data shown above, the HV persists in advice giving (arrow 3) in the face of competence claims (arrow 2). Thus in (15), the HV's continuation of advice giving (arrow 3) does not acknowledge the mother's assertion (arrow 2) that she has already stopped doing the advised-against procedure (putting brown sugar in the baby's feed to alleviate constipation).

1 HV: 1→ Oh I don’t think you need (1.2) you know=
2 M: 2→ = (1) stopped doing it now .=
3 HV: 3→ = You shouldn't do it uh (1.0) as a
4 3→ regular thing otherwise it would be
5 M: 4→ = Ooh no .=
6 HV: 5→ bad for her tec::h.
7 M: 5→ It was just a couple of days and it
8 5→ helped (her).
9 (1.5) ((Tearing Paper))
10 HV: Good.
Similarly, in (11), the HV persists in advising the mother, despite the latter's claim that she is not concerned about the baby's hiccups.

(11 cont.) [3A1:14]
1 HV: 1➔ Don't worry about (h)iccups.
2 M: 2➔ Yea hav k know (. ) she ha s them nearly evry.
3 HV: 
4 HV: 
5 M: 2➔ 

In (10), the HV's advice-adumbrative observation that babies lose a lot of heat through their heads, culminates in the advice that "bonnets are worth having" despite the baby's grandmother's interjection that the baby always has a hat on.

(10 cont.) [4B1:22]
1 M: 
2 HV: 1➔ No: that's what they ( )
3 1➔ Babies lose a lot
4 1➔ of heh- heat through their heads (0.3) hh
5 1➔ s:o:
6 G: 2➔ =Well she's, always got a hat, on ( )
7 HV: 3➔ b
8 Bonnets are
7 3➔ worth having.

And in (16), the HV's advice that the mother "firmly put her do:wn" is augmented through three syntactically continuous accretions (lines 6, 8, and 10) despite the mother's interjected claims (lines 5 and 7) to be doing just that.

(16 cont.) [1C1:30-31]
1 HV: 1➔ =Well my advice to you; is that when she's had
2 1➔ a cuddle and you've changed her and you've fed
3 1➔ her and she's brought her wind up (1.2)
4 1➔ you firmly put her down.
5 M: 2➔ I've started.
6 HV: 3➔ In her ow::n;
7 M: 2➔ I did it this mornin.
8 HV: 3➔ preferably not right by you:
9 (0.8)
10 HV: 3➔ and you can check her every (1.0) fifteen

In the cases shown above, the HV's do not abandon advice giving in the face of the mothers' claims to knowledge or competence.

4 Discussion

Taken as a whole, three facets of the advice-giving sequences in our data base of first visits are particularly striking. The first is the predominantly unilateral character of the ways in which the HVs both initiated and delivered advice. In the substantial majority of cases, the HVs began to deliver advice in the absence of any clear indication that it was wanted and, in a further substantial body of cases, in the absence of any clear indication of a "problem." In a large number of cases, little attempt seemed to be made to fit the advice giving to the particular interactional circumstances from which the advice emerged and, in many of them, it is difficult to resist the impression that the HVs would have initiated advice.
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Moreover, in sustaining their advice giving, they sequentially delete the mothers' claims to competence. This conduct underscores other dimensions of the generally unilateral character of advice giving in these first visits and it suggests that, on occasion, the HVs may take little account of the mothers' claims to competence even when those claims are made clearly and assertively.

3.2.4 Summary

In this section, we have examined three major ways in which the reception of advice may be managed. While our data base contains only one instance in which advice is overtly rejected, only one class of receptions – marked acknowledgment – involves the full-fledged acceptance of advice as advice. The others – unmarked acknowledgment and competence assertions – in their different ways involve resistance to advice giving. Competence assertions resist advice through the claim that its content is already known and/or acted upon by the mother who, in this way, seeks to reject any implication of incompetence or lack of knowledge that may be carried by the initiation of advice. Unmarked acknowledgments, which receipt advisory talk but without acknowledging or accepting its character as advice, constitute a form of "passive resistance," whose motivation may remain opaque. In a substantial number of cases, unmarked acknowledgments were followed by more overt expressions of resistance to advice giving that challenged its relevance or informativeness to advises.

