


Please cite the Published Version

Archer, Dawn  (2020) The value of facework in crisis negotiation: with a focus on barricade situations. In: Politeness in Professional Contexts. John Benjamins. ISBN 9789027207425

Publisher: John Benjamins

Version: Published Version

Downloaded from: <https://e-space.mmu.ac.uk/625150/>

Usage rights:  In Copyright

Enquiries:

If you have questions about this document, contact openresearch@mmu.ac.uk. Please include the URL of the record in e-space. If you believe that your, or a third party's rights have been compromised through this document please see our Take Down policy (available from <https://www.mmu.ac.uk/library/using-the-library/policies-and-guidelines>)

The value of facework in crisis negotiation: with a focus on barricade situations

Dawn Archer

Manchester Metropolitan University

Keywords

Barricade, crisis negotiation, emotion(al state), face(work), hooks, influencing tactics, initial contact, modal worlds, reality paradigm, similarity

1. Introduction

As Archer and Todd ([forthcoming](#)) note,

Modern crisis negotiation involves a law enforcement official communicating with subjects who are threatening violence to themselves and/or others. Such subjects may pose a suicide risk, be engaging in some form of domestic or workplace violence, be part of a hostage or barricade situation (cf. [criminals who are attempting to escape following a botched robbery](#)) and/or be seeking to commit a terror-related act.

Although each of the aforementioned types represents a different discursive context, current negotiation training has tended to teach generic influencing skills based on psychological models and principles (Archer and Todd *ibid.*). The author has been working with (UK) crisis negotiation trainers to address this, by developing training that (i) is particularly sensitive to changing contexts, and (ii) draws on linguistic theories and principles in addition to psychological ones (see also Section 1.1). In line with this new focus, this chapter explores a barricade incident that occurred in Columbus, USA, in 2016 (see Section 1.2 for details). The focus on a barricade incident is deliberate; allowing the author to build on – by offering an alternative analysis to – that provided by Archer et al. (2018), in respect to a second (now infamous) barricade incident involving 20-year old Grant Sattaur and an unnamed negotiator (on December 26 2007). The two-hour negotiation took place when Grant was home alone, at the family residence, and known to be depressed. The 20-year old had been incarcerated at some point in his past, and had recently separated from, on-off girlfriend, Crystal. As the full two-hour negotiation has not been made publically available, to date, Archer et al. (*ibid.*) focused on the four-minute discussion between Grant and the unnamed negotiator prior to Grant taking his own life. Based on that analysis, the authors concluded that the 20-year old and his unnamed negotiator were “operating out of conflicting reality paradigms” (*ibid.*:182) by this point; and that these incompatible “perceptions of reality” (*ibid.*:186) were especially evident in their face(work).

Following Goffman (1967:5), Archer et al. (2018) liken “face” to a *behavioural mask* or *line* an interlocutor might claim based upon what s/he believes others are assuming about him or her. They liken “facework”, in turn, to the actions interlocutors engage in, and occasionally negotiate over, in order to make what they are doing consistent with that developing line or preferred behavioural mask. By way of illustration, the unnamed negotiator repeatedly focussed upon Grant’s shortcomings in their last four minutes together. He likened him to a

stubborn coward who was not “enough of a man to come outside”, thereby undermining his *want* of approval (cf. Brown and Levinson 1987). He also undermined “Grant’s *want* to have freedom of action” by repeatedly ordering him to “keep his mouth shut/shut up”, to “man up” and “take care of [his] problems” (Archer et al. 2018:190, my italics; see also Brown and Levinson 1987). The authors argue that the latter, in particular, was indicative of the negotiator’s perspective “that “real” men behave rationally, rather than being unable to cope due to being rejected by a girlfriend”, as Grant had been, and “struggling with depression”, in consequence (Archer et al. 2018:189). The negotiator did not amend his reality paradigm, even after Grant “exhibited communicative behaviours indicative of shame – in particular decreased responsiveness” (ibid:195). He was therefore unable to move Grant toward a safer frame of mind. Grant fatally shot himself, as the negotiator was trying to get him to re-engage in conversation.

As the authors note, it is highly likely that the unnamed negotiator was attempting to provoke reparative moves indicative of a change in behaviour during their exchange: simply put, he needed Grant to surrender the firearm he was known to be in possession of and then come outside. His strategy failed, in part, because there was too much “dispraise of the other” (Leech 1983:232) when the negotiator should have been focussing upon evaluating Grant’s *actions* (cf. Tangney 1996:743). Insult and personal criticism will tend to fuel “conflict by heightening identity damage” (Jones 2006:29) for most interlocutors in most contexts. When such evaluations provoke shame in a subject-in-crisis (such as Grant), the option of suicide can all too easily become more favourable to them than their living through a traumatic event (Lester 1997:360; Hammer 2007:101; Archer et al. 2018:188, 195).

1.1 Towards a linguistic toolkit of influencing strategies

Currently, police negotiation training in the UK draws on (without explaining the theory behind) fixed models that presuppose influence, such as the behavioural *stairway* (Vecchi et al. 2005) or the Cylindrical Model of Communication (Taylor 2002). Given the communication-based nature of negotiation (Putnam and Roloff 1992:1), there is a growing belief, nonetheless, that it would be more advantageous for police negotiation training to be based on the notion of a linguistic toolkit of influencing strategies (from which police negotiators can draw). Face(work) and reality paradigms have already been shown to be useful pragmatic concepts for such a toolkit (Archer et al. 2018), and will be drawn upon again – and in the case of reality paradigms, expanded upon – in this chapter (see especially Section 4).

It should be noted that a working concept of face(work) is exploited within the extant (North American) crisis negotiation literature too. It tends to be discussed as a face *frame*, however, alongside other frames to do with *attunement*, *emotional distress* or making *substantive demands* (Hammer 2007:72). Simply put, North American negotiators are encouraged to identify as a means of attending to:

- A face frame when the subject is concerned predominantly with how s/he is being perceived.
- An attunement frame when their predominant concern appears to be trust issues.
- An emotional distress frame when the subject is experiencing noticeable (especially negative) emotions.
- A substantive frame when s/he appears to be concerned predominantly with bargaining and problem-solving.

By making face into a frame, in this way, there is a danger that (North American) negotiators will focus on face issues only when a subject seems to be preoccupied with his or her self-image and reputation (e.g., how s/he is being perceived by the negotiator and/or others: cf. Hammer 2007). Conversely, face is likely not to be considered or, if it is, to be deemed to be less crucial if a subject is found to be operating out of an emotional distress frame (i.e., seems focused upon negative emotions like anger, fear or sadness) or an attunement frame (i.e., seems concerned about their relationship with/the extent to which they feel they can trust others). An overarching objective of this chapter, therefore, is to demonstrate that facework is pivotal at each stage of a crisis negotiation - regardless of the predominant frame of the subject.

