

Rauniomaa, Mirka, Keisanen, Tiina & Siitonen, Pauliina 2021. Shared understandings of the human–nature relationship in encounters with small wildlife. In Jan Lindström, Ritva Laury, Anssi Peräkylä & Marja-Leena Sorjonen (eds), *Intersubjectivity in Action: Studies in language and social interaction*, 201–230. Pragmatics & Beyond New Series 326. John Benjamins Publishing Company. doi:10.1075/pbns.326.10rau

Shared Understandings of the Human–Nature Relationship in Encounters with Small Wildlife

Mirka Rauniomaa, Tiina Keisanen & Pauliina Siitonen

Research Unit for Languages and Literature, University of Oulu

Abstract: Drawing on video data and ethnomethodological conversation analysis, the study focuses on sequences of human action and interaction in which participants orient to small wildlife within their nature-related activities outdoors. The participants are family members, friends or participants on organized outings, and they engage in activities such as trekking, foraging and fishing. The study examines moments when small wildlife become the focus of the participants' talk and other action and when the relationship between human beings and the natural world is thus constructed in situ. The study considers how participants in such moments display, pursue and achieve shared understandings about what the appropriate ways of treating other living beings and, more generally, conducting oneself in nature are.

Keywords: conversation analysis, ethnomethodology, human–nature relationship, intersubjectivity, multimodality, nature, shared understanding, social interaction, wildlife

1 Introduction

Some recent studies that are at least informed, if not entirely driven, by a conversation-analytic understanding of social interaction go beyond human communities to explore interspecies interaction between humans and, for instance, horses or dogs (e.g. Lundgren 2017; Mondémé 2018; and see Mondémé 2016 for a review) or intraspecies interaction among other primates, such as bonobos or orangutans (e.g. Rossano 2013; Rossano & Leibal 2014). The studies shed new light not only on the particular interspecies or intraspecies interactions that are in focus but also on various aspects of sociality: what counts as participation, how are social actions to be recognized or by what means can understanding be displayed? In this chapter, we focus on intraspecies interaction among human participants to examine how interspecies relationships may be constructed. We study moments in which human participants cross paths with small wildlife, rather than domesticated animals or animals held in captivity, during their nature-related activities outdoors. We consider these brief encounters as examples of how participants display, pursue and achieve shared understandings of the human–nature relationship.

Shared understandings of nature and participants' ongoing nature-related activities have been shown to be crucial in interactions involving decisions that include various practical, moral and financial dimensions, such as in a meeting between a landowner and an advisory professional who discuss whether particular pieces of land qualify for government subsidies (Bergeå, Martin & Sahlström 2008; see also Virkkula 2018). In the context of foraging for wild produce such as berries and mushrooms, participants have been shown to pursue shared understandings of the key characteristics of their finds in order to be able to classify and assess them, that is, to consider their value for the ongoing foraging activity (Keisanen & Rauniomaa 2019; see also Keisanen, Rauniomaa & Siitonen 2017). Furthermore, transitions from searching to picking in foraging provide a site for socializing children into the specific social order of the activity, including its particular significance for the family (Keisanen et al. 2017), in much the same way as the organization of mundane, everyday activities in the family home presents opportunities for children and caregivers to discuss and negotiate what norms and values those activities may entail for them (e.g. Fasulo, Loyd & Padiglione 2007; Fatigante, Liberatita & Pontecorvo 2010; Galatolo & Caronia 2018; George 2013; Pontecorvo, Fasulo & Sterponi 2001).

We analyze how the human participants in our data display, pursue and achieve shared understandings, or “sufficient understandings for current practical purposes” (Linell & Lindström 2016), about appropriate ways of

treating other species and, more generally, of conducting oneself in nature. We are interested in how such understandings are achieved procedurally in interaction, rather than taken as kinds of cultural givens that participants share because they are, or are becoming, members of a particular community (see Schegloff 1992: 1296–1299; on language socialization, see also Ochs 1996; Ochs & Schieffelin 1984, 2011). In other words, we consider intersubjectivity as an accomplishment that participants bring about together by producing “sequentially organized, reciprocal actions, which mutually display and confirm understandings of prior actions” (Deppermann 2019: 23; see also Deppermann 2015a, 2015b). Following Mondada (2011; see also other contributions to the special issue), we take a holistic view on how participants produce and monitor understandings through the linguistic and embodied design and the temporal and sequential positioning of their actions. That is, we recognize that, in the process of displaying and monitoring their evolving understandings, participants draw on, among other things, talk, gaze, gestures, body positions and movement in space.

After briefly introducing our data, we analyze three kinds of cases of how the human–nature relationship may be constructed in interaction. The analytic sections are organized along a continuum based on how explicitly participants negotiate appropriate orientation to the small wildlife that they encounter. We conclude by reflecting on how our findings contribute to a fuller appreciation of how the human–nature relationship may be

constructed in human social interaction as well as to a holistic view on how shared understandings may be displayed, pursued and achieved.

2 Data

For this study, we have viewed approximately 18 hours of video recordings from relatively unbuilt outdoor settings where participants are engaged in a nature-related activity, such as trekking, foraging or fishing. The data are in English and Finnish. The participants include families with children or groups of friends on casual outings, or groups of people on organized, instructed excursions. During their nature-related activities, the participants sometimes cross paths with other species and make them temporarily the focus of joint orientation and action. Our data comprise cases in which the participants come across wild but common invertebrate species, such as ants, slugs, mosquitos and butterflies. In the cases that we have included in the data, the participants talk about and possibly organize their ongoing activities around either animals that are currently present or visible traces of animals that may take the form of, for instance, anthills, trails of slugs or insect bites. We draw on ethnomethodological conversation analysis to examine the data (see, e.g. Garfinkel 1967; Heritage 1984; Sacks 1992) and follow transcription conventions introduced by Jefferson (2004) and Mondada (2019).

3 Analysis

In our data, sequences of interaction that concern small wildlife are typically initiated with a noticing: a participant points out and makes relevant something (i.e. here, an animal or traces of an animal) in the present environment and attempts to establish joint orientation to it (Goodwin & Goodwin 2012; Sacks 1992: 90; Schegloff 2007: 219; see also Keisanen 2012). Children, especially, may also expand noticings into occasioned knowledge explorations, in which they make imaginative inquiries about the world (Goodwin 2007; see also Waters & Bateman 2015). In sequences initiated through noticings about small wildlife, the wildlife then become the focus of the participants' talk and other actions, and the participants display, pursue and achieve shared understandings about appropriate ways of treating the wildlife.

The following subsections are organized along a continuum of increasing involvement in negotiation, demonstration and instruction: First, participants may all treat the wildlife in more or less the same way, displaying their already established shared understandings (Excerpt 1). Second, participants may pursue shared understandings by treating the wildlife in particular ways and simultaneously providing accounts for doing so (Excerpts 2–3). Third, participants may pursue shared understandings by

guiding others to treat the wildlife in particular ways and holding others accountable for doing so (Excerpts 4–5).

