***Das Heißt* (“That Means”) for Formulations and *Du Meinst* (“You Mean”) for Repair? Interpretations of Prior Speakers’ Turns in German**

Henrike Helmer and Jörg Zinken

Pragmatics Department, Institute for the German Language, Germany

ABSTRACT

The recognizability of a stretch of conduct as social action depends on details of turn construction as well as the turn’s context. We examine details of turn construction as they enter into actions offering interpretations of prior talk. Such actions either initiate repair or formulate a conclusion from prior talk. We focus on how interpretation markers (*das heißt* [“that means”] vs. *du meinst* [“you mean”]) and interpretation formats (phrasal vs. clausal turn completions) each make their invariant contribution to specific interpreting practices. Interpretation marker and turn format go hand in hand, which leads to distinct patterns of interpreting practices: *Das heißt*+clause is especially apt for formulations, *du meinst*+phrase for repair. The results suggest that details of turn construction can systematically enter into the constitution of social action. Data are in German with English translation.

Interlocutors design their actions to make them recognizable to others (see Robinson, 2016). Turn position and turn composition are crucial for this (Schegloff, 2007). In this article, we contribute to a more systematic understanding of how lexical and grammatical practices, as elements of turn construction, contribute to the constitution of action.

Recent research has made progress in showing how linguistic formats enter into action formation (from a large literature see Couper-Kuhlen, 2014, p. 635; Thompson, Fox, & Couper-Kuhlen, 2015, who explicitly discuss the relationship between linguistic form and action). This work illustrates clearly that choices in turn construction not only serve to adapt the move to a particular interactional environment; linguistic formats can also shape the action of a turn (Fox & Thompson, 2010; Sorjonen & Raevaara, 2014; Thompson et al., 2015). In this article, we examine practices in turns that interpret another person’s prior talk.

Formulating interpretations of prior talk

Sometimes, speakers articulate an interpretation of the other person’s talk (or action) by reformulating it, offering additional information or the like. Candidate understandings (e.g., Antaki, 2012; Benjamins, 2012; Schegloff, Jefferson, & Sacks, 1977) and formulations of gist or upshot (e.g., Deppermann, 2011; Heritage, 1985; Heritage & Watson, 1979; Weiste & Peräkylä, 2013) are well-researched examples of actions that interpret prior talk. What these interpreting moves have in common is that they draw on a generic practice: Interpretations are designed to be recognizable as operating on another person’s prior talk; they express “content” that interprets (not repeats) that prior talk; and they offer the interpretation for confirmation with a polar response.

CONTACT Henrike Helmer helmer@ids-mannheim.de Institute for the German Language, R5, 6-13, Mannheim 68169,

This practice of articulating an interpretation can be part of different activities, such as initiating repair or formulating conclusions from prior talk. Schegloff et al. (1977, p. 378f.) cite the format “*y’ mean + candidate understanding*” as a form for the other-initiation of repair that specifically addresses problems of meaning and understanding. This repair practice proposes an interpretation of the prior talk and makes confirmation of that interpretation relevant as a response. The term “formulations” goes back to Garfinkel and Sacks’s observation that participants to a conversation sometimes “formulate the conversation” (Garfinkel & Sacks, 1970, p. 350), that is, describe or provide a gloss for what they are doing. The most prominent line of research on formulations has studied a more circumscribed domain: (re)formulations of the gist or upshot of the prior speaker’s turn (beginning with Heritage & Watson, 1979). Formulations of this kind are prominent in certain activities and settings, such as news interviews, psychotherapy, or political meetings, where they are used to reformulate prior talk in a way that is relevant to the institutional goals of the setting (see, for example, Antaki, 2008; Mondada, 2015; Weiste & Peräkylä, 2013). But “formulations” can also be found in everyday informal talk (see, for example, Bolden, 2010). Grammatically, the turns that have been studied as formulations are mostly *yes/no* declaratives (Raymond, 2010): declarative sentences that formally project a polar response.

Candidate understandings and gist or upshot formulations hence share fundamental characteristics as formal practices: They connect back to prior talk, offer an interpretation of that talk, and project or at least allow for a polar response. The practice of interpreting prior talk straddles repair (where it is concerned with troubles of meaning and understanding) and formulations (where they propose the gist or upshot of prior talk). By focusing on the generic practice of interpretation, we can explore continuities across these domains.

