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Abstract
Making use of videotapes of family interaction, this paper investigates al-
ternative trajectories that develop as parents and children negotiate disputes
resulting from directive/response sequences. Forms of arguments constitu-
ted through recycled positions are distinguished from arguments that are
buttressed by accounts or rule statements. Constellations of features includ-
ing structures of control, forms of tying utterances to prior utterances, ac-
counts, as well as facing formations are consequential. The forms of participa-
tion frameworks that are constructed afford different ways of sustaining
focused interaction, gearing into what someone has said, and displaying to
each other how participants are aligned within the activity frame. Alterna-
tive trajectories develop in light of the forms of joint attention that are es-
stablished, as well as sustained engagement.
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1. Introduction
Recent studies of work/family relations have stressed the importance of
abandoning static concepts of role relations in favor of looking at process
and the practices that constitute the family (Carsten 2000; Sillars 1995;
Wood 1986). At the UCLA Sloan Center on the Everyday Lives of Fam-
ilies (CELF), I have been concerned with how in the midst of accomplish-
ing the work of the family, parents and children construct alternative
forms of participation (Goodwin 1990; Goodwin and Goodwin 2004)
within ongoing activities. As family members work together to jointly
produce the important events of their lives, differing forms of social orga-
nization emerge. To explore some of the ways that families constitute
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themselves, I will investigate sequences where parents and children negotiate disputes resulting from directive/response sequences. I will consider alternative forms of facing formations (Kendon 1990b) and trajectories (Sacks 1995) that directive/response sequences may take. In addition, I will investigate how in the midst of disputes participants demonstrate different types of affective stance or ‘mood, attitude, feeling and disposition, as well as degrees of emotional intensity vis-à-vis some focus of concern’ (Ochs 1996: 410–411). Quite distinctive forms of ethos (Bateson 1972) develop as families overlay their activities with different forms of affect.

2. Data

The data are taken from video recordings of naturally occurring interaction of dual-earner families who are part of the CELF project. Our methods combine ethnographic research, including extensive interviews, with video recording of approximately fifty hours of interaction by two videographers collected over a week’s time. Video makes possible the recording of mundane talk, visible behavior, and relevant features of the settings where people actually constitute their lives. The approach for understanding the orderliness of human interaction adopted here is conversation analysis, a field established by the later Harvey Sacks in collaboration with Emanuel Schegloff and Gail Jefferson (Sacks et al. 1974). Conversation analysis investigates the procedures participants employ to construct and make intelligible their talk, and the events that occur within it (Sacks 1984). Sequences of talk are examined to see how participants make meaning together, not only through the way they produce talk for others to respond to, but through their uptake to what others are saying.

Sacks (1995: 331) in his lecture ‘Poetics: Requests, offers, and threats: The “old man” as an evolved natural object’ urges us to consider the objects ‘offer, request warning, threat—not as though they’re a series of different things, but to see them as sequential versions of a something.’ He discusses how the movement from a variety of offers to a request and threat implicates a changing of ‘operative identities’ (1995: 327) for a seventy-year-old man. In the data Sacks analyzes, as step-children-in-law Ethel and Bill urge Max, a recent widower, to eat, a battle develops; Max produces rejections while Ethel and Bill recycle re-offers. As Sacks argues (1995: 330), the stubborn old man that Max ‘becomes in the sequence, the person they have got to take care of, is an identity that the sequence brings into focus.’ By focusing on trajectories of directive/response sequences, we can examine the practices through which child and parent(s) construct local identities for children, either as parties who are
accountable to their parents for their actions or dismissive of their parents’ directives.

3. Directive/response sequences, accounts, and facing formations

Alternative ways in which speakers format directives, utterances designed to get someone else to do something (Austin 1962; Blum-Kulka 1997; Ervin-Tripp 1976; Labov and Fanshel 1977), and recipients sequence next turns to them make possible a variety of forms of social organization between participants. Goodwin (1990) demonstrated that in comparable task activities the precise linguistic resources used to build directives of a particular shape could constitute very different kinds of social organization in children’s peer groups (for example, hierarchical versus egalitarian social structures). The social force of a directive, as well as its emotional valence, is also heavily shaped through the deployment of resources such as prosody and embodiment (Goodwin and Goodwin 2001 [2000]).

All studies of directives owe much to the pioneering work of Ervin-Tripp (1976) on directives and structures of control (Ervin-Tripp et al. 1984), defined as including ‘offers, requests, orders, prohibitions, and other verbal moves that solicit goods or attempt to effect changes in the activities of others’ (1984: 116). According to Ervin-Tripp and her colleagues (1984: 118), ‘A speaker who is high in esteem has the right to receive verbal deference from others and can make control moves boldly, without offering deference to those who are lower in esteem.’ Blum-Kulka (1997: 150, emphasis in the original) argues, ‘The politeness system of family discourse is highly domain-specific and that within it unmodified directness is neutral or unmarked in regard to politeness.’ Parents’ use of directness indexes both power and solidarity. Forms of mitigation, including tone of voice, affective nicknames, pronoun choice, laughter, as well as nonvocal interactions such as kissing or massaging a child’s shoulders can soften degrees of coerciveness.

Accounts included in a speaker’s initial directive may appeal to justifications related to the requirements of the current activity or display no obvious reason for why the action should be undertaken, aside from the speaker’s personal desires (Goodwin 1990: 113). Hasan (1992), studying accounts in everyday talk between mothers and children, distinguished ‘internal’ accounts (accounts that appeal to rational explanations) from ‘external’ accounts, defined as accounts that include threats (speaker has more power relative to addressee), bribe (speaker knows what addressee likes), blackmail, authority, and tradition. The rules (Wootton 1986)
speakers make evident in accounts accompanying directives vary in critical ways (Goodwin 1990: 65–137; Pontecorvo et al. 2001).

