

CHECKING RECOGNITION: *DO YOU REMEMBER* AND
DO YOU KNOW IN TALK-IN-INTERACTION

BY

HIE-JUNG YOU

DISSERTATION

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Linguistics
in the Graduate College of the
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 2014

Urbana, Illinois

Doctoral Committee:

Associate Professor Numa Markee, Chair
Professor Andrea Golato, Director of Research, Texas State University
Associate Professor Makoto Hayashi
Associate Professor Irene Koshik

Abstract

This dissertation examines how speakers check recognition of knowledge and memory they presume to be shared by their co-participants. In this conversation analytic study, I analyze recognition checks with *(do you) remember* (Chapter 3), *(do) you know* (Chapter 4) in American English and German everyday conversation, and in English classroom interaction, specifically, in teacher talk (Chapter 5). Independent of their sequential position or their position within a turn, *do you remember* and *do you know* in both English and German are expansions of talk that help to structure sequences and turns to avoid problems of intersubjectivity (Auer, 1984; Schegloff et al., 1977) and to establish common ground among participants.

Chapter 1 introduces the topic of this study. Chapter 2 reviews the notions reference, knowledge and memory and describes the major characteristics of spoken German and teacher talk. Chapter 3 investigates English and German *do you remember* recognition checks in everyday conversation. I show how speakers back up their claims or (counter-)challenge their coparticipant with *do you remember* using memory that is assumed to be in the knowledge domain of the recipient (Antaki & Leudar, 1990; Golato, 2012). Chapter 4 explores English and German *do you know* constructions in everyday interaction. For both English and German *do you know* constructions, speakers initiate topic shifts and pursue a response after no or insufficient uptake from the participants (Bolden et al., 2012). Chapter 5 examines *do you remember* and *do you know* as employed in teacher talk. While *do you remember* organizes classroom talk by giving step-by-step information or connecting old with new information, *do you know* either self-repairs teacher talk by reformulating or making a previous teacher question more specific. Chapter 6 summarizes the major findings of this dissertation focusing on a comparison of the two constructions under investigation. It also discusses the limitations of this study and the

avenues of future research. This dissertation addresses issues relevant to the field of conversation analysis, pedagogy, second language acquisition research, linguistics, cognitive science and sociology.

Für meine Eltern

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank my “*Doktormutti*” Andrea Golato, my committee members Numa Markee, Irene Koshik and Makoto Hayashi for their helpful questions, suggestions and comments. It has been a great opportunity to learn and study Conversation Analysis from all four committee members.

I am grateful to my parents and friends for their encouragements and prayers. I would like to thank Andrea and Peter Golato for their guidance and care during the past five years of my life as a graduate student at the University of Illinois.

I thank the Department of Linguistics for their generous support. I appreciate the continued advice I received from the head of the Linguistics department James Yoon and my graduate advisor Jennifer Cole.

Lastly, I am grateful to my participants who agreed to be recorded for my data collection.

Table of Contents

Chapter 1:	Introduction	1
1.1	Objectives and significance of study	1
1.2	Methodology	7
1.3	Previous work on recognition (understanding) checks	8
1.4	Outline of study	11
1.4.1	Data and transcription conventions	11
1.4.2	Structure	13
Chapter 2:	Preliminaries	15
2.1	Introduction	15
2.2	Relevant notions	15
2.2.1	Reference	16
2.2.2	Knowledge	20
2.2.3	Memory	26
2.3	The English constructions under investigation	29
2.3.1	<i>Do you remember</i>	30
2.3.2	<i>Do you know</i>	32
2.4	The German constructions under investigation	33
2.4.1	Features of spoken German	34
2.4.2	<i>Kannst (du) dich erinnern / erinnerst (du) dich / kennst du noch /</i> <i>weißt du noch</i>	35
2.4.3	<i>Kennst du / weißt du</i>	37
2.5	Teacher talk	38
2.5.1	Response pursuits	41
2.5.2	Repair and correction	42
Chapter 3:	<i>Do you remember</i> in English and German	46
3.1	Introduction	46
3.2	<i>Do you remember</i>	46
3.2.1	<i>(Do you) remember</i> in presequences: Checking recognition	47
3.2.2	<i>(Do you) remember</i> in incidental sequences: Making a counter-challenge	50
3.2.3	<i>(Do you) remember</i> in incidental sequences: Backing up a claim	53
3.2.4	<i>(Do you) remember</i> in incidental sequences: Giving directions	57
3.2.5	Turn-final or stand-alone <i>remember</i>	60
3.2.6	Conclusion of <i>remember</i>	63
3.3	<i>Kannst (du) dich erinnern/erinnerst du dich and weißt du noch/</i> <i>kennst du noch</i>	65
3.3.1	<i>Kannst dich (dran) erinnern</i> in presequences: Checking recognition	66
3.3.2	<i>Kannst dich (dran) erinnern</i> in incidental sequences: Challenges	71
3.3.3	<i>Kannst dich (dran) erinnern</i> in incidental sequences: Backing up a claim	76
3.3.4	Turn-final or stand-alone <i>erinnern</i>	80
3.3.5	<i>Weißt du noch / kennst du noch</i> : Checking remembering	85
3.3.6	Conclusion of German <i>erinnern</i> and <i>wissen/kennen + noch</i>	92
3.4	A comparison of <i>do you remember</i> in English and German	95

Chapter 4:	<i>Do you know in English and German</i>	100
4.1	Introduction	100
4.2	<i>Do you know</i>	100
4.2.1	Pursuing a response	101
4.2.2	Initiating a topic shift	108
4.2.3	Giving directions	116
4.2.3.1	<i>Do you know + where</i>	116
4.2.3.2	<i>Do you know + when</i>	123
4.2.4	Conclusion of <i>do you know</i>	126
4.3	<i>Kennst du</i> and <i>weißt du</i>	127
4.3.1	Pursuing a response	128
4.3.2	Checking simple recognition	131
4.3.3	Initiating a topic shift	134
4.3.4	Checking a prior turn	138
4.3.5	Conclusion of <i>kennst du</i> and <i>weißt du</i>	146
4.4	A comparison of <i>do you know</i> in English and German	147
Chapter 5:	<i>Do you remember and do you know in teacher talk</i>	150
5.1	Introduction	150
5.2	<i>Do you remember</i>	150
5.2.1	(<i>Do you</i>) <i>remember</i> : Reminding students	151
5.2.2	(<i>Do you</i>) <i>remember</i> : Structuring teacher talk	154
5.2.2.1	Providing step-by-step information	154
5.2.2.2	Connecting new with old information	157
5.2.3	(<i>Do you</i>) <i>remember</i> : Giving a hint	160
5.2.4	Conclusion of <i>do you remember</i> in teacher talk	170
5.3	<i>Do you know</i>	171
5.3.1	(<i>Do</i>) <i>you know</i> : Doing repair work	172
5.3.2	(<i>Do</i>) <i>you know</i> : Pursuing a response	175
5.3.2.1	Simply seeking recognition	176
5.3.2.2	Making a question more specific	183
5.3.3	Conclusion of <i>do you know</i> in teacher talk	187
5.4	Comparison of <i>do you remember</i> and <i>do you know</i> in teacher talk	188
Chapter 6:	Conclusion	191
6.1	Summary of findings	191
6.1.1	A comparison of <i>do you remember</i> and <i>do you know</i>	195
6.1.2	Everyday conversation and teacher talk	197
6.1.3	Limitations	198
6.2	Implications	199
6.3	Future research	201
References		204
Appendix: Transcription conventions		214
A.1.	Jefferson transcript notation	214

Chapter 1: Introduction

1.1 Objectives and significance of study

Social interaction is a ground for sharing opinions, beliefs, experiences, and memories between participants. In everyday conversation, speakers and listeners are continuously making reference to persons, things, prior utterances, shared knowledge and experiences. This negotiation of references facilitates “the realm of social, interpersonal affiliation” (Enfield, 2006, p. 399). Interactants have expectations as to what and how much recipients know, which is reflected in sequence organization, turn-design and the use of linguistic devices as well as non-verbal means such as gestures, intonation and eye-gaze. In other words, speakers recipient-design their talk based on the assumed knowledge base of their conversational partner, and recipients interpret utterances based on actual and assumed knowledge (Sacks & Schegloff, 1979). As such, “interactants keep detailed score of ‘who knows what’ and ‘who was told what’ as a condition of the interpretation of utterances, [...] identity maintenance (Raymond & Heritage, 2006) and [...] as a means of warranting conversational contributions and building expanded conversational sequences” (Heritage, 2012b, pp. 48-49). Kamio (1997) proposes that each participant has their own territory of information and that while territories may overlap with each other, they do not always have to. Knowledge can therefore “range from circumstances in which speaker A may have absolute knowledge of some item, while speaker B has none, to those in which both speakers may have exactly equal information, as well as every point in between” (Heritage, 2012a, p. 5). The use of certain grammatical constructions allows interlocutors to collaborate in establishing common ground or territories of information, thereby promoting the smooth flow of conversation (Kamio, 1997). These grammatical constructions may function as recognition checks found in presequences “to determinate actions, projecting their occurrence,

contingent on the response to the pre-sequence initiator” (Schegloff, 1988, p. 58) and thus, lead to a future action by establishing common ground among participants. Recognition checks, in these environments, solicit a claim or display of recognition by the recipient. Shaw & Kitinger’s (2007) study on repeat calls to a Home Birth Helpline identified so-called “recognition-solicit sequences” (p. 121) that consist of a “recognition-soliciting, initiating action and a responsive claim to remember” (p. 126) as is shown in the following example taken from Shaw & Kitinger (2007, pp. 120-121).

Figure 1.1 [Tanya 31: Second call]

```

01 Tan:  Hello:hh!
02 Clt:  Sorry: I: I uhm had to get to another
03        roo:m. [huh huh ]
04 Tan:→ [Oh that's] alright. Don't worry.
05        Uhm I actually spoke to you I think it was
06        about six wee:ks ago: .hh uhm (.) I was
07        telling you about how hh I'd had a positive
08        Strep B in the ur[ine [.hh [resu:lt. ]
09 Clt:→ [.hhh[Oh:: I [seem to re]
10        remember that one. Ye:s[:.]
11 Tan:        [Ye]ah. Uhm hhh!
12        Nothing (.) has really developed so far
13        u[hm]
14 Clt:  [mm]hm
15 Tan:  except I'm getting more nervous as it gets
16        closer to the bi:rth an' .hhh I'm thinking
17        that I'd like to spea:k to an independent
18        midwife.

```

The turn marked by the first arrow is the recognition-soliciting, initiating action, which is followed by the call taker’s responsive claim to remember (indicated by the second arrow). After recognition between callers is achieved, the caller Tanya moves on to the reason for the call (lines 12-13).

In my dissertation, I will focus on two grammatical constructions, namely, *do you know* and *do you remember* (and their equivalents in German). Traditionally, these have been analyzed as being situated immediately prior to a larger action (cf. Hayashi, 2005; Schegloff, 1980).

Clayman (2010 as cited in Heritage, 2012a, p. 20) refers to *do you know* questions in presequences as “requesting information [or] cleaning the decks for the delivery of information”.¹ Similarly, both *do you know* and *do you remember*, are categorized by Schegloff (1980) as “pres”, that is, as a means to secure “understandability or recognizability of references” (p. 115). An example of *(do you) remember X* is given in Figure 1.2 taken from Schegloff (1980, pp. 112-113).

Figure 1.2 [#17, ST, simplified]

20 R: Ya sure.
 21 → Oh by the way ((sniff)) I have a
 22 bi:g favor to ask ya.
 23 L: Sure, go'head.
 24 R:→ 'Member the blouse you made a
 25 couple weeks ago?
 26 L: Ya.
 27 R: Well I want to wear it this weekend
 28 to Vegas but my mom's buttonholer
 29 is broken.
 30 L: Fred I told ya when I made the
 31 blouse I'd do the buttonholes.
 32 R: Ya ((sniff)) but I hate ta impose.
 33 L: No problem.
 34 We can do them on Monday after work

In Figure 1.2, the main action is a request produced by R starting in line 27, which however is introduced earlier in lines 21-22 and lines 24-25. In lines 21-22, R projects a request whereas lines 24-25 are not the projected action, but seeking recipient L's recognition of the object that is involved in the request. Only after the recipient's confirmation (line 26) can the speaker proceed to produce the projected action, and may employ pronouns without repeating what was said in the preliminaries. The turn in lines 24-25 is a pre introduced with a *remember* recognition check that precedes R's request of fixing the buttonholes.

¹ In institutional talk, *do you know* can occur in “exam questions, in search for whether the recipient has the information (understanding) requested” (Heritage, 2012a, p. 20; see also Searle, 1969; Heritage & Raymond, 2012). Exam questions with *do you know* will not be investigated in the present study. information (understanding) requested” (Heritage, 2012a, p. 20; see also Searle, 1969; Heritage & Raymond, 2012). Exam questions with *do you know* will not be investigated in the present study.

The following excerpt (Figure 1.3) taken from Schegloff (2007, p. 238) is an example of *do you know* in incidental sequences.

Figure 1.3 (13.05) SN-4, 11:28-12:08 [simplified]

```

1  She:  Luhma:ncha had something dri:pping on the fronta my car
2         last year but I never got tuh collec:ct on it.
3         (0.6)
4  She:  Yihknow when it- (.) came from thee:: I think (a) air
5         conditioning system. it drips on the front of the ca:rs?
6         (.)
7  She:  if you park inna certain place?=
8  Ru?:  =[mm hmm]
9  She:-> =[·hhhh] (.) Peter.
10         (0.2)
11 She:-> Legget?
12         (0.5)
13 Kar:-> [O h          y e a h.]
14 She:-> [(Y'know who) I'm tal]king about? Yeah. ·hh He collected
15         a fo:rtune fer that. He claimed all k(h)i:nds of
16         damages.
17         (1.1)
18 Ru?:  huh huh-huh=
19 Kar:  =From Lama:ncha:?
20 She:  Yeah.
21         (1.4)

```

In this fragment, Sherry refers to a person called Peter (line 9). This is followed by a pause and another piece of information about Peter. By adding the last name Legget (line 11), Sherry provides a try-marked form, which is specially marked with upward intonation, for the other participants to recognize. After the silence in line 12, Sherry self-selects with a declarative question *Y'know who I'm talking about?* (line 14), which is in overlap with Karen's change-of-state token *oh* (Heritage, 1988) and a confirmation response token (line 13). To this, Sherry responds with an acknowledgement token (line 14) and a continuation of her telling once recognition of the referent is established (lines 14-16). The question in line 14 illustrates an instance of *do you know* recognition checks after a try-marked person reference with delayed uptake from the recipient.

The literature (Schegloff, 1980; 1988; 2007; Sidnell, 2010; Ten Have, 1999) has discussed *do you know* and *do you remember* as presequences, but as Figure 1.3 illustrates *do you know* type of recognition checks may also occur in incidental sequences. So far, the analysis of incidental sequences has focused more on try-marking (Koshik & Seo, 2012; Schegloff, 2007), but less so on the *do you know* construction following the try-marked form in this sequential environment.

In the data collected for this study, *do you remember* and *do you know* recognition checks are also used as pres, thus corroborating earlier findings. As this dissertation shows, however, they are also involved in incidental sequences, which are sequences “whose position does not appear to be occasioned by reference to an underlying base adjacency pair” (Schegloff, 2007, p. 237). Bolden (2008) defines incidental as something that is “responsive to something in the immediate environment” (p. 318). Therefore, the incidental sequence relates to the ongoing conversation, but not immediately to the main course of action.

Furthermore, English and German *do you remember* and *do you know* constructions share similar action environments. English *do you remember* constructions are found in situations of challenges, claim-backing situations and direction-giving environments whereas German *kannst (du) dich dran erinnern* ‘can (you) remember’, *erinnerst (du) dich* ‘do (you) remember’, *kennst du noch* ‘do you still know’ and *weißt du noch* ‘do you still know’ recognition checks occur in action environments of challenges, claim-backing situations and situations where speakers seek recognition from their participants to elicit a telling or information prior to a larger action. The action environments observed for *do you know* constructions in English are situations, in which speakers give directions, initiate topic shifts, and pursue a response after no or insufficient uptake

from the participants. Similarly, *kennst du* and *weißt du* in German function as response pursuits or topic shifts.

Another observation relates to the use of the adverb *noch* ‘still’ in German. *Noch* occurs together with *kannst (du) dich erinnern* ‘can you remember’ to express that the speaker’s expectations regarding the recipient’s memory of the reference are not very high, but is also found with *weißt du noch* and *kennst du noch*, both literally meaning ‘do you still know’. When occurring with the particle *noch*, *weißt du* and *kennst du* are translated into English with *do you remember*.

In teacher talk, *do you remember* serves to back up claims, connect new with old information or give hints that guide students in finding the correct answer. Teachers may avoid dispreferred negative evaluations with *do you remember*. *Do you know*, on the other hand, occurs in repair sequences providing an account for the correct answer, or it can reformulate or make a teacher’s original question more specific if used as a response pursuit.

By carving out the structural and interactional patterns and implications of these constructions for the subsequent talk, this study aims to demonstrate how coparticipants manage talk through the negotiation of reference problems that are made explicit via the use of *do you remember* and *do you know* constructions. In this regard, this study shows how language provides its users with a variety of ways to perform social actions, which underlie a social order and which are structured by epistemic hierarchies among participants made transparent through talk-in-interaction.

The analysis of recognition checks with *do you know* and *do you remember* will help us understand how grammar and interaction are intertwined. Moreover it shows how interlocutors engage with each other to achieve intersubjectivity with respect to background knowledge and

memory. This study therefore is not only of interest to conversation analysts, but also teachers, linguists, cognitive scientists, sociologists, psychologists and communication researchers. Furthermore, this study offers a cross-cultural comparison of interactional and grammatical regularities in everyday and expert-novice interactions as shown in two languages, which are distinct in their language systems.

1.2 Methodology

The framework for this study is Conversation analysis (CA), which investigates the systematics of talk through the identification of interactional practices (Schegloff et al., 1977; Schegloff, 2007, Sidnell, 2010). CA offers a tool to lay out how social actions evolve and are accomplished by interactants engaged in talk. The primary objective of CA is the study of social actions through the close examination of talk as it unfolds turn-by-turn. The analysis also incorporates prosody, intonation, gestures and eye-gaze if applicable (Atkinson & Heritage, 1984; Schegloff et al., 1977; Ten Have, 1999). CA with its focus on social actions, sequential organization, and the linguistic composition of turns (i.e., turn design) is an ideal methodology to study two seemingly similar looking grammatical constructions and their (different) functions in discourse. By taking into account not only how a turn is designed, but also how it is responded to by interlocutors, a CA analysis can demonstrate the interactional achievement and impact associated with the two constructions under investigation. In doing so, a CA methodology provides insight into the social order of human behavior that is underlyingly manifest and that becomes visible through actual everyday interactions. When actions and their linguistic manifestations are examined across languages and across language families as proposed in this

study, then work of this kind helps to identify those actions that are unique to a specific language community and those that can be generalized to be cross-culturally available.

1.3 Previous work on recognition (understanding) checks

Psaltis and Duveen (2007) argue that one of the central features of conversation is “the construction of identity as the dual process of being recognized and identification” (p. 95; see also Duveen, 2001).² Furthermore, conversation partners acknowledge each other as independent beings with a certain authority, who strive for establishing mutual agreement or mutual recognition in conversation (Psaltis & Duveen, 2007). This is why speakers may initiate recognition checks to solve possible reference problems.³ Auer (1984) points out a variety of referential problems in conversation. For instance, reference can cause problems among interlocutors if the speaker wrongly presumes background knowledge of the recipient, and/or if the recipient displays his lack of knowledge of an aforementioned referent. This lack of knowledge underlines the importance of recipient design (Auer, 1984; Sacks et al., 1974; Schegloff, 1996). Auer (1984) suggests that speakers rely on their “recipients’ collaboration [such as that there is] no need to ‘fill in’ additional features of the identificandum which they do not mention explicitly” (p. 628). The idea of conversation as a collaborative act is also supported by Clark and Wilkes-Gibbs (1986) who consider the principle of “mutual responsibility” as crucial for referring because: 1) both speaker and hearer need “to mutually believe that [the recipient] ha[s] now understood [the speaker’s] reference correctly” (p. 33), and 2) speakers are

² Recognition sequences in phone openings have to be distinguished from recognition sequences analyzed in this study (cf. Schegloff, 1979). Phone openings without display of who the caller is require a sequence that establishes the caller and the receiver, but in naturally-occurring talk this sequence, which usually precedes the greeting sequence, is not necessary since participants can see who they are talking to.

³ For an overview of the work on reference, see Enfield (2012), Enfield and Stivers (2007) and a special issue on reference in *Research on Language and Social Interaction* (2012, 45(2)).

responsible for their recipients' understanding of the reference before they can continue with their agenda (Clark and Wilkes, 1986, p. 7). Interlocutors are responsible for their recipients' successful understanding of a referent (Sacks & Schegloff, 1979). In addition, "which characteristics of the identifiable object gets verbalized depends on how the speaker estimates the shared knowledge of participants" (Auer, 1979, p. 94). If the speaker underestimates the recipient's knowledge state, the speaker has to expect questions from the recipient, which may be direct or indirect, until the reference problem is resolved and the referent successfully identified (Clark & Wilkes-Gibbs, 1986).

Furthermore, Egbert et al. (2009) point out how referencing serves to uphold intersubjectivity (see also Auer, 1984; Schegloff et al., 1977). Intersubjectivity is defined as "a temporarily shared world where both interlocutors know that the other knows the same thing that they themselves know" (Psaltis & Duveen, 2007, p. 97). Thus, creating mutual agreement on what is and has just been shared is necessary for successful communication. Checking knowledge fulfills several purposes, namely to check the understanding of the recipient or to request information from the recipient (Heritage, 2012a). Checking the understanding of the recipient helps to establish mutual intersubjectivity among conversation partners and questions like *do you understand?* show that participants are sensitive to their interlocutors' responses (Psaltis & Duveen, 2007). Speakers may perform these checks to assure that participants can follow the conversation. Recognition checks are therefore an attempt to assure participants' memories and knowledge that is presumed to be present in the recipient's mind.

The goal of this dissertation is to explore how participants check recognition of references with *do you remember* and *do you know* in English and German, and in everyday and classroom interaction. The examination of classroom talk will only be on English *do you*

remember and *do you know* in order to focus my discussion of *do you remember* and *do you know* on two dimensions, which are 1. a cross-linguistic analysis and 2. a discourse-specific analysis of the two constructions under investigation.

In this dissertation, I restrict my definition of memory to personal experiences, excluding knowledge that has been stored through memorization or formal study, which I consider as knowledge rather than memory. This also helps to differentiate between the two concepts of knowledge and memory. It is furthermore noticeable that interlocutors can have different memories of the same event or object based on the idea that our memories can be influenced by a variety of factors. To avoid confusion, a distinction needs to be drawn between the two concepts, knowledge and memory since they are intertwined to a certain degree. In my work, I try to show that the two notions are different, but at the same time belong to the larger theoretical framework of epistemics. While knowledge is concerned with what and how much a speaker knows, memory focuses on the retrieval and recognition of personally experienced knowledge conveyed through processes of reminding, remembering and forgetting. This classification is necessary to differentiate the subtleties that are apparent in participants' employment of *do you know* vs. *do you remember* constructions. Although they both are a means to express epistemic ground, they are also different in that the former focuses on knowledge and the latter on memory as is made implicit through the respective verb forms *know* and *remember*.

Even though *do you know* constructions check understanding of knowledge, I would like to refer to my examples as recognition checks rather than understanding checks since understanding checks reflect speakers' and not recipients' knowledge states. Given that speakers use *do you know* constructions in my examples to check the recipient's knowledge, the term recognition checks seems more appropriate. As Schegloff (1980) points out, if "the speaker's

rather than the recipient's knowledge [...] is at issue and the recipient is supposed by the speaker to 'know', then the preliminary may take the form of an understanding check question [...]" (p. 115). Thus, this latter type of "understanding check question" as described by Schegloff (1980) will not be included in my collection.⁴ I am also excluding instances like *do you know what?* that are pres to a telling or news announcement (Heritage 2012b). In this dissertation, I am restricting my analysis to examples of *do you know* and *do you remember* that check recognition. The *do you know* and *do you remember* constructions under investigation check whether a certain referent is recognized as knowledge or memory shared by participants.

1.4 Outline of study

This section of the chapter contains information about the English and German data I collected for this dissertation. It briefly renders an idea of the amount of data from which examples were taken to observe and identify patterns within and across different categories of references and recognition checks. This is followed by a structural overview of this dissertation.

1.4.1 Data and transcription conventions

The data for English *do you remember* constructions are drawn from 20 hours of conversation from the Santa Barbara Corpus of Spoken American English (SBCSAE), a corpus of audio-taped interactions among native speakers of American English.⁵ A total of 22 instances of *remember* recognition checks were found. For my collection of English *do you know* constructions, the data stems from the same corpus, that is, the Santa Barbara Corpus of Spoken

⁴ For more examples see Schegloff (1988).

⁵ Available at <http://talkbank.org/CABank/ca-data.html>

American English (SBCSAE, 20 hours) and from 20 hours of conversation from the Call Friend Corpus, a corpus of telephone conversations among native speakers of Northern and Southern American English.⁶ Some of my examples were taken from data published in CA articles. Given that my data are mostly phone call interactions and audio-recorded face-to-face interactions, this analysis did not include any discussion of gestures or facial expressions. Interactants may make non-verbal claims or displays of recognition in face-to-face interactions, which might have been relevant in the understanding of reference formulation and in the doing of reference. A total of 20 instances were gathered for English *do you know* recognition checks.

For German instances that solicit recognition of shared memories with *erinnern* ‘remember’ and of recognition of shared knowledge with *wissen or kennen* ‘know’, I have looked 10 hours of video-recorded face-to-face conversations and audio recorded telephone conversations. In addition, I have also collected instances from the *FOLK* corpus (2005-2012, 101 hours of conversation), the *Zwirner* corpus (1955-1970, 50 hours of conversation) and the *Pfeffer* corpus (1961, 79 hours of conversation), which are all databases of audio-taped interactions among native speakers of German provided by the *Institut für deutsche Sprache*.⁷ For this dissertation, 20 instances of *kannst (du) dich erinnern / erinnerst du dich* recognition checks were found. Furthermore, in my entire collection, I have only observed and included 6 instances of *kennst du noch* and *weißt du noch* ‘do you remember’. I have found 10 *kennst du* and 14 *weißt du* examples of German *do you know* recognition checks.

For *do you remember* instances occurring in teacher talk, I have looked at 4 hours of video-recorded ESL student-teacher writing conferences, and 20 hours of classroom conversation from the ClassBank, a corpus of video-taped classroom interactions among native

⁶ Available at <http://talkbank.org/CABank/ca-data.html>

⁷ Available at <http://www1.ids-mannheim.de/start/>

speakers of American English.⁸ The majority of instances are from the same geometry class among second graders taught by a female teacher named Curtis. I have found total of 25 instances of *remember* recognition checks and 18 *do you know* instances in teacher talk analyzed in this dissertation. All English and German examples were transcribed according to the CA transcription conventions by Jefferson, as described in Atkinson and Heritage (1984).

1.4.2 Structure

The organization of this dissertation is as follows. Chapter 2 will review the previous literature on reference, knowledge and memory (Section 2.1), which are needed to understand how recognition of references is achieved by participants with *do you remember* and *do you know* in English and German. While the reference in *do you remember* is a shared memory, the reference in *do you know* is shared knowledge among speakers. In this chapter, I will also introduce the two constructions under investigation. The English constructions are reviewed in Section 2.2 and the German counterparts in Section 2.3. The German section also includes a summary of the major characteristics of Spoken German that will help understand the basic differences between Spoken English and Spoken German conversation.

Chapters 3 to 5 are the main analytical chapters of my dissertation. Chapter 3 investigates English and German *do you remember* recognition checks in everyday conversation. The subsections are organized according to the sequential position (presequence, incidental sequence, turn-final or stand-alone) and the action environments in which the recognition checks occur. Chapter 4 examines English and German *do you know* constructions in everyday interaction. Similar to Chapter 3, the subsections for *do you know* are structured according to the

⁸ Available at <http://talkbank.org/CABank/ca-data.html>

interactional functions of *do you know* in English and German. Chapters 3 and 4 also contain a cross-linguistic comparison of English and German respectively. In Chapter 5, I will analyze *do you remember* and *do you know* as employed by teachers in classroom interactions or teacher talk since some of my examples are drawn from ESL student-teacher writing conferences. I will also compare the two constructions with each other.

In Chapter 6, I will summarize the major findings of this dissertation with focus on a comparison of the two constructions under investigation, a comparison of *do you remember* and *do you know* in everyday conversation vs. teacher talk and discuss the limitations of this study. I will also present the implications that can be drawn from this dissertation and conclude my study with suggestions for future research. I hope to contribute to the current work on grammar-and-interaction, research on epistemics, studies on cognitive processes involving memory as well as studies in teacher training and classroom interactions and organizations. This dissertation addresses issues relevant to the field of conversation analysis, pedagogy, second language acquisition research, linguistics, cognitive science and sociology.

Chapter 2: Preliminaries

2.1 Introduction

In this chapter, I will review the literature relevant to the role of recognition plays in conversation through a general discussion of the concepts of reference, knowledge and memory (Section 2.2). Then I will introduce the two constructions of interest for this dissertation, which are *do you remember* and *do you know* in English (Section 2.3). Next, I will give a short overview of Spoken German followed by a discussion of the German equivalents of *do you remember* and *do you know*, which include *kannst (du) dich erinnern / erinnerst (du) dich / weißt du noch / kennst du noch* ‘do you remember’ and *weißst du / kennst du* ‘do you know’ (Section 2.4). The last section (Section 2.5) will highlight the previous work on teacher talk focusing on response pursuits, repair and correction in classroom interactions as this will be of interest in the third analytical chapter of the dissertation.

2.2 Relevant notions

The three notions relevant to the broader discussion of how recognition is achieved in talk-in-interaction are reference, knowledge, and memory. All three concepts have received individual attention, but have also been studied in relation to each other in various disciplines. In this section, I will summarize the general ideas of each concept and then review the conversation analytic research on reference, knowledge and memory.

2.2.1 Reference

Since the two constructions under investigation, *do you remember* and *do you know* in English and German, make reference to an entity such as a person, location, time or event, it will be necessary to review the previous work on reference. *Do you know* constructions check whether participants know or recognize references. Reference is a way of relating to an entity, which may be a person, an object, a place etc. (Enfield, 2012). In face-to-face interactions, participants may make reference by pointing to the referent. However, not all entities are or can be referred to by pointing in talk. Instead, interlocutors can make use of linguistic and/or other non-verbal expressions to establish reference. Establishing a reference means to achieve the recipients' recognition of a specific reference. Regardless of what other actions they accomplish with their talk, speakers continuously make reference (Auer, 1984), but they recipient-design their turns according to the knowledge domains or what speakers assume to be in the knowledge domain of recipients (Ford & Fox, 1996; Sacks and Schegloff 1979; Schegloff, 1972; 1996). Recipient-design is one principle that determines speakers' selection of referential expressions in conversation.

Among the different types of reference, person reference has so far received primary attention in previous research (Enfield, 2007; Ford & Fox, 1996; Kitzinger et al., 2012; Levinson, 1996; 2007; Lerner, 2007; Sacks & Schegloff, 1979; Schegloff, 1996; 2007; Sidnell, 2007; Stivers, 2007; Stivers et al., 2007). However, recent studies on reference reveal an increasing interest in reference to other entities than person reference such as objects (Sidnell & Barnes, 2013), accounts (Antaki, 1994), time (Enfield, 2012), place (Auer, 1979; Schegloff, 1972), and events (Sidnell & Barnes, 2013). This growing interest is also reflected in very recent cross-linguistic studies on other-than-person reference (Golato & Golato, in press; Hayashi &

Kim, in press; Taleghani-Nikazm, in press). Reference to places, for example, involve three types of analysis, which include a location analysis, a membership analysis and a topic analysis (Schegloff, 1972). A location analysis refers to how a reference can be identified relative to its local positioning, a membership analysis refers to the social hierarchies and knowledge expectations among participants (Sidnell & Barnes, 2013), and a topic analysis refers to the performed action. Schegloff (1972) classifies place referents into 1. a geographical specification such as an address, 2. a description of a place in relation to interactants (*John's house*), 3. in relation to a landmark (*left of the billboard*), 4. in terms of 'course of action' (*where they leave the garbage*), or 5. as a proper name (*New York*).

Independent of its category, if speakers make reference, they choose certain lexical and/or gestural expressions from among a pool of possible expressions (Brown, 1958; Frege, 1960). Schegloff and Sacks (1973) distinguish between recognitional reference and non-recognitional reference forms. Recognitional reference forms are personal names and recognitional descriptions such as *the guy sitting next to you* whereas non-recognitional reference forms are expressions like *this girl* or *someone*. As stated earlier, how speakers recipient-design their turns is reflected in their delivery of references to the recipient (Ford & Fox, 1996; Sacks & Schegloff, 1979; Schegloff, 1996).

According to Sacks and Schegloff (1979), two preferences for person reference are at play. The preference for minimization suggests that the speaker selects "a single reference form", typically the first name of the person referent (Sacks & Schegloff, 1979, p. 16). The second preference for recognition suggests that the speaker chooses an expression that is recognizable to the recipient. Recognitionals are preferred over non-recognitionals (Schegloff & Sacks, 1979) because they follow the principle of recognition. Schegloff (1996) further argues that proper

names are preferred over recognitional descriptions because names are by default associated with recognitional reference (Downing, 1996; Stivers et al., 2007). Moreover, names follow the principle of minimality consisting of a single or minimal unit (Sacks & Schegloff, 1979). This is also supported by conversational data where speakers provide names after they give a recognitional description or in situations in which recipients ask for names or display recognition by providing the name (Schegloff, 2007). The two preferences in the organization of references are not always satisfied and in those cases, the sequence of talk is typically expanded by speakers to solve referential problems (Downing, 1996; Heritage, 2007; Levinson, 2007). Thus, the preference for recognition is considered to be the driving principle among the two preferences.

In terms of sequential position, Schegloff (1996) distinguishes between initial and subsequent position of referents. Initial position refers to the first or initial mentioning of a referent whereas subsequent position refers to a second or later mentioning of the referent. In this context, Schegloff (1996) introduces the notions of locally initial and locally subsequent reference forms. Full noun phrases are usually found in initial position and pronouns are expected to occur in subsequent positions. If they occur in these positions, their occurrence is unmarked, but if for instance pronouns appear in initial position, their use is marked signaling that speakers expect their recipients to be familiar with the referent. Within the context of person reference, “on some occasions [...] a speaker may *figure* that someone about to be referred to is a person known to [a] recipient, but is not certain of this” (Schegloff, 2007, p.238). Then the speaker may use the appropriate recognitional form – like a name – but deliver it in a specially marked way, commonly with upward intonation followed by a brief pause, which is called try-marking (Koshik & Seo, 2012; Sacks and Schegloff, 1979; Schegloff, 1996; 2007). Try-marking marks the reference as a try to achieve recognition with that reference form. Therefore, it is one

way to resolve referential problems in conversation and to accommodate the two competing preferences for minimality and recognition in conversation (Sacks & Schegloff, 1979). Another way to resolve referential problems is repair (Sacks & Schegloff, 1979). Different from try-marking that is initiated by the speaker, repair sequences may be initiated by the recipient or the speaker to establish recognition of references.

Referential problems in conversation are not “problems of reference alone, but they are also problems in carrying out the ‘larger’ action of which the reference in question is a part” (Hayashi, 2005, p. 438). According to Auer (1984), participants design turns that make up a given main action in which the negotiation of references is a subsidiary action. Japanese, for instance, allows speakers to use postpositional particles to embed references, try-marked nominals, into the ongoing TCU, which is a way to syntactically integrate subsidiary actions into the main action. In this way preliminary work of reference negotiation is done before the main activity is resumed.

The focus of previous research on person reference raises the question if these findings apply to all other types of references. Whether preference for minimality and recognition (Sacks & Schegloff, 1979) may be generally observed across different categories of references, what referential problems occur and how they are resolved in conversation are questions that still deserve further exploration. This dissertation investigates *do you remember* and *do you know* recognition checks that make reference to different ontological categories including person, place and event reference. This work will contribute to the growing body of research on reference and examine how speakers negotiate and organize references through *do you remember* and *do you know* recognition checks in talk-in-interaction.

2.2.2 Knowledge

The prior research on knowledge will be discussed to understand how knowledge determines participants' understanding, orientations and actions in conversation (Chapters 4 & 5). Epistemics has received attention from a variety of disciplines, which include research in psychology, linguistics, and conversation analysis. In psychological approaches to knowledge, researchers have discussed how mental states are associated with oneself and with others, which is also known as the "Theory of Mind" (Premack & Woodruff, 1978). In order for communication to work, we need to understand the mental states of others, which allows us to establish common ground in communication (Clark, 1996). This ability is part of our cognitive faculty and important to successful human communication (Clark, 1996; Stalnaker, 2002).

Linguistics approaches to knowledge include research on the interaction of knowledge and grammar, information structure and knowledge in speech act theory (Hayano, 2013). Studies on the interaction of knowledge and grammar investigate how epistemic modality and evidentiality is expressed through grammatical markers in language. Epistemic modality refers to how committed a speaker is to his or her utterance (Palmer, 1986) whereas evidentiality refers to how accessible or reliable a source is (Boas, 1911; Chafe & Nichols, 1986; Kamio, 1990). Research on information structure again takes a different more context-oriented approach to knowledge. According to Lambrecht (1994), speakers have certain expectations about their recipients' knowledge, which is conveyed through prosodic or grammatical markers in an utterance. This suggests that language use provides speakers with cues that enable them to understand recipients' minds (Chafe, 1976; 1998). In speech act theory, knowledge states of speakers are reflected in the action of an utterance and thus, determine what speech act gets performed. To examine the relationship between information and the action of an utterance,

Labov and Fanshel (1977) distinguish between A - events (known to A, but not to B), B - events (known to B, but not to A), AB - events (known to both A and B), O - events (known to everyone present), and D - events (known to be disputable).

“Research into epistemics [within CA] focuses on the knowledge claims that interactants assert, contest and defend in and through turns-at-talk and sequences of interaction” (Heritage, 2013, p. 370). In addition, studies on knowledge in CA investigate participants’ knowledge states on a turn-by-turn basis throughout a sequence of talk. Knowledge states of participants have several dimensions (Hayano, 2013). To better understand the different dimensions, I will briefly describe epistemic access (Goodwin, 1987; Pomerantz, 1984; Stivers et al., 2011), rights (Heritage & Raymond, 2005), authority (Heritage, 2002), primacy (Raymond & Heritage, 2006), responsibility (Stivers, 2011, Stivers et al., 2011), status (Heritage, 2012a), stance (Heritage, 2012b) and their normative influence on designing turns and talk (for overviews, see for instance, Heritage, 2012a; 2012b; Heritage & Raymond, 2005; 2012; Stivers et al., 2011, among others). Epistemic access refers to a speaker’s access of information or knowledge and the interactional resources that he or she uses to manage, seek, claim or display access (Stivers et al., 2011). Epistemic rights refer to the rights of a speaker to assess or make claims about a referent (Heritage & Raymond, 2006; Stivers, 2005). K+ rights means that a speaker is more knowledgeable and K- rights means that a speaker is less knowledgeable. The concept of epistemic rights is closely related to the concept of epistemic authority, the latter of which is associated with a speaker’s profession or experience (Heritage, 2002; Raymond & Heritage, 2006). For instance, a medical doctor has epistemic authority (and thus also greater epistemic rights) to talk about diseases and other medical issues than someone of a different, unrelated profession. Epistemic primacy then is understood as having primary knowledge and it is the

more general term for epistemic authority (Hayano, 2013; Stivers et al., 2011). Epistemic responsibility relates to participations' expectations of knowledge domains, which are based on participants' social relationships to each other (Stivers, 2011, Stivers et al., 2011). To give an example, teachers have the epistemic responsibility to know the material they are teaching, to answer students' questions and to correct wrong student answers about the material. Epistemic status is defined as "an inherently relative and relational concept concerning the relative access to some domain of two (or more) persons at some point in time" (Heritage, 2012a, p. 5). Exam questions introduced with *do you know*, for example, are questions that seek answers from students not because the teacher does not know the answer, but to evaluate students' performances. The teacher's epistemic status in this case is not fully reflected by the epistemic stance expressed through the *do you know* question. It is the social relationship among participants that gives information about their epistemic states. Moreover, epistemic status is regarded to be a key factor in action formation (Heritage, 2012a, p. 25) since it may account for a speaker's motives in executing a particular social action.

Analysts can only determine the knowledge of speakers and recipients by what speakers produce verbally and non-verbally, by how utterances are produced by speakers and by the verbal, non-verbal or absent reactions of the other participants. It is therefore necessary to differentiate between actual knowledge domains (epistemic status) and epistemic stance of speakers since participants may claim to have more epistemic rights than they actually have (Heritage, 2012b). Hence, epistemic stance is determined by a speaker's self-presentation or positioning in and through turns. In other words, epistemic stance refers to knowledge that is about "epistemic positions taken through language and embodied action" (Stivers et al., 2011, pp. 7-8) and not so much on what is actually available in a speaker's knowledge domain.

Stivers et al. (2011) discuss the role of social norms on participants in relation to epistemic primacy, access and responsibilities. Specifically, Stivers et al. (2011, p. 3) state that [in] everyday social interaction, knowledge displays and negotiations are ubiquitous. At issue is whether we have epistemic access to some state of affairs, but also how certain we are about what we know, our relative authority and our differential rights and responsibilities with respect to this knowledge. Implicit in this conceptualization is that knowledge is dynamic, graded and multi-dimensional and that our deployment of and reliance on epistemic resources are normatively organized.

This quote implies that there is a norm of epistemic primacy that is, that only someone who has more access and rights or authority over a certain piece of knowledge, is eligible to make claims about it. Put differently, this quote implies that knowledge is something that drives interactants to participate or stay silent in talk and it drives them to monitor other participants' talk. Moreover, how speakers design their turns at talk reflects their orientation to the norm to provide sufficient but not redundant information. Thus, there is a norm not to "oversuppose and undertell" (Schegloff, 1979, pp. 50-51) in such a way that speakers should not deliver information to already knowing recipients (Goffman, 1979; Sacks, 1992) and should not claim knowledge without having proper epistemic access (Heritage & Raymond, 2005; Stivers et al., 2011). Participants of talk therefore need to recipient-design talk (Schegloff & Sacks, 1979) so that interlocutors will be provided with new and sufficient information that ensures the proper recognition of references.

How a turn is designed can have implications for the epistemic content of an utterance and the assumptions of speakers about their recipients' knowledge states. Questions, for example, "[invoke] a claim that the questioner lacks certain information (or lacks certainty about

it)” (Heritage & Raymond, 2012, p. 3). Compared to interrogative questions, declarative questions elicit participants’ confirmation (Raymond, 2010; Turner, 2009). Tag questions are again different in that they may downgrade an assessment produced by the same speaker (Heritage & Raymond, 2005). Answers also convey participants’ epistemic access and rights. Repetitional responses confirm the proposition of a question claiming to have more epistemic rights than the questioner. They are also less anaphoric, thus confirming and not affirming the question (Heritage & Raymond, 2012).

Epistemic primacy and responsibility show how participants orient to each other’s epistemic stance. Work on first and second assessments for example suggests that the first speaker claims epistemic primacy (K+ rights) over the second speaker who is considered to have less knowledge or rights (K- rights) (Heritage & Raymond, 2005, p. 34; see also Heritage, 2002). However, modified repeats may be used by second speakers to assert primary rights by confirming a previous claim produced by the first speaker (Stivers, 2005). Epistemic stance is further influenced by speakers’ relationship to certain knowledge domains or states. Pomerantz (1980) distinguishes between two different types of knowables. Type 1 knowables consist of knowledge that belongs to the subject-actor who as the subject-actor has the rights and is obligated to know such as personal information about the speaker, information relative to the speaker or first-hand information. Type 2 knowables consist of knowledge that is introduced, but is not owned by the subject-actor such as hearsay, reported or inferred information (Pomerantz, 1980; Sacks, 1975). When participants are asked questions about knowables to which they do not have access, participants still feel responsible to give an answer even if it means to account for not knowing the answer (Stivers & Robinson, 2006; Stivers et al., 2011).