We focus on two loci of variation in the construction of interpretation turns. The first locus of variation is related to *interpretation markers*, items that overtly mark the term as articulating an interpretation: The turns we examine either contain the marker *das heißt* (“that means,” more literally “that is called/named”) or *du meinst* (“you mean”). We compare these two formats because we found them to be close to a “minimal pair” of interpretation markers: Both combine a pronoun (the personal pronoun *du* [“you”] or the demonstrative pronoun *das* [“that”]) with a verb that can be glossed as “to mean” in English. Despite these semantic commonalities, the literature suggests that *du meinst* (“you mean”) is used to initiate repair, while *das heißt*, (“that means”) is used to formulate an upshot (see section “Research on *das heißt* and *du meinst*”) (see also Keevallik, 2003, on a similar pair in Estonian). The second locus of variation is related to the *interpretation format*, that is, the syntactic design (phrasal or clausal) of that portion of a TCU that constitutes the interpretation proper.

Extracts 1 and 2 provide a first look at our phenomenon. In Extract 1, Anita and Philipp are checking details of their planned holiday. In Extract 2, Jaromir and Madita are discussing worker representation in German companies. *Interpretation markers* and *interpretation formats* are emphasized with gray highlighting.

Extract 1: FOLK_E_00030_SE_01_T_02, 00:31:15–00:31:21

- 01 Philipp: samstag sonntag montag. h.
Saturday Sunday Monday
- 02 (1.1)
- 03 Philipp: dienstag.
Tuesday
- 04 (0.6)
- 05 → Anita: was des heißt wir ham drei überna[chtungen.]
what that heißen.3SG we have three overnight stays
what, that means we have three overnight stays
- 06 Philipp: [vier über]
- 07 nachtungen ham wir.
we have four overnight stays

addressing another person with the personal pronoun *du* (“you”). Both verbs, *meinen* and *heißen*, can in many contexts be translated into English as “to mean,” although both are also used in other contexts, where *meinen* might be translated as “to think” (e.g., *Meinst du der fisch ist noch gut?* [“Do you think the fish is still good?”]), and *heißen* might be translated as “to be called, have the name” (e.g., *die heißt Laura* [“she is called Laura”]). Another dimension of formal variation in our data is the syntactic complexity of the talk that formulates the interpretation proper, specifically, whether the interpretation is formulated as a phrase or as a clause. In the next section, we briefly review prior work on the choice between phrasal and clausal turn design.

Phrasal vs. clausal turn design

Sometimes, a type of action can be implemented either in a phrasal or a clausal turn. However, these options are not equivalent: Several studies have shown that the choice for one or the other systematically indexes aspects of context (Fox & Thompson, 2010; Sorjonen & Raevaara, 2014; Thompson et al., 2015). For example, requesting cigarettes with a phrasal format is the default case in Finnish convenience stores. But buyers sometimes use clausal formats, for example, when they begin formulating the request before they have reached the counter (Sorjonen & Raevaara, 2014). In such cases, the longer, clausal format helps synchronize the completion of the request with the speaker’s arrival at the “transaction point.”

In responsive positions, the choice between a phrasal and a clausal format may be related to matters of affiliation and social alignment. Fox and Thompson (2010) analyze responses to (certain types of) *wh*-questions and show that speakers use phrasal turns to “just answer” a specifying question but use clausal turns to mark trouble with the question or the sequence in which it occurs (see also Thompson et al., 2015). More generally, this line of work shows that phrasal turns are particularly apt for building on relevant context and responding to a prior turn (Thompson et al., 2015, p. 275). Clausal responses, on the other hand, are “in general independent of the prior turn” (Thompson et al., 2015, pp. 275–276) and are therefore particularly apt for doing “more than responding”—for example, for displaying the speaker’s own, independent position regarding some matter (e.g., in assessments, see Thompson et al., 2015, p. 285). With clausal responses, speakers exert more agency in the progression of talk (Deppermann, 2012).

The relationship between clausal turn formats and agency has also been observed in the domain of formulations (Deppermann & Helmer, 2013). Formulations framed with German *also* (“so”) are mostly completed in a phrasal format. These formulations display a high degree of intersubjectivity and common ground, performing bilateral conclusions that are obvious to both participants. Formulations framed with *dann* (“then”), on the other hand, are completed in a clausal format. These formulations perform unilateral conclusions that contain new information and inferences made only by the speaker of the *dann* formulation.

The aim of our article is to examine how interpretation markers (*das heißt* vs. *du meinst*) and interpretation formats (phrasal vs. clausal) contribute to the accomplishment of locally relevant actions and how they relate to ownership and agency. After analyzing typical examples of interpretations with *das heißt* and *du meinst* (see section “Repair vs. formulation”) in the section “Different construction of *du meinst*- and *das heißt*-Turns”, we examine the invariant contributions made by the formatting of the interpretation as a phrase or a clause and by the grammar of *du meinst* and of *das heißt*. In the section “(Dis)confirmations after different interpretation turns”, we examine how next speakers orient to different interpretations as an additional source of evidence for our analysis. First, we briefly describe our methods and data.

