

# **Adjusting the design of directives to the activity environment – imperatives in Finnish cooking club interaction<sup>1</sup>**

Liisa Raevaara

University of Helsinki & Institute for the Languages of Finland

## *Abstract*

This chapter examines the design of directives in Finnish conversation in the specific institutional setting of cooking club meetings held in a youth club. During these meetings, children bake pastries and a teacher supervises them, organising activities and giving the children instructions and advice. This chapter focuses on the teacher's verbal directives. More specifically, the analysis examines imperatively formatted directives, but also compares the activity environments in which imperatives and other directive formats are used, especially second-person declaratives. This choice of these different formats is discussed as well as the specific design features of the imperatively formatted turns, exploring how they are adjusted to the progress and temporality of the ongoing actions as well as to the emerging participation framework.

---

<sup>1</sup> I am grateful to Elizabeth Couper-Kuhlen, Marja-Leena Sorjonen and Trine Heinemann for their thoughtful comments and careful reading of the earlier drafts of this paper. I also wish to thank all fellow contributors of this volume for their valuable feedback throughout the preparation of the chapter. I carried out this study while employed by the Finnish Centre of Excellence in Research on Intersubjectivity in Interaction at the University of Helsinki (Academy of Finland grant no. 284595) and by the Institute for the Languages of Finland.

*Key words*

imperative, second-person declarative, Finnish, instruction, participation, timing, embodied action, adult–child interaction, Conversation Analysis

## **1. Introduction**

This chapter examines a teacher's use of imperatively formatted directives during cooking club meetings for children. To place the present investigation of imperatives in a wider context, directives with other designs will also be discussed, especially ones that are constructed as second-person declaratives. This chapter explores and discusses how the formulation of the directives is adjusted to and reflexively constructs the activity environment in which the turn is presented. The extracts analysed reveal that when a teacher designs her directives, she orients to the progress of ongoing multimodal activities, to the temporality and trajectories of the recipients' verbal and embodied actions in space, and to the emerging participation framework.

The term *directive* has been used to characterise a range of social actions that attempt to effect a change in the activity of others (see, e.g., Searle 1976; Erving-Tripp 1976; Goodwin 2006; Goodwin and Cekaite 2013, 2014; Stevanovic and Svennevig 2015). Many recent conversation

analytic studies have investigated the role of different types of directive actions and their varied linguistic realisations in the organisation of interlocutors' collaborative activities. These studies have examined the speakers' local entitlements to perform directives and the contingencies that affect the recipients' performing the nominated actions as locally constructed and negotiated dimensions of action (Antaki and Kent 2012; Craven and Potter 2010; Curl and Drew 2008; Heinemann 2006; Lindström 2005; Keisanen and Rauniomaa 2012). Studies have also focused on the dimensions of the directive situation, such as who benefits from the nominated action (Couper-Kuhlen 2014; Clayman and Heritage 2014; Rossi 2012, 2015), how the work and agency is distributed between the participants (for instance, in different tasks, guidance, and execution) (Couper-Kuhlen and Etelämäki 2014, 2015; Enfield 2014), and how the action nominated by the directive is related to the ongoing activity and the recipient's current situation (Rossi 2012, 2015; Wootton 1997, 2005; Zinken and Ogiemann 2011, 2013). (See also Drew and Couper-Kuhlen 2014a.)

Studies on the use of imperative forms in directives have reported that imperatives indicate a speaker's local entitlement to make the request and they display that she/he treats the request as easily granted (Antaki and Kent 2012; Craven and Potter 2010; Lindström 2005). It has also been observed that the imperative form is employed when the proposed action benefits both the speaker and the recipient and contributes to their joint project. The use of imperatives is warranted by the recipient's prior

commitment to or engagement in this joint project or goal. Often this means that the action nominated by the directive is compatible and continuous with what the recipient is currently doing (Rossi 2012, 2015; Wootton 1997, 2005; Zinken and Ogiermann 2011, 2013). Recent studies that focus on practical actions to be completed immediately have demonstrated how participants also formulate directive turns to adjust to the temporality and temporal organisation of their ongoing activities in space. The use of the imperative form displays an orientation to an immediate task and indicates a pressing or urgent need for the nominated action. (See, e.g., Mondada 2013, 2014a; Goodwin and Cekaite 2013, 2014.)

The cooking club meetings analysed in this study may be characterised as situations in which the teacher is entitled as well as obligated to direct the children. Her task is to organise the activities, to apportion the work, and to give the children instructions. This involves instructing them on how the cooking projects will or should proceed and how to perform the different tasks and activities involved in the projects. When adults and children interact, non-compliance is common and when adults present directives, they often exploit different types of strategies to secure compliance (e.g., Goodwin 2006; Goodwin and Cekaite 2013, 2014; Kent 2012; also Stevanovic this volume). However, the situation in this cooking club is different. The children have joined the club voluntarily and willingly and they are keen to perform the tasks that the teacher assigns

them. The teacher also recurrently encourages the children to do their work individually.

In this setting, most of the actions requested through the teacher's use of directives contribute to activities that may be described as shared, that benefit both the teacher and the recipient and that they are both committed to. But contrary to everyday adult–adult interactions, the teacher does not request help from the recipient in order to advance the activity (cf. Drew and Couper-Kuhlen 2014b:2). Rather, through her directives, the teacher helps the recipient to perform the nominated actions and tasks that contribute to the ongoing activities. These are actions and tasks that the recipient is willing to undertake, but not necessarily capable of performing by herself.

In this type of situation, the selection of alternative directive forms and the recipients' responses to them reflect an orientation to the participants' entitlements and obligations in the overall event but also, or even primarily, to the local activity environment. The main objective of this chapter is to demonstrate that the choice between the most common forms used by the teacher, namely the imperative and the declarative, as well as the detailed design features of the imperatively formatted turns, are all related to the local, situated management of 1) the progress of the ongoing multimodal activities, 2) the emerging participation framework (cf. C. Goodwin 2000, 2007; Goodwin and Goodwin 2004), and especially 3) the temporality and trajectories of recipients' verbal and embodied actions in space (cf. Mondada 2013, 2014a, 2014b, this volume).

## 2. Data

The data for this chapter consist of two cooking club meetings conducted in a youth club in Helsinki. They are part of a larger database that I collected for my study on adolescent language practices (see Sorjonen, Rouhikoski, and Lehtonen 2015). The youth club was open to all the youngsters living in the neighbourhood. The adolescents were predominantly only hanging out and playing games, but the youth club workers also arranged additional organised activities for them, such as the cooking club. The cooking club meetings that this study focuses on had participants who were 10–12-year-old girls, with one of the youth club workers acting as a teacher. While recording the data, I also occasionally helped to advise the children.

The data (two meetings, each lasting approximately 1 h 30 min.) contain 233 verbal directives by a teacher. They are turns through which the teacher tells the recipient(s) to perform some practical action here and now. Directive actions can also be accomplished solely through bodily means (Rossi 2014, 2015:31–67; Mondada 2014b), but these types of directives are not discussed in this study, even though this chapter will examine the coordination of verbal and embodied resources in constructing directive actions.

In this study, I use the term *directive* as a general label to refer to utterances covering diverse turn formats (see Table 1) and implementing a range of directive actions (such as telling, requesting, giving advice, encouraging the recipient(s) to do something, or prohibiting them from doing something). In recent conversation analytic research, the term *request* is more commonly used as a general label for directive actions (e.g., Curl and Drew 2008, Drew and Couper-Kuhlen 2014a; Lindström 2005; Rossi 2012; Zinken and Ogiermann 2013; Wootton 1997, 2005)<sup>2</sup>. However, the term *directive* is preferred particularly in studies that investigate adult–child interactions and interactions in different types of instructional settings and activities (e.g., Goodwin & Cekaite 2013, 2014; Kent 2012; Mondada 2013). For this reason the term is also adopted in the present study (see also the chapters by Lindström et al., Mondada, Rauniomaa and Stevanovic in this volume). Many studies that analyse interaction in different types of educational and teaching environments favour the term *instruction* (see, e.g., De Stefani and Gazin 2014; Lindwall, Lymer, and Greiffenhagen 2015; Mondada 2014b, d). In my data, most of the teacher's directives are turns that involve her telling the recipient to perform an action and also offering information, verbally and/or bodily, on how to do it (see also Goodwin

---

<sup>2</sup> There are also studies that distinguish requests from directives and use the terms with a narrower meaning. For example, Craven and Potter (2010) and Zinken and Ogiermann (2011) describe directives as actions that claim strong entitlement and do not treat non-compliance as a possible response, while requests display orientation to the possible contingencies in performing the requested action.