3.1 Displaying Shared Understandings

On encountering other species during an ongoing activity, nature-goers in the data may establish a shared understanding of how to orient to the animals without any explicit negotiation or account. Nevertheless, such encounters provide an opportunity for participants to display their shared understanding in that they deal with the animals in similar ways, treating them as living creatures that belong to the particular ecology of the forest – and that may, depending on the species and the situation, be considered useful, dangerous, pleasant or annoying, for example.

In Excerpt 1, three friends, Mikko, Patrick and Pertti, are on a bird-hunting trip. The excerpt includes talk in English and Finnish, both of which all the participants speak fluently. The participants have been walking in the same direction with some distance between them, to cover a maximal area where game bird may be found, but now they gather together to negotiate how to continue. In Excerpt 1, the participants make note of the considerable number of moose flies. Moose flies, or deer keds, are parasites that live on the blood of their host animals, typically moose (Mysterud et al. 2016). Once they have landed on an animal, moose flies shed their wings

and burrow themselves into the animal's fur, or, in humans, usually into the hair. It is therefore harder to shoo them off than mosquitos, for example.

Excerpt 1: *couple moose flies* (36COACT Hunting 00:05:05 / 00:05:03)

(± = Pertti's embodied conduct; * = Patrick's embodied conduct; □ = Mikko's embodied conduct)

01 MIK: couple moose flies,
pat >>walks twd Per-->
02 (0.5)
03 PAT: a couple.
04 (3.8)
05 PAT: what do you think?
06 (.)
07 PER: tsk .hhh *well we have advanced,
pat -->*
08 (0.9)
09 PER: ±just as planned?
±rubs neck-->
10 (0.3)
11 PAT: mm,
12 (.)
13 PER: .hh* ±but uh:,*
-->±touches head, picks off a moose fly-->
pat *takes cap off, hits it on his leg*
14 *(1.8)
pat *wipes head-->

15 PER: (there are) ¯ ¯s(h)o m(h)any of them, #
 mik ¯wipes neck-->
 fig #1a #1b



Fig. 1a: Pertti (left) and Patrick (right) wipe their heads.



Fig. 1b: Mikko wipes his neck.

16 PAT: yeah, ¯
 mik --> ¯
 17 ¯ (0.1) #* (1.6) ¯
 mik ¯wipes moose flies off Per ¯
 pat -->*puts cap back on-->
 fig #1c



Fig. 1c: Mikko wipes Pertti's arm.

18 PER: niitä on joka paikassa.†*
they are everywhere
 -->†wipes neck-->
 pat -->*

19 ¤(1.1)
 mik ¤picks moose flies off his arm-->

20 PAT: ((sniffs))

21 (1.0)¤*(1.1)
 mik -->¤
 pat *picks a moose fly off his sleeve-->

22 MIK: he he [he [he he he

23 PAT: [he [*he

24 PER: [he he
 pat -->*

At the beginning of the excerpt, Patrick is walking towards Mikko and Pertti, who have already stopped. Pertti is viewing his smartphone, which has a map application that tracks their location via GPS. As Patrick gets closer, Mikko produces a noticing, *couple moose flies* (line 1), which is

evidently an understatement about the number of insects at their present location. Patrick responds with *a couple* (line 3), aligning with the noticing as well as the irony evoked in it. After this brief exchange about the insects, the participants initiate talk about which direction they should take next to advance the bird-hunting activity (lines 5–13). During their planning talk, however, all three participants begin to deal with the moose flies that have landed on them: Pertti rubs his neck and head already during his verbal turn, Patrick removes his cap to wipe his head and Mikko begins to wipe his neck, too (Figures 1a–b). That is, the participants all deal with the insects by trying to rub or wipe them off, without any explicit (verbal or embodied) negotiation of how this should be done.

The planning talk is soon suspended altogether (see Haddington, Keisanen, Mondada & Nevile 2014: 24–25), and the participants focus on the moose flies. Pertti assesses the sheer volume of them in both English (*there are so many of them*, line 15) and Finnish (*niitä on joka paikassa* ‘they are everywhere’, line 18), while the participants continue to pick insects off of themselves and each other (Figures 1c–d). Pertti’s assessments, together with the participants’ more or less identical embodied actions, create shared laughter (lines 22–24). The laughter reflects the participants’ having a shared understanding of the situation (see Glenn 1989): evidently the multitude of the moose flies makes the situation not only uncomfortable but somewhat absurd.

In Excerpt 1, moose flies become the joint focus of attention and action for the participants for a while. The participants achieve a shared understanding of appropriate conduct towards the insects in the present situation not only by taking note of and assessing their number but also, and perhaps mainly, by all producing similar embodied actions to deal with them. That is, the rubbing, wiping and picking of the insects show that the participants consider the number, movement and close contact of the insects bothersome and getting rid of them as the appropriate way of treating them. In the following excerpts, participants adopt more respectful orientations to small wildlife and do so, among other things, through demonstrations or instructions.

3.2 Setting an Example and Guiding Others to Achieve a Shared Understanding

In Excerpts 2 and 3, we join participants on a one-day course that concerns the identifying, picking and preparing of wild mushrooms. In comparison with Excerpt 1, the interactional setting is less symmetrical: there are two instructors and thirteen course participants, who alternate between spreading out to pick mushrooms and gathering together to share their finds (see Keisanen & Rauniomaa 2019). Here, we focus on two occasions in which someone finds a slug in a mushroom that they have picked and one of the instructors shows and tells what may be done about it. That is, through both

what she does and says, the instructor provides a kind of a demonstration (see Keevallik 2010), sets an example, on how to treat small wildlife in appropriate ways. She may also guide the less experienced participants explicitly, inviting them to treat the wildlife in the same way that she does. The kind of orientation that is constructed is different from that seen in Excerpt 1: while the slugs in Excerpts 2 and 3 also need to be removed from their current location, that is, off the particular mushrooms that have been picked, the participants take care that the slugs remain alive and in their natural habitat.

In Excerpt 2, the instructor, Elina, and a course participant, Kaisa, are picking mushrooms and making decisions on which ones to keep. Kaisa finds a slug in a mushroom that she is holding.

Excerpt 2: *tääl on kans pikku etana* ‘there is a small slug here also’

(08HANS Sieniretki 00:27:02)

(± = Elina’s embodied conduct; ☐ = Kaisa’s embodied conduct)

01 ELI: myöhemmin mui[stuttaa.
 remind later
 >>holds mushroom in LH; holds RH by the side-->
 kai >>holds mushrooms in RH; inspects mushroom in LH-->
 02 KAI: [tääl on kans pikku etana.☐
 there is a small slug here also
 -->☐

03 KAI: ¤ruuka#taan°(ko niitä) edes tsyyä semmo±usia?°±#

do {people} usually even eat those

¤holds mushroom in LH----->¤

eli

-->±.....±grabs

mushroom±

fig

#2a

#2b



Fig. 2a: Kaisa (left) has made a noticing.



