# Chapter 1

# Recruitments and pragmatic typology

Giovanni Rossi

Department of Sociology, University of California, Los Angeles

Simeon Floyd

Department of Anthropology, Universidad San Francisco de Quito

N. J. Enfield

Department of Linguistics, The University of Sydney

## 1 Introduction

Getting others to do things is a central part of social interaction in any human society. Language is our main tool for this purpose. In this book, we show that sequences of interaction in which one person's behavior solicits or occasions another's assistance or collaboration share common structural properties that provide a basis for the systematic comparison of this domain across languages. The goal of this comparison is to uncover similarities and differences in how language and other conduct are used in carrying out social action around the world, including different kinds of requests, orders, suggestions, and other actions brought together under the rubric of *recruitment* (see §4 below). The project constitutes an exercise in pragmatic typology. We map out a possibility space for linguistically-mediated social actions and we use that possibility space as a grid for comparison between languages. This allows us to look for universals and cross-linguistic variation in this pragmatic domain. While other multi-authored publications present comparative findings from this project (e.g. Floyd et al. 2018), this book lays out the conceptual and methodological background for the project (Chapters 1–2)

and presents the findings language-by-language (Chapters 3–10). The book is intended to serve as a reference source for those interested in primary data on the phenomenon of recruitments in a diverse set of the world's languages.

## 2 Background on research on getting others to do things

A landmark in research on requests and similar speech acts is Searle (1969; 1975), who built on Austin (1962). For Searle, speech acts have felicity conditions, which need to be met if the act is to succeed. For a request, the utterance should refer to a future act of the recipient and the speaker should believe that the recipient can do the requested act, among other conditions (Searle 1969: 66). Many of Searle's felicity conditions refer to mental states of participants. Building on this and the cognitively-grounded theory of Grice (1975), Brown & Levinson (1978; 1987) developed a theory of politeness in which requests featured prominently. The theory began with observations of similarities in pragmatic strategies in three unrelated languages and cultures (Tamil, Tzeltal and English). A theory of face – people's public self-image (Goffman 1967) – suggested universal pressures affecting social behavior, particularly in "face-threatening acts" such as requests.

Researchers in psychology engaged with the ideas of Searle, Grice, Brown & Levinson, seeking to test them with experimental methods. One puzzle concerned the literal meaning of an utterance (e.g. *Can you pass the salt?*) in the comprehension of the intended request, that is, whether or not the literal meaning must be computed first before inferring that a request is being made (Clark & Lucy 1975; Clark 1979; Gibbs 1979; Clark & Schunk 1980; Gibbs 1983; 1986a). Another puzzle concerned variation of request forms in terms of a single general principle: when making a request, a speaker first assesses what reason there might be for the recipient not complying, and then formulates an utterance to deal with the "greatest potential obstacle" they can anticipate (Gibbs 1985; Francik & Clark 1985; Gibbs 1986b; Gibbs & Müller 1988; Clark 1996). The obstacle mentioned may be generic, such as the recipient's inability to do what is requested (e.g. *Can you tell me what time it is?*), or more specific, such as the availability of a relevant object (e.g. *Do you happen to have a watch?*). This is closely related to the ideas of preconditions discussed by Searle (1969) and by Gordon & Lakoff (1971).

Linguists have studied the grammatical structures and pragmatic properties of the basic sentence types, all of which are used in requesting: imperatives, interrogatives, declaratives (Gordon & Lakoff 1971; Sadock & Zwicky 1985; Aikhenvald & Dixon 2017). They have also studied the connections between alternative lin-

guistic forms and social variables in events of requesting (Sinclair & Coulthard 1975; Ervin-Tripp 1976; 1981; Gordon & Ervin-Tripp 1984; Ervin-Tripp et al. 1990), including how these variables may affect the comprehension of the request.

A large body of research in the subfield of "cross-cultural pragmatics" (e.g. Blum-Kulka et al. 1989) has been devoted to the comparative study of linguistic patterns associated with requests across many languages. A unifying element of this tradition of research is a standardized methodology based on "discourse completion tasks" (Blum-Kulka 1982). In §5 below, we further discuss this tradition of research in relation to our pragmatic typological approach.

Research in the fields of conversation analysis, ethnomethodology, and interactional linguistics is perhaps closest to the approach taken here, for a few reasons. One is that the empirical source of data is recordings of informal interaction. Another is that the units of analysis are not clauses or sentences but moves in conversational sequences (Wootton 1981; 1997; Lindström 2005; Vinkhuyzen & Szymanski 2005; Heinemann 2006; Curl & Drew 2008; Craven & Potter 2010; Zinken & Ogiermann 2013; Drew & Couper-Kuhlen 2014a, among many others). These inductive approaches are grounded in the sequential development of interaction. Most conversation-analytic and interactional-linguistic studies of requesting to date have concentrated on a particular language. Comparison between languages has been only possible by drawing on results of distinct studies, each with their own particular focus and goals. Also, most conversation-analytic research tends not to be transparently quantitative. But structured quantitative analysis built on the back of a qualitative analysis has been shown to greatly enhance the analytic possibilities of comparative conversation analysis (e.g. Fox et al. 2009; Rossano et al. 2009; Stivers et al. 2009; Dingemanse et al. 2015).

The pragmatic domain of getting others to do things has been thought of in different ways. A first distinction is often made between getting someone to carry out a practical action and getting someone to provide information. Some work in the philosophy of language (e.g. Searle 1969) and in psycholinguistics (e.g. Clark 1979; Clark & Schunk 1980) tended to merge the two. But most work has distinguished between soliciting practical action and information, and has studied them as separate phenomena.

Another distinction has to do with the categorization of types or subtypes of social action. Two main approaches can be identified here. The first is to treat the domain of getting others to do things as a family of related but distinct speech acts or actions (e.g. directives, requests, hints) on the basis of distinct semantic/pragmatic features, for example those defining different degrees of forcefulness or coerciveness (e.g. Searle 1976; Wierzbicka 1991; Craven & Potter 2010).