For a better understanding of asymmetries and expectancies among interlocutors (Heritage, 2012a; Heritage & Raymond, 2005; Kamio, 1997), speakers design their turns according to what they think is informative to their recipients and solicit a response from the recipient. Epistemic territories not only reflect the knowledge state of participants, but also what information is known and their rights and responsibilities of knowing (Heritage, 2012a; Sacks, 1992; Terasaki, 2004). In the example “I forgot to tell you the two best things that happened to me today” (Terasaki, 2004, p. 176), what the two best things are that happened to the speaker is within speaker’s epistemic territory and it is the speaker’s right to share this knowledge. Thus, if speakers raise a topic that is part of the recipients’ epistemic territory, then recipients are more likely to produce a response whereas if speakers raise a topic that belongs to the epistemic territory of the speaker or is shared territory, then recipients are less likely to produce a second pair part response (Heritage, 2012b; Stivers & Rossano, 2010). Goffman (1971) further argues that personal knowledge can be compared to possessed objects and thus, “territorial offenses” of knowledge domains can happen as they may happen with possessed objects. If we take “I forgot to tell you the two best things that happened to me today” (Terasaki, 2004, p. 176) as an example, it would be a territorial offense if someone else other than the speaker would claim epistemic rights over the speaker’s knowledge of what the two best things are that happened to the speaker. Participants demonstrate their epistemic rights and responsibilities regarding personal knowledge or information (Pomerantz’s (1980) Type 1 knowable), their certainty or uncertainty about propositions throughout conversation (Stivers et al., 2011).

The ultimate goal of the negotiation of knowledge domains among participants of talk is “the pursuit and exploitation of mutual knowledge, shared expectations and other types of common ground [...] which has important consequences in the realm of social, interpersonal

affiliation” (Enfield, 2006, p. 309). To ensure successful communication, the background knowledge of recipients and the orientation of speakers to the recipients’ background knowledge help to secure recognition of references and hence, common ground in conversation (Kim, 2009). A more cognitive approach to common ground by Clark and Marshall (1981) proposes that “community membership, physical and linguistic co-presence” are defining characteristics of mutual knowledge. For example, deictic terms like *this* create physical co-presence whereas proper names are used by speakers to convey that knowledge of the referent is expected by the members of the community. In conversation analytic approaches to common ground, the driving force that establishes shared knowledge is the above-mentioned concept of recipient design (Sacks et al., 1974). To secure recognition of references and to ensure the right delivery of new/known information, speakers are responsible to continuously monitor talk, design their utterances based on the epistemic territories of interlocutors, their epistemic rights and responsibilities. Recipients in return are responsible to claim, assert and display knowledge according to the preference for sequence progressivity (Heritage, 2007), i.e. to move conversations forward and not backward.

2.2.3 Memory

Given that *do you remember* constructions solicit memory prompts and establish memory, I will review the previous literature on memory to give some background information for Chapters 3 and 5. Apart from knowledge, memory presents another factor that determines common ground in conversation. Memory has been the object of study in a variety of disciplines including cognitive science, discursive psychology and conversation analysis. Research on memory in cognitive science examines how memory is stored and retrieved in the brain (e.g.,

Conway, 2005; Engel, 1999; Nelson & Fivush, 2004; Rubin, 2006; Schachter, 1996, to mention just a few works). This research focuses on brain mechanisms and other underlying cognitive processes. In discursive psychology, studies on memory investigate memory “as an interactional phenomenon rather than as (just) a cognitive process” (Shaw & Kitzinger, 2007). For instance, researchers have looked at how forgetting and remembering are accomplished in talk (Edwards, 1997; Edwards & Potter, 1992). Haden et al. (2001) observed that children remember events more successfully if retrieved in joint collaboration with their mothers. Interactants may remember together (Cuc et al., 2006), but they may also need to remind each other, recover a recipient’s memory, or negotiate what all parties to the conversation consider to be correctly remembered or to be plausible facts and accounts (Middleton, 1997, p. 391).⁹ Similarly, conversation analysts understand memory as “an oriented-to interactional device (rather than a cognitive process)” (Shaw & Kitzinger, 2007, p. 118; see also Drew, 1980; Goodwin, 1987, Schegloff, 1991). Studies in discursive psychology and conversation analysis have been particularly interested in how participants claim and display forgetting and remembering of references such as persons or names. It is assumed that forgetting and remembering are produced by interlocutors to perform specific social actions in conversation (Shaw & Kitzinger, 2007).

To further differentiate between discursive psychological and conversation analytic research on memory, the conversation analytic approach to memory investigates memory or remembering as an action that is talked into being in conversation (Drew, 1989; Goodwin, 1987). As Goodwin (1987) points out, remembering and forgetting as mental processes are interactional resources in English. Thus, “the human propensity to forget – especially when claiming to remember – has reverberating implications for the interaction as a whole” (Shaw and Kitzinger

⁹ Other studies have explored the cognitive processes that underlie conversational remembering (e.g., Pasupathi, 2001; Weldon, 2001).

2007:140).¹⁰ This does however not imply that cognitive processes are completely ignored in conversation analytic studies on memory. CA researchers like Drew (1995; 2005) or Mandelbaum and Pomerantz (1990) examined cognitive states as they become manifest through talk-in-interaction. The study on the change-of-state token *oh* by Heritage (1984; 2005) also illustrates how speakers may convey a change in their mental state from unknowing (K-) to knowing (K+) (Goodwin, 1987) through tokens like *oh*.

Similar to the idea that knowledge claims are asserted and defended by participants in talk (Heritage, 2013), the question arises as to how social memory or recognition in conversation is claimed, challenged and displayed by participants on a turn-by-turn basis, how states of recognition can change from unknowing to knowing, and how assumed knowledge can be marked as known or unknown through talk-in-interaction. Thus, recognition of references determines whether sufficient information is provided to avoid possible referential problems. If problems of remembering arise, speakers are responsible to resolve references (Sacks & Schegloff, 1979).

Apart from try-marking (Koshik & Seo, 2012; Sacks & Schegloff, 1979; Schegloff, 1996; 2007) and repair sequences (Sacks & Schegloff, 1979), recognition-soliciting sequences are yet another way to address and resolve referential problems or problems of remembering in talk (Shaw & Kitzinger, 2007). Shaw and Kitzinger (2007) examined how caller and call takers orient to memory of a previous call in phone conversation openings. Memory is checked through direct questions asking whether the caller can remember, “solicit[ing] recollections, index[ing] information as previously conveyed, and treat[ing] the call taker as accountable for remembering” (Shaw & Kitzinger, 2007, p. 140). The researchers note that “in soliciting

¹⁰ For instance, failure to retrieve memory, i.e., forgetting, is considered to be embarrassing and distressing (Haber & Haber, 2000, p. 1071).

recognition, callers provide memory prompts that are recipient designed by reference to what they show themselves to expect the recipient to have remembered about them” (Shaw & Kitzinger, 2007, p. 121). Call takers claim remembering through identification of the caller or display remembering through collaborative completion. Once recognition of shared memory is established, the caller can proceed with the presentation of the caller’s problem. In Shaw and Kitzinger’s (2007) study, recognition-soliciting sequences occur in presequences before the callers introduce the main action or reason for the call.

Betz and Golato (2008) show that the German response token *achja*¹¹ expresses claims of remembering if uttered with a specific intonation contour. Depending on its phonetic variation, *achJA*, with stress on the second syllable, marks that something has been remembered, whereas *^achja*, with stress on the first syllable, marks that a knowledge claim or a next action is withheld.

As stated earlier, studies of memory conducted within a CA framework are more interested in the actions of forgetting and remembering rather than in cognitive processes. My dissertation investigates how interlocutors check other participants’ memory during talk rather than studying cognitive mechanisms that underlie memory retrieval. Thus, memory will be analyzed here with a CA framework.

2.3 The English constructions under investigation

As the main objects of study, this section of the dissertation introduces *do you remember* and *do you know* constructions in American English. In order to understand the interactional

¹¹ Betz and Golato (2008) point out that the literal translation of *achja* is *oh yeah*, but that the functional translation is *oh that’s right*, which is based on Heritage’s (1984) analysis of *oh that’s right*.

functions of the two constructions (to be discussed in Chapters 3-5), it will be necessary to introduce the previous work on the two verbs *know* and *remember*. This section gives a brief overview of the two constructions and discusses relevant literature, in particular, studies within the framework of conversation analysis. I will start with *do you remember* (Section 2.3.1) and then turn to *do you know* (Section 2.3.2).

2.3.1 *Do you remember*

The literature classifies the verb *remember* as a private verb (Biber, 1988; Quirk et al., 1985) due to its semantic feature that involves “a kind of mental process” (Tao, 2001, p. 117). According to Van Valin and Wilkins (1993), *remember* has three different semantic interpretations: “something the agent (1) intends, (2) perceives, or (3) knows/believes to be in the mind” (Van Valin & Wilkins, 1993 as cited in Tao, 2001, p. 117). *Remember* has derived from Middle English *remembren* ‘to remember’, which has its origin in the Latin verb *rememorari* ‘to be mindful of’ (*Merriam-Webster Dictionary of English*)¹². Apart from direct objects, *remember* can be followed by the gerund form (e.g. *I remember leaving the keys in the car*), the infinitive (*I remembered to leave the keys in the car*) and that-clauses (*I remembered that I left the keys in the car*), which reflects the syntactic variety and usage of the verb *remember* in English (Tao, 2001). *Remember* also occurs much more frequently in spoken corpora than in written corpora in English. Another feature of the verb *remember* is that it can stand alone as in “For example, remember, Sharon gave the example (CSPAEE)” (Tao, 2001, p. 127) or in combination with a conjunction such as *and remember*. In terms of prosody, it “often coincides with an intonation

¹² Retrieved on June 24, 2014, available at <http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/remember>

unit boundary” (Tao, 2001, p. 128) that can be either falling, rising, or continuing intonation, which Tao (2001) refers to as “completion, appeal or continuing intonation” (p. 129).

The two interactional functions ascribed to *remember* are: 1) to index the speaker’s epistemic stance towards something mentioned or to be mentioned in the talk, and 2) to focus on the interaction between participants (Tao, 2001). Epistemic stance, in this context, is understood as the “certainty or [...] uncertainty about certain propositions” (Tao, 2001:130). If the speaker wants to index certainty, *remember* is affirmative and usually stands alone as in *I remember*. If the speaker is uncertain, *remember* is negated and preceded/followed by an adverb, modal auxiliary and/or conjunction as in *and I can’t even remember*. Drew’s (1992) study on the strategic uses of *I don’t remember* in courtroom cross-examinations has shown that a witness may claim insufficient knowledge with *I don’t remember* as a strategic way of avoiding complying with the attorney’s questions. As a metalinguistic device, *remember* is trying to get the participants’ attention in turn-initial position, tying utterances in medial position and eliciting or soliciting a response from the recipient in turn-final position marked with rising intonation (Tao, 2001). Thus, *remember* not only conveys epistemic stance, but helps to manage interaction.

The above mentioned CA studies on claims or displays of remembering (Drew, 1989; 1995; 2005; Goodwin, 1987; Mandelbaum & Pomerantz 1990; Shaw & Kitzinger, 2007) do not explicitly investigate *do you remember* constructions. According to Schegloff (1980), *do you remember* can occur as a presequence, that is, as a means to secure “understandability or recognizability of references” (p. 115). Even though Schegloff’s (1980; 1988) study is devoted to an analysis of preliminaries and presequences rather than a discussion of *do you remember*, it introduces both a possible sequential distribution and an interactional function of *do you*

remember in talk, which is relevant to the analysis of *do you remember* constructions in the first analytical chapter of this dissertation (Chapter 3).

2.3.2 *Do you know*

According to *Merriam-Webster Dictionary of English*¹³, the verb *know* is either used as a transitive or intransitive verb. If employed transitively, it can mean 1. to have (information of some kind) in your mind or 2. to understand (something), to have a clear and complete idea of (something). As an intransitive verb, *know* means to have learned (something, as a skill or language). Historically, *know* has derived from the Old English form *cnāwan* ‘to recognize’, which has its origin in the Latin verb *gnoscere* ‘to come to know’. Based on the different semantic meanings of *know*, *do you know* as an interrogative may check knowledge, understanding and/or recognition.

The CA literature (Schegloff, 1980; 1988; 2007; Sidnell, 2010; Ten Have, 1999) has discussed *do you know* (along with *do you remember*) in presequences that serve to establish recognition of references to proceed with the main activity of a sequence of talk. So far, the analysis of incidental sequences has focused more on try-marking (Koshik & Seo, 2012; Schegloff, 2007), but less so on the *do you know* construction following the try-marked form in this sequential environment. A *do you know* interrogative is placed after no immediate or delayed uptake from the recipient. Different to try-marking (Koshik & Seo, 2012; Schegloff, 2007), *do you know* interrogatives explicitly pursue a response from the recipient checking the recipient’s knowledge and/or recognition of references.

¹³ Retrieved on June 24, 2014, available at <http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/know>

Kim (2009) distinguishes between three types of resolving referential problems in conversation, which are 1. try-marking (Koshik & Seo, 2012; Schegloff, 2007), 2. Next Turn Repair Initiation (Sacks & Schegloff, 1979) and 3. knowledge checks. In this context, *do you know* constructions are listed as examples of knowledge checks that can be used to establish recognitional reference among participants. *Do you know* can also introduce characteristics of references to identify the correct reference (Kim, 2012). Kim's (2009; 2012) *en passant* observations are relevant to the present analysis of *do you know* recognition checks in this dissertation.

Similar to *do you remember*, *do you know* constructions in American English have not yet received individual attention. This dissertation therefore aims to contribute to the current research on *do you know* and *do you remember* in American English with regard to their sequential positioning and interactional functions in conversation. It will be particularly interesting to examine how the two constructions are introduced and what implications they have on the immediate environment, that is, the turn-constructive design of upcoming talk and recipients' responsive actions.

2.4 The German constructions under investigation

In this section, the German equivalents of *do you remember* and *do you know* will be introduced and discussed. As with English, this section will provide a literature review of the different verb forms and their variants that will serve as a backdrop for the analysis of the interactional functions associated with the two constructions in German (to be discussed in Chapters 3 & 4). In order to understand the basic differences between German and English conversations, I will summarize some important features of spoken German (Section 2.4.1)

before I will proceed with *kannst (du) dich erinnern / erinnerst (du) dich / kennst du noch / weißt du noch* (Section 2.4.2) and *kennst du / weißt du* (Section 2.4.3).

2.4.1 Features of spoken German

German is classified as a mixed SVO/verb-second (V2) and SOV/verb-final language. In declarative main clauses and *wh*-questions, the verb is typically found in second position following an SVO order. In subordinate clauses, the verb is placed after the subject and the object following an SOV order. Based on this syntactic characteristic of German, the subject and the verb can be far apart with the subject occurring at the beginning of the subordinate clause and the verb at the far end of the subordinate clause. Thus, “the informational verb unit can be withheld for long stretches of talk” (Betz, 2007). Another characteristic involves the more flexible word order in German compared to English. Syntactic rules are nonetheless applied that signal to the recipient when speakers have reached possible points of syntactic completion in talk (Auer, 2007).

The most basic syntactic rules of Spoken German include the German *Satzklammer* ‘sentence brace’ (Auer, 1991), rightward turn expansions (Auer, 1991; 1992) and verb-first constructions (Auer, 1993). Since these three rules are not immediately relevant to the current investigation on *kannst (du) dich erinnern / erinnerst (du) dich* and *kennst du / weißt du* constructions, I will only briefly introduce them. *Satzklammer* ‘sentence brace’ simply refers to composite verb forms like *kannst dich erinnern* ‘can remember’ where the left brace is the conjugated form *kannst* (+ reflexive pronoun *dich*) and the right brace the infinitive *erinnern*. The *Mittelfeld* ‘inner field’ refers to everything that is found in between. For instance, in the utterance *kannst dich an die Kinder vom Nachbarn erinnern* ‘can you remember the neighbor’s

children’, the verb *kannst* ‘can’ serves as the left sentence brace, and *erinnern* ‘erinnern’ serves as the right brace, and *dich an die Kinder vom Nachbarn* would be considered the inner field. Rightward turn expansion goes beyond what is understood as the right brace. An example of rightward expansion would be *kannst* (left brace) *dich* (right brace) *erinnern* + *an die Kinder vom Nachbarn* ‘do you remember the neighbor’s children’. Thus, rightward turn expansion refers to turn expansions by speakers that follow the right brace (see also Auer, 1991). Verb-First constructions in spoken German are not only restricted to interrogative clauses, but may also occur in declarative clauses. Consequently, subject positions may be empty and verbs become the first syntactic element in a declarative sentence (Auer, 1993).

Another relevant feature of spoken German is the occurrence of particles. They have received much attention in recent research (see, for instance the collection of studies in Harden & Hentschel, 2010). Particles in German like *doch* and *ja* convey speakers’ expectations of shared knowledge (Lütten, 1979; Möllering, 2001). While *doch* serves as an appeal, *ja* is assertive; both forms clearly express their expectation of common ground towards the recipient (Lütten, 1979; Möllering, 2001). For *kannst (du) dich erinnern / erinnerst (du) dich* and *kennst du / weißt du*, particles like *doch* and *ja* can be observed in the close environment of these constructions to convey additional meanings.

2.4.2 *Kannst (du) dich erinnern / erinnerst (du) dich / kennst du noch / weißt du noch*

According to the *Duden*¹⁴, *sich erinnern* in German belongs to the category of weak verbs¹⁵ and has three different meanings: 1. to have been stored in one’s memory and to become

¹⁴ Retrieved on June 24, 2014, available at <http://www.duden.de/rechtschreibung/erinnern>

¹⁵ Weak verbs refer to a particular conjugational pattern in past tenses.

aware of it again, 2. a. to remind someone of a memory about someone or something, b. to remind someone not to forget something, c. to remind oneself of something and 3. to give cause for concern (obsolete). Synonyms of *sich erinnern* in German include the verbs *kennen* and *wissen* ‘know’ + the particle *noch* ‘still’.¹⁶ Thus, when *wissen* and *kennen* are used as synonyms for *sich erinnern*, it is only the particle *noch* that may distinguish between *do you remember* and *do you know* in German.

Interrogative construction found in the corpus are *erinnerst (du) dich* and *kannst (du) dich erinnern*. In *erinnerst (du) dich*, the verb is used in the present tense in the second person singular. It is followed by a second person pronoun (which at times is left out in spoken German), followed by a second person reflexive pronoun. In utterances such as *kannst (du) dich erinnern*, the modal verb *können* ‘can’ is conjugated in the second person singular form, which is then followed by a second person pronoun (which again is frequently left out in spoken German), followed by a second person reflexive pronoun.

In both of these constructions, the personal and reflexive pronouns can be exchanged for pronouns indicating a formal form of address. The form would then be *können Sie sich erinnern* and *erinnern Sie sich*. In my collection of data, which is mostly drawn from conversations among family members or friends, the polite form is only rarely used by speakers. Most of my examples of recognition checks are introduced with either *kannst (du) dich erinnern* or *erinnerst (du) dich*.

¹⁶ Other synonyms include *sich entsinnen*, *erinnerlich sein*, *in Erinnerung haben*, *im Gedächtnis haben*, which were not found in the corpora I used for my collection of *do you remember* recognition checks in German.

2.4.3 Kennst du / weißt du

Wissen in German is an irregular verb that can be used in five different meanings: 1. to know of someone or something based on personal experience or hearsay, 2. to be aware of someone or something, to be aware of consequences, 3. to be certain of something, 4. to be in a position to do something and 5. in colloquial contexts used as insertions to reinforce (*Duden*).¹⁷

Kennen is also an irregular verb with even more meanings, which include 1. a. to be familiar with someone or something, b. to be known to someone based on certain characteristics or qualities, c. to be acquainted with someone, 2. to understand, 3. to (be able to) recognize, 4. to know how to label, 5. to know something based on experience, 6. a. to become aware to consider, b. to be influenced by something. As with *kannst (du) dich erinnern / erinnerst (du) dich*, the respective forms of interest are the second person singular present tense forms of *kennen* and *wissen*, which are *kennst du* and *weißt du*.

With regard to their origin, *wissen* is derived from latin *videre* ‘to see’ meaning to know a fact (Pecko, 1985, p. 305). It refers to factual knowledge that has been acquired (Reimann, 2003). *Kennen* is derived from the Old High German word *chennan* ‘to know, understand’ meaning to be acquainted with something (Pecko, 1985, p. 305). It refers to knowledge based on personal experiences (Reimann, 2003). The two verbs are classified as synonyms, which are however not completely exchangeable (Fukuda, 1970). In the question, *wissen Sie den Verfasser des Buches*, *do you know* asks for the recipient for the name of the author of the book whereas *kennen Sie den Verfasser des Buches* asks if the hearer knows the author of the book in person (Fukuda, 1970, p. 91).

¹⁷ Retrieved on June 24, 2014, available at <http://www.duden.de/rechtschreibung/kennen> and <http://www.duden.de/rechtschreibung/wissen>

While *kennen* takes a direct object in the form of a noun phrase (NP), *wissen* takes a direct object in the form of a subordinate clause (Pecko, 1985; Reiman, 2003). The referent of *wissen* is usually a subordinate clause. Even if a direct object follows *wissen*, it has an underlying clausal meaning. Therefore, *wissen Sie seine Adresse* means ‘do you know what his address is’. The literature treats the two forms (*kennen* and *wissen*) as independent forms based on the differences in their syntactic and semantic distributions. Only rarely are the meanings and forms completely overlapping as in *wissen Sie seine Adresse* and *kennen Sie seine Adresse*, both meaning ‘do you know his address’ in English (Fukuda, 1970).

As was pointed out earlier, the two forms *kennst du* and *weißt du* in combination with the adverb *noch* ‘still’ point to a past shared memory meaning ‘do you remember’ in English. This is why Chapter 3 on *do you remember* in German include examples of *kennst du* and *weißt du* + *noch* ‘still’. However *erinnerst du dich* in German cannot be combined with any particle or adverb to mean *kennen/wissen*.

2.5 Teacher talk

Given that the last analytic chapter of the dissertation discusses the interactional functions of *do you know* and *do you remember* constructions in classrooms (or situations that are teacher-student interactions), it seems prudent to provide some background to this form of institutional talk. Classroom interactions led by teachers are “multilogues” (Schwab, 2011) which are “institutional multi-party activit[ies] where participants’ verbal and nonverbal contributions have reference to more than one addressee” (Schwab, 2011, p. 7). Thus, teacher-fronted classroom interactions have a certain turn-taking structure that is unique to classroom talk, which distinguishes it from other types of face-to-face interaction.

One characteristic of classroom interactions are Initiation-Response-Evaluation (IRE) sequences, which are introduced by teachers (I), then answered by students (R) and assessed by teachers (E) (Mehan, 1979, also called Initiation-Response-Feedback (IRF) by Sinclair & Coulthard (1975)). Researchers have primarily investigated how teachers initiate either repair and/or correct or evaluate student's responses (Macbeth, 2003; McHoul, 1978; 1990; Mehan, 1979, to mention just a few). Zemel and Koschmann's (2011) study on re-initiation of IRE sequences found that teachers may avoid correction by initiating repair on a student's previous turn and restarting the IRE sequence; therefore inviting the student to revise his or her answer before giving an evaluation. This shows that IRE sequences do not always consist of the three subsequent parts, but may be reinitiated by teachers.

As for the initiation part, teachers produce real question and also exam questions that seek information of already known information to the teacher. Mehan (1979) refers to these two question types as information seeking questions and known information questions. Long and Sato (1983) distinguish between referential and display questions. Display questions are understood as questions that seek display of known information by the teacher whereas referential questions seek information not known by the teacher (Brock, 1986). Koshik (2000; 2002; 2003; 2005; 2010) analyzes four different types of known information questions, which include Designedly Incomplete Utterances (DIUs), Reversed Polarity questions, Alternative questions, and questions that animate the voice of an abstract audience.

In SLA studies, questions play an important role in investigating non-native speakers' comprehension of native speaker talk (Gass & Varonis, 1985; Long, 1985; 1996). Long (1983) showed that questions may cause trouble to the non-native speaker, but a repeated question can lead to successful understanding of the question (see also Kasper, 2004). Furthermore, "multiple

questions” (Kasper & Ross, 2007) or “expanded question sequences” (Gardner, 2004) are initiated by teachers (or interviewers in Kasper & Ross’s (2007) study) after lack of uptake from students or immediately after the first question resulting in the following question format: Question 1 + Question 2 (+ Question 3...). The next turn would then be the answer produced by the student.

Another characteristic of classroom interactions refers to the organization of turn taking structure in classrooms. McHoul (1978) has observed a set of turn-taking rules in classroom talk, which are different from the turn-taking rules in everyday conversation (Sacks et al., 1974). A good characterization of classroom interaction was first described by McHoul (1978).

(I) For any teacher's turn, at the initial transition-relevance place of an initial turn-constructional unit:

(A) If the teacher's turn-so-far is so constructed as to involve the use of a 'current speaker selects next' technique, then the right and obligation to speak is given to a single student; no others have such a right or obligation and transfer occurs at that transition-relevance place.

(B) If the teacher's turn-so-far is so constructed as not to involve the use of a 'current speaker selects next' technique, then current speaker (the teacher) must continue.

(II) If I(A) is effected, for any student-so-selected's turn, at the initial transition-relevance place of an initial turn-constructional unit:

(A) If the student-so-selected's turn-so-far is so constructed as to involve the use of a 'current speaker selects next' technique, then the right and obligation to speak is given to the teacher; no others have such a right or obligation and transfer occurs at that transition-relevance place.

(B) If the student-so-selected's turn-so-far is so constructed as not to involve the use of a 'current speaker selects next' technique, then self-selection for next speaker may, but need not, be instituted with the teacher as first starter and transfer occurs at that transition-relevance place.

(C) If the student-so-selected's turn-so-far is so constructed as not to involve the use of a 'current speaker selects next' technique, then current speaker (the student), may, but need not, continue unless the teacher self-selects.

(III) For any teacher's turn, if, at the initial transition-relevance place of an initial turn-constructional unit either I(A) has not operated or I(B) has operated and the teacher has continued, the rule-set I(A)-I(B) re-applies at the next transition-relevance place and recursively at each transition-relevance place until transfer to a student is effected.

(IV) For any student's turn, if, at the initial transition-relevance place of an initial turn-constructional unit neither II(A) nor II(B) has operated, and, following the provision of

II(C), current speaker(the student) has continued, then the rule-set II(A)-II(C) re-applies at the next transition-relevance place and recursively at each transition-relevance place until transfer to the teacher is effected. (McHoul 1978, p.188)

Based on these rules, it is the teacher who selects the next speaker. Markee (2000, pp.97-98) further proposed some modification to McHoul's (1978) turn-taking rules based on the findings of additional features of language classroom talk such as the choral production of learners, pre-allocation of turns, student expectations regarding teacher turns and predetermined classroom talk.

In sum, the organization of classroom talk may range from teacher-led turn allocations and initiations to student participation and/or discussion, which reflect students' claims or displays of knowledge in classrooms (Sert, 2011; Sert & Walsh, 2012).

2.5.1 Response pursuits

Since teachers use both *do you remember* and *do you know* in English as response pursuits (as my third analytic chapter will show), this section will review the literature on response pursuits in classroom interaction. Prior to the review of response pursuits in classroom interaction, I will start out with some background on response pursuits in everyday conversation. Speakers pursue responses after a FPP that makes relevant a SPP from the recipient. If no uptake occurs, speakers treat their own turns as problematic to the recipient and revise their FPPs. According to Pomerantz' study on response pursuits in everyday conversation (1984), recipients may not respond because of 1. referential problems, 2. wrong expectations of shared knowledge among participants and 3. actions that give rise to disagreement. Speakers can then modify their FPPs by 1. solving referential problems, 2. checking shared knowledge and 3. revising their actions for the recipient to align with the speaker. Davidson (1984) further suggests that a lack of

uptake after the production of a FPP is treated by speakers not as a problem of hearing or understanding, but by what Pomerantz (1984) describes as the result of an action that gives rise to disagreement.

Moreover, Gardner (2004) offers a number of solutions to address recipients' lack of uptake after the delivery of a FPP for native/non-native classroom interactions. The solutions all present different modifications or versions of the initial question. They include 1. a re-formulation of the question, 2. a turn-increment, 3. a slight modification of the question or 4. an expansion of the question. Compared to that, Kasper & Ross (2007) observe that interviewers in oral proficiency exam interviews commonly treat silences or lack of uptake as a problem of hearing or understanding. Thus, interviewers' next turns are either a repeat, a paraphrase or a modification of the initial question.

A silence or no uptake does not present the only environment of response pursuits by teachers in the classroom. If students initiate repair on a teacher's FPP, teachers may also introduce "expanded question sequences" (Gardner, 2004) "multiple questions" (Kasper & Ross, 2007) to pursue a response from recipients. Another environment is when students provide a wrong answer that may lead to teacher-initiated response pursuits to elicit correct answers from students. Previous work on repair and correction in teacher talk or classroom interaction will be reviewed in Section 2.5.2 below.

2.5.2 Repair and correction

Apart from response pursuits, teachers initiate repair and correction with *do you remember* and *do you know*. In order to understand the differences between the two practices, which will be discussed in Chapter 5, this section will review the previous literature on repair

and correction in teacher talk. Students may initiate repair on teacher talk to indicate that they have problems of comprehension or hearing or insufficient knowledge (Sert, 2011; Sert & Walsh, 2012). This does not necessarily have to be in response to a teacher initiation, but can naturally occur in classroom talk (Gardner & Wagner, 2004; cf. McHoul, 1990; Weeks, 1985). Teachers, on the other hand, also initiate repair to point out that students' answers are incorrect or not satisfactory to the teacher. Kasper & Ross (2007) found that interviewers in oral proficiency exam interviews formulate a second question after interviewees produced unsatisfactory answers. Interviewers therefore do not explicitly correct interviewees' answers, but they initiate repair conveying that the answer is problematic. Similar to Kasper & Ross (2007), Zemel and Koschmann (2011, p. 479) point out that teachers have different ways to respond to students' problematic answers, which is summarized in Figure 2.1 below.

Figure 2.1

- Explicitly evaluate the students' response as correct or incorrect.
- Produces a correction or acts in ways that prompt the students to produce a correction.
- Recycles an alternative version of the initiating query as a way of demonstrating "another route to a correct answer" (Drew, 1981, p. 260)

While the first teacher response is evaluating the student's response, the second is correcting or initiating repair for the student to self-repair his or her original answer. The third possible teacher response is self-repairing the teacher's initial question to guide the student to the correct answer. Reinitiating an IRE sequence by revising the teacher's original question (Zemel & Koschmann, 2011) is one practice that illustrates the third teacher response proposed by Drew (1981).

This again has implications on the difference between repair and correction. One striking difference is that repair can be initiated after an error and can offer correction (Schegloff et al.,

1977). Correction can be done as repair, but not all repair corrects errors and not all correction is done as repair. Speakers may initiate repair due to acoustic problems or other problems of understanding. Macbeth (2004) notes that “repair and correction are distinct but cooperating organization of interaction” (p. 723). While repair can be initiated by both students and teachers to indicate a problem of hearing, comprehension or insufficient knowledge, corrections are usually initiated by teachers and responsive to student talk. In addition, repair may simply point out a problem, but does not have to provide the correct answer by the teacher whereas correction not only corrects, but also contains an (implicit or explicit) evaluation by the teacher. Correction is primarily concerned with student competence, learning and understanding / “achievement” of an instructional sequence and not so much with how talk is negotiated in teacher-student interactions (Macbeth, 2004, p. 705).

Mazeland (1987) further distinguishes between different types of teacher correction, which are “error-indication”, “error-location”, “error-method” and “repair-method”. “Error-indication” refers to teacher talk that points out that there is a mistake. “Error-location” specifically locates the mistake to the recipient. “Error-method” gives an analysis of what the student’s problem is and “repair-method” is guiding the student to the correct answer. Mazeland’s (1987) classification supports the distinction between repair and correction given that correction is the result of an error (Schegloff et al., 1977).

To conclude, teacher talk exhibits various resources to orient to student responses such as repair and/or correction and to initiate response pursuits such as through “alternative questions” that target an error and give a second alternative (Koshik, 2005), “expanded question sequences” (Gardner, 2004) or “multiple questions” (Kasper & Ross, 2007). The chapter on *do you remember* and *do you know* in teacher talk will confirm and contribute to the findings of previous

research. In addition, “multiple questions” produced in the same turn of a speaker do not always pursue a response, but may also be employed to initiate a new topic of talk inviting the recipient to change the trajectory of talk into a different direction (Linell et al, 2003; Kasper & Ross, 2007). Similarly, *do you remember* and *do you know* interrogatives can be employed by teachers to initiate new topics. An in-depth analysis will be found in Chapter 5 of this dissertation.

Chapter 3: *Do you remember in English and German*

3.1 Introduction

In this first analytical chapter of my dissertation, I will begin my discussion of English *do you remember* constructions that occur in everyday conversation and are produced by speakers to establish common ground among participants. The second part of this chapter will be devoted to the analysis of German *remember* recognition checks, which can be realized by more than one linguistic expression in German (Section 3.3).

3.2 *Do you remember*

Among the 22 examples of English *remember* recognition checks, five appear as presequences of the kind described by Schegloff (1980, p. 112-113) and the remaining 18 occur in incidental sequences as proposed in this study. In 13 out of 18 instances of incidental *remember*, the reference to the shared past event is embedded in the *(do you) remember* construction. Thus, *(do you) remember* immediately preceding the past-event-to-be-recognized is located within the same TCU as the referent. Of these 13 instances of turn-initial *do you remember*, two appear in environments of (counter-) challenges, nine in claim-backing environments, and two in direction-giving contexts, which will be discussed in detail below. The remaining four *remember* constructions occur turn-finally or as a separate turn (e.g., *Remember?*).

I first examine examples of presequential *remember* (3.2.1), then turn-initial incidental *remember* (3.2.2-3.2.4) and lastly the stand-alone *remember* constructions (3.2.5), before explaining in the conclusion on *remember* (3.2.6) why these constructions are particularly suited for the actions for which they are deployed.

3.2.1 (*Do you*) *remember* in presequences: Checking recognition

In presequential position, *remember* occurs immediately prior to a larger action (Schegloff, 1980). Below is a data segment from my corpus. In this example, Aline tells a story about Tyke's boyfriend to her sister Lenore. Prior to the actual telling however, Aline checks recognition with *remember* + person referent + rising intonation in line 4. The person referent *Tyke* is followed by a micro-pause and a modifying clause that describes *Tyke* to Lenore.

Figure 3.1 CHA 6, 10-29

```
01  LENO:  [disgusting.
02  ALIN:  [tsk well you know-
03  LENO:  hhh.
04→ ALIN:  remember Tyke?
05          (.)
06          lived next door to mom?
07          (1.8)
08  LENO:  yeah:.
09          (0.2)
10  ALIN:  okay. .hh two weeks ago I'm watching tv (.) and David
11          Horowitz is going to have this former car (.) radio thief
12          on,
13          (0.7)
14  LENO:  °it's° her boyfriend?
15  ALIN:  yeah >her< ex-boyfriend. (.) Mike.
16          (0.5)
17  ALIN:  he's the one that stole Hector's radio.
18          (2.2)
19  LENO:  >how d'you know.<
20  ALIN:  well (0.4) cause well (.) he (.) he was a cocaine addict.
```

In line 2, Aline introduces a turn, which she cuts off due to the overlap with Lenore (line 1). Without any further delay, Aline then solicits recognition with *remember*, which is produced with rising intonation (line 4). After no immediate uptake, Aline continues her turn with a modifying clause that describes Tyke's relationship to Lenore, who used to be a neighbor of their mom. In line 8, Lenore claims recognition after some silence, the latter of which may be due to processing time (line 7). Aline acknowledges Lenore's claim of recognition in line 10 with *okay*, which further conveys that Aline moves toward some forthcoming activity (Beach, 1995), i.e, her story-telling about a car radio thief (lines 10-12). After a short silence, Lenore produces a

candidate understanding, which is conveyed through the rising intonation at the end of line 14. Aline confirms and initiates repair correcting boyfriend to ex-boyfriend. She also provides the name of the ex-boyfriend, which is Mike (line 16). This is followed by Aline's news announcement (line 17). Lenore responds to the news with a question in line 19 and Aline provides a SPP answer in line 20.

In this fragment, the recognition check is introduced with *remember* + a noun phrase in the form of a proper name to which a clause is added. The name Tyke is turned into a syntactical pivot as the direct object of the *remember*-question and as the subject of the sentence *lived next door to mom* (Betz, 2008). It is further noticeable that *do you* in *do you remember* is missing in line 6. However, even without the *do you*, *remember* + NP is found in naturally occurring conversations among native speakers. The recipient does not immediately provide a claim or display of recognition, which is why more information is added by Aline in line 4. Even after that it takes some more time for Lenore to claim recognition. Once she claims recognition however, Aline continues with her story-telling. Lenore then displays her cognition of the referent in line 14, which is corrected by Aline in the following turn.

Both participants have epistemic access to the person reference, but Aline owns more epistemic authority as the news provider that Tyke's ex-boyfriend is a car radio thief. Aline also is responsible for correcting information regarding Tyke's relationship to Mike, who are no longer a couple. Lenore's candidate understanding in line 14 which displays recognition of the person reference is initially produced with a softer voice and also produced as a question that seeks confirmation from Aline.

As pointed out by Schegloff (1996), person reference is done here not only to do referring, but also to check recognition of a person reference in order to establish common

ground among participants. Aline does not know whether Lenore remembers, but she provides the proper name first before she adds more details after the micro pause in line 6. By using the verb *remember*, Aline conveys that she and Lenore have had some form of personal encounter with Tyke who used to live next to their mother. The verb *remember* also places some expectation on the recipient to remember Tyke.

As was shown in this example, *remember* recognition checks in presequential position are primarily seeking recognition of references, here person references. Once recognition is established, the speaker does not hesitate to drive the conversation forward and continue with his or her actual agenda.

However, not all references introduced with *do you remember* recognition checks involve person references. The reference can also be an object or thing as is illustrated in Figure 3.2 taken from Schegloff (1980, p. 112-113).

Figure 3.2 [#17, ST, simplified]

```
20 R: Ya sure.
21 Oh by the way ((sniff)) I have a
22 bi:g favor to ask ya.
23 L: Sure, go'head.
24 R:→ 'Member the blouse you made a
25 couple weeks ago?
26 L: Ya.
27 R: Well I want to wear it this weekend
28 to Vegas but my mom's buttonholer
29 is broken.
30 L: Fred I told ya when I made the
31 blouse I'd do the buttonholes.
32 R: Ya ((sniff)) but I hate ta impose.
33 L: No problem.
34 We can do them on Monday after work.
```

In this example, the main action is a request produced by R starting in line 27, which however is introduced earlier in lines 21-22 and lines 24-25. In lines 21-22, R projects a request whereas lines 24-25 are not the projected action per se, but seeking recipient L's recognition of

the object that is involved in the request. Only after the recipient's confirmation (line 26) can the speaker proceed to produce the projected action, and may employ pronouns without repeating what was said in the preliminaries. The turn in lines 24-25 is a pre introduced with a *remember* recognition check that precedes R's request of fixing the buttonholes.

As the discussion of Figure 3.2 above showed, in the data collected for this study, *do you remember* recognition checks are also used as pres, thus corroborating earlier findings. The next section will introduce *do you remember* in incidental sequences, which are sequences "whose position does not appear to be occasioned by reference to an underlying base adjacency pair" (Schegloff, 2007, p. 237). Bolden (2008, p. 318) defines incidental as something that is "responsive to something in the immediate environment." Therefore, the incidental sequence responds to the ongoing conversation, but not immediately to the main course of action.

3.2.2 (*Do you*) *remember* in incidental sequences: Making a counter-challenge

Based on the data of my study, I have identified three different types of action environments of *do you remember* in incidental sequences. The first type of action is a counter-challenge initiated by a speaker during an ongoing sequence of talk among participants. A counter-challenge occurs in response to a prior sequence challenging an interlocutor in a way that motivates him or her to challenge back by giving a counter-argument, which is here done through reference to a past event with (*do you*) *remember*. Prior to the figure below, Miles tells a story about a dance that he saw at a dance club. The dance became forbidden because it was too vulgar. Following Miles's story-telling, Jamie makes an announcement that she had been to that particular dance club. Her husband Harold marks this information as news. Jamie counter-challenges, which is again treated as news by Harold (lines 12-13). Jamie then initiates a

sequence reminding Harold of her past activities a few months earlier making reference to a past event.

Figure 3.3 CHA 2, 1273-1291

01 JAMI: well (.) maybe I shouldn't go there then.
02 HARO: yeah maybe [you shouldn't.
03 MILE: [it- it- it was interesting.
04 JAMI: tsk no: (.) I went there before it was fi:ne (.) it was
05 [really fun.
06 HARO: [you were the:re before?
07 JAMI: yea:h. I went out there before,
08 HARO: oh.
09 PETE: without even telling Harold?
10 HARO: without telling me?
11 JAMI: .h you kne:w (.) [I was going out da:ncing,
12 HARO: [oh
13 HARO: oh (.) [I did?
14 → JAMI: [remember a few months ago I used to go out dancing,
15 → every now and then?
16 HARO: hmm: I don't remember.
17 (0.4)
18 MILE: well the thing that gets me (0.8) I meet
19 [this:
20 JAMI: [to Caesar's and stuff,

Jamie announces in line 1 that she should not go to that dance club. Harold agrees and Miles makes a summary assessment. Jamie responds with disagreement and her own positive assessment, which she upgrades in lines 4-5. In line 6, Harold produces a confirmation request, which is caused by the unexpected confession of his wife (lines 4-5). Jamie aligns with a type-conforming answer *yeah* and confirms Harold's understanding in line 7. This is received with Harold's change-of-state token *oh* (Heritage, 1984, 1998) and Pete's "appendor question" (Sacks, 1992, p. 652) in line 9 functioning as an understanding check in response to Jamie's and Harold's turns and an accusation that Jamie has hidden information from her husband Harold. Pete's question is repeated by Harold in line 10. The emphasis on *me* reinforces the complaint directed at Jamie, which conveys that this piece of information is news, but should not have been news to Harold because as Jamie's husband he should know about his wife's activities,

especially if they involve things that are potentially “inappropriate” for married couples. Thus, what Jamie expected to be shared knowledge with Harold, or an AB - event (Labov & Fanshel, 1977), turned out to be accessible only to the speaker, that is, it was in fact an A - event. In line 11, Jamie counter-complains with the past tense form of *you knew*, the sound stretch on *knew* and a repeat of the content of information, claiming that Harold knew about it. This is received by Harold with two usages of *oh* conveying the receipt of new information. Jamie then refers to a past shared event which she introduces with *remember a few months ago*, directed at Harold who displays disalignment, treating Jamie’s counter-challenge as news (lines 12-13). Jamie orients to Harold’s reaction by making reference to events that she expects Harold to know in order to elicit recognition. She provides more information about the frequency of her going out dancing as an increment to her prior TCU, to which Harold responds with hesitation and a SPP disconfirming Jamie’s recognition check (line 16). Jamie responds to Harold’s SPP by adding more information about their shared memory (line 20). This response is not only disaligning with Jamie’s confirmation request, but it is also dispreferred in terms of assumed knowledge domains and recipient-design. Jamie then provides the name of a club, a locally initial reference form in locally subsequent position in line 20 (Schegloff, 1996).

Prior to the reference check, Jamie explicitly expresses that she had expected Harold to know (line 11). Here reference to a shared memory is made to argue against Harold’s display of disalignment in lines 12-13 in response to Jamie’s counter-challenge. This is not only to invalidate the disalignment, but more so to formulate another counter-challenge toward her husband Harold. The recognition check with *remember* is responsive to Harold’s talk. The check consists of *remember* + past event and upward intonation. The recognition check itself is making a counter-challenge by backing Jamie’s claim through referencing a shared memory, in order to

deflate Harold's prior resistance. The *remember* construction is particularly useful for situations involving challenges because it provides the speakers with evidence to counter-argue and deflate a participant's argument.

In this study, the *remember* recognition checks that occur in environments of challenges or counter-challenges evolve in response to a challenge which was initiated by the other participant(s). A counter-challenge with *remember* is employed to provide evidence that the speaker is right. Conversation partners are misaligning, which is conveyed through the initiation of incidental sequences with *remember*. In these contexts, reference to shared memory is a powerful practice to prove a speaker's argument.

3.2.3 (*Do you*) *remember* in incidental sequences: Backing up a claim

The second type of action involves claim-backings (Antaki & Leudar, 1990). Speakers produce *remember* recognition checks to introduce evidence for something they said earlier in the conversation, which is different from the environments of challenges discussed above, where *remember* is responsive to another participant's turn. In the example given below, the speaker first makes an assessment and then accounts for it by making reference to a past memory with *remember*. Prior to this figure, Marci makes a news announcement about a person called Edna who is known to the other participants. The news involves Edna having left their church and what Marci has heard to be the reason for Edna's decision.