4 Discussion

Taken as a whole, three facets of the advice-giving sequences in our data base of first visits are particularly striking. The first is the predominantly unilateral character of the ways in which the HVs both initiated and delivered advice. In the substantial majority of cases, the HVs began to deliver advice in the absence of any clear indication that it was wanted and, in a further substantial body of cases, in the absence of any clear indication of a "problem." In a large number of cases, little attempt seemed to be made to fit the advice giving to the particular interactional circumstances from which the advice emerged and, in many of them, it is difficult to resist the impression that the HVs would have initiated advice.
giving no matter how the mothers responded to their inquiries. Secondly, there was little effort to accommodate advice giving to the circumstances of individual mothers and, in particular, to acknowledge their competences and capacity for personal decision making. Indeed, in most of the cases in which the mothers asserted their knowledge of competence in some facet of health or baby management, their assertions received no acknowledgment or minimal acknowledgment and, in a number of cases, were positively resisted. Third, in this context it is significant that fully three-quarters of all the HV-initiated advice met with either passive or active resistance. While it is not possible to extrapolate from the mothers' conduct during the course of advice giving to their subsequent decisions about whether to follow the advice or not, their rejection of it suggests that much of the advice may have been counterproductive.\footnote{27} The responses of the mothers in these sequences may perhaps be aptly summarized by the Scottish mothers in McIntosh's study, who observed:

I don't like the health visitors. I mean, it's no' like help or advice - they tell you. It wisnae, "Maybe you should do this," it was, "You should do this." Y'know, "You're doing it all wrong." That's how I never went to the clinic. I was sick o' bein' bossed about.

She keeps tellin' me, "Do this, do that." It makes ye feel like a moron, that yer no' capable o' Jokin' after yer baby. It undermines yer confidence. Ah always feel guilty after she's been as if ah've been doin' everything wrong. It makes me mad. Ah don't say anything at the time, ah just mutter a few oaths when she's gone.

(McIntosh 1986: 26)

These mothers' accounts of the authority relations assumed in advice-giving sequences and the passive resistance with which this assumption is met ("Ah don't say anything at the time") appear to encapsulate the predominant pattern of advice giving and advice reception that emerges from our data.

In considering this pattern, we are left with the problem of explaining why it is that our HVs persisted in this - apparently unproductive - process of self-initiated advice giving. Although, in the present context, responses to this problem can only be speculative, a number of possibilities suggest themselves.

We begin, first, by recalling Robinson's (1982) contrast between a clinical problem-oriented approach to health visiting associated with a medical background and an approach based on the clients' identification of their own health needs, which might be favored by those whose training originates in social-work contexts (see Baldock and Prior 1981). HVs are, as previously noted, trained nurses - often with extensive clinical and hospital experience. This training and experience may incline them towards, in Robinson's (1982) terms, "an identification, diagnosis and treatment" approach to mothers rather than one in which mothers are encouraged to take the lead in defining their needs.

While this possibility is certainly attractive, it cannot by any means carry the whole burden of explanation. A preliminary analysis of interactions involving the same HVs with experienced mothers (with one or more previous children) suggests that, with these mothers, the HVs were less ready to initiate courses of advice unilaterally and more prepared to acknowledge the knowledge, experience, and competence of the mothers. This evidence, though yet to be fully developed, suggests that the "nursing background" of the HVs, while a possible factor in their orientations towards the first-time mothers, is by no means a factor that influences them to engage in unilateral advice giving regardless of who they are dealing with.

A second consideration arises out of the recognition that our findings are based on data involving interactions with first-time mothers who, in the nature of the case, are inexperienced in dealing with young babies. Much of our advice-giving data is consistent with the possibility that the HVs took up a "pessimistic" or "defensive" stance with respect to the knowledge and competence possessed by these mothers. This stance has a number of aspects.

First, with respect to issues which the mothers treated in some way as problematic, the readiness with which the HVs proceeded to advice giving suggests that they started from the "pessimistic" presumption that the mothers would, at best, have limited competence to deal with the problem. This presumption might also have "defensive" aspects insofar as the HVs are organizationally accountable for the health and welfare of both mother and baby and, in some subsequent context, may desire to assert the adequacy of their conduct with respect to some problem. Second, the HVs' readiness to engage in unilateral advice giving is also consistent with "pessimistic" presumptions about the knowledge of first-time
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of purpose. The delivery of advice, to the extent that it sustains the parties' sense that the HV desires to be useful to the mother, may contribute to a resolution of this "ticket of entry" problem.