In response to a directive, next moves may be compliance or rejection of the proposal. A recipient may provide a flat refusal or an accounting. With respect to accounts in response to invitations, Drew (1984) argues that one way of responding to an implicit request is to avoid taking up a position by reporting some other planned activity, leaving unstated the implications of the reporting. Such an arrangement is sensitive to issues of face, where participants want ‘to negotiate positions, make concessions, stand firm or hold out on some matter, but without any of these activities having been done officially’ (1984: 147).

Negotiations involving acts of control are central to the organization of family life, and display a range of alternative sequencing patterns resulting from a constellation of factors: these not only include directive type, accounts, and next moves to the directive, but also the facing formations of participants (Kendon 1985), footings (Goffman 1979), stances, or affective alignments that participants maintain vis-à-vis one another. Participation frameworks in which access to direct face-to-face communication is established between interlocutors result in different forms of sequencing from those where no such frameworks are established.

4. Facing formations and collaborative action in directives

In his work on how participants to conversation position themselves with respect to one another, Kendon (1985: 237) argues the following:

The establishment and maintenance of spatial-orientational arrangements, it seems, is one way that participants can provide one another with evidence that they are prepared to sustain a common orientational perspective. By arranging themselves into a particular spatial-orientational pattern they thereby display each to the other that they are governed by the same set of general considerations. By co-operating with one another to sustain a given spatial-orientational arrangement, they can display a commonality of readiness.

Kendon (1990a: 239) calls the ‘spatial-orientational arrangement’ that people establish an ‘F Formation’. He states:

Whenever two or more individuals are placed close to each other, orienting their bodies in such a way that each of them has an easy, direct, and equal access to every other participant’s transactional segment, and agree to maintain such an arrangement, they can be said to create an F formation.

Across a range of directive sequences in family interaction, different types of facing formations and types of attunement to such formations can be
established as parents and children jointly negotiate the accomplishment of family tasks (grooming, coming to the dinner table, cleaning, etc.). Participants may closely align both their bodies and their talk to the task at hand, or, alternatively, demonstrate either lack of alignment, disengagement, or protest through different ways they position their bodies and sequence their talk.

Obtaining joint attention for the performance of tasks often requires the active work of multiple parties to the interaction. We will now examine some sequences in which a parent is effective in establishing full attention to the task at hand, and, subsequently, compliance with her directive. In the following example, Mom is attempting to get her children ready to go on an outing as her daughters are engaged in watching a video together.

At the onset of the directive sequence, Mom summons her daughters, Cynthia (6) and Michelle (10), and provides an announcement: ‘Come on guys. You guys’ clothes are ironed.’ With this announcement, Mom provides a warrant for a next course of activity to take place (getting ready to go out). Though Michelle with her ‘okay’ agrees to the new proposed action, she initially stalls with ‘We have to wait.’ Mom then physically moves to where the girls are watching the computer screen, and saying ‘sorry’, she turns off the computer monitor so that there is no competing activity. Having established a new frame for interaction, she then produces a series of directives that take the form of imperatives: ‘Come on. Go: Brush teeth, get dressed, Come on guys.’ Data are transcribed according to the system developed by Gail Jefferson, described in Sacks et al. (1974: 731–733), and reviewed in Wingard (in this issue).

(1) (Mom enters the room as Michele, 10, and Cynthia, 6, are watching a video )

1 Mom: Come on guys.
2 You guys’ clothes are ironed.
3 Michelle: Okay.
4 Cynthia: She’s going.
5 Michelle: We have to wait-
6 Mom: (shuts down the program on video monitor )
7 Sorry.
8 Come on.
9 Go: Brush teeth,
10 Get dressed,
11 Come on guys.
12 Cynthia: I’ll be- brush my teeth right now.
13 (rushes off to the bathroom, while
14 Michelle moves more slowly, turning on her stool )
Mom’s activity of first setting the appropriate frame for the directive to be executed before delivering it is successful; immediately the six-year-old, Cynthia, complies with the directive. She runs off to brush her teeth, stating, ‘I’ll be brush my teeth right now.’ Michelle turns her stool away from the television, moving more slowly, though she also complies with the request.

5. **Socializing accountability**

Executing a successful directive/response sequence requires the collaborative action of multiple parties to the encounter. Example (2) provides a second important illustration of how facing formations, eye gaze, and active pursuit of compliance are all entailed in socializing a child to be accountable to others’ actions. The following, which occurs moments after Cynthia and Michelle exit to brush their teeth (Example [1]), entails Mom and her 11-year-old son Steve. Mom asks Steve, “So. What. Did you brush your teeth?” (line 1). As she produces this talk, her wrist rests on her hip, providing a visible portrait of her stance, challenge, with respect to the current interaction.
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**Figure 1. Example [2], line 2) Mom’s challenge position**

Though Steven is in the midst of a phone call to his Dad, he immediately interrupts the activity of talking on the phone to enter into a facing formation with his mother.
(In the living room)

1  Mom: “So. What. Did you brush your teeth?

2  (wrist on hip in challenge position)

3  Steve: Yeah.

4  Hi Dad. (on phone)

5  Mom: When.

6  Steve: Hold on Dad. (positions phone facing his chest)

7  When I was using the bathroom.

8  Mom: Let me see ‘em.

9  (moves closer to Steven and gazes into his mouth)

10  Oh::: You didn’t br-

11  Steven. (pointing to her own mouth)

12  Steve: I keep on forgetting to brush ‘em.

13  Mom: HOW COULD YOU FORGET ABOUT THAT

14  TOOTH =

15  IT’S PART OF ALL YOUR TEE:TH!

16  Steve: I know. But when I brush I don’t-

17  Steven. No. (shaking head) Brush your teeth.

18  (nodding) Again.