The second approach is to treat the domain as a single, generic type of social action, and to treat variations in the way this is implemented as pertaining to the level of linguistic practice (e.g. Ervin-Tripp et al. 1990; Wootton 1997; Rossi 2012).

Yet another distinction is drawn in terms of the temporality of the practical action being solicited: whether the action is carried out immediately, at the same place and time – such as passing a knife in a kitchen setting – or distally, at a later time and possibly different place – such as picking somebody up from work (see, e.g., Lindström 1999). Although much research encompasses both, studies of telephone calls obviously privilege the latter, whereas studies of face-to-face interaction privilege the former.

## 3 Background to the project and studies presented in this book

The conceptual, empirical, and analytical work on recruitments presented in this volume was carried out by a team of researchers under the auspices of the *Human Sociality and Systems of Language Use* (HSSLU) project, a European Research Council Starting Grant awarded to Nick Enfield (2010–2014). The Recruitments Subproject was coordinated by Simeon Floyd and Giovanni Rossi, and was convened at the Max Planck Institute for Psycholinguistics in Nijmegen, the Netherlands, in collaboration with other members of the Interactional Foundations of Language project in Stephen Levinson's Language and Cognition Department (also encompassing Levinson's European Research Council Advanced Grant INTERACT, 2011–2015).

The authors of the chapters of this book each contributed to the comparative study in a number of ways. All contributed to the conceptual development of the project, including the content of the coding scheme, administering the coding scheme, and analyzing the results. Collection of video corpora used in the study was carried out by Julija Baranova (Russian), Joe Blythe (Murrinhpatha), Mark Dingemanse (Siwu), N. J. Enfield (Lao), Simeon Floyd (Cha'palaa), Giovanni Rossi (Italian, English) and Jörg Zinken (Polish).[1] Steve Levinson provided the context for this project to thrive, and was a key interlocutor at all points throughout the project. As an external collaborator, Paul Drew was present for many of the research meetings, and contributed much to the methodology and conception

---

[1]Part of the English data came from the Language and Social Interaction Archive created by Leah Wingard, available from San Francisco State University (http://www.sfsu.edu/~lsi/).

of the project. Séan G. Roberts provided crucial advice and assistance in developing the quantitative aspects of the comparative analysis (not reported in this volume). The coding and data analysis workflow built on and extended work in a closely related subproject of HSSLU that developed a pragmatic typology of other-initiated repair, coordinated by Mark Dingemanse and Nick Enfield. We also owe a debt to conceptual collaborators in discussion and data analysis over the life of the project: Lorena Pool Balam, Penelope Brown, Tyko Dirksmeyer, Paul Drew, Rósa S. Gísladóttir, Gertie Hoymann, Stephen C. Levinson, Lilla Magyari, Elizabeth Manrique, Ruth Parry, Séan G. Roberts, Jack Sidnell, Tanya Stivers and Francisco Torreira.

The development of the recruitments concept and the timeline of the project work and findings is as follows.[2]

The HSSLU project, which began in January 2010, featured three subprojects. One of these centered on actions of getting people to do things. On 7–9 October 2010, team members discussed requests and similar kinds of social actions in a UCLA workshop on "Action Ascription in Social Interaction". At a follow-up workshop on the same topic in Nijmegen on 18–19 March 2011, Enfield presented a first working definition of "recruitment" (Enfield 2011a). This was a reference point for a one-week intensive data workshop on recruitments held later that month (March 21–25, 2011), in which team members, together with Paul Drew as an external collaborator, delved into data and initial qualitative analysis of candidate recruitment sequences in the languages represented in this volume.

This collaborative work, along with a subsequent session on recruitments at a HSSLU project retreat on 20 April 2011 (Enfield 2011b), resulted in a first draft of the coding scheme for this volume, authored by Floyd and Rossi, and circulated within the project team on 25 October 2011. The project team met (on 27 March 2012) to discuss the first draft coding scheme. Notes by Floyd and Rossi were then circulated, followed by circulation of an updated coding draft on 16 April 2012.

In October 2012, a subgroup of team members – Enfield, Floyd, Rossi, and Dingemanse – carried out a first pilot study using the coding scheme. On November 2, 2012, Floyd presented the ongoing results of the recruitments project at a retreat at Schloss Ringberg, Germany. Later that month, the group met to discuss and plan a second pilot study (with a new coding scheme draft version 1.3), this time with all team members participating. During the week of November 20–27, 2012, the full team carried out a pilot of the coding scheme on all of the languages included in this volume. In December 2012, team members identified

---

[2]See http://recruitments.nickenfield.org/timeline/ for PDFs of the documents and memos mentioned in the rest of this section.

cases in their respective corpora for coding, and on January 20, 2013, the coding scheme was finalized (version 2.2). The full team then held an intensive coding week (January 21–25, 2013), following a shared set of further instructions circulated to the team by Floyd.

After the coding was completed, a coding consistency check was done, followed by a test for coder reliability across the team members. This process was overseen by Floyd and Rossi. Because each team member worked with data in languages that others had no access to, our coder reliability check was carried out using a reference set of English data. The reliability check established that some questions were coded in the same ways across the group, but it also revealed that some questions had not been coded consistently. The final step was for the team to carry out a re-coding of those questions in order to ensure coder reliability. The re-coding took place in December 2013.

Results of the comparative study were publicly presented in February 2014 by Floyd and Rossi at the UCLA workshop "About Face" (Floyd et al. 2014a), and then in June 2014 at the International Conference on Conversation Analysis at UCLA (Floyd et al. 2014b). The June 2014 presentation not only publicized the empirical findings of the comparative project, it also presented the key conceptual elements of our collective development of the concept of recruitment sequences. Other publications in which these ideas and findings have been discussed include Enfield (2014b), Drew & Couper-Kuhlen (2014b), Rossi (2015), Kendrick & Drew (2016), Zinken & Rossi (2016), and Floyd (2017).

