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1 Introduction

All of us probably remember a time when we have been doing something interesting while someone has wanted to get our attention by shouting our name or asking us to look at something. We have then responded to those ‘attention-drawing devices’ either by suspending our current activities and giving them the attention they seek, or we have just ignored them and continued with the activity we were carrying out initially. In the same way, we can all most likely recall moments when we have tried to get someone else’s attention and either succeeded in it or not. It has been shown that attention is a key element of communication (see e.g., Atkinson, 1979, p. 239; Hatch et al., 1979; Keenan & Schieffelin, 1976, p. 356). According to Robinson (2016, p. 3) and Goffman (1983), ‘interaction’ involves two or more people who are physically or vocally co-present, “who have organised themselves as potential conversational participants relative to each other, and whose communication occurs in real (or virtually real) time” (p. 2). An important part of interaction is the concept of ‘intersubjectivity’, which refers to the mutual understanding between speakers and the context in which the interaction takes place (see e.g., Schegloff, 1992, p. 1295). Since interaction requires co-presence and mutual understanding, it could be claimed that without attention there is no interaction.

In addition to seeking attention, ‘multiactivity’ is a very common and an important part of interaction and everyday human lives. The concept of multiactivity seems similar with ‘multitasking’ but in conversation analytic research, the terms ‘task’ and ‘activity’ have been defined differently. According to Haddington et al. (2014), the word ‘task’ refers to a certain kind of activity that has an “identifiable beginning and recognisable completion” (p. 11). Tasks can be considered as goal-directed activities, which can include identifiable steps and practices, and they can also be distributed to others (Haddington et al., 2014, p. 11). Examples of tasks include writing essays or tidying up the house. On the other hand, according to Heritage & Sorjonen (1994), the term ‘activity’ refers to “topically coherent and/or goal-coherent” courses of action (p. 4). Furthermore, Haddington et al. (2014) define activities as “broad sets and forms of human praxeological engagements, which can be formulated in so many words but are often implemented rather than verbalised” (p. 11). The concept of an ‘activity’ can be seen to be broader than the definition of a ‘task’, since e.g., talking to someone and playing with toys can fall under the definition of an activity. When discussing tasks and activities, the term ‘action’ needs to be defined as well. According to Heritage (1984, pp. 23-24), Parsons (1949) has constructed ‘The Action Frame of Reference’, which describes structures of actions. Based on the action frame of reference, ‘action’ refers to a state of affair, which the agent of the act, the actor, plans to bring to an end. When an action takes place, the actor orients that there is something in the
current situation, which needs to be changed. (Heritage, 1984, p. 24.) Additionally, Goodwin (2000, p. 1492) notes that actions refer to interactively organised processes of meaningful events that are produced through the use of semiotic resources. Thus, the definition of an action is quite extensive; actions can vary from asking questions to selecting the next speaker in conversation.

Based on these definitions, multitasking tends to refer to completing more than one task at a time, whereas multiactivity can refer to any activities that are happening at the same time. Examples of multiactivity could be e.g., talking and driving a car simultaneously. According to Haddington et al. (2014), using the term ‘multiactivity’ instead of ‘multitasking’ allows researchers to take into consideration and analyse a variety of “intertwined and embedded actions in different levels of participation, temporalities and contexts” (p. 11), which goes beyond analysing the simultaneous completion of several tasks as in multitasking. Multiactivity is a fairly recent term, especially in the field of linguistics, whereas multitasking has been studied extensively in the field of psychology. However, multiactivity is something that we all do in our everyday lives even more extensively than multitasking, and that is why it is an important and interesting phenomenon to study.

This master’s thesis focuses on participants’ responses to attention-drawing devices in multiactivity situations. The three research questions guiding the analysis are:

1) What kinds of responses are there to attention-drawing devices in multiactivity situations within family interaction?

2) What kinds of interactional practices participants carry out in order to coordinate and manage multiple activities when someone is seeking their attention?

3) How do participants display and/or communicate their involvement in multiple activities to the ones seeking their attention?

Since this study focuses on family interaction, it is important to clarify what the concept of ‘family interaction’ means in the context of this research. When talking about family interaction, this master’s thesis refers to interaction between different aged children and their parents, or other close adults.

There are a few reasons why this topic was chosen to be the focus of this study. Even though multiactivity and attention-drawing devices have been studied in their own accord to some extent, there are no studies on how people respond to, and/or coordinate multiple activities when someone is trying to obtain their attention, even though it could be said that attention-drawing devices are closely linked to the phenomenon of interactional multiactivity. The earlier research on attention-drawing devices mainly concentrate on children’s language development and study the different kinds of attention-drawing devices that young children use when trying to obtain their parents’ attention. There are some earlier studies on the interactional practices that young children use for obtaining their
parents’ attention (see e.g., Mustonen, 2002; Oja, 1999). However, these studies mainly discuss how often parents respond to their children’s attempts of getting adult attention, instead of further elaborating on the types of parental responses. Therefore, it could be said that researching participants’ responses to attention-drawing devices in multiactivity situations fills a needed gap in the research fields of both, attention drawing and multiactivity. Additionally, the topic is very intriguing since attention-drawing devices are an important part of interaction, and they quite often occur in multiactivity situations.

The data used for this master’s thesis consists of video-recorded, naturally occurring everyday interactions between different families at their homes and in cars. The video material was collected in Finland and the UK. The research methodology used for analysing the data is ethnomethodologically informed conversation analysis (EMCA).

The following section further elaborates on the research methodology, the methodological principles of conversation analysis and the basic organisation of talk-in-interaction. After that, in Section 3, the basic concepts and earlier research related to the fields of multiactivity and attention-drawing devices are reviewed. Later, Section 4 describes the video data and transcription conventions used in this thesis. The analysis and the findings of this study are presented in Section 5. Finally, Section 6 discusses the importance of the findings, and concludes this paper.
2 Research methodology

This section discusses the methodological background of this master’s thesis. First, Section 2.1 examines the theoretical and historical background of ethnomethodologically informed conversation analysis (EMCA). After this, the methodological principles of conversation analysis and the research process are explained in Section 2.2. Later, Section 2.3 elaborates on the basic concepts of conversation analysis and the organisation of talk-in-interaction.

2.1 Theoretical background to Ethnomethodologically informed Conversation Analysis

This study draws on the methodological framework of ethnomethodologically informed conversation analysis (EMCA). The reason for choosing this research method is that when used in alliance, ethnomethodology and conversation analysis provide an effective method for studying micro-detailed social interaction and activities as they happen in real life and real-time, as well as taking into account how social participants make sense of their physical and social surroundings (Haddington et al. 2014, p. 13). The combination of ethnomethodology and conversation analysis also allows the analysis to include the relationship of participants and analyse how that might affect the reconstruction of social interaction (Heritage, 1984, pp. 16-17; Lindholm et al., 2016, p. 12). Taking into account the social relationships and the context in which the interaction take place are important since this study focuses on participants’ responses to attention-drawing devices in multiactivity situations within interaction between parents and their children.

Ethnomethodology and conversation analysis are qualitative research methods that have their roots in the field of sociology. Ethnomethodology was developed during the late 1950s and 1960s by the sociologist Harold Garfinkel when he was studying the methods that jury members use for evaluating evidence in courtrooms (Heritage, 1984, p. 18). According to Garfinkel (1967, p. 1), the aims of ethnomethodology are to treat practical and everyday activities, circumstances and reasonings as the topics of empirical study, and to learn about commonplace activities of everyday lives as phenomena in their own right, instead of merely using them as means and tools for studying other phenomena. Ethnomethodological inquiry focuses on so-called ‘ethno-methods’, which are used for describing the different methods individuals use for accounting for their own actions (Hutchby & Wooffitt, 1998,
p. 31; Lindhol et al., 2016, p. 9). The aim of ethnomethodological research is to create analytical elucidations for phenomena, instead of producing theories or explanations (Jalbert, 1999, p. xv).

Harold Garfinkel’s student, sociologist Harvey Sacks, suggested that recordings of talk-in-interaction could be used for studying different underlying ethno-methods. During the years of 1964-1972, lectures given by Sacks introduced a new methodological approach for studying social actions and interaction, which became to be known as conversation analysis. (See e.g., Hutchby & Wooffitt, 1998, pp. 1-2; Lindholm et al., 2019, pp. 9-10.) Conversation analysis is a qualitative research method, which studies naturally occurring interaction (Hutchby & Wooffitt, 1998, p. 14; Vatanen, 2016, p. 313). The study of conversation analysis is empirical, which means that it is strongly data-driven and based on researcher’s observations that are gleaned from audio-video material. On the basis of the observations, researchers aim to identify and describe patterns and form generalisations of the studied phenomenon. This means that conversation analysis is an inductive research approach. (Vatanen, 2016, p. 312-313.) Over the years, conversation analysis has been applied, e.g., in the fields of linguistics, sociology, social psychology and speech therapy (Hutchby & Wooffitt, 1998, p. 2).

One of the aims of conversation analysis is to study the organisation of social activities that form the basis for social interaction (Heritage, 1984, p. 236; Hutchby & Wooffitt, 1998, p. 14). This includes studying how talk-in-interaction is produced, how interaction is determined by context and cultural norms, and how individuals coordinate interaction when communicating with other people (Hutchby & Wooffitt, 1998, p. 1; Lindholm et al. 2016, p. 17). According to Hutchby & Wooffitt (1998, p. 14), conversation analytic research are interested in how people understand and respond to other people in their turns at talk, the central focus being on the sequences of actions. In other words, the focus of conversation analysis is not on language as such, but rather in the underlying organisation of social activities that allow us to express ourselves and understand other people (Hutchby & Wooffitt, 1998, p. 14).

In sum, ethnomethodologically informed conversation analysis is a qualitative research approach that studies talk and embodied micro-details of interaction as they appear in real time in natural contexts. The data used for the analysis are preferred to be video and audio recordings of naturally occurring interaction, and the analysis and findings are data driven. When doing ethnomethodological research, the aim is not to theorise concepts, but rather to understand the structures and practices that allow people to understand and construct their social and cultural surroundings (see e.g., Haddington et al., 2014, pp. 14-15; Heritage, 1984, pp. 16-19). In the following section, the methodological principles of conversation analysis are further elaborated on.
2.2 Methodological principles of Conversation Analysis

This section aims to explain the methodological principles of conversation analysis, as well as describe the conversation analytic research process. As it was explained in the previous section, conversation analysis is a data-driven research method. That is why conversation analytic research process begins with recording data of preferably naturally occurring talk-in-interaction (see e.g., Drew, 2004, p. 99; Hutchby & Wooffit, 1998, p. 13; Vatanen, 2016, p. 313). This means that participants are not recorded in pre-arranged or set up situations in laboratories, but rather in settings that would happen whether cameras were recording or not (Hutchby & Wooffitt, 1998, p. 14). This way talk-in-interaction and other interactional phenomena in the data are more realistic and natural (Vatanen, 2016, p. 313).

After recording the data, the next step in conversation analytic research is the unmotivated viewing of the data. Hutchby & Wooffitt (1998, p. 94) stress that when conducting conversation analytic research, it is important to approach the data first without any particular questions in mind. The reason for this is, according to Sacks (1984, p. 27), and as referred to by Hutchby & Wooffitt (1998, p. 94), that without any pre-assumptions, a researcher will most likely find something interesting to study in the data, whereas if the researcher is only viewing the data from a certain point of view, they may not find what they are looking for while missing the other opportunities of finding interesting phenomena to study.

After viewing the data and making some preliminary notes on interesting phenomena, the next step is to transcribe the data. Transcribing is a significant aspect of conversation analysis, and it can be seen as an important part of the analysis (Vatanen, 2016, p. 316). The reason for this is that the transcribing method, as well as the accuracy of the transcription can affect the researcher’s analysis. Certain aspects of the speech or multimodality might e.g., be left out of the analysis, if they are not included in the transcription. (Ochs, 1976.) When transcribing the video material used for this study, it was noted how the transcribing process allowed the researcher to notice more subtle, micro-detailed aspects of participants’ interaction, which could have been overlooked without the need for detailed transcriptions.

When the research material have been transcribed, the next step is the identification of interesting research phenomenon (see e.g., Hutchby & Wooffit, 1998, p. 110) and the forming of research questions. This is followed by the researcher compiling a collection of examples from the data that are related to the studied phenomenon (see e.g., Hutchby & Wooffit, 1998, p. 95; Vatanen, 2016, p.
After collecting a sufficient amount of examples from the data, the next step is to attempt to describe the research phenomenon with the collected examples (Hutchby & Wooffitt, 1998, p. 110; Vatanen, 2016, p. 323). Ideally, the examples compiled from the data are be used for giving general descriptions of the studied phenomenon, while still paying attention to the individual data examples and the variation between them (Hutchby & Wooffitt, 1998, p. 112). When aiming to describe the studied phenomenon with the data examples, the examples can first be analysed individually while asking questions such as “what is happening”, “how this is related to the phenomenon studied” and “why that now” (Schegloff & Sacks, 1973, p. 299). After this, the data examples are compared to each other for similarities and differences. The conversation analytic research aims to discover variation between the data examples and within the data: how can the same social actions be carried out in different ways. When the variation is clear, the analysis attempts to describe the phenomenon rather than give explanations or prove anything. When doing conversation analytic research, it is also important to bear in mind how the studied phenomena are important to participants within the selected contexts. (Vatanen, 2016, pp. 323-329.)

These methodological principles of conversation analysis were followed and used as guidelines when analysing the data used in this study. The next section elaborates on the basic concepts of conversation analysis, and the organisation of talk-in-interaction.

2.3 The basic organisation of talk-in-interaction

One of the key interests of conversation analysis, as well as ethnomethodology, is the concept of sequentiality. This refers to the way in which participants organise their actions based on what has already happened and what they expect to happen next. (Rawls, 2005, p. 172; see also Schegloff & Sacks, 1973.) Turn-taking, the sequential organisation of talk-in-interaction and embodied actions in communication are some of the basic concepts of conversation analytic research (see e.g., Drew, 2004, pp. 88-89), and closely linked to the idea of sequentiality. Understanding the basic concepts of turn design and turn taking are important for understanding interaction (see e.g., Ford, 2012). The coordination and organisation of multiple activities is also a sequential process, and therefore it is important to discuss the organisation of talk-in-interaction and social actions when studying how people coordinate multiactivity situations through interaction.

‘Turn design’ is one of the main concepts of the organisation of talk-in-interaction. Turn design refers to the processes in which speakers decide which social actions to include in the turns they are going
to perform, and how these actions can be accomplished in the context of interaction. (Drew, 2004, pp. 82-86) The concept of ‘social action’ is central with the idea of turn design, since people do not merely just talk or take turns, but rather perform social actions or manage different activities (Drew, 2004, p. 86). Examples of social actions are e.g., telling stories and asking questions. According to Drew (2004, pp. 87-88), the way people understand the conduct of other people is an important part of conversation analysis. The interaction and the organisation of talk-in-interaction is based on the idea of “nextness” between different turns, since speakers display their understanding of the prior turns and social actions in the turns they take. Thus, participants examine prior turns in order to find out how they could contribute to the on-going interaction. (Schegloff, 2007, pp. 14-15.) When studying the sequential organisation of interaction, as well as participants’ responses to attention-drawing devices, it is important to take into account how participants understand the social actions performed by other speakers, and why the actions performed are understood in a certain manner (Schegloff, 1996, pp. 172-173). It is also important to examine the relationship of turn design and social actions, since turn design can affect the way actions are understood by others (Drew, 2004, p. 87). The understanding of turns and social actions affects the way recipients respond to social actions, since recipients constantly orient to what happens next (Schegloff, 2007). At the same time, speakers mobilise the recipients’ future actions through the actions they perform (Schegloff & Sacks, 1973; Stivers & Rossano, 2010, p. 4).

Social actions and turns in interaction rarely occur individually, but rather they are a part of a systematically organised pattern of sequences. Social actions and turn-taking can be seen as building blocks that together form larger sequences of actions. The most basic examples of organised sequences are ‘adjacency pairs’, which are pairs where initial actions are expected to be responded with certain types of counteractions, e.g., questions are followed by answers. (Drew, 2004, p. 89.) Adjacency pairs consist of two parts: the first pair part, e.g., a question, which is typically followed by the second pair part, e.g., an answer to the question (Schegloff & Sacks, 1973, p. 196). It could be said that the first pair part creates context and expectations for the second pair part (see e.g., Heritage, 2005, p. 105). The second pair part, on the other hand, reveals how the first pair part was understood (Schegloff & Sacks, 1973, pp. 296-298), thus helping to achieve mutual understanding between speakers (Heritage, 2005, p. 105). Since speakers are held morally accountable for their responses (Heritage, 2005, p. 106), or for the lack of them, the absence of expected second pair parts in adjacency pairs can be seen to imply different social actions of their own (Mortensen & Wagner, 2012, p. 2). For example, not replying to a question can suggest that the person is trying to avoid answering the question (Mortensen & Wagner, 2012, p. 2).
However, sequences can be organised in other terms as well, not just via adjacency pairs. According to Drew (2004, p. 90), certain social actions can initiate more extensive forms of sequence organisation. Examples of such actions are invitations. Invitations are usually either accepted or declined, which can be followed by e.g., explanations or negotiations, which may then lead to other relevant social actions (Drew, 2004, p. 90). However, the concept of sequential organisation of actions does not only cover the organisation of speech and turns-at-talk, but also other kinds of actions (Mondada, 2011, p. 225). According to Mondada (2011, p. 225), the study of multiactivity contributes to the understanding of sequential organisation of interaction, and that is why the notion of sequential organisation of actions is important for this research.