Figure 3.4 CHA 13, 2146-2193

01 MARC: I don't know what the real story is but (0.6)
02 it sounded kinda neat.
03 KEVI: [hm.
04 WEND: [oh mus- their I think thei:r motives must
05 (.) be pretty solid if they're willing to talk
06 to Ron about it and [make it a public thing.=
07 MARC: [oh yeah.

Figure 3.4 CHA 13, 2146-2193 (cont.)

08 MARC: =ye[ah.
 09 WEND: [so
 10 MARC: yeah.
 11 WEND: they're neat. they're really neat in fact .h=
 12 MARC: =oh I love [Edna
 13→WEND: [remember when he had his (.) they had
 14→ to cut his sweats
 15 (0.9)
 16 WEND: when [he had his [surgery,=
 17 MARC: [yeah [yeah,
 18 WEND: =he was so upset (0.4) about that
 19 (0.3)
 20 WEND: [so
 21 MARC: [you took em into Edna?
 22 WEND: and she g-
 23 MARC: she [fixed em
 24 WEND: [fixed em for free
 25 MARC: oh: gee[:sh
 26 KEND: [oh:
 27 KEVI: [and you can't even tell,=
 28 WEND: =>an you< can't even [tell that they were
 29 KEVI: [at all.
 30 MARC: [huhuhuh
 31 KEVI: and I don't [even think they cut em (.) on a-
 32 on a sea:m.
 33 WEND: [cut
 34 (0.5)
 35 MARC: yeah they tried to.
 36 KEVI: well they tried [to: but-
 37 KEND: [((clears throat))
 38 MARC: [they tried to.
 39 WEND: but [°I don't know.°
 40 KEVI: [she did a great job with it.
 41 MARC: oh that's [goo:d.
 42 WEND: [we've been taking a lot of stuff [in to her.
 43 MARC: [she's

In lines 1 and 2 of this figure, Marci assesses Edna's reason for leaving their church, which is preceded by a hedge conveying that she is not sure whether this is the true reason. Kevin responds to this with an acknowledgement token, which is in overlap with Wendy's change-of-state token *oh* (Heritage, 1984, 1998) in lines 3 and 4. Wendy cuts off and restarts with an upgraded assessment of Edna's motives explaining why she thinks her assumptions are true (lines 4-6). Marci produces a change-of-state token *oh* and confirms with *yeah*, which is in overlap with Wendy's last part of her turn (line 7). Immediately after Wendy has completed her

turn, Marci reconfirms twice with *yeah* in lines 8 and 10. Wendy continues in line 9, which is received with the third confirmation token by Marci (line 10). Wendy then makes an assessment of Edna and her family, which she upgrades in her next TCU (line 11). Marci produces another change-of-state token in line 12 and upgrades Wendy's prior assessment with emphasis on *love* expressing her personal attachment to Edna. Before Marci can finish her turn, Wendy initiates a recognition check with *remember* in lines 13-14. Wendy's turn refers to a past event involving Kevin, who is referred to with a personal pronoun. The use of pronouns indicates that Wendy assumes this past event to be an O – event, i.e., known to all participants (Labov & Fanshel, 1977). When none of the participants respond to this recognition check (line 15), Wendy provides more information about the past event in line 16. Marci produces two confirmation tokens, which are partly in overlap with Wendy's turn in line 16. After her first TCU in line 16, Wendy produces a rush-through adding more information about the state of this person (line 18). This is followed by a small pause in line 19. Marci makes a request for information via a *yes/no* question in line 21, which Wendy answers with a non-conforming type of answer (lines 22, 24). Wendy's answer is partly produced in joint collaboration with Marci in lines 23 and 24. Wendy adds more information emphasizing *free* in line 24. Marci responds to this with a response cry *oh geesh* (Goffman, 1978) (line 25). Kendra also produces a change-of-state token (line 26), and Kevin adds to Wendy's story-telling, which is picked up and repeated by Wendy in line 28, trying to complete Kevin's turn. Kevin however comes in and completes his turn in overlap with Wendy's turn (lines 28-29). Marci responds with laughter (line 30) and Kevin continues adding more information to the story (lines 31-32). Wendy continues her interrupted turn in line 33, but she cuts off to resolve the overlap with Kevin's turn. After a short pause in line 34, Marci produces a confirmation token and responds to Kevin's assumption in line 31. Kevin produces a

disagreeing response delayed by *well* and a repeat of Marci's turn, which is introduced with *but*. This is then cut off by Marci's overlapping turn, which is a repeat of her own prior turn (line 38). Wendy then picks up Kevin's *but* and continues with her turn, which is produced with a soft voice in line 39. Kevin continues with a positive assessment of Edna's work, which is received with a positive assessment by Marci (line 41). Wendy adds more information to this in lines 42-43 expressing her epistemic access via the information she adds and the use of *we*, where she includes herself as part of the story.

The recognition check introduced with *remember* is solicited by Wendy after her assessment of Edna in line 11. Wendy makes reference to a past event to introduce evidence for her positive assessment. Even though none of the other participants challenge or disagree with her assessment, Wendy pre-emptively backs up her prior claim. Thus, she illustrates through a personal story-telling why she thinks Edna is a neat person. Instead of giving a reason for her assessment, she first elicits recognition from her co-participants reminding them of this past event. The absence of uptake in line 15 makes her give more information about the event in lines 16 and 18, which finally gets confirmed and responded to by Marci in lines 17 and 21. Marci seems to be the only one who claims to remember, whereas Kendra produces her receipt of this telling with a change-of-state token in line 26. Kevin's summary assessment (line 40) displays his epistemic rights as the one whose sweats were cut off and who had Edna fix them. Kevin therefore confirms Wendy's account of her prior assessment, which is also confirmed by Marci in line 41. Throughout this figure, Marci actively responds to Wendy's story-telling. Marci who has produced an upgraded assessment in line 12 gets overridden by Wendy's turn soliciting a recognition check with *remember*. The *remember* check is not responsive to other talk, but is initiated by Wendy after her assessment. The turn is however not a syntactically and

pragmatically complete turn. Wendy self-repairs in line 16 and 18, but it still presents a trouble-source to the other participants, which explains why Wendy adds more information and Marci jointly produces the turn in line 23. Kevin does not come in until the end of the story with his summary assessment.

Reference to a shared memory is made here to provide evidence or do claim-backing (Antaki & Leudar, 1990) for a prior assessment by the same speaker. Similar to *remember* checks in environments of challenges, a *remember* construction is particularly powerful in this context because the speaker uses shared memory as evidence to support his or her own claim. This claim is made about a third person with whom participants have a different hierarchical and personal relationship. This is why the speaker may feel the need to provide some type of proof that shows the speaker's epistemic access and rights about the person reference. In contrast to *remember* in (counter-) challenges, *remember* checks discussed in this section are pre-emptive moves initiated by speakers to introduce supporting evidence to prior claims. Thus, *remember* is not in response to a challenge, but is instead adding to a speaker's own turn.

3.2.4 (*Do you*) *remember* in incidental sequences: Giving directions

A third action environment of *do you remember* recognition checks concerns direction-giving situations. These can be in response to a FPP question as is the case in the next example. Prior to the next figure below, Alice asks Mary about the tree branch Mary brought. Mary tells Alice that she got it for her daughter Nickie who wanted her own Christmas tree for her Barbies. In this figure, Mary tells Alice where she found the tree branch and while giving her specific directions, Mary refers to a shared place referent in line 6 with *remember that first cattle guard*

you go over. This is preceded by another recognition check asking about a referent that helps to give further directions (line 2).

Figure 3.5 CHA 7, 363-386

1 ALIC: where'd you go (0.7) to get em.
2 → MARY: you know where Sarah and Arvela live?
3 ALIC: mhm,
4 MARY: just around the corner.
5 (1.0)
6 → MARY: **remember that first cattle guard you go over?**
7 ALIC: unhunh,
8 MARY: I didn't even go over tha:t.
9 (2.8)
10 ALIC: you mean (0.2) kinda like (.) by the (0.8) by the [tunnel?
11 MARY: [right
12 below the tunnel.
13 ALIC: oh::.
14 MARY: and I just walked up. w:e just walked up around uh
15 that area .hhh an God Alice that was fu::n.

In response to Alice's request for information in line 1, Mary formulates another FPP question to establish a common point of reference to which Alice responds with *mhm* (line 3). Mary continues with specific information about the exact location where she got the tree for Nickie. There is no uptake from Alice in line 5, which is why Mary solicits a recognition check in line 6 making reference to a particular place. She uses the demonstrative *that* in locally initial position and provides exact local characteristics. The demonstrative points to a particular referent that both participants know. After Mary provides a second answer to Alice's question in line 1, Alice produces a confirming SPP that claims access to the reference in line 7. Alice then checks recognition by delivering her candidate understanding of the place referent (line 10). The way she produces this turn conveys uncertainty about the correct referent she has in mind. This is expressed by the delayed production of *by the tunnel* (line 10). *Tunnel* is in overlap with Mary's uptake, which corrects Alice's turn by replacing *by* with *right below* in lines 11 and 12. Mary is thus the one who owns epistemic authority. Alice receives this correction with a change-of-state

token in line 13, expressing that she now knows where Mary has found the tree for Nickie. It is at this point that intersubjectivity (Auer, 1984; Schegloff et al., 1977) is established among the participants. Mary continues with her agenda, telling what she did to find the tree and closes her story with an assessment in line 15.

The relevant turns are lines 2 and 6. In this example, the *remember* recognition check is preceded by a *you know* + place referent question. Line 2 includes proper names in locally initial position, that is, unmarked forms of person references that show that Mary clearly expects Alice to know who Sarah and Arvela are (Auer, 1984; Schegloff, 1996). Similar to that, line 6 contains a demonstrative plus noun, which also expresses that knowledge is presumed to be shared by both participants. The *remember* recognition check is responsive to the silence in line 5. The lack of uptake by Alice explains Mary's initiation of pointing to a presumably shared referent in order for Alice to recognize the referent in question. The reference to a shared place referent is not immediately resolved, but is instead resolved over several turns whereupon Alice clearly displays recognition of the referent. Moreover, the *remember* turn is simply to locate a nearby place, but is not the exact place referent. The turn consists of *remember* + place referent and a modifying clause that contains reference to a shared past event. In this figure, reference to a shared place referent is not the ultimate goal/target. Rather, the *you know* + place and the *remember* recognition check guide Alice through Mary's directions. The recognition check is produced in response to Alice's FPP question in line 1. Again, this example illustrates how a speaker is making reference to a shared memory with *remember* in order to provide the recipient with a more specific description that is based on shared knowledge. *Remember* constructions are useful in this context since they guide recipients through obviously known reference points to reach a common ground of understanding. Giving directions presents another environment in

which *remember* recognition checks may evolve as a practice to support the speaker's course of action.

3.2.5 Turn-final or stand-alone *remember*

The previously not-described three action environments of *remember* in incidental sequences which are observed in this study are (counter)-challenges, claim-backing and direction-giving environments. As stated earlier, out of the 22 instances of *remember*, five are used as presequences as described by Schegloff (1980) while the remaining 17 occur in incidental sequences. In the examples analyzed so far, the reference is embedded in the *remember* construction. In four instances, however, the *remember* recognition check follows the reference to the past event in a separate TCU. The recognition check refers back to the previously mentioned referent seeking confirmation from the recipient. In the following example, a news announcement is made by one of the speakers through referencing a past event. This is followed by another TCU which contains the *remember* recognition check addressed to one of the participants who is supposed to share and confirm that memory, or AB – event (Labov & Fanshel, 1977). Prior to this figure in Figure 3.6, Ken and Joan start talking about their two pets, a female and a male turtle that they have been raising. The male turtle is biting the female turtle. Joan points out that the male turtle used to be bigger, which is repeated and followed by a *remember* recognition check in line 12.

Figure 3.6 CHA 15, 1358-1387

01 KEN: I think when he starts biting her
02 that's [when: he's-
03 JOAN: [do you know:
04 KEN: he's a lot more interested
05 [and so is she hehh
06 JOAN: [that when we bought him when we bought him.
07 KEN: ((SNIFF))

Figure 3.6 CHA 15, 1358-1387 (cont.)

08 JOAN: he was la:rger than her now look at them.
 09 (0.9)
 10 LENO: she's a glutton.
 11 (0.4)
 12→JOAN: h[:e was la:rger than her. **remember** [that?
 13 KEN: [°yah.° [she's like twice
 14 as big as he is now.
 15 (0.3)
 16 JOAN: I mean I- I just can't imagine. >it's incredible.
 17 she's just< growing. she's gonna be as big as
 18 that turtle in the pet shop.

In lines 1 and 2, Ken tries to give an account for the male turtle biting the female turtle. Before Ken can finish his turn, Joan introduces news with a *do you know* question (line 3). Ken continues with his prior turn, recycling the last word of his turn in line 2 and completing his account of why the male turtle is biting the female turtle. The second part of his turn (line 5) is in overlap with Joan's continuation of her *do you know* question (lines 6, 8). Joan's question is not a real question seeking an answer, but instead introduces news with *do you know* (Heritage, 2012b), which is directed toward Lenore. Joan includes Ken in her news using the first person pronoun *we* (line 6). This is followed by an imperative construction asking Ken and Lenore to look at the turtles. There is no immediate uptake in line 9. In line 10, Lenore then assesses the female turtle. After a short pause in line 11, Joan again repeats her prior news in line 8. The content of the news is contrasted with the current situation, that is, the female turtle being larger than the male turtle. The repeat of the news is followed by a second TCU, which is a *remember* recognition check consisting of *remember* and the demonstrative "that" and referring back to the previously stated news (line 12). In lines 13 and 14, Ken produces a confirmation token and a summary assessment comparing the female turtle to the male turtle. After a short pause in line 15, Joan provides her summary assessment of the situation with "it's incredible" and makes reference to a specific turtle that Ken and Joan saw at the pet shop (lines 16-18).

In this figure, the *remember* recognition check is making reference to a past memory in order to compare a previous state with a current state, here the female turtle's size when Joan and Ken first got it to her size at the time of the conversation. The *remember* check follows the reference to a memory (lines 8, 12). The *remember* check contains a referent "that" which points back to what Joan has just uttered (line 12). Thus, the *remember* check solicits recognition of a reference which is not embedded in the *do you remember* question itself, but which has been given immediately prior to the *remember* check. The reference has been made already, but recognition is explicitly sought through *remember* and the rising intonation at the end of the *remember* TCU which is directed at Ken is seeking confirmation. While *do you know* is addressed to Lenore, *remember* is addressed to Ken to which he orients with a summary assessment, which upgrades Joan's initial news. The male turtle used to be larger, but now the female turtle is twice as large as the male turtle, further emphasizing the contrast Joan is trying to make here. The recognition check solicits confirmation from Ken to compare this change that happened to their pets. Furthermore, the turn in line 12 is responsive to a lack of uptake from the recipients. This turn repeats information that is already produced (line 8), and is followed by a turn-final *remember* check soliciting a response from the recipient when no response had been given by Ken to the first attempt (Tao, 2001).

In contrast to the figures discussed earlier, this instance of *remember* appears in an environment where there is a lack of shared knowledge from one of the participants. This lack of shared knowledge is conveyed through the absence of uptake that addresses the female turtle's previous physical shape. The co-participants still express some form of recognition: Lenore makes an assessment in line 10 to confirm the female turtle's current state, and Ken produces an

acknowledgement token. It is the explicit *remember* recognition check in line 12 through which Joan formulates a confirmation request to pursue the desired response from the participants.

According to Schegloff (2007), incidental sequences are less “deeply rooted” sequences (p. 249). If this is true for turn-initial *remember* checks, then turn-final *remember* is more “deeply rooted” in the sense that the transition between turns is less abrupt meaning that the turn-final *remember* still moves the ongoing action forward. Turn-final or stand-alone *remember* also indicates a lack of response from the recipient, which the speaker notices as missing (Sidnell, 2010, p. 167). Similar to tag questions, turn-final or stand-alone *remember* TCUs are marking turn completion and selecting the next speaker (Heritage & Raymond, 2005; Sidnell, 2010, p. 154). Since my collection only contains a few instances of reference followed by *remember*, more research is needed to confirm these findings.

The question of interest is then “why that now” (Schegloff & Sacks, 1973). The answer to this question can be found in the speaker’s orientation towards his recipients. For turn-final or stand-alone *remember*, the speaker adds a new TCU to his prior turn after a point of possible completion has been reached (Schegloff, 1996, pp. 83-84), which is different from turn-initial *remember* that introduces the reference in response to a previous turn.

3.2.6 Conclusion of *remember*

To summarize the major findings of this section, among the 22 examples of English *remember* recognition checks, five appear as presequences and 17 in incidental sequences. Out of these 17 instances, four occur turn-finally or as a separate turn (e.g., *Remember?*), while 13 occur in turn-initial position. Independent of their turn position, the *remember* constructions analyzed in this study have been observed in four different contexts: five occur prior to a course

of action to solicit recognition, three appear in environments of challenges, eleven appear in claim-backing situations, and three appear in direction-giving environments.

The occurrence of *remember* constructions in these sequences is not surprising. It makes sense to establish a common reference point when speakers give directions. To reach a common reference point, participants need to ensure that they have all the necessary information to understand the directions successfully as shown in Figure 3.5. With respect to claim-backing (Antaki & Leudar, 1990), speakers point to a shared memory to provide evidence for something produced earlier (Figure 3.4). In the examples within this study, this is done preemptively by speakers. Claim-backing is done by referencing a memory that is assumed to be in the knowledge domain of the recipient (Antaki & Leudar, 1990; Golato, 2012). Finally, if conversation partners share knowledge without knowing how much the other shares, or either under- or overestimate their partners' knowledge, this may result in a challenge between participants competing to expose their level of knowledge towards a recipient. In these challenging environments, *remember* recognition checks are produced in response to another participant's turn, which is misaligning. However, not all examined instances are examples of misaligning courses of action even though the first two environments often give rise to misalignment between conversation partners. Thus, misalignment between participants may be observed, but cannot be generalized to all instances of *remember* examined in this study.

Lastly, recognition checks with *remember* can either precede or follow the referent to a shared memory. The discussion of Figure 3.6 showed that reference to a past memory can be produced before the actual recognition check is made. It has to be noted that the *remember* check is not addressing all participants, but only one participant that the speaker expects to share that memory. By contrast, a *do you know* question seems to ask about a coparticipant's knowledge,

and does not assume it. In the same turn, the speaker addresses both recipients in separate TCUs, which conveys that the speaker is considering the different knowledge domains of her co-participants. The *remember* check is employed to seek confirmation of the previously mentioned past event.

3.3 *Kannst (du) dich erinnern/erinnerst du dich and weißt du noch/kennst du noch*

Remember in German is translated into the German reflexive verb *sich erinnern* and a combination of *wissen* or *kennen* ‘know’ + the adverb *noch*, which is an expression that is not used in English. This chapter will discuss the different realizations of German *remember* in everyday conversation to achieve intersubjectivity among interlocutors.

For the present study, 20 instances of *kannst (du) dich erinnern / Erinnerst du dich* were analyzed. Ten examples among the 20 examples of German *erinnern* recognition checks occur in presequences to elicit recognition of referents (Schegloff 1980, p. 112-113). For the remaining ten instances of incidental *remember*, seven are found in turn-initial position and three in turn-final position. Among the 20 examples of *kannst (du) dich erinnern*, however, in twelve instances the reference is embedded as an NP or clause in the *kannst (du) dich erinnern* construction. For the other 8 examples, the direct object of *erinnern* is either *daran* ‘that’ or there is no direct object. Instances that contain no direct object or *daran* ‘that’ are very similar to turn-final tags in English as described in the previous section on English turn-final *remember* (Heritage & Raymond, 2005; Sidnell, 2010, p. 154; Tao, 2001). Of the ten instances of incidental *kannst (du) dich erinnern*, three appear in environments of (counter-) challenges and seven in claim-backing environments.

For *weißt du noch / kennst du noch*, only six instances of *weißt du noch / kennst du noch* were found in my data described in Chapter 2. One instance is found in presequential position and the remaining five instances occur in incidental sequences. Among the six examples, three are introduced with *weißt du noch* referencing to a past event or habit and the other three are introduced with *kennst du noch* making reference to a person or thing. Both forms check remembering of references to which participants may, but need not respond with a claim, display or lack of remembering. The environments are similar to English *remember* and German *kannst (du) dich erinnern* occurring in situations when speakers back up claims or as part of a story-telling.

I begin my analysis with an example of presequential *erinnern* (3.3.1), then discuss examples of incidental *erinnern* (3.3.2-3.3.3) and analyze an example of turn-final or stand-alone *erinnern* (3.3.4), before turning to the discussion of *weißt du noch / kennst du noch* instances of my collection (3.3.5). In the conclusion (3.3.6), I will point out the syntactic variations of German *erinnern* and *weißt du noch / kennst du noch* recognition checks, their sequential positions and the use of German particles observed in these constructions.

3.3.1 *Kannst dich (dran) erinnern* in presequences: Checking recognition

The first type of *kannst dich (dran) erinnern* constructions occurs in presequences that are introduced to check simple recognition of a referent. The next figure is taken from a conversation between Kirsten and Rita who are sisters-in-law. Rita starts the sequence with a pre-pre (Schegloff, 1980) announcing a question that she is going to ask. She then continues with reminding Kirsten of Kirsten's pottery that she bought in the city of Essen. This reminder is a pre to the upcoming request. After no explicit claim or display of recognition, Rita initiates a

recognition check with *kannst dich noch dran erinnern* in line 8 to seek confirmation from Kirsten.

Figure 3.7 Kirsten_1a_19.00_Tellermuster

01 Ri: du mal ne andere >frage ehe ichs vergess< ich hab grade hehhh
you time another >question bevor I forget< I have now hehhh
I have another >question before I forget< I have now hehh

02 weißte was ich grade durchblättere?=ich hab grade
you.know what I now flip.through?= I have now
do you know what I am now flipping through?= I have

03 den- .mhhh den prospekt noch wo du die keramik
the- .mhhh the brochure still where you the pottery
the- .mhhh i'm holding the brochure of where you bought the

04 in s- in essen gekauft hast in der hand,
in s- ((in city name)) bought have in the hand,
pottery in s- in essen in my hands,

05 (0.5)

06 K: a hah,
a hah,
a hah,

07 (1.0)

08→Ri: kannst >dich noch dran erinnern?<=
can >you still at.it remember?<=
do you still remember that?

09 K: JAJA. ahahm,
YESYES. uhuhm,
YESYES. uhuhm,

10 (0.2)

11 Ri: diese teller, .hh und ähm du hast doch- teller gekauft? u:nd
these plates, .hh and uhm you have PRT- plates bought? a:nd
these plates, .hh and uhm you did buy plates? a:nd

12 tassen.
cups.
cups.

13 K: ja genau. wir wollten bloß [noch diese eierbecher
yes exactly. we wanted just [still these eggcups
yes exactly. we still just [wanted these eggcups
[

14 Ri: [ja
[yes
[yes

Figure 3.7 Kirsten_1a_19.00_Tellermuster (cont.)

15 K: falls du die siehst.
 if you them see.
 if you see them.

16 (0.8)

17 Ri: *jaja. und jetzt e- äh welches welches dekor war des .hh du hast*
 yesyes. and now e- uh which which pattern was that .hh you have
 yesyes. and now e- uh which which pattern did it have .hh they

18 doch praktisch so nen braunen rand?
 PRT practically PRT a brown rim?
 have a brown rim?

19 (0.5)

20 Ri: also so nen beigen [rand] [.hh und]
 well PRT a beige [rim] [.hh and]
 well more like a beige [rim] [.hh and]
 [] []

21 K: [braun] mit [blauem m]uster
 [brown] with [blue p]attern
 [brown] with a [blue p]attern

22 mit so nem blauen=wie kleene blümchen sehn die
 with PRT a blue=like small flowers look they
 with a blue=the things look like small

23 dinger aus.=
 things out.=
 flowers.=

24 Ri: =blaue blümchen, und zwischen den blauen blümchen
 =blue flowers, and between the blue flowers
 =blue flowers, and between the blue flowers

25 sind noch wie so ne art blätter. ↑ne?
 are still like PRT a kind leaves. ↑right?
 are something like leaves. ↑right?

26 (0.5)

27 K: ä::h >weeß ich jetzt nich.<=da muß ich mal schnell
 e::h >know I now not.<=there must I time fast
 e::h > *I don't know now.<=I would have to quickly*

28 gucken .hh >warte mal<
 see .hh >wait once<
 check .hh >wait a second<

In line 1, Rita announces that she has question as a way of changing the topic. Before she produces the actual question, she cuts herself off and initiates a *do you know* question with

weißte, which serves as a pre-announcement to her new sequence (line 2). She does not wait for a response from Kirsten, but continues with telling Kirsten what she is doing now (lines 2-4). After a short silence, Kirsten responds with an acknowledgement token in line 6. Her response and the lack of uptake in line 7, is treated by Rita as a lack of recognition, which is reflected in Rita's recognition check in line 8. The turn is produced quickly and with upward intonation eliciting an answer from the recipient. Kirsten aligns with a double saying of *ja* 'yes' that indicates that the information provided by Rita is known information and the action of checking recognition should be stopped in line 9 (Golato & Fagyal, 2008). This is also supported by the higher pitch in the production of *Ja Ja* 'Yes Yes'. After a short pause, Rita continues with more specific information about the pottery Kirsten had bought. The turn is a declarative sentence that is produced with rising intonation seeking confirmation from Kirsten about Rita's memory of Kirsten's purchase (lines 11-12). In line 13, Kirsten confirms and adds another TCU saying that they wanted egg cups too. In overlap with Kirsten's turn, Rita acknowledges Kirsten's confirmation and Kirsten adds another TCU in line 15, which turns her previous TCU in line 13 into an indirect request. Kirsten is asking Rita to buy the egg cups for her if she sees them. The indirect request is responded to by silence in line 16 by Rita, which indicates that Rita treats the indirect request as something she already knows or as a trouble source. Rita then produces a double saying of *ja* 'yes' signaling that Kirsten's turn is known information to her (Golato & Fagyal, 2008) and formulates an information request followed by a candidate remembering in lines 17-18. There is no immediate uptake in line 19 and Rita self-repairs her candidate remembering from *brown* to *beige rim*, which gets corrected by Kirsten in line 21. Kirsten provides a more specific description in lines 21-23 to which Rita responds with a candidate understanding seeking confirmation from Kirsten conveyed through *ne* 'right' (Harren, 2001;

Golato 2005) at the end of line 25. The silence in line 26 delays Kirsten's answer in lines 27-28, in which Kirsten backs down further delaying her answer with *äh* 'eh' in response to Rita's confirmation request.

The recognition check in line 8 by Rita follows two silences in lines 5 and 7 and Kirsten's acknowledgement token *ahah* 'ahah' in line 6 that does not display any recognition of Rita's telling in lines 1-4. This might be due to the pre-pre in which Rita announces that she has a question, but she does not formulate her question until line 17. Thus, Kirsten might simply be waiting for Rita to ask her the question. Rita's recognition check with *kannst dich noch dran erinnern* makes reference to the pottery Kirsten had bought in Essen. The double saying of *ja* 'yes' in line 9 strongly aligns with Rita's recognition check, claiming recognition of the past experience (Golato & Fagyal, 2008). Before Rita can continue with her initial agenda, she needs to make sure that they both share common ground. She therefore makes reference to a shared past memory that involves the recipient. Similar to Schegloff's (1980) classification of English *do you remember*, German *kannst dich dran erinnern* in presequential position is here used to simply check recognition of a referent in order to proceed with the speaker's actual course of action.

The German construction contains *noch* 'still.' *Noch* here points to a shared event that is not something that happened recently, but some time ago. In line 11 of the fragment, Rita formulates a candidate remembering which is expressed through the particle *doch*. According to Lütten (1979), the speaker uses the particle *doch* to appeal to the recipient that knowledge among participants is shared by seeking confirmation of her candidate remembering.

At the beginning of the fragment, Kirsten hardly claims or displays remembering, but after the recognition check in line 8, Kirsten strongly aligns with the recognition check. Kirsten

does not seem to *remember* until line 9. In line 13, she produces *yes exactly* and a display of recognition of the past memory. Once she remembers, she even makes an indirect request, which is received by Rita with alignment before she finally returns to her originally intended question in lines 17-18. Kirsten does not clearly remember the pattern on the pottery, which is why she halts the conversation to check on her pottery. As the owner of the pottery, she has more epistemic access and more epistemic rights. Rita aligns with this stance throughout the interaction. It is Kirsten who takes less responsibility in the beginning since she does not seem to remember, but once she remembers, she provides more specific information to confirm Rita's candidate remembering.

3.3.2 *Kannst dich (dran) erinnern* in incidental sequences: Challenges

Instances of incidental *kannst dich (dran) erinnern* are observed in situations of challenges. Figure 3.8 is an instance of a phone conversation between Marcus and his sister Nicole. Marcus is calling from Oregon and Nicole lives in Germany. Prior to the figure, Marcus who is going to Germany soon checks on things Nicole had asked him to bring to Germany. In Figure 3.8, Marcus is telling Nicole about the difficulties in buying a CD that Nicole's neighbor had asked her for. One of the stores Marcus went to buy the CD is *CD World*, which he expects Nicole to recognize. This is conveyed through his recognition check *kannst dich erinnern* in line 11.

Figure 3.8 Oregon_1B_24.05_CDs

- 1 M: .h und die: ich war also der (.) der eine laden
 .h and the: I was well the (.) the one store
 .h and the: well I was the (.) the one store
- 2 der hat gesacht .h die gibts sonst nirgndwo mehr,
 that has said .h them is+it else nowhere more,
 that (place) said .h they are no longer sold

Figure 3.8 Oregon_1B_24.05_CDs (cont.)

- 3 die cds also wenn wir die nich ham, und dann:
 the cds well if we it not have, and then:
 the cds well if we don't have it, then:
- 4 dann gibts die dann auch in nem andern laden nich
 then is+it them then also in one other store not
 then it is also not sold in any other store
- 5 M: .hh
- 6 N: ja: also das is halt bei euch da inner gegend
 yes: well that is just by you.dat there in+the area
 yes: well that is just there in your area
- 7 M: .h nee da bin ich extra zur cd cd-world gefahren
 .h no: because am I deliberately to cd cd-world gone
 .h no: because I deliberately went to cd cd-world
- 8 bei- beim fred myer
 at- at+the fred myer
 at- at fred myer's
- 9 M: .h
- 10 N: ja
 yes
 yes
- 11→M: **kannst dich erinnern ähm**
 can you+reflex. remember uhm
 do you remember uhm
- 12 N: ja. ja ja klar natürlich da warn wa ja auch damals
 yes. yes yes sure of course there were we PRT too then
 yes. yes yes sure of course we were there too back then
- 13 M: also riesen riesengroß is das ja
 well gigantic gigantic+big ist that PRT
 well that (place) is gigantic gigantic big
- 14 M: .h
- 15 N: mhm
- 16 M: und äh ansonsten gibts nur kleinere läden
 and uh otherwise is+it only small stores
 and uh otherwise there are only small stores
- 17 N: mhm
- 18 M: und die ham das dann auch nich-
 and they have that then also no-
 and they also don't have it-

Figure 3.8 Oregon_1B_24.05_CDs (cont.)

19 N: () es is ja auch nich so tragisch
() it is PRT also not so tragic
() *it is not so tragic*

20 der hatte mich ja gefra:gt
he had me.acc. PRT asked
he had asked me

At the start of this figure, Marcus reports on his failed attempts citing a store employee who said that the CD is no longer available for purchase (lines 1-5). Nicole receives with the acknowledgement token *ja* ‘yes’ and then provides a possible reason by invoking the small size of the town why the store did not have the CD (line 6). This is delayed with the discourse marker *also* ‘well’ (Jucker, 1993). By explaining why the store did not have the CD, Nicole produces a disagreeing response claiming that the salesperson is not right and thus, challenging Marcus’ effort in purchasing the CD. Marcus responds with an in-breath, disaligns with *nee* ‘no’ providing the name of the store and further emphasizes his efforts in buying the CD with *extra* ‘deliberately’ (lines 8-9). In line 8, he adds an increment to provide further information about the location of the store. Nicole produces an acknowledgement token, which is followed by Marcus checking recognition with *kannst dich erinnern* (line 11). This TCU occurs turn-initially after Nicole’s turn, but is added here like a tag to Marcus’ previous turns in lines 7-8. Nicole confirms three usages of the type-confirming answer *ja* ‘yes’ and further claims recognition with *klar natürlich* ‘sure of course’, which conveys that she expects Marcus to know that she knows. As if this is not enough, she produces another TCU displaying recognition by providing evidence of a shared event/memory, that is, Nicole having been there too. This is also supported by the use of the personal plural pronoun *wa* ‘we’ including both the recipient and herself (line 12). This shared experience of having been to the CD store aligns with Marcus’ counter-challenge that he tried his best to find the CD Nicole’s neighbor requested. Marcus upgrades his previous turn by

describing the store as *riesen riesengross* ‘gigantic gigantic big (line 13). His use of the particle *ja* communicates his “assertive” expectation of shared memory (Lütten, 1979, p. 36). Nicole responds with a continuer and Marcus continues with his initial account that also aligns with Nicole’s challenge (line 6) that the stores there are rather small (lines 16, 18). In lines 19 and 20, Nicole finally responds to Marcus’ account with a summary assessment that does not address Marcus’ attempts, but assesses the whole situation deflecting the responsibility to herself and away from Marcus.

The shared place referent is used here to counter-challenge Nicole’s implicit challenge and therefore, is responsive to other talk. Reference is made to account for Marcus’ efforts in buying the CD. His counter to Nicole’s challenge (lines 7-8) seems to remain unnoticed by Nicole. She does not seem to register the interactional import of what Marcus says in lines 7-8. Her missing display of understanding of the interactional import of Marcus’ previous turn seem to prompt his recognition check with *kannst dich erinnern*. Nicole displays recognition through the repeat of confirmation tokens and the use of *klar natürlich* ‘yes of course’ that she recognizes the referent in question. Furthermore, Nicole expects Marcus to know that they share this memory, which is expressed through the particle *ja* in line 12 (Lütten, 1979).

In this figure, the progressivity of talk is halted in form of an incidental sequence to check recognition, which is done to visualize how big the store is and to show that Marcus did not go to just any store. Even after Nicole’s display of recognition, Marcus gives more information about the store. He does not stop giving counter-evidence until Nicole orients to it with her summary assessment in lines 19 and 20. Marcus first mentioning of the store is very general *der eine laden* ‘the one store’ (line 1) using a non-recognitional reference form (Schegloff, 1996). He apparently does not feel the necessity to provide specific details, but after

Nicole's challenge in line 7, the referent is changed into a locally-initial form in locally-subsequent position plus exact information about its location *beim fred meyer* 'at fred meyer's'. Making reference to a particular place referent is done in this segment to counter-challenge the recipient's challenge.

In terms of epistemic authority, Marcus is supposed to know more about the stores in his area. Because of Nicole's initial challenge, Marcus is led into a position where he defends his epistemic access by naming the particular place referent. The recognition check not only seeks recognition of the referent, but also alignment with his counter-challenge. Nicole's recognition of the referent presents an indirect mitigation of her initial challenge. Nicole not only claims and displays recognition, but points to a shared personal experience that expresses that participants have established a common ground of understanding. Marcus provides very convincing evidence of epistemic ownership, which Nicole aligns with and supports via a reference to a shared memory, to which Marcus orients with further information about the store. There is no second assessment after Marcus' assessment of the store in line 13. Instead, Nicole produces a continuer turning over the floor to Marcus who continues with his account of his attempts of buying the CDs. He then addresses Nicole's challenge more explicitly agreeing with her initial concerns. Nicole's summary assessment not only expresses her backing down from the challenge, but also points to her own responsibility.

The use of the particle *ja* nicely illustrates the participants' "assertive" expectation of memory of shared experiences (Lütten, 1979, p. 36). Both the speaker and the recipient employ this particle to signal not only that they share knowledge but also that they expect the other to know that they know. It is through social actions (here: the exchange of challenges) and small

linguistic expressions like particles that knowledge domains of speakers can be easily communicated without explicitly saying *I know that you know* or *you know that I know* etc.

3.3.3 *Kannst dich (dran) erinnern* in incidental sequences: Backing up a claim

Another environment of incidental *kannst dich (dran) erinnern* involves claim-backing situations (Antaki & Leudar, 1990). In the following example, Thea, Folina and Nessa are talking about Thea's cat who had her kittens on Thea's pillow. Thea makes reference to this past experience in order to back up her initial claim that not everything can be recorded as was claimed by Folina earlier. In lines 5-6, Thea points out that sometimes unpredictable things can happen. This claim is then supported by the story-telling about a shared event. Thea initiates a recognition check with *kannst dich da noch dran erinnern* in line 11.

Figure 3.9 FOLK_E_000161_SE_01_T_04 *Katzenbabies*

```

01  FK:  [so wie in der heutigen zeit ne      (.) a[lles
        [PRT like in the today's  time right (.) e[verything
        [like in today's world      (.) e[verything
        [                               [
02  TU:  [hehh                               [ja
        [hehh                               [yes
        [hehh                               [yes

03  FK:  wird aufgenommen ne      (.) kamera dabei  ne,
        will be.recorded right (.) camera present right,
        is recorded right (.) the camera is there right,

04      [alles wird          aufgeno[mmen.
        [everything will be.recor[ded.
        [everything is      recor[ded.
        [                               [
05  TU:  [ja,                               [obwohl   is ja auch immer so
        [yes,                               [although is PRT too always PRT
        [yes,                               [although this always depends on the

06      situationsbedi:ngt.
        situationa:l.
        situation:n.

07  FK:  ja
        yes
        yes

```

Figure 3.9 FOLK_E_000161_SE_01_T_04 *Katzenbabies* (cont.)

- 08 TU: weißt du noch die eine katze die auf meinem
 know you PRT the one cat who on my
do you remember the one cat who had her babies
- 09 kopfkissen in meinem bett junge gekricht hat,
 pillow in my bed babies received has,
on my pillow in my bed,
- 10 (0.4)
- 11→TU: **kannst dich da noch dran erinnern?**
 can you there still at.it remember?
do you remember that?
- 12 FK: ja (.) im im kl[eiderschrank
 yes (.) in.the in.the cl[oset
yes (.) in the in the cl[oset
- 13 TU: [die erste katze (.) nee
 [the first cat (.) no
 [the first cat (.) no
- 14 [auf meim kopfkissen
 [on my pillow
[on my pillow
 [
- 15 FK: [äh oh ja stimmt (.) ja
 [eh oh yes right (.) yes
[eh oh yes right (.) yes
- 16 TU: in meim bett.
 in my bed.
in my bed.
- 17 FK: ja.
 yes.
yes.
- 18 TU: dat kopfkissen konnt mer wegschm[eißen.
 that pillow could we throw.aw[ay.
that pillow we had to throw aw[ay.
- 19 FK: [ja ja natürlich
 [yes yes of.course
[yes yes of course
- 20 NM: hehe
 hehe
hehe
- 21 TU: aber auch trotzdem sü:ß och [ja:
 but also anyway cu:te oh[ye:s
but anyway cu:te too oh [ye:s
 [

Figure 3.9 FOLK_E_000161_SE_01_T_04 *Katzenbabies* (cont.)

22 NM: [ha ha
[ha ha
[ha ha

23 FK: ha ha
ha ha
ha ha

In lines 1, 3 and 4, Folina is commenting on how everything can easily be recorded today. Thea responds with an acknowledgement token in line 2, which is in overlap with Folina's second TCU in line 1. Thea produces another acknowledgement token in line 5, which is again in overlap with Folina's turn. She responds with an acknowledgement token after Folina produces the response pursuit *ne* 'right' in line 3 (Harren, 2001). The overlap in lines 4 to 5 is due to Folina's continuation of her turn after the response pursuit. In line 5, Thea adds a disagreeing response to Folina's previous turns to which Folina replies with an acknowledgement token (line 7). Thea then introduces a memory check with *weißt du noch* 'do you remember' that introduces a personal experience (line 8). The adverb *noch* 'still' conveys that Thea is pointing to a past memory that might be still remembered by the recipient. Thus, it is equivalent in its meaning to the verb *remember*, which is why it is translated to *do you remember* here. A more in-depth analysis will be provided in Section 3.3.5 below. The turn is produced with slightly rising intonation at the end of line 9 making a response relevant next from the recipient. This is followed by no immediate uptake from the recipients (line 10), which indicates that there is either a problem with Thea's turn (lines 8-9) or the recipients have other reasons for delaying their response. Thea then self-selects with a recognition check with *kannst dich da noch dran erinnern*. Despite there being two recipients, the use of *du* here indicates that Thea is only addressing one recipient, namely Folina. The recognition check contains the adverb *noch* 'still', which conveys that she mitigates her expectation of Folina to remember that incident (line 11).

Folina in line 12 claims recognition with a type-confirming answer and further displays recognition by providing additional details of the incident. This is partly in overlap with Thea's attempt of continuing her story, which she then cuts off orienting to Folina's turn in line 12. Thea introduces a correction with *nee* 'no' and initiates other-repair (line 13-14). Folina produces two change-of-state tokens (Heritage 1984, 1998) and accepts the repair with *ja stimmt ja* 'yes right yes' (line 15), which is followed by Thea adding an increment to her prior turn which resolves the repair (line 16). After Folina's production of an acknowledgement token in line 17, Thea continues with her initial agenda by returning to the story. This is followed by Folina's turn containing a double saying of *ja* (Golato & Fagyal, 2008) and *of course*, which conveys strong alignment and remembering. Nessa responds with laughter (line 20) and Thea makes a summary assessment that mitigates her previous turn that she had to throw away her pillow because of the cat (line 21). This is received by the two other participants with laughter in lines 22 and 23.

The recognition check with *kannst dich da noch dran erinnern* in this figure is produced after a lack of uptake after the memory check with *weißt du noch* in lines 8-10. The first memory check in lines 8-10 by Thea introduces shared memory that backs up her disagreeing claim that not everything is recorded as was initially claimed by Folina in lines 3-4, but that it would depend on the situation. The reference to a shared past memory is therefore preemptively produced by the speaker to provide evidence by illustrating a situation where not everything can be recorded due to certain unpredictable circumstances. The recognition check is introduced as an incidental sequence to ensure that the recipient can follow the speaker's claim-backing (Antaki & Leudar, 1990). The second recognition check with *erinnern* seeks a response and refers to the same past event. By using the verb *erinnern*, Thea presumes knowledge to be available in the recipient's knowledge domain. However, the use of the adverb *noch* here

mitigates Thea's expectation and the pressure placed on Folina to remember the past experience as Folina showed no recognition.

Thea owns epistemic authority since it was her cat who gave birth to kittens on her pillow in her bed. It was her pillow and her bed that was the place of the incident. Therefore, she seems to clearly remember and solicits recognition from Folina. Folina, however, initiates repair correcting Thea's memory about the location of the birth, which she thinks happened not in Thea's bed, but in the closet. This is then strongly disagreed with and repaired by Thea. Folina backs down and they both agree on Thea's initial account of the story (lines 15-17). Thea stresses the entire noun phrase *meim bett* 'my bed', which is received by Folina with acknowledgement. Thus, Thea not only claims her involvement in the story, but she also displays her epistemic authority of the memory by providing another detail that she had to throw away her pillow. This further becomes clear through her summary assessment in line 21.

3.3.4 Turn-final or stand-alone *erinnern*

Similar to turn-final *remember*, recognition checks with *erinnern* can follow the reference to the past event in a separate TCU or turn. Figure 3.10 below is drawn again from the phone conversation between Kirsten and Rita who are sisters-in-law (Figure 3.6). At the start of the figure, Kirsten is asking her husband Kent whether he has taken the bread out of the toaster (lines 9, 11). Instead of an abrupt change, Kirsten addresses Rita making a reference to Kent and what is he doing right now. Thus, she is sharing with Rita what the other person in Kirsten's place is doing. Kent is installing a new door, which becomes the starting point for the referent in question. Prior to the turn-final recognition check with *kannste dich dran erinnern* in line 16, pieces of information are given which are introduced by *weisste wie bei uns* 'you know like at

our place' making reference to something shared which is expressed through the personal pronoun *uns* 'us' (line 14).