1.2 The dataset

As noted in Section 1, this chapter focuses, primarily, on the barricade incident involving 22-year-old Jeremy Davis and a police negotiator named Sgt. Rich Weiner, from the Columbus Police Department, Ohio (USA). Henceforth, they will be referred to using their first names – Jeremy and Rich – in line with how they opted to refer to each other during the barricade (but see also Section 2). The incident was triggered by Jeremy, on 31 July 2016, when he took control of - and refused to exit - a stationary Columbus police vehicle, following a traffic violation. It later transpired that Jeremy (a heroin addict) had violated his parole by taking drugs and was afraid he would be returned to prison in consequence. The police were fearful too. *First, because the subject had access to a firearm. Second, because of the potential for such incidents to escalate: be it, by causing injury to others or by leading to suicide by cop* (Lyndsay and Lester 2004), *that is, a subject deliberately behaving in a threatening manner with the aim of provoking a lethal response from the attending officers*. As will become clear, Rich was able

to persuade Jeremy to end his barricade - without injury to himself or others - after a 78-minute interaction with him: a recording of which is available from YouTube.¹ This chapter explores eight extracts (of differing lengths) from their 78-minute interaction, as a means of demonstrating the negotiator's need for "mental flexibility" (Ting-Toomey and Oetzel 2001:178) during the negotiation. In this case, for example, Rich was able to:

- (i) signal a sensitivity to the personal and situational factors that were shaping the interaction as it unfolded (see especially Sections 3-4);
- (ii) respond to Jeremy's emotional distress appropriately (see Sections 3-5); and
- (iii) ultimately persuade Jeremy to reappraise his circumstances (see Section 6 and also Hammer 2007:103).

With respect to outcome, this barricade incident stands in stark contrast to the Grant Sattaur barricade incident highlighted in Section 1 (having ended very differently). The two incidents nonetheless share some important similarities that are worth outlining here. Both subjects, Grant and Jeremy, (a) were in their early twenties at the time of the crisis intervention, (b) were treated as barricade subjects in possession of a firearm, and (c) interacted with their negotiator for over an hour. In order to demonstrate why the outcome was so different, the sections that follow will prioritise instances where, in contrast to Grant's negotiator, Rich:

1. Recognised Jeremy's "interpersonal self-worth issues" (Ting-Toomey 1998:188), and reacted accordingly.

¹ See <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=fkmJG7hKgeI>

2. Made use of “face-honoring [i.e., face-enhancing] messages” as a means of initiating “conflict de-escalation” (Hammer 2007:92).
3. Combined empathy with (re)interpretation, as a means of (a) validating Jeremy’s feelings whilst nonetheless questioning any dysfunctional reactions/beliefs Jeremy seemed to have, and (b) guiding him (thereby) towards a safer frame of mind, whilst avoiding colluding (Pain 2009).
4. Was successful in getting Jeremy “to think about” his “experiences in a new kind of way” (Voutilainen 2012:236-7, 242).

I begin by analysing the negotiator’s opening interaction with Jeremy (see Section 2). This is deliberate for three reasons. First, as noted above, the initial interaction between Grant Sattaur and his unnamed negotiator is not publically available (as yet) and therefore could not be explored by Archer et al. (2018). Having access to a barricade negotiation (from its onset to its completion) makes possible a sequential analysis in respect to how, for example, face needs might change over time, beginning with the initial contact between subject and negotiator. Second, crisis-negotiation researchers like Slatkin (2015:20) argue that “the initial contact between negotiator and subject” can be especially crucial with regard to setting “the tone and tenor for the negotiations” (e.g., “getting off on the right foot”). In fact, Slatkin (ibid) believes it to be a “foundation [for] all that follows”. Third, I would contend that, as well as providing insights into how they are feeling, these initial contacts also provide negotiators with important clues as to their subject’s reality paradigm – and how this (current view of the world) may need to change if the crisis is to be resolved (see especially Sections 3 and 6).

2. Initial contact

The YouTube clip of this 78-minute exchange begins, in fact, just prior to Sgt. Rich Weiner's opening interaction with Jeremy. Jeremy is heard to make a revealing self-disclosure – “can't go back” (at 23 seconds) – and two equally revealing imperatives – “tell them to take the shot” (25 seconds) and “tell them to please just shoot me” (52 seconds), all of which alluded to his preference for death (via *suicide by cop*) over prison. It is not initially clear, from the recording, whether Sgt. Rich Weiner – who was still travelling to the scene at this point – heard Jeremy's revelations. Instead, we hear Rich ask a colleague to confirm the identity of the man/guy “in the car” (at 1.09 and 1.37 minutes). After Rich was told (wrongly) that “his name [was] Josh” (1.43 minutes), he began to communicate with Jeremy directly, as follows.

(1) Initial contact [1.48-3.02 mins into the 78-minute negotiation]

Rich: Josh (.) my name is Rich (.) can you hear me

Jeremy: name's not Josh it's Jeremy (.) and I can hear you

Rich: Jeremy (.) I don't know what led to today (.) but (.)
you're gonna be okay (.) I want you to promise me one
thing can you do that

Jeremy: I'm not gonna hurt nobody (.) I don't want to hurt
anybody (.) I just [sobbing] I just want to start shooting
me in the head (.) because it's that simple I'm not going
back (.) I can't go back

Rich: Jeremy I want you to promise me I know you said
you're not going to hurt any of us and I believe you but

I want you to promise me that you won't hurt yourself
either okay

Jeremy: I'm not gonna hurt me (.) you're gonna hurt me for me
[sobbing] (1) listen (.) can you please please tell my
fiancé I'm so sorry I swear to god I'm so sorry I do not
want to leave her like this but I can't go back to prison
man (.) I've been in jail my whole life (.) I can't go
back

Initial contacts have long been recognised as being “particularly stressful moments” for negotiators (Bohl 1997:47), not least because, in assuming “responsibility for...the safety” of others – including, in cases like this, the subjects themselves – they are acutely aware of the need “to set about creating a trusting relationship” with him or her. Notice that, in his first utterance to Jeremy, Rich forwent any form of greeting, preferring (a) to use (what he thought was) the subject's first name, (b) to offer a shortened form of his own first name, and (c) to then ask a polar interrogative to determine whether Jeremy could hear him. Directly addressing someone by their (first) name is a way of signalling that the message is directed to them, as well as being a recognised rapport-building technique (amongst English speakers). It is important to use the correct name, however, and to not be overly presumptuous when it comes to the use of shortened names or nicknames (as well as to consider - in order to facilitate - cultural differences). The faux pas was not disastrous in this case, however, as Jeremy was prepared both to correct the naming mistake - albeit using the full form of his first name - and also answer Rich's hearing query affirmatively, thereby signalling to the negotiator that he was not completely disengaged (in spite of his apparent preference for *suicide by cop* over prison). Rich did not apologise for the naming error, preferring instead to stress that, although he did

not yet know the circumstances that had “led to today”, Jeremy was “gonna be okay”. In essence, Rich was predicting an alternative - more positive - future for Jeremy that did not involve *suicide by cop* (see also Sections 4 and 6). He then sought to secure a promise from him. Instead of spelling out what the “one thing” was that he wanted Jeremy to promise him, however, Rich focussed first on Jeremy’s ability/willingness to make the promise (“can you do that”). Jeremy’s response signalled his belief that the promise related to him not hurting anybody. He was careful to reassure Rich, at this point, that he lacked the desire as well as the intention to hurt others, moreover (compare “don’t want” and “not gonna”). He also repeated his earlier “want” to be fatally “shot” rather than return to prison, and was crying as he did so, thereby providing Rich with a strong signal that his reality paradigm (i.e., how he perceived his world at this time) had not changed. In his response, Rich purposefully acknowledged both the statement that Jeremy “was not going to hurt any” of them and his belief in that statement, before then spelling out what he actually wanted Jeremy to promise: not hurting himself. Jeremy reiterated his own reality paradigm relating to *suicide by cop* at this point – but also signalled his feelings for a significant other in his life, his fiancé Chelsea (see Section 6). The language Jeremy used in respect to his fiancé – “I’m so sorry” (x2), “I swear to god”, “I do not want to leave her like this” – alluded, once again, to the extent of his emotional distress at this time, especially when coupled with his sobbing.