The notions of time and temporality are an important part of the sequential organisation of interaction, since interaction is based on the previous turns and actions, as well as the actions to come (Schegloff, 2007). In the context of sequentiality, time does not necessarily refer to the abstraction of time, but rather to the order of social actions and how events are produced in relation to the on-going interaction. (Rawls, 2005, p. 172.) The concept of temporality is important in multiactivity research, since the organisation of multiple activities draws upon different verbal and embodied temporalities. Different activities can e.g., be organised in parallel, embedded and exclusive temporal orders. (Mondada, 2014a; see Section 3.2.2.)

In addition to the organisation of talk-in-interaction, paying attention to the speaker in conversation is a rudimentary part of conversational competence. Without joint attention between people, the turn-taking order can be disturbed. (Ervin-Tripp, 1979.) Therefore, it could be said that it is important to study the different devices used for obtaining attention, as well as the different ways for responding to attention-drawing devices. The next section defines the basics concepts of attention-drawing devices and multiactivity. As it will be explained in the following section, attention-drawing devices can be seen as initiators of social actions, or as first pair parts of adjacency pairs, since they require a response from the listener. For that reason, it is important to know how talk-in-interaction and turns at talk are constructed, since they are closely linked to the functions of attention-drawing devices.
3 Towards attention-drawing devices and multiple actions in interaction

Attention-drawing devices and multiple actions in interaction are both concepts that are central for this study. Therefore, it is important to define what is meant by when discussing attention-drawing devices and interactional multiactivity in this master’s thesis. The first part of this section, Section 3.1, defines the concept of attention-drawing device, as well as reviews some earlier research on attention drawing relevant for this study. The second part, Section 3.2, elaborates on the phenomenon of interactional multiactivity, as well as discusses relevant earlier research in the field.

3.1 Attention-drawing devices

The earlier research on attention-drawing devices mainly concentrate on children’s language development and examine the different practices young children use for obtaining adult attention. In this thesis, attention-drawing devices themselves are not be the main focus of the study; rather, the focal point is on the different adult responses to attention-drawing devices. Nevertheless, it is important to clarify what the concept of an attention-drawing device means and which utterances can be referred to as attention-drawing devices. First, Section 3.1.1 discusses the importance of attention in interaction. After this, in Section 3.1.2, earlier research and linguistic design of attention-drawing devices are reviewed.

3.1.1 Attention and interaction

Attention is seen to be an important part of interaction. Many researchers claim that without joint attention between the speaker and the recipient, interaction is not possible (see e.g., Keenan & Schieffelin, 1976, p. 356; McTear, 1985). According to Keenan & Schieffelin (1976), “before any communication can take place, the speaker must secure the attention of the hearer” (p. 356). This can be accomplished by many different interactional devices referred to as ‘attention-drawing devices’, which are either verbal, such as calling someone’s name, or nonverbal, e.g., tapping on someone’s shoulder (Hatch et al., 1979.) Securing recipient’s attention is essential for communication, and it is one of the first interactional practices that infants acquire. Before having the ability to speak, very
young children try to obtain adults’ attention by nonverbal means, such as crying, gazing and touching things. (Keenan & Schieffelin, 1976.)

The concept of joint attention is also linked to the act of trying to seek and obtain other’s attention, since attention-drawing devices can be seen as tools for achieving joint attention in communication. Kidwell & Zimmermann (2007) argue that having joint attention between the speaker and the recipient is necessary for engagement and interaction. According to Kidwell & Zimmermann (2007), joint attention has traditionally been studied in psychological sciences where it refers to the interpersonal process of understanding the behaviour of other people. Joint attention is a social phenomenon “that cannot be extricated from the ongoing flow of social activity” (Kidwell & Zimmermann, 2007, p. 592). Kidwell & Zimmermann (2007) claim that in interaction, joint attention is accomplished through different interactional actions that draw the recipient’s attention to the speaker or to an object of attention. In their study, Kidwell & Zimmermann (2007) do not refer to attention-drawing devices as such, but instead they are discussing ‘attention-organising practices’ and ‘methods for making action recognisable’ (pp. 598-608). However, they still indirectly imply that attention-drawing devices are important for achieving joint attention in interaction.

Attention-drawing devices can also be referred to as ‘attention-seeking devices’ and ‘attention-getting devices’ (e.g., McTear, 1985, p. 232). However, the term attention-drawing device is more frequently used, and that is why in this thesis, the term attention-drawing device is used when referring to an interactional device applied for obtaining people’s attention.

3.1.2 Linguistic and interactional practices for drawing attention

This section attempts to elaborate on the linguistic design and functions of different attention-drawing devices. Attention-drawing devices can be categorised into verbal and nonverbal devices (see e.g., Atkinson, 1979; Ochs et al., 1979). However, earlier research on attention drawing mainly concentrate on verbal attention-drawing devices, and this is why this section focuses mostly on the design and functions of verbal devices used for obtaining attention.

One-word utterances, such as ‘look’ and ‘there’ are commonly used for drawing attention, especially in situations where there is no mutual attention between the speaker and the recipient (Atkinson, 1979, pp. 238). When in prefacing turns, Sidnell (2007, pp. 390-392) has noted that ‘look’ is usually used for launching or relaunching a course of action, e.g., changing the topic in the middle of a
conversation. Later in the conversation, ‘look’-prefaced turns are used for redirecting talk (Sidnell, 2007, pp. 392-398). Even though Sidnell (2007) does not consider the word ‘look’ as an attention-drawing device, it could be said that launching interactional courses of actions is one of the main purposes of attention-drawing devices as well. Additionally, other one-word utterances used for drawing recipients’ attention are demonstratives, such as ‘this’ and ‘that’, as well as naming of objects or calling people by their names (Atkinson, 1979, pp. 236-245).

In addition to one-word utterances, also longer utterances can be used for drawing others’ attention. Different kinds of questions, such as “George, are you there?” can be used for checking the recipient’s attention, especially in conversation between adults (Keenan & Schieffelin, 1976, p. 357). Young children have also been noted to use imperatives and declaratives as a means to obtain adult attention (Ochs et al., 1979, pp. 114-115). According to Keenan & Schieffelin (1976, p. 357), expressions such as “you know what” and “guess what”, as well as expressive particles that include expressions like “oh dear” and “woops” can also be used for shifting the recipient's attention to the speaker. In addition to the lexical design, also prosodic means, such as raising one’s voice, can indicate to the listener that the speaker would like to initiate conversation (McMartin, 1985, p.80).

Table 1. Types of attention-drawing devices (see e.g., Atkinson, 1979, pp. 391-414; Keenan & Schieffelin, 1976, p. 357; Ochs et al., 1979, p 257).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nonverbal</th>
<th>Verbal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. pointing</td>
<td>1. naming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. looking at object</td>
<td>2. deictic pronouns or adverbs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. touching hearer</td>
<td>3. expressive particles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. pulling</td>
<td>4. greeting terms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. tugging</td>
<td>5. vocatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. tapping</td>
<td>6. locating directives, e.g., ‘look’ and ‘see’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. showing X to hearer, holding up X</td>
<td>7. interrogatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. giving X to hearer</td>
<td>8. demonstratives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. initiating eye contact</td>
<td>9. imperatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. movement toward hearer</td>
<td>10. prosodic devices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a. whining</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. screaming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. increased pitch or amplitude</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d. whispering</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 above sums the types of attention-drawing devices that are used for drawing co-participants’ attention in interaction. What connects all these different devices is that they are usually overtly directed towards the listener whose attention the speaker wishes to obtain. Even though attention-
drawing devices can be categorised into verbal and nonverbal devices, people may use a combination of both when trying to obtain someone’s attention. They might e.g., name an object and point it at the same time.

This section has presented an overview of linguistic design and functions of attention-drawing devices. When identifying attention-drawing devices later in this thesis, the types of devices mentioned in this section will be referred to. Based on the research data, it could be said that attention-drawing devices often occur in multiactivity situations and that they can be seen as social actions that are used for initiating sequences and activities of their own, since attention-drawing devices can be seen to initiate interaction (see also Nishizaka, 2014, for how questions can initiate activities). Thus, the following Section 3.2 gives an overview of another key concept of this study: ‘multiactivity’.

3.2 Multiactivity

This study focuses the different interactional practices participants carry out in order to coordinate and manage multiple activities when someone is seeking their addition. Therefore, the concept of interactional multiactivity, as well as the different practices people use for coordinating multiple activities in interaction are essential. This section presents earlier research related to the topic of this thesis and shows that there is a need for multiactivity research, which takes into consideration attention-drawing devices as well. This section has been divided into two subsections; first, Section 3.2.1 defines the basics of multiactivity, after which Section 3.2.2 presents the different interactional practices used for coordinating multiple activities.

3.2.1 Defining multiactivity

Multitasking and its effects and benefits have been widely studied and discussed especially in the fields of psychology and sociology. However, interactional multitasking, i.e. multiactivity, has not been studied thoroughly yet. The term ‘multiactivity’ refers to the different ways in which two or more activities can be made co-relevant in interaction and coordinated through talk and embodied action (Haddington et al., 2014, p. 3). These multiple activities can be related to each other and happen at the same time in parallel, or be separate and even mutually exclusive, therefore suspending one another (Haddington et al., 2014, p. 22; Mondada, 2011, p. 207). The management of multiple
activities requires the coordination of verbal and multimodal resources, including the temporal and sequential order of activities, as well as taking into account the actions performed by other people (Deppermann, 2014, p. 251). An example of a multiactivity situation is a setting where a person is driving a car, and talking with passengers at the same time. When analysing whether or not a person is having to coordinate multiple simultaneous activities, it is important to consider how participants orient to the situation, and whether they treat the activities as one or as multiple activities that are possibly converging or conflicting (Haddington et al., 2014, p. 20). In multiactivity research, the focus is often on the different ways people coordinate and accomplish the progression of multiple activities in interaction (see e.g., Keisanen et al., 2014; Haddington et al., 2014, p. 5; Raymond & Lerner, 2014; Mondada, 2011, p. 207). In research literature, multiactivity have been studied e.g., in surgical operation rooms (see e.g., Mondada, 2014a); between doctors and patients (see e.g., Nishizaka, 2014; Pasquandrea, 2014); in cars (see e.g., Haddington & Rauniomaa, 2011; Keisanen et al., 2014); in therapy support groups (see e.g., MacMartin & LeBaron, 2006), and so on.

As mentioned earlier in Section 1, multitasking has been studied previously in the fields of psychology and sociology. The research on multitasking have e.g., focused on the pressure that multitasking puts on cognitive capacity and the negative effects multitasking has on attention, concentration and memory (see e.g., Baron, 2008; Law et al., 2004; Loukopoulos et al., 2009; Salvucci & Taatgen, 2011). The research on multitasking often study phenomena from a broader temporal perspective, which may cover time spans of days and hours. However, the research on multiactivity are mainly interested in the micro-temporal scale of events, and how activities are progressed in real-time. This means that instead of researching events that last for days and hours, the interest is in studying phenomena that happen within seconds. Furthermore, when studying multiactivity, the focus is on how multiple activities unfold and are managed in real-time, in real contexts, moment by moment, through social interaction. (Haddington et al., 2014, p. 12).

Earlier research show that in order to manage multiple activities, participants rely on the organisation of talk, gestures and other multimodal resources (see e.g., Keisanen et al., 2014; MacMartin & LeBaron, 2006; Pasquandrea, 2011). According to Haddington et al. (2014), coordinating multiple activities is a collective and intersubjective process that “relies on participant’s finely-tuned coordination practices and on the real-time in situ organisation of joint activities” (p. 6). Moreover, managing multiple activities is an “intersubjective and collaboratively achieved phenomenon (p. 12)”, since multiple activities are reflexive and coordinated with respect to the social settings and physical surroundings (Haddington et al., 2014). Consequently, when considering multiactivity and
interaction, it is not possible to separate the engagement of other people when researching the multiple activities a person is engaged in (Haddington et al., 2014, p. 12).

In this master’s thesis, the main interest is to study how people manage multiple intersecting courses of activities in situated and coordinated ways in real-time and real life in interactional settings. In multiactivity situations, often the main issue for people is to figure out how to respond and organise the different courses of activities (Mondada, 2011, pp. 207-208). Mondada (2011, p. 225; Mondada, 2014a) claims that in multiactivity settings, the different courses of activities can be temporally organised either simultaneously or successively. In other words, when the simultaneous management of multiple activities is not possible, participants need to organise transitions between intersecting activities. This often means that one of the activities will be temporarily suspended so that other activities, which are possibly prioritised more, can be carried out. (Sutinen, 2014, p. 138.) The different intersecting activities can be coordinated and managed either intra-personally or inter-personally. Intra-personal coordination refers to how participants manage their own conduct by assigning different multimodal resources for different activities in need of attention. On the other hand, inter-personal coordination refers to managing multiple activities collaboratively and intersubjectively. (Deppermann, 2014.)

Different activities employ different verbal and multimodal resources. Certain activities can e.g., be verbal, such as talking, whereas other activities require embodiment, e.g., operating a patient. (Mondada, 2014a, p. 38.) Raymond & Lerner (2014, p. 231) claim that participants can engage in multiple courses of activities simultaneously, if the activities do not employ the same resources, or at least do so at the same time. Time and the temporal features of activities are also important when coordinating multiple activities and distributing resources between them. The temporalities of certain resources and activities can sometimes run in parallel, meaning that the temporality of operating a patient can occur simultaneously with the temporality of talk. (Mondada, 2014a, p. 38.) This way participants can conduct multiple courses of activities with little or no interference to the progressivity of the parallel activities (Raymond & Lerner, 2014, p. 231). In situations where multiple activities require the same verbal or multimodal resources, or their temporalities, the simultaneous progression of activities is often impossible (see e.g., Keisanen et al., 2014; Licoppe & Tuncer, 2014; Mondada, 2014a; Nishizaka, 2014; Sutinen, 2014; Ticca, 2014). This kind of interference in the resources can be seen e.g., as fragmented talk, repairs and delays (see e.g Mondada, 2014a; Ticca, 2014). The next section discusses the different practices that people use for coordinating and accomplishing multiple activities in interaction.
3.2.2 Different practices used for coordinating multiple activities in interaction

This study focuses on the ways participants respond to attention-drawing devices in multiactivity situations, which essentially refers to the different practices participants use for coordinating multiple intersecting activities. Thus, it is important to give a brief overview of the different practices used for coordinating multiple activities in interaction. A sum of different practices that people use for organising multiple activities can be seen in Table 2 below. The practice of suspending an initial activity in order to carry out another one has been covered in multiactivity research more extensively than the other practices, and that is why this section mainly discusses the practice of suspension. Suspension of an activity is also an important part of the analysis, which can be seen in Section 5.2, and that is why covering the phenomenon of suspension is relevant for this study.

Table 2. Different practices for organising multiple activities (Haddington et al., 2014, pp. 24-27).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Practice</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Starting/restarting, engaging/disengaging, interrupting, stopping, halting, pausing, suspending, postponing</td>
<td>Participants can orient to multiple activities in different ways; they may choose to carry out one activity and suspend the other activities momentarily. Suspending an activity usually means that the activity will be resumed later.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switching, alternating, intertwining, inserting</td>
<td>Multiple activities are managed in parallel, so that participants constantly keep switching between the activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusting/readjusting the progress &amp; trajectories of multiple activities, organising, delaying, accelerating</td>
<td>One of the activities may be adjusted so that carrying out multiple simultaneous activities would be possible, or that other activities could be attended.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abandoning</td>
<td>Abandoning a suspended activity; not resuming it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resuming and continuing</td>
<td>Resuming and continuing previously suspended activities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As it was mentioned in Section 3.2.1, progressing two or more activities simultaneously seems to be possible when activities do not call upon the same resources, but rather employ complementary multimodal resources (Mondada, 2014a, p. 46; Raymond & Lerner, 2014, pp. 231-242). When multiple activities are progressed simultaneously, they can be distinguished into parallel and embedded activities. If the temporal organisation of multiple activities is parallel, the activities can be carried out simultaneously with no visible challenges. On the other hand, if the activities are
managed temporally in embedded order, the simultaneous progression of the activities requires constant coordination and adjustments between the activities. This often leads to minor perturbations in either talk or multimodal actions. (Mondada, 2014a.)

If activities employ similar multimodal resources (Mondada, 2014a, p. 46), and therefore make the simultaneous progression of multiple activities impossible, one of the activities may typically be suspended so that the other activities can be carried out instead (Keisanen et al., 2014, p. 118). The suspension of an activity is used as a tool for coordinating the temporal and sequential progression of multiple activities, so that the activities occur in succession (Keisanen et al., 2014). When suspending activities, people hierarchize multiple activities by deciding which ones require immediate attention, and suspend the activities that seem less important (Keisanen et al., 2014, p. 130; Mondada, 2014a; Raymond & Lerner, 2014, p. 238). According to Keisanen et al. (2014, p. 114) and Licoppe & Tuncer (2014, pp. 184-188), suspending an activity typically consists of three different parts. First, there is an identification of a multiactivity setting, which may be made interactionally visible in the form of an utterance, such as “wait”. This is often followed by a verbal reaction or a clarification regarding the coordination of the multiactivity situation. This is also when one of the activities is suspended. (Keisanen et al., 2014, p. 114; Licoppe & Tuncer, 2014, pp. 184-188.) Later, the suspended activity is resumed (Licoppe & Tuncer, 2014).