Figure 3.10 Kirsten_1A_28.30_Fliegengitter

- 1 K: na klar. .hhh he watte mal, ich muss kent n mal
sure. .hhh hey wait once, I have.to name one time
sure. .hhh hey wait a second, I have to tell kent
- 2 sagen, dass der dat Brot rausnehmen soll,
say, that he the bread take.out shall,
that he should take out the bread,
- 3 es riecht hier so anjebrannt=
it smells here very burnt=
it smells burnt here=
- 4 R: =ja
=yes
=yes
- 5 K: ((shouting away from the phone)) .hhh KENT
.hhh name
.hhh kent
- 6 Ku: °KIRSTEN.°
°name.°
°KIRSTEN.°
- 7 K: hehe
hehe
hehe
- 8 R: °e°hehe
°e°hehe
°e°hehe
- 9 K: did you take the bread out baby?
- 10 R: hehe
hehe
hehe
- 11 K: hehe hh ders mein Echo .hhh did you take the bread out baby?
hehe hh he+is my echo. .hhh did you take the bread out baby?
hehe hh he's my echo. .hhh did you take the bread out baby?
- 12 Ku: ye:he:s.
ye:he:s.
ye:he:s.
- 13 K: ye:he:s. der baut gerade ne neue Tür an,
ye:he:s. he is.building now a new door in,
ye:he:s. he is installing a new door,

Figure 3.10 Kirsten_1A_28.30_Fliegengittern (cont.)

- 14 weißte wie bei uns, wenn man rausgeht, da war
 you.know like at us, when one goes.out, there was
 you know like at our place, when you go out, there was
- 15 doch die Tür so kaputt, die ffiel ständig da
 PRT the door PRT broken, it fell always there
 this broken door, it jumped off the track all the time
- 16→ von der Schiene runter, **kannste dich dran erinnern**
 from the bar down, can you at.it remember
 , do you remember that?
- 17 R: we[lche
 wh[ich
 wh[ich
 [
- 18 K: [dieses Fliegengitter da (.) d-raus zum Garten hinten.
 [this fly.screen there (.) th-out to garden back.
 [*this mosquito screen there (.) in the back out to the garden.*
- 19 R: e- ach so das. ja=
 e- oh PRT that. yes=
 e- *I see that. yes=*
- 20 K: =das is schon seit nem Jahr kaputt und
 =that is already since a year broken and
 =*that has already been broken for a year and*
- 21 es ist immer so Kleinigkeiten=aber jetzt
 it is always PRT trivial.things=but now
 it is always odds and ends=but now
- 22 kommen seine Eltern .hh Anfang Juni
 come his parents .hh beginning June
 his parents are .hh coming beginning of June
- 23 R: a:h
 a:h
 a:h
- 24 K: man sollt ja sagen, letzten Sommer
 one should PRT say, last summer
 one should say, last summer
- 25 haben wir geschufftet wie die Wilden weil ihr kamt
 have we work like the savage because you came
 we have worked so hard because you came
- 26 dann war erst mal n Jahr Ruhe hh.
 then was first time a year peace hh.
 then we had peace for a year hh.

Figure 3.10 Kirsten_1A_28.30_Fliegengittern (cont.)

27 R: hhehe
 hhehe
 hhehe

28 K: ((smiling voice))und jetzt? m(hh)achen wir den Rest fertig [hh,hehe
 and now? m(hh)ake we the rest ready [hh,hehe
 and now? we'll f(hh)inish the rest [hh,hehe
 [

29 R: [hahaha
 [hahaha
 [hahaha

In line 1, Kirsten is halting the telephone conversation by giving an explanation that she has to tell her husband Kent to take the bread out of the toaster (lines 1-3). Rita receives this with an acknowledgement token in line 4. Kirsten then calls her husband's name (line 5), which is received by Kent with calling her name in line 6. Both Kirsten and Rita laugh (lines 7-8) and Kirsten formulates a request in line 9 addressing her American husband Kent in English. After some laughter, Kirsten comments on this short exchange to Rita and then repeats her request for confirmation produced earlier in line 9. Kent confirms in line 12 with a type-confirming answer, which Kirsten receives with an acknowledgement token. In line 13, Kirsten also announces that Kent is installing a new door. In line 14, she then provides more specific information about which door is being newly installed. The pieces of information provided include: 1. broken door, 2. the door which was used to exit the house, 3. the door which always jumped off the track (lines 14-16). Reference is made to a door that both participants frequently used and that was broken. The particle *doch* here functions to show that Kirsten expects Rita to recognize the reference (Lütten, 1979). In line 16, Kirsten explicitly checks recognition asking *kannste dich dran erinnern*, with stress on the verb *erinnern*. Prior to Kirsten's production of the recognition check, Rita has missed at least two opportunities to claim recognition since Kirsten's turn had reached two points of possible completion. Thus, the recognition check is prompted here by the lack of response by Rita. Rita then initiates repair in line 17 to which Kirsten in overlap responds

with a more specific characterization of the broken door. The lexical item screen door is framed by the deictic terms *dieses* ‘this’ and *da* ‘there’ pointing to a particular place presuming the recipient to share common ground (Mondada, 2005; 2007). It is after this information that Rita finally claims understanding confirming with *ach so* ‘I see’ (Golato & Betz, 2008) and the demonstrative *das* ‘that’ making reference to the shared referent. Rita further produces a confirmation token *ja* ‘yes’. This token can also be interpreted as the SPP answer to Kirsten’s question in line 16 *kannste dich dran erinnern*. Kirsten continues with further talk returning to the door that Kent is replacing. She provides an account for why Kent is installing a new door in their house. The account that the door has been broken for a year is followed by news about Kent’s parents visiting them, which presents a reason/motivation for repairing that door. Rita receives the news with a change-of-state token in line 23 and Kirsten continues commenting about how the couple is keeping fixing their house for their visitors.

The *kannste dich dran erinnern* recognition check is not immediately answered, but Rita initiates repair by asking for clarification and Kirsten provides more specific details for Rita to identify the referent (line 18). The linguistic means used here to convey expectation of shared knowledge are pronouns, demonstratives, and the particle *doch* (Lütten, 1979). *Kannste dich dran erinnern* is part of a telling and thus, incidental in its sequential position and is used in order for the recipient to recognize the referent. Therefore, using shared memory as a reference point to achieve common ground is a useful tool that helps conversation partners in moving a conversation forward.

Similar to turn-final or stand-alone *remember*, turn-final *erinnern* here also misses a response from the recipient, which the speaker notices as absent. Turn-final or stand-alone *erinnern* TCUs like tags signal the end of a turn and select the next speaker (Heritage &

Raymond, 2005; Sidnell, 2010, p. 154; for German, see Harren, 2001). Since turn-final or stand-alone *erinnern* adds a new TCU after a point of possible completion (Schegloff, 1996, pp. 83-84), turn-final *erinnern* is projecting the course of action forward through the explicit request for recognition, which corresponds to English turn-final *remember*.

3.3.5 *Weißt du noch / kennst du noch*: Checking remembering

The combination of *weißst du/kennst du* + the adverb *noch* formulates a check that refers to something in the past or that occurred in the past. If it is something from the past or has occurred in the past, it involves a past memory or experience. In that sense, it is very similar to *kannst dich erinnern* because it too makes reference to a past experience. Figure 3.11 below provides an example of *weißst du + noch* that is used to elicit remembering rather than explicit recognition from the recipient. Marcus (M) is a German exchange student in Los Angeles and the other interlocutor (X) who had previously been an exchange student in the United States is in Germany.

Figure 3.11 Ingo_2b_5:40

- 01 M: diese woche noch zwei mitterms: gestern (jetz')
 this week still two midterms: yesterday (now')
 this week I still have two midterms: yesterday (now')
- 02 warm wa mal auch wieda im im 'nen bisschen im
 were we time too again in.the in.the 'a little in.the
 we went to a to a dance club
- 03 .hh i(n/m) so'n eh dance club
 .hh i(n/in.the) like eh dance club
 (we stayed there) for a short time
- 04 X: j[a:
 y[e:s
 y[e:s
 [
- 05 M: [ähm: (.) und ähm: (.) die war'n warn'n ganz gute
 [uhm: (.) and uhm: (.) they were were pretty good
 [uhm: (.) and uhm: (.) they were were pretty good

Figure 3.11 Ingo_2b_5:40 (cont.)

- 06 dabei (.) vorgestern war'n wa in (.) in beverly hills
 present (.) the.day.before.yesterday were in (.) in beverly hills
 we went to (.) beverly hills the day before yesterday
- 07→ in so einem .h[h **weiste** **noch (.) imma** .h an an eh:
 in like a .h[h do you know still (.) always .h ein ein eh:
 to like a .h[h do you remember (.) always .h a a eh:
 [
- 08 X: [(ja is' ja gut)
 [(yes it's yes good)
 [(yes it's yes good)
- 09→M: **am** **sunset?**
 at.the sunset?
 at sunset?
- 10 M: da war doch: (.h) eine ecke da warn se imma so diese rocka
 there's PRT (.h) a corner there were they always like these rocker
 there was (.h) a corner there were always like these rockers there
- 11 diese (.)[so schwarz und so .hh da ((laughing voice)) geht's
 these (.)[like black and like .hh there ((laughing voice)) it's
 these (.)[like black and like .hh there ((laughing voice)) it's
 [
- 12 X: [ja ja ja
 [yes yes yes
 [yes yes yes
- 13 M: ((laughing voice)) () da geht's echt voll
 ((laughing voice)) () there it's really totally
 ((laughing voice)) () there it's really totally
- 14 ab du da's is' es total cool .h[h da da sin' wa
 crazy you there it's it really cool .h[h there there we've
 crazy you there it it's really cool .h[h there there we've
 [
- 15 X: [ja:
 [ye:s
 [ye:s
- 16 M: jetz' im so drin gewesn in einem so in den- aba
 now in.the like inside been in a like in the- but
 now been inside in a like in the- but
- 17 das war (.) also nich' wo diese schwarze kerle da
 that was (.) well no' where these black guys there
 that was (.) well not the place where these black guys
- 18 reingehn aba: ehm[: .h daneben an da war so'ne andre bar one
 go.inside bu: ehm[: .h next a there was like a different bar one
 go bu: ehm [: .h next to it there was like a different bar one
 [

Figure 3.11 Ingo_2b_5:40 (cont.)

19 X: [ja:
[ye:s
[ye:s

20 M: hiess die: un[d (.) wa- war echt war echt ziemlich gut
called it: an[d (.) wa- was really was really really good
it's called an[d (.) wa- was really was really really good
[

21 X: [ja
[yes
[yes

22 X: (ja hört sich ganz interessant an)
(yes sounds REFLEX. very interesting)
(yes sounds very interesting)

In lines 1-3, M tells a story about what he did last night. He went to a dance club, which X acknowledges in line 4. This is partly in overlap with M's continuation of his story-telling in lines 5-7. M halts his telling in line 7 and in overlap with X's assessment, M initiates a memory check with *weiste noch*. The memory check introduces shared knowledge, which is produced with turn-final rising intonation in line 9. M self-selects in line 10 and continues with more information about the reference. X claims remembering with *yes* in line 12 and a double saying of *yes* (Golato & Fagyal, 2008) a little later in the same turn conveying that he is familiar with the reference. Even after X's use of the double saying *yes*, M continues with an assessment of the dance club. X responds to the assessment with alignment and a sound stretch on the vowel in line 15. M continues his story-telling in line 16 to 18 and 20 and X acknowledges M's telling (lines 19, 21). In line 22, X makes a positive summary assessment.

M halts his telling in the middle of his TCU in order to check remembering of knowledge that establishes common ground regarding the location of the dance club to which M went the previous night (line 7). The *weiste noch* is followed by a micro-pause, which is a transition relevance place for X to take the floor as the construction by itself is syntactically and pragmatically complete. *Weiste noch* is also in overlap with X's acknowledgement in line 8. M

continues his turn, which contains a number of delays or problems of production such as an in-breath, a repeat of *an* and *eh*:. It also contains an extreme case formulation *immer* ‘always’ (Pomerantz, 1988) that conveys that reference is made to something that has been there for a long time and is supposed to be still there. Even though M produces the memory check with rising intonation at the end of the turn, X does not respond with a claim or lack of remembering. M then provides more information about the surrounding of that place. It is the double-saying of *ja* by X in line 12 that indicates that X is familiar with the reference and that M can stop giving more details about the reference. M then returns to his original agenda, which is his story-telling (line 16).

The memory check in this example is different from the previous *kannst dich (dran) erinnern/erinnerst du dich* instances in German. Thus, *weiste noch* here leaves it open for the recipient to respond without making a claim, display or lack of remembering relevant next. The recipient may, but does not have to provide a SPP to a *weiste noch* FPP.

To return to the earlier instance of *weißst du noch* in Figure 3.9, which is repeated below, Thea is checking Folina’s memory with *weißst du noch* making reference to a past event. The pause in line 10 expresses Thea’s expectation for an answer. After receiving no response, Thea formulates a recognition check with *kannst dich da noch dran erinnern* ‘do you remember that’ in line 11 to which Folina orients with a claim and display of recognition (line 12).

Figure 3.9 FOLK_E_000161_SE_01_T_04 *Katzenbabies* (shortened)

01	FK:	[so wie in der heutigen zeit ne [PRT like in the today's time right [like in today's world [(.) a[lles (.) e[verything (.) e[verything [
02	TU:	[hehh [hehh [hehh	[ja [yes [yes

Figure 3.9 FOLK_E_000161_SE_01_T_04 *Katzenbabies* (shortened) (cont.)

03 FK: wird aufgenommen ne (.) kamera dabei ne,
will be.recorded right (.) camera present right,
is recorded right (.) the camera is there right,

04 [alles wird aufgeno[mmen.
[everything will be.recor[ded.
[everything is recor[ded.
[[

05 TU: [ja, [obwohl is ja auch immer so
[yes, [although is PRT too always PRT
[yes, [although this always depends on the

06 situationsbedi:ngt.
situationa:l.
situation:n.

07 FK: ja
yes
yes

08→TU: **weißt du noch die eine katze die auf meinem**
know you PRT the one cat who on my
do you remember the one cat who had her babies

09 **kopfkissen in meinem bett junge gekricht hat,**
pillow in my bed babies received has,
on my pillow in my bed,

10 (0.4)

11 TU: kannst dich da noch dran erinnern?
can you there still at.it remember?
do you remember that?

12 FK: ja (.) im im kl[eiderschrank
yes (.) in.the in.the cl[oset
yes (.) in the in the cl[oset

Different from the previous example (Figure 3.11), *weißt du noch* in Figure 3.9 makes a response relevant next from the recipient. Thea pursues a response from the recipient in line 11 after failing to receive a response after *weißt du noch*. Hence, the current speaker may pursue a response from the recipient or go on with his/her actual agenda. However, given that I only have three instances of *weißt du noch*, these findings cannot be generalized.

Kennst du noch is the second variant containing the adverb *noch* ‘still’ and *kennen* ‘know’ that speakers can use in German to initiate recognition checks. In Figure 3.12, X is telling I about his plans on making a test copy and giving it to a person called *matthias stenzl*. In line 5, X initiates a memory check with *kennst du noch* after I’s ambiguous response in line 4.

Figure 3.12 Ingo 1A_12:05

- 01 X: dann werd' ich das noch mal ausdrucken so'n probedruck
 then will I that again time print like.a test copy
I will then print it again like a test copy
- 02 I: mhm
 mhm
mhm
- 03 X: das werd' ich dann dem matthias stenzl geben
 that will I then him matthias stenzl give
I will then give it to matthias stenzl
- 04 I: ja
 yes
yes
- 05→ X: =den kennst'e auch noch ne?
 =him you know too still ne?
 =you still remember him too right?
- 06 I: j- der wer wer da gibt's so viele matthiase
 y- he who who there is so many matthias.pl
y- he who who there are so many matthiases
- 07 [äh is' dieser ganz
 [eh is this.one very
 [eh is this guy very
 [
- 08 X: [(ja)
 [(yes)
 [(yes)
- 09 I: ganz grosse lange? ne: der ganz kleine (.) der
 very tall tall.guy? no: the.one very short (.) the.one
very tall the tall guy? no: the very short one (.) the one
- 10 (2.0)
- 11 X: noch 'nen jüngerer der is'n: semester noch unter di:r
 still a younger.one he is.a semester more below you:
 a younger one is he one semester below you:
- 12 (2.0)

Figure 3.12 Ingo 1A_12:05 (cont.)

13 I: ne den kenn' ich nich'
no him know I not
no I don't know him

In lines 1 and 2, X tells I his plans on making a test copy, which I receives with a continuer. X then continues with his telling introducing a person referent, *mattias stenzl*, whom he is going to give the test copy (line 3). I produces an acknowledgement token to which X responds with a memory check introduced with *kennst du noch* in line 5. I initiates a series of self-repairs in the beginning of line 6 and then initiates other-repair on X's previous turn pointing to the problematic referent *matthias*. I starts formulating a candidate understanding of the person referent in line 7, which is in overlap with X acknowledging I's problem (line 8). In line 9, I continues his candidate understanding of the referent, which is received with no uptake in line 10. The silence is indicative of X's disagreement in line 11. X does not produce a disagreement token, but he gives a description of the person referent, who is contrasted with the person described by I. After silence in line 12, which again indicates pre-disagreement to the lack of knowledge of the referent, I finally responds to X's memory check in line 5 with disalignment. The turn consists of the disconfirmation token *ne* 'no' and *den kenn' ich nich'* 'I don't know him'. I repeats the verb *kennen* here to signal that I does not know who *matthias* is.

In this example, X formulates a memory check with *kennst du noch*. The memory check is a declarative question, which is followed by *ne* 'right' (Harren, 2001) ending in rising intonation that signals that X is requesting confirmation from I. After X has introduced the person referent in line 3, I responds with an acknowledgement token, which is ambiguous because it could be also be treated as an answer that claims recognition. X then checks memory, which he presumes to be shared by I. This expectation is further conveyed by the adverb *too* that expresses inclusive meaning, i.e. that the speaker and the recipient know who the referent is. I

produces a candidate understanding making reference to a person I thinks to be *matthias*. After X's disconfirmation of the referent, I expresses lack of epistemic access to the person referent (line 13).

As was shown in this analysis, recipients respond to the remembering check in all three of my examples, which is why I am hesitant to generalize my findings for *weißt du noch* to *kennst du noch* in German. However, both *weißt du noch* and *kennst du noch* constructions are clearly checking memory and not simply recognition of knowledge of or about referents, which is conveyed through the adverb *noch* that points to a shared past experience or memory, which may or may not be remembered by the recipient. Given the limited number of examples, more research is needed to confirm the preliminary findings on *weißt du noch* and *kennst du noch* in German. Moreover, the next chapter on *wissen* and *kennen* in German will demonstrate subtle differences between the two forms of knowing in German. The analysis of the two forms *wissen* and *kennen* suggests that *weißt du noch* and *kennst du noch* may also be different in their interactional functions, which deserves closer investigation for future studies on this topic.

3.3.6 Conclusion of German *erinnern* and *wissen/kennen* + *noch*

In summary, among the 20 examples of German *erinnern* and *wissen/kennen* + *noch* recognition checks, ten are found in presequential position and ten in incidental sequences. Out of the 20 instances, eight occur turn-finally or as a separate turn (e.g., *kannst (du) dich (dran) erinnern?*), whereas twelve examples appear in turn-initial position in which the referent is embedded as a noun phrase or clause. The eight turn-final or separate turn *erinnern* recognition checks function like tags in turn-final position (Heritage & Raymond, 2005; Sidnell, 2010, p. 154). The *erinnern* constructions analyzed in this section of the paper occur in three different

environments: ten are used to simply seek recognition eliciting a telling by the recipient, three appear in environments of challenges and seven appear in claim-backing situations.

German *erinnern* constructions observed in this study are mostly produced with the modal *können* ‘can’, which is *kannst* ‘can you’ in the second person singular form. Out of the 20 examples of *erinnern* recognition checks, only three examples were found with *erinnerst (du) dich* ‘you remember (interrogative)’. In spoken language, *remember* + noun phrase as an interrogative can stand on its own. Similarly, German *kannst du + (dich) erinnern + NP* can also stand on its own, which might be an explanation for its frequency in my collection.

The action environments for German *erinnern* recognition checks are recognition-soliciting, challenging and claim-backing situations. With regard to recognition-soliciting environments, speakers seek recognition from their co-participants to elicit a telling or information prior to a larger action (Figure 3.7). In challenging situations, participants initiate recognition checks with *kannst (du) dich (erinnern)* in order to provide evidence to counter-argue against another speaker’s argument. Reference to a shared personal experience or memory is employed as a useful tool to prove that the speaker is right. For claim-backing (Antaki & Leudar, 1990), reference to a shared memory is employed to support a speaker’s prior claim. The speaker expects the recipient to know. Therefore, joint memory cannot only be used to deflate another participant’s argument, but to support one’s own arguments (Antaki & Leudar, 1990; Golato, 2012).

Furthermore, thirteen examples of recognition checks with *erinnern* contained the adverb *noch* in German. *Noch* which is translated into English as ‘still’ in combination with *kannst (du) dich erinnern* seem to mitigate the expectation that is associated with *erinnern*. It is still more imposing than *weißt du* ‘do you know’ since it draws on the (shared) memory domains of the

participants rather than their knowledge domains. However, adding the adverb *noch* expresses some expectation of remembering, but does not presuppose it. Apart from *noch*, the particles *doch* and *ja* were frequently observed in the immediate sequential environments, through which speakers and recipients claim and display epistemic access and rights by participants in German conversation (Lütten, 1979).

Apart from German *erinnern*, *weißt du noch* and *kennst du noch* are used to check recipients' remembering of references. Out of the six instances found in my entire collection of German data, I have only found three instances of *weißt du noch* and three instances of *kennst du noch* constructions. While *weißt du noch* examples make reference to a shared past event or experience, *kennst du noch* examples make reference to a presumably known person or object encountered or experienced in the past. All except for one instance occur in incidental sequences as part of a larger action, which in my examples either involved a story-telling or claim-backing situation. For *weißt du noch*, speakers may sometimes but not always pursue a response resulting in no uptake by the recipient or continuation of the turn by the current speaker. *Kennst du noch* however, at least for the three instances analyzed for this study, are followed by a response from the recipients, which is why more data is needed to confirm these preliminary findings on *weißt du noch* and *kennst du noch* in German.

Despite the lexical, syntactic, and functional differences in interaction, both *erinnern* and *kennen/wissen* + *noch* are employed by speakers of German in everyday talk to make reference and to establish common ground among participants. Based on the analysis of German *remember*, checking memory and checking recognition seem to be two different practices. A memory check with *weißt du noch* may but not necessarily make a response from the recipient

relevant next whereas a recognition check with *erinnern* seeks an explicit response from the recipient.

3.4 A comparison of *do you remember* in English and German

This section compares the findings on German *erinnern* and *kennen/wissen* + *noch* and English *remember*. The points of comparison include: 1. Syntactic form/construction, 2. Recipient orientation, 3. Use of reference forms, 4. Sequential position, and 5. Action performed.

In terms of form/construction, most instances in American English consist of *(do you) + remember* + direct object (reference). There are only three instances in which the reference is not embedded in the *remember* construction. In the German collection of *erinnern*, 17 constructions consist of *kannst (du) + dich erinnern*. There are three examples of *erinnerst (du) dich* in German. In eight out of 20 instances, the reference precedes the *erinnern* construction. Thus, *kannst (du) dich (dran) erinnern* is located after the referent in the next TCU or even the next turn (referent + *kannst dich (dran) erinnern*). Apart from the 20 *erinnern* examples, three instances of *weißt du noch* + clause and three instances of *kennst du noch* + noun phrase were found. Both forms literally translate into English as ‘do you still know’. In American English, the referent is often observed within the same TCU following the *(do you) remember* construction (i.e., *(do you) remember* + referent).

In the majority of instances of English and German *remember* I have examined, a SPP answer is immediately produced after the question is formulated. If recipients align with the FPP, recognition is claimed through acknowledgement or confirmation tokens. However, not all examined instances where participants align also contain a display of recognition by the recipients in both English and German examples. If recognition is displayed, it happens in form

of additional information about that referent that convey that the FPP question is redundant and knowledge of the referent is clearly shared (Auer, 1984). In German, double sayings of *ja* ‘yes’, for example, signal that the information is known to the speaker and the action of checking recognition should be halted (Golato & Fagyal, 2008). In addition, German *ach so* ‘I see’ also claims understanding to the recipient (Golato, 2010). In English, change-of-state tokens like *oh* are often found that convey the transition from less or not knowledgeable (K-) to more knowledgeable (K+) or with regard to shared memory, not remembering (M-) to remembering (M+) (Goodwin, 1979; Heritage, 1984; 1998). If participants do not remember, they claim or display problems of understanding initiating repair or respond to the check with silence.

Another similarity involves the linguistic means to indicate knowledge that is expected to be shared or known by the recipient. In these instances, recognitional forms such as pronouns and demonstratives are most often found to convey speakers’ expectation of shared knowledge. The use of personal pronouns, in particular, reveals the speaker’s idea of the relationship of the participants towards the reference or personal experience. In addition, German speakers make use of the particles *doch* and *ja* that mark that knowledge is expected to be shared by the participants. While *doch* is appealing in its interaction function, *ja* is assertive; both forms clearly express their expectation of common ground towards the recipient (Lütten, 1979). German also makes use of the adverb *noch*, which seems to mitigate the speaker’s pressure on the recipient to remember. If memory is not expected or irrelevant, non-recognitional forms are used in both languages. Apart from linguistic forms, prosody is another indicator that mirrors an interlocutor’s state of knowledge or remembering. Higher pitch may indicate that knowledge is shared among participants. Non-verbal cues like gestures and facial expressions also provide valuable resources in interpreting utterances and participants’ orientation and speaker intentions, which however in

my analysis were not addressed since most of my examples were taken from audio-recorded face-to-face conversations or from phone conversations where facial expressions are not visible to the other caller.

To answer how these phenomena evolve sequentially, so-called pure recognition checks where speakers expect participants to know and it is just a matter of recalling that memory are found in presequences immediately prior to a course of action that is to come. Both English and German instances of *remember/erinnern* recognition checks are very similar in their use. While many of English examples involved the speaker's own telling after the presequence with *remember*, many of the German examples were followed by the recipient's telling after the recognition check with *erinnern*. As far as the incidental recognition checks are concerned, they arise either in response to another participant's talk or preemptively by the speaker. In both English and German, this would depend on the ongoing main course of action. It would also depend on the recipients' claim or display of recognition. If participants remain silent or claim lack of recognition, the speaker adds more and more specific information until the recipient signals that he recognizes the reference. Only rarely does it happen that pieces of information are given before the actual referent is named. This is because when speakers expect recipients to know they name the referent without giving redundant information describing the referent (Auer, 1984). Even when speakers are uncertain they may first deliver (and possibly try-mark) the referent (Koshik & Seo, 2012; Sacks & Schegloff, 1979). However, if the speaker is not sure how much knowledge is shared, he might start out with pieces of information to elicit and guide the recipient. Or, if the speaker thinks that the referent is not important, reference to a particular referent may be done later in talk when the referent becomes relevant as was for example shown in Figure 3.8.

In terms of actions, recognition-soliciting, claim-backing and challenging environments of *remember/erinnern* recognition checks were found in both the English and German conversational data. My collection of German *erinnern* did not include any instances of *erinnern* that would occur in a direction-giving environment. Given the limited number of instances I examined, this would not exclude the idea that German *erinnern* recognition checks occur in environments where speakers provide directions. For the most part, it seems that English and German recognition checks are very similar in their interactional functions in conversation.

What all action environments have in common is that the *remember* turns are illustrations to support a speaker's course of action. To achieve this goal, speakers tap participants' joint memory, which serves as a convincing tool to align with the speaker. Speakers strive for alignment to establish a common ground of knowledge, which is why speakers orient to recipients' display or lack of assumed knowledge. In this sense, *remember/erinnern* recognition checks are one practice for achieving alignment.

The question that arises is what motivates participants to formulate a recognition check rather than simply making reference to the past event itself. Recognition checks seem to manage interaction in such a way that they negotiate knowledge domains with the interlocutors. By soliciting recognition, speakers do not enforce information as known, but offer recipients a chance to confirm or disconfirm what the speaker thinks is shared by the participants. As pointed out by Tao (2001), *remember* marks a speaker's epistemic stance and thereby manages interaction between participants. Recognition checks with *remember/erinnern* therefore invite recipients to collaborate and display their knowledge domains.

This chapter has shown that intersubjectivity is achieved by making reference to a shared past memory or experience (Auer, 1984; Schegloff et al., 1977). Recognition of shared

experiences is sought to account for something said prior or is about to be said later in the conversation. Furthermore, in a few instances, I found both *weisste* and *(do you) know* preceding the recognition checks with *erinnern/remember*. As a first recognition check, *weisste* and *(do you) know* function as a pre introducing the reference with *remember/erinnern* in both languages. A more detailed analysis of the combination *know + remember* in English and *wissen + erinnern* in German will be given in chapter 6, where all four constructions will be analyzed and reviewed together with respect to their single properties. Before all forms will be compared and discussed, however, the next chapter will examine and compare the second type of recognition checks with *do you know* in English and German.

Chapter 4: *Do you know* in English and German

4.1 Introduction

The second analytical chapter of my dissertation examines the occurrence of English and German *do you know* constructions in everyday talk that solicit recognition of references. As in the previous chapter, I start out with a discussion of *do you know* constructions in English. I then discuss equivalent constructions in German. Similar to German *erinnern*, *do you know* in German has different linguistic realizations that are used by conversational partners to achieve intersubjectivity (Section 4.3). In the conclusion of the chapter, I draw comparisons between the constructions in English and German.

4.2 *Do you know*

Among the 20 instances of *do you know* constructions in English that are used to check recognition, seven examples were found in presequential position and thirteen in incidental sequences as part of a larger ongoing action. After a speaker solicits a recognition check with *(do) you know*, the next relevant action for the recipient is to claim or display recognition.

I start my discussion with examples of *do you know* as a response pursuit (4.1.2), then proceed to *do you know* as a topic change/shift initiator (4.1.2) and lastly, I examine *do you know* as a direction-giver (4.1.3). This will be followed by a summary of the findings on recognition checks with *do you know* in English (4.1.4).

4.2.1 Pursuing a response

The first type of *do you know* recognition check in English occurs as a response pursuit after a referent is provided. This referent might be a noun phrase or even a clause. If a referent is posing a problem for the hearer, the speaker feels responsible to give an explanation of the referent (Clark & Wilkes, 1986; Sacks & Schegloff, 1979). Unless recipients initiate repair or stay silent, the speaker is in a position to assume or presume his or her participants' epistemic access to referents mentioned in talk. Therefore, if speakers are uncertain about their recipients' knowledge domains, they can pursue an explicit response from their recipients through their use of *do you know* recognition checks (Jefferson, 1981; Mandelbaum & Wilkinson, 2012; Pomerantz, 1984). The recognition checks observed in this study are often prosodically marked with stress or a vowel stretch. Immediately after the referent is given, the speakers produce a *do you know* type of question that checks the recipients' recognition of the referent.

Figure 4.1 is a typical example of this category. It is an example of *do you know*, which has been taken from a recording of a phone conversation between a caller to a Birth Crisis helpline (Daw) and the call taker (Clt) (Kitzinger & Mandelbaum, 2008, p. 6). At the beginning of figure 4.1, the call taker lists the different types of childbirth experts who work for the Birth Crisis helpline.

Figure 4.1: Doula-1 [#7 BCC 04] (Kitzinger & Mandelbaum, 2008, p. 6)

```
01 Clt: I mean they're N-C-T teache:rs a:[nd ] u:m=
02 Daw: [yeah]
03 Clt: .hhhhh post-natal (.) people'n breastfeeding
04→ people'n [.hhhh] doulas? d'you know what=.
05 Daw: [yes]
06→Clt: =doulas are.
07 Daw: no:..=
08 Clt: =well they offer (.) woman-to-woman care in childbirth
09 along wi- you know just being another woman friend.
```

In line 1, the call taker starts listing the different experts who work for the Birth Crisis Helpline to which the caller responds with an acknowledgement token in line 2 at the first TRP of the call taker's turn. The call taker continues her list of experts (lines 3-4), which is again received by an acknowledgement token (line 5). The fourth group of experts *doulas* in line 4 is produced with upward intonation and stress on the first syllable of the word. According to Kitzinger and Mandelbaum (2008), the upward intonation on *doulas* "parallels 'try-marking' in references to persons, i.e. the production of a person's name (or other recognitional referent) with upward intonation (Sacks and Schegloff, 1979; Schegloff, 1996) to secure recognition" (p. 7). This is immediately followed by a recognition check introduced with *do you know* (lines 4, 6) by the call taker. The call taker as a childbirth expert cannot suppose that the caller is familiar with a technical term like *doulas*. This uncertainty about her recipient's knowledge or understanding is reflected in the way the term is produced with upward intonation and the following recognition check. The caller disconfirms with a response token (line 7) and the call taker continues with an explanation of *doulas* in lines 8-9.

Given the institutional setting with the call taker as the expert and the caller as the non-expert, recognition checks of this type are not very surprising. The call taker as the expert knows more (K+) than the caller (K-) about childbirth experts (Goodwin, 1979). Knowing more or knowing less mirrors participants' knowledge domains and their access of referents as they arise turn-by-turn in talk-in-interaction. A participant's utterance helps the other conversational partners determine to what degree knowledge is presumed to be available. Thus, in terms of epistemic access and authority, the call taker does not expect the caller to recognize *doulas*, which is conveyed through the prosodic realization of the referent and the *do you know* question that explicitly checks on the recipient's knowledge domain.

Figure 4.2 illustrates an example of *do you know* observed in an everyday telephone conversation between a mother (F1) and her daughter (F2). The referents in question are two rings that belong to F1, which she is thinking about giving to her daughters F2 and Kara. F2 is a college student who lives in Atlanta. The mother (F1) lives in Arizona. Prior to Figure 4.2, F1 has begun telling a story about one of her colleagues who buys and sells jewelry.

Figure 4.2: CF 6899 *Ruby and garnet rings*

01 F1: an:d °uh uh° she says the nice thing
 02 is that she gets to wear it a:ll.
 03 F2: .hhh [I was going to ↑sa:y. (hhh)ye:[ah(h)
 04 F1: [() [every day she comes to
 05 work with different jewelry o:n .hh a:n:d u:m: (0.7)
 06 she has some very ni:ce thi:ngs °you know, u:m°
 07 (0.4)
 08 F1: .hhh and (0.3) basically reasonably pri:ced.
 09 (1.8)
 10 F1: a::h hhh.
 11 (0.6)
 12 F1: so,
 13 (1.9)
 14 F1: ((smack)) .hhh I was (.) almost going to a:sk her if she
 15 wanted to (0.3) and I:- .hhh (0.4) let me see .hhh ↑I have a
 16 → ruby and a garnet ri:ng, **do you know which ones I'm talking**
 17 → **about?**
 18 (0.6)
 19 F2: .hhh I think so, yea:h.
 20 (1.1)
 21 F1: cos I didn't know if you liked either one of them.
 22 (5.0)
 23 F2: yea:h↑ I like both of them but I: (.) also think that Ka:ra
 24 really really li:ked (0.8) one of them.
 25 (1.6)
 26 F2: ((breathy voice)) <I can't remember.>
 27 (2.0)
 28 F1: .hhh well the garnet i:s E- Ellen's it's her bir:thstone not
 29 that's (0.2) a big issue, but (1.5) °u:m:° (0.3) they're
 30 bo:th bi:g as far as I'm concerned, you know
 31 (0.3)
 32 F2: yea:h.
 33 (0.3)
 34 F1: .hhh the ruby is .hhh is the do:me ri:ng, ri:ght?
 35 (0.3)
 36 F2: .hhh yea:h.
 37 F1: I call it the hedgehog ring.
 38 F2: hhh hhh hhh hhh .hhh
 39 F1: °hhh hhh hhh°
 40 F2: hhh hhh [hhh
 41 F1: [hhh ((smiley voice)) with the seven rubies on it,
 42 F2: .hhh hhh hhh [hhh hhh hhh .hhh

Figure 4.2: CF 6899 *Ruby and garnet rings* (cont.)

43 F1: [() hhh hhh w(h)e:ll .hhh °I don't know.°
 44 (2.9)
 45 F1: anyway ↑all right well then I won't sell them.
 46 (1.6)
 47 F1: ((click)) °that would be ridiculous if y- if you two
 48 like them° (0.4) °then°- the:n you can ha:ve them.
 49 (0.8)
 50 F1: °you know, to: (0.3) you know°
 51 (2.5)
 52 F1: .hhh cause I mean even- well with what you're doing no:w, if
 53 you go into the office you can probably wea:r that stu:ff.
 54 (0.3)
 55 F2: ↑oh yea:h.
 56 F1: see an' I ca:n't (0.4) wear that to wor:k.
 57 F2: yea:h.

In lines 1-2, F1 continues her story telling about a colleague from work, who buys and sells jewelry. F2 aligns and confirms with *yeah* (line 3). In the following lines, F1 goes on telling her story and makes assessments about her colleague in lines 6 and 8. After the lack of uptake from F2 (silences in lines 9, 11, 13), F1 self-selects and continues her story-telling about her plans (lines 14-15). She then stops and self-repairs her talk making an announcement that she has a ruby and a garnet ring (lines 15-16). This is followed by a *do you know* question in lines 16-17 introducing an indefinite referent *which ones I am talking about*. The indefinite referent refers back to the rings mentioned in F1's previous TCU. The vowel in *ring* is stretched and the *do you know* question ends in rising intonation making a response relevant next from F2. After a silence in line 18 that indicates lack of immediate recognition by F2, F2 responds with a delayed claim of recognition, which she hedges with "I think so" (line 19). In line 21, F1 starts by giving an account, which is followed by a long silence in line 22. This silence conveys that F2 is hesitant in expressing her preferences and/or waits for F1 to be more explicit. F2 then self-selects, produces an agreement and responds to F1's indirect request for information by answering that she likes the rings (lines 23-24). She then also speaks for Kara, the second person F1 is thinking of giving the rings to. In the remainder of the talk, F1 continues with more information about the two

rings. It is not until lines 47-48 that F1's inexplicit offer turns into an explicit offer. She also provides more reasons for giving the rings to F2 and Kara (lines 52-53, 56), which F2 receives with confirmation tokens (lines 55, 57). Before F1 is formulating the actual offer, F1 attempts to achieve intersubjectivity among participants via *do you know* + referent (Auer, 1984; Egbert, 2009; Psaltis & Duveen, 2007).

The recognition check in Figure 4.2 is soliciting recognition of objects, which are mentioned just prior to the *do you know* question. Again, this example is similar to the previous example in that a specific referent is proffered for identification from the recipient before the speaker proceeds with further talk. What is different, however, is that terms *a ruby and a garnet ring* do not pose an understanding problem like *doulas* in Figure 4.1, but make explicit reference. She therefore is reminding her recipients of the one ruby and one garnet ring F1 owns.

The next example is taken from a phone conversation between two young men, M1 and M2. Prior to Figure 4.3, M1 tells a story about a woman who works at a Technical Research Institute where she develops surgical instruments. The focus of talk then shifts to one of the surgical instruments, which is a needle holder. From line 6 onwards, M1 vividly describes how surgeons are holding the needle holder. In his description of the exact positioning of the fingers, M1 mentions an area where the index finger is placed, which is referred to as *where the screw is* in line 21. This is followed by M1's recognition check with *you know* + NP (*the screw that holds the parts together*) in line 23.

Figure 4.3: CF 4175 *The screw*

```

01 M1: but the needl:e hol:der: looks: li:ke a: sh:ort scis:sor: like
02     the ki:nd of scissor: that you:'d (0.2) cut your nai:l:s
03     wi:th: you kno:w, .hhh so it's got a little short <bla::des>
04     but they're no:t bla:des cause they hold the nee:dl:e
05 M2: hhh hhh hhh
06 M1: .hh a:n:d i:t's go:t (0.4) on:e han:dl:e's long:er than the
07     o:ther: so you figure they put their thu::mb and their
08     fing:er: through the han:dl:e and the:y you kno:w (0.5) do

```


Figure 4.3: CF 4175 *The screw* (cont.)

09 tha::t .hh[h
10 M2: m[hm,
11 M1: they do::n't they don't put any finger through ei:ther of the
12 ho::les:
13 M2: what d' they do:
14 (0.5)
15 M1: .hhh the:y ta:ke the lo::ng han:dl:e (0.5) an:d the:y put
16 (0.2) the:y ja::m their: little fin:ger: .hhh ri:ght abo:ve
17 the ho:l:e, ri:ght abov:e the loo::p .hhh an:d the::y .hhh
18 the:y put their: thu:m:b .hhh alo:ng:: the sma:ll han:dl:e
19 (0.4) don't put their: thum:b through the ho:le ei:ther:.
20 .hhh then they ta:ke their in:de:x finger: and the:y extend it
21 (0.3) f:or:war::d .hhh to whe[r:e the s:crew: i:s
22 M2: [<(o)kay:>,
23 →M1: you kno:w the screw: that hol:ds [<the two: par:ts> together,
24 M2: [ri::ght,
25 M2: yea::h,
26 M1: and they kin:d of li:ke .hhh gui::de the:: the who:le thing:
27 with their index fing:er .hhh and they sort of hold it like a
28 gu:n:.
29 M2: oh I see yea:h okay no[:t-
30 M1: [(yeah)
31 M2: ye:a:h, [okay
32 M1: [with: their inde:x fing:er: s:tuck ou:t, and th-

In lines 1-4, M1 gives a description of the design of the needle holder. From lines 6-9, M1 describes how the needle holder is held, which is received with a request for information in line 13 by M2. M1 responds to this with more details and an account that explains the functions of needle holders (lines 15-21). *The screw* in line 21 refers to the screw that holds the two blades of the needle holder together. M2 receives this with *okay* in line 22, which is partly in overlap with *where the screw is*. M1 produces *you know* + referent in the following turn. With regard to the prosodic realization of X, the vowel in *screw* is elongated and the production of *the two parts* is slower than the rest of the utterance. The referent in question explicitly refers to *the screw* mentioned in M1's previous turn and is additionally modified by a relative clause that defines the object referent. Even though M1's turn in line 23 is not a proper question introduced by the *do* verb form, it is treated as a recognition check by M2 ending in rising intonation and the sound stretches found in this turn. M2 responds with *right*, which is here used as an acknowledgment

token and a continuer before the modifying clause is even completed (lines 24-25). *Right* here is simply used to confirm M1's assumption about M2's recognition of the referent (McCarthy, 2003). This then leads M1 to continue his description of how the needle holder is held by comparing it to holding a gun (lines 26-28). M2 orients with a claim of recognition, which is expressed by the change-of-state token *oh* (Heritage, 1984; 1998), *I see* and the agreement tokens *yeah* and *okay* in line 29. M1 moves on with his agenda once recognition of the referent is ensured (line 32 onwards).

In contrast to the previous two examples, the *you know X* construction not only elicits recognition of the referent, but contains additional information about the referent, which occurs on M1's own volition. The referent in Figure 4.3 is also an object, i.e., a screw that is similar to a screw found in a pair of scissors. However, the first mentioning of *screw* preceded by the definite article *the* conveys that M1 expects M2 to know which *screw* he is talking about (line 21). Thus, with regard to epistemic access, M1 initiates a recognition check with *you know* + referent + more information to assure that the recipient has all the information he needs to recognize the referent. The recognition check might evolve due to the overlap in lines 23 and 24 when the referent was first explicitly mentioned to recheck that the recipient can properly identify the referent.

Another difference between this instance and the two previous examples is that in this instance *you know* is followed by a noun phrase whereas in the previous two instances *you know* is followed by a *wh*-question introducing a subordinate clause. The lack of a *wh*-question may be another indication of the speaker's assumption that the recipient is familiar with the referent, because, even with *you know* without *do*, asking *you know what the screw is* or *you know which screw I'm talking about* makes it sound like the speaker is not assuming common knowledge.

4.2.2 Initiating a topic shift

In this section, I will focus on the second category of recognition checks with *do you know* that serve to initiate a topic shift. I will analyze three instances of *do you know* + X: two instances with X being a NP and one instance with X being a subordinate clause.

In Figure 4.4, F1 is complaining about her philosophy class, which is assessed by M1. F1 disagrees with M1's assessment of her complaint before M1 initiates a topic shift with *do you know* in line 14.