While comparative findings from this project are presented in multi-authored publications (Floyd et al. 2014b; 2018), the present collection was convened as an opportunity for the individual researchers to lay out the project findings specific to their language of study.

## 4  Recruitment sequences defined

Our use of the term *recruitment* reflects a shift from an approach centered around the speech act of requesting to one addressing the interactional process of getting others to act. The two main alternatives to our *recruitments* approach are: i) a definition of the phenomenon based on intentional states, such as someone's desire to have another do something, and ii) a definition of the phenomenon based on linguistic form, for example, focusing on imperatively-formatted utterances. While the former presents problems of evidence, the latter overly limits the scope, as we know that other types of strategies can be used in seeking assistance or collaboration. Our functional approach based on recruitment sequences in recorded

social interaction makes the identification of cases more objective and replicable, the analysis more falsifiable, and comparison across languages easier thanks to the natural control provided by sequential structure (Dingemanse & Floyd 2014), without having to restrict the scope of relevant linguistic patterns beforehand.

As we define it, a recruitment is a basic cooperative phenomenon in interaction consisting of a sequence of two moves with the following characteristics:[3]

**Move A:** participant A says or does something to participant B, or that B can see or hear;

**Move B:** participant B does a practical action for or with participant A that is fitted to what A has said or done.

Crucial to this phenomenon is the nature of the behavior instigated in Move B: a *practical* action involving physical work, typically the transfer of an object, the performance of a manual task, or the alteration of an ongoing bodily movement.

In this project, we restrict the target phenomenon by focusing on the recruitment of practical actions to be performed here and now. The recruitment of information and of future practical actions are excluded. At the same time, we are inclusive of any communicative behavior that causes someone to do something, independently of its verbal or nonverbal construction, and of whatever the speaker's exact intention may be. The identification of cases does not turn on the form of the instigating behavior but on the nature of the behavior instigated, and on the causal relation between the two.

Because of our focus on here-and-now cooperation, Move A and Move B must be temporally adjacent. This means that B must begin to deal with what A has said or done in the next few moments. In some cases, the provision of assistance or collaboration may be displaced because B initiates repair or defers fulfillment on some grounds (e.g. because they are momentarily busy). What is important is that the first response addresses the relevance of immediate cooperation. This obtains also when B refuses to fulfill the recruitment. Finally, there are cases in which B may ignore Move A and produce no response, or a response that does not address the relevance of their immediate cooperation. In these cases, additional measures are taken to preserve objectivity in the identification and inclusion of cases. When there is no uptake of the recruitment, we only consider cases in which: i) Move A involves an explicit, on-record practice, typically a

---

[3]By *move* we intend a unit of communicative behavior that may include language and/or other conduct (Enfield 2013: chap. 6; cf. Goffman 1981). This is a related but distinct concept to *turn*, which we understand as a move involving primarily language (see Schegloff 2007: 3–7).

linguistic practice, that is known to regularly solicit compliance with recruitment (e.g. imperatives, explicit interrogatives such as *Can you x*, etc.); ii) Move A is repeated, either in the same or in another form, showing pursuit of response. These criteria mean that we exclude cases of implicit, off-record practices that could have potentially led to someone doing something but did not, and were not pursued. Finally, note that in cases in which the recruitment is fulfilled or granted in Move B, the sequence may be minimally expanded with a further move – Move C – registering appreciation or satisfaction, in other words, acknowledgment by A.

Recruitment sequences encompass a broad range of actions and interactional events that result in someone providing assistance or collaboration. Our definition does not restrict the focus to request-related events but includes offer-related events, where assistance is provided in response to someone's trouble (Curl 2006). The coding scheme, presented in Chapter 2, helps to distinguish offer-related events from others, while providing a framework for treating both as part of the broader phenomenon of recruitment.[4] The scheme also suggests criteria for discriminating between offers that are occasioned by another's trouble and offers that are not (p. 28).

Across the volume, we examine different kinds of recruitment events, from ones in which someone is told or asked to do something, to others in which someone responds to another's statement of need (individual or collective), to yet others in which someone responds to a wordless gesture requiring cooperation. Each chapter surveys a range of actions, sequential structures, and social-interactional relations between recruiter and recruitee. The cooperative events we examine include both ones in which a participant is recruited to assist another in the realization of an individual goal and ones in which a participant is recruited to collaborate in the realization of a joint goal, involving shared commitments and responsibilities (Enfield 2014b; Zinken & Rossi 2016).

The components of a recruitment sequence and the terminology to describe them can be summarized as follows.

A RECRUITMENT SEQUENCE minimally involves:

- two participants: A (the RECRUITER) producing the instigating action, and B (the RECRUITEE) responding to it;

- MOVE A: the instigating or recruiting action;

---

[4]The coding scheme and the extensive collaborative work that contributed to its development (see §3 and fn. 2) predate a study by Kendrick & Drew (2016) that built on this collaborative work and used data collected within the project.

- MOVE B: an action addressing the relevance of immediate cooperation as a result of the previous instigating action, including:

    - FULFILLMENT: a practical action involving physical work performed for or with A;

    - REJECTION: the conveyance of inability or unwillingness to fulfill the recruitment;

    - DEFERMENT of fulfillment;

    - INITIATION OF REPAIR (often leading to fulfillment after repair).

    If B IGNORES Move A, then the sequence must include an explicit, on-record practice of initiating recruitment and/or pursuit of response in order to be included.

    The sequence can be expanded by a MOVE C, doing ACKNOWLEDGMENT.

The coding scheme (Chapter 2) provides detailed commentary and examples, elaborating on each element of recruitment sequences and on the criteria for their identification presented in summary form here.