It is here, however, that the central dilemma of advice giving may reach its apotheosis. For advice giving must ordinarily constitute the advice recipient as being of at least doubtful knowledge or competence. As we have seen, rather than establishing that mothers definitely lack specific knowledge or competences in relation to health or baby-management issues, HVs tend to act on a presumption of systematic doubt about the mother's abilities. There are good interactional reasons for this. First, the inquiries that might be necessary to establish the mothers' knowledge or competences could readily undermine "rapport" between the parties and may focus attention on just the surveillance aspects of these visits that HVs may be most anxious to have disattained. Second, efforts at a clear determination that a mother is specifically ignorant or incompetent on some matter will, if successful, tend both to humiliate the mother and to sour the context in which the subsequent advice is delivered. Conversely, where the outcome of those inquiries is the finding that the mother is specifically knowledgeable and competent, the basis on which advice can appropriately be given will be undermined. In this case, the result of detailed inquiry would be the loss of the "ticket of entry" that advice giving represents.

Thus, insofar as HVs deploy advice giving as a central "ticket of entry" to mothers' homes, they may tend to initiate advice in contexts where the recipient's desire or need for advice is uncertain. Paradoxically, the HVs' need to make herself useful may result in the delivery of advice in interactional contexts where, at best, it is of indeterminate value to the recipient and, at worst, it is resented and resisted by her. The ultimate dilemma of advice giving as a ticket of entry may be that it can only be bought by spoiling the ball game.

Notes

1. These figures are presented in terms of "full-time equivalents" and thus the actual number of nurses working in the health-visitor service is rather larger than this figure.

2. Audio-recording was selected both because it was a straightforward technique for data collection to be used by the health visitors themselves and because video equipment and the additional persons who
would be required to operate it would have constituted an intrusive distraction in a delicate setting. The audio-record, however, has significant drawbacks. It is impossible to determine the spatial arrangement of the parties to the interaction and, on many occasions, the possibly important non-vocal activities of the parties. The significance of certain aspects of the audio-record is rendered equivocal by these lacunae. In developing our observations, we have avoided data manifesting these difficulties.

3. In the original data-collection process an attempt was made to restrict the social class of the mothers in the sample to IV and V. In the event, our sample is more broadly spread and incorporates persons with a wide range of occupations, including self-employed business persons, white-collar employees, skilled, semi-skilled, and unskilled manual workers, and persons who, at the time of the visits, were unemployed.

4. See Robinson (1982) for a summary account of the historical background to this unusual division of labor between health visitors and other community nurses, and Donzelot (1980) for an account of the ideological background of health visiting.

5. See, for example, Foster (1988) for a comparison of this feature of the British health visitor's role with her opposite number in France – the *puéricultrice*.

6. Although the health visitor has a statutory obligation to cater to the health needs of all children, she does not have a statutory right of entry into the parental home. In practice, however, the accountability of denying entry to the health visitor renders such a right unnecessary.

7. A range of studies from the 1960s onwards (e.g. Political and Economic Planning 1961; Cartwright 1979 cited in Robinson 1982; Graham 1979) have suggested that some mothers perceive health visitors in terms of a surveillance role. McIntosh's (1986) study of a working-class sample of mothers' attitudes to the health visitor service showed that the majority of first-time mothers viewed the health visitor's role primarily in surveillance terms (McIntosh 1986: 15). Such outlooks occasionally emerged as a more-or-less overt feature of the interactions that form the data for this chapter.

8. For example, in our data base home visits were made on a weekly basis for the first month and subsequently on a monthly basis.

9. Indeed Dingwall (1977: 91) has observed that the complexity of the home visit vitiated the value of timing studies.

10. Although the HV service stresses the value of establishing contact with mothers before the birth of a baby and efforts are normally made to do so, only one HV in our sample (HV no. 5) had in fact made contact with her two first-time mothers prior to the first recorded visit.

11. The speakers in this and the data extracts that follow are labeled as follows: HV = health visitor; M = mother; F = father; G = grandmother; Fr = friend.