2007), and therefore they could also be characterised as instructions. This does not, however, apply to all the teacher's directives in my data.

Table 1 displays the different grammatical forms that the teacher uses in her directives. Declaratives that contain a modal verb are used differently than those without one, referred to here as simple declaratives, and consequently they have been separated in the table. Most of the declaratives are in the second-person singular or plural form, but other person forms are sometimes also used, as can be seen in the table.

<b>Grammatical form</b>	<b>Frequency</b>
Imperatives	63 (27 %)
Declaratives Modal-verb declaratives (n=67) 2 <sup>nd</sup> -person forms (n=54), 3 <sup>rd</sup> -person forms (n=3), zero-person forms (n=10) Simple declaratives (n=57) 2 <sup>nd</sup> -person forms (n=42), 1 <sup>st</sup> -person plural forms (n=12), 3 <sup>rd</sup> -person forms (n=3)	124 (53 %)
Interrogatives	7 (3 %)
Phrasal formats	39 (17 %)
<b>Total</b>	<b>233 (100 %)</b>

**Table 1.** Alternative grammatical forms of the teacher's verbal directives

The imperatives examined in this chapter are morphological imperatives, which are clause-formatted directives with the predicate verb in the imperative form. Imperative verb forms do not have marking for person, or tense, or modality (see, e.g., Lauranto 2014).

In the data analysed, the most frequent form is the declarative, but imperatives are also commonly used. I will focus on the teacher's use of these two most frequent directive formats. The comparison between the



imperative and declarative cases aims to discover the kinds of dimensions of action the teacher orients to when she selects the imperative form. This chapter also explores some design features in imperative turns, such as turn-initial particles, as a resource for adjusting the turn to the specific features of the current situation. I will demonstrate that the design of the teacher's directives displays orientation to the progressivity and temporality of the ongoing activities as well as to the emerging participation framework. The teacher adopts imperatively formatted directives to manage recipients' actions that are already in progress in contexts where the participation framework is clear (section 3). By contrast, declaratively formatted directives are used to initiate a new activity or action in contexts where a need arises to re-arrange, or attend to the participation (section 4).

### **3. Imperatives – managing recipient's actions that are already under way**

The choice of the imperative form displays the teacher's orientation to the temporal progress of the recipient's actions. Imperatives are most commonly used when the recipient of the directive has already initiated some practical embodied action and the teacher tells her to modify her way of performing an action she is already engaged in (cf. Zinken and Deppermann this volume). The use of the imperative form adjusts the directive to and

constructs a context where the relevant relationship between the teacher and the recipient already prevails, established through their joint orientation to or engagement in the ongoing activity (cf. Goodwin 2007; Goodwin 2006).

In extract 1, one of the girls participating in the cooking club, Sara, is trying to cut the greaseproof paper. The teacher, Heli in the transcripts, advises her verbally and also demonstrates bodily how to do it.<sup>3</sup>

(1) [M1<sup>4</sup>, Kotus h0104]

01 Heli: tuo↑hon, \*(0.4) sit ota-t kiinni ja,  
DEM2-LOC-ILL then take-SG2 hold and  
there, (0.4) then [you] take a hold and,

02 Heli: \*CUTS THE PAPER A BIT TO SHOW HOW TO DO IT

03 Sara: ° (- -) °=

=> Heli: =**tuu** **tälle** **puolelle?**  
come-IMP-SG2 DEM1-ALL side-ALL  
come to this side?

05 (1.0) SARA CHANGES POSITION, STANDS IN FRONT OF  
HELI, HER BACK TOWARDS HER

06 Heli: +ja sit ota-t kiinni ja sitte< [just  
and then take-SG2 hold and then right  
and then you take a hold and then<

07 Sara: [↑au<

08 Sara: +TAKES HOLD OF THE PAPER, TRIES TO CUT; THE PAPER RIPS

---

<sup>3</sup> The embodied activities are transcribed using a simplified version of the system developed by Mondada (see, e.g., 2014a). Embodied activities are indicated in capitals. The signs \* and + indicate the moment when the embodied action begins in relation to the verbal turn. Furthermore, Fig indicates a screen shot, and # signals the moment at which it has been taken.

<sup>4</sup> M1 and M2 refer to the two meetings of the data collection. In M1, the participants were the youth club worker Heli, two girls, Ella and Sara, and myself as a researcher. In M2, the participants were Heli, four girls, Ella, Sara, Nina, and Tiia, and myself. All names are pseudonyms.

09 Heli: ↑e[i haittaa, ] (.)  
 NEG-SG3 matter-INF  
 it doesn't matter (.)

10 Sara: [ °ɛm::ɛ heh° ]

11 Heli: #\*sä voit vetää siitä korjata<  
 you can-SG2 pull-INF DEM3-ELA fix-INF  
 you can pull there fix it

12 Heli: \*CUTS THE PAPER A BIT, FIXES THE RIP  
 #fig1

13 (0.5) SARA CUTS THE PAPER BY RIPPING IT

=> Heli: #\***paina, (.) tavallaa alaspäin sitä;**  
 press-IMP-SG2 in.a.way downward DEM3-PAR  
 press it, like downward;

15 Heli: \*SHOWS HOW TO PRESS THE PAPER  
 #fig2

16 (2.0) SARA GOES ON RIPPING THE PAPER



Figure 1



Figure 2

Heli places the greaseproof paper roll on the edge of the table and cuts it a little in order to demonstrate to Sara how it should be done (line 2). Sara takes hold of the paper from the front, but Heli instructs her to first come to the side of the table where she herself is standing (line 4). After changing her position, Sara tries to cut the paper, but it rips (line 8). While presenting a reassuring comment to Sara (line 9), Heli cuts the paper slightly in order to repair the rip (line 11). During her attempt to repair it, Sara continues to

hold on to the paper with her hand (see figure 1). Then Sara proceeds to cut the paper by ripping it (see figure 2). Next, Heli tells Sara to press the paper downwards (line 14) and thereby change how she is currently performing the action. Simultaneously, Heli demonstrates how to press it (see figure 2). Nonetheless, Sara continues ripping the paper (line 16), and Heli allows her to do so.

Heli employs imperatively formatted directives when she instructs Sara to change her position (line 4) and when she advises her to press the paper instead of ripping it (line 14). By using these directives, Heli tells Sara to change her way of performing the action she has already initiated and is currently engaged in. At the moment when the imperatively formatted directive is presented, the relevant relationship between Heli and Sara already prevails. Before the extract, Sara has announced that she is unable to cut the greaseproof paper, and Heli has promised to help her and show her how to do it. After verbally establishing their relationship as the instructor and the person to be instructed, this participation framework is also ratified and sustained bodily, through Heli's hands-on guidance (cf. Goodwin 2007). In addition, immediately before the imperatives are uttered, a problem arises with Sara accomplishing the ongoing action or advancing it (Sara tries to cut the paper, but on the wrong side; the paper rips when Sara tries to cut it), which makes relevant the instruction, realising the teacher's position as the instructor (see also Stevanovic this volume; Rauniomaa this volume).

Imperative directives are also utilised as go-ahead directives (see also Zinken and Deppermann this volume). This means that they are used to tell the recipient to proceed with an action that she has already announced verbally (extract 2) or which she has expressed bodily without yet having accomplished it (see extract 3). Extract 2 features girls who are taking their baked pastries and packing them into paper bags to take home. Heli tells the girls that if they want, they can use two bags, one inside the other. Sara looks at and touches the greasy blotches on her bag and announces that she wants another bag (line 4).

(2) [M2, Kotus h0120]

01 Heli: siihev voi laittaa ↑toisen semmosen päälle  
 [one] can put another such [bag] on top

02 jos haluaa ku sielt tulee sitä rasvaa läpi.  
 if [one] wants because the grease comes through.

03 (0.9) SARA LOOKS AT HER PAPER BAG

04 Sara: mä haluan toisen [°päälle°].  
 I want another on top

=> Heli: [ \***ota** +**sieltä**, (.)  
 take-IMP-SG2 DEM3-ABL  
 take from there, (.)