3. Acknowledging anxieties, sowing the seeds of an alternative future

Differing “perceptions of reality” (Archer et al. 2018:186) have the potential to shape interlocutors’ face(work) for good or ill. Grant Sattaur was perceived unfavourably as being a

“coward” and thus “not man enough” to come outside by his negotiator, for example (ibid.: see also Introduction). Rather than attacking the subject’s positive face, as Grant’s negotiator had done, Rich opted to enhance Jeremy’s positive face whenever possible. He attended to Jeremy’s primary concern - going back to prison - almost immediately, for example, using a *tell me*-imperative that was specific (in seeking to understand *why*) but non-directive (in requiring neither a “yes”/“no” response, nor suggesting a specific answer to Jeremy).² As Extract 2 reveals, Jeremy addressed the *why* of Rich’s *tell me*-imperative twice in a five-minute interchange, each time explaining that his “parole officer” had “violated” him “because” he had been “doing drugs”:

(2) Tell me why... [3.05-8.08 mins into the 78-minute negotiation]

- Rich: Jeremy tell me why you think you’re going back to prison
- Jeremy: [sobbing throughout] “cos my parole officer violated me because I’m doing drugs man (.) I haven’t broke any laws I haven’t hurt anybody nothing man (2) I’m going to prison because I’m doing drugs man (.) I came home (1) I didn’t know I went to prison when I was sixteen man I didn’t know how to live out here man (3) I just – I can’t go back to prison man I just needed help with the drug problem that was all (.) I got pulled over (.) it’s the end of the line man (.) can you tell them please [coughing] just shoot me in the head man please (.) ‘cos I don’t wanna go back to prison

² Demanding some sort of response from Jeremy automatically imposed upon his negative face of course: i.e., his *want* or desire to be able to act freely (Brown and Levinson 1987), but this was offset by the invitation for Jeremy to begin exploring his feelings over (returning to) prison.

Rich: hey Jeremy (.) no one said you're going back to prison (.) and if what you're telling me if this was just a traffic stop (.) this is a small bump in the road right now okay (.) you're not- no one said you're going back to prison (.) and I can hear the pain in your voice so I don't want you to think that way now okay (.) you're thinking way down the line (.) and as far as getting help (.) for your drug problem for your addiction (.) we can help you do that (.) but the first thing we gotta do is get through right now (.) so what I'm asking you to do (.) is I want you to put that gun down (.) I do not want any officers to see you with that gun in your hand (.) can you do that for me

Jeremy: [sobbing throughout] they can't see this gun (.) this gun is in my pants man (.) and I'm not gonna do anything to anybody with it [sobs] they shoot me in the leg or something try to drag me out (1) then that's when I'm gonna shoot my head off man (.) until then I'm not gonna do nothing to nobody (.) not myself not nobody else (1) I don't even want it to be a shoot out here there's a big ass gas truck over there the gas station (.) fucking thing's gonna go up like a bomb man (.) innocent people gonna be hurt everywhere

Rich: you don't sound like the kind of guy that wants to hurt anybody so I don't think we have to worry about that today (.) so long as you promise me right (.) I wanna hear you say (.) that you promise you're not gonna hurt yourself

Jeremy: I promise I'm not gonna hurt myself and nobody else man (.)
but I'm not going back to prison (.) if they (.) make it my last
resort to kill myself before I go back then that's what it's gonna
be

Rich: hey Jeremy (.) just so you know I'm not there so I can't see
what's going on but I'm on my way there okay (.) and I want
you to know that nobody's- nobody there is going to hurt you

Jeremy: [sobbing throughout] just need them to sir (.) I need them to go
ahead and end this (1) it's been drawn out too long already (.)
people got shit to do man (.) my PO (.) she violated me man
I'm doin- I'm going back to prison man (.) for doing drugs (.)
they're going to put me in the county (.) I've got to withdraw
off of heroin (.) I can't do it man I can't do it

Rich: alright then let us help you (.) that's all we wanna do just
wanna help you (.) now (.) nobody's hurt you so far (.) all they
did was pull you over (.) you're talking to me you seem (1) like
you- like you don't wanna hurt anybody so everyone's gonna
be just fine today do you- do you hear me

Jeremy: listen man I'm not gonna hurt nobody I got a fucking twelve
gauge sitting right next to me man (.) [sobbing] I'm in the cop
car with the keys man (1) if I wanted to take off right now I
could (.) I just don't want nobody innocent to get shot man

Rich: then that's not gonna happen (.) would you be willing to toss
that gun out the door

Jeremy: nope nope not yet man no (.) [sobbing] ‘cause all they’re gonna do is run up on me man (1) I’m already in handcuffs (1) they’re gonna run up on me man and- and take me to jail man (.) that gun’s the only thing keeping me from going to jail right now (..) but I promise you I won’t hurt nobody with that gun

Rich: I believe you (.) now (.) can I make a promise to you

Jeremy: If you’d like to sir

Rich: I promise you (.) if you talk to me (.) and we work through this (.) you’re not gonna get hurt (.) I promise you that’s not gonna happen

This interchange, some 3-to-8 minutes into the 78-minute barricade incident, provided Rich with further evidence of the subject’s emotional state. Jeremy’s fear of having to return to prison was evident throughout, for example, as was the helplessness he felt due to his drug addiction. Rich appears to have recognised both as (what police negotiators call) *hooks*, *that is*, topics with which to begin de-escalating the situation, with the aim of “extract[ing] the subject from [the] crisis” (Strentz 2013:17). He emphasised that “no one [had] said [Jeremy was] going back to prison” (x2), for example: but stopped himself from stating that this was not a possibility (see Section 6). He then acknowledged “the pain in [Jeremy’s] voice”, as a means of validating his feelings, whilst being careful to combine his demonstration of empathy with a re-interpretation of Jeremy’s situation. He stressed that, if Jeremy’s explanation of this as “just a traffic stop” was accurate, this was no more than a metaphorical “bump in the road” – and a “small” one at that. He also used Jeremy’s “pain” as his reason for “want[ing Jeremy not] to think that” death was favourable at this point. He went on to suggest “help” for Jeremy’s

“addiction” was possible, but that it was contingent upon the (more pressing) imminent action of Jeremy putting his gun down and being “willing to toss [it] out the door”.

The objective of the type of strategy highlighted above – beyond securing a firearm without incident – is to guide the subject toward a safer frame of mind, whilst avoiding any sense of colluding in their dysfunctional beliefs (Pain 2009): such as death (and, in particular, *suicide by cop*) being preferable to prison. If we look beyond Jeremy’s repeated claims that “it [was] the end of the line” for him because he did not “wanna”/could not “go back” to prison and that he “need[ed] them to go ahead and end this”, we do have evidence of the beginnings of a change in mind-set – even at this early stage in the negotiation. Notice in particular that Jeremy modified his negative responses (x3) using “not yet” when asked if he “would be willing to toss [the] gun out the door”. He then explained that the gun was “the only thing keeping [him] from jail”, before promising to not “hurt nobody with” it. This meant that, at some level, Jeremy was open to eventually surrendering the gun, without injury to others, in the knowledge that he would most likely be returned to prison (see Section 6).

In spite of such positive signs some eight minutes into the barricade incident, it would take a further 70 minutes before Jeremy surrendered the firearm and exited the police vehicle. As McMains and Mullins (2014:151) note, negotiations tend to “take time” because of the need to build a relationship between negotiator and subject that allows the former to gather intelligence, defuse emotions and enhance self-efficacy in the subject. In a crisis-negotiation context, the latter in particular involves:

- (i) determining the beliefs a subject holds, especially in respect to their perceived ability to face challenges;

- (ii) helping them to establish some self-belief that they can change things, be it themselves and/or their circumstances; and
- (iii) moving them on to problem solving with the support of the negotiator and, possibly, others.