Figure 4.4: CHA 6157 *Chicken soup for the soul*

01 F1: ((whispering)) [I am so sick of philosophy.
02 F1: I spent more time on that this semester than everything
03 else put together. .hh
04 (0.6)
05 M1: hhhh. hh.
06 F1: okay I'm (stu- bitched) now huhhh.
07 M1: did you go over the (.) writing (.) Plato's Socrates?
08 F1: no: American philosophy
09 M1: [(oh okay (.) cool.)]
10 F1: [William James (.) Amberson (Perse) (0.7) Dui and
11 Whitehead.
12 M1: ↑that doesn't sound bad I probably would enjoy that.
13 F1: uhh:h. (0.3) you can have it. huh hhh.
14 →M1: um:m (2.0) **do you know (.) chicken soup for the soul?**
15 F1: yea:h.
16 M1: um:m. .h (0.5) I read a couple of things to Jennies,
17 F1: uh huh,
18 M1: an:d (0.2) for Hanukkah, she got it (.) for her father
19 (0.3)
20 F1: awww
21 (2.2)
22 M1: um:m (1.0) which tells you if I didn't say (soup for)
23 that Jennies is Jewish.
24 (0.2)
25 F1: you didn't. but I picked up on it hh
26 M1: okay. huhh hh u:m

In lines 1 to 3, F1 produces a complaint about her philosophy class. After a lack of uptake in line 4, F1 continues in line 6 with a possible¹⁸ upgrade of her previous turn (line 1) by producing a self-deprecation indicating the pressure she is facing due to the class. M1 again does not align,

¹⁸ Possible because the turn in line 6 by F1 was not clearly audible to the transcriber.

but instead formulates a FPP request for information about the content of the class in line 7. F1 then produces a SPP answer with a type conforming answer with a sound stretch on the vowel and more information about her philosophy class in line 8. M1 receives this with a change-of-state token (Heritage, 1984) and *okay* and a positive assessment (line 9). This is in partial overlap with F1's continuation of her SPP answer of her previous turn (line 10). She is naming some of the American philosophers that they discussed in her philosophy class. M1 assesses F1's situation in line 12 with the first TCU assessing the overall situation and the second TCU shifting the perspective to himself if he were in F1's position. This imaginative scenario is conveyed through the hedge *would* here. F1 responds with hesitation and an offer conveying her disagreement with M1's positive assessment (line 13). The laughter at the end of her turn may indicate her joking offer to avoid further disagreement. In line 14, M1 starts his turn with hesitation followed by a short silence and then produces a *do you know* question that changes the trajectory of talk into a completely different direction. The referent introduced with *do you know* is an NP *chicken soup for the soul*, which is the title of a book series known for its emotional real stories about ordinary people. The turn is not only syntactically produced as an interrogative sentence with the use of *do you know*, but also is prosodically produced with rising intonation at the end of the turn. It is noticeable that *do you know* here is followed by a micropause, preceded by a hesitation marker and a pause, which might indicate M1's hesitation regarding the abrupt beginning of a sequence. In line 15, F1 confirms with a claim of recognition of the referent, which is followed by M1 moving on with his actual story-telling *I read a couple of things to Jennies* after a short delay at the beginning of his turn (line 16). Here *a couple of things* refers back to X (= *chicken soup for the soul*). M1 again refers back to the referent in line 18 with the pronoun *it*.

The *do you know* question is here employed to assure that F1 shares knowledge of the referent to proceed with this agenda, which is M1's story about the card he wrote to Jennie and her reaction to the card, which follows this piece of talk. The *do you know* question serves as a pre to give background information, that is, knowing the referent is a prerequisite for F1 to understand the upcoming talk/story. The referent *chicken soup for the soul* is therefore a background topic that introduces the real topic to come. The recognition check helps to establish intersubjectivity among participants prior to a story-telling (Schegloff, 1980). At the same time, it changes the trajectory of talk into a new direction moving away from the philosophy class about F1 that led to disagreement between the participants to something, which is about M1 shifting the attention away from the disagreement or even away from F1 to himself.

The next instance is taken from a conversation between two males M1 and M2 who are friends. M2 is named Charles and lives in Atlanta. M1 lives in Philadelphia. Prior to this segment, M1 and M2 talk about condoms as protection against STDs. The topic shift takes place in lines 9-10 initiated by M1 with *you know let me tell you about a few- about one thing. do you know nirvana?* The first TCU is a pre-pre as defined by Schegloff (1980). *Do you know nirvana* is the pre that initiates a topic shift to the ongoing talk.

Figure 4.5: CHA 6661 *Nirvana*

```

01  M2:  I think it's good to look at things but I guess (.) but I
02        don't know sometimes I wonder because, it just seems like
03        (0.3) .hhh
04        (0.2)
05  M1:  .hh
06  M2:  a racket to me if [it ( ) me
07  M1:                                     [yea:h.
08  M2:  hhh hhh [hhh
09  M1:  [you know let me tell you about a few- about one
10 →    thing. do you know nirva:na?
11        (1.5)
12  M2:  do I kno:w nirva[na?
13  M1:                                     [the group. [do you know their music?
14  M2:                                     [ah, I'm not su(h)re hhh hhh
15  M1:  hhh [hhh hhh hhh hhh hhh hhh hhh hhh

```

Figure 4.5: CHA 6661 *Nirvana* (cont.)

16 M2: [have I been to nirvana? hhh hhh
 17 M1: are you in nirvana?
 18 M2: u::m
 19 (0.4)
 20 M2: I've ↑heard of them, I'm not sure that I'm (0.5) I've
 21 probably heard some of their music if they're real popular,
 22 [but
 23 M1: [yea::h well,
 24 M2: °I'm not real familiar [with them°
 25 M1: [l- let me tell you, this- this
 26 rea:lly (0.7) stirred me up because it was a ba:nd I
 27 kinda was interested in.
 28 M2: uhuh,
 29 M1: .hh (0.2) and it was, its a younger band, you know I mean
 30 (0.7) it (1.0) and (0.9) anyway (1.3) the lea:d singer
 31 (0.3) committed suicide.
 32 M2: um
 33 (1.0)
 34 M1: .h it's such an incredible story for me:

Prior to this segment, M1 and M2 discuss the importance of protection. Both speakers have different opinions resulting in an exchange of disagreeing responses followed by a short silence (not shown). In line 1 M2 aligns with a positive assessment, but then in line 2 introduces a disagreeing response with the hedge *but I don't know* further delaying his disagreement. M1 aligns with an acknowledgement token in line 7. This is followed by M1's pre-pre in lines 9-10 and the recognition check *do you know nirvana* that is a preliminary to the *one thing* M1 is about to tell. There is no immediate uptake from M2 (line 11), which indicates M2's problem of understanding M1's question before he provides a candidate hearing of the question in line 12. In line 13, M1 gives more information about *nirvana* and produces another *do you know* question, which is requesting information about the recipient's knowledge regarding the referent. M2's SPP disaligning response to M1's recognition check is provided in line 14. M2 starts his turn with a change-of-state token and then claims lack of recognition of the referent. His turn is in overlap with M1's *do you know* request for information in line 13. M1 responds with laughter, which is in overlap with M2's turn that formulates another (non-serious) candidate understanding

of M1's turn. He is making fun of the referent *nirvana*, whose meaning is ambiguous since it could refer to the sexual reference of *nirvana*, the Buddhist concept *nirvana* meaning 'stillness of mind' or the group *nirvana*. It is M1's reformulation of his question in line 13 that clarifies the correct referent. M2 is displaying his access of the referent *nirvana*, which alludes to the sexual reference of *nirvana* given the prior talk about condoms. M1 responds with a returning question aligning with M2's joke (line 17). Lines 20-22 present a continuation of M2's SPP answer in line 14, which claims some access to the referent, which is limited to *having heard of the group* (line 20). M2 further mentions that he has heard some of their music, but he is not sure. M1 produces an acknowledgement token in line 23 followed by *well*, which is in overlap with M2's previous turn. In line 24, M2 continues with a summary assessment of his knowledge about the referent. His turn is produced in a soft voice signaling that he is backing down and no longer joking. Starting in line 25, M1 in slight overlap with M2's SPP response, provides some background information about the referent returning to his initial agenda, which is his story-telling. This use of *do you know* is initiating a topic shift and at the same time preparing a new topic that involves the referent. The speaker is making sure that the conversational partners share common ground regarding the referent (Kamio, 1997).

The recognition check in line 10 involves a noun phrase, which is a proper noun and the name of a rock band. *Nirvana* is here prosodically marked with an elongated vowel and produced with rising intonation at the end of the turn. The grammatical construction consists of *do you know* + NP, which is syntactically a question addressing M2. The referent is mentioned for the first time in the *do you know* construction and it is preceded by preliminary to a preliminary that introduces this recognition check. The pre-pre (Schegloff, 1980) sets the stage for the pre-initiation of a new topic to come. The recognition check is employed to ensure that M1 can

continue with his actual agenda, which is the story-telling involving the referent *nirvana*. What is noticeable here is the orientation of the recipient towards the recognition check, which delays the actual story-telling. This is due to the ambiguous meaning of the referent, which results in the joking attitude by the two participants. M2 here claims some knowledge of the referent displaying knowledge about the other possible meanings of the referent. In return, M1 also displays his epistemic access of the different meanings of the referent. M2 finally admits his partial access of the referent in question, which approves M1's epistemic authority over the referent paving the way for M1's initial story-telling.

In the next segment, F1 and F2 are talking about the wedding news of Amanda. F1 is studying at University of Pennsylvania and writing her thesis in classical archeology and F2 is in medical school. After deciding to talk for five more minutes, F1 introduces news with *do you know* + X. X here is a clause describing news about a third person called Amanda, who is not present in this conversation.

Figure 4.6: CHA 6938 *Amanda's getting married*

01 F2: five more minutes.
02 F1: and no:w, then I'll never wa:ste another free phone call on
03 ↑you: again hhh
04 F2: hhh .hhh tha:t'll ser:ve ↑me: da:mmit [hhh hhh
05 F1: [hhh yea:h that'll
06 ser- [so
07 F2: [that's a really ni:ce thi:ng I mean that's kind of a
08 cool idea to (1.1) get money for ca:lling somebody
09 F1: it i:s pretty coo:l so [what have we talked about yet.
10 F2: [()
11 (0.4)
12 F2: [what ha-
13 →F1: **[you know Amanda's getting ma:rried,**
14 (0.4)
15 F2: >what.<
16 →F1: **you know Amanda's getting married [don't-**
17 F2: [o:h yea:h, yea:h
18 F1: [yea:h.
19 F2: [yea:h.
20 (0.3)
21 F2: [when is she
22 F1: [°an°

Figure 4.6: CHA 6938 *Amanda's getting married* (cont.)

23 F2: getting [married anyway?
 24 F1: [oh
 25 (0.4)
 26 F1: probably not for a whi:le
 27 F2: oh oka:y I was (0.2) wondering if it was going to be
 28 another wedding this summer I've got so many
 29 [weddings to go to this summer.
 30 F1: [no: like at least a yea:r I guess
 31 (0.5)
 32 F1: u:m, (0.6) .hhh it didn't seem like there was any rush but
 33 we're all bri:desmai:ds.
 34 (0.4)
 35 F2: we are?
 36 F1: as far as I kno:w
 37 F2: oh I'm no:t.
 38 (0.4)
 39 F1: you're no:t?
 40 (0.5)
 41 F2: I dou:bt it,
 42 (0.3)
 43 F1: o:ka:y,

After F1's request to talk for five more minutes¹⁹ and F2's agreement to do so, F1 introduces a new topic in line 13 with *you know* + announcement. The referent is a clause which is an announcement about a third person's future action. The turn is not introduced with *do*, but *you know* + clause ending in upward intonation. The vowel in *married* is lengthened emphasizing the newsworthiness of this announcement. The use of the recognitional form in the form of a proper name indicates that F1 is expecting F2 to recognize Amanda (Sacks & Schegloff, 1979). The sentence structure of this recognition check further expresses a certain level of expectation from the speaker about her epistemic access towards the news. After a lack of uptake in line 14, which is repair-implicative due to the overlap of turns by the two speakers, F2 initiates repair with *what*, which is produced quickly and with falling intonation. F1 repeats her prior turn and adds the beginning of a tag question, but drops out after F2 produces a change-of-state token and claims recognition through multiple sayings of *yeah* (Stivers, 2004) to signal to the recipient that the

¹⁹ Participants were required to talk a certain length of time by those who collected the data.

news is known information to F2 and F1 can halt the action of news-telling (lines 16-18). After a small pause in line 20, which may be due to the overlap, F2 continues with a request of information regarding the announcement in lines 21 and 23. F1 then produces a change-of-state token in partial overlap with F2's question in line 24. She continues her turn with a SPP answer (line 26) to which F2 responds with a change-of-state token marking F1's answer as news in line 27. F2 then provides an account for her question (lines 27-29). Following this, F1 produces a more specific SPP answer to F2's question (line 30) and further adds another announcement (line 32-33), to which F2 orients with another question initiating repair in line 35.

The *you know* recognition check in line 13 is employed to launch a new topic after the two participants had decided to talk for an additional five minutes on the phone. Line 9 shows that F1 is driving the conversation forward after her positive assessment at the beginning of her turn. With regard to epistemic access, F2 conveys that she has less epistemic access to the news than F1 since she is asking F1 about the date of the wedding.

Different to the previous figures, the *do you know* + announcement by itself presents a new topic that participants become engaged in during the remainder of the conversation. This example of a *do you know* construction both introduces a topic as potential news and checks if the recipient already knows the news. It is further noticeable that participants display their knowledge domains not only through confirmation, disconfirmation or display of recognition, but they also display their partial epistemic access through questions. Those questions seek more information about the referent in question positioning the recipient into an epistemically higher position (K+) than the speaker (Goodwin, 1979; Heritage & Raymond, 2005).

4.2.3 Giving directions

The third category of recognition checks with *do you know* occurs in the context of giving descriptions. I will analyze four instances of *do you know* + *wh*-question: three instances with *where* and one instance with *when*. All four instances elicit recognition of place referents, which according to Schegloff (1972) are classified into 1. a geographical specification such as an address, 2. a description of a place in relation to interactants (*John's house*), 3. a description in relation to a landmark (*left of the billboard*), 4. a 'course of action' (*where they leave the garbage*), or 5. a proper name (*New York*). Based on Schegloff's (1972) classification, the place referents elicited with *do you know* + *where* or *when* in this dissertation all fall into category 4. That is, they involve some activity or course of action associated with a particular place referent.

4.2.3.1 *Do you know* + *where*

The first example of *do you know* + *wh*-question solicits recognition of a specific place referent. In Figure 4.7 below, Alice asks Mary about the tree branch Mary brought. Mary tells Alice where she found the tree branch, making reference to a shared reference point in line 2 with *you know where Sarah and Arvela live*. This is followed by another recognition check with *remember* providing the recipient with a second landmark (line 6).

Figure 4.7: CHA 7 *Sarah and Arvela*

```
01  ALIC:  where'd you go (0.7) to get em.
02  →MARY: you know where Sarah and Arvela live?
03  ALIC:  mhm,
04  MARY:  just around the corner.
05          (1.0)
06  MARY:  remember that first cattle guard you go over?
07  ALIC:  unhunh,
08  MARY:  I didn't even go over tha:t.
09          (2.8)
10  ALIC:  you mean (0.2) kinda like (.) by the (0.8) by the [tunnel?
11  MARY:                                     [right
12          below the tunnel.
```

Figure 4.7: CHA 7 *Sarah and Arvela* (cont.)

13 ALIC: oh::.
14 MARY: and I just walked up. w:e just walked up around uh
15 that area .hhh an God Alice that was fu::n.

In response to Alice's request for information in line 1, Mary formulates another FPP question to establish a common point of reference to which Alice responds with confirmation (line 3). Mary continues with specific information about the exact location where she got the tree for Nickie. There is no uptake from Alice in line 5, which is why Mary elicits a second recognition check in line 6.

In this example, the *do you know* recognition check is in response to an information request produced by Alice in line 1. Line 2 includes proper names in locally initial position, that is, names as the most common form of recognitional reference that show that Mary clearly expects Alice to know who Sarah and Arvela are (Auer, 1984; Schegloff, 1996). Instead of producing a SPP answer to Alice's question, Mary elicits recognition of a shared landmark. Once she has secured Alice's recognition of the shared landmark (line 3), Mary continues with her description to formulate a SPP answer to Alice's question in line 1. The lack of uptake by Alice in line 5 explains Mary's initiation of referencing another presumably shared landmark in order for Alice to recognize the place referent in question. The reference to a shared place referent is not immediately resolved, but is instead resolved over several turns whereupon Alice clearly displays recognition of the referent with a candidate understanding in line 10 and a change-of-state-token (Heritage, 1984; 1998) in line 13. Mary's turn in line 2 consists of *you know* + *wh*-question. In Figure 4.7, the reference to a shared place referent is not the ultimate goal. Rather, the *you know* + *where* and the *remember* recognition check guide Alice through Mary's directions. Again, this example illustrates how a speaker is using shared landmarks in order to provide the recipient with a more specific description that is based on knowledge shared among

participants. Recipients are guided through obviously known reference points to reach a common ground of understanding.

The second segment with *you know + where* question is taken from a conversation between MK1 and his brother Jeff. MK1 is from Kentucky, married and has a son named Jacob. Jeff lives in North Dakota, has two children and goes to fiber optics school. In Figure 4.8, Jeff provides a description of the exact location of Wichita Falls. He produces an attempt of *you know + where* question in line 26, which gets self-repaired and resolved in the rest of the utterance (lines 26-27). The *you know + where* recognition check initially designed as a question is turned into a description by Jeff.

Figure 4.8: CHA 6526 *Panhandle*

01 MK1: °hmm° (.) what are you going to school fo:r anyhow.
02 (0.9)
03 JEF: huh?
04 (0.3)
05 MK1: what are you going to school for anyways.
06 (2.3)
07 JEF: uh: fiber optics school
08 MK1: fiber optics, (.) hey that's cool
09 (0.3)
10 JEF: yeah, .hhh San Antonio yeah, San Antonio's down way down in
11 the middle of Texas,
12 (0.2)
13 MK1: ye:s, long ways
14 (0.9)
15 JEF: Wichita Falls is, .hhh (0.3) if they looked on the map is
16 (0.4) exactly (0.7) it's about twenty miles from (0.9) uh:
17 Oklahoma in the middle par- almost in the middle part of
18 Oklahoma,
19 (0.5)
20 MK1: .hhh [ain't that where uh:?
21 JEF: [not out by the panhandle
22 (0.7)
23 MK1: ain't that where uh:, (0.7) Texas the top of it looks like
24 a te: (0.3) and it's at the top of the te:?
25 (0.3)
26 →JEF: .hhh no, **you know where it (2.0) uh:: (0.8) you know, they**
27 → **call it the panhandle, where like the skinny part goes up,**
28 MK1: uh huh
29 (0.3)
30 JEF: that borders Oklahoma,
31 (0.2)
32 MK1: yeah.

Figure 4.8: CHA 6526 *Panhandle* (cont.)

33 (0.3)
34 JEF: if you followed the skinny part down on the east side,
35 (0.3)
36 MK1: uh huh
37 JEF: to where it starts widening out and go east some (0.4)
38 it's over there.
39 (0.2)
40 MK1: oh:: okay I know what you're talking about

In line 1, MK1 requests information about Jeff's school. After a silence that is indicative of upcoming trouble, Jeff produces an open-class repair initiator (Drew, 1997) in line 3 which MK1 treats as a problem of hearing by repeating the question in line 5. The silence in line 6 indicates that the trouble is not a problem of hearing. Instead, Jeff delays his production of a SPP answer in line 7 to which MK1 produces a third turn assessment in line 8. Jeff then receives this with *yeah* and gives his description of *San Antonio*. MK1 aligns and produces an assessment (line 13), which conveys knowledge about *San Antonio*'s location. Jeff continues with another description of the location of *Wichita Falls* in lines 15-18. The pause in line 19 invites MK1 to self-select. In line 20, MK1 makes an attempt to initiate repair, which is in overlap with Jeff's increment in line 21. This is followed by a silence in line 22, which results in MK1's re-initiation of repair. In lines 23-24, he displays his candidate understanding of where *Wichita Falls* is. Jeff disagrees with *no* and produces an attempt of *you know + where*, which is followed by pauses, a word search and a parenthetical (Mazeland, 2007) *you know, they call it the panhandle* before he completes the repair resolution *where like the skinny part goes up* (lines 26-27). In *you know + where it*, the pronoun *it* is specified by referring to *panhandle* in line 27. After the name is given, a further description is provided by Jeff to give an explanation of *panhandle*. Before Jeff can finish his recognition check in line 26, *it* turns out to be a trouble source, which is why Jeff initiates self-repair. MK1 then produces an acknowledgment token and Jeff adds an increment to his description in line 30, which MK1 receives with *yeah* in line 32. Jeff's description continues

in lines 34 and 37-38. MK1 produces a change-of-state token, which is prosodically marked, a receipt of information token and an explicit claim of recognition in line 40.

In this example, a series of descriptions are produced by Jeff. The attempt of a recognition check in line 26 is in response to MK1's candidate understanding in the previous turn. Jeff disaligns at the beginning of his turn and then continues with an explanation to help MK1 locate the referent in question. Given that Jeff does not complete his second TCU, it remains open whether he intended to produce a recognition check. This example is similar to the previous segment where the speaker gives directions to the recipient by first establishing landmarks to achieve common reference points that guide the recipient to the actual target location. The *you know* + *where* construction is turned into an explanation that gives new information to the recipient not expecting MK1 to know the *panhandle*. In terms of epistemic stance, Jeff repairs his own utterance that initially expected some knowledge from the recipient, to one that does not expect any knowledge from the recipient.

A third instance of *do you know* + *where* question is given in Figure 4.9 below. This example is syntactically different from the first two in that the *you know* is placed after the turn like a tag question. Despite its syntactic variation, the recipient treats turn-final *you know* as a recognition check to which he orients. In Figure 4.9, Jason and Rodney talk about their activities the previous night. Jason is from Hot Springs, Arkansas and Rodney lives in Little Rock, Arkansas and is a high school student. Jason tells a story about spilling chili on his white polo shirt. In line 35, Rodney produces a request for information where the chili drop landed on Jason's polo. In response to this question, Jason produces an answer in line 37 including the description of a place referent to locate the exact position of the chili drop. The description

introduced with *where the buttons are* is immediately followed by *you know* ending in slightly upward intonation.

Figure 4.9: CHA 6285 *Where the buttons are*

01 JAS: what'd you do last night. nothing,
 02 (1.4)
 03 ROD: no::, well I put lights u::p
 04 (1.6)
 05 ROD: what'd you do.
 06 (0.8)
 07 JAS: °oh:: what did I do°?
 08 (0.6)
 09 JAS: went dicking around town.
 10 (2.4)
 11 ROD: huh
 12 (1.7)
 13 JAS: [spill:ed uh:
 14 ROD: [how much fun can you pack into one Hot Springs night.
 15 (1.0)
 16 JAS: huh?
 17 ROD: how much fun can you pack into one Hot Springs night.
 18 JAS: I don't know I was pushing it to the limit [last night
 19 ROD: [hhh hhh
 20 (1.1)
 21 JAS: °just having crazy fun°, I spilt chili from a (.) chili
 22 cheese coney on my white button up polo
 23 ROD: no:: way::, [how much.
 24 JAS: [yeah.
 25 (0.5)
 26 JAS: huh?
 27 ROD: how mu:ch.
 28 (0.3)
 29 JAS: just like a dro::p
 30 ROD: yeah.
 31 (1.1)
 32 JAS: like half, a penny si:ze
 33 (1.2)
 34 JAS: I wasn't very happy about tha:t
 35 ROD: hhh (0.2) .hhh (.) where did it land.
 36 (0.6)
 37 →JAS: **like right where the buttons a:re you know,**
 38 (0.3)
 39 ROD: yeah.
 40 (1.0)
 41 JAS: right in the (0.2) middle
 42 (0.4)
 43 ROD: hhh hhh [hhh (0.4) hhh hhh .hhh
 44 JAS: [right in the middle
 45 (0.3)
 46 JAS: not hh on the sleeve or something, [but right where
 47 ROD: [hhh
 48 JAS: e:everyone would see it.

In line 1, Jason produces a request for information asking Rodney about last night. Jason adds a candidate answer to his question to which Rodney does not respond immediately (line 2). Rodney disaligns and produces a SPP in line 3, which is followed by silence or no uptake from Jason (line 4). In line 5, Rodney again self-selects and returns the question back to Jason (line 5). After a short pause that indicates a problem of understanding by the recipient, Jason first produces a change-of-state token (Heritage, 1984) before he repeats the question (line 7) and then gives an answer in line 9. In line 14, Rodney is making fun of *Hot Springs* where Jason is from. This is in overlap with Jason's turn in line 13, which is a continuation of his previous turn in line 9. Starting in line 18, Jason makes a summary announcement about the previous night and continues with an upgrade of an assessment (line 21), which is followed by an announcement of chili spilling accident (lines 21-22). In response to that, Rodney produces a series of questions soliciting more details about the accident. He first asks Jason about the amount of chili he actually spilled on his polo (lines 23, 27). Jason responds in line 29 and provides more specific information in line 32. He then makes an overall assessment in line 34 to which Rodney responds with laughter in line 35 and a second information request asking for more details about the exact location of the spill. In line 37, a description is given followed by *you know* ending in upward intonation. The turn is produced as one string, that is, there is no prosodic pause between the description and *you know*, which seems to be a little different from *you know* used as a discourse marker (Schiffrin, 1987). The sound stretch on *are* (line 37) may indicate turn completion seeking recognition from the recipient. Rodney responds with a delayed minimal acknowledgement token in line 39, which may have contributed to Jason's adding a further component in line 41, which does succeed in eliciting a more expanded response from Rodney. In addition, Jason stresses the first syllable of *middle*, which he repeats in line 44. In lines 46 and

48, Jason adds more information to make it sound more dramatic, which is expressed through the extreme case formulation *everyone* in line 48 (Pomerantz, 1988).

Different from the previous two examples, the *you know* construction is not produced as a preliminary to the main action, but is part of the main action. Moreover, the prosodic realization of the turn with postpositioned *you know* is not only a SPP answer, but at the same time another FPP action soliciting recognition from the recipient (line 37). Rodney's confirmation token in line 39 suggests that his response is treating this turn-final *you know* as a recognition check to which he is providing a confirming response.

This section has shown that the place referents in all three instances of *do you know* + *where* (or *where* + *you know* in Figure 4.9) involve a course of action or activity that provides a clue to recognizing the actual place referent. With regard to the sequential context of *do you know* + *where* constructions, *do you know* + *where* evolves in response to a previous FPP question and makes relevant a claim or display of recognition from the recipient.

4.2.3.2 *Do you know* + *when*

The next section discusses an example *you know* + *when* making reference to a place referent. This example is taken from the same conversation between MK1 and Jeff as shown in Figure 48. In this part of the conversation, the two brothers are talking about their golf experiences. In lines 15-17, Jeff initiates a telling about a golf course. He provides a description that contains a recognition check and a word search (lines 21-23).

Figure 4.10: CHA 6526 *Harlan & down the fairway*

01 MK1: [there's this
02 JEF: [I went (0.5) last time when- when we were down there when
03 we stopped in Ishton
04 ((baby crying))
05 (0.5)

Figure 4.10: CHA 6526 *Harlan & down the fairway* (cont.)

06 MK1: °yeah°
 07 JEF: I went with Joey one day
 08 (0.4)
 09 MK1: you did.
 10 (0.8)
 11 MK1: he any good, ((Jeff's baby continues crying))
 12 (0.9)
 13 JEF: I beat ↑him
 14 (0.5)
 15 MK1: hhh hhh hhh hhh hhh (0.2) uh: there's this on:e uh:, (0.7)
 16 the one in Williamsberg it's all hill:s an:d, (0.3) stuff
 17 like that and cor:ner::s, you gotta go around trees and
 18 stu:ff ((baby crying))
 19 JEF: yeah,
 20 (0.2)
 21 →MK1: but we played this one place, uh:, (1.7) sh- way up ni- **you**
 22 → **know when you go wa:y up, (0.3) to the end of ninety two**
 23 (0.9) uh: >what's that called< up around Harlan,
 24 ((Jeff's baby continues crying))
 25 (0.3)
 26 JEF: yeah,
 27 MK1: in fact just out of Harlan there's a place up ther:e a golf
 28 course
 29 (0.7)
 30 MK1: .hhh it's completely flatland hardly any trees at all:
 31 (0.7)
 32 JEF: [yeah
 33 MK1: [ni- (0.3) nine times out of ten it's just a straight
 34 shot,
 35 (0.3)
 36 MK1: you know down the fairway,
 37 (0.2)
 38 JEF: yeah,

In lines 1 and 2, both MK1 and Jeff initiate a new sequence in overlap. MK1 drops out and Jeff continues with his telling (lines 2-3, 7). In response to this, MK1 produces an acknowledgement token and asks an information-seeking question in line 9. Jeff provides a SPP answer to which MK1 responds with laughter. After a short silence, he starts a new telling. In fact, this seems to be the telling he had attempted to start in line 1. He then continues with a description of the golf course (lines 15-18), which Jeff receives with *yeah* in line 19. MK1 continues contrasting the previously mentioned golf course to another golf course at which he played. He continues with his description of the location of the golf course by saying *way up ni-*, he then self-repairs and

changes his turn into a recognition check with *you know* + *when you go way up* followed by a short pause and more information in lines 21-23. *This one place* mentioned in line 21 links back to the restart in line 1. There is a silence between the *you know* recognition check and the next TCU, but Jeff does not come in. This could be because *you know when you go way up to the end of 92* is not grammatically complete, but a continuation of the beginning of line 21. MK1 self-selects and initiates a word-search. Jeff produces a continuer in line 26. Starting in line 27, MK1, provides more specific details about the golf course. The *you know* + *when* construction gives directions to the recipient. After a lack of uptake, the increment *to the end of ninety two* is added, which contains very specific information regarding the referent in question. *When* introduces here a conditional clause that expresses MK1's expectations regarding Jeff's knowledge about the referent. The word search introduced with *what's that called* is further conveyed through the pauses and *uh* (Schegloff et al., 1977). The referent is described as "this one place" to which more and more pieces of information are added until recognition among participants is achieved.

The recognition check in this segment evolves as part of a description. MK1 self-repairs to initiate a recognition check that invokes shared knowledge about the end of route *ninety-two* eliciting a response from the recipient. The word search containing the proper noun *Harlan* also assumes shared knowledge mobilizing the recipient to respond. In line 26, Jeff only produces an acknowledgement token, but MK1 considers this as sufficient to move on with his agenda. Even though this instance of *you know* introduces a *wh*-question with *when*, the activity that is accomplishes in conjunction with *going way up* is leading to a place referent. MK1 again uses landmarks to get to the actual target referent. Here, a description that contains a *you know* recognition check helps the speaker to recipient-design his upcoming utterances.

4.2.4 Conclusion of *do you know*

To conclude, seven out of the 20 instances of English *do you know* recognition checks occur in contexts when speakers initiate a topic shift. The remaining thirteen examples are observed in incidental sequences to pursue a response (eight instances) and to give directions (five instances). While nineteen of the 20 instances of *do you know* constructions occur turn-initially or at the beginning of another TCU, only one instance is found in turn-final position comparable to turn-final (or tag-like) *remember* as discussed in chapter 3 of this study. As far as their syntactic form is concerned, only five examples are produced with a form of *do* whereas the remaining fifteen instances consist of *you know* or *y'know* + NP or clause.

The rare occurrence of turn-final *do you know* or *you know* might be explained by the use of *you know* as a discourse marker in English conversation (Schiffrin, 1987). If used as a discourse marker, it usually is a stand-alone, prosodically independent unit that is often found in turn-medial or turn-final position. *You know* as a discourse marker is predominantly used as a filler in word-searches i.e., as a way to hold the floor (Schiffrin, 1987). Therefore, it is different from *you know* (or *do you know*) used to check recognition of referents.

Recognition checks with *(do) you know* in this study introduce new referents as topic initiators, which are embedded in the *(do) you know* constructions. As part of a direction-giving situation, *(do) you know* can be employed to introduce reference points or landmarks to which the recipients can orient in the entire process of identifying a particular place referent. The third function of *(do) you know* involves the pursuit of a response after a lack of uptake or insufficient uptake from the participants or directly after a try-marked referent. For all three types of *(do) you know* recognition checks found in this study, the next relevant action for the recipient is to claim or display recognition. Only after recognition of references is properly established, can the

speaker proceed with his or her agenda or with more information regarding the referent in question to achieve intersubjectivity among participants (Auer, 1984; Egbert, 2009; Psaltis & Duveen, 2007).

Finally, *you know* + *wh*-question can evolve in response to a prior FPP question (see examples 4.7-4.9) or as part of descriptions that use landmarks to give proper descriptions of referents (4.10). In addition, the analysis of incomplete *you know* + *where/when* in segments 4.8 and 4.10 has revealed that speakers may first initiate *you know* + *wh*-question and self-repair their turn to a description (in declarative format) or, they may begin with a description and on their way of completion, they change the description to a *you know* question that considers and checks the recipient's knowledge domain.

4.3 *Kennst du* and *weißt du*

Similar to the discussion of *do you know* in English, this section will focus on the environments of the two forms *kennen* and *wissen*, their turn-design and interactional functions within a sequence of talk. The 24 instances selected for German *do you know* recognition checks, consist of 10 *kennst du* and 14 *weißt du* examples. Despite their different lexical realizations, the environments for the two forms of German *do you know* are the same. *Kennst du* and *weißt du* may be employed by speakers as a response pursuit (Section 4.3.1), as a recognition/understanding check (Section 4.3.2), as a topic initiator (Section 4.3.3) or as a response check of a prior turn produced by another speaker (Section 4.3.4). In section 4.3.5 of this chapter, I will summarize the main findings of this section on German *kennst du* and *weißt du* recognition checks before I will compare and discuss English *do you know* and German *kennst du/weißt du* as employed by participants engaged in talk-in-interaction (Section 4.4).

4.3.1 Pursuing a response

The first environment of *kennen* and *wissen* recognition checks involves situations when speakers pursue a response from the recipient. In Figure 4.11, Philip (PB) and Anita (AM) are talking about German bread they both like. PB and AM are a couple and university students in Germany. At the beginning of Figure 4.11, Anita talks about different types of German bread she likes. One of them is *sojabrot* ‘soybread’, which Anita introduces in line 3. This is followed by a positive assessment (line 3) and a recognition check with *kennst du* (line 5).

Figure 4.11: FOLK_E_00027_SE_01_T_01 *Sojabrot*

01 AM: abber ich find des ja auch toll (0.8) so steinofenbrot
but I find that PRT too great(0.8) for example stonebaked bread
but I find that great too (0.8) for example stonebaked bread

02 is toll oder so bauernbrot oder vom grimminger, die
is great or for example farmhouse bread or from NAME, they
is great or for example farmhouse bread or grimminger's, they

03 haben sojabrot des is toll.
have soybread that is great.
have soybread which is great.

04 (.)

05 → >kennst du das?<
>know-2PERS.SG you that?<
>do you know that?<

06 (0.6)

07 PB: ja des kenn ich. natürlich kenn ich des vom grimminger
yes that know I. of course know I that from grimminger
yes I know that. of course I know that bread from grimminger

08 des sojabrot
that soybread
their soybread

09 AM: [des is toll
[that is great
[that is great

10 PB: des ess ich seit ja::h[ren
that eat I since yea[rs
I've been eating that for yea[rs
[

Figure 4.11: FOLK_E_00027_SE_01_T_01 *Sojabrot* (cont.)

11 AM: [ich ess des auch schon lang (.)
[I eat that too already long (.)
[I've eaten that for a long time too (.)

12 .h früher immer hab ich immer n (.) so[jabrot mit nutella
.h in the past always have I always (.) so[ybread with NAME
.h I always used to eat (.) so[ybread with nutella
[

13 PB: [°hehheh°

14 AM: gegessen zum frühstück .hhh
eaten for breakfast .hhh
for breakfast .hhh

15 PB: ja
yes
yes

16 AM: ja du bestimmt auch
yes you sure too
yes you sure too

17 (0.2)

18 PB: nee.
no.
no.

In lines 1 to 3, Anita mentions three other types of bread she likes, which are *stonebaked bread*, *farmhouse bread* and *soybread*. She begins her turn with a preview summary assessment with *des* ‘that’ making reference to some upcoming talk/referent. In the next TCU she mentions the referent *stonebaked bread* and repeats the positive assessment *is great* that she used in her previous TCU. She then adds two other breads *farmhouse bread* and *grimminger’s soybread* and repeats her assessment *that is great*. Anita makes multiple assessments without receiving any second assessment or response from Philip. This can be interpreted by Anita as Philip not knowing the referent or as a form of disagreement. After a micropause (line 4), she produces a *kennst du* recognition check (line 5) that seeks recognition of the referent. *Kennst du* here is followed by a direct object *das*, which is a pronoun referring back to *soybread* in the previous TCU. This turn-final TCU is produced with rising intonation at the end. There is no immediate

uptake (line 6), but after a short silence that is indicative of the upcoming disagreement, Philip responds with the type conforming response token *yes* and a modified repeat of the verb *kennen* in the first person singular form *I know* in line 7. This signals that he has rights to know about the referent (Stivers, 2005). This is followed by another TCU that calls into question the askability of the prior question, which is conveyed through the use of *natürlich* ‘of course’ (for English *of course*, see Stivers, 2011), a repeat of *I know* and a repeat of the modifier *grimminger’s soybread*. In line 9, Anita repeats her positive assessment about the referent, which might be due to the lack of a second assessment by Philip in response to her positive assessments (lines 7-8). Philip in line 10 continues with a description of his personal experience of this bread, thereby displaying his recognition and access to the referent. Anita receives this with her experience of the referent in line 11 and then adds more information making reference to a past event or habit involving the referent in lines 12 and 14. Philip receives this with *ja* ‘yes’ and Anita confirms and invites Philip to share this past habit with her (line 16). She expresses a certain expectation, with which Philip disaligns in line 18.

The recognition check formulated by Anita is to seek recognition of the referent in order to pursue a response from the recipient after Anita’s production of multiple positive assessments in lines 1-3. Philip does not align, but recognizes the referent and displays his full access of the referent. The full repeat of the referent, and the modified repeat of the form *kennen* in the first person singular clearly convey that Philip owns knowledge and has even more knowledge than Anita had expected (Stivers, 2005; see also Heritage, 2012a; 2012b; Heritage & Raymond, 2005; in press; Stivers et al., 2011). Philip treats Anita’s recognition check as having underestimated his knowledge or personal encounter with the referent in question. This is supported through the use of *natürlich* ‘of course’ and the reference to a past, but ongoing experience. As this analysis

has shown, *kennst du* (and *weißt du*) constructions can function as response pursuits in talk that move the conversation forward by soliciting explicit responses from recipients where no immediate uptake has taken place and where, therefore, access to the referent is in doubt.

4.3.2 Checking simple recognition

A second environment in which *kennst du* and *weißt du* constructions occur is when speakers solicit simple recognition checks. In Figure 4.12, Anita (AM) and Philip (PB) are having dinner and Philip is tasting Anita's food. Anita asks Philip to try her *samosa* in line 1, which he accepts in line 3. It is after Philip's acceptance that Anita initiates a recognition check introduced with *aber* 'but', which solicits recognition of the reference *samosa* (line 5).

Figure 4.12: FOLK_E_00047_SE_01_T_01 *Samosa*

01 AM: ((humming)) magst du auch samosa probieren,
 like you too samosa try,
 would you also like to try samosa,

02 (0.8) ((chewing noise))²⁰

03 PB: ja:.
 ye:s.
 ye:s.

04 (0.7) ((cutting noise))

05→AM: **aber du kennst die ja ne?**
 but you know it PRT PRT?
 but you know it, right?

06 (0.7) ((cutting noise))

07 PB: ja aber in london sahen die jetzt'n bisschen anders aus
 yes but in NAME look they now+a little different
 yes but in london they looked a little different

08 (0.3)

²⁰ A limitation of this data is that the recordings are audio-recorded face-to-face conversations, which is why the transcripts do not contain any notations on multi-modal behavior unless it was audible to the transcriber. Pauses and audible background noise have been included in the transcript.

Figure 4.12: FOLK_E_00047_SE_01_T_01 *Samosa* (cont.)

09 AM: kriegst sogar des erste stück is des nich lieb von mir?
 get even the first piece is this not kind of me?
you even get the first piece isn't that kind of me?

10 (0.5)

11 PB: uhum.

12 AM: ((smiley voice)) ich bin immer so lieb zu dir.
 ((smiley voice)) I am always so kind to you.
 ((smiley voice)) *I am always so kind to you.*

13 (6.6) ((chewing noise))

14 PB: hei:ß
 ho:t
hot

15 AM: tut mir lei-
 sorr-
sorr-(y)

16 (0.5)

17 PB: [°macht nix°
 [°makes nothing°
 [°no problem°
 [

18 AM: [hey (0.2) hm ((schmatzt)) .hh (0.3) mh die wurden
 [hey (0.2) hm ((smacks)) .hh (0.3) mh they were
 [hey (0.2) hm ((smacks)) .hh (0.3) mh but they

19 aber gut frittiert, (ey)
 but good fried, (ey)
were fried well, (ey)

20 PB: ja ha,
yes ha,
yes ha,

21 (1.7) ((chewing noise))

22 AM: .h ja in london waren die nich so frisch ne (.)
 .h yes in London were they not so fresh right (.)
.h yes in London they weren't as fresh, right (.)

23 da ham die die schon (.) [ham
 there have they they already (.) [have
there they they have already (.) [have
 [

24 PB: [doch
 [DM
 [no

In line 1, Anita makes an offer by asking Philip to try her samosa. Philip responds with an acceptance in line 3. Anita then initiates a recognition check with *aber du kennst die ja ne* ‘but you know it right’ produced with rising intonation (line 5). The particle *ne* produced with rising intonation conveys Anita seeking confirmation of her claim *aber du kennst die ja* ‘but you know it right’ (Harren, 2001; Jefferson, 1981). The declarative sentence structure is turned into a question with the use of *ne* and the rising intonation at the end of the turn. Moreover, the particle *ja* conveys Anita’s expectation regarding Philip’s recognition of the referent. *Ja* is used in German to indicate shared common ground (Luetten, 1979). *Die* ‘it’ is a pronoun that refers back to the previously mentioned referent. Thus, Anita conveys her expectation regarding her recipient’s state of knowledge of *samosa*. Philip receives the recognition check with alignment in line 7 and further adds a personal experience with the referent. He therefore displays his access of the referent to his conversational partner. In line 9, Anita does not orient to Philip’s personal encounter, but continues with her initial agenda of passing the samosa to Philip. She formulates a question containing a joking positive self-assessment, which is confirmed by Philip in line 11. Anita repeats her self-assessment with smile voice in line 12. After a long silence of presumably due the fact that Philip is eating (see the chewing sounds in line 13), Philip is negatively assessing the *samosa* in line 14, which is treated as a complaint by Anita. Anita apologizes, to which Philip responds with *macht nix* ‘no problem’ and Anita continues with a positive assessment that offsets Philip’s complaint (lines 18-19). In lines 22-23, Anita refers back to a past memory that turns out to have been shared by both participants. Her memory is however a little different from Philip as is shown in line 24 through Philip’s disagreement of Anita’s prior turn.

Similar to the previous segment, the recipient not only expresses recognition of the referent, but also displays his epistemic access of the referent through his personal encounter. The speaker who initiates the recognition check also communicates her expectation of what she thinks the recipient knows or how much he knows about the referent (Raymond & Heritage, 2006; Sacks & Schegloff, 1979). The analysis of Figure 4.12 illustrates how speakers can employ *kennst du* constructions to simply elicit recognition of references. Once recognition is achieved, the participants continue with talk about the referent *samosa*.

4.3.3 Initiating a topic shift

The third environment of *wissen/kennen* recognition checks are when speakers initiate topic shifts that invite participants to change the trajectory of talk into a different direction. The following Figure 4.13 has been taken from the same audio-recorded face-to-face conversation between Anita and Philip who are a couple and both university students (see Figures 4.11 and 4.12). They just have started making breakfast and Anita is asking Philipp to bring her toast. At the beginning of Figure 4.13, she is making another request asking Philip to massage her (line 1). Starting in line 12, Anita initiates a topic shift, which is followed by a *weißt du des?* ‘do you know that?’ (line 13).

Figure 4.13: FOLK_E_00027_SE_01_T_01 *Hohlkreuz*

01 AM: und dann hätt ich später gern eine rückenmassage.
and then would.have I later like a back.message.
and then I would like to have a massage later.

02 (0.2)

03 PB: ja
yes
yes

04 (0.3)

Figure 4.13: FOLK_E_00027_SE_01_T_01 *Hohlkreuz* (cont.)

05 PB: ich auch.
I too.
me too.

06 (1.7)

07 PB: kannst da runner gehn in die stra:ße [hhh
can.you there down go in the stree:t [hhh
you can go downstairs on the stree::t [hhh
[
08 AM: [hhh nei:n.
[hhh no:.
[hhh no:.

09 ((kitchen noise 7.79s))

10 PB: du kannst da schon ma bissi thai lernen.
you can there already once a.little Thai learn.
you could learn a little bit of Thai there.

11 (3.6)

12 AM: du hast vor allem manchmal des hohlkreuz manchmal,
you have especially sometimes that swayback sometimes,
sometimes you are especially swaybacked sometimes,

13 → **weißst du des?**
know you that?
do you know that?

14 PB: was?
what?
what?

15 (0.2)

16 AM: du hast voll des hohlkreuz.
you have totally the hollow-back.
you are totally swaybacked.

17 (0.4)

18 PB: nee.
no.
no.

19 AM: doch wenn du dich so hinstellst hast du voll des hohlkreuz.
PRT when you self like stand have you totally the hollow-back.
you (anyway) totally have a hollow-back when you stand.