19  And your face is dirty. (disengages and moves

Figure 2. (Example 2, line 9) Joint attention between Mom and son
In this interaction, Steven responds to his mother’s directive by putting another interaction (talking with his father over the phone) temporarily on hold (line 6: ‘Hold on Dad.’) and by answering Mom’s question with ‘When I was using the bathroom’ (line 7). After Mom establishes a participation framework in which the activity of attending to her question is the explicit focus, Mom (line 8) asks ‘Let me see ‘em’ as she moves closer to Steven. Inspecting his mouth, she provides a response cry, immediately marking her alignment of disapproval, as well as an accusation—‘Oh::: You didn’t br- Steven.’—while she points to her own mouth. This action calls attention to Steve’s teeth brushing as behavior that is deficient, as activity that has not met the standard she has set for him. By calling attention to the ‘untoward act’ (Wootton 1986: 150–151) of inadequate brushing, Mom makes relevant a next action from Steven.

Steve’s next move is not a denial, but rather an account: ‘I keep on forgetting to brush ‘em.’ In producing this move, Steven accepts the legitimacy of the complaint, but provides a reason for why the action was not accomplished. Mom for her part treats his account as utterly unacceptable, responding with raised volume in her voice as she says, ‘HOW COULD YOU FORGET ABOUT THAT TOOTH. IT’S PART OF ALL YOUR TEE:TH!’ Steven accepts the validity of his mother’s counter with ‘I know.’, and once again attempts to account for why he has not successfully completed the action his mother requested of him with ‘But when I brush I don’t c-’. This action is once more treated as unacceptable by Mom. She interrupts his ongoing talk to issue a flat refusal of his explanation, using the polarity term ‘No’ with ‘Steven. No. Brush your teeth. Again.’ To assert in an even more direct manner that an untoward act has occurred (and that she is in charge), she issues a second complaint: ‘And your face is dirty.’ Steven next responds to Mom’s assessment and directive activity with an accepting ‘Okay’ and then returns to his phone call. Throughout this negotiation, as Steven provides excuses for his behavior, he never denies the validity of his mom’s claims.

Thus through a constellation of actions within this activity—(i) suspending a competing framework of orientation and establishing a facing formation that permits careful scrutiny of the domain (Steve’s mouth) at issue while demanding explanations, (ii) direct imperative forms and their warrants, (iii) clear positions with respect to the untoward event, as well as (iv) negative assessments, we see the resources with which (a) participants call another into appropriate alignment, (b) target responds with
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moves that permit response, and (c) initiator of the sequence evaluates the
performance of the target.

Later, when Mom and Steve reestablish a framework (visible in Figure
3) for the inspection of how appropriately Steve has carried through with
his brushing teeth assignment, Mom again evaluates how well he has car-
ried out the task set for him with ‘I see plaque, I see- dirt’ (lines 6 and 7)

Figure 3. Inspecting Steven’s teeth brushing

(3)
1 Steve:  ((approaches Mom who is vacuuming))
2 Mom:  Huh?
3 Steve!  ((turns off vacuum cleaner))
4 Will you look in the mirror?
5 ((inspecting Steve’s teeth)) Lookit!
6 I see plaque, ((points to area in her own mouth))
7 I see- dirt!
8 You gotta- bush that out! ((brushing motions))
9 Steve:  ((leaves to brush teeth))
10 Mom:  Bein lazy. That’s just nasty.
11 Steve:  I’m not bein lazy.
12 Mom:  That’s just nasty.
Across multiple turns, Mom works to establish viable facing formations, discontinues her own activities to attend the immediate matter at hand (see line 3), and is unyielding in her quest to make her child accountable to her demands. There is an explicit moral dimension to this sequence as well, as Mom concludes with explicit evaluative commentaries about Steve’s behavior (lines 10, 12).

6. Arguments of recycled positions

Alternative types of trajectories of directive sequences occur when parent and child fail to establish a shared framework for mutual orientation. When two interlocutors are in different rooms, or even in the same room attending to different activities that fully engross them, participants may not succeed in bringing off the activity that the parent proposes. The following provides a case in point.

In Example (4), Mom calls to eight-year-old Jonah, who is in the bedroom, from the kitchen. Mom and Jonah recycle positions for several turns through structures of format tying (Goodwin 1990: 177–188), as Mom attempts to get Jonah to come to clean up his dishes from the table.

(4) ((Jonah is in his bedroom))

1  Mom:  JONAH LYLE. SWEETIE!
2  MOMENT TO DO.
3  YOU HAVE A PROJECT! ((yelling from kitchen))
4  Jonah:  I’M NOT () DOING IT.
5  Mom:  YES YOU ARE:  ((singsong))
6  Jonah:  NO I’M NOT.  ((singsong))
7  Mom:  OH YES YOU ARE:  ((singsong))
8  Jonah:  OH NO I’M NOT.
9  Mom:  IF I HAVE TO DRAG YOU BY THE HAIRS
10  OF YOUR CHINNY CHIN CHIN  ((singsong))
11  Jonah:  NO I’M NOT.
12  Mom:  ((walks towards Jonah’s bedroom))
13  OH YES I AM.  ((singsong))
14  OH YES YOU ARE:.

Directives do not stand as isolated speech acts; rather, they are frequently repeated until they are agreed with. Following a request, when a refusal occurs, a recycling of positions can occur with opposing sides arguing their respective points of view. In Example (4), Mom initiates a directive sequence by yelling to her son, who is in another room: ‘JONAH LYLE. SWEETIE! SOMETHING TO DO. YOU HAVE A PROJECT!’ In
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initiating the sequence, Mom makes use of address terms, Jonah’s first
and middle name, as well as an endearment term (Blum-Kulka 1997:
160–162), ‘sweetie’, to summon the attention of her son.

