To cite the text: Stevanovic, Melisa (2020). Mobilizing student compliance: On the directive use of Finnish second-person declaratives and interrogatives during violin instruction. In Emma M. Betz, Carmen Taleghani-Nikazm, & Peter S. Golato (eds.) *Mobilizing others: Grammar and lexis within larger activities* (pp. 115–145). Amsterdam: Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/slsi.33.05ste

Mobilizing Student Compliance: On the Directive Use of Finnish Second-Person Declaratives and Interrogatives during Violin Instruction

Melisa Stevanovic, University of Helsinki

Abstract

Drawing on video-recorded violin lessons as data, the article describes the violin teacher's use of Finnish second-person declarative and interrogative directives in mobilizing student compliance. It is shown that the declarative directives are regularly used when (1) the student is already engaged in the task at hand and (2) the nominated actions concern the basics of violin playing. The paper argues that these directives are thus not only about mobilizing recipient action locally but also about establishing normatively-desired behavior more generally. The interrogative directives, on the other hand, are typically used when (1) there has been a momentary shortcoming in the student's prior behavior and (2) the mobilized action is a one-time accomplishment remedying the smooth unfolding of the instructional encounter.

Keywords

conversation analysis, instructional interaction, violin lessons, directives, compliance, declaratives, interrogatives.

1. Introduction

In this paper, I analyze the design of Finnish directives in the context of a violin teacher seeking to mobilize student compliance during violin lessons. While directives may be defined as speech acts intended to cause the hearer to take a particular action (e.g., Searle 1976), my analysis focuses on what warrants the teacher's choices between two specific directive forms: second-person declarative directives, and second-person interrogative directives.

Speakers' choices between different directive forms have been traditionally discussed in the literature revolving around the notion of politeness. Here, directives have been considered to involve some degree of imposition, which speakers commonly try to mitigate (e.g., Lakoff 1973; Clark 1979; Fraser 1980; 1990; House and Kasper 1981; Blum-Kulka 1987; Brown and Levinson 1987 [1978]; Caffi 1999; Eelen 2001; Mills 2003; Watts 2003; Silverstein 2010). Within the field of conversation analysis (CA), in contrast, the choices of directive form have been discussed with reference to specific turn-design features which tailor the directive action to the particular context in which it is produced (e.g., Wootton 1997; Curl and Drew 2008; Craven and Potter 2010; Zinken and Ogiermann 2011; 2013; Rossi 2012; Stevanovic 2013; Zinken and Rossi 2016). Recently, specific research efforts have been made with respect to imperatives. For example, Kent and Kendrick (2016) described the kinds of imperative directives issued *after* the nominated action has already become due. Kent and Kendrick (2016) suggest that, due to their timing, these utterances not only seek to mobilize recipient action, but also to treat the recipient as accountable for his or her previous shortcoming (see also Kent 2012). To summarize the state-of-the-art of CA research on imperatives, Sorjonen, Raevaara, and Couper-Kuhlen (2017) suggested that the choice of imperative form is warranted by four pragmatic dimensions of the situation: (1) the participation framework, (2) the relation of the nominated action to the on-going activity, (3) the degree of immediacy or urgency of the action nominated, and (4) the deontic rights and responsibilities of the participants. Presumably—and

as will also be demonstrated in this chapter—the same dimensions inform the uses of other directive forms, too.

Given the interest in how different directive forms configure in the local, multimodal and temporal context of cooperative activities, there has also been a growing awareness of the embeddedness of directives in their material and embodied surroundings (e.g., Cekaite 2010; Goodwin and Cekaite 2013; 2014; Mondada 2014; Kendrick and Drew 2016). One context where this phenomenon has been shown to be particularly relevant is *instruction*, where the notions of modelling and embodied learning have been increasingly acknowledged (e.g., Evans et al. 2009). From this point of view, CA studies have discussed instructional activities in the classroom (McHoul 1978; Mehan 1979; Lerner 1995; Sahlström 2002), dance lessons (Keevallik 2010; Broth & Keevallik 2014), surgical training (Zemel and Koschmann 2014), pre-clinical dental training (Hindmarsh et al. 2014), and driving lessons (De Stefani and Gazin 2014; Deppermann, 2015; 2018; Broth et al. 2017). There is also an increasing body of CA studies specifically on musical instruction (e.g., Weeks 1996; Nishizaka 2006; Szczepek Reed et al. 2013; Reed & Szczepek Reed 2014; Parton 2014; Merlino 2014), which have thus far particularly highlighted the multimodal features of instructional activities. Thus, for example, Veronesi (2014) examined correction sequences in collective music-making workshops, describing how the conductor's talk, singing, gestural imitation of instrumentalists' actions, and directive enactments mutually elaborated one another when the conductor sought to get a specific musical piece played correctly. Furthermore, and particularly relevantly for this study, Nishizaka (2006) examined violin instruction, describing how talk, gestures, and the physical handling of objects (e.g., bow) work to structure and restructure the environment so as to establish learning targets, or what others have referred to as "learnables" (Reed and Szczepek Reed, 2014).

In this chapter, I consider violin instruction in the context of Finnish. In that language, the imperative is the only linguistic form in which the directive nature of the speech act is encoded directly in its grammatical structure (Hakulinen et al. 2004: 1560–1562). However, the directive uses of indicative, non-modal, second-person declaratives and interrogatives are also highly conventionalized in Finnish. Similar to imperatives, both second-person declaratives and interrogatives are used in unproblematic and routine-like directives (on declarative directives, see e.g., Sorjonen 2001; on interrogative directives, see e.g., Lappalainen 2008). In contrast to "genuine" declaratives and interrogatives, the directive use of these forms has been associated with a lack of an overt subject pronoun referring to the actor (Yli-Vakkuri 1986: 155–157). In this way, these directive forms are reminiscent of imperatives. Unlike imperatives, however, these forms have a second-person inflectional ending in the finite verb (e.g., *laita-**t*** 'put-SG2' 'you put'), which, in the case of an interrogative, is also followed by the question clitic *-kO* (e.g., *laita-**t-ko*** 'put-SG2-Q' 'do you put').[1]

Formally, second-person declarative directives assume the recipient's compliance in a straightforward way—given that no contingency on the recipients' willingness to comply is encoded in the grammatical structure of these utterances (Stevanovic 2011). From this perspective, declarative directives seem to embody particularly aggravated attempts to mobilize compliant recipient action (cf. Ervin-Tripp 1976; West 1990). At the same time, however, a crucial feature of these directives is their equivocal status as "directives" in the first place. In their study using Finnish telephone conversations as data, Etelämäki and Couper-Kuhlen (2017) demonstrated that, in order for an utterance such as "you eat" to receive a directive reading, it needs to occur in an already-established "directive environment." Similarly, in her study on Finnish cooking instruction, Raevaara (2017) found indicative, non-

[1] Notably, though, in colloquial speech (and also in my data), these types of interrogatives are often produced in a format where the question clitic *-kO* is replaced with a second-person subject pronoun (e.g., *laita-**t-sä*** 'put-SG2-YOU' 'do you put'). Moreover, the second-person inflectional ending *-t* is sometimes replaced with *-k*, which originates in the question clitic (e.g., *laita-**k-sä*** 'put-Q-YOU' 'do you put'). (Hakulinen et al. 2004: 166-167.)

modal, second-person declarative directives to be commonly used for prompting the recipient to carry out a next step in a project which was ongoing and of which the recipient was already in charge. In more abstract terms, the interpretation of declarative directives seems to be associated with the ambiguity between epistemics and deontics (Stevanovic 2018). Such ambiguity has been found to characterize the giving of instructions in settings such as service encounters (Rouhikoski 2015), medical consultations (Landmark et al. 2015; Lindström and Wetherall 2015) and psychotherapy sessions (Ekberg and LeCouteur 2015). In these contexts, interpretations giving more weight to the description of future action (epistemics) than to its prescription (deontics) are common. This may be due to the fact that, in these contexts, the second-person declarative directives typically target actions to be realized independently by the client without the control of the institutional representative (e.g., "you take the corridor to the left"; Rouhikoski 2015).

