

Anna Lindström
FUMS
Uppsala Universitet
Anna.Lindstrom@nordiska.uu.se

*This paper is based on a contribution to the workshop
"Samtalsspråkets Grammatik", Linköping University, May 5-7,
2000. Please do not cite without author's consent.
Draft date: 00 06 13.*

HOW TO DO THINGS WITH WORDS:

TALK AND PRACTICAL TASKS IN THE HOME HELP SERVICE

In a seminal monograph, published nearly four decades ago, John Austin challenged the prevailing philosophical assumption "that the business of a 'statement' can only be to 'describe' some state of affairs, or 'to state some fact', which it must do either truly or falsely" (1962, p. 1). Austin observed that there are utterances that do not describe or report any thing and are neither true nor false. These utterances are instead part of doing some action. Prototypical examples include words uttered by the parties in a marriage ceremony, during a christening, in a will or within a betting exchange. Austin's observations on the performative character of language were developed within speech act theory (cf. Searle, 1969). The notion that language, and conversation in particular, first and foremost, is a social rather than descriptive resource is also central for conversation analytic research (hereafter abbreviated as CA). CA was developed in sociology around the same time that Austin published his monograph. In a critical review of speech act theory, Schegloff (1992a) argued that

speech act theory as developed by Searle "is not so much a theory of how to do things with words" (to use Austin's familiar title) as it is a kind of lexical semantics of speech act verbs, that is, a conceptual substruction or decomposition of what is meant by referring to something as a promise, an invitation, a complaint etc. It is, then, a conceptual undertaking, and a philosophical one. (p. 1)

CA by contrast is an empirical enterprise rooted in detailed examinations of recordings of naturally occurring interaction in a range of social settings. Among other things, CA aims to provide systematic descriptions of how particular utterances situated in actual sequences of talk can be understood as distinct courses of action. This paper is a preliminary report of a CA-study-in-progress of meetings between home help providers and elderly care recipients in the Swedish home help service.

Austin's observation that words in and of themselves can be performative was revolutionary for philosophy. By uttering the words "I do" within the marriage ceremony the prospective bride or groom performs the act of marriage. Provided that the appropriate circumstances prevail, the words constitute the act of marriage. The paper at hand takes a different slant on the relationship between words and actions. The analysis centers on sequences where the care recipient (CR) issues a directive that requires the home help provider (HH) to perform a practical task such as closing a door, watering a flower, or adjusting a

necklace. The arrowed lines in example (1) show a directive from the corpus.¹

(1) **THE TRUNK** [IIIB1:1:21.0] HH and CR are in CR's bedroom. HH has just assisted CR to get dressed. CR is sitting on the bed facing the window while HH is opening the venetian blinds.

- 01 R: *Va¿*
What
- 02 HH: *LJU:ST i guds hu:s.*
Light in God's house
- 03 CR: [*Ja: just.=*
Yes right
- 04 HH: [*Hehe*
- 05 HH: *=De så mörkt (0.2) så där.*
'T so dark so there
'T so dark there
- 06 (1.6)
- 07 CR: *->VILL DU VRIDA PÅ DEN där*
Would you turn on the one there
Would you turn the one there
- 08 *->(0.8)*
- 09 *->eh:: meu eh: ((creaking sound)) den där me*
eh with eh the one there with
- 10 *->(.) s:tammen där.*
the trunk there
- 11 HH: *Mm:?*
- 12 (0.4)
- 13 CR: *Fö ja tycker han lutar så mycke*
For I think he leans so much
Cause I think he leans so much
- 14 *u:tåt om'an s- får stå sådär*
outward if'e s- gets to stand sothere

¹ All data in this paper was transcribed according to the transcription system first developed by Gail Jefferson. See Ochs, Schegloff & Thompson (1996), pp. 461-465 for a description of these conventions. The line below the Swedish talk provides a word-by-word English translation while the next line gives a more idiomatic translation.

towards the outside if he sits like that

15 *he[la tiden*
 the whole time
 all the time

16 HH: [*Behöver no vattnas också 'rö(hh).*
 Needs probably watering also 'ya
 Probably needs to be watered as well see

CR issues a directive in lines 7-10, *VILL DU VRIDA PÅ DEN där*
(0.8) eh:: meu eh: ((knarrljud)) den där me (.) s:tammen där.

Like most directives in this data this one is not formatted as an imperative (cf. Lindström, 1999a). Instead it is done as a "yes"/"no" question. The directive includes a deictic expression, *DEN där*. CR helps locate its referent by first "pointing" with her face toward the window and then repeating the deictic expression with a specification *den där me (.) s:tammen*. The directive requires HH to implement a practical task namely to turn the plant around. Given the practical character of the requested action one might assume that the directive could be satisfied nonvocally with HH simply turning the plant. However, preliminary analysis of the collection at hand suggests that when the HH implements requested actions of a practical character she always gives a verbal response. This response can be a minimal acknowledgment as in line 11 of the example above or an extended turn. It thus seems that Austin's observation could be taken a step further. It appears that it is not only that we can do things with words, we cannot do things without them.

I begin by introducing the data and the methods used for transcribing talk and nonvocal activities. I then review some prior research on directives. One point of departure is a study of aligning responses to actions that cannot be immediately satisfied but involve a commitment to a future activity. This study provided the impetus for the paper and is therefore given special attention. The appendix shows the core collection of directive sequences that I will analyze as I continue this work-in-progress.