20 (0.2)

Figure 4.13: FOLK_E_00027_SE_01_T_01 *Hohlkreuz* (cont.)

21 PB: nein hab ich nich
 no have I not
 no I don't

22 AM: doch.
 PRT
 you do.

In line 1, Anita formulates a request, which is followed by a short pause indicating pre-disagreement. Note that Philipp produces an acknowledgement token in line 2. However, he then reciprocates the request, which can be viewed as an indirect decline of Anita's request and thus a dispreferred second pair part. After no uptake in line 6, which conveys Anita's lack of a response to Philipp's indirect decline of her request, Philipp expands on his previous turn producing mock advice that Anita could go downstairs and get her massage (line 7). This presents another dispreferred action that adds to Philipp's first dispreferred second pair part in line 5. Both participants laugh and then Anita declines the offer with *nein* 'no' in line 8. Philipp responds to this with another dispreferred action by challenging/teasing Anita with another reason why Anita should go there (line 10). This is followed by no immediate uptake from Anita in line 11. Anita then introduces a new trajectory of talk, which counter-challenges Philipp's challenge, and produces a recognition check with *weißt du des* in line 13. Philipp's being swaybacked is the reason why he should have a Thai massage. Philipp responds to this with an open-class repair initiator *was* 'what' ending in rising intonation in line 13 (Egbert et al., 2009). Anita treats Philipp's turn as a hearing problem and repeats her announcement (line 16) without the *weisst du des*. In her repeating turn, she includes the extreme case formulation (Pomerantz, 1986) *voll* 'totally'. After the silence in line 17 that is indicative of disagreement, Philip produces a disagreeing response in line 18. Anita formulates another disagreement introduced with the particle *doch* that implies a strong insisting attitude, which is followed by a piece of evidence

that proves that Philipp is swaybacked. She again includes the extreme case formulation *voll* ‘totally’ to emphasize that she is right (Pomerantz, 1988). Philipp again provides two disagreeing responses (lines 21) to which Anita responds with another *doch* in line 22. This series of disagreeing responses has been initiated by the *weißt du des* recognition check by Anita in line 13. The disagreeing responses are not negating the “knowing of being swaybacked”, but are disaligning with being swaybacked.

The *weißt du* recognition check in this example is positioned turn-finally after the clausal referent has been provided in the previous TCU. *Des* ‘that’ therefore is making reference to a state of being swaybacked. The recognition check is produced with rising intonation, which makes an answer relevant from the recipient. It is noticeable that Anita uses the adverb *vor allem* ‘especially’ that communicates a strong claim about the recipient. *Vor allem* ‘especially’ is then upgraded to *voll* ‘totally’ in lines 16 and 19. Anita therefore conveys that she has some epistemic access about her boyfriend’s physical state. It is used here as a counter-challenge in response to Philipp’s teasing challenges in lines 7 and 10. By formulating her counter-challenge with a final *weißt du des* ‘do you know that’, Anita conveys a certain level of expectation regarding Philipp’s knowledge about his own physical state. The recognition check with *weißt du des* is preceded by Anita’s counter-challenge that shifts the attention from herself to Philipp. The explicit formulation of a recognition check makes her counter-challenge even more challenging.

This example is similar to instances of English *do you remember* that occur in environments of challenges and counter-challenges where reference to a shared past event or memory is made to back up a claim (see Chapter 3). However, in this example with *wissen*, the speaker is not making reference to a shared past event, but to a possibly shared present state. Making reference to a present state can be much stronger because it refers to something that is

available or true at the time of speaking. In this example, a new topic is introduced and recognition is checked in order to counter-challenge another participant's course of action.

4.3.4 Checking a prior turn

A fourth environment of *kennen/wissen* recognition checks is when recipients respond to an utterance produced by the prior speaker. If interlocutors display knowledge of references that the speaker does not expect to be in the knowledge domain of the other interlocutor, speakers may initiate recognition checks with *kennen* or *wissen* as is shown in the following example. In Figure 4.14, Sabine (SK) and her younger sister (NK) are playing a game with their father (VK). While playing a game, SK makes reference to another game called mister x. It is VK who orients to that with a *kennst du* recognition form in line 15.

Figure 4.14: FOLK_E_00012_SE_01_T_01 *Das Spiel*

```
01 VK:  so (.)   du darfst wieder
        now (.) you may   again
        now it's again your turn

02      (3.2)

03 VK:  .h drei  (.) ok[ay.
        .h three (.) ok[ay.
        .h three (.) ok[ay.
        [
04 SK:  [die idee ist wahrscheinlich vom mister ix.
        [the idea is   probably      from mister ix.
        [the idea is probably from mister ix.

05      (0.8)

06→VK:  jo kennst du das spiel?
        yes know  you the game?
        yes do you know that game?

07 SK:  nein.
        no.
        no.

08      (2.4)
```

Figure 4.14: FOLK_E_00012_SE_01_T_01 *Das Spiel* (cont.)

09 SK: ja aber ich hab mal die verpattung gesehen
 yes but I have once the packaging seen
well but I have seen the packaging once

10 (0.7)

11 VK: des is halt durch'n spiel n stadt[plan
 that is PRT through.a game and city.[map
that is a city map through a [game
 [

12 NK: [nich nägel beißen
 [not nails bite
 [don't bite nails

13 (1.2)

14 NK: un umdrehen augen zu:
 an turn.around eyes clo:se
turn around and close your eyes

15 (0.2)

16 SK: °ouh°
 °ouh°
 °ouh°

17 (0.5)

18 NK: .h

19 VK: des (.) mister ix des is en spiel (0.3) wo ein (1.3)
 that (.) mister ix that is a game (0.3) where a (1.3)
that (.) mixer ix that is a game (0.3) where a (1.3)

20 unbekannter versucht in london, (0.2) .hh mit ve- öffentlichen
 stranger tries in london, (0.2) .hh with tra- public
stranger in London tries, (0.2) .hh by tra- public

21 verkehrsmitteln durch den (.) durch die stadt zu fahren
 transportation through the (.) through the city to tour
to take a tour through the cite by public transportation

22 (0.8)

23 VK: .h un versucht da (.) von einer stelle zur nächsten zu kommen,
 .h an tries there (.) from one position to next to get,
.h an tries there to get from one position to the next,

24 (1.3)

25 VK: un muss sich aber ab und zu zeigen. un man weiß nur ob
 an has.to himself but sometimes show. an one knows only if
an has to however show himself sometimes. an one only knows if

Figure 4.14: FOLK_E_00012_SE_01_T_01 *Das Spiel* (cont.)

26 er mit dem taxi, oder mit'm (0.2) bus.
 he with the taxi, or with.the (0.2) bus.
he would take the taxi or the bus.

27 (0.4)

28 SK: können wir's auch mal spielen?
 can we.it also once play?
can we play it once, too?

29 (0.6)

30 VK: öh ja ich glaub des hab (0.4) des hab ich noch
 eh yes I believe that have (0.4) that have I still
eh yes I believe that I (0.4) that I still have

31 (0.3)

32 SK: ja des hab ich ja gesehen
 yes that have I PRT seen
yes I have seen that

33 (0.2)

34 VK: ja (0.2) kö'ma au' mal spielen
 yes (0.2) can.once too once play
yes (0.2) we can- we can play it once too

In line 1, VK is selecting the next player. The next player throws a three, which VK calls out by adding an acknowledgement token to the number. In slight overlap, SK then makes reference to another game called mister x in line 4. After a lack uptake from the recipients in line 5 that is indicative of trouble, VK aligns and checks SK's knowledge of the referent to which SK responds with disalignment by giving a type-conforming answer. SK then self-selects in line 9 modifying her previous response with *yes, but I have seen the packaging*, which conveys that she has had a personal encounter with the referent, which is however limited to just the visual mode of seeing than actually having played that game. She does not claim to know the game meaning that she has actually played the game for which *kennen* would be the appropriate form, but she still has some access or knowledge about the game, which she introduces with *yes but I have seen the packaging* in line 9. VK responds to this with a display of his knowledge about the

referent in question by explaining the game in line 11. This is in slight overlap with a side sequence initiated NK who formulates a request to which SK responds with a change-of-state token in lines 12-18 (Heritage, 1984; 1998). VK self-selects in line 19 providing a more specific description about the game *mister ix* (lines 19-21). After a lack of uptake, he continues in line 23 and lines 25-26. SK formulates a request in line 28 asking her dad whether they can also play that game. After some hesitation conveyed through *öh* ‘well’, VK confirms and marks his epistemic rights over the referent (line 30). He therefore not only knows, but possibly even owns the referent. This possible ownership is confirmed by SK in line 32 with a confirming response. Thus, she is acknowledging that SK knows that VK has more knowledge (K+), more access and authority over the referent (Goodwin, 1979; Heritage & Raymond, 2005). This is further conveyed in VK’s next turn that begins with an acknowledgement token followed by his offer *we can play it next time* (line 34).

The *kennst du* recognition check in line 6 is preceded by a confirmation token and consists of *kennst du* + noun phrase. The noun phrase is *das Spiel* the game is referring back to SK’s *mister ix*. Different from the previous examples where the recognition check is initiated by the same speaker who first provided the referent, in this example it is a different speaker who orients to the mentioned referent and checks recognition of the referent. It is noticeable that the original referent *mister x* is abstracted to *the game* by VK. This shows that VK has some knowledge of the referent in question or at least knows that *mister x* is a game. *Kennst du* here asks for the level of familiarity with the game, which could be understood as general knowledge about the game or experience of having played the game before. SK treats this question as asking her of her personal experience with the game. Her type-conforming answer in line 7 clearly claims her lack of personal experience with the referent. The silence in line 8 indicates that VK

takes SK's answer as sufficient to ask for more information. SK then modifies her previous answer with *yes but I have seen the packaging*, which explains her turn in line 4 where she first introduces the referent. SK claims recognition of the referent, but lacks personal engagement with the referent. Her turn in line 4 however further conveys her limited access since she uses the adverb *wahrscheinlich* 'probably' here. That the idea is from *mister ix* further indicates that she has some access. VK checks SK's epistemic access through *kennst du* in line 6. Moreover, he displays his knowledge of *mister ix* by explaining the specific details about the game. SK acknowledges his primary access by asking VK whether they could play the game together. As was pointed out earlier, he not only knows, but owns the game or has owned it at some point (line 30). Therefore, it is clear that his epistemic access or authority cannot be questioned. SK's confirmation in line 32 clearly demonstrates her relationship to the referent as an object that belongs to her father. This example illustrates how speakers initiate recognition checks with *kennen* in response to a previous turn that is produced by another participant to establish intersubjectivity among interlocutors.

Speakers may also initiate recognition checks with *kennen* or *wissen* after a turn that makes relevant a response from the speaker such as a second assessment, a SPP answer to a question or even a response to a response cry as is illustrated in the following example. Figure 4.15 was taken from a conversation between two co-workers ME (female) and MA (male) who are both working as nurses. At the beginning of Figure 4.15, ME gives a report on a female patient to which MA orients with a response cry in line 9 (Goffman, 1978). After a short pause, ME initiates a recognition check with *kennst du + des* 'that'.

Figure 4.15: FOLK_E_00118_SE_01_T_01 *Kirchengemeinde*

01 ME: die nacht über hat se geschlafen die frau ((patientin)) heute
the night over has she slept the woman ((NAME)) today
she has slept during the night Ms. ((NAME))

Figure 4.15: FOLK_E_00118_SE_01_T_01 *Kirchengemeinde* (cont.)

- 02 morgen anfänglich noch recht mü:de sehr verhangen wirkte
morning initially still quite ti:red very dull seemed
in the morning she still seemed quite ti:red very dull,
- 03 sie, °h sachte auch ah ja des käm wohl von dem domina:l,
she, °h said too ah yes that came perhaps from the NAME,
°h she also said ah yes that perhaps came from the domina:l,
- 04 (0.8)
- 05 ME: hat sich dann aber nach dem frühstück .hh ausgiebigst gepflegt
has self then but after the breakfast .hh amply groomed
but after breakfast she has groomed .hh herself amply
- 06 mit (.) mit duschen und haare und so weiter .hh un hatte
with (.) with shower and hair and so on .hh an had
with (.) with a shower and hair and so on. hh an had
- 07 dann die idee sie möchte gerne (0.2) heute, (0.2)
then the idea she wants gladly (0.2) today, (0.2)
then the idea today she would (0.2) like to (0.2)
- 08 nachmittag °h ihre (0.5) kirchengemeinde besuchen.
afternoon °h her (0.5) church visit.
visit her church in the afternoon.
- 09 (0.4)
- 10 ME: und zwar gehört sie dem ((kirchliche gemeinde in der straße x))
and indeed belongs she the ((name of the church and street))
and in fact she belongs to the ((name of the church and street))
- 11 MA: oh jesses.
oh jesus.
oh Jesus.
- 12 (0.3)
- 13→ME: kennst du des,
know you that,
do you know that,
- 14 (.)
- 15 da [hatten wir schon mal jemanden gell
there [had we already once someone right
we [already had someone there once, right
[
- 16 MA: [ja.
[yes.
[yes.

Figure 4.15: FOLK_E_00118_SE_01_T_01 *Kirchengemeinde* (cont.)

17 MA: ja hatten ma (.) schon mal patienten
 yes had once (.) already once patients
 yes we once (.) we once had patients

18 ME: ja ja (.) ähm
 yes yes (.) uhm
 yes yes (.) uhm

19 (0.4)

20 ME: un da i[s dann immer äh mh sam sonntag nachmittag
 an there i[s then always uh mh sat- sunday afternoon
 an there i[s always uh mh on sat- sunday afternoon
 [

21 MA: [hhhhhhhhhhhhh.

22 ME: von eins bis um fü:n[f
 from one until fi[ve
 from one until fi[ve
 [

23 MA: [hm::

In Figure 4.15, ME is reporting on a female patient, her physical condition and plans for today (lines 1-3, 5-8). This is followed by more specific information about the church community, which the patient wants to visit in the afternoon. ME provides the name and the location of the church community to which MA answers in line 11 with a response cry (Goffman, 1978). The response cry indicates that MA is not pleasantly surprised, but rather worried. ME receives this with a recognition check with *des* ‘that’ referring back to the church community of her previous talk. The end of the turn is produced with slightly rising intonation. After a micropause, ME seeks agreement with previously shared experience, which is conveyed through the *gell* ‘right’ at the end of line 15 (Golato, 2005; Harren, 2001). This is in overlap with MA’s response to the recognition check with *kennst du*. MA’s type confirming answer *ja* ‘yes’ claims recognition of or rather familiarity with the referent in question. After ME’s confirmation request, MA confirms and repeats ME’s question changing *patient* to *patients* and further confirming or claiming epistemic access to the referent. MA not only claims shared epistemic access, but he also claims

shared experience with the referent. This previously shared experience is conveyed through the adverbs *schon mal* ‘already once’ in lines 15 and 17. ME responds to this with alignment with a double saying of *ja* ‘yes’ in line 18 that indicate that the information provided by MA is known information (Golato & Fagyal, 2008). She then continues in line 20 and 22 with her previous telling by giving more information about the church community. This is received by MA with overlapping laughter in line 21.

The recognition check with *kennst du* is checking the recipient’s epistemic access of the referent. Before MA can respond, ME reminds MA about their shared experience in the past. It is not the first time that they had a patient who attended this church. The confirmation request is formulated as a declarative statement followed by *gell* ‘right’ that seeks confirmation from MA. The use of the personal pronoun *we* and the deictic *da* ‘there’ all point to the shared knowledge ME expects MA to have. It is noticeable that ME uses *jemanden* ‘someone’ here, but it is clear to MA that it refers to a patient since he uses the word *patients* in line 17. Once recognition of the shared past experience is established in response to MA’s response cry in line 11, ME moves with her initial agenda returning to the story-telling about the female patient. Both ME and MA share common ground in terms of the referent, which is checked here by ME to make sure that she can proceed with her initial agenda. Making reference to a past experience is here used to remind the recipient and it further conveys a speaker’s expectation about a participant’s knowledge domain. *Kennst du* in this example is followed by a reminder, which indicates that ME is not only reminding her recipient, but she herself remembers that this is a shared experience. Otherwise, she could have used *kannst dich erinnern* ‘do you remember’ in the first place.

4.3.5 Conclusion of *kennst du* and *weißt du*

In summary, the analysis has shown that *kennst du* and *weißt du* recognition checks occur in the same action environments. The environments examined here include situations in which speakers pursue a response, check recognition/knowledge, initiate a topic and check another participant's prior turn. As a response pursuit, *kennst du* and *weißt du* constructions seek an explicit answer from the recipient. Speakers may also simply check recognition of references, which sometimes places recipients in a position to display their knowledge of referents. As a topic initiator, *kennst du* and *weißt du* may direct talk into a different trajectory, or as was shown in this section, turn the attention from one speaker to another speaker. Lastly, speakers may formulate *kennst du* and *weißt du* recognition checks in response to a prior utterance that check other participant's knowledge and epistemic access of a referent. *Kennen* and *wissen* constructions are observed in all of these environments, which suggests that both forms have different lexical realizations, but still fulfill similar interactional functions. As far as the present investigation is concerned, both *kennst du* and *weißt du* recognition checks are used by interlocutors to achieve mutual agreement/knowledge of references among participants.

In addition, the forms observed in this collection confirm the findings of previous work on *kennen* and *wissen* in German (Fukuda, 1970; O'Pecko, 1985; Reimann, 2003). While the referent in *kennst du* is a direct object, the referent in *weißt du* is a subordinate clause even if a pronoun is used. *Kennst du* recognition checks may convey a speaker's expectation towards the recipient, which can be confirmed/proved through a display of recognition (personal encounter/experience, which is even sometimes shared) from the recipient. *Weißt du* recognition checks demonstrate a speaker's epistemic access of the referent and the speaker's expectation of the recipient's lack or partial epistemic access of the referent.

Similar to the findings on German *erinnern*, speakers employ particles like *ja* and *doch* (Lütten, 1979), which additionally support the meanings indicated through the use of *wissen* and *kennen*. It is therefore not only the meaning differences of the verbs *wissen* and *kennen* that express knowledge domains among participants, but also little linguistic elements as small as particles that carry epistemic meaning in German. The study of German particles will deserve an independent analysis of investigation, which is however beyond the scope of this dissertation.

4.4 A comparison of *do you know* in English and German

In this section, I will compare the findings on German *wissen/kennen* and English *know*. The points of comparison are: 1. Syntactic form/construction, 2. Recipient orientation, 3. Use of reference forms, 4. Sequential position, and 5. Action performed.

First, English *(do) you know* recognition checks appear with or without the *do* form. If used with *do*, *do you know* is sometimes shortened to *d'you know*. If used without *do*, *you know* is sometimes contracted to *y'know* in English conversation. The reference is mostly embedded in the recognition check following *(do) you know* in form of a noun phrase or clause. Only one instance of my collection included an example where *you know* was not followed by a noun phrase or clause, which contains the referent in question. On the other hand, German *(do) you know* has two forms that can be employed to solicit recognition of referents. *Wissen* and *kennen* are synonyms, which are however not entirely interchangeable. The forms used in my collection included the second person singular and plural of *wissen* and *kennen*, which are *weißt du* (singular) – *wissen Sie* (plural) and *kennst du* (singular) and *kennen Sie* (plural) in German. Contracted forms of *weißt du* and *kennst du* observed in the data are *weißte* and *kennste*. Moreover, *weißt du des* ‘do you know that’ is another form observed in the data with *des* ‘that’

referring back to a previously mentioned referent. While the main difference of English *do you know* is the presence or absence of the *do* form, the main distinguishing feature of German are the availability of two forms *wissen* and *kennen*, with which speakers can express different epistemic stances in talk.

Second, recipients orient to recognition checks with *do you know* with claims or displays of recognition. In both English and German, speakers actively elicit a response from their recipients in order to ensure that participants share common ground for the speaker to proceed with his agenda. For English *do you know* constructions, eight out of 20 instances were observed after a lack of uptake pursuing a response from the recipient. This shows that recognition checks are recipient-designed as speakers make continuous efforts in securing intersubjectivity among participants. As far as German is concerned, four out of 24 instances were employed after a lack of uptake to pursue a response from the recipient and another five instances were responsive (relevant next) to prior talk produced by another participant. Recipients also indicate their epistemic access through particles like *doch* and *ja* (Lütten, 1979) or through double sayings of *ja* ‘yes’ that the referent is known and the action of checking recognition should be halted as was shown in the analysis (Golato & Fagyal, 2008).

Third, the references that are checked for recognition in this collection are place referents, objects, persons, news and personal experiences in both English and German. In contrast to English where *do you know* can be followed by a noun phrase or a clause, *kennst du* in German is usually followed by a noun phrase and *weißt du* by a clause. Clausal reference forms that occur with *weißt du* in German or *do you know* + *wh*-question may already contain more information regarding the referent in question. Noun phrases, however, may also be modified by relative clauses providing additional identifying information to the recipient. The

reference forms are in the majority of cases explicitly mentioned in the *do you know* construction even if they may occur in a prior turn or TCU. However, topic-initiating recognition checks with *do you know* first introduce the referent without prior mentioning.

Fourth, the syntactic position of *do you know* in English is often at the beginning of a turn or TCU and only very rarely at the end of a turn with *you know* ending in rising intonation. Similarly, German *kennst du* and *weißt du* occur at the beginning of a TCU and turn-initially. While *kennst du* has to be followed by a direct object in turn-final position, *weißt du* may occur without a direct object in turn-final position. Both English *do you know* and German *kennst du* and *weißt du* are observed in presequences and incidental sequences in conversation.

Finally, the actions that are performed through English *do you know* and German *kennst du* and *weißt du* are very similar. While the data on English distinguishes between *do you know* recognition checks used as response pursuits, direction-givers and topic initiators, *kennst du* and *weißt du* constructions are employed as response pursuits, simple recognition/knowledge checks, topic initiators and checks of other participants' knowledge domains that is claimed and/or displayed in the immediate preceding talk. Thus, it can be said that the interactional functions expressed through *kennst du* and *weißt du* and *(do) you know* are the same for situations when speakers pursue a response or initiate a new topic. For the remaining environments, more data is needed to map or generalize the findings to English or German.

Chapter 5: *Do you remember and do you know in teacher talk*

5.1 Introduction

This chapter constitutes the third analytical chapter of the dissertation. While the first two analytical chapters focused on a cross-linguistic comparison of *do you remember* and *do you know* in English and German, this chapter will focus on English *do you remember* and *do you know* in institutional talk, specifically in teacher talk. I will restrict my analysis to teacher talk in English given the amount of accessible data on English classroom talk. Both *do you remember* and *do you know* occur in various action environments in teacher talk. I will start my discussion with *do you remember* recognition checks (Section 5.2) before I will analyze *do you know* recognition checks (Section 5.3) that are elicited by teachers in English classroom talk. I will close this chapter with a comparison of *do you remember* and *do you know* in teacher talk (Section 5.4).

5.2 *Do you remember*

In this section, I will first discuss *do you remember* constructions as employed by teachers in classroom interactions to back up what they said or are about to say. Then I will examine environments of *do you remember* where teachers provide hints to students to get to the right answer.

For *do you remember* instances occurring in teacher talk, I have collected 25 examples of which two appear in presequences as analyzed by Schegloff (1980) and discussed in the literature review of this dissertation. Among the remaining 23 instances, which all occur in incidental sequential position (Schegloff, 2007), six are found in reminding environments, four appear in environments where teachers structure their talk to provide step-by-step information or

connect new with old information and thirteen occur in situations in which teachers give hints to guide students to find correct answers to questions. The remainder of this section will analyze these usages of *do you remember*. I will start with *do you remember* in reminding situations (5.2.1) and proceed to situations in which *do you remember* is employed to structure teacher talk (5.2.2). Then I will examine hint-giving environments (5.2.3) and conclude with some final remarks explaining why these constructions are employed by teachers in these contexts.

5.2.1 (*Do you*) *remember*: Reminding students

Figure 5.1 is taken from an ESL writing conference between Jane and her student Hamid. They are discussing Hamid's organization of his paper. Prior to Figure 5.1, Jane has asked Hamid to include a thesis statement expressing his position at the end of the introduction. Hamid acknowledges Jane's request to include a thesis statement in line 1 and then continues with a request for information (lines 1-5). Jane is aligning in line 6 and then introduces a recognition check with *do you remember we talked about the uh portion* in line 8.

Figure 5.1: ESL Writing conference: Jane & Hamid (08:31-09:25)

```

01  Hamid: =>sure.< also I was thinking that do you want some (0.3)
02          background?=like I introduced that pre:viously of
03          biotechnology and the genetically modified food product
04          (.) but if I include that (0.5) the introdiction will be
05          somewhere around a page.
06  Jane:   ((nodding)) ↑right a page is good.
07  Hamid:  [((nods))
08→ Jane:   [do you remember we talked about the (.) [uh portion?
09  Hamid:                                     [six portions
10  Hamid:  yeah.
11  Jane:   so (0.3) <one-fifth> (0.5) is the idea:l portion of the
12          introduction, (0.2) so we have six pages, so ideally you
13          have to spend one page on introduction.
14          (0.4)
15  Jane:   ((nodding)) [so it's a very good plan.=
16  Hamid:  ((nodding)) [so that's good.
17  Hamid:  =°okay.°
18          (1.0)
19  Jane:   so make sure that you have your position here, (1.1) at

```

Figure 5.1: ESL Writing conference: Jane & Hamid (08:31-09:25) (cont.)

20 the end of the::
21 Hamid: sure.

Hamid's request for information in lines 1 and 2 is followed by a description of what he would include, which is unpacking the word *background* (lines 2-4). The turn also includes a potential problem with what Hamid suggested, namely that his introduction might then become too long. In line 6, Jane responds with nodding and a confirmation token produced with higher pitch. Jane further adds a positive assessment on the proposed (not actually) length of Hamid's introduction. Hamid's nodding is in overlap with Jane's turn in line 8. Jane introduces a recognition check making reference to a shared past event, which points to a past class discussion on the different parts of an essay (line 8). Hamid displays knowledge of the shared experience by producing a collaborative turn completion in line 9 (Lerner, 2004). Hamid's display of knowledge might have been caused by the delay of Jane finishing her turn. The micro-pause after *the* and the filler *uh* in line 8 are indicative of a word-search. Thus, Hamid marks recognition before Jane can even finish her turn. He also claims recognition with *yeah* conveying that he can recall this experience immediately after the collaborative turn completion has been produced (line 10). In lines 11 to 13, Jane then resumes with *so* and produces an upshot of the class discussion (Raymond, 2004), which picks up on Hamid's turn *six portions* in the previous turn. Jane makes calculations about the length of an introduction and reconfirms her prior alignment and assessment of line 6. This further confirms Hamid's assumption of the length of his introduction in lines 4-5. After a short pause that indicates Hamid's lack of an immediate response to Jane's SPP answer to his question, Jane provides a positive summary assessment of Hamid's organization of his paper in line 15. The assessment contains the intensifier *very*, the adjective *good* and is supported by nodding. Hamid's receipt of Jane's expansion on their shared experience in class is a little

delayed, but in overlap with Jane's turn in line 15. It is further accompanied by nodding and contains a returning positive summary assessment (line 16). Because of the overlap with Jane's turn (lines 15-16), Hamid again produces an acknowledgement token *okay* closing down this sequence. After a silence in line 18, Jane moves on to a different problem of Hamid's essay outline.

In this figure, the ongoing action is not really halted, but Jane's *do you remember* turn accounts for her positive assessment in line 6 by reminding Hamid of what was taught in class. Hamid orients to the recognition check, but despite his display of recognition in line 9, Jane continues explaining (lines 11-13). In addition, Jane is using locally initial reference forms, that is, an NP with a definite article indicating that the referent is something that should be known to Hamid. Thus, the turn is explicitly asking Hamid for a shared memory expressed by the personal pronoun *we* and the shared activity of talking (line 8).

The initial question provided by the student Hamid is followed by a candidate answer of how long he thinks his introduction will be if he included some background information in his introduction. Jane gives an evaluation (line 6), which she then expands in her following turns. She points to a class discussion on the different proportions of sections in a paper. Instead of repeating class content, she checks shared memory or experience to remind the student of the lesson leading him to an answer to his question. By making reference to a past class discussion, the teacher may be orienting to the epistemic responsibility on the student's part - i.e., that he should know the answer to the question because it was discussed in class. The teacher is guiding the student to the right answer, that is, giving clarification on why Hamid's initial assumption is in fact ideal for a paper that is six pages long. In lines 11 to 13, the teacher explains to the student that an introduction makes up one fifth of a paper. She therefore gives him general

guidelines not only specific to this particular assignment, but paper proportions in general. Thus, this recognition check is giving teaching instructions while evaluating a student's candidate response.

In terms of epistemic rights, the student orients to the teacher's epistemic authority, but also claims and displays knowledge throughout the figure. The teacher checks recognition with *remember* that conveys her expectation of remembering by the student. However, as was pointed out above, the main function is not proving that the teacher is right, but more so to help the student find and remember the answer himself.

5.2.2 (*Do you*) *remember*: Structuring teacher talk

5.2.2.1 Providing step-by-step information

Different from the previous example in Figure 5.1 where the teacher is reminding the student, here, the teacher is giving step-by-step information to guide students to the correct answer to a question. The following figure was taken from a video-recorded classroom conversation between the teacher (TEA) and a student called Alex (ALX). SEV stands for several students and STU for student who could not be properly identified. Prior to Figure 5.2, the teacher had asked another student called Kevin about ways to use blue and green squares to make core squares. After a small sequence of talk, the teacher positively evaluates Kevin's response and selects the next speaker, Alex, which is where Figure in 5.2 starts. In this figure, the teacher asks Alex in lines 6 to 8 why he thinks that *there are thousands of ways to make core squares using green and blue squares*, which presents the initiation act of the IRE sequence (Mehan, 1979). Alex gives an answer (R) in line 9, which is followed by the evaluation (E) in

line 11. This is immediately followed by a *remember* recognition check making reference to a shared past event that involved doing nets for a cube (lines 11-12).

Figure 5.2: CB Curtis Nov 23b Nets for a cube (00:25-01:30)

01 TEA: Alex what are you thinking? oh don't write on your core
02 square building mats please I'll be collecting em.
03 Amanda could you put your pencil away cause you won't be
04 needing it for anythi:ng (.) right now.
05 ALX: it may sound crazy but thousands.
06 TEA: you think there's thousands? tell me why:. I don't think that
07 sounds crazy. why do you think there could be thousands of
08 ways to make core squares using green and blue squares.
09 ALX: well cause there are lots of ways to do lots of things.
10 (0.8)
11→TEA: oka::y. we found that out our↑selves. **remember the other day**
12→ **we did nets for a cube**, did we find just one or two ways
13 [or did we find lots of [ways?
14 STU: [no. [lots of ways.
15 SEV: lots.
16 TEA: lots of ways. Alex was there anything else you were thinking
17 that made you think (.) maybe there's just a hu:ge number of
18 ways to do it or thou:sands as you said.
19 (1.0)
20 ALX: well (2.5) quilting is one of them.
21 TEA: quilting is one of (.) what.
22 ALX: () can make thousands out of it.
23 TEA: quilting is one of the things you make thousands out of?
24 thousands of what.
25 ALX: different types of quilts.
26 TEA: okay.

In lines 1 to 4, the teacher selects one of her students Alex by producing an information request. Before Alex can answer, the teacher formulates two admonishments in the form of requests, one addressing students who are writing on their core square building mats and the other addressing Amanda. It is not until line 5 that Alex provides an answer to the teacher's question in line 1. Alex assesses his answer and stresses the first syllable of the word *thousands*. In line 6, the teacher formulates a questioning repeat (Robinson, 2013) before she makes another request asking Alex for an account. Moreover, the teacher disagrees with Alex's negative assessment of his answer expressing her positive evaluation of his answer, which leads to her repeat and the subsequent request in lines 6-7. This is followed by a full formulation of her request for an

account, which is turned here into a *wh*-question (lines 7-8). After Alex's answer in line 9, there is a lack of immediate uptake in line 10 before the teacher produces an acknowledgement token with *okay*. The sound stretch on *okay* and the following TCU convey that the student's response is not sufficient to the teacher (Lee, 2007; Mehan, 1979). The rising pitch on the second syllable of *ourselves* also aligns with Alex's answer since this is what they already found out. Reference to a past event is already done with *we found that out ourselves*. The teacher then makes a second, more specific reference with the *remember* recognition check that points to a previous class when they made nets for a cube (lines 11-12). The *remember* recognition check is produced with slightly rising intonation at the end of the TCU. The teacher however does not wait for a verbal response²¹, but continues with an alternative question in lines 12-13 (Koshik, 2005). One of the students aligns after the first question part in line 14 and confirms with a partial repeat the correct answer *lots of ways*. Several students align with the student's response in line 15. After the teacher repeats the answer, she again selects Alex to elicit more information on his previous answer from line 5. After a silence that belongs to Alex, Alex responds with an example, to which the teacher orients with a question that initiates repair on Alex's turn (line 21). Alex then makes an attempt to resolve the trouble in line 22, to which the teacher orients with another initiation of repair in lines 23-24. After Alex responds to this repair initiation, the teacher then produces an acknowledgement token in line 26 closing down the prior talk on why there are thousands of ways to make core squares using green and blue squares.

The recognition check in lines 11 to 12 is referencing a past shared class event where students made nets for a cube. This reference with *remember* + noun phrase that contains a modifying clause is made here to back up the preceding *we found this out our↑selves*. Thus, the

²¹ The camera is on Alex, which is why other students' non-verbal behavior is not noted here. Students may have shown signs of recognition, which could have been a non-verbal response to the teacher's recognition check.

teacher here addresses the entire class. The teacher encourages all students, including Alex, to make a connection between the question being asked here-and-now and what was discussed before in class. The teacher does not wait for the students' claim or display of recognition, but proceeds right away with her agenda. The question that follows the *remember* check further expresses the teacher's efforts in guiding the class to the right answer, to which the students orient in line 14-15. The teacher then reformulates her question in lines 16 to 18 to pursue a response (Svennevig, 2013) reselecting Alex as the next speaker.²²

In addition, the teacher includes herself into the shared past event by using the first personal pronoun *we* in lines 12 to 13. Once recognition of the shared experience is established through the correct answer in lines 14 and 15, the teacher confirms it with a repeat of the answer (Kääntä, 2010; Park, 2013) in line 16. The referent *the other day* is not a specific time reference, but is followed by a concrete description of the activity or the event that took place on that day. Overall, in this example of a *remember* recognition check, the teacher is giving step-by-step information and asking challenging questions that guide students who do not know the answer to the correct answer to the problem.

5.2.2.2 Connecting new with old information

The next example in Figure 5.3 illustrates how a *remember* recognition check is made to connect new information to old information from previous class discussion. Different from a presequence as discussed by Schegloff (1988), this type of *remember* is part of an ongoing action that points to a past shared event to structure classroom talk. In Figure 5.3, the class is talking

²² Since the camera only shows Alex, nothing can be said about the teacher's or the other students' gaze or any other non-verbal behavior.

Figure 5.3: CB Curtis Dec 13f Color wheel (06:42-08:16) (cont.)

36 better than the ones we've done before.

In lines 1 and 2, the teacher selects Brittany and asks her to give an account of why she thinks two colors are better than three. Brittany responds with an account in lines 3 to 5, which is received by the teacher with an acknowledgement token in line 6. The teacher continues with a concrete example to explain the use of opposite colors that Brittany used in her previous account (lines 6-14). Thus, the teacher reformulates Brittany's turn adding details and explanations to achieve intersubjectivity (Auer, 1984; Heritage, 2007; Schegloff, 1992) among students. To ensure that students are following her, the teacher checks her students' understanding in line 14. After a silence, several students give an answer (line 16), which the teacher confirms with a repeat of the answer produced with falling intonation (line 17), which displays that she has evaluated their answers as correct (Kääntä, 2010; Svennevig, 2004). She further adds an example to demonstrate that the answer is correct (lines 17-18). In line 19, one student attempts to self-select, but is interrupted by the teacher who begins her turn with *um* and the initiation of a *remember* recognition check (line 20). The teacher points back to a previous class discussion on color wheels quoting her own words starting in line 21. The *remember* construction is produced with slightly rising intonation at the end of the TCU and is accompanied by the teacher placing her forefinger on her chin in line 21. The teacher does not wait for a response from the students, but proceeds with her own talk. When introducing alternative ways, she raises her finger to repeat the information of using opposite colors (lines 22-25). She then asserts that there is one other way, which is followed by a prosodically marked *but* in line 25 before she selects Alex to guess what that other way might be (lines 26-27). After some silence that is indicative of pre-disagreement or trouble with the teacher's turn, Alex produces a delayed response, which is not

addressing the teacher's question (line 29-30). His delayed response, which is conveyed through the hesitations tokens and pauses at the beginning of his turn, introduces a new topic of talk. The teacher receives Alex's response with an acknowledgement token and a request asking Alex to halt his course of action (line 31). Alex confirms in line 32 and the teacher adds an account for delaying Alex's idea in lines 29-30.

The *remember* recognition check in this figure is reminding the students of the first class on color wheels, which is conveyed through the use of the personal pronoun *we* as was shown in the previous example in Figure 5.2. The teacher provides a very specific time reference (*the first time*) to specify the exact occurrence of the event in question. Moreover, the teacher adds her own words to help students remember. For those who do not remember, the repeat serves as a teaching moment and to underline that what she said earlier in that class period is important for the ongoing discussion. The teacher connects old or known information with new information, which she tries to elicit from Alex in lines 26-27. Therefore, the *remember* construction helps to organize the teacher's talk so that she can effectively refer to known information to raise something new, which is however still relevant to the entire class discussion. The teacher uses *remember* not only to structure her ongoing class, but to structure her class in its entirety making connections that guide students in seeing the larger picture of concepts and ideas taught in class.

5.2.3 (*Do you*) *remember*: Giving a hint

Another type of *remember* construction observed in teacher talk is in environments when teachers provide students with hints (Gardner, 2004) to pursue answers from students and to help students understand concepts. This can be seen in Figure 5.4. The teacher teaches the difference between symmetrical and asymmetrical core squares by using two student sample core squares,

one from Asratu and another one from Kevin. Holding the two samples, she formulates an information request in lines 1-4. After discussing the differences between the two student sample core squares with the students, the teacher reformulates her instructions in line 19, before she initiates a recognition check with *remember Vanessa's idea* (line 20).

Figure 5.4: CB Curtis Dec 5h Vanessa's idea (05:34-06:59)

01 TEA: so what is it- what happens differently, when you imagine
 02 those lines on Asratu's core square.
 03 (.)
 04 than when you imagine those lines on ↑Kevin's core square.
 05 AMA: Kevin's looks like-
 06 TEA: and I don't want you to just imagine where those lines are.
 07 <a[nother big hint>.
 08 BTY: [it's not it's not by its not (0.3) th- this is something
 09 that it's- this is not true.
 10 TEA: what.
 11 BTY: it's not that uh (0.4) um Asratu's- is that one Asratu's?
 12 TEA: this one's Asratu's.
 13 JIL: [because ()
 14 BTY: [it's not that Asratu's um symmetrical because it's in
 15 crayon and Kevin's isn't because it's in marker,
 16 TEA: you're right. whether you use crayon or marker has nothing
 17 to do with being symmetrical.
 18 JIL: be-
 19 TEA: ↑PLEASE IMAGINE FOLDING these core squares. please imagine
 20→ folding these core squares. **remember Vanessa's idea?** if you
 21 can fold something evenly, (0.7) you've found the middle,
 *((whispers to Amanda))
 22 u:m (.) *would you put that down for a second?
 23 TEA: imagine folding them along those lines we ju:st traced and
 24 something different happens with Kevin's then with
 25 Asratu's.
 26 (1.8)
 27 TEA: Jillian what are you thinking?
 28 JIL: um (0.5) that- I think that they're symmetrical because they
 29 look the same.
 30 TEA: these aren't both symmetrical. this one is not.
 31 (0.3)
 32 TEA: [and this one is.
 33 JIL: [I mean (0.2) because they (.) um they're different.
 34 (0.7)
 35 TEA: what's different.
 36 JIL: it's a different th- one of them is symmetrical and the
 37 other is no:t sym[metrical.
 38 TEA: [right

In lines 1 to 4, the teacher formulates a question that asks the students to compare the two core squares. Before Amanda can complete her response in line 5, the teacher continues with more

detailed instructions, which she calls *a big hint*. In overlap with the teacher's second TCU, Brittany produces a series of self-repairs in lines 8 to 9. The teacher then initiates repair on the underspecified referent (Egbert et al., 2009) *this* in Brittany's turn with the open-class repair initiator *what* produced with downward intonation (line 10). Brittany answers with an attempt of a repeat of her question, which she self-repairs into a repair initiation of her own in form of a candidate understanding check (line 11). The teacher confirms in line 12 and Brittany produces a response in overlap with Jillian resolving the repair (line 13). The teacher agrees and rephrases Brittany's answer in lines 16-17. Before she lets Jillian to continue, the teacher gives her students specific instructions, which she initially produces with a distinctly higher pitch and higher volume. She repeats this information again in lines 19 to 20 asking her students to find an answer to her initial question in lines 1-4. By making reference to Vanessa's idea through the *remember* construction, she provides an additional clue for students to get to the right answer. The *remember* construction is produced with rising intonation that signals a check for recognition. The teacher however does not wait for a response, but continues with a formulation of Vanessa's idea (lines 20-21). She gets distracted by Amanda in line 22 before she returns to her instructions starting in line 23 where she partially repeats her previous turn in line 19. She then points out that the two sample core squares are different. After no uptake in line 26, the teacher selects Jillian as the next speaker. Jillian provides a delayed response (lines 28-29), which gets corrected by the teacher in line 30 (For research on teacher corrections, see Kääntä, 2010 and Van Lier, 1988; 2004). After a short pause in line 31, the teacher adds more information, which is in overlap with Jillian's changing claim. Her claim is prefaced with *I mean* as if Jillian is merely explaining what she said earlier. The teacher then pursues a more specific response (Gardner,

2004) through her question in line 35. Jillian answers with a repeat of the teacher's correction (lines 36-37), which the teacher confirms in line 38.

The recognition check in this figure is part of an instructional sequence that is designed to help students figure out the difference between the two sample core squares. After the teacher confirms Brittany's turn in lines 16-17, she gives a hint to her students (lines 19-20). She then uses reference to a shared memory to lead students to the correct answer, which she even restates in the TCU that follows the *remember* recognition check. The referent in question is a noun phrase *Vanessa's idea* that refers to a student's previous observation. Vanessa's idea gives a clue because symmetrical squares can be folded evenly, but not asymmetrical ones. Even after the clue, the teacher continues with more information that should help students to find the correct answer.

The teacher does not wait for students' claim or display of recognition of Vanessa's idea, but continues right away with stating Vanessa's idea to the students. By repeating Vanessa's idea, the teacher is communicating that she is not expecting students to remember for themselves what Vanessa said. Instead, the teacher reminds her students through the *remember* recognition check, which serves here more as a bridge to introduce the actual clue, which is Vanessa's idea.

The teacher not only decides on how much information she gives to elicit a response from her students, but she also determines the content and delivery of information as is shown in this example. By making reference to a student's previous comment, the teacher uses students' interactions and contributions to give instructions and to help students develop their own thinking skills. As the teacher, she also selects the next speaker and has the right to correct students' responses and direct the conversation into a trajectory that conforms to the lesson plan of this class meeting (Kääntä, 2010).

Another example of a remember construction that serves to give a hint is found in Figure 5.5. In this figure, the teacher refers to a previous lesson on fourth turns starting in line 1. One of the students, Alex, provides an answer in line 16, which the teacher corrects in line 17. After her correction, she initiates a *remember* recognition check that further provides a clue to understand the correct answer.

Figure 5.5: CB Curtis Dec 1a My right (03:25-04:37)

01 TEA: we talked about (1.0) fourth turns one- turning one fourth
 02 or turning a quarter turn mo:re. how many qua:rter turns do
 03 I- can I go before I've gone a whole turn. how many times can
 04 I turn one fourth
 05 (1.1)
 06 TEA: in the same direction before I've gone a whole turn I've
 07 turned completely arou:nd,
 08 (1.2)
 09 TEA: °well° think about that. which way would you like me to turn
 10 Alex right or left?
 11 ALX: .hhhh °I'd like you to turn° right.
 12 TEA: oka:y. I need just a little bit more room here (.) if I turn
 13 to the right Alex um if I'm gonna turn one fourth to the
 14 right- this is my right- what will I be facing when I've
 15 completed that turn?
 16 ALX: left.
 *((TEA waving her right hand, gazing at Alex))
 17 TEA: *this this is my right. this is my right. (0.3) **remember I'm**
 18→ **gonna use my: right not yours.**
 19 ALX: oh.
 20 TEA: cause I am the turtle now or I am the turner.
 21 (0.3)
 *((TEA still gazes at Alex))
 22 TEA: *so (.) think about what I should turn to face I'm gonna turn
 23 and face what you tell me to but I need to turn one fourth to
 24 the right.
 25 (2.2)
 26 ALX: turn to the ca:mera.
 *((TEA turns to the camera))
 27 TEA: o*ka:y, (.) did I make a quarter turn to the right?
 28 (0.2)
 29 ((Alex nods))
 30 TEA: yep. how many quarter turns have I turned so far?
 31 SEV: one.