Second-person interrogative directives, in contrast, make it explicit that recipient compliance is needed for the nominated action to be realized. In the context of Finnish, however, the results on the uses of indicative, non-modal, second-person interrogative directives have been mixed. Consistent with the politeness approach, the research on use of interrogative directives in service encounters (Rouhikoski 2015) has shown these utterances to be common in situations where the recipient needs to go to some extra trouble in complying with the directive. The interrogative directives have thus been argued to embody considerateness toward the recipient, who might need to deviate from the anticipated course of action. Other studies, however, have associated these utterances with actions which are of merely routine nature and of particularly low cost to the recipient (Lappalainen 2008; Sorjonen et al. 2009). What is nonetheless common to both of these views on the interrogative directives is the idea of idea of them placing particularly great constraints on the recipient, who needs to comply with the directive immediately (Lappalainen 2008; Sorjonen et al. 2009; Rouhikoski

2015). This view is also consistent with a recent account by Stivers and Rossano (2010), who suggested that interrogative morphosyntax is one of the four turn-design features by which a speaker can increase the recipient's accountability for responding, the other three features being rising intonation, recipient directed speaker gaze and recipient-tilted epistemic asymmetry. From this perspective, the interrogative utterance form is a vehicle dedicated to "mobilizing response" (Stivers and Rossano 2010) in the here-and-now of the interactional encounter.

In sum, second-person declaratives and interrogatives embody quite different orientations to recipient compliance. In this chapter, I consider the very aspects by which these two different orientations may be warranted in the context of Finnish violin lessons with a teacher and a young child as the participants.

2. Data and Method

In this study, I draw on a data set of four video-recorded 30-minute-long violin lessons with a 5-year-old pupil, Nea, and her teacher as the participants. The lessons were recorded in the spring of 2012, at a point when the young violin pupil had already been playing her instrument for half a year. Nea's grandma is present at the lessons, sometimes providing a piano accompaniment to Nea's playing, but otherwise remaining largely silent during the lessons. Each of the four lessons lasted approximately 30 minutes, consisting of the same series of actions: tuning the instrument, warming up, playing the "homework" pieces, working on specific segments of these pieces, and introducing new material to practice at home. The recordings resulted in about two hours of data. These data contain 763 directives produced by the teacher to the student (see Table 1).

Previously, I examined the imperatives and hortatives[2] in this data set, considering how the interactional functions of those imperative and hortative turns with the Finnish clitic particle *-pA* or *-pAs* attached to their finite verb differed from the turns without clitic particles (see Stevanovic 2017). Here, I investigate those two non-modal directive forms which were beyond the scope of the earlier study (due to the lack of the clitic particle *-pA* or *-pAs* in these forms): second-person declarative directives *(n*=73) and second-person interrogative directives *(n*=54). The method used is conversation analysis (Heritage 1984; Psathas 1995; Schegloff 2007; Sidnell 2010; Sidnell and Stivers (eds.) 2013; Clift 2016).

In the data extracts presented below, I use the transcription conventions by Nevile (2004) to represent the timing of bodily activities in relation to talk. Bodily activities are described between double brackets below the line of talk with which they are concurrent (see also Appendix A). In cases of several overlapping bodily activities, these are listed below one another in the order in which they begin. Upward pointing arrows (↑) are used to indicate the precise points in the talk when a bodily activity begins and ends, with these arrows being joined by underlining to show the duration of that activity (↑_____↑).

Table 1. *Directives by the teacher to the student during the four violin lessons*

Directives		**N**	**%**
Imperatives		222	29
Hortatives		211	28
Second-person declaratives	Modal	72	9
	Non-modal (e.g., *laitat* 'you put')	73	10
Second-person interrogatives	Modal	30	4
	Non-modal (e.g., *laitatko* 'do you put')	54	7
Other (e.g., verbless phrases, zero-person or third-person declaratives)		101	13
Total		763	100

[2] The term "hortative" has been commonly used to refer to directives with other than the second person as the addressee(s) (see e.g., Jary and Kissine 2014: 26–31). Here, the term is used specifically to refer to the first-person plural directives ('let's do X').

3. Analysis

In this section, I begin by describing five contexts for the use of the second-person declarative directives during violin instruction. I then proceed to considering the use of second-person interrogative directives in this setting.

3.1. Second-Person Declarative Directives

As pointed out above, due to their ambiguous status as "directives", declarative directives constitute a paradoxical way of mobilizing recipient compliance. The apparently contradictory nature of these directives is also reflected in the noticeably variable temporal distance between the issuance of a directive, and its expected compliance, where the archetypical pattern of a directive being followed by immediate compliance represents only 25% of all cases (see Table 2). Existing literature on the use of Finnish declarative directives does not allow one to determine whether this is characteristic for instructional settings in particular or whether such a distribution of temporal relations is a more general feature of declarative directives in other settings, too (see e.g., Sorjonen 2001: 94–95 on doctors' use of declarative directives to guide their patients' post-consultation activities).

Table 2. *The temporal relations between second-person declarative directives and their expected compliance*

Temporal relation	***n***	**%**
Directive hours or days before compliance (explaining homework), **Extract 1**	6	8
Directive several minutes prior to compliance (transitions), **Extract 2**	27	37
Directive immediately prior to compliance, **Extract 3**	18	25
Directive at the same time as compliance, **Extract 4**	15	21
"Directive" immediately after "compliance", **Extract 5**	7	10
Total	73	100

Although specific *a priori* assumptions of temporality are inherent in the everyday usage of the terms "directive" and "compliance", here, however, these terms are used to refer to a content-related, rather than to a temporally fixed, linkage between the teacher's verbal utterance and the student's respective non-verbal behavior (see specifically the last two temporal categories). The reason for this choice is that, despite the variety in the timing between the issuance of a directive and the expected timing of compliance, I seek to draw attention to the remarkable similarity in the actions that the teacher in my data targets when using these utterances. To appreciate that similarity, let us consider the following brief examples of declarative directives, each of which represents one of the five temporal-relation categories described in Table 2.

Extract 1 (VT1_25:57)

```
01 T: just (.) sä voit totaki harjotella vähän kotona ja nyt ku
      'right (.) you can also practice that a bit at home and now that'

02    on tää e-kieli ni se on paljo ohuempi ku se karhu-kieli
      'it is this E string so it is much thinner than the "Bear string"'

03    (.) sen    otat   kevyemmin sitte (0.2)
          it-GEN take-2 light-ADV-COMP PRT
      '(.) you take it lighter then'
                                      ↑______↑
                                     ((N nods.))
```

Extract 2 (VT1_03:53)

```
01 T: tehäämpäs semmosta leikkiä että tota
      'let's play a kind of game that erm'

02    ((5 lines removed, where T explains what will be done next))

03 T: että tota pidät peukaloa   siinä ja  sitten
      PRT  PRT  hold-2 thumb-PAR there and then
      'that erm you hold the thumb there and then'

04    käännät  aina   eri       kielille
      switch-2 always different string-PL-ALL
      'you always switch to different strings'
      ↑_________________________________↑
      ((N turns to look at T and smiles.))
```

Extract 3 (VT1_01:40)

```
01 T: laitetaan tämä tästä tänne? (1.0) eteen?
      'let's put this from here to here (1.0) to the front'
                ↑_____________________________↑
                ((T holds her violin in the air in front of her.))

02    (.) ((N puts her (own) violin in front of her))

03 T: ja  sitte laitat sen    sinne    olalle
      and then  put-2  it-GEN to.there shoulder-ALL
      'and then you put it then on the shoulder'
      ↑_____________________________↑
      ((T puts her violin on her left shoulder.))
                        ↑____________________↑
                        ((N puts her violin on her left shoulder.))
```