Following Mom’s opening control move (lines 1–3), a series of recycled
opposition moves occur. Jonah responds with, ‘I’M NOT ( ) DOING IT.’
Turns 4–8, 11–14 are remarkably similar in structure. Opposition is dis-
played immediately with turn prefixes that contain terms of polarity
(‘yes’ and ‘no’) signaling disagreement with the prior utterance. Opposi-
tion is further heightened through contrasting verb forms (‘are’ versus
‘am not’) while making use of the format of the prior utterance (Goodwin
1990: 178–185). These turns are occupied principally with displaying di-
vergent positions through opposition; no accounts or explanations ac-
company the assertions. Such extended recycling of positions constitutes
what Piaget (1926: 66) has called ‘primitive argument’ (see also Goodwin
1990: 159). In Example (4) (lines 9 and 10), Mom includes a threat with
her directive action that embeds a line from the children’s story The Three
Little Pigs, as she says ‘IF I HAVE TO DRAG YOU BY THE HAIRS
OF YOUR CHINNY CHIN CHIN.’ The nursery tale refrain provides
a framing to the activity that detracts from the serious nature of the
imperative.

Shortly afterwards, in an attempt to get her son to clean up his dishes,
Mom physically escorts reluctant Jonah into the kitchen, and she states,
‘Look at your mess.’

Two divergent stances are taken up toward the task at hand. Dad dem-
onstrates his seriousness toward the activity: ‘Jonah clean it up. It’s not
funny.’ (line 2). Mom makes use of a series of directives: ‘Get a sponge
and clean it. And I want you to bus your dishes.’ (lines 3 and 4) and
‘Bus the dishes. That’s your job. Go for it.’ (line 7).

Following her query ‘Did you hear me?’, she undercuts the seriousness
of her directives once again, this time with an affectionate kiss (line 5).
Here, though a range of different imperatives are given, Jonah ignores
them and eventually runs off, laughing, escaping the responsibilities his
parents set out for him.

Mom ends the sequence with a threat to Jonah, saying that his Game-
boy will be taken away; during the entire evening, however, the threat
was never actualized.

\[(\text{Holding onto Jonah’s shoulders, Mom escorts Jonah into the kitchen to clean up})\]

1 Mom: Look at your mess.
2 Dad: Jonah clean it up. It’s not funny.
3 Mom: That’s your yogurt. Get a sponge and clean it.
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Figure 4. Escorting Jonah into the kitchen to clean up

Figure 5. Positioning Jonah to observe his dishes to bus
And I want you to bus your dishes. You hear me? Did you hear me? ((kisses him))

Dad: Not just your dishes. All the dishes.

Mom: Bus the dishes. That’s your job. Go for it.

Jonah: Neh hah hah!! ((runs away))


In Example (4), Mother initiated the sequence through delivering a directive from a distance, yelling to her son in another room. Considerable work was subsequently devoted to attempting to establish a joint framework of attention. Mother had to literally drag her son into the room where he had been asked to clean up a mess. She pointed toward the dishes she wanted the child to clear from the table and positioned his body so that he was gazing directly toward them. Despite the fact that Jonah eventually was positioned to attend the task in question, Jonah did not willfully collaborate in bringing about this alignment. Mom’s directives were continuously met with resistance from Jonah, culminating with his running away and defiantly laughing, refusing to comply with the order given to him.

As Examples (4) and (5) illustrate, without first a framework of mutual orientation, a parent’s request may fail. The next example will illustrate
that the parent’s as well as the child’s mutual alignment is critical. In the following sequence (Example [6]), Dad, who is the sole parent in charge of dinner for the evening while his wife is at work, is in the midst of studying for an important work-related exam. Dad summons two-year-old Dylan (lines 1 and 2) and Jonah (line 3) to dinner. Jonah never answers his Dad; instead, he lies immobile on the couch. Dylan, who was in another room at the time he was given the initial directive, responds to his Dad’s requests with an account that he had already eaten.

Cycles of recycled responses by Dylan and Dad, prefaced with polarity markers, continue for several turns (lines 6–9) until Dylan eventually enters the room. Finding his father immersed in work, however, he leaves.

((Dad has been studying for an exam at the dining room table. He suddenly jumps up and summons his younger son Dylan, who is in his bedroom to dinner. Meanwhile eight-year-old Jonah lies on the couch watching television))

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Dad:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>DYLAN! COME ON OUT HERE!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>LET’S EAT DINNER!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Here. Jonah. Sit down and eat dinner.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>(( Dad returns to his studying;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Jonah remains immobile ))</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Dylan: I ATE SOME ALREADY!

Dad: NO YOU DIDN'T. ((continuing to look down)).

Dylan: YES I DID. I ATE DINNER! ((yelled from another part of the house))

Dylan: I ATE DINNER MOM!

Dylan: ((Enters dining room mumbling ‘I ate it’ but Dad does not look up from his studying, and Dylan leaves))

Example (6) clearly demonstrates the relevance of facing formations and an orientation of mutual co-presence on the part of the parents as well as the child for successful accomplishment of the activity at hand.

7. Bargaining in recycled sequences

One strategy that children attempt in the midst of recycled directives is bargaining. Through bargaining, children agree to partial acceptance of the directive but assert their own terms of acceptance (with regard to when they will comply, to what extent they will comply, etc.). The directive response sequence in Example (7) is largely constructed out of sequences of recyclings. Dad requests that Jonah and Dylan stop rough housing with ‘Okay! It’s time to mellow it out.’ (line 2). In response Jonah defiantly protests with ‘Ah::: No it’s not.’ (line 4). When Dad recycles his stance (lines 5, 10) with ‘Yeah it is.’ and a restatement that ‘It’s time to mellow it out.’, Jonah takes up an oppositional position...
with the response cry ‘Ah:::.’ Rather than assuming a serious stance to
the matter at hand, he instead laughs at the instruction and begins to
bargain for more time (line 11). His counter, itself framed as a direc-
tive, ‘Gi(hh)ve us five more minutes.’ (line 11), is filled with laugh to-
kens. When Dad counters that the children can have five more seconds
rather than minutes (line 12), the younger son Dylan runs into another
room (line 13). Jonah counters his dad’s proposal, using polarity
 markers at the onset of his turn (‘Nope. No no’) bargaining for more
time with ‘Give us about- twenty more seconds.’ (lines 14, 16, 17), and
runs off with Dylan.