The suspension of an activity and participants’ involvement in multiple activities can be visible in their physical orientation (see e.g., Pasquandrea, 2014, p. 467; Raymond & Lerner, 2014, p. 238). For example, in a situation where a doctor suspends the activity of writing in order to talk to a patient, the doctor might keep their torso oriented towards a table and hold a piece of paper while gazing at the patient in order to signal the readiness for interaction (MacMartin & Lebaron, 2006, p. 71; Pasquandrea, 2014, pp. 467-470). Similarly, Pasquandrea (2014, pp. 467-470) notes that in multiactivity situations, gaze as well as bodily alignment can be used for switching between different activities, thus they can function as tools for coordinating multiple simultaneous activities.

Section 3 has given an overview of the basic concepts of attention-drawing devices and multiactivity situations. However, it is obvious that the section does not cover any research considering both, attention-drawing devices and coordination of multiple activities. The reason for this is that prior to this study, there have been no similar research. There are earlier research on reacting to summoning events in multiactivity situations (Licoppe & Tuncer, 2014), and responding to phone calls while driving (see e.g., Haddington & Raunioma, 2011; Rauniomaa & Haddington, 2012), which suggest that summons in multiactivity situations can lead to a suspension of an initial activity or to a simultaneous progression of multiple simultaneous activities. Even though these studies do not
consider attention-drawing devices per se, it could be said that they are fairly similar with attention-drawing devices since certain summoning events, such as phone rings, require the participants’ attention, therefore leading to an organisation of multiple activities. However, the main difference between summons and attention-drawing devices is that attention-drawing devices are always produced by people, not by the environment, and they are often overtly directed towards a certain person. This is how this study on attention-drawing devices in multiactivity situations differs from summon-related research, and therefore it could be said that there is a need for multiactivity research that include attention-drawing devices as well.

In the following section, this thesis moves on from the theoretical background to describing the research materials and the findings of this study. First, Section 4.1 elaborates on the research ethics, after which the research data, as well as the transcription methods used in this thesis are described.
4 Description of the video data and transcription conventions

This section gives a description of the video data, the ethical guidelines guiding this study, and how the video data were transcribed. First, in Section 4.1, the research ethics followed in this master’s thesis are explained. After this, Section 4.2 elaborates on the four different data sets used for this study. Last, the transcription method used for transcribing the excerpts in this thesis is explained.

4.1 Research ethics

When recording naturally occurring interactions in real life with real people, certain ethical concerns need to be acknowledged. The video data used for this thesis include parts of everyday life in families and sensitive information about participants’ lives that needs to be handled with caution. When processing and presenting the data for the purposes of this master’s thesis, certain ethical guidelines were followed, as they are stated e.g., by European Science Foundation (2011) and Finnish Advisory Board on Research Integrity (2012).

All of the video data used in thesis were recorded by other researchers, so no video data were collected solely for the purposes of this thesis. Thus, the researchers responsible for gathering the data have dealt with the ethical issues, such as informing the participants of the research purposes, and collecting the informed consents. The ethical responsibilities concerning this research began after the researcher of this study received the data.

According to European Science Foundation (2011, p. 6), all data need to be stored securely. For the purposes of this thesis, this was ensured by storing the data only in an encrypted external hard drive, which was only accessible to the researcher. This ensured that the private information concerning the research participants was handled confidentially and with respect. Information that would reveal the participants’ identities was secured, and this is how their rights for privacy were protected. When showing examples of the data in seminars or on this paper, the anonymity of the participants was ensured, unless they had given the permission to show the data for educational and research purposes.
4.2 Description of the data sets

The research data used in this thesis consist of four sets of video-recorded, naturally occurring, everyday family interaction at homes and in cars. The research data have been collected in Finland and in the UK between early 2000s to late 2010s, and it includes recordings of five different families. Altogether, 30 hours and 31 minutes of video data were analysed for this research, from which 21 hours and 39 minutes of the data were recorded in Finland and 8 hours and 52 minutes in the UK.

Video data were used in this thesis because it allows the researcher to analyse the interaction, multimodalities and the sequential organisation of social actions in detail as it occurs in real time. Video material can be paused, zoomed and viewed several times, which makes the observation of micro-details possible. Those are the reasons why using video data serve the research purposes and the aims of this research better than any other kind of data.

Initially, the analysis of the research data began from the viewing of the data set ‘Easter Sunday’. In this data set, attention-drawing devices were used extensively in multiactivity situations, especially in interaction between children. After this, more video data were included in the analysis in order to find out whether the phenomenon was present in other video recordings as well, and to increase the validity of this research. In the end, four different data sets were included in the analysis of this thesis: Easter Sunday, Habitable Cars, Talk&Drive and Family Data.

Easter Sunday

The first data set, Easter Sunday, consists of 6 hours and 43 minutes of naturally occurring, everyday interaction within a bilingual family. The video data were recorded in England in 2016, and the languages spoken in the recordings are English and Finnish. The video material were recorded with three GoPro cameras that were placed in the kitchen, living room and dining room. In addition to these, a researcher followed and recorded the family’s Easter egg hunting event. The pseudonyms used for referring to the participants are Paula (the mother), Malcolm (the father), Tanja (an adolescent daughter), as well as Samuli and Markus (two pre-teen sons).

First, the video recordings show Paula preparing dinner for the family, whilst the two sons, Samuli and Markus, are playing with their toys in the living room. After this, the family has dinner together, after which they hunt hidden Easter eggs in the garden, using maps and hints written by the other family members.
Habitable Cars

The second data set used in this master’s thesis is Habitable Cars. It was originally collected as a part of the Habitable Cars project by researchers Barry Brown, Eric Laurier and Hayden Lorimer from the Universities of Glasgow and Edinburgh. The project focused on people travelling together as friends, families and car-sharers. The data were recorded during the early 2000s in the UK, and overall it consists of 240 hours of video material. When recording the video material, the participants were given cameras for a week and asked to record when they were driving. Each participant recorded six of their typical drives where they were driving or being passengers while interacting with their family members, friends or co-workers. For the purposes of this thesis, only the video recordings including parent-child interaction were analysed. Overall, 2 hours and 9 minutes of video recordings were analysed for this study. This includes recordings of three different families. However, the examples presented in this thesis only include excerpts from two of these families.

The first family consists of a mother Jennifer, and her two pre-teen daughters Kelly and Luzy. The recordings of the second family show a mother Liz, and two of her young children Noel and Lucy. In addition, a family friend Emily can also be seen in some of the video recordings. In the video recordings, the participants are carrying out ordinary tasks, such as driving the children to school, whilst interacting with each other.

Talk&Drive

The third data set, Talk&Drive, was originally recorded for the research project Talk&Drive (2009-2012) at the Universities of Oulu and Helsinki. The data set consist of video recordings of a Finnish-speaking family driving a car over multiple days. The video material was recorded in Finland in late 2000s. The videos were recorded with two cameras that were placed inside the car: one on the back and one on the dashboard. For the purposes of this thesis, 1 hour and 32 minutes of the video data from this data set were analysed.

The participants in the video recordings are a father Martti with two of his pre-teen sons Aaro and Iiro. During the recordings, they are driving and navigating in different towns, as well as carrying out mundane errands.

Family Data

The fourth data set, Family Data, includes video recordings of naturally occurring everyday interaction within a family. The data were collected in the late 2010s in Finland and the language of the recordings is Finnish. The video data were recorded for over two days with five different cameras:
two cameras were placed in the kitchen, two in the living room and one at the children’s bedroom. Overall, 20 hours and 7 minutes of the video recordings were analysed for this study.

The family in the recordings consists of a father (referred to as Dad) and three young children: Julius (4 years old), Ilona (2 years old), and Ville (1-year-old). The video recordings show the family’s everyday life, which includes having breakfast, playing, cooking, as well as cleaning the home and completing other ordinary tasks around the house.

4.3 Transcription method

As a part of the analysis, and as a means to present selected data excerpts in this thesis, some parts of the data have been transcribed. The two different transcription methods used in this thesis are Jefferson’s (2004) method for transcribing talk and Mondada’s (2014b) approach for transcribing embodiment. A full list of the transcription conventions used are provided in Appendix 1.

In order to preserve the anonymity of the research participants, all of the names and other information giving away their identities have been changed. Pseudonyms are used when referring to the participants. The rhythm and the number of syllables in the pseudonyms resemble the participants’ real names. However, in situations where the participants are in cars, a different kind of system is used for referring to them. The driver of the car is referred to as “DRV”. Since most of the car data were recorded in the UK, where the people drive on the left-hand side, the person sitting on the front passenger seat is referred to as “FSL” (front seat left). The participants sitting at back seat are called “BSR” (back seat right) or “BSL” (back seat left). The fabricated example below demonstrates how speech and embodiment have been transcribed in this thesis.

Excerpt 1. An example of a transcript.

01 FSR:  %hei, *nääksää @*tuota autoa* tuolla?*
  hey, can you see that car over there?
  $twd the car-->
  ............,*points-----*,*,*,*,*;
  @twd the car-->

02 (0.5)

03 DRV:  +tarkotakko nää +tuota+ autoa?+
  do you mean that car?
  +,+++++*points+*,*,*,*+
The bolded and numbered lines represent talk and pauses as they occur in the video data. The participant talking is identified at the beginning of the line. The name of the speaker is abbreviated and capitalised. If the speech is not in English, an English translation has been provided with a different font below the line representing talk. Glossed translations of the original speech are not included in the transcripts of this thesis. As mentioned earlier, Jefferson’s (2004) conventions have been used for describing the quality of the speech, and the full list of the conventions used are provided in Appendix 1.

The lines representing gaze and other embodied actions are below the speech and translation. The lines representing gaze are shown in italics, whereas the lines showing embodied actions are neither in italics nor in bold. If the person carrying out the action is different than the speaker, that will be mentioned at the beginning of the line with lower case letters: e.g., the embodied actions of a car driver (DRV) would be marked as “drv” and the gaze as “drg”. For transcribing embodiment, Mondada’s (2014b) conventions are used. According to Mondada (2014b), embodied actions are divided into three different steps: the preparation, symbolised by full points (…); the apex, symbolised by hyphens (---); and the retraction of the action, symbolised by commas (,,). If the transcribed action is e.g., pointing, the preparation phase can refer to lifting the hand, the apex refers to pointing, and the retraction to lowering the hand. The different phases of the action are marked to the speech lines with different, participant-specific symbols, such as plus signs (+) or asterisks (*). In order to maintain the transcripts’ readability, only the gestures and gaze that affect attention-drawing devices or participants’ responses to them have been transcribed.
5 The temporal and sequential organisation of multiple activities

This section presents the analysis and findings related to the focus of this thesis: how participants respond to attention-drawing devices in multiactivity situations. When it comes to analysing responses to attention-drawing devices, it is important to note that in this thesis, attention-drawing devices are seen as social actions that can initiate sequences and activities. The reason for this is that attention-drawing devices are used for obtaining participants’ attention in situations where they need to respond to attention-drawing devices in a certain way, e.g., by answering to a question. Since talking with another person is seen as an activity, it could be claimed that attention-drawing devices aim at initiating activities. Therefore, in this thesis, attention-drawing devices are seen as initiations of activities.

The analysis of this thesis shows that participants organise multiple activities temporally and sequentially in four different ways when faced by an attention-drawing device: 1) they progress multiple activities simultaneously, 2) they suspend the initial activity in order to carry out an activity introduced by the attention-drawing device, 3) they organise multiple activities successively, or 4) they ignore the attention-drawing device and continue progressing the initial activity. ‘Initial activities’ refer to activities that participants were engaged with before an attention-drawing device occurred.

The analysis of this study is data-driven and guided by examples from the research data. This means that the analysis is based on few selected data excerpts, which are analysed in detail from the multiactivity point of view. These excerpts presented in the sections were chosen because they show how participants organise multiple activities in multiactivity situations when faced by an attention-drawing device. The excerpts examined in each section also show the variation between the data and display how participants use similar methods for coordinating multiple activities in different contexts.

Overall, the analysis is based on a collection of 58 data examples where attention-drawing devices were used in multiactivity situations, but only a few of them are presented in this thesis. Table 3 below shows how the data examples were distributed between the different ways of coordinating multiple activities. The Easter Sunday data set includes a lot of interaction between children, and that is when most of the attention-drawing devices occurred within that data set. However, in order to limit the scope of this thesis, only examples in which children produced attention-drawing devices as a means to obtain adult attention are included in the analysis. In the table below, the numbers in the brackets include the examples in which children were the recipients of attention-drawing devices.
Table 3. The distribution of the cases where attention-drawing devices occurred in multiactivity situations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coordinating activities</th>
<th>Progressing multiple activities simultaneously</th>
<th>Suspending the initial activity</th>
<th>Organising simultaneous activities successively</th>
<th>Ignoring the attention-drawing device</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Easter Sunday</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>3 + (5)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>3 + (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Habitable Cars</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talk&amp;Drive</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Data</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>58 + (9)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When looking at the distribution of the examples presented in the table, it is important to bear in mind that the data sets Habitable Cars and Talk&Drive included videos where the families were in cars, whereas the data sets Easter Sunday and Family Data were recorded at the participants’ homes. This can be seen in the distribution of the cases: most of the participants driving a car responded to attention-drawing devices by progressing multiple activities simultaneously, whereas the participants at homes suspended the initial activities or organised the activities successively. It can also be seen that in the video recordings where the families are in cars, more multiactivity situations occur.

5.1 Progressing multiple activities simultaneously

The first section of the analysis discusses situations where participants respond to attention-drawing devices by “accepting” the activities initiated by them and by continuing to progress these intersecting activities simultaneously. The analysis pays attention to the ways in which participants make it visible in interaction that they are progressing multiple activities simultaneously. This section also shows that while sometimes it is possible to progress multiple activities in parallel with no visible problems, this may not always be the case. Occasionally, participants need to distribute different verbal and multimodal resources, such as their gaze, between intersecting activities so that the simultaneous progression of multiple activities is possible.

Excerpt 2 below presents an example of a situation where multiple actions are progressed simultaneously. Situations where parents are driving and children are trying to get their attention are
common in the data. In Excerpt 2, a mother is driving a car and two daughters are sitting in the back seat as passengers. The mother is approaching a junction and beginning to slow down, when one of the daughters initiates interaction by performing an attention-drawing device and asking the mother whether it is true that some crisps are made out of potatoes. In the meanwhile, the mother applies the indicator and looks towards the junction in order to check whether it is safe to turn. When she starts to turn at the junction, she replies to the daughter’s question, which then instigates further interaction about the ingredients of different crisp. Right after the excerpt, the mother parks the car to the side of the road and turns around to look at the daughter in the back seat.

**Excerpt 2.** Habitable Cars; Mum, is it true that some crisps are made out of potatoes? DRV= the mother, BSR= Suzy. The mother is wearing sunglasses, so the transcript for the gaze is based on the movements of her head.

01 BSR: mum, ∆is it true that (0.4) that- *that- the *some
      drv ∆slows down to a junction-->
      *..........*indic. on-->
02      crisps* are made out of
      drv -->*
03 BSR  (0.7)
04      pota+toes.
      drg +..<>
05      ∆(0.8)
      drv ∆turning right-->
06 DRV: +yea::h,# crisps are made out of potatoes.
      drg +twd the direction of turning-->
      #fig1
07 BSR: oh. ∆%+# (.) +And it s- = >this one say::s<
      drv --∆driving straight-->
      env %the indicator switches off
      drg -->+twd rearview mirror+
      #fig2
      drg +twd road--->
08      (.)
09 BSR: co:rn puffs.
10 DRV: oh, ∆>maybe those ones are made out of corn< then.
      -->∆drives to the side, begins to park-->
When looking at the excerpt in detail, we can see that in lines 1-2, Suzy says *mum, is it true that some crisps are made out of potatoes*. Suzy’s utterance is interesting, since it can be seen to serve at least two different functions in interaction. First, the utterance can be seen to function as an attention-drawing device, which contains two different parts and is used for carrying out different social actions. Suzy names the mother to be the target audience of her following utterance, as well as asks the mother a question, both of which are practices used for drawing someone’s attention (see Ochs et al., 1979). It is clear that with the attention-drawing device, Suzy makes explicit that she specifically wants the mother’s attention, and that she is expecting a response from the mother. Second, Suzy’s utterance carries a social action of a question, which can be seen to serve as the first-pair part of an adjacency pair. As it was explained in Section 2.3, the first pair parts of adjacency pairs require a response, meaning that questions are often expected to be followed by answers (see e.g., Schegloff & Sacks, 1973). Thus, by producing an attention-drawing device and at the same time asking the mother a question, Suzy orients to a response from the mother. However, in lines 1-4, the mother gazes at the junction while she is getting ready to turn. At this point, she does not use any interactional means for showing that in addition to controlling the vehicle, she is also listening to her daughter speak. Nevertheless, as it can be seen later, it is obvious that the mother hears what her daughter says.

In line 5, there is a 0.8-second long pause between the end of Suzy’s question and the beginning of the mother’s response. The pause is not so long that Suzy would need to repeat her question and/or the attention-drawing device, but together with the act of turning at the junction, it suggests that before answering to the question, the mother needs to make sure that turning at the junction is safe. In situations where intersecting activities require the same resources, there might be an interference in the progression of the activities, which can be seen e.g., as delays in speech (see e.g., Mondada,
In this case, talking to Suzy and turning at the junction both require the mother’s attention, and this might be why there is a slight delay in her response to Suzy.