Data

The data for the collection that provides the basis for this study was drawn from a corpus of 33 videorecordings of naturally occurring visits in the Swedish home help service. The home help service is a government subsidized program that provides senior citizens with assistance with personal hygiene and simpler housekeeping tasks in their home. Most of the elderly persons recorded in our study had received assistance once or several times a day for at least a year. Persons with severe hearing problems or who were diagnosed as senile were not included in our study. The recordings were made during 1997 and 1998 by the author. See Lindström (2000) for a description of the data collection. Parts of the data has been transcribed according to the CA-method (see Ochs et. al 1996 for a description of these conventions).

I am in the process of building a sample of directive sequences from this corpus. The current sample consists of 17 candidate directive sequences where one of the interactants directs the other to implement a practical task. In order to qualify for the collection, the requested task had to be one that could be immediately fulfilled. The initial sample was made from the written transcript. Inspection of the video revealed that the participants were not in the video frame in four sequences. Since the analysis of non-vocal activities is critical, I decided to exclude those sequences. The appendix show the cases that are included in the original core collection of candidate directive sequences.

Brief overview of some prior work on directives

Directives have provided a rich topic for research in anthropology, linguistics, and sociology. Perhaps this is because they are "positioned right at the interface between language and social action; although built through speech, they are designed to make things happen in the larger world of social action within which speech is embedded" (Goodwin, 1990, p. 65). A full overview of the plethora of studies on directives is beyond the scope of this paper. Instead I will briefly discuss work that is relevant for the paper at hand.

Linguistic formats for expressing directives

Ervin-Tripp (1976) studied the linguistic structures of American English directives. Her study was based on

ethnographic notes and audiorecordings of natural conversations as well as notes from conversational situations that were created for the purposes of her study. In contrasting the audiorecordings with the other data she noted that "the tape recordings suggest that there is a greater formal range than the paper and pencil recordings have located, and that the directives do much more than direct" (Ervin-Tripp, 1976, p. 27). Ervin-Tripp found that directives could be expressed in a variety of syntactic forms. Her corpus yielded six different types of directives: need statements, imperatives, imbedded imperatives, permission directives, question directives, and hints. This suggests that it is futile to rely on syntactic form (e.g. imperatives) when studying directives. Permission directives such as "May I have the salt" were scant in her corpus. I have yet to find a permission directive in the home help service corpus. The other five types occurred and they are exemplified in table (1).

Table (1) Directive Types (from Ervin-Tripp, 1976).

| Directive Type | Examples from the home help service |
|---------------------|---|
| Need statement | <i>Ja letar efter en (.) <u>osthyvel</u>,</i> I'm looking after a cheese slicer I'm looking for a cheese slicer |
| Imperative | <i>.hh ta sedan <u>tvagan</u> ...</i> take then the scouring whisk |
| Imbedded imperative | <i>Vill du flytta (dä:r) <u>bordet</u></i> Would you move (there) the table |

åt fönstret t[ill],
towards the window to
towards the window

Question directive *Har du tid att sjunga nånting?*
Have you time to sing any
Do you have time to sing at all

Hint *Å du har tvätta händerna som va:nlit?*
And you have washed the hands as usual

-

A cursory examination of the directives in the home help service corpus suggests that need statements and imbedded imperatives are frequent while imperatives are rare (Lindström, 1999a). When Ervin-Tripp examined the use of different types across her corpus she found that they varied systematically according to familiarity, rank, territorial location, difficulty of task and whether or not a duty was expected, or non-compliance was likely. For example need statements often occurred between persons differing in rank as when a physician states to a technician *I'll need a routine culture and a specimen* (ErvinTripp, p. 29). Ervin-Tripp rejected the idea that the selection of one directive type over another was dictated by feelings of deference or politeness (p. 60). In order to understand the social meaning of a particular type we must take into account contextual factors such as the relationship between speaker and addressee. *Could I trouble you to take out the garbage, Joseph McAllister?* thus comes off as

sarcastic rather than polite when uttered by a child to her younger sibling.

Ervin-Tripp's arguments notwithstanding, one of the most ambitious studies of directives has sought to explain the selection of particular directive formats in terms of politeness strategies. Brown and Levinson (1978) studied directives across languages with the ambition to establish universal patterns in language use. In their analyses, the authors extended Goffman's (1955) notion of face, that is, "the positive social value that a person effectively claims for himself by the line others assume he has taken during a particular contact" (Goffman, 1967 [1955], p. 5). A person's "face" is a social rather than a psychological entity:

While his [sic] social face can be his most personal possession and the center of his security and pleasure, it is only on loan to him from society, it will be withdrawn unless he conducts himself in a way that is worthy of it. Approved attributes and their relation to face make of every man his own jailer, this is a fundamental social constraint even though each man may like his cell (Goffman, 1967 [1955], p. 10).

Brown & Levinson (1978) analyzed the different strategies used when engaging in act that constitute a threat to face. The authors argued that such acts can be done "on" and "off the record". The former category includes bold unmitigated talk as well as talk that involves what Brown & Levinson call positive and negative politeness. Positive politeness involve an affirmation of the face of the other person whereas negative politeness involves an orientation toward the other person's

right to be unimpeded. Brown & Levinson's schema is based on the assumption that actions that are formulated indirectly are less threatening than those that take a direct form. This idea has been challenged in subsequent studies (cf. Aronsson & Thorell, 1999; Goodwin, 1990).

Aronsson & Thorell (1999) studied directive use in role play situations involving Swedish preschoolers and school children (ages 6 and 8). The children were invited to play house and enact different scenarios that implicated inter- and intra-generational conflicts. Each enactment involved two children as well as male and female doll figures which the children used to playact other family members. The interactions in these enactments tended to become aggravated and the aggravation escalated during the course of the enactment. Many of the directives in their data are thus bald and unmitigated. Table (2) shows some examples.