Fig. 2b: Elina (right) grabs the mushroom in Kaisa's hand.

04 ±(0.4)±

eli ±takes mushroom from K±inspects mushroom-->

05 ELI: e:i ¤niit(ä kannate).

it is no use {eating} them

kai ¤inspects mushrooms in RH-->

06 (0.3)

07 KAI: joo.

yes

08 KAI?: ne ei oo ehkä hirveen hyvän näkösiä.¤

they aren't perhaps awfully good-looking

kai

-->¤

09 ¤(0.7)¤(1.0)¤#

kai ¤takes mushrooms in LH¤lowers LH¤

fig

#2c



Fig. 2c: Kaisa lowers mushrooms.

10 ELI: no pe[↑]riaatteessa nää ois,

well in principle these would be

11 (0.3)

12 ELI: ois tuota mää katon,

would be erm I'll check

13 (.)±

eli -->¤picks a slug off mushroom-->

14 ELI: monesti tullee, (.) tälleen pikakurkattua.

often {I} do a quick check like this

15 nää ois ihan tniinku syötä#viä.¤

these would actually be like edible

$$--> \pm \dots \dots \dots -->$$

kai αlifts LH-α

```
fig #2d
```



Fig. 2d: Kaisa lifts mushrooms up again.

16 ELI: mää JÄTTÄSIN NUO ettanat.

I would leave the slugs

```
-->tsquats down;
```

lowers RH to ground-->

```
kai  xinspects mushrooms-->
```

17 ELI: mää on vähän liian teläinurakas ni

I'm a bit too fond of animals so

```
±lifts RH±cleans mushrooms-->>
```

```
kai -->xcleans mushrooms-->
```

18 ELI: mää jätän nuo [etanat tänne met:t(h)ään.¤

I leave the slugs here in the woods

19 KAI: [theh

-->x

20 ELI: ¤hehe

```
xinspects mushrooms-->
```

21 KAI: aivan?
right

22 (.)

23 ELI: heh

24 (1.2)¤(0.4)
 kai -->¤lowers mushrooms to ground-->

25 KAI: no# ↓@(tän) varmaan,@
well this probably

fig #2e

26 ELI: joo: ?#
yes

fig #2f

27 KAI: mää jätän tuohon,
I'll leave this there

28 (0.6)¤
 kai -->¤

29 ELI: joo.
yes



Fig. 2e: Kaisa lowers mushrooms.



Fig. 2f: Kaisa leaves mushrooms on ground.

While inspecting the mushroom (see Mortensen & Wagner 2019; see also Keisanen & Rauniomaa 2019), Kaisa makes a noticing: *tääl on kans pikku etana* ‘there is a small slug here also’ (line 2), *kans* ‘also’ probably referring to a similar previous noticing by Elina (discussed in Excerpt 3). Kaisa continues to inspect the mushroom and asks Elina whether mushrooms that have been eaten by slugs are usually eaten by people (line 3). At this point, Elina takes the mushroom from Kaisa and begins to inspect it (Figures 2a–b). Although she initially provides a negative response (line 5), Elina finally concludes that the slug-eaten mushrooms that Kaisa has referred to are ‘in principle’ edible (line 10). She then holds the mushroom in Kaisa’s field of vision and picks off the slug from the mushroom, providing at the same time an explanation of how she usually does ‘a quick check’ (lines 12–15; see Heritage & Stivers 1999 on similar online commentary). After Elina’s initial negative response, Kaisa inspects the mushrooms that she is holding in her right hand, takes them in her left hand and begins to lower them next to Elina’s basket (Figure 2c). Throughout Elina’s subsequent explanation,

Kaisa holds her hand in this lowered position, but she then lifts her hand up and begins to inspect the mushrooms again (Figure 2d). Elina now continues with another explanation, *mää jättäsin nuo etanat* ‘I would leave the slugs’ (line 16), squats down and apparently places the slug on the ground.

Both Elina and Kaisa then begin to clean the mushrooms that they are holding, and Elina provides an account of how she treats slugs: *mää on vähän liian eläinrakas ni mää jätän nuo etanat tänne mettään* ‘I’m a bit too fond of animals so I leave the slugs here in the woods’ (lines 17–18). Elina presents herself as going to extremes in her respectful treatment of other species, perhaps in contrast with what may generally be expected of foragers, and this receives amused and acknowledging responses from Kaisa (lines 19 and 21). After Elina’s account, Kaisa once more inspects the mushrooms in her hand but then begins to lower them again and, after seeking and receiving confirmation from Elina (lines 25–29), leaves them on the ground (Figures 2e–f) and moves on (data not shown). In short, Elina has here set Kaisa an example of how foragers may deal with slugs and slug-eaten mushrooms: she has provided verbal explanations and accounts, as well as an embodied demonstration of what she typically does. Kaisa follows Elina’s example in carefully inspecting and cleaning the mushrooms but eventually deems the mushrooms as not worth keeping (see Keisanen & Rauniomaa 2019). The participants can thus be seen to achieve a shared understanding of how to treat slugs in the context of foraging: rather than simply discarding the mushrooms that have slugs on them, the participants

consider the mushrooms as possibly consumable, and rather than simply picking and brushing the slugs away, the participants handle the slugs with some care and gently lower them to the ground.

In Excerpt 3, Elina similarly sets an example of a respectful orientation to slugs but this time does more work to engage her co-participant in the saving of a slug as a joint endeavor. Here, Elina is walking along a path with another course participant, Mikael. Before the beginning of the excerpt, Elina has picked a mushroom from the side of the path.

Excerpt 3: *meille tuli näköjään etana matkaan* ‘apparently a slug tagged along with us’ (08 HANS Sieniretki 00:24:50)

(±, * = Elina’s embodied conduct; ☐, § = Mikael’s embodied conduct)

01 ELI: (täss) on kuule# semmonen ku ↑ryytio☐rakats.
here's you know one called woolly tooth.
>>walks along path-----±
>>inspects mushroom-->
mik >>walks along path behind E-----☐passes E-->
fig #3a



Fig. 3a: Elina (left) makes a noticing.

02 ELI: meille tuli näköjään etana₈ matkaan.

apparently a slug tagged along with us

mik -->walks aheadturns to look back-->

03 ELI: ei# moteta- oteta₈ s[itä].

let's- let's not take it

mik -->walks back to E-->

fig #3b

04 MIK: [↑NÄYTÄ.

show {me}



Fig. 3b: Mikael (right) turns in direction of Elina (left), who has stopped.

