

1
3 **RESPONDING TO DIRECTIVES:**
5 **WHAT CAN CHILDREN DO**
7 **WHEN A PARENT TELLS THEM**
9 **WHAT TO DO?**
11

13 Alexandra Kent

15
17 **ABSTRACT**

19 *Purpose – This chapter examines children’s options for responding to parental attempts to get them to do something (directives).*

21 *Methodology/approach – The data for the study are video recordings of everyday family mealtime interactions. The study uses conversation analysis and discursive psychology to conduct a microanalysis of sequences of everyday family mealtimes interactions in which a parent issues a directive and a child responds.*

27 *Findings – It is very difficult for children to resist parental directives without initiating a dispute. Immediate embodied compliance was the interactionally preferred response option to a directive. Outright resistance was typically met with an upgraded and more forceful directive. Legitimate objections to compliance could be treated seriously but were not always taken as grounds for non-compliance.*

33 *Research implications – The results have implications for our understandings of the notions of compliance and authority. Children’s status in*

35
37 **Disputes in Everyday Life: Social and Moral Orders of Children and Young People**
Sociological Studies of Children and Youth, Volume 15, 57–84
39 **Copyright © 2012 by Emerald Group Publishing Limited**
All rights of reproduction in any form reserved
ISSN: 1537-4661/doi:10.1108/S1537-4661(2012)0000015007

1 *interaction is also discussed in light of their ability to choose whether to*
 2 *ratify a parent's control attempt or not.*

3 *Originality/value of paper – The chapter represents original work on the*
 4 *interactional structures and practices involved in responding to control*
 5 *attempts by a co-present participant. It offers a data-driven framework*
 6 *for conceptualising compliance and authority in interaction that is based*
 7 *on the orientations of participants rather than cultural or analytical*
 8 *assumptions of the researcher.*

9
 10
 11 **Keywords:** Directives; compliance; authority; children; family
 12 interaction; conversation analysis

13 INTRODUCTION

AU :1

14
 15
 16
 17 Family mealtimes are busy and often fraught interactional events. Feise,
 18 Foley, and Spagnola (2006, p. 77) gloss family meals as ‘densely packed
 19 events’ where ‘lots has to happen in approximately twenty minutes: food
 20 needs to be served and consumed, roles assigned, past events reviewed, and
 21 plans made’. In addition to the practical tasks involved in holding a family
 22 meal, researchers have identified the dinner table as a crucial site for the
 23 performance of key family functions such as the socialisation and social
 24 control of children (Charles & Kerr, 1985; DeVault, 1984; Larson,
 25 Branscomb, & Wiley, 2006; Nock, 1987). Given the time constraints and
 26 highly task-oriented nature of the mealtime interaction, parental directives
 27 such as ‘Sit up straight’ or ‘Finish your fish’ where they *tell* children to do
 28 something are, not surprisingly, common occurrences (Vine, 2009).

29 This chapter will examine instances in everyday family interaction when
 30 parents attempt to tell children what to do (directives). Directives claim an
 31 entitlement to control the actions of the recipient. As such they are a highly
 32 assertive and invasive social action. When faced with a directive from a
 33 parent, children can comply (and accept their parent’s right to control them)
 34 or resist the directive, challenge their parent’s authority and dispute the
 35 legitimacy of the directive. The turn immediate following a directive action
 36 is crucial for determining the progression of the sequence and will be the
 37 focus of the analysis presented here: Will the sequence escalate into family
 38 conflict? Will the child acquiesce to parental control?

39 I begin with an introduction to the study of directives in family
 interaction, particularly parental directives targeting children. I then explore

1 some of the response options available to children in the data. Finally, I
discuss the implications of the identified practices for responding to
3 directives for our understanding of authority, compliance and children's
status in family interactions.

5

7

Directives

9 Directives are examples of actions often labelled by analysts as social
control acts (Pearson, 1989). This includes actions such as 'offers, requests,
11 orders, prohibitions, and other verbal moves that solicit goods or attempts
to effect changes in the activities of others' (Ervin-Tripp, O'Connor, &
13 Rosenberg, 1984, p. 116). Goodwin glosses directives as 'utterances designed
to get someone to do something' (Goodwin, 2006, p. 517). This description
15 fits with Searle's (1979) sense of the 'illocutionary point' of directives in his
discussion of Speech Act Theory; it has also become an accepted way of
17 characterising directives by subsequent researchers (e.g. Vine, 2009) and is
the working definition adopted here. Blum-Kulka (1997) points out that all
19 forms of social control acts impinge on the recipient's freedom of action to
some degree.¹ Directives are actions through which the speaker can assert
21 control or authority over the recipient. Kidwell (2006) points out that one of
the central research themes running through work on directives has been
23 with how directives constitute and point up power differentials between
participants (e.g. Ervin-Tripp, 1976; West, 1990). This is explored here
25 through the question of whether the entitlement to tell someone what to do
is grounded in static social roles (such as parent and child) or provided for in
27 the interactional roles occupied by participants in the interaction.

Recent interaction based work on actions designed to get someone to do
29 something has developed the notion of entitlement as an alternative to more
static concepts of power and authority between participants (see Curl &
31 Drew, 2008; Heinemann, 2006). Such work suggests that the formulation of
the social control act varies depending on the degree to which the speaker
33 treats himself or herself as entitled to expect compliance with their request/
directive. For example, Heinemann (2006) examined interactions between
35 home-help care assistants and their elderly care recipients. She showed that
the care recipient could display different 'degrees of stance towards whether
37 she is entitled to make a request or not, depending on whether she formats
her request as a positive or negative interrogative' (Heinemann, 2006,
39 p. 1081). Similarly Curl and Drew (2008) showed how different request
formulations varied in the degree to which the speaker displayed (a) an

1 entitlement to expect the request to be fulfilled and (b) an awareness of
2 potential contingencies that could hinder compliance. The notions of
3 entitlement and contingency do not necessarily contradict findings that
4 suggest social roles do matter. A local claim to entitlement often does reflect
5 the social statuses of speakers (e.g. teacher versus student (Macbeth, 1991)
6 but not always (e.g. Maple Street children (Goodwin, 1980, 1990).

7 In an earlier study using the same data to be analysed here, Craven and
8 Potter (2010) extended Curl and Drew's (2008) analysis of entitlement and
9 contingency and applied it to sequences involving parental directives to
10 children at mealtimes. What was striking about the collection of mealtime
11 directives is that they embodied no orientation to the recipient's ability or
12 willingness to perform the stated activity. In addition to restricting the
13 contingencies available to the recipients, the imperative formulation enabled
14 speakers to display full entitlement to direct the recipient's actions.
15 Directives are occasions when one person involves him or herself with
16 another's business without asking, or even reporting a wondering, about
17 their willingness or capacity (with a modal construction or 'I wonder if ...'
18 preface). The imperative formulation *tells*, it does not *ask*. This means that,
19 unlike a question or a request, the directive does not make acceptance
20 relevant as a next action; it makes relevant compliance.

21

22

Directing Children

23
24
25 There exists a cultural assumption that parents should be able to expect
26 compliance from their children in a way they would not from other adults
27 (Dix, Stewart, Gershoff, & Day, 2007). Children are often on the receiving
28 end of directives from adults. The general observation from Craven and
29 Potter (2010) was that non-compliance with mealtime directives recurrently
30 led to upgraded (more entitled and less contingent) repeat directives. Second
31 directives tended not to acknowledge the recipient's right not to comply and
32 so upgraded the directive to further restrict the optionality of response solely
33 to compliance. This is the basis for the suggestion that when imposing on
34 another participant's behaviour, highly entitled parental directives claim the
35 right to *tell*, not just to *ask*. The recipient is not straightforwardly permitted
36 to decline. If children choose not to accept a parents' claim of entitlement
37 and instead resist the demands of the directives, then a conflict situation
38 arises between parent and child.

39 This chapter is interested in directives for their potential to spark parent-
child conflict. It aims to explore the practices used by children to respond to

1 parental directives and examine the consequences of the various response
options in terms of conflict management and power negotiations between
3 participants. This chapter will outline some of the practices evidenced in the
data that children used to respond to parental directives and draw some
5 preliminary conclusions about the character of directive responses. I will
then spend some time reflecting on the key issues raised by the analysis,
7 drawing on findings from the research literature in order to flag up some of
the issues involved with responding to a directive that need to be accounted
9 for and managed both in situ by participants and during analysis by
researchers.