(7) (Jonah and Dylan have been rough housing on the couch)
1 Jonah: Come to me! ((grabs Dylan))
2 Dad: Okay! It’s time to mellow it out!
3 (Dad attempts to disentangle Dylan from Jonah’s arms)
4 Jonah: Ah::: No it’s not.
5 Dad: Yeah it is.
6 (Dylan gently hits Dad and Dad relinquishes
7 his grip of Dylan)
8 Jonah: Ah::: eh heh heh!
9 (‘I don’t want to do that.)
10 Dad: It’s time to mellow it out.
11 Jonah: Gi(hh)ve us five more minutes.
12 Dad: No. You can have five more seconds.
13 Dylan: (Hurry.) (Dylan runs off)
14 Jonah: Nope. No no. Give us-
15 ((runs off with Dylan))
16 Jonah: Give us about- (2.0)
17 Give us about- twenty more seconds.
18 ((boys rough house in the kitchen))
19 Dad: ((sighs, breathes deeply. slaps arm on couch arm,
20 raises eyebrows and gives a hopeless look)
21 MHG: You tired?
22 Dad: No. I’m not tired. I’m just-
23 Everything’s a potential catastrophe. (.)
24 With these two.

Early attempts at establishing a framework for mutual orientation oc-
cur in Example (7), but are not successful. In lines 6 and 7, Dad tries
to disentangle his younger son Dylan from Jonah’s grasp. However,
following a gentle hit from Jonah, Dad quickly releases Dylan, and is
never able to establish a facing formation permitting direct face-to-
face communication. Moreover, congruent affective alignments (as in
Examples [1]–[3] toward the matter at hand are never achieved. Jonah laughs (line 8) defiantly as he protests his dad’s directive, with ‘Gi(h)ve us five more minutes.’ (line 11). In contrast to Examples (1)–(3), where the parent tells the child what to do, here Jonah not only disagrees with his dad’s directive to ‘mellow it out’, but also tells his dad what to do.

Bargaining for more time, as occurs in Example (7) (lines 11–17) above, is a frequent strategy children make use of in attempting to negotiate with their parents (Sirota in this issue). In other instances children’s attempts at bargaining are overturned. The next fragment, Example (8), provides a case in point. Here an eight-year-old child, Allison, attempts to put off taking a bath. In response, rather than ignoring the move, her mother invokes a rule about bargaining, stating, ‘It’s not negotiable. = okay?’ and Allison complies with Mom’s directive.

(8)  ([At the dinner table])
1    Mom:   Alright. It’s twenty minutes to eight
2          even though it doesn’t feel like it.
3  Allison:  It feels like seven.
4    Mom:   We have to get you in the bath.
5  Allison:  Mmm mmm. How about the next day.
6    Mom:   It’s not negotiable. =okay?
7  Allison:  ([Exits from table and goes to run bath water])

Example (9) below demonstrates how parents formulate promises of partial compliance as ‘dealing’ or ‘bargaining’ (line 8) and lay out the consequences of not complying with parents’ requests—for example, not being able to engage in desirable activities, playing on a new slide (lines 12–14 in Example [9] below) Dad has just installed. In Example (9), Dad is attempting to get his daughter to finish her entire lunch, though she wants to eat only carrots (line 7). She resists complying with Dad’s directive (lines 7, 11) by bargaining.

(9)
1    Dad:   Anna, you need to finish your lunch Sweetie.
2     Anna:  ([Slides down the slide.])
3          I’m gonna finish the rest of my corn, okay?
4    Dad:   Aren’t you going to finish your hot dog?
5  Anna:   No.
6    Dad:   Are you going to finish your carrots?
7  Anna:   I’ll finish just my carrots.
8    Dad:   Annie, we’re not dealing. We’re not bargaining. Go.
9     (He gestures towards the table
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In Examples (8) and (9), parents set the rules and provide sanctions for noncompliance. By way of contrast, in Example (7), children continue to bargain despite what their dad says; the parent, rather than the child, is eventually silenced. In the face of multiple defiant and noncompliant moves, Dad comments, ‘Everything’s a potential catastrophe. (.) with these two.’ (Example [7], lines 23 and 24).

8. Accountable request sequences

Across these sets of examples, requests and direct imperatives are used to solicit the accomplishment of a task. A pattern where children disregard parents’ directives and set the terms for when and how activities are to be accomplished (Examples [4]–[7]) differs dramatically from Examples (1)–(3), in which clear limits are set and rules are invoked, treated as serious, and enforced. Some features differentiating Examples (1)–(3) from Examples (4)–(7) are the establishment of a common facing formation before interaction began, framings of the interaction as unequivocally serious, and the categorization of untoward acts as not meeting up to certain standards. Next actions by children are not flat refusals, but rather accounts that demonstrate the legitimacy of the complaint, thereby according some face-saving vis-à-vis the party issuing the directive.