06 Heli: \*POINTS WITH HER FINGER

07 Sara: +TURNS TO THE POINTED  
 DIRECTION

08 Heli: se on siinä  
 DEM3 is DEM3-INE  
 it is there

09 Tiian, (.) siinä keskimmäisessä ne pussit ni;  
 NAME-GEN DEM3-INE middle.one-INE DEM3-PL bag-PL PRT  
 Tiia's, (.) there in the middle one the bags so;

Here, Heli uses the imperatively formatted directive (line 5) to prompt Sara to accomplish the action that she has just stated a wish to do. In addition, the directive offers information that helps her perform the action. At the moment when Heli begins her verbal turn, she also begins a pointing gesture (line 6) that indicates where to find the bags; and after the imperative utterance (line 5: *ota sieltä* 'take from there'), Heli continues her turn with a verbal description of the location (lines 8 and 9). Sara already begins to move in the indicated direction (line 7) after the imperatively formatted verb (*ota* 'take') in Heli's turn.

Imperatively formatted go-ahead directives prompt the recipient to perform an action that she has conveyed a desire or willingness to do. As a result, the directive grants her permission to accomplish the action. In my data, however, generally these types of go-ahead imperatives also offer information on how to carry out the action. This can occur verbally and/or through accompanying embodied action, as in extract 2. This means that the go-ahead directives are simultaneously, or even primarily, working as instructions. (See also Zinken and Deppermann this volume; Heinemann and Steensig this volume; Sorjonen this volume.)

The imperatively formatted directive in extract 2 (lines 5, 6, 8 and 9) is employed to advance an action that a recipient has verbally committed herself to, in announcing that she wants to take another paper bag. But the more common usage of imperatively formatted directives is to modify or to

advance an embodied action by the recipient that is already in progress (see extract 1).

### *3.1 Indicating an immediate need for the nominated action*

One set of situations where imperatively formatted directives are used can be characterised as time-critical (cf. Mondada 2013, 2014a). *Time-critical* is used here in the sense that the directive (such as *varo sitä levyä* 'be careful with the tray') is presented so as to avoid a serious consequence (such as touching a hot baking tray) that the recipient's current course of action could cause. The use of the imperative form in these situations is both warranted by and indicates the necessity of urgent compliance. The imperative is a means of adjusting the design of the directive to the type of context where even a short delay in the nominated action may prove to be fatal. (Cf. Mondada this volume; Rauniomaa this volume.)

However, imperatively formatted directives are also commonly adopted in situations where a delay in the nominated action would not cause serious or even problematic consequences. For example, in extract 1, there was no need to hurry to the other side or to rush in pressing the greaseproof paper. In these situations, the imperative form, lacking a tense marking, indicates a tight temporal linkage – immediacy – between the directive and the recipient's action at that very moment and displays orientation to the

immediate task (cf. Mondada this volume). Thus, the imperative form works as a means of adjusting the design of the directive to a situation where the targeted action is already in progress and there has arisen a problem in its execution – and which is in that sense time-critical.

Besides the use of the imperative form, specific design features in the imperative turns can also be used to indicate or highlight that the situation is time-critical. The syntactic brevity and fast tempo of the turn invoke an implication of urgency and display that the nominated action is overdue and should already be in progress (cf. Mondada this volume; Zinken and Deppermann this volume). Before extract 3, Ella has been spreading the topping on the cake, but she is now about to finish the task. A moment before (not seen in the extract), Heli has urged her to hurry because the topping hardens quickly so that the sprinkles might no longer be able to stick to it. In line 1, Heli informs Sara that she can now spread the sprinkles on top.

(3) [M1, Kotus h0110]

```
01 Heli: nyt voi Sara, (.) levittää jo nonparelleja
        now can-SG3 NAME spread-INF already sprinkles-PAR
        now can Sara, (.) already spread sprinkles

02      siihe +kes>kelle<.
        there in the middle.

03 Sara:      +TAKES HOLD OF THE SPRINKLE JAR

04      (1.5) SARA OPENS THE LID OF THE JAR

05 Heli: tai siihen, (0.4) päälle.
```



or there, (0.4) on top.

- 06 (2.0) ELLA LOOKS AT THE KNIFE SHE HAS USED FOR SPREADING THE TOPPING
- 07 Ella: £>mitä mä< tälle +teen;£  
what do I do with this;
- 08 Sara: +HOLDS THE JAR OUT OVER THE CAKE
- 09 Heli: #+no sä voit vaikka nuo:lla s[e;  
PRT you can-SG2 for.example lick-INF DEM3-ACC  
well you can for example lick it
- 10 Sara: +HOLDS THE JAR OVER THE CAKE WITHOUT POURING  
#fig3
- 11 Sara: [+a:i  
PRT
- 12 Sara: +GLANCES AT ELLA
- 13 (1.8) SARA LOOKS AT HELI, SHAKES THE JAR WITHOUT POURING
- => Heli: #>levi+tä<?  
spread-IMP-sg2  
spread  
#fig4
- 15 Sara: +CONTINUES SHAKING THE JAR AND POURING OUT THE SPRINKLES
- 16 (1.4) SARA POURS THE SPRINKLES
- 17 Sara: joka <pualelle>.  
all over.
- 18 Heli: mm:;



Figure 3



Figure 4

After Heli has informed Sara that she can now spread the sprinkles (line 1), Sara immediately takes the sprinkle jar and opens it (lines 3 and 4). She holds the jar over the cake (line 8) and shakes it slightly, but does not yet turn it to pour the sprinkles onto the topping (line 10; see figure 3). At the same time, Ella has finished spreading the topping and asks what she should do with the knife she has used, and Heli answers her (lines 6–9). This means that Heli’s attention is momentarily directed to Ella and this leads Sara to hesitate continuing with her current action, which entails spreading the sprinkles on the topping. As she continues to shake the jar without pouring out the sprinkles, Sara solicits confirmation by gazing at Heli (line 13). Heli re-orientes to Sara and utters an imperatively formatted turn that instructs Sara to proceed with spreading the sprinkles (line 14; see figure 4). Heli’s turn consists of only the predicate verb in the imperative form, which is pronounced at a fast tempo. Here, not only the choice of grammatical form but also the syntactic brevity and fast tempo of Heli’s turn indicate, in an iconic way, the urgency of the nominated action and the fact that it should already be underway. Sara also orients to this urgency by initiating the complying action immediately, before Heli’s short turn is completed (line 15). The particular syntactic shape and delivery of the directive turn expressing urgency also construct the directive as an instructive one, rather than as a permissive one (cf. Zinken and Deppermann this volume; also Heinemann and Steensig this volume; Sorjonen this volume).

### *3.2 Elaborating on the imperative turn: managing the temporality of the nominated action*

The immediacy evoked by the imperative form may be enhanced through the brevity of a turn, as in in extract 3, but also revoked or overruled through the elaboration of a turn. Directives that are formulated as imperatives typically have the imperative verb in the initial position. In other words, the element that both marks the turn format as imperative and nominates the required action is presented immediately, as the first element of the turn. This turn design occurs when the situation calls for swift compliance with a nominated action. This is also reflected in the timing of the embodied responses to imperatively formatted directives, as they are generally initiated after the imperative verb is uttered and before the directive is finished (Mondada this volume). Swift compliance occurs even when the nominated action is not urgent (see, for example, extract 2, line 7).

However, in a few cases in the data, the imperative verb does not occur in the initial position, but instead the turn begins with the particle *sitten* 'then' or the particle chain *no niin* 'well okay', 'well now'. These turn-initial particles delay the occurrence of the imperative verb and consequently work as a means to manage the temporality of the nominated action. One of these cases is presented in extract 4, which also reveals how participants in particular adjust their use of the imperative not only to the progress and temporality of the recipient's actions, but to the progress and

temporality of the ongoing joint activity, which is constructed through the coordination of their actions.