13 DATA AND ANALYTIC APPROACH

15 The data for the present study came from a corpus of video recordings of
family mealtimes. Mealtimes are a site of co-ordinated family action in an
17 environment where standards of behaviour and normative practices are
routinely made relevant (Feise et al., 2006). This makes it an ideal site for
19 the study of corrective or instructive sequences, potentially rich with conflict
and challenge for participants.

21 Families with at least two children under ten who regularly ate together at
a table were recruited to participate in a study about mealtime interaction.
23 Having at least two children provided the opportunity for the analysis of
sibling interaction as well as adult and parent–child interaction. The aim
25 was to have material in which there was interaction between family members
in all combinations.² All participating families were given a camera and
27 asked to film meals as they felt happy and able to. They had the option of
not recording or deleting any meal before submission to the researcher for
29 any reason. Typically, filming began at or around the time the first
participant sat down, and ended when most or all family members left the
31 table at the conclusion of the meal. All activities that took place during the
recording period were treated as mealtime interaction even if they were not
33 directly oriented to eating a meal. This mirrors sociological work suggesting
the function of the family meal extends far beyond just the consumption of
35 food (Feise et al., 2006).

The data were transcribed according to the Jefferson transcription
37 conventions (Hepburn & Bolden, in press; Jefferson, 2004). Names and
identifying features within the talk were anonymised through the use of
39 pseudonyms.³ The analysis focuses primarily on the data collected by the
three families recorded specifically for this project. The data is supplemented

1 by excerpts of data from a further four families taken from the DARG
 3 archives with permission from the original researchers where applicable.⁴ In
 5 total the data represent just over 25 hours of video recordings. The analytic
 7 approach draws heavily on contemporary conversation analysis (Drew,
 9 2008; Hutchby & Wooffitt, 2008; Schegloff, 1996). At the same time, it is
 11 guided by discursive psychological principles in considering the role of
 13 cognition or psychological states in unfolding action (Edwards, 1997;
 15 Edwards & Potter, 1992).

11 ANALYSIS

13 A very common response type found in the data was immediate embodied
 15 compliance. Craven and Potter (2010) describe immediate embodied
 17 compliance as the interactionally preferred response to a highly entitled
 19 directive. Therefore, the analysis will begin by considering three examples of
 21 that response type before evaluating alternative ways of responding to
 23 directives. The discussion will then relate these findings back to the existing
 25 literature on compliance, authority and children's status in interaction

23 *Embodied Compliance*

25 The responses to directives in the data collected for this study have not been
 27 counted or coded in terms of compliance or noncompliance, as the focus
 29 was not to make distributional claims about directives. Nevertheless one of
 31 the most common and straightforward responses to a verbal directive is an
 embodied response that displays compliance without the need for a verbal
 comment (Excerpts 1–3).

31 *Excerpt 1. Amberton_7_8_53-62*

1	Emily	Urh huh huh chocolate up[my mouth urh urrrrgh]
33 2	Emily	[[contorts face]]]
3 3	Emily	((cough)) ut[ur t ur uhht]
35 4	Emily	[[points repeatedly at her mouth
5		while raising arms and grimacing))]
37 6	Mum →	((turns to look at Emily)) ENou:gh
7		[(0.3)]
39 8	Emily →	[[puts her arms down and sits normally]]
9	Jess	Hh hh HAh

1 In Excerpt 1 Mum issues the directive ‘ENou:gh’ on line 6. In response,
 2 7-year-old Emily immediately stops waving her arms about, pointing at her
 3 mouth and making noises. She lowers her arms and sits still and upright in
 4 her chair. She makes no verbal acknowledgement that Mum has directed her
 5 to stop her ongoing activity, but her embodied conduct displays both her
 6 receipt of, and compliance with, Mum’s directive. Excerpts 2 and 3 are
 7 examples of the same phenomenon – the child is directed to change her
 8 behaviour and does so without verbally responding to the directive.

9
 10 *Excerpt 2. Forbes_5_1_68-75*

11 1 **Lucy** A [((takes mouthful and hangs her elbow over back
 12 2 of chair with fork in her hand))]
 13 3 [(1.8)]
 14 4 **Dad** → >Now< DO:N’t fli:ck ya- (.) kni:-[>fo:rk o:ver=
 15 5 **Lucy** [((unhooks elbow))]
 16 6 **Dad** =the::re. Keep it over your pl:ate pl:ase.
 17 7 B [(1.9)]
 18 8 **Lucy** → [((begins to eat again))]



Image A – Line 1 (Excerpt 2)



Image B – Line 7 (Excerpt 2)

26
 27 *Fig. 1. Forbes_5_1_68-75 – Images A and B of Lucy’s arm position before and*
 28 *after Dad’s directive on line 4.*

29
 30
 31 At the start of Excerpt 2, 5-year-old Lucy has hooked her elbow over the
 32 back of her chair and is dangling her fork over her shoulder in a somewhat
 33 cavalier fashion. On line 4 Dad begins a directive with ‘>Now< DO:N’t
 34 fli:ck ya- (.) kni:-[>fo:rk o:ver=’. As Dad repairs kni- to fork Lucy begins
 35 to unhook her elbow. Dad continues the directive on line 6, and in the space
 36 for a response Lucy begins to eat again using her fork correctly (line 8).
 37 Through her embodied actions Lucy displays an orientation to Dad’s
 38 incomplete TCU as a directive and delivers a change in conduct as a
 39 response. That conduct is in line with the prescription delivered in the
 directive. Her change in conduct is swiftly and neatly provided without
 elaboration or performance. Like Emily in Excerpt 1, Lucy does not offer

1 any verbal acknowledgement of the directive or her stance towards it.
 2 Notice that Lucy has finished complying before Dad has finished delivering
 3 the directive. This is an example of how embodied responses to directives
 4 can blur the turn taking structure of the interaction by responding to a
 5 directive before it has been fully delivered. It also speaks to the projectability
 6 of directives as a social action and the type of response they make relevant.

7 In Excerpt 3, 5-year old Lucy ostentatiously pauses mid way to putting
 8 food in her mouth. Dad issues a directive on line 6 for her to ‘plea:se eat
 9 ni:cely’. In response Lucy sharply and swiftly closes her mouth around the
 10 fork and pulls it out before swallowing the food.

11

Excerpt 3. Forbes_7_2_63-70

13

14 1 [(1.0)]
 15 2 **Lucy** [((opens mouth wide and holds fork with food on
 16 3 it in her open mouth, looking at Dad))]
 17 4 **Daisy** °Oh yeah.°
 18 5 (0.8)
 19 6 **Dad** → Lu:c°y° plea:se eat ni:cely.
 20 7 [(1.4)]
 21 8 **Lucy** → [((closes mouth sharply around fork then pulls it
 22 9 out and swallows))]
 23 10 **Mum** [Wi:ll y-]
 24 11 **Lucy** ((turns to look at Mum) [Is it] schoo:l tomorrow=

25 Lucy’s immediate response to the directive is embodied compliance (lines
 26 8–9). Once Lucy has demonstrated compliance, her next action is to initiate
 27 a new sequence of talk unrelated to the directive (line 11). It is interesting
 28 to note that Mum and Lucy both initiate new talk simultaneously, and that
 29 Mum gives up the floor to Lucy, allowing her to progress the conversation.
 30 Here we can see an example of how directives, once responded to, drop
 31 quickly from conversation, typically without a sequence closing third or
 32 other acknowledgment of compliance.

33 Excerpts 1–3 are examples of the simplest and smoothest form of directive
 34 sequence found in the mealtime data. They also represent the shortest type
 35 of directive sequence. This type of directive sequence rarely extends beyond
 36 two turns and typically does not become topicalised in the conversation. It
 37 appears designed to maximise progressivity and prevent the wider
 conversation becoming stalled by the directive. The response itself exhibits
 no markers of dispreference, such as mitigation, elaboration, delay or
 hesitation (Schegloff, 2007). Immediate embodied compliance adopts a
 positive alignment to the action initiated by the directive speaker and moves

1 to further that course of action. As such, it can be considered the preferred
2 response to a directive (Pomerantz, 1978, 1984).