9. Extended arguments involving accounts

Eisenberg and Garvey (1981: 166) postulate that within disputes the accounts or explanations for positions that are taken up are ‘significantly more likely to lead to a termination of the episode.’ Such practices are, however, themselves vulnerable, in that one’s opponent can find fault with the justification that is offered (Goodwin 1990: 163–165). In fact, with each subsequent turn, accounts can generate a new arena for dispute and can lead to extended sequences of conflict, as coparticipants oppose another speaker’s utterances with their own oppositional moves, in cycles of disagreement turns.
In Example (10), Mom, who is affectionately called ‘the General’ by her family members because of her no-nonsense attitude toward getting things done, attempts to get her son Luke to take a bath. Extended counters to her demand that Luke take a bath occur. Throughout the multiple turns involved in the dispute, Mom never once wavers from her position. One important feature of this encounter that differentiates this sequence from Examples (1)–(3) is the facing formation of participants. Rather than entering into a facing formation vis-à-vis his mom, Luke hides on the living room couch underneath a blanket while his mom moves about the house conducting chores. What affiliates Example (10) with Examples (1)–(3) is the persistence with which Mom pursues her directive, making for a very different trajectory from Examples (6) and (7); despite counter-moves, Mom never once flinches in her determination that compliance is mandatory.

The sequence of moves and counter moves begins when Mom issues a directive with ‘Luke, bath. Come on.’ Luke protests the directive: ‘No: Not yet.’ (line 5) and argues that he wants to put off taking a bath until after his piano lesson (line 8). Mom refuses to give in to his request for taking the bath later (‘No:! Now!’ in line 9). Turns of polarity continue over several turns as Luke with ‘YE::S!’ and Mom with ‘No:!’ ‘Huh uh’ and ‘Nope’ provide alternative perspectives (lines 5–15). When Mom provides the account that by the time the lesson is over it will be ten-thirty (lines 19–23), Luke still protests.

Mom then makes use of a strategy employed frequently by elementary school teachers to align students to the task at hand by counting to three (line 27). In response, when Luke provides the account that he is tired (line 28), making use of format tying, Mom turns the very excuse he offers on its head: ‘And you’re going to be even more tired’(line 31) as she begins counting again. Luke continues being defiant to his mom, rejecting her directives to take a bath. When he argues ‘Why right now::’ (line 41), Mom once more makes use of format tying to redirect his excuse to him as an imperative: ‘YES, RIGHT NOW.’

In response to the recycling of his plea that he’s tired (lines 36–44), Mom provides a counter argument in line 45 with an explanation for her position: ‘Luke? Then you can take a nap before Marty comes. Since Linda’s going to go first. Okay? I don’t want to hear any more complaints please.’ (lines 45–49). Mom demonstrates the seriousness of her directive with the statement that provides a metacommentary on his prior actions. When he protests that he took a bath the day before (lines 49 and 50), she quickly refutes his utterance with ‘No you did not. You think I would forget that!’ She does not allow any of his
excuses to be considered legitimate. To each excuse she provides a response in kind. When he reiterates that he wants to go to sleep (line 64), she argues that this can be accomplished before the piano teacher comes and after a short bath (lines 65–71). Though she does not permit him to put off taking a bath, as she closes the bathroom door she says that he can take a ‘short bath’, taking into account his plea of being tired.

(10)

1 Mom: Is Luke: watching?
2  Ah oh. Better go give him a bath.
3  ((several minutes later))
5 Luke: NO: Not ye:::t! (from couch (with blanket over him))
6 Mom: No- y y- not yet? What do you mean not yet.
7 Marty’s coming-.
8 Luke: [AFTER (.) PIANO::
9 Mom: No:: ! Now.
10 Luke: YE::S! [PLEA::SE
11 Mom: [Huh uh.
12
13 Mom: You are taking a bath now.
14 Luke: [After piano::
15 Mom: [Nope.
16 Luke: Why::
17 Mom: NOW::
18 Luke: Plead::se::
19 Mom: By the time Marty- ( (pulling blanket off Luke:) )
20 By // the time you’re-
22 Mom: No. By the time Marty’s done
23 It’s going to be ten thirty.=
24 Come on.
25 Luke: ‘NO:: Please::
26 Mom: No.
27 Mom: I’m counting to three right now.
28 Luke: [But I’m [tired
29 and I want to go to [slee::p::
30 Mom: And you’re-
31 And you’re going to be even more tired.
32 Come on. =ONE, [TWO
33 Luke: [PLEASE::
Plea::se

Mom: NO! COME!

Luke: But::: I’m tired::!

Mom: HUH UH.

Mom: NOPE. You have to come.


Mom: COME ON.

Luke: NO::: wa. Why right now:::

Mom: YES. RIGHT NOW.

Luke: I’m tired:::

Mom: Luke? Then you can take a nap

since Linda’s going to go first.

Luke: Okay? I don’t want to hear any more complaints
please.

Luke: But I took a bath

yesterday.

Mom: No you did not.

Luke: You think I would forget that?

Mom: Close the door.

Luke: Close the door Luke::

Luke: I don’t want to do it now. I’m ti:red.

Mom: Yes you are doing it now.

Luke: I’m going to go get your clothes.

Luke: Ah:::

Mom: Here.

Mom: Come on.

Luke: Why:::

Mom: Close the door. Shhh! Come on.

Luke: I wanna go to sleep.

Mom: Luke:. No more complaints.


Mom: YE:S::

Luke: I want to go to sleep.

Mom: Yeah? well then you can take a nap

before Marty comes.

After you take a shor- a short bath. Here. Come on.


Mom: Close the door.


Mom: Uh huh.
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76  Mom:  Oh is there soap in there?
77  I think Daddy put some soap in there last time.
78  Mom:  Okay you can do it quickly. Okay. Here.

This sequence began without the positioning of bodies in a framework of mutual engagement; nevertheless, Mom is eventually successful in the delivery of her directive. In contrast to sequences that are structured as recycled positions, which do not result in following through with a parent’s directive due to a child’s resistance (Examples [5] and [7]), or a parent’s involvement in another task (Example [6]), in this extended sequence Mom is persistent in her demands. Mom responds to counter-arguments (and complaints) from her son by providing reasons for her requests over multiple turns. She refuses to back down from her stance that she wants him to take a bath now. Mom modifies her position only by saying that Luke can take his bath quickly. After an extended sequence of directives and counters to her proposals, she is eventually successful in gaining Luke’s compliance in taking a bath.

