**NANYANG
TECHNOLOGICAL
UNIVERSITY**

***REQUESTS FOR ACTIONS AND THEIR RESPONSES
IN CAREGIVER-CHILD INTERACTIONS:
A CONVERSATION ANALYTIC APPROACH***

YVONNE TSE CREPALDI

School of Humanities

A thesis submitted to the Nanyang Technological University
in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

2017

Acknowledgement

My language falls short in expressing my immense gratitude to my supervisor (and co-author, if I may) Prof. K.K. Luke for his tremendous patience and dedication in guiding me through this learning journey. This thesis is a collaborative accomplishment. Thank you for introducing me this ingenious and beautiful CA methodology that opens up my eyes to a great deal of interesting themes about human beings and societies (this goes way beyond the Linguistics degree that I thought I was signing up for!). Thank you for providing countless opportunities for learning and meeting the experts, for granting the freedom to explore but pushing my limits when necessary, for being understanding with family matters, for helping with research funding, and for being a great role model in all aspects. Your mentorship reminds me of what Malala's (youngest Nobel Prize laureate) father Ziauddin Yousafzai said about raising his courageous daughter "I did not clip her wings, and that's all".

A heartfelt thanks to many at NTU, in particular, my unofficial mentors Ni Eng, Hiroko Fujita and my co-supervisor Bee; professors who have taught, helped or enlightened me: Francesco, Alec, Randy, Alice, Francis B., Luca, František, Stefanie, James, Ying Ying, Francis W., Prof Qu, Prof. Bolton, Younhee and Mark at NIE, as well as the awesome LMS admin team Nura, Ann-Marie, Amutha, and the GSO Carol, Ivy and Christina. A huge hug to my always helpful and caring peers: Ratih, Rachel, Shujing, Hiram, Billy, Lin, Takashi, Tania, Darlene, Gim Thia, Hannah, Elvis and many others. Thanks NTU for bringing these best people and for offering me the indispensable research scholarship. *Terima Kasih / Gam Sia!*

Sincere thanks are due to all the professors and scholars who offered me valuable insights: Elizabeth Lanza, Paul Drew, Hiroko Tanaka, Carly Butler, Jonathan Potter, Alexa Hepburn, Nynke van der Schaaf, Pauline Beaupoil, Aliyah Morgenstern and my examiners. A special thanks goes to Alexandra Kent - I could not have built my thesis without your brilliant and

crystal clear work on directives.

I am deeply indebted to my parents, who created the multilingual me today and have endured much in supporting my extensive education despite difficult circumstances. I dedicated this work to my father, who could not pursue education due to poverty and cultural revolution, but has always encouraged me to climb higher. 爸媽，衷心感激你們養育之恩及無限的忍耐讓我任性地追求學問。

My gratitude goes to a big crowd of very supportive relatives, friends and helpers: 党伟叔叔，万分感谢您助我一臂之力。Phoebe多謝你呢個【豬朋狗友】無時無刻聽我訴苦及給我各方面的寶貴意見。Thanks to my LKL friends for having mocked at my ludicrous PhD dream in high school! I am grateful for Dr. Olga Degtyareva who pulled me up at my lowest point and helped me keep going during the last few difficult months. Much appreciation goes to the many helpers (Ely, Eva, Giska and Delia) who took great care of our household and kids while I studied and for participating in the recordings.

Lastly and most importantly, I deeply thank my beloved family for their participation in the project. *Mille grazie* to my husband's financial and spiritual support and endurance on my self-indulging project. *Un ringraziamento sincero va ai miei suoceri per avermi aiutato tantissimo.* 谢谢我的心肝宝贝给了妈妈无数灵感，但愿一天你们也体会到语言和分析语用带来的乐趣。

致親愛的爸爸

Table of Contents

Acknowledgement	2
Table of Contents	5
Tables of Extracts	9
Tables of Figures	10
Abstract	11
1. Introduction.....	13
1.1. In a nutshell	13
1.2. Why study requests for actions and responses of a two-year old?.....	15
1.3. Requests for actions.....	17
1.3.1. Early Accounts on Variations of Requests	18
1.3.2. CA Studies on Requests for Actions	20
Starting with Actions and Sequences.....	20
Participants' Orientation as a Proof Procedure	21
Entitlement & Contingency.....	22
1.4. Developmental Studies on Refusal and Rejection	24
1.4.1. Verbal and Gestural Resources to Refuse and Reject	24
1.4.2. Categorical Response Options.....	29
1.5. CA Studies on Children's Responses to Requests for Actions	30
1.5.1. Children's Responses to Requests for Action	30
1.5.2. Themes from studies on request sequences.....	32
Agency and Autonomy	33
Authority, Accountability and Morality	34
Affective Stances.....	36
Participants' Orientation and Attend Track	38
Multimodality and Material Contexts	40
1.6. Scope of the present study.....	41
1.6.1. Response Cline	41
1.6.2. Research Gaps	43
1.6.3. Sequential Analysis for Social Understanding	45
Wootton's Studies.....	45
Kidwell's Studies	47
1.6.4. Research Aims	48

1.7. Data and Method	49
1.7.1. Recruitment and Ethics	49
1.7.2. Participants	50
Investigation of Researcher's Own Family	51
1.7.3. Data Collection and Management.....	52
Naturalness of video data	54
Supplementary materials.....	55
1.7.4. Transcription and Analysis	56
Selecting Data for transcription	57
Transcription process.....	57
Transcription conventions	59
Making a collection during analysis	60
1.8. Thesis Organization.....	62
2. Less Than Full Compliance.....	63
2.1. Full Compliance and Sequential Placement of Resistance-Implicative Elements	63
2.2. Passive Compliance.....	65
2.3. Incipient Compliance.....	69
2.4. Framing a compliance as an independently motivated action	74
2.5. Reluctant Stance	77
2.6. Summary	81
3. Resistance-implicative responses I: Non-response	84
3.1. Unproblematic Silence	86
3.2. Non-response in verbal tasks	88
3.2.1. Not repeating as requested.....	88
3.2.2. Withholding of a response	91
3.3. Disengagement and Withdrawal	97
3.3.1. Disengagement: Case 1	98
3.3.2. Disengagement: Case 2	104
3.3.3. Withdrawal.....	109
3.4. Attentional response as insufficient	115
3.5. Summary	119
4. Resistance-implicative responses II: Non-aligning verbal turns.....	122
4.1. Non-affiliative but legitimate response	123

4.2.	Response that might divert the sequence	128
4.3.	Initiating rather than responding	133
4.3.1.	Extending a previous talk	139
4.4.	Procuring attention to mobilize reciprocity	141
4.5.	Follow-up action	143
4.6.	Summary and Discussion.....	150
5.	Clear Noncompliance	155
5.1.	The Child's Development of Negation	155
5.2.	Bald Noncompliance as a 'Last Resort'	156
5.2.1.	Bald Noncompliance Propelled by Physical Imposition	158
5.2.2.	Bald noncompliance not as a last resort	162
5.3.	No vs Don't want	163
5.3.1.	'Don't Want' proceeds 'No'	164
5.3.2.	A case of 'don't want more'	165
5.3.3.	Pleading 'don't want'	169
5.3.4.	Outright 'NO'	171
5.3.5.	A case of 'No' proceeds 'Don't Want'	173
5.4.	Summary	175
6.	Conclusion	176
6.1.	Summary	176
6.2.	Main Contributions	177
6.2.1.	On responses to requests for action	178
6.2.2.	On social understanding.....	180
6.2.3.	Conversational analysis for early childhood research	181
6.3.	Implications and Further Work.....	182
6.3.1.	Requests and Responses	182
	Requests for action	182
	Responses	184
6.3.2.	Agency	186
6.3.3.	Language Acquisition	187
6.3.4.	Multilingualism.....	189
6.3.5.	Language Socialization	190
	Individual differences.....	192
6.3.6.	Raising awareness on caregiver-child interactions	194

6.4. Concluding Remarks.....	195
References	197
Appendices	208
Appendix A: Transcription Conventions.....	208
Appendix B: First Words	209
Appendix C: Consent forms (Adults & Child)	211

Tables of Extracts

Extract 1.1 TEST-1;11.28 OUT OF SHOWER.....	14
Extract 1.2 Craven and Potter (2010:427).....	23
Extract 1.3 Kent (2012a, pp. 718-719)	31
Extract 1.4 Goodwin et al. (2012:28).....	36
Extract 1.5 Goodwin et al.(2012:31)	37
Extract 1.6 Goodwin (2006, pp. 534-535)	38
Extract 2.1 12-2:08-EN Big Mouth	65
Extract 2.2 12-2:08-MIX What about Watermelon	70
Extract 2.3 27-2;1.5-EN Pacifier.....	74
Extract 2.4 6-2;0.7-EN Don't touch	78
Extract 3.1 42-2;2.8-CN Pour Back.....	84
Extract 3.2 2-2;0.8-MIX More Pizza	85
Extract 3.3 Kent (2011:p.84)	86
Extract 3.4 12-2:08-EN Big Mouth(Extract 2.1)	87
Extract 3.5 12-2:08-EN Say Sorry Mummy	89
Extract 3.6 14-2;09-IT Say "Light"	90
Extract 3.7 42-2;2.8-CN Pour Back (Extended from Extract 3.1)	91
Extract 3.8 12-2:08-EN 12 Say Sorry Mummy (Extract 3.5).....	98
Extract 3.9 6-2:07-EN Driver.....	99
Extract 3.10 49-2;2.27-EN Don't sit like that	104
Extract 3.11 22-2;0.4-IT PICK UP.....	110
Extract 3.12 12-2:08-MIX What about Watermelon (Extract 2.2).....	116
Extract 3.13 27-2;1.5-EN Pacifier (Extract 2.3)	117
Extract 4.1 Kent (2012:71)	123
Extract 4.2 42-2;2.7-CN Unfinished milk.....	124
Extract 4.3 12-2;0.8-MIX Melon Melon	128
Extract 4.4 12-2:08-EN Broken	133
Extract 4.5 12-2;0.8-MIX ELY (extracted from Extract 4.3)	134
Extract 4.6 42-2;2.7-CN Unfinished Milk (continued from Extract 4.2)	134
Extract 4.7 48-2;2.27-IT Kitten's Eyes	134
Extract 4.8 21-2;0.26-CN Porridge	135
Extract 4.9 12-2;0.8-MIX Hold	135
Extract 4.10 12-2;0.8-MIX Plane.....	137
Extract 4.11 12-2:08-EN Broken (Extract 4.4).....	139
Extract 4.12 48-2;2.27-IT Kitten's Eye.....	142
Extract 4.13 42-2;2.8-CN Unfinished Milk (extended from Extract 4.2).....	145
Extract 4.14 Goodwin (2006: 534-535)	153
Extract 5.1 12-2;0.8 Melon Melon (Extract 4.3)	157
Extract 5.2 22-2;0.24 Pick Up (Extended from Extract 3.11).....	159
Extract 5.3 9-2;0.8 Sit Here	160
Extract 5.4 42-2;2.7-CN Pour Back (Extract 3.7)	161
Extract 5.5 TEST-1;11.28 OUT OF SHOWER (Extract 1.1)	162
Extract 5.6 9-2;0.8 Sit Here (Extract 5.3 line 12-19)	163
Extract 5.7 (Kent, 2012b, p.66).....	167

Tables of Figures

Figure 1.1 Request samples	13
Figure 1.2 A blog article from BabyCenter.com	16
Figure 1.3 Interaction between channel and semiotic status of the modalities of expression (Beupoil-Hourdel et al., 2015, p. 102))	25
Figure 1.4 Modalities used to express negation throughout the corpus (Beupoil-Hourdel et al., 2015, p. 105).....	26
Figure 1.5 Some Refusal Examples in Italian (Volterra, 1972).....	27
Figure 1.6 Spectrum of Response Options.....	42
Figure 1.7 Zoom Q3 HD camcorder	53
Figure 1.8 Documentation of recording details	54
Figure 1.9 Diary entries of brief episodic examples.....	55
Figure 1.10 Recordings transcribed and used for the present study	57
Figure 1.11 Using Excel for transcription of multilingual data.....	58
Figure 1.12 Macintosh tagging function.....	61
Figure 1.13 Arrangement of files by tags for easy search	61
Figure 2.1 Transition-relevance places (TRPs) (Clayman, 2013b, p. 151)	64
Figure 2.2 Sequential positions of resistance-implicative elements	65
Figure 2.3 Leslie's hand on lips blocks the feeding (Line 1).....	66
Figure 2.4 Ely strokes off Leslie's blocking hand (Line 4)	68
Figure 2.5 Leslie turns to Mum after a nibble of watermelon	72
Figure 2.6 Leslie's compliance by retreating his hand (line 4-6).....	79
Figure 3.1 Leslie is playing sand during Mum's request (L1).....	92
Figure 3.2 Mum is reaching out the bucket Line 3	97
Figure 3.3 Leslie is trying to put figurine B behind figurine A (L4-7).....	100
Figure 3.4 Ely taps lego car while Leslie passes over Figurine B (L8-9).....	102
Figure 3.5 Praat screenshot of 'or:h you sit like-' (L3).....	105
Figure 3.6 Leslie's disengagement after 'or:h'	107
Figure 3.7 A bottle drops while Leslie is playing (L1)	109
Figure 3.8 Leslie's withdrawal (L2-4)	111
Figure 3.9 Leslie continues to look at Ely (L9) after "your pacifie↑R:".....	118
Figure 4.1 Leslie keeps playing sand (L2-5)	125
Figure 4.2 Leslie apparently turns to tripod during '↑melon' (L13)	131
Figure 4.3 Leslie draws Ely's attention	138
Figure 4.4 Leslie gazes at Ely as she proffers the food (Line 5).....	140
Figure 4.5 Leslie looks up at Mum then pans around (L13-16).....	144
Figure 4.6 Pointing at '(i ting)' (L20)	147
Figure 4.7 Pointing up after a 1.4 second pause (L21).....	149
Figure 5.1 Leslie's refusal and subsequent disengagement	167

Abstract

This thesis examines how a two-year-old child handles caregivers' requests for actions in everyday interactions (including 'directives', 'suggestions', 'proposals', 'entreaties', etc.). Child research has shown that children at an early age are already able to refuse or reject using a range of multimodal resources, including body actions, gestures, vocalizations and verbal negation (e.g. Beaupoil-Hourdel, Dominique, & Morgenstern, 2015). Using these resources, children may respond to requests in a variety of ways, as identified in previous studies of family interactions, ranging from a swift and embodied compliance all the way to defiance, with various types of compliance and noncompliance-implicative responses in-between (Kent, 2012b, 2012a). The various responses may show children's assertion of agency, rights, display of affective stances and management of participation framework (e.g. Aronsson & Cekaite, 2011; Goodwin, 2006; Goodwin, Cekaite, & Goodwin, 2012). The present study focuses on some resistance-implicative actions (specifically non-responses and non-responding verbal turns) as well as outright non-compliance.

The aim of the present study is to develop an interactional account of how a young child handles imposing situations with the help of verbal and multimodal resources and how different responding actions may lead to different sequential trajectories. Very young children have already acquired skills like joint attention (Kidwell & Zimmerman, 2007; Tomasello, 1995, 1999) and rudimentary forms of turn-taking that are necessary to engage with others in interactions (e.g. Casillas, 2014; Filipi, 2009; Garvey, 1984). My interest is in how a young child's developing mind may be observable through the ways in which they formulate actions in interaction with their caregivers in locally, publicly and morally significant ways (Carpendale & Lewis, 2006; Kidwell, 2013; Wootton, 1997).

Ten hours of video recordings are transcribed and analysed in detail from a larger corpus collected biweekly during the child's second and third

year interacting with his Italian father, Chinese mother and Filipino English-speaking babysitter in a domestic environment. In line with CA (Conversation Analysis) methodology, the analysis relies on participants' orientations to their own and others' actions, the timing and design of the child and the caregivers' actions as well as the organization of sequences.

It is found that in response to a variety of impositions from the adult, the child may show his inclination towards non-compliance in a number of ways. He may disattend the adult's request by not giving a response (= 'non-response'); or he may withhold a responsive action during a joint activity or withdraw engagement to avoid perceived upcoming 'troubles'. Also during caregivers' pursuits, instead of responding, the child may initiate a new course of action by directing his interlocutor's attention away from the current focus (and he may initiate hurriedly to pre-empt further pursuits). This may result in a reversal of the initiator-responder roles, thus momentarily postponing or diverting the sequence. Finally, a closer examination of instances of bald resistance reveals that some *no*'s, in comparison with *I don't want*, may display a heightened sense of entitlement in dealing with the adults' impositions.

In addition to contributing to studies of requests and directives in adult-child interaction, it is hoped that the thesis may help advance research on children's acquisition of social understanding. Implications for preference organization in interactions, agency, language acquisition, multilingualism and socialization are also discussed.

1. Introduction

1.1. In a nutshell

This thesis examines the various ways that a single child aged two handles caregivers' requests for actions, in particular ways that may project non-compliance, through the methodology of conversation analysis (CA). Everyday adult caregivers try to help children manage their life and become competent social members. One of the ways they do this is to get children's cooperation through *requests for actions* (or *requests* in short). These requests can be done in a number of ways. For instance, caregivers may prompt, propose, tell, ask, persuade or coerce a child to take on some task, make progress or move from one task to another, prohibit their actions, rectify their conduct. Below are some request samples from my data - they are uttered by the child's Mandarin-speaking Chinese mother, Italian father and Filipino English-speaking babysitter.

Figure 1.1 Request samples

- (1) "Open your mouth" during feeding
- (2) "是不是很满了我们倒回去好不好" (is it full we throw back alright?)
- (3) "mh disegniamo la macchina adesso dai" (mh let's draw the car now com'on)
- (4) "remove your pacifier"
- (5) "吃一点呀" (just eat a bit)
- (6) "dici luce" (say light)
- (7) "say sorry mami"
- (8) "no no no no no no Don't touch" when the child is approaching the camcorder
- (9) "tira su" (pick up) after the child has made some bottles to fall
- (10) Caregiver asks "where is the driver?" when the child is placing a figurine on a lego vehicle

Encountering these initiating moves, the child-recipient is expected to

produce some sort of response, preferably one that fulfils the request - doing what he is being told or at least show some commitment to do, but he may not and instead produce some actions that could be interpreted by his caregivers as opposing, such as the the following example that inspires the current study:

Extract 1.1 TEST-1;11.28 OUT OF SHOWER

13	MUM:	leslie 我们洗澡-洗澡洗完 na .出来好不好. <i>leslie, we shower- shower is finished. come out alright?</i>
14	LES: ->	no: wan. ((gazing at M, slightly shakes head))
15		(1.9) ((L looks in the air then floor))
16	MUM:	出来啦:好不好. <i>Come out, alright?</i>
17	LES: ->	NO:! ((looks down then at M))
18		(2.2)
19	MUM:	我们吃饭啦(.) 好不好. ((at micro-pause L turns to water)) <i>we're going to eat (.) alright?</i>
20	->	(1.5)
21	MUM:	吃饭了好不好. <i>go and eat alright?</i>
22	->	(2.2)

When asked to come out of the shower, the child Leslie (LES), aged 1;11.28, halts the bottle and cup that he has been playing in hands and looks up at the mother (MUM) after his name is called out at line 13. He expresses his unwillingness (line 14), then as Mum pursues, he opposes baldly (line 17). When Mum shifts to propose to eat (dinner), he turns back to playing the water and does not look at Mum nor respond to her questions (lines 20 and 22). These actions may seem ordinary from a two year old, but the timing and way that they make their appearance, the fact that they appear at all, and most importantly, in that particular order are revealing and worth investigating. We may ask, for example, what is the difference between “no want” (line 14) and “NO:!” (line 17)? What quality do the silences in line 20 and 22 have? They appear to be deemed as a withholding of response, rather than not hearing or not understanding, based on the design of the mother's subsequent pursuit. It is these kinds of non-cooperative 'responses' that are of interest to the present study.

1.2. Why study requests for actions and responses of a two-year old?

This topic has attracted much attention from researchers of various disciplines and it is also a concern of many parents, babysitters, educators and clinicians. My motivation for the research begins with a personal encounter. In May 2012, the days before my son's second birthday, when I was trying hard to come up with a doctoral research topic, it seemed that all that I could hear was my son's endless *no*. I found out later on the internet that many parents had a similar encounter, as such they had given them the epithet *the terrible twos*. It describes a developmental stage in which children around age two exhibit aggressive and oppositional behaviours (Hupp & Jewell, 2014, pp. 115–122), characteristically by saying *no*. This oppositional behaviour raises some concerns. Getting obedience is a primary objective (at least for American parents, Dix & Branca, 2003), and for researchers, it is a marked behaviour from the pro-affiliation way of our interactions (Goffman, 1983). There is a research tradition that evaluates compliance positively and noncompliance negatively as a "marker for poor parent-child relationships, poor internalization of prosocial values and increased likelihood of serious behaviour problems" (Dix, Stewart, Gershoff, & Day, 2007, p. 1205).

Children's non-compliance may simply be children's way to express their unwillingness. Expressing one's desire (and lack of) is a primordial human instinct¹ triggered during the infancy by physiological needs and feelings (Siegler & Wagner Alibali, 2005) like thirst or discomfort. This is evidenced in early requesting behaviour, a basic social action which is exhibited in the first year of life (e.g. Bruner, 1983; Cameron-Faulkner, 2014; Carpenter, Nagell, & Tomasello, 1998; Tomasello, 2008; Wootton, 1997), which may explain the early acquisition of the word *want* (de Villiers, 2007). Similarly then, the lack of desire to any imposing objects or actions appears

¹ I observed that my second baby at two weeks old was able to display dislike for pacifier by spitting it out. Many parents also narrate how their babies show desire for milk or dislike for bottles (in preference for breastfeeding) by crying, wiggling or spitting out bottle teats.

also early through the acts of refusal, rejection and protest which are identified as first negative functions (Beaupoil-Hourdel et al., 2015; Bloom, 1970; Choi, 1988). They are performed early by gestural means then in addition with verbal negation tokens such as *no*, which makes to the chart of early vocabulary as well (Tardif et al. 2008).

Being basic social actions, requests for action and responses indeed happen frequently in interactions, in a rough counting exercise of six hours of family interaction, Kent (2011) has found 228 requests of which 194 (81%) are issued by parents to children. That means, there are about 32 parental requests per hour that children have to handle.

Being such a prevalent social action, young children's responses to adults' control actions ought to be well understood. However, there are misconceptions. Below is an article ("Resistance: What to do about the endless no's," 2015) extracted from a popular parenting website:

Figure 1.2 A blog article from BabyCenter.com

Resistance: What to do about the endless no's | BabyCenter

Reviewed by the BabyCenter Medical Advisory Board

Why it happens

The technical name for your child's fascination with the word "no" is "toddler refusal" — and the simple fact is that toddlers say "no" because they can. "They've just found out that they have a will, and they want to exercise it," explains Susanne Denham, professor of developmental psychology at George Mason University and author of *Emotional Development in Young Children*.

This phase often comes on suddenly, leaving parents perplexed over their toddler's newfound defiance. Mike Lynd, of Redwood City, California, says his first child, Meredith, began saying "no" when she turned 2. "All of a sudden," Lynd says, "everything was 'no.' And she'd wind up to it in this funny way — 'Nnnnnnnnnno.'"

The stage can disappear as quickly as it appeared, too. "One day Meredith opened her mouth," Lynd says, "and instead of 'No,' out came 'Mmmmmmm I don't know.' And that was the end of it." While

While this kind of articles may succeed in making parents feel relieved that their children's non-cooperative behaviour is normal and temporary, the description is however somewhat oversimplified and misleading, based on current research. For one thing, *no* (or any other word for that matter) will not always be produced in the same way - there are prosodic variations. Existing linguistic, gestural and psychological studies have also shown that there are various modalities used for resisting, refusing or rejecting and that there are development stages of their uses (see 1.4). In other words, there are multiple ways of saying *no*, as evidenced in the earlier Extract 1.1. Second, this kind of articles depict young children as simply strong-willed and somewhat irrational, which calls for an investigation.

There are many psychological, linguistic and interactional studies on the topic of requests and saying *no*, but very few considers the interactional environment in which these *no*'s and other practices are situated. Scholars of interactional studies also agree that there are insufficient studies on children responses to adults' initiating actions (Wootton, 2010), especially children as recipients of a directive (Kent, 2011). The current study therefore aims to contribute to this gap and find out if children's responses may tell us anything about their understanding.

1.3. Requests for actions

Before I describe young children's responses, it is necessary to understand what kind of actions they are responding to. Identifying the initiating actions (requests for actions in this case) helps locate the target sequences for analysis. Children's non-cooperative behaviour may be manifested in many diverse and subtle ways as this thesis shows, even though it has often been discussed under the rubric of 'saying no' in media (such as the above blog article) as well as academic studies (Bresnahan, Cai, & Rivers, 1994; Cuccio, 2011; Garvey, 1984, Chapter 5; Tardif & Wan, 2001). Although *saying no* is a convenient and easily comprehensible descriptor, it can be problematic because *no* and its related forms (i.e. *not*, *don't*) have multiple diverse functions in conversations (Cameron-Faulkner, Lieven, &

Theakston, 2007; Choi, 1988) including, for example, non-occurrence (e.g. an object disappears), misfires (e.g. accidentally uttered something wrong) or truth function (denial of a statement), etc., which are not the focus for the present study. Also, starting out with negation forms, one may miss out other possible resistant behaviour (which is found in the present study); at the same time, the path may lead to some other different outcomes like conflicts and disputes only (Garvey, 1984; Tardif & Wan, 2001). Therefore, understanding what sort of requests we are looking at in the first position will help us 'set the stage right' and narrow down the scope of the study.

1.3.1. Early Accounts on Variations of Requests

Requests for actions (or *requests*, in short) and its associated term *directives* are generally referred as attempts to get someone to do something (M. H. Goodwin, 2006; Kent, 2011; Searle, 1969). They share a close history of research development, and cover a large range of social actions. Thus their forms are greatly varied, influenced by interactional concerns.

The most commonly known origin is from the work on speech act theory (Austin, 1962; Searle, 1969). First, Austin (1962) proposes that certain verbs can perform illocutionary acts, i.e. by saying "I order you to go", the speaker in effect makes someone go. He classifies some of these performative verbs like *order*, *command*, *direct*, *warn*, *plead*, *beg*, *entreat*, *urge*, *press*, etc. (1962:150) under the label *exercitive* which is defined as "an assertion of influence or exercising power" (p.162). Later Searle (1969) re-categorizes some of these verbs as 'requests' but he realizes that in fact utterances without these explicit performative verbs can also have the same force (1969:68). Hence, he develops the indirect speech acts (Searle, 1975) with a new label 'directives' to exemplify how addressees may understand non-literal meaning of utterances like "Can you reach the salt?" and "I would like you to go now" through inference. Searle's belief that indirect speech acts are used for politeness reason has sparked off Brown and Levinson's work on a universal account of politeness theory (Brown & Levinson, 1987 [1978]). Using Goffman's (1967) face work, Brown and Levinson propose an account

of positive and negative face strategies involved in the design of on-record, mitigated and off-record requests (Curl & Drew, 2008). However, Searle's literal and non-literal distinction is assessed as inadequate to explain the intricacy between syntax of utterances and pragmatic forces (Levinson, 1983, Chapter 5.5-5.7) and the inferential explanation for understanding indirect speech acts also assumes too much mental work that cannot be attested (Curl & Drew, 2008; Drew & Couper-Kuhlen, 2014a). In support of a context based account, Ervin-Tripp (1976), using hand-taking notes collected by her students from everyday conversations, classifies six types of directives that considers syntactic structure as well as social distance and power relation:

- i. Need statements: *I need a match.*
- ii. Imperatives: *Gimme a match, a match.*
- iii. Imbedded imperatives: *Could you gimme a match?*
- iv. Permission directives: *May I have a match?*
- v. Question directives: *Gotta match?*
- vi. Hints: *The matches are all gone.*

The social dimension highlighted in both Ervin-Tripp's (1976) and Brown & Levinson (1987), work has since influenced nomenclature in research. Directives are often used when the issuer is of a higher status (Vine, 2004), e.g. a manager to subordinates (Chan et al. 2015) and parents or caregivers to children (e.g. Cekaite, 2010; Goodwin, 2006; Kent, 2011; Takada, 2013); while *requests* tend to be issued by speakers of equal / lower/ or complex status, e.g. child-child (Stivers, Sidnell, & Bergen, under review), patients to doctors (Curl & Drew, 2008), customers to staff (Vinkhuyzen & Szymanski, 2005), staff to intellectually impaired clients (Antaki & Kent, 2012) or children to parents (Wootton, 1981, 1997, 2007, 2012, 2014) or from linguistically less competent speakers, e.g. children (Nguyen & Nguyen, 2016) or second language learners (Taleghani-Nikazm & Huth, 2010). However, rights and statuses are not static but more complex in interactions, as we shall see later in 1.3.2. In Ervin-Tripp's later work in family talk

(Ervin-Tripp, Guo, & Lampert, 1990; Ervin-Tripp, O'Connor, & Rosenberg, 1984), another encompassing term 'control acts' is introduced referring to "offers, requests, orders, prohibitions and other verbal moves that solicit goods or attempts to effect changes in the activities of others" (1984, p. 116). This spells out the point that requests (or directives or control acts) are in fact not a single action but consist a cluster of actions. How do then we identify these actions with greatly varied forms, and how are these actions related? This is a question that CA studies can shed some lights on.

1.3.2. CA Studies on Requests for Actions

Starting with Actions and Sequences

Unlike the above mentioned linguistics studies that started out with request forms and worked on fixed classifications, CA approach emphasizes to start with actions by asking "what can someone be doing by speaking in that way?" (Schegloff, 2007; Schegloff & Sacks, 1973, p. 299), and this action-oriented approach has proven to be fruitful in furthering our knowledge on requests. The pioneer of CA, Harvey Sacks, proposes to reconsider "these objects - offer, request, warning, threat - not as though they're a series of different things, but to see them as sequential versions of a something." (Sacks, 1992, p. 331). He illustrates with a piece of talk in which a couple tries to offer some fish to their step-father-in-law (Max). But the offer soon turns into a request, entreaty, threat because of the continuous resistance from Max, and the subsequent request-forms take account of the earlier rejections (Sacks, 1992, p. 327).

This proposed sequential relationship has prompted a claim on the dispreferred nature of request. One prominent debate regards the preference of offers over requests (Kendrick & Drew, 2014). One evidence comes from the observation that a pre-request (Schegloff, 2007) may elicit an offer. That is, recipient may provide an offer before a request is fully articulated (Lerner, 1996). The pre-emptive offer, together with Schegloff (2007) points that

requests often occur late or appear to be withheld, mitigated or disguised as other actions form the argument that support the claim that requests are intrinsically disaffiliative (Brown & Levinson, 1987) and dispreferred in talk. However, recently Kendrick & Drew (2014) provide counter evidences and suggest that offers and requests do not have a direct relationship and they are alternative options in seeking assistance.

It is still not certain, whether this debate on preference has to do with the different types of requests. In early days, *requests for actions* are deemed as embracing all types of requests (requests for confirmation, information, attention, permission, etc.) by Labov & Fanshel (1977), but in CA, a finer distinction is made because different types of requests make relevant different responses. As such, *requests for actions* are now used specifically to mean requests for other people's actions (cf. Thompson, Fox, & Couper-Kuhlen, 2015). Meanwhile, *requests* in some recent CA studies are used specifically for requests for objects or assistance for oneself (Curl & Drew, 2008; Drew & Couper-Kuhlen, 2014b), i.e. to secure another's help for one's own goals (Tomasello, 2008), and this difference of agent (who is doing the action) and beneficiary (i.e. who benefits from the execution of the requested action) (Clayman & Heritage, 2014; Couper-Kuhlen, 2014) has led to a recent evolution in viewing *requests* as 'recruitment' of assistance (Drew & Couper-Kuhlen, 2014a; Kendrick & Drew, 2016).

Participants' Orientation as a Proof Procedure

To help identify a requesting action among a myriad of forms that it may take, conversation analysis relies on participants' own understanding of each other's actions as displayed in the next turn(s). This intersubjective understanding is given as a by-product from the turn-taking system (Sacks, Schegloff, & Jefferson, 1974). Kent (2011) demonstrates how to apply this concept on identifying a request for action during family mealtimes and finds out some utterances that may not look like a prototypical directive but are nevertheless implicative of a request for action by virtue of how they are responded (she calls them *directive-implicative*). For example, a girl rectifies her

posture immediately upon her Mum's question "what are you doing young lady?" (p.64); and in another example, when a mother comments "You still got some beans left haven't you", her daughter responds after a 2.7 second delay "don't want the beans" and the mother follows with an explicit request "You've to eat some beans" (p.67) - here both participants' subsequent actions orient to the mother's initial noticing as a request for the child to take action (eat the beans).

This shows how participants are expected to provide a next action conditionally relevant to the prior actions (see 'adjacency pair' and 'conditional relevance in Schegloff (1968), and in doing so, the responder displays an understanding of that prior action, and if they do not respond or do not respond relevantly, then they may be held accountable. This endogenous comprehension serve as a proof procedure (Edwards, 2004; Sacks et al., 1974) for analysts. This analytical tool helps identify non-verbal body posture, e.g. A mother put her wrist on her hip displaying a challenge position in pursuit of her son to brush teeth (M. H. Goodwin, 2006), body orientation and shepherding gestures (Cekaite, 2010, 2015) and other gestures (Rossi, 2015b, 2015a) as performing a request for action.

Entitlement e3 Contingency

Another account that conversation analysts has contributed that helps explain the immense variations found in request forms and actions is the concepts of entitlement and contingency (Craven & Potter, 2010; Curl & Drew, 2008). These two concepts are often used in tandem (Thompson et al., 2015, pp. 217–222). Entitlement refers to speakers' construal of their own rights in making a request; and contingency refers to speakers' orientation of possible contingencies in relation to the grantability of a request. For example, patients in the UK are reported to use *I-wonder* prefaced requests (e.g. "I wonder if you could give me some advice") to doctors during out-of-hour calls, they may use modal requests (*Can/Will you...?*) that display a higher entitlement in requesting when they portray the medical problem as being quite serious.

Craven & Potter (2010) apply the same concepts on family mealtime discourse and show that in using modal requests, parents make provision for contingencies surrounding children's ability or willingness to do the requested tasks, whereas with imperative-formulated directive, parents do not orient to such contingencies, and hence heightening their claim of entitlement. Moreover, when navigating along a directive sequence, modal requests are often used first (Extract 1.2, line 1), but when children display noncompliance (line 5-7), parents work their way through to remove or manage the contingencies, and may eventually upgrade to a stronger form of directive (line 8-10).

Extract 1.2 Craven and Potter (2010:427)

1	Mum	→	[kath'rine] >c'you move< [along] a little bit please.]
2	Mum		[((starts to push chair next to Kath))]
3	Anna		[((moves out of the way of the chair))]
4	Anna		.hhu:
5	Kath	A	[((swings legs round to side))]
6	Kath		[nng] (.) I wanna sit
7			[<on> th-]
8	Mum	→	[KATH'rine], [katherine don't] be:- (.) do:n' be=
9	Mum		[((shakes head))]
10	Mum	→	=horrible. [↑come on, mo:ve back ple:ase.]
11			[((restarts pushing chair towards Kath))]
12	Kath		aah

Recent studies drills deeper to investigate what kinds of entitlement requestors are claiming or what stances they are displaying, and what resources are used to support their claim. Clayman & Heritage (2014) find that speaker may display a benefactive stance through formulating a requested future action as for 'our' or 'your' benefit to order to pursue acceptance. Claims of epistemic and deontic rights may also be used as resources to heighten speakers' entitlement in requesting (see a special issue edited by Stevanovic & Svennevig, 2015) but these claims of rights need to be ratified by recipients, and at times, negotiated between participants. For

example, while physicians may propose a treatment deferring the decision-making right to the patients, patients may resist the responsibility of making that decision by orienting to physicians' epistemic authority instead (Landmark, Gulbrandsen, & Svennevig, 2015). Vinkhuyzen & Szymanski, (2005) also show when customers at photocopying shop are redirected to use the self-help photocopiers, they procure the staff's help by displaying a lack of knowledge in operating the machines. Similarly, the two cases in Aronsson & Cekaite (2011) show parents invoke common knowledge on social rules to get their children to do somethings (e.g. one needs to tidy up their room before guests' visit).

With the concept of entitlement, the term *directive* has been in recent years used to refer to forms that claims a heightened entitlement and *request* may be used as a shorthand referring to modal requests (Antaki & Kent, 2012, 2015; Craven & Potter, 2010). However, as Kent (2011) explains there are various directive-implicative actions such as noticings "you still got some beans left haven't you?" and many action types that may project a request for action, we adopt the more neutral term *request for action* in the thesis.

1.4. Developmental Studies on Refusal and Rejection

Having reviewed that there are diverse ways for parents to requests for actions, we will now review developmental studies to see just what resources a two year child may have acquired which can be called upon to fend off requests for actions, or how he can possibly respond. This information will become useful when looking at the analysis in the following chapters, especially clear noncompliance (Chapter 5). Besides, this section will help understand what contributions a conversation analytic approach can add to the numerous existing studies on negation.

1.4.1. Verbal and Gestural Resources to Refuse and Reject

Linguistics and semiotic studies are interested in what *forms* of verbal

and non-verbal resources children have and what *functions* each form represent, how they are acquired and develop. Therefore, resources used to respond or resist to requests are normally discussed under the rubric of development of negation, and the most relevant negation functions to the current study are usually categories under the labels 'refusal', 'rejection', 'protest' and to certain extent 'prohibition'.

There is a rich body of literature on the development of negation but the latest study by Beaupoil-Hourdel et al., (2015) has an excellent summary of the history on this topic and offers the most comprehensive latest findings, therefore I will be referencing it the most. The authors suggest a categorization of four types of modalities for negation: actions (non-conventionalized bodily movement in reaction to the environment rather than being intentional), vocal productions (e.g. grunts and shouts), (conventionalized) gestures and words. They evidence a development from visual to auditory and from non-symbolic to symbolic (see Figure 1.3)

Figure 1.3 Interaction between channel and semiotic status of the modalities of expression (Beaupoil-Hourdel et al., 2015, p. 102))

Now to set the scene, most data analysed for the current thesis is taken when the child (Leslie) is 24 months old and up to almost 27 months. This would put him under a stage (Stage I in Brown's study, 1973) with a mean length of utterance (English) about 1.75 words, or in general 1.5-2 words (Beupoil-Hourdel et al., 2015; Choi, 1988). Based on Beupoil-Hourdel et al.'s findings, a child at this age of two would have moved from a stage in which he uses mainly gestural, some vocal productions and combined modalities, to a stage that his negation means comprises of about 1/3 gestural, 1/3 verbal and 1/3 multimodalities.

Figure 1.4 Modalities used to express negation throughout the corpus
(Beupoil-Hourdel et al., 2015, p. 105)

Indeed, non-verbal negation emerges before verbal negation (Garvey, 1984; Guidetti, 2005), and rejection, refusal and protest are among the earliest negative functions (agreed by Choi, 1988; Clark, 1978). Infants can already refuse by body actions (e.g. taking a book and closing it when asked to count the animals on the page, (Beupoil-Hourdel et al., 2015, pp. 102–103), and conventionalized gestures like shaking head and pushing away unwanted food items (Clark, 1978, p. 86).

Studies on verbal negation focus much on its morphosyntactic development and they generally agree on a developmental path of ‘no > not >

-n't' differing only on how they divide the stages, which is related to language specificity. For example, Klima & Bellugi (1966) three stage syntactic categorization distinguishes between negators external to the clause (Stage I: *no*, *no X* and *not X*) and those that are internal to clause; between negators that are used with zero marked verbs as unanalysed wholes (Stage II e.g. *can't*, *don't*, *I no want juice*) and adult-like use of negation morphemes and particles with inflected forms (e.g. *didn't*, *doesn't*, *couldn't*, *won't*, etc.). However, contracted auxiliaries are not present in other languages like German, and hence, Wode (1977) does not make such a differentiation, but instead he distinguishes between an anaphoric use of *nein* (*no*), e.g. *nein, Milch* 'no, milk' (refusing the offered fluid in favour of milk) and a non-anaphoric use, possibly because the latter would evolve into the intra-sentential use of *nicht* (not) and *kein+N* (not any +N). The developmental trajectory seems to hold true grossly cross-linguistically, including Italian (Volterra & Antinucci, 1979) - a language involved in the present study. However, this path is not applicable for an analytical languages like Mandarin - another language involved here. Wang (2008) reports that some children seem to acquire non-existential *mei you* 'there isn't/aren't or haven't (V-ed)' first while some others may acquire *bu* (+V) 'don't (+V)' first, and these are all fairly developed before the age two. It is hoped that my study will contribute to the discussion on the emergence of these negation tokens (see Chapter 5 & 6).

One problem with classification is that diverse variations of negators used with rich contexts are oversimplified and grouped together. For example, under Choi (1988) rejection in Phase II (2;1-2;10), there are only two forms: 'no' and 'I don't want to +', but if we take a look of some examples in Italian extracted from Volterra, 1972) during this age, we will see more diversity (Figure 1.5 below). Still the accompanied multimodal details like prosody, facial expression, body position and gestures are often not neglected or grossly described as if their differences do not matter.

Figure 1.5 Some Refusal Examples in Italian (Volterra, 1972)

Age	Italian (Volterra, 1972)	Context
1;11.19	pipì no (pee pee no)	child doesn't want to pee
1;11.19	no	child doesn't want to dress up
1;11.27	a Inni no (to Inni no)	child doesn't want to give ham to Virginia (Inni)
2;0.14	no Checco	child doesn't want to be called by name Francesco (Checco) loudly
2;0.14	no	in reply to mother's 'Vuoi l'acqua?' (Do you want water?)
2;1.13	no! io (no! I)	child wants to blow the balloon himself
2;1.13	etta no, etta no quetta no	child has fear of a girl with drum drawn on a napkin
	(t'is no, t'is no this no)	
2;2.18	...detto di no, pettino io	child doesn't want Virginia to brush him, he wants to brush Virginia
	(said no, I brush)	
2;4.2	no, è mia (no, it's mine)	Paola wants to take a sheet that the child has put on window sill
2;4.2	no	child doesn't want to give the big pincers to mum

Another common issue is that the child's productions are often extracted out from their interactional contexts to be studied and computed on their own, and considerations of the adult/caregivers' input is also computed separately. Recent studies corroborate a usage-based account on the development of negation in that the emergence of negators and their functions are correlated to the frequency of their usage in the maternal input (Beaupoil-Hourdel et al., 2015; Cameron-Faulkner et al., 2007). We therefore do not see how a particular form of response emerges from the interaction or triggered by an adult's talk and how the adult in return treats the child's use of negation.

