CrossMark

Language in Society **47**, 409–434.
doi:10.1017/S0047404518000362

Resolving knowledge discrepancies in informing sequences

LUCAS M. SEUREN[a], MIKE HUISKES[a] AND TOM KOOLE[b]

[a]*University of Groningen, The Netherlands*
[b]*University of Groningen, The Netherlands & University of the Witwatersrand, South Africa*

ABSTRACT

This article investigates a specific practice that recipients in Dutch talk-in-interaction use when responding to turns that have as one of their main jobs to inform. By responding to an informing turn with an *oh*-prefaced nonrepeating response that has yes/no-type interrogative word order, recipients treat that turn as counter to expectation and request both confirmation of the inference formulated in his/her response, as well as reconciliatory information for the two discrepant states of affairs. This practice is compared to similar cases where the nonrepeating response is not *oh*-prefaced to show that such turns implement different actions. Data are in Dutch with English translations. (Counterexpectations, change-of-state, yes/no-type interrogatives, action formation, practions)*

RECEIPTING INFORMATION

When dealing with actions that are done to inform, such as news, reports, and answers to questions, recipients have a whole array of verbal responsive practices at their disposal that they can provide upon completion of that informing action, each showing a different orientation to that informing action and varying in agency (Thompson, Fox, & Couper-Kuhlen 2015). The projected response to an informing action is a move that signals that the recipient has been informed, but there is more than one way in which recipients can *do being informed*.

One family of practices that accomplishes this is news receipts (Heritage 1984; Maynard 2003; Couper-Kuhlen 2012). The simplest, least agentive practice recipients have for receipting information is what Heritage (1984) calls a change-of-state token (see also Local 1996; Golato 2010; Koivisto 2015a; Persson 2015; Hilmisdóttir 2016; Kasterpalu & Hennoste 2016; Weidner 2016; Heinemann 2017). With interjections like *oh*, speakers claim that they now know, after which the sequence reaches possible completion (Heritage 1984; Schegloff 2007). A slightly more expanded sequence arises when recipients use minimal clausal responses, which consist of a pronoun and a copula or auxiliary such as *you are* or *did you* (Thompson et al. 2015:90ff) to request reconfirmation. They thereby treat the

© Cambridge University Press, 2018 0047-4045/16 $15.00

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404518000362 Published online by Cambridge University Press

information as news, without encouraging further talk on the topic (Schegloff 1984; Maynard 2003; Couper-Kuhlen 2012).

In contrast with these relatively minimal forms of uptake, recipients have practices to encourage further talk on the news. Many of these practices fall into the family of newsmarks (Jefferson 1981; Heritage 1984; Maynard 2003; Robinson 2009; Couper-Kuhlen 2012). These newsmarks often come in the form of a lexical or phrasal response with rising intonation such as *really*. Speakers use them to suggest that the veracity of the news is not a foregone conclusion, and often to solicit some form of an account (Thompson et al. 2015).

Even more agentive forms of uptake are expanded clausal responses, such as clausal repetitions (Thompson et al. 2015). These can be used to treat the informing turn as counter to expectations or as counterinformings: the recipient claims to have had prior beliefs on the issue addressed by the speaker (Heritage 1984; Robinson 2009; Persson 2015). These practices are strongly expansion-implicative and solicit some form of an account for the discrepancy.

This article is concerned with the fourth and most agentive type of response, what Thompson and colleagues (2015) call *unrelated clausal responses*. With these responses recipients do not deal with the information as put by the speaker, but retrieve information that was embedded or presupposed in prior talk: either the immediately prior informing turn or a larger discourse unit in which that turn is contained. By formulating an inference or understanding[1] of that turn and making relevant confirmation, recipients treat something as news which was not done as news (see also Terasaki 1976; Smith 2013; Steensig & Heinemann 2013).

We argue in this article that when recipients in Dutch talk-in-interaction produce an *oh*-prefaced[2] unrelated clausal response with yes/no-type interrogative word order, they implement what we gloss as a *counterexpectation remark*. This term should not be understood as a category of action, on par with such actions as requests or invitations, but as a specific combination of practices used for a specific interactional purpose, comparable to the action of *confirming allusions* (Schegloff 1996; see also Enfield 2013; Sidnell & Enfield 2014).

By doing a counterexpectation remark, a recipient (i) accepts the terms of the prior, informing turn—the action it implements and the information it conveys; (ii) treats that turn as not in line with a prior, private belief or expectation—one not made public in the interaction; (iii) topicalizes the unexpected inference; (iv) requests confirmation of that inference as well as what Robinson (2009) calls reconciliatory information; and (v) tentatively accepts the formulated inference or understanding.

Counterexpectation remarks, at least as we define them for this article, thus come in a specific sequential position: after an informing turn. They are therefore produced in environments similar to other types of news uptake, such as free-standing *oh*. But as they constitute a more agentive form of uptake, they do not merely receipt information, completing a question-answer-*oh* sequence (Heritage 1984; Schegloff 2007), but also launch a new adjacency pair.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404518000362 Published online by Cambridge University Press

We want to stress here that our claims are not about the speaker's actual, private beliefs; we have no access to the speaker's cognition and as such do not aim to discuss his or her cognitive state. But participants display beliefs through talk, and thus also make claims about what their prior beliefs were through talk, irrespective of whether these claims are true.

To support our argument, the analysis in this paper consists of three steps. We begin by demonstrating that *oh*-prefaced unrelated clausal responses with yes/no-type interrogative word order (YNIs) (Raymond 2003) implement counterexpectation remarks. We first discuss the clearest cases: counterexpectation remarks that are implemented with *oh*-prefaced negative YNIs. As Koshik (2002, 2005; see also Reese 2007) has shown, negative YNIs can be used in environments where prior beliefs of the recipient have been called into question. They are used to imply that the formulated belief or understanding is counter to expectations. While this makes them particularly suitable for implementing counterexpectation remarks, we subsequently show that positive YNIs can also implement counterexpectation remarks. That is not to say that positive and negative YNIs are equivalent practices, but both can be used to treat a prior informing turn as counter to expectation.

In closing we show that when unrelated clausal responses with yes/no-type interrogative word order are not *oh*-prefaced, they implement different actions. By not using *oh*, the recipient does not accept the terms of speaker's informing turn—either the information it provides or the action it implements—nor the inference formulated in the YNI. In fact, any change-of-state token is only produced after the speaker has provided confirmation and, where relevant, an account (see Heritage 1984). These non-*oh*-prefaced YNIs are thus used to convey that the recipient has a problem understanding or accepting the speaker's prior turn.

DATA AND METHOD

The data we use in this article consist of twenty hours of audio recordings of Dutch informal phone and Skype conversations between friends and family, which were recorded by students at Utrecht University in 2011 and 2012. All speakers signed informed consent forms allowing use of the data for research and publication purposes, and the transcripts have been anonymized: all proper names are pseudonyms, except in a few cases where the original name does not help in identifying the participant and was necessary for analytical purposes—for example, we did not change the names of sports teams.

From these data we initially selected all *oh*-prefaced YNIs (n = 38). We subsequently removed the cases where the YNI (i) did not respond to an informing turn,[3] or (ii) implemented topicalization in response to a news announcement (*was het leuk* 'was it fun') (Button & Casey 1985). This resulted in a collection of twenty-seven counterexpectation remarks.

In order to compare these counterexpectation remarks with other YNIs we also collected the first 300 YNIs from the corpus and then selected all YNIs that were

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404518000362 Published online by Cambridge University Press

used to convey that the prior, informing turn was not in line with the speaker's prior beliefs or expectations. This led to a total of twenty-six cases of non-*oh*-prefaced YNIs for comparison.