After the mother has made sure that turning is safe, and when she has already began turning the car, she answers to Suzy’s question by saying: *yeah, crisps are made out of potatoes* (line 6). With this response, she provides the second pair part of the adjacency pair. Nevertheless, at the same time she keeps her gaze on the road whilst she is turning the car. This shows that she progresses the activities of driving a car and answering to the question simultaneously. In line 7, Suzy continues the discussion by stating that the crisps she has are called corn puffs. At this point, the mother has finished turning at the junction, the indicator switches off and she is driving on a straight road. It is then that she quickly gazes at the rear-view mirror possibly in order to gaze at her daughter, or to check whether it is safe to park the car at the side of the road. After this, she replies to the daughter’s statement as if it was a question (line 10) and begins to park the car. The reason the mother treats Suzy’s statement as a question is possibly due to the asymmetry in the epistemic domain between the mother and Suzy; the mother is expected to know whether corn puffs are made out of corn or potatoes (see e.g., Labov & Fanshel, 1977; Heritage & Roth, 1995). After the car is parked and the hand-brake is on, the mother turns around and continues the discussion of ingredients in crisps with her daughter.

In Excerpt 2, the mother simultaneously progresses two intersecting activities, which are separate and disconnected from each other, meaning that the activity of talk is not related to the activity of driving (see e.g., Mondada, 2014a). At the beginning of the excerpt, the attention-drawing device produced by Suzy embeds an activity of talk to the mother’s initial activity, which is driving. According to Mondada (2014a), the embeddedness of activities can cause minor hitches or perturbations in the progression of two activities. This is observable in line 5, where there is a slight delay in the mother’s response to the attention-drawing device. However, soon the activities of talk and driving become parallel, meaning that there are no visible problems in the simultaneous progression of the two activities (see e.g., Mondada, 2014a). The mother is able to progress the two activities in parallel because the activities employ complementary resources (see e.g., Mondada, 2014a; Raymond & Lerner, 2014). The activity of driving a car seems to require multimodal resources, such as gaze and movement of the upper body, including hands and arms, as well as feet for controlling the pedals. On the other hand, the activity of talk requires verbal resources. It is apparent that in addition to these, the mother also needs to pay attention to the traffic and the junction she is approaching. When Suzy produces the attention-drawing device, the mother needs to share the attention and distribute it between the intersecting activities, since at this point she is interacting with the environment and the
passenger at the same time. However, progressing the two activities in parallel is possible because there are no major conflicts between the deployed multimodal and verbal resources.

Excerpt 3 presents a different situation where a mother progresses two intersecting activities and makes it verbally explicit to the passengers. In the example, a family is getting ready to leave. The mother has just checked that everything is ready; the children are sitting in the car, have their seat belts fastened, and everything is ready for leaving. The mother starts reversing the car, and in the meanwhile the boy in the back seat is talking to her. The mother does not respond to the boy talking, so the boy tries to obtain the mother’s attention by producing an attention-drawing device *mummy* (line 8). The mother responds to this almost immediately by saying *yes, I’m listening* (line 9) whilst still focusing on reversing the vehicle.

Excerpt 3. Habitable Cars; Let’s just get started. DRV= the mother, FSL= Lucy, BSR= Noel, sw= steering wheel

((At the beginning of the excerpt the mother is gazing at the gear lever))

01 BSR: [(                      )]
02 DRV: [*let’s just get star*ted.]
        "....................*reverse gear on-->
03 BSR: +under +the *mud.* (.) #they say, mu:*
        drv +.........+back window-->
        drv -->,,,,*grabs the sw--------*turns sw right*   
        #fig3
        drv Δreversing the car-->  
04 BSR: *they* say, +af+ter + (. ) the +e-, 
        drv *turns sw left* 
        drv -->+.+right+..........+back window-->  
05 FSL: [(ha ha)  ]
06 BSR: **%[af+er:,]+++* 
        drv *turns sw right, left hand off the sw*
        env: %radio turns on automatically  
        drv -->+......+the radio-->
        drv @....>
07 Δ(0.5)@
        drv Δstops the car--> 
        ..>@turns off the radio@,,,>
08 BSR: Δmum+@*my+::? a:[fte:r,     ]  
        drv Δreversing the car-->
        drv -->+.+....+back window--> 
        drv ,,,@+turns the sw left-->  
09 DRV: [yes, I'm #liste]ning.
        #fig4
10 BSR: (the tough* po+ta+to), you say, +#un+der the mud.  
        drv -->*
        drv -->+bsr+back window-->+bsr+back window-->  
        #fig5
11 DRV: do you?
12 BSR: **yeah. the +mud.+  
        drv +............+right window+....>
        drv *turns the sw right-->
13 DRV: what-, +what’s +under the mud.+
        drv ..>+right window+.........+left window--->
In line 3, Noel starts talking while the mother is getting ready to reverse the car. At this point, he does not direct his talk to anyone, so it is not clear to whom he is talking to, or whether he is just talking to himself. The mother does not reply or respond to Noel’s talk in any way; instead, she seems to focus on reversing the car (see Figure 3). In line 5, Lucy quickly gazes at Noel and laughs quietly. However, here it seems that Noel has tried to talk to the mother, and since the mother has not responded to Noel’s talk in any way, he tries to obtain the mother’s attention with the attention-drawing device *mummy* (line 8). In contrast to Excerpt 2, here Noel uses the attention-drawing device for obtaining the mother’s attention, but also for asking the mother to attend to his talk. In contrast to the previous example, here Noel has not paired the attention-drawing device with other social actions (e.g., questions), so he does not require the mother to perform any other social actions, but to confirm or indicate that she is listening to Noel.

Almost immediately after the attention-drawing device in line 8, before Noel has time to repeat what he has been trying to say, the mother replies to Noel by saying *yes, I’m listening* (line 9; see Figure 4). This response suggests that the mother understood Noel’s attention-drawing device as an attempt of getting a confirmation that she is listening to him. The mother’s immediate response to the attention-drawing device also suggests that even though she has been focusing on reversing the car, and not gazing or replying to Noel, she has still simultaneously been paying attention to Noel talking. Even though she is visibly progressing only one activity, by stating that she is listening, she accounts that she is progressing two activities simultaneously: attending Noel’s talk and reversing the car. After this Noel knows that the mother is listening to him, and he repeats what he has been saying earlier. From line 11 onwards, the mother continues discussing the topic with Noel, while still reversing the car.
Figures 4.1 and 4.2: The mother says Yes, I'm listening, showing the views from both cameras (line 9)

Figure 5. The mother briefly gazes at the boy in the back seat (line 10).

In Excerpt 3, Noel is not sure whether the mother is listening to him, and this is why he produces an attention-drawing device in order to get a response from the mother. The mother produces a response to Noel’s attention-drawing device in parallel with the activity of driving, by explicating that she is listening to him. This way she also interactionally reveals to the passengers that she is involved in multiple activities simultaneously: she is listening, as well as now talking to Noel whilst interacting with the environment, i.e. reversing the car. Reversing the car can be seen as interaction with the environment, since it requires paying attention to the traffic and the direction where she is reversing, as well as controlling the vehicle. Similar to Excerpt 2, in Excerpt 3, after responding to the attention-drawing device, the mother continues to progress the activities of talk and driving in parallel with no visible challenges. This seems to be possible because the activities deploy complementary resources: talking requires verbal resources, whereas driving requires multimodal resources, such as gaze and the upper body (see e.g., Mondada, 2014a; Raymond & Lerner, 2014). In addition to these, the mother also pays attention to the environment in order to make sure that reversing the car is safe.

The next example, Excerpt 4, represents a multiactivity situation in which a car driver coordinates three intersecting activities simultaneously. Prior to the excerpt, a father has taken his two sons to a
sports shop to get some braces as well as knee and elbow pads. At the beginning of the transcript, the two sons in the back seat are talking about the new braces, during which the father is driving. Soon, the father takes out his phone and starts using it while driving; at this point, he is switching his gaze between these two activities. Later, one of the sons tries to get the father’s attention and initiates discussion about the elbow pads. This is when the father tries to manage and carry our three activities in parallel; driving a car, using a phone and talking to his son.

Excerpt 4. Talk&Drive: Elbow pads are not very useful. DRV = the father, BSL= Iiro, BSR= Aaro.

((Children in the back seat talk together, driver concentrates on driving. ‘Buttons’ means that the driver is dialling the buttons of his phone.))

01 BSL: eihän- won’t-
02      (0.5)
03 BSL: eihän niin nää suo+jaa+ eni+ten,+ so these don’t cover the most
drv       +...+right, down 
          +....+in front-->
04      (0.5)
05 BSL: vaan nää suoja+aa .hh but these cover
06      (0.5)
07 BSL: huonoit+en, the least
08 BSR: =ei suoja+aa ku par+haiten no they cover the most
drv       *......>
09 BSL: ne +*erm+ ne ranne*suojat those erm those bracers
drv -->+left+in front-->
drv     ..>*grabs a phone from his pocket*,,,>
10      (0.3)*(0.3)
drv     ,,,*
11 BSL: ja +polvi+°suojat° on tär*kei*mmät and knee pads are the most important
drv -->+left+in front-->
drv                  *...*holds phone, buttons-->
12      +#(0.8)
drv     +phone--> #fig6
13 BSL: ++isi++
daddy
drv      +....+in front-->
drv   >*lowers phone down*
14 DRV: +#mhm+
drv +rearview mirror #fig7
          +in front--> 
15 BSL: kyynär-- erm suo--
elbow-- erm pa--
16      (0.5)
In lines 1-11, Aaro and Iiro are chatting in the back seat and disagreeing about the usefulness of elbow pads, Iiro saying that they are not very useful and Aaro disagreeing with him. At the beginning of the transcript, the father is driving and gazing at the road. In lines 8-9, the father takes a phone out of his pocket and this way embeds an activity of using the phone to an activity of driving (see also Mondada, 2014a). In line 11, he starts dialling the phone, and in line 12, he gazes at the phone quickly (see Figure 6). Soon after this, Iiro tries to get the father’s attention by producing an attention-drawing device isi, ‘daddy’ (line 13). In addition to obtaining the father’s attention, with this device Iiro establishes that the utterance about to follow is directed towards the father. This way, he also selects the father to be the next speaker (see also Excerpt 2). When the father hears Iiro’s attention-drawing device, he instantly raises his gaze and looks at the road again, at the same time lowering the phone. The father responds to Iiro by saying mhmm (line 14) and briefly glances at the rear-view mirror (see Figure 7).
Figure 7). At the end of line 14, the father looks at the road again, and it seems like he has oriented to listening what Iiro says in lines 15-17. This is when Iiro states kyynärsuojista ei oo paljoa hyötyä, ‘elbow pads are not very useful’ (lines 15-17). Even though the utterance is grammatically a statement, it could be argued that in this excerpt, it functions as a turn that invites the father to take a stance and provide a response to Iiro’s statement about the elbow pads. This way an activity of talk is also embedded to the activities of using the phone and driving the car (see also Mondada, 2014a). Since the father can be seen as an authority, and there is an asymmetry in the epistemic domain between the father and Iiro about the usefulness of elbow pads (see e.g., Labov & Fanshel, 1977; Heritage & Roth, 1995), Iiro, as well as the father, might feel that the father is accountable for taking a stance and responding to Iiro’s utterance.

In line 17, in the middle of Iiro’s utterance, the father orients towards the phone again by raising the hand holding the phone and gazing at the phone (see Figure 8). At the same time, it is observable that he uses his thumb for dialling the phone’s buttons. At the end of line 17, the father gazes at the road again very briefly, and whilst gazing at the road, he keeps dialling the phone. At this point, he is driving the car, listening to Iiro’s talk and using the phone. It appears that the father treats the simultaneous progression of these activities as conflicting, since they all require his attention, as well as multimodal resources, such as gaze. However, the father seems to be able to progress these three activities simultaneously by switching his gaze between them, even though it appears that the simultaneous progression of the activities is challenging. This is observable in line 18, where there is a 0.7-second silence between Iiro’s utterance and the father’s response. During the silence, the father gazes at the phone, which could be the reason for the delayed response: he is paying attention to the activities of driving and using the phone simultaneously, both of which require his focus and attention. This might be because he wants to organise the activity of dialling the phone to a point where he can suspend it for a while and start talking to Iiro.
At the end of the silence in line 18, the father begins to raise his gaze and direct it towards the road. In lines 19-21, the father provides a response to Iiro’s earlier utterance by saying *niin on niist on ehkä vähiten hyö- vähiten hyötyä tuota* ‘yeah they are probably the least use- the least useful uhm’. The father’s response partly affiliates with Iiro’s statement in lines 15-17, but still indicates some kind of uncertainty, or even neutrality towards the topic. This is observable in the usage of *ehkä* ‘maybe’ (line 19). It is interesting to notice, that even though the father has not taken part in Aaro’s and Iiro’s discussion about the usefulness of the elbow pads, the neutrality of his response may suggest that he has been listening to the boys. This is because in the beginning of the transcript, Aaro and Iiro are disagreeing about the usefulness of elbow pads, Iiro is claiming that elbow pads are not very useful, whereas Aaro is saying that they are. The indication of an uncertainty in the father’s speech might imply that even though he has been engaged with the activities of driving and handling the phone, he has heard that his sons are disagreeing about something and he does not want to side with either one of the boys.

When replying to Iiro in lines 19-21, the father keeps switching his gaze between the activities of using his phone and driving the car. In line 19, when the father starts talking to Iiro, he is gazing at the road. However, soon he lowers his gaze and gazes at the phone again, dialling the phone whilst still talking to Iiro. At this point, it appears that the father is carrying out multiple embedded activities simultaneously: driving the car, talking to Iiro, and using the phone. This appears to be challenging; this is observable at the end of line 19, when the father is trying to say *vähiten hyötyä*, ‘the least useful’, but the last word gets cut off, and he just says *vähiten hyö*, ‘the least use-‘. At this point, the father also raises his gaze off the phone and looks at the road. This is followed by a half a second pause in line 20 where the father is just driving and gazing at the road (see Figure 9). In line 21, the father continues his utterance by saying *vähiten hyötyä tuota*, ‘the least useful uhm’. This could be seen as an attempt of repair and as a clarification of what he was meaning to say (see e.g., Fox et al., 2012). In line 21, the father gazes at the phone again, but raises his gaze and looks at the road when he says *tuota*, ‘uhm’. According to Etelämäki & Jaakola (2009, p. 203), the Finnish particle ‘tota’ (similar with ‘tuota’) is used for expressing the openness of an ongoing action. *Tota* can also indicate some kind of uncertainty (see e.g., Penttilä, 1963), or imply that the person is trying to think what to say (see e.g., Lappalainen, 2004). In this context, the use of the word ‘tuota’ might imply that the father wants to remain neutral towards Iiro’s earlier statement. On the other hand, it might also implicate that the father is uncertain what to say next since he is in a situation where he is trying to carry out three activities simultaneously.
In Excerpt 4, the car driver attempts to progress three intersecting activities simultaneously, which appears to be challenging. This can mostly be seen in the orientation of the driver’s gaze, as well as in the delayed response and the fragmented speech (see e.g., Keisanen et al., 2014; Mondada, 2014a), which requires repair later in the sequence. Based on the excerpt, it appears that the father has hierarchized the multiple activities and organised them as ‘main and side involvements’ (see e.g., Goffman, 1963), or as primary and secondary activities. Driving seems to be the father’s primary activity, since the progression of the activity is constant: even though the father keeps switching his gaze between the road and the phone, he is still constantly pressing the throttle and controlling the vehicle. The secondary activities are talking to Iiro and handling the phone. These activities are embedded to the activity of driving the car, and their progression is clearly affected by the multiactivity situation. (See e.g., Mondada, 2014a.) However, as Mondada (2014a, p. 46) argues, it is not necessarily possible or even reasonable to assign main and side involvements, since the hierarchy of the activities can change rapidly. In Excerpt 4, it could be argued whether the activity of driving the car is even a main involvement, since even though the father does not completely suspend the activity, he keeps switching his gaze and focus away from the activity of driving in order to progress the other activities.

In Excerpt 4, it seems like the father is trying to coordinate and find a balance between the secondary activities, but despite the challenges, he manages to progress these activities fairly equally. However, the simultaneous progression of these three activities seems challenging because they deploy the same multimodal resources; e.g., driving the car and using the phone require the resource of gaze. Additionally, all of the three activities require the father’s attention. Based on this excerpt, it appears that more activities there are to be progressed simultaneously, more challenging it seems to be for an individual.

This section has presented three examples of different multiactivity situations where participants accept the activities of talk initiated by attention-drawing devices and thus progress multiple activities simultaneously. Despite the differences in the attention-drawing devices and their functions seen in the examples, this section has shown how participants produce responses to them simultaneously with other activities. The examples analysed in this section are representative of the broader collection of examples compiled from the data. The data include several cases where the activities of driving and talking are temporally organised in parallel orders, and the progression of both of the activities is smooth (see also Mondada, 2014a). There are only a few cases in the data that show how activities are progressed simultaneously when participants are faced by attention-drawing devices at homes. This is because in less busy contexts, participants seem to prefer suspending activities rather than
trying to progress multiple activities simultaneously. The data show that if participants progress multiple activities simultaneously at homes, they are doing manual labour, such as folding clothes, while talking to others. Additionally, it is observable in the data that the progression of multiple parallel activities is possible, if the activities employ complementary multimodal resources (see e.g., Mondada, 2014a; Raymond & Lerner, 2014).