(4) [M1, Kotus h0110]

- 01 Sara: [saanks mäki:n sekottaa. ]  
[can I also mix ]  
[ ]
- 02 Heli: [\*mä voin kaataa sulle kah]via kun nos↑ta-t, >joo  
I can-SG1 pour you-ALL coffee-PAR when lift-SG2 PRT  
I can pour you coffee while you lift, yeah >you
- 03 Heli: \*MOVES TOWARDS THE BOWL WITH A COFFEE POT IN HAND
- => te voitte vuorotella<;\*nosta sitä lusikkaa  
you-PL can-PL2 take-turns lift-IMP-SG2 DEM3-PAR spoon-PAR  
you can take turns; lift the spoon
- 05 Heli: \*STOPS MOVING THE POT
- => Heli: +ylemm↑äs vähä, (0.4) \*sil<sup>lee</sup> et siel pysyy kahvi.  
a little more upwards, (0.4) so that the coffee stays there
- 07 Ella: +LIFTS THE SPOON
- 08 Heli: \*STARTS TO ANGLE THE POT TO POUR
- 09 (3.0) HELI STARTS TO POUR COFFEE INTO THE BOWL
- 10 Heli: \*yks, (0.4) \*\* (suunnillee) kaks, \*\*\*°kolme°  
one, (0.4) (about) two three
- 11 Heli: \*POURS \*\*POURS \*\*\*POURS
- 12 (0.5)
- => Heli: \*no niin kokeileppas nytte +sekottaa;=  
PRT PRT try-IMP-2SG-CLI now mix-INF  
all right try now to mix
- 14 Heli: \*STRAIGHTENS HER BACK
- 15 Ella: +STARTS TO MIX

At this point, the girls are preparing the cake topping. They have added all the dry ingredients to the bowl, and now it is time to pour coffee into the mix. During this activity, Heli also participates. Sara stands behind Ella, watching as Ella holds the bowl and continues to mix the dry ingredients with a spoon. While moving towards the bowl with the coffee pot in her hand (line 3), Heli begins to tell Ella what is going to happen next by using a division of labour construction that consists of a speaker's commitment to perform an action as well as a directive to the recipient to perform a complementary action (Couper-Kuhlen and Etelämäki 2014). The teacher first describes her part (line 2: *mä voin kaataa sulle kahvia*, 'I can pour you coffee'), but as she proceeds to Ella's task (line 2: *kun nostat*, 'when [you] lift'), she interrupts the utterance in order to answer Sara's question (line 1; lines 2 and 4). In the division of labour construction, Heli refers to Ella's task by using a declarative form (line 2: *nosta-t* 'lift-SG2'), describing the next action that Ella is to perform (see section 4.3). However, when the teacher returns to this task after answering Sara, she uses an imperative form (line 4: *nosta* 'lift-IMP-SG2'). The change of the verb form is adjusted to the progress of the ongoing joint project. While presenting the division of labour construction (line 2), Heli is still moving towards the bowl with the coffee pot in her hand (line 3). Accordingly, the next step in the joint activity consists of the actions by Heli and Ella, which are nominated in the construction. But after Heli answers Sara's question, her part of the activity progresses. She is already about to pour the coffee into the bowl and has to

interrupt the progress of her action (line 5), because Ella's spoon is in the way. At this moment, the action nominated by the imperative, lifting the spoon, is no longer the next step, but rather an action that should already be under way in the ongoing joint activity.

After adding coffee to the bowl, Heli instructs Ella to mix the ingredients (line 13). In addition, Heli utters an imperatively formatted directive. Meanwhile, the recipient of the turn has been waiting with a spoon in her hand, ready to continue her task of mixing the ingredients. This means that the turn works as a go-ahead directive that informs the recipient that she should restart the action she is already engaged in. Furthermore, the use of the imperative form is adjusted to this dimension of the activity environment and reflects it. However, Heli's turn includes elements that are somewhat rare in imperatively formatted directives and that elaborate the turn and the time it takes to present it (cf. the imperative turn in extract 3). These elements manage the temporal progress of the ongoing activity, overrule the indication of urgency evoked by the imperative form, and construct a context in which there is no hurry to perform the proposed action.

The elements are also particularly suited to manage the temporality of the action nominated by the turn. Heli's directive begins with the turn-initial particle chain *no niin* 'well okay' or 'well now', which is commonly used to mark a transition to the next, often expected action or activity (Raevaara 1989). This particle chain delays the imperative verb. In addition,

the particle chain *no niin* and the particle *nytte* 'now', which is also included in the turn, explicitly express how the prompted action is related to the progress of the ongoing activity and to the recipient's current situation. These particles mark the directive as a turn that accomplishes a transition to the next action. By indexing the transition, the particles loosen the tight temporal linkage between the turn and the immediate present, the right-now moment, indicated by the imperative form. Here, the teacher also employs a verb chain (*kokeilep-pas*<sup>5</sup> *sekottaa* 'try-CLI to mix') and, through this formulation, prompts the recipient to just begin and try to perform the action. This, in addition to the other above-mentioned features, constructs a context in which there is no hurry to perform and complete the nominated action.

In extract (4), the recipient begins her embodied response, mixing the ingredients, just before the required action is specified (line 15). This shows that she treats the teacher's turn as a go-ahead directive, telling her to restart the action she has been ready to perform. Although the recipient here begins her response before the directive is completed, the launching of the response may not be characterisable as being early, but rather as being late,

---

<sup>5</sup> The teacher's turn also includes the clitic *-pas*. Stevanovic (in this volume) reveals that during violin lessons, the teacher uses directives that include the imperative verb + clitic *-pas* in transitions from one activity to another. Stevanovic also argues that in these cases, the temporal linkage between the directive and the realisation of the nominated action is not as tight as in the instances of the imperative without the clitic *-pas*. In line with this, likewise here the clitic *-pas* seems to work together with the particle chain *no niin* as a transition marker that loosens the tight temporal linkage between the directive and the required action and neutralises any indication of urgency that is invoked by the imperative.

in comparison to the timing of the other embodied responses to the go-ahead imperative turns in the data (see, for example, extract 2, line 7; extract 3, line 15).

Extract 5 illustrates another instance in which Heli begins her imperative turn (line 5) with the turn-initial particle chain *no niin* and also elaborates her turn with an explicit reference to the recipient (*sää Nina* 'you Nina'). By using this turn design, Heli adjusts her directive to the features of the current situation. These features are related to the temporal progress of the targeted action and the configuration of participation. Nina has finished preparing her star-shaped pastry, and while still arguing (lines 1 and 3) with Tiia, who is sitting beside her, she stands up (line 2). She then begins taking the pastry into her hand so that she can put it on the baking tray (line 4; see figure 5). The tray is just outside the video frame, on the left.

(5) [M2, Kotus, h0114]

01 Nina: kaikkie omilla +sä teit [ton,  
with all of your own ones you did that,  
[

02 Nina: +STANDS UP [

03 Tiia: [e:-ih vaa +↑iha #omil↓la,  
no but with my very own,

04 Nina: + TAKES HER PASTRY  
#fig5

=> Heli: >no< nii pistä sää, (.) #+Nina tonne nurkkaa  
PRT PRT put-IMP-SG2 you [NAME] DEM2.LOC-ILL corner-ILL  
all right you Nina put [it] there into the corner

06 Nina: +BEGINS TO MOVE TOWARDS THE  
TRAY



#fig6

07 Heli: **sitte** ↑**se**, (0.4) **siihe**;  
then DEM3-ACC DEM3.LOC-ILL  
it then, (0.3) there

08 Nina: \*mä kirjotan tähä.<sup>6</sup>  
I'll write here

09 ni: \*TAKES A PENCIL FROM THE TABLE

=> Heli: joo-o, (0.5) **pistä** **vähä** **sinne** **reunempaa**  
PRT put-IMP-SG2 a.bit DEM3.LOC-ALL side-COMPA-ILL  
yeah, (0.5) put it a bit closer to the side

11 et kato se<sup>7</sup>, (.) mahtuu ↑mahollisimma paljo  
that look.PRT DEM3 have.room-SG3 possible-SUP much  
so that y' see it, (.) there is room for as many [pastries] as possible on the

12 samaa.  
same-PAR  
same [tray]

(0.5)

13 Heli: pitää aina miettiä nii;  
must always think-INF so  
[one] must always think so



Figure 5



Figure 6

Heli is standing beside the baking tray and uses an imperatively formatted directive to tell Nina to place the pastry in the corner of the tray (lines 5 and

---

<sup>6</sup> The girls have written their names on the greaseproof paper beside their pastries so as to identify them after the pastries have been baked in the oven.

<sup>7</sup> It seems that Heli is making a self-correction here. She begins to say something about Nina's pastry (*et kato se* 'so that it'), but then, instead, presents her statement as a piece of more general advice.