## 5 Pragmatic typology

Pragmatic typology is the comparative study of language use. It brings together conceptual and analytic tools from a range of disciplines including linguistics, conversation analysis, gesture studies, and anthropology. A key innovation of the approach in relation to tools for analysis in linguistics is the reference to features of a sequentially ordered exchange of actions in conversation, including the temporal unfolding of such exchange, and its social and normative context. Further, because of the reliance on video corpora, it incorporates both verbal and nonverbal conduct in the analysis of sequences of action. We are faced with the challenge that faces any comparative linguist, namely the need to distinguish between language-particular descriptive categories and language-independent comparative categories or "comparative concepts" (Haspelmath 2010). We submit that our appeal to features of conversational organization – outside the usual realm of "concepts" in the semantic sense – is an advance in the search for tools for linguistic comparison.

A landmark effort to carry out comparative pragmatics was the subfield of "cross-cultural pragmatics", launched in the 1980s. Building on speech act theory

and politeness theory, cross-cultural pragmatics has studied the realization of requests across a large number of languages.[5] This work was motivated, on the one hand, by a search for similarities and differences in the use of language across cultures, and on the other hand, by an interest in the acquisition and development of pragmatic competence (see Woodfield 2008 for a review). Studies in this tradition have provided insights into culture-specific features of politeness and directness, and produced rich inventories of request realization patterns. However, these advances in systematic comparison of speech acts across languages have been limited by their methodology. By using written elicitation, in the form of a "discourse completion task", this work relied on speakers' metalinguistic beliefs about appropriate usage, rather than on direct observation of actual usage in situ. A first problem with this is that we cannot be sure if speakers' intuitions match with what they do in practice. A second problem is that such an approach is relatively low in ecological validity, and does not provide access to the kinds of empirical evidence that direct and repeated observation of behavior in recordings can provide.

Our approach to pragmatic typology has two fundamental elements: (i) the empirical analysis of verbal and nonverbal behavior in video recordings of naturally occurring interaction across languages, and (ii) a coding-based methodology for systematic comparison (see also Dingemanse & Enfield 2015; Rossi 2020). In some previous comparative work in conversation analysis and interactional linguistics, the comparison emerges from the cumulative results of distinct studies, each with their own particular focus and goals; this applies, for instance, to collections of studies of questioning (Steensig & Drew 2008), person reference (Enfield & Stivers 2007) and change-of-state tokens (Heinemann & Koivisto 2016). In other cases, the comparison is designed in advance and carried out jointly by reference to a common focus. Studies of this kind have examined, among other phenomena, the intersection of self-repair and turn-taking (Fox et al. 1996), other-initiated repair (Egbert 1996; Egbert et al. 2009), epistemically authoritative second assessments (Sidnell & Enfield 2012), and requests (Zinken 2016). Finally, some structured comparisons involve a combination of qualitative and quantitative methods, including a coding scheme with a battery of standardized questions asked of hundreds of cases for each language; these include studies of gaze behavior (Rossano et al. 2009), turn-taking (Stivers et al. 2009), self-repair (Fox et al. 2009; 2010), question-answer sequences (Enfield et al. 2010), and other-initiated

---

[5]See House & Kasper (1981), Blum-Kulka et al. (1989), Sifianou (1992), Lee-Wong (1994), Le Pair (1996), Márquez-Reiter (2000), Tsuzuki et al. (2005), Rue & Zhang (2008), Félix-Brasdefer (2009), Ogiermann (2009), Peterson (2010), among many others.

repair (Dingemanse et al. 2015). The project reported on in this book falls within the third group. Ours is a mixed methodology in six defined steps, outlined in the next section.

# 6  A six-step method

We now describe our six-step method for comparative team-based pragmatic typological research. We outline the process in idealized form, in part as a description of what we have done in this project and in part as a recipe for carrying out subsequent pragmatic typological team projects on other aspects of social interaction.

**Step 1. Record:**  Project members carry out sustained field expeditions to village, home, and equivalent community settings, making high-quality video recordings of everyday interaction. This step is the foundation of each language's corpus within the project's comparative empirical work. High quality is paramount. Common practical and ethics protocols for the collection of conversational materials in fieldwork are crucial (see Enfield 2014a; Dingemanse & Enfield 2015). To guarantee that the highest quality materials are captured, and as a way of maximizing the investment in field research, each field researcher collects a large number of hours of raw material which ensures availability of sufficient quality data, as well as providing extensive materials for later research if needed. This step assumes significant background work on the part of the researcher, who has likely already established the appropriate type and degree of familiarity and integration in a host community and with the relevant language.

**Step 2. Transcribe:**  Project members then work with native speakers in the field to transcribe and translate the recordings collected. This is a lengthy and involved phase of the research, and represents a major commitment of research resources, but with a major payoff in result. Full transcription and translation of one minute of recorded social interaction takes approximately three hours; about an hour for fine-grained transcription and about two hours for full translation (when the researcher is not a native speaker of the language being transcribed and translated). Securing an accurate and complete account of what is being said in a free-flowing conversation is difficult and time-consuming. Many team members are working on languages that are not their first languages. These hours of transcription and translation may also require more general investigation of the language

as necessary background to the analysis of the corpora, along with the relevant biographical and ethnographic background. This means that the "Transcribe" step will likely require between 9 and 12 months of dedicated fieldwork. This is a valuable investment with broader payoff. An important outcome of this step is that these corpora will then be available for further research in the future.

**Step 3. Confer:**  Team members work together in intensive internal group meetings over a sustained period, in which all members of the team share data and observations from the corpora relating to the phenomena of interest; these are hands-on intensive meetings, carried out at close quarters with the goal of identifying and operationalizing the empirical phenomena for quantitative investigation in Step 4 below, and articulating their relation to the project's research questions. This step is important for the project's conceptual and theoretical outcomes, and it ensures coherence and clarity of the outcomes in subsequent steps. An important goal of this step is to ensure that the team members become so steeped in the empirical materials, not just from their own field language but from all languages in the project, that the team develops deep and shared intuitions for the phenomena at the core of the project. These sessions also have the specific goal of producing a coding scheme to be used in Step 4.