The data have been analyzed using conversation analysis (Ten Have 2007) and transcribed according to Jeffersonian conventions (Jefferson 2004; see the appendix for an overview). The transcripts consist of three lines: first the original Dutch, then a word-by-word translation into English, and finally a free translation.

COUNTEREXPECTATION REMARKS

Combining practices

Informing turns should be designed to fit the recipient's knowledge state (Sacks, Schegloff, & Jefferson 1974): speakers should not tell recipients what they already know, presuppose information that recipients do not know, or convey information that recipients believe to be false. But discrepancies can arise, and when they do, recipients can deal with them in myriad ways. For example, Heritage (1984:314ff; see also Robinson 2009) showed that recipients can contradict a speaker's statement by doing a counterinforming. More recently Smith (2013) and Steensig & Heinemann (2013) discussed practices with which recipients topicalize a discrepancy between their prior beliefs and the information conveyed by the speaker. Smith (2013) focused on recipients who formulate their prior belief with counterfactual modality (Kärkkäinen 2009) by using turn-initial *I thought*. In contrast, Steensig & Heinemann (2013) focus on recipients who formulate an inference of the prior turn that is discrepant with their prior knowledge, implementing what Steensig & Heinemann call knowledge-discrepancy questions. With both practices, recipients solicit not just confirmation, but also an account.

Counterexpectation remarks are a more fine-grained category of action. They are best analyzed as a specific combination of practices that together implement a specific action, what Enfield (2013:100; see also Sidnell & Enfield 2014) calls a *praction*. The practices used are not produced as distinct actions, but provide the recipients with different cues as to what type of response is being solicited, that is, what action the speaker is doing.

There are three practices, the combination of which we gloss as counterexpectation remarks. The main practice is an unrelated clausal response: the recipient formulates an inference of the speaker's prior, informing turn. By being next-positioned, the understanding comes off as having been gleaned or inferred from the prior turn, even though the speaker had not designed that turn to convey this understanding (see Terasaki 1976; Maynard 2003; Steensig & Heinemann 2013). By doing an unrelated clausal response, the speaker treats this inference as counter to expectation (Steensig & Heinemann 2013; Thompson et al. 2015) and topicalizes it, thereby SHIFTING THE FOCUS OF THE AT-ISSUE TALK: in the subsequent

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404518000362 Published online by Cambridge University Press

turns the participants discuss the inference formulated by the recipient, not the informing turn that was done by the speaker.

The following extract is a case in point. Lisa is going on vacation to Indonesia in six weeks and is telling Amelie in lines 1–2 when she has an appointment to get the necessary vaccinations. Initially, Amelie receipts that telling with *oh* (Heritage 1984), but after a micropause she produces an *oh*-prefaced YNI. In it she formulates her inference that Lisa does not have to get those vaccinations a set number of weeks in advance of her trip. She thus shifts the talk from when Lisa is going on vacation to whether the time she gets the vaccination matters.

(1) VC1 – 02:16.5-02:26.0

1	Lisa:	volgens mij m:aandag over: (0.5) twee of drie we:ken.	
		according.to me Monday in two or three weeks	
		‘I think Monday in: (0.5) two or three wee:ks.’	
2		.H >’kweet het eigenlijk [niet<.]	
		I.know it actually not	
		‘.H >I actually don’t [know<.]’	
3	Amelie:	[o:]::h.	
		[o:]::h.	
4		(.)	
5	→	>oh moet het niet een bepaalde< tijd eh een pa-	
		oh have.to it not a certain time a	
		‘>oh does that not have to ‘be done’ a certain< time eh a fe-’	
6	→	een aantal weken van te voren:,	
		a number weeks of PRT advance	
		‘a number of weeks in advance:,’	
7		(0.4)	
8		of [( )]	
		‘or [( )]’	
9	Lisa:	[o:h] >da’ maakt niet uit<,=je moet het	
		oh that matters not out you have.to it	
		‘[o:h] >that doesn’t matter<,=you simply have to’	
10		gewoon ten minste een maand van te voren doe:n,	
		simply at least a month of PRT advance do	
		‘do it at least a month in adva:nce,’	
11		(0.6)	
12	Amelie:	°o[:h°;] [°oh ja°]	
		oh oh yeah	
		‘°o[:h°;] [°oh yeah°]’	

The second practice is *oh*-prefacing. By *oh*-prefacing the speaker accepts the information conveyed in the prior, informing turn, and thereby also tentatively accepts the subsequently formulated inference (Heritage 1984). It is treated as a candidate understanding that the recipient just now arrived at. In extract (1), Amelie’s *oh* preface conveys that she has tentatively accepted the formulated inference that

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404518000362 Published online by Cambridge University Press

one does not have to get vaccinations a certain number of weeks in advance. She thereby implicitly also accepts the information conveyed by Lisa that she will get her vaccinations in two or three weeks. Without *oh*, her turn would likely be heard as challenging, as raising a potential problem (Steensig & Heinemann 2013; see also CHALLENGES AND REPAIR in this article).

The third practice is the use of the negative YNI, which in this environment treats the formulated understanding as contradicting a prior belief or expectation.[4] In the case of extract (1), Amelie uses the negative YNI to imply that she previously thought that there is a timetable for vaccinations, but that this belief has been called into question. She thereby asks Lisa not just to (dis)confirm, but also to explain why she does not have to get her vaccinations a set number of weeks in advance. Only after Lisa has explained in lines 9–10 that you have to get them at least a month in advance, does Amelie move to sequence closure (Schegloff 2007). Acceptance of the inference is thus tentative until reconciliatory information has been provided.

This is different from yes/no declaratives (Raymond 2010)—which are often called B-event statements (Labov 1970)—that are *oh*-prefaced: with these, recipients do now-understanding and solicit only confirmation (Seuren, Huiskes, & Koole 2016). In other words, by using a negative YNI the recipient accepts the speaker's prior, informative turn, but only tentatively accepts the inference that he or she has gleaned from it and offered up for confirmation. But at the same time, because it is *oh*-prefaced, her negative YNI will not be heard as a challenge, but as a prior expectation that in light of the prior turn has tentatively been abandoned.

Responding with negative interrogatives

In extract (1) above, the speaker uses a negative YNI for implementing the counter-expectation remark. In this section, we discuss additional cases where the counter-expectation remark is implemented with an *oh*-prefaced negative YNI. We begin our analysis by showing a prototypical case in which the recipient of an informing turn treats that turn as offering evidence against a prior belief, and where the speaker subsequently also treats that prior belief as something that could have been expected. In excerpt (2), Ronald is on the phone with Wendy, his girlfriend. He initiates the sequence by formulating his expectation that she will have a class in a moment.

(2) BN3 – 01:55.2-02:07.8
1 Ronald: =ga je nou e:h
go you now
'=are you now going to e:h'
2 >je hebt dadelijk col↑lege<;
you have in.a.moment class
'>you have class in a moment<;'
3 (0.8)

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404518000362 Published online by Cambridge University Press

4	Wendy:	.h ja: om een uur;
		yeah at one o'clock
		'.h yea:h at one o'clock;'
5		ik ga ↑eerst nog even thuis wat dingetjes doen,
		I go first still just home some things do
		'I am ↑first going to do some things at home,'
6		°en dan eh°
		and then
		'°and then eh°'
7		(0.8)
8	Ronald:→	oh ↑ga je niet naar de bieb.
		oh go you not to the library
		'oh ↑are you not going to the library. '
9		(0.4)
10	Wendy:	nee: >nee nee< °van↑daag niet°.
		no no no today not
		'no: >no no< °not today°.'
11		(1.4)
12	Ronald:	↑o:ke.
		okay
		'↑o:kay.'