Extract 4 (VT2_12:16)

```
01 T: katotaas (.) kuinka nopeesti ↑kakkossormi ↑nousee? (0.8)
      'let's see (.) how fast the second finger rises'
      ↑_____________________________________________________↑
      ((T holds N's left-hand "second" finger (middle finger).))
                                                  ↑__________↑
                                              ((T raises N's finger.))

02 T: pidät  muut   alhaalla. (.) pelkästään tämä?
      keep-2 others beneath       only       this
      'you keep the others beneath (.) only this'
      ↑_____________________↑               ↑___↑
      ((T guides N's fingers.))          ((T grasps N's middle finger.))
```

Extract 5 (VT1_25:21)

```
01 T: just? (.) ja sitte ympyrä
      'right (.) and then a circle'

02 N: ♬ [⬒:: ] ♬

03 T:   [(--)] ympyrän alakaari ja sit
               'bottom arc of the circle and then'
            ↑_________↑↑_____________↑
      ((N's bottom arc))((N's top arc))

04 T: sä  teet   yläkaaren  [ja koko  kä]si
      SG2 make-2 top.arc-GEN and whole hand
      'you make the top arc and the whole arm'
      ↑____________________↑
      ((N places the bow ready for the next bow stroke.))

05 N:                       [ ♬ ⬒:: ♬ ]
```

```
06 T: rentoutuu siinä.
      'relaxes there.'
      ↑_____________↑
      ((N is already raising her right arm to make a new circle.))
```

While there are differences in the expected timing of compliance, the second-person declarative directives in Extracts 1–5 exhibit two important similarities: (1) The second-person declarative directive is not the first directive within a sequence, since the teacher has previously used at least one other directive, such as a hortative (Extracts 2–4), to establish the student's engagement in the activity at hand; (2) Each declarative directive was about the teacher instructing the student in the basic details of the physical handling of the instrument—that is, in the placing of violin (Extract 3), plucking the strings (Extract 2), using the bow to make sounds (Extracts 1 & 5), and moving fingers on the fingerboard (Extract 4).

Where the second-person declaratives in Extracts 1–5 differ, however, is in the degree to which they mobilize recipient action in the here-and-now of the interaction. In Extract 1, where Nea receives her next homework and the teacher instructs her on how to do it, Nea just nods to receive the instruction (line 3). In Extract 2, where the teacher explains the participant's next activity, Nea only turns to look at the teacher and smiles. In Extract 3, in contrast, the teacher's second-person declarative is followed by Nea's immediate compliance, while the utterance is embedded in a larger activity of teacher modelling, with the student imitating the teacher's embodied actions with a short time lag. In Extract 4, where the declarative directives are accompanied with the teacher physically modelling the compliant responses by manipulating the student's hand and fingers, the function of the utterance is twofold: besides being an attempt to get the student (not) to do something in the here-and-now of the interaction, the utterance also provides an account for the teacher's intrusion into the student's physical space and upon a body part.

Finally, in Extract 5, the teacher's second-person declarative ('you make the top arc', line 4) is produced immediately after the respective recipient action (i.e., making the top arc, line

3). Due to its timing, the utterance comes across as an affirmative description of the student's past behavior. Of course, at the first sight, the timing pattern appears to call into question the whole idea of a directive-compliance sequence (see the quotation marks around the words "directive" and "compliance" in Table 2). Importantly, however, in this and other instances belonging to the same temporal-relation category, the participants are engaged in *repetitive cyclical actions*, where the utterance not only affirmatively describes past recipient behavior but also prescribes—in a most encouraging way—the behavior to come in the next activity cycle. In this sense, these second-person declaratives in this context are also about mobilizing further similar action. (Evidently, the status of the participants' current activity as "repetitive cyclical action" has not been predetermined, not to mention the length of the activity. Instead, the occurrence of every new activity cycle is negotiated at every possible activity juncture—that is, after each bow stroke.)

Let us now deepen our understanding of these details in the use of declarative directives by focusing specifically on the last two declarative directive categories, where the normative temporal relation between directives being followed by complaint responses falls apart. As pointed out at the beginning part of the chapter, declarative directives embody an assumption of the recipient's willingness and capability to comply with the directive. Such assumptions may, however, be considered as highly legitimate in those instances where the directives occur at a moment when the student is already actively engaged in the very activity that the teacher seeks to instruct, perhaps already anticipating the directives to teacher's directives to come. Extract 6 is a case in point. It is a continuation of the activity launched earlier. Similarily to Extract 4, it represents the category of declarative directives where directives and their compliant responses occur simultaneously.

Extract 6 (VT2 12:38)

```
01 T: yks kaks (.) koitat pitää    muut  pyöreinä     alhaalla (.) ja
      one two      try-2  keep-INF other round-PL-ESS beneath      and
     'one two(.) you try to keep the other fingers round beneath (.) and'
      ↑________↑   ↑_____________________________________________________↑
   ((T raises N's           ((T molds N's entire left hand.))
  middle finger twice.))
```

```
02    no{stat vaan t- yhtä    sormee    ja  sitäki     ↑pyöreenä
      raise-2 PRT     one-PAR finger-PAR and it-PAR-CLI round-ESS
      'you raise just one finger and also that as round'
        {Frame 1
      ↑_____________________________________________________________↑
        ((T grasps (again) N's middle finger, molding it.))
```

```
03    ei  suorana      vaan (0.6) näin. (0.4)
      NEG straight-ESS PRT        like.this
      'not straight but (0.6) like this. (0.4)'
         ↑___________________________________↑
      ((T raises N's middle finger seven times.))
```

Extract 6: Frame 1

The teacher issues a second-person declarative directive ('you try to keep the other fingers round beneath and you raise just one finger,' lines 1–2) in the middle of an ongoing finger exercise—at a moment when Nea is looking intently at her fingers and demonstrably trying to carry out the exercise correctly. This type of student engagement is a common pattern in the use of the second-person declaratives in my data.

As has already been pointed out, second-person declarative directives are frequent in the context of repetitive cyclical actions (e.g., moving the bow, raising and lowering the fingers),

where “directives” sometimes occur only after “compliance”—that is, where the teacher affirmatively describes the student’s previous conduct simultaneously mobilizing further similar action. Let us consider one such instance, where the student is engaged in a bow exercise, in more detail.

Extract 7 (VT1 25:38)

```
01 T: ja  sit tosta
      and PRT from.there
      ‘and then from there’
      ↑___________↑
      ((T touches both N’s right shoulder and the hand holding the bow.))

02 N: ♫ ⬒:: ♫
      ↑______↑
      ((T straightens N’s bow arm, thus making a sound.))

03 T: {ja  taas ojen#nat     {tänne#
       and PRT  straighten-2 to.here
      ‘and again you straighten (it) to here’
      {Frame 1               {Frame 2
      ↑_____________________↑
      ((T moves N’s hand back to the original position.))

04 N: ♫ ⬒:: ♫ {
              {Frame 3
      ↑______↑
      ((T straightens N’s bow arm, making a sound.))

05    (1.0)
      ↑_____________________↑
      ((T moves N’s hand back to the original position.))

06 T: äiti-kiel[tä? ]
      mother.string-PAR
      ‘the Mother string’

07 N:         ♫ [⬒::] ♫  (.)
               ↑__________↑
               ((T straightens N’s bow arm, thus making a sound, after which
               N moves her arm rapidly back to the original position))

08 T: ta[as oj{en]nat
      again straighten-2
      ‘again you straighten (it)’

09 N:   [♫ ⬒:{: ♫ ]
             {Frame 4
         ↑______ ↑
          ((T straightens N’s bow arm, making a sound.))
```

```
10 T: tonne    noin
      to.there like.that
      'to there like that'
      ↑__________↑
      ((T brings N's bow arm back to the original position in a
      prominent circular movement.))
```

```
11 T: ympyrän    [teet    ]
      circle-GEN  make-2
      'you make a circle'
```

```
12 N:             [♫🎻::♫ ]
                   ↑______ ↑
                   ((T straightens N's bow arm, making a sound.))
```

Extract 7: Frame 1

Extract 7: Frame 2

Extract 7: Frame 3

Extract 7: Frame 4

In this extract, the teacher guides Nea's bow movements by holding her hand and drawing her bow downwards and upwards. At the beginning part of the extract, the teacher's second person declarative directive ('and again you straighten (it) to here', line 3) works to anticipate and call for a bow movement to be realized next. As can be seen in Frames 1–3, the teacher begins her utterance at a point where Nea has just started to carry the bow upward in the air (see line 3, Frame 1). She also utters the final word of the directive, *tänne* 'to here' (line 3), which indexes the direction or target of the straightening arm movement, before Nea has even started the bow stroke (see line 3, Frame 2). It is only later (see line 4, Frame 3) that Nea's arm will be straightened and thus the actual direction or target of the bow movement becomes visible. Hence, in this instance, the declarative directive appeared to contribute to the mobilization of recipient action.