10. Affective dimensions to directive/response sequences

Achieving collaborative action in focused interaction not only requires a common facing formation (Kendon 1985: 235). It also demands orientation toward a common focus of attention. In Example (11), Mom and son are aligned in a facing formation where they are visibly co-present to each other, sitting across from one another at the dinner table; however, each is involved in a different ‘attend track’. While Mom is talking to Jason, telling him to wash out the blue and green paint from his hair (from a paint ball session), Jason does not reciprocate gaze. Instead he picks up an iced tea bottle cap and reads the label.

(11) ((At the dinner table))

1  Mom:  After dinner I want you to take a shower.
2     Wash your hair super good Jason.
3     ‘Cause I’ll get in the shower with you
4     and wash it if you don’t.
5     And you can’t see it- in this light
6     but outside today there were blue and green
7     still from Friday night.
8  Jason:  Mom. A duck’s quack doesn’t echo.
9     ((reading bottle cap from iced tea))
10  Mom:  Kay. = Did you hear me?
11  Jason:  Yeah.
Mom: Kay.

Jason: A duck’s quack does not echo.

Mom: ‘Cause you don’t want me to take a shower with you
      Do you?

Jason: No.

Mom: ‘Cause you don’t want me to go to school tomorrow Babe
      With blue and green in your hair.
      ‘Cause all your friends will laugh at you.
      Say you have dirty hair. (0.4) From Friday.

Dad: Yeah. They’ll think it’s tight.

Jason: Tight tight tight tight. ((chanting))

As Example (11) begins, rather than gearing into each other’s talk, Mom and Jason only minimally attend each other. They set up alternative frameworks for participation; while Mom issues a directive to Jason (lines 1–7), Jason picks up an iced tea bottle cap, looks at it, and introduces a noticing: ‘A duck’s quack doesn’t echo.’ (line 8). Mom for her part with ‘Kay’ only minimally attends to his noticing and subsequently demands uptake to her directive with her question ‘Did you hear me?’ (line 10). Mom’s directive about taking a shower is accompanied by threats: Mom will get in the shower with Jason if he doesn’t wash out the green and blue dye he has in his hair (lines 2, 3, 14, and 15).

As Mother closes off the sequence by providing a rationale for her directive (lines 18–21), she invokes a theme of embarrassment, through elaborating the possible scenario of Jason being ridiculed by his peers at school laughing at his green hair. In dyadic situations such forms of critique could end with the parent getting the last word. However, what
occurs in a next utterance is that Dad enters the discussion to provide a contrasting description and assessment of the activity with ‘Yeah. They’ll think it’s tight.’ (line 22). This assessment results in the sudden reframing (Goffman 1974) of the situation at hand. Jason, smiling, repeats the words his father has said in a rhythmic fashion and Mom enters into the playful frame by smiling. We thus see how consequential multiparty participation in directive sequences can be. Here Dad’s talk visibly transforms a negative depiction of Jason, with friends laughing at him, into a portrait of him as someone whose blue hair is positively assessed.

Example (12) exhibits another directive about getting clean before bedtime, one that through parents’ persistence proves successful in getting things done. While Example (11) was from its onset infused with threats, an alternative way of framing directives is through teasing and word play. At mealtime the family had been discussing a shy new Brazilian boy in Aurora’s classroom. Mom and Dad tell Aurora to ask him about the Samba, a Brazilian dance, and they discuss their versions of what Brazilian Portuguese sounds like. As the conversation about Brazilian Portuguese winds down, Mom asserts ‘Okay. Time to brush your teeth.’ This is playfully countered by Aurora’s partial repeat of the prior utterance in falling rising intonation: ‘Time to brush your teeth, That is not Brazilian.’

(12) ((At dinner the family has been talking about the Brazilian Portuguese language))

1 Mom: Okay. Time to brush your teeth.
2 Aurora: Time to brush your teeth,
3 Wes: ‘That is not Brazilian.
4 Mom: ‘Ah heh heh heh!
5 Aurora: ‘Stands up from table’
6 Mom: Samba. ‘Pointing to bathroom’
7 Aurora: Sam:
8 Aurora: Samba to the bath
9 Mom: ‘Samba to the bathroom.
10 ((taps Aurora’s back as Aurora moves from her seat towards the bathroom))
11 Wes: Sam:
12 Aurora: Samba.
13 Mom: ‘Smiles’
14 Aurora: ‘Smiles’
15 Mom: ‘Smiles’
16 Aurora: All right. Dn nen nen ((begins dancing as exits))
17 Wes: I don’t wanna samba.

Here format tying and word play (lines 7–9) rather than seriousness and threats color the sequence. Mom, through her directive ‘Samba’ and
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'Samba to the bathroom', enters into the frame of play by providing a
next move that is appropriate within the frame Aurora initiates.

When Weston responds to Mom's directive several moves later with an
account that he doesn't know how to samba, Mom provides a return
move. Using format tying she states, 'You'll learn how to samba.' She
then produces an explicit command: 'Get in the bathroom.' Providing
backup to Mom's directives, Dad then issues direct unmitigated impera-
tives in rapid-fire form like a drill sergeant (line 7).