These aspects are explored, further, in Sections 4 and 6, in particular.

4. Belief-worlds, want-worlds and intent-worlds

McMains and Mullins (2014:151) highlight the importance of contrasting any “violent confrontation” the subject may expect “from the police” with a “genuine desire to help” such that the negotiator comes to be perceived as an “ally”. Because of Jeremy’s preference for *suicide by cop* over prison, Rich’s use of (what is often labelled) “the contrast effect” (Cialdini 1984) did not involve juxtaposing “potential deadly harm” with a “genuine desire to help” as McMains and Mullins suggest negotiators might do when interacting with hostage takers (ibid). Rich was careful, instead, to emphasise that the “guys” he worked with were “professionals” (20.43-20.48 minutes), that is, “good cops” who had “a lot of patience” and were thus “the best people” to “have here” (49.30-49.41 minutes), given Jeremy’s predicament. We have further evidence, then, of Rich attempting to influence Jeremy’s reality paradigm (i.e., the “filter” by which he perceived and interpreted the world) with his own. Negotiators need to be able to identify - so that they can influence – subjects’ mental models of the world (or mind-sets), in this way, as they have the capacity to not only shape how a subject understands his/her world, but also how s/he makes inferences from/predictions based on what others have said or done

(and decisions about how to act in consequence, etc.). Rich needed to convince Jeremy to surrender a firearm, and end a barricade incident, but this also meant convincing him he had a future. Hence his statement that Jeremy was “gonna be okay” (in Extract 1); designed to project an immediate future reality for Jeremy that was different to Jeremy’s prediction he would be killed by police snipers. Rich also went on to assert that, as Jeremy did not “wanna hurt anybody...everyone [was] gonna be just fine today” (at 6.53-6.57 minutes).

These competing realities to Jeremy’s reality paradigm can be described as “belief-worlds” (Werth 1999), as can Rich’s descriptions of his colleagues (above). Negotiators might also look out for “want-worlds” and “intent-worlds” (Werth 1999) in their interactions with subjects.³ As this barricade incident reveals, these modal-worlds can overlap with one another as well as with (deontic) modal-worlds to do with, for example, permission, obligation and requirement or (epistemic) modal-worlds to do with, for example, (not) knowing, tentativeness, etc. Rich, for example, repeatedly stated an intention - using [*not*] *gonna* / [*not*] *going to* - and a desire - using *want* / *wanna* - whilst obliging himself and/or requiring Jeremy to act in some way - using *promise*. “I want you to promise me that you won’t hurt yourself” is one of three examples of Rich requiring something of Jeremy in such a way in Extract 1.⁴ Jeremy used a similar strategy, in the same extract, to signal he was “not gonna” nor did not “want to hurt anybody”; he “just want[ed them] to start shooting [him] in the head”.

Rich went on to use the phrase *I want you* [...] on twenty further occasions during the 78-minute barricade incident. Two sought for Jeremy “to take a couple of breaths” and “gather

³ Gavins (2007) prefers the description, boulomaic modal-worlds.

⁴ A promise equates to a purpose-world, under Werth’s (1999:238-9) terminology, as it presents intentions that are deictically placed within some future time zone. Rich used the word, *promise(s)*, on 41 occasions – most of which performed the speech act of promising or reported that a promise had been made and/or was going to be adhered to. As well as seeking a promise from Jeremy that he would not harm himself (as in this example), Rich “want[ed]” him to promise that he would keep the gun/his hands where they were, and “not...do anything until” they had the opportunity to “talk some more” (56.01-56.12 minutes). Rich promised, in return, that no-one would move against Jeremy, that Rich would make a recording of his fiancé once she arrived, and that he would also help Jeremy in other ways.

[him]self” so that Rich could better hear him, thereby attending to his level of emotional distress (see Extract 3). Signalling a “want” for Jeremy to calm down (in order to become less emotional and more rational), as in Extract 3 (below), had the potential to be face threatening, given the latent implicature that Jeremy was being too emotional. The strategy was probably deemed worthwhile, by Rich, given the need for Jeremy to repeat an address that would allow them to make contact with Chelsea (Jeremy’s partner). Note that Rich then went on to use the same phrase, *I want you* [...], alongside its negated form, to make clear he did not “want [Jeremy] talking to [Chelsea] on the phone”, preferring instead for them all to “talk [together] face to face” (see 9.22 minutes and especially 14.44-14.48 minutes). The aim, here, was to continue reinforcing a more positive, immediate future for Jeremy (that involved speaking with Rich and Chelsea), whilst nonetheless maintaining some control over the message Jeremy would hear from Chelsea and how he would ultimately hear it (for more details, in this regard, see Section 6).

(3) Keep talking to me [10.42-15.47 mins into the 78-minute negotiation]

Rich: hey Jeremy (.) I have a hard time hearing you on this radio (.)
 when you’re crying (.) so I want you to take a couple of deep
 breaths for me okay (.) and I want you to gather yourself (.) and
 I want you to repeat what you just said

Jeremy: [composes himself] she’s on the corner of Sixth and Reed
 South Columbus (.) Sixth Street and Reed Avenue (.) R – E – E
 – D [xxx] if you pull up there (.) have somebody ask for her
 she’ll come out [...]

Rich: [...] alright we’ll start working on that but you keep talking to
 me okay

Jeremy: (2) sir I just don't wanna go back to prison (.) I came home [sobs] (.) I tried to find a job (.) nobody'd give me a job (.) can't go to college because of my criminal background (2) don't know what else to do man I-I struggle out here every day [sobs] (1) but I don't I don't commit no crimes man I don't do anything I-I do heroin (.) little cocaine (.) the only thing wrong I do man (1) you know I went to every drug class she ordered me to go to (.) I tried to go to rehab (1) you know (.) the fucking (.) there's one thing after another man I was supposed to go to rehab Wednesday (.) shattered my ankle (.) so I had to go have surgery on my ankle (1) my fucking ankle's killing me man [sobs] (.) you know what I mean (.) so they won't let me into rehab for that (.) [...]

Rich: you know addiction's tough (.) we deal with a lot of people that have that (2) I-I don't know what you're going through I can't pretend that I know (.) but I've seen a lot of people struggle with it (.) and I know that we have a lot of resources that can help you (.) so (.) prison is the last thing (.) the last place that that I want to put you or see you go (.) so you gotta be willing to work with me so we can work around this but I tell you (.) I'm gonna be honest with you (.) the longer this goes on (1) the less chance we have of keeping you out (.) I'll make you a promise (.) if we can get this resolved quick (.) without anyone getting hurt including yourself (.) we can get the resources for you (.) do you believe me

Jeremy: I don't know man (.) if you let me see my wife I'm willing to trust you though

Rich: okay (1) so wife (.) is that- is that Chelsea

Jeremy: yeah

Rich: okay I'll make you that promise (1) now I'm not gonna let you talk to her until we resolve this but I promise you that you me and her can sit in the back of a wagon and we can talk about what our next steps are (.) you willing to do that

[...]