In line 8 Ronald uses the three practices discussed earlier, implementing a counter-expectation remark. First, Ronald formulates an inference of Wendy's answer: that she will not be going to the library. The evidence that he has been offered for this inference is that Wendy told him that she will do chores at home before going to class. Wendy, at least on the face of it, did not design her turn to convey that she would not be visiting the library any more than she conveys that she will, for example, not be going to a coffee shop. Ronald thus provides an unrelated clausal response to Wendy's informing turn. He thereby treats the inference as based on Wendy's turn and shifts the focus of the at-issue talk from going to class to not going to the library.

Second, Ronald's turn is *oh*-prefaced, with which he treats his inference as just now arrived at. He thereby tentatively accepts that Wendy will not be going to the library, and that instead she will be doing stuff at home and then going to class. In other words, it is only after Wendy has said she will be doing chores that Ronald comes to believe that she will likely not be visiting the library.

Third, by formulating his inference with a negative YNI Ronald implies that he had expected that Wendy would be going to the library. He thereby requests not just confirmation of his inference, but also some form of reconciliatory information for this discrepancy. As Wendy has said that she is going to do chores, she has already accounted for why she won't be visiting the library, but nonetheless she elaborates. She says she is not going *today*, suggesting that her visiting the library is a regular and therefore expectable occurrence. She thus validates Ronald's prior expectation that she could have been going to the library.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404518000362 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Both participants show an orientation to Ronald's *oh*-prefaced YNI as suggesting a prior expectation. Ronald does so by simply asking the question. Whereas declaratives and tag-questions convey a speaker's strong epistemic stance and solicit confirmation of a speaker's expectations (Heritage 2010, 2012; Raymond 2010), negative interrogatives are used to solicit confirmation of the inverse of some belief or expectation of the speaker for which he or she has just been provided counterevidence (Koshik 2002, 2005; Reese 2007). Wendy in her response deals with the expectability of her visiting the library, by stating that she won't visit *today*. That is, her visits are recurrent and therefore expectable.

By combining these practices, a recipient of some informing thus conveys that he or she had a prior belief to which the speaker has provided counterevidence, and that in light of this evidence the recipient no longer holds that belief or at least strongly questions it. That is, the recipient does not challenge the speaker's prior turn, but instead attributes epistemic primacy in the matter formulated to the speaker. We use two examples below to offer further evidence that *oh*-prefaced negative interrogatives both accept the prior turn and treat it as counter to expectation.

First consider excerpt (3). The data is from a conversation between Miep and Bea, who are mother and daughter respectively. Bea has called Miep on a Friday to make arrangements for bringing over groceries on Saturday—it is clear that Miep is an elderly woman, but we do not know her exact age. Bea shows in line 1 that she is launching a new activity with turn-initial *hey*.

(3) CS5 – 01:54.6-02:11.9

1	Bea:	=.HH hey ↓ik wilde morgen even langskomen
		hey I wanted tomorrow just come.by
		'=.HH hey I wanted to come by tomorrow'
2		om Eten te #brengen#.
		to food to bring
		'to #bring# over groceries.'
3		(0.4)
4	Miep:	wanneer?
		when
		'when?'
5		(0.2)
6	Bea:	m:orgen,
		tomorrow
		'tom:orrow,'
7		(0.5)
8	Miep: →	#oh# kom ik ↑niet naar jou toe.
		oh come I not to you to
		'#oh# am I ↑not coming to you.'

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404518000362 Published online by Cambridge University Press

9	Bea:	nee je komt niet naar MIJ,
		no you come not to me
		'no you are not coming to ME,'
10		want z:ondag komt #ans:#.
		because Sunday come Ans
		'because on s:unday #Ans:# will come.'

In lines 1–2 Bea says that she wants to come over the next day to bring some groceries. After a brief repair sequence in which the day is established Miep uses an *oh*-prefaced negative YNI in which she formulates her inference that she will not be visiting Bea. This is subsequently confirmed and accounted for by Bea: Ans, a friend of hers, will be visiting on Sunday. With her account Bea indicates that Miep will not be able to visit her on Sunday as she normally would, since Ans is already visiting. But since Bea still has to bring over groceries, she plans to visit on Saturday instead.

Miep uses the by now familiar three practices. First, she uses an unrelated clausal response, treating her inference as based on Bea's prior turn and shifting the focus of the at-issue talk from Bea's plan to bring over groceries to Miep not going to visit Bea. Miep's inference is of course strongly implied by Bea's plans—if Bea is going to visit Miep, it will likely not be the other way around as well—but Bea did not formulate her plans as such. Second, by *oh*-prefacing this inference, Miep claims that she has just now arrived at it and thus treats Bea's plan to come over as already established, that is, not as something she has to agree to. Third, by using a negative YNI she implies that she previously believed she would be visiting Bea and requests reconciliatory information for why she won't be. Bea aligns with this request by not only giving a type-conforming and preferred *nee* (Raymond 2003), but by also providing an account: she already has someone coming over on Sunday.

An additional interesting point of this excerpt is that Miep in her uptake seems to ascribe a different action to Bea's turn in line 2–3 than what Bea had designed that turn to do. Bea formulates plans that are contingent on Miep's availability. Miep is a co-participant in the proposed plans and it would thus seem that she would have to accept it. Miep, however, formulates the plans in line 8 as having already been established: she has just inferred that she will not be visiting Bea. Miep thereby treats Bea's turn not as a proposal that has to be agreed with, but as simply announcing a change in plans in which she has no say. In fact, after shifting the focus of the talk, she never agrees or disagrees. She treats Bea's turn as an announcement, not a proposal.

Miep thus treats Bea's turn in lines 1–2 as contradicting her prior, private belief that she would be visiting Bea, and by *oh*-prefacing her uptake of that turn, Miep shows that she has tentatively accepted it and thus abandoned her own expectation. Bea also orients to Miep's *oh*-prefaced negative YNI as such: she does not simply confirm, but goes on to give an account for why Miep cannot visit (Steensig & Heinemann 2013; Thompson et al. 2015).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404518000362 Published online by Cambridge University Press

The following case offers further evidence that *oh*-prefaced negative interrogatives are used to claim that the preceding talk was not in line with the speaker's prior, private beliefs. The excerpt is from the start of a phone call where Toos has called her friend Angela. In line 1 Toos responds to Angela's reciprocal *how are you*, and builds on that response in line 2 to shift to a new topic.

(4) LM1 – 00:12.1-00:31.4
1 Toos: <ook #hoo:r# >.
also PRT
'<me #too# >.'
2 ik ↓lag even lekker <op bed te chillen>.
I lay just nice on bed to chill
'I was just lying <in bed and chilling>.'
3 (0.3)
4 Angela: ↓echt?
really
'↓really?'
5 (0.4)
6 → ↓o:h ↑moet je nie[t aan je] scriptie.
oh have.to you not on your thesis
'↓o:h don't you ↑have to "wor[k" on your] thesis.'
7 Toos: [#ja:#]
yeah
'[#yea:h#]'
8 (0.8)
9 .HH ja ik heb hem al >helemaal< af;
yeah I have it already completely finished
'.HH yeah I've already >completely <finished it;'
10 <dus das wel fijn>.
so that's ADV nice
'<so that's kind of nice>.'
11 Angela: ↑ECHT? ↓wo::w.
really wow
'↑REALLY? ↓wo::w.'
12 (.)
13 hUh? [je ↑was er] (echt) net aan begonnen; of niet;
huh you were there really just on started or not
'hUh? [you had] (really) only just started; or not;'

Angela responds to Toos' telling of what she is doing with a newsmark, *echt* 'really' (line 4), treating that telling as more than just informative, and projecting further talk (Jefferson 1981; Heritage 1984; Maynard 2003; Couper-Kuhlen 2012). After a brief gap—Toos' response is eventually produced in overlap—Angela produces a counterexpectation remark, formulating her inference that Toos does not have to work on her thesis. Toos then explains that she has

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404518000362 Published online by Cambridge University Press

already finished it, and so she has no thesis to work on. Although her response has a turn-initial *ja*, this particle thus does not implement confirmation.