Notably, however, in the latter part of the extract—after the student has been told to do the same exercise on 'the Mother string'[3] (line 6)—the timing between directives and their implementation becomes more simultaneous. In the teacher's declarative directive ('again you straighten [it] to there,' line 8), the word *ojennat* 'you straighten' occurs at the same time that Nea makes the bow stroke and thereby straightens her arm (line 9, Frame 4). This renewed temporal relationship between the two participants' actions works to highlight the joint nature of the participants' activity, where the function of the teacher's verbal utterance is to explicate its structural unfolding and provide a final specification for it (see Broth and Keevallik 2014). Such "final specifications" may play a specific role in instructional interaction, where the teacher's affirmation of the student's action as a correctly executed token of a type of conduct serves also to affirm what the student should learn during her music education.

[3] In Finnish children's violin instruction, the four strings of the violin are commonly called "the Bear string" (g), "the Father string" (d^1), "the Mother string" (a^1), and "the Bird string" (e^2).

At the very end of the segment, the teacher uses the phrase *ympyrän teet* 'you make a circle', which refers to the arm movement when carrying the bow upwards in the air between two different strokes, to describe the student's movement shortly after it was completed (note the beginning of a new stroke on the word *teet* 'you make,' lines 8 and 9). In this way, the teacher not only acknowledges Nea's previous prominent bow movement (line 10), but also encourages the production of further similar movements during the cycles to come. Indeed, these slight changes in the temporal relations between the directives and their respective responses during the bow exercise may be argued to reflect the student's gradual acquisition of control over her bow during the exercise.

As has been already pointed out, the similarity in the type of actions targeted in the declarative directives is remarkable. These directives are all about the teacher instructing the student in the basic details of the physical handling of the instrument. While such instructions may be conveyed through verbal means alone (see Extracts 1–2), it is particularly when the participants focus on physically manipulating the instrument or other relevant object in the setting that the action-mobilizing capacities of the declarative directives in the here-and-now of the encounter also become apparent. In this usage, declarative directives are remarkably similar to what has been found in the use of imperatives in similar contexts (see e.g., Stevanovic 2017; Raevaara 2017)—that is, that declarative directives treat the student's compliance as unproblematic and non-contingent. However, due to their temporal flexibility in relation to the nominated actions, declaratively formatted directives allow the teacher to move back and forth between directive instruction and generic description of normatively-desired behavior. In this setting, this is essentially what distinguishes directives from imperatives.

But what about those actions that do *not* constitute the core learnables in violin instruction? Is it possible that the use of the second-person declarative directives in my data is due precisely to the centrality of the targeted actions in the institutional context of violin instruction? Extracts

8 and 9 to be discussed below suggest that this might indeed be the case. These extracts represent those (ordinary) categories of temporal relations where declarative directives precede their compliant responses, which are expected to follow later in the encounter.

In Extract 8, Nea has previously been told to make some bow strokes. Instead of complying, however, she has another idea: she takes a block of rosin[4] in her hand and suggests that they put it on the bow (line 1).

Extract 8 (VT1 23:08)

```
01 N: laitett↓ais
      put-PASS-COND
      'could we put'
      ↑__________↑
      ((walks away))


02 T: mitä?
      what-PAR
      'what?'
      ↑__↑
      ((T turns to look at N who is outside of the camera's scope.))

03    (1.9)

04 T: hartsia   #haluaisit  laittaa#
      rosin-PAR want-COND-2 put-INF
      'you would like to put rosin (on)'

05    (0.5)

06 T: jaa, (1.2)
      PRT
      'I see, (1.2)'
      ↑__↑
      ((N walks back to the camera's scope holding a block of rosin
      in her hand.))

08 T: he he (.) no  laitappa sitä   sitte ja
                PRT put-CLI  it-PAR PRT   and
      'hee hee (.) well put it then and'
      ↑_____________________________________________________↑
      ((N walks towards her chair.))

09    otat   sen    jälkeen jonkun   jousenvedon    vielä yk°sin°.
      some-GEN bow.stroke-GEN PRT   alone take-2 it-GEN after
      'after that you take still a couple of bow strokes, alone'
                  ↑_____________________________________↑
                ((N sits down and starts to open the rosin block.))
```

[4] Rosin is a solid form of resin. Due to its friction-increasing capacity, players of bowed string instruments occasionally rub blocks of rosin on the bow hair to help it grip the strings better.

After the teacher has understood what Nea is up to (lines 2–5), she is first silent (line 7) and then laughs (line 8), thereby displaying orientation to the unexpected and inapposite nature of Nea's idea at this point in the violin lesson. Then the teacher gives in to Nea's idea, using a second-person imperative ('well, put it then,' line 8). The utterance-initial particle *no* 'well' works to mark the content of the utterances as a departure from the participants' core activity (Sorjonen & Vepsäläinen 2016), while the clitic particle *-pA* attached to the finite verb 'put' works to underline the teacher's deontic authority in the matter at hand (Hakulinen et al. 2004: 800–801, 1580–1581; Stevanovic 2017; 2018). In the same breath, the teacher announces the activity that will be done next by using a second-person declarative ('after that you make a couple of bow strokes,' lines 8–9), thereby implying that she, and not the student, is the one who determines the next item in the lesson's agenda. In this context, it is clear that although the teacher treats the making of bow strokes as part of the lesson's official agenda, this does not hold for putting rosin on the bow. I suggest that the selection of the declarative form to announce the activity of making bow strokes is warranted precisely by the centrality of the activity in the teacher's institutional agenda.

Extract 9 demonstrates the same orientation, albeit in a different way. This extract is from the end of a violin lesson—at a point when Nea is being given a sticker as a reward for her good behavior during the lesson.

Extract 9 (VT1 27:47)

```
01 T: ja täältä sitte otat vielä    (1.9)
      and from.here PRT take-2 PRT
     'and from here you take still' (1.9)
         ↑_______________________________↑
         ((reaches for a bag of stickers))

02    ottaisiksä nyt tämmösen (0.8)
      take-COND-2-Q+SG2 PRT this.kind.of-GEN
      'would you take this kind of' (0.8)
      ↑____________________________↑
      ((takes one sticker strip from the bag))
```

```
03    <tähtitarran °vaikka°>
      star.sticker-GEN PRT
      'a star sticker for example'
            ↑_____________↑
      ((gives the sticker board to N))

04    (1.8)((N scrutinizes the stickers.))

05 N: joo?
      PRT
      'yeah?'
```

At the beginning of the extract, the teacher uses a second-person declarative ('from here you take,' line 1) to announce the next item in the lesson's agenda: the sticker-taking activity, simultaneously reaching for a bag of stickers. In line 2, however, she initiates her utterance anew, while taking one sticker board from the bag. This time her utterance has the form of a modal interrogative ('would you take this kind of a star sticker,' lines 2–3), which leaves the student a word to say in the matter. In addition to transforming the directive to come across more like an offer than as a pure directive, I suggest that this change of form also reflects the teacher's orientation to the student choosing "a star sticker" (and not, say, a "horse sticker") as *not* a central matter of the institutional activity of violin instruction.