3 By complying with the directive, the recipient aligns not only with the
4 action indicated by the directive but also with the speaker's right to have
5 issued it in the first place. That is, they support and confirm the directive
6 speaker's entitlement to *tell* them what to do and to control their actions.
7 The combination of a directive as a first pair part and immediate embodied
8 compliance as the second pair part leads to the collaborative and locally
9 occasioned creation of a ratified power asymmetry between the participants.
10 Without both parts the asymmetry would not be confirmed as a shared
11 orientation between the participants. There is no power struggle in Excerpts
12 1–3. There is no conflict. Instead, the directive speaker asserts a claim to
13 primary deontic rights to make decisions and control actions and the
14 recipient surrenders their own claim.

15 The general impression within the data of the prevalence of compliance as
16 a response to parental directives mirrors findings from developmental
17 psychology suggesting there is a relatively high rate of compliance from
18 children in response to parental control moves (Braine, Pomerantz, &
19 Lorber, 1991). For example, Brumark (2010) reports that children aged 6–11
20 years 'complied in about 70% of cases with direct as well as indirect parental
21 regulation' (2010, p. 1083). Similarly, Kuczynski and Kochanska (1990)
22 reported that 'children's most frequent response to the requests of their
23 parents was immediate compliance' (1990, p. 404). The findings from these
24 studies and my own data indicate that compliance is the preferred second
25 pair part to a directive, and that children do frequently comply with parental
26 directives. Therefore, any interpretation of noncompliance or resistance as a
27 response to a directive needs to be done in the context of immediate
28 compliance as the norm.

29

31

Resistance

33 Craven and Potter (2010) demonstrated that recipients can and do
34 sometimes refuse to comply with attempts to get them to do something.
35 The focus of that paper was primarily centred on the directive rather than
36 the response. However, it merits comment here that recipients in the data
37 did resist some directives and that this resistance had consequences for the
progression of the sequence. In Excerpts 1–3, the recipient's immediate
compliance fully ratified the entitlement claimed and offered no challenge

1 towards the speaker's right to issue the directive, and so to control the
 3 actions of the recipient. However, this is not always something recipients are
 3 willing to concede.

5 Contingency (according to Craven & Potter, 2010; Curl & Drew, 2008)
 7 relates to the provision the speaker makes within the directive to
 9 acknowledge that the recipient's capacities and desires might interfere with
 11 compliance. The more contingent an attempt to get someone to do some-
 11 thing is the more scope is offered for resistance. Recipients often take
 13 advantage of the scope for resistance offered by modal formulations to do
 13 just that. For example, in Excerpt 4 Dad says 'C'n yuh] finish your fi:sh'
 13 (line 1), and in response 4-year-old Jessica delivers a turn that directly
 13 opposes the directive (line 4).

13 *Excerpt 4. Amberton_1_12_51-62*

15	1	Dad	[Er: (.) C'n yuh] <u>fi</u> nish your <u>fi</u> :sh (.)
	2		plea:se.
	3		(0.2)
17	4	Jess →	I: don' want
	5		(0.4)
19	6	Dad	Don't <u>ca::re</u> ,
	7		(0.5)
21	8	Dad	Finish yuh <u>fi</u> sh.
	9		(0.7)
23	10	Mum	I::'m jus' g[unna get (uh) p]iece of fish=
	11	Emily	[((cough))]
25	12	Mum	=between these two:.

27 In this excerpt, Dad issues a directive to Jessica using a modal form, 'C'n
 29 yuh] finish your fi:sh (.)' (line 1). Note that the modal form orients, at least
 29 notionally, to Jessica's ability or willingness to perform the projected action.
 31 It ostensibly enquires about Jessica's ability to finish her fish by asking if she
 31 *can* perform the stated action. Jessica's response (having had her ability/
 33 willingness invoked) is to explicitly state that she does not want to comply
 33 with the directive ('I: don' want' on line 4). In his next utterance, Dad
 35 straightforwardly treats Jessica's desires as no longer consequential for the
 35 ongoing directive sequence. He explicitly tells her he doesn't care what she
 37 wants (line 6). Dad then reissues his directive, this time as an upgraded
 37 imperative formulation (line 8).

39 The upgraded formulation removes any orientation to Jessica's will-
 39 ingness or ability in relation to the directed action. It outright tells her to
 39 finish her fish. This highlights Dad's claim for entitlement to direct her

1 actions and prevents compliance being contingent upon her ability or
 2 willingness. It is for this reason that Craven and Potter (2010) claim that
 3 strongly entitled directives do not just project compliance as a preferred
 4 response but can work to restrict the available response options to solely
 5 compliance. Incidentally, Jessica does then back down, comply with the
 6 directive and ratify Dad's entitlement to control her actions.

7 Had Jessica continued to resist it is likely that the ensuing disagreement
 8 between her and Dad would have escalated into a situation of open conflict.
 9 This highlights how difficult it can be for children to resist directives when
 10 the speaker is willing to upgrade their entitlement and restrict the scope for
 11 resistance in subsequent versions. Resistance leads to confrontations and
 12 argument talk that threatens progressivity and intersubjectivity. This can be
 13 seen more clearly in an excerpt taken from Craven and Potter (2010) and
 14 reproduced as Excerpt 5.

15 *Excerpt 5.* Crouch_2_1_12-35 (Taken from Extract 6, Craven & Potter,
 16 2010, p. 427)

17 1 Mum → [kath'rine] >c'you move< [along] a little bit please.:

18 2 Mum [((starts to push chair next to Kath)) :
 19 3 Anna [((moves out of the way of the chair)) :
 20 4 Anna .hhu:
 21 5 KathA [((swings legs round to side))]
 22 6 Kath [nng] (.) I wanna sit
 23 7 [<on> th-]
 24 8 Mum→ [KATH'rine], [katherine don't] be:- (.) do:n' be=
 25 9 Mum [((shakes head))]
 26 10 Mum→ =horrible. [↑come on, mo:ve back ple:ase.]
 27 11 [((restarts pushing chair towards Kath))]
 28 12 Kath aah
 29 13 Mum [((pushes Kath and her chair backwards))]
 30 14 [(2.0)]
 31 15 Kath [Aaa::how:::~::~:~::~:~::~: ((dur 3.1))]
 32 16 Mum [((moves other chair into position))]
 33 17 Mum [((picks Anna up and sits her on the chair))]
 34 18 Kath [↑faoo[ww:::~::~:~::~: ((dur 2.8))]
 35 19 Mum→ [y'need t'be ki:::nd to yo:ur]
 36 20 → si:ste:r. (0.2) [now mo:ve your le:g] round the=
 37 21 Mum B [((moves Kath's leg round))]
 38 22 Kath [↑A:::~::~:h!]
 39 23 Mum → =front.
 40 24 (0.4)



Image A: Line 5



Image B: Line 21

11

13 In Excerpt 5, Katherine is sitting on her chair somewhat askew. In line 1,
 15 Mum's turn takes the form of a modal interrogative: 'kath'rine] >c'you
 17 move< [along] a little bit please.']. It asks a question about Katherine's
 19 willingness or ability to perform the indicated action. In response to Mum's
 21 turn, Katherine could offer immediate embodied compliance on line 5 by
 23 shunting herself and her chair sideways to make space for her sister's chair
 25 to be positioned next to hers. Instead she swings her legs round to where
 Mum wants to place the chair (line 5 – Image A). That is, in the slot directly
 after the request, her movements display the opposite of compliance.
 Katherine also begins to formulate an account that specifies her wants or
 desires ('I wanna sit [<on> th-]' on lines 6–7). Similarly to Jessica in
 Excerpt 4, Katherine draws on the orientation to willingness/ability indexed
 by the modal form of the directive to account for her non-compliance.

Mum does not allow Katherine time to finish delivering her account. She
 27 breaks into Katherine's turn on line 8 with an upgraded version of the first
 29 attempt. Note that some elements of the initial directive no longer appear in
 this construction. Relevantly in this context the modal form is not now used.
 Thus, Mum says 'do:n' be horrible', rather than using a modal such as 'can
 31 you not be horrible'; and she says 'mo:ve back' rather than using a modal
 such as 'will you move back'. In addition, the moderating element 'a little
 33 bit' has been dropped. By dropping the modal form from the construction
 Mum removes the contingency of the 'can/could you' modal interrogative in
 35 the earlier utterance. In showing less concern with contingent elements such
 as the recipient's capacity or willingness, she heightens her display of
 37 entitlement to direct her daughter's actions.

Mum's turn in lines 8 and 10 provides several opportunities for
 39 compliance. Katherine could move her legs around during or after the
 naming, the formulation of her non-compliance as horrible, the 'come on',

1 the directive or the politeness marker. However, Katherine's only response
is a small cry on line 12 as Mum is pushing a chair towards her.