Most studies on refusal and rejection (or negation at large) revolve around more conventionalized gestural and verbal forms. However, conventionalized forms are not entirely context-free as they are always interpreted within the situated interactions, and at times a headshake may not necessarily indicate a negation but can mean quite the opposite (MH. Goodwin, 1980). Development of pragmatics has always been somewhat constrained by a formal perspective, largely due to Chomsky's tremendous influence since the 50's, confining Linguistics to the study of language form rather than language use (Bates, 1976). Starting out with forms lead to a number of issues:

- 1) a view of child language as a static and bounded inventory with an orientation to adult form as the end-goal,
- 2) an extraction of recognizable forms out of their sequential context and

meaningful situated multimodal actions are neglected. We will therefore turn to multimodal CA studies in the next section to see how gaze work, body orientation and vocalizations are used in responding to requests for actions too.

3) classifications of forms through a rigid coding system may compel analysts to group apparently similar forms together: for example, negators with diverse prosodic features (NO::!) and other design features like repetitions (no no no) may be grouped together, resulting an insufficient or inadequate interpretation of its meaning.

1.4.2. Categorical Response Options

In developmental and clinical psychology, since noncompliance is seen as a problematic behaviour, the research interest has been focused on finding out *why* children do not comply - whether it is caused by poor parent-child relationship, maternal competences or children's growing sense of autonomy. Since most studies are done on older children, Dix et al. (2007) sets out to observe how 119 young children aged 14-27 months react when their mothers forbid them to play some toys and when ask them to tidy up, as guided by an experimenter. Children's responses are coded into these five categories:

1. Willing compliance (without asking for help and without protest or negative affect)
2. Resistive compliance (children did as asked but whined or complained)
3. Passive noncompliance (children ignored mothers' requests)
4. Simple refusal (e.g. head-shaking and saying no without affect)
5. Defiant noncompliance (refusal with anger, aggression or other negative affect)

The study has also categorized the mothers' behaviour throughout the interactions as to see whether they are connected with the child's activity and

supportive to the child's behaviour. The study concludes that at this early age "resistance reflects children's motivation to control events, not poor-parenting or stained parent-child relationships" (Dix et al., 2007, p. 1204). However, just how a child's autonomy is displayed through these various responses in interactions is left unclear. We therefore now turn to some CA studies on responses.

1.5. CA Studies on Children's Responses to Requests for Actions

In contrast to studies that use coding, CA studies emphasize on the interactions itself, that is, how a request for action (or an action implicative of it) is produced and how it constrains the next action, and how the design of this next action in turns influences its next, and what kind of intersubjective understanding is constructed through this process. In this section, we will review the current spectrum of possible responses as detailed by Kent (2011, Chapters 6 & 7, 2012b, 2012a), then we will discuss themes as implicated in this and other similar request/directive-response studies as they enrich the response spectrum, and finally from this response spectrum, we will review the scope of investigation in this thesis.

1.5.1. Children's Responses to Requests for Action

Kent's studies (*ibid.*) look at directive-response sequences at family mealtimes based on video-recordings from families in the UK with at least two children under ten years old. The possible responses range from compliance, incipient compliance, legitimate resistance, all the way to bald resistance or non-compliance.

According to Kent's findings, despite the large range of actions that may be used to project and pursue a request for action, all the requesting (or requesting implicative) actions ultimately orient to compliance as a preferred response (Kent, 2011). One of the most common and straight forward responses to a verbal directive is a swift and embodied compliance, without

any verbal comment. This smooth compliance is oriented to by both parents and children as a preferred next action to a directive action. This interactional preference is attested in two ways: first, the child's response itself "exhibits no marker of dispreference such as mitigation, elaboration, delay or hesitation (Schegloff, 2007). Second, when children do not comply immediately, parents often issue an upgraded directive (e.g. from a modal request as the first move to an imperative-formulated directive) or ignore children's willingness (e.g. a father says "don't care" upon his daughter's refusal to finish her fish, (Kent, 2012b:66), thus narrowing scope for contingencies and forcing compliance to happen.

In accordance with this preference for compliance, Kent illustrates two types of resistance practices: incipient compliance (2012a), and legitimate resistance (2012b). Incipient compliance, first noted by (Schegloff, 1989), constitutes a set of temporising verbal and non-verbal actions that move *towards* compliance but without actually offering it or offering it in a very minimal way. In the example below from Kent (2012a), when Jess is being asked to finish her soup, she quietly repeats "soup", pulls up her sleeve, adding "I am thirsty" (line 15) which challenges the grounds on which Mum issue the directive, blows on the soup, and finally taking only a tiny sip. Such an elaborate delivery together with the unsolicited verbal comments works to delay or minimize (or possibly avoid) compliance without provoking a confrontation with their parents, and mark the response as a self-motivated action (see Section 2.3 for an elaboration).

Extract 1.3 Kent (2012a, pp. 718-719)

10	Mum	→	No::w, would you phlea:se <finish your ↑soup>
11			(0.8)
12	Jess	→	°Soup°
13	Jess	→	[((pulls up sleeve))]
14			[(0.9)]
15	Jess	→	I: am (.) si:rsty::
16			[(6.4)]
17	Jess	→	[((gets a spoonful and blows on it, then takes a
18			tiny sip))]
19	Mum		°Mm°
20	Jess		[((puts her spoon down))]
21	Jess		[Nyat] say-] (.) THat sa:ys (0.4)
22			[S:err: (.) >dat sa:ys< (0.4) S:ou:p.]
23	Jess		[((traces finger round the edge of the bowl))]
24	Mum		No: that sa:ys SPArro:w.

Legitimate resistance (Kent, 2012b, pp. 70–73) describes a practice in which the request-recipient provides grounds for non-compliance that are treated as legitimate. Kent reports a case in which a mother asks her nine-year-old son to inject insulin (for diabetics). The son is about to do the requested action, but asks ‘hhh where shall I do it to avoid all the bruises’. This puts the compliance on hold with a pre-second insertion (Schegloff, 2007). The mother addresses the son's concern about the visible bruises instead of upgrading, then she tries to resume the pursuit for his action. The child's actions therefore display an orientation towards compliance though with somewhat difficulty.

The non-compliance examples in Kent's data (2012b: 65-70) occur often with a pause after parent's request, that is, the children do not carry out the requested action immediately. On the contrary, they may carry on doing the opposite - an unwanted action, and in addition, they may express their unwillingness (e.g. **I: don' want**) or specify their 'wants' (e.g. **I wanna sit <on> th-**) that accounts for their noncompliance .

1.5.2. Themes from studies on request sequences

A few themes are derived from studies on directive-response sequences that are taken into consideration during my data analysis later.

They have also brought out some finer response distinctions.

Agency and Autonomy

Various designs of noncompliance responses point strongly to the theme about children's agency and autonomy, resonating with the positive view that some developmental psychologists have on resistance behaviour (e.g. Dix et al., 2007, reviewed earlier). With the help of adjacency pairs (Schegloff, 1968, p. 2007), CA provides tools to illustrate these abstract and hard to define concepts (Ahearn, 2001) in concrete examples. Responses are second actions, which means recipients are normatively constrained to the respond to the action implemented in the first position . There are two known operations that allow responders to reclaim agency in second positions: action framing and action selection (Clayman, 2013a). The case of incipient resistance exemplifies action framing: the response "is portrayed as implementing an action independently of the prior action." (Clayman 2013: 290). In Kent's example cited above, the series of actions from Jess is produced as self-motivated rather than responsive. It can be seen as she notices the soup and is now announcing her own action to consume it due to her thirst or needs. Through her verbal formulations, she regains control of her own actions rather than merely complying as requested. Kidwell (2013) also shows how a child may show their action not as directed by caregivers through complying without mutual gaze nor acknowledgement. The case of legitimate resistance exemplifies action selection: the child chooses to do an action (e.g. asking a question) which is not made conditionally relevant by the prior request.

Caregivers in these compliance-oriented resistance cases seem to make allowance for children's self-directed responses. Hence, both requestors and recipients seem to collaboratively promote a preference for autonomy (Kent, 2011). This fine-tunes the view presented in early socio-pragmatic studies with regards to caregiver's requests for action as control acts (e.g. Blum-Kulka, 1990, p.; Ervin-Tripp et al., 1984). Agency is then not simply a private property executed by an individual but also something that is made provision

for and accepted by co-participants. In most directive-implicative sequences (except the urgent cases) in Kidwell's (2013) study, caregivers actually wait for the young child to answer after a summons instead of merely and forcefully compelling children to alter their conduct. Kidwell concludes that this interactional act promotes agentful self-monitoring and self-regulation. Also in the case of incipient compliance (Kent, 2012a), even though a child may take time to perform the requested action, and comply only minimally, adults do not pick on their independent actions or wait for a full compliance, thus leaving space for the child's own execution.

Authority, Accountability and Morality

Although early sociolinguistic studies suggest social power may be at play among the variants of request/directive forms, CA studies advocate abandoning static concepts of roles relation (M. H. Goodwin, 2006) or perceived asymmetries of knowledge and power in support of "situated displays of authority in interactions" (Kent, 2012b:75).

On one hand, parents display their authority or power through the ways they request and carry through request sequences. Children's resistance-implicative actions (e.g. no forthcoming response) may bring about parents' tactile interventions (Cekaite, 2010, 2015), and noncompliance often results in parents heightening their entitlement claim through upgraded directives (Craven & Potter, 2010)(Craven & Potter 2010) or even threats (Hepburn & Potter, 2011).

On the other hand, the fact that parents need to make explicit claims of epistemic and deontic rights also demonstrate that authority is not necessarily pre-determined by social roles. Requestors may display, claim or renounce their rights in requesting / proposing / enforcing and recipients of those actions may ratify those claims or negotiate for their own rights (Bolden, 2016; Kent, 2011; and the special edition of Journal of Pragmatics by Stevanovic & Svennevig, 2015). Sequential analysis of Swedish family interactions by (Aronsson & Cekaite, 2011) reveal a more democratic culture,

in which family members including children may negotiate for their rights and obligations, and parents orient to their children's accounts for non-compliance as legitimate and resort to establishing activity contracts (i.e. coming to an agreement as to when to do the requested task) and invoking accountability in order to secure compliance. Through such negotiations and securing agreements for deferred-actions (Lindström, 2005; Schegloff, 2007), "parents and children establish relations of trust and accountability that make possible coordinated action without extensive delay" (M. H. Goodwin & Cekaite, 2013, p. 136). Social relationship is thus interactionally accomplished, rather than presumed.

In fact, many requests-for-action issued to children are a way to hold children accountable for "their" duties and obligations, if not for some faults or untoward acts. These accountable actions or tasks in a light form may be some daily chores or routine tasks (e.g. brushing teeth, tidying up bed) which they have not done or need to be reminded of (e.g. Fasulo, Loyd, & Padiglione, 2007; Goodwin & Cekaite, 2013). It may also be that children's action is insufficient, that parents need to direct them to finish it (e.g. eating up their beans or soup at dinner), or do it properly (e.g. to use fork or sit right up) (Kent, 2011). In some serious cases, the accountable behaviour relates to overt transgressions like snatching toys or hitting others (Kidwell 2013). This moral aspect makes 'directive' drastically different from the term 'request' which is more neutral. The moral dimension has also sequential implicative as to how one could respond, as compliance may implicate one's admission to the accusation posed in the directive. For example, a summons delivered in a way to hound someone down relating to a child's untoward act may already be heard as directive-implicative or even blame-implicative. The moral implication of calling on children to alter their untoward conduct, rather than simply making the action happen, treats children not so much as non-compliant as "caught up in their own affairs" (just too absorbed), thereby painting a benign picture. Through these requests / directives, children learn what their duties and responsibilities are, what behaviours are regarded as good and bad in their society. This is why requests / directives form a significant part of the field *language socialization* (inter alia, Duranti, Ochs, &

Schieffelin, 2012; Fasulo et al., 2007; Ochs & Shohet, 2006))

Affective Stances

Requesting activity and their responses are laminated with affect in various forms, especially when participants negotiate disputes (MH Goodwin, 2006, MH Goodwin et al. 2012). Similarly, children may also display a playful stance with laughter injected in their bargaining talk when being asked seriously by their father to stop rough-housing. Parents and children in disputes developed from directive sequences therefore display affective disalignment.

Affective stance, expressed through multimodality (in particular body and prosody), has been useful to unpick non-compliance. MH Goodwin et al. (2012) illustrates prosodic properties may index a strong defiant response: "Both duration of the vowel (well exceeding 200 msec.) as well as the pitch height (above the 250 Hz normal pitch range for children) signal strong opposition. As such, the most firm refusals "No!" has a dramatic pitch leap with rise-fall contour (p.27). But a strong defiant stance may also be expressed through bodily oppositional alignment, as shown in Extract 1.4 below. Jonah refuses to get prepared for bedtime by responding "Never." with arms akimbo (M. H. Goodwin et al., 2012, p. 28). Note that the choice of the extreme-formulated negation token "Never" as well as its interruptive placement cutting off Dad's turn also strengthens the defiance. These strongly formulated defiance turns contrast utterly with other soft types of refusal, for example, when asked to go to bath, the child shakes head and utters in a low pitched "Uh uh" (M. H. Goodwin et al., 2012, p. 30).

Extract 1.4 Goodwin et al. (2012:28)

- 1 Dad: **Go-** get a **book**.
- 2 For yours-
- 3 Jonah: **Never.** ((*defiant stance arms akimbo*))
- 4 Dad: How long is **never**.

Through contrasting distinctive affective stances, Goodwin et al. (2012) identifies yet another non-compliance practice used by children to put off a requested task. This kind of response may comprise of pleading turns that use verbal resources such as 'please' (cf. Wootton, 2007), address terms of endearment and accounts, laminated by distinctive prosodic features 'high global pitch, rising-falling elongated glides on lengthened vowels as well as marked aspiration' (p.31), such as Luke's rejection to bath below. The arrangement of the entire body (face, torso and limbs) in these responses also works to reflect their stances. Children may, for example, hide their face, show an unhappy look and tired body. These pleading objections allow "children (to) construct the parent as someone who is as esteemed, but who nonetheless has obligations to attend to aspects of the children's emotional life" (p.26).

Extract 1.5 Goodwin et al.(2012:31)

Figure . Goodwin et al. 2012:p.31

Goodwin et al (2012) propose to see these affective stances (and emotion) as public displays responsive and relate to the others' actions within

the ongoing interaction (cf. crying and crying responses). These stances are rapidly changing, locally relevant, and are not add-ons, but "constitute a central components of situated actions" (p. 40) bringing hearers to a live shared experience.

Participants' Orientation and Attend Track

Participant's orientation is not only a key tool in identifying requests for actions as mentioned earlier in 1.3.2, but also in responses. In the case of incipient compliance, by showing early an inclination towards complying, the child is able to buy time to perform the necessary actions and comply minimally, and hence avoids an upgrade to directive (Kent, 2012a).

What is critical in this orientation process is how participants attend to the other's actions, and whether they choose to focus on something in common. Goodwin (2006) shows two examples in which the child-recipient attends to a different track: the first case, copied below (Extract 1.6), shows that when the child Jason is being talked to about taking a shower after dinner, instead of responding to the request, he attends to some words on a bottle cap and even draws Mum's attention to it (line 8-9). This action allows him to divert from the course of action that Mum is projecting. Although he is acknowledged with an okay, his attentiveness is questioned (line 10).

Extract 1.6 Goodwin (2006, pp. 534-535)

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

In the second example from Goodwin (2006), a child responds to Mum's request to brush teeth by linking it to their just prior talk about Brazilian Portuguese ("Time to brush your teeth, that's not Brazilian"), and as such she manages to continue the previous track, and disregards the request action. The mother handles this by saying "Samba to the bathroom" while shepherding the children to bathroom. That is, she converges the two tracks through maintaining a playful mode. The children in this case is able to maintain their agentive control throughout the play while complying the request. This shows that diverting verbal track offers participants a wider avenue to work their way towards compliance.

Other papers have also provided similar examples of responses. Some are more elusive responses. For example, a five-year old autistic child frequently uses 'or else' in response to parental requests, which does not show a clear orientation to compliance (Sterponi & Fasulo, 2010). This non-aligning response, as Sterponi & Fasulo describe, 'opens up an elusive, indeterminate space' and "freezes the conventionally expected response to the instruction and launches a different language game that engages a different participatory logic". There are times when such misaligning second-pair-parts face challenges. For instance, when being asked to eat her broccoli, instead of complying, the child asks for more cheese, and the mother issues a stretched *no* - the outrightness rejection has its basis on the child's disattendance of the

mother's first request (Craven & Potter, 2010).

Multimodality and Material Contexts

CA studies show a holistic way that participants make use of rich multimodal resources (body orientation, gaze work and vocalizations) and material contexts in making requests for actions and responding.

Embodied resources, in particular participant's facing formations (F-formations, (Kendon, 1990) plays a key role in establishing a successful mutual activity orientation (M. H. Goodwin, 2006). Caregivers may for example, position their body behind the children in a "C-formation" (controlling formation) to ensure compliance (Cekaite, 2010) and even in urgent cases use "pre-emptive face hold" (e.g. cupping children's face) to force reciprocity from young children (Kidwell, 2013). Such tactile intervention (e.g. haptic moves like body twist, gentle shovelling) is also used often in temporally anchored or goal-oriented projects, notably routine activities like getting ready for bed (Goodwin & Cekaite, 2013). Recipients may on the other hand resist by remaining immobile when being requested to move (Cekaite, 2015), refuse to rearrange their body for a viable participation framework or getting away from the F-formation to cut off the mutual orientation, e.g. when being asked to wash dishes, a child laughs "neh hah hah!!" and runs away, M. H. Goodwin (2006) (cf. Kidwell 2013). This, and also the earlier mentioned case of the boy in a posture of arms akimbo saying "Never", illustrate that the body can be arranged in oppositional alignment (Goodwin et al. 2012) together with other modalities to construct an action that can be recognized not only as noncompliance, but also with a dismissive stance. This kind of affective stance can perhaps serve to differentiate between defiance and noncompliance.

There is no study that directly talks about how gaze may be used in resistance or noncompliance, but observably they play a critical role in the delivery of resistance. From studies on gaze work in interactions (e.g. C. Goodwin, 1981; Rossano, 2012), we understand that gaze disengagement is

one way that very young children may use to cease involvement in interactions (Filipi, 2009). It is then not surprising to see young children shift their gaze direction or withhold from establishing a mutual gaze, in order not to show reciprocity to the caregiver's projected reprimand action (Kidwell, 2013). There is also an example in Beaupoil-Hourdel et al. (2015, p. 110) that shows when a mother offers some chicken to her 10 month old daughter, she leans on one side first to avoid the spoon full of chicken, then again to avoid making eye contact with the mother.

Vocalizations (e.g. whining, shouting, grunting) might be one essential resource for noncompliance, especially during a pre-linguistic stage, although its usage is in fact not not frequent (Beaupoil-Hourdel et al., 2015). Gerholm (2007) describes crying and shrieks can be used as an emotive resource to protest. However, as Gerholm and also Hepburn & Potter (2012) remark, research on crying as it appears in talk-in-interaction is curiously absent.

Apart from bodily resources, material artefacts in the immediate surrounding plays also a role in the calibration of requests for actions as well as responding, in particular by displaying having an alternative attend track or a lack of interest to engage, e.g. a child refuses in going to bath by intensely looking at the washing machine (Goodwin & Cekaite, 2013:132).

1.6. Scope of the present study

1.6.1. Response Cline

Summarizing all the response options mentioned in Kent's paper (2012b) and other interactional studies reviewed above, we have then a cline from compliance to non-compliance and defiance with various responses that are treated as either orienting to compliance or resistance-implicative as summarized in the Figure below.

Figure 1.6 Spectrum of Response Options

Compliance	Swift and Embodied Compliance	Kent 2012a, 2012b
Compliance	Incipient Compliance	Kent 2012a
Implicative	Legitimate Resistance	Kent 2012b
	"Or else?"	Sterponi & Fasulo 2010
	Non-responsive: continue talking to sister	Craven & Potter 2010
Resistance	Different 'attend track':	
Implicative	"Mom. A duck's quack doesn't echo"	Goodwin 2006
	"Time to brush your teeth, <u>That</u> is not Brazilian"	
	"c'n ↑ I ha:ve some more che:::::ese"	Craven & Potter 2010
	Account: "I wanna sit"	Craven & Potter 2010
Resistance /	Unwillingness: "I: don' want"	Kent 2012b
Noncompliance	Putting-off by pleading: "Plea:::::se.", "ma::m"(mo::m)	Goodwin et al. 2012
	Soft refusal: "uh uh"	Goodwin et al. 2012
	Strong refusal: NO::!	Goodwin et al. 2012
Defiance	Strong defiance: "Never" with arms akimbo	Goodwin et al. 2012

It should be noted though that the spectrum is only a suggestive demonstration of possible responses. The labels represent a scalar continuum rather than a categorical classification. The labels are relative to each other, and they are not absolute. They are also based on participant's orientations situated at particular moments in particular interactions. Therefore, while a 5 year old autistic child's response "or else?" to a parental directive is treated rather neutrally in the family studied by Sterponi & Fasulo (2010), it can be treated as challenging or orienting to non-compliance in other context, or uttered by a different child. Also, some of the examples cited above (especially the resistance-implicative) will not be understood without their contexts. This is also the type of actions that have drawn my interest.

Driven by the data and analysis, the study focuses mainly on resistance-implicative actions (non-response and non-aligning verbal turns), as well as some clear non-compliance. They will take up Chapter 3, 4 and 5 respectively. These more indeterminate responses are of interest here because a two-year-old seems to take longer time to provide an uptake, generally speaking. Hence, pauses are common in caregiver-child interactions (Casillas, Bobb, & Clark, 2016; Garvey, 1984); but pauses in adult conversation can be problematic as they project dispreferred responses such as refusal and rejection (Pomerantz, 1984). It is interesting then to examine

non-responses to see if they merely indicate a latency in turn-taking skills and how those non-responses are being treated by the competent speaking adults. Similarly, novice speakers seem to have difficulty in answering questions in a relevant manner (Casillas, 2014), so how their non-responding verbal turns are treated and what sequential implicativeness they bring about to a request sequence is worth investigating.

1.6.2. Research Gaps

There are three research gaps my study fills: 1) the use of an interactional approach to study a child's responses to requests, 2) in particular, a young two-year-old, 3) with an emphasis on sequential analysis to explore the young child's social understanding.

First, I will summarize the forementioned rationale for adopting a conversational analytic approach. Many existing studies from psychology or linguistics focus mainly on children. Children do not say *no* 'out of the blue'. They may have neglected the dynamic 'interactions' (with adults) from which children's noncompliance behaviour (refusal, rejection and protest) emerges. Besides, most studies code the various forms of responses or behaviours according to their self-defined classifications. While they succeed in picking up some forms and functions of children's responses, their discovery may be limited to the more tangible and categorical responses. To code and classify a child's actions (whether gestural, vocal or verbal), unavoidably, one will lump some "apparently similar" responses together, and this results in a failure to explain variations (e.g. between *don't want* and *no* in Choi, 1988; or more subtly between *no:::*, *NO!* and *no no*). A subjective classification may also overlook some forms of responses which do not appear at prima facie to the researchers as a noncompliance but may be recognized as such by participants. Therefore, it is believed with an endogenous method like conversation analysis which goes deep into the interactions and relies on participants orientations to their actions can help the above issues, and discover more about how various resources are deployed in the design of responses.

Second, turning to interactional studies, the bulk of existing studies on requesting for actions or directing children's actions involve older children (youngest being three in Kent's studies, 2011) who show a good command of linguistic skills to craft their actions, as reviewed in 1.5. They can account for their inability or unwillingness to comply (Kent, 2012b), negotiate their rights and obligations (Aronsson & Cekaite, 2011) and inject affect in their talk (Goodwin et al, 2012), and even attend two parallel courses of actions verbally (Goodwin, 2006). There are very limited CA studies of requests for action that involve younger children. An exceptional study is Kidwell's (2013) which will be discussed later. Two-year-old is a critical age for language development, as suggested by Bloom's (1993) book titled *Language Development from Two to Three* and the tremendous amount of studies (see for example summaries in Tomasello, 2003). The present study aims to contribute to this age gap and to leave some dots on the developmental path in terms of response practices. Young children at this age are admittedly difficult to comprehend and interpret, "we tend to anthromorphize (read into) their acts" (Carpendale & Lewis, 2006, p. 6; Edwards, 1997), and therefore the participants' own orientations as used in CA may help alleviate this issue.

Lastly, what is also missing in the rich existing work on request/directive sequences is a sequential analysis of children's responses. On the request side, sequential analysis flourishes and has proven fruitful: from (Sacks, 1992 [1971]) early example that highlights sequential versions of requests, to Wootton's (1997) work on a young child's request forms as informed by her understanding, until the latest work on imperative-directives and modal requests (e.g. Craven & Potter, 2010; Kent & Kendrick, 2016 and Sorjonen, Raevaara, & Couper-Kuhlen, 2016) are all attempts to untangle the intricacy of the various request actions and formulations through a look at their sequential positions, their implicativeness and participants' intersubjective understanding of such. This path has advanced our understanding on requests beyond classifications. For instance, subsequent requests (or continuous requests, Bolden, 2016) after an initial request is

fulfilled are deemed as low-cost (Rossi, 2012, 2015b), i.e. with less expectation of contingencies and a presumption of willingness from the recipient (Wootton 1997:62), and thus requestors may use a more entitled imperative form . This shows requestors' understanding of affordances in the unfolding interactions. However, similar sequential analysis on the response side is lacking. Most studies focus on themes like accountability, emotion, multimodality, etc. as mentioned in 1.5.2. We do not know yet whether a two year old shows any understanding of the sequential implicativeness brought by their responding actions.. Hence, the current study attempts to contribute to this gap. Next, we will review just what kind of understanding we may expect to find from such sequential analytical work.

1.6.3. Sequential Analysis for Social Understanding

Prior work of sequential analysis on very young children in interactions have proven revealing in not only understanding the emergence of languages among very young children, but also their learning process about the social world and their developing cognition. Notably is the work by Anthony Wootton on his daughter's request activities, which the present work attempts to model on.

Wootton's Studies

The book *Interaction and the development of mind* by Wootton (1997) and a few other papers by the same author are based principally on video-recordings of his family's interactions with their daughter Amy from 12 months to four years of age. As Wootton attempts to understand how cultural awareness about social norms become incorporated in a child's conduct, it soon comes to his attention that the various kinds of the child's initiating actions - requests, displays her rather distinctive understandings of the ongoing courses of actions. He observes the specific designs of the requesting devices as they are acquired at each phase of development, and the sequential position at which they are deployed. The observations show '(...) the systematic bases which the child uses when selecting one way, rather than

another, of enacting a request.' (P.53). The young child's request forms are not used idiosyncratically. I will exemplify three cases here:

The first case concerns a kind of the child's early imperatives from around age two (Wootton, 1997, Chapter 3). When Amy orders her father to remove her from the highchair, she says **Lift out Dad**. This occurs after her earlier affirmation that she is done with eating and wants to get down, but the parents' granting action gets held up as they shift to giving her medicine. The more entitled imperative formulation, in comparison to other existing forms at the time **I like X** and **I want X**, represents an 'unproblematicness of her expectation' (p.67). The second case relates to a kind of the child's distress behaviour due to a breach of an earlier agreement (Wootton, 1997, Chapter 4; also 2012). During a pretence play, Amy has instructed her mother to sit on a particular chair to play shopkeeper, but later she discovers that her father (the presumed shopper) is sitting down on that chair instead and that her mother has sat on a wrong chair. These cause Amy a sudden distraught as she shouts out a series of repeated loud and stretched **NO** in a tearful tone, stamping around the room, pulls her mother and asks her to **GE::T U::P** and **GO: AWA::::Y**. These emotionally laden actions attribute a deficiency on the parents' part - their violation of a previously established accountable basis resulting in her high level of frustration from the irrevocable event. This distraught differs qualitatively from other kinds of distress such as when a request to play before bedtime has not been granted (Wootton, 1981, 2012). The third illustration concerns the emerging use of **Shall we do x?**, which (in comparison with **Can we do x?**) is used to propose some further action that is likely to be granted warranted by an early agreement in doing the activity (Wootton, 1997, Chapter 6). For example, after the father eventually agrees to play just one game with some toy animals before bedtime, Amy proceeds and asks **Shall we make a farm**.

The child's selection of a request form and her solutions to handle contingencies at talk attend closely to her understandings derived from the shared activity in the prior and /or ongoing sequences - some kind of social knowledge. These understandings guide the child's expectations of others'

and self actions, and are used to convey to her interlocutor if an earlier agreement is still owed (as in the use of an imperative), has been breached (in some distressed cases) or reached (**Shall we do X?**). These understandings are locally (i.e. within local sequences) and publicly displayed, and embody a moral quality.

Kidwell's Studies

Similarly, Kidwell's numerous studies prove how a sequential analysis can reveal young children's understandings. Her participants are very young children (mostly between one to two and a half years of age) and their caregivers in daycare centers in the United States. These young children are demonstrated to be already in possession of a capacity to understand intentions of the others, which "is fundamentally an interactional process" (Kidwell & Zimmerman, 2007, p. 592). Young children can track the others' actions including their attention organizing behaviour (Kidwell, 2011; Kidwell & Zimmerman, 2006), and a recognition of the formal structure of activity context (Lerner, Zimmerman, & Kidwell, 2014), in order to inject their own actions or adjust them to handle interactional contingencies.

One of Kidwell's recent studies (Kidwell, 2013), which is the closest study to the current, looks at pre-sequences of summoning young children (aged only one to two and half) prior to rectifying their transgressive action with explicit directives (e.g. "BRIAN?" or "BRIAN!"). It can be observed that in some occasions a child recipient displays a recognition of the projected corrective action underlying the summons and self-rectifies the action instantly before the caregiver issues a directive. In other occasions, a child may turn to the summoner but then quickly resumes the misbehaviour (e.g. taking a ball from another child) before the caregiver intervenes physically, or a child may withhold responding to the summons altogether and escapes from the scene blocking possible further (reprimand) actions.

This shows these very young children have already an ability to make

sense of their on-going conduct in relation to the nature of the caregiver's summons, and an ability to project what might be coming, and this understanding facilitates them to deliver a responsive action that pre-empts, avoids or ignores the adults' next action. This ability may be identified as 'early reasoning' in developmental psychology. In infamous "broccoli vs. goldfish biscuits" experiment, 18-month-old children are shown to have started developing an early belief system that they would comply to requests by offering the food (broccoli) that the requestor has shown desire for earlier, even though that may be different from their own preference or desire (goldfish biscuits). While psychology studies relate these understandings to a broader mental development, CA adds insight by highlighting the multimodal, temporal details and sequential significance, to show their social understanding as revealed through sequences of talk in interactions.

Modelling Wootton's way of sequential analysis from a young child's requests onto the present work, keeping in mind findings from Kidwell, we may expect to see that the young child in the present study also displays such nuanced understandings in his responding actions.

1.6.4. Research Aims

Synthesizing all the aforementioned considerations, the first aim of the current thesis is to examine in detail how a two-year-old child handles a variety of requests for actions from his caregivers in naturally occurring interactions. Special attention is paid to the resources available to the child in his action formation, which include linguistic, multimodal and contextual, and the sequential positions of their employment. It endeavours to report on all the meaningful nuances from cases of less than full compliance, resistance-implicative responses, all the way to noncompliance. Through a meticulous description of such caregiver-child interactions, the study's second aim is to explore how the young child's actions are designed as informed by his social understanding of his co-participants in the on-going talk.

It should be noted that by using an inductive approach like conversation analysis, the study started out in a similar way as Wootton's in that it is primarily an investigation of how conversational sequences work and not an exploration of a child's mind, but in the due process, 'certain kinds of mental mechanism are required of her [the child] to participate in the interaction in the ways in which she does' (Wootton, 1997, p. 12). It is hoped that such an interaction account of a young child's understanding will contribute to the still small but growing body of interactional work on the development of mind.

1.7. Data and Method

Now I will introduce the participating family and detail the procedures from data collection to transcription and analysis.

1.7.1. Recruitment and Ethics

At the initial stage, I collected some home videos of my child as a pilot study, with verbal consent from the participants. The impulse to film my own family lies on an initial observation of a language mixing practice found on my own trilingual child and two other multilingual children: all three young children seem to use the English 'no' to their non-English native parents. As the research topic shapes up, an application for the IRB's (Institutional Review Board) ethic approval is submitted and obtained. I tried to recruit similar trilingual families through flyers and online postings but had no luck. Thus, I carried on recording with my own supportive family. The data from my own multilingual and multicultural family seemed to be promising.

Usage of recordings was explained to the participants and consent forms were signed (see Appendix). All the recordings have been stored in a password protected laptop and backed up in two secured hard-drives. I have kept participants informed about any public presentations of the videos.

Ethical concerns were considered. Child subjects are vulnerable in research as their competence and agency in giving a valid consent is questioned (Skånfors, 2009), their participation is determined by parents. As such, I tried to ensure recordings were not done against Leslie's will, and I obtained a post-recording consent from him later at 4;6 (see a child-friendly consent form in Appendix). This ethical practice was shared by Prof. Carly Butler, who also suggested that continuous consent on data usage could be sought when the child participants become bigger. This respects their rights to withdraw from research (Farrell, 2005, 2016) and alleviates ethical concerns. Free will of other participants was also respected and verbal consent was always obtained prior to each recording. As the father expressed dislike in being filmed at mealtimes, his recordings were limited to mainly playtime. Throughout the process, the child has never verbally refused or covertly conveyed dislike in being filmed (Skånfors, 2009). The camera was always turned on and placed in a visible position, i.e. no hidden camera.

1.7.2. Participants

The participating family consists of a cross-cultural couple, their only child and a full-time domestic helper who stays with the family in Singapore. The child in focus, pseudonym Leslie, was a boy, aged 1;11 to 3;6 during the data collection. He was born locally and can be categorized as a simultaneous trilingual (Hoffmann, 2001), i.e. exposed to English, Italian and Mandarin consistently since birth. Since multilingualism is not the focus of the study, cross-linguistic influence will only be mentioned where relevant. The family largely adopts a 'One Parent One Language' (OPOL) policy. Leslie is primarily taken care of during the day by the domestic helper. He started attending an English-speaking nursery at age 1;7 in the mornings during weekdays before moving to a four-hour bilingual Mandarin-English kindergarten at age 2;7. Leslie started producing intelligible words around 1;10 (one-word stage) and was entering two-word stage at the onset of data collection (2;0).

Leslie's father comes from Italy and speaks standard Italian to the child.

Leslie's mother who was born in Shanghai and brought up in Hong Kong, speaks a southern Mandarin to the child. Between the parents, a home-grown Asian English is used with mixing from their native languages. The domestic helper nicknamed Ely is from the northern Philippines and knows Ilocano, Tagalog and a little Cantonese but communicates with the family in basic English. A few recordings involving Leslie's grandparents are also collected but are not presented here.

Investigation of Researcher's Own Family

Using researcher's own family is not uncommon and it offers an array of benefits, such as facilitation of long-term data collection, obtainment of encounters that may otherwise be hard to come by, and insights from intimate interactions. Many researchers get first hand observations from their own children, from psychologists like Piaget's to linguists like Halliday, (1975), from early diary based studies (e.g. Wode, 1977) to today's video based studies (e.g. Filipi, 2009; Wootton, 1997). Because of the easy access to participants, longitudinal study becomes more feasible. This saves the hassle required in establishing rapport with participants for data collection (as seen in other studies, e.g. Budwig, 1991; Lanza, 1997). Among bilingual and multilingual population, because of the difficulty in finding families with matching language pairs, proficiency and age, examination of researchers' own children is specially popular: bilingual studies examples include Deuchar, 1999; Vihman, 1985 and Yip & Matthews, 2007, and trilingual studies are exemplified by Cruz-Ferreira, 2006; Hoffmann, 1985; Stavans, 1990; Wang, 2008. The use of single cases enable analysts to maximize analytic depth and details (Sterponi & Fasulo, 2010). By focusing on just one family, I am able to dive in and examine differences in the management of contingencies afforded by various contexts and individuals (see Conclusion).

Intimacy with participants also makes the data collection less intruding for the participants. This easiness on the participants part may yield more natural materials and fruitful findings. For example, Yip & Matthews (2007) discover a syntactic transfer of relative clauses from

English to Cantonese among their bilingual children only from their personal observations noted on diaries, but not on video-recorded play sessions with research assistants. They conclude that it may have to do with the vast shared experience that parents have with their children that enables them to use such more complex attributional clauses. The smooth integration of recording into participants daily life also enables researchers to capture some truly emotional episodes, such as a child's distress (Wootton, 1997). My study has also benefited from this in capturing some emotionally charged episodes (e.g. Extract 5.2 and Extract 5.8).

Other upsides include getting help on verifying unclear utterances. Children's proto-words are notoriously difficult to comprehend and sometimes are only intelligible to their caregivers. Having extra help on the child's language and languages that are unfamiliar to me (Ilocano, Venetian and Italian) enhances accuracy on transcription and analysis.

1.7.3. Data Collection and Management

Data collection was planned to be least restrictive to preserve naturalness and to enable long-term data collection.

Frequency of recording was controlled loosely. Each of the three main caregivers (father, mother and helper) was recorded with the child once (for about 20 minutes) every two week. This accumulated to about two hours of recording per month. The frequency was set in consideration of the exponential linguistic development of children during two years old (Bloom, 1993). Most recordings were dyadic consisting of a caregiver and the child, and there were a few recordings of multi-party interactions as well.

Recordings were self-administered. Participants were reminded to make a recording every fortnight but they had the freedom to decide when and where they would like to conduct the recording. They were instructed to carry on whatever they were doing as usual during the recording. The data therefore covers a large range of contexts from routine activities (mealtime,

diaper-changing, bath time, etc.) to playtime. The venue was mostly home in Singapore with a few recordings done in Italy and Hong Kong.

To facilitate the self-recording, participants were free to use any recording equipment at their convenience and liking, including iPhones, iPads, laptops (Macbook Air) and mostly a portable camcorder (Zoom Q3 HD, Figure 1.7). This camcorder was selected primarily because of its portability, non-intrusive size, self-standing and cordless features, which are suitable for filming an active child and allow participants to move around freely. Its user-friendliness is also suitable for the non-tech savvy helper (see picture below and more details on <http://www.zoom.co.jp/products/q3hd>). However, a major drawback is its battery-operated nature which has caused some recordings cut short and also its narrow lens has at times not been able to capture participants who have gone far from the camera. This poses certain challenge as “participation framework and interactional space” as well as “multimodal details” which are key dimensions that need to be preserved for analysis (Mondada, 2006). Compromise on the quality is made to sustain a prolonged period of data collection. Analysis has thus carefully taken these points into consideration by selecting episodes in their entirety and bearing in mind of possible embodied enactment out of the camera.

Figure 1.7 Zoom Q3 HD camcorder

During the 18 months of data collection, a total of 205 video files with a duration of 52 hours 51 minutes (plus 19 hours of extra recordings) are collected. I transcribed about 10 hours of data only as the selected data has

provided already enough instances to support the claims that I am making in the following chapters.

For data management, I use Microsoft Excel to document the recording's details (see Figure 1.8), assigning each file a name (formatted as “a serial number – age – main language used”), and noting its time of recording, duration, venue, participants, key activity, topic, languages involved, remarks (e.g. the child was not well), etc. The information is helpful for managing a large set of recordings and transcription work.

Figure 1.8 Documentation of recording details

	A	C	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	N
1	Period	File	Time	Duration	Venue	Activity / Topic	Participants	Language	Deemed	Remarks
9	2;0	6-2;0.7-EN	11:22 AM	14:11	Home L's Room	Lego	ELY, MUM	EN, CN	EN	Battery went out, first 10 minutes can't see L; 1 yes
11	2;0	9-2;0.8-MIX	11:26 AM	02:43	Home living	lunch, TV	ELY, MUM	CN, EN	MIX	one instance 'no', Ely & Mum trying to make L to the table but L focuses much on TV. L tired bad
12	2;0	11-2;0.8-EN	6:42 PM	00:18	Home dining	eating, TV	ELY	EN, IL	EN	mood crying. Ely eliciting 'Yes' (follows by #12), battery finished
13	2;0	12-2;0.8-MIX	6:47 PM	29:28	Home dining	eating, tripod, supermarket	ELY, MUM	CN, EN	MIX	L broke the mini tripod, Ely feeding him; Some rejections
14	2;0	13-2;09-IT	9:31 AM	03:47	Home L's Room	Lego	DAD	IT, EN	IT	little spoken
15	2;0	14-2;09-IT	9:45 AM	01:01	Home L's Room	balloon light, flower and moon	DAD	IT, EN, CN	IT	Followed #13. Nico teaching how to say this and that, L replied in CN, EN
17	2;0	15-2;0.9-EN	6:00 PM	18:00	Home dining	eating	ELY, MUM	EN, CN, IT	EN	little spoken. D present in small room. L ran to him in the last 20 seconds
21	2;0	22-2;0.24-IT	7:00 PM	11:40	Hong Kong Hotel	skype, playing bottles, doors	DAD, MUM, NNO	IT, EN, CN	IT	Skype with nonno, a few prohibitive from D, then battery died
25	2;0	21-2;0.26-CN	6:45 PM	16:00	Hong Kong Hotel	eating	DAD, MUM, POP	CN, CT, EN, IT, SH	CN	"I wan don wan". D on trip to HK; M went along for home visit. Last two days L had fever and didn't speak much, and had terrible time taking medicine
26	2;1	26-2;1.5-EN	8:00 AM	00:48	Home L's Room	clean face	ELY	EN	EN	followed by #27
27	2;1	27-2;1.5-EN	8:01 AM	19:55	Home L's Room	drink milk, book	ELY, MUM, DAD	EN, IL, CN, IT	EN	pacifier on for the first 15min, then 1 min not on camera, little spoken
37	2;1	37-2;1.21-IT	8:46 AM	23:17	Italy Nonni garden	hanging clothes, tricycle	MUM, NNA, NNO	IT, CN, EN	IT	Just arrived Italy 24 hours ago. A bit jet lag and tired; but L adopts the new environment and language well
39	2;1	39-2;1.24-CN	2:04 PM	25:10	Italy Nonni living	iPhone games, skype w baba	MUM, DAD	CN, EN, IT	CN	First 13 min in CN only, 无/no no no / no need, but otherwise not much talking L playing iphone then eating chips. then mix with some Italian and English as they started facetime with dad
42	2;2	42-2;2.8-CN	9:00 AM	21:21	Italy Nonni garden	tape ring, sand, mosquito spray	DAD, MUM, NNA	CN, IT, EN	CN	Sound quality not too well because it's windy outside. Good instances of code-switching, language awareness/awareness and distress
48	2;2	48-2;2.27-IT	11:04 AM	24:20	Home L's Room	draw	DAD	IT	IT	Italian 'no' to disconfirm @13:30 and to confirm just repeats what the keyword that father says

Naturalness of video data

Despite caution taken to preserve naturalness, participants did orient to the camera as an object in their interactional environment once in a while, but these naturally occurring acts “need not necessarily make the activity any ‘unnatural’” (Kent 2011:41). They might peek at the camera, for example, to check if it was still on or to ensure that it was facing the child). The child at times showed interest in grabbing the camcorder. There was a case in which the mother used the recording activity as a resource to persuade the child to take off his pacifier. There are also dubious cases in which the presence of a camera might have influenced the participants' behaviour. For example, the

helper said in a few occasions 'what are you doing?' specially after she turned on the camcorder. This might be a way to get the child to speak up or she felt compelled to speak because of the recording activity. Also, the father in a few occasions seemed to ask the child to repeat a word excessively. This kind of behaviour is something that was kept in mind during the analysis. As Kent suggests, "how and when participants choose to orient to the camera may be integral to the analysis" (2011:40), which opens up a new avenue for research on video practices and to understand better how and how much 'naturalness' is affected.