Jeremy: [...] I just- I don't even gotta see her man I just need to talk to her on the phone

Rich: hey you know what (1) I don't want you talking to her on the phone (.) I want you to talk to her face to face with me (.) okay

Jeremy: (2) I don't understand why I gotta go back to prison for getting high man (.) and then on top of that I just caught this case (.) you know so that's another five ten years in the joint (.) I just did six man (.) supermax max close I done been through it all (.) it's all the same man

Rich: you know what you're having a conversation with me right now (.) you're calming down (.) you haven't threatened to hurt anybody (.) that goes a long way in-in court and I promise you (.) if you work with me (.) I'll come to that court case and I'll- I'll talk to the prosecutor and the judge (.) I can't make you promises because they're gonna do what they do (.) but I can

definitely tell them how you cooperated with me (.) but (.)
that's exactly what you gotta do you gotta help me help you

Note how Rich responded to Jeremy's self-disclosures in Extract 3 above. He counter-balanced not "know[ing] what" Jeremy was "going through" and not "pretend[ing to] know", with knowing that "addiction's tough" and having knowledge of "a lot of resources that can help". The latter, in turn, became Rich's justification for "prison" being "the last place that" he "want[ed] to put...or see [Jeremy] go". However, he was careful to draw on an obligation-world in order to emphasise that Jeremy had to "be willing to work with" him. Rich then described their "conversation" in ways that pointed to the progress made to date. This included highlighting that Jeremy had "calm[ed] down" and had not threatened "to hurt anybody", both of which attended to his positive face (i.e., Jeremy's "want" to be approved of, appreciated, etc.). Rich followed this with a conditional promise and a "gotta" statement, thereby merging purpose-worlds (see footnote 5) and obligation-worlds on this occasion. Collectively, they emphasised a point that Rich was to make in different ways throughout the 78-minute barricade incident: that Jeremy's cooperation was the key to a positive outcome.

5. Influencing through (a temporary) connection

Promises are not only amongst the most common speech acts in negotiation contexts (Donohue and Ramesh 1992:220) but also provide an extremely useful means by which negotiator and subject can signal a level of mutual cooperation (Cheney et al. 1972). Indeed, Bonoma et al. (1974) and Donohue and Ramesh (1992) share the view that negotiators can trigger a reciprocal

exchange of promises - as well as offers - by engaging in a process of cooperative bargaining. There is evidence of this in this barricade incident. It is also in line with the Liking Principle, namely, the human tendency to (be more likely to) comply with the requests of those we know and like – or, failing that, those with the “likeability factor” (Cialdini 2001:144). Compliments can be another reliable method of influence, according to Cialdini (ibid. 148-156), although they need to be context-sensitive given that subjects like Jeremy (and Grant) may have an extremely poor self-image⁵ to the point of displaying suicidal tendencies. We have already noted Rich’s use of promises and face enhancement above (see especially Section 4). The strategies feature in Extract 4 too, as does a third influence-inducing strategy relating to accentuating similarities.

(4) Something in common [52.40-55.47 mins into the 78-minute negotiation]

Rich: alright (.) tell me a little bit more what school did you go to
 [...] what kind of activities did you do (.) did you play sports or
 uh (.) hang out with your friends

Jeremy: yeah I played baseball man (.) till I started fucking with drugs
 uh at about fourteen(.) real heavy (.) so (.) started smoking
 crack when I was twelve (.) seems like I’ve been fucked up
 ever since man

Rich: well hey (.) you ain’t gonna believe this until you see me later
 (.) but we’ve got something in common

Jeremy: (1) you like to play ball do you

⁵ Other subjects may be pursuing a course of action that most people would find morally objectionable (such as threatening to murder hostages).

Rich: I had to leave the baseball field to come out here and talk to you (.) I'm still in my uniform

Jeremy: I'm sorry about that

Rich: nah man you don't have to apologise don't apologise at all (.) just when-when she comes here (.) you and me can talk a little bit but until then (.) what position did you play

Jeremy: shortstop mostly (.) you know I bounced around a lot though (.) never pitching

Rich: alright good so we have a lot in common because I'm uh (.) I'm second baseman (.) so you got the power middle

Jeremy: yeah that's where all the fun's at

Rich: yeah you got that right (.) so you didn't ruin anything for me today (.) I-I was O for one so far for the day so (.) you might've just pulled me out of a slump

Jeremy: [chuckles] that's cool you can give me some shits and giggles [laughs] right now man

Rich: well that's because you're letting me talk to you (.) so I appreciate that (8) so you a righty or a lefty

Jeremy: righty

Rich: what-what pl- uh what place did you er bat in the order

Jeremy: [coughs] round three or four

Rich: nice (.) do you ever play a wooden bat or are you just all aluminium

Jeremy: I started to (.) I was- I was toughening my hands up for it and that was around the time I quit

Similarity is touted by both Byrne (1971) and Cialdini (2001) as being the most influential quality a negotiator can display in negotiation contexts, due to the human tendency to like those with whom we have the most in common. Interestingly, Rich made use of this particular strategy after Jeremy became agitated by the presence of armed police officers looking for and then retrieving his phone from the car he had been driving (before being pulled over for the traffic violation). Rich asked a question designed to establish “what activities”, including “sports”, Jeremy had engaged in when in school. When Jeremy stated he had “played baseball” prior to getting involved with drugs, Rich retorted: “hey (.) you ain’t gonna believe this until you see me later (.) but we’ve got something in common”. As Brown and Levinson (1987:108) highlight, even when strangers “imply common ground...to a limited extent”, it enables them to “perceive themselves as similar” (if only “for the purposes of the interaction”).⁶ Rich’s language at this point served to intensify this effect, as he framed whatever they shared in common as something that would (positively) surprise Jeremy, thereby allowing Jeremy to guess - and invite Rich to confirm - whether their similarity related to playing baseball. When Jeremy learned Rich had had to leave the playing field in order to talk with him, he engaged in more facework: “I’m sorry about that”. As the apology had positive face implications for Jeremy, Rich was quick to insist he did not “have to apologise”. He then made explicit that, whilst they waited for Chelsea, they could use the time to continue talking. Rich’s questions thereafter elicited responses, around baseball, that allowed this negotiator to claim they had, in fact, “a lot in common” (my emphasis). He also engaged in further face enhancement, by suggesting that, rather than “ruin[ing] anything for him”, Jeremy had “pulled [him] out of a slump”. Rich’s self-deprecatory humour regarding his poor performance served to increase the

⁶ “Establishing common ground” is a well-known positive politeness strategy (see Brown and Levinson 1987:107).

(growing) connection between them, as evidenced by Jeremy's statement that Rich had "give[n him] some shits and giggles" and his accompanying laughter. Using "humour and joking" is not always advisable, as part of crisis negotiations, due to their potential to heighten emotional arousal in subjects experiencing psychological difficulties (Ireland 2012:86). Rich, however, drew on a type of humour that strangers might use when getting acquainted, in order to achieve relational connection (see, e.g., Haugh 2011). Rich also followed this up with an expression of appreciation for "letting" [him] "talk" to Jeremy. Rich's positive evaluation of this particular behaviour - using something akin to process-oriented complimenting - was most likely a move to encourage Jeremy to repeat that behaviour (i.e., keep talking). And it worked. Indeed, as Rich prepared to move to another location (in order to pick up a phone), Jeremy revealed to him he had guessed he was the police officer "in the Ford Focus huh or the Fusion" (56.30 minutes), allowing both an opportunity to continue connecting, relationally-speaking:

(5) Don't laugh [56.44-57.09 mins into the 78-minute negotiation]

Rich: alright if you see me don't laugh (.) because I got flip flops
my baseball pants and a cut off shirt on

Jeremy: that your average day work attire

Rich: oh I wish man

Jeremy: it's a Sunday (.) getting some overtime man right

Rich: yeah a little bit

On this occasion, Jeremy engaged in banter with Rich, by asking him whether his clothing was his "average day attire". He also initiated a new other-focussed topic, relating to whether Rich

would receive overtime (given it was a Sunday), and signalled, thereby, an increased level of engagement.

