

Chapter 8

Recruiting assistance and collaboration in Polish

Jörg Zinken


Department of Pragmatics, Leibniz-Institute for the German Language

This chapter describes the resources that speakers of Polish use when recruiting assistance and collaboration from others in everyday social interaction. The chapter draws on data from video recordings of informal conversation in Polish, and reports language-specific findings generated within a large-scale comparative project involving eight languages from five continents (see other chapters of this volume). The resources for recruitment described in this chapter include linguistic structures from across the levels of grammatical organization, as well as gestural and other visible and contextual resources of relevance to the interpretation of action in interaction. The presentation of categories of recruitment, and elements of recruitment sequences, follows the coding scheme used in the comparative project (see Chapter 2 of the volume). This chapter extends our knowledge of the structure and usage of Polish with detailed attention to the properties of sequential structure in conversational interaction. The chapter is a contribution to an emerging field of pragmatic typology.

1 Introduction

This chapter provides an overview of many of the practices for recruiting another person's assistance or collaboration in Polish. The data for this overview come from a corpus of video recordings of informal everyday interactions in the homes of families living in urban areas of Poland. As this chapter will show, recruitment practices in Polish follow many of the regularities that we have observed for other languages in the larger project reported in the present volume. Some distinctive aspects of Polish recruitments, such as the diverse imperative, impersonal, and infinitive formats of recruiting moves, are also discussed.



Jörg Zinken. Recruiting assistance and collaboration in Polish. In Simeon Floyd, Giovanni Rossi & N. J. Enfield (eds.), *Getting others to do things: A pragmatic typology of recruitments*, 281–324. Berlin: Language Science Press.
DOI:10.5281/zenodo.4018384 

Publikationsserver des Leibniz-Instituts für Deutsche Sprache
URN: <http://nbn-resolving.de/urn:nbn:de:bsz:mh39-100892>

1.1 The Polish Language

Polish is an Indo-European language that belongs to the West-Slavic branch of the Slavic language family. Polish is spoken by about 40 million people worldwide, of whom about 37 million live in the Republic of Poland in Central Europe.

Polish has a long tradition of grammatical description (comprehensive grammars are Bąk 2010 and Strutyński 2006). Although it is characterized by relatively free word order, its basic word order is SVO. There is a rich tradition of pragmatic work in Polish linguistics, but work on the basis of recorded interaction has been virtually absent until recently (though see Labocha 1985; 1986). Grammatical features relevant to recruitment practices include verbal aspect, the absence of interrogative syntax, a relatively elaborate imperative paradigm, and impersonal modal constructions with the verbs *trzeba* ‘it is necessary to’ and *można* ‘it is possible to’.

1.2 Data collection and corpus

The Polish corpus of video recordings was built outside the comparative project this volume reports on. Most recordings were made in 2009 as part of a comparative project on *Sharing responsibilities in English and Polish families*, funded by the British Economic and Social Research Council (ESRC). For that project, matched corpora of video recordings of everyday life in British and Polish families were collected. Participants were asked to record everyday activities, such as mealtimes, cooking, or playing with their children. The Polish corpus from that project includes 10 hours of recordings made by six families. Other recordings have been made during field visits since then. These further data amount to 3.5 hours of recordings made by three families. The restriction to family interaction distinguishes the Polish data from other languages examined in this volume, which include recordings of informal interaction beyond family contexts. The reader might want to keep this caveat in mind when comparing the results across languages.

The recordings were made in the capital city Warsaw and in Lublin, a university city in the southeast of Poland. This means that all recordings come from Eastern regions in Poland. The data considered for comparison consisted of coded samples from the recordings, with the goal of coding at least 200 recruitments. Most of the families had young children, and many recruitment sequences found in the data included a child, either as “recruiter” or as “recruitee”. To maximize comparability of the data across languages, only recruitments in which both participants are adults were considered for the study reported on here. Six hours and

thirty minutes of recordings were sampled to identify 215 recruitment sequences.

Transcripts may include up to three tiers for each line. The first tier represents the original talk and/or other conduct following the conventions of conversation analysis (Jefferson 2004); the second tier gives a word-by-word or morpheme-by-morpheme gloss of the talk following the Leipzig glossing rules and abbreviations (Comrie et al. 2020);¹ the third tier gives a more idiomatic English translation.

2 Basics of recruitment sequences

As defined in Chapter 1, §4, a recruitment is a basic cooperative phenomenon in social interaction consisting of a sequence of two moves with the following characteristics:

Move A: participant A says or does something to participant B, or that B can see or hear;

Move B: participant B does a practical action for or with participant A that is fitted to what A has said or done.

A recruitment sequence can have a minimal shape, consisting only of two moves, or it can have a more complex shape. I begin with examples illustrating this difference. In the transcripts, ▶ and ▷ designate Move A and Move B, respectively.

2.1 Minimal recruitment sequence

Extract 1 provides an example of a minimal recruitment sequence. The participants are seated at the table for supper. At lines 1–2, Ilona asks Jacek to pass her the salad bowl (Move A); at line 3, Jacek passes her the salad bowl (Move B).

(1) PP2-1_2224980

- ▶ 1 ILO wiesz co podaj mi kochanie jeszcze
 know.2SG what pass.IMP me dear still
 you know what, pass me some more
- 2 sałatki
 salad.GEN
 salad, dear
- ▷ 3 JAC bardzo proszę ((passes salad bowl))
 very plead.1SG
 here you are

¹In addition to the standard abbreviations, I also use HRT for hortative and PTC for particle.

2.2 Non-minimal recruitment sequence

Recruitment sequences are non-minimal when the recruiting move is done again (e.g. to clarify it, to make it more forceful, or because the recruiting speaker is not certain whether it has been heard) before it is complied with or rejected. In (2), Piotr is sitting at the dinner table with a baby on his lap. He tells Aga at line 1 that cheese has dropped to the floor (Move A). Aga arrives at the table and puts her coffee cup down. This might, but need not be, a move preliminary to doing the target action of picking up the cheese (line 2 is not marked with ▷ to allow for this uncertainty). Piotr then redoes the recruiting move in truncated form (line 3), and Aga picks up the cheese from the floor immediately thereafter.

(2) PP5-4_0154810a

- ▶ 1 PIO tutaj ser u- (0.4) tu ser upadł jeszcze
 here cheese dr- here cheese drop.down.3SG.PST still
 here cheese has- here cheese has dropped down also
- 2 AGA ((arrives at table, places coffee cup on the table))
- ▶ 3 PIO ser upadł
 cheese drop.down.3SG.PST
 cheese has dropped down
- ▷ 4 AGA ((picks up cheese))

2.3 Subtypes of recruitment sequence

In the comparative project, we distinguish between four types of recruitments: i) sequences in which B provides a service, ii) sequences in which B gives an object to A, iii) sequences in which B alters the trajectory of his or her current behavior, and iv) sequences in which B does something to address A's current or anticipatable trouble.

We have already seen examples for two of these: (2), where A recruits B to pick up something that has dropped to the floor, was an example of a recruitment the point of which was that B provide a service; (1), where A recruits B to pass the salad bowl, was an example of a recruitment the point of which was that B give an object to A. Passing an object can be a particular kind of service, but we consider object requests separately, because such requests are numerous and they constitute a distinct domain (see also Zinken 2015).

Extract 3 is an example of a recruitment the point of which is to alter some current conduct by B. Ilona is putting sugar into Jacek's tea. At line 4, Jacek's recruiting turn *już=już* 'already already' (or, more idiomatically, 'enough enough')

gets Ilona to stop sweetening the tea further (cf. Stivers 2004 on multiple sayings as a practice for indicating that some course of action should be halted).

(3) PP2-5_949800

- 1 ILO proszę:: ((spoons sugar into A's tea))
plead.1SG
here you are
- 2 JAC dzie[kuję bardzo
thank.1SG very
thank you very much
- 3 ILO [słodzę:: [ci mężu
sweeten.1SG you.DAT husband.VOC
I sweeten it for you, my husband
- ▶ 4 JAC [już= już
already already
enough enough
- ▷ 5 ILO ((stops putting sugar into tea))

Finally, (4) is a case in which Move B addresses some current or anticipatable problem of A's. Piotr is trying to cut pizza, but he is also holding a baby on his lap. The baby has started to pull the table mat with the pizza plate on it towards himself, and Piotr is in the difficult position of having to juggle trying to cut pizza, holding the baby, and controlling the baby's hands, all at the same time. Piotr's trouble is both visible and audible (*kurczę*, loosely translatable as 'damn', line 3). The two children, Łukasz and Przemek, laugh at Piotr's predicament (lines 4 and 5), but his wife Aga announces help and shortly thereafter comes to the table and takes the baby from Piotr.

(4) PP5-4_0134460

- 1 PIO ((cuts pizza on his plate))
- ▶ 2 BAB ((pulls the table mat))
- ▶ 3 PIO ku::rcze no,
EXPL PTC
damn no
- 4 ŁUK Hh::
- 5 PRZ A: hhahaha .H
- ▷ 6 AGA już go ci biorę stamtąd
already him.ACC you.DAT take.IPFV.1SG from.there
already I'm taking him for you from there
- ▷ 7 ((comes to the table and takes the baby))

Cases of assistance with current or anticipatable trouble can also often be analyzed as eliciting a service of some sort. What separates them as a category, however, is that A might not have designed their conduct to recruit assistance. Nonetheless, B's practical action is occasioned by some conduct in what then becomes Move A.

3 Formats in Move A: The recruiting move

3.1 Fully nonverbal recruiting moves

Sometimes recruiting moves are fully nonverbal. For example, a person can simply point to an object that they want to be given, or they can reach out to receive an object, or – as in the following case – a person can hold out an object and thereby recruit another person to take it and do something with it. In (5), Marta and Karol are searching for a particular medication in the fridge. Marta takes a package out of the fridge, inspects it, and then holds it out for Karol to take it from her. Karol then takes the package from Marta (Figure 1).

(5) (PP6-3_1920720)

► 1 MAT ((holds out package))

▷ 2 KAR ((takes package))



Figure 1: Karol takes the package from Marta (Extract 5, line 2).

Fully nonverbal recruiting moves can be successful when the context provides a rich scaffold that secures the other person's attention and makes the point of the recruitment transparent (Rossi 2014 and Chapter 5, §3.1; see also Kendrick, Chapter 4, §4.1.3; Baranova, Chapter 9, §3.1; Dingemanse, Chapter 10, §3.4). The recruitment in (5) occurs in a context in which Marta and Karol are already engaged in the activity of inspecting various packages of medicine they have in the fridge. Fully nonverbal practices make up 6.5% ($n=14$) of all recruiting moves.