Supplementary materials

At data collection commenced, I also began taking various forms of notes about Leslie's early development, especially linguistic behaviour for references. First, it is some 'Developmental Notes', which are inspired by De Houwer's (2009a) narratives of bilingual children's development. These notes consist of recollections of daily life and observations from short home video clips and daily life narrating family language planning, major linguistic changes in the child's environment, developmental remarks (e.g. joint attention behaviour). This narrative ends at 2;7. Second, there is a list of 'First Words' containing 96 recognizable words (in all three languages) produced by Leslie noted down between age 1;11.17 and 2;1.14. Lastly, there is a 'Diary' in Excel format that was used to keep all kinds of observations till the end of data collection period. Entries were made instantly by the researcher using the "Notes" application on iPhone and iPad and were compiled to Excel regularly. They contain brief episodic examples of compliance and noncompliance (Figure 1.9 below) as well as linguistic remarks . A total of 352 entries are taken with 80% occurred before age 3;0.

Figure 1.9 Diary entries of brief episodic examples

B	C	D	E	F
Age	Y/N	Strategy	Interlocutor	Long Description
1;11.26	Y	Action	MUM	MUM:看电视好吗? LESLIE:(ran out from bedroom to living room, and climb up the sofa)
1;11.27	N	Switch	MUM	MUM:来, 说大头大头, 唱歌。LESLIE: No
1;11.28	Y?	Pause, Copying	MUM	MUM:哦, (upon opening a box) 这是什么啊? 这是饼干。要不要吃饼干啊? (short pause) LESLIE:饼干 (taking a biscuit out)
2;0.1	Y?	Copying	DAD	Dad asked LESLIE to go upstairs with him. DAD: andiamo su. LESLIE:su (then LESLIE followed Dad went upstairs)
2;0.1	Y	quieter, 好	MUM	LESLIE: hiding hiding heavy (pointing behind sofa). MUM:你要什么? 你要躲在沙发后面啊? (pause, LESLIE looking at mum) LESLIE:° ha° (some sec) MUM: 你要躲在后面吗? LESLIE: 好
2;0.1	N	Body, Switch+quieter+No, Distraction	MUM	MUM: 你要不要吃饭啊? (LESLIE looked down and shook head) LESLIE: ° no° =(looked and smiled)=HAI (to distract mum)
2;0.3	N	Switch	MUM	after drawing LESLIE pushed the notebook and pens to my side (on table) LESLIE: no 笔 no 笔

Without a doubt, recollections of interactions or linguistic productions are not accurate due to the lack of rich contextual, temporal and multimodal details. The number of entries is also heavily biased towards what was heard by the researcher, with some reported instances by other caregivers, and biased towards the research interest, and contain mainly noticeable productions that deviate from adult language. They are by no means comprehensive record. However, they have in the course of transcription and analysis served as useful references. For example, when looking up the emergence of certain linguistic elements (e.g. address terms like *mama*, *baba*, or constructions “no want”), examples were sought in these notes to support the observation (see Chapter 3 and 4). These notes that capture the child’s fast-growing communicative development might also inspire future research.

1.7.4. Transcription and Analysis

Although CA transcription is very meticulous, it cannot replace the original rich video datas. In fact, some conversation analysts of young children simply watch the videos with scrupulous attention to detail and take notes instead of transcribing (as Mardi Kidwell shared at the 14th ICCA, June 2014). Transcription is, however, helpful for researchers to discover phenomena along the way (Hepburn & Bolden, 2013; Sidnell, 2011), to assemble a collection as well as to present points in case to readers.

Selecting Data for transcription

Ten hours of data was selected for transcription but there were no stringent selection criteria. During the exploration stage, I randomly looked up episodes in which there seemed to be some directing or non-compliance behaviour (based on what I learnt from Kent's thesis, 2011). I tried to get a feel of the overall dynamics between participants in the various languages and settings. Videos that are transcribed tended to have relevant sequences, better in quality, more engagements, longer in duration. The presented materials represents only some possible displays of resistance and are by no means exhaustive. The target was to transcribe some 20 minutes in each language for each month during the first six months (age 2;0-2;5). Data during 2;6-3;0 was chosen more randomly but an overall balance between languages was maintained. (see Figure 1.10 below).

Figure 1.10 Recordings transcribed and used for the present study

Age	Chinese	English	Italian	Mixed	Per Month
1;11 (Test)	0:02:05				0:02:05
2;0	0:16:00	0:32:29	0:16:28	0:32:11	1:37:08
2;1	0:25:10	0:20:43	0:23:17		1:09:10
2;2	0:21:21	0:30:47	0:24:20		1:16:28
2;3			0:25:28	0:40:18	1:05:46
2;4	0:23:42	0:04:12	0:23:56	0:19:33	1:11:23
2;5	0:24:52	0:26:12	0:16:52		1:07:56
2;6			0:19:46		0:19:46
2;8	0:48:23	0:25:17	0:20:52		1:34:32
2;11		0:41:45			0:41:45
3;0			0:14:51		0:14:51
Total per language	2:41:33	3:01:25	3:05:50	1:32:02	10:20:50

Transcription process

The first stage was a verbatim transcription of selected recordings: typing out the intelligible words, sound objects (e.g. *uhm*, *oh*, *tck* etc.), grossly

marking silences, prosodic features and embodied actions (e.g. Leslie pushes food away). Along the way, arrows for turns of interest are placed for later inspection and some comments are added on the side. Care has been taken when transcribing the helper's Filipino English and Italian, who are not my native; but luckily their child-directed speech was simple enough for me to transcribe. When in doubts, I always consult the participants. I have also hired an Italian-student to help speed up the transcription, but it turned out that it was more difficult for non family members to comprehend the family lingual, especially when they are not familiar with the child's usual vocabulary and code-mixed languages.

The second stage was a fine-grained transcription (using CA conventions). This is only done on certain episodes identified as potentially relevant sequences for detailed examination. Audacity is used to measure pauses. For episodes which are analyzed in details, a finer transcription is performed and sometimes Praat is also used to measure syllable length, pitch and intonation, breathing, etc. Timing of overlap and embodiment are also made more precisely with the slow motion and loop replay functions from VLC media player. Inqscribe software is used to add subtitles for presenting my data at conferences and at data sessions, at NTU, for feedback.

It is worth noting that I used Microsoft Excel to transcribe, different from other conversation analysts. I found it particularly suitable for multilingual data (see Figure 1.11). It is a more familiar and user-friendly tool than other specialized transcription programmes (e.g. ELAN, CLAN or Transana). It allows integration of multiple transcription files, facilitating key word search across files. The filter function provides a quick glance of all the turns from a particular speaker. The biggest advantage for multilingual data is the possibility of inserting and hiding extra glossing and translation lines. Also, I coloured different file tabs for easy access and comparison of data in the same language. One may also freely add or move columns for extra remarks like line numbers, arrows for key turns and comments.

Figure 1.11 Using Excel for transcription of multilingual data

Transcription conventions

The transcription is largely done in consideration for readability and is unavoidably biased towards research interest (Ochs, 1979) and in showing evidences in the argument. The conventions used for this study are documented in the Glossary in Appendix. They follow the conventions in CA as developed by Jefferson, 2004 and enriched by Hepburn & Bolden (2013) especially for transcribing emotionally laden elements e.g. whimper, sob, etc. In addition, I have also referenced GAT 2 ('Gesprächsanalytisches Transkriptionssystem 2' (Couper-Kuhlen & Barth-Weingarten, 2011) to enhance precision on prosodic features and voice quality, where necessary. Multimodal remarks are described with '((())' next to its accompanying turns or in a separate line with the overlap sign '[' when marking for its precise commencement time is consequential, following Kent's (2011) practice.

Non-English data is presented in two-lines only (original language and translation) for simplicity and because most of the child-directed speech and the child's turns are fairly short. The translation is done carefully though

to preserve the original turn's syntax while keeping a balance to render its stance in English. Chinese characters are employed instead of the Romanised phonetic system (Pinyin) for the benefits of Chinese readers, and standard Italian orthographic diacritics is also retained (unless accentuation is produced differently). A four-line presentation (incl. Pinyin and word-by-word morphosyntactic gloss) is only used when a granular linguistic analysis becomes necessary. When transcribing young children's proto-language, some researchers (e.g. Filipi, 2009; Tarplee, 1993) make use of IPA phonetic symbols. This is considered not necessary in the current study, as phonetics is not the focus, therefore only minimal orthographic adjustment is adapted.

Making a collection during analysis

Since what is of interest here - the child's noncompliance (or noncompliance implicative) actions - are second actions, I began by identifying the first actions 'requests-for-actions'. Early collection is a handful set of randomly picked examples that involves some prototypical directive actions (referencing Kent's work, 2011). Since requests for actions can appear in many 'faces' or developed out from many actions (as discussed in 1.3), and such phenomena can appear in any settings, I had to look for instances from the whole data set with varied contexts (ten Have, 2007, p. 71) and collect generously, "that is, including in it occurrences which *prima facie* appear different from the target instances – the initiating observation(s)" (emphasis in the original, Schegloff 1997:502).

As I gained a better understanding of the relevant sequences from literature, I move back and forth between examination of single cases and making the collection (Sidnell, 2013, p. 77)(Sidnell, 2013:77). I reviewed each transcribed recording scrupulously, trimming down the relevant episodes in their entirety and tagging some characteristics such as the use of 'no', 'no X', 'nonresponse', 'vocalization', 'redirecting attention', 'repetitional response', '好不好' (lit. good-not-good?, 'okay?'), etc. This was done by the tagging function in Macintosh in which free texts or colour tags can be applied and functioned only as a shorthand to keep track of practices and

features found in the growing collection of examples and to facilitate later search and comparison (see Figures below).

Figure 1.12 Macintosh tagging function

Figure 1.13 Arrangement of files by tags for easy search

The loosely-labelled tags were subject to change, as the analysis went deeper (for example, when I realized that there were various practices of nonresponse as detailed in Chapter 2, grosser actions like 'disengagement' and more specific practices like 'withdraw' were added to differentiate the examples). Analysis was then done by examining (and comparing) those

features and practices, case by case, with their unique multimodal design, sequential environment, activity context (Lerner et al., 2014), interlocutor's treatment and sequential implicativeness. This tagging system is thus only a tool for managing the collection and is by no means similar to coding systems commonly used in child language studies, which apply a small set of more strict pre-defined categories (e.g. Beaupoil-Hourdel et al., 2015; Tardif & Wan, 2001) for statistical analysis and in which case sequential import is usually not considered. For a more detailed account on identifying practices and building a collection (see Hutchby & Wooffitt, 1998; Sidnell, 2013).

1.8. Thesis Organization

The remaining of the thesis presents my findings based on the cline of response options (Figure 1.6), from the more compliance-oriented actions to more noncompliance-oriented responses. In Chapter 2, I shall present some less than full compliance cases and spell out where and how resistance-implicative elements may present. Then I will expand the description of these elements from the most minimal resistance-implicative action, namely non-response in Chapter 3, to some overt non-aligned verbal turns in Chapter 4, all the way to bald noncompliance and defiance in Chapter 5. Finally, I will conclude with a discussion on contributions, implications and directions for future studies in Chapter 6.

2. Less Than Full Compliance

Chapter 1 has laid out some possible ways in which a child may convey their lack of willingness to comply with a request for action. These take various forms, from subtle signs of reluctance to an outright defiance. In this chapter, I will start with cases of 'less than full compliance', which have some subtle elements resulting in them to be perceived as a lesser qualified compliance or deference in interactions. In particular, I will highlight the sequential positions *where* these non-cooperative or resistance-implicative elements may appear and *how* they appear with agency or emotion. This can be seen as an expansion on Kent's findings on compliance and incipient compliance (Kent, 2011, Chapters 6 & 7, 2012a).

2.1. Full Compliance and Sequential Placement of Resistance-Implicative Elements

As mentioned in the Introduction (Section 1.5), one relevant next action to a request for actions is the undertaking of the requested action, which is also the preferred action in interactions (Kent, 2011). A full compliance is 'swift and embodied', without any delay and without any need of a verbal comment, as Kent (2011) has noted. Any deviation from that norm may represent reluctance or some troubles in complying, if there is no other contingency in the environment; and even though compliance may be obtained, this may be considered as a 'less than full compliance'.

Kent explains that a swift and embodied compliance is expected at the transition relevance place (TRP), which is a transition space when the request for action becomes recognizable or is delivered. Of course a request for action may be constructed in more than one turn constructional unit (TCU), for example, by adding a reason to account for the request ((Baranova & Dingemanse, 2016; Robinson & Kevoe-Feldmann, 2016; also see Extract 3.7); or with tags like 'okay?' ("I give you water melon okay?" in

Extract 4.3) or 'you know?' ('your milk is still not finished you know?' in Extract 4.2). In which case, the recipient may deliver their response after the first or second (or subsequent) unit or as soon as they recognize the action. See an illustration below (Figure 2.1):

Figure 2.1 Transition-relevance places (TRPs) (Clayman, 2013b, p. 151)

Extracting from Kent's findings and adding my own observations, I am proposing four sequential positions in which resistance-implicative elements may be present. The first is the TRP (or also response-relevant place in this case) is one place in which qualification of a compliance may be challenged, when a response is not delivered in time or 'swift' enough, as this may be treated as problematic. As to how 'swift' the child may need to respond before his inaction is regarded as a non-response or delay, this will depend on the requestor's subsequent action (see Chapter 3). The second crucial sequential position is the delivery of a response itself, because apart from a less 'swift' response, a more than 'embodied' compliance can be seen as a sign of resistance or that the child is doing more than just complying. The third place is often the issuance of a request itself which may implicate the presence of some contingencies to or absence of the requested action as a failure on the recipient part (the moral implicature is more evident in the case of imperative directives (Kent & Kendrick, 2016). A last sequential position at which the child may exhibit reluctance is post-response. Below Figure 2.2 summarizes these various possible places for the various kinds of non-cooperation, reluctance, resistance or noncompliance-implicative elements in a temporal order.

Figure 2.2 Sequential positions of resistance-implicative elements

1. Caregiver: Request for Action (casting prior or existing child's conduct as problematic or non-cooperative)
2. Response-relevant place (or transition-relevance place)
3. Child: Delivery of the requested action (compliance)
4. Child: Post-response action

2.2. Passive Compliance

Often the occasioning of a request for action is prompted by the child's own action, which may be deemed as inappropriate, non-cooperative or problematic. The child's embodied and verbal conduct can be "seized on retrospectively by the directive speaker and treated as grounds for a directive" (Kent, 2011, p. 85). This has some moral implication that the requestor deems the child as having done something improperly. There can also be a less morally laden request which simply indicate that the speaker believes that it is not obvious the hearer (the child) would perform the desired action without being directed - a preparation condition for the issuance of a request as suggested by Searle (1969). Many cases presented in this thesis will demonstrate this point and below is the first one.

During a mutual activity such as feeding, a young child may at times be immersed in another activity (e.g. watching TV) and disattends the expected eating actions, therefore prompting the issuance of a verbal request for action. This may in retrospect, casts the child as being inattentive or even non-cooperative. The following case that happens at mealtime illustrates this:

Extract 2.1 12-2:08-EN Big Mouth

1	((Ely delivers a spoonful of food as L watches TV with a hand in front of his mouth))
2	ELY: big [mou
3	[(L moves hand away from mouth and opens palm slowly, still fixated at TV)]
4	(1.0) ((E's right hand retracts spoon and left hand strokes off L's blocking hand))
5	((E puts the spoon inside L's mouth))

This episode takes place towards the end of feeding time. The child appears to be immersed in watching TV at the moment. When the helper Ely delivers the spoonful, she finds herself dealing with an inattentive co-participant whose gaze (and thus attention) is not with her. The way she manages the trouble with progressivity of the joint project (Rossi, 2012) is by using an alternative sensory means - speaking. She utters **big mou** 'big mouth' at line 2. The fact that the helper has to bring the eating business to the surface talk shows the presence of some barrier - that the child has not been playing his part - in the on-going joint activity, and some measure needs to be taken to remove this contingency. The contingency includes also Leslie's hand hanging on his lips blocking the feeding channel (Figure 2.3).

Figure 2.3 Leslie's hand on lips blocks the feeding (Line 1)

Instead of calling for the child's attention for example by name, Ely's turn highlights the needed element 'big mouth' for the feeding activity. The turn takes form of a minimal noun phrase without a predicate - a naming practice that "specifies less of the target action than a clausal form like the imperative" (Rossi, 2012:54), which assumes the child's readily accessible attention, as well as display "the action requested as projectable to some degree" but some element of it (here, a big mouth) is not present. The noun phrase thus relies on the child's knowledge to figure out what to do. Such a minimal form highlights the obligation on the child's part in performing the due diligence. In comparison with a more contingent interrogative formulation that asks if the child can or will open his mouth wider (Note though being a non native speaker the helper might not be able to use modal requests the same way as native English speakers as stated in the literature), the minimal noun phrase here claims more entitlement (Craven & Potter, 2010) to demand the child's to fulfilment of the expected obligation, i.e. the provision of a big mouth, under the established shared activity (Rossi, 2012). The fairly entitled request here also shows little concern of the visibly present contingencies (e.g. the child's attention with TV).

A verbal request here under the presence of non-attentiveness works at two levels, first in procuring the semi-available attention of the child (through direct request instead of summons) and in getting the cooperation. Joint attention is a pre-requisite for interaction and thus critical for the ultimate compliance (Kidwell, 2013). Securing attention facilitates the main request business here - the feeding. Kidwell describes that often caregivers summon the child by name to secure their attention and align each other's gaze before delivering a directive action. She describes the practice as a kind of "containment measure": "it attempts to remedy actual/potential troubles at the first sequential opportunity before it emerge in the interactional proper space, the directive space", and that this practice may paint a benign picture that the child has "caught up in their own affairs" instead of non-complying. The fact that the helper has not summoned him by name displays that the helper orients to the child as a ready co-participant. Also by her lexico-syntactic

choice of “big mouth” instead of “open your mouth” (which she uses later in the recording), it shows at that moment her orientation to his mouth as not being open wide enough for feeding as an issue, and not whether he will open or not.

Upon the verbal request, the child seems to have removed his hand slowly but is still gazing at the TV and has not provided a big enough mouth. He has therefore displayed some understanding of the ultimate desired action (being fed), oriented to it somewhat but at the response relevant place not provided the actual requested action. Ely has then to stroke off the child’s blocking hand and she does it in a way that will allow her to grab his arm if necessary, thus pre-empting further contingencies (See below Figure 2.4).

Figure 2.4 Ely strokes off Leslie's blocking hand (Line 4)

This very brief example demonstrates that even though the feeding gets done, the child’s lack of proactive cooperativeness presents challenge to the activity, first his disattention gives rise to a verbal request, then in the delivery of an insufficient embodied response. In the end, he has not

complied by proffering a big mouth but has been made to comply by letting the helper remove his hand and accepting the feeding, and hence a 'passive compliance'. The presence of an alternative activity has provided the child a safe haven in not having his inattentiveness or lack of cooperation being treated as an outright noncompliance.

2.3. Incipient Compliance

Next, I will elaborate on incipient compliance (Kent, 2012a; Schegloff, 1989), which is briefly presented in 1.5.1. Centring on the premise that a full compliance is swift and embodied (Kent, 2011, 2012b, 2012a), signs of a non full compliance can then be traced in the timing and manner of the response delivery. Incipient compliance makes a good example. It refers to a set of features in the response design that may be used in combination to display an orientation to compliance but not necessarily a full compliance itself, or the delivery may be more marked than required.

Kent (2011, p. 171) presents the following key features of an incipient compliance:

- Embodied compliance and verbal resistance both occurring as responses to the same directive
- Exaggerated embodied actions with a sense of a performance about them
- Embodied actions that project compliance and move towards it without actually offering it

What an incipient compliance accomplishes is to buy time and space, to delay compliance. It may frame a compliant response as a self-motivated action and at times challenge the basis of issuing the directive. The purpose is for the directive-recipient to reclaim the agency for their action (Kent, 2011, 187), rather than responding exactly as told or asked.

Below is an illustration of incipient compliance from my own data. The

following occurs in the same recording as the previous two examples but towards the end of dinner. After the child has rejected food and watermelon a number of times, the helper announces to Mum that the child ('he' in line 1) is full.

Extract 2.2 12-2:08-MIX What about Watermelon

1	ELY:	[okay (0.3) he's fu:ll
2	LES:	°mami ma [mami ma°
3	ELY:	[can't eat (that one)
4	MUM:	nh (.) 西瓜le nh (.) (what about) watermelon?
5		(0.5) ((L turns around to M))
6	MUM:	吃西瓜 好 [不好 Eat watermelon al[right?
7		[((L turns front to watermelon))
		((skips 7 lines: L eats a bit of watermelon, glances at E))
8		(1.7) ((L puts down tripod; glances at M then plate))
9	ELY:	°put it here°
10	LES:	(°°瓜°°) ((pinches a little watermelon)) (°°melon°°)
11		(0.8)
12	ELY:	°°hm°°
13		(.)
14	ELY:	[°°put (it) he'°°
15		[(((L eats a nibble of watermelon, glances at E))
16		(1.7) ((L looks at M))
17	MUM:	好吃吗 Is it delicious?

Mum reacts to the helper's announcement (line 3) that the child cannot eat "that one" (presumably some pizza in the container) by first making a realisation sound "nh" and following by a noticing about the untouched watermelon (line 4). Note that her noticing in Chinese is designed to address to the child and not the helper to whom she speaks in English. A noticing invites a recipient to account for a noticeable item or event, and by mentioning it, it invites the recipient to account for its failure (Kent, 2011, Chapter 4) and make the recipient to proceed in doing something about it and therefore it is a directive implicative (Kent, 2011, Chapter 3). Positioning after Ely's announcement that the feeding is done, here the mentioning of the watermelon challenges the closing of the mealtime activity. Mum shows her deontic authority over the helper through neglecting her account that the

child is full and her right to decide when and how the feeding should be deemed as ended. This also calls the child for an explanation in particular as to why the watermelon is still visibly there. Therefore, it can implicate an accusation for his fault.

Upon Mum's mentioning of watermelon, the child abandons his existing activity of playing with the tripod, turns around to her (line 5) showing acknowledgement of her talk and his readiness as a recipient. This mutual gaze allows their engagement to proceed. From the previous open question "*how* about the watermelon?", Mum now suggests specifically to the child to "*eat* the watermelon". The turn ending with a 好不好 "alright" or "okay" tag question structurally limits the response to two polar choices, with agreement being the preferred answer, given that it is a pursuit. Kent argues that a modal request makes relevant acceptance before compliance (at least notionally) (2011, p. 122). Here what seems to be expected by Mum and understood by the child is an embodied action rather than a verbal okay-token "好/hao", which the child has produced elsewhere at this age.

From line 7 onwards, the child launches a series of actions in response, which can be qualified as an instance of incipient compliance. These can be broken down into the following parts:

- 1) preparatory steps projecting compliance,
- 2) a soft verbal utterance,
- 3) the actual compliance action, a minimal nibble, and
- 4) a post-compliance engagement

First, as soon as Mum mentions "eat watermelon" (i.e. before she finishes her turn as shown in the overlap in line 7), he turns back to the front, where the watermelon is. He leaves the tripod he has been holding and has a quick glance at Mum (line 8), showing a little uncertainty as to what to do, but it also allows him to see whether Mum is waiting or monitoring his

actions. Then, in line 10, he picks up a nibble from one of the cubes on the plate. These actions of ending his prior activity and preparing him to eat shows to the directive-speaker an orientation to compliance, and helps temporarily avoid a directive upgrade.

Second, while looking at the watermelon and scratching a nibble off, he utters something very softly, which might be English *der* 'there' or Chinese *gua* 'melon'. The lack of gaze and low volume makes the mumble appear as a self-talk, and not a turn addressed to anyone. This little verbal element enhances the child's agency in the undertaking of the nibbling action.

Then, in line 15, he finally puts the nibble of watermelon in his mouth, while glancing at Ely, who happens to be speaking to the child. Her utterances are more like a correction telling the child where the tripod legs should have been placed, as she rectifies and moves them over to the table. Her action is not responded to by anyone.

After Leslie put the nibble in his mouth, he turns around to Mum. While still visibly chewing the nibble, he gazes at Mum (Figure 2.5) until he receives her acknowledgement. However, this acknowledgement does not come in a form of 'okay' or 'good'. Instead, she asks the child if the watermelon is delicious. This presupposes her knowing of the child's consumption of some watermelon, and the design also orients to a preferred response of positive assessment from the child. An affirmation of this question could lead to an encouragement of eating more.

Figure 2.5 Leslie turns to Mum after a nibble of watermelon

While the compliance here is done in a fairly swift and embodied manner, it is a little more elaborate than necessary, and instead of picking up a cube, he picks a nibble, complying in the most minimal fashion possible. His display of eating helps solicit Mum's acknowledgement of the completion of the required task and this may help close the course of action. However, Mum's questioning regarding the watermelon's taste has not left the eating business far. We may say that the topic has been steered a little from 'eating' watermelon to 'commenting' about it.

Kent (2011) explains that what has partly given rise to an incipient compliance is the complex nature of the required task, such as 'eat nicely' or 'finish your soup', or here 'eat watermelon'. These are not tasks that one can accomplish within the space of one turn, and the quantity to be consumed is often not clearly specified. Therefore, when a child displays an orientation towards compliance, even when they do not completely finish the requested action, the parents may accept that orientation and move forward. However, different from Kent's cases, the mother here has actually not only left the child or the task. She is on the contrary pursuing the watermelon business further by soliciting a positive assessment from the child. Such food evaluation sequences seem to be common in making children to consume (or consume more) a particular food item at mealtime (cf. Wiggins, 2014). What this may mean is she may deem the just prior nibbling as insufficient or she may in any case be moving towards a pursuit of further eating.

Here we see a case of incipient compliance, in much a similar way, the compliant action is done ostensively and minimally. The resistance part comes not only from the delivery but also from the child's gaze engagement with the mother after the nibbling. This could prompt an acknowledgement from the mother and lead to a sequence closing, but this does not happen. Instead, there seems to be a tug of war between the participants on closing the course of action. What constitutes a compliance involves then collaborated actions and may involve negotiations between participants. Whether a child has complied or complied enough relies much on the

caregiver's affirmation or endorsement (Kent, 2011).

This case of incipient compliance has demonstrated that even though the child is constrained in delivering a pair typed second action, there is room in the way of delivery and sequence-closing (post-response) that he may exert agentive control: complying to a degree that he chooses and seeking recognition of such a compliance to close off the sequence.

2.4. Framing a compliance as an independently motivated action

As it reveals so far, the concept of agency is quite important in the design of a less than full compliance or resistance-implicative response. With some simple requested actions, not only incipient steps are taken to orient to compliance, but the entire compliance may be made as a self-motivated action especially through some verbal element during the supposingly embodied delivery of compliance. In Extract 1.3, I cited an example by Kent (2012a) in which a mother asks "Now would you please finish your soup?" and the daughter responds by taking her time "(0.8) Soup (0.9) I am thirsty" while pulling up her sleeve. The verbal elements frames the scene as if the child noticed the soup by herself and claimed desire of it, and therefore her consumption of it is framed as a self-motivated action rather than a responsive action. This resembles the concept 'action framing', which is one of the two operations in which a recipient may assert agency (Clayman, 2013a). Below is an example in which the child complies (line 16) with the request to surrender his pacifier but delivers it in his own peculiar way.

Extract 2.3 27-2;1.5-EN Pacifier

```

1  ELY:      ye::s ;remove your pacifier ah, (.) (t')tita:
2            ((E left the room for 21 seconds; when E re-
3            enters the room, L looks up at her))
4  LES:      ((mumbles))
5  ELY:      m:h?
6  LES:      ((mumbles))
7            (0.5)
8  LES:      ((mum[bles]))
9  ELY:      [your pacifie;R:
10           (0.6)
11           gimme your pacifier.
12           ((L points at the pacifier))
13           (1.2)
14           (le') tita ;o:h
15           (0.4) ((E squats down in front of L picking up
16           a book))
17           ((can/clean[ ready])...
18           ((pacifier drops from L's mouth))
19           [YA:,
20           ;YA:: It [[so dirty- dir[ty,
21           [[[E picks up the pacifier))
22           [Les
23           (1.0)
24           [ya:: ]=
25           [((gesticulate pull-out and lean forward))
26           ((dirt- 'so-)]
27           yea::[:h
28           [mout
29           (2.4) ((L keeps looking up at E))

```

The participants are initially sitting on the floor engaged in a picture book labelling activity. The helper confirms the child's prior labelling but tells him to remove his pacifier (line 1), probably because it hinders him from articulating the words clearly. But as she said this, she is also getting up and leaving the room to do or to get something which she has not finished explaining (she trails off with *tita*, 'auntie' in Tagalog, her self-address term for the boy). When she re-enters the room, the boy seems to be saying something to her (as he is also looking at her) but she cannot comprehend it not even after a repair *mh?* (line 3-7). Thus it results in her reminder to remove the pacifier (line 8). Even though there is no verb 'remove' this time, her labelling of "your pacifier" in this position where there is a breakdown of intersubjective understanding due to his mumbling puts the pacifier as a

problem object and the problem object is highlighted through the hyper-articulation (sound stretch, high-pitch, exaggerating curl-up of the final retroflex). As the child shows no immediate compliance, she adds on another more forceful and specific directive “gimme your pacifier.”. This imperatively formulated directive makes an embodied action as a relevant next action and leaves no scope for non-compliance (Kent, 2011).

Following that, the child immediately points at or taps on the pacifier, showing an orientation to compliance, though not the compliance itself. During all this time, the helper seems to be moving around in the room doing something, thus some pauses in line 6,9,12. When there is no forthcoming surrender of the pacifier, instead of upgrading and demanding the pacifier, she provides what seemingly to be a justification: it’s already time to let **tita** (auntie) clean the pacifier (line 13 and 15). She also squats down facing closely to the child in an attempt to pick up the picture book or perhaps resume the labelling (line 14). The close distance means that a force-compliance may happen, as she may physically remove the pacifier herself if she wants to.

At this critical moment, Leslie delivers the requested object but with his own design. He drops the pacifier and he utters at the same time “YA:”. The open-vowel *ya* sound may have facilitated the mouth-opening and the dropping, or it may be an impersonating voice added to the ‘bungee-jumping’ pacifier, or it may be a sound effect for the dropping. In any case, what needs to be noted is, this is not what is specified by the directive.

The helper, instead of saying “thank you” or acknowledging the receipt of a compliant action, reciprocates the sound made by the child. That is she joins the child in the enactment of the pacifier spectacular. But she quickly adds on the assessment “It is so dirty” as she picks up the pacifier. The negative assessment steers the course of interaction back to supporting the reason for her initial request of it.

Paying no attention to this comment, the child replays the whole

enactment in a cheerful manner like narrating the just happened event (cf. Filipi, 2017 on emergency of storytelling): first he utters his name “Leslie” - the agent of the event (line 20), then he replays the sound *ya::* (line 22) and simultaneously performing a pull-out gesture with body leaned slightly forward and added the source location “mouth” (line 26). While Ely repeats her ‘dirty’ assessment (line 24), as soon as she hears his enactment, she quickly responds with a celebratory *yeab* token (line 25) that aligns with the child’s affective stance. The child has thus neglected her comment and made her align with his version of an interesting pacifier-dropping event, instead of her version of handing in a dirty pacifier.

What this suggests is that the child may have certain reluctance in complying and instead of actually complying, he takes control in the delivery of a supposedly compliant action by surrendering the requested object in his own way. First, the child decides the timing when he delivers the requested object. He does not pull out the pacifier right after any of the three explicit directives (line 1,8 and 10). The delayed response to three directives reflects certain reluctance in complying. Second, he makes the requested object available to the requestor instead of complying literally to the instructions as they are designed, to ‘remove’ the pacifier by hand or to ‘give’ or hand it to the helper. This is done through the creation of a small performance. Third, the sequence is closed with his re-enactment of the event and her acknowledgement of it as such. The whole delivery of the compliance is packaged in such a way that the child is putting up a show rather than complying to a directive. The provision of the pacifier becomes a by-product of that show. This way the child frames the required second pair part as an independently motivated action, and not one that is induced nor constrained by the first pair part. In doing so, he reclaims agency in a supposedly responsive action.

2.5. Reluctant Stance

So far we have seen a few quasi-compliance cases in which resistance is

implicated through doing it minimally or doing it on his own pace and in his own way, and after conducting the requested action, he seeks an acknowledgement of his compliant action as a sufficient completion (Extract 2.2) or to frame his action in retrospect as a self-motivated action rather a responsive action. Next we will look at another compliance case, in which the child ends it with a stance displaying that his compliance is nevertheless against his will.

In Extract 2.4, the helper and the child (2;0.7) are playing in the room. The child wants to get out to find Mum but is desisted by the helper who attempts to keep him in the room and directs him to get a book (line 1), which he ignores and chooses to approach the camera (line 2).

Extract 2.4 6-2;0.7-EN Don't touch

1	ELY:	that gone the: [books
2	LES:	[((L turns to camera))
3		(0.5)
4	ELY:	no DON touch!
5		(.)
6	ELY:	[no no no no no no, no,
7	LES:	[((steps back and turns around))
8		(0.8)
9	ELY:	mami said NO! mami get angry
10	--> LES:	erhehehh
11	ELY:	yea(h)r {okay come!
12		{((signals L to come))

Over a minute ago, as Mum is setting up the camcorder, the child has already shown much desire to touch the camcorder and Mum has prohibited and warned him not to touch that. We may well say that the child has already shown disobedience from Mum's early warning in that he approaches the camera. This invokes the helper's prohibition in line 4 preventing him from doing it. So again, here the presence of a directive already implies a problematic or non-cooperative conduct as deemed by the speaker.

The helper's prohibition "no DON touch!" shows a reaction calibrated to the child's ongoing embodied movement. She changes from a rather

normal-volume 'no' rapidly to a much louder "DON'T", and shows a gesture that reaches out to him (Figure 2.5a), but this anxious-toned phrase rapidly comes down with a soft but firm ending "touch" as the child has probably suspended his movement or drawn back. This sort of self-repair reveals there are at least two forms of prohibition that the helper's rudimentary English has: "no" and "Don't X". With the latter form showing heightened entitlement for urgent situations. Both forms can be considered as imperative prohibitions which make an embodied compliance as a relevant next action and the child does comply embodiedly here. Unfortunately his upper body is out of camera, but in line 6 after the first 'no' the child's elbow is lowering down and the helper's hand is also coming down from a flat reaching position (Figure 2.6b).

The series of 'no' in line 6 is then issued *after* the compliance of the prohibited action (touching the camera). It works to draw the child further away from the camera or prevents him from re-approaching. Shooting these many 'no's that last two seconds is perhaps a way to create a solid spatial boundary for the prohibited item - the camera. In a sense, it uses a temporary boundary to build a physical boundary. It emphasizes the seriousness of the prohibition - that he cannot touch AND must stay away from the camera. Towards the end of the prohibition, the child's hand is lowered and is moving backwards a little (Figure 2.6c). At the end, he turns back facing the helper. So the child has complied with the command.

Figure 2.6 Leslie's compliance by retreating his hand (line 4-6)

The rising tone and the slightly slow-down-pace in the last two 'no's gives rise to a sense of warning for any further attempt. As the child turns around facing her, she adds on a justification (line 9) by means of reported speech "Mami said NO!" and impersonates the mother's tone in saying a firm "NO!". Takada (2013) finds cases of Japanese caregivers in changing their footing (Goffman, 1981) through modifying their original directive (which does not receive an acceptance) to a pursuit with a reported speech involving a third party. It is described as a less intense way to get young children to do things and one that shows empathy or *omoiyari* (a core Japanese value) when the control attempt is positioned as a by-stander's reporting.

The helper also adds on the consequence of a non-compliance which is "Mami get angry". The ingenious lack of tense marking, which may be a feature of her non-native English, helps actually to allow it to be heard as both a reminder of the past - the negotiation with Mum to have the earlier in the interaction (which would be congruent to the prior TCU of "mami said NO!") as well as a warning of what would happen if the child does not comply. Interestingly, what would transpire this consequence of making Mum angry is left bare - there is no conditional clause such as "if you touch it". With the indexical talk and action in interaction, it does not seem to hinder the little one's understanding as we see next. By providing a noxious upshot (that Mum will get angry, positioning it as a unwanted consequence, as commonly understood), she seems to be threatening the child of what will happen if he carries on, i.e. she wants to influence the child's immediate conduct. However, by using a third person, she shifts that agency of the unwanted product to Mum, hence framing the threat as a warning from a by-stander. This makes an interesting addition to Hepburn & Potter's (2011) distinction between threat and warning. But this way, Ely also lets go of her own deontic right to direct the child's behaviour and transfers it to Mum, positioning the mother as the authority that governs her instructions as well as the child's conducts.

Upon the provision of the upshot, the child wraps up his part in the

sequence with a grunt “erhehehh” (line 10). This can be heard as an emotional display of dissatisfaction or resentment towards the *eventual* forbidden action. His movement, as also understood by Ely’s prohibition (line 4), shows his desire to touch the camcorder, but now this desire is being held back not just temporarily. After the helper’s warning, the consequence of his action is generalised. The whimper at this position expresses his unhappiness also of the suspension against any future exploration of the camcorder. So there is no way he can insist or resist. The only thing he can do to counter this absolute suppression of will is to give his emotion an airing. It is however not an emotional protest that demands any outcome (there is no pursuit of change). It is simply a display that shows he acknowledges the involuntary and hopeless situation. Notice the helper’s subsequent ‘yeah’ aligns with the child’s vocalization as a correct understanding of her prior warning. It acknowledges his emotional display and works to close the sequence together with her subsequent move to summon the child back to play (line 11-12).

Here we see that although the child complies bodily through refraining from touching the camcorder and backing off, he is able to express this compliance as against his will through giving a voice to his emotion. Adults also display similar dissatisfactory stance in a wide range of situations through such affect-laden sound objects (Reber, 2012). They just have a wider range such response cries like “ah”, “tck”, click or sighing which are used in a very systematic way. For the 24-month old here, this simple vocalization is a good example showcasing young children’s ability to express their agency and own will.

2.6. Summary

In this chapter, we have seen a few apparent compliance cases which in fact have some frictions. The child in these cases is seen by co-participants at the onset of the sequence as either in a status that needs to be rectified or is being uncooperative, and after the issuance of a request, he may still be seen as insufficiently or unwillingly complied. I have exemplified where and how

these indications appear (with agency and emotion) through:

(I) The issuance of a request for action itself: The child may be continuing with an existing course of action that is different from the one that co-participant wants him to do, e.g. keep watching TV in Extract 2.1. A request may also spring out from an earlier absence of compliance as in Extract 2.2 when Mum notices the uneaten watermelon or Extract 2.3 when Ely reminds the child of the pacifier. In the more morally laden cases, a request (usually prohibitions) points directly to an on-going transgression as in Extract 2.4. The lack of proactive cooperative actions from the child's part, under a joint project, may propel his co-participant to make certain embodied actions (e.g. feeding) more forceful or intrude at a verbal level with a directive action. This way, the issuance of a request for action or request/directive implicative action in itself raise attention to some problematic conduct that is derailed from the expected cooperation under the joint project. Or in other time it may still indicate the conflict of interest between the parties.

(II) Inaction during the immediate space after a request for action: The child may carry on doing an existing alternative activity beyond after the request is issued (Extract 2.1). The 'possible' resistance (cf. Schegloff, 2006) is now indicated by the lack of a swift response or action at the response relevant place. What this lack of responsive action accomplishes is to delay complying in a kind of legitimate manner. This may be achieved by not showing any mutual gaze and the child may be seen as "caught up in their own affairs" (cf. Kidwell, 2013) as in Extract 2.1, or he may maintain mutual attention and be seen as not delayed in compliance or not fully understood (Extract 2.2). More discussion on non-response in the next chapter.

(III) The delivery of a compliant action: Even if the child chooses to comply, he may take his own time to comply (Extract 2.2 and Extract 2.3) and complies to a minimal degree or complies in his own way, such as putting up a show. This "complying on my own term" allows the child to exert agency in a second position where agency is restricted.

(IV) The post response / sequence-closing space: During the closing of a directive sequence, a child may take certain actions that lead the recipient to recognise their minimal compliance as sufficient (Extract 2.2) or not as a compliance at all (Extract 2.3). This grants him agentive control or autonomy in the required course of action. The child has also resources available to him to express his emotion and that the compliant action that he has just done is in fact against his will through vocalisations (Extract 2.4). Sequence closing is the last space in which he can make a relevant claim of his unwillingness.

Some of these points are raised or elaborated by Kent (2011, 2012a, 2012b), especially the properties of full compliance and resistance through incipient compliance, but this chapter has expanded on them and it has made explicit the sequential placement of the various resistance elements. It has also added the cases of passive compliance (which may be common with little children) and reluctance stance. Although Kent has given a few examples that include no immediate response, non aligning response and bald noncompliance, my study zooms in each one of these practices in the subsequent chapters 3, 4, 5 respectively, therefore I am making the spectrum of response options (Figure 1.6) fuller and more clear. I am also applying all the previous findings on a young child, in a wider context not limiting to mealtime.

This chapter has attested that compliance is an interactional achievement. While there may be signs of resistance or lack of compliance after a request, a compliance can be made happen or pursued. When performing such compliance, of particular interest is how agentive control may be reclaimed through ‘action selection’ and ‘action framing’ (Clayman, 2013a) and emotional stance is displayed (M. H. Goodwin et al., 2012) by the two year old.