In line 1, the teacher talks about quarter turns before she produces a question in lines 2 to 4. She self-repairs her initial question and also adds another variation of the question (Gardner, 2004). After a lack of uptake in line 5, the teacher adds an increment (Schegloff, 2007) turning the gap

into an intra-turn pause. After another lack of uptake in line 8, the teacher breaks the problem down into steps and enacts it visually to make it easier for the students to respond. This time, she selects Alex as the next speaker. Alex responds in line 11, which the teacher receives with an acknowledgement token before she continues with more questions addressing Alex in lines 12 to 15. Alex answers in line 16 and the teacher initiates repair by giving a non-verbal/gestural hint. She repeats the gesture twice before she makes use of a remember construction that further specifies that she is using her right and not his right hand (lines 17-18), which is received by Alex with a change-of-state token (Heritage, 1984; 1998). The teacher then gives more information helping the student understand why his answer was not correct (line 20). There is no uptake in line 22 and the teacher self-selects in line 22 still talking to Alex asking him to tell her where to turn. After some silence in which the teacher gazes at Alex waiting for his directions, Alex provides an answer in line 26, which the teacher receives with an acknowledgement token and another question checking the students' understanding of the concept of a quarter turn. Alex nods (line 29) and the teacher responds with a confirmation token and formulates another question to which the student responds with *one* in line 31.

The teacher produces a recognition check when there is no uptake from Alex after her first clue in line 17. Neither Alex nor any of the other students seem to have understood the problem with Alex's answer in line 16 that the hand the teacher is waving is not her left, but right hand. The *remember* construction is part of an IRE sequence (McHoul, 1990) that helps the student get to the right answer by eliciting the correct response from the student. The initiation (I) is found in lines 14-15 where the teacher again selects Alex to answer her question. Alex's turn in line 16 is the student's response (R). Before the teacher formulates an evaluation (E) however, she provides hints for Alex to figure out the problem with his answer in line 16. She

therefore does not immediately evaluate Alex's response, but delays her evaluation to lead Alex to find the right answer by himself. This hint-giving practice is supported by the teacher's hand wave (line 17). The silence prompts the teacher to continue and provide an additional cue that explains her hand wave. The vowel in *my* is stretched here, which signals the contrast between the teacher's right hand and Alex's right hand (for contrastive stress, see Koshik, 2005). Even after Alex claims recognition, the teacher continues with her account why the answer is right and not left (line 20).

The recognition check is not produced with rising intonation, which conveys that she is not seeking a response from her participants. Instead, she wants her students to recognize that the shift in perspective in what they perceive to be her left is actually her right. The teacher's goal is for the students to recognize this knowledge that when people are facing each other, they are mirroring each other. The *remember* construction is therefore part of a series of hints that is used to guide students to the right answer and to help them understand the problem. Interestingly, this type of *remember* construction is not making reference to a past event or experience per se as was shown in many of the previous examples of *do you remember*, but referencing to a present or even future state expressed through *I'm gonna* that involves common knowledge.

The hint introduced with a *do you remember* construction initiates and completes repair on the student's turn, i.e., the teacher corrects the student's turn (Seedhouse, 2004; 2007). Since participants in conversation strive for mutual agreement or alignment in conversation, it is not surprising that an explicit correction would be dispreferred here (Gardner, 2004; Kääntä, 2010). The teacher makes several verbal and non-verbal attempts to guide Alex in figuring out the problem of his answer and the correct answer to this question. After Alex's claim of recognition, the teacher continues with her attempts to explain the broader concept of quarter turns before

illustrating to her students an easier or more visual approach to the notion of a quarter turn. Similar to the previous figure, the teacher determines the level of complexity, which she adjusts according to the needs of the students in her class. If students seem to have more problems, the teacher not only provides step-by-step hints, but she uses a variety of tools to activate students' understanding and recognition of knowledge. As the teacher, she can structure her talk in such a way that she selects the next speaker and pursues a response from a particular student until she thinks that she wants to select someone else or ask the entire class (Sert, 2011).

Figure 5.6 is another instance of *do you remember* in hint-giving situations that involve an IRE sequence, which is however not complete in this example. After the teacher initiates a question in lines 1-2, Justin provides an answer in lines 7-8, which is not the correct answer to the question. Without formulating an explicit evaluation of the student's incorrect answer, the teacher introduces a *remember* construction that reminds the class of the precise instructions of the question given earlier in the conversation (lines 10-11).

Figure 5.6: CB Curtis Dec 13h Whatever shape (07:11-08:16)

01 TEA: ↑Justin has a suggestion for something we could try that we
 02 haven't tried yet. °Justin what do you think.°
 03 (0.4)
 04 TEA: could you just sit down and tell us about em plea:se Justin?
 05 thank you.
 06 (0.2)
 07 JUS: um (0.6) so what if you take a triangle (.) and you cut the
 08 um top corner off
 09 (1.0)
 10→TEA: **remember whatever shape you come ↑up wi:th (.) it has to be**
 11→ **able (.) to fill the whole core square with that shape.**
 12 JUS: you could use another small triangle that you cut and use it.
 13 TEA: ah is this triangle that you're describing going to end up
 14 being a different [size than the one you've
 15 JUS: [°it'd be a bigger one.°
 16 TEA: already talked to us about?
 17 (1.9)
 18 TEA: how bi:g?
 19 (0.6)
 20 JUS: just cut in half.
 21 TEA: right. that size we've used before, and then what do I do to
 22 [that triangle.

Figure 5.6: CB Curtis Dec 13h Whatever shape (07:11-08:16) (cont.)

23 JUS: [um just flip it over and then you cut the-
*((coughing and sneezing from other students))
24 TEA: *well if I do tha:t how am I gonna get that whole core square
25 filled in.
26 (0.6)
27 TEA: that is a triangle
28 (0.7)
29 TEA: it is right. Justin took a triangle we've been using all
30 along (.) and he sai:d just imagine cutting the top off it
31 (0.5)
32 TEA: tha:t is still a triangle. (0.2) right?
33 SEV: yeah.

In lines 1 and 2, the teacher selects Justin as the next speaker. Justin does not respond in line 3, which is why the teacher self-selects and reformulates her question reselecting Justin as the next speaker (lines 4-5). Justin provides an answer in lines 7 and 8. After a lack of uptake that is indicative of pre-disagreement, the teacher introduces a *remember* recognition check in lines 10 and 11, which is not responsive to Justin's prior turn. The teacher does not evaluate Justin's answer, but refers to a past event or memory pointing to previous or pre-owned knowledge among students. In this case, it refers to the idea that the entire core square has to be filled with the shape they have in mind. In line 12, Justin adds to his previous turn. In response, the teacher initiates repair (lines 13-14, 16). The teacher's turn is in overlap with Justin's response to the teacher's question (line 15). The lack of uptake in line 17 might be due to the overlap in lines 14-15. The teacher then orients to Justin's turn in line 15 with a request of information to which Justin provides an answer in line 20. The teacher confirms in line 21 and elicits another response returning to her initial question in lines 1 to 2. Justin produces an attempt of an answer, which is however difficult to hear based on the coughing and sneezing in the background. The teacher delays her disagreeing response in lines 24-25 with *well* and a conditional clause telling Justin that by using his method, the core square cannot be entirely filled. The teacher continues with a

more detailed explanation in lines 27 and 29-30 this time addressing the class restating the problem with Justin's triangle in the remainder of the figure.

The recognition check in this figure is making reference to previously mentioned instruction that is repeated here by the teacher to guide Justin and the class throughout this task. The teacher initiates a question in lines 1-2 and 4-5. Justin provides an answer in lines 7-8. The teacher does not provide an evaluation of the response part, but instead initiates a *remember* construction that reminds Justin of the precise instructions of the teacher. Thus, this *remember* recognition check makes reference to what was said in an earlier lesson by the teacher. At the same time, the teacher provides Justin with a clue to figure out the right answer. The clue is that Justin has to come up with a shape that can fill the rest of the core square. As was pointed out above, this response is produced instead of a negative evaluation allowing the student to revise his answer.

The sequential position of the *remember* construction is incidental as part of a larger action of solving a mathematical problem that was asked by the teacher. The *remember* construction is produced with falling intonation at the end of line 11 and is not oriented to as a question by the recipient. Justin however acknowledges the reminder by suggesting another solution to the problem. Even though the teacher does not explicitly seek recognition from the recipient, the *remember* construction is used here to make reference and to achieve recognition of the reference by the students, which at least for Justin turns out to be successful or partly successful since he tries to revise his suggestion he made earlier. A reminder in this sense may not overtly seek recognition in form of an explicit claim or display of recognition, but it still seeks to secure mutual alignment among participants in terms of common ground. In this

example, the common ground is to know that the core square needs to be filled entirely in order to complete this task successfully.

In Figure 5.6, the teacher gives students the possibility to revise their answers and to come up with the correct answer themselves. The teacher who owns epistemic authority provides cues throughout the entire conversation to guide students in their process of understanding the task and the answer to the task. The *remember* construction is used as a resource to avoid a dispreferred response by reminding the students of the precise instructions that are needed to answer the question correctly. In that sense, the teacher is the hint-giver who leads her students into finding the right answer to the problem. Epistemic domains are negotiated throughout this figure with the teacher pointing to earlier conversations that would help to better approach the problem. Justin orients to the teacher's epistemic authority by revising his answers throughout this figure (lines 12 and 15). Giving a hint by using a *remember* construction is therefore indirectly telling the student that the answer is wrong and that the student needs to reconsider his answer. This is also supported by the absence of a positive evaluation from the teacher. Since the action is dispreferred (Gardner, 2004), the teacher introduces her disagreement with *remember* and at the same time offers the student the opportunity to redesign his turn. In striving for mutual alignment, the teacher moves the conversation forward with clues that can lead to the correct answer in order to finally align with the student and evaluate a student's response positively.

5.2.4 Conclusion of *do you remember* in teacher talk

As was shown in the analysis above, *do you remember* recognition checks in teacher talk are found in environments in which teachers remind students, provide step-by-step information, connect new with old information or give hints that guide students in finding the correct answer.

Similar to everyday conversation, *do you remember* can be used by speakers to check recognition of a shared memory to establish intersubjectivity. Furthermore, the teacher avoids dispreferred negative evaluations by providing recognition checks with *do you remember* that serve as clues eliciting students' recognition of references to find the correct answer.

5.3 *Do you know*

This part of the chapter investigates *do you know* constructions in teacher talk. I will begin with an examination of *do you know* constructions that initiate repair or correction before I will analyze instances of *do you know* that are used by teachers to make their initial questions more specific.

Among the eighteen *do you know* instances in teacher talk analyzed in this dissertation, three are found as part of a repair sequence in third turn (5.3.1) (Kääntä, 2010; Lee, 2007; Seedhouse, 2004; Van Lier, 1994). For the remaining fifteen instances, *do you know* is used to pursue a response from the students (5.3.2). I further distinguish between simple response pursuits that seek recognition of references (5.3.2.1) and response pursuits that are employed by the teacher to make his or her initial question more specific (5.3.2.2). Before I begin my discussion of *do you know*, I would like to note that the overall number of instances of *do you know* in teacher talk compared to *do you remember* in teacher talk (see Section 5.2) was lower with 25 examples for *do you remember* and 18 for *do you know*, which might be due to the interactional functions of *do you know* and *do you remember* in classroom interactions. A closer examination of *do you know* in L2 classroom talk compared to L1 classroom talk could be addressed in the future.

5.3.1 (Do) you know: Doing repair work

Do you know recognition checks can occur in environments of repair as is shown in Figure 5.7 below. In Figure 5.7, the class is talking about software programs that allow students to make quilt designs in their geometry class. There are two software programs, one that can flip and turn quilt designs and the other called *Logo* that allows diagonal turns, but no flips and turns. Prior to the beginning of this figure, the class discusses the features of the first software.²⁴ The teacher initiates a third-turn repair after Jillian displays a problem of understanding in lines 4 and 7. The repair is followed by a *do you know* recognition check that introduces the correct referent, and contains a detailed description of the referent in question (lines 9-10, 12-13).

Figure 5.7: CB Curtis Dec 1i The software (00:38-01:20)

```
01 TEA:    do you think that's possible that you thought of something
02          that the people who designed that software didn't think of?
03 SEV:    [no.
04 JIL:    [but then the turtle
05 BTY:    maybe.
06 JIL:    went-
07 TEA:    not- but not the turtle we're not talking about Logo right
08          now honey cause Logo doesn't let us flip. you know the soft
09→       ware we used
                                     *((raises fore finger
                                     and thumb in c shape moving her hands))
10→       the other piece, the geometry and [design *that lets us make a
11 JIL:                                     [yea:h.
12 TEA:    core square and build a whole quilt family on the screen by
13          copying the core again and [again.
14 JIL:                                     [oh.
                                     *((pointing))
15 EA:     *tha:t one. we are using Logo to make quilt designs too but
16          those are different becau:se, once we make a quilt design on
17          Logo can we flip it?
18          (0.3)
19 SEV:    no:.
20 TEA:    mm no and um I don't know and (0.3) I: don't know a way to do
21          it. I don't think Logo allows us to do that. but the ↑other
22          software does allow us to mit- make flips and tu:rns. .h but
23          it doesn't allow diagonal turns.
```

²⁴ The name of the software is not mentioned here.

In lines 1-2, the teacher formulates an information request addressing the class. Several students respond with a type-conforming answer in line 3, which is in overlap with Jillian's attempt of a disagreeing response in line 4. Brittany provides another SPP answer in line 5 and Jillian tries to complete his turn before he gets interrupted by the teacher starting in line 7. The teacher initiates other-repair in line 7 responding to Jillian's previous turns in line 4 and 6. She also provides an account for why she is correcting Jillian's misunderstanding (lines 7-8) (Kääntä, 2010; Lee, 2007; Seedhouse, 2004; Van Lier, 1994). The teacher initiates a recognition check with *you know* +NP (*the software we used*, followed by another clause: *the other piece, the geometry and design that lets us make a core square and build a whole quilt family on the screen by copying the core again and again*). The teacher makes reference to something that the class has used previously, that is, another software which is different from Logo the software that the class has been using to make quilt families. Jillian claims recognition in line 11 and produces a change-of-state token in line 14 after the teacher provides a long description of the difference between Logo and the other software that they are talking about. In lines 15-17, the teacher adds another explanation pointing to a feature that is different or missing in Logo, to which she adds a rhetorical question expressed through the interrogative sentence structure *can we flip it* and the rising intonation at the end of turn in line 18. After a short silence, several students produce a type-conforming answer in line 19 to which the teacher aligns with a repeat of the type-conforming answer to mark receipt of information (Svennevig, 2004). This answer is however preceded by a hesitation marker and followed by more delays until the teacher states her uncertainty whether Logo has that flipping feature or not. She then returns to the other software, which has that feature of flipping and turning, but lacks the feature of creating diagonal turns.

The recognition check with *(do) you know* is initiated by the teacher after the other-initiation of repair and repair resolution by teacher in lines 7-8. The trouble source is the referent *that software* in line 2, which Jillian understands to be Logo, but it turns out that the teacher is talking about a different software. Jillian's misunderstanding is displayed in lines 4 and 7, which results in the teacher's correction. The repair is followed by a *do you know* recognition check that contrasts Logo with the software that the teacher is talking about, which the teacher refers to as *the other piece* listing special features of the software like geometry and design that enable them to build a quilt family on the screen. By adding a modifying clause to the NP software the teacher distinguishes the software from Logo and also provides an account why the class is using this software for their project. The modifying clause contains a past event introduced by *we used*, which conveys that Jillian has actually used that software in class. Jillian receives this with alignment in line 11. His second response in line 14 shows that the latter part of the teacher's description is new information, which is conveyed by Jillian's use of the change-of-state-token (Heritage, 1984; 1998). In line 15, the teacher refers back to the description by pointing with her forefinger while saying *that one* with a sound stretch on *that*. It is when Jillian produces the change-of-state token that intersubjectivity among the teacher and the students is established. Thus, the repair is resolved over several turns of which the incidental *you know* construction is used to seek recognition of the correct referent. After the teacher points out that the referent is not correct, the teacher adds a reason why this software cannot be Logo, that is, she states that it is missing a flipping feature. The order of the repair is thus as follows: 1. Pointing out the problem, 2. Stating the reason why the referent is wrong and 3. Checking recognition of the correct referent by giving a long description of the referent in question.

The teacher is responsible to correct a student's misunderstanding of a referent, which is relevant to the ongoing class discussion. The teacher not only initiates and resolves repair, but she delays the actual repair resolution by introducing a recognition check in order for the student to identify the actual referent. The actual referent is a software, which is not named here by the teacher, but instead she provides the important features of the software that the students have in fact already used in class. By referencing to a past event with the *(do) you know* recognition check, the teacher uses a past experience to explain or correct a student's knowledge domain about the software they have been using in class. The embedded reference to a past activity, which is very similar in its function to German *weißt du noch* 'do you remember', makes the student accountable for understanding and recognizing a difference in the software programs. The student's use of *oh* displays his transition of knowledge from K- to K+ (Goodwin, 1979), which indicates that the clarification was needed for the student to recognize the problem successfully. The teacher is responsible to help students understand concepts correctly, but she is also responsible to relate previous to new knowledge domains. Moreover, students are accountable for knowing or recognizing previously performed in-class activities. It is through these different ways of negotiating references, that knowledge domains are compared, corrected and reestablished.

5.3.2 *(Do) you know*: Pursuing a response

Do you know as a response pursuit in teacher talk can be further distinguished between recognition checks that re-elicite a response from students (5.3.2.1) and recognition checks that make a teacher's initiation or question more specific (5.3.2.2).

5.3.2.1 Simply seeking recognition

In Figure 5.8, the teacher asks his students for any difficult terms that need clarification. One of the student mentions *convex* as a problematic term. The teacher try-marks the form and initiates a recognition check with *know* + *wh*-question, which however is introduced not by the second person *you*, but by *anyone* in this example provided below.

Figure 5.8: CB TIMSSMATH Aussie 436b Convex (04:34-06:20)

```
01 T: first thing is, you need to go to the segment tool bar and
02 change it to a ray, because you want to draw rays rather than
03 segments.
04 (0.7)
05 T: and then?
06 (0.8)
07 S: °u:m, (1.7) start from one point and then go ( ) create a
08 ray. and then somewhere along that ray draw another one
09 across.°
10 T: okay. just listen carefully to what he said there. you create
11 one ray,
12 (1.3)
13 T: let me get rid of this and start again.
14 ((T writes on board for six seconds))
15 *((T turns around and looks at class))
16 T: *it'll look like that, won't it?
17 (1.2)
18 T: okay. now the next thing he said was you go somewhere along
19 that ray, and do another one.
20 (1.8)
21 T: now think carefully about that.
22 (1.4)
23 SN: you go to the point.
24 T: right. you actually start at this point that's already there.
25 you don't pick a point somewhere else.
26 (0.3)
27 *((T draws on board)) *((points to board))
28 T: *start at that point (0.2) *to make sure that the new one you
29 draw is joined on to the old one (.) rather than separate. so,
30 you actually start with that one.
31 (0.7)
32 *((T points to screen))
33 T: *when you read through this you'll see that it (.) does all of
34 that. now what haven't we explained yet?
35 (0.7)
36 SN: °convex.°
37 *((T looks at class))
38 →T: *convex, anyone know what convex is,
39 (2.0)
40 *((T turns to board and cleans the board))
41 T: *anyone know there's a word that's the opposite of convex.
```

Figure 5.8: CB TIMSSMATH Aussie 436b Convex (04:34-06:20) (cont.)

37 (0.6)
38 SN: o::h.
39 (4.2) ((T writes convex on board, SN raises her hand and T
 points at SN))
40 SN: doesn't convex mean, its like, um, when you have glasses
41 there's uh, () convex lens is the one which is curved?
42 *((T nods))
43 T: *°curved. ye:s.° curved which way? that's the key thing.
44 (0.4)
45 SN: outside.
46 SN: inside.
47 (0.3)
48 S: outside.
49 T: yeah. curved inside.

At the start of Figure 5.8, the teacher gives students instructions about drawing rays (lines 1-3). After a short silence, the teacher directs a question in line 5, which is received with silence by the students in line 6. In lines 7-9, one student self-selects and responds continuing the teacher's turn. The teacher receives this with an acknowledgement token and further adds a comment referencing back to the student's answer in the previous turn. He stresses the first syllable of the verb *create* (lines 10-11). The teacher continues in line 13 by cleaning the board while commenting on what he is doing before he starts writing on the board for the next six seconds. In line 15, the teacher formulates known-answer question, which is conveyed through the question tag at the end of the turn. He is looking at the class while he is formulating his information request. After no verbal uptake²⁵, the teacher resumes with *okay* and repeats the next step the student mentioned earlier. He then adds a comment asking the students to think about this step the student proposed (line 20). One of the students responds in line 22, to which the teacher responds with *right* and an initiation of pedagogical correction in lines 23-25. The teacher then provides more specific instructions (lines 26-28) using the board by drawing and pointing to it.

²⁵ The camera is only recording the teacher. For this part of the classroom talk, non-verbal responses from the students could therefore not be included in this transcript.

Next, the teacher initiates another question while pointing to the screen in lines 30-31. One of the students gives an answer produced in a soft voice in line 33 after a short silence in the previous line. The teacher repeats the answer at the beginning of his turn in line 34 and produces a recognition check with the verb *know* asking for an explanation/definition of the word. The teacher produces this turn looking at the class. There is no uptake by the students in line 35 and the teacher turns to the board and cleans it before he self-selects and formulates another recognition check with *know*. This time the teacher makes reference to the opposite term of the referent *convex*, which he again marks prosodically in line 36. The second recognition check is however produced with falling intonation. After a short pause, one student produces a change-of-state token in line 38. The teacher writes *convex* on the board when a student raises her hand and is selected by the teacher. The student attempts to answer the teacher's question in line 34. Based on this turn, the display question (Brock, 1986; Long & Sato, 1983) in line 34 is not treated as a recognition check, but treated as an information request checking the knowledge of students, which the student in lines 40-41 tries to answer. The student frames his question with *doesn't convex mean*, therefore turning her answer into a question to communicate that she is not sure about her answer. The teacher nods and then picks up on a word that the student provided repeating the word and adding a confirmation token (line 42). This is followed by the teacher's expansion of the turn adding an assessment.

There are two recognition checks introduced by the teacher in this figure. The teacher is asking the students for any technical terms they do not know. The term *convex* is given by one of the students, which the teacher repeats with slightly rising intonation and stretch on the vowel of the second syllable. Immediately after the referent is given, the teacher checks the students' knowledge of the technical term. The teacher uses here *anyone* instead of *you* or *do you*, which

signals that he is addressing this question to the entire class and anyone who knows this term is accountable to speak. There is no uptake from the participants which results in the teacher producing a second *anyone + know* recognition this time asking for the opposite term of *convex*. This second recognition check also receives no immediate response until a student produces a claim of understanding with the change-of-state-token *oh* in line 38 and a candidate understanding in lines 40-41. The second recognition check is here used as a hint in order to recognize the first referent, which is *convex* (line 34). While the first recognition check is simply seeking students' recognition of the referent, the second recognition check is giving the students a clue, which is similar to *remember* constructions in teacher talk as discussed in Section 5.1. A more detailed analysis of the second instance of *anyone know* in this figure will be provided in Figure 5.12 below.

The teacher's epistemic authority is displayed as early as he asks the students for any terms that needs to be explained. By naming *convex* as a term that needs to be explained, the student claims a lack of knowledge of this term (Sert, 2011). The teacher repeats the term, which might be due to the soft production of *convex* by the student in line 33 or it might be due to the exact pronunciation of the word with stress on the second syllable. Given that the teacher has offered that students can ask any unknown terms in the first place, makes the teacher responsible for explaining terms and gives the students the right not only to ask questions but also to claim lack of knowledge. Therefore, the teacher assumes that students might not know or recognize this term, which means that he has no or less expectation about his students' knowledge. The hint he gives in line 36 in form of a recognition check is based on his knowledge or expectation of knowledge that students will be able to recognize the relationship and figure out the meaning of *convex* by pointing to the opposite meaning of the referent.

Different from the previous figure where the teacher addresses all recipients engaged in the conversation or all students in class, Figure 5.9 presents an instance where the teacher is selecting a specific speaker. In Figure 5.9, which is taken from a geometry class, the teacher has posted sets of colored sheets on the board asking the students to name the single colors. In line 1, the teacher requests information about the number of colors of the set of colored sheets that Kevin has already found. After a short series of question-answer sequences, the teacher moves on to the next set of colored sheets in lines 19 to 20 before she selects Alex as the next speaker to answer her question.

Figure 5.9: CB Curtis dec13g Three colors (00:26-01:36)

```

01 TEA: so how many colors did you just say so far Kevin.
02 KEV: two.
          *((TEA pointing at a set of colored sheets on the board))
03 TEA: two. *so blue green a:nd,
04 STU: bluegreen.
05      (0.9)
06 STU: blue:.=
          *((TEA pointing at the blue green colored sheet))
07 TEA: =*Kevin (1.0) what's that last color.
08      (0.6)
09 KEV: °bluegreen.°
10      (0.3)
          *((TEA pointing at blue sheet)) *((pointing at green sheet))
11 TEA: *here's blue,                *here's green,
12      (0.4)
          *((TEA pointing at blue green sheet))
13      *what's tha:t color.
14 STU: °greenblue.°
15 TEA: bluegreen.
16      (0.5)
17      yep always say the um (.) primary color first yep.
18      (0.2)
          *((TEA posts another set of colored sheets on the board))
19 TEA: *okay and how about the last (.) combination we already talked
20→    about this one a little bi:t, Alex >do you know what those
21→    three colors are?<
22      (0.3)
23 ALX: redorange orange and re:d.
24 TEA: yep. re:d orange and redorange. .h now there are lots of
25      other combinations, Vanessa's suggestion- no Katie's I'm
26      sorry. of blue violet violet and red violet was no:t (0.6) um
27      there was nothing wrong with her suggestion just from the
28      colors that are already cut and that we had here in the room.
29      here were three sets of adjacent colors, that I can offer you

```

Figure 5.9: CB Curtis dec13g Three colors (00:26-01:36) (cont.)

30 to choose from this time. ↑bu:t besides color (0.2) Alex has
31 one idea and I have some other ideas if you don't about what
32 else you can do. so we're gonna choose new sets of colors for
33 our two by two designs for the final quilts, Teddy could you
34 sit down flat?
35 (0.4)
36 TEA: Alex please tell us what else we could do to make our quilts
37 better since it'll be our final quilt project.
38 ALX: you should do your ve:ry very be:st.

In line 1, the teacher asks a question and selects Kevin as the next speaker, who responds in the next turn. The teacher repeats the answer and names the two colors Kevin named prior to this exact (line 3). She ends her turn with slightly rising intonation, which elicits a response from the students. In line 4, one student repeats the two colors, which is followed by silence before the student self-selects adding another color. The teacher again selects Kevin as the next speaker to answer her next question (line 7). After a short silence, Kevin repeats his answer, which he produces with a soft voice. The teacher first points to the blue sheet, then to the green sheet (line 11) before she points to the blue green sheet changing her previous question from *what's that last color* to *what's that color* (line 13). In this figure, the teacher reformulates her question to pursue a response (Svennevig, 2013) from the student by making the question more accessible and answerable for the student. The sound stretch in *that* in line 13 further indicates that she is referencing a specific color. The student changes his previous answer to *green blue*, with which the teacher disaligns by repeating (Kääntä, 2010; Park, 2013) the student's original answer to this question. After a short silence, the teacher confirms and adds an instruction in line 17 that should help students talk about colors correctly. The teacher then produces an acknowledgement token and formulates another question *how about the last combination*. She asks Alex to answer her question *do you know what those three colors are*. Alex gives an answer in line 23, and the teacher aligns and repeats Alex's answer (line 24). The teacher then adds information about the

possible combinations of colors referencing Katie's suggestion. Furthermore, the teacher continues by showing students the three sets of adjacent colors from which they can choose (lines 29-30) and introduces the next task to the students, which refers to the final quilts the students are supposed to create. The teacher again selects Alex to answer her question in line 37, which Alex orients to with an answer that contains two usages of intensifiers and an extreme case formulation with a sound stretch on the first intensifier and the superlative form *best* (line 38).

The recognition check in lines 20 to 21 is seeking recognition of the three colors of the last combination, which the class has discussed earlier. The teacher thus makes reference to a past class discussion, which the teacher assumes to be familiar to the students. The teacher however uses *a little bit* mitigating the pressure she puts on her students (line 20). By selecting the next speaker, the teacher narrows down the recipient to a single person making him accountable to respond to the teacher's question. The *do you know wh*-question is produced more quickly and with rising intonation at the end of the turn in line 21. The teacher not only seeks recognition of the referent (Koole, 2010), but formulates a request asking Alex to name the three colors, which Alex does in line 23. The teacher is therefore not only checking recognition, but also knowledge of a reference, which in this case is a combination of three colors.

The teacher in this figure initiates a series of questions, which the students attempt to answer before the teacher provides an evaluation. In other words, this figure is following the basic IRE sequential structure. After the teacher provides a correction followed by an evaluation in lines 15 and 17, the teacher moves on to prepare the next initiation part. The teacher drives the conversation forward deciding on when to initiate a new action, selecting next speakers and providing students with reference points to remember previous lesson and materials that guide

students in relating and understanding topics and questions from a larger context. The teacher in Figure 5.9 makes a subsequent pursuit using another set of colored sheets to elicit correct answers from students. In addition, in eight out of ten of the instances of *do you know* used by teachers to simply seek recognition, teachers pursue responses from students after a lack of immediate response or after no response. The teacher not only seeks recognition of previous knowledge, but also pursues students' answers to questions based on the expectation of previous knowledge that has been learned together in class.

5.3.2.2 Making a question more specific

Apart from simple recognition checks introduced with *do you know*, teachers can also use *do you know* constructions to formulate a more specific question. In the next example in Figure 5.10, a *do you know* construction is employed to make the initiation (I) of an IRE sequence more specific. After the teacher requests information at the beginning of line 5, she halts her talk to check recognition of a particular *core square building mat* (line 5-6), which she uses later in the remainder of her turn to make her initial question more specific.

Figure 5.10: CB Curtis nov28e That core square (01:03-02:09)

01 TEA: I've decided on a design for my core square I laid out my
 02 shapes I really like the way they look I know what colors
 03 I'm going to use-
 04 STU: ()
 05→ TEA: what am I going to make to help me. I've just got- **you know**
 06→ **that core square building mat where we rearranged shapes?**
 07 what if I did a design on that core square building mat,
 08 (0.2) what do I need to do next.
 09 (2.0)
 10 BRI: I don't know.
 11 TEA: hmm, who can help Brian out.
 12 (0.6)
 13 TEA: who can help him out. Nicole what'll I need to do next.
 14 NIC: um (1.7) figure out what (0.4) six (5.0) six family (2.0) um
 15 [quilt-

Figure 5.10: CB Curtis nov28e That core square (01:03-02:09) (cont.)

16 TEA [well I have two two by two designs, that is my goal is to
17 find five or six different two by two designs (.) that I can
18 make from my core square, a:ll of them would be different.
19 what will I need to help me figure that out. that's kind of
20 a big jo::b,
21 (0.3)
22 TEA: coming up with five or six different de[signs from the same
23 STU: [yeah.
24 TEA: core square. so you guys are going to be able to do it just
25 fine because today you did wo:nderfully.

In lines 1 to 3, the teacher is describing a scenario in order to prepare her actual question, which she formulates in line 5. She then continues with more instructions, which she cuts off to introduce a recognition check with *you know* that makes reference to a specific core square building mat (lines 5-6). The referent is further modified by a past experience that involved the referent, which is again very similar in its function to *weißt du noch* ‘do you remember’ in German. Without waiting for a response from her students, the teacher returns to her initial question specifying the scenario by referencing the core square building mat. This is followed by silence in line 9 before Brian responds with lack of sufficient knowledge *I don’t know* in line 10 (Sert, 2011). In line 11, the teacher produces a hesitation marker and addresses all students asking them to answer the question. After a short silence, the teacher repeats her request (Svennevig, 2008) and then selects Nicole as the next speaker (line 13). Nicole gives a response in lines 14-15, which the teacher interrupts providing a more specific description of the problem. She then reformulates her question, which is followed by an assessment (lines 19-20). The teacher adds more details before she makes a positive summary assessment in lines 24-25. Her question remains unanswered here.

The teacher introduces a referent through the recognition check with *you know*, which is employed to make a question more specific and thus more accessible to the students. Thus, the recognition check is intended to help them in answering the question. The teacher refers to a core

square building mat that they have used in class to rearrange shapes. The use of the demonstrative *that* indicates that the teacher presumes recognition of the referent. The core square building mat becomes the locus of the hypothetical scenario that the teacher creates to elicit a response from her students (lines 7-8). By adding *where we re-arranged shapes*, the teacher points to a shared experience, which she can therefore presume to be available in her students' knowledge domains. This might explain why she is not waiting for a claim or display of recognition from her students. The teacher moves on with her actual question. Brian's lack of knowledge makes her select another speaker to answer the question.

Even though teachers can presume knowledge from the students, examples as shown in Figure 5.10 are frequent in classroom situations. Teachers can refer back to previous activities to explain concepts and as this instance demonstrated to make a question more specific that helps students to better answer a question. Participants may experience together, but they may not all remember things equally. Reference points are useful resources to secure common ground among speakers. In this example a recognition check of the referent is combined with a reference to a past activity that involved the referent, which is needed to answer the teacher's question.

Figure 5.11 is a third example of a *do you know* recognition check that is reformulating a question (Svennevig, 2013). In this figure, a recognition check is initiated after a first recognition check has been made (line 34) and after a lack of uptake from the students (line 35). The first recognition check has already been discussed in the previous section, which is why I will only focus on the discussion of the second recognition check in line 36.

Figure 5.11: CB TIMSSMATH Aussie 436b Opposite of convex (04:34-06:20)

```

01  T:   first thing is, you need to go to the segment tool bar and
02        change it to a ray, because you want to draw rays rather than
03        segments.
04        (0.7)
05  T:   and then?
06        (0.8)

```


Figure 5.11: CB TIMSSMATH Aussie 436b Opposite of convex (04:34-06:20) (cont.)

07 S: °u:m, (1.7) start from one point and then go () create a
 08 ray. and then somewhere along that ray draw another one
 09 across.°
 10 T: okay. just listen carefully to what he said there. you create
 11 one ray,
 12 (1.3)
 13 T: let me get rid of this and start again.
 14 ((T writes on board for six seconds))
 15 T: *it'll look like that, won't it?
 16 (1.2)
 17 T: okay. now the next thing he said was you go somewhere along
 18 that ray, and do another one.
 19 (1.8)
 20 T: now think carefully about that.
 21 (1.4)
 22 SN: you go to the point.
 23 T: right. you actually sta:rt at this point that's already there.
 24 you don't pick a point somewhere else.
 25 (0.3)
 26 T: *start at that point (0.2) *to make sure that the new one you
 27 draw is joined on to the old one (.) rather than separate. so,
 28 you actually start with that one.
 29 (0.7)
 30 T: *when you read through this you'll see that it (.) does all of
 31 that. now what haven't we explained yet?
 32 (0.7)
 33 SN: °convex.°
 34 T: *convex, anyone know what convex is,
 35 (2.0)
 36→T: *anyone kno::w there's a word that's the opposite of convex.
 37 (0.6)
 38 SN: o::h.
 39 (4.2) ((T writes convex on board, SN raises her hand and T
 points at SN))
 40 SN: doesn't convex mean, its like, um, when you have glasses
 41 there's uh, () convex lens is the one which is curved?
 42 *(T nods))
 43 T: *°curved. ye:s.° curved which way? that's the key thing.
 44 (0.4)
 45 SN: outside.
 46 SN: inside.
 47 (0.3)
 48 S: outside.
 49 T: yeah. curved inside.

In Figure 5.11, the teacher asks his students for any difficult terms that need clarification. One of the student mentions *convex* as a problematic term. The teacher initiates a recognition check with

know + *wh*-question in line 34. After a lack of uptake by the students in line 35, the teacher formulates another recognition check with *anyone know* in line 36. While producing the question, the teacher turns to the board and cleans it. Thus, he is not able to see his students' non-verbal responses to his first recognition check.

This recognition check is produced with a sound stretch on the verb *know* and like the first recognition check (line 34), it contains *anyone* instead of *you* addressing one person out of the class to answer his question. The referent in question is introduced by a clause *there's a word that's the opposite of convex*, which is different from *anyone know the opposite of convex*. Given that the teacher had asked the students to name terms that need explanation, the teacher cannot presuppose that students know the term. However, he can check whether there is anyone else in this classroom who knows this term. The lack of uptake is treated by the teacher as lack of knowledge, which is why he provides a hint by referencing to the opposite meaning of *convex* that might help to get to the actual meaning of *convex*.

As is shown in this example, teachers design and redesign their utterances and in particular, their questions according to their students' needs and responses throughout classroom interactions. In this sense, teachers seem to be particularly more attentive to their recipients' responses, which may be either verbal or non-verbal. Moreover, teachers can provide students with clues by eliciting recognition checks that guide students to figure out the right answer to the teacher's question.

5.3.3 Conclusion of *do you know* in teacher talk

In summary, *do you know* recognition checks in teacher talk are notably not only checking recognition, but also seek display of knowledge (Koole, 2010) from the students. When

do you know constructions occur in repair sequences, the teacher may use *do you know* to account for the correct answer after the teacher's evaluation has been given and after repair has been initiated by the teacher. Thus, the teacher points to something that helps students understand the problem and the reason for correction. In this context, the teacher often does not wait for a response from students, but continues with her repair sequence, which is different from *do you know* functioning as a response pursuit. When pursuing a response from students, teachers may simply elicit recognition of references or they may reformulate or make a previous teacher question's more specific. Making a question more specific allows the teacher to redesign a teacher's previous utterance and to avoid silence or lack of uptake from students. Thus, it gives students more time to answer questions. Moreover, teachers' reformulation or specification of question can provide students with additional clues in finding the correct answer to the question.

5.4 Comparison of *do you remember* and *do you know* in teacher talk

This section compares the findings on *do you remember* and *do you know* as employed by teachers in classroom talk. Apart from the common interactional function of checking recognition of references, teachers use *do you remember* and *do you know* to establish intersubjectivity among students. Both constructions occur in presequences or incidental sequences of classroom talk and are initiated by the teacher to fulfill various interactional functions in the classroom, which are different from the functions of *do you remember* and *do you know* observed in everyday conversation. A closer examination of the similarities and differences between *do you remember* and *do you know* in everyday and classroom interaction will be given in the next chapter of the dissertation.

As was shown in the analysis, *do you remember* and *do you know* occur in different action environments. While *do you remember* is found in situations where students are reminded, in environments where step-by-step information is provided and in situations where hints are given, *do you know* is observed in sequences that initiate repair on student's talk and environments when teachers are pursuing a response. As a response pursuit, the teacher uses *do you know* to simply check recognition or to reformulate a question. If questions are reformulated or specified by the teacher, the teacher initiates self-repair on his or her own talk. In this regard, *do you know* can serve both functions, that is, to do repair work and to pursue a response.

In line with the findings of Pomerantz' (1984) study on response pursuits in everyday conversation, *do you know* is initiated by the speaker to avoid referential problems, wrong expectations of shared knowledge or actions that give rise to disagreement. By checking whether a referent is known, *do you know* gives speakers the opportunity to modify their previous talk or prepare an upcoming main activity. The findings further confirm the prior work on response pursuits in classroom interactions such as "expanded question sequences" (Gardner, 2004) or "multiple questions" (Kasper & Ross, 2007). Questions allow students time to formulate a response or give them clues (such as second alternatives proposed by Koshik, (2005)) to produce the correct answer. *Do you know* is one type of question that teachers employ to pursue a student response or to do repair work on their own talk.

Another difference between *do you know* and *do you remember* lies in the number of instances found for this collection. My entire collection had 18 instances of *do you know* in classroom talk compared to 25 examples of *do you remember*. The higher frequency of *do you remember* in teacher talk might be due to the limitations of the data, which were largely drawn from the same classroom talk (a geometry class taught by a female teacher). Moreover, most of

the data is based on L1 classroom interactions, which might be another explanation suggesting that L2 classroom interactions might include more instances of *do you know* recognition checks based on the students' lack or limited access of vocabulary. Another explanation might be that *do you know* as an other-initiated repair is a dispreferred action and therefore may be less frequently found in classroom talk. On the other hand, *do you remember* used to provide step-by-step information, to remind students or to give hints are all illustrative moves that help the students to achieve mutual understanding or agreement in the classroom.

Lastly, the analyses of Figure 5.10 and 5.11 have shown that *do you know* may sometimes be similar in its function to *do you remember*. In Figure 5.10, *do you know* makes reference to a shared past event to do reminding, which is analyzed in Section 5.2.1 as an interactional function of *do you remember*. In Figure 5.11, the *do you know* construction is giving students a hint, which is analyzed in Section 5.2.3 as an action environment of *do you remember*. Even if the two constructions are different in their specific interactional functions, the overall interactional function remains the same, which may explain that in a few instances *do you know* may take over some of the interactional functions of *do you remember* or vice versa. However, to confirm these findings more research and data are needed. In addition, *weißt du noch* in German may be equivalent to *do you remember* in English (Chapter 3). This might also support the idea that the two forms may sometimes be employed in the same contexts creating only minor or no functional differences.

Chapter 6: Conclusion

6.1 Summary of findings

Do you remember and *do you know* constructions in English and German are practices to check recognition of references in conversation. In my investigation of *do you remember* recognition checks in Chapter 3, I observed that *do you remember* constructions in English and German occur in similar action environments. While English *do you remember* constructions are found in situations of challenges, claim-backing situations and direction-giving environments, German *erinnern* recognition checks occur in action environments of challenges, claim-backing situations and situations where speakers seek recognition from their participants to elicit a telling or information prior to a larger action. For both English and German, speakers back up claims with memory that is assumed to be in the knowledge domain of the recipient (Antaki & Leudar, 1990; Golato, 2012). Moreover, when challenging or being challenged by other participants, speakers can make reference to shared past memories to initiate or return a challenge. Independent of their sequential position or their position within a turn, *do you remember* in both English and German are expansions of talk that help to structure sequences and turns to avoid problems of intersubjectivity (Auer, 1984; Schegloff et al., 1977) and to establish common ground among participants.

Recognition checks with *do you remember* and *kannst (du) dich erinnern* may be shortened in spoken language. Thus, *remember* + noun phrase as an interrogative can stand on its own without the subject *you* and the auxiliary *do*, and the subject pronoun *du* in German *kannst* + *dich erinnern* + noun phrase can also be omitted. This may very well be the case because participants engaged in a conversation know who their recipients are and when they are talked to. Moreover, in spoken language, speakers can make use of other means like prosody (e.g.

intonation), gaze or other non-verbal behavior to indicate that they are soliciting a response from the recipient.

Another important finding is the use of adverbs and particles in German. *Noch* ‘still’ in German is found together with *kannst (du) dich erinnern* ‘can you remember’ to lower the expectation that is associated with *erinnern*, but is also found with *weißt du noch* and *kennst du noch*. Both literally translate to ‘do you still know’ but in terms of their interactional function, the correct translation is ‘do you remember’. In other words, *weißt du* and *kennst du* are translated into English with *do you remember* only if combined with the adverb *noch* in German. If *noch* is not included, *weißt du* and *kennst du* check knowledge, which in English can be achieved with *do you know*. Furthermore, *doch* and *ja* are two particles that were found in the immediate sequential environment of *kannst (du) dich erinnern* instances that are employed to claim and display an assumption of shared epistemic access to what is talked about (Lütten, 1979; Möllering, 2001).

Furthermore, *remember* and *erinnern* recognition checks exhibit differences in the syntactic realizations of forms. While English uses *(do you) remember* or *d’you remember* + noun phrase, German uses *erinnerst (du) dich* and *kannst (du) dich erinnern* + noun phrase, *weißt du noch* + clause and *kennst du noch* + noun phrase which literally translates into English as ‘do you still know’. In my small set of instances with *weißt du noch* and *kennst du noch*, I found that *weißt du noch* examples make reference to a shared past event or experience whereas *kennst du noch* examples make reference to a presumably known person or object encountered or experienced in the past.