Angela's unrelated clausal response is on the more inferential side of the continuum described by Thompson and colleagues (2015). While it may be that Toos said that she was chilling as a means of implying that she had finished her thesis, there is nothing in the data that supports this idea. In fact, when she responds in line 9–10, her assessment of the situation is rather downgraded, certainly compared to how Angela takes it up in line 11. Toos is thus not hinting at good news: she is simply saying that she is relaxing and Angela infers from this that Toos does not have to work on her thesis.

With the unrelated clausal response Angela treats her understanding as inferred from Toos' prior turn and, as it is *oh*-prefaced, it also does what her newsmark did not do: it tentatively accepts Toos' telling. By formulating her inference with a negative YNI she does, however, make clear that she is not just soliciting confirmation of a revised belief, but reconciliatory information for the contradictory states of affairs: her prior belief that Toos has to work on her thesis, which she thinks Toos had only just started working on (line 13), and Toos' announcement that she is relaxing.

So we see in (4), as we did in (1)–(3), that recipients use *oh*-prefaced negative YNIs to convey that the prior, informing turn by the speaker was in some way not in line with their prior, private beliefs. Again, whether these are actual beliefs in the mind of the speaker is not what we are interested in and we make no claims about this. Our point is that the speaker treats it as what he or she previously believed. By formulating an inference and treating it as just now arrived at as a result of the interlocutor's prior turn, these YNIs are used to treat the prior turn as counter to expectations, and solicit reconciliatory information for the two contradicting states of affairs.

RESPONDING WITH POSITIVE INTERROGATIVES

So far we have focused exclusively on negative interrogatives, but positive interrogatives can be used in a similar, albeit not completely identical, manner. We demonstrate this on the basis of two examples.[5] In the first case, excerpt (5) below, the recipient initially produces a positive YNI but after a short pause produces a negative YNI, changing the preferred response from *yes* to *no*. Tina has been telling Anna, her daughter, what she had for dinner and that it tasted very good, which Anna positively assesses in line 1. Tina then in line 2 shows that she is now going to ask about Anna, and subsequently, after 0.3 seconds of silence, displays her expectation that Anna still has to eat.

(5) AG1 – 06:21.4-06:39.3
1 Anna: =↓oh ↑chillie:;=
oh chill
'=↓oh ↑chill:;='

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404518000362 Published online by Cambridge University Press

2 Tina: =en jij:?
and you
'=and you:?'
3 (0.3)
4 je ↑moet nog eten.
you have.to still eat
'you still ↑have to eat.'
5 (0.7)
6 Anna: ik heb al: een zak ↑wortels leeggegeten?=
I have already a bag carrots empty.eaten
'I've already: eaten a bag of carrots?='
7 Tina: =ja,
yeah
'=yeah,'
8 Anna: °.h°
9 (0.4)
10 <moet nu alleen nog e:::h>
have.to now only still
'<now I only still have to e:::h>'
11 (0.9)
12 een tar↑taar bakken;
a tartare bake
'bake a tar↑tare;'
13 (0.2)
14 Tina: → oh maar ben je alleen;
oh but are you alone
' oh but are you alone; '
15 (0.8)
16 → is ni[cole] der niet;
is Nicole there not
'is Ni[cole] not there;'
17 Anna: [ja]
[yeah]
18 (0.8)
19 Anna: <nee die moet allemaal dingen voor de dies
no she has.to all things for the anniversary
'<no she has to arrange a bunch of things for the'
20 van ↓veri regelen>.=
of Veri arrange
'anniversary of Veri>.='
21 Tina: =oh ja ja ja.
oh yeah yeah yeah
'=oh yeah yeah yeah.'

Anna's response in line 6 shows that neither confirmation nor disconfirmation are appropriate responses. She has already eaten something, a bag of carrots, but

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404518000362 Published online by Cambridge University Press

also still has some cooking to do, baking a tartare. Instead of simply receipting or assessing Anna's answer, Tina provides a positive *oh*-prefaced YNI, inquiring whether Anna is alone. After a 0.8 second gap and in overlap with Anna's confirmation, she uses a negative YNI to inquire whether Nicole, Anna's roommate, is not with her. Anna subsequently explains that Nicole has to make arrangements for the anniversary of Veri, her student society (similar to a fraternity/sorority), which Tina receipts with *oh ja* in line 21.

Like the *oh*-prefaced negative YNIs discussed in the prior section, Tina's turn in line 14 consists of three practices. First, while Anna has been talking about what she is having for dinner, Tina responds by asking whether she is alone. She thus implements an unrelated clausal response, shifting the focus of the at-issue talk. Second, her turn is *oh*-prefaced, treating her inference that Anna is alone as just now arrived at, thereby accepting Anna's answer about her dinner. Third, by using the YNI she takes a relatively unknowing stance with regard to the inference. This does not mean the issue of whether or not Anna is alone is considered in doubt: by *oh*-prefacing Tina tentatively accepts this inference and as is indeed clear from her subsequent negative YNI, she no longer holds the belief that Anna is alone. Instead by using a YNI and not uttering a declarative, she treats the inference as unexpected. But unlike that subsequent negative YNI, her positive YNI does not explicitly register an abandoned expectation.

The positive YNI as it is used here is in a sense a weaker version of the negative YNI. With an *oh*-prefaced negative YNI the speaker implies that he or she had a prior belief that directly contradicts the prior talk, but with a positive YNI the speaker merely treats the formulated inference as unexpected. Having abandoned a prior belief, as in (5), is only one of the reasons why something may be unexpected.

The following case makes that emphatically clear. Bea has called Moniek, her daughter, simply to chat. After a reciprocal greeting sequence, Bea asks Moniek in line 1 how she is doing.

(6) CS4 – 00:02.0-00:18.2

1	Bea:	=hoe ↑is het met je.
		how is it with you
		'how are you.'
2		(0.2)
3	Moniek:	het is goed met mIJh;
		it is fine with me
		'I'm doing fine;'
4		(0.9)
5	Bea:	o:h? ↓wat bEn je aan het doen.
		oh what are you on the do
		'o:h? ↓what are you doing.'
6		(.)

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404518000362 Published online by Cambridge University Press

7	Moniek:		ik ben effe aan het eten met marjanne.
			I am just on the eat with Marjanne
			'I'm just having dinner with Marjanne.'
8			(1.0)
9	Bea:	→	oh b- is mar↑janne bij je.
			oh is Marjanne at you
			'oh b- is Marjanne at your place.'
10			(0.3)
11	Moniek:		nee: ik ben bij marjanne,
			no I am at Marjanne
			'no: I am at Marjanne's,'
12			(0.8)
13	Bea:		.h oh je bent ↑bij: marjanne. oh [gezellig.
			oh you are at Marjanne oh lovely
			'.h oh you are ↑at Marjanne's. oh [lovely.'
14	Moniek:		[ja
			'[yeah'
15			ja:↑ha is het ↑ook; .h >en ze wou je nog even<
			yeah is it also and she wanted you still just
			'yea:↑heah it is; .h >and she just wanted to<'
16			bedanken voor de chocola.
			thank for the chocolate
			'thank you for the chocolate.'