All examples presented in this section are situated in cars where the people coordinating multiple activities have driving as one of their primary activities. In all of the examples, participants coordinate multiple activities intra-personally, meaning that they manage their own conduct and assign different multimodal resources for different activities by themselves without necessarily explicating it to others (see Deppermann, 2014). It is also clear that in each excerpt, participants treat attention-drawing devices as initiators of activities (see also Nishizaka, 2014), and as utterances that require a response. The first example, Excerpt 2, shows how the activity of talk is embedded to the activity of driving, which causes a slight delay in the mother’s response. However, soon the activities change from embedded temporal order to parallel order, which is when the activities are progressed simultaneously without any visible problems mainly due to the activities employing complementary resources (see e.g., Mondada, 2014a; Raymond & Lerner, 2014). Excerpt 3 shows how multiple activities can be progressed in parallel, while simultaneously interacting with passengers and the environment. Finally, Excerpt 4 displays a setting where the driver tries to progress three embedded activities simultaneously by switching the multimodal resources between the activities. As Excerpt 4 shows, progressing multiple embedded activities can cause minor perturbations in the progression of the activities, which is visible in delayed responses and fragmented speech (see e.g., Keisanen et al., 2014). The next section discusses how participants respond to attention-drawing devices by suspending the initial activity in order to carry out an activity initiated by an attention-drawing device.

5.2 Suspending the initial activity

This section examines multiactivity situations in which participants respond to attention-drawing devices, or utterances introduced by them, by suspending activities they were carrying out initially in order to engage with an activity initiated by an attention-drawing device. In this thesis, the suspension of the initial activity means that the suspended activity will be resumed later on. The analysis focuses on verbal and nonverbal practices participants use for coordinating and making it visible to others that they are in a multiactivity situation. The analysis show how participants’ involvement in multiple
activities can be visible in their bodily orientation (see e.g., Nishizaka, 2014). Furthermore, the data suggest that participants use different interactional practices, such as negotiation, as means to coordinate and organise multiple intersecting activities. In addition to looking into the different ways of suspension, this section discusses how different activities might be hierarchized in relation to each other (see e.g., Mondada, 2014a). All of the excerpts in this section take place in family homes. The reason for this is that as Table 3 shows (see Section 5), most of the examples where participants suspend the initial activities in order to engage with activities initiated by attention-drawing devices occur in family interaction at homes.

In Excerpt 5, a mother Paula is in a doorway between kitchen and living room, whilst her sons, Markus and Samuel, are playing with toys in the living room. Before the transcript, Paula has asked Markus to open the living room curtains so they could see when their father comes home. Right after this, Paula grabs her phone. At the beginning of the transcript, she is holding the phone whilst gazing at Markus and Samuli. Even though she is looking at the direction of the boys, it seems that she is not paying attention to what the boys are doing. Soon, Markus tries to get Paula’s attention because he wants to show her something. However, right after Markus’s first attempt of trying to get Paula’s attention, Paula gazes at her phone and does not seem to respond to Markus’s attention-drawing device. Later on, she briefly looks at Markus, after which she gazes at her phone again. In the data, there are several different examples where an initial activity is briefly suspended due to an activity initiated by an attention-drawing device. These kinds of brief suspensions occur especially in interaction between children.

**Excerpt 5. Easter Sunday: Hey mum.**

01 MAR: hei% (.) äiti
   hey   mother
   %...>

02 (0.4)+(0.2)+(0.5)%(2.0)
   pag  +.....+twd phone-->
   mar  ..>%showing a toy-->

03 MAR: äiti (.) äiti
   mother  mother

04 (0.2)*(0.7)+(0.4)+(1.0)*#
   pau   *walks twd the boys*
   pag   -->>+.....+twd Markus-->

   #fig10

05 PAU: okei
   okay

06 **(0.3)+
   pau *turns sideways-->>
   mar   -=,,>>,>
   pag   -->>+twd phone-->>

**Figure 10.** Paula gazes at Markus (line 4).
At the beginning of the excerpt, Markus initiates an attention-drawing device *hei äiti* ‘hey mother’ (line 1) as an attempt to get Paula’s attention. However, Markus does not get the response that he is expecting. This is observable in line 2, where there is a 3.1-second pause after Markus’s utterance, during which Paula is gazing at her phone. Soon Markus relaunches the attention-drawing device by saying *äiti äiti* ‘mother mother’ (line 3). This is followed by a 0.2-second pause, after which Paula begins to walk towards the living room, still keeping her gaze at the phone. 0.9 seconds after the end of Markus’s attention-drawing device, Paula raises her gaze and looks at Markus, who is showing his toy to her. Even though Paula has not reacted to the attention-drawing device immediately, she seems to treat it as an utterance that requires a response. Whilst gazing at Markus, Paula’s upper torso sustains the orientation of using the phone. This way the orientation of her body shows that she has suspended the activity of using the phone because it was interrupted by the attention-drawing device (see e.g., Nishizaka, 2014; see Figure 10). Paula responds to Markus by saying *okei* ‘okay’ (line 5), and immediately after this, in line 6, she turns her body sideways and gazes at the phone again. In other words, Paula resumes the activity of using the phone after suspending it because of responding to Markus’s attention-drawing device.

The excerpt above shows how an activity can be temporally suspended so that another activity can be carried out instead. In Excerpt 5, Paula treats the activities of using the phone and looking at Markus’s toy as mutually exclusive, which means that the activities need to be organised temporally and sequentially in succession. In this case, the activity of using the phone is momentarily suspended. The two activities can be seen as mutually exclusive since they both require the same multimodal resources, such as Paula’s gaze in this example. (See e.g., Keisanen et al., 2014; Mondada, 2014a.) In the example, Paula makes the suspension noticeable with the orientation of her body. When she raises her gaze in order to respond to Markus’s attention-drawing devices, her upper torso remains in the position where it was when she was using her phone. This way the position of her upper body shows that even though she has suspended the activity for now, she is still going to resume the activity of using the phone (see e.g., Nishizaka, 2014; Pasquandrea, 2014; Raymond & Lerner, 2014; MacMartin & LeBaron, 2006). This phenomenon of keeping the body oriented towards the suspended activity can also be seen in few other examples in the collection of examples complied from the data. Based on the data, it appears that if an intersecting activity involves using the upper body but does not require the participant to move far away from the position where the initial action occurs, the upper body may remain sustained to the initial activity during a suspension.

In the next excerpt, a participant is using negotiation as a means to manage multiple activities, after which he suspends the initial activity by walking to another room. Prior to the transcript, a father has
been folding laundry with her daughter Ilona in the kitchen, during which his son Julius has visited the toilet. Ilona and the father are chatting whilst folding clothes when Julius asks the father to come to the toilet with him. The father is trying to negotiate if Julius could use another toilet instead, but since Julius disagrees with him, he suspends the activity of cloth folding and goes to the toilet with Julius. After the transcript, the father walks back to the kitchen and resumes the activity of cloth folding with Ilona.

Excerpt 6. Family Data: Come here quickly!

((Dad and Ilona are folding clothes. Dad is gazing downwards at the clothes on the drying rack.))

01 ILO: tämä on minun paita.
    this is my shirt
02 DAD: äitän paita, ]
    mother’s shirt
03 JUL: [(minä meen)] meen [(miksi)] tänne
    I will go go (why) here
04 ILO: [minun ]
    mine
05 DAD: *siellä on sinun, *anna *mulle.
    there is yours give to me
*.................*grabs a shirt*,,,>
06 JUL: (tuu* isä ) tänne (. ) tule.
    come here dad come
dad ,,,>*folding the shirt-->
07 (1.4)#
    #fig11
08 JUL: #tule ↑heti (. ) tule ÄK[KIÄ TÄNNE ]
    come immediately come QUICKLY HERE
09 DAD: [voikko sää-] (. ) voikko sää
    can you-
10 käyä täällä pissalla täällä ves°sassa+
    can you pee here in the toilet here
    -->
11 JUL: *TÄÄLLÄ %(. ) *mä *dotan kuule (TÄÄLätä) hou@sut (.) pois.
    HERE hear I will take FROM HERE pants off
dad *.............*puts shirt aside*
12 DAD: *Ilona viepää *tuo Juliuksen *kor%riin,*
    Ilona take that to Julius’s basket
    *.............*gives Ilo clothes*,,,,,,*
    jul -->%knocking fridge door-->
13 JUL:ﷺ:.maä käyn nyt% *siellä pis%alla.
    I will go pee there now
dad *grabs clths-----*folding clothes-->
    #fig12
    jul -->%turns twd toilet%
14 ihan @oi+kees*ti.
    for real
    dag伴有,,,,,,,,,,,>
    -->*
15 (.)
16 JUL: *+mulla ei tu:*le *+sit*:ten noin# @kun mää-
   it won’t come then like when I-
dad *pushes toy aside*,,,*
dag >+twd drying rack--twd Jul-->> #fig13
dad ,,>@walks to toilet-->>
17 *+mulla ei ole yhtään housuja. (.) nii.
   I don’t have any pants yeah
dad *touches Julius’s head, guides him to toilet-->>
   jul %walks to toilet-->>

Figure 11. The father after the first attention-
   drawing device (line 7).

Figure 12. Julius is trying to convince the father
   to come to the toilet with him (line 13).

In lines 1-5, Ilona is chatting with the father whilst they are folding laundry. The father has oriented
his body towards the drying rack and the activity of cloth folding. Julius is in the toilet, which is in
another room, where the father cannot see him. In line 6, Julius produces the first attention-drawing
device, the directive *+tul* isä tänne tule ‘come here dad come’. As seen in Section 3.1.2, directives can
be seen as practices used for drawing people’s attention (Ochs at al, 1979). Thus, Julius’s attention-
drawing device has two different interactional functions in the setting: in addition to drawing the
father’s attention, the device functions as a directive, which requires compliance. Additionally, with
his utterance, Julius selects the father to be the target of the directive, meaning that he wants the father
to comply with the directive and go to the toilet with him. At this point, the father does not respond
to the attention-drawing device in any way, instead he continues folding laundry. In line 7, there is a
1.4-second pause, which indicates that either the father did not hear Julius or that he is ignoring him
(see Figure 11). Because the father does not comply with Julius’s directive, Julius repeats the
attention-drawing device, the directive *tule heti tule ÄKKIÄ TÄNNE ‘come immediately come
QUICKLY HERE’ (line 8). This time he emphasises the urgency of his case by using words such as
“immediately” and “quickly”, as well as by raising his voice.
At the end of line 8 and the beginning of line 9, there is an overlap in Julius’s and the father’s speech; this time the father responds to Julius’s attention-drawing device quickly. At this point, the father is probably projecting the suspension of the activity of cloth folding (see e.g., Ticca, 2014), since as an attempt of negotiation, the father asks and suggests that Julius could use the other toilet: *voikko sää käyä täällä pissalla täällä vessassa* ‘can you pee here in the toilet here’ (lines 9-10). At this point, the father briefly progresses the activities of talk and cloth folding simultaneously, which is possible since the activities require different multimodal and verbal resources (see e.g., Raymond & Lerner, 2014). It also interesting to note, that the father responds to the directive formulated attention-drawing device with an attempt of negotiation, since according to Goodwin (2006), directives often initiate sequences through recipient responses, which may include e.g., compliance rejection or negotiation of the request. However, Julius declines the father’s suggestion by stating *TÄÄLLÄ* ‘HERE’ (line 11). Julius also raises his voice and walks towards the father at the same time. At this point Julius can possibly see that the father is involved in a multiactivity situation, because of the father’s bodily orientation towards the activity of cloth folding, even though the father does not explicate this verbally. Furthermore, Julius tries to stress that he needs to use this specific toilet, and that it is important that the father comes to the toilet with him. Nevertheless, the father does not gaze at Julius, but continues folding the laundry.

In line 12, the father gives Ilona some clothes and asks her to take them to Julius’s laundry basket. The father is still oriented towards the activity of cloth folding, and he does not seem to be taking Julius to toilet yet. At the end of line 12, Julius begins to knock the fridge door. This is followed by Julius’s statement *mää käyn nyt siellä pissalla* ‘I will go pee there now’ (line 13), during which the father is gazing towards the clothes (see Figure 12). Gaze can be seen to indicate readiness for interaction (see e.g., Goffman, 1963; Schegloff, 1995), and since the father is not gazing at Julius, it can be seen to imply the opposite: the father is not ready to move on to the next activity just yet. This is when Julius turns his body towards the direction of the toilet, physically showing that he is going to the toilet. In line 14, Julius states that he is serious about going to the toilet, and this is when the father, who is still not gazing at Julius, finally complies with Julius’s directive, suspends the activity of cloth folding and begins to move towards the toilet as well. Even though the father is already moving towards the toilet in line 14, it is interesting that in lines 16-17, Julius is still trying to justify to the father why he needs he needs to go to the toilet (see Figure 13).
In Excerpt 6, the father organises two exclusive activities (cloth folding and helping Julius) sequentially and temporally in succession by suspending the activity of cloth folding. The two activities are seen as exclusive since they cannot be completed simultaneously. The reason for this is that the activities require similar multimodal resources, as well as the father’s physical movement to another room. (See e.g., Mondada, 2014a.) Since the activities are exclusive, the father hierarchizes and prioritises the activities based on their urgency (see also Keisanen et al., 2014; Mondada, 2014a). The excerpt shows how the father uses the practice of negotiation for determining the urgencies of the different activities, and therefore for organising the multiactivity situation. With negotiation, the father attempts to find out which activity needs to be prioritised over others, and whether the activity requiring his attention could be organised differently. In this case, he suggests that Julius could use another toilet instead of the one Julius was planning to use. However, Julius declines the father’s suggestion, which means that eventually the father has to comply and suspend the activity of cloth folding. In this case, the father prioritised Julius’s need to go to the toilet over his initial activity of folding laundry. This can also be seen in Excerpt 7, which takes place a minute after Excerpt 6.

In Excerpt 7, the father has returned from the toilet and resumed the activity of cloth folding. He is talking to Ilona, when Julius again tries to obtain his attention. The father does not immediately respond to Julius calling him. Instead, he again asks and evaluates how urgently he needs to go and help Julius. After agreeing that Julius needs his help, the father tells Julius to go to the toilet to wait for him.
Excerpt 7. Family Data: well, go to the toilet to wait for me.

((Dad is folding clothes and gazing downwards at the clothes. Julius is in the toilet.))

01 ILO: *jonkun (.) *täm- [nämä minun ]*
someone’s this these my
dad *..........*puts shirt aside------*
02 JUL: [tule pyyhkimäään]
come to wipe
03 ILO: *sukat *kato
socks look
dad *.......*folding a shirt-->
04 JUL: TULE pyy[hki ]mään.
COME to wipe
05 ILO: [kat-]
lo-
06 (0.5)
07 ILO: kato nämä on :minun
look these are mine
08 (0.3)+(0.2)
dag +,...>
09 JUL: %+PYY+HI+
WIPE
%walks to dad-->
dag +%jul+,,,+clothes--> #fig14
10 DAD: +millä +asialla sää% kä*vit?
which business did you do?
dag +......+jul-->
  jul -->%turns around-->
dad *...
11 % (0.5)*+(0.3)+@(1.0)@ (0.9)
  jul %walks twd toilet----------%stops-->
dad -->*puts the shirt aside*
dag -->+,,,+,+clothes-->
dad @.....@folding a shirt-->
12 JUL: kakal.
poo
13 DAD: aijaa, no mene sinne pöntölle oottamaan ni mää tuun.
alright, well just go to the toilet to wait and I will come
14 % (0.5)
  jul %walks to toilet-->
15 JUL: en uskalla.
I’m not brave enough
16 DAD: *mee*
go
  *...*puts the shirt aside-->
  (0.2)*(1.8)
  dad -->*
17 ILO: *nä[mä]
these
dad *...>
18 JUL: [TU]LE:*
COME
19 JUL: *folding a shirt-->
dad -->*folding a shirt-->
20 ILO: nuo
those
21 JUL: TULE jo
COME already

Figure 14. The father gazes at Julius (line 9).

Figure 15. The father finishes folding the shirt before helping Julius (line 24).
22 ILO: tämä on minun
this is mine
23 (1.4)
24 DAD: joo, hetkisen,#
yeah, one moment
    #fig15
25 (1.8)
26 ILO: (*äitin housut*) *niin
mother’s trousers yeah
    dad -->*....>
27 (0.5)*(0.8)*@(0.5)#(3.5)+(1.0)
dad ..>*grabs clothes*
@walking to the toilet--->
    #fig16
dag -->+direction of the toilet--->

Figure 16. The father has suspended the activity of cloth folding and is walking towards the toilet (line 27).

