



Marking counterinformation with *oh*-prefaced YNIs

TABU Dag 2016

Lucas M. Seuren
University of Groningen, CLCG
l.m.seuren@rug.nl

*I am indebted to Kobin Kendrick, Elliot Hoey, and Tayo Neumann for their invaluable comments on earlier versions of my analysis.



Corrigendum

“We will show that *oh*-prefaced YNIs are used by speakers to index that the interlocutor treated some information as shared, when in fact this information was either new to the speaker or even contradicted the speaker’s background assumptions.”



Corrigendum

- › “With an *oh*-prefaced yes/no-type interrogative the speaker claims that the prior informing turn by the interlocutor was in some way incompatible with his/her private beliefs or *expectables*.”
- › Treat prior informing turn as a counterinforming

(Heritage, 1984)



Terminology

- > Counterinformation: incompatible position
- > Private: not made public in the interaction.
 - “commitment sets”
- > Expectable: likely or salient belief

(Heritage, 1984; Robinson 2009; Gunlogson, 2001)



Aims

- › Show function of *oh*-prefaced YNIs
 - Mark counterinformation
- › Compare to *oh*-prefaced declaratives
 - Extract embedded news



Data & Method

- › 20 hours phone interaction (38 cases)
 - Spontaneous
 - Friends/Family
 - Recorded at Utrecht University 2010 and 2011
- › Conversation Analysis
 - “Concerned with understanding the structural underpinnings of everyday conversation.”

(Stivers & Sidnell, 2013: 3)



Counterinformation marks

- › Unrelated Clausal Response
 - Respond to informing turns
 - Shift at issue talk
 - Candidate understanding/inference
- › Just-now realized
- › Request confirmation (and an account)

(Thompson et al., 2015; Heritage, 1984; Raymond, 2003;
Terasaki, 2004; Maynard, 2003)



Example 1



BN3 – 01:55.2-02:07.8

08 ik ga ↑eerst nog even thuis wat dingetjes doen
 I am first going to do some things at home

09 °en dan eh°
 and then eh

10 (0.8)

11 R **oh ↑ga je niet naar de bieb.**
 oh go you not to the library
 oh are you not going to the library

12 (0.4)

13 W nee: >nee nee< °van↑daag niet°.
 no no no not today

14 (1.4)

15 R ↑o:ke.
 okay



Example 2



AG1 – 06:21.4-06:39.3

10 A <moet nu alleen nog e:::h>
must now only still e:::h

11 (0.9)

12 een tar↑taar bakken;
bake a steak tartare

13 (0.2)

14 T **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 Ni[cole] not there

17 A [ja]
[yeah]

18 (0.8)

19 A <nee die moet allemaal dingen voor de dies
no she has to arrange a bunch of things for the
20 van ↓veri regelen>.=
anniversary of Veri



Oh-prefaced YNDs

- › Treat understanding as already established
- › Two major types of activities:
 - Do now-understanding
 - Extract news

(Seuren et al., in press; Terasaki, 2004; Maynard, 2003)



Example 3



DN1 – 02:13.1-02:25.3

01 S nee ja dus (.) ↑die heef:t ie >dus uiteindelijk< nie:t,
no yeah so (.) that one he eventually did not get

02 maar ik had echt >zoiets van< ↑hmm
but I was really like hmm

03 en: Petra Ook, dus
and Petra as well so

04 J ↓oh (.)
oh

05 **oh petra was ook ↓mee:**
oh Petra was also along
oh Petra had also come along

06 (0.9)

07 S ja: heel de familie was er.
yeah: the whole family was there

08 (0.6)

09 J whauw huhuhu (0.3) [huhu↑hu]
wow huhuhu (0.3) [huhuhu]



Conclude

- › *Oh*-prefaced YNIs responding to informing turns:
 - Best understood as multiple practices
 - Accept the terms of that turn (conveyed information, action implemented)
 - Treat it as offering counterevidence to private belief or expectable

(Enfield, 2013; Sidnell & Enfield, 2014)



Oh are there questions?



References

Enfield, N.J. (2013). *Relationship Thinking: Agency, Enchrony, and Human Sociality*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Gunlogson, C. (2001). *True to Form: Rising and Falling Declaratives as Questions in English* (Doctoral dissertation). University of California, Santa Cruz.

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

Maynard, D.W. (2003). *Bad News, Good News: Conversational Order in Everyday Talk and Clinical Settings*. Chicago, Ill: University of Chicago Press.

Robinson, J. (2009). Managing Counterinformings: An Interactional Practice for Soliciting Information that Facilitates Reconciliation of Speakers' Incompatible Positions. *Human Communication Research*, 35, 516–587.

Seuren, L.M., Huiskes, M. & Koole, T. (in press). Remembering and understanding with *oh*-prefaced yes/no declaratives in Dutch. *Journal of Pragmatics*. DOI: 10.1016/J.PRAGMA.2016.02.006

Sidnell, J. & Enfield, N.J. (2014). The ontology of action in interaction. In N.J. Enfield, P. Kockelman, & J. Sidnell (Eds.), *The cambridge handbook of linguistic anthropology* (pp. 423–446). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Stivers, T. & Sidnell, J. (2013). Introduction. In J. Sidnell & T. Stivers (Eds.), *The handbook of conversation analysis* (pp. 1–8). Chichester, UK: Wiley-Blackwell.

Terasaki, A.K. (2004). Pre-announcement sequences in conversation. In G. Lerner (Ed.), *Conversation analysis: Studies from the first generation* (pp. 171–223). Amsterdam, NL: John-Benjamins.

Thompson, S.A., Fox, B.A. & Couper-Kuhlen, E. (2015). *Building Responsive Actions*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge university Press.