3 At this point something interesting and complicated happens. Mum
moves from verbally directing Katherine to physically moving her (Image
5 B). Katherine accompanies this with extended indignant sounding cries on
lines 15 and 18. This is perhaps a limit case of minimising contingency and
7 maximising the display of entitlement. By physically moving Katherine into
position she is given (almost) no possibility to avoid compliance. It is hard
9 to think of a stronger display of entitlement to control the actions of the
other than to physically move them into place. Mum does issue a further
11 verbal directive on lines 20 and 23. This has no modal construction; it
prefaces an imperative – 'mo:ve your le:g round the front'. – with a curt
13 sounding 'now' (which perhaps upgrades the cajoling but encouraging
'↑come on'). However, given the coordination with the physical movement
15 of Katherine by Mum it is hard to see how any further compliance could be
given. At this point Mum leaves no space for Katherine to comply
17 independently.

Katherine does not ratify Mum's entitlement to direct her in the same way
19 as the recipients in Excerpts 1–3 did through their immediate embodied
compliance. Equally, whereas Jessica relented in Excerpt 4 and complied
21 after Dad upgraded his directive, Katherine does not. Mum physically
forces Katherine into the directed position. The only way for Katherine to
23 continue to resist at this stage would be for her to undo Mum's physical
manipulation and return her legs to their previously defiant position.
25 Instead she sits still. For Katherine, absence of action (that of continued
resistance) now ratifies Mum's entitlement to control her actions. None-
27 theless Mum has only succeeded in controlling Katherine's actions at the
point when Katherine stops resisting. Up until then the parties had been in
29 conflict over who had the deontic right to control Katherine's behaviour. A
deontic asymmetry was asserted by Mum when she first issued her modal
31 interrogative on line 1, but only ratified and created by Katherine when she
stopped resisting by line 24

33 From Excerpts 4 and 5 we can see that responses other than full
compliance did not lead to the same swift, unmarked resolution of the
35 directive sequence that the embodied compliance responses did in the first
three excerpts. Instead, when recipients did not offer compliance, parents
37 tended to reissue the directive in an upgraded form potentially creating
conflict.

39 In Excerpt 4, Excerpt 5 and the other examples in Craven and Potter
(2010) the scope for resistance is first acknowledged during the directive

1 itself through an orientation to compliance as being contingent on the
2 recipient's capacity and/or desire to perform the action. This is typically
3 achieved using a modal formulation. I do not want to claim that resistance
4 only happens following modal formulations. Instead, my intention here is to
5 show that resistance is provided for following a modal formulation in a way
6 that is not done with a more strongly entitled directive. Thus there exists a
7 specific environment in which the conditions projecting compliance are
8 relaxed and alternative responses are more likely to occur. There is more
9 scope for resistance provided for in the design of a modal request than an
imperative directive.

11 The recipients did eventually comply with the directives in both Excerpts
12 4 and 5. Thus, in the end, they ratified the speakers' entitlement to tell them
13 what to do. Without the recipient's ratification of the speaker's claim, the
14 directive itself could hardly be taken to be an exercise in the imposition of
15 one person's authority over another. It is the dual process of displaying and
16 ratifying an entitlement to direct that give the directive-compliance exchange
17 the sense of being an exercise in the imposition of authority or power.

18 Excerpt 5 demonstrated just how far directive speakers can go to compel
19 compliance; overriding all objections and physically performing the action
20 themselves. Despite this, the data contained instances where recipient
21 objections to compliance were not overridden but treated seriously as
22 potentially legitimate barriers to compliance. Such instances are important
23 because they reveal limits to the deontic entitlement that can be claimed and
24 therefore offer a potential route for recipients to resist directives without
25 provoking open conflict.

27

Legitimate Non-Compliance

29

30 When issuing directives parents need to remain alert to the possibility that
31 unforeseen contingencies might impact on the recipient's ability or
32 willingness to comply. Possible reasons for noncompliance can sometimes
33 be reduced or controlled through the turn design and delivery of the
34 directive (Craven & Potter, 2010). However, there is always the possibility
35 that a recipient may refuse to comply and be able to offer grounds for doing
36 so that undermine the speaker's entitlement to demand compliance. In such
37 cases the grounds for refusal then need to be dealt with and responded to
rather than disregarded through a reissued directive.

39 There were cases in the data where non-compliant responses were
treated as legitimate answers and responded to progressively rather than

1 with an upgraded restatement of the earlier directive. One example of this
 3 type of response can be seen in Excerpt 6 where Jack's objections to
 Mum's directive are responded to as a legitimate reason for non-com-
 5 pliance. Jack is a 9-year-old recently diagnosed with diabetes. He requires
 daily insulin injections, which are performed as part of the family's break-
 fast routine.

7 *Excerpt 6. Hawkins_3_2.12-4.22_3-27*

9 1 **Jack** [last night] and it had money in,
 2 **Mum** [Jack.]
 3 **Mum** [[((points at his leg then looks for her tea mug))
 11 4 **Mum** → Get your insulin done please.
 5 **Jack** .hh
 6 [(0.5)
 13 7 **Jack** [[((changes his grip on the pen so it is in a
 8 position to inject and examines his leg))
 15 9 **Jack** U::h. (peez) ((Yawn))
 10 (0.6)
 17 11 **Jack** ((looking at his leg)) hhh where shall I do it
 12 to avoid all the bruises:.
 13 (0.5)
 19 14 **Jack** .ts[s ((glances at Mum))
 15 **Mum** [So:mewhere away from the brui[ses I-]
 16 **Jack** [Look at tha:jt.
 21 17 [(0.2)]
 18 **Jack** [[((jerks leg up))]
 19 **Mum** ((nods)) Come on,
 23 20 (0.5)
 21 **Jack** You can tell I'm diabetic from that. I think
 25 22 the pe:n's doing it.
 23 (0.3)
 24 **Mum** No:: it's: probably you're just
 27 25 inj[ecting () close] to each si:te
 26 **Jack** [No:: cause]
 29 27 **Mum** C You are love, ((stands up and leans over the
 28 table to look at his leg))
 29 **Jack** ¹THat is where I hit with my:- <with
 31 30 [muh nee:dle.]
 31 **Mum** D [(thi)] you c'n do it more on the si::de
 32 <You're doing it- (0.5) Not that side yuh daft
 33 33 ape (.) [Out]side. hh
 34 **Jack** [This:]
 35 35 [[(0.8)
 36 **Mum** [[((sits down))
 37 **Mum:** Come on get it in love cause it's gone eight

39 In this excerpt, Mum issues a directive to Jack on line 4: 'Get your
 insulin done please'. Jack already had his insulin pen in his hand. At this
 point he repositions it in preparation for injecting and does a display of

1 searching for a suitable site (lines 7–10). Through these actions Jack
displays his orientation towards compliance and signals he is moving
3 towards it. On lines 11–12 Jack then delivers a pre-second insert expansion
to ask ‘hhh where shall I do it to avoid all the bruises’. This is markedly
5 different to Jessica’s response in Excerpt 4. While Jessica displays her
unwillingness to comply, Jack signals a problem that is interfering with his
7 attempts to comply. This may contribute to why Jack receives a different
reaction to his failure to comply than Jessica did. Instead of disregarding
9 Jack’s objection to immediate compliance (as Dad did to Jessica in
Excerpt 4) Mum engages with Jack’s question about bruises and offers a
11 relevant response on line 15 ‘So:mewhere away from the bruises’. In this
excerpt, Mum’s subsequent turn at talk is not an upgraded directive as we
13 might expect, but is a second pair part to an insert expansion sequence
initiated by the recipient.

15 Note the limits of Mum’s willingness to progress an expansion sequence
that is delaying compliance. When Jack directs Mum’s attention to his
17 bruises in a more direct fashion ‘Look at tha:jt’ (line 16) Mum disengages
from the bruises sequence and returns to the directive sequence with an
19 encouraging or cajoling token ‘Come on’ (line 19). Again note how this is
not an upgraded directive in the sense that entitlement is increased and the
21 concern with contingencies is downgraded. Mum does not dismiss Jack’s
problem with bruises, she just encourages him to progress. This is noticeably
23 different from Dad’s ‘Don’t ca::re, (0.5) Finish yuh fish’ response in
Excerpt 4. In the current excerpt, Mum does not disregard Jack’s concerns
25 about his bruises. She does not treat them as irrelevant or inconsequential
in the face of her demand for him to inject insulin. Instead she treats the
27 bruises as a legitimate problem, just not an insurmountable one that would
prevent eventual compliance.