6. (Temporarily) seeing experiences in a new kind of way

As Kolb and Williams (2001:186) note, albeit in respect to a different kind of negotiation, it can be:

[...] difficult to keep [a] conversation going. But as long as [interlocutors] continue talking there is a chance to come together. It takes times for trust and rapport to be established and for the [subject]'s story to emerge. It takes times for [them] to adjust to seeing things differently. The steps [interlocutors] take to keep the dialogue going provide that time.

As crisis negotiators know only too well, “adjust[ing] to seeing things differently” (ibid.) may only be temporary when it comes to subjects in crisis. Indeed, they all too often find themselves called out to talk with a suicidal subject, who they (or a colleague) has negotiated with previously. Alternatively, they find they are able to help an individual at the scene, only to learn those individuals have not been able to change their life longer term (as in Jeremy’s case).⁷ This does not affect the crisis negotiator’s role, of course, as the expectation of getting

⁷ See <http://www.dispatch.com/content/stories/local/2017/01/02/1-police-negotiator-never-sure-how-efforts-will-turn-out.html>.

a subject past their immediate crisis assumes a short-term fix at best (Strentz 2012). An important part of achieving this involves encouraging the subject towards “a new *outer reality*” (Archer et al. 2018:196), that is, getting them “to think about” their “experiences in a new kind of way” (Voutilainen 2012:236-7, 242): hence my focus on reality paradigms (as well as facework) in this chapter. As the previous sections demonstrate, Rich’s strategy, in this regard, was to offer Jeremy an alternative future and how to get to that future via both a re-interpretation of his current predicament and also the promise of specific future actions on Rich’s part that, importantly, were contingent upon Jeremy first promising and then performing reciprocal (imminent) future actions. There were at least three pivotal moments, in this barricade incident, where Jeremy went on to signal his openness to Rich’s strategy. As Extracts 6-8 reveal, all centred around Chelsea in some way.

(6) If X then Y [58.46-101.19 mins into the 78-minute negotiation]

Rich we got Chelsea (.) and they’re bringing her to me right now

Jeremy you serious

Rich told you man I ain’t gonna lie to you (8) alright (.) so I want you to try thinking about something (.) she’s gonna come here and I’m gonna talk to her (.) then I’m gonna play a recording (.) I’m gonna have her talk into the recorder (.) and then I’m gonna play it for you (.) just so you know that she’s here (1) you good with that

Jeremy Yeah

Rich alright (1) are we still good (.) as far as our plan (.) and that plan is (.) once you know she’s here you’re willing to come out (.) is that right

Jeremy yeah (.) that's right

Rich thank you (.) alright you wanna talk some more ball

Jeremy (3) [crying] just give me a sec

Rich (4) I'll give you a second just tell me (.) tell me why

Jeremy I just get upset thinking about her man that's all

Rich (4) sounds to me like you have a lot of feelings for her

Jeremy (4) ain't never felt like this about anybody in the world

Rich (4) everybody has one that falls in their laps at least one time in their life (.) sounds like this one is yours (.) so I promise you (.) I'm gonna help with some resources for both you and her (.) but it- no kidding around it's gonna be a lot of work on both your parts

Jeremy (5) if they can get her into rehab man and get her clean (2) I'll take the prison cell

In section 3, I noted how Rich used Jeremy's fear of having to return to prison and helplessness he felt due to his drug addiction as *hooks* with which to begin de-escalating the situation, very early in the barricade incident. Two other *hooks* then became evident as the incident developed, namely, Jeremy's feelings for Chelsea and Jeremy's statements throughout that he did not want innocent people to die due to his actions. The former hook is especially evident in Extract 6. It begins with Rich signalling that Chelsea is on her way. That Rich was able to honour this promise definitely benefitted the negotiation (cf. Greenstone 2005:92). He was also able to reiterate to Jeremy that, true to what he had told him previously, he was not "gonna lie". Such statements have impression formation in mind: simply put, Rich was portraying himself as consistently trustworthy. Rich then informed Jeremy that he would prepare a recording of Chelsea for him, and clarified with him that their "plan" of Jeremy coming out once he knew

Chelsea was there was “still good”. When Jeremy confirmed this to be the case, Rich intended to continue their discussion around baseball, but had to change tactics when Jeremy became emotional again. When it transpired that Jeremy was “upset” due to thinking about Chelsea, Rich was careful to emphasise his recognition that Chelsea was special to Jeremy, and then reassert his promise to get him help. He also mentioned helping Chelsea, and it was at this point Jeremy signalled a willingness to go to prison, conditional upon Chelsea getting help. This constituted a significant change in Jeremy’s reality paradigm, when compared to the beginning of the call (cf. Section 2). A changing reality paradigm is also evident in Extract 7, at the point Jeremy acknowledged that he could “see” an alternative, possible future world where he made “it through this” and, thus, got to experience a “second chance”. The extract begins with Rich using a colloquial expression, “paper” (denoting Jeremy’s probation status), as a rapport strategy:

(7) Positive short stop [1:02:08-1:05:07 mins into the 78-minute negotiation]

Rich: what kind of paper you got hanging over your head

Jeremy: I got three years over my head (.) nine month increments (2) they can’t send me back for no more than nine months (.) it’s not the time though man (.) it’s the principle (.) I did every day of my six years man (.) every day (.) for a- a mistake I made as a kid man (.) a grown man tried to kill me and I shot him (.) I was sixteen years old never had a felony in my life (.) and they sent me to prison man as an adult (.) I went through a lot of shit in there man (2) I don’t wanna go back there man (.) turned me into somebody I don’t wanna be (.) just to survive day to day

Rich: so you said you made some mistakes when you were still a kid well
I'm gonna tell you what you're twenty two years old (.) you're still
a kid

Jeremy: yeah and I've already fucked my life forever

Rich: no you didn't (.) you got a long life ahead of you bud (10) you hear
me (.) you're twenty two years old (.) I got a son that's twenty two
he's still a kid (1) you got a lot ahead of you (.) but the biggest
obstacle you got right now (.) is this addiction problem (.) and this
is definitely something that we can get you through

Jeremy: I hope so (.) I hope so for Chelsea's sake man (2) I don't wanna die
man but I ain't scared to (.) I'll look death right in the eye today if I
have to (.) I just want what's best for her (.) and I'm terrified of
leaving her out there alone

Rich: I know you had a hard one man (.) that'd be tough on anybody (.)
but you're gonna make it through this one today (.) this is gonna be
your second chance (.) do you agree

Jeremy: yeah I can see that happening

Rich: good man (.) I need a positive short stop on this end and it sounds
like I got one

Jeremy: Yeah

In this three minute exchange, Jeremy disclosed a “mistake” he made as a “kid” (shooting “a grown man” that “tried to kill” him when he “was sixteen years old”). Rich mirrored his description back to him (“made some mistakes”) before stating that, at only “twenty two years old” he was “still a kid”. The likely strategy, here, was to signal to Jeremy that, given he was

“still a kid”, he was young enough to change his future (and hence do something about the man he had become in order “to survive day to day” in prison). The potential for such statements to sound patronising and/or to be rejected must be considered here. Jeremy’s response, for example, signalled his belief that he had “fucked [his] life forever”. Rich emphatically disagreed at this point, and opted to disclose something about himself: that he had “a son that’s twenty two” who was (also) “still a kid” (as a means of justifying his youthful assessment of Jeremy). Rich then re-asserted explicitly that Jeremy had a future, by affirming he had “a long life” and “a lot ahead of” him. He was careful, nonetheless, to stress that Jeremy’s “biggest obstacle...right now” was his “addiction problem”, before stressing this was “something” they could get through (and together - hence the “we”). When Jeremy signalled he “hope[d] so for Chelsea’s sake” and was “terrified of leaving her out there alone” (even though he was not “scared to die” but – note – did not “wanna die” by this point), Rich acknowledged Jeremy had “had a hard” life “that’d be tough on anybody”. He then reasserted, once again, that Jeremy was “gonna make it through this one today”, and that it would be his “second chance”, before asking for Jeremy’s agreement. Jeremy gave it, and was evaluated positively by Rich in consequence (“good man”).