Similar to Excerpt 6, in Excerpt 7 the father organises the exclusive activities of folding laundry and helping Julius sequentially and temporally in succession by suspending the activity of cloth folding. He does this by evaluating the importance of the activities and by hierarchizing them (see e.g., Mondada, 2014a). At the beginning of the transcript, Ilona talks to the father about her socks. At the same time, in line 2, Julius, who is currently in the toilet, calls for the father to come and help him. It is not clear whether the father hears Julius, since Ilona is talking to him at the same time. Julius does not get any response from the father, so he raises his voice and calls for the father again with a directive: *TULE pyyhkimään*, ‘COME to wipe’ (line 4). These directives function as attention-drawing devices, since they are directed towards the father (he is the only adult home at the moment), and because Julius is evidently using the directives for drawing the father’s attention (see Section 3.1.2; Ochs et al., 1979). Despite Julius’s efforts, the father continues the activity of cloth folding while gazing towards the drying rack. In line 9, Julius raises his voice again and shouts *PYYHI* ‘WIPE’, this time walking towards the kitchen at the same time. This is when the father quickly gazes at Julius (see Figure 17), but again he soon lowers his gaze towards the drying rack. After this, the
father asks what Julius did in the toilet. The father’s question functions as a first pair part of an adjacency pair, requiring a response (see e.g., Schegloff & Sacks, 1973). The father can probably project that he needs to suspend the activity of cloth folding, therefore he is trying to evaluate how urgently he needs to go and help Julius in the toilet. This knowledge is important so that the father knows whether he needs to suspend his current activity or not. At this point, the father is also gazing at Julius, expecting to get a response from him.

The father’s question is followed by a 2.7-second long pause in line 11, during which Julius begins to walk towards the toilet. In line 12, Julius provides a second pair part of the adjacency pair sequence by answering to the father that he had a poo. Julius’s answer gives the father the knowledge he needs in order to evaluate whether or not the suspension of his current activity is necessary. He responds to Julius by stating aiğaa, no mene sinne pöntöle oottamaan ni måä tuun ‘alright, well just to go the toilet to wait and I will come’ (line 13). This suggests that he needs to bring the current activity to a point when it is sensible to suspend the activity of cloth folding and go help Julius. This way he also confirms that he has agreed on helping Julius soon. In line 14, there is a half a second long silence, during which Julius walks to the toilet. At this point Julius knows that the father will come and help him soon. He has heard the father’s utterance in line 13 because he responds to it by saying en uskalla ‘I’m not brave enough’ (line 15). Keeping his gaze and body oriented towards the drying rack, the father tells Julius to go to the toilet to wait for him (line 16). This is followed by a 2.0-second long silence, during which the father continues folding laundry.

In lines 19 and 21, Julius again tries to get the father’s attention with the directives TULE ‘COME’ (line 19), and TULE jo ‘COME already’ (line 21). This implies that even though Julius knows that the father is coming, he is not coming quickly enough; instead, he should come and help Julius immediately. At the same time, in lines 20 and 22, Ilona is trying to talk to the father, but the father does not acknowledge this. In line 23, there is a 1.4-second silence, after which the father replies to Julius by stating joo, hetkinnen ‘yeah, one moment’ (line 24). With this, he again confirms to Julius that he will come and help him, but at the same time, he postpones the activity of helping him until he is able to suspend the activity of cloth folding. The father’s utterance also suggests that he is in a multiactivity situation, as well as introduces the sequentiality and temporalities of different activities (see e.g., Mondada, 2014a), since something else needs to be carried out before he can help Julius. Eventually, in line 27, the father suspends the activity of cloth folding and walks to the toilet. Later, he resumes the activity of cloth folding again.

In Excerpt 7, Julius tries to get the father’s attention, because he wants the father to help him in the toilet. In the example, the father uses acquisition of information about the intersecting activity as a
device for organising the multiple activities: he wants to know how urgently Julius needs help, so that he can decide whether he needs to suspend his current activity or not. He uses this knowledge as a tool for coordinating and prioritising the intersecting activities. In this case, he prioritises the activity of helping Julius over cloth folding, thus suspending the activity of folding clothes. However, he does not suspend the activity of cloth folding immediately; even after deciding that he is going to help Julius, the father continues folding the clothes until he reaches a point where he can suspend the activity and resume it later. It could be questioned whether the father suspends the activity of cloth folding, or whether he organises the activities successively. Nevertheless, after helping Julius, the father resumes the activity of folding laundry. Thus, it can be said that the father suspends the activity of cloth folding in order to help Julius. Additionally, it could also be claimed that the father progresses the activities of talk and folding laundry in parallel in lines 10-16, since he folds laundry and talks to Julius simultaneously with no visible problems.

This section has provided three excerpts where participants have suspended the initial activities in order to engage with activities initiated by attention-drawing devices. The first example, Excerpt 5, shows how the suspension of an activity can be visible in participants’ bodily orientation when participants’ body posture remains oriented towards the initial activity while engaging with a new, intersecting activity. Excerpt 6 displays how participants can use negotiation as a tool for coordinating multiple activities, as well as for deciding whether suspending an activity is necessary. The last example, Excerpt 7, presents a situation where the father asks questions regarding the activity initiated by the attention-drawing device in order to decide which activity should be prioritised and which ones can be suspended. These examples show how activities can be suspended in different ways, and they represent the variation within the data well. Based on the excerpts, as well as the rest of the examples compiled from the data, the practice of suspending an activity differs from the phases of suspension introduced e.g., by Keisanen at al. (2014) and Licoppe & Tuncer (2014). In most examples, as a response to an attention-drawing device, participants suspend their initial activities without uttering that they are in a multiactivity situation. Some of the only exceptions to this were Excerpts 6 and 7, where the father does not necessarily explicate that he is in a multiactivity situation, but rather inquires more information about the intersecting activities before suspending the initial activity. Later on, in all of the examples presented here, participants resume the initial activities that were interrupted by attention-drawing devices.

In the excerpts shown in this section, all participants coordinate the intersecting activities intrapersonally (see Deppermann, 2014), even though all of the multiactivity situations have arisen in interaction with other people. However, the data show that in some cases, participants may also
coordinate multiple activities interpersonally, for example by negotiating, whether some of the activities could be altered or abandoned. When looking at the examples presented here, it is important to take into account the context and the fact that the attention-drawing devices, as well as the coordination of multiple activities, occur in interaction between parents and their fairly young children. The way participants choose to coordinate multiple activities may be because as parents, they are expected to act in a certain manner, e.g., help their children when they need help. The social context of being a parent most likely also affects the prioritisation of multiple activities. The next section shows how participants respond to attention-drawing devices by organising multiple activities successively, by completing the initial activity before engaging with an activity introduced by an attention-drawing device.

5.3 Organising activities in succession

This section focuses on multiactivity situations where participants respond to attention-drawing devices by organising multiple intersecting activities successively, i.e. putting an activity introduced by an attention-drawing device on “hold” until they have carried out the initial activity. Organising activities temporally and sequentially in succession is similar with the practice of suspending an activity momentarily. However, the main difference between these two practices is that, as mentioned in Section 5.2, suspending an activity requires the resumption of the same activity later on. Nevertheless, when multiple activities are organised in succession, the initial activity needs to be carried out and completed before an activity introduced by an attention-drawing device can be engaged with. For example, if a parent is making coffee when a child tries to obtain their attention, the parent will finish the activity of making coffee before moving on to the activity initiated by the child’s attention-drawing device. Since the initial activity will be finished completely, there is no need to resume the same activity later on. Thus, the activity is neither suspended nor abandoned, but organised temporally and sequentially in succession. The analysis in this section focuses on interactional practices that participants use for accounting that they are in a multiactivity situation, as well as for coordinating multiple activities in interaction. Additionally, the examples presented in this section suggest that organising activities in succession can function as a way of showing and socialising children for how to behave and act in situations where multiple courses of action occur simultaneously.
Prior to Excerpt 8, children Julius and Ilona have been sitting at a table, colouring printed pictures. Julius has finished colouring the pictures on the table and he seems restless. At the beginning of Excerpt 8, Ilona is at the table colouring images and Ville is standing on the floor next to the father. The father is sitting at the table, gazing at Ville. Julius is standing near the kitchen counter, holding some colouring pictures. Julius wants to get the father’s attention, since he wants the father to print him more colouring pictures. At the same time, the father realises that the floor is dirty and starts to look for a brush and a dustpan. While the father is getting ready to brush the floor, Julius continuously tries to get the father’s attention. However, the father states that the floor needs to be brushed first.

**Excerpt 8.** Family Data: can we print more?

01 JUL: ♩missä ♩on. Δ+
where is

dag +....+searches dustpan with gaze-->

vil Δ...>

02 (0.5)

03 JUL: khh# *;tulos-
can we...

#fig17

jul %walking around kitchen-->
dad *...>

04 (0.3)

05 JUL: °tetaan+ko.°
...print

dag -->+...>

06 * (0.5) + (0.5)
dad *stands up-->
dag -->+Ville-->

07 VIL: ehe

08 (.)

09 JUL: Δ*+;tu+lostetaanko ;lissää.
can we print more

vil Δcrawling under the table-->
dad *walks off the camera-->
dag -->+...+dustpan-->

10 (0.7) + (0.3)+
dag -->+......+searching brush with gaze-->

11 VIL: *ehe*
dad *grabs the dustpan, off camera*

12 (1.2)

13 DAD: *Julius mihin oot vieny Δmeiän,
Julius where have you taken our

vil -->Δsits on the floor-->

14 (.)

15 DAD: sen +harjan.
that brush

dag -->+the brush-->

16 (0.3)

17 DAD: %tuossa.
there

jul %following dad-->
Figure 17. The father is searching the dustpan with his gaze (line 3).
In the first line, Julius is looking for more colouring pictures, and this is when he asks *missä on* ‘where is’. His question can be seen to function as an attention-drawing device (see e.g., Ochs et al., 1979). The reason for this is that the question is uttered with a higher pitch, and it can seen to be directed towards the father, since there is an asymmetry in the epistemic domain between Julius and the father: father is most likely expected to know where the colouring pictures are (see e.g., Labov & Fanshel, 1977; Heritage & Roth, 1995). At the same time with Julius’s question, the father begins to search for the dustpan with his gaze. This is when the activity of brushing the floor begins. Half a second later, the father starts to get up, and this is when Julius asks whether they could go and print more pictures, *tulostetaanko* ‘can we print’ (lines 3-5; see Figure 17). The question functions as a first pair part of an adjacency pair. However, the father does not respond to Julius’s question. Instead, he seems to be oriented towards the activity of finding a brush. This is observable in the second-long pause in line 6. Thus, Julius repeats the attention-drawing device, the question *tulostetaanko lissää* ‘can we print more’. In line 9, the father walks off the camera into another room. In lines 13-15, he returns to the kitchen and asks Julius where the brush is, disregarding Julius’s initial question.

Figure 18. The father grabs the brush while Julius is following him (line 19).

Figure 19. The father starts to brush the floor, Julius is still following him (line 21).

In lines 15-17, the father notices the brush and starts walking towards it. At the same time, Julius is following the father, probably expecting to get an answer to his question about printing more pictures. However, in line 18, there is a 0.8-second pause, after which Julius repeats his question, which also functions as an attention-drawing device: *tulostetaanko* ‘can we print’ (first pair part of an adjacency pair; line 19; see Figure 18). This is when the father grabs the brush and walks towards the table, getting ready to brush the floor. In line 20, there is a 1.6-second-long pause, after which the father provides the second pair part of the adjacency pair by answering *käyään kohta tulostaan* ‘we will go and print soon’ (line 21; see Figure 19). With the temporal word *kohta* ‘oon’ he explicates that the activity of printing more pictures is temporally postponed and organised to happen later. Julius picks up this temporality, this is observable when he asks *milloin* ‘when’ (line 23; first pair part of an
In line 24, the father accounts that he is in a multiactivity situation by saying *otetaan nämä pois ennen ku Ville syö ne* ‘let us take these away before Ville eats them’ (second pair part of an adjacency pair); the father is essentially telling that this activity needs to be carried out before the other one. He explicates that there are two activities, which are sequentially and temporally organised in succession. This answer, which gives a temporal context for when the father is able to help Julius, seems to be sufficient since Julius does not try to obtain the father’s attention anymore. Instead, in lines 25-30, he walks around the kitchen, singing on his own. After the father has brushed the floor, he states *sinne meni Villen herkkupalat* ‘there go Ville’s delicacies’ (line 31). With this statement, he expresses that he has finished the activity of brushing the floor. The transcript is followed by a silence, during which Julius keeps walking around the kitchen and singing. Approximately a minute after the transcript has ended, the father walks to another room where he possibly prints more colouring pictures for Julius.

In Excerpt 8, Julius tries to draw the father’s attention since he wants the father to print more colouring pictures for him. However, the father needs to brush the floor first, so that Ville, who is crawling on the floor, does not have a chance to eat dirt off the floor. The father treats the activities of brushing the floor and printing more images for Julius as mutually exclusive. This is because the different activities need to be carried out in different rooms: the activity of brushing the floor takes place in the kitchen, whereas the printer is in another room. Therefore, it is not possible for the activities to be carried out simultaneously, which is why the father organises the activities temporally and sequentially in succession (see e.g., Mondada, 2014a). He makes this interactionally apparent with his physical orientation, as well as with explicating verbally that he is in a multiactivity situation where certain activities need to be carried out before others. The father accounts why the floor needs to be brushed first: *ennen ku Ville syö ne* ‘before Ville eats them’ (line 24). Additionally, he uses temporal concepts such as *kohta* ‘soon’ (line 21) and *ennen* ‘before’ (line 24) for clarifying the temporalities of the different activities. This also shows that the father has hierarchized the two different activities; printing colouring pages is not as urgent as making sure that Ville does not eat dirt off the floor.

In the next example, Excerpt 9, a mother is driving a car, whilst her two children Noel and Lucy and a family friend Emily are sitting in the car. In the example, Emily is talking to the mother when Noel tries to get the mother’s attention by saying *mummy* (line 2). The mother does not respond to Noel’s attention-drawing device immediately, but rather lets Emily finish what she has wanted to say. When Emily has finished talking, the mother gives the permission for Noel to speak. At the beginning of the transcript, the mother is gazing at the road, holding the steering wheel.
Excerpt 9a. Habitable Cars: I really want top trumps from the shop. DRV= the mother; BSR= Noel; BSL= Emily; FSL= Lucy.

01 DRV: ( )
02 BSR: MUMMY:::# [I- I JUST-]
   #fig20
03 BSR: [ ( )] first of all, Lucy or Kate had left it.
04 DRV: al[right.]
05 BSR: [then, ] [ um] then was the other one (> <)
06 BSL: [mmm::]
07 BSL: that’s a different *thing .hh* *then they do *it together.
   drv
   "..........*ind. on
   *.............*scratching face-->
08 DRV: alright, #[right Noel] what did you want to say lo[ve ( ).]
   #fig21
09 BSR: mu[mmy:::]:
10 want top trumps +*fr+om+ the* +shop
   drg
   -->*radio+
   drv
   -->*..........*radio volume down-->
   +,,,,+road-->
11 DRV: par[don?]
12 FSL: [tha ]t’s *what*
   drv
   -->*,,,*

Figure 20. The mother is gazing at the road when Noel produces the attention-drawing device (line 2). Figure 21. The mother gives Noel a permission to talk (line 8).

At the beginning of the transcript, the mother is driving and talking with Emily. In line 2, Noel produces an attention-drawing device, calling for his mother by saying mummy. In this example, Noel’s tries to obtain the mother’s attention with the attention-drawing device, but additionally, it appears that he uses it as a practice for getting a turn in the conversation. Noel’s utterance in line 2 is partially overlapped with Emily’s speech in line 3. The mother does not respond to Noel’s attention-drawing device immediately. Rather, she orients towards listening to Emily. It could be that she decides to ignore Noel’s attention-drawing device because talking to Noel and Emily separately would deploy the same verbal resources, thus making the activities mutually exclusive (see also
Mondada, 2014). In lines 3-7, Emily is telling a story of an event to the mother, during which the mother establishes that she is listening to her by saying *alright* in line 4. This also implies that she is carrying out two parallel activities simultaneously: driving the car and talking to Emily. It is notable that in line 6, Noel utters *mmmm*, which may indicate that he wants to say something and cannot wait for his turn. After Emily has finished talking, the mother replies to Emily by saying *alright* (line 8). The word ‘alright’ can be used for disengaging from the previous topic and for introducing a new topic (see e.g., Drew & Holt, 1998). Consequently, in this context, the mother’s utterance may indicate that the activity of talking with Emily is about to end and it is time to move on to the next activity.

At the end of line 8, the mother asks *right Noel what did you want to say love ( )* . She directs the utterance to Noel by identifying his name so that it is clear that now is his turn to speak. This way the mother makes the temporal and sequential succession of the two activities explicit. In lines 8-9, there is also an overlap between the mother’s utterance and Noel’s second attention-drawing device *mummy* (line 9). It is observable that since Noel’s utterance overlaps with the mother’s turn, Noel realises even before the mother has finished her utterance that now it is appropriate for him to speak. From line 9 onwards, Noel is talking to the mother, and at this point, the mother is progressing the activities of driving and talking to Noel in parallel. The second part of the example, Excerpt 9b, occurs less than a minute after the first part of the excerpt, and shows how Noel is again trying to get the mother’s attention. In between the excerpts, the mother, together with Lucy, explains to Emily what the card game ‘top trumps’ is.