3.2 Nonverbal behavior in composite recruiting moves

Moves initiating recruitment in face-to-face interaction often involve a combination of verbal and nonverbal conduct. For example, when A asks B to pass the butter, A might also gaze towards B, a practice that can serve to address the relevant person (Lerner 2003). Here, however, we coded only conduct that aids the recipient in identifying the target object and/or action. Table 1 provides an overview of the types of nonverbal behavior found in composite recruiting moves in the Polish data.

Table 1: Types of nonverbal behavior in composite recruiting moves ($n=77$).

Nonverbal behavior	Count	Proportion
Pointing gesture	26	34%
Holding out object	9	11.5%
Reaching to receive object	9	11.5%
Iconic gesture	0	0%
Other	33	43%

Aga's turn in (6) includes two recruiting components, both of which are accompanied by relevant nonverbal conduct. In line 2, when Aga formulates a request to be given the baby, she also stretches out her arm to receive him (Figure 2*a*). This is an example of a "reach to receive" gesture, although it also has an iconic element, because Aga would not actually grasp the baby with her outstretched hand (when Piotr hands Aga the baby, she takes him with both hands). After the completion of this recruiting move, Aga immediately launches the next element in her turn: another request for Piotr to sit down (line 4). As she formulates this request, Aga also slightly pushes back the chair (Figure 2*b*). Such manipulation of objects involved in the target event was coded as an "other" form of nonverbal

conduct.

(6) PP5-5_28800a

- 1 PIO nakarmimy jego tutaj?
 feed.PFV.1PL him.ACC here
 will we feed him here?
- ▶ 2 AGA wiesz co (.) daj [mi go na chwileczkę=
 know.2SG what give.IMP me.DAT him.ACC on moment.ACC
 you know what give him to me for a moment
- ▶ 3 [((stretches out arm))
- ▶ 4 =siedź [sobie tutaj sam ja go nakarmi=
 sit.IMP REFL here self I him.ACC feed.1SG
 sit yourself down here, I will feed him
- ▶ 5 [((pushes chair back))
- ▶ 6 =owocową
 fruit.ADV.INS
 fruit (soup)
- ▷ 7 PIO ((walks to Aga, hands over baby))



(a) Aga stretches out arm (line 3).



(b) Aga pushes back chair (line 5).

Figure 2: Frames from Extract 6.

By pushing back the chair, Aga indicates where Piotr should sit down, but also makes sitting down more straightforward for Piotr. Like pointing gestures, “other” forms of nonverbal conduct often indicate a relevant object. However, they also commonly make the object more useable for the intended purpose, and thereby increase the transparency of the recruiting move. In another example, (15) below, Bogusia places a salad bowl on a small counter between the kitchen and the living room, saying *jeszcze proszę salateę* ‘also please the salad’. Placing the salad bowl there makes it more easily accessible to the others, and, in conjunction with the verbal turn, constitutes a transparent request for somebody to bring the salad to the living room table in preparation for the meal.

3.3 Verbal elements: construction types and subtypes

Verbal elements in recruiting moves were classified with reference to three cross-linguistically common sentence types: declarative, interrogative, and imperative. As there is no interrogative syntax in Polish, questions are recognizable through intonation, the use of question particles, and what one speaker knows that the other knows (for a conversation-analytic discussion, see Weidner 2013a). Further construction types are recruiting turns without a predicate and others with a verb in the infinitive. Imperative recruiting turns are the most common. At the same time, we find other formats in more than half of recruiting moves with a verbal component (see Table 2).²

Table 2: Construction type of recruiting moves including spoken elements ($n=199$).

Construction type	Count	Proportion
Imperative	93	47%
Declarative	46	23%
No predicate	40	20%
Question format	14	7%
Infinitive	6	3%

3.3.1 Imperatives

Polish has a relatively complex imperative paradigm. Morphological imperatives exist for the second person singular and plural, and the first person plural. Periphrastic hortative constructions exist for the third persons and the first person singular, as well as for formal (V-form) second person reference (on imperatives and hortatives, see Van der Auwera et al. 2013).

In the examined corpus, nearly all imperatives are in the second person. The only exception is found in (7) where Henio uses the third person hortative construction *niech* + verb (roughly, ‘may it x’).³ Henio’s move at lines 4–5 recruits Bogusia to leave the camera on by saying *niech to jeszcze ten* ‘may this still that one’, where *ten* ‘that one’ is a demonstrative pronoun that in spoken Polish often functions as a dummy term. Here, it stands in for an otherwise expectable third

²The missing 0.5% is due to one case in which the verbal component of Move A is inaudible.

³Another instance of this format can be found in (30), where the recruitment is initiated but not completed.

person singular verb, such as *filmuje* or *nagrywa* ‘it records’. Bogusia complies at lines 8–9, reformulating the hortative utterance, this time with the “missing” third person predicate.

- (7) PP3-1_2348380a
- 1 BOG ((moving to turn off camera))
- 2 HEN ((getting up from the table))
- 3 dobre to jeszcze jeszcze to póki Magda
 good.ADV then still still then while Magda
 alright then while Magda is still
- ▶ 4 je to niech to jeszcze ten
 eat.3SG then HRT this still that.one
 eating then may this still that one
- 5 (0.4)
- ▷ 6 BOG tak¿> osta- [Magda ostatnia od[chodzi od
 yes las- Magda last leave.3SG from
 yes? Las- Magda leaves the table last?
- 7 HEN [(no) [tak
 PTC yes
 no yes
- ▷ 8 BOG stołu tak,= niech będzie
 table.GEN yes HRT be.3SG
 right, may it be
- ▷ 9 sfilmowane no
 filmed.PASS PTC
 filmed no
- 10 HEN niech będzie sfilmowane
 HRT be.3SG filmed.PASS
 may it be filmed

In the remainder of this section, I discuss only second person morphological imperatives. Among these, I distinguish three turn formats: imperatives with perfective aspect marking, imperatives with imperfective marking, and the (perfective) double imperative, *weź zrób x* (‘take do x’). Perfective imperatives are by far the most common in the corpus ($n=68$), followed by imperfective imperatives ($n=13$),⁴ and by the double imperative ($n=12$).

3.3.1.1 Perfective imperatives. Perfective imperatives are the most common subtype of imperative recruiting format in the data. Work on the selection of imperatives for requesting action demonstrates that such recruiting moves convey an expectation of compliance (Wootton 1997; Goodwin 2006; Craven & Potter

⁴One of these is the monoaspectsual *siedź* ‘be/remain sitting’.

2010; Kent 2011; 2012; Rossi 2012). This expectation is, in informal interaction among friends and family, typically grounded in the fact that the requested action is integral to a wider activity to which the recipient is already committed (Wootton 1997; Rossi 2012). The two examples of recruiting moves with perfective imperatives that we have seen so far, (1) and (6), illustrate this. In (1), Jacek is available for jobs such as passing the salad bowl on the basis of his participation in the mealtime event, and the imperative orients to this availability. In (6), Piotr is already engaged in finding arrangements for feeding his son (see his question in line 1) and the imperative recruiting move is designed as a step in this wider activity (see also Zinken & Deppermann 2017). Recruiting moves formatted as perfective imperatives will be discussed repeatedly in later sections (Extracts 8, 19, 22, 26, 32, 34, 35, 37) and I therefore do not provide further examples here.

3.3.1.2 Imperfective imperatives. Imperfective imperatives have repeatedly concerned linguists working on Slavic languages (see Forsyth 1970; Lehmann 1989; Benacchio 2010).⁵ From the perspective of sequential analysis, it is striking that imperfective imperatives are used in positions where the relevant action has already been brought into play by the other person, or is the direct consequence of what has occupied the interaction in the just prior turns. In other words, although we might think of requests and directives as good examples of sequentially first actions (Sorjonen et al. 2017), imperfective imperative turns in Polish are never textbook examples of first pair-parts (Schegloff 2007). In fact, imperfective imperatives are often used in second position to accomplish actions such as giving a go-ahead (Lehmann 1989; Zinken & Deppermann 2017). In the domain of recruitments, imperfective imperatives treat an action as already “authored” by the other (Zinken 2016: chap. 8).

In (8), Ania is urging her mom Ela to start dinner, because she has to leave in ten minutes (lines 1–2). The turn-initial *no* in Ela’s agreeing response (line 3) conveys that it is obvious to Ela that the meal is to start now (on turn-initial *no*, see Weidner 2013b), while her *już* ‘already’ conveys that in fact everything is on track. She then extends her turn to address a directive to Ania, namely to serve the food for the younger children (line 5). This recruiting turn is designed with an imperfective imperative. It begins, again, with the particle *no*, which here expresses Ela’s stance that serving the food is the obvious consequence of Ania’s wish to speed things up. In response, Ania begins serving the food.

⁵This literature is mostly concerned with Russian data but is relevant also to Polish.

(8) PP1-1_0145540

- 1 ANI do:bra: mo- czy możemy zjeść =bo ja muszę
 good.ADV ca- Q can.1PL eat.INF because I must.1SG
 okay, can we eat, because I'll have to
- 2 za dziesięć minut wyjść.
 after ten minutes go.out.INF
 leave in ten minutes
- 3 ELA no już =
 PTC already
 no already
- 4 TAD =^ojest już^o
 is already
 it's already done
- ▶ 5 ELA rno to już nakładaj im.
 PTC then already serve.IMP.IPFV them
 no then serve them (their food) already
- 6 (0.5)
- ▶ 7 ELA mięsko weź na stół! (.) surówka jedna druga!
 meat take.IMP.PFV on table slaw one other
 put the meat on the table, the one salad and the other
- ▷ 8 ANI ((puts salads on the table))

We can think of recruiting moves as having a deontic side (telling the other that they should do something) and an information side (telling them what to do). Imperfective imperatives add little to the information side of a recruiting move. Insofar as the recruitment concerns a new action at all, that action, as in line 5 of (8), is framed as a direct consequence of what has come before. Imperfective imperatives mainly deal with the deontic side of the prospective action, that is, they give the go-ahead to, insist on, or prohibit an action that already concerns the other or is inferably relevant (see also Extract 37) (Zinken 2016: chap. 8). Note that Ela extends her turn with another directive detailing what exactly Ania is supposed to serve the younger children (line 7), reformulating the previous recruiting component *nakładaj* 'serve them (the food)' (line 5) in a more informative manner – this reformulation is done with a perfective imperative.

3.3.1.3 Double imperative. A double imperative construction that is recurrent in spoken Polish takes the form of the perfective verb 'take' (*wziąć*, imperative: *weź*) plus the relevant action verb, also with perfective aspect. In (9), Jacek is talking to his children about observations the children have made at the local swimming pool. The turn in line 1 belongs to that conversation. His wife, Ilona, is in the process of clearing the table, and she is scraping the last bits of a vegetable salad onto Jacek's plate. Some of the salad is sticking to the spoon and Ilona

recruits Jacek to scrape it off (lines 3–5) while holding out the spoon for him to take.