05 (0.8)

06 ELI: jo[o.
yes

07 MIK: [he# he he
-->#stops to look at mushroom-->

08 (2.0)

09 ELI: °sie*llä on.°
there is
*-->*removes slug-->*

10 (1.1)

11 ELI: [jätetään se,]
let's leave it

12 MIK: [<↑eta]na> [<↓e#tana.>] ((singing))
slug slug

13 ELI: [↑jä#tetään se tä]nne me*t:tään.#*
let's leave it here in the woods
*-->*turns, looks*
*away**

mik *-->#*

fig #3c



Fig. 3c: Elina picks slug out of mushroom, and Mikael monitors.

14 ±α(0.4)

eli ±walks ahead along path-->

mik ±turns away from mushroom-->

15 MIK: jo[o (he-)]

 yes (--)

16 ELI: [etittää s]±ille# ↑etippä si\$lle

let's find it {you} find it

mik -->±walks along path with E-->

mik \$orients to bucket-->

fig #3d



Fig. 3d: Elina and Mikael continue walking and look for mushroom.

17 ELI: [semmonen sopiva korvaa]va sienien.
a suitable substitute mushroom

18 MIK: [↑TÄÄL on hyvä sienien.]
here's a good mushroom

19 MIK: (tiitti,)

eli -->fwalks across path to the side-->

20 (0.7)

21 ELI: tu:ola, >jätetään se tuonne<,
 there let's leave it there

22 (0.5)±(0.8)±(0.5)¤

eli -->fbends downfsquats-->>

mik -->¤

23 ELI: ¤tuola#

 there

mik ¤leans fwd-->>

fig #3e



Fig. 3e: Elina (left) places slug on another mushroom.

Having picked the mushroom and inspected it for a moment, Elina identifies it for Mikael as a woolly tooth (*ryytiorakas*, line 1). Elina places emphasis on the name of the mushroom and also uses the attention getter *kuule* ‘you know’ (lit. ‘hear’; see Hakulinen, Keevallik Eriksson & Lindström 2003). The design of the turn projects more talk about the mushroom; indeed, in these data, an identification of a mushroom is typically followed by a

description of its characteristics (see Keisanen & Rauniomaa 2019).

Moreover, by continuing to walk throughout her verbal turn, Elina orients to the present topic as one that can be advanced while on the move (Figure 3a). However, after her turn in line 1, Elina stops walking and changes the course of her talk by making a noticing: *meille tuli näköjään etana matkaan* ‘we apparently picked a slug with it’ (line 2). She then produces a proposal (see Couper-Kuhlen 2014), *ei moteta- oteta sitä* ‘let’s not take it’ (line 3), and begins to pick the slug out of the mushroom. In this way, Elina accounts for having stopped and indicates that she is now engaged in an activity that requires her to stand still.

During Elina’s noticing, Mikael has walked forward, but he now stops, turns, walks towards Elina and requests her to show him the slug (line 4; Figure 3b). Mikael then monitors from close range, singing ‘snailie, snailie’, as Elina picks out the slug and produces another proposal, *jätetään se, jätetään se tänne mettään* ‘let’s leave it, let’s leave it here in the woods’ (lines 11 and 13; Figure 3c). It is worth noting that both the initial noticing and the subsequent proposals imply that the participants are involved in a joint activity (see Rauniomaa 2017). Now that Mikael is clearly focused on the slug, too, Elina self-repairs from a proposal, in colloquial first-person plural, into a directive, in second-person singular, for Mikael to take up the task (*etittää sille etippä sille* ‘let’s find it {you} find it’, lines 16–17; Figure 3d; see Rauniomaa 2017; see also Raevaara 2017). In partial overlap, after having a look in his bucket, Mikael exclaims to have found ‘a good

mushroom' (line 18). Elina, however, does not accept the mushroom that Mikael offers but walks across to the side of the path and squats down to place the slug on a mushroom still growing in the ground (Figure 3e). In sum, Elina demonstrates and guides Mikael in treating small wildlife with respect: not only do they leave the slug in its natural habitat, in the forest, but they also put some effort into finding another mushroom to place it on.

In Excerpts 2 and 3, we saw how a more experienced forager, a professional, displays her orientation to slugs, acknowledging their entitlement to mushrooms as a part of their natural habitat and source of food, which happens to be a source of food also for humans. This orientation is evident in her embodied actions of stopping, inspecting, picking the slug and placing it on another mushroom as well as in the ways in which she explains and accounts for those actions. She sets an example for the less experienced to follow at their will, on this and possible future occasions (especially Excerpt 2), and, additionally, invites and guides the less experienced to conduct themselves in similar ways (especially Excerpt 3). In these cases, the less experienced do follow the more experienced forager's example or at least momentarily engage in saving the slugs together with her.

3.3 Guiding and Instructing Others to Pursue a Shared Understanding

In Excerpts 4 and 5, shared understandings about appropriate ways of treating small wildlife are negotiated between family members of various ages, that is, again in a somewhat asymmetrical interactional setting. In contrast with Excerpts 2 and 3, in which an instructor implicitly directs course participants by inviting and guiding them to follow her example, here the more experienced participants, caregivers, explicitly instruct the less experienced participants, children, on how to treat ants. Indeed, using linguistic resources such as the imperative form and the zero-person construction, they produce verbal directives that guide the recipient's conduct in both the present situation and similar ones in the future (see Laitinen 1995; Raevaara 2017; Rauniomaa 2017). They may also cut off the recipient's embodied actions and thus display that they treat such conduct as somehow problematic, in which case control touch and carrying may also be employed (see Cekaite 2015).

In Excerpt 4, the participants negotiate the appropriate treatment of ants, as small wildlife to observe but not to touch. Here, three-year-old Risto, his mother and his grandfather notice an anthill when picking bilberries. Only Risto is visible in the video recording.

Excerpt 4: *hei siinoo paljom muulahaisia* 'hey there are lots of ants' (06

HANS Mustikassa I 00:14:35)

(§, * = Risto's embodied conduct)

01 GRA: r[is(to) .

02 RIS: [HE[₂SI,
hey
 >>looks at anthill-->\$turns to M-->

03 MOT: [₂SIinä kuule,\$ hhh nii.\$
there you know hhh yes
 ris -->\$looks at M\$turns to anthill-->

04 (.)

05 RIS: hei* sii\$noo*, (.) ↑pa#ljom m*uula*haisia.
hey there are lots of ants
 *.....*points at anthill*,,,*,
 -->\$looks at anthill-->

fig #4a



Fig. 4a: Risto looks at and points to anthill.

06 MOT: nii on.
yes there are

07 (.)