**Excerpt 9b.** Habitable Cars: Just wait a minute. DRV= the mother; BSR= Noel; BSL= Emily; FSL= Lucy.

```plaintext
13 BSR: +(-[-])
   drg +road-->  
14 FSL: [um] *uh, a bigger *number* than *you
   *.............*indicator*,*,*holding wheel-->  
15 BSR: mum[my::,]  
16 DRV: [shhh.]  
17 BSL: a:h, 
18 FSL: on their cards, then  
19 BSL: oh *yeah, *+I’ve +I’ve *[played that~]
   drg --r.-------+radio+,,,,,,,,,,*road-->>
   drv *.............*radio volume down-->  
20 BSR: [mummy:::*::]
   drv -->',,,>  
21 DRV: shhh,# *yes it [(will)]
   #fig22
   ',,*holding wheel-->  
22 BSL: [I’ve  ] [played,]
23 NOE: [(   )]
```
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At the beginning of Excerpt 9b, Lucy is explaining to Emily the rules of the card game 'top trumps'. In line 15, Noel tries to obtain the mother’s attention by initiating an attention-drawing device mummy. At the same time overlapping with the attention-drawing device, the mother responds to Noel by hushing shhh (line 16). The mother hushing Noel implies that Noel needs to keep quiet; it is not his turn to talk yet. In lines 17-19, Lucy and Emily continue discussing the card game, until the end of Emily’s utterance in line 19 overlaps with Noel’s second attempt of trying to draw the mother’s attention: mummy (line 20). The mother is again hushing Noel in line 21 (see Figure 22), and at the same time she is getting ready to turn at a junction. Soon, she says to Noel: just wait a minute, wait 'til Emily is finished then you can speak (lines 24-26). This way the mother explicates that Noel needs to temporally suspend the activity of talking until Emily has finished talking first (see also Keisanen et al., 2014). With this statement, the mother makes it noticeable that the turns at talk and the different activities of talk need to be organised successively. In her utterance, the mother uses several different temporal concepts: wait a minute, wait 'til Emily is finished and then (line 24). All of these suggest that Noel cannot talk simultaneously with the girls, but rather he needs to temporally reorganise and postpone his speech. At the same time, the mother also accounts why Noel needs to wait, and why the activities need to be organised differently; so that Emily can finish talking first. However, Emily finishes her turn when the mother starts speaking in line 24, thus Noel joins the discussion about the rules of the game in line 28. Even though it can be argued, whether the mother is carrying out multiple simultaneous activities in Excerpt 9b (she is getting ready to turn at the junction whilst listening to the girls), her statement in line 24 implies that multiple activities are happening simultaneously within the setting, and that the activities need to be organised in succession. Additionally, it again seems that the mother is trying to teach Noel that it is not polite to talk over other people.
Figure 22. The mother is hushing Noel (line 21).

Excerpt 9a presents a situation in which the mother is in a multiactivity situation where she organises three intersecting courses of activities in succession, so that one of the activities needs to be finished before the activity introduced by the attention-drawing device can occur. The activity of driving a car is constant, but in addition, the mother is taking part in the activities of talking with Emily and Noel. In the example, the mother treats the activities of talking to Emily and Noel as mutually exclusive, since both activities require the same verbal resources. It is not physically possible for the mother to talk about two different topics to two different people at the same time. Thus, the mother explicates verbally that these activities need to be organised in succession. She uses a few different temporal terms for specifying that the activities need to be temporally organised successively in turns and that they cannot happen simultaneously. One of the findings of Section 5.2 was that participants tend to prioritise different activities in multiactivity settings. In contrast to Excerpts 7 and 8, in Excerpt 9 the mother does not hierarchize the intersecting activities based on their urgency, or due to the children’s needs. Instead, she chooses to organise the activities in succession because of social norms: talking over other people is often considered impolite. Additionally, the mother is the only adult in the situation, and it could be seen that she has the responsibility to socialise the children and teach them common courtesy in the given cultural context.

The following example, Excerpt 10, shows how participants can also organise intersecting activities in succession without explicating it verbally. In Excerpt 10, a father and his two sons have been to a sports shop, and they have just got back to their car. At the beginning of the excerpt, the father is adjusting and turning on a camera on the dashboard. At the same time, Aaro tries to get the father’s attention, since he wants to know whether the father is going to buy him an electric guitar. For a while, the father disregards Aaro’s attempts to get his attention, since the activities of turning on the camera and getting ready for leaving are given priority. After these activities have been carried out, the father replies to Aaro’s questions about the electric guitar.
Excerpt 10a. Talk&Drive: Will you buy me the guitar for sure? DRV= the father; BSL= Iiro; BSR= Aaro.

01 BSR: *isi:*, onko se varmata että sää ostat mulle sen kitaran? daddy:, is it certain that you will buy me that guitar?
  drv *turning on the dashboard camera-->
02 (4.2)
03 BSR: onko? is it?
04 (5.2)
05 BSR: isi onko se kovin varmata että sää ostat mulle sähkö*kitaran? daddy is it very certain that you will buy me that electric guitar?
  drv -->*sits back-->
06 (0.8)\*+(0.8)*+(0.4)+(0.2)+*@(1.2)
  drv -->*.....*puts keys in ignition*
  drg +ignition---+.....+in front-->
  drv @pulls trousers up-->
07 DRV: +no, (. eh-# well, eh-
    drg +left, down-->
    #fig23
08 (0.4)
09 BSL: hei mää koitan [näitä <yksiä:> .hh kit-] hey I will trese these ones
10 DRV: [kyllä se nyt on @silleen +(.+) +*no kokeile] well now it is so that go ahead and try them
    drg -->@
    drv -->+....+back seat-->
    *torques right-->
11 onko #sulla turvavyö kiinni? do you have the seat belt fastened? #fig24
12 BSL: +on. yes
    drg +....>
13 DRV: +hy*vä, good
    drg +in front--->
    drv *,,,>

Figure 23. The father produces a brief response to Aaro’s attention-drawing device no eh ‘well eh’ while he is orienting towards the activity of leaving (line 7).
The transcript begins with Aaro producing an attention-drawing device *isi* ‘daddy’ (line 1), which is followed by a question *onko se varmaa että sää ostat mulle sen kitaran* ‘is it certain that you will buy me the guitar’ (line 1). Similar to Excerpt 2, Aaro’s utterance can be seen as an attention-drawing device, which contains two different parts: naming the father and asking him a question, both of which are practices used for drawing people’s attention (see Section 3.1.2; Ochs et al., 1979). It is observable that in addition to drawing the father’s attention, Aaro’s attention-drawing device serves other functions as well: he asks a question and specifies that the question is targeted towards the father. Furthermore, Aaro’s utterance can be seen as a first pair part of an adjacency pair, which means that the father is expected to provide the second pair part of the adjacency pair by giving an answer to Aaro’s question (see e.g., Schegloff & Sacks, 1973). Thus, in addition to drawing the father’s attention, Aaro orients to a response from the father. However, in line 2 there is a 4.2-second long pause, during which the father is adjusting and turning on the dashboard camera. Aaro is waiting for the father to answer to his question and it seems that the pause is too long, since he relaunches the question *onko* ‘is it’ (line 3). Aaro’s question is followed by a 5.2-second long pause. This again appears to be too long, since Aaro produces the third attention-drawing device *isi onko se kovin varmaa että sää ostat mulle sähkökitaran* ‘dad is it very certain that you will buy me that electric guitar’ (line 5; first pair part of an adjacency pair). At this point, the father has turned on the dashboard camera, he sits back and is visibly oriented towards the activity of getting ready to leave.

The father does not respond to Aaro’s attention-drawing device immediately; this is observable in the 3.4-second pause in line 6. However, in line 7, the father utters *no, eh* ‘well, uhm’, which is not an answer to Aaro’s question but rather an implication that he has heard the question, even though at the same time he orients towards the activity of getting ready to leave (see Figure 23). The father's utterance is followed by a 0.4-second long pause, which is interrupted in line 9 when Iiro declares that he is going to try on the new elbow pads that they have just bought from the sports shop. Iiro’s utterance is overlapped with the father saying *kyllä se nyt on silleen (.) no kokeile* ‘well now it is so that (.) go ahead and try them’ (line 10). The first part of this, *kyllä se nyt on silleen* ‘well now it is so that’ (line 10), seems to function as an answer to Aaro’s earlier question. However, the father soon changes the topic of the discussion since the end of his utterance, *no kokeile* ‘go ahead and try them’ (line 10), is clearly directed towards Iiro. At the same time, the father torques his upper body to the right and gazes towards the back seat (see Figure 24). In line 11, the father again changes the topic, this time by asking whether the boys have fastened their seat belts. It is obvious that he has oriented towards the activity of leaving; at this point, the other activities seem to be exclusive with this activity. Additionally, the father might also try to avoid answering Aaro’s question about the guitar since he
does not want to give a promise about buying the guitar straight away. However, soon Iiro confirms that they have their seat belts fastened (line 12), after which the father notes hyvä ‘good’ (line 13). This is followed by a long silence, during which the father starts the car and drives off the parking spot. Excerpt 10b occurs roughly 30 seconds after Excerpt 10a. During the time between the excerpts, the father is driving the car and gazing at the road.

Figure 24. The father torques his upper body and looks at his sons (line 10).

Excerpt 10b. Talk&Drive: Well I guess it will be an electric guitar.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>BSR: isi:, onko se sähkökitara se minkä sää mulle ostat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>dad, is it the electric guitar that you will buy for me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>DRV: no eiköhän# se oo sähkökitara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>well I guess it will be an electric guitar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#fig25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 25. The father replies to Aaro’s question whilst gazing at the road (line 16).

In line 14, Iiro relaunches his fourth attempt at trying to get the father’s attention: isi, onko se sähkökitara se minkä sää mulle ostat ‘dad, is it the electric guitar that you will buy for me’ (first pair part of an adjacency pair). This is followed by a 1.4-second pause, after which the father responds to Iiro by providing the second pair part of the adjacency pair and confirming no eiköhän se oo
sähkökitara ‘well I guess it will be an electric guitar’ (line 16; see Figure 25). After the transcript, the father and Aaro continue talking about which guitar they should buy for him.

In Excerpt 10, the father organises the disconnected and exclusive activities temporally and sequentially in succession without explicating it verbally. Instead, the prioritisation of the intersecting activities can possibly seen in his bodily orientation. At the beginning of the transcript, the father is coordinates the activities of turning on the dashboard camera and answering to Aaro. The temporal organisation of the activities suggests that the father treats them as exclusive, even though they do not necessarily employ similar multimodal resources, although both activities require the father’s attention. After the father has turned the dashboard camera on, he orients towards another activity: getting everything ready to leave. At this point, he attempts to carry out two activities simultaneously: talking to Aaro and getting ready for leaving. However, it becomes evident that these two activities are exclusive, since the father soon suspends the activity of talking to Aaro because he needs to ask the boys whether their seatbelts are fastened. In the excerpt, it occurs that the father has prioritised the activities of turning on the camera and getting ready to leave over the activity of answering to Aaro’s question. In the excerpt, it appears that the father organised the activities temporally and sequentially intra-personally (see e.g., Deppermann, 2014) without explicating it to others. On the other hand, the example is similar with the phenomenon that will be discussed in the next section: ignoring an attention-drawing device. However, the father shows in line 7 that he has acknowledged Aaro’s question, thus he is not completely ignoring the attention-drawing devices, but rather wanting to carry out the other, more urgent activities first. Furthermore, compared to the other excerpts presented in this section, it is exceptional that the father does not verbally explicate that he has organised the activities sequentially in succession. Instead, his orientation towards the chosen activities can be seen in the orientation of his body.

This section has shown how organising activities in succession differs from the practice of suspending an activity, and how there are different ways of organising the activities successively. In all of the examples, participants consider intersecting activities mutually exclusive, meaning that they cannot be carried out simultaneously. Thus, the participants organise the multiple intersecting activities temporally and sequentially in succession so that the initial activities are carried out and finished first, and that the activities initiated by the attention-drawing devices need to be postponed or put in “queue”. The first example, Excerpt 8, shows how multiple activities are organised in succession mainly because the activity of brushing the floor is prioritised over the activity of printing more colouring pages. In Excerpt 9, the mother organises two intersecting activities of talk in succession as a means to socialise her child and teach him that it is not polite to talk over other people. In the last
example, Excerpt 10, the father postpones the activity of answering to his son’s question because he prioritises the activities of turning on the camera and getting ready to leave over answering the question. All of these excerpts show how participants tend to hierarchize activities that are mutually exclusive. The prioritisation of the activities appears to be based on either the urgency of the activities, or socialising and teaching children what is e.g., socially acceptable behaviour in a multiactivity situation in the given cultural context. Examples of socialising the children are e.g., teaching that it is not polite to talk over other people, or that you need to wait for your own turn. The other examples compiled from the data also support the idea that multiple activities are prioritised either based on their urgency, or because they are used as tools for socialising children.

Another interesting notion is that in the data, participants tend to explicate the temporally successive organisation of activities to the other people within the setting. In addition to the excerpts above, the rest of the data show how participants use phrases such as ootteleppa vähän ‘wait for a while’, or saat ihan kohta ‘you will get it in a minute’. In contrast, when suspending activities and resuming them later, participants do not seem to verbally explicate that the activities need to be temporally reorganised. Instead, in situations where participants finish the initial activities before engaging with new activities, they seem to emphasise the temporal organisation and postponing of activities. It could be that the parents’ explication of the temporal orders of activities is also another way of socialising children and teaching how to act in multiactivity situations.

Sections 5.1-5.3 have examined how participants temporally and sequentially organise multiple activities when an attention-drawing device is used for initiating a new activity in a multiactivity situation. The next section studies how occasionally attention-drawing devices can be ignored as a means to coordinate multiple activities.

5.4 Ignoring the attention-drawing device

This section examines how ignoring an attention-drawing device functions as a tool for coordinating a multiactivity situation. This thesis suggests that attention-drawing devices have certain functions, and they are expected to be responded in a certain way. First, in this study, attention-drawing devices are seen as social actions that can be used for initiating new activities (see similarly Nishizaka, 2014). This is because it could be claimed that people do not want to draw others’ attention merely for the sake of having their attention, but rather because attention is needed for carrying out different social actions and activities (see also Drew, 2004). Second, as mentioned in Section 2.3, attention-drawing
devices can be seen to function as first pair parts of adjacency pairs, since they can be seen to require a response. This means that an attention-drawing device, or the first pair part of an adjacency pair, creates the context and expectations for the second pair part (see e.g., Heritage, 2005; Schegloff & Sacks, 1973). Social participants expect and require that attention-drawing devices are followed by certain kinds of responses. This is because people are held morally accountable for their responses (see Heritage, 2005), or for the lack of them, and because the absence of the expected second pair parts of adjacency pairs can imply different social actions of their own (Mortensen & Wagner, 2012). Additionally, it is important to remember that having joint attention between participants is an important part of interaction (see e.g., Ervin-Tripp, 1979). Thus, the phenomenon of ignoring attention-drawing devices should not be disregarded, since it reveals how talk-in-interaction is based on sequentiality and the idea of “nextness” (see Schegloff, 2007).

This section only presents one example, Excerpt 11, since the selected excerpt can be seen to represent the rest of the data on the studied phenomenon, as well as to give an insight into how the ignorance of attention-drawing devices can be used for coordinating multiple simultaneous activities. Prior to Excerpt 11, a father has turned down the volume of a radio. This has annoyed Julius, since he wants to be the one turning down the volume. In the video data, it appears that Julius wants the father to turn up the volume, so that he can turn it down again. Before the beginning of the transcript, Julius has spent roughly five minutes moaning and insisting that he wants to turn down the volume. At the beginning of the transcript, the father responds to one of Julius’s previous attention-drawing devices, by stating that he does not want to go and adjust the volume of the radio with Julius; instead, he starts making coffee. After this, the father ignores Julius’s attempts at getting his attention. At the end of the excerpt, the father finally replies to Julius.

At the beginning of the excerpt, the father is standing near the stove and reaching for something in a kitchen cupboard while gazing at the direction of the cupboard. Julius and Ilona are also standing near the stove, right next to the father. Ville is sitting on a highchair behind the others.
Excerpt 11. Family Data: I don’t want to.