(9) PP2-5_2002280

- 1 JAC trudno powiedzieć
difficult say.INF
difficult to say
- 2 dlaczego akurat (())
why exactly
why exactly
- ▶ 3 ILO [weź kochanie
take.IMP dear
take dear
- ▶ 4 (((holds out spoon for Jacek to take)))
- ▶ 5 zgarnij z łyżki
collect.IMP from spoon.GEN
gather (it) from the spoon
- ▷ 6 JAC ((takes salad spoon, scrapes salad onto his plate))

Ilona's recruiting move allows for a serial interpretation ('take the spoon and scrape off the salad'). However, *weź* is grammaticalized to the extent that it is unproblematically used to solicit actions that do not involve taking anything. In other words, it functions as a particle rather than as the imperative of the verb 'take' (see Zinken 2016: chap. 7). Simple perfective imperatives are often selected to recruit actions as part of an established joint project, as outlined in §3.3.1.1. However, the 'take-V2' format is selected in situations in which B's commitment to the relevant project is not evident, although it often is expectable at a more general level. Here, Jacek is not involved in clearing the table when Ilona makes her request, but he is one of the adults responsible for organizing the mealtime event at a more general level (see also Extracts 17, 30, 31) (Zinken 2016: chap. 7; Zinken & Deppermann 2017).

3.3.2 Declaratives

Declarative recruiting turns make up nearly a quarter of all the attempts that contain a verbal element ($n=46$). These can be further divided into subtypes. One group are non-modal descriptions in the third person ($n=12$) as in (2) (*ser upadł* 'cheese has dropped down'). Sometimes, third person descriptions can also recruit B by telling another, third person what B will do. In the present corpus, these are cases where one parent says to a child what the other parent will do, thereby recruiting the adult for that action (such cases are not part of the group

of non-modal descriptions, which are restricted to objects requiring action). In (10), for example, Ilona first proposes to the child that ‘we’ can put a special ointment on a scratch that the child has. Both parents seek and receive approval from the child for this course of action. At that point, the question remains as to which of the parents will go to get the ointment. It would seem that Ilona is in a better position to do so, as Jacek has the child on his lap and is feeding him. However, at line 1, Ilona formulates the target turn, addressed to the child: *tatus posmaruje takim kremem* ‘dad will put on this ointment’ and in so doing mobilizes Jacek to put the child on an adjacent chair and leave to get the cream.

(10) PP2-1_3410860

- 1 ILO tatus po- posmaruje takim kremem
 dad smear.PFV.3SG such.INS cream.INS
 daddy wi- will apply this ointment
- ▷ 2 JAC ((puts child on adjacent chair, leaves))

Another group of recruiting turns in declarative format involve impersonal constructions with a verb expressing deontic modality ($n=9$) (see also Floyd, Chapter 3, §3.3.4; Rossi, Chapter 5, §3.3.4; Baranova, Chapter 9, §3.3.3). In Polish, turns with the impersonal modal verb *trzeba* ‘it is necessary to / one has to’ are a practice for recruiting another person’s collaboration (Zinken & Ogiermann 2011). In (11), the family have been crafting together; some glue remains on a piece of paper in the center of the table. When Marta tells her daughter not to play with the glue, this becomes an occasion for Karol to formulate what ‘is necessary’ to do, namely to throw the glue away (line 5). In overlap with Karol’s turn, Marta begins extending her arm and then picks up the paper sheet with the glue on it and throws it away (see Zinken 2016: chap. 6).

(11) PP6-1_4228840

- 1 MAR to juz tym klejem sie Gabrysiu
 this already this.INS glue.INS REFL Gabryisia
 don’t play with this glue
- 2 nie baw wiesz:ż
 not play.IPFV.IMP know.2SG
 already Gabryisia
- 3 (.)
- 4 MAR [(on juz troszke)]
 it already a.bit
 it has already somewhat
- 5 KAR [to juz trzeba wyrzucic]
 this already necessary throw.away.INF
 it is necessary to throw this away already

- 6 MAR (.) [zasechł
dry.3SG.PST
dried out
- ▷ 7 ((picks up paper sheet with glue))

The modal verb *móc* ‘can’ is sometimes used with person marking in turns that recruit another person. In (12), Olek addresses his daughter Kasia with a proposal to give her toddler son (Olek’s grandson) something to eat. He uses an infinitive recruiting form (see §3.3.4 below). Kasia responds by asking her son whether he would like to eat something (line 2) but then turns back to her father and recruits him to mount a contraption designed to hold small children, a kind of cloth child chair, on an ordinary chair (line 3). This recruiting turn is in the form of a declarative with second person singular marking.⁶

(12) MiBrApr2012_0459322

- 1 OLE jakiejś wędlinki może mu dać
some.GEN sausage.GEN maybe him.DAT give.INF
maybe (to) give him some sausage
- 2 KAS (Józienko) chcesz coś zjeść
NAME.VOC want.2SG something eat.INF
Joseph you want to eat something?
- ▶ 3 wiesz co możesz mu (.) zmontować ((to Olek))
know.2SG what can.2SG him.DAT mount.INF
you know what, you can mount for him
- 4 to siedzenie ()
this seat
this seat ()
- ▷ 5 OLE ((gets up))
- 6 KAS tylko mu jakąś poduszkę.
only him.DAT some.ACC cushion.ACC
just (also use) a cushion for him
- ▷ 7 OLE ((begins mounting child seat on chair))

Recruiting moves in this format build on the other’s displayed or assumed readiness to contribute to the relevant matter (see also Extract 27), in this case on Olek’s suggestion or proposal that the child should or could eat something (line 1).

Turns with a performative verb in the first person are also used to recruit another person’s action ($n=7$). A turn format that is specialized for recruiting another person to provide an object is built with the verb *prosić/poprosić* ‘plead, ask’ (*poprosić* is the perfective form) in the first person plus the item as direct object

⁶Note that Kasia extends her recruiting turn at line 6 with a predicate-less unit (see §3.3.3 below).

in the accusative (see Ogiermann 2015; for a usage of this form outside object requests, see Weidner 2015). In (13), Kasia asks Dorota to pass the horseradish. Kasia's talk in line 1 closes a prior, unrelated interaction.

(13) MiBrApr2012_0643192

- 1 KAS dobrze na razie Józio nie chce siedzieć
 good.ADV on time NAME not want.3SG sit.INF
 okay, for now Józio doesn't want to sit
- ▶ 2 po- poproszę m- chrzani
 pl- plead.PFV.1SG m- horseradish.ACC
 I ask (for) m- horseradish
- ▷ 3 DOR ((passes horseradish))

Announcements in the first person (singular or plural, $n=4$) can also recruit another person's collaboration. A type that occurs a few times in the corpus involves a family member announcing that 'we will say grace' (*pomodlimy się*), which recruits the others to move into the appropriate posture. Other declarative formats are attested as single cases, such as that of the second person non-modal declarative turn in (14). Paweł and Klaudia are preparing a salad and in line 1 Klaudia brings a peeled cucumber to where Paweł is standing, for him to slice. In line 2, Paweł recruits Klaudia to give him a bowl; in response, Klaudia turns to the cupboard and gets a bowl out.

(14) PP4-1_0812980

- 1 (4.0) ((Klaudia walks towards Paweł))
- ▶ 2 PAW dałabyś mi m- (.) miskę,
 give.2SG.F.PST.COND me.DAT m- bowl.AKK
 you'd give me a b- (.) bowl
- ▷ 3 KLA (turns to cupboard, gets bowl))

At first glance, this turn looks just like a request formulated as a second person yes/no question (see §3.3.4 below). However, in this sequential position, the prosody of the turn – with stress on the first syllable of *dałabyś* 'you'd give' and level turn-final intonation – clearly marks it as a statement.

3.3.3 No predicate

Recruiting turns without a predicate are common in the Polish corpus (see also Extract 28). These are most often names of objects ($n=16$) requiring some action. In (15), the family are busy laying the table for supper. Talk is about a near-accident that the family dog has had with a car (lines 1–5). Bogusia is taking

things out of the fridge. At line 7, she puts a bowl of salad onto the worktop and says *jeszcze proszę sałatę* ‘also, please, salad’, recruiting an unspecified family member to take the salad and put it on the table. *Proszę* ‘I plead, please’ is the imperfective form of the same verb that we have encountered in the object request in (13). This imperfective form is commonly used in actions of passing or offering an object to another person. In this function, it is best translated as ‘please’ or ‘here you are’. *Sałatę* ‘salad’ here is not an argument of *proszę* ‘I plead, here you are’ but a stand-alone item naming the object that has been made available for taking by somebody.

(15) PP3-2_0338665a

- 1 BOG nie zauważyła samochodu
not notice.3SG.PST car.GEN
she didn't notice the car?
- 2 MAG nie zauważyła bo ona siedz[ia]ła tyłem
not notice.3SG.PST because she sit.3SG.PST back.INS
she didn't notice cause she was sitting backward
- 3 BOG [ona zawsze
she always
- 4 ucieka przed samochodem
run.3SG from car.INS
runs away from the car
- 5 MAG znaczy była tyłem, znaczy
mean.3SG was.3SG back.INS mean.3SG
that is, she was with her back, that is,
- 6 [tyłem była
back.INS was.3SG
with her back
- ▶ 7 BOG [jeszcze proszę sałate]i ((puts salad bowl onto work top))
also plead.1SG salad.ACC
also, please, salad
- 8 ((remaining family members look at and talk to the dog))

Naming an object does not select a particular person for the job at hand. A generic danger of such an “untargeted” recruiting move is that others can choose not to feel addressed (unless addressing is done in other ways, e.g., through gaze). This is what happens here: all the remaining family members have turned to the dog, and the recruiting move remains unanswered (and is pursued by Bogusia a few moments later).

Some recruiting turns without a predicate only “activate” another person with a vocative, leaving the required action to be inferred.⁷ In (16), the family are

⁷In this project, we use the term “vocative” to refer to proper names addressing the recruiting move to a person, and not just in relation to vocative case.

preparing for a craft activity with their children, making an earthworm. This preparation involves getting the children to come to sit down at the table (lines 1–3) and making space on it. Marta is in the process of stowing things away in a cupboard; Karol is on the other side of the table. He picks up a piece of crockery that is on the table and places it closer to Marta, saying *mamuška* ‘mommy’ (line 6). This initiates a recruitment for Marta to stow away the crockery as well and thereby make more space on the table. It might be that Marta first misunderstands Karol’s recruiting turn as summoning her to the table (in extension to his directives towards his daughter a bit earlier, lines 1 and 3). Her initial response (line 7) is fitted to either recruitment – to sit down or to clear away the piece of crockery – but her subsequent, redone response (line 9) is specifically fitted to a recruitment to clear away the crockery.