Table (2) Examples of unmitigated directives
(excerpted by the author from Aronsson & Thorell, pp. 44-47).

| |
|---|
| - |
| <i>Och du är tyst och du är tyst! (SP44)</i> |
| <i>Ni ska inte titta på tv. Ni ska ta frukost. (SP40)</i> |
| <i>Nej, stopp! (FP20)</i> |
| <i>Gå av säjer jag. ((slår pojken)) Gå av! Gå av!</i> |
| <i>Det är min tur.((pipig röst)) Pappa säj åt lillskiten!</i> |
| <i>(SP46)</i> |

| - |

Aronsson and Thorell's study fills an important gap in the research on directives. While most prior research has focussed

on mitigation, their study showed how aggravation is collaboratively constructed. The authors found that current politeness models, including the one by Brown & Levinson, could not fully account for the escalations that took place in their materials. With the exception of Aronsson & Thorell (1999), the studies reviewed so far have tended to focus on directives as isolated utterances. A more fruitful approach is to examine directives as sequentially realized activities (cf. Goodwin, 1990, pp. 66-67).

Directives as sequential activities

Schegloff & Sacks (1973) argued that syntax alone does not determine the directive force of an utterance. Whether or not an imperative is understood as a directive is governed more by sequential position than syntactic form. This is shown in example (2) below.

(2) (From Schegloff & Sacks, 1973, p. 313). Lines shortened and line numbers added.) B has called to invite C, but has been told that C is going out to dinner.

01 B: Yeah. Well get on your clothes and get out and
02 collect some of that free food and we'll make it
03 some other time Judy then.
04 C: Okay then Jack
05 B: Bye bye
06 C: Bye bye

As Schegloff & Sacks observed, B's imperatives in lines 1-2 are not treated as directives but as a conversational pre-closing that is ratified in the subsequent good-bye sequence in lines 5-6.

How directives are sequentially realized has been examined in CA research (cf. Goodwin, 1990; Heritage & Sefi, 1992; Wootton, 1997). Whether or not a turn at talk constitutes a directive need not be deciphered on the basis of intuition but can be determined interactively by the participants in the interchange. Consider the arrowed lines in the next example which is taken from the home help service data.

(3) **STRONG** [IIIA1:1:18] CR and HH are in CR's kitchen. CR is drying her hair with an electric hairdryer at the kitchen table while HH is doing the dishes at the sink. There has been a conversational lapse for almost a minute and a half.² CR has just turned off the hairdryer.

- 01 CR: ->De står en citronflaska därinne :
 'T stands a lemonbottle in there
 There is a bottle of lemon juice in there
- 02 (0.2)
- 03 ->i dörren däruppe men ja får inte upp den.
 in the door there up but I get not up it
 in the door up there but I can't open it

CR is sitting at the kitchen table while HH is doing the dishes at the sink. CR selfselects (Sacks, Schegloff & Jefferson, 1974) to make the statement in line 1, *De står en citronflaska därinne* :. Latter parts of this sequence reveals that the deictic expression *därinne* : refers to the door of the refrigerator. The turn is prosodically and grammatically possibly complete at the end of line 1. Its pragmatic relevance however is still unclear. It is not obvious whether HH is

² A lapse is an extended silence at a transition relevance place. See Sacks, Schegloff & Jefferson (1974, p. 715, footnote 26) for a distinction of different types of silences in conversation.

merely informing HH that she has a bottle of lemon juice or whether the utterance is a preliminary to some other activity (Schegloff, 1988b). This may be why HH does not respond during the silence in line 2. CR thus continues her previous turn by further specifying the location of the bottle, *i dörren däruppe*. HH is still standing at the sink with her back toward the refrigerator. CR's continuation can be seen as an invitation to have HH physically locate the bottle. The pragmatic relevance of this spate of talk does thus gradually emerge. CR is not just informing HH about the fact that she has a bottle of lemon juice, she wants her to locate the bottle. CR continues her turn in progress with the contrastive *men ja får inte upp den*. This is a formulation of a failure, namely CR's inability to open the bottle (Schegloff, 1988a, p.121). This formulation coupled with the contrastive *men* makes the turn in lines 1-3 hearable as a presentation of a problem. As such it is an example of what Ervin-Tripp might classify this as a need statement and Brown & Levinson might call an off record request. These types of directives are vulnerable to be treated as something other than directives. This is indeed what happens in this sequence as HH merely gives a neutral acknowledgment in line 3.

(4) **STRONG** [IIIA1:1:18] CR and HH are in CR's kitchen.

01 CR:->De står en citronflaska därinne: (0.2)
 'T stands a lemonbottle in there
 There is a bottle of lemon juice in there

02 ->i dörren däruppe men ja får inte upp den.

in the door there up but I get not up it
in the door up there but I can't open it

03 HH: ->Mm↑.

04 (0.2)

However, what an utterance amounts to is not up to the individual addresser and her recipient but can be the result of a finetuned negotiation between the two (cf. Sacks & Schegloff, 1973; Schegloff, 1992a). HH's response in line 3 does therefore not mean that the directive has failed. Since directives are accomplished sequentially rather than unilaterally, CR can counter HH's neutral uptake with a renewed effort to get her to undertake the requested task. Consider the continuation of the sequence (below).

(5) **STRONG** [IIIA1:1:18] CR and HH are in CR's kitchen.

01 CR: *De står en citronflaska därinne*: (0.2)
'T stands a lemonbottle in there
There is a bottle of lemon juice in there

02 *i dörren däruppe men ja får inte upp den.*
in the door there up but I get not up it
in the door up there but I can't open it

03 HH: Mm↑.

04 (0.2)

05 CR: ->Om du e [sta:rk (å vill),
If you're strong and would

06 HH: [.hh De ska ja hjälpa dej me se
That will I help you with see
I'll help you with that alright

07 (.)