08 MOT: ↑kuhina käy.
it's swarming

09 (2.7)

10 MOT: katopa tänne pu\$uhunki.
look here on the tree too

ris -->\$turns to tree-->

11 (0.4)\$ (0.7)\$ (0.7)

ris -->\$looks at tree\$no longer visible in video-->

12 MOT: sii:nä ne mennee.
there they go

13 (0.4)

14 GRA: se mennee ↑puu\$hun siel on,\$
it goes in the tree there is

ris -->\$looks at anthill\$

15 \$(0.6)\$ (0.3)

ris \$turns to tree\$walks twd tree-->

16 RIS: minä voisin na#pata yhen\$ muula[(haisen).
I could snatch one ant.

-->\$stands in front of and
looks at tree-->>

fig #4b



Fig. 4b: Risto approaches tree.

17 MOT: [↓elä ota.=
don't take.

18 MOT: =anna niitten rauhassa kato,
 let them {be} in peace see

19 (0.6)

20 MOT: ne men[nee si-]
 they go the-

21 RIS: [ne voi] pulata.
 they can bite

22 (.)

23 MOT: no vo:i ne purastaki.
 well yes they can bite too

```
24      §(1.0)§(.)#

ris      §stretches out RH$holds RH up-->

fig      #4c
```



Fig. 4c: Risto holds his right hand up but does not touch ants.

25 MOT: ↓ei kan[nata ottaa.]

it's no use taking

26 GRA: [ne pissaa] päälle j\$os (m[eet lähelle]).
 they pee on you if you go near

ris -->\$withdraws RH slowly-->

27 MOT: [↓elä ota.
 don't take

28 (.)

29 RIS: #ja pannee\$ pissaa päälle.
 and {they} put pee on you

-->\$

fig #4d

30 MOT: nii,
 yes



Fig. 4d: Risto withdraws his right hand.

The excerpt begins with the grandfather, Risto and the mother each producing in overlap linguistic elements that are typically used to bring about joint attention (see, e.g. Tomasello 1995): the grandfather starts with the address term *Risto* (line 1), Risto with the attention getter *hei* ‘hey’ (line

2) and the mother with the deictic adverb *siinä* ‘there’ and the attention getter *kuule* ‘you know’ (line 3; see Hakulinen et al. 2003). Indeed, they all employ linguistic resources typical of constructing noticings (see Goodwin & Goodwin 2012), and Risto also turns to look at the mother at the end of his turn. The mother cuts off her own turn and positions herself as a recipient with the particle *nii* ‘yes’ (line 3), displaying orientation to the course of action initiated by Risto. After getting the mother’s attention, Risto turns back to the anthill and produces a noticing that indicates where and what the others are to look at. He also describes the target with *paljom muulahaisia* ‘lots of ants’ (line 5, Figure 4a). The mother first claims to have perceptual access to the target by producing the unmodified agreement *nii on* ‘yes there are’ (line 6; see Sorjonen & Hakulinen 2009) and then demonstrates that she sees the anthill and adopts a similar perspective towards it by providing a description of her own (*kuhina käy* ‘it’s swarming, line 8; see Goodwin & Goodwin 2012; see also Mondada 2011). At this point, the participants apparently remain at a distance from the anthill (Figure 4a) and thus display that they have a shared understanding of their ongoing activity as being about observing ants. The mother then directs Risto to look at a tree (line 10), and Risto turns towards the tree on which more ants can be found.

Next, Risto walks to the tree to take a closer look at the ants and proposes to snatch one of them, employing the conditional modal verb *voisin* ‘I could’ (lines 15–16, Figure 4b). However, the mother explicitly

guides him not to do so by using imperative forms, the first of which (*elä ota* ‘don’t take’, line 17) forbids Risto to follow the course of action that he has proposed and the second of which (*anna niitten rauhassa* ‘let them {be} in peace’, line 18) suggests an alternative course of (non-)action that Risto is to follow. The mother’s directives are followed by the attention getter *kato* ‘see’, which typically projects a forthcoming account (Hakulinen & Seppänen 1992; see Siitonen, Rauniomaa & Keisanen 2019; see also Raevaara 2017). Here, after a 0.6-second pause, the mother begins an account by referring to what the ants are doing (*ne mennee si-* ‘they go the-’, line 20). Risto, too, orients to an account being relevant at this point by providing one in overlap with the mother’s turn: *ne voi pulata* ‘they can bite’ (line 21). Whereas the mother’s directives and account have implied that they should respect the ants’ right to be left in peace, Risto’s account suggests that they should not touch the ants because the ants might hurt them. Indeed, the verb + subject construction (see Hakulinen & Sorjonen 2009) as well as the dispreferred features, namely the turn-initial *no* ‘well’ (see Raevaara 1989) and the lengthened *vo:i* ‘can’, in the mother’s following response (*no vo:i ne purastaki* ‘well yes they can bite too’, line 23) display that Risto’s account does not match the mother’s. Nevertheless, the clitic *-kin* ‘too’ at the end of the verb *puraista* ‘bite’ indicates that the mother accepts Risto’s account as well.

Still standing by the tree, Risto stretches out his right hand as if to snatch an ant (line 24, Figure 4c). Again, the mother forbids him, but this

time designing the directive as a zero-person construction, *ei kannata ottaa* ‘it’s no use taking’ (line 25). By employing such a construction, the mother treats the nominated action as valid both in the current situation and in similar ones more generally (see Raevaara 2017; Rauniomaa 2017), and by employing the verb *kannattaa* ‘be worth it; be of use’, she appeals to reason, rather than empathy. Partly in overlap with the mother’s directive, the grandfather joins in and explicates another reason not to go near the ants. By saying *ne pissaa päälle jos meet lähelle* ‘they pee on you if you go near’ (line 26), he, too, suggests that the ants’ ability to cause harm or inconvenience to human participants is the reason to keep away from them. So far, Risto has held his right hand up relatively close to the ants on the tree and, in this way, displayed that he does not comply entirely with the mother’s directives but continues to orient to the possibility of snatching an ant. After the grandfather’s informing about the possible unpleasant consequences, however, Risto starts to withdraw his hand very slowly. At the same time, the mother forbids Risto to take an ant one more time (line 27). By withdrawing his hand and by repeating the grandfather’s warning (line 29, Figure 4d), Risto displays that he now aligns with the nominated action, not to touch the ants. The other participants, in turn, do not provide any further directives and thus treat Risto’s conduct as an indication of the achievement of a shared understanding that the ants should be left in peace.

In Excerpt 5, we see the same family spotting another anthill a year later, when also the father and Risto’s two-year-old little brother, Väinö, join

the others on an outing. Here, too, the caregivers guide the children to treat ants and anthills with respect, but, in contrast with Excerpt 4, the participants do not use the ants' ability to cause harm to humans as the reason not to go near them. Instead, as they talk about the ants, the participants refer to them by using terms that are familiar to the children from their own human environment and thereby aid the children in taking into account the perspective of the ants (see Galatolo & Caronia, 2018). In other words, the caregivers appeal to and develop the children's sense of empathy. The excerpt starts with a noticing by Risto.