Methods and data

Our analysis is based on two corpora of German talk-in-interaction. One is the *FOLK* corpus of spoken German, which at the time we gathered our collection (2017) comprised about 170 hours of audio and video recordings from diverse informal and institutional settings (fully transcribed audio

recordings are accessible via www.dgd.ids-mannheim.de). The other is the German part of the *Parallel European Corpus of Informal Interaction (PECII)*, which currently comprises about 20 hours of video recordings.² All participants gave their informed consent for their data to be recorded and used for research and presentation purposes.

We identified all turns framed by *das heißt* or *du meinst* that articulate an interpretation of another speaker's prior talk and project or at least afford a polar response ($N = 138$). This also included the inverted forms with interrogative syntax: *heißt das* and *meinst du*, as well as, in the case of *meinen*, the formal variant *Sie meinen/meinen Sie*. We did not systematically analyze differences between the declarative forms *du meinst/das heißt* and the interrogative forms *meinst du* and *heißt das* (but see Extract 5). We excluded cases that afforded a polar response if they initiated a new sequence rather than interpreting prior talk (see, e.g., *Meinst du der fisch ist noch gut?* ["Do you think the fish is still good?"]). We also excluded cases that interpreted prior talk but did not afford a polar response (e.g., alternative questions: *Meinst du rechts oder links?* ["Do you mean right or left?"]).

We developed initial analytic observations through detailed examination of individual cases, with particular focus on the sequential context and construction of our target turns. Our qualitative analyses suggested regularities between turn construction and interactional function that we wanted to assess statistically. We developed a coding scheme and coded all cases for the categories described in Table 1.

Most of these categories will be self-explanatory, but some may require some explication. Responses were coded as answers when they could be interpreted as a *yes* or a *no*, regardless of whether or not these response tokens were used, and as nonanswers when such a decision was avoided (e.g., "I don't know") (Stivers, 2010).

We categorized responses as "minimal" when they consisted of only one response token (be it type-conforming like *mhm* or *ja* ["yes"] or non-type-conforming³ like *richtig* ["right"]) or a combination of minimal response tokens (e.g., *ja richtig* ["yes right"]). We categorized responses as "more than minimal" when responses were elaborations (initiated by a minimal response token or not).

We categorized the response as containing "new information" when it delivered new information that was not provided explicitly in the prior context. We categorized the reaction as containing "no new information" when it was minimal or when an expansion only repeated previously given information. We tested interrater reliability for each category by double-coding an arbitrary subsection of the data (20%). We achieved satisfactory *kappas* between $\kappa = 0.71$ and $\kappa = 0.77$.

All statistical analyses were conducted using R, specifically the online tool *Kogra-R* (<http://kograno.ids-mannheim.de/index.html>).

Transcripts reported in this article were prepared according to conversation analytic conventions, based on the work of Gail Jefferson (2004). The second line of transcript provides a word-by-word gloss; the third line provides an idiomatic gloss. A problem of translation concerned the verb *heißen*, which can be rendered as "to mean" or as "being called." We decided not to translate *heißen* in

Table 1. Coding categories.

Category	Values
Regarding interpretations	
Turn construction	phrase, clause, not applicable
Sentence type	declarative, interrogative, not applicable
Regarding responses to interpretations	
Response function	answer, nonanswer, no response
Confirmation	confirmation, disconfirmation, unclear
Begins with response token	yes, no
Complexity of response	minimal, more than minimal
Information	new information, no new information
Regarding basis of the interpretation	
Basis	a complete sequence, a specific prior turn/TCU/element within a sequence

²PECII comprises recordings in Finnish, French, German, Italian, and Polish of board games, joint meals, and car drives.

³We categorized response tokens into type-conforming versus non-type-conforming orienting to Raymond (2003). Stivers (2011) differentiates response types, too, calling the non-type-conforming responses "marked interjections" (Stivers, 2011, p. 85).

the second line to display that there is no literal equivalent in English and to convey the lexical difference between this verb and the verb *meinen* (“to mean”) but translated it more idiomatically as “that means” in the third line.

Results

Repair vs. formulation

In our data, interpretations with *du meinst* often problematize aspects of the prior speaker’s turn. Interpretations with *das heißt* often formulate a next step within the ongoing activity on the basis of a prior sequence. In other words, as prior literature suggests, *du meinst* turns mostly accomplish actions belonging to the domain of repair, whereas *das heißt* turns mostly accomplish actions belonging to the domain of formulations.