In sum, my analysis suggests that to issue a directive in the form of a second-person declarative is a choice warranted not only by the student's engagement in the activity at hand, but also by the institutional centrality of the kind of action which is being called for. Moreover, as for the actions mobilized immediately, the participants' joint focus on the object to be handled physically provides them an instructional scaffolding where the declarative directives acquire a flexible mixture of meanings ranging from affirmation and encouragement to directive instruction and generic description of normatively-desired behavior.

3.2. Second-Person Interrogative Directives

Unlike declarative directives, interrogative directives highlight the contingency of the student's compliance and problematize it. It is therefore to be expected that these directives target actions quite different from the ones targeted in declarative directives. From this point of view, let us consider Extracts 10 and 11, in both of which the student deviates from the course of action projected by the teacher at the beginning of the segment.

Extract 10 (VT2_17:48)

```
01 T: nyt meillä o- on semmonen pieni hyppelytauko?
      'now we'll have a little jumping break'
      ↑_____________________________________________↑
      ((T turns to walk to the stereos, N disappears
      from the scope of the video camera))

02    (1.5)

03 T: tuuksä       sieltä     sängyn  alta (.)  e(h)i sängyn  kun
      come-2-Q+SG2 from+there bed-GEN below-ABL NEG   bed-GEN PRT
      'are you coming [out] from there below the bed (.) not bed but'

04    flyygelin alta?
      'from below the grand piano'
```

Extract 11 (VT2_32:47)

```
01 T: kokeillaas siitä
      'let's try from here'

02    (2.5)((N puts her violin away from her shoulder and then
      places it back but does not hold it properly.))

03 T: ↑no (.) annaksä   sen    olla   siellä (0.6) laitaksä sen
      PRT     let-Q+SG2 it-GEN be-INF there        put-Q+SG2
      'well (.) do you let it be there then (0.6) do you put the'
      ↑_____________________________________↑
      ((T holds N's violin in place.))
                                    ↑_____________________↑
                                ((N holds up the violin with her inner arm.))

04    (.) käden kaikukopalle (.) hyvä
          hand-GEN sound.box-ALL good
      (.) hand on the sound box (.) good'
          ↑_____________________↑
          ((N moves her hand to hold the violin.))
```

Similar to second-person declarative directives, second-person interrogative directives are also seldom the first directive within a sequence; rather, the teacher has previously used at least one other directive to establish the participants' next activity ('now we'll have a little jumping break', Extract 10: line 1; 'let's try from here', Extract 11: line 1). However, instead of relying on the student already being engaged in the participants' joint activity at the moment of the directive, interrogative directives are issued precisely when student engagement is lacking—that is, when the student, for example, hides under the grand piano (Extract 10) or does not hold the violin in its place against the shoulder (Extract 11). The analysis of my data collection suggests that an interrogative directive is essentially a way for the teacher to convey two messages: (1) that there is some problem with the student's conduct which should be remedied, and (2) that the student should react to that problem now. In other words, the teacher's directives target actions that are instrumental, but not fundamental, to violin instruction. This point is further elucidated in Extracts 12 and 13 below.

Extract 12 starts with the teacher's assessment *hyvä* 'good,' with which she brings the participants' previous activity to a close (cf. Antaki et al. 2000; Antaki 2002)—something which is also demonstrated by the teacher beginning to collect the equipment used in the previous exercise (line 2). While the teacher is still engaged in gathering up the equipment, she begins to explain the next activity in the violin lesson (lines 3–4). However, at the point when she intends to bring the claves back to their place, she encounters a problem: Nea is holding one clave firmly in her hand and seems unwilling to let it go (line 5; see Frame 1).

Extract 12 (VT2 23:04)
01 T: hyvä
good
'good'

02 (.)

```
03 T: ja  nyt voidaan  sitte kirjottaa että mis-
      and PRT can-PASS PRT   write-INF PRT
      'and now we can then write'
          ↑_____________________________________↑
          ((collects the claves used in the previous exercise.))

04    mitä     kieliä       ne   oli?
      what-PAR sting-PL-PAR they be-PST
      'which strings they were'
      ↑_______________________________↑
      ((grasps a clave that N holds in her hand, trying to take it))

05 T: (0.5) annaksä      tän      kapulan
      give-2-q+SG2 this-GEN clave-GEN
      '(0.5) do you give (me) this clave'
      ↑_____________________________________↑
      ((T tries to take the clave from N, who holds it tight. Frame 1))

07    (1.3) ((N relaxes her hand and lets T take the clave away.))

08 T: nin tota
      PRT PRT
      'so erm'
```

Extract 12: Frame 1

In response to Nea hindering her previously launched line of action, the teacher issues a second-person interrogative directive: *annaksä tän kapulan* 'are you giving (me) this clave' (line 6). The directive is followed by Nea relaxing her hand and letting the teacher take the clave (line 7), which then allows the teacher to resume her explanation of the participants' next activity (line 8).

In Extract 13, Nea is just about to begin playing a violin piece with piano accompaniment to be provided by her grandmother. The extract starts with the teacher explaining that Nea should start playing at the same time as her grandmother does (line 1), which is followed by Nea sitting down (line 2) and producing a compliance token *okei* 'okay' (line 3). The teacher, however, treats Nea's previous sitting down as problematic, and issues an interrogative directive *seisoksä* 'will you stand (up)' to remedy the problem (line 4). In response to the teacher's directive, Nea does stand up (line 5) and a bit later she begins to play with her grandmother (not shown in the transcript).

Extract 13 (VT2 6:34)

```
01 T: lähtee ↑mummin      kanssa yh#tä   ai#°kaa°
      start   grandma-GEN PRT    one-PAR time-PAR
      '[it] begins at the same time with grandma'
                  ↑_____________________________________↑
                  ((N sits down on a chair.))

02 N: oke:i?
      PRT
      'okay?'

03 T: seisoksä?
      stand-2-Q+SG2
      'will you stand (up)?'

04    (2.3) ((N stands up.))
```

Extracts 10–13 demonstrate the common pattern that surrounds the use of second-person interrogative directives in my data. First, in each case, the student was *not* quite doing what she was supposed to do at the moment the directive was issued. In other words, there were grounds for the teacher to problematize her conduct, in the face of the sudden and unanticipated momentary shortcomings that hindered the smooth unfolding of what the participants were supposed to do. Second, the interrogative directives by the teacher were systematically followed by the student's immediate compliance. They thus seemed to provide the teacher with a particularly effective resource to remedy behavioral problems quickly and effectively. Third,

unlike the declarative directives, the interrogative directives regularly did *not* target the core learnables of violin playing, the teaching of which the teacher could be held accountable, but rather the *preconditions* of violin instruction: being present (Extract 10), having the violin in its place (Extract 11), letting the teacher clean up (Extract 12) and standing (Extract 13).

Finally, in line with the notion that second-person interrogative directives secure the preconditions of the participants' main activities, such directives regularly targeted actions which could be accomplished only once—something with reference to which the declarative directives were very different. (It is enough to come out from beneath the grand piano only once, while the fingers and the bow must be moved in specific ways every time one plays the violin). In effect, in choosing the second-person interrogative form to issue a directive, the teacher may even reflexively orient to a desire that certain actions (e.g., hiding under the grand piano) do not become a routine part of every violin lesson.

As the final example in this paper, I will discuss a case where the participants' orientations to the nature of the mobilized action differ. In this case, the teacher uses an interrogative directive to address a momentary shortcoming in the student's conduct. In line with that, the student orients to the called-for action as a one-time accomplishment, which is however problematic given the type of activity that the teacher obviously seeks to launch.

In Extract 14, the participants are about to start a new activity: learning a new rhythm by clapping it together. At the beginning of the extract, the teacher announces the clapping activity with a hortative ('let's start clapping this rhythm,' line 1), reminds the student of the relevant time signature ('four quarters,' line 2), and establishes the rhythmic pulse according to which the participants should pursue their joint clapping (lines 2–3). Nea does not, however, join in the activity as expected. In response to Nea's non-compliance, the teacher issues a directive, which has the form of a second-person interrogative directive ('will you clap,' line 4).