(16) PP6-1_8650

- 1 KAR siadaj Julka
sit.IPFV.IMP Name
sit down, Julka
- 2 (0.2)
- 3 KAR Julka siadaj będziemy robić dżdżownicę
Name sit.IPFV.IMP will.IPL make.INF worm.ACC
Julka, sit down, we’ll make the worm
- 4 JUL no wszy:yscy razem
PTC all together
no all together
- 5 (0.2)
- ▶ 6 KAR mamuška ((places piece of crockery closer to Marta))
mom.DIM
mommy
- ▷ 7 MAR no już
PTC already
no already / just a second
- 8 ((50 seconds omitted))
- ▷ 9 MAR sprzątnę
clean.PFV.1SG
I’ll clear it
((50 seconds omitted))
- ▷ 10 MAR ((removes crockery from table))

3.3.4 Question formats

Since Polish does not have interrogative morphosyntax, I speak more generally of “question formats” in this section. Question formats are morphosyntactically

equivalent to declaratives in Polish. But they become recognizable as questions through prosody and the distribution of epistemic rights among participants (Weidner 2013a) or the use of question words in the case of content questions. The particle *czy* can be used turn-initially to mark a polar question but is rarely used in spoken Polish and not at all in the data at hand. About 7% of all recruiting moves in the Polish corpus ($n=15$) have a question format.⁸

Nine recruiting moves in question format project a polar response. Polar questions are sometimes used to indirectly recruit B for some action. In (17), the family have sat down for supper, and at line 1 one of the sons implores the parents (both of them, using a second person plural double imperative) to turn on the TV. His mom, Aga, turns to dad, Piotr, with a question: *włączymyż* ‘do we turn it on?’. A yes-response to this question would imply that somebody should now turn on the TV. In the current situation, seating arrangements are such that Piotr is best placed to do such a job, while Aga is also feeding the baby. Immediately upon completion of the question, Piotr turns his gaze towards the TV and quickly moves up his torso, presumably getting up from the table. Ultimately, though, he interrupts that movement and rejects the proposal to turn on the TV, because this would make it more difficult for the researchers to listen to the recording (line 7).

(17) PP5-5_47880b

- 1 PRZ *weźcie włączcie* ()
 take.PFV.IMP.2PL turn.on.PFV.IMP.2PL
 come on, turn it on (you two)
- 2 (0.6)
- ▶ 3 AGA *włączmyż* ((gazes at Piotr))
 turn.on.PFV.1PL
 (do) we turn it on?
- ▷ 4 PIO ((quick upward movement, gaze to TV))
- 5 PRZ °no *włącz°*
 PTC turn.on.PFV.IMP
 no turn (it) on
- 6 PIO ((sits back down, gaze to Aga))
- ▷ 7 *nie:: bo nie będą nas słyszeli*
 no because not will.3PL us.ACC hear.PST.3PL
 no because they won't be able to hear us

Recruiting turns that, at least at first glance, merely ask for a decision or for information are in danger of being treated as just that. In (18), Karol and his two

⁸In addition, a few of the cases described below as infinitives could also be counted as “questions”.

daughters are sitting at a table, preparing for a crafts activity. Marta is not sitting yet but standing behind one of the daughters, doing the girl's hair. At line 1, she asks her husband, who is sitting at the other side of the table, *masz tam wolne jedno krzeselko* 'do you have one free stool there?'. It might be evident to Karol that Marta is asking that question because she still needs a stool to sit on at her side of the table. However, he does not take the opportunity to hand a stool to her – that is, he does not take up her question as a recruiting move – but instead treats 'do you have one free stool there?' merely as a request for information.

(18) PP6-1_0520400

- 1 (3.4)
- ▶ 2 MAR masz tam wolne jedno krzeselko?
have.2SG there free one stool
do you have one free stool there?
- ▷ 3 KAR mam
have.1SG
I do
- 4 MAR ((walks around table, carries stool to her place))

Questions that (ostensibly) ask whether B can or will do some action are used conventionally in various languages to recruit another person (see, e.g., Kendrick, Chapter 4, §4.2.1 on English). These question formats are understood as recruiting moves also in Polish. In the present Polish corpus, however, such recruiting moves are rare ($n=4$). What is more, they are resisted in three out of four cases, either by ignoring the recruiting move altogether (see below, §4) or by overtly displaying annoyance while complying. This indicates that, in Polish, this format might be restricted to attempts at recruitment that are judged by A to be particularly sensitive (see also Rossi 2015: chap. 4 and Chapter 5 of this volume, §3.3.3 on 'can you x' requests in Italian). On the other hand, in the one case where the recruitment is not resisted, shown below as (19), the question format is treated as overly cautious (see also Zinken & Ogiermann 2013 on a similar case).

Dorota wants Wiesia to take a plate out of the cupboard for Dorota's granddaughter.⁹ She first formulates a perfective imperative turn (line 4), but seeing that Wiesia has already started moving toward the table to sit down (line 3) as just suggested by Kasia (line 1), Dorota immediately changes the formulation of her recruiting turn. This is in polar question format (line 5), selected here possibly because complying will now require Wiesia to depart from her current trajectory of sitting down (see Wootton 1997; Rossi 2012). The verbal response accompany-

⁹Zinken (2016: chap. 4) provides a more detailed discussion of this case.

ing the nonverbal compliance (line 6) begins with the particle *no*, which in turn-initial position can indicate that the previous turn communicated something that is obvious (Weidner 2013b), followed by *tak* ‘yes’ with marked prosody involving high pitch onset and lengthening (see also Bolden 2017 for Russian). As a whole, this verbal response seems to indicate that Wiesia’s compliance with the request is obvious and need not have been questioned.

(19) Pa02Apr2012_0823880

- 1 KAS siadasz?
sit. IPFV.2SG
are you sitting down?
- 2 (0.6)
- 3 WIE [((starts moving towards table, then stops))
- ▶ 4 DOR [ɪdaj jej talerz mamó (przepraszam)
give.PFV.IMP her.DAT plate mom.VOC (apologize.1SG)
give her a plate mom (I’m sorry)
- ▶ 5 dasz jej?
give.PFV.2SG her.DAT
(will) you give her?
- ▷ 6 WIE no tɪa::k ((turns to cupboard for plates))
PTC yes
no yes
- ▷ 7 ((walks towards cupboard))

Other recruiting turns in question format are used even more rarely, and are attested only as single cases in the corpus. For example, a speaker can try to get another person to stop doing something by (ostensively) demanding an account (*po co robisz x* ‘why are you doing x’).¹⁰ Or they might ask ‘who will do x’ to get somebody to volunteer (*kto wyjmuję naczynia ze zmywarki* ‘who is taking the dishes out of the dishwasher’).

3.3.5 Infinitive

Infinitive constructions are functionally versatile in a way that is particularly relevant to the domain of recruitments. Depending on context, prosody, and lexical turn construction, they can embody various “directive-commissive” actions from requests to offers to suggestions to proposals (see Couper-Kuhlen 2014). Similar to turns in the no-predicate category, infinitive turns cannot be categorized for sentence type. One way of thinking about this construction is to treat it as an

¹⁰See (35) for a use of this format as a way of rejecting recruitment.

elliptical construction that has developed out of a modal (declarative or interrogative) sentence, e.g. ‘[you must] tie your laces’, ‘[shall we] make a salad?’ etc. (see Deppermann 2006 on such “deontic infinitives” in German). Striking features of this construction as a recruiting move are its modal vagueness (it is not always clear whether the relevant action is something that must or could or should be done) and its impersonality: it does not formally specify who should or must do the relevant action. Consider (20), presented earlier as (12). In line 1, Olek suggests to his daughter that her son (his grandson) should or could be given some sausage to eat, using an infinitive turn.

(20) MiBrApr2012_0456292

- 1 OLE jakiejs̄ wędlinki może mu dać
 some.GEN sausage.GEN maybe him.DAT give.INF
 maybe to give him some sausage / maybe he should be given some sausage
- ▷ 2 KAS (Józienko) chcesz coś zjeść
 NAME.VOC want.2SG something eat.INF
 Joseph you want to eat something?
- 3 wiesz co możesz mu (.) zmontować
 know.2SG what can.2SG him.DAT mount.INF
 you know what, you can mount for him
- 4 to siedzenie (z y::)
 this seat with INTJ
 this seat ()

Olek’s turn in line 1 could be a strong suggestion that Kasia could give the child some sausage, or it could equally be a tentative proposal that she give the child some sausage. In response, Kasia asks her son whether he would like to eat, but then moves to a counter-request for Olek to mount the child seat in preparation for the child’s meal. All cases of (deontic) infinitives in the corpus are mitigated with *może* ‘maybe’, which gives them the quality of a suggestion or proposal, rather than of a blunt order (see also Wierzbicka 1991; Królak & Rudnicka 2006).

3.4 Additional verbal elements

Like recruitment sequences, individual recruiting moves can be more or less complex. In this section, I consider verbal elements beyond those required by the argument structure of the predicate. These include mitigators or strengtheners, vocatives, the provision of reasons in a turn with multiple turn-constructural units, benefactives, or adverbs that suggest a connection of the recruited action to ongoing activities.

3.4.1 Mitigators and strengtheners

The previous case (20) already provided an example of an additional verbal element, namely the mitigator *może* ‘maybe’, which softened the deontic force of the infinitive. The following recruiting move has the form of an impersonal declarative (see also §3.3.2 above). After Ilona and Jacek have agreed to swap childcare duties so that Jacek could finish his meal (lines 1–7), Ilona formulates the target turn, initiating recruitment for Jacek to turn off the camera (lines 8–9). This turn contains elements that mitigate the recruiting move and seem to acquiesce to an earlier suggestion (*chyba* ‘probably’ and *faktycznie* ‘really’).