**Step 4. Code:**  Team members carry out quantitative coding based on Step 3 outcomes. Coding schemes should eventually be published, so as to allow the international research community to apply them in extensions and adaptations of the research (see Chapter 2, as well as Stivers & Enfield 2010, Dingemanse et al. 2016, for examples). The coding step can be done within a few weeks, and is done in an intensive block-out work period, with all team members in daily contact to discuss and iron out coding issues while working through the data.

**Step 5. Check:**  After coding of individual language corpora is completed, there is a check for coding reliability. This ensures that the coding done by each team member of data in different languages is done consistently across the project. The procedure is to use a sample of data from a language common to all team members (e.g. English) and have everybody independently code the same data, using the coding scheme from Step 4, in order to then carry out a test of reliability and consistency in coding. It is then possible to report with confidence that the coding of different languages by different

> researchers in Step 4 was done in the same way (as Dingemanse et al. 2015 do for other-initiated repair).

**Step 6. Model:** This final step involves statistical modeling of the coding results from Step 4. The data resulting from the large-scale coding scheme enables statistical modeling for quantitative assessment of patterns of association and interdependence between the phenomena coded for (as formulated in Step 3 and executed in Step 4). It is necessary to use multivariate statistics to control for interdependence among these variables (see Dingemanse et al. 2015 for an example of this). Steps 5 and 6 do not take a long time, but require special expertise.

This protocol requires a team science approach. Given the demanding combination of fieldwork (Steps 1, 2), expertise in comparative linguistics, interactional linguistics, and conversation analysis (Steps 3, 4), and quantitative approaches (Steps 5, 6), this could never have been done in any way other than by a team. Team science in linguistics is still rare and we were fortunate to have had the opportunity to do this here.

The findings reported in the language-specific chapters in this volume are primarily the product of qualitative analysis but also include quantitative findings particular to each data set.

# 7 Data

This study is based on the analysis of corpora of audiovisual recordings of informal everyday language usage in social interaction in eight languages from five continents (see Figure 1). In building these corpora, we placed unattended cameras in household and community contexts to record social interactions as they were occurring naturally, using high standards for audio and video quality (see Step 1 discussed in §6 for more details).

The data were transcribed and translated by a language expert (see Table 1) with assistance from native speakers. The corpora range in size from about ten to over ninety hours of footage. In some cases, the corpus represents the largest available database for the language, especially in the case of unwritten minority languages like Cha'palaa (Chapter 3), Murrinhpatha (Chapter 7), and Siwu (Chapter 10). For larger-scale national languages like Italian, Lao, Polish, and Russian, other corpora may be available to some degree, but most of these are limited to written language, due to the intensive demands of transcription of spoken language.

Figure 1: World map showing locations of data collection for the eight languages involved in the study (Credit: satellite composition of Earth's surface by NASA).

Sampling procedures and criteria for inclusion/exclusion are detailed in Chapter 2.

## 8 This book

The goal of this book is two-fold: to document the conceptual and methodological framework of our project (especially here and in Chapter 2) and to provide detailed qualitative/quantitative analyses of recruitment sequences in each of the eight languages: Cha'palaa, English, Italian, Lao, Murrinhpatha, Polish, Russian, and Siwu. Each language-specific study gives an overview of linguistic, gestural, sequential, and contextual features of recruitment sequences, following the categories defined in the coding scheme. While written to stand independently, the eight chapters adopt the coding scheme's common reference structure to facilitate navigation and comparison. At the same time, the chapters develop aspects and topics that are specific to each language and data.

By focusing on the phenomenon of recruitments, this large-scale collaborative study examines a domain of social action in interaction in which social relations are exploited, maintained, and potentially tested. We find that cross-linguistic diversity in this pragmatic domain is relatively low, considerably lower than the

Table 1: Languages covered in this volume, data sources, coding credits.

| Language | Language family | Location | Data collected by | Data coded by |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Cha'palaa | Barbacoan | Ecuador | Simeon Floyd | Simeon Floyd |
| English | IE (Germanic) | United Kingdom, United States | Giovanni Rossi, LSI archive http://www.sfsu.edu/~lsi/ | Kobin H. Kendrick |
| Italian | IE (Romance) | Italy | Giovanni Rossi | Giovanni Rossi |
| Lao | Tai | Laos | N. J. Enfield | N. J. Enfield |
| Murrinhpatha | Southern Daly | Northern Australia | Joe Blythe | Joe Blythe |
| Polish | IE (Slavic) | Poland | Eva Ogiermann, Jörg Zinken | Jörg Zinken |
| Russian | IE (Slavic) | Russia | Julija Baranova | Julija Baranova |
| Siwu | Kwa | Ghana | Mark Dingemanse | Mark Dingemanse |

diversity observed in phonological, morphosyntactic, and semantic systems. This is in line with the idea that a species-wide infrastructure for interaction underpins the use of language, largely independent of the specific shape of that language (see Levinson 2000; 2006; Schegloff 2006; Enfield 2013; Enfield & Sidnell 2013; Stivers et al. 2009; Dingemanse et al. 2015). This is not to say that these pragmatic systems are identical. The chapters of this book show that there are differences. But we are struck by the commonalities that our approach reveals in a domain of language where many might expect to find radical variation.

# Acknowledgments

# References

Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. & R. M. W. Dixon (eds.). 2017. *Commands: A cross-linguistic typology.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Austin, J. L. 1962. *How to do things with words.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Blum-Kulka, Shoshana. 1982. Learning how to say what you mean in a second language: A study of the speech act performance of learners of Hebrew as a second language. *Applied Linguistics* 3. 29–59.

Blum-Kulka, Shoshana, Juliane House & Gabriele Kasper. 1989. *Cross-cultural pragmatics: Requests and apologies* (Advances in Discourse Processes 31). Norwood: Ablex.