7). As in the previous extracts, at the moment the directive is presented, the recipient has already initiated the proposed action. This temporal linkage is reflected in the speaker selecting an imperative form. However, when Heli begins her turn, Nina is still standing beside the table, relatively far from the baking tray (see lines 3–7 and figure 5). Heli adjusts the emerging formulation of her directive according to the progress of the action targeted by the directive and to its temporality in space (cf. Mondada this volume; Sorjonen and Raevaara 2014). But the imperatively formatted directive used by Heli does not tell the recipient to change the trajectory of her current action; instead, it manages the trajectory "on-line". By elaborating the imperative turn through the turn-initial particle chain *no niin* (line 5), the explicit reference to the recipient (*sää* (.) *Nina* 'you Nina'; line 5), the particle *sitte* 'then' (line 7), and the evolving references to the target position (*tonne nurkkaa* – – *siihe* 'into the corner – – there'; lines 5 and 7), Heli coordinates the temporal progress of her directive with the temporal progress of Nina's action in space: taking the pastry, walking to the baking tray, and placing the pastry on it.<sup>8</sup>

Heli's overt reference to the recipient also adjusts the design of her directive to the emerging participation framework. For most situations that

---

<sup>8</sup> Unfortunately, the baking tray is just outside the video frame on the left and this prevents the viewer from seeing the exact temporal coordination of the end of Heli's turn and the final stage of Nina's embodied action, placing the pastry on the tray. However, the video does show Nina taking the pencil from the table (lines 8–9). At this moment, she will have put the pastry onto the tray.

involve the teacher using imperatively formatted directives to manage the recipient's current action, the relevant relationship between the speech-act participants already prevails, constructed through their current mutual orientation and the coordination of their actions (see extracts 1–4) (cf. Goodwin 2000, 2007; Kendon 1990; Mondada 2009; also Etelämäki and Couper-Kuhlen this volume). In this case, however, Heli is standing rather far from Nina and prior to initiating her directive, Heli is not engaged in Nina's ongoing actions; likewise, Nina is not oriented to Heli (lines 1–4, see figure 5). Thus, the overt reference to the recipient – a rare design feature in imperative turns – reflects an exceptional feature in the activity environment of an imperatively formulated directive: a need to evoke the participant role of the recipient (cf. Etelämäki and Couper-Kuhlen this volume).

Despite Heli's directive, Nina does not place her pastry sufficiently close to the edge of the baking tray. Heli now re-phrases the directive, using an imperatively formatted turn (line 10). At this moment, Nina has already placed her pastry onto the tray and initiated a new action: she is picking up a pencil from the table in order to write her name on the greaseproof paper (see footnotes 6 and 8). By re-using the imperative form and the same verb as in her previous directive (*pistä* 'put', as opposed to, e.g., *siirrä* 'move'), Heli treats Nina's previous action, placing the pastry on the tray, as not yet completed, but as ongoing and in need of modification (cf. Etelämäki and Couper-Kuhlen this volume, example 1). Thus, the design of her directive

not only reflects the temporal organisation of current actions, but also constructs it.

Heli's directive, telling Ella to change the position of her pastry, is accompanied by an account (line 11). This utterance, which is explicitly marked as an account by the particles *et kato* 'so y' see' (line 11) (see Raevaara 2011), offers an explanation as to why the directive should be complied with. After this explanation, Heli further elaborates her turn by using a comment in the zero-person form (line 13). Through this comment, she reformulates her previous directive and the account, which was anchored in the specific situation at hand, as a piece of general advice to be followed in similar situations. Accounts that accompany imperatively formatted directives are not very common in the data,<sup>9</sup> but they are systematically present when the action nominated by the directive is discontinuous with the recipient's own trajectory of action, as seen here. The teacher generally uses imperatively formatted directives to tell the recipient to perform actions that either continue the course of the recipient's current action or are in line with its objective. By adding the account to her directive, the teacher orients to the discontinuity of her directive with what the recipient is currently doing or pursuing and marks her imperatively

---

<sup>9</sup> In the data, 18 out of 63 imperatively formatted directives are accompanied by an account. It is important to mention that 15 of these directives were produced during the second meeting (M2), which had more participants present (see footnote 4). During this meeting, the teacher presented more directives to maintain order, that is, she requested actions that were discontinuous with the recipient's ongoing course of action.

formatted directive as unexpected in the current activity environment. (Cf. Rossi 2012, 2015, this volume; also Zinken and Deppermann this volume.) In addition, the type of account she offers for her directive displays her orientation to her role as a teacher. She appeals to the participants' collective benefit and success in the ongoing activity and explains the conditions for a successful performance in this type of activity in general. In this manner, she evokes her role as one who is obligated and entitled to advance both the participants' personal and collective benefits and their goals.

The particular elements included in the teacher's imperatively formulated directives in extracts 4 and 5, such as the turn-initial particles, the elements referring to the recipient, and the account, all modulate the turn design so that it is tailored to and reflexively constructs a context where the recipient need not be in a hurry to perform the nominated action, where the relevant relation between the speech-act participants does not yet prevail, and where the nominated action is not continuous with the recipient's current line of action. These elements, rarely included in imperative turns, serve to modulate the implications evoked by the imperative form. In so doing these elements indirectly indicate the dimensions of action otherwise invoked by the use of the imperative form.

In the next section, I will briefly examine the activity environments in which the teacher uses directives constructed as declaratives. The comparison between the imperative and declarative cases places the analysis of the imperative turns in a wider context and aims to explore which types

of features in the context the teacher orients to when she selects the declarative format instead of the imperative format. I will show that this choice is also related to the progress of the ongoing activities and the management of the participation framework.

#### **4. Declaratives – initiating new actions**

The most frequent grammatical form used by the teacher in her directives is the declarative form. The declaratives are usually in the second-person singular or plural form, but sometimes third-person and zero-person forms are also used. Furthermore, more than half of the declaratively formatted directives include a modal verb; typically the verb is *voida* 'can'<sup>10</sup> (53 cases out of 67). However, declaratives without a modal verb, referred to here as simple declaratives, are also common. (See Table 1.) Contrary to imperatives, which are used to manage recipient actions that are already in progress, declaratively formatted directives are employed by the teacher to initiate new activities or actions. This often occurs when it is also necessary to re-arrange or otherwise attend to participation.

##### *4.1 Modal-verb declaratives: initiating a new project*

---

<sup>10</sup> The Finnish verb *voida* 'can' has both an epistemic ('be possible') and a deontic ('be allowed') meaning. It can also have a dynamic meaning, referring to capability.

The teacher uses directives formulated as modal-verb declaratives at activity junctures to tell the recipient(s) to perform an action that initiates a new project. The project also requires a re-arrangement of participation; by using the directive, the teacher both nominates the action to be pursued and specifies who should accomplish it. Here, the term *project* refers to a series of actions aiming to achieve a certain goal (cf. Goodwin and Cekaite 2014; Levinson 2013; Linell 1998:217–18; also Rossi this volume). The series of actions that constitute a project in the data aim at fulfilling some practical task, such as spreading the topping on a cake, getting sprinkles from the cupboard, or cleaning the table after baking pastries.

In extract 6, the two girls, Ella and Sara, have begun to prepare a topping for a cake they have baked. Sara has put the butter in the microwave oven to melt it and Ella stands nearby, watching her. Heli has got a bowl for the other ingredients. Sara looks at her, soliciting permission to turn the microwave on. Heli produces a confirmation (line 1) while placing the bowl on the table. She then proceeds to the other side of the table and tells the girls that they can come to put the powdered sugar in the bowl (lines 4 and 7).

(6) [M1, Kotus h0110]

01 Heli: \*>↑juu<  
>↑yeah<

02 Heli: \*NODS LOOKING AT SARA, PLACES THE BOWL ON THE TABLE

03 (1.2) SARA PRESSES THE BUTTON, HELI GOES AROUND THE TABLE

=> Heli: \***ja sit neitiset voi +tulla laittaa**  
and then missy-PL can-3SG come-INF put-3INF  
and then the missies can come to put

05 Heli: \*REACHES HER HAND OUT TOWARDS THE SUGAR PACKAGE ON THE TABLE

06 Ella: +TURNS HER GAZE AT HELI

=> Heli: \***+↑tomusokeria;**  
powdered.sugar-PAR  
↑powdered sugar;

08 Heli: \*TAKES THE PACKAGE

09 Ella: +BEGINS TO MOVE TOWARDS THE TABLE<sup>11</sup>

10 (0.7) HELI BEGINS TO OPEN THE SUGAR PACKAGE

11 Heli: *tää ei varmaan ↑i<sub>h</sub>a:n kokonaan - -*  
this probably not quite the whole package --

With her directive, Heli initiates a new project that consists of a series of actions to be accomplished in a certain temporal order (cf. Goodwin and Cekaite 2014). Simultaneously, she also re-arranges the participation framework by addressing the turn to both girls (*neitiset* 'missies'), summoning Ella to also participate in the next task. Here, the verb chain *tulla laittaa* 'come put' (line 4) indicates a gradual transition to a new project. The transition is also constructed as gradual through Heli's embodied conduct. At the moment she begins the directive, she extends her hand to take the sugar package (line 5), and when completing the turn, she begins to open it (line 10). Only after a moment or so does she hand the

---

<sup>11</sup> At this moment, Sara is behind Heli and therefore not visible in the video.



package to Ella (not seen in the video extract). Thus, her verbal directive occurs simultaneously with her engagement in an embodied activity that prepares the action nominated in the directive, putting powdered sugar in the bowl. In this case, Heli continues her embodied activity beyond the completion of the directive, thus delaying the nominated action and constructing the transition to it as gradual. In addition, the type of embodied activity that accompanies the production of this verbal directive and prepares the nominated action indicates that compliance with the directive and the implementation of the nominated action by the recipient is presupposed and treated as self-evident.