29 Jack continues to resist compliance following Mum’s encouragement on
lines 21–22. He announces a possible cause for the bruises – ‘I think the
31 pe:n’s doing it’. If the pen is to blame for the bruises then using it to inject
today will make the problem worse. Mum resists Jack’s proposed
33 explanation by suggesting an alternative explanation for the bruises: that
he is injecting too close to previous sites (lines 24–25). This explanation
35 situates the cause of bruises as being in Jack’s technique, something that
practice will improve rather than an inherent feature of injecting. Mum
37 takes Jack’s evident concern about his bruises seriously. She even stands up
and leans over the table in order to gain a better view and assess for herself
39 how bad they are (see Fig. 2).



Image C: Line 27 (Excerpt 6)



Image D: Line 30 (Excerpt 6)

9 *Fig. 2. Hawkins_3_2.12-4.22_3-27 – Images C and D of Mum’s movement to*
11 *examine Jack’s bruises more closely.*

13 Mum’s movement shows she is treating Jack’s announcement as new
15 information, prompting her to assess the bruises for herself. By line 31,
17 having seen Jack’s bruises, Mum reasserts her earlier solution of injecting
19 elsewhere and proposes an alternative injection site ‘more on the side’. Thus
21 Mum has engaged with Jack’s announcement but has resisted accepting a
23 formulation of the problem that could lead to a refusal to comply. Although
25 she treats his complaints as valid she does not allow him to refuse her
27 directive to inject. In fact, as the sequence progresses she does eventually
29 reissue the directive rather than continue to engage with Jack’s objections
(line 37). The crucial point I wish to make here is that Mum’s entitlement to
tell Jack what to do is not all encompassing. Despite the imperative
directive’s projection of solely compliance as a response option, the new
information (bruises) introduced by Jack placed a limit on Mum’s
entitlement. He was objecting to doing something that hurt and Mum
needed to modify the directive such that it no longer commanded him to
perform a painful action (inject further away from the sites of earlier
injections).

31 Excerpt 6 provides further evidence that social roles alone do not
33 provide parents with an inalienable right to expect compliance from their
35 children. Deontic rights (the entitlement to make decision about and
37 control courses of action) are negotiated moment-by-moment between
39 directive speaker and recipient in interaction. Issues of recipient desire or
ability can be invoked to challenge or resist a directive. Such invocations
risk escalating the directive sequence into conflict unless the grounds
for resisting can be presented as a legitimate barrier to compliance.
Even then there is no guarantee that the barrier will be treated as
insurmountable.

DISCUSSION

The analysis so far has revealed that compliance is the preferred response to a directive and that children will often (but not always) comply with parental directive. The analysis highlighted that resisting a directive is difficult and can lead to upgraded and more forceful control attempts with a heightened potential for conflict. When recipients do resist directives, they are more likely to avoid escalation of the sequence into conflict if they can demonstrate the legitimacy of their objections. Nonetheless for the children in the excerpts presented here the deck does seem to be stacked against them when it comes to negotiating primary deontic rights in a directive sequence. If necessary, parents can go so far as to physically manhandle the child through the directed actions (e.g. Excerpt 5). So do parents, by virtue of their social role as parent, possess a normative entitlement to control their child's behaviour and to expect compliance?

Compliance and Authority

Compliance is often expressed in terms of its relationship to authority. In fact, when studying compliance it is almost impossible not to also study authority. Moscovici (1976) suggested that power is the basis of compliance. This seems to be a feature of traditional psychological approaches to compliance, which looked predominantly at persuasion strategies such as ingratiation (Smith, Pruitt, & Carnevale, 1982), the reciprocity principle (Regan, 1971), guilt arousal (Carlsmith & Gross, 1969), and foot-in-the-door (Freedman & Fraser, 1966).

Studying compliance often seems to automatically involve studying authority and vice versa (e.g. Bacharach & Lawler, 1981; Butler, 2008; Gordon & Ervin-Tripp, 1987). However, there is a developing body of interaction-based research that seeks to understand the nature of asymmetrical power distributions within a stretch of interaction. Such work considers how authority is produced and sustained within interaction using understandings of epistemic priority and institutional knowledge rather than assumptions about static social or personal characteristics of the participants (e.g. Buzzelli & Johnston, 2001; Heath, 1992; Heritage, 2005; Heritage & Sefi, 1992; Macbeth, 1991; Perakyla, 1998; Raymond, 2000; Sanders, 1987).

Much of the interaction-based research into authority and compliance has made use of the medical environment and the perceived asymmetries of

1 knowledge and power between doctors and patients. For the purposes of the
current study, the key finding to emerge from work on medical interactions
3 is that ‘a large body of research has demonstrated that actual medical
interaction does not consistently embody, and sometimes contradicts,
5 theoretical, social–structural relationships as they relate to asymmetrical
distributions of communication practices’ (Robinson, 2001, p. 23).
7 Researchers have consistently found that institutional roles alone cannot
account for situated displays of authority in interaction (Perakyla, 1998,
9 2002; Robinson, 1998; Stivers, 2001; e.g. ten Have, 1991).

Similar findings have emerged in studies examining asymmetries and
11 power dynamics in interactions between children as they play. The
environments and types of play varied between the studies; including school
13 and preschool crèche settings (Butler, 2008; Goodwin, 2002; Kyratzis &
Marx, 2001), home settings (Griswold, 2007), pretend play or acting games
15 (Kyratzis, 2007), and game based play (Goodwin, 1990). Across the
different settings, authority figures did, on occasions, appear to emerge
17 based on social roles such as the relative ages of the children (Griswold,
2007) or the status of the character being played during pretend play; such
19 as a teacher (Butler, 2008; Kyratzis, 2007). However, these factors did not
universally prevent younger peers from refusing to submit (Goodwin, 2002)
21 or submissive characters in pretend play from ‘misbehaving’ or walking out
of the game (Butler, 2008; Kyratzis, 2007). Factors such as expertise and
23 competence emerged as useful predictors for authority figures within groups
(Kyratzis & Marx, 2001). As the experience levels of the groups members
25 changed so to did the balance between authoritative and compliant mem-
bers (Goodwin, 2002).

27 Across all of the studies examined here it was interesting that although
social roles were often used to scaffold or legitimise displays of authority, in
29 fact each move to take authority or to acknowledge the authority of a co-
participant was built out of the moment-to-moment interactions and subject
31 to continual reassessment and swift changes as the play progressed
(Goodwin, 2002). These findings reflect the conclusions reached from
33 studying my own data: that authority and compliance were worked up
collaboratively between participants as talk progressed rather than being
35 features of static power relationships that endured across time and contexts.

The practical accomplishment of authority in action requires a
37 collaborative effort from both parties. Authority is not a feature of an
individual, but is a potential outcome of interactional negotiations regard-
39 ing future courses of action if one participant acquiesces to the other’s vision
(Allsopp, 1996; De George, 1976).

1 *Children's Status in Interaction*

3 Children's status in interaction is a complicated affair that has important
 5 implications for how research is conducted (e.g. Forrester, 2010). Interaction
 7 researchers are often scrupulous about avoiding abstract explanations
 9 for asymmetry that cannot be tied to participants' orientations. Interestingly
 11 however, even interaction researchers, so unwilling to accept exogenous
 13 accounts for power differences between doctors and patients, do refer to
 15 static 'status differences' between adults and children. For example, ten
 Have (1991) alongside his appeal not to view doctor–patient interaction as
 an artefact of the participants' relative statuses, comments that adults adopt
 certain styles of speaking when addressing children. He briefly describes
 elements that he suggests form part of 'a wider "conversational" approach
 taken especially with persons with non-adult status' (1991, p. 157). His 'non-
 adult status' group includes children and the elderly.

Assumptions about the relevance of social roles (particularly relationship
 roles) between adults and children can sneak unnoticed into even the most
 rigorous of studies. For example, Stivers (2005) showed that repeated
 utterances can provide second position speakers an opportunity to claim
 primary epistemic rights to the object under discussion. She goes on to claim
 that the basis on which the epistemic right can be claimed is either a social or
 interactional role. I support her analysis in cases where the social role can
 clearly be shown to have been topicalised in the talk. For example in
 Excerpt 7 Stivers argues that mum indexes her social role 'as the mother and
 the money provider' as a basis for asserting primary epistemic right to judge
 five dollars as a substantial weekly allowance for her teenage daughter
 (2005, p. 152). In a discussion about money, mum's social role as a 'money
 provider' is indeed made salient in the interaction and can be shown to be
 the basis for asserting a primary epistemic right to assess allowances, but I
 struggle to see how her status as 'mother' is topicalised.