3. Resistance-implicative responses I: Non-response

In this and the next chapter, I am moving farther from the compliance end on the response cline to investigate some resistance-implicative responses. The first kind presented in this chapter is some silent moments that occur after an adult caregiver has initiated some action which attempts to get the child to do something or possibly projects such an attempt (like the use of a directive implicative, Kent, 2011). As the name suggests, non-responses are moments in talk where a response to a first action is due but not delivered. The child may be selected or prompted as the responder to produce a second pair part, under the adjacency pair concept (Sacks et al., 1974; Schegloff, 1968, 2007). However, the child does not provide any immediate verbal uptake nor a pair-typed embodied action in response to what may be implicated in the first action, and his non-response or inaction creates a recognisable pause in the ongoing interaction. The pause is marked by the first speaker's pursuit or continuation of talk in the third position, as illustrated below:

- 1st position: Caregiver initiates an attempt to get the child to do something or an action that may project that attempt
- 2nd position: Child's non-response
- 3rd position: Caregiver's pursuit or continuation of talk related to the action in the 1st position

Here are two examples containing a non-response turn marked by arrows:

Extract 3.1 42-2;2.8-CN Pour Back

Mum and Leslie are filling sand in a bucket in the garden.

1	MUM:	是不是很满了我们倒回去好不好.
		<i>Is it very full we pour back alright?</i>

2 ->		(0.9)
3	MUM:	哈倒出来了好不好.=
		<i>huh pour out alright?</i>

Extract 3.2 2-2;0.8-MIX More Pizza

After refusing to eat a last spoonful of rice, Ely changed to offer pizza.

17	ELY:	[you wan more pi]zza?
18	LES:	[(°ma ma ma ma°)]
19 ->		(1.8)
20	ELY:	more pizza?
21 ->		(1.3)
22	ELY:	yes?
23 ->		(6.9) ((E cuts the pizza smaller))

(Note that in Extract 3.2 what Leslie softly mumbles in a singsong tone in line 18 is produced at the same time as Ely's question so it is not a response to that.)

Silence may become interpretable as a possible something (Schegloff, 2006) e.g. a possible disagreement, possible refusal, etc., only under the structure of an adjacency pair. CA work has so far shown systematicity in the way how participants orient to non-response in the second pair part as problematic. First, recipients usually deliver a relevant second fairly swiftly upon a first action. Second, when recipients cannot deliver a relevant second, they may display difficulty or account for their inability in doing so. Lastly, if they delays in initiating their talk post the completion of the first action or shows no sign in taking up a responsive turn, then the first speaker may pursue an account or repair/reformulate post the gap. All these actions display participants' awareness of the norm of adjacency pair and the turn-taking mechanism. The latter two even show participants' sensitivity towards a discrepancy between their actions and a gap may therefore be seen as disagreement implicative (Pomerantz, 1984) or non-compliance implicative in our cases here.

The present chapter seeks to answer a key question on non-response

is: are all the child's non-responses the same? If not, what makes them difference and what do those differences mean to his understanding? Other questions we may think about as we go through the examples are:

1. Does a young child have the same sensitivity or can he express such sensitivity towards affiliative discrepancies?
2. How do caregivers orient to a young child's non-responses?
3. What may a young child's non-responses accomplish in talk? What do these outcomes inform him?

3.1. Unproblematic Silence

Silence is ubiquitous in interaction, especially with young children. Silence as presented by pauses in a response slot is not necessarily a non-response. Non-response is generally referred to as a lack of verbal uptake in *talk-in-interaction* (e.g. Stivers & Rossano, 2012). However, with directive sequences, often it is not a verbal response, but an embodied action that the first speaker is after. Hence, as long as the recipient is delivering the requested action, those silent moments will not be deemed as problematic, as shown from the below example from Kent (2011: 84):

Extract 3.3 Kent (2011:p.84)

1	Dad	Uummm; (.)What di:d °th' tea°cher say?
2	Lucy	[[((picks at food on her plate with her fingers))
3		[[(0.7)
4	Lucy	Mm[m
5	Daisy	[↑Bi:LLy::]
6	Mum →	[°C'n you° use] your kni:fe and [for-]
7	Lucy	[Mo:v]e up!
8		(0.4)
9	Mum →	C'n you- [[(0.6)
10	Mum	[[((turns to look at Lucy))
11	Mum →	Use your kni:fe and fork Lucy plea::se
12	Lucy	[[(moves hand over to her fork))
13		[[(0.5)

In line 6, Mum issues a modal request “Can you use your knife and fork?” and pursues in line 9 and 11, the child complies in line 12 non-verbally during the 0.5 second pause. Both participants thus orient to Mum’s turns as a request for action, and not for an answer such as “Yes I can”. In fact, if Lucy had actually treated them as a question without taking the required action, it would probably infuriate Mum further (see conversational breaching, Hester, 2016). Therefore, after the embodied compliance, there is no more pursuit from Mum.

The modal request “Can you use your knife and fork?” is formulated as a question, and questions make answers relevant as next actions (Schegloff, 2007), or at least notionally, as Kent (2011) points out. However, we must not confuse ‘question’ in a grammatical sense with the action ‘questioning’. What this and other examples from Kent’s studies show is that often whether a directive action is designed with an interrogative (e.g. Can you do X?) or imperative (Do X!), ultimately the parents are expecting their children to execute the requested task and not just respond verbally. Therefore, in many request for action sequences, participants may not orient to the lack of a verbal uptake or silent moments as problematic, provided that there is some embodied sign of orientation to compliance, such as the first example we saw in the last chapter:

Extract 3.4 12-2:08-EN Big Mouth(Extract 2.1)

1			((As Ely is delivering a spoonful of food, L is watching TV with a hand in front of his mouth))
2	ELY:	->	big [mou'
3			[((L moves hand away from mouth and opens palm slowly, still fixated at TV))
4			(~1.0)((E's right hand retracts spoon and left hand strokes off L's blocking hand))
5			((E puts the spoon inside L's mouth

Leslie has been fixated in watching TV before the helper calls out “big mouth” and has remained so afterwards. It is mentioned in the last chapter that the helper treats the child as a ready recipient from the fact that she is not summoning him but calling for a cooperative action. Although Leslie does

not comply literally by providing a big mouth nor engaging visually or verbally, he removes his hand promptly (though slowly) from his mouth right after the helper has initiated speaking. This movement makes the mouth accessible and facilitates the feeding, and hence it may be taken as a warrant for possible cooperation. Although the hand is now in-between him and the helper, i.e. possibly blocking the feeding passage, the helper simply strokes the hand off, instead of asking the child to do it. That is, the helper displays an unproblematic stance in physically making the feeding happen.

Making one's mouth accessible for feeding is arguably in line with the request of making one's mouth big enough for feeding. It is not literally complying but is orienting to the same end goal, and it is certainly the opposite of defying. So even though there is a silent moment after the request for action, this is not a case of a total non-response. The lack of full compliance can be attributed to the divided attention between the two activities that the child is undertaking - eating and watching television. This often happens to participants in interaction, especially young children. The helper here is not holding the child accountable for his lack of full attention or response. We have therefore a case of orientation to compliance without verbal response and this is treated as unproblematic, as evidenced by the lack of a verbal pursuit.

3.2. Non-response in verbal tasks

One situation in which an absence of a verbal response is problematic is in requests for verbal action, but that is not delivered, such as the two examples in the beginning of this chapter. We may ask: why are there requests for actions designed to secure a verbal response at all when what is wanted from the child is an embodied compliant action (as explained earlier)?

3.2.1. Not repeating as requested

One type of circumstances when a verbal response is expected is that the requested task is actually a verbal task such as Extract 3.5 when Ely asks Leslie to apologise and say *sorry mummy*, and Extract 3.6 when the father engages Leslie in an object labelling task and asks him to repeat *luce* “light”. In both cases, the child’s lack of verbal uptake in certain moments have resulted in the caregiver’s repeating the request. In Extract 3.5, Ely breaks down not only the requested words “sorry mummy” down in two parts but also facilitating it by uttering the first half of each word in a raising intonation to mobilize reciprocity (Stivers & Rossano, 2010) and pausing for the child’s filling in the second syllable of the word. The child completes the part for “sorry” in line 4-5, but does not do so for the word “mummy” in line 7-9. He has somewhat disengaged by shifting gaze to the broken tripod in hand (in line 6) and does not look up at the helper until she finishes completing the second word for him (line 10). With his lack of involvement in the second word completion, the helper animates a higher voice in delivering the whole apology in line 11. This making the compliant action happen on the child’s behalf may be deemed as a force compliance. In Extract 3.6, the father’s first attempt to request the child to say *luce* (line 4) is overlapped with his playful touch of the child’s mouth and the child’s repeating of the word (line 5). He repeats the label *luce* in the clear (in line 6). Without the verb *dici* ‘say’, it is not certain, if he means to solicit a repetition. Although by labelling again he seems to invite the child to follow him to say that. There is no response from the child. He therefore makes the task explicit again indicating to ‘say’ the label *dici luce* “say light”, when there is still no response, he repeats with the single label with pointing at the lighting in the ceiling, which coincides with the child’s response and the sequence ends with Dad’s appraisal, which is a common third position action in object labelling sequences (Tarplee, 1993).

Extract 3.5 12-2:08-EN Say Sorry Mummy

1	MUM:		妈咪生气. (.) 不要跟我说话 <i>Mummy is angry. (.) Don't talk to me</i>
2	ELY:		°say° sorry mami
3		->	(pause) ((L turns from looking at E to TV))
4	ELY:		say sor,
5	LES:		ry.

6			(pause)((L turns to E; then look down at broken tripod))
7	ELY:		ma: ,
8		->	(pause)
9	ELY:		mi: .
10			(.) ((L looks up at E briefly))
11	ELY:		[>sorry mami<
12			[((delivers a spoonful to L))

Extract 3.6 14-2;09-IT Say “Light”

1	DAD:		cosa è questo qua? ((pointing at a balloon's light)) huh? <i>What is this here? huh?</i>
2		->	(pause)
3	DAD:		cos'è? <i>What is it?</i>
4	DAD:		luce, di[ci ((touching L's mouth)) <i>light, say</i>
5	LES:		[luce <i>light</i>
6	DAD:		luce <i>light</i>
7			(Pause)
8	DAD:		dici luce <i>say light</i>
9		->	(pause)
10	DAD:		lu[ce ((little finger pointing at the light)) <i>light</i>
11	LES:		[ce luce <i>'ight light</i>
12	DAD:		bravo [luce <i>Well done light</i>

There is much more that can be said about these two cases, but for now, my interest remains on the consequence of a lack of verbal uptake: When the child does not repeat the word(s) that he is asked to (line 3 in Extract 3.5 and line 7 in Extract 3.6), the caregivers simply pursue for a response without holding the child accountable for his lack of or delay. This shows that at this stage caregivers are socialising the young child on conversational rules - the constraint from an adjacency pair, that a responsive action should be given. The pursuit hinders the progressivity but offers the child an opportunity to produce an eventual compliant response, which he does (line 5 in Extract 3.5 and line 11 Extract 3.6) and these late responses turn his 'lack of uptake' into a mere delay in responding. A delay in speaking

up from a two year old appears to be an acceptable behaviour, as there is no indication of any problematic stance from the adults in both cases. Younger children who have just started speaking are given more allowance for pauses, delays and non-responses. This is an advantage that they have over older children and adults, whose non-response or delay in response are likely to be held accountable.

3.2.2. Withholding of a response

The interactional advantage of being less capable in responding and responding fast to the others' talk becomes more pronounced when the child is undertaking a current activity on his own, such as the earlier TV watching case in Extract 2.1 Below shows another situation in which a verbal response is expected before executing the desired task. Here Mum and Leslie are playing grits and sand in grandparents' garden in Italy.

Extract 3.7 42-2;2.8-CN Pour Back (Extended from Extract 3.1)

1	MUM: 是不是很满了我们倒回去好不好. <i>Is it very full we pour back alright?</i>
2	(0.9) ((L keeps moving sand to bucket))
3	MUM: 哈 [倒出来了好不 好.= <i>huh [(let's) pour out alright</i>
4	((M drops trowel and reaches bucket))
5	((L shakes head, slightly pushes M's hand))
6	-> LES: =nom: no=no
7	((L waves and M lets off of bucket))
8	(0.4) ((L turns back to sand))

Mum proposes to pour the sand out of the bucket and back to the soil in line 1, which follows by a 0.9 second of silence. Then she asks again while reaching to the bucket in line 3-4. Leslie swiftly refuses bodily and utters three 'no's.

The child's continuous sand-play in silence during line 2 is turned into a non-response due to the constraint cast by Mum's initiating turn in line 1.

She asks if the bucket is full and if it is okay that they pour the grit back. Her turn takes place while the child is facing down and engaged in transporting some sand to the bucket (see Figure 3.1). That is, she has not done any particular work to first secure interlocutor's gaze and simply assumes that her co-participant as a ready recipient. This makes sense given that they have been talking intermittently while they play sand.

Figure 3.1 Leslie is playing sand during Mum's request (L1)

[a]

[b]

1 MUM: ^[a]是不是很满^[b]了
^[a]*is it very full*^[b] (*already*)

The first part of the Mum's turn is designed as a A-not-A question, which can be glossed as 'is-not-is very full + particle'. Both of these two questions are issued in one breath leaving no transition relevance place (Clayman, 2013b; Sacks et al., 1974; Schegloff, 2007); that is, no time for the child to respond to the first question - whether he agrees that the bucket is indeed full. to the first question. The second part is designed much like a proposal with a statement 'we pour back' plus a tag question '好不好 hao-bu-hao', which can be glossed as 'good-not-good' and translated as 'alright?' or 'okay?'. It is used to solicit an agreement. Retrospectively then, the first interrogative can be heard as an account backing the proposal (cf. Robinson & Kevoe-Feldmann, 2016). This orients to a stronger preference for an agreement. Ending with a tag question that mobilizes uptake (Stivers & Rossano, 2012), the turn makes a verbal response relevant as a next action. In asking the child's agreement, Mum orients to Leslie as a co-participant

who has deontic right to decide their course of action - the inclusive 'we' minimises the directing sense (Craven & Potter, 2010, p. 435). By using this tag-question form, the mother can then be said to provide room for the child's say and show a lower entitlement as well as some orientation to possible contingency (cf. (Craven & Potter, 2010; Curl & Drew, 2008)Curl & Drew, 2008; Craven & Potter, 2010). The low entitlement status may be more evident if we compare Mum's turn with other possible designs such as 吧/ba-final proposal (e.g. *Let's pour it back*) and imperative *Pour it back* - both are more forceful.

Despite Mum's proposal to pour back the sand makes an agreement a relevant next, no verbal response comes through. What Leslie does instead is to continue his on-going work to carry some sand over into the bucket. Balancing the sand in an upside down rake and carrying it to the bucket (Figure 3.1) can be seen as a delicate job for the little one, which arguably provides grounds for not being able to attend to Mum. During the 0.9 second of silence, he takes time to unload the sand into the bucket, with no sign of suspending or rushing off to attend to Mum. This non-response projects a possible disagreement (Pomerantz, 1984; Schegloff, 2006 on possibles).

Even though a candidate non-response can be described to commence from the end of the first action or its transition relevant place (TRP), much CA research has now informed us that *as* a speaker produces his/her turn, the recipient may in the due course already show some signs of alignment or disalignment (our two-year-old participant has also shown to do that in the next section 'Withdrawal'). Here, for example, during Mum's proposal, the child focuses on his current task, and does not pause his task in hand or even look up to the adult who is speaking to him at the moment.

There are reasons to postulate that the child in this case is withholding a response, though pinning this down is difficult if not impossible: From a reception perspective, it is highly likely that the child has registered Mum's talk, given the close proximity between the two and their prior conversation

has ended just ten seconds ago with the same body position. Mum's hand-wagging above the bucket during her proposal (see Figure 3.1 [b]) should be within Leslie's line of vision and should help draw his attention. It is also likely that the child has understood Mum's message for he does not initiate any repair (toddlers may already be able to display lack of understanding through still gaze, Filipi, 2009). If he has registered Mum's talk and chooses not respond (or not to repair any non-understanding), then he is simply displaying no interest in Mum's talk.

From a production perspective, elsewhere the child has demonstrated multi-tasking ability in attending both the manual work of carrying sand and talk simultaneously. For example, in the same video at {6:30} when Mum corrects the child to call the grit that they are playing *soil* “泥土” and not *sand* “沙沙”, the child suspends his transporting task, turns around to look at Mum (standing behind him) and repeats *soil* in Chinese; then later at {6:55}, the child also verbally repeats Mum's correction while transporting some sand over without gazing at Mum (who is now squatting next to him). And the child has shown at an earlier age that he can answer this A-not-A form question with *hao* “好” (good/okay/alright).

If there should not be any issue in hearing, understanding or handling two activities at the same time, then Leslie's lack of response may implicate the prior turn as somewhat problematic to respond to. As mentioned, Mum's question is not a neutral, but has a preferred response through the use of an account (fullness of the bucket), which makes the delivery of a dispreferred turn somewhat difficult. We may ask: why does the child not simply negate if he does not want to endorse the proposal? Verbal negation displays a more definitive understanding and a more definitive disalignment. Non-response however invites the speaker to elaborate or modify the proposal. Mum's reformulation in line 3, changing 'pour back' to 'pour out', displays that she senses some trouble with the pouring action. It is possible that the child deems returning the sand as the end of the play. In addition, the child might

deem negation as not a helpful tool, given Mum's usual insistence from their interaction history (as seen in many of their lengthy negotiations). In fact, this proposal of pouring back the sand has become part of an extensive episode (lasting over 11 minutes) in getting the child to return indoor. Leslie's overt objection in line 5-7 immediately following Mum's re-asking also enhances the possible interpretation of his non-response as a disaffiliation act.

The duration or the end point of this non-response relies entirely on interlocutor's tolerance and interpretation of a silence. The identification of a non-response practice thus lies on the first speaker's framing of it in the first and third position. It is Mum's initiating action that sets a requirement for a response that materialize his on-going activity in silence in a noticeable non-response. And it is Mum's reformulation "huh (gonna) pour out alright?" in line 3 that signals her awareness of a non-response. This also informs the analyst the occurrence of a non-response. In the case that the first influencing move happens at a moment when the child has an on-going action, a non-response can then be described as housed in a sequential structure like this:

1. Background: B has an on-going action / task
2. Action 1: A's first move
3. Action 2: B's continuous action that is now turned into a non-response
4. Action 3: A's next move (e.g. redo, reformulation, seek attention, initiate something else or let the first move lapse)

A non-response that takes the form of his immersion in an alternative activity thus provides an opportunity of being seen as "caught up in his own fair" (Kidwell, 2013) rather than being disaffiliative or defiant. If the child responds after the speaker's pursuit in the third turn, as his negation here in line 6, then this latent action may transform his earlier non-response into a delay in respond, and not a refusal to respond.

A key design feature in this type of non-response is that the child must display the same level of involvement in his on-going action or task prior and

after the caregiver's initial attempt to control or interfere. Any notable change in his embodied action, such as slowing down or hastening may be interpretable as being evasive to engage with the speaker (see Kidwell, 2013). In Extract 3.1, the child maintains the same pace, and the speaker's reformulation in line 3 is not an accusation of the child's evasion, rather, it is a pursuit for a response (with 'huh'), a management of the potential lexical trouble (changing 'pour back' to 'pour out') and a proceeding to execute the proposed action (approaching the bucket).

Leslie's non-response results in Mum's pursuit (line 3-4). There are a number of features in her reformulated turn (see the details in Figure 3.2): 1) Mum does not simply repeat but reformulate, hence treating it not as a problem of hearing. 2) Her revision from 'pour back' to 'pour out', reduces the interpretation of the sense of terminating the sand-play and help promote an acceptance response. 3) Comparing the cajoling effect brought about by the use of “哈” (“huh”), in contrast with other devices like “喂” (“Oi/Hey!”) and summons, the huh-preface does not simply secure attention but calls for a response through inviting the child to repair his prior response or non-response in this case. Thus, the speaker remains seeing the child as a readily attentive but just not responsive' body. 4) A huh other-initiated-repair (OIR) mobilizes reciprocity but Mum latches on to reformulate the proposal without really waiting for the child to respond, thus again treating him as a ready recipient 5) The collective “we” is not no longer used, reflecting an indifference on the executor but essence on executing the action itself. 6) The inchoative aspectual marker “le” is accompanied with Mum's commencement of reaching out to the bucket. This feature in the construction together with leaving no room to respond after "huh" display her strong desire in executing the action to pour the sand back. 7) Her simultaneous corporal control makes it doubtful if the tag question hao bu hao (okay/alright?) in line 3 can be heard as response relevant, or if it is like modal requests in Kent's (2011) data, illustrated above, that mobilizes a compliant action with a display of less entitlement.

Figure 3.2 Mum is reaching out the bucket Line 3

3 MUM: ^[a]哈 倒 出来 ^[b]了 好 不^[c]好
 ha dao chu-lai le hao-bu-hao
 huh pour out PTCL good-not-good
 huh (let's) pour out alright

Mum's physical control is calibrated in a well-timed manner (Figure 3.2): During turn initial position as Mum seeks fuller attention and response with 'huh', she first points with her right hand at the bucket while Leslie is still pouring [a]. Then as Leslie's unloading of sand comes to an end marking the boundary within an activity context (Lerner et al., 2014), he retracts his rake while Mum drops the spade in her left hand and reach out to the bucket [b]. By the end of the turn, both of her hands are touching the bucket's edge and only then Leslie tilts his head back, looks at her hands, promptly shakes head and knuckles her hand off the bucket [c]. Mum's determination to execute the action is evident. She does not wait for a response any more, ignoring possible contingencies brought by the child's non-response, taking acceptance for granted and at the same time diminishes orientation to Leslie's autonomy (a continued analysis with Extract 5.4). Through buying time, a non-response may then expose the level of interlocutor's insistence in executing the desired action.

3.3. Disengagement and Withdrawal

Another kind of non-response that shows a more evasive nature is that of a withdrawal. It differs from the previous kinds in that it usually changes from a mutual engagement (no matter how brief or subtle) established at the onset of a sequence, to the child's sudden and overt

disengagement and follows by a sustained withholding until the sequence is over or he is forced to respond.

Filipi's work (2015, p. 80) shows that very young children's body movement, in particular gaze disengagement, may suggest a withdrawal - a cessation of involvement and projects possible closure of an activity (in accordance with C. Goodwin, 1981).

Earlier we have already come across this kind of non-response in Extract 3.5, reproduced below. After the child completes the label 'sorry' in line 5, during line 6-10, he turns to attend to the tripod in his hand instead of responding to the helper's solicitation of the label "mummy". That is, he disengages from the interaction. Note that his completion of that label may implicate a completion of doing the apology that is requested initially in line 2. This in turn may entail his admission to the mistake of breaking the tripod. A lack of completion then, on the other hand, helps to suspend such an admission of error. In the end, the helper apologizes on his behalf (she does not produce "say sorry mami", but delivers "sorry mami" in a rapid and high pitched manner.

Extract 3.8 12-2:08-EN 12 Say Sorry Mummy (Extract 3.5)

1	MUM:		妈咪生气. (.) 不要跟我说话 "Mummy is angry. (.) Don't talk to me"
2	ELY:		°say° sorry mami
3		->	(pause) ((L turns from looking at E to TV))
4	ELY:		say sor,
5	LES:		ry.
6			(pause) ((L turns to E; then look down at broken tripod))
7	ELY:		ma:,
8		->	(pause)
9	ELY:		mi:.
10			(.) ((L looks up at E briefly))
11	ELY:		[>sorry mami<
12			[((delivers a spoonful to L))

3.3.1. Disengagement: Case 1

Below Extract 3.9 shows an example. The helper and the child are playing lego and have just jointly made a simple lego vehicle. The child **has been trying since line 2** to put a figurine B on that vehicle behind figurine A which is placed earlier in the middle of the vehicle. After the helper asked for confirmation on whether figurine A is a passenger in line 1, now she asks “and where is the driver” in line 4 and pursues in 6 and 8 but receives no response.

Extract 3.9 6-2:07-EN Driver

1	ELY:	this is the passenger?
2		(1.3)
3	LES:	[this?] ((holds up figurine B))
4	ELY:	[an:d,] where is the driver } ((L tries to put
5	-->	(0.4) } figurine B behind
6	ELY:	dri:ver } figurine A on the lego
7	-->	(1.0) } vehicle))
8	ELY:	u:h dri[ver you put here.= ((taps vehicle front))
9	LES:	[I cannok (hang [tis] ((passes fig. B to Ely))
10	ELY:	=[cannot
11		(0.3)
12	LES:	.h asa:i? ((L points at the position where he has just
		tried to put figurine B but E puts it in front))
13		(0.6)
14	LES:	asa[i ((E moves it to L's pointed area))
15	ELY:	[nh this ah (.) m this, (0.3) mhehehemh

As the sequence unfolds, it reveals that what the helper refers to as ‘driver’ is the figurine B that Leslie is trying to place. The helper’s question “and where is the driver?” is then not a request for information. Categories like ‘driver’ and ‘passenger’ are related and may form a collection (see Sacks 1992). So by invoking the whereabouts of ‘driver’, after her labelling of figurine A as ‘passenger’, she calls upon the recipient to attend to the whereabouts of a driver. Note that her use of definite article ‘*the* driver’ presumes that there is already an identifiable driver but his whereabouts is unclear. Questioning where the driver is makes the driver's front seat location relevant in the immediate context and this is visibly in contrast with the rear position at which the child is trying to put the figurine B (Figure 3.3). There is then a conflict between participants on where they want

figurine B to be placed. Notice also that this assignment of driver is a self-decision and not through a solicitation of agreement from the child. Thus, the child is not given a chance, sequentially speaking, to reject the assignment. Now in questioning whereabouts is the driver on one hand prompts the child to see figurine B as the driver and also promote him to put it in the front, and on the other hand it implicates that the child is putting the figurine B in the wrong place. Note that the place that the helper identifies as the front of the vehicle attributes to the facing of figurine A ('the passenger') which is placed earlier in the middle. It is not clear if this is in line with the child's spatial concept at this age.

Figure 3.3 Leslie is trying to put figurine B behind figurine A (L4-7)

The child's remains silent and *continues* to place figurine B behind A during line 4-7, after the helper's question and throughout her pursuit in line 6. His attempt to put that figurine B at the back starts actually in line 2 before the helper's question about the driver. Then as the helper asks about the driver's location, the child utters "this" in overlap while holding up figurine B slightly towards the helper. Locating specifically after a little

attempt of trying to put the figurine himself for 1.3 second in line 2, this gesture together with the verbalization "this" (indexing the figurine B in hand) can be heard as a request for assistance to put the figurine (rather an object-showing or giving action (Kidwell & Zimmerman, 2007). With the helper launches her turn in overlap, i.e. she is not attending to his action. In projection of an unsuccessful recruitment of help (Kendrick & Drew, 2016), the child instantly retracts the figurine and goes on to put it on by himself again (Figure 3.3).

The lack of response to her question results in the helper's partial repeat of 'driver' in line 6. This highlights that the 'driver' as a trouble-source that requires participants' attention. The design of this fairly high-pitched and elongated "dri:ver" makes it hearable possibly as her call out for the driver as well as her urge to get the child to make the figurine in his hand as driver. This ambiguous interpretation offers the trajectory more possible ways of development, which can be helpful in avoiding disputes. Pursuing for a co-participant's action presents insistence, but doing it in this playful way of searching a missing driver makes the pursuit also less imposing.

Upon another non-response, the helper pursues again, this time she specifically topicalizes and refers the figurine B as "driver" and tells the child "you put here " where she taps (line 8), but this instruction is run over by the child's self-initiated turn "I cannot hang this" revealing that he is having trouble in placing the figurine. His speech is also accompanied by a sustained holding of the figurine towards the helper (Figure 3.4 below). That is, he is giving the figurine B to the helper and requesting for her help.

Figure 3.4 Ely taps lego car while Leslie passes over Figurine B (L8-9)

The child's non-responses in Line 5 and 7 are a sign of resistance from the helper's perspective. Her attempts to mobilize the child's action highlight the problematic matter of the driver not in the driver's place and pursue a rectified action. In line 4, she first points out the problematic matter of the whereabouts of the driver; then in line 6, she calls the recipient to attend the problematic item "driver" and finally pointing out what the child should do explicitly in line 8. Her pursuits do not treat the child as very absorbed in the activity or inattentive. They are not summonses for attention and thus presumes the existence of joint attention.

If the child has not yet put on a figurine, the helper's instructive work can be taken as a request for a future action to place the figurine B at the driver's place. But now that the child is putting on a figurine, the highlighting of 'driver' does the job of interfering or rectifying the child's ongoing action. That is, she views his current action as inapt, and against her prescription. Her explicit directive in line 8 exposes their disalignment.

Throughout the child does not respond to any of the helper's talk and only focuses on achieving his own goal of putting the figurine B behind the figurine A. By doing that, he can be publicly seen as neglecting the helper's course of action. However, he does not verbalize any rejection outright. What this withholding accomplishes is to avoid engaging altogether with the interlocutor who is on to a goal different from his. This way, he will not have to confront nor reject the interlocutor. Also, any non-response will require the interlocutor to think of ways to progress by either pursuing, modifying their pursuit or abandoning the course of action altogether. This possibility provides the recipient a chance to triumph in the negotiation.

In fact, not only does the child neglect by not responding, he also initiates a turn in the middle of Ely's turn, i.e. not at a typical transition relevant place (TRP) where participants usually take up or initiate their turns. His request for help in line 9 is designed not to respond to her prior or current turns, but to center on his own difficulty "I cannot hang this" and index the difficulty "this" to their shared visual domain and shared understanding (e.g. what exactly needs to be done, where to put the figurine). By stating his difficulty and passing the object, he displays his entitlement in getting help and does not project any issue with the helper's willingness to help, and also does not leave much room for her non-granting. This request thus works to suspend her on-going action (of getting him to put the figurine B front) and to attend his need.

At the end, when the helper assists the child in placing the figurine B, she tries to put it in the front where she wants, but gets corrected by the child twice (line 12 and 14) to put it "asai" (possibly his proto-word for "this side"), i.e. at the back. The helper goes along with his correction and verbalizes it to make explicit the conflicted position (line 14-15). Her final laugh (which extends further) shows some understanding of the prior interaction as amusing.

Throughout the episode, what we see is each participant is trying to achieve their own goal, without being responsive to the other's. From the

child's perspective, he deems the situation as one that he has deontic rights in going on his own way without responding, and in demanding the helper through presenting his need. He does not deem it as necessary to reject explicitly in any particular way. That is, he treats the helper's talk at this moment as negligible. On the other hand, by allowing the child to ignore her question and pursuits, and attending to him as and when he requests, the helper here honours the child as having a more deontic right in deciding what to do during the playtime, and she treats his interruption as totally legitimate.

3.3.2. Disengagement: Case 2

Below is another example of withdrawal, one that shows the potential accomplishment of a non-response to derail a possible directive sequence into something else. In Extract 3.10, the helper and the child here are sitting on the floor playing and conversing. When the helper points out the child's problematic sitting posture, the child retracts from the interaction.

Extract 3.10 49-2;2.27-EN Don't sit like that

1	LES:	tita
2		(0.3)
3	ELY:	[or:h [you sit like-
4		[((points at L's legs))
5		[((L drops gaze))
6		(0.8) ((E scavenges toys))
7	ELY:	mums- I said don sit like that,
8		(1.7)
9	ELY:	tita make a building.

Leslie is gazing at the helper and calls her *tita* ("auntie" in Tagalog) in line 1. The helper does not respond to that summons. She notices and gets the child to attend to his posture in line 3. (It has been a known issue in the family that the child sits with legs bending outwards like an M-shape, which may have attributed to his in-toeing problem during the first three years. The mother has thus instructed the helper a few times to monitor and rectify

that).

As the helper utters *or:h* (or [ɔ:] a closer representation in IPA) she points at the child's legs (Figure 3.6[a]) and thus draws him to attend to them. The vocalization of a similar *ob*-sound ([əʊ]) may display a realization, i.e. change of state (Heritage 1984). With the pointing, her *or:h* seems to deliver a similar job of a noticing of something. But on an affective level, the lowering (or opening) of the vowel, laminated with a low and elongated contour (Figure 3.5) here seems to point to an undesired or unpleasant conduct, which belongs to the child, as being pointed to. But pointing out a problematic conduct with an implicit exclamation instead of informing the child a wrongdoing presupposes that the matter is known to the recipient. In which case, what the helper is pointing out is not just a problematic conduct but an offence - that the child knows and yet does the untoward act. The helper's subsequent talk "you sit like-" spells out the matter as related to his sitting. At this point, the course of action could develop into a blame or a complaint and possibly a rectifying action such as "don't sit like this" or "sit properly" but it does not.

Upon hearing the blame-implicative *or:h*, the child instantly drops his gaze (compare Figure 3.6 a and b), signalling a disengagement from the interaction. By the time the helper finishes her cut-off turn "you sit like-", Leslie is already facing down and has located a specific item (a toy coach) to look at (Figure 3.6 c). At this point, Ely cuts her turn short and resumes scavenging toys on the floor (notice her hand in Figure 3.6 d). Leslie seems to have glanced briefly at her hand while looking around at the toys on the floor

(Figure 3.6 e), which may suggest he is attentive of co-participant's action but just withhold from engaging. During Ely's next bit of talk "mums- I said don sit like that," (line 7), Leslie is pushing the toy coach away, which is a display that he has now chosen to be occupied with playing rather than engaging with Ely.

The child has thus remained silent since the helper initiates the talk about his posture in line 3. But different from the previous instances of silence, here he shifts from a fully engaged interaction to a totally enclosed mode. Just prior to this, the helper has pushed over the coach to Leslie, which he is sitting on and touching (Figure 3.6 a-c). But after the helper's *or:h* remark, Leslie abandons the ongoing joint engagement. He does not pursue his call for the helper's attention issued in line 1. He no longer plays *with* her, and has dropped verbal as well as visual engagement altogether. For some time (from end of line 3 until end of line 7, or from Figure 3.6 c to f), he searches for an item to attend and ends up with pushing the coach alone without making any sound that might promote engagement. He only resumes engaging with the helper some ten seconds after this stretch of talk when they have distant from this talk about his posture and are on a totally different course of action (playing blocks), and that she shows no sign of renewing or pursuing the business about his posture, and he still sits the same way. The child's sudden and total disengagement to a talk that is addressed to him shows in fact he has registered the talk, but chooses to not to involve in it. His attention 'runs away' from the interaction, and his action can thus be seen as a withdrawal, rather than a lack of understanding or attentiveness. Notice also the helper carries on the talk in line 7 and 9 despite she receives no visual or verbal reciprocity. That is, she does not challenge the silent reciprocity.

Figure 3.6 Leslie's disengagement after 'or:h'

[a] mutual gaze

[b] Ely's pointing and Leslie drops gaze

[c] Leslie pulls out bu

[d] Ely drops pointing

[e]

3 ELY: [o^[a]r:h [you^[b] sit li^[c]ke-
 4 [((E points at L's posture))
 5 [L gazes down))
 6 (0.8)
 7 ^[d]mums- I said don sit like that, ^[e]

The child's gaze-dropping after or:h is soon followed by Ely's cut-off of her turn and cessation of pointing, and her attentional shift to the toys - an abandonment of her original action. Her subsequent turn "mums- I said don sit like that," could possibly be projecting "Mum said..." but is revised to a first person "I said". The past tensed reported speech presupposed that the

child has sat like 'that' before and has already been informed that he should not do so. Now a reiteration of what she has said not to do at the scene of the child's doing it again works to ascribe to the child an offence (a neglect of her instruction). If uttering this was the only thing that Ely did at the time and if she had waited for a responsive action from the child, then she could be heard as making the child to correct his posture. However, as Ely reminds the child of her past instruction, she is also rummaging among the toys, as seen in Figure 3.6 d and e, and by then her partial facial orients to the toys and not the boy. With her utterance formulated not as an order nor question, not with gaze at the recipient, it is not designed with any feature to demand reciprocity (Stivers & Rossano, 2012) and she has left the sequence without pursuit (she initiates a new sequence in line 9).

Different from the other cases included in this chapter, the pause in this episode (line 6) is NOT highlighted by the first speaker in her subsequent talk. That is, there is no pursuit of a particular action for the recipient to perform. Ely's continued talk in the third position is holding the child accountable for not complying with an earlier instruction, but not holding the child's silence accountable.

So what could have transpired into an instruction or prohibition to rectify the behaviour (e.g. with an imperative "don't sit like this") in line 7 is now heard as her attesting and chastising of the child's outright defiance and her airing of discontent about it. And this is ignored by her recipient. The child's silence, or more specifically withdrawal from interaction, has made his interlocutor to be heard as monologic and the sequence to lapse. This example shows that for a sequence to come off as a directive sequence it requires participants' sustained collaboration. A sequence that starts off projecting one course of action may end as another. Here when the child does not participate and does not orient to the caregiver's utterances as correcting his conduct, and subsequently the caregiver also does not demand a compliant action, the sequence lapses quickly without a responsive action.

In terms of identity and relationship, here the helper positions herself

as a caregiver who has to reiterate instructions and is helpless in getting her instruction complied. She also positions the child as defiant, one that needs to be told again and again. The child treated the helper as one whose talk is neglectable and that he has right in deciding what to attend.

3.3.3. Withdrawal

Next we will look at an utterly different form of disengagement: withdrawal. It takes place in a hotel room in Hong Kong when both parents are present in the room. Leslie has been leaning against the sofa arm and playing three supplement bottles on a desk (pushing them around). Over a minute ago Leslie's playing has already caused a door card fall and Dad warns him by saying in Italian *piano* 'slowly / be careful' twice as he picks it up. Then some ten seconds ago, one of the bottles rolls down on the floor and Dad picks it up again for Leslie and warns him with a soft *piano*. Now as Leslie is looking down smilingly at a bottle that he is hiding, his right hand accidentally knocks another bottle off from the desk (Figure 3.7).

Figure 3.7 A bottle drops while Leslie is playing (L1)

As the dropping bottle knocks on the floor, Leslie turns aside towards the parents instantly. The child's look out, instead of simply continuing the self-play displays an awareness on the child's part that what has just happened might trigger parents' attention, and whether the parents have 'seen' it seems to matter. Kidwell (2011) evidences that very young children aged 14-30 months have already possessed the "abilities to assess another

person's knowledge based on his or her perceptual access to an event" (p.257). Next the child looks up at Dad and Dad starts off ordering the child to pick up the dropped bottle as shown below:

Extract 3.11 22-2;0.4-IT PICK UP

1		(0.6) ((a bottle drops; L turns sideways & up at Dad))
2	DAD: ->	pian [NO:! <i>slow</i> [LY:!
3		[(L leans forwards))
4	DAD:	EI!
5		(0.7) ((L shrinks and facing down))
6	DAD:	tira su! ((D points at floor; L hides face behind sofa arm)) <i>pick up!</i>
7		(1.3)
8	DAD:	ti:ra su:! ((L moves outward a little)) <i>pick up!</i>
9		(0.8) ((L raises up looking at floor))
10	DAD:	avanti! ((D's hand approaching L; from pointing changes to reaching out)) <i>go on!</i>
12	DAD:	(.) ((grabs L's hand))
13	LES: ->	na:(h)=
14	DAD:	=tira su!= ((pulls up L's arm)) <i>pick up!</i>
15	LES: ->	=vo:ia (possibly 'I don't want' from the standard form 'non voglio'))
16	DAD:	<A::VANTI>. ((drags L down)) <i>GO:: ON</i>
17	LES: ->	[(>awan<)~不要[::~= (I want) don't want
18	DAD:	[TIRARE[SU! (YOU MUST) PICK UP!
19	LES:	=[hhE:::hu::: .hhh=

What happens next are some very precise calibrated actions between the interactants leading towards Leslie's withdrawal. As soon as Leslie looks

up at Dad, Dad utters **pianNO:!** ‘slowLY’ - the gloss is purposefully adapted to the way that the word is produced. The standard spelling is *piano*, but the sudden pitch step-up kind of makes the last syllable sound like a separate unit, which coincidentally is the negation token *no* (/nɔ/) in Italian. Although Dad is out of camera, it can be conjectured that a mutual gaze has been established at the beginning of this word. As soon as this joint attention is established, Leslie instantly leans forward with his torso and head tilting to the front (see Leslie’s posture before and after **pianNO:!** in Figure 3.8 [a] and [b] respectively). This swift distancing action displays a projection of some forthcoming event that he wants to detach from. Dad reacts to the child’s distancing action simultaneously by heightening the tone of the word he is producing, resulting in a loud and elongated ending **-NO:!**. The prosodic calibration makes the negation-like second syllable **-NO:** sound like a stopper to the child’s on-going disengagement. The production of **pianNO:** in fact, starts on a lower volume which might have been a projection of a warning, but as the child turns away from Dad in the meantime, the projected action and its form appear to be calibrated half-way through the single-word turn (see calibration of directives in Goodwin & Cekaite, 2013). Dad’s calibrated reaction implicates his understanding that the child is doing something contrary to what he may want or expect, and thus the sudden exaggerated prosody works to draw the child’s disconnecting attention back.

Figure 3.8 Leslie’s withdrawal (L2-4)

As Leslie carries on turning front, i.e. away from Dad, Dad shouts out **EI!**. This response cry {Citation} is added on to chase the continuous

detaching child. Now, not only is Leslie seen as taking no heed of the first and second warning of 'piano' ('slowly / be careful', prior to this extract), but he is deemed as 'running away' from the scene of transgression - he is orienting to the opposite side of a self-remedial act and is avoiding making himself available as the recipient of Dad's ensuing talk. The father's abrupt **EI!** treats the child's withdrawal as 'un-let-go-able'. Being at this position, Dad's vocal attention-catching device is produced with heightened emotion, much like the British interjection 'Oi', that challenges an interlocutor's on-going action. Leslie continues his line of action - bending down further (Figure 3.8 [c]).

Similar to Wootton's (1997) findings, this kind of bodily action (despite being silent or non-vocal) display the child's understandings which have three properties: local, public and moral. The child's actions are situated in the local sequences: a body twist and bending in another environment may not be interpreted as hiding or withdrawal. His evasive actions are constructed based on an understanding how his interlocutor will interpret the current incident in light of the recent past sequences, i.e. the two-times of object-falling caused by his play and father's warnings in the prior stretch of talk. It is not in the child's belief that the father will take it as the bottle rolling down by itself inconsequentially. The prior warnings serve as a temporarily situated rule to restrict the child's future behaviour during that encounter. The child's evasive move is therefore not so much to do with the bottle-falling itself, which he may not bother as happened in the first object-falling, during which he looks into the father's eyes. The fearful flight of the interaction here displays a moral understanding that he may be deemed as breaching those prior warnings. It reflects his projection that some immediate unpleasant event might happen and that he needs to quickly get out of. These local and moral understandings are reflected through the child's actions in the public sphere, and not simply a conjecture of the child's internal working by the analyst. The child's projection reflects his own ascription of Dad's actions, and this is learnt based on his interactional experience - a history he has with each interactant. Compare this with the previous Extract in which Leslie's posture raises blame-implicative **or:h** from the helper, but he simply

disengages without escaping from the scene.