(21) PP2-2_2315590

- 1 ILO może ja się nim zajmę skończysz coś
maybe I REFL he.INS occupy.1SG finish.2SG what
maybe I take care of him, you finish, okay?
- 2 (1.0)
- 3 ILO skończysz y:: z:jeść.
finish.2SG INTJ eat.INF
you finish eh eating
- 4 (.)
- 5 JAC dobrze
good.ADV
okay
- 6 ILO [skończysz
finish.2SG
you finish?
- 7 (.)
- ▶ 8 ILO dobrze †to chyba już można
good.ADV then probably already possible
okay, then it is probably really already possible
- ▶ 9 wyłączyć faktycznie
turn.off really
to turn (it) off
- ▷ 10 JAC ((turns camera off))

3.4.2 Vocatives

Vocatives are present in roughly 12% of all recruiting moves ($n=27$). Vocatives can be inserted at the beginning of the recruiting move to single out the addressed party and mobilize the addressee’s attention. In (22), Jacek is involved in a conversation with his children, Asia and Bolek, with his body facing them. Ilona’s

recruiting move in line 6 begins with a substantial portion of talk that is preliminary to the request, and that can serve to ascertain that Jacek will be attending to Ilona's talk by the time the request is formulated.

(22) PP2-5_1423040

- 1 JAC ale (.) każdy (0.4) wia[domo że woli (.)
but every known that prefer.3SG
but everybody, it's clear, prefers
- 2 ASI [ma swoją intymność
have.3SG their intimacy
has their privacy
- 3 JAC tak ma swoją intymność i woli
yes have.3SG their intimacy and prefer.3SG
yes, has their private sphere and prefers
- 4 BOL °'wiemż°
know.1SG
I know
- 5 JAC czasem żeby go nie oglądali wszyscy
sometimes so.that him not watch.PST.3PL all
sometimes that everybody doesn't look at them
- ▶ 6 ILO y wiesz co kochanie 'podaj mi: serwetkę
INTJ know.2SG what love.VOC pass.IMP.PFV me napkin
eh you know what dear, pass me a napkin
- 7 ASI [mogą też się śmiać.
can.3PL also REFL laugh
they can also be laughing
- 8 JAC [wiadomo że (0.4.) wiadomo że ry: nie to [nie o
known that known that INTJ no this not about
it's clear that, it's clear that eh no it, that's
- 9 ASI [am:::
INTJ
- 10 JAC to nawet [cho:dchi 'ale=
this even go.3SG but
not really the point but
- ▷ 11 [((passes tissue))
- 12 ILO [°o dziękuję°
PTC thank.1SG
o thanks

Sometimes, vocatives are inserted at the end ($n=7$) or in the middle ($n=6$) of a recruiting turn-constructural unit (TCU). Extract 1, reproduced here as (23), illustrates such a case, where a vocative is inserted after a move has become recognizable as a recruiting one but before the TCU's possible completion. Jacek is gazing at Ilona, and when she turns her gaze to him, she formulates a request for the salad bowl. The request turn begins with a turn-initial element, *wiesz co* 'you know what' (line 2), like (22) did. The vocative *kochanie* 'dear' (line 2) comes after Ilona has told Jacek to give her something, but before telling him

what to give her. Such a vocative can do work to disambiguate between potential addressees, although this does not seem to be the case here: Jacek is already being addressed through gaze, and the only other people present are two young children who are engaged in a separate conversation. Turn-final and turn-medial vocatives might rather be doing some affiliational work in recruitments, as we will see in §6 below (cf. Lerner 2003). Possible functional differences between these two positions will require further research to be elucidated.

(23) PP2-1_2224980

- 1 JAC ((gaze to Ilona))
- ▶ 2 ILO wiesz co podaj mi kochanie jeszcze
know.2SG what pass.IMP me dear still
you know what, pass me some more
- 3 KAS sałatki
salad.GEN
salad, dear
- ▷ 4 JAC bardzo proszę ((passes salad bowl))
very plead.1SG
here you are

3.4.3 Reasons

Sometimes, speakers give a reason for recruitment ($n=21$). Reasons can be given to make a request easier to understand and comply with (Baranova & Dingemanse 2016). In (24), the recruiting move might be barely intelligible without the appended reason. Aga is holding her baby Feliks in her arms, and the baby has fallen asleep. Piotr, the family father, is admonishing the two sons, Przemek and Łukasz, to stop mucking about. At line 3, Aga admonished the others to be quiet – a recruitment that might be difficult to make sense of, and be hardly acceptable to the others without the subsequent reason.

(24) PP5-1_301160

- 1 PRZ hehehe
- 2 PIO je::dz (że) Łukasz n[o:
eat.IPfv.IMP (that) Łukasz PTC
eat now Łukasz no
- ▶ 3 AGA [sz::
sh
- ▶ 4 bo Feliks mi zasnął
because NAME me.DAT fall.asleep.3SG.PST
because Feliks has fallen (me) asleep
- ▷ 5 ((Piotr, Przemek, Łukasz gaze at Aga))

But reasons can also have other interactional motivations. In (25), the provision of a reason seems to be mainly a vehicle for doing affiliational work between partners. The pair's toddler, Staś, has been pleading to get a dummy for some time (also in line 1). In line 3, his mom Ilona gives in. She recruits her partner Jacek to bring the dummy, and she expands this recruiting move with a reason that expresses her exasperation in a humorous way.

(25) PP2-2_1616090

- 1 STA khykhy Hha .Hh::=monia?
dummy?
- 2 (0.8)
- ▶ 3 ILO monia. monia=tatusiu przy[nieś tego
dummy dummy daddy bring.IMP this
dummy, dummy, daddy get that
- ▷ 4 JAC [już.
already
- ▶ 5 ILO monia bo ja dostanę: [choroby nerwowej
dummy because I get.ISG illness nervous
dummy because I am having a nervous breakdown
- ▷ 6 JAC [((puts down cutlery))
- ▷ 7 ((gets up))

Reasons are not always introduced with a *bo* 'because' and appended to the recruiting component. In (26), Kasia starts her turn with an observation: the toddler fed by Wiesia has a runny nose. This observation then becomes the grounds on which Kasia incrementally builds an extended recruiting turn.¹¹

(26) Pa02Apr2012_1127560

- 1 WIE czekaj mniejszy kawałek
wait.IPFV.IMP smaller piece
wait, a smaller piece
- ▶ 2 KAS [katar
cold/runny nose
- ▶ 3 ɹpodaj [husteczkę ((point towards tissues))
pass.PFV.IMP tissue.ACC
pass a tissue
- ▷ 4 DOR [((gets up))

¹¹In fact, the observation might have been sufficient to mobilize Dorota to get a tissue: Dorota starts getting up after the first word of the recruiting TCU, before Kasia has formulated the object she wants to be passed.

3.4.4 Benefactives

Speakers sometimes formulate the beneficiary of the recruitment, which may be the recruiter ($n=14$) or another participant ($n=28$), usually a child. However, as (26) illustrated, formulating the beneficiary is not obligatory in spoken Polish even with recruitments that involve ‘giving’ or ‘passing’ something. The question therefore arises as to what function benefactives serve. One context in which benefactives are used is contrastive, as shown in the next example, where Bogusia is getting Magda her promised dessert, biscuits, and Henio recruits Bogusia to get something else for him (line 4).

(27) PP3-1_1236810

- 1 BOG dobrze dobrze już wyjmę te pieguski=
 good.ADV. good.ADV already take.out.PFV.1SG these cookies
 okay okay, I'm already taking the cookies out
- 2 MAG =pieguski marki:zy >pieguski mark[izy
 cookies biscuits cookies biscuits
- 3 HEN [to-
 then-
- ▶ 4 a mi możecie dać tego piernika
 and me.DAT can.2PL give.INF this.GEN gingerbread.GEN
 and to me you can give that gingerbread
- 5 (0.8)
- ▷ 6 BOG dobrze
 good.ADV
 okay
- ▷ 7 ((brings gingerbread to the table))

3.4.5 Adverbs embedding the recruitment in a larger activity

Adverbs such as *jeszcze* ‘still, also’, *też* ‘also’, and *już* ‘already’ can connect the recruitment to a larger activity ($n=8$). In (28), Klaudia and Paweł are preparing a meal. On his way to the fridge, Paweł stops and turns around, looking at the oven, apparently unsure about what to do next. A moment later, the *jeszcze* ‘still, also’ in Klaudia’s recruiting move (line 3) marks the recruited action as part of the larger activity of gathering ingredients for the meal they are preparing (see also Extracts 1, 2, 15, and 32).

(28) PP4-1_620160

- 1 PAW a- °czekaj°
 wait.IPFV.IMP
 a- wait

- 2 (1.0)((Paweł stops, turns towards oven))
- ▶ 3 KLA sera jeszcze
cheese.GEN also
(we need) cheese still
- ▷ 4 PAW prosz: ((opens fridge, passes cheese))
plead.1SG
here you are
- 5 KLA dzie:ki
thanks
thanks

The temporal adverb *już* ‘already’ can connect the recruitment to a larger course of action by marking the requested action out as a temporal milestone (e.g. the endpoint) within that activity. In (29), Ela has been offering her daughter Gabi various items of food. Tadek requests at line 4 that she stop distracting the daughter from eating what she has on her plate (a recruiting move that Ela disregards at line 6).

(29) PP1-1_1230310

- 1 ELA Gabi może chcesz ka- tego brokułka?
NAME maybe want.2SG po- this.GEN broccoli.GEN
Gabi maybe you want some of this broccoli
- 2 (0.8)
- 3 GAB nie::
no::
▶ 4 TAD nie mieszaj już jej
not confuse.IPFV.IMP already her.DAT
don't confuse her now / stop confusing her now
- ▶ 5 [niech ona je to co
may she eats.3SG this what
she should eat (let her eat) what-
- ▷ 6 ELA [a może dać ci marchewkę.
and maybe give.INF you.DAT carrot.ACC
or maybe you want a carrot

4 Formats in Move B: The responding move

The space of possible next actions by participant B after a recruiting move by participant A can be partitioned into two nested sets. At one level, B can either produce some response to the recruiting move or not respond to it at all; if B responds to the recruiting move, the response can either work towards complying with the recruitment or embody non-compliance.