Excerpt 5: *tuossa on tiiäkkö kuule muulahaisen keko* 'there is you know listen an ant's hill' (22 HANS Mustikassa II 00:07:37)

(⌘ = grandfather's embodied conduct; §, * = Risto's embodied conduct; % = Väinö's embodied conduct)

```
01          (1.8) * (0.3)
    gra      >>⌘assists V-->
    ris      >>looks at anthill-->
    ris      *.....-->
02 RIS:      ↑kato pap*pa.#
              look grandad
              -->*points at anthill with cup-->
    fig      #5a
```



Fig. 5a: Risto looks at and points to anthill but remains at some distance from it; and grandfather assists Vainö in getting up.

03 (.)

04 RIS: **tuossa on tiiäkö kuule muulahaisen\$ keko.\$*#**

there is you know listen an ant's hill

-->\$looks at G\$

-->*

gra -->#straightens up,

turns to look at anthill-->

fig

#5b



Fig. 5b: Risto points to anthill but looks at grandfather; and grandfather orients to anthill.

05 \$*(.)

-->*walks after V-->>

ris -->\$turns to anthill\$looks at anthill-->

16 MOT: [↑niin.]
 that's right

17 RIS [sitte] ne\$ ni- niitä ↑halmittaa.\$
 then they the- they are annoyed
 -->\$looks at V----->\$

18 MOT: \$*ihan [varmasti ha*rmittaa.
 {they} surely are annoyed

ris \$looks down-->>

ris *takes step right*bends down-->

19 FAT: [(nii har(-)
 yes (they) (-)

20 (.)

21 RIS: ↑ihan *valmasti halmit*taa.
 {they} surely are annoyed
 -->*picks berry----*squats down-->>

The grandfather is busy assisting Väino when Risto produces a noticing about an anthill (*kato pappa. tuossa on tiiäkkö kuule muulahaisen keko* ‘look grandad. there is you know listen an ant’s hill’, lines 2 and 4). Risto also looks in the direction of the anthill and points at it with a paper cup in his hand (Figure 5a). At the end of the verbal noticing, by glancing at the grandfather, Risto ensures that they share the same focus of attention. At this point, the grandfather has indeed already straightened up and turned to look at the anthill (Figure 5b). Then, turning back to Väinö and bending

down to assist him, the grandfather verbally affirms Risto's noticing (*siinä on muurahaisen keko* ‘there is an ant’s hill’, line 6). At the same time, Risto looks at the anthill again and subsequently expands the noticing into a knowledge exploration (see Goodwin 2007), asking about the consequences of breaking the anthill (*mitä (tuo) likkoo tuon muulahaisen keko* ‘what (that) one breaks that ant’s hill’, line 8). The grandfather explicitly forbids him to break it (*ei saa rikkoa* ‘{one} mustn’t break {it}’, lines 10–11) and, by using the zero-person construction, portrays the nominated action as a more general piece of advice that concerns also other people and other situations (see Raevaara 2017; Rauniomaa 2017). However, the grandfather does not account for the directive.

Consequently, Risto repeats his previous question and, by using the conjunction *jos* ‘if’ and the zero-person construction, highlights it as a hypothetical one, an initiation of a knowledge exploration (*mitä jos sen likkoo* ‘what if {one} breaks it’, line 12). In line with this, Risto neither approaches the anthill nor orients to it in other embodied ways. The father (not visible on video) answers Risto’s question in terms of human phenomena, i.e. having a home (*sit muurahaisella ei oo kotia* ‘then the ant doesn’t have a home’, line 13), and both the grandfather and the mother confirm this explanation with the particle *niin* ‘that’s right’, produced with emphatic prosody starting with high pitch (lines 15–16). Risto himself complements the explanation by referring to an ant as a sentient creature that is capable of being annoyed and, in so doing, displays his ability to take

the other's perspective (*sitte ne ni- niitä halmittaa* 'then they the- they are annoyed', line 17; see Galatolo & Caronia 2018). The mother and the father soon confirm the inference that Risto has made (lines 18–19).

It is worth noting that, throughout the excerpt, Risto, the grandfather, the mother and the father all stand some distance away from the anthill and do not display any intention of moving closer to or touching it. The two-year-old Väinö, however, starts to walk towards the anthill in the middle of the knowledge exploration between Risto and the caregivers. The grandfather orients to Väinö's embodied conduct first by following him and later by using control touch and carrying to stop his movement towards the anthill (data not shown; see Cekaite 2015).

Excerpts 4 and 5 show that, in natural outdoor settings, the caregivers explicitly direct the children to conduct themselves in ways that the caregivers consider appropriate. In this socialization process, the participants employ multiple resources, including language, bodily conduct, (non-)movement, touch and carrying, to construct a respectful orientation towards ants as entitled inhabitants of the forest, in particular, and towards other living beings, in general. The children, in turn, are treated as accountable for complying with the directives and thus displaying in situ that they subscribe to the values set forth by the caregivers. Such values are best established and maintained in those extraordinary moments of everyday life in which human participants cross paths with other species in the wild: unlike the family pet of which children take care and to which they are

emotionally attached, or indeed the exotic beast about which children have learnt in television documentaries and which they follow in awe from behind a glass wall in a zoo, small wildlife are varied in shape, size and number, and encounters with them during any outdoor activities are common but unpredictable.

4 Conclusion

In many ways, in our data from natural outdoor settings, representatives of other species are talked about and oriented to similarly to objects on guided tours in urban environments (e.g. Broth & Mondada 2013; De Stefani 2010; De Stefani & Mondada 2014, 2017): participants produce noticings about them, talk about their characteristics and possibly negotiate what to do with them, before moving on to other objects. Moose flies, slugs and ants, however, are *animate* objects, in the sense of both *alive* and *mobile*. They are available for observing and even acting on, but they live and move independently of humans. Apart from moose flies and mosquitos perhaps, participants in our data treat other species as having a right to their natural habitats, which may be described in human terms for the children (i.e. anthills are talked about as homes), and their existence is considered as meaningful in itself.

While all our cases begin with noticings, the subsequent courses of action unfold in different ways so that participants may display and renew their already established shared understandings by all treating the wildlife in similar ways; pursue shared understandings by setting an example and providing accounts for the ways in which they treat the wildlife; or pursue shared understandings by guiding and instructing others in treating the wildlife in appropriate ways and by holding others accountable for their conduct. In other words, the cases in our data fall on different points along a continuum of the degrees to which participants explicitly negotiate, demonstrate and instruct others in constructing the human–nature relationship in social interaction.