Typical examples of *du meinst* interpretations are cases in which a speaker halts a sequence to initiate repair on a trouble of understanding. The following example comes from a language biography interview. The interviewer (Torsten) and interviewee (Helmut) have been talking about a perceived disadvantage of e-bikes, namely, the fact that you can’t leave them anywhere when going to the city because they will be stolen. At line 1, the interviewee asks whether “they”—acquaintances of the interviewer’s—have a shed. This question is not immediately comprehensible for the interviewer: After a gap (line 2), he asks *ach du meinst zu hause* (“oh you mean at home,” line 3).

Extract 3: FOLK_E_00148_SE_01_T_02 *ach meinst zu hause*

- 01 Helmut: *h un un un ham die n schuppen oder so wat?*
and and and do they have a shed or something?
- 02 (0.5)
- 03 → Torsten: *mts ach >du< meinst zu hause.=*
oh you mean.2S at home
mts oh you mean at home
- 04 Helmut: *=ja,*
yes
- 05 Torsten: *ja klar dat ham die [schon.]*
yes sure they have that
- 06 Helmut: *[schuppen] ne,*
shed, right

Torsten’s *du meinst* turn offers a piece of additional information (Antaki, 2012) t h a t explicates what Helmut “meant.”⁴ Helmut confirms this briefly, and Torsten can now respond to the original question (line 5). This case shows a typical insertion sequence. The *du meinst* turn addresses a problem that needs to be resolved before the activity can progress. The change of state token *ach* hints at the fact that Torsten assumes to have understood how to resolve the problem but that this is still to be negotiated by further talk (see Golato & Betz, 2008).

With *das heißt*, speakers often formulate a conclusion or consequence to progress the ongoing activity (see Deppermann & Schmidt, 2014; Kaiser, 2017 for self-reformulations). In the following case from another interview, a linguist (Nils) talks with a pupil (EST4) about his use of dialect. After asking about his dialect use with friends, the interviewer asks about the use of dialect in his family:

⁴In this example, the repair differs from the repair in Example 2: Example 2 illustrates a correction, whereas Example 3 illustrates a candidate understanding. The different types of repair, however, are not the topic of our present analysis.

Extract 4: FOLK_E_00186_SE_01_T_01_DF_01, 04:52-05:19

- 01 (1.1)
 02 Nils: mhm >.h und in der familie
 and in the family
 03 (0.7)
 04 EST4: auch d (0.25) dialekt. h.
 also (0.25) dialect
 05 (0.6)
 06 → Nils: das heißt dein vater kanns auch.=oder,
 that heißen.3S your father can.it too or.TAG
 that means your father is able to (speak dialect), too, right
 07 EST4: mhm,
 08 Nils: .hh wie lebt ihr da?
 how do you live there/then
 09 (.)
 10 Nils: (zu-)
 to-
 11 (0.7)
 12 EST4: ja eh >also (0.3) h. (0.3) wir reden zu hause
 yeah eh well we speak at home
 13 im dialekt denk ich so (2.1) jeder mit jedem
 dialect I guess like- all with one another

When the pupil (EST4) states that he uses dialect with his family too, the interviewer produces a *das heißt* turn that formulates a conclusion of this information: *das heißt dein vater kanns auch. = oder*, (“that means your father is also able to [speak dialect], too, right,” line 06). With this formulation, the interviewer moves to the dialect use of a specific member of the family. This suits the interviewer’s agenda: To register and evaluate the pupil’s language biography, he also needs to check the language and dialect skills of his parents and the family language. The formulation is a way for the interviewer to move the topic along, in accordance with his interview schedule.

Those two examples are typical of our collection and in line with the literature: Interpretations with *du meinst* address problems with prior talk, whereas interpretations with *das heißt* formulate a conclusion to implement a next action and progress the activity.

Different construction of *du meinst* and *das heißt* turns

As outlined in the introduction, *du meinst* has been treated in the literature as a repair practice, and *das heißt* has been treated as a practice for formulating conclusions. The data we have considered so far support this research. What we are interested in now is the following: What is it that makes interpretations with *du meinst* particularly fitting for initiating repair, and what makes interpretations with *das heißt* particularly fitting for formulations?

A striking observation in our data is the strong association of the use of *du meinst* with phrases and *das heißt* with clauses. This association is confirmed by a chi square test, $\chi^2(1, N = 138) = 34.58$, $p < .001$ (see Table 2).