Brown, Penelope & Stephen C. Levinson. 1978. Universals in language usage: Politeness phenomena. In Esther N. Goody (ed.), *Questions and politeness: Strategies in social interaction*, 56–311. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Brown, Penelope & Stephen C. Levinson. 1987. *Politeness: Some universals in language usage* (Studies in Interactional Sociolinguistics 4). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Clark, Herbert H. 1979. Responding to indirect speech acts. *Cognitive Psychology* 11(4). 430–477.

Clark, Herbert H. 1996. *Using language.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Clark, Herbert H. & Peter Lucy. 1975. Understanding what is meant from what is said: A study in conversationally conveyed requests. *Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior* 14(1). 56–72.

Clark, Herbert H. & D. H. Schunk. 1980. Polite responses to polite requests. *Cognitive Psychology* 8(2). 111–143.

Craven, Alexandra & Jonathan Potter. 2010. Directives: Entitlement and contingency in action. *Discourse Studies* 12(4). 419–442.

Curl, Traci S. 2006. Offers of assistance: Constraints on syntactic design. *Journal of Pragmatics* 38(8). 1257–1280.   DOI:10.1016/j.pragma.2005.09.004

Curl, Traci S. & Paul Drew. 2008. Contingency and action: A comparison of two forms of requesting. *Research on Language & Social Interaction* 41(2). 129–153.

Dingemanse, Mark & N. J. Enfield. 2015. Other-initiated repair across languages: Towards a typology of conversational structures. *Open Linguistics* 1. 96–118. DOI:10.2478/opli-2014-0007

Dingemanse, Mark & Simeon Floyd. 2014. Conversation across cultures. In N. J. Enfield, Paul Kockelman & Jack Sidnell (eds.), *The Cambridge handbook of linguistic anthropology*, 434–464. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Dingemanse, Mark, Kobin H. Kendrick & N. J. Enfield. 2016. A coding scheme for other-initiated repair across languages. *Open Linguistics* 2(1). 35–46. DOI:10.1515/opli-2016-0002

Dingemanse, Mark, Seán G. Roberts, Julija Baranova, Joe Blythe, Paul Drew, Simeon Floyd, Rósa Signý Gísladóttir, Kobin H. Kendrick, Stephen C. Levinson, Elizabeth Manrique, Giovanni Rossi & N. J. Enfield. 2015. Universal principles in the repair of communication problems. *PLoS ONE* 10(9). e0136100. DOI:10.1371/journal.pone.0136100

Drew, Paul & Elizabeth Couper-Kuhlen. 2014a. Requesting – From speech act to recruitment. In Paul Drew & Elizabeth Couper-Kuhlen (eds.), *Requesting in social interaction* (Studies in Language and Social Interaction 26), 1–34. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Drew, Paul & Elizabeth Couper-Kuhlen (eds.). 2014b. *Requesting in social interaction* (Studies in Language and Social Interaction 26). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Egbert, Maria M. 1996. Context-sensitivity in conversation: Eye gaze and the german repair initiator *bitte*? *Language in Society* 25(4). 587–612.

Egbert, Maria M., Andrea Golato & Jeffrey D. Robinson. 2009. Repairing reference. In Jack Sidnell (ed.), *Conversation analysis: Comparative perspectives* (Studies in Interactional Sociolinguistics 27), 104–132. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Enfield, N. J. 2011a. Elements of action ascription: A generative account? Talk presented at the Workshop on "Proposals and Action Ascription in Conversation", March 17–20. Available at http://recruitments.nickenfield.org/files/sites/6/2018/01/027-Enfield-talk-Saturday-05.pdf.

Enfield, N. J. 2011b. Summary of Interactional Foundations of Language / Human Sociality and Systems of Language Use Retreat, 20 April 11 — attended by Nick Enfield, Julija Baranova, Giovanni Rossi, Penelope Brown, Simeon Floyd, Rósa S. Gísladóttir, Joe Blythe, Lilla Magyari, Gertie Hoymann, Paul Drew, Kobin H. Kendrick, Tyko Dirksmeyer, Lorena Pool Balam, Mark Dingemanse, Elizabeth Manrique, Francisco Torreira, and Stephen C. Levinson. Max Planck Institute for Psycholinguitics, The Netherlands. Available at http://recruitments.nickenfield.org/files/sites/6/2018/01/050-Summary-of-IFL-HuSSLe-meeting-2011-04-20.pdf.

Enfield, N. J. 2013. *Relationship thinking: Enchrony, agency, and human sociality.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Enfield, N. J. 2014a. Doing fieldwork on the body, language, and communication. In Cornelia Müller, Alan Cienki, Ellen Fricke, Silva Ladewig, David McNeill & Sedinha Tessendorf (eds.), *Body – language – communication: An international handbook on multimodality in human interaction. Volume 1*, 974–981. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.

Enfield, N. J. 2014b. Human agency and the infrastructure for requests. In Paul Drew & Elizabeth Couper-Kuhlen (eds.), *Requesting in social interaction* (Studies in Language and Social Interaction 26), 35–54. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Enfield, N. J. & Jack Sidnell. 2013. Language presupposes an enchronic infrastructure for social interaction. In Daniel Dor & Chris Knight (eds.), *The social origins of language: Studies in the evolution of language*, 92–104. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Enfield, N. J. & Tanya Stivers (eds.). 2007. *Person reference in interaction: Linguistic, cultural and social perspectives* (Language, Culture, and Cognition 7). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Enfield, N. J., Tanya Stivers & Stephen C. Levinson. 2010. Question-response sequences in conversation across ten languages: An introduction. *Journal of Pragmatics* 42(10). 2615–2619. DOI:10.1016/j.pragma.2010.04.001

Ervin-Tripp, Susan M. 1976. Is Sybil there? The structure of some American English directives. *Language in Society* 5. 25–66.

Ervin-Tripp, Susan M. 1981. How to make and understand a request. In Herman Parret, Marina Sbisà & Jef Verschueren (eds.), *Possibilities and limitations of pragmatics*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Ervin-Tripp, Susan M., Jiansheng Guo & Martin Lampert. 1990. Politeness and persuasion in children's control acts. *Journal of Pragmatics* 14(2). 307–331.