08 HH: *De går bra de* hh. (.) .h[h:
That goes fine that
That's no problem

09 CR: [Ser du den
See you it
Do you see it

CR's turn in line 5 can be understood as an increment to her prior turn. One linkage is established through the turninitial connective *om*. Another is the contrast between CR's comment on her own lack of strength in line 2 and HH's potential strength in line 5. With the added increment in line 5, CR has thus not merely commented on her own inability but also implied that HH has the resources that CR lacks to accomplish the practical task at hand namely opening the bottle. The increment thus enhances the status of the previous turn as a directive. This analysis is supported by HH's ensuing turn where she indeed promises to undertake the requested task.

The paper at hand fills a void in CA-oriented work on directives in two ways. First, while much CA-work has focussed on how non-compliance is achieved, this study examines compliance, that is responses where the recipient of the directive agrees to undertake the requested action. Second, with the exception of Wootton (1997) who studied requesting of pre-schoolers, much of the existing CA-work on directives has focussed either on telephone conversations or on audiorecordings of co-present interaction (cf. Goodwin, 1990; Heritage & Sefi, 1992). It has thus not been possible to examine how the participants' non-vocal activities may shape their verbal formulations in directive sequences. This an issue that is at the center of the study at hand. The impetus for the work presented here was a study that dealt with how promises

are collaboratively constructed in conversations conducted over the telephone (Lindström, 1997, 1999b). I will therefore now briefly review some of its key findings.

Aligning responses to deferred action requests

Deferred action requests are first pair parts that cannot be immediately satisfied but require the recipient to make a commitment toward the future. Whether a first pair part involves a deferred action can be a reflexive matter. Examples 6–8 show some of the deferred actions in my dissertation corpus. In example (6), Ulla asks Rut to tell Malena that she called. This requested conveyance cannot be immediately satisfied since Malena is not home.

(6) **BIRTHDAY WISHES [GRU:4:A]**. Ulla is calling her daughter Rut's home to congratulate her grand-daughter (Rut's daughter) Malena on her birthday. Malena is not home.

25 Rut: Ja:.'rå,
Yes then

26 Ulla: ->Mm: du kan väl hälsa till Malena att ja har ringt
Mm: you can väl tell to Malena that I have called
Mm: tell Malena that I have called

27 ->då,
then

28 Rut: Ja: de ska ja göra, ((creaky voice))
Yes that will I do
Yes I'll do that

In example (7), Allan is asking his mother to call back later. This directive also involves a deferred action that cannot be immediately satisfied.

(7) **CALL LATER [MOL:4:A]**. Allan's mother is calling Allan's home to wish Allan's wife a happy birthday. She is not home.

- 09 M: *Ja får- [ja-*
I will- [I-
- 10 A: -> *[RING se:nare hörrudu ring klockan eh (.)*
Call later listenyouyou call clock eh
Call later listen call at nine
- 11 ->*ni:e?*
nine
o'clock
- 12 M: *Ja: ja kan ri:nga lite se:[nare*
Yes I can call little later
Yes I can call a little later
- 13 A: *[Ja: gör-*
Yes do-

In example (8) Lisa is inviting Malena to go out dancing. Like the previous two examples this invitation cannot be satisfied here and now. Rather, it makes relevant a commitment to a future activity.

(8) OUT DANCING [GRU:8:A].

- 30 M: *Näe:j? ((upbeat))*
No
- 31 L: ->*Kan vi inte gå ut å da:nsa? ((pleading))*
Can we not go out and dance
Why don't we go out dancing
- 32 M: *Ska vi gör de?*
Shall we do that
- 33 L: *Ja e så j(h)ävla sugen på å gå u:t å höra*
I 'm so fucking thirsty on to go out and hear
"Fuckin'ay" I really feel like going out and listening
- 34 *lite bra musik,*
a little good music
to some good music
- 35 M: *Ja de [kan vi göra,*
Yes that can we do
Yes let's do that

All the deferred action requests in the dissertation corpus were formatted as "yes"/"no" inquiries.³ In spite of this "yes"

³ This category includes syntactic interrogatives as well as B-event statements (Labov & Fanshel,

or its equivalent was not treated as aligning with the deferred action request. An additional unit of talk was required where the speaker makes a future commitment. This is illustrated in example (9) below which is taken from a conversation between two women, Mona and Liv. Mona's child is in Liv's homebased daycare. Mona is trying to figure out when she can pick up her child. Liv tells her that the children have just sat down to watch a video. Liv is calculating when the video will be over in her turns in lines 1-2 and 4-5.

(9) **QUARTER PAST FOUR [VAT:11:A]**. The deferred action proposal is marked a-> and the acceptance with b->.