Extract 14 (VT3 9:46)

```
01 T: ni (.) lähetäämpäs    taputtaa tätä     rytmiä
      PRT    start-PASS-CLI clap-INF this-PAR
      'so (.) let's start clapping this rhythm'

02    neljä neljäsosaa (.) otetaan   tämmönen     pulssi
      four  quarter-PAR    take-PASS this.kind.of pulse
      'four quarters (.) let's take this kind of a pulse'

03    (.) yks (.) kaks (.) kol (.) nel
          one     two      three   four
         'one     two      three   four'
         ↑_______________________________↑
          ((claps four times))

04    taputaksä (.) yks (.) kaks (.) kol (.) nel=
      clap-2-Q+SG2  one     two      three   four
      'will you clap  one     two      three   four'
                    ↑_______________________________↑
                     ((claps four times))

05 N: =ai  tällei     (.) >yks kaks kol   nel<
      PRT like.this       one  two  three four
      'you mean like this one two three four'
                          ↑__________________↑
                         ((claps four times very fast))

06 T: no se oli aika nopee tempo sulla nyt (.)
      PRT it be-PST quite fast tempo SG2-ADE PRT
      'well you had quite a fast tempo now' (.)

07    semmone     nopee vauhti
      the.kind.of fast  speed
      'the kind of fast speed'
```

At first glance, the teacher's interrogative directive (line 4) appears to function effectively: it prompts an immediate response from the student, who starts to clap (line 5). However, instead of actually complying with the directive, Nea frames her clapping as a candidate understanding or a question of clarification by using the turn-initial phrase 'you mean like this' (line 5). In addition, instead of starting to clap *together with the teacher*, the student performs the clapping as an individual performance, as an activity of her own: she claps in a tempo very different from that of the teacher—something that the teacher also subsequently points out (lines 6–7). In other words, the student treats the teacher's directive as targeting some individual action that the student has thus far failed to produce, instead of regarding it as an invitation to participate

in a joint activity. Furthermore, the student also seems to orient to the teacher-requested clapping as something like a one-time accomplishment. She claps four times like the teacher did, apparently without grasping that the teacher was launching a new activity, which involves not only producing four claps—or two times four claps as the teacher actually produced—but that the clapping of the pulse should be carried on (together with the teacher) during the whole rhythm exercise, which has not even really gotten going.

The analysis above makes it evident that, the student in Extract 7 was actually orienting to the teacher's second-person interrogative directive in the same way as in those contexts where these directives occurred to remedy a one-time problem of compliance. In other words, even if the student's response may not have been what the teacher was hoping for when she called for the student's compliance by issuing the interrogative directive, it nevertheless involved the systematic features of her responses to similarly-formatted directives in other contexts.

Extract 14 highlights the obvious efficacy of the second-person interrogative directives in mobilizing immediate compliance. Given that the new activity launched by the teacher was already underway, the teacher may have sought to mobilize immediate student compliance without having to interrupt the flow of the ongoing activity. And, indeed, the student reacted eagerly. However, given that the "one-time solution" in this case involved the student getting engaged in a continuous activity, such eagerness actually hindered the progress of what the participants were supposed to do (cf. Stivers and Robinson 2006).

4. Discussion

The analysis of the directive uses of Finnish declaratives and interrogatives demonstrate two different patterns. The declarative directives assume the recipient's compliance, but this is warranted by the recipient's already-established engagement. These directives exhibit a

flexible temporal relation to their respective recipient actions, in that their interactional function varies from directive instructions (Extracts 1–3 & 8) to affirmative descriptions and generic descriptions of normatively desired behavior (Extracts 4–7). Furthermore, they normally target the core learnables in violin instruction. In contrast, the second-person interrogative directives are used to problematize the recipient's compliance, warranted by the preceding momentary shortcoming by the recipient. These directives come across as requests for immediate (one-time) changes in the recipient's behavior. Moreover, they target the preconditions for the institutional main tasks of violin instruction, not the core activities themselves. In these ways, the analysis of this paper contributes to a deeper understanding of how participants' moment-by-moment choices of grammatical form reflexively organize courses of action in interaction "situation design." More specifically, with reference to instructional interaction, the analysis highlights the relevance of the content of the very action that the teacher seeks to mobilize as a part of those contextual features that inform the choice of directive form.

The findings of this study are largely consistent with earlier research on speakers' choices between different directive forms. This holds particularly for the recent account by Sorjonen and colleagues (2017), which—as reviewed at the beginning of this paper—suggests that such choices are informed by (1) the participation framework, (2) the relation of the nominated action to the on-going activity, (3) the degree of immediacy or urgency of the action nominated, and (4) the deontic rights and responsibilities of the participants, which play a major role in this regard (Sorjonen et al. 2017). My current results are clearly in line with the above-mentioned points (2) and (3). While both the declarative and interrogative directives in my data were used only after the participants' activity was launched through other means, their relation to the content of the activity was the opposite, with the declarative directives orienting to the recipient's current actions as being in accordance with the directive and the interrogative directives foregrounding the recipient's deviation from the expected course of action.

Simultaneously, the two directive forms also differed in the degree of immediacy of the nominated actions. Consistent with earlier research on Finnish interrogative directives (Lappalainen 2008; Sorjonen et al. 2009; Rouhikoski 2015), the interrogative directives in my data also appeared to carry particularly great expectations of immediate compliance by the recipient. In contrast, the temporal relationship between the second-person declarative directives and their respective recipient responses was more flexible, with the expectations of immediacy arising mostly from the teacher's bodily and physical engagement with the student and the joint objects of attention (cf. Stevanovic and Monzoni 2016).

In addition to the previously-described insights, my study highlights a further dimension informing the choices of directive form. It suggests that, these choices may be best accounted for with reference to the larger activity to which the form of directive is reflexively related. As I have demonstrated, the second-person declarative and interrogative directives in the context of Finnish violin instruction exhibit two different kinds of orientation to recipient compliance, these being associated either with the goal of carrying out an activity that is central to why the participants have come to interact with each other in the first place, or the goal of insuring that the preconditions for the mentioned main activity are satisfied. This view also helps to elucidate the paradoxical nature of second-person declarative directives as actions. Given their use in the context of actions particularly central to violin playing—actions that will consequently be done over and over again—the declaratively-formatted directives exceed the boundaries of place and time. In addition to instructing the student in the here-and-now, the scope of the directives also extends to the future—indeed, to any occasions where the student plays the violin. Thus, in the second-person declarative directives in this particular setting, the immediate and distant futures are bound together. This temporality is radically different from the one exhibited in the interrogative directives, which call for a one-time solution to a problem that has been caused by the recipient and which can therefore be best remedied by him or her. Thus, besides the

formal "response mobilizing pressure" (Stivers and Rossano 2010) associated with the interrogative format, it may also be the mere notions of contingency and responsibility with reference to the recipient which contribute to the relative effectiveness of interrogative directives in mobilizing compliance.[5]

Finally, this study adds to a fuller understanding of instructional interaction. The findings of this paper complement this larger picture by demonstrating that one important aspect of instructional activity is the interactional organization of instructional activities into institutionally-central learnables (Reed and Szczcepek Reed 2014), and into those activities which play a supporting role in this regard. In other words, my data have shown that these two different action priorities associated with violin instruction may be managed and reflexively related to the teacher's selection of different directive forms. It is the task of future research to consider the extent to which these findings apply to other instructional contexts.

Hence, in sum, even if a young child as a violin student may not always have a clear idea of what violin instruction is about and may sometimes even challenge the whole activity framework through her behavior, the teacher has ways to continuously talk the institution of violin instruction "into being" (Heritage 1984: 290). The choice between Finnish second-person declaratives and interrogatives as a part of the interaction "situation design" provides a resource for doing this.