Let us consider the first of these distinctions: responding in some way vs. not responding at all. A lack of response to the recruiting move is not uncommon in the Polish data: there are 23 such cases in the corpus (11%) in which B “ignores” the recruiting move as it were (cf. Blythe, Chapter 7, §4.2.4). A closer look, however, reveals that many of these cases are more benign.¹² A potential recruitee who is already involved in some work – especially if it is work related to a wider activity within which the recruitment emerges – might claim some allowance for not attending to the recruitment “just now”. The clearest cases of this come from nonverbal requests. For example, think back to the activity of two people checking the medicines they have in the fridge (Extract 5). Marta repeatedly takes a package of medicines from the fridge, inspects it, and then holds it out for Karol to take. In that interaction, there are two instances where Marta holds the package out for Karol to take, but Karol is still inspecting the package he was given previously. Noticing that Karol is not attending to her gesture, Marta puts the new package on the table, from where Karol eventually takes it. It seems plausible that potential recruitees can also use their being occupied strategically as a way to avoid responding to a recruiting move. Extract 30 might be an example of this (also discussed in the context of deontic infinitives, see Extract 20 above). Olek is beginning to mount a kind of child seat for his toddler grandson, following a request by Kasia to do so (lines 3–4). At line 6, Kasia incrementally extends her request with another one, namely that Olek should also put a cushion onto the chair (so that the toddler would sit high enough to be securely held in place by the child seat, and to be able to reach the table). At this time, Olek has already begun mounting the child seat, and there is no response to this subsequent recruiting move. At lines 8–9, Wiesia reformulates the request made by Kasia at line 6, but again, Olek does not respond to this but carries on trying to unravel parts of the child seat. At lines 11–12, Wiesia incrementally extends the request and thus provides another occasion for Olek to provide a response, which he does not do (line 13). At line 14, Wiesia announces that she will bring this cushion herself. Shortly after this, Olek puts the part of the child seat that he has been wrestling with down on the table and starts walking towards the next room, at the same moment as Wiesia. Seeing that Olek is now (presumably) on his way to get the cushion, Wiesia stops and walks back to where she was working in the kitchen, and formulates another increment to the request, specifying the kind of cushion (lines 17–18).

¹²These cases are more difficult to quantify in that it is not always clear whether a person has genuinely not heard a request or simply does not want to hear it (more on this below).

(30) MiBrApr2012_0456292

- 1 OLE jakiejś wędlinki może mu dać
some.GEN sausage.GEN maybe him.DAT give.INF
maybe (to) give him some sausage
- 2 KAS (Józienko) chcesz coś zjeść
NAME.VOC want.2SG something eat.INF
Joseph you want to eat something?
- 3 wiesz co możesz mu (.) zmontować
know.2SG what can.2SG him.DAT mount.INF
you know what, you can mount for him
- 4 to siedzenie (znaczy)
this seat mean.3SG
this seat
- 5 OLE ((gets up))
- ▶ 6 KAS tylko mu jakąś poduszkę
only him.DAT some.ACC cushion.ACC
just (also use) a cushion for him
- 7 OLE ((begins mounting child seat on chair)) (1.8)
- ▶ 8 WIE weź tylko ten (jakąś) weź jakąś
take.IMP only this (some.ACC) take.IMP some.ACC
take only this (some), take some
- ▶ 9 poduszkę położy mu
cushion.ACC put.IMP him.DAT
cushion put (on the chair) for him
- 10 (0.2)
- ▶ 11 WIE tego najlepiej taką grubą:=u ciebie
this.ACC best this thick at you.GEN
this, ideally a thick one, in your (room)
- ▶ 12 jest taka gruba poduszka
is this thick cushion
there is a thick cushion
- 13 (3.2)
- 14 WIE zaraz przyniosę
in.a.moment bring.1SG
I'll bring it in a moment
- 15 (1.6) ((Olek puts child seat down on table))
- ▷ 16 ((Olek and Wiesia both start walking towards bedroom)) (0.8)
- ▶ 17 WIE [u ciebie ta gruba taka z kwiatkami
at you.GEN this thick such with flowers
in your place, the thick one with flowers
- 18 [((halts, returns to kitchen))
- ▶ 19 żeby była gruba taka wysoka
so.that was thick such high
so that it would be thick, the high one
- 20 ((Olek comes back with cushion after some time))

In short, there is a series of recruiting moves here, and Olek does not produce an on-record response to any of them. Instead, he starts a move that is conceivably the complying response (lines 15–16) in a position where it is contiguous to a prior turn that was *not* a recruiting move (line 14). “Ignoring” another person’s requests would seem to be a socially sensitive matter. However, this might be mitigated here by the fact that Olek is already involved in work on the child seat. The cushion might only be required once the child seat itself is fixed to the chair. In other words, Olek’s non-responsiveness may not be treated as “ignoring” if it can be accounted for as him being busy with step 1 of the project of preparing a seat for the toddler (securing the child seat to the chair) before moving on to step 2 (providing a cushion).

Another context in which B sometimes does not respond, but may not be fully held accountable for “ignoring” the recruiting move, is when this is formatted as an impersonal declarative (see §3.3.2 above; see also Rossi & Zinken 2016). Consider (31), where the family are at the dinner table and Jacek is feeding his toddler son on his lap (line 1 is part of that interaction). At lines 2–3, Ilona formulates an impersonal declarative: *Stasiowi by się przydał widielczyk*, roughly: ‘a fork for Staś would be useful’. This turn is prefaced with *wiesz co* ‘you know what’, which marks it as being addressed to some individual (Lerner 2003). However, Ilona does not use any formal resources that would convey who is to get the required fork (she is cutting food on her plate and gazes down throughout her turn). It is the fact that the recruitment attempt is concerned with a childcare matter that makes the turn relevant for her partner. However, Jacek does not provide any response. Ilona fills the emerging silence with another short turn thinking out loud (line 5). When Jacek still does not begin any response to the recruiting move, engaging instead in a short exchange with his son (lines 6–7), Ilona begins a new turn, which explicitly addresses the recruiting move, in different form, to her daughter, Iza (lines 8, 9, 11).

(31) PP2-2_241620a

- | | | |
|-----|-----|---|
| 1 | JAC | proszę bardzo
plead.1SG very
here you are |
| ▶ 2 | ILO | .h:: wiesz co::i Stasiowi by się przydał
know.2SG what Staś COND REFL suit.PST.3SG
.h:: you know what, Staś could use a |
| ▶ 3 | | widielczyk
fork.DIM
fork |
| 4 | | (0.8) |

- 5 ILO °zaraz°
right.now
just a moment
- 6 STA odział
- 7 JAC orzeł?
eagle
eagle?
- ▶ 8 ILO Iza! [↑]weź przynieś ten malutki
Iza take.IMP bring.PFV.IMP this small
Iza bring this little
- ▶ 9 Stasia widelczyk wie:sz który ten biały [taki z=
Staś.GEN fork know.2SG which this white such with
fork of Staś's you know which one, the white one made
- 10 IZA [>a<
- ▶ 11 ILO =melaminy.
melamine
from melamine
- ▷ 12 IZA ((gets up and leaves))

We now turn to recruiting moves that receive a response.

4.1 Fully nonverbal responses

One way – arguably the basic way – of responding to a recruiting move is to do the relevant action. There are many such cases among the examples discussed so far (Extracts 2–3, 5–6, 8–14, 21–22, 24, 26). Fully nonverbal compliance is common when a recruited action can be performed quickly and easily (Rauniomaa & Keisanen 2012): passing a knife across the table, picking up something that has dropped to the floor etc. Out of 69 cases of such quick compliance in the data, 50 (72%) come without any verbal element. What is maybe more surprising is that fully nonverbal compliance is also common in cases where doing the relevant action takes more time, where it is necessary to create certain conditions for the requested action first: going to the kitchen in order to fetch a spoon, for example. There are 72 cases in the data where B's next move after a recruiting one is the first step of a compliant response, but where that compliance takes a bit longer (or might become stalled after that first move). Of these recruitments, 45 cases (63%) do not involve any verbal response. Extract 32 illustrates such a case. Jacek and Ilona are talking to their son about possible places where he could search for his lost ball (line 1 is a contribution to this conversation). At lines 2 and 5, Ilona recruits Jacek to also look 'here', that is, in a corner of the room. In response, Jacek takes steps in that direction and begins moving back some furniture to look for the ball. His response is not accompanied by any verbal turn.

(32) PP2-1_3936480

- 1 JAC może być też
can.3SG be.INF also
it can also be (there)
- ▶ 2 ILO i może jeszcze Jace::ki
and can.3SG still NAME
and maybe also, Jacek?
- 3 (.)
- 4 JAC °hm°
- ▶ 5 ILO [y:: rzuć okiem [o tutaj w:: (°° °°)
INTJ throw.PFV.IMP eye.INS PTC here in
eh, have a look o here, in ()
- 6 [((head nod)) [((head nod))
- ▶ 7 JAC ((turns and searches for ball))

4.2 Verbal elements of responses

Verbal elements accompanying complying responses to recruitments can be ordered according to their grammatical complexity (cf. Thompson et al. 2015). The simplest verbal responses are polar responses that indicate (upcoming) compliance or reject the recruitment. As mentioned above, such responses might be more relevant for recruited actions that are not quick and easy. However, the relevance of a particular type of verbal response might also depend upon the form of the recruiting move. Recruiting moves in polar question format grammatically project a polar response that accepts the recruitment (Raymond 2003).¹³ Quick and easy compliance can diminish the usefulness of accepting – after all, acceptance should occur before the actual compliance. Out of the four conventional request moves in polar question format in the Polish data, one receives a polar response (*no tak* ‘PTC yes’, Extract 19), while the other three are “problematic” recruitments (see §3.3.4 above). Out of 93 imperative recruiting moves, only one receives a polar response: a flat-out rejection with *nie* ‘no’ (Extract 34, see below). The action of accepting conveyed by a positive polar response does not seem to be relevant in response to imperative recruiting moves in Polish (see also Craven & Potter 2010; Rossi 2012 for English and Italian). This does not mean that there are no verbal responses to imperatives. However, these verbal responses emphasize compliance rather than accepting the recruitment, e.g. *proszę bardzo* ‘here you are’, *masz* ‘here you are’, literally ‘you have’, *już przyniosę* ‘already I bring it’ (see Zinken 2016: chap. 5, for a discussion).

¹³But cf. Thompson et al. (2015) for an argument against this view.

Another response token is *dobra* or *dobrze* ‘okay’, which appears to indicate compliance “in principle”, in a situation where maybe immediate compliance is not possible, or the recruitee does not know how to go about the recruited action (see Extract 27). A practice found repeatedly in the corpus is to begin a verbal response with a temporal adverb, for example, *już* ‘already’. In response to an on-record request, *już* can be produced as a response not just to indicate compliance but also to treat the request as urgent (see Extract 25). Clausal responses with a turn-initial *już* enact stronger agency and initiative on the part of the recruitee (see Extract 4).

In general, clausal responses do more than simply indicating compliance. In (33), Ania notices that the sauce she requested earlier has not been poured on her food, and she asks for it again (line 2), designing her turn as “having to ask again”. In other words, her turn is formatted not just (and maybe not primarily) as a request, but as a complaint. The clausal response in line 4 is fitted to this “double-barreled” first action (Schegloff 2007: 76; see also Kitzinger et al. 2013; Rossi 2018). The response indicates not only or not so much compliance with the request, but manages the disaffiliational undercurrent through a relatively elaborate verbal offering of the sauce.