01 L: *Ja de håller på en- en- de håller på en ti:mme men dom*
Yes 't holds on one- one it holds on one hour but they
Yes it is on for one- one- it is on for an hour but they

02 *har no titta en kvart-*
have probably watched fifteen minutes

03 M: *Ja: [men va bra:,*
Yes but what good
Yes but that's good

04 L: *[ungefä:r*
approximately

05 L: *(Så [den e no klar till)*
(So it's probably done til
(So it'll be probably be over by)

06 M:a-> *[Ja men då kommer ja lagom till en*
Yes but then come I just in time to one
Yes but then I'll come at the right time if

07 a->[*kvart över fyra ungefär då,*
quarter past four approximately then
I come around a quarter past four then

08 L: *[Ja:rå,*
Yesthen
Yes

09 L:b->Aa, *De går br[a de,*
Yes 'T goes well that
Yes That will be fine

10 M: [Ja de e fi:nt de,
Yes 't's fine that
Okay fine

While Liv is calculating when the video will end, Mona begins to propose a time to pick up her child in lines 6-7, *Ja men då kommer ja lagom till en kvart över fyra ungefär då* 'Yes but then I'll come at the right time if I come around a quarter past four then'. Liv's *Ja:rå* 'Yes then' in line 8 comes before Mona's turn is transition relevant but at a point where Mona has made it clear that she will calibrate the timing of her pick-up with the end of the video film. This is done through the word *lagom* which is akin to the English expression 'just in time'. Liv's utterance in line 8 may thus display her willingness to accept that Mona picks up her child after the end of the video. Mona completes her turn by proposing an approximate time, *kvart över fyra ungefär* 'around a quarter past four'. She ends this proposal with the inference marker *då* 'then' thereby marking that the time was derived from the prior talk, most proximately, Liv's calculation of the end of the video.

Liv responds to the proposal with a compound turn in line 9, *Aa, De går bra de* 'Yes, That will be fine'. She accepts the proposal by assessing it positively with the second TCU, *De går bra de* 'That will be fine'. As represented by the intonation marker and the capitalization of *De* 'That', the affirmative response token is produced as a separate TCU and the turn is

possibly complete after Aa. Mona is apparently intent on getting off the phone. That she nonetheless waits until the second TCU of Liv's turn is recognizably complete (Jefferson, 1983) before initiating a pre-closing (Schegloff & Sacks, 1973) demonstrates that she is treating the affirmative response token as insufficient as an acceptance of her proposal. Liv's compound acceptance in line 9 is thus contingently accomplished by Mona withholding talk at the possible completion point of Liv's turn in line 9 and Liv continuing after the affirmative response token in the same turn.

Sequences that deviate from the normative pattern that I described provide the most telling evidence that deferred action requests require an extended turn. Example (9) shows one such case. The example involves a young couple, Tore and Cajsa. They are trying to figure out the best way for Cajsa to travel to Tore the following day.

(9) PICK UP [GRU:7:B]. Cajsa is calling Tore from work. She works and lives in a different town than Tore. She has just informed Tore that she intends to take the 3:30 train to the town where Tore lives the next day. The deferred action request is marked a->, the freestanding affirmative response token is marked y->, and the granting is marked b->.

01 T: *Tju:go över tre: när var'u här då:,*
 Twenty past three when were you here then
 Twenty past three when would you be here then

02 (0.4)

03 C: *Ti:e i fy::ra,*
 Ten to four

04 (2.0)

05 T: *Ha,*

06 C: *Om du kan åka å hämta mej då,*
 If you can drive and pick up me then
 If you can come and pick me up then

07 T: *Mm.*
08 C: *Eller nå:gon,*
Or somebody
09 T: *Mm:¿*
10 (1.8)
11 T: *Kan ja gör,*
Can I do
I can do that
12 C: *↑Mm:*

Cajsa states that her travel plans are dependent on Tore picking her up at the train station (line 6). This is a deferred action request that makes a response relevant. Tore gives a minimal response in line 7. Cajsa's uptake in line 8 suggests that she is not hearing this response as aligning with her request. By suggesting that someone other than Tore picks her up, Cajsa orients to the possibility that Tore might not be able to fulfill her deferred action request. Tore continues with another response token in line 9. In withholding talk during the ensuing 1.8 second silence, Cajsa shows an orientation toward the incompleteness of this response token as a granting. When Tore finally responds he constructs his turn as a syntactic increment by placing the predicate rather than the subject in turn-initial position *kan ja gör* 'can I do'. This syntactic construction underscores that he is elaborating on the affirmative response token in his prior turn rather than producing a turn that is meant to be understood in its own right.

As should be evident from the examples shown so far, the design of aligning responses to deferred actions are not a matter of individual speaker styles (Tannen, 1990). Rather this is a jointly constituted normative practice. Departures from the normative pattern are accountable (Garfinkel, 1967). The data for the dissertation was Swedish telephone conversations. While deferred action requests are not limited to telephone conversations it may be that they are particularly prevalent in conversations where the parties are not co-present. Aligning responses in co-present interaction may exhibit a different organization. One possibility is that spoken language is less salient. As mentioned earlier, one might imagine that a non-vocal activity could stand in the place of a spoken utterance. To explore this possibility I decided to build a collection of requests or directives that could be immediately satisfied in interactions where the speaker and recipient were in each others immediate presence.