In response to Moniek's positive assessment in line 3, Bea produces an *oh* with a strong rising intonation, possibly to convey that some elaboration is desired, and asks what Moniek is doing. Moniek answers in line 7 that she is eating with Marjanne, a friend of hers whom Bea also knows. After a long lapse of 1.0 second, Bea produces an *oh*-prefaced YNI in line 9, formulating her understanding that Marjanne is at Moniek's.[6] This is disconfirmed by Moniek as she is at Marjanne's. Bea then uses an *oh*-prefaced repeat in line 13 to formulate her now-revised understanding (Koivisto 2015b; Persson 2015; Robinson 2009; Seuren et al. 2016) and follows with an assessment. Moniek agrees with this assessment and then moves to a new topic in lines 15–16.

Our focus is on the turn in line 9. By disconfirming and correcting, Moniek addresses it as a fairly straightforward request for information. We want to argue, however, that with it Bea treats it as here-and-now relevant that she did not know that Moniek was with Marjanne. That is, she does not ask a follow-up question, but implements a counterexpectation remark. To start, we show that it consists of the same three practices as excerpt (5).

First, Bea shifts the focus of the talk from Moniek's answer of sharing dinner with Marjanne to Marjanne visiting Moniek, thereby providing an unrelated clausal response. Second, by *oh*-prefacing Bea tentatively accepts the inference that Marjanne is visiting Moniek, something Bea thus previously did not know, thereby also

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404518000362 Published online by Cambridge University Press

accepting that Moniek is having dinner with Marjanne. Third, Bea uses a YNI, thereby taking a relatively unknowing stance and projecting not just confirmation but, at least in this sequential environment, also some form of elaboration.

Using a positive YNI does not, therefore, suggest an abandoned expectation: there is no evidence that Bea had any expectations about Marjanne. But neither does it merely convey an inference, nor, as with (5), does it treat the matter as still in question. Speakers can extract news, that is, foreground something as news that was not conveyed as news both with declarative or polar interrogative word order (Steensig & Heinemann 2013; Thompson et al. 2015). By using an *oh*-prefaced YNI, Bea does not treat the news as something she just now learned (cf. Seuren et al. 2016), but as in some way not in line with her prior beliefs, that is, as unexpected. And indeed, by conveying the inference at all, by extracting news that was not conveyed as news, she treats it as relevant that she did not expect it.

The reason why Bea considers Moniek being at Marjanne's house relevant then and there does not become clear immediately: both participants treat Bea's turn as requesting confirmation. And after having resolved who is visiting whom, Moniek simply launches a new activity, thanking Bea on Marjanne's behalf. It thus initially seems that it is merely treated as unexpected news.

But if we look at how the conversation progresses in (7) below, we see that this activity is closed quickly: the talk between excerpts (6) and (7) comprises a mere nine seconds in which Bea acknowledges Marjanne's gratitude. Immediately afterwards Bea says that they will keep the conversation short (line 35). Moreover, with the resumption marker *maar* 'but' (Mazeland & Huiskes 2001) and the inferential *dan* 'then' Bea designs this proposal as based on earlier talk: Bea conveys that they should keep the conversation short, because Moniek is with Marjanne. She thus changes the activity from a somewhat standard conversational opening "how are you" sequence and establishing a first topic (Schegloff 1968), to the topic of Moniek being with Marjanne, as it means they can talk only briefly.

(7) CS4 – 00:27.4-00:34.1

29	Bea:	.H heb je- >hEb je< heb je het er ook gegeven?
		have you have you have you it her also given
		'.H did you- >did you< did you also give it to her? '
30		le[uk.
		nice
		'ni[ce. '
31	Moniek:	[ja. leuk hè?
		yeah nice TAG
		'[yeah. nice right? '
32		(0.8)
33	Bea:	ja [↓leuk
		yeah nice
		'yeah [↓nice'
34		[( )

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404518000362 Published online by Cambridge University Press

35 Bea: HEY MAAR dan e:h >houwe we 't maar effe< ko:rt,
hey but then keep we it only just brief
'HEY BUT then e:h >we'll just keep it< brie:f, '
36 (.)
37 Moniek: ja:ha [( )
yeah
'yea:hea [( ) '

Bea thus treats the inference as unexpected and as relevant, because it means Marjanne is not available for talk. The assumption that a call-taker is available for talk is inherently conveyed by the act of calling (see Schegloff 1968), or at least by moving into the conversation without verifying whether the recipient is indeed available for talk. By calling, Bea has interrupted a social encounter, and not just any social encounter: a dinner between friends. By proposing to keep the conversation brief and relating that proposal to her inference that Moniek is having dinner with Marjanne, she implies that had she known that Moniek was having dinner with Marjanna, she would not have called.

While it may seem that Bea is proposing to keep the conversation short of her own accord, on deeper inspection it looks like Moniek has been dropping subtle hints that Bea is calling at a bad time. First, she does not answer Bea's 'how are you' in the conventional way with a simple adjective, but instead gives a clausal response. Second, she does not reciprocate the question, resulting in a lapse of 0.9 seconds. Third, she answers Bea's inquiry in line 5 in the most minimal way, stating only what she is doing. She does not take it up as a topic proffer (Schegloff 2007), and the result is again a lapse, this time of 1.0 second. Finally, she does not treat Bea's turn in line 13 as an invitation or an opportunity to say more about what she is currently doing with Marjanne.

If these points do show that Moniek treats her mother's call as ill-timed, they are subtle clues, and they also do not work very well. While both agree to keep the conversation short, they actually talk for another minute and a half, in which Bea unsuccessfully solicits news from Moniek (data not shown). When Moniek says that she wants to get back to being *gezellig* 'fun'/'sociable' Bea instead passes the phone to Moniek's father. Only when Moniek starts pressing for an end to the conversation by saying that it is not *gezellig* if she is on the phone the whole time do they move to conversational closure.

To sum up, we have shown in this section that *oh*-prefaced positive YNIs are used in a manner similar to *oh*-prefaced negative YNIs: when produced in response to an informing turn, they are used to convey an inference from the interlocutor's prior turn, and to treat that inference as unexpected. Both also make relevant confirmation as a next action.

But there are differences. While negative YNIs treat the inference as here-and-now relevant and unexpected, because it is polar opposite to a prior belief by the speaker, positive YNIs do not convey a now-abandoned expectation. They

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404518000362 Published online by Cambridge University Press

merely imply that the inference is somehow not in line with the speaker's prior beliefs. The here-and-now relevance of the inference is therefore not made clear through the counterexpectation remark itself.

Additionally, as there are no discrepant states of affairs, it is not clear whether positive YNIs also request reconciliatory information. Extracts (5) and (6) do not provide evidence that they do, but we do find it in other cases (see for example Seuren et al. 2016:ex. 6). The limited size of our collection makes it hard to answer this question definitively.

What does become clear is that the action implications of negative and positive YNIs are not that dissimilar, at least not in Dutch talk-in-interaction. Much depends on the sequential position of the turn in which the YNI is produced. We showed that when either is *oh*-prefaced and used to address turns that are done to inform, they implement counterexpectation remarks.

CHALLENGES AND REPAIR

In the previous sections we argued that by combining three practices—(i) an unrelated clausal response, (ii) *oh*-prefacing, and (iii) yes/no-type interrogative word order—speakers implement what we gloss as a counterexpectation remark. In this section we show three cases similar to counterexpectation remarks. All consist of an unrelated clausal response with yes/no-type interrogative word order, but in each case the recipient does not preface his or her turn with *oh*. Like knowledge-discrepancy questions, these non-*oh*-prefaced YNIs are used by recipients to address a discrepancy between the speaker's prior informing turn, and the recipient's prior knowledge or beliefs (Steensig & Heinemann 2013). In these cases, however, the recipient does not necessarily request confirmation and elaboration. While these actions can receive confirmation and an account, the speaker can also provide only confirmation or even back down, treating the response not as an inquiry, but a challenge (see Heinemann 2008). Without the *oh*-preface the recipient does not accept the terms of the prior informing turn—either the action it implements or the information it conveys—and thus implements a different action.