It is interesting to compare Jeremy’s self-evaluations throughout the 78-minute incident with Rich’s evaluations of Jeremy (and his plight) as well as himself (and his role in helping Jeremy). Jeremy saw himself as a drug addict (see Extract 2), who “started smoking crack when [he] was twelve” and started “fucking with drugs... real heavy” at “fourteen”, and had “been fucked up ever since” (Extract 4). He stated that he had tried but failed to get a job and had not gone to college because of his “criminal background” (Extract 3), but stopped short of presenting himself as a criminal. Indeed, he claimed not to “commit no crimes”, and that “the only thing wrong he” did was to take “heroin” and a “little cocaine” (Extract 3), but did disclose (as stated above) that he had made the “mistake” of killing a man when a “kid” of “sixteen”

(see Extract 7). Jeremy was adamant, nonetheless, that he would hurt no one (Extract 3), but himself, in this barricade incident. His preference, though, was for the police to hurt him (Extracts 1 and 2). Indeed, suicide by cop was preferable to him than prison. In the context of crisis negotiation, subjects like Jeremy are expected - and strongly encouraged - to self-disclose. Self-disclosure can be used by negotiators too: to create a connection with the subject and/or to humanise them. Rich, for example, shared his passion for baseball with Jeremy and presented the both of them as baseball players, in consequence. He also told Jeremy he had a son his age, thereby presenting himself as a father (as well as a negotiator). He presented himself, in addition, as someone who could help Jeremy and his fiancé (Extracts 2, 3, 6 and 7) and who was true to his word (i.e., consistently trustworthy: Extract 6). Rich portrayed Jeremy, in turn, as someone who had made “mistakes” (Extract 7), and had a “drug addiction” problem (Extracts 2, 3 and 7), following Jeremy’s lead, but also emphasised (contra Jeremy) his belief that Jeremy still had “a lot ahead of” him (Extract 7). When Jeremy exhibited behaviours that Rich wanted him to continue (such as letting them talk together), Rich signalled his appreciation (Extract 4). He was willing to signal, too, that he believed Jeremy (when, e.g., he stated he was “not going to hurt any[one]”: Extract 1), as well as to thank him (Extract 6) and evaluate him positively (as a “good man”: Extract 7) when he demonstrated he was moving towards a safer frame of mind.

In their last exchange together, Jeremy talked about believing Rich too, but made this conditional upon Rich having been able to give him a name (Jerome) that he would not have known without speaking to Chelsea (see Extract 8). It came after Rich played the audio recording of Chelsea to him, and prompted Jeremy, in turn, to keep to his commitment to exit the vehicle straightaway (see Extract 8).

(8) Coming out [1:16:34-17.57 mins into the 78-minute negotiation]

Rich Alright man you ready to hear this recording

Jeremy Yeah

Rich alright here it is

Recording Jeremy this is Chelsea (.) I miss y'all (.) I love you and I need
 you in my life (.) please
 come out to me I love you so much

Rich alright man that was it

Jeremy the only reason I believe you is because you know Jerome (.)
 I'm gonna come out though

Rich wait a second (.) are you ready to come out you said

Jeremy yeah (.) but are you gonna stick to your word (.) and we're
 gonna talk (.) me you and her

Rich yep I made that promise I'm gonna keep it

Jeremy we'll see (.) and if not man thank you for what you done man
 (1) now listen (.) I'm gonna roll that window down so that man
 can give me the instructions

Rich alright

Note that, when Rich sought clarification that Jeremy was ready to exit the vehicle, and Jeremy gave it, Jeremy sought clarification in turn that Rich would “stick to [his] word” that the three of them – Rich, Chelsea and Jeremy – would talk. Although Rich reaffirmed himself to be a man of his word, Jeremy engaged in some interesting facework of his own at this point: he allowed for the possibility that the talk might not happen, nonetheless, and “thank[ed Rich] for what [he had] done” anyway.

7. Value of facework and other pragmatic concepts to crisis negotiators: A summary

Like Grant's negotiator, much of Rich's strategies were motivated by the need to provoke specific reparative moves that, in turn, required a change in the subject's reality paradigm. Simply put, Rich needed Jeremy to surrender the firearm and then exit the vehicle he had hijacked (Sections 2, 3 and 6), and under specific, orchestrated conditions. This meant Jeremy had to come to see a future for himself, as opposed to "want[ing]" *suicide by cop* in preference to prison (Sections 2-4 and 6). His strategy likely succeeded, where the strategy used by Grant's negotiator failed, because Rich was careful to evaluate Jeremy positively rather than negatively (cf. Archer et al. 2018). He recognised Jeremy's "interpersonal self-worth issues" (Ting-Toomey 1998: 188), for example, and responded to them using positive facework strategies (see Sections 4-6) in addition to combining his empathy with (re)interpretation (see Sections 2-4, and 6). Simply put, Rich validated Jeremy's feelings whilst nonetheless questioning any dysfunctional reactions/beliefs Jeremy seemed to have, and guided him (thereby) towards a safer frame of mind, whilst avoiding colluding (Pain 2009). By so doing, he was able to convince Jeremy "to think about" his "experiences in a new kind of way" (Voutilainen 2012:236-7, 242) - at this point at least (see Section 6).

In the Introduction to this chapter, I emphasised how reality paradigms - as well as facework - have already been shown to be useful pragmatic concepts for a negotiator's linguistic toolkit (Archer et al. 2018). As highlighted in the chapter, one means by which negotiators can identify reality paradigms is by paying attention to a subject's self-disclosures (see especially Sections 2 and 6). By way of illustration, Jeremy self-disclosed what he described as a "mistake" to Rich: his "killing a man". He was careful, nonetheless, to signal that the "grown man tried to

kill” him first, and to present himself as a “sixteen year old” “kid” who, although acting in self-defence, had effectively “fucked [his] life forever” (Extract 7). He also provided his reason for preferring *suicide by cop* over prison, in the same three minute exchange, when he stated he “went through a lot of shit in there”, such that he “turned...into...somebody” he did not “wanna be” (see Section 6).

This chapter has also sought to expand upon the notion of reality paradigms. Negotiators like Rich need to be able to identify – so that they can attempt to influence subjects’ mental models of their world(s) – as Rich sought to by offering an alternate future reality to Jeremy. They need to be able to do this in real time, however. Section 4 demonstrates how the modal-world concept makes a useful addition to the negotiator’s toolkit, especially where a subject uses them frequently. Jeremy’s consistent use of “I can’t go back”, for example, pointed to a “belief-world” that Rich had to attend to, in order to end the barricade incident. Rich sought to persuade Jeremy that he had a future worth living for, by drawing consistently on a different “belief-world”. He told Jeremy that he was “gonna be okay” (Extract 1) and that, as Jeremy did not “wanna hurt anybody...everyone [else was] gonna be just fine today” too (6.53-6.57 minutes), for example. The identification of modal-worlds – that is, “belief-worlds”, “want-worlds”, “intent-worlds”, “purpose-worlds”, “knowledge-worlds”, etc. – by negotiators is made easier, potentially, by being identifiable at the word level. A high frequency of “(not) want to”/ (not) “wanna” statements, for example, would signal a subject’s desire (unless designed to get the negotiator to do something [*I want you to...*], in which case they might signal that the subject’s apparent desire is more akin to a necessity, from their perspective). A high frequency of “(not) going to” / (not) “gonna” statements would signal a subject’s intent (and, potentially, level of determination). A high frequency of “promise” would signal their apparent obligation to some action deictically placed within a future time zone.