During the 0.7 second pause in line 5, Leslie continues ‘shrinking’ and turning his face downwards much like ‘burying one’s head in the sand’. By doing so, the child changes from a ready-to-engage facing formation (Kendon, 1985) to a total disengagement position leading to Dad’s highly entitled directive **tira su!** ‘pick up!’ (line 6) (see entitlement of directives in Craven & Potter, 2010). The occasioning of the directive is not just caused by the bottle dropping, but reflects an intersubjectivity: the father believes that Leslie’s turning away not as a random body movement, but the child’s recognition of his own untoward act; and the child is evading from facing or rectifying his own untoward act. As mentioned in Chapter 2, and in Kent & Kendrick (2016) study, imperative directives that occur after the directed action could have first been relevantly performed “tacitly threat the absence of the action as a failure for which the recipient is accountable” (p.1). And precisely, commanding the child to pick up the bottle here (rather than the father picking it up himself) is a way to sanction the child for and holding him accountable for some misbehaviour, as well as work retrospectively towards a remedial action. However, during Dad’s command, Leslie further turns his face against the sofa arm, orienting to noncompliance.

As Dad utters the command for the second time, with emphatic stretching, **ti:ra su!** ‘pi:ck u:p!’ (line 7), Leslie gradually moves outwards and sits up to look at the dropped bottle (line 8) showing his understanding of the command (even though ‘bottle’ is not spelt out in the command) and an orientation towards complying with the request, putting an end to the withdrawal. But this orientation to compliance is deemed as an insufficient response (unlike in some other incipient compliance cases, Kent, 2012a). Dad’s next turn **avanti!** ‘go on!’ (line 10) presses the child to take the presumably understood action. When the expected action is not forthcoming, he follows up with a corporal imposition (line 12-16), pulling the child down from the sofa to force compliance to happen. That is, compliance here is being defined by the father as to a here-and-now, swift and embodied compliance, with no room for delay or any contingency. Despite visible

contingency that Leslie is reluctant in picking up, Dad issues a fully entitled strong directive anyhow. This imply that one's claim of entitlement may override their awareness of contingencies. This supports the recent claim that entitlement and contingencies operate separately (Maynard & Hollander, 2014; Nolen & Maynard, 2013).

Withdrawal in light of other noncompliance actions

This withdrawing kind of noncompliance and lack of swift compliance here is utterly different from a verbal noncompliance like 'I don't want' or a head-to-head defiance that confronts the requestor. For instance, since the child resumes engagement by raising his body (line 9), his gaze has always been maintained towards the object of focus instead of the speaker. This helps him to hold the floor as an acquiesced recipient of the requested task, instead of displaying a defying body that may precipitate more talk regarding his problem conduct

The withdrawal in this case is anticipatory in nature rather than being responsive, different from other noncompliance that occurs after a request for action. In the last case, the child's disengagement happens after a blame-implicative **or:h** that might project a request for action to rectify his posture. This time, the disengagement commences after just a mutual gaze in line 2. The proto-typical directive 'tira su' ('pick up') does not come until line 6. The child's hasty escape from engagement displays an anticipation of trouble ahead (cf. Kidwell, 2011), which implicates a kind of inferential and attributional ability (i.e. anticipating the other's behaviour). This early cognitive ability can be seen as a prelude to the development of theory of mind (cf. Wootton, 2006).

A withdrawal also differs from non-response in term of its attentional placement in sequences. To withdraw one's engagement implies a prior established mutual orientation to a matter. In this case, participants have established mutual gaze shortly after the bottle drops. This joint attention to the bottle-dropping event has interrupted the possibility for the child to hang

on to his existing play activity seamlessly. The deployment of a withdrawal after the mutual engagement is thus highly noticeable by participants, unlike non-response in which the child can hang on to his existing activity, and his attentional focus to the request is arguable. The withdrawing therefore makes it irrevocable for the child to return to the previous activity.

Because of this noticeable and irrevocable nature, a withdrawal may not be effective in getting the child away from a control situation. Although a withdrawal practice has accomplished in delaying compliance, displaying the child's agentive control, it is performed at a cost of bringing more charges onto oneself due to the evasiveness. It leads to a stalemate where the child may be forced to comply.

3.4. Attentional response as insufficient

As mentioned, silence does not mean that the child is not responding. Quite the contrary, as we discuss in the last chapter, a compliant response is often embodied. We must look into what the child is actually doing non-verbally during the silent space after a caregiver's initiating action to influence the child's action.

In Extract 2.2 What about some watermelon, partly reproduced below, after Mum's noticing 'nh' and mentioning about the watermelon, which is formulated with a particle 'le' (possibly *ne* in standard Mandarin) that can be translated to "what/how about X". She may be making a noticing of the uneaten watermelon or proposing that the child to eat it, even though the verb to 'eat' is not uttered. There is no verbal uptake nor does the child pay attention to, approach, or eat the watermelon. During the 0.5 second pause, the child who sits on a high chair originally facing the TV has in fact turned all the way around to look at Mum, showing that he has registered her talking to him. This may display a lack of understanding of the label or the action behind Mum's utterance, though a display may not be the same as his actual understanding. Mum does not hold the child's lack of action as

problematic, although a pursuit does entail that the child's attentional response as insufficient. The mother's more explicit formulation in line 6 spells out the proposal to 'eat' the watermelon in line 6 and shows also her orientation to the child as perhaps not having comprehended the task with the initial mentioning. Another thing that the turn-around action showcases is the child's understanding in maintaining a facing formation (Kendon, 1985) at interactions. A visual and bodily attunement can be an indication for cooperation and compliance (comparing to his gaze and body orientation in withholding and withdrawal cases). It is likely for this reason that the mother does not see this 0.5 second pause as problematic. What this turn-around action does is a slight delay in the actual compliance and a need for Mum's pursuit, which could possibly turn out to be a concession that favours non-eating such as "you don't want to eat any more, right?" or "are you full?". It is this kind of possible responses to contingencies in the third position that makes a non-response or attentional response in a second position worth-doing, if the child is to refuse.

Extract 3.12 12-2:08-MIX What about Watermelon (Extract 2.2)

4	MUM:	nh (.) 西瓜le nh (.) (what about) watermelon?
5		(0.5) ((L turns around to M))
6	MUM:	吃西瓜 好[不好 Eat watermelon al/right?
7		[((L turns front to watermelon))

Extract 2.3 Pacifier, discussed in the previous chapter (and reproduced below) shows another example, but here we zoom in the 0.6 second pause in line 9 a little more. Joint gaze has already been established when the helper highlights his pacifier in line 8. During the 0.6 second pause, he continues to gaze at the helper without any embodied or verbal 'response' (Figure 3.9), i.e. he has not 'responded' in attending to the highlighted object. Similar to most non-response cases, the child's mere attention results in the helper's issuance of a more explicit instruction "gimme your pacifier", specifying what it is the child has to 'do' with the highlighted object. However, the helper's imperative formulation, impending tone and quick delivery (condensed 'gimme' and no

more elongation on ‘pacifier’ comparing to *pacifie↑R*: in line 8) displays an upgraded entitlement in demanding for a compliant action, leaving little room for non-response - compare to the more open proposal by Mum “Eat watermelon alright?” presented earlier. Given that the participants have established joint attention, the child’s continued gaze does in fact not show any response particular to the caregiver’s highlighting of the pacifier. This heightened deontic authority may then have to do with this inaction and that the helper is requesting for the pacifier for the third time in line 10 (the first time takes place some 25 seconds ago not shown here). It therefore indicates a lack of compliance. And this goes against the common intersubjective understanding of the requested task (her quickened design reflects that the caregiver does not foresee any potential issue in comprehending the request.)

Extract 3.13 27-2:1.5-EN Pacifier (Extract 2.3)

```
3  LES:      ( (mumbles) )
4  ELY:      m:h?
5  LES:      ( (mumbles) )
6            (0.5)
7  LES:      ( (mum[bles] ) )
8  ELY:      [your pacifie↑R:
9            (0.6)
10 ELY:      gimme your pacifier.
11           ((L points at the pacifier))
```

Figure 3.9 Leslie continues to look at Ely (L9) after “your pacifie ↑ R:”.

These examples show that after a noticing, the child may deliver an embodied response - a gaze, that creates a pause during the talk-in-interaction. Such a gaze or attentional response may communicate a lack of understanding or lack of willingness to move on to the requested action. It is in any case deemed as inadequate. But what this accomplishes is that it delays compliance and a possibility for various pursuits or abandonment. These cases also show us how a child may come to learn what noticing or highlighting an object implicates and the consequences of not delivering a pair-typed response swiftly enough. Caregivers' subsequent pursuits in the above cases work to socialise the child in learning that his mere show of joint attention is not enough when a certain responsive action is sought through the initial noticing of something. Display of one's noticing of something works to position some task or object as being problematic and the action of highlighting it is in fact to mobilize the recipient to attend to these problematic matters.

These examples also demonstrate that whether there is established joint attention or not may bring a difference on how caregivers see the child's attentional response. When there is no prior mutual engagement, an attentional response to some initial talk may be acceptable even though not sufficient, but when participants have already established joint attention, a continued show of attention is then the same as inaction. It is this lack of

response that warrants the caregiver more right to upgrade their pursuit.

3.5. Summary

To answer the questions raised in the beginning of this chapter, we have seen that the child's non-responses to requests for actions (or actions that may project them) are greatly varied in terms of the sequential positions of his deployment of multimodal resources, especially gaze work. 'Non-response' to requests for actions refers here to as a lack of verbal uptake or an embodied compliant action. I have first presented cases in which silence does not necessarily mean non-response (Extract 3.4) and when silence is problematic with a verbal compliance being expected (Extract 3.5 and Extract 3.6). All the examples make visible the complexity among taxonomies: silence, non-response, disattention, ignorance, negligence, avoidance, withholding, disengagement, withdrawal and more. Despite my effort to disentangle them, it may not be entirely clear as they have overlapping properties.

Essentially the differences between various non-response actions seem to lie on whether the child shows any mutual attention (through mutual gaze) prior and after the adult's request for his action. In the case of disattention, that is when the child has an alternative activity, his attention/gaze is continuously away throughout the request. This allows his failure to attend the request to be seen as him being immersed in the alternative activity (Extract 3.4). However, the issue is he may not be treated as 'totally away'. There may be prior interaction or close physical proximity that prompts the requestor to presume the child's readiness to engage and in which case, the child's absence of response may be deemed as delayed or withholding, and he may be held accountable for that (e.g. Extract 3.2, Extract 3.7). If mutual attention is established prior to a request, but is immediately dropped after a requests for action (or request-implicative) with the child returning to his own activity or in search of a new one, then this may appear more clearly as unwilling to engage and a refutation to respond to the request (e.g. Extract

3.9 and Extract 3.10). If this disengagement is performed in a 'fleeing' manner in terms of speed and body disalignment (M. H. Goodwin et al., 2012), then it is more like a withdrawal (Extract 3.11).

Apart from the design, this rough classification of non-responses depends much on how the adult co-participants treat the non-responses in the specific interaction; but these treatment may vary between different individuals. We have seen when the child has divided attention between the TV and eating, the helper works around the contingency to feed (Extract 3.4). And when the child disengages at playtime, the helper pursues a couple of times then gives in to the child (Extract 3.9). But the mother pursues more forcefully when the child continues to play sand instead of responding, until she attempts to physically make the action happen (Extract 3.7). Also, we see a clear distinction between the child mild disengagement upon the helper's pointing out his improper posture (Extract 3.10), and his hasty (perhaps fearful) withdrawal upon the father's pointing out the bottle he made dropped (Extract 3.11). It seems then some adults are putting more pressure to pursue their expected responses. From this, we may imagine also that non-response may be oriented to very differently in child-child interactions, when such pressure to respond becomes less forceful (see more discussion in 6.3.1 and 6.3.5).

The child may not have acquired that non-response as implicative of disaffiliative, and he may not intend it to be either, he may simply be handling the interactional challenges put forward to him. Here again, it relates to the concept of agency. Sometimes it is more clear that the child is pulling out from the interactions and from complying to the request, other times it may be harder to tell. It is noted though that there is rarely any case that the child realizes later that he has missed responding, and repairs himself quickly to perform the desired task. On the other hand, adults may at times interpret the child's actions as disaffiliative by reformulating the request to pursue and facilitate compliant action. This line of inquiry may engender more discussion on the relationship between alignment and affiliation (cf. Stivers, 2008).

Despite some uncertainty, it can be observed that the child displays in many cases an ability to interpret his co-participants' actions, for example, when Ely asks 'where is the driver?' (Extract 3.9), his disengagement shows a disinterest to her question or at the very least a preference to focus on his own goal - putting the lego figurine at his desired location. His lack of uptake to her question, pursuit and then a cutting-in to her explicit request portray his disengagement, withholding (or more subjectively 'ignoring') and disalignment with an inconsequential stance. Compare also the aforementioned differentiated designs of non-response (disengagement vs. withdrawal) towards the helper's and the father's noticings of an untoward act. They reflect an understanding of the different situations, his projection of his co-participants' upcoming actions, and a developing 'reflective accountability' (Forrester, 2017, p. 57), i.e. in which situations he perceives himself as being held accountable for his own conduct.

Equipped with an awareness that the requestor is taking him to an undesired direction as shown in many occasions, a non-response works to suspend his participation in going along with his co-participant's proposed course of action, or at least helps buy some time until either the co-participant lets go of the request, clarifies it, improves its terms, or the child is forced to confront the request.

Non-responses can perhaps be conceptualized as a useful temporal resource endowed to the young child before he acquires more verbal means and becomes able to account for his unavailability, lack of interest, unwillingness, noncompliance or negotiate for better terms.

4. Resistance-implicative responses II: Non-aligning verbal turns

This chapter continues to examine more resistance-implicative responses. This time, the young child actually produces some verbal elements upon parents' request-implicatives or more controlling acts. The child's utterances however do not orient to an affiliative response (compliance, agreement, acceptance and so on), rather they are deemed as disaffiliative (non-complying) or even disaligned ('not responding' to the request). The diverse actions that these utterances embody have something in common: they defer compliance, improve the terms of compliance to be favourable to the child or put off the required compliance altogether (at least, temporarily) - that is they may divert the original course of action to something else.

So far we have already seen cases when a child does not respond or respond merely with gaze, the caregiver may reformulate to pursue the expected response. This reformulation sometimes exposes their insistence and treats the child as having understood the required action but does not act on it. For example, two earlier examples demonstrate how a more open formulation of questioning like "where is the driver?" (in Extract 3.9) or hinting like "your pacifier" (in Extract 2.3), upon the child's non-response, may be reformulated into a more restrictive pursuit for action, e.g. "Uh driver you put there" in Extract 3.9 and "gimme your pacifier" in Extract 2.3. The early formulations that simply point to the problematic matter and leaves the child to attend to the projectable task or execute the necessary action in his own way have brought about subsequent pursuits that *tell* the child exactly what to do (cf. Craven and Potter 2010), which suppresses the child's agency and removes his autonomy. There is therefore a need at times when the child can foresee potential upcoming pursuits and may initiate some actions with talk to alternate the on-going course of action before the caregiver continues pursuing.

The use of talk relies on the child's linguistic competence. From the supplementary First Words and Diary notes (mentioned in), as well as the recordings, it can be observed that English was the dominant language at the initial stage of Leslie's verbal production. This helps account for some language mixing phenomena in the child's use of negation. Multilingualism is not the focus of the current thesis, although it is certainly relevant to see how the child's language choice may be recipient-designed (Filipi, 2015) for the establishment of a participation framework (Butler & Wilkinson, 2013). More will be discussed in 6.3.4.

4.1. Non-affiliative but legitimate response

Now if a child verbalises what might be deemed as his concerns, then pursuits could be turned in a different direction. Kent (2012) presents a case in which when the mother asks her 9-year-old diabetic child Jack to do the insulin in line 4, the child responds in line 9-14 by asking "where shall I do it to avoid all the bruises?". Kent describes it as a legitimate resistance in that the mother acknowledges the concern and deals with it in line 15. But this side tracks the interactions to talk about the bruises, how he may have been injecting too closely to each site and where may be more appropriate to inject, until finally the mother pursues on the requested action - inject the insulin.

Extract 4.1 Kent (2012:71)

1	Jack	[last night] and it had money in,
2	Mum	[Jack.]
3	Mum	[((points at his leg then looks for her tea mug))
4	Mum →	Get your insulin done please.
5	Jack	.hh
6		[(0.5)
7	Jack	[((changes his grip on the pen so it is in a
8		position to inject and examines his leg))
9	Jack	U::h. (peez) ((Yawn))
10		(0.6)
11	Jack	((looking at his leg)) hhh <u>where</u> shall I do it
12		to avoid all the bruises:.
13		(0.5)
14	Jack	.ts[s ((glances at Mum))
15	Mum	[So:mewhere away from the brui[s(es I-]
16	Jack	[Look at tha:]t.

The extract below demonstrates a case from our two-year-old similar to that of Kent's legitimate resistance. This episode happens after breakfast at grandparents' garden in Italy. Leslie (2;2.8), has been squatting and playing sand for a few minutes. Mum squats next to him.

The child's verbal turn "sand" in line 5 is treated as presenting difficulty to Mum's call to attend his unfinished milk (line 1 and 4) and it brings about the mother's modification in line 7 which favours the child's current situation of sand-play, as expressed by his prior turn.

Extract 4.2 42-2;2.7-CN Unfinished milk

1	MUM: 你的奶还没有喝完[知道吗	MUM: your milk is still not finished [(you) know?
2	LES: [nou	LES: [nou
3	(3.9) ((L scoops sand))	(3.9) ((L scoops sand))
4	MUM: °来°	MUM: °Com'on°
5	-> LES: 沙沙:	LES: Sa:nd
6	(0.5)	(0.5)
7	MUM: 我奶拿过来好不好	MUM: I bring the milk over alright?

In line 1, Mum asks if Leslie knows that his milk is not finished (i.e. drunk up). Her turn is formulated with a statement "your milk is still not finished" and a tag question '(you) know?'. The statement informs the child about a state of affair and denotes that the mother has knowledge about the unfinished milk. The tag works to bring the child to the same epistemic status, and mobilise reciprocity through the use of a question particle (吗 *ma*).

However, as she is about to utter the tag, Leslie swiftly comes in with a **nou** in line 2 (the spelling 'nou' is used to distinguish the English 'no' /nəʊ/ from the Italian 'no' /no/). He utters the negation token while continuing his current activity - gazing at sand and scooping it (Figure 4.1a). Their overlap occurs precisely at a transition relevance place where Mum's turn could possibly end. It is therefore a response to the informing, and not the epistemic tag that is yet to issue. This shows the child has been attentive to her talk and has understood her turn-at-talk hitherto as projecting to something that is

refutable. The negation token ‘no’ around this age may not have a wide range of functions (Choi, 1988). It could be a denial to fact or information (i.e. ‘My milk is not unfinished’), a refusal or disagreement to a request for action (i.e. ‘I won’t finish my milk’).

Figure 4.1 Leslie keeps playing sand (L2-5)

Mum’s act of topicalizing the unfinished milk plays a role like a pre-sequence to draw the child's attention to the milk and ‘test the water’ - checking his willingness or potential contingency to attend to the milk. Kent (2011) describes a similar practice through the use of a noticing something to invite the recipient to attend, and implicatively do something about it, and demonstrates it with a similar example in which the mother uses "You still got some beans left haven’t you”² (2011:67) to get her daughter to finish eating beans. For a few seconds (line 3), the outright refusal seems to have made Mum back off, but shortly after she issues a soft-toned cajoling “come” (line 4). It urges the child in moving on or to act. It does not only presuppose the child as having understood what action to move onto (which has not been

² In Kent's case, the tag 'haven't you' downplays Mum's epistemic access to the status of the unfinished beans, and invite the child to account for it. It is less imposing and leaves room for a valid explanation (Kent, 2011: p.68). In Extract 4.2 42-2;2.7-CN Unfinished milk Extract 4.2 however, the tag "(you) know?" asserts the mother's state of knowledge and serves to implicate what the child 'ought to' know too (and do). The mother is therefore displaying a higher degree of epistemic status.

explicitly articulated), but also displays a heightened determination in controlling his movement as she ignores the child's refusal. An urge signals a lack of cooperative action and frames the silence in line 3 as Mum's waiting for a (right) responsive action instead of backing off. Retrospectively, the urge also lends support to validate the directive nature of her earlier turn.

Now being pressed to make a move, Leslie utters "sa:nd" in line 5 while lingering on the sand-play. The word "sand" has been uttered many times earlier in the same recording mostly to request or invite to Mum to play the sand along with him. Here the word being in a second position, it can be heard as responding to Mum's urge for action or to attend to the unfinished milk. The child is not working to draw the interlocutor's attention to the sand nor *away* from their on-going sequence, for he is not gazing at Mum or checking at Mum's gaze nor pointing to any object (unlike attention-drawing instances shown later in this study and others, e.g. (Kidwell & Zimmerman, 2006, 2007). His continued fixation at the sand (Figure 4.1b) displays an embodied preoccupation with the sand that is congruent with his verbal turn. His on-going activity thus provide a resource in signalling his unavailability to take another action, countering Mum's urge to move onto something else. By topicalising his engagement instead of complying, the child presents a barrier to compliance. The objective 'sand' provides external force that hinders his ability to comply right now. Rather than a pure unwillingness to comply, this may legitimately accounts for non-cooperation. The account also does not eliminate the possibility that he may be able to comply later. It thus shifts his earlier refuting stance to a less definitive stance.

When encountering a lack of compliance, parents may disregard the child's unwillingness and inability to comply and pursue by upgrading (Kent, 2011, 2012b). This is not exactly the case here. After a 0.5 second pause, Mum does pursue exposing her determination in securing the desired action from the child (cf. Kent 2011: p.69 and chapter 5), but her next move (line 7) presents a more specific proposal "I bring the milk over alright?". That is, Mum breaks down the task of finishing off the milk into some concrete steps - first to get hold of the milk (or milk bottle), which requires them to go

inside the house or the milk needs to be brought out to the child. The mother here chooses the latter. This takes into account of the child's current engagement with sand, as expressed in his prior turn "sand". Thus, although Mum does not explicitly acknowledge Leslie's "sand" token, she has addressed it as a legitimate concern subtly by coming to a solution that will satisfy his concern, as well as the course of action that she has been pursuing - get the child to finish off the milk. Comparing to Kent's case of 'legitimate resistance' aforementioned, here the mother's turn does both actions of addressing the child's prior utterance of "sand" as well as pursuing in one turn, minimising the possibility of side-tracking into another business. By converging her control attempt and the child's interest on sand (grounds for noncompliance), specifying the next step, and with the use of a choice or polar question (literally 'good-(or)-not-good' or translated as 'okay' or 'alright?'), Mum does not only manage to stay on her course, but also makes it harder now for the child to deviate from her course of action or not to agree on the proposed future action.

Different from many previous examples, what the mother is getting to here is the child's agreement to finish off the milk. First in line 1, she raising the child's awareness about the unfinished milk, positions the task meticulously as a sensitive business against the on-going playtime context. Her formulation does not specify the required next action but has worked to 'fish' the child's disposition. Upon the child's resistance, she proposed, taking the child's concern into account, an action on her part and seeks an agreement from the child. Throughout the mother respects the child as a stakeholder. She could have proposed in the first instance: "let's go inside and finish your milk" or simply walk inside the house to bring the milk out. What this shows is that she defers to child as having more entitlement, or specifically, deontic right in deciding how to go about this task that she wants to get done.

Here the child's reliance an ongoing activity and verbalization of that engagement may work to make the interlocutor attend to that engagement as a legitimate concern for not complying (or not agreeing, in this case). The

child's verbal turn in a response slot is taken as some sort of reasoning for "not being able" to agree or comply with, rather than refusal. The speaker can therefore make use of the child's verbal turn to modify their subsequent pursuit accordingly to further their agenda. This way, the speaker treats the child's verbal turn as a response to their initiating control act, and a contingency that they need to work to remove it. If the speaker is to empathize with the child, s/he could offer some favourable terms in return, e.g. by setting up an activity contract like 'alright 5 more minutes and we will go' (Aronsson & Cekaite, 2011) or cease the pursuit altogether. Here, Mum's following pursuit is modified in a way that favours the child, by letting him to stay with the sand, much like a compromise or concession. What this case shows are also an orientation to compliance as preferred (Kent, 2011).

4.2. Response that might divert the sequence

There are times when the child does not have an on-going activity which he can rely on, but may make use of elements in the on-going talk in an attempt to get himself out of a caregiver's control attempt. Here we are talking about a practice of a partial repeat of some element(s) in the prior turn. For example, in following extract which occurs towards the end of dinner Ely tells Leslie to eat the last spoonful (line 7) and after that she will offer him watermelon (line 9), Leslie responds by repeating "melon (1.4) melon" (line 13 and 15).

Extract 4.3 12-2;0.8-MIX Melon Melon

```

1          (4.0) ((Mum just walks away; L looks down at tripod;
E proffers a spoonful of rice))
2 -> LES: †Ely ((gazes at E; right hand points front))
3          (0.5) ((L leans back))
4      ELY: tita: ((E moves spoon closer to L))
5          (1.8) ((L pushes spoon while turns to TV))
6      LES: [((coughs ))]
7      ELY: [mm las' ]one (.) an' then,=
8 -> LES: =°tita:°= ((gazes front))
9      ELY: =|I give |you          water|melon. °okay°?
10         |((delivers a spoonful to L))
11         |((L purses mouth|then tilts head))
12         (0.3) ((E tilts spoon |facing L))
13 -> LES:          |†melon ((looks at tripod?))
14         (1.4) ((E sustains the spoon))
15 -> LES: °melon°
16         (.)
17      LES: >d'wan mo< ((pushes E's hand away))

```

It should be first noted that Ely has been trying to feed this spoonful of food (fried rice) that she is holding now for a few seconds already, but Leslie has managed to get away from it. Moving on from this difficult situation, Ely pursues both verbally and non-verbally. In line 7 and 9, she makes some sound "mm" that works to secure the recipient's attention, then informs him the spoonful that she is going to feed is the "last one", making it sound less effortful, and she adds on, after the spoonful ("and then"), "I give you watermelon okay?". These incremental bits of talk appear like informing the child a procedure: first he needs to eat the last spoonful, then she will offer some watermelon. The order of these events makes the offer of watermelon a dependent of his eating, transforming the entire turn into a conditional offer (more similar to 'If you eat this last spoonful, I will give you watermelon'. The offer itself is formulated as a statement telling the child what she will do, instead of asking if the child wants watermelon in the first place, thus it presupposes the child's desire of watermelon. The added offer promotes cooperation but at the same time also reflect that the child has not shown any cooperative orientation during/after the first bit of her turn "mm last one". In fact, the child is uttering softly *tita* ('auntie' in Tagalog) in line 8, right after Ely's "and then,", when she has not finished talking. What Leslie is doing here is not totally transparent. He could be repeating the address term that Ely has just corrected him (not shown here), or it could be an attempt to initiate or more likely a self-talk. In any case, it suffices here to say that Leslie *displays* that he is not attending to Ely's on-going talk by mumbling something

before her turn completion and by not gazing at her; that is, a lack of reciprocity.

As Ely begins to utter the future offer in line 9, she is actually delivering the spoonful of food in parallel. This bi-modal pursuit highly constrains what the child may do next, given that he is sitting in a high chair. As soon as Ely moves the spoonful toward Leslie, Leslie instantly purses mouth and tilts his head away (line 11), which is making the feeding impossible. During this time, as contingency of non-compliance emerges, Ely finishes her verbal turn tagging a question-toned "okay?". This interrogative changes her position from telling the child what to do now and what will happen next, to one that seeks the child's agreement on what she has just said, thus displaying a lowering in her entitlement claim, and transforming once again the whole turn into something like a proposal. The *okay*-question may help mobilize reciprocity, but it is an embodied, not verbal, compliant action (i.e. eating) that Ely is pursuing as shown in her contemporaneous feeding pursuit. Upon Leslie's tilting away (line 11), Ely swiftly tilts the spoon accordingly as well so to maintain the same facing to Leslie's mouth, and it is during this 'chase' that Leslie bursts out "melon" (line 13).

The child's "melon" in this position preceded by Ely's turn which contains 'watermelon' can be heard as a partial repeat picked up from her turn. It cannot be ascertained if Leslie knows what (water)melon means, as there has been no prior record of his production of this token. The partial repeat of 'melon', instead of 'watermelon', may have to do with the child's linguistic capacity at this age (most of his intelligible turns consist of two syllables³ and the stress on the penultimate syllable '-me-' makes 'melon' a more prominent unit.

³ A quick survey from the same recording #12 shows some two-syllable turns (initiated by the child and not a repeat from a prior turn) include mostly address terms such as *tita*, *mami*, *baba* and others like *no more*. There are also a few three-syllable turns: *pisia* (may be 'pizza'), *broken this* and *tita eat* but four-syllable turns or words are extremely scarce - examples contain repetitional items "milo milo..." and an emotionally charged "me don wan yo::"

The token "melon" (line 13) that situates in a fairly immediate position after a polar question can also be heard as doing a response, and the design using a partial repeat renders it more like a confirmation or agreement rather than a negative-valenced response. In addition, in selecting a specific token to repeat the speaker exerts more agency in taking the action, different from a mere acquiescing 'yes' or a repetitional 'okay' which will consent to all the terms contained in the former turn (cf. Heritage & Raymond, 2012). The selection of "melon" buttresses specifically the second part of Ely's proposition ("I give you watermelon okay?"), while leaving alone the first part of her turn (to eat the last spoonful). The slight pitch step-up at the onset intensifies his endorsement to "melon", making it sound almost like he is requesting for it. However, the delivery weakens as the word trails off in a softer volume and that he seems to be facing down (possibly looking at the tripod in hand) instead of at Ely (Figure below), the keenness of requesting for a "melon" thus diminishes.

Figure 4.2 Leslie apparently turns to tripod during '↑melon' (L13)

Ely does not respond to Leslie's ↑melon. She stays silent and sustains the spoon for a fairly long 1.4 second (line 14). With her persistence, Leslie does not surrender and take in the spoonful of food that is right in front of his mouth. Instead, he repeats °melon°. This self-repeat is delivered in an even softer volume, possibly still with no mutual gaze, (unfortunately Ely's arm blocks the camera from capturing Leslie's gaze (Figure 4.2) but he is possibly

still looking at the tripod, which is a display of his attentional unavailability). This configuration dampens the requirement for reciprocity, making it perceivably as a self-talk. When Ely continues with her feeding gesture, the participants now come to a deadlock. It is under this situation that Leslie finally rejects with **d'wan mo'** (don't want more) as well as a push off her hand (line 17).

The token "melon" which is picked from the immediate sequential environment is used as a resource to fend off the constraining situation that Leslie finds himself in. Both turns containing *melon* are produced when Leslie is cornered by Ely's tenacious pursuit of feeding. A repetition makes it hearable as a pursuit of uptake on "melon". But this pursuit is rather feeble and hence not taken up by Ely as a relevant action to the ongoing course of action. These repeats bring about a delay in compliance as well as propel a potential suspension of the ongoing force-feeding. Should Ely engage with Leslie on the business of *melon* (by responding for example, "do you like watermelon?" or "you want watermelon now?") then the tenacious feeding of the spoonful in hand may have to be suspended or even abandoned. The lack of gaze throughout this stretch of talk also works to show his disengagement with Ely. The shift to a focus item (tripod) helps to license grounds for a more legitimate noncompliance. That is, he is simply attending something else, and not specifically doing non-complying.

In the above two cases, what makes the child's utterances ("shasha" *sand* and "melon (1.4) melon") appear as a response is the position of the turn-at-talk: they are issued fairly soon after caregivers' verbal pursuits which make relevant a responsive action.

A common feature in the design of both responses is the lack of mutual gaze. When responding verbally to some directive actions or directive-implicative actions, the child's gaze is fixated at some objects in front of him (sand and tripod respectively). That is, he displays a preoccupation with some other activities and is only peripherally available to engage with the caregiver. This half-attending bodily display may prompt the

caregiver to abandon the pursuit, or incorporate his current preoccupation in the pursuit, as happened in the first case Extract 4.2 Unfinished Milk.

4.3. Initiating rather than responding

Instead of uttering something that sounds like responding, the child may also utter something that sounds more like an initiation of some other action. We have come across a case earlier, reproduced below:

Extract 4.4 12-2:08-EN Broken

1	ELY:	broken	
2		(6.2)	
3	ELY:	you see?	
4		(1.5) ((L looks at tripod then looks up at E))	
5	LES:	<broken [(°tis°)>	
6	ELY:	[ya:	
7	->	(1.4) ((E proffers food))	
8	LES: ->	[mami	
9		[((L looks front then at E; E holds spoon near L))	
10	ELY:	°mm mami angry° A:::M	
11		[((E puts food in L's mouth))	
12	ELY:	big mou:. ((scraping food around L's mouth)	

Here Leslie utters **mami** (mummy) when Ely is delivering a spoonful of food to him. The address term **mami** is taken by Ely (line 10) as relevant to the just prior talk about the broken tripod. She treats it as a legitimate action and responds to it by extending it to a fuller unit acknowledging (**mm**) understanding of his turn that mummy is angry about the broken tripod. Then she quickly resumes the feeding by encouraging Leslie's to open mouth with an onomatopoeic sound "A:::M" and unloads the food in his mouth. What **mami** accomplishes then is to suspend the feeding and delay the required cooperative action. By ignoring the spoon delivered right in front of him and selecting the line of action that he will follow (the talk over the feeding), he displays an equally high agentive role in the interaction and his contribution has reshaped the interactional trajectory.

There is a simple difference between a more response-like action and

an initiation-like action at a response slot. In the former case, the directive-mover (the caregiver) may either incorporate the child's response-like as a concern directly in the next reformulated pursuit (Extract 4.2 Unfinished Milk) or simply deem the child's turn as irrelevant by ignoring it and continuing the pursuit (Extract 4.3 Melon Melon). In contrast, an initiating action requires the caregiver to respond to it or handle it first before they may resume to pursue their agenda.

With a rudimentary stock of productive vocabulary, how does the two-year-old actually initiate when he is not expected to? In Extract 4.4 Broken, he topicalizes the mother through the simple address term "mami". And that alone is enough for his interlocutor to make sense of his turn based on the just prior talk. Address terms are early acquired vocabulary and hence are indeed an easy resource for a two-year-old to initiate a course of action. Besides being used to topicalize the agent of an event, the child also uses address terms to summon his caregiver's attention. This particular use when deployed in a response position works to deter a caregiver's control attempt. In most cases, because of the dyadic nature of the interactions, the child calls out his interlocutor by address terms such as "Ely", "mama" in and "baba" in the following extracts.

Extract 4.5 12-2;0.8-MIX ELY (extracted from Extract 4.3)

1	(4.0) ((Mum just walks away; L looks down at tripod; E proffers a spoonful of rice))
2	LES: -> †Ely ((gazes at E; right hand points front))
3	(0.5) ((L leans back))

Extract 4.6 42-2;2.7-CN Unfinished Milk (continued from Extract 4.2)

7	MUM: 我奶拿过来好不好	MUM: I bring the milk over alright?
8	(1.5)	(1.5)
9	MUM: 哈;	MUM: huh;
10	(0.9)	(0.9)
11	-> LES: 妈妈	LES: mama
12	(0.7) ((L looks up at M))	(0.7) ((L looks up at M))

Extract 4.7 48-2;2.27-IT Kitten's Eyes

1	DAD: dove sono gli occhi del gattino. gli occhietti (2.3)	DAD: where are the eyes of the kitten. the little eyes (2.3)
3	DAD: qua?	DAD: here?
4	(2.0) ((D taps on paper, L looks at it then shifts gaze))	(2.0) ((D taps on paper, L looks at it then shifts gaze))
5	DAD: ha?	DAD: huh?
6	(2.5) ((L picks up a pen))	(2.5) ((L picks up a pen))
7	--> LES: baba ((passes it to D))	LES: baba ((passes it to D))

At times in tri- or multi-partite interactions, he may call out a third party e.g. "baba" (Dad) in Extract 4.8 below when being asked to finish some porridge by Mum and grandma (GMA), and "mami" (Mum) in Extract 4.9 when being coerced by Ely to eat some pizza. These third party participants are present in the same space but they are not the ones who are at the moment interacting with the child.

Extract 4.8 21-2;0.26-CN Porridge

1	MUM: 来这个. h还有一口粥 ((touches bowl))	MUM: com'on this. Still a mouthful of porridge ((touches bowl))
3	(0.4) ((L gazes at the bowl))	(0.4) ((L gazes at the bowl))
4	MUM: [我们吃完它>好不好<	MUM: [We eat it up >okay<
5	[(M lifts up bowl towards L; L turns away)]	[(M lifts up bowl towards L; L turns away)]
6	(1.0) ((M scoops up a spoonful))	(1.0) ((M scoops up a spoonful))
7	GMA: [粥咯]	GMA: [Porridge]
8	--> LES: [PA:]PÀ ((leans towards D))	LES: [PA:]PÀ ((leans towards D))
9	(0.7)	(0.7)
10	MUM: 哈, 爸爸叫[你吃 ((turns to D))	MUM: huh, Daddy asks[you to eat ((turns to D))
11	[(L reaches out to D)]	[(L reaches out to D)]
12	(0.4)	(0.4)
13	MUM: ho,=	MUM: ho,=
14	DAD: =si	DAD: =yes
15	(0.7)	(0.7)
16	DAD: °vieni [qua°	DAD: °come [here°
17	LES: [ba ((lowers down RH, raises LH))	LES: [ba ((lowers down RH, raises LH))
18	MUM: 爸爸叫他[吃=	MUM: Daddy ask him [eat=
19	GMA: [爸爸	GMA: [Daddy
	=[最后一口没有了	MUM: =[last mouthful no more
20	DAD: [a::m yum[yumyumyumamamaba...	DAD: [a::m yum[yumyumyum= =mamamaba...
21	[(D takes bowl to L, L turns to	[(D takes bowl to L, L turns to
22	GMA: [啊哟正啊正乖乖乖 ((CAN))	GMA: [wohoo great good good good ((CAN))

Extract 4.9 12-2;0.8-MIX Hold

```

ELY:      ((delivers [a forkful of pizza towards L])
LES:      [((looks up at E))
ELY:      [((retracts hand))
LES:      [((turns head to TV then back))
ELY:      hol(d) ((shakes fork slightly))
           (1.5) ((E moves fork towards L; L turns to TV))
           ((E moves the fork further & L turns head a little further
           away))
LES: ->    ma[mi:
           [((turns to look at E))
           (.)
ELY:      °°mm mm°°
LES: ->    [↑Mami:
           [((pushes E's arm down with slightly irritated face))

```

In some situations, the summons is issued in a fairly imminent situation when the child is coerced to comply. For example, in Extract 4.5 the spoonful of food is delivered till Leslie's mouth when Leslie suddenly utters "Ely"; similarly in Extract 4.8 his PAPA is uttered when Mum has scooped up a spoonful of porridge and is about to deliver, and in Extract 4.9 12-2;0.8-MIX Hold, the child has tried to get away from the forkful of pizza by turning away several times but the helper still moves the fork to pursue the feeding and he turns to confront the helper when uttering "mami:". In other situations, the summons is issued when the interlocutors have produced an other-initiated-repair (OIR) token like 'huh' such as in Extract 4.6 line 9 and Extract 4.7 line 5, and are waiting for a responsive action from the child.

What is interesting is why uses a summons, when the caregiver is already paying attention to the child? Clayman (2013) mentions prefatory address term projects a disjunctive turn. What the child does here is not only to seek interlocutors' attention (which is already present) but an attention to a projection of a different course of action. Comparing to other initiating actions, when joint attention is already established, the child can simply initiate by directing the interlocutor's attention to the matter of interest. For example, in Extract 3.9, he seeks assistance by directly reporting his trouble "I cannot hang this", or in an object showing sequence (cf. Kidwell) such as the one below, the child points out the object of interest by simply naming it "plane" and pointing it at the TV. In these cases, the child's initiating actions

assume that the interlocutor's attention is ready or readily accessible at the point of his talk.

Extract 4.10 12-2;0.8-MIX Plane

```
1 LES:      [plane
2            [((points at TV))
3 ELY:      oh plane
```

Now we will dive in a couple of these examples and see how some of these summons is designed, how they may be treated, and what they do to the trajectory of the sequences.

First, let us examine the design of 'Ely' in Extract 4.3 in more details:

Extract 4.3 12-2;0.8-MIX ELY

```
1          (4.0) ((Mum just walks away; L looks down at tripod; E
proffers a spoonful of rice))
2 LES: -> †Ely ((gazes at E; right hand points front))
3          (0.5) ((L leans back))
4 ELY:      †tita: ((E moves spoon closer to L))
5          (1.8) ((L pushes the spoonful of rice and turns to TV))
6 LES:      [((coughs ))]
7 ELY:      [mm las' ]one (.) an' then,=
8 LES:      =°tita:°= ((gazes front))
9 ELY:      =|I give |you          water|melon. °okay°?
10          |((delivers a spoonful to L))
11          |((L purses mouth|then tilts head))
12          (0.3) ((E tilts spoon |facing L))
13 LES:      |†melon ((looks down))
14          (1.4) ((E sustains the spoon))
15 LES:      °melon°
```

When Ely proffered the spoonful of fried rice, Leslie utters "Ely" in a somewhat precipitous way as shown by the pitch step up and increased loudness at the onset of the name, creating a sense of imminence for attendance. His body language also works to secure engagement with Ely by pointing to a direction where Mum has just left and a stare at her (Figure 4.3). It appears that Leslie is not only summoning Ely, but requesting her to attend to something that he is pointing at.

Figure 4.3 Leslie draws Ely's attention

Since Ely head and body is not captured by camera, it is not clear if she has responded to the attention-seeking action during or after the summons, but it is clear that she has sustained the spoon at the same position close to Leslie. Leslie leans back a little (as can be seen in Figure 4.3 that Leslie is leaning against the back of the high chair). Ely's next move is not to query on what he is intending to bring her attention to, but a correction of how he should have addressed her with "tita:" (auntie in Tagalog) and not by name as he has done. At the same time, she moves the spoon closer to Leslie's mouth now that he has leaned back. That is, she is verbally responding to his talk but non-verbally pursuing the feeding action. By responding to the linguistic element and continuing with her embodied directive action, Ely totally neglects Leslie's initiation and leaves no chance for the trajectory to deviate.

When his engagement attempt falls apart, and facing a persistent force-feeding, he abandons his line of action, and focuses to get away from the feeding. He pushes the spoonful of rice and turns to an alternative activity to occupy his attention (TV). He also coughs which is arguably also a device that displays unavailability for eating and postpone the required compliance here, regardless of its genuineness. Ely disregards that coughing and trumps over to urge him to act on what she is now labelled as "last one". But as mentioned he continues to display being on a different radar by delivering an ultra-soft "tita" with a vacuous gaze to the front, which could be a delay repeat of Ely's correction or a feeble attempt to re-initiate.