Félix-Brasdefer, Julio César. 2009. Pragmatic variation across Spanish(es): Requesting in Mexican, Costa Rican and Dominican Spanish. *Intercultural Pragmatics* 6(4). 473–515.

Floyd, Simeon. 2017. Requesting as a means for negotiating distributed agency. In N. J. Enfield & Paul Kockelman (eds.), *Distributed agency*, 67–78. New York: Oxford University Press.

Floyd, Simeon, Giovanni Rossi, Julija Baranova, Joe Blythe, Mark Dingemanse, Kobin H. Kendrick, Jörg Zinken & N. J. Enfield. 2018. Universals and cultural diversity in the expression of gratitude. *Royal Society Open Science* 5(5). 180391. DOI:10.1017/S0047404516000385

Floyd, Simeon, Giovanni Rossi, N. J. Enfield, Julija Baranova, Joe Blythe, Mark Dingemanse, Kobin H. Kendrick & Jörg Zinken. 2014a. Everyday requesting across eight languages. Talk presented at the Center for Language, Interaction, and Culture (CLIC) workshop "About Face", February 7-8. Available at https://posttruthinitiative.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/01/220-Floyd-Rossi-2014-Everyday-requesting-across-eight-languages.pdf.

Floyd, Simeon, Giovanni Rossi, N. J. Enfield, Julija Baranova, Joe Blythe, Mark Dingemanse, Kobin H. Kendrick & Jörg Zinken. 2014b. Recruitments across languages: A systematic comparison. Talk presented at the 4th International Conference on Conversation Analysis (ICCA 2014), June 25-29. Available at https : / / posttruthinitiative . org / wp - content / uploads / 2018 / 01 / 240 - Recruitments-across-languages-4.pdf.

Fox, Barbara A., Makoto Hayashi & Robert Jasperson. 1996. Resources and repair: A cross-linguistic study of syntax and repair. In Elinor Ochs, Emanuel A. Schegloff & Sandra A. Thompson (eds.), *Interaction and grammar* (Studies in interactional sociolinguistics 13), 185–237. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Fox, Barbara A., Yael Maschler & Susanne Uhmann. 2010. A cross-linguistic study of self-repair: Evidence from English, German, and Hebrew. *Journal of Pragmatics* 42(9). 2487–2505.

Fox, Barbara A., Fay Wouk, Makoto Hayashi, Steven Fincke, Liang Tao, Marja-Leena Sorjonen, Minna Laakso & Wilfrido Flores Hernandez. 2009. A cross-linguistic investigation of the site of initiation in same-turn self-repair. In Jack Sidnell (ed.), *Conversation analysis: Comparative perspectives* (Studies in Interactional Sociolinguistics 27), 60–103. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Francik, Ellen P. & Herbert H. Clark. 1985. How to make requests that overcome obstacles to compliance. *Journal of Memory and Language* 24(5). 560–568.

Gibbs, Raymond W. 1979. Contextual effects in understanding indirect requests. *Discourse Processes* 2(1). 1–10.

Gibbs, Raymond W. 1983. Do people always process the literal meanings of indirect requests? *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition* 9(3). 524–533.

Gibbs, Raymond W. 1985. Situational conventions and requests. In Joseph P. Forgas (ed.), *Language and social situations* (Springer Series in Social Psychology), 98–110. New York: Springer-Verlag.

Gibbs, Raymond W. 1986a. Comprehension and memory for nonliteral utterances: The problem of sarcastic indirect requests. *Acta Psychologica* 62(1). 41–57.

Gibbs, Raymond W. 1986b. What makes some indirect speech acts conventional? *Journal of Memory and Language* 25(2). 181–196.

Gibbs, Raymond W. & Rachel A. G. Müller. 1988. Conversational sequences and preference for indirect speech acts. *Discourse Processes* 11(1). 101–116.

Goffman, Erving. 1967. *Interaction ritual: Essays in face-to-face behavior*. Garden City: Anchor Books.

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

Gordon, David & Susan M. Ervin-Tripp. 1984. The structure of children's requests. In Richard L. Schiefelbusch & Joanne Pickar (eds.), *The acquisition of communicative competence*, 295–322. Baltimore: University Park Press.

Gordon, David & George Lakoff. 1971. Conversational postulates. In *Proceedings of the 7th Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society*, 63–84.

Grice, H. Paul. 1975. Logic and conversation. In Peter Cole & Jerry L. Morgan (eds.), *Syntax and semantics*, vol. 3, 41–58. New York: Academic Press.

Haspelmath, Martin. 2010. Comparative concepts and descriptive categories in crosslinguistic studies. *Language* 86(3). 663–687. DOI:10.1353/lan.2010.0021

Heinemann, Trine. 2006. "Will you or can't you?": Displaying entitlement in interrogative requests. *Journal of Pragmatics* 38(7). 1081–1104.

Heinemann, Trine & Aino Koivisto. 2016. Indicating a change-of-state in interaction: Cross-linguistic explorations. *Journal of Pragmatics* 104. 83–88.

House, Juliane & Gabriele Kasper. 1981. Politeness markers in English and German. In Florian Coulmas (ed.), *Conversational routine*, 157–185. Cambridge: MIT Press.

Kendrick, Kobin H. & Paul Drew. 2016. Recruitment: Offers, requests, and the organization of assistance in interaction. *Research on Language & Social Interaction* 49(1). 1–19.

Le Pair, Rob. 1996. Spanish request strategies: A cross-cultural analysis from an intercultural perspective. *Language Sciences* 18(3-4). 651–670.

Lee-Wong, Song Mei. 1994. Imperatives in requests: Direct or impolite – Observations from Chinese. *Pragmatics* 4(4). 491–515.

Levinson, Stephen C. 2000. *Presumptive meanings: The theory of generalized conversational implicature.* Cambridge: MIT Press.