Consider excerpt (8). Sarah and Jessica are talking about a mutual friend who is in her final year of high school. In the Netherlands, high schools have a centralized national exam, which their mutual friend has to take. Sarah says in line 2 that the exams are soon, and Jessica initially accepts with her claim of remembering; *oh ja da's waar* 'oh yeah that's right' (Heritage 1984; Seuren et al. 2016).

(8) DN1 – 02:54.3-03:15.5

1	Sara:	ja >ik weet niet< hoe vaak zij ↑werkt >nou eigenlijk<.=
		yeah I know not how often she works now actually
		'yeah >I do not know< how often she ↑works >now actually<.='

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404518000362 Published online by Cambridge University Press

2		=maar ze heeft (.) binnenkort exa:mens °volgens mij°.=	
		but she has shortly exams according.to me	
		‘=but she has (.) to take exams soon °I believe°.=’	
3	Jessica:	=↑oh ja das ↑waa:r;	
		oh yeah that.is true	
		‘=↑oh yeah that’s ↑ri:ght;’	
4		(0.4)	
5	→	↑is dat niet deze week begonnen al de exa:mens?	
		is that not this week started already the exams	
		‘↑has that not started this week already the exa:ms?’	
6		(1.2)	
7	Sara:	zou zo eens kunnheh hu hu (.) .Hh	
		could thus once can	
		‘could just be the case hu hu (.).Hh’	
8	Jessica:	volgens mij[: ↑wel >namel]ijkh<.	
		according.to me ADV namely	
		‘I believe[: ↑so >namel]y<’	

While Jessica initially accepts Sarah’s informing turn that the exams are soon, even claiming that she also knew it, she uses a negative interrogative in line 5 to introduce her expectation that the exams have in fact already started. As she uses a negative interrogative, confirmation would be in line with Sarah’s statement that the exams are to start soon. That is, a confirming response would mean that the exams have not started this week. But Sarah does not provide confirmation. In fact, both participants in the subsequent talk orient to the YNI as a challenge, as a reversed polarity question where disconfirmation is the preferred response (Koshik 2005): (i) Sarah backs down from her earlier statement, now saying that it could be that the exams have already started (line 7) and (ii) Jessica states that she actually believes that the exams have already started (line 8).

Jessica’s YNI seems to hold the middle ground between a counterinforming and a counterexpectation remark. She does not say Sarah is wrong and that the exams have already started, but neither does she treat the formulated state of affairs as an inference she has now arrived at. She thus creates room for Sarah to either confirm, whereby Sarah would claim epistemic primacy, or to back down. The difference between Jessica’s YNI and the cases in RESPONDING WITH POSITIVE INTERROGATIVES above is brought about by the lack of *oh*: as Jessica’s turn in line 5 is not *oh*-prefaced she does not convey tentative acceptance of either the formulated inference or the terms of the turn it addresses.

The following excerpt is also a case in which the negative YNI indexes resistance to the terms of a prior informing turn. In this case the speaker treats the prior turn as confusing, that is, the speaker claims a lack of understanding and shows why she does not understand. The excerpt is from a conversation between two friends,

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404518000362 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Rianna and Melinda. Rianna has been telling Melinda about her recent visit to a university in Belgium where she might want to get a master's degree.

(9) CL1 – 01:00.3-01:24.4

1	Rianna:	°ik° vond er drie lEU:k,
		I found there three fun
		'°I° liked three of them,'
2		en die WA:ren >d'r allemaal< niet eens.
		and those were there all not even
		'and they WE:re >none of them< even there.'
3		.H[h
4	Melinda: →	[HUH?
		'[HUH?'
5	→	maa[r ↑wist je dat niet van te voren.]
		but knew you that not of PRT ahead
		'bu[t ↑did you not know that beforehand.]'
6	Rianna:	[( ) ik dacht .hh]
		I thought
		'[( ) I thought .hh]'
7		(0.7)
8		nEE: er stond op de site van JA:
		no there stood at the site of yeah
		'nO: it said on the website like YEAH:'
9		°dat en dat° zijn masteropleidingen,
		that and that are master's.programs
		'°that and that° are master's programs,'
10		en dat er geen .HHh E::h (.) niet
		and that there none not
		'and that there not a . HHh e::h (.) not'
11		>zalk maar zeggen< zo'n WOR:kshop van WAS.
		shall.I just say such.a workshop of was
		'>so to speak< like a WOR:kshop of WAS.'
12		dat je gewoon echt (.) voorlichting krijgt.
		that you simply really information get
		'that you simply really (.) get information.'

In line 1 Rianna is finishing a complaint. She had gone to Belgium to get information about three specific programs, but the university did not provide information on those programs. An affiliating response might be something like co-complaining or expressing sympathy, but instead Melinda claims she does not understand with *huh* and then uses a YNI to address the issue of whether Rianna could have known in advance. She uses a TCU-initial *maar*, not as a resumption marker, but to show that there is a contrast between what Rianna just said and her uptake. In other words, she can be seen to question whether Rianna has a right to complain: should she not simply have prepared better? Melinda also responds to it as a complaint: she

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404518000362 Published online by Cambridge University Press

provides confirmation and explains that indeed she could not have known in advance, shifting the blame to the university.

Melinda's YNI shares some features with the counterexpectation remarks: she addresses a discrepancy between Rianna's prior informing turn and what might be expected. Rianna also subsequently confirms and elaborates. But as Melinda's turn is not *oh*-prefaced, it does not convey an inference Melinda has now arrived at. Instead, using *huh* she claims that she does not understand the prior turn and in her YNI she formulates the problem.

Finally, consider (10). This excerpt is also from a conversation between two friends, Christy and Marsha, who are talking about a recent soccer match, the final of the annual cup in which FC Twente beat Ajax 3–2 despite being down 0–2 at half-time.

(10) DL1 – 03:10.0-03:29.5

1	Marsha:	tom die ging EErst helemaal niet eens meer kijk:en
		Tom he went at.first at.all not even anymore watch
		'Tom he at FIrst did not go watch anymore at all'
2		enzo. .h roep maar wEEr als het gel#ijk staat#.
		and.such yell just again if it tied is
		'and such. .h just yell agAIn when it #is tied#.'
3		(0.8)
4	Christy: →	↑maar (m-) (0.2) is tom voor ↑twent↓#e:#.
		but is Tom for Twente
		'↑but (m-) (0.2) does Tom support ↑Twent↓#e:#.'
5		(1.1)
6	Marsha:	jaha:,
		yeah
		'yeahea:h,'
7	Christy:	o:h dat w[ist ik niet.]=
		oh that knew I not
		'o:h I d[idn't know that.]='
8	Marsha:	[(ook fan]
		'[(also fan)]'
9	Christy:	='kdacht dat tom ook voor a:jax wa:s.
		I.thought that Tom also for Ajax was
		'=I thought that Tom also supported A:jax
10		(0.5)
11	Marsha:	#nee:: hij is voor ↑twente#.
		no he is for Twente
		'#no:: he supports ↑Twente#.'

In line 1 Marsha tells Christy that Tom, her boyfriend, stopped watching when Ajax was ahead and that he wanted her to call out to him only if the game was again level. What follows is a silence of 0.8 seconds, after which Christy produces a YNI, formulating her inference that Tom supports Twente. Christy's turn has almost all of

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404518000362 Published online by Cambridge University Press

the telltale signs of a counterexpectation remark: (i) it is an unrelated clausal response, (ii) it has yes/no-type interrogative word order, and (iii) it formulates an inference that is not in line with her prior beliefs, a contrast that is even marked with turn-initial *maar*. But she only produces an *oh* after Marsha has provided confirmation, that is, she does not accept the revised understanding until after the confirmation.