Works cited

- Aronsson, K. & Thorell, M. (1999). Family politics in children's play directives. Journal of Pragmatics, 31, 25-47.
- Austin, John, (1962). How to do things with words. Oxford.
- Brown, Penelope, & Levinson, Stephen, 1978: Universals of language usage: Politeness phenomena. In Esther N. Goody (Ed.), Questions and politeness strategies in social interaction (pp. 56-311) Cambridge University Press.
- Ervin-Tripp, Susan (1976). Is Sybil there? The structure of some American English directives. Language in Society, 5, 25-66.
- Garfinkel, Harold (1967). Studies in ethnomethodology. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.
- Goffman, Erving (1955). On face work. Psychiatry, 18. 213-231.
- Goffman, Erving (1967). Interaction ritual: Essays in face to face behavior. Garden City, New York.
- Goodwin, Marjorie, Harness (1990) He-Said-She-Said: Talk as social organization among black children. Bloomington University Press.
- Heritage, John & Sefi, Sue (1992). Dilemmas of advice: Aspects of the delivery and reception of advice in interactions between health visitors and first time mothers. In Paul Drew & John Heritage (Eds.), Talk at work: Social interaction in institutional settings (pp. 359-417). Cambridge University Press.
- Jefferson, Gail (1983). Notes on some orderlinesses of overlap onset. In V.D'Urso, & P.Leonardi (Eds.), Discourse analysis and natural rhetoric (pp. 11-38). Padua.
- Labov, William & Fanshel, David (1977). Therapeutic discourse: Psychotherapy as conversation. New York.
- Lindström, Anna (1997). Designing social actions: Grammar, prosody, and interaction in Swedish conversation. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles, Los Angeles.
- Lindström, Anna (1999a). Directives and the negotiation of work tasks in the Swedish home help service. I: P. Linell, L. Ahrenberg & L. Jönsson (Eds.) Samtal och textanvändning i professionerna. (ASLA:s skriftserie 11.) (pp. 157-168). Uppsala.
- Lindström, Anna (1999b). Language as social action: Grammar, prosody, and interaction in Swedish conversation. (Skrifter utgivna av Institutionen för nordiska språk, Uppsala universitet 46.) Diss. Uppsala.
- Lindström, Anna (2000). Om konsten att spela in naturligt förekommande social interaktion. Erfarenheter från inspelningar i hemtjänsten. In G. Byrman, M. Levin, & H. Lindquist (Eds.) ASLA:s skriftserie 13: Korpusar i forskning och undervisning.

- Ochs, Elinor, Schegloff, Emanuel A. & Thompson, Sandra (Eds.)(1996). Interaction and grammar. Cambridge University Press.
- Sacks, Harvey, Schegloff, Emanuel A. & Jefferson, Gail (1974). A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation. Language, 50, 696-735.
- Schegloff, Emanuel, A. (1988a). Goffman and the analysis of conversation. In Paul Drew, & Anthony Wootton (Eds.), Erving Goffman: Exploring the interaction order (pp. 89-135). Cambridge University Press.
- Schegloff, Emanuel, A. (1988b) Presequences and indirection: Applying speech act theory to ordinary conversation. Journal of Pragmatics, 12. Pp. 55-62.
- Schegloff, Emanuel, A. (1992a). Repair after next turn: The last structurally provided for place for the defence of intersubjectivity in conversation. American Journal of Sociology, 95 (5), 1295-1345.
- Schegloff, Emanuel, A. (1992b). Talk-embodied action: Speech act and conversation-analytic perspectives. Unpublished manuscript.
- Schegloff, Emanuel, A., & Sacks, Harvey (1973) Opening up closings. Semiotica, 8, 289-327.
- Searle, John, R. (1969). Speech acts: An essay in the philosophy of language. Cambridge.
- Tannen, Deborah (1990). You just don't understand: Women and men in conversation. New York.
- Wootton, Andrew, (1997). Interaction and the development of mind. Cambridge University Press.

APPENDIX: CORE COLLECTION OF DIRECTIVE SEQUENCES IN THE HOME HELP SERVICE DATA.

X-> marks the directive turn and Y-> its response.

(1) TUNNA HALSKEDJAN [IIIB1:1:15.0]

VB: Så där.
(0.4)
P: [Mm:]
VB: [Nu] så (.) känns de [bra elle:]
P: [°(Mm-)]
P: Ja:[:]
VB: Mm:[:] ((en hund flåsar i bakgrunden))
P:X->Mm: (eh) ↑TUNna↑ halskedjan .hh vill ja
X->gärna ha fram°(fö[r]).°
VB:Y-> [Ja:[:]
(5) [16.0]
P: De trasslar ↑till↑ se iblann.
VB: Ja de gör de(hh).
P: Mm,
(6.0)
VB:Y->(Eh de) dä(hh)r (de) °vänta ska du se.° ((på utandning))
(2.0)
VB:Y->°Ja få ta å göra så där så länge få
Y->vi se° (få vi) bort den där.
P: Vart de så ↓trass[(lit.)↓
VB: [Ja: de va så
Y->°trasslit så vi gör så här i ställe så°
Y-> (.hh) e're enklare tror ja
Y->ska titta- <kolla på låse här också.
(0.6)
P: Mm:[:]
(1.4)
VB:Y->°(Att) de e låst.°
(0.4)
VB:Y->Orå (.) °>de e re.<° ((viskande))
P: °Nu sitt (den).°
(0.6)
VB: Så DÄ:R?
(0.2)

(2) LARMET [IIIB1:1] (consecutive with tunna halskedjan)

VB: Å SEN (sk-) drar vi ↓på den där(hhh)↓
(0.4)
P:X->Ja: (.) ja vill har'en där inåt [ja.
VB:Y-> [Så (dä)- A:[:]
P: Mm,
(1.2)
VB: Å sen lägge vi ner den va. ((knarrande röst))
(0.6)
P: °Mm:[:]
(4)
VB: Så[:]
(1.0)
VB: Nu så blir °enklare(hh).°
(0.4)
P: Nu vart de bra(hh). ((knarrigt))
(0.8)

VB: Å så vare strumperna(hhh).

(3) STAMMEN [IIIB1:1:21.0]

P: Va;
VB: LJU:ST i guds hu:s.
P: [Ja: just.=
VB: [Hehe
VB: =De så mörkt (0.2) så där.
(1.6)
P:X->VILL DU VRIDA PÅ DEN där (0.8) eh::
X->meu eh: ((knarrljud)) den där me
X->(.) s:tammen där.
VB:Y->Mm:?
(0.4)
P: Fö ja tycker han lutar så mycke
u:tåt om'an s- får stå sådär
he[la tiden
VB: [Behöver no vattnas också 'rö(hh).