(33) PP1-1_0509630b

- 1 (1.6)
- ▶ 2 ANI ale ja jeszcze poprosiłam (.) y °sosiku° =moment
but I still ask.PFV.PST.1SG INTJ sauce.DIM.GEN moment
but I still asked for some sauce wait a moment
- 3 (1.0) ((Ania picks up her plate, walks toward cooker))
- ▷ 4 ELA ɪno to ma:sz.
PTC then have.2SG
no then here you have (some)
- ▷ 5 ((serves Ania sauce))

4.3 Types of rejections

Recruitments are rejected in 23 cases in the corpus (nearly 11%). Overt rejection with just the response particle *nie* ‘no’, however, occurs in only one case (Extract 34). Klaudia and Paweł are having supper, and when Paweł moves up his fork with melted cheese sticking to it, Klaudia pleads with him to give her the cheese. Paweł responds curtly with a ‘no’, and then turns to the family dog squealing at his legs.

(34) PP4-1_2301200

- 1 PAW ((moves up fork with melted cheese sticking to it))
- ▶ 2 KLA da::j mi tego żółtego sera
give.PFV.IMP me.DAT this.GEN yellow.GEN cheese.GEN
(do) give me some of that yellow cheese
- ▷ 3 PAW nieź
no
no
- 4 ((turns to dog))

It is questionable whether Klaudia's request in (34) was serious. It is more likely that she did not really expect Paweł to scrape the cheese from his own food and pass it to her. Her plea for the cheese might more plausibly be part of some kind of tease between the two, and this also puts Paweł's seemingly blunt rejection in a different light. In any case, rejections are overwhelmingly done in ways that avoid being blunt in one way or another.

One way of rejecting a recruitment is to question the need for the requested action (see Zinken & Ogiermann 2011). A format for rejection in Polish that at least ostensibly does this is *po co* 'what for'. However, this format does not really seem to question the need for the requested action – a reason is never provided in response, and is never pursued. Instead, questioning the need in this format works as a practice for rejecting a recruitment (cf. Bolden & Robinson 2011 on account solicitations with *why*). In (35), Wiesia is walking around the flat with her toddler granddaughter. At line 2, Dorota, who is sitting at the kitchen table, recruits Wiesia to turn on the light in the corridor where she and the toddler are (in fact, Wiesia had just switched the light off, but Dorota might not have noticed). Wiesia does not respond to this recruiting move, continuing instead a turn addressed to her granddaughter (lines 1 and 3). Dorota repeats her recruiting move in line 5 and, after some silence, Wiesia rejects the recruitment with *a po co* (*światło*) 'but why (light)' (line 8).

(35) Pa02Apr2012_0725770b

- 1 WIE chodź ()
come.IPFV.IMP
come (here)
- ▶ 2 DOR zapal tam światło mamunia
turn.on.PFV.IMP there light mom.DIM.VOC
turn the light on there, mommy
- 3 WIE może coś zjesz
maybe what eat.PFV.2SG
maybe you'll eat something

- 4 (.)
- 5 DOR zapal tam światło.=°mamusiu°
 turn.on.PFV.IMP there light mom.DIM.VOC
 (do) turn the light on there mommy
- 6 (0.4) ((Wiesia walking towards kitchen with toddler))
- 7 DOR Pol[uniu:ż
 NAME.DIM.VOC
 Polly
- ▷ 8 WIE [a po co [(światło)
 and.but for what (light)
 but why (light)
- 9 DOR [Poluniu zjesz jeszcze salami?
 Pola.DIM.VOC eat.PFV.2SG still salami
 Polly will you eat some (more) salami?

A common element in turns rejecting a recruitment is an informing TCU that can be taken as providing an explanation for not complying. Sometimes such turns begin with a rejection token (*nie* ‘no’, $n=2$) but more commonly they do not.

Extract 36 is a case where a recruitment is rejected with a *nie* ‘no’ plus explanation. This case comes from the same setting as the previous Extract 35. Dorota is asking Wiesia and the toddler, who are walking around the flat, to come to the table to eat something as the rest of the family are having breakfast. Wiesia initiates repair at line 3, and Dorota redoes the recruiting move, addressing it now only to the toddler (line 4). However, Wiesia apparently does not notice this and responds with a rejection token (*nie* ‘no’) and an appended explanation (line 5).

(36) Pa02Apr2012_0714730a

- 1 DOR cho::dźcie zjeść z nami
 come.IPFV.IMP.2PL eat.INF with us.INS
 come (you two) eat with us
- 2 (0.2)
- ▷ 3 WIE proszę
 plead.1SG
 excuse me?
- 4 DOR chodź córuś może zjesz coś.
 come.IPFV.IMP daughter.DIM maybe eat.2SG something
 come (my) daughter maybe you’ll eat something
- ▷ 5 WIE nie:: ja jestem po śniadaniu.
 no I am.1SG after breakfast.LOC
 no, I have had breakfast
- 6 DOR ale nie do ciebie mówię(h) ((laughter))
 but not to you talk.1SG
 but I am not talking to you

More commonly, a rejection is accomplished with just an explanation for not doing as requested. In (37), Ania has sat down with her back straight to the camera, and the participants have just commented on this. At line 1, Ela directs Ania to sit 'here', on the chair next to the one she is sitting on. Ania does not respond to the initial recruiting move, with her gaze directed at the free chair Ela is indicating. When Ela redoes the recruiting move in amended format, Ania rejects this with a turn composed of two units, each of which formulates a reason for not taking the "better" chair: *ale ja nie zostanie* 'but I am not staying' (line 4) and *ja już jestem po śniadaniu* 'I have already had breakfast' (lines 4–5).

(37) PP1-1_0615520b

- ▶ 1 ELA *usiądź* *tu* ((points to vacant chair))
 sit.down.PFV.IMP here
 sit down here
- 2 (0.8)
- ▶ 3 ELA *siada:j*
 sit.IPFV.IMP
 (do) sit (down)
- ▷ 4 ANI *ale ja nie zostanie* *ja już* *jestem*
 but I not stay.PFV.1SG I already be.1SG
 but I am not staying, I have already
- ▷ 5 *po śniad(h)a(niu)(h)*
 after breakfast
 had breakfast

5 Acknowledgment in third position

As in the other languages examined in the comparative project (Floyd et al. 2018), acknowledgment of compliance is rare in the Polish data: only 3 cases were found. We have seen two of these in (22) and (28), where the recruiter thanks after receiving a requested object. The third case, shown below, is also an object request. Kasia asks Georg to pass the horseradish across the table. Georg does this, accompanying the action with a verbal turn, *prosz::* 'here you are'. Kasia takes the horseradish and quietly says *dziękuję* 'thanks'.

(38) MiBrApr2012_0552334

- ▶ 1 KAS *poproszę* *chrzanik*
 plead.PFV.1SG horseradish.DIM
 I ask for the horseradish / can I have the horseradish
- ▷ 2 GEO *prosz::* ((takes horseradish, places in front of Kasia))
 plead.IPFV.1SG
 here you are

3 KAS °dziękuję°
thank.1SG
thanks

Thanking is a way of recognizing another's agency in providing assistance (Zinken et al. 2020). It is also worth noting that in two out of three cases, the recruitee points to his compliance with *proszę* 'please, here you are', which might make the provision of an acknowledgment more likely.

6 Social asymmetries

The videos in the Polish corpus were recorded by families in their homes. Social asymmetries enter the picture in so far as interactions are sometimes between parents and their adult children. The interactions mostly take place in the parents' homes, and both the setting and the social relationship might contribute to some deference on the part of the adult children. No strong influence was noticed in terms of the ratio of fulfillments to rejections. However, one striking aspect in the formulation of recruiting moves is the common use of vocatives by adult children when attempting to recruit their parents. Out of 24 recruitment sequences in which the recruiter was analyzed as occupying a higher social position than the recruitee, only 3 (12%) contained a recruiting move with a vocative. But out of 23 recruitment sequences in which the recruiter was analyzed as occupying a lower social position than the recruitee, 10 (43%) contained a recruiting move with a vocative (e.g. Extract 35 above).

Extract 39 is one of those rare cases where a father uses a vocative in addressing a recruiting move to his adult daughter, Dorota. Olek has his toddler grandson on his lap, and the toddler wants to get off to walk around. This has been problematic before, because the toddler has a sausage in his hand, and Dorota – whose home is this is – does not want the little ones to run around with food in their hands. Olek addresses a turn to Dorota, in which he raises this problem and thereby recruits her to do something about it (a recruited action that is about to be made more specific in line 3). Dorota responds in two ways: she rejects the plan to 'go', attributed to the toddler (lines 2 and 5), while walking towards him, and taking the sausage from him and putting it on a plate (line 7), thus creating the circumstances in which the toddler can have his wish to walk around granted.

(39) Pa02Apr2012_1227960

► 1 OLE nie mo- ciocia on chce iść patrz o
not pos- aunt he want.3SG go.INF look.IPFV.IMP PTC
you can't- aunt, he wants to go look o

- ▷ 2 DOR n[ie ((gaze at toddler, eyebrows raised))
no
- ▶ 3 OLE [trzymaj go na ()
hold.IPFV.IMP him.ACC on
hold him ()
- 4 KAS ale to
but this
- ▷ 5 DOR nie ((gaze at toddler, eyebrows raised))
no
- 6 KAS poprostu go
simply him.ACC
- ▷ 7 DOR tutaj to hopsa i można iść ((takes sausage from toddler))
here this hop and possible go.INF
here (we put) this, hop, and you can go

Of particular interest is Olek's use of the category term *ciocia* 'aunt' (line 1). Dorota is in fact Olek's daughter and the toddler's aunt. Olek addresses Dorota in her family relationship role to the toddler, who is the target of the recruitment (see also Extracts 10, 16, and 25 above). For one thing, a vocative addresses the recruiting move to a particular person in a multiparty setting; at the same time, it provides a slot in which the choice of vocative item can be used to mobilize or acknowledge particular social relationships (see also Kendrick, Chapter 4, §4.3.1; Baranova, Chapter 9, §3.4).

7 Discussion

This chapter provided an overview of practices that speakers of Polish use for the organization of collaboration and assistance in informal family settings. In many respects, the Polish data are consistent with findings from other languages in the cross-linguistic project, and with expectations based on the extant literature.

For example, the findings show that there seem to be hardly any verbal turn formats that could *not* become part of a recruiting move: imperative, declarative, and interrogative turn shapes are all attested, as are turns without a predicate and interactional moves without any talk. This supports the contention that drawing on others' cooperation is a fundamental facet of human sociality that does not make any specific demands on grammatical structures (Tomasello 2008). Imperatives are the most common sentence type in recruiting moves, as we would expect given that imperatives are dedicated to the delivery of directive actions (e.g. Aikhenvald 2010). Also, the findings support arguments for a bias towards prosocial orientations at work in human interaction (e.g. Heritage 1984). Rejections are much less frequent than compliant responses, and are mostly done by

providing explanations for non-compliance, rather than by bluntly rejecting the recruitment. Even cases in which a person does not respond to a recruiting move at all show traces of such a prosocial orientation: recruits skillfully orient to aspects of the situation that could make their lack of response accountable in terms other than “ignoring”.