Notice that after Marsha's confirming response, Christy explicitly formulates that she did not know (line 7) and that she thought that Tom supported Ajax (line 9). Although this prior belief is introduced with *Ik dacht* 'I thought', it is a different practice from the 'I thought'-initiated turns discussed by Smith (2013). In the cases discussed by Smith, the 'I thought'-turns are produced in response to a problematic informing turn in order to reveal a discrepancy and solicit an account for that discrepancy. Here Christy uses it after the discrepancy has already been resolved, and it gets only reconfirmation. She uses it to account for the delay in progressivity. It is a practice that is frequently produced to account for a problem after repair has been initiated and resolved (Schegloff 1992; Ekberg 2012; see also Seuren et al. 2016:ex. 5).

These three cases show that while unrelated clausal responses to informing turns implemented with YNIs treat that prior turn as counter to the speaker's beliefs or expectations, they do not implement counterexpectation remarks. Instead, they treat that prior turn as somehow problematic in light of the recipient's prior beliefs. *Oh*-prefacing is thus a crucial aspect of counterexpectation remarks: it indexes that the speaker has tentatively accepted the formulated understanding and by extension the terms of the prior informing turn, both the information it conveys and the action it implements.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

Research over the last thirty years has shown that participants have a vast array of resources to respond to informing actions such as news, stories, and other tellings of past, current, or future experiences (see Thompson et al. 2015 for an overview). All of these responsive actions take a different stance to the informing action, and therefore have different sequential implications. On the one hand, recipients can be mostly passive by conveying that they have been informed, typically by using a change-of-state token like *oh* (Heritage 1984; see also Heinemann & Koivisto 2016 and the references cited therein) thereby proposing sequence closure (Schegloff 2007). At the other end of the spectrum, we find actions with which speakers actively partake in the informing sequence. By formulating prior beliefs, recipients can treat the informing turn as not just conveying new information, but as information that contradicts those prior beliefs, and thus merits elaboration (Robinson 2009; Steensig & Heinemann 2013; Smith 2013). They actively transform the newsworthiness of the prior turn (see Terasaki 1976; Maynard 2003).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404518000362 Published online by Cambridge University Press

The analysis in this article contributes to this line of investigation by discussing one specific way in which recipients in Dutch talk-in-interaction respond to informing turns: producing an *oh*-prefaced yes/no-type interrogative in which they formulate an understanding inferred from the informing turn. We glossed these as counterexpectation remarks; they treat the prior turn as conveying information that is counter to what the recipient expected, even though that prior turn was not designed as such. We have argued that in producing such a response, the recipient (i) accepts the terms of the prior, informing turn—the action it implements and the information it conveys; (ii) treats that turn as not in line with a prior, private belief or expectation—one not made public in the interaction; (iii) topicalizes the unexpected inference; (iv) requests confirmation of that inference as well as what Robinson (2009) calls reconciliatory information; and (v) tentatively accepts the formulated inference or understanding.

To support this analysis, we compared counterexpectation remarks to YNIs that also treat a prior informing turn by the interlocutor as providing information that is counter to expectation but that are not *oh*-prefaced. We showed that because these YNIs are not *oh*-prefaced, they do not accept the terms of that prior turn and instead treat that turn as in some way problematic. In each case the recipient has discrepant beliefs or expectations, but is not yet willing to even tentatively commit to the inference gleaned from the speaker's turn. That these YNIs implement different actions from counterexpectation remarks is partially revealed in their sequential uptake: (i) the speaker can back down, treating the response as a correction or challenge, or (ii) the speaker can provide only confirmation and no reconciliatory information. The recipient can also convey that he or she has a problem by prefacing the YNI with *huh*, which is used to claim a problem with understanding the prior turn.

Both the way in which this combination of practices is used and the infrequency with which we find it in casual conversation suggest that these *oh*-prefaced YNIs are not one fixed practice. Instead, counterexpectation remarks consist of multiple practices that are combined to implement one specific action and make relevant a specific response; they are best analyzed as what Enfield (2013:100) calls a *praction* (see also Sidnell & Enfield 2014). The relevant practices with which these counterexpectation remarks are implemented are as follows: (i) the recipient produces what Thompson and colleagues (2015) call an unrelated clausal response: a response that formulates some inference that was gleaned from the prior informing turn; (ii) this response is *oh*-prefaced to index a here-and-now change-of-state (Heritage 1984) and convey that the speaker has accepted the terms of the prior informing turn and has tentatively accepted the formulated inference; and (iii) the response has yes/no-type interrogative word order to request both confirmation and reconciliatory information (Robinson 2009).

This article thus supports the idea that there is much to be gained in our understanding of talk-in-interaction by looking not at particular actions or practices, but focusing on a more micro level of participant behavior: what is recurrently achieved by a specific combination of behavioral practices in a specific sequential

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404518000362 Published online by Cambridge University Press

environment (e.g. Schegloff 1996). It will lead to the discovery of actions that are maybe impossible to anticipate, and it can demonstrate the ability of people to attend to the most subtle details of interaction and design their turns accordingly moment by moment, without even having to be aware of it.

Appendix: Transcription conventions

(1.0)	seconds of silence; silences between turns are written on a separate line; silences within turns are written in the turn
(.)	silence of less than 200 ms; a *beat* of silence
=	latching
[	overlap onset
]	overlap ends
.	prosodic completion with a boundary pitch that falls to low in the speaker's range
,	prosodic completion with a boundary pitch that rises to the middle of the speaker's range
?	prosodic completion with a boundary pitch that rises to high in the speaker's range
;	prosodic completion with a boundary pitch that falls to the middle of the speaker's range
_	prosodic completion with a flat boundary pitch
↑	upstep in the speaker's pitch that lasts no longer than one syllable
↓	downstep in the speaker's pitch that lasts no longer than one syllable
::	preceding vowel or syllable is held longer than normal
underline	audible stress or emphasis
pi:tch	pitch that rises and falls during the production of the vowel
pi:tch	pitch that rises throughout the production of the vowel
LOUD	speech produced relatively loudly
°soft°	speech produced relatively softly
>talk<	contracted speech produced relatively fast
<talk>	elongated speech produced relatively slowly
-	cut-off in mid-production, typically audible as a glottal stop
.hh	audible inbreath; each *h* denotes about 200 ms
ha hi hu	various laughter tokens
#talk#	speech produced with creaky voice
( )	speaker said something but it is not hearable what; more space means more talk
(talk)	not clear what the speaker said; only attempt could be made at transcription

NOTES

*An earlier version of this article was presented during a workshop at the Max Planck Institute for Psycholinguistics; we are grateful to the participants for their feedback. We would also like to thank four anonymous reviewers and the editors of this journal for their invaluable comments.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404518000362 Published online by Cambridge University Press

[1]Thompson and colleagues (2015) distinguish between *candidate understandings* and *inferences*. This distinction, however, is not treated as relevant by the participants in our data. Therefore we stick to the term *inferenc*e.

[2]Dutch *oh* seems to be used very similarly to English *oh*. There is, however, little research on Dutch *oh*, and what research there is has focused on different sequential environments.

[3]As a reviewer pointed out to us, this leaves open the possibility that counterexpectation marks can also be produced in response to other types of actions. Of the eleven cases we removed, however, only two were produced in responses to a noninforming turn, and of these two only one looks similar to a counterexpectation mark; the other is used to launch an activity disjunctive from the prior talk. But since it is only one case, we have kept it out of our analysis.

[4]See Koshik (2005:ex. 3) for a similar use of negative YNIs, albeit in a slightly different sequential environment. In that example, lacking ratification by the recipient of a formulated belief, the speaker moves from an assertive position—"But those were Alex's tanks"—to a weakened position —"Weren't those Alex's tanks?". The sequence gives rise to a possible understanding that a prior belief, in that case explicitly formulated, was incorrect, and this is made salient first with a negative YNI.