[5] This may also be something that, in Finnish, distinguishes the interrogative declaratives from the imperatives with the clitic particle *-pA*, which have also been shown to be used to address the momentary shortcomings of the recipient (Stevanovic 2017). While the *-pA*-imperatives highlight the asymmetrical relation between the speaker and the recipient, the interrogative directive form treats the outcome of the directive as contingent on the recipient's willingness to comply and thus positions the participants more equally to one another.

References

Antaki, Charles. 2002. "'Lovely': Turn-Initial High-Grade Assessments in Telephone Closings." *Discourse Studies* 4: 5–23.

Antaki, Charles, Hanneke Houtkoop-Steenstra, and Mark Rapley. 2000. "'Brilliant. Next Question...': High-Grade Assessment Sequences in the Completion of Interactional Units." *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 33: 235–262.

Blum-Kulka, Shoshana. 1987. "Indirectness and Politeness in Requests: Same or Different." *Journal of Pragmatics* 11: 131-146.

Broth, Mathias, Jakob Cromdal, and Lena Levin. 2017. "Starting Out as a Driver: Progression in Instructed Pedal Work. In *Memory Practices and Learning: Interactional, Institutional and Sociocultural Perspectives*, ed. by Åsa Mäkitalo, Per. Linell, and R. Säljö, 113–142. Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.

Broth, Mathias, and Leelo Keevallik. 2014. "Getting Ready to Move as a Couple: Accomplishing Mobile Formations in a Dance Class." *Space and Culture* 17: 107–121.

Brown, Penelope, and Stephen Levinson. 1987 [1978]. *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Caffi, Claudia. 1999. "On Mitigation." *Journal of Pragmatics* 31: 881–909.

Clark, Herbert H. 1979. "Responding to Indirect Speech Acts." *Cognitive Psychology* 11: 430-477.

Clift, Rebecca. 2016. *Conversation Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Craven, Alexandra, and Jonathan Potter. 2010. "Directives: Entitlement and Contingency in Action." *Discourse Studies* 12: 419-442.

Curl, Tracy S., and Paul Drew. 2008. "Contingency and Action: A Comparison of Two Forms of Requesting." *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 41: 129–153.

Deppermann, Arnulf. 2015. “When Recipient Design Fails: Egocentric Turn-Design of Instructions in Driving School Lessons Leading to Breakdowns of Intersubjectivity. *Gesprächsforschung* 16: 63-101.

Deppermann, Arnulf. 2018. “Instruction Practices in German Driving Lessons: Differential Uses of Declaratives and Imperatives.” *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 1-18.

De Stefani, Elwys, and Anne-Danièle Gazin. 2014. “Instructional Sequences in Driving Lessons: Mobile Participants and the Temporal and Sequential Organization of Actions. *Journal of Pragmatics* 65: 63–79.

Eelen, Gino. 2001. *A Critique of Politeness Theories*. Manchester: St. Jerome’s.

Ekberg, Katie, and Amanda LeCouteur. 2015. “Clients’ Resistance to Therapists’ Proposals: Managing Epistemic and Deontic Status.” *Journal of Pragmatics* 90: 12–25.

Ervin-Tripp, Susan. 1976. “Is Sybil There? The Structure of Some American English Directives. *Language in Society* 5: 25–66.

Etelämäki, Marja, and Elizabeth Couper-Kuhlen. 2017. “In the Face of Resistance: A Finnish Practice for Insisting on Imperatively Formatted Directives.” In *Imperative Turns at Talk: The Design of Directives in Action*, ed. by Marja-Leena Sorjonen, Liisa Raevaara, and Elizabeth Couper-Kuhlen, 215–240. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Evans, John, Brian Davies, and Emma Rich. (2009). The body made flesh: embodied learning and the corporeal device. *British Journal of Sociology of Education* 30: 391–406.

Fraser, Bruce. 1980. “Conversational Mitigation.” *Journal of Pragmatics* 4: 341–350.

Fraser, Bruce. 1990. “Perspectives on Politeness.” *Journal of Pragmatics* 14: 219–236.

Goodwin, Marjorie H., and Asta Cekaite. 2013. “Calibration in Directive/Response Sequences in Family Interaction.” *Journal of Pragmatics* 46: 122–138.

Goodwin, Marjorie H., and Asta Cekaite. 2014. “Orchestrating Directive Trajectories in Communicative Projects in Family Interaction.” In *Requesting in Social Interaction,* ed. by E. Couper-Kuhlen, and P. Drew, 185–214. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Hakulinen, Auli, Maria Vilkuna, Riitta Korhonen, Vesa Koivisto, Tarja Riitta Heinonen, and Irja Alho. 2004. *Iso suomen kielioppi [The Comprehensive Grammar of Finnish]*. Helsinki: Finnish Literature Society.

Heritage, John. 1984. *Garfinkel and Ethnomethodology*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Hindmarsh, Jon, Lewis Hyland, and Avijit Banerjee. 2014. “Work to Make Simulation Work: “Realism,” Instructional Correction and the Body in Training.” *Discourse Studies,* 16: 247–269.

House, Juliane, and Gabriele Kasper. 1981. “Politeness Markers in English and German.” In *Conversational Routines: Explorations in Standardized Communication Situations and Prepatterned Speech,* ed. by Florian Coulmas, 157–185. The Hague: Mouton de Gruyter.

Jary, Mark, and Mikhail Kissine. 2014. *Imperatives.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Keevallik, L. (2010). Bodily quoting in dance correction. *Research on Language and Social Interaction, 43*(4), 401–426.

Kendrick, Kobin H., and Drew, Paul. 2016. “Recruitment: Offers, Requests, and the Organization of Assistance in Interaction.” *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 49: 1–19.

Kent, Alexandra. 2012. “Responding to Directives: What Can Children Do When a Parent Tells Them What to Do?” In *Disputes in Everyday Life: Social and Moral Orders of Children and Young People*, ed. by Maryanne Theobold, and Susan Danby, 57–84. Bingley, UK: Emerald Books.

Kent, Alexandra, and Kendrick, Kobin H. 2016. “Imperative Directives: Orientations to Accountability.” *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 49: 272–288.

Lakoff, Robin. 1973. “The Logic of Politeness: Or, Minding Your P’s and Q’s.” In *Proceedings of the Ninth Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society*, 292–305.

Landmark, Anne Marie Dalby, Pål Gulbrandsen, and Jan Svennevig. 2015. “Whose Decision? Negotiating Epistemic and Deontic Rights in Medical Treatment Decisions.” *Journal of Pragmatics* 78: 54–69.

Lappalainen, Hanna. 2008. ”Kelan virkailijoiden henkilötunnuspyynnöt: Tutkimus rutiininomaisista toiminnoista. [Asking for Clients’ Identity Number or Identity Card at Finnish Social Security offices: A Study of Routinized Activities.]” *Virittäjä* 112: 483–517.

Lerner, Gene H. 1995. “Turn Design and the Organization of Participation in Instructional Activities.” *Discourse Processes* 19: 111–131.

Lindström, Anna, and Ann Weatherall. 2015. “Orientations to Epistemics and Deontics in Treatment Discussions.” *Journal of Pragmatics* 78: 39–53.

Macbeth, Douglas H. 1991. “Teacher Authority as Practical Action.” *Linguistics and Education* 3: 281–313.

McHoul, Alexander. 1978. “The Organization of Turns at Formal Talk in the Classroom.” *Language in Society* 7: 183–213.

Mehan, Hugh. 1979. *Learning Lessons: Social Organization in the Classroom*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Merlino, Sara. 2014. “Singing in ‘Another’ Language: How Pronunciation Matters in the Organisation of Choral Rehearsals.” *Social Semiotics* 24: 420–445.

Mills, Sara. 2003. *Gender and Politeness*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Mondada, Lorenza. 2014. “Requesting Immediate Action in the Surgical Operating Room: Time, Embodied Resources and Praxeological Embeddedness.” In *Requesting in Social Interaction,* ed. by Paul Drew, and Elizabeth Couper-Kuhlen. 269–302. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Nevile, Maurice. 2004. “Integrity in the Airline Cockpit: Embodying Claims about Progress for the Conduct of an Approach Briefing.” *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 37: 447–480.