In addition, *remember* and *erinnern* support a speaker’s course of action. Whether they are used to back up claims, counter-challenge, give directions or elicit information or a telling

prior to a larger action, they are supporting the speaker's main activity. *Remember* and *erinnern* do so by tapping participants' joint memory, which serves as a convincing tool to align with the speaker. Speakers also orient to recipients' display or lack of assumed knowledge. Therefore, *remember/erinnern* recognition checks are one practice for achieving alignment.

Based on the findings of Chapter 4, *do you know* constructions in English are employed in situations, in which speakers give directions, initiate topic shifts, and pursue a response after no or insufficient uptake from the participants (Bolden et al., 2012). For German, *kennst du* and *weißt du* recognition checks are found in very similar environments such as to pursue a response or initiate topic shifts. An environment observed in German, but not in English are simple recognition checks that do nothing but checking recognition of references. German further distinguishes between the two forms *kennst du* and *weißt du*. In my data, *kennst du* recognition checks signal that the speaker has a certain expectation towards the recipient to recognize the referent, to which the recipient can orient with a display of recognition such as through (shared) personal experiences. *Weißt du* recognition checks convey that the speaker owns epistemic access to the referent and the speaker does not expect the recipient to have epistemic access to the referent.

Participants orient to *do you know* recognition checks with claims or displays of recognition. *Do you know* constructions in English are introduced after a lack of uptake pursuing a response from the recipient or are responsive to another participant's prior talk. Similar to *kannst (du) dich dran erinnern*, *erinnerst (du) dich*, *kennst du noch* and *weißt du noch*, instances of *kennst du* and *weißt du* recognition checks are responded to by recipients with response tokens such as *ja* 'yes' which claim recognition (Golato & Fagyal, 2008) or through double sayings of

ja ‘yes’ that signal that the referent is known and that the action of checking recognition should be halted (Golato & Fagyal, 2008).

While English *do you know* has a few variants including *d’you know*, *you know* and *y’know*, German has two different lexical realizations, namely, *kennen* and *wissen* (Fukuda, 1970; Pecko, 1985; Reimann, 2003). Similar to English, the personal pronoun and verb forms can be contracted in spoken German resulting in *kennste* and *weißt*. German *kennen* and *wissen* are also different in their syntactic distributions. *Kennst du* in German is usually followed by a noun phrase and *weißt du* by a clause, which contrasts to English with *do you know* being followed either by a noun or a clause.

Chapter 5 on *do you remember* in teacher talk discussed how teachers employ recognition checks to remind students, provide step-by-step information, connect new with old information or give hints that guide students in finding the correct answer. Teachers not only check recognition of shared memory to achieve common ground among students, but teachers may avoid dispreferred negative evaluations with *do you remember*. Teachers introduce *do you remember* checks as a clue to guide students to the correct answer.

Compared to *do you remember*, *do you know* in teacher talk is used to check recognition and to elicit display of knowledge (Koole, 2010) from the students. In repair sequences, *do you know* accounts for the correct answer after the teacher’s evaluation. The account points to the problem and gives the reason for correction. In response pursuits, *do you know* constructions reformulate or make a teacher’s original question more specific, or seek simple recognition of references from students.

To summarize the differences between *do you remember* and *do you know* in teacher talk, *do you remember* organizes classroom talk by giving step-by-step information or connecting old

with new information. As a matter of fact, novice teachers are typically taught that building new knowledge on the basis of already existing knowledge is a best practice. In contrast *do you know* either self-repairs teacher talk by reformulating or making a previous teacher question more specific, or merely checks recognition of references.

To conclude, the two constructions *do you remember* and *do you know* fulfill different interactional purposes in classroom interaction, but serve the same overall purpose, which is to establish common ground. However, as was shown through the analysis of examples in chapter 5, the two constructions have their specific functions and environments in talk. Depending on whether they remind students, provide step-by-step information, connect new with old information, repair or halt talk to ensure recognition of references, the teacher may introduce *remember/know* recognition checks to avoid giving negative evaluations and to guide students to the correct answers. That way, it allows both students and teachers to negotiate references in such a way that helps to uphold the progressivity of talk while establishing a mutual ground of understanding and knowledge in the classroom. Even if it is not guaranteed that all students share the same level of understanding or knowledge, the teacher's responsibility is to address students' needs and questions.

6.1.1 A comparison of *do you remember* and *do you know*

As was pointed out at the end of Chapter 3, when *do you remember* and *do you know* in English occur together in the same sequence of conversation, then *do you know* usually precedes *do you remember* constructions. The assumption that was proposed in the chapter was that *do you know* is less “imposing” on the recipient's knowledge domain. “Imposing” meaning that speakers expect less epistemic access from recipients than they would with *do you remember*.

What the two constructions have in common is the overall goal of establishing intersubjectivity among participants. The environments in which the two constructions occur are overlapping in only one environment, that is, when speakers give directions. By using *do you know* constructions, the speaker uses references as landmarks that guide the recipient to the target location.

In German, the two constructions are even more overlapping due to the lexical variants of German *remember*, which include the two forms *kennst du noch* and *weißt du noch*. It is the adverb *noch* that makes the meaning difference, whether the speaker makes a shared past reference (*do you remember*) or a knowledge check (*do you know*). Apart from the structural similarities, German seems to have more variants to express participants' epistemic status, stances and access. *Kennen* and *wissen* convey different ways to own knowledge, which is also reflected in the subtle meaning differences for *kannst (du) dich erinnern / erinnerst (du) dich / kennst du noch* and *weißt du noch*. For *kennst du noch* and *weißt du noch*, the particle *noch* 'still' signals the expectation of an available reference that used to be in the knowledge domain of the recipient. The speaker therefore needs to check recognition to ensure that the participants mutually agree with how much knowledge is shared.

The question arises why German has so many variants and particles to express epistemic relationships, but English does not. It seems that *do you remember* and *do you know* constructions in English allow speakers to convey sufficient epistemic meaning for recipients to make the correct inferences. The sequential context to which participants orient may further play a role in indexing epistemic relationships throughout talk. Romance languages like Spanish, Italian and French also have two forms for the verb *to know* respectively. This suggests that languages with two verb forms for *to know* may have a different conceptualization or

interpretation of knowledge and epistemic relationships that is differentiated by its users compared to languages like English that has only one verb form for *to know*.

6.1.2 Everyday conversation and teacher talk

Since Chapters 3 and 4 were examining everyday conversational data and Chapter 5 institutional, specifically, classroom talk, this section will compare similarities and differences in the use of *do you remember* and *do you know* in these two different contextual environments.

Do you remember in everyday conversation is primarily used to support a speaker's action such as back up a claim, provide landmarks and challenge another participant. In teacher talk however, *do you remember* serves an additional, very distinct interactional function that organizes teacher talk, namely, providing step-by-step information or linking new with old information in classroom discussions. Thus, it allows teachers to connect previous to ongoing classroom interactions, which facilitate the overall management of classroom interaction.

Another point of comparison relates to the teacher's expectation of knowledge or recognition. In everyday conversation, participants depending on their social relationship to each other expect more knowledge (K+) or less knowledge (K-) from their recipients (Goodwin, 1987; Heritage, 2002; Heritage & Raymond, 2005). Usually if speakers in everyday conversation make use of *do you remember* constructions, the probability is high that the recipient has sufficient epistemic access or at least, the speaker expects the recipient to have sufficient access. For classroom talk however, teachers may expect knowledge if it is something the teacher has been teaching the class for a while, or insufficient or lack of knowledge / recognition if the teacher is not sure about students' epistemic access of the referent. As a teacher, he or she is responsible to pass on knowledge and to ensure that all students are sharing the same level of information. This

means that the teacher cannot just reject or ignore students' claims of insufficient knowledge (Sert, 2011; Sert & Walsh, 2012), but may solicit recognition and may even test or challenge students' understanding, recognition and knowledge of references.

Do you know in everyday conversation and in teacher talk is employed by speakers to initiate a topic shift or pursue a response. What both functions have in common is that the speaker is simultaneously pushing talk forward and recipient-designing his talk so that the recipient can orient to the speaker's agenda. By initiating self-repair, the speaker recipient-designs his or her talk. Reformulations allow recipients more time to think about answers and to revise answers if needed. As was shown in the examples for teacher talk, the teacher delays his or her evaluation and thus, avoids dispreferred evaluations.

In addition, teachers check students' knowledge with *do you know* to prepare and navigate the upcoming teacher talk. Depending on students' lack of access of knowledge or understanding, the teacher is responsible to clarify and provide more information that help to guide students to the correct answer. Consequently, it is a common tool that is used by teachers to continually prove students' epistemic stance. Students may claim to know (epistemic stance), even if they do not know the answer. Display of knowledge or understanding is therefore important, and teachers may use *do you know* in teacher talk to proffer/solicit knowledge or understanding displays that help to address and assess students' performances and needs more effectively.

6.1.3 Limitations

As was already pointed out throughout this dissertation, there are a number of limitations to this study. These include the large number of audio-recorded face-to-face conversations that I

used for my English and German data of everyday conversation. Even if my data included both video-recorded face-to-face conversations and phone conversations of German and English, audio-recorded face-to-face interactions do not reflect multi-modal behavior in neither the transcripts nor the analysis.

Another limitation concerns the number of instances. Overall, the number of instances in relation to the phenomenon under investigation could be higher. Given the great number of forms and variants, I tried to reduce the amount of data in order not to get lost in the number of instances, but at the same time I made sure to have enough examples to propose the pattern of a practice. The action environments can therefore not be generalized to be the sole environments in which *do you know* and *do you remember* occur. Nor do the findings suggest that the action environments observed for English are not found in German or vice versa. As far as the classroom data is concerned, most of the data is based on L1 classroom talk, which might explain the lower number of instances of *do you know* recognition checks compared to *do you remember* recognition checks. Moreover, the classroom data are largely drawn from the same classroom interaction, a geometry class taught by a female teacher, which further limits the variety of data of teacher talk. More research is needed to expand the findings of this dissertation.

6.2 Implications

The implications of this dissertation are manifold. First, the examination of reference with *do you remember* suggests that participants engage in conversation to solve referential problems to achieve intersubjectivity. This study has implications on how intersubjectivity is achieved through grammatical constructions that tap on participants' joint memory and (shared) knowledge and/or understanding.

Second, the analysis of *do you know* and *do you remember* has shown that speaker expectations tied to a grammatical expression determine what form is used over the other. Therefore, speakers recipient-design their turns according to what they expect to be known by recipients and this expectation is further conveyed to the recipient through the lexical selection of the verbs *know* and *remember*. Despite the different interactional functions the two verbs perform, references to knowledge and memory are highly interrelated given that recognition presupposes that a certain reference is available in the knowledge domain of a recipient and thus, known to the recipient.

Third, the comparison of English and German *do you remember* and *do you know* has shown that German has more lexical variants than English for both *do you know* and *do you remember*. The use of particles in German again demonstrates how much semantic meaning can be added to an utterance depending on the presence or absence of a German adverb, in this case, *noch* ‘still’. This again emphasizes the importance of research on German particles (e.g., Harden & Hentschel, 2010). English, on the other hand, can convey all these subtle meaning differences without having a great number of expressions, which implies that not the number of forms is important in the successful understanding or recognition of references, but participants’ negotiating practices of reference. Recipient-design and knowledge expectations are crucial in determining the success of resolving or avoiding referential problems to occur in talk (Sacks & Schegloff, 1979).

Fourth, recognition checks as a practice in conversation not only achieve intersubjectivity (Auer, 1984; Schegloff et al., 1977), but they also avoid misalignment among participants such as dispreferred negative evaluations in teacher talk. The general preference for supporting actions (Pomerantz, 1978) or alignment is another driving principle that can be observed in these

practices with *do you remember* and *do you know*. However, it was also observed that challenges and claim-backing situations were found to be misaligning courses of actions. In these contexts, the preference for mutual recognition or intersubjectivity seems to prevail over the principle for alignment in conversation.

Fifth, *do you remember* recognition checks in English and German are used for claim-backing (Antaki and Leudar, 1990) to support an argument based on shared experience between participants. Speakers can deflate a counter-argument or provide powerful evidence for claims by referring to experiences that are part of the recipient's knowledge domain, which presents a clever practice of arguing for interlocutors. This finding has implications for research on argumentation, reasoning and rhetoric. As was pointed out earlier, tapping participants' joint memory serves as a convincing tool to align with the speaker.

Lastly, the study has implications for teacher talk and how teachers could monitor and structure classroom more efficiently to ensure students' understanding and recognition of references. The study suggests that response pursuits through *do you remember* and *do you know* as well as self-repair strategies such as reformulation of questions (Drew, 1981; Gardner, 2004; Kasper & Ross, 2007; Zemel & Koschmann, 2011) can help to elicit student response and guide students to correct answers without evaluating their lack of or insufficient responses negatively.

6.3 Future research

Given the scope and limitations of this dissertation, this dissertation has opened a number of doors for future work. This includes the investigation of the similarities and differences between turn-final *remember* or *know* checks and turn-initial *do you remember* or *do you know* + referent recognition checks in both English and German. Future research might also investigate

action environments other than the ones observed for this data or even more overlapping action environments among the different grammatical constructions. An action environment of *do you remember*, which was observed in the data, but did not receive further attention, concerns reminiscing environments in which speakers initiate *remember* recognition checks to reminisce about past events or memories.

In addition, the concept of “event” in this study is broadly defined as some past memory or experience. For a better classification, it will be necessary to define “events” more precisely and to propose a categorization of formulations of event reference, as has been suggested for example for place reference (Schegloff, 1972) and time reference (Enfield, 2012). Through its view of the construction of solidarity in social interaction, conversation analysis facilitates our understanding of language and its interaction with knowledge domains as speakers remember, elicit memories of past experiences, share and establish knowledge to secure recognition. Common ground is part of how we define and identify with our peers, and our community, and with our society mirroring our social relationships and affiliations among members.

Lastly, future studies on the lexical and grammatical realization of *do you remember* and *do you know* constructions in languages other than English and German will yield comparative analyses of the two forms across different languages. French, for example, has two words for the verb *to know*, which are *savoir* and *connaître*. Spanish also distinguishes between *saber* and *conocer*. Another Romance language is Italian with *sapere* and *conoscere* meaning *to know*. It will be interesting to examine subtle meaning differences and the interactional functions associated with these grammatical constructions in different languages. Moreover, it leads to the question why some languages have two (or more) forms for the verb *to know* whereas others have only one form. *Do you remember* and *do you know* are two ways to check recognition of

memory and knowledge in English and German. What other languages offer their speakers remains to be investigated in the future.

References

- Antaki, C. (1994). *Explaining and Arguing: Social Organization of Accounts*. London: Sage Publications.
- Antaki, C., & Leudar, I. (1990). Claim-backing and other explanatory genres in talk. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, 9, 279-292.
- Atkinson, J. M., & Heritage, J. (Eds.). (1984). *Structures of Social Action. Studies in Conversation Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Auer, P. (1979). Referenzierungssequenzen in Konversationen: das Beispiel 'Ortsangaben'. *Linguistische Berichte*, 62, 94-106.
- Auer, P. (1984). Referential problems in conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 8, 627-648.
- Auer, P. (1991). Vom Ende deutscher Sätze. *ZGL*, 19, 139-157.
- Auer, P. (1992). The neverending sentence: Rightward expansions in spoken language. In M. Kontra & T. Váradi (Eds.), *Studies in Spoken Language: English, German, Finno-Ugric* (pp. 41-59). Budapest: Linguistics Institute, Hungarian Academy of Sciences.
- Auer, P. (1993). Zur Verbspitzenstellung im gesprochenen Deutsch. *Deutsche Sprache*, 3, 193-222.
- Auer, P. (2007). Syntax als Prozess. In H. Hausendorf (Ed.), *Gespräch als Prozess. Linguistische Aspekte der Zeitlichkeit verbaler Interaktion* (pp. 95-142). Tübingen: Narr.
- Beach, W. A. (1995). Preserving and constraining options: "Okays" and 'official' priorities in medical interviews. *The Talk of the Clinic: Explorations in the Analysis of Medical and Therapeutic Discourse*, 259-289.
- Betz, E. (2008). *Grammar and Interaction: Pivots in German Conversation*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Biber, D. (1988). *Variation across Speech and Writing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Boas, F. (1911). *Handbook of American Indian Languages*. Washington, DC: Government Publication.
- Bolden, G. (2008). "So what's up?": Using the discourse marker so to launch conversational business. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 41(3), 302-337.
- Bolden, G. B., Mandelbaum, J., & Wilkinson, S. (2012). Pursuing a response by repairing an indexical reference. *Research on Language & Social Interaction*, 45(2), 137-155.
- Brock, C. A. (1986). The effects of referential questions on ESL classroom discourse. *TESOL Quarterly*, 20, 47-59.
- Brown, R. (1958). How shall a thing be called? *Psychological Review*, 65, 14-21.
- Chafe, W. (1976). Givenness, contrastiveness, definiteness, subjects, topics, and point of view. In C. N. Li (Ed.), *Subject and Topic* (pp. 25-55). New York: Academic.
- Chafe, W. (1998). Language and the flow of thought. In M. Tomasello (Ed.), *The New Psychology of Language: Cognitive and Functional Approaches to Language Structure* (pp. 93-111). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Chafe, W., & Nichols, J. (1986). *Evidentiality: The Linguistic Coding of Epistemology*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Clark, H. H. (1996). *Using Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Clark, H. H., & Marshall, C. R. (1981). Definite reference and mutual knowledge. In A. K. Joshi, B. Webber & I. A. Sag (Eds.), *Elements of Discourse Understanding* (pp. 10-63). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Clark, H. H., & Wilkes-Gibbs, D. (1986). Referring as a collaborative process. *Cognition*, 22(1), 1-39.
- Conway, M. A. (2005). Memory and the self. *Journal of Memory and Language*, 53, 594-628.
- Cuc, A., Ozuru, Y., Manier, D., & Hirst, W. (2006). On the formation of collective memories: The role of a dominant narrator. *Memory & Cognition*, 34(4), 752-762.
- Davidson, J. A. (1984). Subsequent versions of invitations, offers, requests, and proposals dealing with potential or actual rejection. In J. M. Atkinson & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Structures of Social Action. Studies in Conversation Analysis* (pp. 102-128). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Downing, P. A. (1996). Proper names as a referential option in English conversation. In B. A. Fox (Ed.), *Studies in Anaphora* (pp. 95-144). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Drew, P. (1981). 'Adults' corrections of children's mistakes: A response to Wells and Montgomery'. In P. French & M. MacLure, (Eds.), *Adult-Child Conversation: Studies in Structure and Process* (pp. 244-267). London: Croom Helm.
- Drew, P. (1989). Recalling someone from the past. In D. Roger & P. Bull (Eds.), *Conversation*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Drew, P. (1992). Contested evidence in courtroom cross-examination: The case of a trial for rape. In R. Pirard (Ed.), *Anthropo-logiques, IV (1992)* (pp. 470-520). Louvain: Peeters.
- Drew, P. (1995). 'What?': A sequential basis for an 'open' form of repair initiation in conversation (and some implications for cognitive approaches to interaction). Paper presented at the Georgetown Linguistics Society Conference. Georgetown.
- Drew, P. (1997). 'Open' class repair initiators in response to sequential sources of troubles in conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 28, 69-101.
- Drew, P. (2005). Is confusion a state of mind? In H. te Molder & J. Potter (Eds.), *Conversation and Cognition* (pp. 161-183). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Duveen, G. (2001). Representations, identity, resistance. In K. Deaux & G. Philogene (Eds.), *Representations of the Social* (pp. 257-270). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Edwards, D. (1997). *Discourse and Cognition*. London: Sage Publications.
- Edwards, D. & Potter, J. (1992). *Discursive Psychology*. London: Sage Publications.
- Egbert, M. (2009). *Der Reparaturmechanismus in deutschen Gesprächen*. Mannheim: Verlag für Gesprächsforschung.
<http://www.verlag-gespraechsforschung.de/2009/pdf/reparaturen.pdf>.
- Egbert, M., Golato, A., & Robinson, J. (2009). Repairing reference. In J. Sidnell (Ed.), *Conversation Analysis: Contrastive Perspectives* (pp. 104-132). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Enfield, N. (2006). Social consequences of common ground. In N. J. Enfield & S. C. Levinson (Eds.), *Roots of Human Sociality: Culture, Cognition, and Interaction* (pp. 399-430). London: Berg.
- Enfield, N. (2012). Reference in conversation. In J. Sidnell & T. Stivers (Eds.), *The Handbook of Conversation Analysis* (pp. 433-454). Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Engel, S. (1999). *Context is Everything: The Nature of Memory*. New York: W.H. Freeman.
- Ford, C. E., Fox, B. A., & Thompson, S. A. (1996). Practices in the construction of turns: The "TCU" revisited. *Pragmatics*, 6(3), 427-454.
- Frege, G. (1960). On sense and reference. In P. Geach & M. Black (Eds.), *Translations from the Philosophical Writings of G. Frege*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Fukuda, Y. (1970). 'Kennen' und 'wissen'. *Doitsu Bungaku*, 45, 91-102.

- Gardner, R. (2004). On delaying the answer: Question sequences extended after the question. In R. Gardner & J. Wagner (Eds.), *Second Language Conversations* (pp. 246-266). New York/London: Continuum Press.
- Gardner, R., & Wagner, J. (Eds.). (2004). *Second Language Conversations: Studies of Communication in Everyday Settings*. New York/London: Continuum Press.
- Gass, S., & Varonis, E. (1985). Variation in native speaker speech modification to non-native speakers. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 7, 37-58.
- Goffman, E. (1971). *Relations in Public. Microstudies of the Public Order*. New York: Basic Books.
- Goffman, E. (1978). Response cries. *Language*, 54, 787-815.
- Goffman, E. (1979). Footing. *Semiotica*, 25(1/2), 1-29.
- Golato, A. (2005). *Compliments and Compliment Responses: Grammatical Structure and Sequential Organization*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Golato, A. (2012). German oh: Marking an emotional change-of-state. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 45(3), 1-24.
- Golato, A., & Betz, E. (2008). German ach and achso in repair uptake: A resource to sustain or remove epistemic asymmetry. *Zeitschrift für Sprachwissenschaft*, 27, 7-37.
- Golato, A., & Fagyal, Z. (2008). Comparing single and double sayings of the German response token ja and the role of prosody – A conversation analytic perspective. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 41(3), 1-30.
- Golato, A., & Golato, P. (in press). Reference repair in German and French. *Journal of Pragmatics*.
- Goodwin, C. (1979). The interactive construction of a sentence in natural conversation. In G. Psathas (Ed.), *Everyday Language: Studies in Ethnomethodology* (pp. 97-121). New York: Irvington Publishers.
- Goodwin, C. (1987). Forgetfulness as an interactive resource. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 50(2), 115-131.
- Haden, C. A., Ornstein, P. A., Eckerman, C. O., & Didow, S. M. (2001). Mother-child conversational interactions as events unfold: linkages to subsequent remembering. *Child Development*, 72(4), 1016-31.
- Harden, T., & Hentschel, E. (2010). *40 Jahre Partikelforschung*. Tübingen: Stauffenburg.
- Harren, I. (2001). "Ne?" in *Alltagsgesprächen - Interaktive Funktionen und Positionierung in Turn und Sequenz*. Unpublished M.A. Thesis. Universität Oldenburg, Oldenburg.
- Hayano, K. (2013). *Territories of Knowledge in Japanese Conversation*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of Nijmegen.
- Hayashi, M. (2005). Referential problems and turn construction: An exploration of an intersection between grammar and interaction. *Text*, 25(4), 437-468.
- Hayashi, M. & Kim, H. S. (in press). Turn formats for other-initiated repair and their relation to trouble sources: some observations from Japanese and Korean conversations. *Journal of Pragmatics*.
- 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. Studies in Conversation Analysis* (pp. 299-345). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Heritage, J. (1988). Explanations as accounts: A conversation analytic perspective. In C. Antaki (Ed.), *Analyzing Everyday Explanation: A Casebook of Methods* (pp. 127-144). London: Sage Publications.

- Heritage, J. (1998). Oh-prefaced responses to inquiry. *Language in Society*, 27, 291-334.
- Heritage, J. (2002). Oh-prefaced responses to assessments: A method of modifying agreement/disagreement. In C. E. Ford, B. A. Fox & S. A. Thompson (Eds.), *The Language of Turn and Sequence* (pp. 196-224). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Heritage, J. (2005). The terms of agreement: Indexing epistemic authority and subordination in talk-in-interaction. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 68(1), 15-38.
- Heritage, J. (2007). Intersubjectivity and progressivity in person (and place) reference. In T. Stivers & N. J. Enfield (Eds.), *Person Reference in Interaction: Linguistic, Cultural and Social Perspectives* (pp. 255-280). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Heritage, J. (2012a). Epistemics in action: Action formation and territories of knowledge. *Research on Language & Social Interaction*, 45(1), 1-29.
- Heritage, J. (2012b). The epistemic engine: Sequence organization and territories of knowledge. *Research on Language & Social Interaction*, 45(1), 30-52.
- Heritage, J. (2013). Action formation and its epistemic (and other) backgrounds. *Discourse Studies*, 15(5), 551-578.
- Heritage, J., & Raymond, G. (2005). The terms of agreement: Indexing epistemic authority and subordination in assessment sequences. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 68(1), 15-38.
- Heritage, J., & Raymond, G. (2012). Navigating epistemic landscapes: Acquiescence, agency and resistance in responses to polar questions. In J. P. de Ruiter (Ed.), *Questions: Formal, Functional and Interactional Perspectives* (pp.179-192). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Himmelmann, N. (1996). Demonstratives in narrative discourse: A taxonomy of universal uses. In B. Fox (Ed.), *Studies in Anaphora* (pp. 205-254). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Jefferson, G. (1981). The abominable “ne”: A working paper exploring the phenomenon of post-response pursuit of response. *Occasional Paper*, 6. Manchester: University of Manchester, Department of Sociology.
- Jucker, A. H. (1993). The discourse marker well: A relevance- theoretical account. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 19(5), 435-452.
- Kamio, A. (1990). *Joohoo No Nawabari Riron*. Tokyo: Taishukan.
- Kamio, A. (1997). *Territory of Information*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Kasper, G. (2004). Participant orientations in German conversation-for-learning. *Modern Language Journal*, 88, 551-567.
- Kasper, G., & Ross, S. J. (2007). Multiple questions in oral proficiency interviews. *Journal of Pragmatics: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Language Studies*, 39(11), 2045-2070.
- Kääntä, L. (2010). *Teacher Turn-allocation and Repair Practices in Classroom Interaction: A Multisemiotic Perspective*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of Jyväskylä.
- Kim, Y. (2009). *Achieving Reference in Talk-in-interaction: L1 and L2 English Speakers' Conversation*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of Hawaii.
- Kim, Y. (2012). Practices for initial recognitional reference and learning opportunities in conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 44(6-7), 709-729.
- Kitzinger, C., & Mandelbaum, J. (2008). Word selection and social identities in talk-in-interaction. Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the National Communication Association, San Diego, CA, November.

- Kitzinger, C., Shaw, R., & Toerien, M. (2012). Referring to persons without using a full-form reference: Locally initial indexicals in action. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 45(2), 116-132.
- Koole, T. (2010). Displays of epistemic access: Student responses to teacher explanations. *Research on Language & Social Interaction*, 43(2), 183-209.
- Koshik, I. A. (2000). Conversation analytic research on institutional talk: Implications for TESOL teachers and researchers. *TESOL Research Interest Section Newsletter*, 7(2), 3, 8-11.
- Koshik, I. A. (2002). Designedly incomplete utterances: A pedagogical practice for eliciting knowledge displays in error correction sequences. *Research on Language & Social Interaction*, 35(3), 277-309.
- Koshik, I. A. (2003). *Wh*-questions used as challenges. *Discourse Studies*, 5(1), 51-77.
- Koshik, I. A. (2005). Alternative questions used in conversational repair. *Discourse Studies*, 7(2), 193-211.
- Koshik, I. A. (2010). Questions that convey information in teacher–student conferences. In A. F. Freed & S. Ehrlich (Eds.), *Why Do You Ask? The Function of Questions in Institutional Discourse* (pp. 159–86). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Koshik, I. A., & Seo, M. (2012). Word (and other) search sequences initiated by language learners. *Text & Talk*, 32(2), 167-189.
- Labov, W., & Fanshel, D. (1977). *Therapeutic Discourse: Psychotherapy as Conversation*. New York: Academic.
- Lambrecht, K. (1994). *Information Structure and Sentence Form. Topic, Focus, and the Mental Representations of Discourse Referents*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lee, Y.-A. (2007). Third turn position in teacher talk: Contingency and the work of teaching. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 39(6), 1204-1230.
- Lerner, G. (2004). On the place of linguistic resources in the organization of talk-in-interaction: Grammar as action in prompting a speaker to elaborate. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 37, 151-185.
- Levinson, S. C. (1996). Frames of reference and Molyneux's question: Cross-linguistic evidence. In P. Bloom, M. Peterson, L. Nadel, & M. Garrett (Eds.), *Language and Space* (pp. 109-169). Cambridge, MA: MIT press.
- Levinson, S. (2007). Optimizing person reference: Perspectives from usage on Rossel Island. In N. J. Enfield & T. Stivers (Eds.), *Person Reference in Interaction: Linguistic, Cultural and Social Perspectives* (pp. 29-72). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Linell, P., Hofvendahl, J. & Lindholm, C. (2003). Multi-unit questions in institutional interactions: Sequential organization and communicative functions. *Text*, 23, 539-571.
- Long, M. (1983). Linguistic and conversational adjustments to nonnative speakers. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 5, 177–193.
- Long, M. (1985). Input and second language acquisition theory. In S. Gass, & C. Madden (Eds.), *Input and Second Language Acquisition* (pp. 268–286). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Long, M. (1996). The role of the linguistic environment in second language acquisition. In W. C. Ritchie, & T. K. Bhatia (Eds.), *Handbook of Research on Language Acquisition: Second Language Acquisition*, Vol. 2 (pp. 413–468). New York: Academic Press.
- Long, M. H., & Sato, C. J. (1983). Classroom foreigner talk discourse: Forms and functions of teachers' questions. In H. W. Seliger & M. H. Long (Eds.), *Classroom Oriented Research*

- in *Second Language Acquisition* (pp. 268-285). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Lütten, J. (1979). Die Rolle der Partikeln *doch*, *eben* und *ja* als Konsens-Konstitutiva in gesprochener Sprache. In H. Weydt (Ed.), *Die Partikeln der Deutschen Sprache* (pp. 30-38). Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Macbeth, D. (2003). Hugh Mehan's "learning lessons" reconsidered: On the differences between naturalistic and critical analysis of classroom discourse. *American Educational Research Journal*, 40(1), 239-280.
- Macbeth, D. (2004). The relevance of repair for classroom correction. *Language in Society*, 33(5), 703-736.
- Mandelbaum, J., & Pomerantz, A. (1990). What drives social action? In K. Tracy (Ed.), *Understanding Face-to-face Interaction: Issues Linking Goals and Discourse* (pp.151-166). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Markee, N. (2000). Conversation analysis. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Handbook of Research in Second Language Teaching and Learning*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Mazeland, H. (1987). *A short remark on the analysis of institutional interaction: The organization of repair in lesson*. Paper presented at the International Pragmatics Association (IPrA) Conference, Antwerp, Belgium.
- Mazeland, H. (2007). Parenthetical sequences. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 39(10), 1816-1869.
- McCarthy, M. (2003). Talking back: "Small" interactional response tokens in everyday conversation. *Research on Language & Social Interaction*, 36(1), 33-63.
- McHoul, A. W. (1978). The organization of turns at formal talk in the classroom. *Language in Society*, 7, 183-213.
- McHoul, A. W. (1990). The organization of repair in classroom talk. *Language in Society*, 19, 349-377.
- Mehan, H. (1979). *Learning Lessons: Social Organization in the Classroom*. Cambridge, MA/London: Harvard University Press.
- Middleton, D. (1997). Conversational remembering and uncertainty. Interdependencies of experience as individual and collective concerns in teamwork. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, 16(4), 389-410.
- Möllering, M. (2001). Teaching German modal particles: A corpus-based approach. *Language Learning & Technology*, 5(3), 130-151.
- Mondada, L. (2005). Seeing as a condition of saying. On the discursive construction of knowledge in travel writing. In H. Schulz-Forberg (Ed.), *Unravelling Civilization. European Travel and Travel Writing* (pp. 63-85). Bern: Lang.
- Mondada, L. (2007). Multimodal resources for turn-taking: Pointing and the emergence of possible next speakers. *Discourse Studies*, 9(2), 199-225.
- Nelson, K., & Fivush, R. (2004). The emergence of autobiographical memory: a social cultural developmental theory. *Psychological Review*, 111, 486-511.
- O'Pecko, M. (1985). Wissen or kennen? A grammatical explanation. *Teaching German* 18(2), 305-306.
- Palmer, F. R. (1986). *Mood and Modality*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Park, Y. (2013). The roles of third-turn repeats in two L2 classroom interactional contexts. *Applied Linguistics*, 35(2), 145-167.
- Pomerantz, A. (1978). Compliment responses. Notes on the co-operation of multiple constraints. In J. Schenkein (Ed.), *Studies in the Organization of Conversational Interaction* (pp. 79-112). New York/San Francisco/London: Academic Press.

- Pomerantz, A. (1980). Telling my side: 'Limited access' as a 'fishing device'. *Sociological Inquiry*, 50(3-4), 186-198.
- Pomerantz, A. (1984). Pursuing a response. In J. M. Atkinson & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Structures of Social Action. Studies in Conversation Analysis* (pp. 152-164). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Pomerantz, A. (1986). Extreme case formulations: A way of legitimizing claims. *Human Studies*, 9(2-4), 210-229.
- Pomerantz, A. (1988). Offering a candidate answer: An information seeking strategy. *Communication Monographs*, 55(4), 360-373.
- Premack, D., & Woodruff, G. (1978). Does the chimpanzee have a theory of mind? *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 1(4), 515-526.
- Psaltis, C., & Duveen, G. (2007). Conservation and conversation types: Forms of recognition and cognitive development. *British Journal of Developmental Psychology*, 25(1), 79-102.
- Quirk, R., Greenbaum, S., Leech, G., & Svartvik, J. (1985). *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. New York: Longman.
- Raymond, G. (2004). Prompting action: The stand-alone 'so' in sequences of talk-in-interaction. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 37(2), 185-218.
- Raymond, G. (2010). Grammar and social relations: alternative forms of yes/no-type initiating actions in health visitor interactions. In A.F. Freed & S. Ehrlich (Eds.), *Why Do You Ask? The Function of Questions in Institutional Discourse* (pp. 87-107). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Raymond, G., & Heritage, J. (2006). The epistemics of social relations: Owning grandchildren. *Language in Society*, 35(5), 677-705.
- Reiman, M. (2003). *Grosser Lernwortschatz als Deutsch Als Fremdsprache: Deutsch – English*. München, Hueber.
- Robinson, J. D. (2013). Epistemics, action formation, and other-initiation of repair: The case of partial questioning repeats. In J. Sidnell, M. Hayashi, & G. Raymond (Eds.), *Conversational Repair and Human Understanding* (pp. 261-292). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rubin, D. C. (2006). The basic-systems model of episodic memory. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 1, 277-311.
- Sacks, H. (1975). Everyone has to lie. In M. Sanches & B. Blount (Eds.), *Sociocultural Dimensions of Language Use* (pp. 57-80). New York: Academic Press.
- Sacks, H. (1992). *Lectures on Conversation*. Ed. by Gail Jefferson, introduction by Emanuel A. Schegloff. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Sacks, H., & Schegloff, E. A. (1979). Two preferences in the organization of reference to persons in conversation and their interaction. In G. Psathas (Ed.), *Everyday Language. Studies in Ethnomethodology* (pp. 15-21). New York: Irvington Publishers.
- Sacks, H., Schegloff, E. A., & Jefferson, G. (1974). A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation. *Language*, 50(4), 696-735.
- Schachter, D. L. (1996). *Searching for Memory: The Brain, the Mind, and the Past*. New York: Basic Books.
- Schegloff, E. A. (1972). Notes on a conversational practice: Formulating place. In D. Sudnow (Ed.), *Studies in Social Interaction* (pp. 74-119). New York: Free Press.
- Schegloff, E. A. (1979). Identification and recognition in telephone conversation openings. In G. Psathas (Ed.), *Everyday Language: Studies in Ethnomethodology* (pp. 23-78). New York:

- Irvington Publishers.
- Schegloff, E. A. (1980). Preliminaries to preliminaries: "Can I ask you a question?". *Sociological Inquiry*, 50(3-4), 104-152.
- Schegloff, E. A. (1988). Presequences and indirection. Applying speech act theory to ordinary conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 12, 55-62.
- Schegloff, E. A. (1991). Conversation analysis and socially shared cognition. In L. Resnick, J. Levine, & S. Teasley (Eds.), *Perspectives on Socially Shared Cognition* (pp. 150-171). Washington, D.C.: American Psychological Association.
- Schegloff, E. A. (1992). Repair after next turn: The last structurally provided defense of intersubjectivity in conversation. *American Journal of Sociology*, 97(5), 1295-1345.
- Schegloff, E. A. (1996). Some practices for referring to persons in talk-in-interaction: A partial sketch of a systematics. In B. A. Fox (Ed.), *Studies in Anaphora* (Vol. 33, pp. 437-485). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Schegloff, E. A. (2007). *Sequence Organization in Interaction. A Primer in Conversation Analysis* (Vol. 1). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Schegloff, E. A., Jefferson, G., & Sacks, H. (1977). The preference for self-correction in the organization of repair in conversation. *Language*, 53(2), 361-382.
- Schegloff, E. A., & Sacks, H. (1973). Opening up closings. *Semiotica*, 8(4), 289-327.
- Schiffrin, D. (1987). *Discourse Markers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Schwab, G. (2011). From dialogue to multilogue: a different view on participation in the English foreign-language classroom. *Classroom Discourse*, 2(1), 3-19.
- Seedhouse, P. (2004). The Organization of Language Classroom Interaction. *Language Learning*, 54, 181-222.
- Seedhouse, P. (2007). Interaction and constructs. In Z. Hua, P. Seedhouse, L. Wei, & V. Cook (Eds.), *Language Learning and Teaching as Social Inter-Action* (pp. 9-21). Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Sert, O. (2011). *A micro-analytic investigation of claims of insufficient knowledge in EAL classrooms*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Newcastle University, UK.
- Sert, O., & Walsh, S. (2013). The interactional management of claims of insufficient knowledge in English language classrooms. *Language and Education*, 27(6), 542-565.
- Shaw, R., & Kitzinger, C. (2007). Memory in interaction: An analysis of repeat calls to a home birth helpline. *Research on Language & Social Interaction*, 40(1), 117-144.
- Sidnell, J. (2007). Repairing person reference in a small Caribbean community: Generic organization, local inflection. In T. Stivers & N. J. Enfield (Eds.), *Person Reference in Interaction: Linguistic, Cultural, and Social Perspectives* (pp. 281-308). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sidnell, J. (2010). Questioning repeats in the talk of four-year old children. In H. Gardner & M. Forrester (Eds.), *Analysing Interactions in Childhood: Insights from Conversation Analysis* (pp. 103-127). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Sidnell, J., & Barnes, R. (2013). Alternative, subsequent descriptions. In M. Hayashi, G. Raymond, J. Sidnell (Eds.), *Conversational Repair and Human Understanding*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sinclair, J., & Coulthard, M. (1975). *Towards an Analysis of Discourse*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Sinclair, J., & Coulthard, M. (1992). Towards an Analysis of Discourse. In M. Coulthard (Ed.), *Advances in Spoken Discourse Analysis* (pp. 1-34). London: Routledge.

- Stalnaker, R. (2002). Common Ground. *Linguistics & Philosophy*, 25(5/6), 701-721.
- Stivers, T. (2004). "No no no" and other types of multiple sayings in social interaction. *Human Communication Research*, 30(2), 260-293.
- Stivers, T. (2005). Modified repeats: One method for asserting primary rights from second position. *Research on Language & Social Interaction*, 38(2), 131-158.
- Stivers, T. (2007). Alternative recognitionals in person reference. In N. J. Enfield & T. Stivers (Eds.), *Person Reference in Interaction: Linguistic, Cultural, and Social Perspectives* (pp. 73-96). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Stivers, T. (2011). Morality and question design: "Of course" as contesting a presupposition of askability. In T. Stivers, L. Mondada, & J. Steensig (Eds.), *The Morality of Knowledge in Conversation* (pp. 82-106). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Stivers, T., Enfield, N. J., & Levinson, S. (2007). Person reference in interaction. In N. J. Enfield & T. Stivers (Eds.), *Person Reference in Interaction: Linguistic, Cultural, and Social Perspectives* (pp. 1-20). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Stivers, T., Mondada, L., & Steensig, J. (Eds.). (2011). *The Morality of Knowledge in Conversation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Stivers, T., & Robinson, J. (2006). A preference for progressivity in interaction. *Language in Society*, 35(3), 367-392.
- Stivers, T., & Rossano, F. (2010). Mobilizing response. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 43(1), 3-31.
- Svennevig, J. (2004). Other-repetition as display of hearing, understanding and emotional stance. *Discourse Studies: An Interdisciplinary Journal for the Study of Text and Talk*, 6(4), 489-516.
- Svennevig, J. (2008). Trying the easiest solution first in other-initiation of repair. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 40(2), 333-348.
- Svennevig, J. (2013). Reformulation of questions with candidate answers. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, 17(2), 189-204.
- Taleghani-Nikazm, C. (in press). Indexing epistemic stance in Farsi conversation: An analysis of the particle *dige* in turn-final position. *Journal of Pragmatics*.
- Turner, P. (2009). *Grammar and epistemics in question construction: After hours calls to an on-call physician*. Unpublished paper. Department of Applied Linguistics, UCLA.
- Tao, H. (2001). Discovering the usual with corpora: The case of *remember*. In R. C. Simpson & J. M. Swales (Eds.), *Corpus Linguistics in North America* (pp. 116-144). Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Ten Have, P. (1999). *Doing Conversation Analysis. A Practical Guide*. London: Sage Publications.
- Terasaki, A. (2004). Pre-announcement sequences in conversation. In G. Lerner (Ed.), *Conversation Analysis: Studies from the First Generation* (pp. 171-223). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Van Lier, L. (1988). *The Classroom and the Language Learner*. London: Longman.
- Van Lier, L. (1994). *The Classroom and the Language Learner. Ethnography and Second-Language Classroom Research*. London: Longman.
- Van Lier, L. (2004). The semiotics and ecology of language learning - perception, voice, identity and democracy. *Utbildning & Demokrati*, 13(3), 79-103.
- Van Valin, R., & Wilkins, D. (1993). Predicting syntactic structure from semantic representations: remember in English and its equivalents in Mparntwe Arrernte. In R.

- Van Valin (Ed.), *Advances in Role and Reference Grammar* (pp. 499-534). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Weeks, P. A. D. (1985). Error-correction techniques and sequences in instructional settings: Toward a comparative framework. *Human Studies*, 8(3), 195-233.
- Wilkinson, S., & Kitzinger, C. (2006). Surprise as an interactional achievement: Reaction Tokens in Conversation. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 69(2), 150-182.
- Zemel, A., & Koschmann, T. (2011). Pursuing a question: Reinitiating IRE sequences as a method of instruction. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 43(2), 475-488.

Appendix: Transcription conventions

A.1. Jefferson transcript notation²⁶

[text]	Indicates the start and end points of overlapping speech.
=	Indicates the break and subsequent continuation of a single utterance.
(# of seconds)	A number in parenthesis indicates the time, in seconds, of a pause in speech.
(.)	A brief pause, usually less than .2 seconds.
. or ↓	Indicates falling pitch or intonation.
? or ↑	Indicates rising pitch or intonation.
,	Indicates a temporary rise or fall in intonation.
-	Indicates an abrupt halt or interruption in utterance.
>text<	Indicates that the enclosed speech was delivered more rapidly than usual for the speaker.
<text>	Indicates that the enclosed speech was delivered more slowly than usual for the speaker.
°	Indicates whisper, reduced volume, or quite speech.
ALL CAPS	Indicates shouted or increased volume in speech.
Underline	Indicates the speaker is emphasizing or stressing the speech.
:::	Indicates prolongation of sound.
hhh.	Audible exhalation.
.hhh	Audible inhalation.
(hhh)	Laughter.
(text)	Speech which is unclear or in doubt in the transcript.
((text))	Annotations.

²⁶ Retrieved on June 31, 2014, available at <http://www.transana.org/support/onlinehelp/team1/transcriptnotation1.html> (shortened and modified)