[5]See Seuren et al. (2016:ex. 6) for an additional case.

[6]*Bij* in this construction can be used both to inquire whether Marjanne is WITH Moniek, or whether Marjanna is AT Moniek's; it is taken up by Moniek, and subsequently by Bea as well, as the latter.

REFERENCES

Button, Graham, & Neil Casey (1985). Topic nomination and topic pursuit. *Human Studies* 8(1):3–55.

Couper-Kuhlen, Elizabeth (2012). Some truths and untruths about final intonation in conversational questions. In Jan-Peter de Ruiter (ed.), *Questions: Formal, functional and interactional perspectives*, 123–45. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ekberg, Stuart (2012). Addressing a source of trouble outside of the repair space. *Journal of Pragmatics* 44(4):374–86.

Enfield, Nick J. (2013). *Relationship thinking: Agency, enchrony, and human sociality*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Golato, Andrea (2010). Marking understanding versus receipting information in talk: *Achso*. and *ach* in German interaction. *Discourse Studies* 12(2):147–76.

Heinemann, Trine (2008). Questions of accountability: Yes–no interrogatives that are unanswerable. *Discourse Studies* 10(1):55–71.

——— (2017). Receipting answers that are counter to expectations: The polar question-answer-*nå* sequence in Danish. *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 50(3):249–67.

———, & Aino Koivisto (2016). Indicating a change-of-state in interaction: Cross-linguistic explorations. *Journal of Pragmatics* 104:83–88.

Heritage, John (1984). A change-of-state token and aspects of its sequential placement. In J. Maxwell Atkinson & John Heritage (eds.), *Structures of social action*, 299–345. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

——— (2010). Questioning in medicine. In Alice Freed & Susan Ehrlich (eds.), *Why do you ask? The function of questions in institutional discourse*, 42–68. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

——— (2012). Epistemics in action: Action formation and territories of knowledge. *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 45(1):1–29.

Hilmisdóttir, Helga (2016). Responding to informings in Icelandic talk-in-interaction: A comparison of *nú* and *er það*. *Journal of Pragmatics* 104:133–47.

Jefferson, Gail (1981). The abominable 'ne?': A working paper exploring the phenomenon of post-response pursuit of response. *Manchester Sociology Occasional Papers* 6:1–82.

——— (2004). Glossary of transcript symbols with an introduction. In Gene H. Lerner (ed.), *Conversation analysis: Studies from the first generation*, 13–31. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404518000362 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Kärkkäinen, Elise O. (2009). I thought it was pretty neat: Social action formats for taking a stance. In Stef Slembrouck, Miriam Taverniers, & Mieke Van Herreweghe (eds.), *From 'will' to 'well': Studies in linguistics offered to Anne-Marie Simon-Vandenbergen*, 293–304. Ghent: Academia Press.

Kasterpalu, Riina, & Tiit Hennoste (2016). Estonian *aa*: A multifunctional change-of-state token. *Journal of Pragmatics* 104:148–62.

Koivisto, Aino (2015a). Dealing with ambiguities in informings: Finnish *aijaa* as a 'neutral' news receipt. *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 48(4):365–87.

——— (2015b). Displaying now-understanding: The Finnish change-of-state token *aa*. *Discourse Processes* 52(2):111–48.

Koshik, Irene (2002). A conversation analytic study of yes/no questions which convey reversed polarity assertions. *Journal of Pragmatics* 34(12):1851–77.

——— (2005). *Beyond rhetorical questions: Assertive questions in everyday interaction*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Labov, William (1970). The study of language in its social context. In Pier P. Giglioli (ed.), *Language and social context*, 283–308. Middlesex: Penguin Education.

Local, John (1996). Conversational phonetics: Some aspects of news receipts in everyday talk. In Elizabeth Couper-Kuhlen & Margret Selting (eds.), *Prosody in conversation*, 177–230. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Maynard, Douglas W. (2003). *Bad news, good news: Conversational order in everyday talk and clinical settings*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Mazeland, Harrie, & Mike Huiskes (2001). Dutch 'but' as a sequential conjunction: Its use as a resumption marker. In Margret Selting & Elizabeth Couper-Kuhlen (eds.), *Studies in interactional linguistics*, 141–69. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Persson, Rasmus (2015). Indexing one's own previous action as inadequate: On *ah*-prefaced repeats as receipt tokens in French talk-in-interaction. *Language in Society* 44(4):497–524.

Raymond, Geoffrey (2003). Grammar and social organization: Yes/no interrogatives and the structure of responding. *American Sociological Review* 68(6):939–67.

——— (2010). Grammar and social relations: Alternative forms of yes/no-type initiating actions in health visitor interactions. In Alice Freed & Susan Ehrlich (eds.), *Why do you ask? The function of questions in institutional discourse*, 87–107. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Reese, Brian J. (2007). *Bias in questions*. Austin: University of Texas dissertation.

Robinson, Jeffrey D. (2009). Managing counterinformings: An interactional practice for soliciting information that facilitates reconciliation of speakers' incompatible positions. *Human Communication Research* 35:516–87.

Sacks, Harvey, Emanuel A. Schegloff & Gail Jefferson (1974). A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation. *Language* 50(4):696–735.

Schegloff, Emanuel A. (1968). Sequences in conversational openings. *American Anthropologist* 70 (6):1075–95.

——— (1984). On some questions and ambiguities in conversation. In J. Maxwell Atkinson & John Heritage (eds.), *Structures of social action*, 28–52. New York: Cambridge University Press.

——— (1992). Repair after next turn: The last structurally provided defense of intersubjectivity in conversation. *American Journal of Sociology* 97:1295–345.

——— (1996). Confirming allusions: Toward an empirical account of action. *American Journal of Sociology* 102(1):161–216.

——— (2007). *Sequence organization in interaction: A primer in conversation analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Seuren, Lucas M., Mike Huiskes & Tom Koole (2016). Remembering and understanding with *oh*-prefaced yes/no declaratives in Dutch. *Journal of Pragmatics* 104:180–92.

Sidnell, Jack, & Nick J. Enfield (2014). The ontology of action in interaction. In Nick J. Enfield, Paul Kockelman, & Jack Sidnell (eds.), *The Cambridge handbook of linguistic anthropology*, 423–46. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404518000362 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Smith, Michael S. (2013). 'I thought' initiated turns: Addressing discrepancies in first-hand and second-hand knowledge. *Journal of Pragmatics* 57:318–30.
Steensig, Jakob, & Trine Heinemann (2013). When 'yes' is not enough – as an answer to a yes/no question. In Beatrice S. Reed & Geoffrey Raymond (eds.), *Units of talk: Units of action*, 213–48. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
Ten Have, Paul (2007). *Doing conversation analysis: A practical guide*. London: SAGE.
Terasaki, Alene K. (1976). Pre-announcement sequences in conversation. Social science working paper 99, University of California, Los Angeles. Reprinted in Gene Lerner (ed.), *Conversation analysis: Studies from the first generation*, 171–223. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2004.
Thompson, Sandra A.; Barbara A. Fox; & Elizabeth Couper-Kuhlen (2015). *Grammar in everyday talk: Building responsive actions*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Weidner, Matylda (2016). *Aha*-moments in interaction: Indexing a change of state in Polish. *Journal of Pragmatics* 104:193–206.

(Received 5 September 2016; revision received 17 October 2017;
accepted 24 November 2017; final revision received 10 January 2018)

Address for correspondence:
Lucas M. Seuren
P.O. Box 716 9700 AS, Groningen,
The Netherlands
l.m.seuren@rug.nl

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404518000362 Published online by Cambridge University Press