Another example of the ease with which social roles can be drawn into
 analyses of adult–child interaction can be taken from Excerpt 13 of the same
 paper (reproduced as Excerpt 7).

35 *Excerpt 7. (13) (Schegloff, 1996, p. 176) (Stivers, 2005, p. 146)*

37	1	TEA	Check and see if there's any down on the
	2		bottom that people forgot to hang up.
39	3	GIR	→ That was Alison's job.
	4	TEA	→ Oh that's right. It is Alison's job
	5	GIR	A:lison! ((Calling out for her))

1 Here the teacher delivers a modified repeat of ‘That was Alison’s job’
(line 3) on line 4. In her analysis, Stivers claims that ‘her social roles—
3 teacher versus student; adult versus child—appear to be indexed in the
teacher’s claim of authority’ (2005, p. 146). I would argue that this excerpt
5 can be more fully explained on the basis of the participants’ interactional
roles as directive speaker and recipient with the attendant claims to
7 entitlement and restricted response options that go with such an exchange in
interaction. The quasi-explanatory work done by invoking the participants’
9 statuses as adult and child runs the risk of perpetuating assumptions about
relative role identities that are not as grounded in empirical study as they
11 perhaps could be.

The difference between adults’ and children’s statuses is not simply a
13 case of them occupying different but equivalent groups; one is often
treated as superior to the other. In their study of videotapes of children
15 following written instructions for school science experiments, Amerine and
Bilmes (1988) explain their findings that the children did not ‘successfully’
17 follow instructions as being a feature of childhood incompleteness and
incompetence in comparison to a hypothetical adult completing the same
19 task. They suggest that social scientists can safely treat all children as
‘incompetent in the ordinary, taken-for-granted skills of daily life’ (1988,
21 p. 329).

The idea that children are ‘incomplete adults’ may stem from a focus
23 within developmental psychology on the acquisition of skills as the child
ages (Forrester, 2010). Classical studies of children’s language have
25 tended to focus on ‘what the child can do at what age and how long it
takes to learn’ (Cook-Gumperz, 1977; Dore, 1985; Karmiloff-Smith, 1986;
27 Sachs, 1983). This established and extensive focus on children’s compe-
tencies at various points in their individual development glosses over an
29 implicit presupposition that children’s experiences are incomplete or
missing some of the aspects required in order to be treated as a partici-
31 pant member in society or interaction (Livingston, 1987). Ethnometho-
dologists and conversation analysts have identified that children seem to
33 have shaky or restricted membership rights to categories such as ‘compe-
tent speaker’ and ‘participant in a conversation’ and have begun to
35 reframe arguments about competencies into discussions about member-
ship, status, and access to resources (Forrester, 2010; Forrester, 2002;
37 Forrester & Reason, 2006; James & Prout, 1997; Watson, 1992). This
may be of particular relevance when looking at notions of authority and
39 compliance within interaction. Are children forced into positions of
submission and compliance by virtue of their quasi-member status in
interaction?

1 There are studies supporting the ability of children to exert themselves
within interaction and to expect parental compliance. Burman (1994)
3 suggests that when children draw on discourses of parental duty and
responsibility for children they can exercise control. This is very similar to a
5 finding by Ervin-Tripp et al. (1984) that children could exert the power to
secure compliance when making requests related to parental obligations to
7 care for them.

On one level, experimental and lab based work has clearly shown that
9 language skills develop as the child matures. Therefore an adult when
conversing with a child clearly has a greater range of linguistic resources at
11 their disposal for engineering power, authority and control within the
interaction. This is not to say that children are completely without such
13 skills. Sacks (1972) discusses one practice recurrently used by children to
gain a turn at talk (You know what?). He suggests that by eliciting a go-
15 ahead in the form of ‘what?’ from parents, children are then able to speak
again through the obligation to reply made relevant by the ‘what?’. Here we
17 can see children drawing on (and thereby showing their mastery of) the rules
and features of sequence organisation (specifically pre-sequences where
19 checking for reciprocity is a common function) in order to accomplish a
specific interactional goal (Schegloff, 2007). Sacks (1972) postulated that
21 ‘you know what?’ was a device used by children as a means to overcome the
restricted speakership rights associated with childhood. Filipi (2009) has
23 gone even further to demonstrate how pre verbal infants can affect a form of
an other-initiated repair initiator through the direction and duration of their
25 eye-gaze when interacting with their parents. Children may therefore have
specific resources and skills with which to bring their own agenda and
27 authority to bear in interaction.

Just because adults are better practiced at, and have more extensive
29 resources available for, exercising control in an interaction, does that mean
that children should be expected to comply with their parents’ demands?
31

33

CONCLUSION

35 The analysis began by suggesting that immediate embodied compliance was
a very common response option within the data. I argued that it leads to the
37 smoothest, shortest directive sequences by aligning positively with the
course of action indicated by the directive. As such immediate embodied
39 compliance can be considered the interactionally preferred response to a
directive (Pomerantz, 1984; Schegloff, 2007).

1 In contrast, resisting a directive tended to lead to more forceful, upgraded
2 directives and, ultimately, to open conflict between the participant for as
3 long as they continued to disagree about who had primary rights to make
4 decision about and control the recipient's actions (deontic rights). Open
5 conflict was more likely to be avoided if the recipient's ground for resisting
6 were treated as legitimate barriers to compliance by the directive speaker.
7 However, resisting a directive remained a difficult social action to perform in
8 interaction.

9 As a concept, compliance has traditionally been studied in conjunction
10 with the notion of authority (Griswold, 2007). Interaction-based studies
11 have worked to reframe the study of authority to focus on situated displays
12 of knowledge (epistemic) or power (deontic) asymmetries (Drew, 1991;
13 Heritage, 2005; Heritage & Raymond, 2005; Heritage & Raymond,
14 Forthcoming; Raymond, 2000; Stevanovic, 2011; Stevanovic & Perakyla,
15 Forthcoming). Within this framework, considering the interaction in terms
16 of how the control over a given action is distributed between participants
17 offers a more action-oriented approach to the study of asymmetries and
18 helps to guard against unwarranted assumptions of status differences
19 between participants.

20 The fact that directive recipients in my data are often children cannot be
21 ignored, but it remains unclear as to how their childhood status should be
22 handled in the analysis. A wealth of studies have commented on the
23 restricted participation rights of children in interaction (Forrester, 2002;
24 Forrester & Reason, 2006; Forrester, 2010; James & Prout, 1997; Watson,
25 1992). However, such work also suggests that children can and do develop
26 their own set of resources to overcome their participation difficulties (e.g.
27 Filipi, 2009; Sacks, 1972) and that membership rights vary across different
28 domains (Forrester, 2010). This makes it hard (for either parents or
29 analysts) to develop any universal guidelines for dealing with children's
30 interactional contributions.

31 Despite the difficulties children face when trying to resist parental
32 directives, the recipient is ultimately the only person who can ratify a
33 speaker's claim to a deontic entitlement to issue the directive. Until a
34 recipient complies with a directive, the speaker's claim to entitlement is
35 simply that; a claim. Deontic asymmetries between the participants are
36 created after a claim has been asserted by one party and ratified by another.
37 The potential for conflict exists in the space between the assertion and
38 ratification of a directive speaker's claim to deontic authority (between
39 issuing a directive and it being complied with). When resisting a directive,
the recipient is refusing to go along with the directed course of action, is

1 rejecting the speaker's attempts to control them and (if their objections
 2 are not treated as legitimate) creates an environment for conflict where the
 3 two parties dispute who holds deontic authority over the recipient's
 4 behaviour.

5 The fact that directive recipients must surrender their claim to deontic
 6 authority over their own actions to ratify the speaker's claim reveals the
 7 fundamental dialogic process through which deontic asymmetries are
 8 created and sustained between parents and children. The management of
 9 a directive sequence requires collaborative work from both speaker and
 10 recipient. Neither party on their own is sufficient to create and sustain a
 11 given interlocutor as entitled to control the actions of another. Under-
 12 standing how all parties to the directive sequence contribute to the
 13 production of situated authority will be key to understanding the action
 14 of a directive and its potential to spark conflict within interaction.