12. In Brown and Levinson's (1987) terms, advice giving threatens both the positive face and negative face of the advice recipient. The recipient's positive face is threatened by the advice giver's implication that the recipient is not knowledgeable or competent concerning the matters that are advised upon. The recipient's negative face (desire to be unimpeded) is threatened by the obligation to follow the course of action recommended by the advice giver.

13. See Ervin Tripp (1976) and M. H. Goodwin (1991) for an analysis of directive forms. West (1990) describes similar features in the design of physicians' directives, though she also finds differences in their design that are strongly patterned by gender.

14. This procedure for requesting advice is not, of course, restricted to these materials. In the following datum, G has called E for a recipe for Tacos. Her initiation of the request is designed to show some knowledge of the relevant ingredients (arrowed):

[NB:IV:2:R]

| G:  | → | 'hhhh So c- d'you need you need uh |
| E:  | → | 'hh Yc: u gg? e n y uh nged |
| G:  | → | u n |
| E:  | → | some u n |
| G:  | → | n h shrgd lettuce? |
| E:  | → | Shredded lettuce on CHEE:SE? |

15. See Drew (1984) for a discussion of other cases of reportings in which the relevance or implications of the reportings are left implicit. Drew notes that "the way in which an event is portrayed in a reporting establishes the relevance of a particular kind of involvement/co-participation by the recipient through some conventional tying between the kind of occasion/activity and a relevant action by the recipient" (1984: 149, n. 10).

16. As it turns out, in both (10) and (11) the offered advice is resisted, see pp. 404–5.

17. For a related discussion of a context in which a professional seeks to build an interactional environment in which the delivery of professionally expert information will not conflict with the lay perspective, see Maynard (this volume).


19. We do not intend to imply in this paragraph that more complete stepwise approaches to advice giving always eventuate in appropriately designed giving. In (15), for example, while it is apparent that the mother presents the child's problem as past and presents her approach to it as the product of advice from another health professional, the HV nonetheless initiates advice giving.

20. In (20), the advice giving may be stimulated by intimations earlier in the visit that the mother is considering abandoning breast feeding.
21. See Pomerantz (1980) for a further discussion of this segment.
22. It may be noted that the mother's additional use of "right" at line 21 to acknowledge acceptance of the HV's advice after her acceptance has been resolicited (at line 20) is further evidence that "right" is a standard, but "minimal" form of marked acknowledgment for the acceptance of advice.
23. It is notable that this overt acknowledgment of past error is made by the grandmother rather than the mother. The grandmother does not have direct responsibility for the child's welfare and, moreover, is "experienced" and may have little to prove with respect to her competence in child-raising practices. Moreover, her account is couched in terms of conscientious, if misplaced, concern for the baby's welfare during a cold English winter.
24. For a parallel argument with respect to the receipt of answers to questions, see Heritage (1984b).
25. We particularly note here that the mother asserts that she was "taught" this procedure rather than, for example, "told about" it. The term "taught" here conveys not only that she was told about it, but that she learned the procedure or otherwise "took it on board."
26. This sequence illustrates a recurrent anxiety among the HVS in our data base about alternative sources of advice. In the following sequence, the HV receives no response (arrow 1) to a two-component advice delivery. Subsequently, she moves to undercut the baby-food packet as a source of advice about feeding (arrow 2).

[1C1:29-30]

```
HV: Don't (t) - (0.2) I think it - (. ) it's sensible to
    (1.0)
HV: you know tuck - (0.2) to use your common sense
    and give 'er what you think she needs.
1→ (0.3)
HV: 'uh If she's ( . ) 'uh happy: (. ) she's not
    being sick (0.6) she's not screaming the
    place down you're doing the right thing.<
1→ (0.5)
HV: 2→ Don't take any notice of what it says on the
    packet an' how many ounces ( . ) per how many
    ( . ) weeks.
```

Here it is noticeable that the HV's elaboration of her first piece of advice is designed in terms of a three-part list format (Jefferson 1990) which is often used in talk designed to persuade (Atkinson 1984; Heritage and Greatbatch 1986). The failure of this advice component to get any response may be implicated in the HV's subsequent move to deny the value of the baby-food packet as a source of direction for the mother - a move that was possibly foreshadowed with her initial turn...