(4) LILLA SKOTTE [IIIB1:1:32.0]

VB: Nu ska vi se här hh ha vi nånting
här °också.°
(1.0)
P: °Mm[:;°
VB: [Å vattna:;
P: °Mm.° ((knarrigt))
(1.0)
VB: Kanske:?
(1.0)
VB: (Dum dum) ((nästan sjungande))
(2.0)
P:X->De där som de e lilla skotte i: vill
X->du fylla på lite där.
VB:Y->Mm:; (0.4) 'ka gö'a.
(0.2)
VB: [Dä:r.
P: [(Mm-) (.) mm:?
(6) [33.0]
VB: >Å så re hä fina< träde här borta(HHH).
(0.4)
P: Ja:,
(1.0)
P: De e lite märkvärdit de.=
VB: =Mm:;
(2.0)
P: Ja tycker'e ha växt väldit bra på
sista [tiden här;
VB: [Mm: (.) de har'e gjort.

(5) FRISYREN [IIIC2:1:5.0]

P: Å dom hade inge sån där eh (1.0) till:
eh (1.6) va heter'e: ((ansträngd röst))
(.) du vet som (de) stå lajt ((eng. light))
på.

(0.4)
 VB: °Mm [mm,° ((mycket svagt))
 P:X-> [Hörru du du fixa till de dä:r.
 (0.4)
 VB:Y->Mm:¿
 (0.4)
 P: De blir bättre när du gör ([])¿
 VB: [De blir bättre
 när ja får fixa.
 P: Ja:(hh)¿
 VB: A:.
 (0.4)
 P: Du få nog bli hår frisyr- frisörska.=
 VB: =Mm ((knarrande)) du säjer de.

(6) OSTHYVEL [IIID2:1:13.0]

M: ().
 (11)
 M: Ta på dej förklä (mo:r).
 (51) [14.0]
 VB: (Jaha:) ha Hildur sovi lugnt i natt då
 elle¿
 (1.2)
 M:X->Ja letar efter en (.) osthyvel,
 (1.0)
 VB:Y->En osthyvel,
 (3.0)
 VB:Y->Den (kom de) här en.
 (0.2)
 M: Va,
 (0.6)
 VB:Y->Du kan få en här.
 (0.2)
 M: Ja de e bra,
 (16) [15.0]
 VB:Y->S:å:?=
 M: =Tack.

(7) STOLEN [IIID2:1:20.0]

M:X->Kan du hjälpa 'na å flytta fram sto:l(e)n
 X->lite.
 (0.6)
 VB:Y->Mm:¿
 (1.0)
 P: () ((rosslig))
 (1.2)
 P: (Vi) e fö långt (.) () .=
 VB: =Du e ju fö långt ifrån.
 (4.0)
 P: ([]).
 VB: [(Kan)/('ka) du flyttat (0.4)
 °fram din föt lit(e).
 (1.6)
 VB: Så dä:¿
 (1.4)
 VB: Vart de bättre:?
 (1.0)
 P: Höu: de vart bra.
 (0.2)

VB: Mm:ç
P: Tack ska du ha.
VB: Mm: ((stac.)) .hh varsegoç [21.0]
(72)
VB: Så där då:?
(1.4)
VB: Inge mera:?
M: Ne: bra nu.

(8) FÖNSTERPUTSAREN [IVB3:2:9.0]

VB: °Ja stängde dörren ([]°-
P: [°()].°
(3.0)
P:X->När fönsterpu- <putsarn var här,
(1.0)
P:X->>Skulle han< (0.2) tvätta de fönstret
X->så,
(1.0)
P:X->Så ramlade (.) ([]),
VB: [°Ass:: åç° [10.0]
(0.2)
P:X->(Och) (.) rann de smutsvatten
X->ner [i badkaret.
VB: [Ja::.
VB: (Uh)
(0.4)
P:X->Å ja försökt å duscha bort de men de:,
(0.2)
VB: De [går inteç
P: [()].
(.)
VB:Y->(Du sa [ja ska ti å) göra rent sen.
P: [()
P: Ja når inte ner (å) [() att=
VB:Y-> [Ne:,
P: =rengöra de.
VB:Y->Måst ha BÖrs:te lite [grann lite-
P: [Ja:.
(0.6)
P: .Ja
(0.6)
VB:Y->Ska lägga lite (vi:m) [å borsta (de där).
P: [()
([]).
VB: [Ja:,
(0.4)
P: Dä:rç
(2.0)
P: °() .
(1.0)
VB: (Hä::r å), ((knarrande röst))
(1.5)
VB: Ja:?=
P: =Ja.

(9) TORR HANDDUK [IVB3:2:16.0]

P: °Ja: (.) ja ska ta den.° [(ja).

VB: [.Mm
 (1.0)
 P:X->Vi kan-
 (3.6)
 P:X->Vi kan ta e- en hh t- torr handduk
 X->å lägga över.
 (0.4)
 P:X->Över ax[larna (),
 VB: [Axlarna ja.
 (2.0)
 VB:Y->() (0.4) °de ska ja göra.°
 (2.0)
 VB: Annikas:¿
 (1.0)
 P: Ja: ja som hänger.
 VB: Mm[:.
 P: [Ja hänger den på (),
 (3.0)
 ? : Hhh
 (0.4)
 VB: Så där ja.
 (0.6) [17.0]
 VB: °Så ja° hänger [den ↑här¿↑
 P: [°Mm: .°
 (3.0)
 ? : ()
 (1.6)
 ? : Mm: .
 VB: ↓Så(h):.↓
 P: °.Ja:°
 (1.6)
 P: °(Ja: du,)°
 (2.0)
 P: (Student)
 (9)
 P: (Sp-)
 (0.8)
 A: (F'låt)
 (10)
 ? : °(Så,)°
 (0.6)
 ? ()
 (2.0)
 VB: °S:mörja lite i kroppen.°