15 It remains to be seen how far the patterns reported here can be applied to
 16 directives in other contexts. It will be interesting follow up the organisation
 17 of directives in other task based setting such as classrooms, therapy sessions,
 18 or driving lessons, where the institution provides for different potential
 19 asymmetries (both deontic and epistemic) between the participants. This
 20 may facilitate a further disentangling of the role played by social and
 21 interactional identities when studying social interaction.

23

NOTES

25

26 1. This has also been expressed as a threat to the recipient's face (Brown &
 27 Levinson, 1987; Goffman, 1967).

28 2. The use of families with more than one child is not intended to reflect a value
 29 judgement about what counts as a family. In contrast, by including the potential for
 30 as many interactive combinations as possible (e.g. all members, mum and two
 31 children, just adults and dad and one child), the goal was to be inclusive and try to
 32 capture as much of the rich diversity of family interaction as was possible within the
 33 constraints of the project.

34 3. The reader will notice that in the excerpts presented here the adult participants
 35 are referred to as Mum and Dad. This was a deliberate choice, not to expose the
 36 category bound entitlements of the social role of parents, but rather to represent
 37 participants with the name most commonly used to address them during the
 38 interaction (cf., Watson, 1997). Overwhelming children were addressed using their
 39 first name (which was replaced with a pseudonym with the same number of syllables)
 40 and adults were referred to as Mum and Dad (or variations such as mummy and
 41 daddy).

42 4. I am particularly grateful to Laura Jenkins (Loughborough University) for
 43 allowing me to use excerpts of the data she collected.

REFERENCES


- 1
- 3 Allsopp, M. E. (1996). Deontic and epistemic authority in Roman Catholic ethics: The case of
Richard McCormick. *Christian Bioethics*, 2(1), 97–113.
- 5 Amerine, R., & Bilmes, J. (1988). Following instructions. *Human Studies*, 11, 327–339.
- 7 Bacharach, S. B., & Lawler, E. J. (1981). *Power and politics in organisations: The social
psychology of conflict, coalitions, and bargaining*. London: Josey Bass Publishers.
- 9 Blum-Kulka, S. (1997). *Dinner talk: Cultural patterns of sociability and socialisation in family
discourse*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- 11 Braine, L. G., Pomerantz, E., & Lorber, D. (1991). Conflicts with authority: Children's feelings,
actions, and justifications. *Developmental Psychology*, 27(5), 829–840.
- 13 Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals of language usage*. Cambridge:
Cambridge University Press.
- 15 Brumark, A. (2010). Behaviour regulation at the family dinner table. The use of and response to
direct and indirect behaviour regulation in ten Swedish families. *Journal of Child
Language*, 37, 1065–1088.
- 17 Burman, E. (1994). *Deconstructing developmental psychology*. London: Routledge.
- 19 Butler, C. W. (2008). *Talk and social interaction in the playground*. Hampshire: Ashgate.
- 21 Buzzelli, C., & Johnston, B. (2001). Authority, power, and morality in classroom discourse.
Teaching and Teacher Education, 17, 873–884.
- 23 Carlsmith, J. M., & Gross, A. E. (1969). Some effects of guilt on compliance. *Journal of
Personality and Social Psychology*, 11, 232–239.
- 25 Charles, N., & Kerr, M. (1985). *Food, and families*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- 27 Cook-Gumperz, J. (1977). Situated instruction: Language socialisation of school-age children.
In S. Ervin-Tripp & C. Mitchell-Kernan (Eds.), *Child discourse* (pp. 103–121). London:
Academic Press.
- 29 Craven, A., & Potter, J. (2010). Directives: Entitlement and contingency in action. *Discourse
Studies*, 12(4), 419–442.
- 31 Curl, T., & Drew, P. (2008). Contingency and action: A comparison of two forms of requesting.
Research on Language and Social Interaction, 41(2), 129–153.
- 33 De George, R. T. (1976). The nature and function of epistemic authority. In R. Baine (Ed.),
Authority: A philosophical analysis (pp. 76–93). Alabama: University of Alabama Press.
- 35 DeVault, M. L. (1984). *Feeding the family: The social organisation of caring as gendered work*.
London: University of Chicago Press.
- 37 Dix, T., Stewart, A. D., Gershoff, E. T., & Day, W. H. (2007). Autonomy and children's
reactions to being controlled: Evidence that both compliance and defiance may be
positive markers in early development. *Child Development*, 78(4), 1204–1221.
- 39 Dore, J. (1985). Children's conversations. In T. A. Van Dijk (Ed.), *Handbook of discourse
analysis volume three: Discourse and dialogue* (pp. 47–65). London: Academic Press
Harcourt Brace Javanovich.
- Drew, P. (1991). Asymmetries of knowledge in conversational interactions. In I. Markova &
K. Foppa (Eds.), *Asymmetries in dialogue* (pp. 21–48). Hertfordshire: Harvester
Wheatsheaf.
- Drew, P. (2008). Conversation analysis. In J. A. Smith (Ed.), *Qualitative psychology: A practical
guide to research methods* (pp. 133–159). London: Sage.
- Edwards, D. (1997). *Discourse and cognition*. London: Sage.
- Edwards, D., & Potter, J. (1992). *Discursive psychology*. London: Sage.

- 1 Ervin-Tripp, S. (1976). 'Is Sybil there?' The structure of some American English directives.
Language in Society, 5, 25–66.
- 3 Ervin-Tripp, S. M., O'Connor, M. C., & Rosenberg, J. (1984). Language and power in the
 family. In M. Schluz & C. Kramer (Eds.), *Language and power* (pp. 116–135).
 Belmont, CA: Sage.
- 5 Feise, B. H., Foley, K. P., & Spagnola, M. (2006). Routine and ritual elements in family
 mealtimes: Contexts for child well-being and family identity. *New Directions for Child
 and Adolescent Development*, 111, 67–89.
- 7 Filipi, A. (2009). *Toddler and parent interaction*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins B.V.
- 9 Forrester, M. (2010). Ethnomethodology and adult-child conversation: Whose development? In
 H. Gardner & M. Forrester (Eds.), *Analysing interactions in childhood: Insights from
 conversation analysis* (pp. 42–58). Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.
- 11 Forrester, M. A. (2002). Appropriating cultural conceptions of childhood. *Childhood*, 9(3),
 255–276.
- 13 Forrester, M. A., & Reason, D. (2006). Competency and participant in acquiring a mastery of
 language: A reconsideration of the idea of membership. *The Sociological Review*, 54(3),
 446–466.
- 15 Freedman, J. L., & Fraser, S. C. (1966). Compliance without pressure: The foot-in-the-door
 technique. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 4, 195–202.
- 17 Goffman, E. (1967). *Interaction ritual: Essays on face-to-face behavior*. New York, NY:
 Doubleday.
- 19 Goodwin, M. H. (1980). Directive-response speech sequence in girls' and boys' task activities.
 In S. McCommell-Ginet, R. Borker & N. Furman (Eds.), *Women and language in
 literature and society* (pp. 157–173). London: Praeger.
- 21 Goodwin, M. H. (1990). *He-said-she-said: Talk as social organisation among black children*.
 Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.
- 23 Goodwin, M. H. (2002). Building power asymmetries in girls' interaction. *Discourse and
 Society*, 13(6), 715–730.
- 25 Goodwin, M. H. (2006). Participation, affect, and trajectory in family directive/response
 sequences. *Text and Talk*, 26(4-5), 515–543.
- 27 Gordon, D., & Ervin-Tripp, S. (1987). The structure of children's requests. In
 R. L. Schiefelbusch & J. Pickar (Eds.), *The acquisition of communicative competence*
 (pp. 295–322). Baltimore: University Park Press.
- 29 Griswold, O. (2007). Achieving authority: Discursive practices in Russian girls' pretend play.
Research on Language and Social Interaction, 40(4), 291–319.
- 31 Heath, C. (1992). The delivery and reception of diagnosis and assessment in the general practice
 consultation. In P. Drew & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Talk at work* (pp. 235–267). Cambridge:
 Cambridge University Press.
- 33 Heinemann, T. (2006). 'Will you or can't you?' Displaying entitlement in interrogative requests.
Journal of Pragmatics, 38, 1081–1104.
- 35 Hepburn, A., & Bolden, G. (in press). Transcription for conversation analysis. In: J. Sidnell &
 T. Stivers (Eds.), *Blackwell handbook of conversation analysis*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- 37 Heritage, J. (2005). Revisiting authority in physician-patient interaction. In J. F. Duchan &
 D. Kovarsky (Eds.), *Diagnosis as cultural practice* (pp. 83–102). Berlin: Mouton de
 Gruyter.
- 39 Heritage, J., & Raymond, G. (2005). The terms of agreement: Indexing epistemic authority and
 subordination in talk-in-interaction. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 68(1), 15–38.