4.3.1. Extending a previous talk

Even when joint attention has been established, in settings where there are multiple tracks of activities in parallel such as mealtime when people eat and talk (Kent, 2011), the child may take advantage and choose an activity that he wishes to follow, even though that may be different from the one that he is required to perform. Extract 4.11 is a case in point. This happens during feeding. Mum has just admonished Leslie for having broken a mini-tripod. She left the tripod on Leslie's tray and angrily left the dining room. The helper is about to resume feeding.

Extract 4.11 12-2:08-EN Broken (Extract 4.4)

1	ELY:	broken	
2		(6.2)	
3	ELY:	you see?	
4		(1.5) ((L looks at tripod then looks up at E))	
5	LES:	<broken [(°tis°)>	
6	ELY:	[ya:	
7	->	(1.4) ((E proffers food))	
8	LES: ->	[mami	
9		(((L looks front then at E; E holds spoon near L))	
10	ELY:	°mm mami angry° A:[::M	
11		(((E puts food in L's mouth))	
12	ELY:	big mou:. ((scraping food around L's mouth)	

Prior to Ely's proffer of food (line 7), the participants have been engaged in a talk about the tripod that Leslie has just broken. Ely first mentions 'broken' sullenly, then utters in a raising-toned 'you see?' (line 3). Asking the child ('you') to attend to an object which he has already been attending points to something additional or specific than the object itself - here, the visible broken condition, which has been the topic prior to this point. This question then implicates a blame. Leslie's description "broken this" confirms (line 3) his awareness of the condition but by adding a very soft 'this', the child is effectively holding onto an agentless topic about the state of the tripod (this is broken), instead of letting the agentful event develop (he has broken it). Ely affirms their intersubjective understanding in

the third position (line 6).

Now that Ely's 'ya' has closed the talk, she is about to deliver a spoonful in the clear while Leslie's gaze is still with her (Figure 4.4). The delivery of a spoonful itself is effectively an offer of food. It is a rather forceful one, as it does not make the child's response of acceptance or decline as a relevant next, but rather it makes opening the recipient's mouth and his eating the relevant next, leaving little autonomy to the child.

Figure 4.4 Leslie gazes at Ely as she proffers the food (Line 5)

Here, instead of accepting the food, Leslie utters "mami". With gaze at the helper, "mami" is used as a reference term rather than an address term. Given the backdrop of the just prior talk about the broken tripod, the reference *mummy* is designed for the recipient to draw connection with that talk. With this turn, the child manages to depart from the constraint set by the caregiver's first pair part (the embodied proffer of food) by taking control of his action and the course of the trajectory. He can also be heard as continuing an unfinished talk, rather than being noncompliant.

The helper responds to the child's initiation by extending his turn to 'mm mami angry', which acknowledges a common understanding that mummy is upset of the broken tripod. By doing so, she endorses the legitimacy of his initiating action, not holding him accountable for not responding to the feeding. However, she is not withdrawing the feeding

either. She holds the spoon near Leslie, and immediately after her responding comment, she latches on with an onomatopoeia "A:::M" that accompanies her unloading of food in Leslie's mouth. This vocalization mimics the action of eating putting herself in the feeding-recipient position and in doing so, it creates a mirror effect to encourage the child to do the same mouth opening. The elongation of the sound also helps maintain its openness during the unloading of the food. The vocalization is another intervention measure like the directive "big mouth" in Extract 2.1 issued only when the child is not cooperating to a desired or expected degree. So even the helper deems his additional talk as legitimate, she deals with it quickly and allows no space for any more extension of talk. Then with her mimicking sound, she steers not only the suspended course of action back, but also carries the feeding to its completion.

The helper's "big mouth" which is issued after she has already unloaded food in the child's mouth, is then not projecting for an immediate next action, but a reminder of the general cooperativeness required. It has a moral underpinning that the child has not provided it.

The participants' actions have interwoven two parallel courses of action (the talk about Mum and the feeding activity) nicely in such a way that talk can postpone the feeding and yet a verbal and embodied directive action can work to resume the feeding. This example has shown that by occupying the relevant place for a compliant action with another action, the child manages to put off a forthcoming feeding without displaying noncompliance, even when established joint attention is established.

4.4. Procuring attention to mobilize reciprocity

The multimodal features in the child's interruptive turn is crucial in action formation and ascription (Levinson, 2013). The child's initiating-like turn may be designed in a way that merely seeks attention and thus projects a temporary suspense or they may be designed in way that highly mobilize

recipency, hence propelling the directive speaker to reverse his role and provide an uptake. This is what ultimately divert a trajectory. Here is one example in which the summons interrupts the progressivity of an ongoing directive sequence:

Extract 4.12 48-2;2.27-IT Kitten's Eye

1	DAD: dove sono gli occhi del gattino. gli occhietti	DAD: where are the eyes of the kitten. the little eyes
2	(2.3)	(2.3)
3	DAD: qua?	DAD: here?
4	(2.0) ((D taps on paper, L looks at it then shifts gaze))	(2.0) ((D taps on paper, L looks at it then shifts gaze))
5	DAD: ha?	DAD: huh?
6	(2.5) ((L picks up a pen))	(2.5) ((L picks up a pen))
7	--> LES: baba ((passes it to D))	LES: baba ((passes it to D))
8	DAD: gli occhietti del gattino,	DAD: the little eyes of the kitten,

Dad is trying to instruct Leslie step by step in drawing a cat, he asks Leslie "where are the eyes of the kitten. the little eyes" (line 1) and upon no reply, Dad prompts him a place to draw the eyes "here?" and tap a specific place on the paper (line 3-4). Leslie looks at the pointed place upon the tapping then shifts his gaze back to the other side of the paper. When Dad pursues for a missing response with "ha?", Leslie bends down to pick up a colour pen and utters "baba" when he passes the pen to Dad. This giving-action (cf. Kidwell & Zimmerman 2006, 2007) is delivered without gaze at Dad, nor any prosodic emphasis like in the previous summonses. Dad deals with the summons and giving by simply receiving the pen. He resumes immediately in getting Leslie to draw the (missing) eyes of the cat (line 8) and thus does not leave any room for Leslie to project more talk.

So far, we see that by using a timely "sudden" summons, the child shows an impending desire to get out of the current course of action pursued by the caregiver. By summoning, the child engages the summoned person (whether the interlocutor or a third party) and projects a different course of action from the current one that he is tied to and in which he is constrained to

produce a certain response. Also, when being summoned, the summoned person owes the child an answer. This turns the child from being in a constrained recipient position into an initiator's position with more control in designing the next action in the interaction. And if the child is not yet asked or forced to comply, then the summons may serve to pre-empt that controlling act of the caregiver. In any case, the caregiver in pursuit of the child's action (whether s/he is also the summoned person) now have to deal with the child's summons first before they can pursue. The summoning action thus breaks off the on-going directive (or directive-implicative) sequence, and inevitably suspends it, if not eliminates it altogether.

The usage of summons then does not only secure caregiver's attention but also mobilize reciprocity through prosody and gaze, and it is a fairly remarkable skill. Sacks (1972:343) discusses that for young children to start a talk to adults is a special matter, because they seem to orient to their restricted rights to talk as a young social member by using devices like this: "You know what? Daddy" and "You know something Mommy?" in order to secure a "what?" response to allow then to go-ahead and launch their talk. Here we have a two-year-old who has yet to acquire the linguistic competence to utter something that complicated. But he is already capable in maximising the delivery of his summons with multimodality to propel or invite the summoned person to respond to query for more.

4.5. Follow-up action

The child must harness the opportunity that is created through his initiating action like summons, if he ever wants to get out of a directive sequence. So apart from the design of the initiating action, the design of the subsequent follow-up actions is also important. The child must sustain his course of action albeit caregiver's persistence of hers/his.

Failing in delivering a swift follow-up action may result in the caregiver's resumption of the pursuit, such as in the following example.

Extract 4.2 42-2;2.7-CN Unfinished milk

7	MUM: 我奶拿过来好不好	MUM: I bring the milk over alright?
8	(1.5)	(1.5)
9	MUM: 哈;	MUM: huh;
10	(0.9)	(0.9)
11	-> LES: 妈妈	LES: mama
12	(0.7) ((L looks up at M))	(0.7) ((L looks up at M))
13	MUM: °hm;°	MUM: °hm;°
14	(0.6) ((M points right))	(0.6) ((M points right))
15	MUM: 奶拿进来好不好	MUM: bring the milk inside alright?

When the mother is pursuing a response from the child (line 9) as to whether he agrees that she brings the milk over for him to finish. The child utters "mama". This summons, instead of an agreement token like *bao* "good/okay/alright"⁴, projects a different course of action from the on-going pursuit of Mum and also frames the action as self-motivated (Clayman 2013). He soon halts his sand activity in hand and looks up at the mother (line 12). The gaze works to secure mother's attention and mobilize her reciprocity (Butler and Wilkinson, 2013) to forthcoming talk. Mum's response to the summons with a rising **hm**; (line 13) offers a chance for the child to go-ahead whatever he is projecting to say, which would then be a chance for Leslie to trail off from Mum's control attempt without the need of any direct refusal or confrontation.

Figure 4.5 Leslie looks up at Mum then pans around (L13-16)

⁴ ¹ Leslie has been observed to produce the agreement token *bao* "good/okay" since the recording taken at age 1;11, but not the negative valenced *bu-bao* "not good / not okay". This developmental phenomenon, when validated, then work at the request speaker's advantage when she formulates such a choice question *bao-bu-bao* (good-not-good).

MUM: ^(a)hm; (0.6) ^(b)奶^(c) 拿进来 好不好^(d)
 hm (0.6) nai najinlai haobuhao
 hm (0.6) milk take-enter good-not-good
hm? (Let's) bring the milk inside alright?

However, after Mum's "hm", Leslie doesn't produce any continued talk. Mum self-selects to continue swiftly, pointing to her right where the house (or the milk bottle) is and latches on to re-propose on bringing the milk inside/over⁵ again at line 15 (Figure 4.5). Thus she overrides Leslie's summons and takes advantage of the joint attention to pursue on the still missing relevant response. The child's attempt has therefore succeeded in gaining the mother's reciprocity, but failed in sustaining the interaction on another course of action due to his lack of a swift follow up action. Mum manages to maintain the interaction on the milk-pursuit trajectory.

We will now examine the child's next diverting move upon Mum's re-proposal, which shows that both the design of the initiating action as well as the follow up action work together to display the genuineness of the child's initiation and ensure its success in steering the interaction away from the directive action, albeit their disjunctiveness to the on-going course of action. This action is a little long and can be divided into three parts: a series of embodied 'run-up' (lines 16-19), the key turn "(ni ting)" (y'listen) at line 20 and the successfully diverted new trajectory (lines 21-46):

Extract 4.13 42-2;2.8-CN Unfinished Milk (extended from Extract 4.2)

⁵ ² Since they are outdoor, what she means by 'inside' could be a slip of tongue representing a mixed desire of going inside the house as well as a need to accommodate the child in bringing the milk over to them or it could simply mean bring in to the open garage-garden area where they are.

15	MUM:	奶拿进来好不好	MUM:	bring the milk inside alright?
16		((L turns to the pointed direction and further sideways))		((L turns to the pointed direction and further sideways))
17		(1.4)		(1.4) ((L looks around))
18	MUM:	(°°哈°°)	MUM:	(°°huh°°)
19		(0.9)		(0.9)
20	-> LES:	('i ting) ((points up; then looks at M))	LES:	(y'listen) ((points up; then looks at M))
21		(1.4) ((M looks up; then L looks up))		(1.4) ((M looks up; then L looks up))
22	MUM:	(有)什么东西啊	MUM:	what is it (there)?
23		(5.2) ((L's head inclines; index finger moves like spraying))		(5.2) ((L's head inclines; index finger moves like spraying))
24	LES:	(pon/喷) ((moving finger gets closer to M))	LES:	(pon/spray) ((moving finger gets closer to M))
25		(2.1)		(2.1)
26	LES:	(i ting) ((finger circling outwards and upwards))	LES:	(you listen)
27	MUM:	°°什么东西啊°°	MUM:	°°what is sit?°°
28		(1.0)		(1.0)
29	LES:	(ni niao)	LES:	(you bird)
30		(0.6)		(0.6)
31	MUM:	鸟啊	MUM:	bird?
32		(2.9)		(2.9)
33		((L nods))		((L nods))
34	MUM:	°°鸟°°	MUM:	°°bird°°
35		(1.3) ((L nods))		(1.3) ((L nods))
36	MUM:	这样唱歌的吗鸟	MUM:	bird sings like this?
37		(1.0)		(1.0)
38	LES:	鸟:=	LES:	bi:rd=
39	MUM:	=di du di du 这样唱歌啊	MUM:	=di du di du sing like this?
40		(0.5)		(0.5)
41	LES:	di du di du	LES:	di du di du
42		(1.6) ((looks up at M))		(1.6) ((looks up at M))
43	LES:	<di du> [di du	LES:	<di du> [di du
44		((looks down at bucket and resumes scooping))		((looks down at bucket and resumes scooping))
45	MUM:	[didu: didu: hmhm:	MUM:	[didu: didu: hmhm:
46		hmhm: (5.4) ((M watches L's play then scratches body))		hmhm: (5.4) ((M watches L's play then scratches body))
47	MUM:	好了我们去洗手了好不好	MUM:	okay let's go wash hands alright?

A background works to support the legitimacy and genuineness of a diversion. The background here commences during Mum's pursuit at line 15. When Mum points right to the house (line 14) Leslie's gaze follows but pans continuously⁶ and slowly sideways as if he is locating something in the environment. He then slightly frowns and turns back to Mum (line 17). Upon mutual gaze, Mum again urges a response with an ultra-soft *huh* (line 18). Attending to interlocutors' pointing is what young children from around one year of age can do (Carpenter et al., 1998) but taking the time to attend

⁶ Note that the continuous gaze-panning occurs after the topicalized label 'milk', at which point, the turn can be projectable as relevant to the milk-pursuit.

beyond the pointed direction, when (an agreement) response is awaited, is demonstrably doing something else. The series of embodied actions (observing around, looking concerned and swiftly turning back to Mum) suggest that there may be something noteworthy, which would make interrupting the on-going course of action legitimate to perform. While there is no way to verify what the child is attending to, it is certain that he has taken the liberty to disregard Mum's pending milk-pursuit. It is arguably not a disagreement but a disalignment.

The key turn (*'i ting*) at line 20 is then produced against the backdrop of this intersection of a long-awaited agreement and the child's autonomous observation. His brief utterance is not acoustically clear (to myself the transcriber) but it sounds like (*n*)*i ting* "(you) listen", and this rendition would be congruent with his simultaneous gaze at Mum and upwards pointing (Figure 4.6) as well as supported by their subsequent talk about bird's singing.

Figure 4.6 Pointing at '*'i ting*' (L20)

Leslie is drawing Mum's attention again in a response position but this time specifically *to* something intangible, as is displayed with the additional pointing, on top of the visual and verbal elements packaged in the turn (*'i ting*) "listen" (cf. "look" in Nino 2015). Pointing helps draw Mum's attention to the point of interest. Different from object-showing sequences (Kidwell and Zimmerman, 2007) in which a physical object is present, what

the child wants to indicate here is something 'in the air' (perhaps some sound), therefore his upward pointing. His gaze is also not fixated at any specific object (nor is Mum's and his subsequent look in line 21). Instead, Leslie looks at Mum to ensure the interlocutor's attention is secured as he speaks. This is clearly a self-motivated initiating action that is not provided for in the scope of the prior turns which seek an agreement response. The verbalized item (*'i ting*) "(y'listen)", being an imperative-formulated directive, enables the child to launch a new course, and thus suspending other on-going activities (both his sand-playing and Mum's milk-pursuit). This has a similar function to the turn-prefaced 'listen' in first positions, shown in Sidnell's (2007) data from a TV reality show, in which adult participants use 'listen' to "pre-empt further development of the course of action otherwise underway". Despite the unclear acoustics due to this outdoor episode, the import brought by the accompanying pointing still clearly signals to something worth taking note of *first*. Thus the turn (*'i ting*) enables the child to legitimately disalign and divert from the prior and the larger course of action in progress.

The diversion can be deemed as successful as Mum provides a fitting subsequent response by looking-up (line 21) to locate the reference of the child's pointing (see the change in her facing orientation in Figure 4.6 and 4.7. This displays a recognition of the prior turn as a request to pay attention to some reference in the surrounding and provides a relevant second pair part. Mum has now become a recipient of the new sequence initiated by the child.

Figure 4.7 Pointing up after a 1.4 second pause (L21)

The action underlying the turn **'i ting** "listen" works effectively not only in diverting but making a sustainable alteration. What **'i ting** does is to direct Mum to something intangible. Attention-drawing often projects not only a second pair part (paying attention), but a longer sequence as the child's preliminary language leaves much work for the adult to figure out what it is that the child wants to point out. It is common then for adults to extend the sequence by providing a label, an appreciation or a comment after seeing the object (cf. Kidwell and Zimmerman, 2007). So here what we have is a rather long series of collaborative follow-up actions: locating the object of interest (line 21-27), identifying and discussing whether the source of the sound is 'bird' (line 29-35), and questioning whether a bird sings like what they hear (line 36-45) (there is some siren sound at the background). Since Mum encounters difficulty in identifying the object and has doubt about Leslie's suggestion of 'bird', the sequence is extended to an even longer stretch in order to reach a common intersubjective understanding. Driving the new course of action far away from being the original directive sequence may help prevent it from resumed.

To sustain the new course of action, it requires collaboration, i.e. both participants orient toward a common focus of attention (M.H. Goodwin, 2006). It is then important that the young child "follows up" his initial attention-drawing action to keep his interlocutor on the new track, even though his real interest might be in the sand-play rather than the sound. Their continuous engagement is done through a joint investigation (line 21,

Leslie looks up after seeing Mum looks up), clarification sequence raised by Mum and supported by Leslie's gesticulations and verbal responses (lines 22-29) including a repeat of the initial attention-drawing turn (**'i ting**) at line 26 that re-requests for Mum's action and keeps her on track. Leslie could be telling Mum about 'mosquitoes' based on his spray-like gesticulation (line 23-26), unclear utterances that sound like (**pen**) "spay" at line 24 and (**ni yao**) "you bite" at line 29. Nevertheless, Mum heard the reference as *niao* "bird" and Leslie confirmed it with a delayed nodding at line 33 and another nodding at line 35. Whether they have reached the right reference is not essential. The key is a continuous engagement on the new course of action. Once the track seems totally distant from the original milk-pursuit sequence, Leslie does not 'follow up' any longer but resumes scooping the sand (line 43-44). Upon seeing this (line 46), Mum initiates another control attempt (line 47). This shows 'follow-up' work is important to keep the diversion at work and prevent the caregiver from starting out with another control attempt.

4.6. Summary and Discussion

In this chapter, we look at some of the child's verbal turns upon caregivers' pursuits of a responsive action and discover that despite a small inventory of lexicon, the child can in fact use his few words (acquired or borrowed from earlier turns, proto-words or non-words) very creatively. These verbal turns are often treated to be responsive, although some of them have a more initiating quality to them.

One response-like action is a description of some on-going activity, which can be taken as presenting an account or fact for his non-compliance ('sand' in Extract 4.2). The advantage in highlighting some fact or a concern is that the child is not orienting to a compliance nor a defiance (he is not verbally refusing or rejecting). This could result in caregivers' modification of their requested action taking into account of his concern to accommodate him in order to achieve his/her agenda. That is, some verbal turns could serve to negotiate and achieve more favourable terms of the requested action, but

might not get him out of the control act altogether.

How the verbal turn is produced in orchestration with other multimodal elements is vital in forming the action as responding or initiating. This will have implications in the caregiver's next move and the development of the trajectory. Generally, the child's initiating actions in a response position are to draw the caregiver's attention to something else, and possibly demands for a response, thus reversing their roles as an initiator and responder.

One simple and effective device to break off from the interaction is the use of summons. The child may call his caregivers for something that is not relevant to the pending action from him (such as giving a pen to the caregiver in Extract 4.7). This independently inserted sequence may result in the requestor's redoing the request. Hence, this type of summons brings about only a temporary suspension.

The child may also add more multimodal features to the design of such summoning action so to enhance its imminence and genuineness. This helps not only in gaining reciprocity but also mobilising a new course of action, i.e. demanding a response towards a newly projected sequence. The multimodal features deployed include:

- prosodic: outburst delivery through pitch step-up and/or loudness
- visual: intense gaze at the summoned person or the interested matter
- gesture: pointing, reaching out

These features work as a floor-holding device that projects the child as having more to say and thus maximising the effect in propelling reciprocity. Interlocutor's next action becomes critical to the development of the directive trajectory. At the same time, they reflect the child's awareness that he is breaking off from the on-going sequence. (cf. Butler & Wilkinson, 2013; Clayman, 2013a).

Similar to the function of this summons is the use of a counter request

(or request-like turn) to attend something such as (**'i ting**) "y' listen" in Extract 4.13. Depending on the environment that they are housed (or how impending the child needs to act), these turns may also embody some of the above mentioned multimodal features. The design features are to display a genuine interest in something else that the child is trying to draw the interlocutor to. When these features are not present, then the attention-seeking attempt may be totally ignored as in Extract 4.3 with an unenthusiastic **↑melon (1.4) °melon°** that lack in mutual gaze and gesture.

Many of these non-pair-typed verbal elements, especially those with an initiating quality like address terms produced in a position where a response is due frames the action as self-motivated, rather than constrained by the first action, allowing the child to exert more agency (Clayman, 2013). These independent actions thus paint the child as a more autonomous body.

Most of the verbal attempts presented in this chapter, whether treated as relevant or not to the ongoing course of action, may result in a suspension of an impending pair-typed response from the child, the interaction may even derail the caregiver's control attempt, at least temporarily, or the caregiver may modify his/her pursuit in such a way that it accommodates his preference or current situation (e.g. Extract 4.2) mentioned in the child's turn. All of these are achieved without necessitating a direct refusal or confrontation (cf. the use of "or else" by an autistic child in Sterponi & Fasulo, 2010). The minimisation of direct refusal or rejection, whether the evasive moves are genuine or not, displays an orientation to dispreference for non-compliance, or preference for compliance, in accordance with Kent, (2011) finding, and the body of research in preference organization. The design of his moves as situated in their specific position also forms part of the ontogenesis of preference organization.

Therefore, the child's non-pair-typed actions framed by the turn's position in the course of a pursuit are sometimes being ignored or overridden,

i.e. treated as a diversion. These reactions socialize the child to orient to a normative turn-taking behaviour. Being a young social member, the two-year-old child's evasive kind of moves seem to be tolerated and only rectified at a later age, as shown in Goodwin's (2006) example below (also cited earlier as Extract 1.6) where the mother questions her son in line 10 if he hears what she has been saying about taking a shower after dinner, after he deviates with "Mom. A duck's quack doesn't echo", presenting a non-aligning action which breaches conversational rules (cf. Hester, 2016). Thus allowance given to children for non-alignment may be gradually tightened with age.

Extract 4.14 Goodwin (2006: 534-535)

(11) ((*At the dinner table*))

- 1 Mom: After dinner I want you to take a shower.
- 2 Wash your hair super good Jason.
- 3 'Cause I'll get in the shower with you
- 4 and wash it if you don't.
- 5 And you can't see it- in this light
- 6 but outside today there were blue and green
- 7 still from Friday night.
- 8 Jason: Mom. A duck's quack doesn't echo.
- 9 ((*reading bottle cap from iced tea*))
- 10 Mom: Kay.= Did you hear me?
- 11 Jason: Yeah.
- 12 Mom: Kay.
- 13 Jason: A duck's quack does // not echo.
- 14 Mom: 'Cause you don't want me to take a shower with you
- 15 Do you?
- 16 Jason: No.
- 17 Mom: I didn't think so.
- 18 'Cause you don't want to go to school tomorrow Babe
- 19 With blue and green in your hair.
- 20 'Cause all your friends will- laugh at you.
- 21 Say you have dirty hair. (0.4) From Friday.
- 22 Dad: Yeah. They'll think it's tight.
- 23 Jason: Tight tight tight tight tight. ((*chanting*))

In sum, the two-year-old child has showcased a range of creative uses of his interactional skills and rudimentary linguistic repertoire in handling the

imposing situations and contingencies. He makes use of timing in interaction, address terms, partial repeats from a prior turn, proto-words or sounds together with multimodal resources (body orientation, gesture, gaze) and repeats of these resources in the upkeep of the newly diverted course of action. Their effectiveness in handling practical tasks offer him incentives in the course of language acquisition and in furthering his understanding of turn-taking mechanism.

5. Clear Noncompliance

So far I have shown how some non-responses and non-responding verbal turns may be designed and/or ascribed to as resistance-implicative responses, and how the child displays his understandings of troubles ahead (in the case of withdrawal) or projected pursuits (in case of diverting attempts). In this chapter, I will describe some cases of bald noncompliance mainly through the use of standalone verbal negation tokens like **no** and **don't want** (and their variants). These emphatic verbal responses to requests are fairly common in parent-child interactions as reviewed in Chapter 1 by Kent, Goodwin, Cekaite and others, but much less in adult interactions, at least not in standalone turns (Thompson et al., 2015, p. 238).

5.1. The Child's Development of Negation

Before diving into the analysis, I shall offer a developmental snapshot about Leslie's verbal negation. According to my notes (See Appendix B: First Words) based on recollections, the following English negation tokens were noted during the initial period:

At 1;11.17: **no** (English and Italian), **no more**, **don wan(t)** (also **wan'**)

At 2;1.14: **I don wan(t)**, **don touch**, **cannot**

The Chinese and Italian negations were not noted on the 'First Words'. However, there are some signs in the recordings show that a possible early form of Chinese refusal **wo bi** which appeared in recording #9 and #12 at age 2;0.8 resembling a proto and truncated form of **wo bu** (I no/not). The day after at 2;0.9 in recording #15, when the helper requests **say ba(k)ba(k)** (may be **baba** 'father'), the child responds with **buya baba** in which **buya** could be a proto-word for **buyao** 'don't want'. By recording #22 at age 2;0.24, as shown in Extract 3.11, the child is already using the standard form **buyao**. In the same extract, a possible proto form of the Italian equivalent of 'I don't want' also emerges in the form of **na voia** (the standard form is **non voglio**,

negation particle plus 'want' in first person singular and present tense). Note that, as aforementioned, the Italian 'no' (/nɔ/) is a little similar with the English *no* /nəʊ/.

As for functional development, based on the latest categorization reviewed in 1.4.1 ((Beauport-Hourdel et al., 2015; Choi, 1988), most negation functions should have already emerged by the commencement of my data collection at age 2;0, and I have observed many of them in the course of analysis, but we will only focus on refusal, rejection, protest, prohibition here.

As reviewed in 1.4.1, these conventional verbal negation tokens have been studied much primarily on the age of acquisition, the order of acquisition, morphosyntactic development, relation with usage in input (Cameron-Faulkner et al., 2007) and relation with multimodal negation (Beauport-Hourdel et al., 2015). However, little is known about the differences in usage between apparent synonyms. For example, (Choi, 1988) has classified **I don't want X** in parallel with the earlier acquired form **no** for rejection function, but no explanation has been offered as to when a child uses one form over another. Conversation analysts have made attempts to describe these negation forms in their natural interactional contexts and pointed out differences in terms of affective stance, as shown in Chapter 1.5.2. Varying degrees of outrightness is displayed through prosody and accompanied body posture, compare for example, a more pleading like **I: don' want** (Kent, 2012b) and a more outright rising-toned **NO::!** (M. H. Goodwin et al., 2012). In this chapter, I seek to explore further differences by adding a sequential dimension.

5.2. Bald Noncompliance as a 'Last Resort'

For a sequential analysis, a first question is when exactly in the sequences are such negation tokens used in response to a request for action? The previous chapters suggest that a two-year-old has a few alternative means in getting around complying and these non-outright means are often

used before the need to deploy an overt verbal opposition arises. That is, a bald refusal or rejection is withheld like a 'last resort' (the negation tokens in this chapter are highlighted by an arrow). Here is an example partially discussed before and reproduced here with an extension. In this example, countering the helper's proffer of rice at line 1, the child only refuses verbally with **d'wan mo** (don't want more) at line 17.

Extract 5.1 12-2;0.8 Melon Melon (Extract 4.3)

```

1      (4.0) ((Mum just walks away; L looks down at tripod; E
proffers a spoonful of rice))
2 LES:  ↑Ely ((gazes at E; right hand points front))
3      (0.5) ((L leans back))
4 ELY:  tita: ((E moves spoon closer to L))
5      (1.8) ((L pushes the spoonful of rice and turns to TV))
6 LES:  [((coughs ))]
7 ELY:  [mm las' ]one (.) an' then,=
8 LES:  =°tita:°= ((gazes front))
9 ELY:  =|I give |you          water|melon. °okay°?
10      | ((delivers a spoonful to L))
11      | ((L purses mouth|then tilts head))
12      (0.3) ((E tilts spoon |facing L))
13 LES:  |;melon ((looks down))
14      (1.4) ((E sustains the spoon))
15 LES:  °melon°
16      (.)
17 LES:  -> >d'wan mo< ((pushes E's hand away))
18      (1.4) ((fiddling and gazing at tripod))
19 LES:  [('mama mama° )]
20 ELY:  [you wan more pi][zza? ((takes up pizza container))
21      [((L shifts gaze from E to tripod))
22      (1.8) ((L continues playing tripod while E sustaining the
pizza container))
24 ELY:  more pizza?
25      (1.3)
26 ELY:  yes?
27      (6.9) ((E cuts the pizza smaller; Mum comes in))

```

The verbal refusal to the feeding here is withheld *after* multiple alternative means of resistance has been deployed as described in the last chapter: attending to alternative tracks (M. H. Goodwin, 2006) including drawing Ely's attention to somewhere/something (line 2), turning to TV (line 5), self-talk (line 8) and request-like repetitions of 'melon' (line 13-15); displaying physical unavailability (coughing at line 6) as well as embodied avoiding

actions like leaning back (lines 3), pushing the spoon (line 5) and pursing mouth (line 11). At last, during lines 13-15, when the child's 'echoing' of the word 'melon' from Ely's prior turn (line 9) and its repetition receive no uptake and the spoon is still held right in front of Leslie who is sitting in a high chair, Leslie can be described as physically and sequentially 'cornered'. It is only then he produces the explicit verbal refusal >d'wan mo< and waves Ely's hand aside, then shifts to fiddle and gaze at the tripod in hand, displaying his unavailability to engage. The verbal refusal is therefore used in a dispreferred manner like a 'last resort' after a number of devices are used to navigate through the force-feeding.

The question is: what has Leslie accomplished by not refusing baldly in the first place at line 2? Leslie's multiple attempts in engaging in alternative activity may provide the child a more legitimate basis to hold out against a response due. As it shows, the child's participation in alternative lines of actions also requires the caregiver to deal with those contingencies first before she can resume her pursuit. Hence, if the requested action is not abandoned, at least it postpones the dealing of it.

This late deployment displays some reluctance on the child's part to oppose the adults baldly and thus an unequivocal noncompliance is withheld in the conversation instead of performed where they were made relevant in the first place (Pomerantz, 1984). This supports the claim that refusal as well as rejection are dispreferred actions in interaction, as generally described in CA literature (e.g. Heritage, 1984, pp. 265–280; Schegloff, 2007, Chapter 5); and on the other side of the same coin, it might support the claim that there is a preference for compliance (Kent, 2011)).

5.2.1. Bald Noncompliance Propelled by Physical Imposition

The above example illustrates that the child only explicitly refuses the request to eat when he has no choice, so to speak. There are evidences that suggest that the child often uses bald noncompliance only when the interlocutor upgrades the pursuit to a very forceful formulation such as a

physical imposition. The child then must 'act before he is acted upon', as in the following examples.

In Chapter 3 an example shows that the father catches the child's withdrawal (or retreating) from picking up a bottle he made dropping, he commands the child to pick it up in line 6 and line 8. As the child orients to the requested task very slowly, even after Dad's urge to hurry up 'avanti' (go on) in line 10, the father grabs the child's hand to drag him down from the sofa to the floor, it is at this time the child explicitly refuses (lines 13-17).

Extract 5.2 22-2;0.24 Pick Up (Extended from Extract 3.11)

1		(0.6) ((a bottle drops; L turns sideways and look up at Dad))
2	DAD:	pian [NO:! <i>slow</i>]/LY:!
3		[(L leans forwards))
4	DAD:	EI!
5		(0.7) ((L shrinks and faces down))
6	DAD:	tira su! ((D points at floor; L hides face behind sofa arm)) <i>pick up!</i>
7		(1.3)
8	DAD:	ti:ra su:! ((L moves outward a little)) <i>pick up!</i>
9		(0.8) ((L raises up looking at floor))
10	DAD:	avanti! ((D reaches out to L)) <i>go on!</i>
12	DAD:	(.) ((grabs L's hand))
13	LES: ->	↑ na:(h) ↑=
14	DAD:	=tira su!= ((pulls up L's arm)) <i>pick up!</i>
15	LES: ->	=↑vo:ia↑ (L13 & 15, possibly proto-form of <i>non voglio</i> 'I don't want')
16	DAD:	<A:[:VANTI>. ((drags L down)) <i>GO:: ON</i>
17	LES: ->	[(↑> awan<) ~ 不要 [:::~=] (I want) don't want
18	DAD:	[TIRARE [SU! (YOU MUST) PICK UP!
19	LES:	= [hhE:::hu:::.hhh=

Sometimes the negation token 'no' may be produced due to a physical imposition (or force compliance) is doing more than just responding. It is important to observe their precise sequential position, as the negation token may not take place in the immediate post-request space, i.e. the response-relevant place (as mentioned in Chapter 2), but a post-response position. It may have properties both as a response and an initiating action to fend off any further imposition. Such a prohibitive move claims entitlement to tell the other what not to do. Extract 5.3 illustrates this. The child is watching TV. The mother tries to draw the child's attention by tapping the high chair (line 1) and asks if he wants to eat (line 3). With no response forthcoming, she goes over in an attempt to carry him over to the high chair by force, it is only then the child issues an overt noncompliance **NO!**. But looking more closely, this 'No' is not exactly produced at the physical control action, although it can be argued that it situates in a larger response space (line 13-15). The 'No' is produced when Leslie has gotten away from Mum's physical control. The 'No' here may be heard both as a response to Mum's unwarranted physical action as well as as a prohibition to warn her off (more discussion in 5.3.4)

Extract 5.3 9-2;0.8 Sit Here

1		(0.4) ((M starts tapping high chair's backrest))
2	ELY:	becau:se [°I (give half)°
3	MUM:	[要不要吃啊? ((still tapping)) (do you) want to eat?
4	ELY:	I <u>give</u> [(one uhn) (0.6) an' fried rice
5		[(M turns to E; L glances at M then back to TV))
6		(0.7)
7	MUM:	°o::h hu:h° ((L slowly distances from M, out of camera))
8		(0.7)
9	MUM:	来坐下来这里吃好不好. ((gently taps chair, then moves away)) come, sit down here and eat alright?
10		(1.4) ((M walks towards L with open arms))
11	MUM:	来吃啦: come 'n eat
12		(0.8) ((M bends down trying to carry L))
13	LES:	#eh eh eh# ((heavily steps forward on the last 'eh'))
14		(0.5) ((M's hands drop to sides))
15	LES:	-> NO:!
16		(1.3) ((M kicks a slipper; then return to table))
17	LES:	(°wan tis°)
18		(1.6)
19	MUM:	那我吃啦: then I'm gonna eat

In Extract 5.4, an aforementioned case, Mum proposes to pour the sand back to the soil, the child remains silent and only responds with multiple *no*. When Mum approaches the bucket without his consent (line 4). While his embodied reaction (headshake and pushing) is deployed a millisecond before his verbal turn at line 6, his overt negation "noum: no=no" adds further force to stop the mother. The multiple 'no' (cf. Stivers, 2004) is produced with Leslie's wave and ends when Mum lets go of the bucket. So while being a response, the *no's* expel Mum's physical imposition.

Extract 5.4 42-2;2.7-CN Pour Back (Extract 3.7)

1	MUM: 是不是很满了我们倒回去好不好. <i>Is it very full we pour back alright?</i>
2	(0.9) ((L keeps moving sand to bucket))
3	MUM: 哈 [倒出来了好不 好.= <i>huh [(gonna) pour out alright</i>
4	((M drops trowel and reaches bucket))
5	((L shakes head, slightly pushes M's hand))
6	-> LES: =noum: no=no
7	((L waves and M lets go of bucket))
8	(0.4) ((L turns back to sand))

The negation tokens, in these few cases, function like an injunction (Wootton, 1997) or more commonly known as prohibition (Beaupeil-Hourdel et al., 2015; Choi, 1988), to forestall the interlocutor's on-going or impending physical actions. These situations are imminent, which require the child's immediate attention and responsive action. Of course the child may use some physical actions to prohibit the adult's action in the first place as seen in Extract 5.3, the child first wiggles out of the mother effortfully - there is a hearable stomp and some struggling vocalization #eh eh eh# in creaky voice. Only after that, he issues an outright **NO: !**. In Extract 5.4 too, the child instantly reacts to the Mum's touching the bucket first with some swift embodied actions, and only after that comes his verbal prohibition, although they are all launched so rapidly as if the child was pulling all his resources at

once to deal with Mum's intervention.

By forestalling the interlocutor's on-going actions, the child displays an understanding of the interlocutor's projected course of action in the immediate future. For example, in Extract 5.2, the child's swift production of **na:(h) vo:ia** (possibly a proto form of **non voglio** 'I don't want' in Italian) in line 13 right after the father's grab of his hand displays an understanding that the father is not bringing him to a favourable place or activity. Similarly, in Extract 5.4, the child's swift embodied actions together with the immediate verbal negation (lines 5-6) shows he understands Mum is not merely touching the bucket (e.g. to assess its fullness) but is projecting an undesirable action. His negation tokens are produced not only to forestall the current action but to forbid the projected courses of actions from happening.

5.2.2. Bald noncompliance not as a last resort

There are situations in which the child shows no problem in delivering a clear noncompliance early. These cases reflect a stance of having the (deontic) right to say *no*. Recall the first extract Extract 5.5 (reproduced below) where the mother asks the child to come out of the shower, the child produces **no: wan** 'no want' with headshake and confront with gaze at the mother. This may display his orientation to the situation as one that he is entitled to say *no* to: the child has been playing shower water with a bottle and a cup and so Mum's request will interrupt his play. Mum's interrogatively formulated requests respect the child in 'having a say', giving him room to agree or disagree, although her subsequent pursuits (not shown here) seem to give it away.

Extract 5.5 TEST-1;11.28 OUT OF SHOWER (Extract 1.1)

13	MUM:	leslie 我们洗澡-洗澡洗完 na .出来好不好. <i>leslie, we shower- shower is finished. come out alright?</i>
14	LES: ->	no: wan. ((gazing at M, slightly shakes head))
15		(1.9) ((L looks in the air then floor))
16	MUM:	出来啦:好不好. <i>Come out, alright?</i>
17	LES: ->	NO:! ((looks down then at M))
18		(2.2)

In fact, the outright **NO:!** in the earlier Extract 5.3 (reproduced below) can also be said to be issued early and not withheld, even though there were a few nonresponse prior to that. The child's nonresponse can be seen as a (displayed) immersion in watching TV. There has been no exchange until the mother's attempt to carry him. His emotionally charged **NO:!** may be heard as an accusation to Mum's unwarranted action of carrying him without asking - that is, positioning Mum's action as having no prior basis. Supporting this argument are the post-response unintelligible grumble-toned turn in line 17, and Mum's retreat to the dining table and announcing her start of eating. Her back off not only acquiesces the child's rejection (or prohibition), but also ratifies his right in doing so (in speaking in that manner to her).

Extract 5.6 9-2;0.8 Sit Here (Extract 5.3 line 12-19)

12		(0.8) ((M bends down trying to carry L))
13	LES:	#eh eh eh# ((hearably steps forward on the last 'eh'))
14		(0.5) ((M's hands drop to sides))
15	LES: ->	NO:!
16		(1.3) ((M kicks a slipper; then return to table))
17	LES:	(°wan tis°)
18		(1.6)
19	MUM:	那我吃啦: <i>then I'm gonna eat</i>

5.3. No vs Don't want

Given that both 'don't want' and 'no' may be withheld in interaction and both can be a result of interlocutor's physical imposition, we need to understand better what difference(s) it makes to respond with 'I don't want'

or 'no'.

5.3.1. 'Don't Want' proceeds 'No'

It seems a good idea to start exploring the differences between these two negation tokens with episodes where both tokens are deployed, and to analyze if their sequential positions can be revealing. It turns out that there are a number of cases in the data in which 'don't want' (or its variants) is used before 'no'. We have seen one such example earlier (reproduced below).

Extract 5.5 TEST-1;11.28 OUT OF SHOWER (Extract 1.1)

13	MUM:	leslie 我们洗澡-洗澡洗完na.出来好不好. <i>leslie, we shower- shower is finished. come out alright?</i>
14	LES: ->	no: wan. ((gazing at M, slightly shakes head))
15		(1.9) ((L looks in the air then floor))
16	MUM:	出来啦:好不好. <i>Come out, alright?</i>
17	LES: ->	NO:! ((looks down then at M))
18		(2.2)

When the child responds to the mother's first request⁷ to come out of shower, he responds with **no: wan** 'no want', but to the second request (a pursuit) he utters **NO:!**. As mentioned, the early deployment of negation 'no want' shows that the child sees no problem in refusing Mum's request at line 13.

Encountering a refusal, Mum does not override with enforcement (like 'I don't care' by a father in Kent's study, 2012b) . She reformulates with a kind of imploration through the use of an elongated 啦 'la' particle as if the request task (coming out the shower) is for the benefit of the requestor. This LA particle has been shown in Cantonese data⁸ to be a device for soliciting agreement while expressing a sense of eagerness and appealing for sympathy (Luke,1989). Despite being a weak reformulation, the pursuit action itself

⁷ There is actually a request sequence before the request at line 13 issued when Mum enters the bathroom to call the child out, but the child 'responds' or 'greet' Mum with a 'Hi' and hence it is not certain whether the child has heard the request.

⁸ Mandarin and Cantonese, being Chinese dialects, share much in common and the mother's Mandarin has also much influence from Cantonese, since she grew up in the Cantonese speaking Hong Kong.

disclose a non-acceptance of the child's negation. It is under such circumstance, the child pushes further with the strong NO:!. The move from 'no want' to 'no' may therefore be an upgrade of entitlement in noncompliance. We see here a case of the Mum positioning herself as having no authority in commanding the child, and the child's display of having right to say 'no' and right in getting his indisposition accepted.