The modal-verb declaratives that initiate new projects contain turn design features that reflect the adjustment of the turn to the particular activity environment it occurs in. The declarative often begins with the particle *sit(ten)* 'then' or *ja sit(ten)* 'and then' as it does here (line 4). These particles mark the directive as a turn that initiates a transition from the previous activity to the next one. In addition, these types of directives always include an overt subject that refers to the recipient(s). This may be a personal pronoun, a name, and/or a category term; in extract 6, it is the category term *neitiset* 'missies'.<sup>12</sup> The overt subject reflects the use of the directive as a turn that also re-arranges the division of labour. It is important to note that an overt subject is not obligatory in Finnish. A subject in

---

<sup>12</sup> When the recipient is referred to by name or by a category term, the declarative may also be in the 3<sup>rd</sup>-person form, as it is here.

Finnish can be expressed by using the inflectional person ending in the predicate verb alone. In fact, second-person declaratives used as directives typically lack an overt subject (e.g., Helasvuoto 2014; also Etelämäki and Couper-Kuhlen this volume). The data under analysis here display variation in how the subject is presented in declaratively formatted directives, and the presence or absence of an overt subject is connected to the ways the directive manages, re-arranges, or sustains the participation framework. This becomes evident particularly when comparing modal-verb declaratives that are used to rearrange the participation and that contain an overt subject with the use and design of simple declaratives (see section 4.3).

When a modal-verb declarative is used to initiate a new project, the modal verb is always *voida* 'can' (such as *sä voit ottaa täältä kaksi teelusikallista* 'you can take from here two teaspoonfuls'). But the use of this verb, which indexes possibility, does not convey that compliance is optional. On the contrary, these turns are treated as directives to be complied with; in the data, they are not responded to with refusals, and if compliance is delayed, the teacher re-does the directive. In addition, when the teacher produces such a verbal directive, she often also engages in bodily action, which prepares the action nominated in the directive. By accompanying the verbal directive with this kind of bodily action, she anticipates the implementation of the action requested and treats the recipient's compliance as self-evident (as in extract 6). Instead of displaying that compliance is optional, the indication of possibility – evoked by the verb *voida* 'can' – is

related to the temporal progression of the ongoing activities. In other words, it signals that it is now possible to proceed to the next stage, to the new project initiated by the directive. The deontic meaning carried by the modal verb is also related to the recipient's right to perform the nominated action. The use of the modal verb indicates that the recipients who are addressed in the directive are allowed to perform the action. By employing this format in her directives when initiating new projects and sharing tasks, the teacher seems to display an orientation to the recipients' stance; she indicates an assumption that the children are eager to participate in the projects being initiated.

#### *4.2 Giving advice with modal-verb declaratives*

Some cases also arise in the data in which directives constructed as modal-verb declaratives are employed by the teacher to give advice – to suggest an action as a solution to some problem. Unlike the cases described above, for these declaratives, the modal verb (commonly *voida* 'can' but in a few cases also *kannattaa* 'be worth' and *saada* 'may') indicates that the nominated action is possible or advisable but that the recipient's compliance is not presupposed. Often the turn includes or is accompanied by an explicit expression signalling voluntary compliance (e.g., *jos haluaa* 'if one wants'; see extract 7, line 2). Directives of this type are often left unnoticed or even

rejected by the recipient, and the teacher does not insist on compliance, such as by restating the directive.

These advice-giving modal-verb declaratives are used in activity environments that are different from the ones in which the teacher uses the modal-verb declarative for initiating a new project. The declaratives used to give advice do not occur at activity junctures, but instead are responsive in the sense that the suggested action offers a solution to a problem that has emerged during the ongoing activity. In this respect, they resemble the imperatively formatted directives that are used to modify or correct the recipient's ongoing action when a problem has arisen in the accomplishment or progress of the action (see, e.g., extracts 1 and 3). However, contrary to the imperative turns that construct a tight connection to the immediate present, to the right-now moment and to the current participation framework, the directives formulated as modal-verb declaratives present the nominated action as optional, and accordingly not as necessary or urgent. Furthermore, these directives are often formulated with zero-person constructions (Hakulinen 1987; Laitinen 2006), not addressed to a certain recipient here and now, but rather expressing more general advice.

Extract 7 illustrates one such case. The girls are packing pastries into paper bags in order to take them home (see also extract 2). The teacher tells the girls that it is possible to use two bags, one inside the other (line 1). As an account for her suggestion, she refers to an apparent problem that she has noticed (lines 2 and 3: the grease seeps through the bags).

(7) [M2, Kotus h0120]

=>	Heli:	<b>siihev</b>	<b>voi</b>	<b>laittaa</b>	<b>↑toisen</b>	<b>semmosen</b>	<b>päälle</b>	
		DEM3-ILL	can-SG3	put-INF	another-ACC	DEM3.ADJ-ACC	on.top-ALL	
		[one]	can	put	another	such	[bag] on top	
02		jos	haluaa	ku	sieltä	tulee	sitä	rasvaa
		if	want-SG3	when	DEM3.LOC-ABL	come-3SG	DEM3-PAR	grease-PAR
		if	[one]	wants	because	the	grease	comes
03		läpi.						
		through						
		through						

The modal verb (*voida* 'can') included in the teacher's directive (line 1) indicates that the nominated action is possible. This turn also includes an utterance that explicitly expresses in which sense it is possible (line 2: *jos haluaa* 'if one wants'): the compliance is optional. Furthermore, in her declaratively formulated directive, the teacher uses the zero-person construction, which has no element that refers to the subject or to the actor who could or should perform the nominated action. In Finnish, the zero-person construction is a conventional means of constructing generic statements that concern human beings (Hakulinen 1987; Laitinen 2006). In this construction, the lack of reference to a particular recipient works differently than in imperatively formulated directives. Instead of indicating a tight connection to the present situation and the current speech-act participants, the lack of reference actually loosens the connection by construing an open personal reference (ibid.). Thus, it transforms the directive into a more general piece of advice, not only or specifically related

to the present moment and to a particular recipient. When the directive is presented, the girls are packing the pastries into the bags, and the teacher is merely watching them without being engaged in the ongoing activity of any of the participants. Also, the problem targeted by the directive is common, to all the girls.

#### *4.3 Simple declaratives: a new step in the ongoing project*

Declaratively formulated directives with no modal verb, referred to here as simple declaratives, are also used to launch new actions. Similar to the modal-verb declaratives, they commonly begin with a turn-initial particle *sit(ten)* 'then' or *ja sit(ten)* 'and then' indexing a transition from one action to another. Whenever modal-verb declaratives are used to initiate new projects, simple declaratives are employed in the following stage. In other words, they are used to prompt the recipient to take the next step in the ongoing project, to tell the recipient to proceed to the expected next action in the series of actions aiming to fulfil some practical task. In line with this, the simple declaratives are addressed to a recipient who is already in charge, engaged in the project wherein the nominated action constitutes the next step. Thus, this form is used to sustain the participation framework. This is reflected in how the recipient is referred to. Simple declaratives do not contain a separate subject pronoun referring to the actor, but only a second-

person inflectional ending in the predicate verb (*siirry-t* ‘move-SG2’ *siirry-tte*, ‘move-PL2’).

Extract 8 illustrates the difference between the use of simple and modal-verb declaratives. In this extract, the teacher employs both simple and modal-verb declaratives. The former are addressed to a participant who is in charge at the exact moment when the directive is presented (lines 1 and 11), whereas the latter are used to re-arrange the participation (lines 4 and 7). Ella has been mixing the topping for the cake and has finished the task just before the extract. She still has the spoon and the bowl in her hands. Sara is standing near Ella and is watching her. Heli begins a directive (line 1), presumably to instruct Ella to move beside the other table where the cake is in order to pour the topping on it (cf. lines 7 and 11). This simple declarative directs the recipient who is already in charge of the ongoing project to perform an expected next action within it.