We have shown how, in the process of displaying and monitoring their evolving understandings about the appropriate ways of engaging in interspecies encounters, the participants draw on, among other things, talk, gaze, body position and space in their own intraspecies interaction. Moreover, we have shown how touch emerges as an important resource in managing such interspecies encounters. Through their multimodal conduct, human participants communicate to one another what forms of touch are appropriate when dealing with other species: for instance, should a careful, and even caring, touch be employed (e.g. Excerpt 2) or should the wildlife not be touched at all (e.g. Excerpt 4). Sometimes, small wildlife may also seek contact with humans as part of their natural feeding and breeding behavior, and in such cases touch is used to shoo them off or even to kill

them (Excerpt 1). These different forms of touch in interspecies encounters show that touch is one important means for displaying, pursuing and achieving shared understandings of the human–nature relationship among human participants.

Acknowledgements

We wish to thank the reviewers and editors for helping us turn the manuscript into a publication, Anna Vatanen, Leena Kuure and others in COACT Grassroots sessions for providing comments on various early versions of the manuscript, Charlotte Lundgren and others at Linköping University as well as participants at MOBSIN7 for sharing their observations and ideas on the data and Paul McIlvenny and other participants in the panel “Talk in/with the Environment and Other Life Forms” at IPrA 2017 for discussing interspecies encounters in general. The preparation and publication of the study was made possible with funding from the Academy of Finland (project “Human Activity in Natural Settings”, decision number 285393; the Finnish Centre of Excellence in Research on Intersubjectivity in Interaction, decision number 284595) and from the Finnish Cultural Foundation, North Ostrobothnia Regional Fund.

References

- Bergeå, Hanna, Cathrin Martin, and Fritjof Sahlström. 2008. ““I Don’t Know What You’re Looking for”: Professional Vision in Swedish Agricultural Extension on Nature Conservation Management.” *Journal of Agricultural Education and Extension* 14 (4): 329–345.
- Broth, Mathias, and Lorenza Mondada. 2013. “Walking Away: The Embodied Achievement of Activity Closings in Mobile Interaction.” *Journal of Pragmatics* 47 (1): 41–58.
- Cekaite, Asta. 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.
- Couper-Kuhlen, Elizabeth. 2014. “What Does Grammar Tell Us about Action?” *Pragmatics* 24: 623–647.
- De Stefani, Elwys. 2010. “Reference as an Interactively and Multimodally Accomplished Practice. Organizing Spatial Reorientation in Guided Tours.” In *Spoken Communication*, ed. by Massimo Pettorino, Antonella Giannini, Isabella Chiari, and Francesca Dovetto, 137–170. Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- De Stefani, Elwys, and Lorenza Mondada. 2017. “Who’s the Expert? Negotiating Competence and Authority in Guided Tours.” In *Identity Struggles: Evidence from Workplaces around the World*, ed. by Dorien Van De Mierop, and Stephanie Schnurr, 95–124. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

- De Stefani, Elwys, and Lorenza Mondada. 2014. "Reorganizing Mobile Formations: When "Guided" Participants Initiate Reorientations in Guided Tours." *Space and Culture* 17 (2): 157–175.
- Deppermann, Arnulf. 2019. "Intersubjectivity and Other Grounds for Action-Coordination in an Environment of Restricted Interaction: Coordinating with Oncoming Traffic When Passing an Obstacle." *Language & Communication* 65: 22–40.
- Deppermann, Arnulf. 2015a. "When Recipient Design Fails: Egocentric Turn-Design of Instructions in Driving School Lessons Leading to Breakdowns of Intersubjectivity." *Gesprächsforschung* 16: 63–101.
- Deppermann, Arnulf. 2015b. "Retrospection and Understanding in Interaction." In *Temporality in Interaction*, ed. by Arnulf Deppermann, and Susanne Günthner, 57–94. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Fasulo, Alessandra, Heather Loyd, and Vincenzo Padiglione. 2007. "Children's Socialization into Cleaning Practices: A Cross-Cultural Perspective." *Discourse & Society* 18: 11–33.
- Fatigante, Marilena, Vivian Liberatía, and Clotilde Pontecorvo. 2010. "Transitions In and Out of Games: How Parents and Children Bracket Game Episodes at Home." *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 43 (4): 346–371.
- Galatolo, Renata, and Letizia Caronia. 2018. "Morality at Dinnertime: The Sense of the Other as a Practical Accomplishment in Family Interaction." *Discourse & Society* 29 (1): 43–62.

George, Rachel. 2013. “‘What’s a Vendetta?’ Political Socialization in the Everyday Interactions of Los Angeles Families.” *Discourse & Society* 24 (1): 46–65.

Glenn, Phillip. 1989. “Initiating Shared Laughter in Multi-Party Conversations.” *Western Journal of Speech Communication* 53: 127–149.

Goodwin, Charles, and Marjorie Harness Goodwin. 2012. “Car Talk: Integrating Texts, Bodies, and Changing Landscapes.” *Semiotica* 191 (1): 257–286.

Goodwin, Marjorie Harness. 2007. “Occasioned Knowledge Exploration in Family Interaction.” *Discourse & Society* 18 (1): 93–110.

Haddington, Pentti, Tiina Keisanen, Lorenza Mondada, and Maurice Nevile. 2014. “Towards Multiactivity as a Social and Interactional Phenomenon.” In *Multiactivity in Social Interaction: Beyond Multitasking*, ed. by Pentti Haddington, Tiina Keisanen, Lorenza Mondada, and Maurice Nevile, 3–32. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Hakulinen, Auli, Leelo Keevalik Eriksson, and Jan Lindström. 2003. “*Kuule, kule, hördu* – projicerande praktiker i finska, estniska och svenska samtal [*Kuule, kule, hördu* ’– practices of projection in Finnish, Estonian and Swedish conversation].” In *Grammatik och samtal: Studier till minne av Mats Eriksson* [Grammar and conversation: Studies in the memory of Mats Eriksson], ed. by Bengt Nordberg, Leelo Keevalik Eriksson, Kerstin Thelander, and Mats Thelander, 199–218. Uppsala: Uppsala universitet.

- Hakulinen, Auli, and Eeva-Leena Seppänen. 1992. "Finnish *kato*: From Verb to Particle." *Journal of Pragmatics* 18: 527–549.
- Hakulinen, Auli, and Marja-Leena Sorjonen. 2009. "Designing Utterances for Action: Verb Repeat Responses to Assessments." In *Talk in Interaction. Comparative Dimensions*, ed. by Markku Haakana, Minna Laakso, and Jan Lindström, 124–151. Helsinki: Finnish Literature Society.
- Heritage, John, and Tanya Stivers. 1999. "Online Commentary in Acute Medical Visits: A Method of Shaping Patient Expectations." *Social Science & Medicine* 49: 1501–1517.
- Jefferson, Gail. 2004. "Glossary of Transcript Symbols with an Introduction." In *Conversation Analysis: Studies from the First Generation*, ed. by Gene Lerner, 13–31. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Keevallik, Leelo. 2010. "Bodily Quoting in Dance Correction." *Research on Language & Social Interaction* 43 (4): 401–426.
- Keisanen, Tiina. 2012. "'Uh-Oh, We Were Going There': Environmentally Occasioned Noticings of Trouble in In-Car Interaction." *Semiotica* 191: 199–224.
- Keisanen, Tiina, and Mirka Rauniomaa. 2019. "Classifying Finds in Foraging on the Basis of (Guided) Sensory Inspection." *Gesprächsforschung* 20: 518–544, special issue on "Object-Centred Sequences in Social Interaction", ed. by Sylvaine Tuncer, Christian Licoppe, and Pentti Haddington.