Nishizaka, Aug. 2006. “What to learn: The embodied structure of the environment.” *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 39: 119–154.

Parton, Katharine. 2014. Epistemic stance in orchestral interaction. *Social Semiotics* 24: 402–419.

Psathas, George. 1995. *Conversation Analysis: The Study of Talk-in-Interaction.* Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Reed, Darren, and Beatrice Szczepek Reed. 2014. “The Emergence of Learnables in Music Masterclasses.” *Social Semiotics* 24: 446-467.

Rossi, Giovanni. 2012. “Bilateral and Unilateral Requests: The Use of Imperatives and Mi X? Interrogatives in Italian.” *Discourse Processes* 49: 426–458.

Rouhikoski, Anu. 2015. ”Laita, laitatko vai laitat? Kolmen direktiivirakenteen variaatio asiakaspalvelutilanteessa. [Imperative, Interrogative or 2nd-Person Declarative? Variation of Three Directive Constructions in Service Encounters].” *Virittäjä* 2(2015): 189–222.

Sahlström, J. Fritjof. 2002. “The Interactional Organization of Hand Raising in Classroom Interaction.” *The Journal of Classroom Interaction* 37: 47–57.

Schegloff, Emanuel A. 2007. *Sequence Organization in Interaction: A primer in Conversation Analysis*, vol. 1. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Searle, John R. 1976. “A Classification of Illocutionary Acts.” *Language in Society* 5: 1–23.

Sidnell, Jack and Tanya Stivers (eds). 2013. *Handbook of Conversation Analysis*. Boston: Wiley-Blackwell.

Sidnell, Jack. 2010. *Conversation Analysis: An Introduction*. London: Wiley-Blackwell.

Silverstein, Michael. 2010. “’Direct’ and ‘Indirect’ Communicative Acts in Semiotic Perspective.” *Journal of Pragmatics* 42: 337–353.

Sorjonen, Marja-Leena. 2001. “Lääkärin ohjeet. [Doctor’s Instructions].” In *Keskustelu lääkärin vastaanotolla [Conversation during doctor’s consultation]*, ed. by Marja-Leena Sorjonen, Anssi Peräkylä, and Kari Eskola, 89–111. Tampere: Vastapaino.

Sorjonen, Marja-Leena, Liisa Raevaara, and Hanna Lappalainen. 2009. ”’Mä otan tän’. Käynnin syyn esittämisen tavat kioskilla. [‘I’ll have this’. Presenting one’s reason for the visit at convenience store].” In *Kieli kioskilla: Tutkimuksia kioskiasioinnin rutiineista. [Talk at Convenience Store. Studies on the Routines in Convenience Store Encounters]*, ed. by Hanna Lappalainen, and Liisa Raevaara, 90–119. Helsinki: Finnish Literature Society.

Sorjonen, Marja-Leena & Heidi Vepsäläinen. 2016. “The Finnish *No*.” In *NU and NÅ: A Family of Discourse Markers Across the Languages of Europe and Beyond*, ed. by Peter Auer, and Yael Maschler, 243–280. Berlin: de Gruyter.

Sorjonen, Marja-Leena, Liisa Raevaara & Elizabeth Couper-Kuhlen. 2017. Imperative turns at talk: An introduction. In *Imperative turns at talk: The design of directives in action*, ed. by Marja-Leena Sorjonen, Liisa Raevaara, and Elizabeth Couper-Kuhlen, 1–24. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Stevanovic, Melisa. 2011. “Participants’ Deontic Rights and Action Formation: The Case of Declarative Requests for Action.” *Interaction and Linguistic Structures (InLiSt)* 52. http://www.inlist.uni-bayreuth.de/issues/52/Inlist52.pdf

Stevanovic, Melisa. 2013. “Constructing a proposal as a thought: A way to Manage Problems in the Initiation of Joint Decision-Making in Finnish Workplace Interaction.” *Pragmatics* 23: 519–544. https://doi.org/10.1075/prag.23.3.07ste

Stevanovic, Melisa, and Chiara Monzoni. 2016. “On the Hierarchy of Interactional Resources: Embodied and Verbal Behavior in the Management of Joint Activities with Material Objects.” *Journal of Pragmatics* 103: 15–32.

Stevanovic, Melisa. 2017. “Managing Compliance in Violin Instruction: The Case of the Finnish Clitic Particles *-pa* and *-pAs* in Imperatives and Hortatives.” In *Imperative turns at talk: The design of directives in action*, ed. by Marja-Leena Sorjonen, Liisa Raevaara, and Elizabeth Couper-Kuhlen, 357–380. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Stevanovic, Melisa. 2018. Social deontics: A nano-level approach to human power play. *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour*. https://doi.org/10.1111/jtsb.12175

Stivers, Tanya, and Jeffrey D. Robinson. 2006. “A Preference for Progressivity in Interaction.” *Language in Society* 35: 367–392.

Stivers, Tanya, and Federico Rossano. 2010. “Mobilising Response.” *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 43: 3–31.

Szczepek Reed, Beatrice, Darren Reed, and Elizabeth Haddon. 2013. “NOW or NOT NOW: Coordinating Restarts in the Pursuits of Learnables in Vocal Masterclasses.” *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 46: 22–46.

Veronesi, Daniela. 2014. “Correction Sequences and Semiotic Resources in Ensemble Music Workshops: The Case of Conduction®.” *Social Semiotics* 24: 468–494.

Watts, Richard. 2003. *Politeness*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Weeks, Peter. 1996. “A Rehearsal of a Beethoven Passage: An Analysis of Correction Talk. *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 29: 247–290.

West, Candace. 1990. “Not Just ‘Doctors’ Orders’: Directive-Response Sequences in Patients’ Visits to Women and Men Physicians.” *Discourse and Society* 1: 85–112.

Wootton, Anthony J. 1997. *Interaction and the Development of Mind*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Yli-Vakkuri, Valma. 1986. *Suomen kieliopillisten muotojen toissijainen käyttö. [Secondary Uses of Finnish Grammatical Forms]*. Publications of the Department of Finnish and General Linguistics 28. Turku: University of Turku.

Zemel, Alan, and Timothy Koschmann. 2011. “Pursuing a Question: Reinitiating IRE Sequences as a Method of Instruction.” *Journal of Pragmatics* 43: 475–488.

Zinken, Jörg, and Eva Ogiermann. 2011. “How to Propose an Action as Objectively Necessary: The Case of Polish *Trzeba X* (“One Needs to X”).” *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 44: 263–287.

Zinken, Jörg, and Giovanni Rossi. 2016. “Assistance and Other Forms of Cooperative Engagement.” *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 49: 20–26.

Zinken, Jörg, and Eva Ogiermann. 2013. “Responsibility and Action: Invariants and Diversity in Requests for Objects in British English and Polish Interaction.” *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 46: 256–276.

Appendices

Appendix A: Transcription conventions

.	pitch fall
?	pitch rise
,	level pitch
↑↓	marked pitch movement
underlining	emphasis
-	truncation
[ ]	overlap
=	latching of turns
(0.5)	pause (length in tenths of a second)
(.)	micropause
:	lengthening of a sound
#	creaky voice quality
°	whisper
<word>	slow speech rate
>word<	fast speech rate
♬ ⬒ : : ♬	one bow stroke from the frog to the tip (with a length of appr. 0.3 seconds)
↑_____↑	beginning and end of non-verbal activity
((words))	description of non-verbal activity

Appendix B: Glossing abbreviations

PL	plural
2	second person
SG2	second-person singular pronoun
GEN	genitive
PAR	partitive
ESS	essive
ADE	adessive
ABL	ablative
ALL	allative
INF	infinitive
COND	conditional
CLI	clitic
Q	question clitic
PASS	passive
PST	past tense
ADV	adverb
COMP	comparative
NEG	negation

Singular, *third person*, *nominative*, *active*, and *present tense* are forms that have been considered unmarked. These have not been glossed.