(8) [M1, Kotus h0110]

```
=> Heli  *ja sitte, (0.3) sit siir**ry-t<=  
         and then                then move-SG2  
         and then, (0.3) then [you] move<
```

02 Heli: \*MOVES TOWARDS THE TABLE ON WHICH THE CAKE IS

03 Heli: \*\*GLANCES AT THE SPRINKLES  
 ON THE OTHER TABLE

```
04 Heli: *sä voi-t hakee ***nomparellit,  
         you can-SG2 fetch-INF sprinkles  
         ↑you can get the sprinkles,
```

05 Heli: \*TURNS GAZE AT SARA \*\*TOUCHES HER AT THE BACK  
 #fig7

06 (1.7) SARA GOES TO GET THE SPRINKLES, HELI TURNS HER GAZE TO ELLA

07 Heli: \*sä voi-t, (0.3) tulla Ella [>tänne<.  
you can-SG2 come-INF [name] DEM1.LOC-ILL  
you can, (0.3) come Ella >here<.

08 Heli: \*REACHES HER HAND OUT TOWARDS ELLA

09 Ella: [+ (ou:nou)]

10 Ella: + TURNS TOWARDS THE  
CAKE WITH THE BOWL

=> Heli: \*sit vaal #\*\*läv<sup>ä</sup>ytä-t sen tuohon päälle,=  
then just slap-SG2 DEM3-ACC DEM2.LOC-ILL on.top-ALL  
then [you] just slap it there on the top,=

12 Heli: \*TURNS TOWARDS THE CAKE  
\*\* POINTS TO IT WITH A SLAPPING MOVEMENT  
#fig8

13 Heli: =mä haen sulle veitsen  
I get-SG1 you-ALL knife-ACC  
=I'll get you a knife



Figure 7



Figure 8

While presenting the directive (line 1), Heli glances at the sprinkle jar on the other table (line 3). Instead of completing her turn, she makes a self-correction and tells Sara to get the sprinkles (line 4). This directive, with which Heli also re-arranges the division of labour, is formulated as a modal-verb declarative that contains an overt pronominal subject referring to the



recipient. Furthermore, the recipient is also indicated through bodily means, by gaze and touch (line 5; see figure 7). After giving Sara a task, Heli orients to Ella again and restates the directive she addressed to her a moment before (line 7). However, Ella is no longer the one in charge of the project in focus, so the design of the directive is both adjusted to and reflects this altered configuration: Heli now uses a modal-verb declarative that contains a personal pronoun as well as a name referring to the recipient. Furthermore, she addresses the recipient through bodily means: just before initiating the directive, she turns her gaze to Ella (line 6), and while presenting the directive, she reaches her hand towards her (line 8). Just as Heli completes her directive, Ella turns towards the table where the cake is (see line 10), and with this embodied move, begins the designated action. With her next directive, Heli tells Ella – who is now the one in charge of the ongoing project – what to do next (line 11, see figure 8). This is reflected in the design of Heli's next directive, formulated as a simple declarative.

The teacher uses declaratively formulated directives to launch new projects and to initiate new actions within the ongoing projects. The choice between the modal-verb and simple declaratives also works as a means to manage participation. The modal-verb declaratives, which contain a separate element referring to the actor(s) of the nominated action, re-arrange the participation and nominate new actors. By contrast, the simple declaratives, where the actor is referred to only through a second-person inflectional

ending in the predicate verb, are used to sustain the current participation framework and to display that the actor will be the person already in charge.

## **5. The design of teacher's directives – managing the temporal progress of the ongoing activities and the participation framework**

The main objective of this chapter has been to demonstrate that the choice between the most common directive forms used by the teacher in the cooking club – imperative, modal-verb declarative, and simple declarative – reflects the teacher's orientation to the local activity environment: to the progress of the ongoing activities, to the emerging participation framework, and to the temporality and trajectories of the recipients' actions in space.

Imperatively formatted directives construct a tight connection to the immediate present and to the prevailing relationship between the speech-act participants. Lacking tense, person, and modality marking, they are adjusted to and construct a context in which there is an immediate need for the nominated action, implementing a change in the recipient's action that is already under way, and furthermore, in which the participation framework is clear, the relevant relationship between the speaker and the recipient already prevails, and the recipient's compliance is taken to be self-evident.

Contrary to the imperatively formulated directives that the teacher uses to manage action already under way, the declaratively formulated

directives are used to launch new actions: to initiate a new project at activity junctures (modal-verb declaratives that include a separate element referring to an actor), or to prompt the recipient already in charge to proceed to the next action within the ongoing activity (simple declaratives in which the actor is only referred to through a second-person inflectional ending). These directives also manage the participation framework. They re-arrange it by nominating the new actor(s), or they sustain it by indicating that the actor of the action nominated will be the one who is already in charge in the ongoing project. In some cases, a directive in declarative form is used to suggest an action as a solution to a problem that has emerged in the ongoing activity (the modal-verb declarative, often in the zero-person form). In these cases, accomplishing the nominated action is presented as being optional; often the directive is not addressed to a particular recipient, but is instead formulated as a more general piece of advice.

The teacher's directives, formulated both as declaratives and imperatives, are constructed and treated as directives to be complied with. This is generally true even when the declarative includes a modal verb that indexes possibility. The presupposition of compliance that the participants orient to in the directive sequence is related to the recipients' willingness and commitment to carry out the projects and tasks nominated in the directives. In the case of modal-verb declaratives that are employed at activity junctures to initiate a new project, the modal-verb *voida*, 'can', constructs the directive as a permission, and displays the recipient's right to

undertake the nominated action. This, in turn, reveals the teacher's orientation to the global inferential framework that is particular to this setting (Drew and Heritage 1992): the assumption that the children are eager to participate in the work and to carry out the projects being initiated. In the case of simple declaratives and imperatives, the presupposition of compliance indicated by the grammatical form is also evoked and established locally. The use of these forms conveys the teacher's orientation to the recipient's earlier commitment to the ongoing activity or action, which the action nominated by the directive contributes to (cf. Rossi this volume; Zinken and Deppermann this volume).

The teacher's orientation to her own tasks, rights, and obligations as well as to those of the participants in the overall event is also reflected in the frequencies of the alternative directive forms she uses. The high prevalence of declaratively formatted directives displays an orientation to her entitlements and obligations as a teacher, as one whose task it is to organise the activities, to distribute the work among the participants, and to help the children by telling them how to perform the different tasks involved in the projects. The teacher's orientation to her task to help the participants is also displayed through the design of declarative and imperative directives. These turns often include information, presented verbally and/or offered bodily through embodied demonstration, on how to carry out the nominated action. It is also noteworthy that the teacher rarely employs first-person plural hortatives (e.g., *sit siivotaan pöytää*, 'then [we] clean-PAS the table')

(see Table 1). She uses these only when the participants are performing tasks not involved in the baking projects themselves, such as when the tables need to be cleaned and materials and containers need to be returned to the cupboards at the end of meetings. The fact that she does not favour first-person plural hortatives, which construct the nominated action as shared – not even when she actually performs the action together with the recipient (see, e.g., extract 1, figures 1 and 2) (cf. Stevanovic this volume; Rauniomaa this volume) – seems to be indicative of her strategy to let the children perform the tasks by themselves, encouraging them to learn by doing.

## References

- Antaki, Charles, and Alexandra Kent. 2012. "Telling People What to Do (and, Sometimes, Why): Contingency, Entitlement and Explanation in Staff Requests to Adults with Intellectual Impairments." *Journal of Pragmatics* 44: 876–889.
- Couper-Kuhlen, Elizabeth. 2014. "What Does Grammar Tell Us about Action? Special Issue on Approaches to Grammar for Interactional Linguistics", ed. by Ritva Laury, Marja Etelämäki, and Elizabeth Couper-Kuhlen. *Pragmatics* 24 (3): 623–647.
- Couper-Kuhlen, Elizabeth, and Marja Etelämäki. 2014. "On Divisions of Labor in Request and Offer Environments. In *Requesting in Social Interaction. Studies in Language and Social Interaction*, ed. by Paul Drew, and Elizabeth Couper-Kuhlen, 115–144. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Couper-Kuhlen, Elizabeth, and Marja Etelämäki. 2015. "Nominated Actions and Their Targeted agents in Finnish Conversational Directives." *Journal of Pragmatics* 78: 7–24.
- Clayman, Steven, and John Heritage. 2014. "Benefactors and Beneficiaries. Benefactive Status and Stance in the Management of Offers and Requests." In *Requesting in Social Interaction. Studies in Language*