(10) INLÄGGNINGSVÄTSKA [IVB3:2:28.0]

VB: Kan hämta li[te-
 P: [°(Ja:.)°
 (0.8)
 M: A (vi) går väl [u:t nu då så ni få=
 VB: [Inläggningväska.
 M: =fotografera [i fre:,
 A: [(N)ja(h)a(h)a,
 (0.4)
 VB: He[hehe ((kraftigt skratt))
 P:X-> [Eh: Sven om du ta- gå efter läggning^{svätska}
 X->den där,=
 M:Y-> °Ja:¿°=
 VB: =.hh=
 P:X->=Flaskan i badrumsskåpet.

(1.8)
 VB: ↓Mm::↓ ja (1.0)
 P: Jo:: Alice e (.) e hos sin so:n å hon hade visst ordnat så hon kunde (0.2) kunde ligga dä:r hos [honom]
 VB: [Jaha] (1.2)
 VB: Han ha tagi sin väska också (ver[kar de(hh).])
 P: [Hh]
 P: Nä: (.) hon ha inte hämtat de, (0.4)
 VB: °Ne[:]°
 P: [Sina saker här. (0.4)
 VB: .Nä (2.0)
 P: Så nu (.) ha hon ingen mat i ().
 VB: .A: ja, (1.0)
 P: ((ljud vid ansträngning)) (0.6)
 M: ↑Den här e i de (.) allra↑ närmaste slut Lisen
 P: Jas:↑Å? (0.4)
 M: De e: (0.2) de e ba nå droppar ne: [på botten.=
 P: [(Vill du)?
 VB: =Ja: de räcker. (0.2)
 P: (H[a])
 VB: [De e bra.=
 P: =Då ska vi (0.2) sk(r)iva upp de: (0.4)
 VB: Mm:::
 P: På (0.2) inköpslis↑tan?
 VB: .Ja:

(11) FRAMSIDAN [VD2:1:10.0]

VB: Kranarna e ↑du-↑ (0.2) [toki'a i da=
 P: [Ja:.
 VB: =[(så.)
 P: [(Ja dom e så tokia,) (0.2)
 P: Ja men dom e allti toki'a här eh,=
 VB: =(J)a: (6.0)
 P:X->(De) bäst (du ta)/(å ta) framsidan me (dö).
 VB:Y->Ja: (0.4) ja ska ta lite här, (5.0)
 P:X->Där ha ja haft mycke (0.2) två:1 så de,=
 VB:Y->=A: (.) ska duscha bort alltihop, (2.0)
 VB: °(Så) (de blir),° [11.0]
 P: Så dä: ja (0.4)
 VB: °Ska ta hä bak ock(h)så(hh). ((ansträngt)) (4.0)

(12) TORKA RYGGEN [VD2:1:18.0]

P: Va [då,
VB: [De- den här brukar'u ta ti håret va:ç
(.)
P: Ja- NE:?
(0.2)
P: (S-) ↑ta den som sitte där (0.4) uh ytterst,↑
VB: Aha: (0,2) de va den de.
(11)
VB: Oj: (hh) blev vå:t på kjol(hh) he (0.2) .hh
(0.6)
VB: (.hh)
(1.0)
P: De så mycke hår nu.
(0.2)
VB: Aha de lå:ng:tç ((glatt))
(1.5)
VB: <Hoppas att de blir> ((stac.)) av i
mo[rr'on nu.
P: [Ja:< de ska vi hoppas.=
VB: =Aoa:ç
(6.0)
VB: °().
(2.0)
VB: ((harklar sig))
(27) [19.0]
VB: °(U) dä:r(hh).°
(0.4)
P:X->Du få nog TOrka me på rygg[en.
VB:Y-> [Ja: ja ska
Y->göra de(h).
(14)
P: () tack så dä:r (ja),=
VB: =>Mm:.<
(0.6)
VB: Ska [(ta-)
P: [Ska vi torka ↑bena eller hur
sk[a↑ (de:) (0.2) vänta me de tills=
VB: [Mm:ç
P: vi (),
VB: ?->A vi kan torka dom lite.
P: A:.
(.)
VB: Men de brukaru ha ren hä:r blommi'a
han'du[ken tillç
P: [A:.
(1.5)
VB: °Då ska vi se.
(3.0)
VB: Få väl torka fötte'na en gång till
kan[ske,
P: ?-> [A vi få göra de.= ((oartikulerat))
VB: =A: ,
(11) [20.0]
P: Så ja.
(.)
VB: M: ,
(17)

VB: °M.
 (4.0)
 VB: °Ja ska,
 (4.0)
 VB: A nu ha ja inte lagt nån han'duk dä'på
 som vanli't,=

(13) **HANDDUKEN** [VD2:1:46.0]

VB: °(Här e de).°
 (4.0)
 ((hårtorken stängs av))
 (2.0) [47.0]
 VB: °(Här).° ((mycket svagt))
 (10)
 P: (Du) Karin,
 VB: Ja:ç=
 P:X->=Ja måste ha hannduken
 X->[(0.4)] (som lö:- u-) <under=
 VB:Y->[Jaha.]
 P:X->=morrönroc[k'n.
 VB:Y-> [Den här ja:(h).
 (1.0)
 VB: Så:.
 (0.2)
 VB: Varsegod,
 (4.0)
 VB: Samarinen börjar ta slu:t,
 (.)
 VB: Har du mer,