A promise is a speech act, of course. As highlighted in Section 5, promises constitute one of the most discussed speech acts in the negotiation literature, because of their prevalent use in (crisis) negotiation contexts (see Section 5). But they tend not to be explained in facework terms, in spite of the fact that negotiators would benefit from knowing the implications that particular speech acts (such as promises, offers, requests, demands) may have for the interlocutors' "face(s)". Promises are recognised as one of several influencing strategies in the (crisis) negotiation literature, however, along with compliments and the promotion of similarity (as noted in Section 5). This chapter has sought to demonstrate that the three aforementioned influencing strategies share facework in common too, thereby adding weight to my argument that facework is pivotal at each stage of a crisis negotiation (see Introduction and also Archer et al. 2018). The links between complimenting and facework are obvious, and have been much discussed by politeness researchers. Similarity has been less discussed, but is recognised, nonetheless, to be a way of implying common ground "for the purposes of the interaction" (Brown and Levinson 1987:108), such that a relational connection can be created/maintained for the duration of that interaction (Haugh 2011). That so many of the concepts already drawn upon by negotiators can be linked to facework, in such ways, underlines its value to negotiators: and justifies, in turn, the argument for making facework a pivotal part of a negotiator's linguistic toolkit.

References

Archer, Dawn. 2015. "Slurs, insults, (backhanded) compliments and other strategic facework moves." *Language Sciences* [doi:10.1016/j.langsci.2015.03.008](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.langsci.2015.03.008)

- Archer, Dawn, and M. Todd (forthcoming). "Police crisis negotiation: An assessment of existing models." In *Handbook of Forensic Linguistics*, ed. by Malcolm Coulthard, Alison Johnson, and Rui Sousa-Silva. London: Routledge.
- Archer, Dawn, Rebecca Smithson, and Ian Kennedy. 2018. "Achieving influence through negotiation: An argument for developing pragmatic awareness." In *Legal Pragmatics*, ed. by Dennis Kurzon, and Barbara Kryk-Kastovsky, 181-202. [Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins](#).
- Bohl, Nancy. 1997. "Post-incident Crisis Counselling for Hostage Negotiators." In *Dynamic Processes of Crisis Negotiation: Theory, Research, and Practice*, ed. by Randall G. Rogan, Mitchell R. Hammer, and Clinton R. Van Zandt, 45-56. London: Greenwood Publishing Group.
- Bonoma, Thomas, James Tedeschi, and Bob Helm. 1974. "Some effects of target cooperation and reciprocated promises on conflict resolution." *Sociometry* 37: 251-261.
- Brown, Penelope, and Stephen C. Levinson. 1987. *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Byrne, Donn. 1971. *The Attraction Paradigm*. New York: Academic Press.
- Cheney, John, Thomas Harford, and Leonard Solomon. 1972. "The effects of communicating threats and promises upon the bargaining process." *The Journal of Conflict Resolution* 16 (1): 99-107.
- Cialdini, Robert. 2001 [1984]. *Influence: The Psychology of Persuasion*. Revised Edition. New York: HarperCollins.
- Donohue, William A., and Closepet N. Ramesh. 1992. "Negotiator-Opponent Relationships." In *Communication and Negotiation*, ed. by Linda L. Putnam, and Michael E. Roloff, 209-232. London: Sage.

- Gavins, Joanna. 2007. *Text World Theory: An Introduction*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Goffman, Erving. 1967. *Interaction Ritual: Essays on Face-to-Face Behavior*. Garden City, N.Y.: Anchor Books.
- Greenstone, James L. 2005. *The Elements of Police Hostage and Crisis Negotiations: Critical Incidents and How to Respond to Them*. New York: The Haworth Press, Inc.
- Hammer, Mitchell R. 2007. *Saving Lives. The S.A.F.E. Model for Resolving Hostage and Crisis Incidents*. Oxford: Westport, Conn., Praeger Security International.
- Haugh, Michael. 2011. "Humour, face and im/politeness in getting acquainted." In *Situated Politeness*, ed. by Bethan L. Davies, Michael. Haugh, and Andrew J. Merrison, 165-186. London: Continuum.
- Ireland, Carol A. 2012. "Application of mental illness and cognitive impairment to the critical incident: considerations and implications." In *Conflict and Crisis Communication: Principles and Practice*, ed. by Carol A. Ireland, Martin Fisher, and Gregory M. Vecchi, 75-92. London: Routledge.
- Jones, Tricia S. 2006. "Emotion in Mediation: Implications, Applications, Opportunities, and Challenges." In *The Blackwell Handbook of Mediation: Bridging Theory, Research, and Practice*, ed. by Margaret S. Hermann, 277-306. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.
- Kolb, Deborah, and Judith Williams. 2001. *The Shadow Negotiation: How Women Can Master the Hidden Agendas That Determine Bargaining Success*. London and New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Leech, Geoffrey. 1983. *Principles of Pragmatics*. London and New York: Longman.
- Lester, D. (1997). "The Role of Shame in Suicide." *Suicide and Life-Threatening Behavior* 27 (4): 352-361.

- Lyndsay, Mark, and David Lester. 2004. *Suicide by Cop: Committing Suicide by Provoking Police to Shoot You*. Amityville, NY: Baywood Publishing Company.
- McMains, Michael J., and Wayman C. Mullins. 2014. *Crisis Negotiations: Managing Critical Incidents and Hostage Situations in Law Enforcement and Corrections*. Fifth edition. Oxon: Routledge.
- Pain, Jean. 2009. *Not Just Talking: Conversational Analysis, Harvey Sacks' Gift to Therapy*. London: Karnac Books.
- Putnam, Linda L., and Michael E. Roloff. 1992. "Communication Perspectives on Negotiation." In *Communication and Negotiation*, ed. by Linda L. Putnam, and Michael E. Roloff, 1-17. London: SAGE Publications.
- Slatkin, Arthur A. 2015. *Crisis Negotiation for Law Enforcement, Corrections, and Emergency Services: Crisis Intervention as Crisis Negotiation*. Springfield, Illinois: Charles C. Thomas Publisher Ltd.
- Strentz, Thomas. 2013. *Hostage/Crisis Negotiations: Lessons Learned from the Bad, the Mad, and the Sad*. Springfield, Illinois: Charles C. Thomas Publisher Ltd.
- Strentz, Thomas. 2012. *Psychological Aspects of Crisis Negotiation*. Second Edition. London and New York: CRC Press.
- Taylor, Paul J. 2002. "A cylindrical model of communication behaviour in crisis negotiations." *Human Communication Research* 28: 7-48.
- Tangney, June P. 1996. "Conceptual and Methodological Issues in the Assessment of Shame and Guilt." *Behavioral Research and Therapy* 34: 741-754.
- Ting-Toomey, Stella. 1988. "Intercultural conflict styles: A face-negotiation theory." In *Theories in intercultural communication*, ed. by Young Y. Kim, and William B. Gudykunst, 213-237. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Ting-Toomey, Stella, and John G. Oetzel. 2001. *Managing Intercultural Conflict Effectively*.

London: Sage Publications.

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 (5): 533-551.

Voutilainen, Liisa. 2012. "Responding to Emotion in Cognitive Psychotherapy." In *Emotion*

in Interaction, ed. by Anssi Peräkylä, and Marja-Leena Sorjonen, 235-254. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Werth, Paul. 1999. *Text Worlds: Representing Conceptual Space in Discourse*. London:

Longman.