- and Social Interaction*, ed. by Paul Drew, and Elizabeth Couper-Kuhlen, 51–82. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Craven, Alexandra, and Jonathan Potter. 2010. "Directives: Entitlement and Contingency in Action." *Discourse Studies* 12 (4): 419–442.
- Curl, Tracy, and Paul Drew. 2008. "Contingency and Action: A Comparison of Two Forms of Requesting." *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 41 (2): 129–53.
- De Stefani, Elwys, and Anne-Danièle Gazin. 2014. "Instructional Sequences in Driving Lessons: Mobile Participants and the Temporal and Sequential Organization of Actions." *Journal of Pragmatics* 65: 63–79.
- Drew, Paul, and Elizabeth Couper-Kuhlen (ed). 2014a. *Requesting in Social Interaction. Studies in Language and Social Interaction*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Drew, Paul, and Elizabeth Couper-Kuhlen. 2014b. "Requesting – From Speech Act to Recruitment." In *Requesting in Social Interaction. Studies in Language and Social Interaction*, ed. by Paul Drew, and Elizabeth Couper-Kuhlen, 1–34. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Drew, Paul, and John Heritage. 1992. "Analysing Talk at Work: An Introduction." In *Talk at Work*, ed. by Paul Drew, and John Heritage, 3–65. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Enfield, Nick. 2014. "Human Agency and the Infrastructure for Requests." In *Requesting in Social Interaction. Studies in Language and Social Interaction*, ed. by Paul Drew, and Elizabeth Couper-Kuhlen, 35–55. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Ervin-Tripp, Susan M. 1976. "'Is Sybil There?'" The Structure of Some American English Directives." *Language in Society* 5: 25–66.
- Goodwin, Charles. 2000. "Action and Embodiment within Situated Human Interaction." *Journal of Pragmatics* 32: 1489–1522.
- Goodwin, Charles. 2007. "Participation, Stance and Affect in the Organization of Activities." *Discourse & Society* 18 (1): 53–73.
- Goodwin, Charles, and Marjorie Harness Goodwin. 2004. "Participation." In *A Companion to Linguistic Anthropology*, ed. by Alessandro Duranti, 222–244. Malden: Blackwell.
- Goodwin, Marjorie Harness. 2006. "Participation, Affect and Trajectory in Family Directive/Response sequences." *Text and Talk* 26: 513–541.
- Goodwin, Marjorie Harness, and Asta Cekaite. 2013. "Calibration in Directive/Response Sequences in Family Interaction." *Journal of Pragmatics* 46: 122–138.
- Goodwin, Marjorie Harness, and Asta Cekaite. 2014. "Orchestrating Directive Trajectories in Communicative Projects in Family Interaction." In *Requesting in Social Interaction. Studies in Language and Social Interaction*, ed. by Paul Drew, and Elizabeth Couper-Kuhlen, 185–214. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

- Hakulinen, Auli. 1987. "Avoiding Person Reference in Finnish." In *The Pragmatic Perspective*, ed. by Jef Verschueren, and Marcella Bertucelli-Papi, 141–153. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Heinemann, Trine. 2006. "Will You or Can't You?": Displaying Entitlement in Interrogative Requests." *Journal of Pragmatics* 38: 1081–1104.
- Helasvuo, Marja-Liisa. 2014. "Searching for Motivations for Grammatical Patternings." *Pragmatics* 24 (3): 453–476.
- Keisanen, Tiina, and Mirka Rauniomaa. 2012. "The Organization of Participation and Contingency in Pre-beginnings of Requests Sequences." *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 45 (4): 323–51.
- Kendon, Adam. 1990. *Conducting Interaction. Patterns of Behaviour in Focused Interactions*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kent, Alexandra. 2012. "Compliance, Resistance, and Incipient Compliance when Responding to Directives." *Discourse Studies* 14 (6): 711–730.
- Laitinen, Lea. 2006. "Zero Person in Finnish. A Grammatical Resource for Construing Human Reference." In *Grammar from the Human Perspective*, ed. by Marja-Liisa Helasvuo, and Lyle Campbell, 209–231. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Lauranto, Yrjö. 2014. *Imperatiivi, käsky, direktiivi. Arkikeskustelun vaihtokaupakielioppia* [Imperative, command, directive. Grammar of exchange in everyday conversation]. Helsinki: Finnish Literature Society.
- Levinson, Stephen. 2013. "Action Formation and Ascription." In *Handbook of Conversation Analysis*, ed. by Tanya Stivers, and Jack Sidnell, 103–130. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Lindström, Anna. 2005. "Language as Social Action: A Study of How Senior Citizens Request Assistance with Practical Tasks in the Swedish Home Help Service." In *Syntax and Lexis in Conversation: Studies on the Use of Linguistic Resources in Talk-in-interaction*, ed. by Auli Hakulinen, and Margret Selting, 209–230. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Lindwall, Oskar, Gustav Lymer, and Cristian Greiffenhagen. 2015. "The Sequential Analysis of Instruction." In *The Handbook of Classroom Discourse and Interaction*, ed. by Numa Markee, 142–157. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell
- Linell, Per. 1998. *Approaching Dialogue: Talk, Interaction and Contexts in Dialogical Perspectives*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Mondada, Lorenza. 2009. "Emergent Focused Interactions in Public Places: A Systematic Analysis of the Multimodal Achievement of a Common Interactional Space." *Journal of Pragmatics* 41: 1977–1997.
- Mondada, Lorenza. 2013. "Coordinating Mobile Action in Real Time: The Timely Organization of Directives in Video Game." In *Interaction and Mobility. Language and the Body in Motion*, ed. by Pentti

- Haddington, Lorenza Mondada, and Maurice Nevile, 300–341. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Mondada, Lorenza. 2014a. “Requesting Immediate Action in the Surgical Operating Room: Time, Embodied Resources and Praxeological Embeddedness.” In *Requesting in Social Interaction. Studies in Language and Social Interaction*, ed. by Paul Drew and Elizabeth Couper-Kuhlen, 267–302. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Mondada, Lorenza. 2014b. “Instructions in the Operating Room: How the Surgeon Directs their Assistant’s Hands.” *Discourse Studies* 16 (2): 131–161.
- Raevaara, Liisa. 1989. ”No – vuoronalkuinen partikkeli [*No – turn-initial particle*].” In *Suomalaisen keskustelun keinoja I*, ed. by Auli Hakulinen, 147–161. Kieli 4. Helsinki: Department of Finnish Language, University of Helsinki.
- Raevaara, Liisa. 2011. ”Accounts at Convenience Stores. Doing Dispreference and Small Talk.” *Journal of Pragmatics* 43: 556–571.
- Rossi, Giovanni. 2012. “Bilateral and Unilateral Requests: The Use of Imperatives and Mi X? Interrogatives in Italian.” *Discourse Processes* 49: 426–458.
- Rossi, Giovanni. 2014. “When Do People Not Use Language to Make Requests?” In *Requesting in Social Interaction, Studies in Language and Social Interaction*, ed. by Paul Drew, and Elizabeth Couper-Kuhlen, 303–334. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Rossi, Giovanni. 2015. *The Request System in Italian Interaction*. Ph.D. dissertation, Radboud University Nijmegen.
- Searle, John. 1979. *Expression and Meaning. Studies in the Theory of Speech Acts*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sorjonen, Marja-Leena, Anu Rouhikoski, and Heini Lehtonen (eds). 2015. *Helsingissä puhuttavat suomet. Kielen indeksisyys ja sosiaaliset identiteetit* [Finnishes spoken and spoken about in Helsinki. Indexicality of language and social identities]. Helsinki: Finnish Literature Society.
- Sorjonen, Marja-Leena, and Liisa Raevaara. 2014. “On the Grammatical Form of Requests at the Convenience Store: Requesting as Embodied Action.” In *Requesting in Social Interaction. Studies in Language and Social Interaction*, ed. by Paul Drew, and Elizabeth Couper-Kuhlen, 243–268. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Stevanovic, Melisa, and Jan Svennevig. 2015. “Epistemics and Deontics in Conversational Directives.” *Journal of Pragmatics* 78: 1–6.
- Zinken, Jörg, and Eva Ogiermann. 2011. “How to Propose an Action as Objectively Necessary: the case of Polish *Trzeba x* (“One Needs to *x*”).” *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 44 (3): 263–287.
- Zinken, Jörg, and Eva Ogiermann. 2013. “Responsibility and Action: Invariants and Diversity in Requests for Objects in British English



- and Polish Interaction.” *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 46 (3): 256–276.
- Wootton, Anthony. 1997. *Interaction and the Development of Mind*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wootton, Anthony. 2005. “Interactional and Sequential Configurations Informing Request Format Selection in Children’s Speech.” In *Syntax and Lexis in Conversation: Studies on the Use of Linguistic Resources in Talk-in-interaction*, ed. by Auli Hakulinen, and Margret Selting, 185–208. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.