Levinson, Stephen C. 2006. On the human "interaction engine". In N. J. Enfield & Stephen C. Levinson (eds.), *Roots of human sociality: culture, cognition and interaction*, 39–69. Oxford: Berg.

Lindström, Anna. 1999. *Language as social action: Grammar, prosody and interaction in Swedish conversation.* Uppsala University. (Doctoral dissertation).

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 Auli Hakulinen & Margret Selting (eds.), *Syntax and lexis in conversation* (Studies in Discourse and Grammar 17), 209–233. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Márquez-Reiter, Rosina. 2000. *Linguistic politeness in Britain and Uruguay: A contrastive study of requests and apologies.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Ogiermann, Eva. 2009. Politeness and in-directness across cultures: A comparison of English, German, Polish and Russian requests. *Journal of Politeness Research* 5(2). 189–216.

Peterson, Elizabeth. 2010. Perspective and politeness in Finnish requests. *Pragmatics* 20(3). 401–423.

Rossano, Federico, Penelope Brown & Stephen C. Levinson. 2009. Gaze, questioning and culture. In Jack Sidnell (ed.), *Conversation analysis: Comparative perspectives* (Studies in Interactional Sociolinguistics 27), 187–249. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rossi, Giovanni. 2012. Bilateral and unilateral requests: The use of imperatives and *Mi X?* interrogatives in Italian. *Discourse Processes* 49(5). 426–458. DOI:10.1080/0163853X.2012.684136

Rossi, Giovanni. 2015. Responding to pre-requests: The organization of *hai x* "do you have x" sequences in Italian. *Journal of Pragmatics* 82(Supplement C). 5–22. DOI:10.1016/j.pragma.2015.03.008

Rossi, Giovanni. 2020. Other-repetition in conversation across languages: Bringing prosody into pragmatic typology. *Language in Society* 49(4).

Rue, Yong-Ju & Grace Qiao Zhang. 2008. *Request strategies: A comparative study in Mandarin Chinese and Korean.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Sadock, Jerrold M. & Arnold Zwicky. 1985. Speech act distinctions in syntax. In Timothy Shopen (ed.), *Language typology and syntactic description*, 155–96. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Schegloff, Emanuel A. 2006. Interaction: The infrastructure for social institutions, the natural ecological niche for language, and the arena in which culture is enacted. In N. J. Enfield & Stephen C. Levinson (eds.), *Roots of human sociality: Culture, cognition, and interaction*, 70–96. Oxford: Berg.

Schegloff, Emanuel A. 2007. *Sequence organization in interaction: A primer in conversation analysis. Volume 1*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Searle, John R. 1969. *Speech acts: An essay in the philosophy of language.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Searle, John R. 1975. Indirect speech acts. In Peter Cole & Jerry L. Morgan (eds.), *Syntax and semantics*, vol. 3, 59–82. New York: Academic Press.

Searle, John R. 1976. A classification of illocutionary acts. *Language in Society* 5(1). 1–23.

Sidnell, Jack & N. J. Enfield. 2012. Language diversity and social action: A third locus of linguistic relativity. *Current Anthropology* 53(3). 302–333. DOI:10.1086/665697

Sifianou, Maria. 1992. *Politeness phenomena in England and Greece: A cross-cultural perspective.* New York: Clarendon Press.

Sinclair, John McHardy & Malcolm Coulthard. 1975. *Toward an analysis of discourse: The English used by teachers and pupils.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Steensig, Jakob & Paul Drew. 2008. Introduction: Questioning and affiliation / disaffiliation in interaction. *Discourse Studies* 10(1). 5–15.

Stivers, Tanya & N. J. Enfield. 2010. A coding scheme for question-response sequences in conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics* 42(10). 2620–2626. DOI:10.1016/j.pragma.2010.04.002

Stivers, Tanya, N. J. Enfield, Penelope Brown, Christina Englert, Makoto Hayashi, Trine Heinemann, Gertie Hoymann, Federico Rossano, Jan Peter Ruiter, Kyung-Eun Yoon & Stephen C. Levinson. 2009. Universals and cultural variation in turn-taking in conversation. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 106(26). 10587–10592. DOI:10.1073/pnas.0903616106

Tsuzuki, Masako, Kazuhiro Takahashi, Cynthia Patschke & Qin Zhang. 2005. Selection of linguistic forms for requests and offers: Comparison between English and Chinese. In Robin T. Lakoff & Sachiko Ide (eds.), *Broadening the horizon of linguistic politeness*, 283–298. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Vinkhuyzen, Erik & Margaret H. Szymanski. 2005. Would you like to do it your-self? Service requests and their non-granting responses. In Keith Richards & Paul Seedhouse (eds.), *Applying conversation analysis*, 91–106. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Wierzbicka, Anna. 1991. *Cross-cultural pragmatics: The semantics of human interaction*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Woodfield, Helen. 2008. Interlanguage requests: A contrastive study. In Martin Pütz & JoAnne Neff-van Aertselaer (eds.), *Developing contrastive pragmatics: Interlanguage and cross-cultural perspectives* (Studies on Language Acquisition 31), 231–64. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Wootton, Anthony J. 1981. Two request forms of four year olds. *Journal of Pragmatics* 5(6). 511–523.

Wootton, Anthony J. 1997. *Interaction and the development of mind*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Zinken, Jörg. 2016. *Requesting responsibility: The morality of grammar in Polish and English family interaction*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Zinken, Jörg & Eva Ogiermann. 2013. Responsibility and action: Invariants and diversity in requests for objects in British English and Polish interaction. *Research on Language & Social Interaction* 46(3). 256–276. DOI:10.1080/08351813.2013.810409

Zinken, Jörg & Giovanni Rossi. 2016. Assistance and other forms of cooperative engagement. *Research on Language & Social Interaction* 49(1). 20–26. DOI:10.1080/08351813.2016.1126439