01 DAD: en halua.*
I don’t want to.
  *opens a cupboard-->
02 (1.2)%(0.2)*(0.2)
  jul %grabs the hem of dad’s shirt-->
dad -->*takes a pot from the cupboard-->
03 JUL: %HALU+AT**
you do want
  dag +the pot-->
  -->*
04 (0.2)½(1.0)½(1.0)½(0.2)+
  ilo ↓drops her handbag↓
        ↓picks up the handbag↓
dag -->+the counter-->
05 JUL: *halu%at%
you do want!
  dad *opens the pot, sprinkles it on smthg-->
  jul %pulls the hem up and down%
06 (0.5)
07 ILO: (- ) [(-)]
08 JUL: [%H]luat.<#%*
you do want.
  %pulls the hem up and down%
      #fig25
09 (0.3)*(0.7)+;(0.3)*(0.6)*(2.3)+(0.2)%
  dad *.................*puts the pot in the cupboard*,*,>,
  jul %pulls the hem up%
dag -->+the cupboard-------Julius-->
10 DAD: *emmää-* Julius mää en%*+ jak[sa *nyt]* te elä viitti.
I don’t- Julius I ca[n’t no]w don’t be bothered.
  *closes the cupboard----------------*,*,*,*
      #fig26
  jul -->%
  dag -->+the stove-->>
11 JUL: [%haluat.°]
you do want.
12 (0.6)
13 JUL: Jåksat.
you can.
14 DAD: %elä viitti.+
don’t be bothered.
  jul %hits a cup against a drawer-->
dag -->+Ilona-->
As mentioned earlier, prior to the transcript Julius has been moaning at the father, trying to get him to go and adjust the volume of the radio with him. In line 1, the father responds to the earlier complaints. This is followed by a 1.6-second long pause, during which the father grabs a pot from the kitchen cupboard. At this point the father is gazing at the cupboard, and it seems that he has oriented towards the activity of making coffee. Simultaneously, it appears that Julius has realised he does not have the father’s attention anymore, thus he grabs the hem of his shirt (line 2) and initiates an attention-drawing device *HALUAT* ‘you do want’ while tugging the father’s shirt (line 3). Julius’s utterance functions as an attention-drawing device, since it utilises both verbal and nonverbal means that are clearly used for getting the father’s attention: he raises his voice and tugs the father’s shirt. Both of these interactional means can be seen as practices for obtaining attention (see Section 3.1.2; Ochs et al., 1979), which is why Julius’s utterance can be seen as an attention-drawing device. The father ignores Julius’s attention-drawing device, which can be seen in the 2.4-second pause in line 4. In the meanwhile, the father gazes at the pot he has just grabbed, after which he torques his body towards the kitchen counter. With this body torque, the father’s upper body faces towards the kitchen counter, positioning Julius partly behind his back. It is observable that the father uses the body torque for showing Julius that he has oriented towards the activity of making coffee. Additionally, when showing Julius his back, the father seems to be signalling that he is not available for interaction. Since Julius does not get the response he is expecting, he relaunches the attention-drawing device by tugging the father’s shirt and insisting *HALuat* ‘you do want’ (line 5). Again, the father disregards Julius’s attempts at obtaining his attention; instead, he continues making coffee whilst facing towards the kitchen counter. It seems that Julius is getting impatient, because soon he tugs the father’s shirt and persists *HALuat* ‘you do want’ (line 8). When Julius tugs the hem of the father’s shirt, the father keeps his gaze and upper body oriented towards the kitchen counter (see Figure 25). However, in
lines 9-10, the father puts the pot back to the cupboard, again showing Julius that he is ignoring the attention-drawing devices, and that instead he has orientated towards the activity of making coffee.

In the end of the 3.5-second pause in line 9, the father gazes at Julius and gives him the attention he wants. In line 10, the father responds to Julius by saying *emmää- Julius mää en jaksanyt elä viitti* ‘I don’t- Julius I can’t now be bothered’ (see Figure 26). At the end of his utterance, the father gazes at the stove and again it seems that with the act of turning his gaze away, the father tries to show Julius that he does not want to comply with Julius’s request: he does not want to go and turn up the volume of the radio. During the father’s utterance, there is an overlap with Julius insisting *haluat* ‘you do want’ (line 11). This is followed by a 0.6-second long pause in line 12, after which Julius again persists *Jaksat* ‘you can’ (line 13). To this, the father replies immediately *elä viitti* ‘don’t be bothered’ (line 14). At the end of the transcript, the father shifts his gaze from the stove to Ilona, and after the transcript, the father starts talking to her. He asks Ilona to go to the living room; he is possibly trying to reduce the amount of distractions within the multiactivity situation, so that he can solely concentrate on the activity of making coffee. On the other hand, the father might use the activity of making coffee as an excuse so that he does not have to comply with Julius’s request concerning the volume of the radio.

Excerpt 11 shows how ignoring an attention-drawing device and thus ignoring an activity introduced by the attention-drawing device can be used as a practice for coordinating multiple simultaneous activities. In the example, the father orientates towards the activity of making coffee while ignoring Julius’s attempts at getting his attention. It appears that by ignoring Julius’s attention-drawing devices, the father makes sure that he does not end up in a situation where he has to carry out multiple activities simultaneously or suspend his initial activity of making coffee. As mentioned earlier in this thesis, attention-drawing devices can be seen as social actions, which are often used for initiating activities and sequences. Thus, the practice of ignoring an attention-drawing device can be seen as a tool for managing multiple activities, since by ignoring attention-drawing devices, participants can avoid engaging with the emerging activities. This is how participants can avoid the temporal or sequential organisation of multiple intersecting activities. In the future, it would be interesting to conduct further research on whether ignoring an activity, or an attention-drawing device, could also be used as a way of socialising children in multiactivity situations.

Since the father eventually gives up and answers to Julius, it can be questioned whether the father truly ignores Julius’s attempts at obtaining his attention. However, since interaction and the organisation of talk-in-interaction are based on the idea of “nextness” between different turns (see Section 2.3), responses of social participants are important for the understanding of turns and social
actions (see e.g., Schegloff, 1996; 2007). In Excerpt 11, it is clear that Julius treats the lack of the father’s responses as if he is being ignored, which leads to the repetition of the attention-drawing device. Since it appears that Julius feels the father is ignoring him, the father’s lack of response will be considered as ignoring in this study.

Section 5 has examined the temporal and sequential organisation of multiple activities in situations where participants are faced by an attention-drawing device. This section has provided an overview of the phenomenon, even though it also leaves room for further research on the same topic. Furthermore, the following section concludes this thesis and discusses the findings and their implications further.
Multiactivity refers to the different ways in which multiple activities are coordinated through talk and embodied action (Haddington et al., 2014, p. 3). On the other hand, attention-drawing devices are verbal or nonverbal devices used for obtaining other’s attention (e.g., Hatch et al., 1979; Ochs et al., 1979). The definition of attention-drawing devices is broad, since several different interactional practices such as calling for someone’s name or tugging the hem or their shirt can be seen as practices used for drawing attention. In this study, attention-drawing devices are seen as social actions that can initiate sequences and activities. The reason for this is that attention-drawing devices are used for obtaining participants’ attention in situations where they need to respond to the attention-drawing devices in a certain way, e.g., by answering to a question. Since talking with another person is seen as an activity, it could be claimed that attention-drawing devices aim at initiating activities. This master’s thesis has focused on participants’ responses to attention-drawing devices in multiactivity situations. The analysis of this thesis has shown that participants sequentially and temporally organise activities in four different ways when faced by an attention-drawing device. These different practices are: 1) progressing multiple activities simultaneously, 2) suspending the initial activity in order to engage with an activity introduced by the attention-drawing device, 3) organising simultaneous activities in succession, 4) ignoring the attention-drawing device and continuing to carry out the initial activity instead. The research questions guiding the research process were:

1) What kinds of responses are there to attention-drawing devices in multiactivity situations within family interaction?

2) What kinds of interactional practices do participants carry out in order to coordinate and manage multiple activities when someone is seeking their attention?

3) How do participants display and/or communicate their involvement in multiple activities to the ones seeking their attention?

The data show that if an attention-drawing device is produced in a situation where participants are engaged with activities that cannot be suspended, they attempt to progress two or more parallel or embedded activities simultaneously (see also Mondada, 2014a). As Excerpts 2-4 show, driving a car is often seen as an activity that requires participant’s constant attention, and as an activity that cannot be abandoned or suspended when a driver is faced by an attention-drawing device. Therefore, participants adapt to the situation and try to progress multiple activities simultaneously. This is most likely a matter of safety and convenience, since it is not always safe or sensible to suspend an activity
of driving in order to engage with another activity, such as talking to passengers. The simultaneous progression of multiple activities is occasionally smooth and easy. For example, as Excerpt 2 shows, participants may progress the activities of driving a car and talking to someone in parallel with no visible challenges. However, the progression of multiple activities is not always effortless. As Excerpt 4 shows, progressing multiple intersecting activities can be challenging, which can be seen in fragmented speech and delays in responses (see also Keisanen et al., 2014; Mondada, 2014a).

If an attention-drawing device occurs in a situation where participants feel that they cannot progress multiple activities simultaneously, they may temporarily suspend the activity they were carrying out initially in order to engage with an activity initiated by the attention-drawing device. After participants have carried out the activity introduced by the attention-drawing device, they resume the initial activity. It is observable that participants often suspend the initial activities in situations where they prioritise the activity introduced by the attention-drawing device more than the initial activity. Participants seem to prioritise activities that are related to safety or needs of young children that need to be carried out immediately (see Excerpts 6 & 7). The data show that participants may use different interactional practices for finding out how important or urgent activities initiated by an attention-drawing devices are as a means for assessing the priorities of the intersecting activities. Examples of such practices seen in the data are social actions of asking questions and negotiating whether the intersecting activities could be carried out differently (see Excerpts 6 & 7).

If participants prioritise the initial activity over the activity introduced by an attention-drawing device, they organise the intersecting activities in succession. When organising activities temporally and sequentially in succession, participants carry out the initial activity before they engage with the activity introduced by an attention-drawing device. The data show that in contrast to suspending activities, when organising activities in succession participants often verbally explicate why the activities need to be organised in a certain order. When participants carry out the initial activities before engaging with the activities initiated by attention-drawing devices, they almost invariably verbalise the temporal and sequential organisation of multiple activities to people who are trying to obtain the participants’ attention. The data show that participants use phrases such as just wait a minute (Excerpt 9) or käyään kohta tulostaan ‘we will go and print soon’ (Excerpt 8). Additionally, participants may account to their co-participants why activities need to be carried out in a certain order, by saying wait ‘til Emily is finished (Excerpt 9) or otetaan nämä pois ennen ku Ville syö ne ‘let us take these away before Ville eats them’ (Excerpt 8). These clarifications suggest that participants feel socially accountable if they do not immediately engage with activities initiated by other people’s attention-drawing devices.
The data also show that in multiactivity situations, participants may intentionally ignore the attention-drawing devices initiated by their co-participants. Excerpt 11 shows that ignoring of an attention-drawing device is observable in participants’ physical orientation, as well as in the lack of a verbal response. Participants may e.g., keep quiet and torque their upper body away from the people who are trying to obtain their attention in order to signal their unwillingness to engage with the activity introduced by an attention-drawing device. The analysis presents that ignoring attention-drawing devices in multiactivity situations can be due to at least two different reasons. First, participants use the ignoring of attention-drawing devices as a means to coordinate multiple intersecting activities and to make sure that they do not get involved with multiple simultaneous activities. Second, participants may ignore attention-drawing devices simply because they are not willing to comply with the activities that co-participants are trying to initiate with attention-drawing devices. This way, participants may use a multiactivity situation as an excuse for not wanting to engage with an emerging activity (see Excerpt 11). However, the research data show that there might be cultural differences in the ways people ignore attention-drawing devices in multiactivity situations. As Table 3 shows, most of the examples where participants ignore attention-drawing devices occur in the Finnish speaking data. This suggests that participants coming from Finnish cultural backgrounds ignore attention-drawing devices more often than participants who have been raised in the UK. This is an interesting finding and something that could be studied further. However, this could also be due to the fact that most of the research data were collected in Finland (see Section 4.2). Thus, it is not reasonable to speculate, whether there are cultural differences between these practices or not.

The data show that the way participants respond to attention-drawing devices may depend on verbal and multimodal resources that the intersecting activities deploy. In situations where multiple activities do not call upon the same verbal or multimodal resources, the simultaneous progression of multiple activities seems to be visibly unproblematic (see also Mondada, 2014a; Excerpt 2). If the activities employ the same verbal or multimodal resources and the situation does not allow neither one of the activities to be suspended, participants keep switching the resources between the intersecting activities (see Mondada, 2014a; Excerpt 4). On the other hand, if suspension of an activity is possible, participants prefer to suspend or organise multiple activities in succession rather than carry them out simultaneously (see Excerpts 5-10).

In order to answer the research questions and to sum this section, the analysis and the data have shown that participants organise multiple activities temporally and sequentially in different ways when faced by an attention-drawing device in family interaction. These different practices are: 1) progressing multiple activities simultaneously, 2) suspending the initial activity in order to engage with an activity
introduced by the attention-drawing device, 3) organising simultaneous activities in succession, 4) ignoring the attention-drawing device and continuing to carry out the initial activity instead (see Section 5). Participants may carry out different interactional practices for organising multiple activities. They may e.g., use temporal phrases such as *just wait a minute* (Excerpt 9) for explaining when activities are going to occur, or account why activities need to be carried out in a certain order (see Excerpts 8 & 9). Additionally, participants may display their involvement in multiple activities in their bodily orientation (see Excerpts 5 & 11) or by stating it verbally (Excerpt 8).

The findings of this study suggest that parents may use the coordination and organisation of multiactivity situations as a means to socialise and raise their children. This is observable in the parents’ responses, when they e.g., tell the children that they are supposed to wait for their turn, or not to talk over other people. Additionally, the way parents hierarchize multiple activities can function as a tool for teaching children which activities are prioritised over others and why. The practices parents use when faced by an attention-drawing device in multiactivity situations are not always conscious or purposefully designed to serve as a means to socialise children. However, children still acknowledge them, thus these practices have the ability to affect children’s views on morality and interaction. Additionally, based on the social constructionist worldview, people construct their knowledge about the world consciously and unconsciously through interaction. Thus, it is important to research how parents organise multiple activities, as well as how they respond to attention-drawing devices in interaction with their children.

This study has given an insight into how parents coordinate and organise their conduct in multiactivity situations, and how they explicate and make it visible in interaction with their children. Since this study only concentrates on parent-child interaction, the different social and moral expectations of parenthood most likely affect the way parents organise their conduct. This can e.g., be seen in the way parents prioritise the intersecting activities, as well as in the ways parents choose to ignore attention-drawing devices. In interaction between adults, responses to attention-drawing devices possibly differ from the findings of this study. When it comes to the trustworthiness of this study, it can be said that the appropriate research methodology and research data were used for conducting the research. No other kind of data or methodology would have provided such good tools for analysing the temporal and sequential organisation of multiactivity situations, as well as taken into the context the relationship of the participants and the family setting. The research data and methods applied also allowed the researcher to examine the studied phenomena in detail, which assisted in answering to the research questions accordingly. However, participants and the studied contexts are always unique, and if this study was repeated with different participants in different contexts, the findings of the
research might differ. Thus, this thesis does not aim to give generalisations of the studied phenomena, but rather to provide an insight into the ways of how parents tend to organise multiple activities when children try to obtain their attention in the studied contexts and cultural backgrounds.

Even though there is no earlier research studying attention-drawing devices in multiactivity situations, this study has shown that the concepts of multiactivity and attention-drawing are linked together. Thus, it could be claimed that there is a need for further research on attention drawing in multiactivity situations, as well as on the practices that parents use when managing multiple activities in interaction. In the future, it would be interesting to conduct further research on how the parents’ organisation of multiple activities can serve as a means to socialise children how to act in multiactivity situations. In addition to studying the organisation of multiple activities at homes, it would be intriguing to include data from institutional settings, such as schools and day-care centres. It would be interesting to see, whether the professionals of education use the organisation of multiactivity situations as a means to raise children, and whether they organise their conduct differently from parents since they are used to looking after several children at the same time. Furthermore, it would be intriguing to study whether there are any major cultural differences in the ways parents respond to attention-drawing devices or in the ways they organise multiple activities. These are questions that will hopefully be answered by future research, since they are important for the purposes of studying multiactivity, as well as for studying the socialising processes of children.
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Appendices

Appendix 1: Transcription conventions

1. Transcription of speech (Jefferson, 2004; see also Haddington et al., 2013).

[ ] A left square bracket on two successive lines indicates the beginning of overlapping talk by two or more speakers.

] A right square bracket on two successive lines indicates the end of overlapping talk by two or more speakers.

= Equal signs indicate no pause between the utterances.

( ) A dot in parentheses indicates a pause, which is shorter than 0.2 seconds.

(0.5) Numbers in parentheses indicate the length of a silence in seconds and tenths of seconds.

. A dot indicates a falling or final indication.

, A comma indicates slightly rising or continuous intonation.

? A question mark indicates rising intonation.

::: Colons indicate the stretch of the immediately prior sound. More colons, the longer the stretching.

- A hyphen indicates a cut-off of a word.

HI Capital letters indicate a loud voice.

hi Underlining indicates that the underlined part is stressed or emphasized.

"hi" Degree signs around an utterance indicate that the quality of speech is softer or more quiet than the surrounding talk.

↑ The upward arrow indicates rise in pitch.

↓ The downward arrow indicates fall in pitch.

>hi< Right/left carats indicate that the utterance between them is faster than the surrounding talk.

<hi> Left/right carats indicate that the utterance between them is slower than the surrounding talk.

hhh A row of ‘h’s indicates an outbreath. More letters, the longer outbreath.

.hh A dot-prefixed row of ‘h’s indicates an inbreath. More letters, the longer inbreath.
ha ha Indicates laughter. Laughter can be referred to in different ways.

(hi) A word inside parentheses indicates transcriber’s uncertainty of the transcribed talk.

( ) Empty parentheses indicate that the transcriber was unable to hear what was said.

(( )) Double parentheses indicate the transcriber’s comment or descriptions.

2. Transcription of embodiment (Mondada, 2014b)

* * Gestures and descriptions of embodied actions are delimited between two identical symbols (one symbol per participant)

Δ Δ and are synchronised with correspondent stretches of talk.

*---> The action described continues across subsequent lines

-->* until the same symbol is reached.

>> The action described begins before the excerpt’s beginning.

-->> The action described continues until the excerpt’s end.

.... Action’s preparation.

---- Action’s apex is reached and maintained.

,,,, Action’s retraction.

ric Participant doing the embodied action is identified when they are not the speaker.

fig The exact moment at which a screen shot has been taken

# is indicated with a specific sign showing its position within turn at talk.

3. Other abbreviations used in the transcriptions

twd towards

sw steering wheel

env environment