Other findings might be cross-linguistically more restricted. For example, imperative recruiting moves with imperfective verbal aspect in Polish display that the recruiting move does not convey new information. Speakers can use this resource to indicate that the other person should have acted already – that they already knew what to do (cf. Kent & Kendrick 2016). Conventionally indirect (Brown & Levinson 1987) recruiting practices, such as questions about the ability or willingness to do something, are very rare in the examined corpus. Instead, declarative turns and turns without a predicate make up nearly half of recruiting moves with a verbal element that are not imperatives. These turn formats have received little attention in the literature relative to their prominence in (Polish) informal everyday interaction.

Acknowledgments

I am grateful to two anonymous reviewers for their detailed and helpful comments on an earlier version of this chapter.

References

- Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. 2010. *Imperatives and commands*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bąk, Piotr. 2010. *Gramatyka języka polskiego: Zarys popularny (wyd. 14)*. Warsaw: Wiedza powszechna.
- Baranova, Julija & Mark Dingemanse. 2016. Reasons for requests. *Discourse Studies* 18(6). 641–675. DOI:10.1177/1461445616667154
- Benacchio, Rosanna. 2010. *Vid i kategorija vežljivosti v slavjanskom imperative: Sravnitel'nyj analiz* (Slavistische Beiträge 472). München: Sagner.
- Bolden, Galina B. 2017. Requests for here-and-now actions in Russian conversation. In Marja-Leena Sorjonen, Liisa Raevaara & Elizabeth Couper-Kuhlen (eds.), *Imperative turns at talk: The design of directives in action* (Studies in Language and Social Interaction 30), 175–211. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

- Bolden, Galina B. & Jeffrey D. Robinson. 2011. Soliciting accounts with why-interrogatives in conversation. *Journal of Communication* 61(1). 94–119. DOI:10.1111/j.1460-2466.2010.01528.x
- Brown, Penelope & Stephen C. Levinson. 1987. *Politeness: Some universals in language usage* (Studies in Interactional Sociolinguistics 4). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Comrie, Bernard, Martin Haspelmath & Balthasar Bickel. 2020. Leipzig glossing rules. <https://www.eva.mpg.de/lingua/resources/glossing-rules.php>, accessed 2020-05-27.
- Couper-Kuhlen, Elizabeth. 2014. What does grammar tell us about action? *Pragmatics* 24(3). 623–647.
- Craven, Alexandra & Jonathan Potter. 2010. Directives: Entitlement and contingency in action. *Discourse Studies* 12(4). 419–442.
- Deppermann, Arnulf. 2006. Deontische Infinitivkonstruktionen: Syntax, Semantik, Pragmatik und interaktionale Verwendung. In Susanne Günthner & Wolfgang Imo (eds.), *Konstruktionen in der Interaktion*, 239–262. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Floyd, Simeon, Giovanni Rossi, Julija Baranova, Joe Blythe, Mark Dingemans, Kobin H. Kendrick, Jörg Zinken & N. J. Enfield. 2018. Universals and cultural diversity in the expression of gratitude. *Royal Society Open Science* 5(5). 180391. DOI:10.1017/S0047404516000385
- Forsyth, James. 1970. *A grammar of aspect: Usage and meaning in the Russian verb*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Goodwin, Marjorie Harness. 2006. Participation, affect, and trajectory in family directive/response sequences. *Text & Talk* 26(4–5). 515–543.
- Heritage, John. 1984. *Garfinkel and ethnomethodology*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Jefferson, Gail. 2004. Glossary of transcript symbols with an introduction. In Gene H. Lerner (ed.), *Conversation analysis: Studies from the first generation*, 13–31. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Kent, Alexandra. 2011. *Directing dinnertime: Practices and resources used by parents and children to deliver and respond to directive actions*. Loughborough University. (Doctoral dissertation).
- Kent, Alexandra. 2012. Compliance, resistance and incipient compliance when responding to directives. *Discourse Studies* 14(6). 711–730. DOI:10.1177/1461445612457485
- Kent, Alexandra & Kobin H. Kendrick. 2016. Imperative directives: Orientations to accountability. *Research on Language & Social Interaction* 49(3). 272–288. DOI:10.1080/08351813.2016.1201737

- Kitzinger, Celia, Gene H. Lerner, Jörg Zinken, Sue Wilkinson, Heidi Kevoe-Feldman & Sonja Ellis. 2013. Reformulating place. *Journal of Pragmatics* 55. 43–50.
- Królak, Emilia & Kinga Rudnicka. 2006. Selected aspects of directives in Polish. *Revista española de lingüística aplicada* 19. 129–142.
- Labocha, Janina. 1985. Sposoby wyrażania żądania we współczesnej polszczyźnie mówionej, cz. I. *Polonica* XI. 119–145.
- Labocha, Janina. 1986. Sposoby wyrażania żądania we współczesnej polszczyźnie mówionej, cz. I. *Polonica* XII. 203–217.
- Lehmann, Volkmar. 1989. Pragmatic functions of aspects and their cognitive motivation. In Lars-Gunnar Larsson (ed.), *Proceedings of the Second Scandinavian Symposium on Aspectology*, vol. 19, 77–88.
- Lerner, Gene H. 2003. Selecting next speaker: The context-sensitive operation of a context-free organization. *Language in Society* 32(2). 177–201.
- Ogiermann, Eva. 2015. In/directness in Polish children's requests at the dinner table. *Journal of Pragmatics* 82. 67–82. DOI:10.1016/j.pragma.2015.03.007
- Rauniomaa, Mirka & Tiina Keisanen. 2012. Two multimodal formats for responding to requests. *Journal of Pragmatics* 44(6-7). 829–842.
- Raymond, Geoffrey. 2003. Grammar and social organization: Yes/no interrogatives and the structure of responding. *American Sociological Review* 68(6). 939–967.
- Rossi, Giovanni. 2012. Bilateral and unilateral requests: The use of imperatives and *Mi X?* interrogatives in Italian. *Discourse Processes* 49(5). 426–458. DOI:10.1080/0163853X.2012.684136
- Rossi, Giovanni. 2014. When do people not use language to make requests? In Paul Drew & Elizabeth Couper-Kuhlen (eds.), *Requesting in social interaction* (Studies in Language and Social Interaction 26), 303–334. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. DOI:10.1075/slsi.26.12ros
- Rossi, Giovanni. 2015. *The request system in Italian interaction*. Radboud University Nijmegen. (Doctoral dissertation).
- Rossi, Giovanni. 2018. Composite social actions: The case of factual declaratives in everyday interaction. *Research on Language & Social Interaction* 51(4). 379–397. DOI:10.1080/08351813.2018.1524562
- Rossi, Giovanni & Jörg Zinken. 2016. Grammar and social agency: The pragmatics of impersonal deontic statements. *Language* 92(4). e296–e325. DOI:10.1353/lan.2016.0083
- Schegloff, Emanuel A. 2007. *Sequence organization in interaction: A primer in conversation analysis. Volume 1*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Sorjonen, Marja-Leena, Liisa Raevaara & Elizabeth Couper-Kuhlen (eds.). 2017. *Imperative turns at talk: The design of directives in action* (Studies in Language and Social Interaction 30). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Stivers, Tanya. 2004. “No no no” and other types of multiple sayings in social interaction. *Human Communication Research* 30(2). 260–293.
- Strutyński, Janusz. 2006. *Gramatyka polska* (wyd. 7 zm). Kraków: Wydawnictwo Tomasz Strutyński.
- Thompson, Sandra A., Barbara A. Fox & Elizabeth Couper-Kuhlen. 2015. *Grammar in everyday talk: Building responsive actions*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Tomasello, Michael. 2008. *Origins of human communication*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Van der Auwera, Johan, Nina Dobrushina & Valentin Goussev. 2013. Imperative-hortative systems. In Matthew S. Dryer & Martin Haspelmath (eds.), *The world atlas of language structures online*, 72–1. Leipzig: Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology.
- Weidner, Matylda. 2013a. *On the organization of Polish doctor-patient communication: Practices for building questions, negotiating knowledge, and recommending treatment*. University of Antwerp. (Doctoral dissertation).
- Weidner, Matylda. 2013b. “This is how I see it”. No-prefacing in Polish. In Nadine Thielemann & Peter Kosta (eds.), *Approaches to Slavic interaction* (Dialogue Studies 20), 147–166. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Weidner, Matylda. 2015. Telling somebody what to tell: *Proszę mi powiedzieć* in Polish doctor–patient interaction. *Journal of Pragmatics* 78. 70–83. DOI:10.1016/j.pragma.2015.01.006
- Wierzbicka, Anna. 1991. *Cross-cultural pragmatics: The semantics of human interaction*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Wootton, Anthony J. 1997. *Interaction and the development of mind*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Zinken, Jörg. 2015. Contingent control over shared goods: “Can I have x” requests in British English informal interaction. *Journal of Pragmatics* 82. 23–38. DOI:10.1016/j.pragma.2015.03.005
- Zinken, Jörg. 2016. *Requesting responsibility: The morality of grammar in Polish and English family interaction*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Zinken, Jörg & Arnulf Deppermann. 2017. A cline of visible commitment in the situated design of imperative turns. In Marja-Leena Sorjonen, Liisa Raevaara & Elizabeth Couper-Kuhlen (eds.), *Imperative turns at talk: The design of directives*

- in action* (Studies in Language and Social Interaction 30), 27–63. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Zinken, Jörg & Eva Ogiermann. 2011. How to propose an action as objectively necessary: The case of Polish *trzeba x* (“one needs to x”). *Research on Language & Social Interaction* 44. 263–287. DOI:10.1080/08351813.2011.591900
- Zinken, Jörg & Eva Ogiermann. 2013. Responsibility and action: Invariants and diversity in requests for objects in British English and Polish interaction. *Research on Language & Social Interaction* 46(3). 256–276. DOI:10.1080/08351813.2013.810409
- Zinken, Jörg, Giovanni Rossi & Vasudevi Reddy. 2020. Doing more than expected: Thanking recognizes another’s agency in providing assistance. In Carmen Taleghani-Nikazm, Emma Betz & Peter Golato (eds.), *Mobilizing others: Grammar and lexis within larger activities* (Studies in Language and Social Interaction 33), 253–278. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. DOI:10.1075/slsi.33.10zin