- 1 Heritage, J., & Raymond, G. (Forthcoming). Navigating epistemic landscapes: Acquiescence,
agency, and resistance in responses to polar questions. In: J. P. Ruiters (Ed.), *Questions*.
3 Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Heritage, J., & Sefi, S. (1992). Dilemmas of advice: aspects of the delivery and reception of
5 advice in interactions between health visitors and first-time mothers. In P. Drew &
J. Heritage (Eds.), *Talk at work: Interaction in institutional settings* (pp. 359–417).
Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- 7 Hutchby, I., & Wooffitt, R. (1998). *Conversation analysis*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- James, A., & Prout, A. (Eds.). (1997). *Constructing and reconstructing childhood: Contemporary
issues in the sociological study of childhood* (2nd ed.). Basingstoke: Falmer Press.
- 9 Jefferson, G. (2004). A sketch of some orderly aspects of overlap in natural conversation.
In G. H. Lerner (Ed.), *Conversation analysis: Studies from the first generation* (pp. 43–59).
11 Amsterdam: John Benjamin Publishing Company.
- Karmiloff-Smith, A. (1986). Some fundamental aspects of language development after age 5. In
13 P. Fletcher & M. C. Garman (Eds.), *Language acquisition: Studies in first language
development* (2nd ed., pp. 455–474). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kidwell, M. (2006). ‘Calm down!’ The role of gaze in the interactional management of hysteria
15 by the police. *Discourse Studies*, 8, 745–770.
- Kuczynski, L., & Kochanska, G. (1990). Development of children’s noncompliance strategies
17 from toddlerhood to age 5. *Developmental Psychology*, 26(3), 398–408.
- Kyratzis, A. (2007). Using the social organisational affordances of pretend play in American
preschool girls’ interactions. *Research on Language & Social Interaction*, 40(4), 321–352.
- 19 Kyratzis, A., & Marx, T. (2001). Preschoolers’ communication competence: Register shift in
the marking of power in different contexts of friendship group talk. *First Language*, 21,
21 387–429.
- Larson, R. W., Branscomb, K. R., & Wiley, A. R. (2006). Forms and functions of family
23 mealtimes: Multidisciplinary perspectives. *New Directions for Child and Adolescent
Development*, 111, 1–15.
- Livingston, E. (1987). *Making sense of ethnomethodology*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- 25 Macbeth, D. H. (1991). Teacher authority as practical action. *Linguistics and Education*, 3,
281–313.
- 27 Moscovici, S. (1976). *Social influence and social change*. London: Academic Press.
- Nock, S. L. (1987). *Sociology of the family*. NJ: Prentice Hall.
- 29 Pearson, B. (1989). “Role-ing out control” at church business meetings: Directing and
disagreeing. *Language Sciences*, 11(3), 289–304.
- Perakyla, A. (1998). Authority and accountability: The delivery of diagnosis in primary health
31 care. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 61, 301–320.
- Perakyla, A. (2002). Agency and authority: Extended responses to diagnostic statements in
33 primary care encounters. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 35(2), 219–247.
- Pomerantz, A. (1978). Compliment responses: Notes on the cooperation of multiple constraints.
35 In J. Schenkein (Ed.), *Studies in the organisation of conversational interaction* (pp. 79–
112). New York, NY: Academic Press.
- Pomerantz, A. (1984). Agreeing and disagreeing with assessments: Some features of preferred/
37 dispreferred turn shapes. In J. M. Atkinson & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Structures of social action:
Studies in conversation analysis* (pp. 57–101). London: Cambridge University Press.
- 39 Raymond, G. (2000). The voice of authority: The local accomplishment of authoritative
discourse in live information broadcasts. *Discourse Studies*, 2(3), 354–379.

- 1 Regan, J. (1971). Guilt, perceived injustice, and altruistic behaviour. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 18, 124–132.
- 3 Robinson, J. D. (1998). Getting down to business: Talk, gaze and body orientation during openings of doctor-patient consultations. *Human Communication Research*, 25(1), 97–123.
- 5 Robinson, J. D. (2001). Asymmetry in action: Sequential resources in the negotiation of a prescription request. *Text*, 21(1/2), 19–54.
- 7 Sachs, J. (1983). Talking about the there and then: The emergence of displaced reference in parent-child discourse. In K. E. Nelson (Ed.), *Children's language* (pp. 1–28). London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- 9 Sacks, H. (1972). On the analyzability of stories by children. In J. J. Gumperz & D. Hymes (Eds.), *Directions in sociolinguistics: The ethnography of communication* (pp. 329–345). New York, NY: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- 11 Sanders, R. E. (1987). The interconnection of utterances and nonverbal displays. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 20(1), 140–170.
- 13 Schegloff, E. A. (1996). Confirming allusions: Toward an empirical account of action. *American Journal of Sociology*, 102(1), 161–216.
- 15 Schegloff, E. A. (2007). *Sequence organisation in interaction: A primer in conversational analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- 17 Searle, J. R. (1979). *Expression and meaning: Studies in the theory of speech acts*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- 19 Smith, D. L., Pruitt, D. G., & Carnevale, P. J. D. (1982). Matching and mismatching: the effect of own limit, other's toughness, and time pressure on concession rate in negotiation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 42, 876–883.
- 21 Stevanovic, M. (2011). Participants' deontic rights and action formation: The case of declarative requests for action. *InLiSt-Interaction and Linguistic Structures*, 52. Retrieved from <http://www.inlist.uni-bayreuth.de/issues/52/InLiSt52.pdf>
- 23 Stevanovic, M., & Perakyla, A. (Forthcoming). Deontic authority in interaction. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*.
- 25 Stivers, T. (2001). Negotiating who presents the problem: Next speaker selection in pediatric encounters. *Journal of Communication*, 51(2), 252–282.
- 27 Stivers, T. (2005). Modified repeats: One method for asserting primary rights from second position. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 32(2), 131–158.
- 29 Ten Have, P. (1991). Talk and institution: A reconsideration of the “asymmetry” of doctor-patient interaction. In D. Boden & D. H. Zimmerman (Eds.), *Talk and social structure: Studies in ethnomethodology and conversation analysis* (pp. 138–163). Cambridge: Polity Press.
- 31 Vine, B. (2009). Directives at work: Exploring the contextual complexity of workplace directives. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 41, 1395–1405.
- 33 Watson, D. R. (1992). Ethnomethodology, conversation analysis and education: An overview. *International Review of Education*, 38(3), 257–274.
- 35 Watson, D. R. (1997). Some general reflections of category and sequence. In S. Hester & P. Eglin (Eds.), *Culture in action: Studies in membership categorization analysis* (pp. 49–75). Washington: International Institute for Ethnomethodology and Conversation Analysis and University Press of America.
- 37 West, C. (1990). ‘Not just “doctors’ orders”’: Directive-response sequences in patients’ visits to women and men physicians. *Discourse and Society*, 1, 85–113.
- 39

AUTHOR QUERY FORM

	Book: SSCH-V015-3610514 Chapter: 3	Please e-mail or fax your responses and any corrections to: E-mail: Fax:
---	---	---

Dear Author,

During the preparation of your manuscript for typesetting, some questions may have arisen. These are listed below. Please check your typeset proof carefully and mark any corrections in the margin of the proof or compile them as a separate list.

Disk use

Sometimes we are unable to process the electronic file of your article and/or artwork. If this is the case, we have proceeded by:

- Scanning (parts of) your article Rekeying (parts of) your article
 Scanning the artwork

Bibliography

If discrepancies were noted between the literature list and the text references, the following may apply:

- The references listed below were noted in the text but appear to be missing from your literature list. Please complete the list or remove the references from the text.**
 ***UNCITED REFERENCES:* This section comprises references that occur in the reference list but not in the body of the text. Please position each reference in the text or delete it. Any reference not dealt with will be retained in this section.**

Queries and/or remarks

Location in Article	Query / remark	Response
AU:1	Please check whether heading levels are correct.	
AU:2	Please provide complete detail in reference "Stevanovic & Perakyla (forthcoming)."	