- Keisanen, Tiina, Mirka Rauniomaa, and Pauliina Siitonen. 2017. "Transitions as Sites of Socialization in Family Interaction Outdoors." *Learning, Culture and Social Interaction* 14: 24–37.
- Linell, Per, and Jan Lindström. 2016. "Partial Intersubjectivity and Sufficient Understandings for Current Practical Purposes: On a Specialized Practice in Swedish Conversation." *Nordic Journal of Linguistics* 39 (2): 113–133.
- Lundgren, Charlotte. 2017. "Ridtränares kommunikation under privatlektioner i dressyr: En samtalsanalytisk studie [The communication of trainers in equestrian dressage: A multimodal interaction analysis]." *Scandinavian Sport Studies Forum* 8: 67–86.
- Mondada, Lorenza. 2019. *Conventions for Multimodal Transcription*. <https://www.lorenzamondada.net/multimodal-transcription>
- Mondada, Lorenza. 2011. "Understanding as an Embodied, Situated and Sequential Achievement in Interaction." *Journal of Pragmatics* 43: 542–552, special issue on "Understanding Understanding in Action", edited by Timothy Koschmann.
- Mondémé, Chloe. 2018. "Comment parle-t-on aux animaux? Formes et effets pragmatiques de l'adresse aux animaux de compagnie [How do we talk to animals? Modes and pragmatic effects of communication with pets]." *Langage et société* 163: 77–99.
- Mondémé, Chloe. 2016. "Extension de la question de "l'ordre social" aux interactions hommes/animaux – une approche ethnométhodologique

[Extending the notion of “social order” to human/animal interaction. An ethnomethodological approach].” *Année Sociologique* 66 (2): 319–350.

Mortensen, Kristian, and Johannes Wagner. 2019. “Inspection Sequences – Multisensorial Inspections of Unfamiliar Objects.” *Gesprächsforschung* 20: 399–343, special issue on “Object-Centred Sequences in Social Interaction”, ed. by Sylvaine Tuncer, Christian Licoppe, and Pentti Haddington.

Mysterud, Atle, Knut Madslien, Anders Herland, Hildegunn Viljugrein, and Bjørnar Ytrehus. 2016. “Phenology of Deer Ked (*Lipoptena cervi*) Host-Seeking Flight Activity and Its Relationship with Prevailing Autumn Weather.” *Parasites & Vectors* 9, article number 95.

Ochs, Elinor. 1996. “Linguistic Resources for Socializing Humanity.” In *Rethinking Linguistic Relativity*, ed. by John J. Gumperz, and Stephen C. Levinson, 407–437. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ochs, Elinor, and Bambi B. Schieffelin. 1984. “Language Acquisition and Socialization: Three Developmental Stories and Their Implications”. In *Culture Theory: Essays on Mind, Self and Emotion*, ed. by Richard A. Shweder, and Robert A. LeVine, 276–320. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ochs, Elinor, and Bambi B. Schieffelin. 2011. “The Theory of Language Socialization”. In *The Handbook of Language Socialization*, ed. by Alessandro Duranti, Elinor Ochs, and Bambi B. Schieffelin, 1–21. London: Blackwell.

- Pontecorvo, Clotilde, Alessandra Fasulo, and Laura Sterponi. 2001. "Mutual Apprentices: The Making of Parenthood and Childhood in Family Dinner Conversations." *Human Development* 44 (6): 340–361.
- Raevaara, Liisa. 1989. "No – vuoronalkuinen partikkeli [*No* – a turn-initial particle]." In *Suomalaisen keskustelun keinoja I* [Characteristics of Finnish conversation I], ed. by Auli Hakulinen, 147–161. Helsinki: Department of Finnish, University of Helsinki.
- Raevaara, Liisa. 2017. "Adjusting the Design of Directives to the Activity Environment. Imperatives in Finnish Cooking Club Interaction." In *Imperative Turns at Talk: The Design of Directives in Action*, ed. by Marja-Leena Sorjonen, Liisa Raevaara, and Elizabeth Couper-Kuhlen, 381–410. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Rauniomaa, Mirka. 2017. "Assigning Roles and Responsibilities. Finnish Imperatively Formatted Directive Actions in a Mobile Instructional Setting." In *Imperative Turns at Talk: The Design of Directives in Action*, ed. by Marja-Leena Sorjonen, Liisa Raevaara, and Elizabeth Couper-Kuhlen, 325–355. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Rossano, Federico. 2013. "Sequence Organization and Timing of Bonobo Mother–Infant Interactions." *Interaction Studies* 14 (2): 160–189.
- Rossano, Federico, and Katja Liebal. 2014. "'Requests' and 'Offers' in Orangutans and Human Infants." In *Requesting in Social Interaction*, ed. by Paul Drew, and Elizabeth Couper-Kuhlen, 335–364. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

- Sacks, Harvey. 1992. *Lectures on Conversation*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Schegloff, Emanuel A. 2007. *Sequence Organization in Interaction. A Primer in Conversation Analysis I*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Schegloff, Emanuel A. 1992. "Repair after Next Turn: The Last Structurally Provided Defense of Intersubjectivity in Conversation." *The American Journal of Sociology* 97 (5): 1295–1345.
- Siitonen, Pauliina, Mirka Rauniomaa, and Tiina Keisanen. 2019. "'Kato. Hulluna puolukoita.'" *Kato* vuorovaikutuksen resurssina luontoilussa ["Kato. An insane amount of lingonberries." *Kato* as an interactional resource in nature-related activities]. *Virittäjä* 123 (4): 518–549.
- Sorjonen, Marja-Leena, and Auli Hakulinen. 2009. "Alternative Responses to Assessments." In *Conversation Analysis. Comparative Perspectives*, ed. by Jack Sidnell, 280–300. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Virkkula, Outi. 2018. "Customer-Driven Questioning in Finnish Forestry Advisory Conversations." *Scandinavian Journal of Forest Research* 33 (3): 271–277.
- Tomasello, Michael. 1995. Joint Attention as Social Cognition. In *Joint Attention: Its Origins and Role in Development*, ed. by Chris Moore and Philip J. Dunham, 103–130. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Waters, Jane, and Amanda Bateman. 2015. "Revealing the Interactional Features of Learning and Teaching Moments in Outdoor Activity." *European Early Childhood Education Research Journal* 23 (2): 264–276.