(13)

1  Wes:     ((laughing)) I do(hh)n't kno(hh)w how to sa(hh)mba.
2  Mom:    You'll learn how to samba.
3  Dad:    No, Go.
4  Wes:    Bath?
5  Mom/Dad: No.
6  Dad:    Wash face, wash hands, brush teeth.
7  Wes:    Eee:: ow::::. ((goes toward bathroom))

Though in the directive sequence in Example (11) Jason and Mom geared
into separate projects from the directive's onset, in Examples (12) (lines 8
and 9) and (13) (lines 1 and 2) children and parents tie their utterances
very closely to the talk of the preceding speaker in a series of 'exchange
and return' (Goodwin 1990: 152–154) moves that are treated as playful.
Further contrasts are that Examples (12) and (13) demonstrate movement
from playful to a more serious mode of argumentation, rather than re-
verse, as happens in Example (11). Both parents in Example (13) collabo-
rate in executing imperatives that are complied with.

11. Conclusion

While many studies of directives take a speech act approach and examine
directives in isolation from the longer sequences from which they emerge,
this paper makes use of a methodology inspired by conversation analysis
and examines the sequential analysis of directive use. Alternative trajec-
tories are exhibited by the examples presented in this paper. Strategies for
formulating directive/response sequences involve constellations of fea-
tures, including structures of control, forms of tying utterances to prior
utterances, as well as facing formations. The forms of participation
frameworks that are constructed allow for different ways of sustaining a
common perspective on events, for gearing into what someone has said
(or not), and displaying to each other whether participants are attuned
to a similar activity frame, as well as affective alignment. Forms of arguments constituted through recycled positions (Examples [4], [6], and [7]) have been distinguished from arguments that are buttressed by accounts or rule statements (Examples [1]–[3], [10]). Types of accounts may appeal to a positive logic, with a rational explanation, or a negative logic, making use of threats (Examples [5], [9], [10]). Participants take up different forms of affective stances, and these may shift from serious to playful (Example [10]) or from playful to serious (Examples [11] and [12]).

Future studies may find that some of these forms of argument trajectories are correlated with different ways that parents and children co-construct family process. Psychologists taking a typological (and unidirectional) approach to families have focused on different forms of ‘parenting styles’. For example, Baumrind (1967, 1989) distinguishes authoritarian, authoritative, and permissive parenting. Some of the behaviors associated with these styles can be roughly correlated with dispute styles in directive/response sequences. While the ‘authoritative’ parent directs the child in a rational, issue-oriented manner and firmly enforces rules, the ‘permissive’ parent does not enforce rules firmly and imposes few demands (Grolnick 2003: 5–6). The ‘authoritarian’ parent values obedience first, while enforcing rules firmly using set standards.

Rather than taking as a point of departure differing parenting styles, I have instead focused on the practices through which parents and children together build important events in their lives. Forms of arguments built of recycled positions differ in important ways from arguments where children are involved in accounting for their untoward behavior with parents. In situations where children are successful at bargaining (Example [7]), children may not gear into the projects their parents propose, and even run away from responsibilities (Examples [5], [7]), leading to escalations of assertions of authority through threats (Example [5]) or a parent’s giving up in defeat (Example [7]). By way of contrast, where parents are persistent in pursuing their directives (Examples [1]–[3], [10], [12], [13]), often facilitated by situations where children and parents join in sustaining face-to-face access to one another (Examples [1]–[3]), children learn to be accountable for their actions. Successful trajectories of directive sequences entail vigilant work on the part of parents—their full engagement in pursuing a response from children in the midst of the multiple competing activities that occupy their lives and demand their attention. As was seen in Example (12), ways of combining play with seriousness can provide for distinctive interactive styles in families, ones I have found to be related to joyful engagement in exploring how the world works (Goodwin in preparation). Future studies need to examine further the repertoire of trajectories, with differential forms of affect
and participation, that are used to constitute ways of being in the world within particular families.

Appendix: Transcription conventions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>word</th>
<th>Underlining indicates some form of emphasis, which may be signaled by changes in pitch and/or amplitude.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[</td>
<td>A left bracket marks the point at which the current talk is overlapped by other talk. Two speakers beginning to speak simultaneously are shown by a left bracket at the beginning of a line.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>:</td>
<td>Colons indicate that the sound immediately preceding has been noticeably lengthened.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>//</td>
<td>Double slashes provide an alternative method of marking overlap.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.</td>
<td>A period indicates a falling contour.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?</td>
<td>A question mark indicates a rising contour.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>,</td>
<td>A comma indicates a falling–rising contour.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>=</td>
<td>A degree sign indicates that talk it precedes is low in volume.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(words)</td>
<td>The equal sign indicates ‘latching’; there is no interval between the end of a prior turn and the start of a next piece of talk.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.8)</td>
<td>Numbers in parentheses mark silences in seconds and tenths of seconds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(.)</td>
<td>Denotes a micropause.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAPS</td>
<td>Capitals indicate increased volume.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(words)</td>
<td>Material in parentheses indicates a hearing that the transcriber was uncertain about.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(h)</td>
<td>An h in parentheses indicates plosive aspiration, which could result from events such as breathiness, laughter, or crying.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes

* I am grateful to all of the members of the CELF team for their exploration with me of ideas developed in this paper. Undergraduate students I have worked with on these materials, Jennifer Fabian, Sarah Press, and Erin Jacobs (who worked also on frame grabs for this paper), have all contributed invaluable discussions of directive sequence trajectories. Two anonymous readers provided insightful commentary, and I greatly acknowledge their careful reading of the manuscript. The most recent version of my work on directives was given at the 14th World Congress of Applied Linguistics, 26 July 2005,
Marjorie Harness Goodwin

in Madison, Wisconsin, at an invited symposium, ‘Accomplishing Family Social Life through Embodied Language Practices’. I would like to thank my panel members, Karin Aronson, Alessandra Fasulo, and Charles Goodwin, as well as Ceci Ford, Doug Maynard and Penny Stribling, for their helpful comments on this occasion.

1. For a history of the field, see Goodwin and Heritage (1990) and Clayman and Maynard (1994).
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