5.3.2. A case of 'don't want more'

After a granular examination of a handful of examples, I would like to suggest that the use of 'don't want' tends to express a lack of willingness in performing the requested action and it does not challenge the speaker's right in making the request. On the contrary, in some cases, an outright 'no' may challenge the requestor's deontic right in insisting through a display of heightened entitlement. Let us now see in greater details how these differences come off in interactions. First, we return to

Extract 5.1 12-2;0.8 Melon Melon (Extract 4.3)

.

Extract 5.1 12-2;0.8 Melon Melon (Extract 4.3)

```

1      (4.0) ((Mum just walks away; L looks down at tripod; E
proffers a spoonful of rice))
2 LES:  ↑Ely ((gazes at E; right hand points front))
3      (0.5) ((L leans back))
4 ELY:  tita: ((E moves spoon closer to L))
5      (1.8) ((L pushes the spoonful of rice and turns to TV))
6 LES:  [((coughs ))]
7 ELY:  [mm las' ]one (.) an' then,=
8 LES:  =°tita:°= ((gazes front))
9 ELY:  =|I give |you      water|melon. °okay°?
10      |((delivers a spoonful to L))
11      |((L purses mouth|then tilts head))
12      (0.3) ((E tilts spoon |facing L))
13 LES:  |↑melon ((looks down))
14      (1.4) ((E sustains the spoon))
15 LES:  °melon°
16      (.)
17 LES:  -> >d'wan mo< ((pushes E's hand away))
18      (1.4) ((fiddling and gazing at tripod))
19 LES:  [('mama mama° )]
20 ELY:  [you wan more pi][zza? ((takes up pizza container))
21      |((L shifts gaze from E to tripod))
22      (1.8) ((L continues playing tripod while E sustaining the
pizza container))
24 ELY:  more pizza?
25      (1.3)
26 ELY:  yes?
27      (6.9) ((E cuts the pizza smaller; Mum comes in))

```

The child's refusal >d'wan mo< is not only a response to the on-going action of sustaining the spoon, but to the larger feeding project (cf. Levinson, 2013 for the concept of 'project') as conveyed in the use of 'more'. In comparison to a mere 'don't want' (or his early version 'no-want' in Extract 1.1) which may be used to respond to an initial offer or proposal, 'don't want more' presupposes that the child has already consumed some food and more of it is no longer desired; and therefore it is used later in the activity context. Comparing it to an abrupt 'no', >d'wan mo< here is not to obstruct a feeding motion - the same spoonful has already been placed near his mouth during lines 1-5 and again since line 10 until his refusal at line 17. The verbal refusal here functions like a request for ending the feeding activity which has already been going on for a while, by means of offering an account on his cease of desire to eat. By doing this, the child orients to caregiver as someone who has the obligation to take care of or respect his will. It does not however challenge the requestor's right in requesting.

Both the position and composition of the refusal reveals the child's orientation to performing it as a disaffiliative action. The verbal refusal is not only sequentially withheld until the child is 'cornered' (as discussed earlier), but it is also produced softly and rapidly, without mutual gaze, and accompanied with a gesture to wave the food away (Figure 5.1 [a] below). The softness and lack of gaze displays some reluctance in confronting the requestor on the matter, which perhaps displays an understanding of lack of right in doing what he is doing. His quickened multimodal refusal together his subsequent disengagement (Figure 5.1) constitutes a practice to quickly get out of the undesired situation.

Figure 5.1 Leslie's refusal and subsequent disengagement

The helper's subsequent pursuit does take into account the child willingness or 'want' as is expressed in his refusal. She orients to this contingency by incorporating 'want' in her next offer **you wan more pizza?**. That is, the helper ratifies the child's right in expressing his willingness. This is drastically different from a case presented by Kent (2012b:66) in that when a daughter refuses to eat, the father responds with 'Don't care' invalidating her account:

Extract 5.7 (Kent, 2012b, p.66)

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

But upon the child's disengagement, Ely changes the full-fledged construction to a more simplified 'more pizza?' to finally just the polar question particle 'yes?'. The second reformulation 'more pizza?' without orientation to the child's 'want' opens up the question to whether the child wants or can accept more pizza. The re-offer of 'more pizza' also ties formally to the child's refusal of not wanting 'more' but this re-offer assigns ingeniously an interpretation that the lack of want as merely on the rice proffered earlier rather than on eating in general. While these reformulations progressively facilitate the child's responding by offering a ready-made response, it also gradually narrows down the response options to a 'yes', strongly orienting to acceptance as a preferred next action.

Despite the continued pursuit, at the very least the refusal has now accomplished in making the helper modify her course of action and in enhancing the child's situated entitlement. Ely's verbal offers make the child's verbal acceptance (or decline) a relevant next, i.e. she is offering him a possibility to say 'no' instead of demanding compliance with her former physical insistence of feeding. Therefore, through declaring his lack of 'want' and making interlocutor to orient to this, the child manages to reclaim entitlement in having a say to the feeding activity. Verbal refusals are therefore not only a tool for noncompliance but also for power negotiations.

A final note about this refusal is its complex moral aspect. Although the child displays awareness that the refusal is a dispreferred and

disaffiliative action, he does not orient to it as an offence. The verbal refusal is followed instantly by the child's attentional shift to the tripod in hand. The genuineness of his interest in the tripod is however questionable due to his subsequent evasive gaze work. When his sing-song like mumble (line 19) overlaps with Ely's question (line 20), he glances at his interlocutor but then quickly shifts gaze back to the tripod and stops mumbling at "you wan more pi-" - as Ely's turn becomes projectable as another insistent offer of food. This attentional withdrawal shows that he deliberately ignores Ely's talk and withholds any kind of engagement. The child's withdrawal here is more similar to his outright withdrawal when being spotted of having a wrong posture in Extract 3.10 'Sit like that' rather than the guilt-implicative avoidance in Extract 3.11 Pick up, to which I will compare now.

5.3.3. Pleading 'don't want'

In the Extract 5.2, reproduced below, the child's emotionally laden delivery of 'I don't want' *pleads* the father to attend to his unwillingness rather than *tells* him in a more outright manner to attend to it, as is in the previous case **Error! Reference source not found..**

Extract 5.2 22-2;0.24 Pick Up (Extended from Extract 3.11)

1		(0.6) ((a bottle drops; L turns sideways and look up at Dad))
2	DAD:	pian [NO:! <i>slow</i> !LY:!
3		[(L leans forwards))
4	DAD:	EI!
5		(0.7) ((L shrinks and faces down))
6	DAD:	tira <u>su</u>! ((D points at floor; L hides face behind sofa arm)) <i>pick up!</i>
7		(1.3)
8	DAD:	ti:ra su:! ((L moves outward a little)) <i>pick up!</i>
9		(0.8) ((L raises up looking at floor))
10	DAD:	avanti! ((D reaches out to L)) <i>go on!</i>
12	DAD:	(.) ((grabs L's hand))
13	LES: ->	↑ na: (h) ↑=
14	DAD:	=tira <u>su</u>!= ((pulls up L's arm)) <i>pick up!</i>
15	LES: ->	=↑vo:ia↑ <i>(L13 & 15, possibly proto-form of non voglio 'I don't want')</i>
16	DAD:	<A:[:VANTI>. ((drags L down)) <i>GO:: ON</i>
17	LES: ->	[(↑>awan<) ~不要[:::~= <i>(I want) don't want</i>
18	DAD:	[TIRARE[SU! <i>(YOU MUST) PICK UP!</i>
19	LES:	=[hhE:::hu:::.hhh=

The child's refusal 'na voia' is used only when the child is being pressed sequentially and physically. The father insists (with imperative-directives 'pick up' in 6 and 8) and hurries (with avanti! 'go on!' in line 10) the child to rectify a transgression, i.e. the child is being treated as guilty of. He orients to the child's lagging in delivering a compliant action as insupportable by coercing the child to comply immediately. The child instantly responds with the possibly proto-form **na:(h) vo:ia** 'I don wan' while the father continues dislodging him from the sofa with a repeated directive **tira su!** 'pick up!' that overrides the child's ongoing entreaty. Different from the outright 'no' that can also be issued upon a caregiver's physical impositions to command a

suspension of the caregiver's physical coercion as discussed above, the perceivable 'I don't want' here conveys the child's strong disinclination in complying through an emotional display. The turn 'I don wan' is produced in high pitch, with a little breathing and sound stretch. Goodwin et al. (2012) describes such emotionally laminated noncompliance responses as positioning the child to be helpless and making appeal with compassion. This pleading turn is then "implicitly casting the parent as someone who has obligations to take the child's feelings and position into account" (Goodwin et al. 2012:33).

If the child was to use 'no', the child might be working towards getting the speaker to suspend the proceeding of speaker's action (i.e. dragging him down). However, by merely expressing his unwillingness in a whiny voice the child victimizes himself and entreats at the mercy of the interlocutor to suspend the projected action. There lies in an understanding of right and rightness. The child orients to the father as the one who can grant the suspension of his request, rather than the child has right in demanding for the suspension. At the same time, a pleading action implicates the child's admission to the offence - compare to the NO:! in Extract 5.3 Sit Here (discuss below) in which the child outright 'no' that follows by some trailing grunt (line 17) point to the mother as the one who has committed some untoward act. The father ignores the child's entreaty by prosodic upgrading and commanding the child to proceed with the understood requested task (AVANTI: presupposes the interlocutor knows what to go on). That is, the father is ratifying the right conferred to him and heightening the entitlement leaving little option for noncompliance (see Craven & Potter, 2010). This insistence shows that the requestor may choose to claim a high entitlement that overrides their orientation to contingency.

5.3.4. Outright 'NO'

In contrast to the above 'I don't want', the child's outright 'NO' (line 15) in Extract 5.3, forbids the mother's picking him up over to the high chair. Together with his trailing grunt (line 17) that airs some emotion in an admonishing tone, it points to the mother as the one who has committed some

untoward act.

Extract 5.3 9-2;0.8 Sit Here

1		(0.4) ((M starts tapping high chair's backrest))
2	ELY:	becau:se [°I (give half)°
3	MUM:	[要不要吃啊? ((still tapping)) (do you) want to eat?
4	ELY:	I <u>give</u> [(one uhn) (0.6) an' fried rice
5		[(M turns to E; L glances at M then back to TV))
6		(0.7)
7	MUM:	°o::h hu:h° ((L slowly distances from M, out of camera))
8		(0.7)
9	MUM:	来坐下来这里吃好不好. ((gently taps chair, then moves away)) come, sit down here and eat alright?
10		(1.4) ((M walks towards L with open arms))
11	MUM:	来吃啦: come 'n eat
12		(0.8) ((M bends down trying to carry L))
13	LES:	#eh eh eh# ((heavily steps forward on the last 'eh'))
14		(0.5) ((M's hands drop to sides))
15	LES:	-> NO:!
16		(1.3) ((M kicks a slipper; then return to table))
17	LES:	(°wan tis°)
18		(1.6)
19	MUM:	那我吃啦: then I'm gonna eat

It should be highlighted that the apparent⁹ lack of a joint attention (or the available of an alternative activity) might have aided the child's outright rejection. Before the mother's call of attention by tapping the high chair (line 1 and 3) and questioning (line 3), the child has been engaged in watching TV with full attention. When the child eventually turns to the mother, she seems to have just turned to Ely who is telling her that she has already fed the child some food. The child quickly shifts gaze back to TV and starts moving slightly away from the mother (and out of camera) while still watching TV. When Mum's attention returns to the child (line 9), she reformulates specifying the requested actions (come over, sit and eat), but continues to receive no response. At the end of her turn in line 9 (while notionally soliciting the child's agreement with *baobubao* 'alright?'), she initiates to walk towards the child to physically bring him over. The child's response cry with

⁹ Unfortunately the camera does not at all time captures participants' gaze, but most of the time inferences can be made based on their head / facing direction.

multiple saying (cf. Stivers, 2004) #**eh eh eh**# works to forestall Mum's ongoing persisting action while depicting an understanding of a lack of prior agreement. Therefore, it is possible that the lack of mutual attention to the interaction has empowered the child in expressing an outright rejection.

The outright **NO:!** is in fact produced in the clear *after* Mum's retreat (line 14). Its loudness, stress and slight lengthening displays an outright stance. This pitch leap of rise-fall contour is perhaps the most dramatic way in displaying a defiant opposition (Goodwin et al, 2012:27). It tells the adult not to do what she is proceeding just now, implicating her wrongness in commissioning the action. The sequence-final softly uttered (**wan tis**) is appended like a self-talk and a complaint about the just prior event, furthering the attribution of wrongness to the coercive action taken by mother. The mother casually kicks a slipper to under the sofa (that somewhat trivializes the dispute) and her silence also ratifies the child's right in suspending her action. She acknowledges his rejection by retreating to the dining table and announces that she is going to eat (by herself) *then*, i.e. 'in that case'.

5.3.5. A case of 'No' proceeds 'Don't Want'

There is one case in which 'No' appears before 'don't want'. However, a closer examination reveals that this is not an exception.

Here at the end of dinner, Ely and Leslie are sitting on the floor with toys. Ely is trying to feed more while Leslie has shown some sign of unwillingness and been trying to get away with the feeding including explicit expressions like 'no like' in the prior sequence. Now Ely proffers a spoonful of rice quickly with one hand cupping his chin (line 1), while continuing the verbal interaction with a repair (line 2) to clarify some unintelligible word that Leslie has said earlier. Leslie immediately turns away from Ely and shouts 'NO:U! DON. WAN!' These two negation tokens are produced syllable by syllable with much accentuation on each sound. Also, 'don't want' is issued in overlap with the helper's clarification 'mh?' and hence it is not a

reply to it. They can be heard as one turn. Similar to the cases examined before, the 'no' here rejects to the feeding as well as prohibits it. The 'don't want' unit is added on making the turn to come off as a manifesto declaring his indisposition for the food. The whole turn designed with strong prosodic features of beating rhythm and loudness displays anger and a heightened claim of entitlement, demanding his co-participant to 'back off'. The face-wiping face with his palm with the sounds ch:::: is also done in an indignant manner. The child's emotionally charged negation here is built on a sequential basis of his prior resistance and expression of unwillingness not being heard and therefore this upgraded stance points to an judgement that his co-participant is at fault for neglecting his prior refusals or for insisting.

Ely's treatment of his outright rejection is interesting. She utters a quiet 'mh?' cancelling any clear understanding, and clarifies with the question 'enough?'. With the child's repeated 'no no' in line 11, Ely takes it as an agreement to her question 'enough' and calmly furthers the course of action by telling him to drink water. Her subsequent turns downplay the child's forceful pushback and disregards any possible assignment of moral responsibility for her insisting action.

Extract 5.8 49-2;2.27-EN {10:37} NO DON WAN

1		[(E proffers food)]
2	ELY:	what [did you [say]
3		[(L turns away)]
4	-> LES:	[n:]NO:U!
5		(0.5)
6	ELY:	[*°mh?°°
7	-> LES:	[DON. <u>WAN</u> !
8		(.)
9	LES:	ch:::: ((wipes face))
10	ELY:	enough?
11	LES:	[nou nou hh
12		[(shakes head)]
13	ELY:	okay dri[n' wate:r
14	LES:	[enough,

5.4. Summary

In this chapter, I have surveyed some cases containing two overt negation tokens 'no's and 'don't want' (and their variants). It is found that first clear noncompliance is often withheld to a later position in a request sequence or a later pursuit sequence. That is, they are used as a 'last resort' when other less explicit resistance resources have been deployed and failed. Alternatively, they may be deployed in imminent moments such as when they are being forced to comply, i.e. a disregard of autonomy. A sequential analysis reveals that 'don't want' tends to be used as a refusal before the more entitled 'no', which can also play a dual role of rejecting while prohibiting further pursuits, but multimodal resources used in the formulations also play an important role in their meaning-making and should not be overlooked. More data and a statistic study would be helpful to reinforce some of the observations raised in this chapter.

'No' and 'don't want' have at times been perceived as synonyms in the studies of negation. But it is important we question the existence of true synonymy, as Bolinger puts it: "The idea that things can be the same but different or different but the same is prerequisite to science" (1977, p. 2). It is hoped that what this chapter sets out to do in differentiating them against the flux of interactions makes a start for future exploration.

6. Conclusion

As stated in Chapter 1 of this thesis, this study set out to determine, through a close investigation of naturally occurring data, how a two year old child handles a variety of requests for actions from his parents and caregivers. In particular, what resources are available to the child in constructing his responses to these requests, including linguistic and multimodal ingredients and their employment in a range of sequential contexts. The aim was to gain, through a careful description of such child-adult interactions, a better understanding of the young child's social understanding as reflected in the ways in which he formulates and reformulates his actions in response to the adults' requests.

In this concluding chapter, I will first recapitulate the main findings below, and then highlight what contributions the present study might be able to make to the existing literature. Finally, I will suggest several possibilities for further studies.

6.1. Summary

This study has shown that a two-year-old child is already in possession of a good number of ways of responding to requests for actions, which are sequentially significant and not idiosyncratic (cf. Wootton, 1997). The various locations in interactions where resistance-implicative elements may show up is discussed in Chapter 1. The diverse ways of not responding and responding in a non-aligned manner are illustrated in Chapter 2 and 3 respectively. Lastly Chapter 5 demonstrates how the young child deploys negation tokens in various sequential positions and contexts, and what stance they implicate. The multimodal actions which the child formulates and presents in a second position appear to be designed in ways which display the child's understanding of the adults' requests and at the same time his take on

it: delaying, disengaging, withdrawing, attention-diverting, getting around an expected compliance or non-complying to the caregiver's requests for action.

The deployment of the various resources at different sequential environments attend very closely to the child's understandings of the talk in progress; specifically, his co-participant's mind and behaviour. He can attribute and project interlocutor's actions, as Wootton, Kidwell and others have shown in their work (Kidwell, 2011, 2013, Wootton, 1997, 2006). There are numerous cases in which the child, based on early interactions, arrives at an understanding of the other's behaviour: for example, Chapter 3 shows that the child's gaze drop may take place right after caregivers' turns which may be heard as pointing out some wrongdoing on the child's part (Ely's **or:h** in Extract 3.10 and Dad's **pianNO:EI** in Extract 3.11). But his differentiated actions, namely disengagement through a simple departure from mutual attention in contrast to withdrawal through hiding his face shows a distinctive understanding and assessment of the situation (which includes who the co-participants are and what is at stake, etc.). In Chapter 4, the child shows understandings of whether the caregiver is going to pursue any further, by launching rapidly a new course of action and displaying his awareness of its disjunctiveness through the usage of address terms, or in other cases, a new course of action is quickly launched at sequential junctions where the request could have ended, and he also shows ways to sustain the newly initiated course of action in order for the interlocutor to come off from the previous request sequence. This shows an ability to attribute and project the other's actions. Then finally in Chapter 5, it was shown how the child can display an intersubjective understanding of his entitlement in-situ: which context he may refute directly; when or to whom he may escalate his opposing stance.

6.2. Main Contributions

The current study has addressed an under-developed topic regarding a young child's ways of responding to requests for action and their implications on his state of mind.

6.2.1. On responses to requests for action

The present study will hopefully add value to the existing literature on directive-response sequences by providing findings (1) focusing on responses, (2) from a much younger child (3) in a wider range of contexts, and (4) showing a fuller spectrum of responses than previous studies (Figure 1.6). It may also have implications for parents, caregivers and the general public, in that it may help to dispel a particular misconception about very young children (as detailed below).

(1) Although interactional studies have provided rich insights into request sequences (see Chapter 1.3.2 and 1.5), focus has been placed primarily on requests and directives and only secondarily on their responses (e.g. Craven & Potter, 2010; Goodwin et al., 2012; Kidwell, 2013). The present study hopefully adds another piece to this puzzle.

(2) Another possible contribution of the present work relates to the young age of the child participant. The most similar study to mine is the work by Kent, MH Goodwin and a few others who examine family interactions, but they worked with older children (the youngest being four years old in Kent's, 2011). These children are capable to offer account for their noncompliance, negotiate and reason with parents (e.g. Aronsson & Cekaite, 2011; Goodwin, 2006; Kent, 2012b). My study examines a two-year-old, who may be perceived as having very limited verbal resources, but the present study evidences that a two year old has in fact many multimodal (gesture, body, vocalization, and gaze), contextual, temporal, and verbal resources at their disposal (see also discussion in 6.3.3). Some of these may have been touched upon in prior literature but the present study is, I believe, the first of its kind in laying them out comprehensively. Although these findings may not

be generalizable to all children, they may be helpful when examining other typical or atypical children.

(3) Also, most previous studies focus on routine contexts (in which a goal-oriented activity must be brought to completion), but my study has captured a wider range of contexts. Undoubtedly, routine activities are sites where requests for actions are abundant and therefore we have studies like Kent (2011) and Ochs & Shohet (2006) on mealtime, Goodwin & Cekaite, (2013) on bedtime, (Fasulo et al., 2007) on cleaning tasks. By not limiting to a specific context, my study discovers some interesting phenomena: how a request for a routine task may be employed in support of a larger goal (in Extract 4.13 Mum's hint about finishing up some milk is part of a very long sequence to get the child to end the sand play), how deontics vary in playtime contexts (e.g. Extract 3.1, Extract 3.7) and transgression (e.g. Extract 3.5, Extract 3.10, Extract 3.11, and how participants play a part of the context (compare Leslie's responses to Dad in Extract 3.6, Extract 3.11, Extract 4.12 containing non-routine requests, and his ways of handling other caregivers). Some of these observations may be worthy of further investigations.

(4) For laying out response types that I observed in prior research, I proposed a full spectrum of responses (Figure 1.6) from compliance to defiance, with many types in between which orient to compliance, ambivalent, or are implicative of resistance or noncompliance. This then has become useful to situate specific actions of the two year old found in continuous streams of interaction. Even though a request sequence does not usually end with a single response, the implicativeness brought by each action in a response position can be traced along the response cline to see how the dynamics shifts with each pursuit.

To rectify the misconception made popular by the media, the wide range of actions found taking place in a response position in this research proves that a two year old does not in fact behave like a 'terrible two' with strong-will and irrational behaviour. Instead, their actions may have a

systematic basis in the local sequence and they may be better perceived as a 'terrific two' with refined social understandings.

6.2.2. On social understanding

The social understandings, or states of mind, as reflected through the child's responses (or actions in the second positions) are derived from local interactions, which confirms insights first reported in Wootton (2006) and Kidwell (2013), as described in Chapter 1. While Wootton's work focuses on his child's requests, the present study fills the gap on responses; and in addition to Kidwell's paper on young children's responses to summons that project requests for corrective action, the present study shed light on a much wider range of requests and responses.

Carpendale and Lewis (2006) have pointed out that among the many studies of "theory of mind", there is "an overemphasis in the field on false belief understanding with a resulting neglect of earlier social cognitive development in infancy and the process of development. " (p.47). Wootton, (2006) echoes this and expresses that what is unclear from the experimental studies on the theory of mind is how a child actually comes to understand other's beliefs and thoughts are different from theirs through their daily interactions. To that point, he suggests that what is needed in the first place is an attributional process that shows an understanding of causes from other's actions in sequences of talk. He cited a simple example of a child saying 'eh mummy' when her mother has not replied to her. The 'eh' shows that the child interprets the mother's non-response as an accountable matter - an understanding that the mother must have accessed to the child's prior utterance and yet is not replying.

My study has hopefully contributed to strengthening the claim presented in the works of Wootton (1997) and Kidwell (2013) by providing another piece of evidence that a young child is already equipped with abilities of attribution and projection of the others' conducts. The child's knowledge and belief regarding how others behave or will behave are supported by his

perceptual access to the events, as Kidwell (2011) suggested; and this knowledge in turn provides a basis for the choices and designs of his own actions in interactions.

'Belief' as a psychological construct is said to develop later around the age of three (Wellman, 1990) or four after the more primal construct 'desire' (Carpendale & Lewis, 2006; Chapter 1.2). The present study shows that 'beliefs' appears to figure earlier. A two-year-old may already have some form of 'belief' (or 'reasoning', Repacholi & Gopnik, 1997) of the other's conducts,. More investigations to qualify the various kinds of belief may be fruitful to better understand young children's development of mind.

6.2.3. Conversational analysis for early childhood research

The current study apart from contributing to the growing body of research on children in interaction has demonstrated suitability of the CA approach for research on child language, behaviour and cognition.

CA offers complementary value to the existing research on children that are mainly experimental or task-based. Examining some naturally occurring interactions with a child in an "unmotivated way" Sacks (1984, p. 27) helps discover social phenomena, orderliness of a child's behaviour, and resources that a child can make use of, which may otherwise go unnoticed if one was to start the research with a subjective perception or hypothesis. As laid out in Chapter 1, some existing relevant research on the topic focuses on visible forms (verbal or gestural) only and code them according to self-defined classifications. As a result, something is overlooked or left unexplained, such as the less tangible non-response. Even though non-response can be coded, nuances on the differences between a withholding, disengagement and a withdrawal may not be discovered without a fine temporal and holistic approach like CA. Also, given that a young child's verbal production (with proto-words and non-words) is notoriously difficult to comprehend and analyze, a CA approach with participants' orientation as a proof procedure help tackle this problem substantially. This is not to say

that caregivers' interpretation manifested in their subsequent turns is a true representation of what the child says or does. Sidnell (2015) clarifies that the strength of CA lies in showing how children orient to norms (or depart from them). Different from other methods that may strip off social or environmental factors in order to observe young children's acquired ability, CA concerns "the process of becoming a social being (p.257). For example, from how participants hold a child accountable for their actions or inactions, we can tell what ability is expected of the child in that society, and more importantly to see whether the young child shows reflexive awareness of the social norms.

CA research has demonstrated its fitness for examining psychological or cognitive concerns such as attention, agency and mental states by contributing a social dimension. As such, more and more conversation analysts are beginning to discover greater potential of very young children. "Given the multifaceted richness of children's social worlds and interactions" , academic enquiry into children's social interactions will provide individual disciplines (psychology and development, linguistics and education) "exciting opportunities for contributing, broadening and transcending traditional disciplinary norms and established ways of thinking" (Butler, 2017, p. 2).

6.3. Implications and Further Work

Numerous implications and observations springing from the analysis are worthy of further study. They spread from topics on requests and responses, to language acquisition and language socialization, to multilingualism, which are all worth exploring in the future.

6.3.1. Requests and Responses

Requests for action

Although the study does not focus on request designs, the data has given a glimpse of caregivers' requests for actions addressed to a very young child in the three linguistic varieties. Their design appears to be accommodative to the little one's linguistic competence. There are uses of tag questions (好不好 "okay / alright"), pursuit of compliance with a simple prompt **yes?** or cajolery like "come on" (来 in Chinese or **dai** in Italian) or "go on" (**avanti**), and most request turns seem fairly short. Despite the formal simplicity, some requesting and pre-requesting actions are fairly implicit and may require quite some mental work, such as hints (e.g. "your milk is still not finished you know?" in Extract 4.2, "where is the driver?" in Extract 3.9), delay offer (e.g. mentioning the provision of a watermelon in the near future to entice the child to take in the last spoonful of rice, in Extract 4.3). These designs make assumption of the child's inferential ability of the underlying action. The adults' requesting and pursuing actions in general display a recognition of the child's emerging ability of 'doing formulating' (Forrester, 2017, p. 57).

In addition to the formal design of caregivers' requests, the various practices of requesting are also worth further study. So far, Craven & Potter (2010) has showcased upgrading from modal requests to imperatively formulated directives. My data has showcased how requests may also be calibrated also through downgrading or concession, converging, breaking down the request in steps, enticing, downplaying the task (for example by talking about something else while feeding). The deployment of these practices are contingent on the child's on-going actions or responses. This real time fine-tuning of turn design is similar to what is shown in recent studies from the recruitment of assistance (Drew & Couper-Kuhlen, 2014a; Kendrick & Drew, 2016). Although some request studies involving negotiations (e.g. Aronsson & Cekaite, 2011; Goodwin & Cekaite, 2013) have given a glimpse to some of these practices, more systematic and elaborated investigations will allow us to gain a deeper understanding of the dynamics in caregiver-child interactions.

Responses

On the response side, a next step may be to conduct a statistical study to find out which response type is the most prevalent in the current dataset (and/or other young children corpora), although quantification has its own difficulty and concerns (Kent, 2011, pp. 58–63; Schegloff, 1993). My conjecture for the most frequent response is non-response. Pauses are a common feature of child interactions due to their young age, developing linguistic understanding and insufficient interactional skill. Besides, I suggest to consider also the elusive nature of non-response. It is unarguably the easiest resource to deploy, and an excellent device to defer displaying a definitive orientation to noncompliance. This has the advantage of allowing adults to drop the request (Extract 3.10) or reformulate with a more favourable term (Extract 4.2) and a chance for the young child to later comply without conviction of being defiant (Extract 2.3), i.e. precisely Kidwell's point of being seen as "caught up in their own affairs" (2013: p. 257). All of these help preserve social affiliation. A statistical study may also help prove my intuition that clear negation tokens like 'no' is in fact used not as frequently as some parents may perceive (as narrated in Figure 1.2).

Another significant thread for further study is the formation of preference organization in early childhood. Much is now known about how adult speakers organize their talk in a way so to promote social affiliation (Goffman, 1967, 1983; Pomerantz & Heritage, 2013). However, little is known on whether and how children go about designing their talk to orient to this preference, and how they come to acquire such skill in the first place. Stivers et al. (under review) is one rare study on this topic and they find that in child-child interactions, four- to eight-year-olds do not orient to social norms in providing a relevant, timely, preferred or fitted response as adults do. However, the current study based on adult-child interactions shows different dynamics¹⁰. Caregivers appear to put more pressure in making the child to respond or put him back on the adult's course of action. That is to

¹⁰ I am thankful to Dr. Kim Younhee for having pointed this out to me.

say, many of the child's actions (whether non-response or disaligned verbal elements) are prone to be interpreted as 'responding'. The assumed relevance and intersubjective understanding operate under the mechanism of adjacency pairs (Schegloff, 2007). It is a way that adults scaffold or socialize children into competent social members by materializing their plausible understanding and propel them to interact in a more adult-like fashion. The consequences of these scaffolded interactions allow the child to learn about just what actions may be interpreted as dispreferred.

Another topic that merits further study is the notions of entitlement and contingency in responses to requests for action. Existing studies (e.g. (e.g. Craven & Potter, 2010; Curl & Drew, 2008) on entitlement and contingency concern mainly with request design, but the findings in the present study demonstrate that a young child can already display various degrees of entitlement in his response design. And similar to what is known on requests, deployment of highly entitled responses may be traced back to earlier interactions. Chapter 5 illustrates that the child's emotionally charged 'NO' is only used when a caregiver insists, which rejects implicitly the child's earlier overt refusal. This sequentially based explanation rectifies then some misperception towards a two year's outright 'no' that they might appear 'suddenly' (such as the popular article in Figure 1.2 suggests) or that young children may be 'aggressive' for no reason. Although the discovery that a two-year-old has ways to claim entitlement comes perhaps not so much as a surprise. Some CA studies have already shown ways in which adult recipients may formulate their responses to reclaim their epistemic rights (e.g. Heritage & Raymond, 2012 on the use of repetitional response), or to assert agency (e.g. Clayman, 2013a on the use of prefatory address term).

Finally, some data and findings in my research may also contribute to the current discussion on whether children have difficulty in answering timely and relevantly (cf. Casillas, 2014). We are perhaps, as Casillas suggests, moving towards finding out which type of first action children have difficulty in responding to in a timely manner.

6.3.2. Agency

What is worth mentioning is the concept of 'agency'. Agency has been viewed differently because of its abstraction and different forms of manifestations in various disciplines (see Ahearn's review, 2001). One misguided approach, as Ahearn mentions, is to consider agency a synonym for resistance:

"While one can certainly understand the impulse behind equating agency with resistance, agency should not be reduced to it. Oppositional agency is only one of many forms of agency. " (p. 115)

Throughout the thesis, care has been taken not to ascribe agency (including mind and emotion) to the child's actions. To begin with, the title and the research aims are formulated as a study on how the child responds, (or at times, better 'handles'), and not how the child resists. Even so, I am aware that the child in many cases may not be 'responding', but simply 'doing his own thing'. In this sense, the term 'response' and its variants are often used for convenience only.

Being faithful to a CA approach, the analysis rests predominantly on participants' orientations. That is, I observe how the caregivers treat the child's prior actions and how the child's subsequent actions may reflect his intersubjective understanding. While agency may be more palpable in some cases like disengagement and withdrawal (Chapter 3), and timely pre-emptive initiations (Chapter 4), it may appear less certain in other cases. In those indefinite cases, caregivers may indeed not treat the child's actions as deliberate noncompliance, but they do hold his actions of not responding or not orienting to compliance accountable and pursue it. In clear noncompliance cases (Chapter 5), we may see the adult's pursuits containing blame-elements like an angry tone or a concession to back down - both orientations recognize the child's actions as his intended actions. In other words, as caregivers interact with children, they unavoidably interpret their

actions and assign agency to them. This may explain why children gradually learn to deal with this problem by bringing up an account for a perceived noncompliance (e.g. 'don't want the beans', Kent, 2011: p. 67).

To Ahearn's (2001) provisional definition of agency - 'the socioculturally mediated capacity to act', I'd then like to add that agency may be perceived as a socially or collaboratively constructed accomplishment, and not merely an individual's capacity to act. My study has provided some concrete examples that support a dialogic approach mentioned in Ahearn's paper, but a more elaborate account still awaits further study.

6.3.3. Language Acquisition

Working on this young child's dataset in depth led me to think that language acquisition may be better conceptualized as development of communication because what the child accomplishes in interactions is in fact done through deployment of multiple resources (verbal, multimodal and contextual) in tandem. Language, manifested in recognizable words, is interwoven in the orchestration of communication¹¹.

A remarkable resource that a two-year-old can make good use of is multimodality. Goodwin et al. (2012) demonstrates how body alignment and prosody are used in expressing emotion and resistance to directives. My findings support that. Chapter 5 has testified that strong prosodic features on negation tokens work to manifest entitlement and emotion. Chapter 2 and 3 have illustrated that the child's control of gaze and body orientation at certain sequential position (prior and after a request) matters as to whether he will be seen as disattending, having difficulty, disengaging or withdrawing. In these cases, "time" also works as a resource. Children's recognition of timing in turning-taking constitutes a core part of their communication competence

¹¹ The term "orchestration of communication" is apparently already used in a corporate communication theory (<http://www.anpad.org.br/admin/pdf/ESO103.pdf>). Here I am referring to the assemblage of communication resources and their interdependent workings in talk-in-interactions.

(cf. Casillas, 2014). In addition, the child's use of objects and activities in the immediate physical context (TV, a tripod in hand, ongoing sand play, some sound in the environment, etc.) has also played an important role on the trajectory of interactions, as they may stall a request for action.

The study has also witnessed moments in which interactional contingencies motivate the child's emergent and creative use of these communicational resources. Recall in Extract 4.3 (partly reproduced below), when the helper tries to force-feed a spoonful of rice (line 10) with a delayed offer of watermelon (line 9), the child follows by uttering "melon" (line 13). This lexical resource borrowed from the prior turn is deployed at a moment when he has exhausted other resources (pursed mouth, tilted head, disengaged gaze) and there is not much room for him to turn away as he is sitting in a high chair. When the first "melon" does not mobilize a change of course-of-action from Ely, who continues to hold the spoon right in front of his mouth, he produces a second "melon". So the production of the first "melon" and the repeat are propelled by interactional pressure.

Extract 4.3(Shortened reproduction)

```

9      ELY:  =|I give |you          water|melon. °okay°?
10         |((delivers a spoonful to L))
11         |((L purses mouth|then tilts head))
12         (0.3) ((E tilts spoon |facing L))
13 -> LES:  |melon ((looks at tripod?))
14         (1.4) ((E sustains the spoon))
15 -> LES:  °melon°
16         (.)
17      LES:  >d'wan mo< ((pushes E's hand away))

```

The child has also shown creative usage of words (such as address terms), proto-words and non-words. They are often supplemented with multimodal resources and are deployed to procure attention to an alternative course of action, mobilize reciprocity or sustain adult's attention on the alternative course. Equally impressive is the usage of vocalizations such as exclamation ya:: (Extract 2.3) to assert agency in the course of responding (cf. Kent's incipient compliance, 2012a), and grunts (Extract 2.4) in a post-response position to air the child's discontent.

To say a two-year-old has limited resources is perhaps an understatement. The multiple meaningful resources are part of the child's communicative competence. Their creative deployment testifies how a child reinvents a language (in Lock's term, 1980) that serves him to handle just the interactional contingencies presented in his daily life (Schegloff, 1989). This encompassing way of looking at communication development may present challenges to language acquisition and notions like mean length of utterance (MLU) - a prevalent measure in child language research that considers only formal features in a child's verbal production.

6.3.4. Multilingualism

Another theme relating to language that can be addressed in future research is multilingualism; specifically, the topic of language choice and code-switching. One observation concerns the child's use of verbal negation in different languages. We saw instances in which English negations 'no' and 'don't wan' are used in addressing the Chinese-speaking mother. There are various accounts on the table:

- 1) prominence of the English 'no' in terms of frequency in the input ((Nicoladis & Genesee, 1997) and ease of pronunciation, which may cause entrenchment (according to usage-based theory, Tomasello, 2003)
- 2) the child's language dominance (De Houwer, 2009b; Yip & Matthews, 2000)
- 3) caregiver's communicative style (Lanza, 2001),
- 4) negation particle as a functional word is prone to code-mixing (Deuchar & Vihman, 2005; Köppe, 1996)

The caregivers' multilingual competence as displayed in their everyday interactions is also crucial. It may also be interesting to note that although it has been observed that the child uses the English 'no' to all three

main caregivers, he seldomly uses the Chinese 'no' to Dad (except in Extract 5.2 with Mum's presence), the Italian 'no' to Mum (except Extract 3.7 being in Italy), or the Chinese / Italian negation to the helper (one exception of using Chinese **buya** 'don't want' noted in 5.1 when the mother was present). It could be that he has a developing understanding of his interlocutor's linguistic competence or is getting habituated to a specific language mode (Grosjean, 1998) with each individual taking their linguistic competence into consideration.

My preliminary hunch is that sequential positions of when these negation tokens seems also to be revealing. There are some instances that the child would use an Italian refusal first before he pulls out his resources in other languages. Hence, I may explore further from this rare dataset of a simultaneous trilingual child how his actions are recipient-designed with his developing multilingual skill (Filipi, 2015) and look also into recordings with multiple participants to see how participation framework works by means of language choice (Butler & Wilkinson, 2013).

6.3.5. Language Socialization

Apart from language use, through these sequences of requests for actions, a young child also comes to learn about his position in the society, his duties and obligations. When adults issue requests for action, contexts are created for the child to to 'act, react and interact'¹². At the same time, through their claim of entitlement in requesting, their social relationship with the child is being shaped up. With highly entitled requests at the onset of a sequence, such as imperatives 'pick up' (Extract 5.2) and 'say sorry' (Extract 3.8), the child comes to understand that he *ought to* pick up the item and he *ought to* apologize. Kent & Kendrick (2016) demonstrate that when imperative directives are issued after the requested action could have been performed earlier (without being requested), they "tacitly treat the absence of the action as a failure for which the recipient is accountable" (p.1). As he grows, the

¹² Thanks to Prof. K.K. Luke for pointing this out.

child is gradually socialized to reflective accountability (Forrester, 2017) and implementing his autonomy in the face of others' autonomies (cf. Kent, 2012a).

On the other hand, there are cases when the child comes to learn and express his rights in interaction. Sometimes caregivers may supply an account as to why the child may need to do what is being requested: "shower is finished, come out alright?" (Extract 1.1), "gimme your pacifier. (0.6) (let) tita oh (clean ready)" (Extract 3.7). Here the child acquires knowledge that he is not obligated but there is a reason for cooperation. These requests make provision for contingencies and room for negotiations by virtue of their design. As adults insist, the child may continue with resistance-implicative actions, and there may come to a point that the child knows how far he may 'push the envelope'. Kent (2011) points out that entitlement of a (parent's) request requires the (child) recipient's ratification - that is, the recipient does not question the requestor's right to get them to do something. Similarly, my study has shown, when the child issues an outright noncompliance (Chapter 5), he displays his right to reject, but this 'right' requires his caregivers to ratify or accept.

As with any interactional episode, a child gets also socialized into turn-taking mechanism and conversational rules. He comes to experience the outcomes of his non-response, non-aligned actions and bald noncompliance, and he continues to fine-tune his behaviour closer to the more acceptable social norms, such as to respond immediately when being talked to. But as mentioned above in 6.3.1, a child may behave differently when interacting with adults, comparing to interacting with other children. Further investigations require references to more developmental psychology studies to better understand questions like whether children indeed move from a monologic to a dialogic stage, how they get socialized in this process, and when young children do not respond, is it a question that they lack the resources to do disagreement, or is it the case that they understand the consequence of a dispreferred response with their interlocutor. Such

fundamental knowledge on how communication works is co-constructed through their everyday interactions (cf. Bateman & Church, 2017).

Individual Differences

Among all these threads, there lies the question of cultural and individual differences. Currently most CA studies are based on a dataset from a single speech community, or sometimes two communities; and patterns are presented as features in those speech communities, often leaving individual differences unaddressed. But teasing out individual differences may not be that straight-forward when an overarching picture of a phenomenon is still being constructed, as Hopper (1989) remarks:

How can one focus on the study of individual differences, and simultaneously inquire into probable sequential universals? That is part of the future's challenge. The conversation analyst might claim that, in the absence of theory about conversational universals, studies of individual differences are left rudderless. Individual differences in what? What kind of difference makes a difference? It might be like constructing a theory of the Jaguar v. the Buick v. the Toyota in the absence of a construct like 'automobile'. (p. 61)

In my data, individual differences between the three main caregivers may at times be evident. The Italian father in most cases tend to be more assertive in bringing the requested action to a completion, even with coercion at times; whereas the Chinese mother offers much room for negotiation and concession but insists that the child complies to a certain extent; and the Filipino helper also insists a little but gives in much sooner. Apart from their distinctive cultural-linguistic make-up, childrearing practices, gender, roles and relationship may also play a part, or they may not show up at all. We shall look closely at the data and not let any perception influence the analysis.

There is a danger in comparing languages and attributing a feature to a social factor. For one thing, words across languages do not have exactly the same function. A tag question like Ely's 'okay?' (Extract 4.3) may appear as equivalent to Mum's use of 好不好 *hao-bu-hao* (literally, good-not-good), translated as 'okay?' or 'alright?'. But beside this A-not-A construction, a yes-no question can also be constructed with the particle *ma* as in 好吗 *hao-ma* ('good+PARTICLE') and this may also be translated as the same 'okay?'. Only *hao-bu-hao* is observed in the data, and it is uncertain whether it has to do with Mum's dialectal background (an idiolect) or the child addressee (her child-directed speech). Also, there is still much unknown on request practices in other varieties of English (such as the helper's Filipino English or English as a second language) and other languages (Italian and Mandarin) presented in the study. Rossi (2012, 2015b) work on Italian requests is very comprehensive, yet there are forms found in my data which are not present in his data that is based on adult interactions, such as directives by means of an infinitive verb like *tirare su* ('(to) pick up') and adverb 'avanti' (go on) in Extract 5.3. These formulations display the requestor's claim of deontic right, but it may be impossible to attribute the practices definitely to Italian parenting, male, father or a superior person in power ranking.

One solution to conducting a comparison is perhaps to focus on a single context, such as a routine task, playtime or transgression, and to examine how various caregivers make their requests differently and how the child handles them. A good attempt is Fasulo et al. (2007) study which shows that in contrast to US parents who tend to be less coercive, thus allowing children more autonomy in completing or simply trying out some household tasks, Italian parents focus on the quality of the tasks, so much as that sometimes they complete the tasks themselves instead of directing children to do them. So, a similar cultural comparison may be feasible as a follow-up study, but first we need a more solid understanding of the practices by the various individuals, or else any comparative work may not be sound. More data coupled with a statistical study may also be helpful.

6.3.6. Raising awareness on caregiver-child interactions

Finally, it would be nice for scholars to transform our knowledge gained from research to contribute to the general public. A senior child language researcher Professor Aliyah Morgernstern reminded me of that when we met in 2013 and she gave me a suggestion. She said it would be valuable if I could offer parents advice on how to get their children complied. I have been thinking about this over the years and have now come to a little conclusion: we will never be able to control children's every move, because they are not robots that can be programmed. We may also prefer children to remain the marvelous human beings with agency and mind as they are. What we could try to do, however, is to reflect on our interactional practices and regulate, if we wish, the ways we go about getting children to do things, that imposes on their freedom. Clearly, it is the first actions that set up an environment for the *no*'s in second position. I am not suggesting that we should avoid children's *no*'s altogether. These refusal, rejection or noncompliance actions play an essential part of being a competent social member. But a better caregiver-child interaction would have a long term impact on children's behaviour and subsequently our relationship with children.

The current data offers a glimpse on how pre-established relationship may have an influence on the current ways in which the child interprets interlocutor's current actions or project their upcoming actions and thus his differentiated ways of dealing with the situations. For example, compare Leslie's mere disengagement when the helper utters an admonishment-indicative 'or:h' while spotting his sitting posture (Extract 3.10), and Leslie's hasty withdrawal when Dad utters the warning **pianNO:** ("slowly") after a bottle has dropped (Extract 3.11). The different responses are not an issue about which conduct being more transgressive, but rather an understanding of what may happen next with *that* interlocutor that prompts different reactions, and different caregivers' treat these reactions differently. These treatments may sometimes have a long term effect on children. For instance,

non-acceptance of children's refusal by means of coercive feeding practices may affect children's later eating behaviors (Williams et al., 2017).

Further discursive studies like the current one may therefore be fruitful in revealing more about the dynamics and practices in caregiver-child communications. The data and results of these studies can be made useful in providing workshops or sharing sessions for parents, caregivers and educators, through the application of CARM (Conversation Analytic Role-play Method). It is an empirically based, interactive training method developed by Prof. Elizabeth Stokoe at the University of Loughborough (<http://www.carmtraining.org>). Through observing how real life interactions unfold, caregivers may reflect on their own practices and compare their conversational outcomes. Caregivers can then decide for themselves what they may want to see differently in their interactions with children - whether they want to be less persistent or more assertive and what are the nuances in talk that shape their relationship with children.

6.4. Concluding Remarks

With all the above threads, and additional data collected until the child was 3 years and 5 months old, there is plenty that can be worked on in the near future. In particular, furthering the findings on the child's non-response and non-aligned verbal responses (Chapter 3 and 4) may help offer researchers a different perspective when examining children's actions in interactions.

To conclude, the present study has showcased many ways that a two year old child may respond to a request for action, and these ways of responding attend closely to the child's understandings which have three important properties: "they are local, public and moral", concurring with Wootton's (1997, p. 7) work. The understandings are intelligible only through actions as they unfold in the local sequences. They are informed by what has publicly taken place in the talk (i.e. they are not inaccessible inner

workings). These understandings also convey a moral aspect projecting the child's perceived entitlement (or lack of) to reject, his judgement or belief on the just prior or ongoing events. The argument presented offers rationale to view "social interaction as an essential ingredient in social cognitive development" (Carpendale & Lewis, 2006, p. 47).

References

- Ahearn, L. M. (2001). Language and Agency. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 30(1), 109–137. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.anthro.30.1.109>
- Antaki, C., & Kent, A. (2012). Telling people what to do (and, sometimes, why): Contingency, entitlement and explanation in staff requests to adults with intellectual impairments. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 44(6–7), 876–889. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2012.03.014>
- Antaki, C., & Kent, A. (2015). Offering alternatives as a way of issuing directives to children: Putting the worse option last. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 78, 25–38. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2015.01.004>
- Aronsson, K., & Cekaite, A. (2011). Activity contracts and directives in everyday family politics. *Discourse & Society*, 22(2), 137–154.
- Austin, J. L. (1962). *How to Do Things with Words*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Baranova, J., & Dingemanse, M. (2016). Reasons for requests. *Discourse Studies*, 18(6), 641–675. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1461445616667154>
- Bateman, A., & Church, A. (Eds.). (2017). *Children's Knowledge-in-Interaction - Studies in Conversation*. Singapore: Springer.
- Bates, E. (1976). *Language and context : the acquisition of pragmatics / Elizabeth Bates*. New York : Academic Press, c1976.
- Beaupoil-Hourdel, P., Dominique, B., & Morgenstern, A. (2015). A child's multimodal negations from 1 to 4: the interplay between modalities. In P. Larrivé & C. Lee (Eds.), *Negation and Polarity: Experimental Perspectives*. Switzerland: Springer.
- Bloom, L. (1970). *Language Development: Form and Function in Emerging Grammars*. Cambridge, MA: MIT.
- Bloom, L. (1993). *Language Development from Two to Three*. Cambridge University Press.
- Blum-Kulka, S. (1990). Special Issue on “Politeness” You don’t touch lettuce with your fingers: *Journal of Pragmatics*, 14(2), 259–288. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166\(90\)90083-P](https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166(90)90083-P)
- Bolden, G. B. (2016). Requests for here-and-now actions in Russian conversation. In M.-L. Sorjonen & E. Couper-Kuhlen (Eds.), *Imperative turns-at-talk: the design of conversational directive*. John Benjamins.
- Bolinger, D. L. M. (1977). *Meaning and form*. London: Longman.
- Bresnahan, M., Cai, D. A., & Rivers, A. (1994). Saying no in Chinese and English: Cultural similarities and differences in strategies of refusal. *Asian Journal of Communication*, 4(1), 52–76. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01292989409359594>
- Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (1987). *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage* (2nd ed.). Cambridge Cambridgeshire ; New York: Cambridge University Press.

- Brown, R. (1973). *A First Language: The Early Stages*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Bruner, J. (1983). *Child's Talk: Learning to Use Language*. New York: Norton.
- Budwig, N. (1991). Functional Approaches to Child Language. *First Language*, 11(1) [31].
- Butler, C. (2017). Editor's Introduction. *Research on Children and Social Interaction*, 1(1), 1–3.
- Butler, C. W., & Wilkinson, R. (2013). Mobilising reciprocity: Child participation and “rights to speak” in multi-party family interaction, 50, 37–51.
- Cameron-Faulkner, T. (2014). The interaction of gesture, intonation, and eye-gaze in proto-imperatives. *Journal of Child Language*, 41(4), 842–860.
<https://doi.org/10.1017/S0305000913000238>
- Cameron-Faulkner, T., Lieven, E., & Theakston, A. (2007). What part of no do children not understand? A usage-based account of multiword negation. *Journal of Child Language*, 34(2), 251–282.
- Carpendale, J. I. M., & Lewis, C. (2006). *How children develop social understanding*. Malden, MA; Oxford: Blackwell.
- Carpenter, M., Nagell, K., & Tomasello, M. (1998). Social cognition, joint attention, and communicative competence from 9 to 15 months of age. *Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development*, 63(4), 1–143.
- Casillas, M. (2014). Turn-taking. In D. Matthews (Ed.), *Pragmatic development in first language acquisition* (pp. 53–70). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Casillas, M., Bobb, S. C., & Clark, E. V. (2016). Turn-taking, timing, and planning in early language acquisition. *Journal of Child Language*, 43(6), 1310–1337.
<https://doi.org/10.1017/S0305000915000689>
- Cekaite, A. (2010). Shepherding the child: embodied directive sequences in parent–child interactions. *Text & Talk*, 30(1), 1–25.
- Cekaite, A. (2015). The Coordination of Talk and Touch in Adults' Directives to Children: Touch and Social Control. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 48(2), 152–175. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08351813.2015.1025501>
- Chan, A., Zhang, W., Zayts, O., Yin Tang, M. H., & Tam, W. K. (2015). Directive-giving and grammatical forms: Mitigation devices in a medical laboratory setting. *Chinese Language and Discourse*, 6(2), 133–161.
<https://doi.org/10.1075/cld.6.2.02cha>
- Choi, S. (1988). The semantic development of negation: a cross-linguistic longitudinal study. *Journal of Child Language*, 15(3), 517–531.
- Clark, E. V. (1978). From gesture to word, on the natural history of deixis in language acquisition. In J. S. Bruner & A. Garton (Eds.), *Human Growth and Development* (pp. 85–120). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Clayman, S. E. (2013a). Agency in response: The role of prefatory address terms. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 57, 290–302.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2012.12.001>

- Clayman, S. E. (2013b). Turn-Constructional Units and the Transition-Relevance Place. In J. Sidnell & T. Stivers (Eds.), *The Handbook of Conversation Analysis* (pp. 150–166). John Wiley & Sons.
- Clayman, S. E., & Heritage, J. (2014). Benefactors and beneficiaries: benefactive status and stance in the management of offers and requests. In P. Drew & E. Couper-Kuhlen (Eds.), *Requesting in Social Interaction* (Vol. 26, pp. 51–82). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Couper-Kuhlen, E. (2014). What does grammar tell us about action? *Pragmatics*, 24(3), 623–647.
- Couper-Kuhlen, E., & Barth-Weingarten, D. (2011). A system for transcribing talk - in - interaction: GAT 2. *Gesprächsforschung*, 12, 1–51.
- Craven, A., & Potter, J. (2010). Directives: Entitlement and contingency in action. *Discourse Studies*, 12(4), 419–442.
- Cruz-Ferreira, M. (2006). *Three is a crowd? : acquiring Portuguese in a trilingual environment*. Clevedon; Buffalo: Multilingual Matters.
- Cuccio, V. (2011). On Negation. What do we need to “say no”? *Acquisizione Del Linguaggio*, 4, 47–55.
- Curl, T. S., & Drew, P. (2008). Contingency and Action: A Comparison of Two Forms of Requesting. *Research on Language & Social Interaction*, 41(2), 129–153.
- De Houwer, A. (2009a). *An introduction to bilingual development*. Bristol; Buffalo: Multilingual Matters.
- De Houwer, A. (2009b). *Bilingual first language acquisition*. Bristol; Buffalo: Multilingual Matters.
- de Villiers, J. (2007). The Interface of Language and Theory of Mind. *Lingua. International Review of General Linguistics. Revue Internationale de Linguistique Generale*, 117(11), 1858–1878.
- Deuchar, M. (1999). Are function words non-language-specific in early bilingual two-word utterances? *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*, 2(1), 23–34.
- Deuchar, M., & Vihman, M. (2005). A radical approach to early mixed utterances. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, 9(2), 137–157.
- Dix, T., & Branca, S. H. (2003). Parenting as a Goal-Regulation Process. In L. Kuczynski (Ed.), *Handbook of Dynamics in Parent-Child Relations* (pp. 165–189). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.
- 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.
- Drew, P., & Couper-Kuhlen, E. (2014a). Requesting – from speech act to recruitment. In P. Drew & E. Couper-Kuhlen (Eds.), *Requesting in Social Interaction* (Vol. 26, pp. 1–34). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Drew, P., & Couper-Kuhlen, E. (Eds.). (2014b). *Requesting in Social Interaction* (Vol. 26). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

- Edwards, D. (1997). Membership: Children, Animals, and Machines Membership: Children, Animals, and Machines. In *Discourse and Cognition* (pp. 295–323). London: SAGE Publications Ltd.
- Edwards, D. (2004). Proof Procedure. In M. Lewis-Beck, A. Bryman, & T. F. Liao, *The SAGE Encyclopedia of Social Science Research Methods*. 2455 Teller Road, Thousand Oaks California 91320 United States of America: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Ervin-Tripp, S. (1976). Is Sybil There? The Structure of Some American English Directives. *Language in Society*, 5(1), 25–66.
- Ervin-Tripp, S., Guo, J., & Lampert, M. (1990). Politeness and persuasion in children's control acts. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 14(2), 307–331.
[https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166\(90\)90085-R](https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166(90)90085-R)
- Ervin-Tripp, S., O'Connor, M. C., & Rosenberg, J. (1984). Language and power in the family. In C. Kramarae, M. Schulz, & W. O'Barr (Eds.), *Language and Power* (pp. 116–135). Los Angeles: Sage.
- Farrell, A. (2005). New possibilities for ethical research with children. In A. Farrell (Ed.), *Ethical research with children* (pp. 176–178). New York: Maidenhead.
- Farrell, A. (2016). Ethics in Early Childhood Research. In A. Farrell, S. Kagan, & E. K. Tisdall (Eds.), *The SAGE Handbook of Early Childhood Research* (pp. 187–200). London: SAGE Publications Ltd.
- Fasulo, A., Loyd, H., & Padiglione, V. (2007). Children's socialization into cleaning practices: a cross-cultural perspective. *Discourse & Society*, 18(1), 11–33.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0957926507069454>
- Filipi, A. (2009). *Toddler and Parent Interaction: The Organisation of Gaze, Pointing and Vocalisation*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing.
- Filipi, A. (2015). The Development of Recipient Design in Bilingual Child-Parent Interaction. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 48(1), 100–119.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/08351813.2015.993858>
- Filipi, A. (2017). The Emergence of Story-Telling. In A. Bateman & A. Church (Eds.), *Children's Knowledge-in-Interaction* (pp. 279–295). Singapore: Springer.
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-10-1703-2_15
- Forrester, M. (2017). Participation and engagement: Some possible challenges for research on early social interaction. *Research on Children and Social Interaction*, 1(1), 55–76.
- Garvey, C. (1984). *Children's Talk*. Harvard University Press.
- Gerholm, T. (2007). *Socialization of verbal and nonverbal emotive expressions in young children*. Stockholm University, Stockholm.
- Goffman, E. (1967). *Interaction ritual: Essays on face to face behavior*. New York: Doubleday.
- Goffman, E. (1983). The interaction order. *American Sociological Review*, 48, 1–17.
- Goodwin, C. (1981). *Conversational organization : interaction between speakers and hearers*. New York : Academic Press, c1981.
- Goodwin, M. H. (1980). He-Said-She-Said: Formal Cultural Procedures for the Construction of a Gossip Dispute Activity. *Ethnologist*, 7(4), 674–495.

- Goodwin, M. H. (2006). Participation, affect, and trajectory in family directive/response sequences. *Text & Talk - An Interdisciplinary Journal of Language, Discourse Communication Studies*, 26(4–5), 515–543.
<https://doi.org/10.1515/TEXT.2006.021>
- Goodwin, M. H., & Cekaite, A. (2013). Calibration in directive/response sequences in family interaction. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 46(1), 122–138.
- Goodwin, M. H., Cekaite, A., & Goodwin, C. (2012). Emotion as Stance. In A. Peräkylä & M.-L. Sorjonen (Eds.), *Emotion in Interaction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Grosjean, F. (1998). Studying bilinguals: Methodological and conceptual issues. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*, 1(2), 131–149.
- Guidetti, M. (2005). Yes or no? How young French children combine gestures and speech to agree and refuse. *Journal of Child Language*, 32(4), 911–924.
- Halliday, M. A. K. (1975). *Learning how to mean : explorations in the development of language*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Hepburn, A., & Bolden, G. (2013). The Conversation Analytic Approach to Transcription. In J. Sidnell & T. Stivers (Eds.), *The Handbook of Conversation Analysis* (pp. 57–76). John Wiley & Sons.
- Hepburn, A., & Potter, J. (2011). Threats: Power, family mealtimes, and social influence. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 50(1), 99–120.
<https://doi.org/10.1348/014466610X500791>
- Hepburn, A., & Potter, J. (2012). Crying and crying responses. In A. Peräkylä & M.-L. Sorjonen (Eds.), *Emotion in Interaction* (pp. 194–210). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Heritage, J., & Raymond, G. (2012). Navigating Epistemic Landscapes: Acquiescence, Agency and Resistance in Responses to Polar Questions. In J. P. de Ruiter (Ed.), *Questions* (pp. 179–192). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hester, S. (2016). Answering questions instead of telling stories: Everyday breaching in a family meal. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 102, 54–66.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2016.06.012>
- Hoffmann, C. (1985). Language acquisition in two trilingual children. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 6(6), 479–495.
- Hoffmann, C. (2001). Towards a description of trilingual competence. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, 5(1), 1–17.
- Hopper, R. (1989). Conversation analysis and social psychology as descriptions of interpersonal communication. In D. Roger & P. Bull (Eds.), *Conversation: An Interdisciplinary Perspective*. Multilingual Matters.
- Hupp, S., & Jewell, J. (2014). *Great Myths of Child Development*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Hutchby, I., & Wooffitt, R. (1998). *Conversation analysis: principles, practices, and applications*. Malden, MA: Polity Press.
- Jefferson, G. (2004). Glossary of transcript symbols with an introduction. In G. H. Lerner (Ed.), *Conversation Analysis: Studies from the first generation* (pp. 13–31). Amsterdam; Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

- Kendon, A. (1985). Behavioral foundations for the process of frame attunement in face-to-face interaction. In G. P. Ginsburg, M. Brenner, & M. Von Cranach (Eds.), *Discovery Strategies in the Psychology of Action* (pp. 229–253). London: Academic Press.
- Kendon, A. (1990). *Conducting Interaction: Patterns of Behavior in Focused Encounters*. Cambridge ; New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Kendrick, K. H., & Drew, P. (2014). The putative preference for offers over requests. In P. Drew & E. Couper-Kuhlen (Eds.), *Requesting in Social Interaction* (Vol. 26, pp. 87–114). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Kendrick, K. H., & Drew, P. (2016). Recruitment: Offers, requests, and the organization of assistance in interaction. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 49(1), 1–19.
- Kent, A. (2011). *Directing Dinnertime: Practices and Resources used by Parents and Children to Deliver and Respond to Directive Actions*. University of Loughborough, Loughborough.
- Kent, A. (2012a). Compliance, resistance and incipient compliance when responding to directives. *Discourse Studies*, 14(6), 711–730.
- Kent, A. (2012b). Responding to Directives: What can Children do when a Parent Tells them what to do? In S. Danby & M. Theobald (Eds.), *Disputes in Everyday Life: Social and Moral Orders of Children and Young People* (Vol. 15, pp. 57–84).
- Kent, A., & Kendrick, K. H. (2016). Imperative Directives: Orientations to Accountability. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 49(3), 272–288. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08351813.2016.1201737>
- Kidwell, M. (2011). Epistemics and embodiment in the interactions of very young children. In *The Morality of Knowledge in Conversation*. Cambridge University Press. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511921674.012>
- Kidwell, M. (2013). Availability as a trouble source in directive-response sequences. In M. Hayashi, G. Raymond, & J. Sidnell (Eds.), *Conversational Repair and Human Understanding* (pp. 234–260). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kidwell, M., & Zimmerman, D. (2006). “Observability” in the Interactions of Very Young Children. *Communication Monographs*, 73(1), 1–28. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03637750600559673>
- Kidwell, M., & Zimmerman, D. H. (2007). Joint attention as action. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 39(3), 592–611.
- Klima, E., & Bellugi, U. (1966). Syntactic regularities in the speech of children. In J. Lyons & R. J. Wales (Eds.), *Psycholinguistics papers*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Köppe, R. (1996). Language differentiation in bilingual children: the development of grammatical and pragmatic competence. *Linguistics*, 34(5), 927–954.
- Labov, W., & Fanshel, D. (1977). *Therapeutic Discourse: Psychotherapy as Conversation*. New York: Academic Press.

- Landmark, A. M. D., Gulbrandsen, P., & Svennevig, J. (2015). Whose decision? Negotiating epistemic and deontic rights in medical treatment decisions. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 78, 54–69. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2014.11.007>
- Lanza, E. (1997). *Language mixing in infant bilingualism : a sociolinguistic perspective*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Lanza, E. (2001). Bilingual first language acquisition: A discourse perspective on language contact in parent-child interaction. In J. Cenoz & F. Genesee (Eds.), *Trends in bilingual acquisition / edited by Jasone Cenoz, Fred Genesee* (pp. 201–229). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Lerner, G. H. (1996). Finding “Face” in the Preference Structures of Talk-in-Interaction. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 59(4), 303–21.
- Lerner, G. H., Zimmerman, D. H., & Kidwell, M. (2014). Formal Structures of Practical Tasks: A Resource for Action in the Social Life of Very Young Children. In J. Streeck, C. Goodwin, & C. LeBaron (Eds.), *Embodied Interaction: Language and Body in the Material World*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Levinson, S. C. (1983). *Pragmatics* (9th ed.). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Levinson, S. C. (2013). Action Formation and Ascription. In J. Sidnell & T. Stivers (Eds.), *The Handbook of Conversation Analysis* (pp. 103–130). West Sussex: John Wiley & Sons.
- Lindström, A. (2005). Language as social action: A study of how senior citizens request assistance with practical tasks in the Swedish home help service. In A. Hakulinen & M. Selting (Eds.), *Syntax and lexis in conversation* (pp. 209–230). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Lock, A. (1980). *The guided reinvention of language / Andrew Lock*. London ; New York : Academic Press, 1980.
- Luke, K. K. (1989). The Cantonese Utterance Particle LA and the Accomplishment of Common Understandings in Conversation. *Pragmatics*, 3(1), 39–87.
- Maynard, D. W., & Hollander, M. M. (2014). Asking to Speak to Another: A Skill for Soliciting Survey Participation. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 47(1), 28–48. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08351813.2014.871804>
- Mondada, L. (2006). Participants’ online analysis and multimodal practices: projecting the end of the turn and the closing of the sequence. *Discourse Studies*, 8(1), 117–129. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1461445606059561>
- Nguyen, H. T., & Nguyen, M. T. T. (2016). “But please can I play with the iPad?”: The development of request negotiation practices by a four-year-old child. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 101, 66–82. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2016.05.013>
- Nicoladis, E., & Genesee, F. (1997). The role of parental input and language dominance in bilingual children’s code-mixing. In E. Hughes, M. Hughes, & A. Greenhill (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 21st Annual Boston University Conference on Language Development* (pp. 422–432). Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Press.

- Nolen, J. A., & Maynard, D. W. (2013). Formulating the request for survey participation in relation to the interactional environment. *Discourse Studies*, 15(2), 205–227. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1461445612471465>
- Ochs, E. (1979). Transcription as theory. In E. Ochs & B. B. Schieffelin (Eds.), *Developmental pragmatics* (pp. 43–72). New York: Academic Press.
- Ochs, E., & Shohet, M. (2006). The cultural structuring of mealtime socialization. *New Directions for Child & Adolescent Development*, 2006(111), 35–49. <https://doi.org/10.1002/cad.153>
- Pomerantz, A. (1984). Agreeing and Disagreeing with Assessment: Some Features of Preferred/dispreferred Turn Shapes. In J. M. Atkinson (Ed.), *Structures of Social Action: Studies in Conversation Analysis* (pp. 57–101). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Pomerantz, A., & Heritage, J. (2013). Preference. In J. Sidnell & T. Stivers (Eds.), *The Handbook of Conversation Analysis* (pp. 210–228). Wiley-Blackwell.
- Reber, E. (2012). *Affectivity in Interaction*. Amsterdam; Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Repacholi, B. M., & Gopnik, A. (1997). Early reasoning about desires: evidence from 14- and 18-month-olds. - PubMed - NCBI. *Developmental Psychology*, 33(1), 12–21.
- Resistance: What to do about the endless no's. (2015). Retrieved July 15, 2015, from http://www.babycenter.com/0_resistance-what-to-do-about-the-endless-nos_12285.bc
- Robinson, J. D., & Kevoe-Feldmann, H. (2016). The Accountability of Proposing (vs. Soliciting Proposals of) Arrangements. In J. D. Robinson (Ed.), *Accountability in Social Interaction*. Oxford Scholarship Online.
- Rossano, F. (2012). *Gaze behavior in face-to-face interaction*. Radboud Universiteit, Nijmegen.
- Rossi, G. (2012). Bilateral and Unilateral Requests: The Use of Imperatives and Mi X? Interrogatives in Italian. *Discourse Processes*, 49(5), 426–458. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0163853X.2012.684136>
- Rossi, G. (2015a). Other-initiated repair in Italian. *Open Linguistics*, 1(1). <https://doi.org/10.1515/opli-2015-0002>
- Rossi, G. (2015b). *The request system in Italian interaction*. Radboud Universiteit, Nijmegen.
- Sacks, H. (1984). Notes on methodology. In J. M. Atkinson (Ed.), *Structures of Social Action: Studies in Conversation Analysis* (pp. 21–27). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Sacks, H. (1992). *Lectures on Conversation*. (G. Jefferson, Ed.) (Vols. 1–2). Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.
- Sacks, H., Schegloff, E. A., & Jefferson, G. (1974). A Simplest Systematics for the Organization of Turn-Taking for Conversation. *Language*, 50(4), 696–735.
- Schegloff, E. A. (1968). Sequencing in Conversational Openings. *American Anthropologist*, 70(6), 1075–1095.
- Schegloff, E. A. (1989). Reflections on language, development, and the interactional character of talk-in-interaction. In M. H. Bornstein & J. S. Bruner (Eds.),

- Interaction in Human Development* (pp. 139–153). New York: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Schegloff, E. A. (1993). Reflections on Quantification in the Study of Conversation. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 26(1), 66–128.
- Schegloff, E. A. (2006). On possibles. *Discourse Studies*, 8(1), 141–157.
- Schegloff, E. A. (2007). *Sequence Organization in Interaction: Volume I: A Primer in Conversation Analysis*. Cambridge University Press.
- Schegloff, E. A., & Sacks, H. (1973). Opening up Closings. *Semiotica*, 8(4), 289–327.
- Schieffelin, B. B. (2012). *The handbook of language socialization*. (A. Duranti & E. Ochs, Eds.). West Sussex: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Searle, J. R. (1969). *Speech Acts. An Essay in the Philosophy of Language*. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 1969.
- Searle, J. R. (1975). Indirect Speech Acts. In P. Cole & J. L. Morgan (Eds.), *Syntax and semantics Volume 3: Speech Acts* (Vol. 3: speech acts, pp. 59–82). New York: Academic Press.
- Sidnell, J. (2011). *Conversation analysis: an introduction*. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Sidnell, J. (2013). Basic Conversation Analytic Methods. In J. Sidnell & T. Stivers (Eds.), *The Handbook of Conversation Analysis* (pp. 77–100). West Sussex: John Wiley & Sons.
- Sidnell, J. (2015). A Conversation Analytic Approach to Research on Early Childhood. In A. Farrell, S. Kagan, & E. K. Tisdall (Eds.), *The SAGE Handbook of Early Childhood Research*. London: Sage.
- Siegler, R. S., & Wagner Alibali, M. (2005). *Children's thinking* (4th ed.). New Jersey: Pearson Education.
- Skånfors, L. (2009). Ethics in Child Research: Children's Agency and Researchers' "Ethical Radar." *Childhood Today*, 3(1), 1–22.
- Sorjonen, M.-L., Raevaara, L., & Couper-Kuhlen, E. (Eds.). (2016). *Imperative turns at talk: The design of directives in action*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Stavans, A. (1990). *Codeswitching in Children Acquiring English, Spanish and Hebrew: A Case Study* (Unpublished PhD dissertation). University of Pittsburgh.
- Sterponi, L., & Fasulo, A. (2010). "How to Go On": Intersubjectivity and Progressivity in the Communication of a Child with Autism. *Ethos*, 38(1), 116–142. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1548-1352.2009.01084.x>
- Stevanovic, M., & Svennevig, J. (2015). Introduction: Epistemics and deontics in conversational directives. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 78, 1–6. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2015.01.008>
- Stivers, T. (2004). "No no no" and Other Types of Multiple Sayings in Social Interaction. *Human Communication Research*, 30(2), 260–293.
- Stivers, T. (2008). Stance, Alignment, and Affiliation During Storytelling: When Nodding Is a Token of Affiliation. *Research on Language & Social Interaction*, 41(1), 31–57.

- Stivers, T., & Rossano, F. (2012). Mobilising response in interaction. In J. P. de Ruiter (Ed.), *Questions: Formal, Functional and Interactional Perspectives* (pp. 58–80). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Stivers, T., Sidnell, J., & Bergen, C. (under review). Children's responses to questions in peer interaction: A window into the ontogenesis of interactional competence. *Unpublished Manuscript*.
- Takada, A. (2013). Generating morality in directive sequences: Distinctive strategies for developing communicative competence in Japanese caregiver–child interactions. *Language & Communication*, 33(4, Part A), 420–438. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.langcom.2013.03.012>
- Taleghani-Nikazm, C., & Huth, T. (2010). L2 requests: Preference structure in talk-in-interaction. *Multilingua - Journal of Cross-Cultural and Interlanguage Communication*, 29(2), 185–202. <https://doi.org/10.1515/mult.2010.008>
- Tardif, T., Fletcher, P., Liang, W., Zhang, Z., & Kaciroti, N. (2008). Baby's First 10 Words. *Developmental Psychology*, 44(4), 929–938.
- Tardif, T., & Wan, C. (2001). Learning to say “no” in Chinese. *Early Education and Development*, 12(3), 303–323.
- Tarplee, C. (1993). *Working on talk : the collaborative shaping of linguistic skills within child-adult interaction* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of York.
- ten Have, P. (2007). *Doing conversation analysis*. London: SAGE.
- Thompson, S. A., Fox, B. A., & Couper-Kuhlen, E. (2015). *Grammar in Everyday Talk: Building Responsive Actions*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Tomasello, M. (1995). Joint attention as social cognition. In C. Moore & P. J. Dunham (Eds.), *Joint Attention: Its Origins and Role in Development* (1 edition, pp. 103–130). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Tomasello, M. (1999). *The cultural origins of human cognition*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Tomasello, M. (2003). *Constructing a language : a usage-based theory of language acquisition*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Tomasello, M. (2008). *Origins of human communication*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Vihman, M. M. (1985). Language differentiation by the bilingual infant. *Journal of Child Language*, 12(2), 297–324. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0305000900006450>
- Vine, B. (2004). *Getting things Done at Work: a Discourse of Power in Workplace Interaction*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Vinkhuyzen, E., & Szymanski, M. (2005). Would You Like to Do it Yourself? Service Requests and Their Non-granting Responses. In K. Richards & P. Seedhouse (Eds.), *Applying Conversation Analysis* (pp. 91–106). London: Palgrave Macmillan UK.
- Volterra, V. (1972). Il “no”. Prime fasi di sviluppo della negazione nel linguaggio infantile. *Archivio Di Psicologia, Neurologia e Psichiatria*(XXXIII), 16–52.
- Volterra, V., & Antinucci, F. (1979). Negation in Child Language: A Pragmatic Study. In E. Ochs & B. B. Schieffelin (Eds.), *Developmental pragmatics* (pp. 281–303). New York: Academic Press.

- Wang, X.-L. (2008). *Growing up with three languages : birth to eleven*. Bristol; Buffalo: Multilingual Matters.
- Wang, Y.-F. (2008). Beyond Negation--The Roles of “Meiyou” and “Bushì” in Mandarin Conversation. *Language Sciences*, 30(6), 679–713.
- Wellman, H. M. (1990). From simple desires to ordinary beliefs: The early development of everyday psychology. *Cognition*, 35, 245–275.
- Wiggins, S. (2014). Adult and child use of love, like, don’t like and hate during family mealtimes. Subjective category assessments as food preference talk. *Appetite*, 80, 7–15. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.appet.2014.04.024>
- Williams, N. A., Dev, D. A., Hankey, M., & Blitch, K. (2017). Role of food preoccupation and current dieting in the associations of parental feeding practices to emotional eating in young adults: A moderated mediation study. *Appetite*, 111, 195–202. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.appet.2017.01.003>
- Wode, H. (1977). Four early stages in the development of L1 negation. *Journal of Child Language*, 4(1), 87–102.
- Wootton, A. J. (1981). The management of grantings and rejections by parents in request sequences. *Semiotica*, 37(1–2), 59–89. <https://doi.org/10.1515/semi.1981.37.1-2.59>
- Wootton, A. J. (1997). *Interaction and the development of mind*. Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Wootton, A. J. (2006). Children’s Practices and Their Connections with “mind.” *Discourse Studies*, 8(1), 191–198.
- Wootton, A. J. (2007). A Puzzle About Please: Repair, Increments, and Related Matters in the Speech of a Young Child. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 40(2&3), 171–198.
- Wootton, A. J. (2010). “Actually” and the sequential skills of a two-year-old. In H. Gardner & M. Forrester (Eds.), *Analysing Interactions in Childhood: Insights from Conversation Analysis* (1st ed., pp. 59–73). Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Wootton, A. J. (2012). Distress in Adult-Child Interaction. In A. Peräkylä & M.-L. Sorjonen (Eds.), *Emotion in Interaction*. Oxford ; New York: Oxford University Press.
- Wootton, A. J. (2014). *Two request forms of four year olds*. (P. Drew & E. Couper-Kuhlen, Eds.) (Vol. 26). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Yip, V., & Matthews, S. (2000). Syntactic transfer in a Cantonese–English bilingual child. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*, 3, 193–208.
- Yip, V., & Matthews, S. (2007). *The bilingual child : early development and language contact*. Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press.

Appendices

Appendix A: Transcription Conventions

[talk]	overlapping talk or multimodal actions
=	latching
(0.5)	pause
(.)	micropause
(talk)	unintelligible talk
jus'	sound omission
.hh / hh	in-/outbreaths
>words<	quickened talk
<words>	slowed down talk
°words°	quieter talk
↑ and ↓	pitch step up and down
word <u> </u>	emphasis
WORD	loudness
:	sound lengthening
?	rising to high final intonation
,	rising to mid final intonation
.	falling to low final intonation
!	
#eh eh eh#	creaky voice
->	focused turn

Appendix B: First Words

These are the first 97 words acquired by Leslie. Words are presented resembling his pronunciation at the time. In brackets are the often omitted sounds. Words separated by strokes represent alternative pronunciations. Some words are prompted only after elicitations and may be imitations are noted with *. Other annotations are indicated after the words. Chinese tones are not noted.

First batch (64 entries were recalled at age 1;11.17)

English

1. moon	13. fish	25. hand
2. no more	14. there	26. babos - bubbles
3. wan - want	15. ca(t) - cat	27. yex - yes ¹³
4. ju:s - juice	16. xit - sit ¹	28. ho(t)do(g) - hot dog
5. no	17. pee pee	29. brella - umbrella
6. wet	18. poo poo	30. ans - ants
7. bus	19. thix - this ¹	31. dar - star
8. hot/k - hot	20. kis - biscuits	32. key
9. don wan(t) - don't want	21. hinin - hiding	33. airp(l)ane - aeroplane
10. mil(k) - milk	22. heavy	
11. car	23. dirty	
12. broken	24. car(d) - card	

Chinese

34. yueliang - 月亮 'moon'	43. nar - 那儿 'there'*
35. popo - 婆婆 'grandmother'	44. mao - 猫 'cats'
36. wao / yao - 要 'need, want'	45. mian / mian mian - 面 'noodles'
37. baobao - 抱抱 'hug, carry'	46. ka - 卡 card*
38. fafa - 花花 'flower'	47. paopao - 泡泡 'bubbles'*
39. ba:sh - bashi 巴士 'bus' (previously babu, perhaps a blended word from Chinese 'bashi' and Italian 'autobus')	48. mayi / mani - mayi 蚂蚁 'ants'
40. nai - 奶 'milk'	49. xinxin / xingxing - 星星 'stars'
41. hao - 好 'good, alright'	50. shu - 书 'books'
42. yu - 鱼 'fish'	51. eiji - feiji 飞机 'aeroplan' (later <i>deiji</i> before it comes <i>feiji</i>)

Italian

¹³ 's' sound resembles

Chinese alveolar palatal

fricative /ç/ or 'x' in pinyin

52. luna - moon	54. nonno - grandfather	56. no - no
53. (ac)qua - water	55. nonni - grandparents	57. nonna - grandmother

Common (proper names)

58. Buli - cat's name (previously Bli)	62. dedi - Daddy
59. (Yu)ki - cat's name	63. baba - Dad
60. mami - Mummy	64. ba:ni - Barney
61. mama - Mummy in Chinese	65. (his own name)

Subsequent batch (32 were added on a day to day basis up until 2;1.14)¹⁴

English

66. I don wan(t)	73. (y)ello - yellow	80. close
67. don touch	74. red	81. p(r)ess - press
68. nix - nice1	75. train	82. zo - straw
69. anot - cannot	76. open	83. put
70. door	77. blue (both IT and EN)	84. dirt
71. again	78. water	
72. lin up - clean up	79. eat	

Chinese

85. kai - 开 'open'	89. ayo - 啊哟 'oops'
86. bi - 笔 'pen'	90. an - 按 'press'
87. deng - 灯 'light, lamp'	91. sai - shai 晒 'shine (upon)' (Mum
always mispronounced it as <i>sai</i>)
88. shui - 水 'water'	

Italian

92. blu - blue (both EN and IT)	94. li -there	97. nana - nap or sleep
93. qua - here	95. (li)mone - lemon*	
	96. gru - crane	
	Total	97 100%

Total Word Count by Language

English	52	54%
Chinese	25	26%
Italian	12	12%
<u>Common</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>8%</u>

¹⁴ the 'baba' used at home is mostly stressed on the first syllable, and occasionally on the second (with vocative and interrogative usage). It is perhaps a compromised form between standard Italian **papà** /pa'pa/ and the standard Mandarin **bàba** /pâpa/.

Appendix C: Consent forms (Adults & Child)

NANYANG TECHNOLOGICAL UNIVERSITY PARTICIPANT INFORMATION SHEET AND CONSENT FORM

Title of Project: Language development of multilingual children
Principle Investigator: Prof. LUKE Kang Kwong
Co-investigator: Yvonne Tse Crepaldi

Yvonne Tse Crepaldi, a PhD student from the Division of Linguistics & Multilingual Studies under the supervision of Prof. LUKE Kang Kwong, is currently conducting a research on language development of multilingual children.

You, the Father / Mother / Grandparent / Helper / Other (please specify: _____) of the target child _____ are invited to participate in this study, because the child fulfills the research's requirements.

If you agree to participate and give permission¹ to allow the target child to participate in this study, you will be asked questions about the child's background (such as DOB, language exposure, family language policy, developmental milestones or communicative behaviour), and then you will participate in a pilot study, which involves a 20-30 minute video-recording of you and the child engaging in daily activities (playing, feeding, reading, etc.). This is to determine whether the family is suitable for the main study.

The main study will then be conducted as described below:

1. you should have a video recorder, or one that is provided by the investigator.
2. you need to conduct regular video-recordings with the child (usually biweekly, each recording lasts 20-30 minutes). The investigator will discuss and agree with you on a schedule.
3. recordings can be done at any time or anywhere at your convenience during the scheduled period.
4. no restriction on activity or topic of discussion during the recording. You can behave normally. You and the child are free to move around, preferably within the recording area.
5. the investigator will meet you once a month to collect the recorded files and pay you a small amount of cash compensation (see below).
6. the project will last for a minimum of six months but you have the freedom to discuss your preference or availability with the investigator
7. you may review the recordings before approving their use in the research
8. all participants will be made anonymous and all personal information will be kept confidential, unless there is additional written agreement to indicate which bit of information may be used.

Participation in this study does not involve any foreseeable risk or health issue.

In consideration of your time, you and the child will each receive SG\$10 per recording (20-30 minutes). Cash payment will be made monthly.

¹ Domestic helpers, grandparents or others must have first gained written permission from the parents of the target child before participating in this study.

**NANYANG TECHNOLOGICAL UNIVERSITY
PARTICIPANT INFORMATION SHEET AND CONSENT FORM**

Title of Project: Language development of multilingual children

Principle Investigator: Prof. LUKE Kang Kwong

Co-investigator: Yvonne Tse Crepaldi

Yvonne Tse Crepaldi, a PhD student from the Division of Linguistics & Multilingual Studies under the supervision of Prof. LUKE Kang Kwong, is currently conducting a research on language development of multilingual children.

You, the Father / Mother / Grandparent / Helper / Other (please specify: _____) of the target child _____ are invited to participate in this study, because the child fulfills the research's requirements.

If you agree to participate and give permission¹ to allow the target child to participate in this study, you will be asked questions about the child's background (such as DOB, language exposure, family language policy, developmental milestones or communicative behaviour), and then you will participate in a pilot study, which involves a 20-30 minute video-recording of you and the child engaging in daily activities (playing, feeding, reading, etc.). This is to determine whether the family is suitable for the main study.

The main study will then be conducted as described below:

1. you should have a video recorder, or one that is provided by the investigator.
2. you need to conduct regular video-recordings with the child (usually biweekly, each recording lasts 20-30 minutes). The investigator will discuss and agree with you on a schedule.
3. recordings can be done at any time or anywhere at your convenience during the scheduled period.
4. no restriction on activity or topic of discussion during the recording. You can behave normally. You and the child are free to move around, preferably within the recording area.
5. the investigator will meet you once a month to collect the recorded files and pay you a small amount of cash compensation (see below).
6. the project will last for a minimum of six months but you have the freedom to discuss your preference or availability with the investigator
7. you may review the recordings before approving their use in the research
8. all participants will be made anonymous and all personal information will be kept confidential, unless there is additional written agreement to indicate which bit of information may be used.

Participation in this study does not involve any foreseeable risk or health issue.

In consideration of your time, you and the child will each receive SG\$10 per recording (20-30 minutes). Cash payment will be made monthly.

¹ Domestic helpers, grandparents or others must have first gained written permission from the parents of the target child before participating in this study.

**TALKING AT HOME
CONSENT FORM (CHILD)**

My name is Yvonne and I am from Nanyang Technological University. I am learning how child and adult talk.

I would like to make a video of you playing or talking with your Daddy, Mummy, Grandpa, Grandma or friends. If this is okay with you, you will sometimes be recorded with a video camera.

I will tell other people about how children behave by writing about it. I may also show people your video.

Can I film you? YES NO

You can say no or change your mind later.

Please write your name

THANKS!