Table 2. Turns with phrasal vs. clausal formats after *du meinst* vs. *das heißt* ($p < .001$, Cramer’s $V = 0.5156788$ [strong effect]).

	<i>Du meinst</i>	<i>Das heißt</i>
Phrasal format	41 (62.1%)	9 (12.5%)
Clausal format	25 (37.9%)	63 (87.5%)
Overall/construction	66	72
Overall	138	

Indeed, the cases of repair with *du meinst* that we have seen were phrasal; the cases of formulations with *das heißt* were clausal. Or to put it from the perspective of linguistic practices, all of our cases of *du meinst* + phrasal turn format accomplish a repair initiation, and all of our cases with *das heißt* + clausal turn format accomplish a formulation. In the following two sections we want to discuss in what way interpretation marker and format contribute to the constitution of repairs and formulations.

The invariant contribution of phrase and clause. To understand the invariant contributions that interpretation marker and format make to a turn's action, it will be useful to look at cases that depart from the statistical association. This association is, after all, not perfect: Sometimes, *du meinst* is used with a clausal format and *das heißt* is used with a phrasal format.

In Extract 5, from a language biography interview, the interviewer initiates repair of the phrase *mit freunden kommunizieren* ("communicate with friends," line 11) in an interrogative *heißt das* turn:

Extract 5: FOLK_E_00180_SE_01_T_01_DF_01, 00:04:00–00:04:19

- 01 Nils: .h bist du viel im internet.
are you online/on the internet a lot
- 02 (0.5)
- 03 AAC2: .h ja.
yes
- 04 (0.3)
- 05 AAC2: kann man sagen.
you might say (that)
- 06 (0.3)
- 07 Nils: [.h]
- 08 AAC2: [dass ich das] schon (0.44) intensiv nutze.
that I use it intensively
- 09 (.)
- 10 für schule.
for school
- 11 mit freunden kommunizieren.
communicate with friends
- 12 (0.5)
- 13 Nils: mhm .h
- 14 (0.5)
- 15 → Nils: ähm: mit freunden kommunizieren heißt das e mail;
PTCL with friends communicate heißen.3SG that e-mail
ehm to communicate with friends does that mean email
- 16 (0.2)
- 17 AAC2: nee das heißt (.) ähm (.) mit chatprogrammen das,
no that means ehm with chat programs
- 18 (0.9)
- 19 Nils: [aye cee] cue.=oder,
ICQ or
- 20 AAC2: [(xxx)]
- 21 (0.3)
- 22 AAC2: em es en.
em es en (MSN)
- 23 (0.5)
- 24 Nils: mhm

The interviewer (Nils) asks the pupil (AAC2) if he is online a lot (line 01). After confirming (lines 03–08), the pupil adds for which purposes he uses the Internet: for school and to communicate with friends (lines 09–10). The interviewer repeats this phrase (*mit freunden kommunizieren* [“to communicate with friends”], line 15) and then offers a candidate understanding using *das heißt* and a phrasal interpretation: *heißt das e mail*; (“does that mean email,” line 15). Recall Extract 4: The assumption that the pupil’s father speaks dialect was a logical conclusion from the fact that they speak dialect “in the family.” In Extract 5, in contrast, the assumption that the pupil communicates via e-mail is not a logical conclusion based on the prior turn. The interviewer just formulates a prototypical example of what the expression “communicate with friends (via Internet)” might mean. As in the earlier cases of *du meinst* turns, *heißt das* here initiates repair by explicating a possible understanding of the prior turn and offering it for confirmation.

Just as *das heißt/heißt das* can be used to initiate repair, *du meinst/meinst du* can mark a formulation. Extract 6 provides an example. During another language biography interview, the interviewee (IE) has been talking about her horseback riding experience and about the fact she does both show jumping and dressage.

Extract 6: FOLK_E_00130_SE_01_T_01_DF_01_c442

- 10 IR: >aha< was machst du lieber?
ah what do you prefer
- 11 IE: °h springreiten Hu[hu
show jumping
- 12 IR: [ja [.H:
yes
- 13 IE: [ja
yes
- 14 IR: öm:: (0.2) °h was willst du mal beruflich
ehm what do you want to
- 15 mach[en
do professionally (later)
- 16 IE: [khm kriminalkommissarin
chief inspector
- 17 → IR: .h: aha also °H du meinst dass das (1.0)
ah so you mean.2S COMP this
ah, so you think that this
- 18 also für (.) für de für den (.)
so for for th- for the
so for, for th-, for
- 19 broterwerb nich reichen wird das
bread.winning not suffice.INF will this
making a living it will not suffice, the
- 20 springreiten >al[so
show.jumping so
show jumping so
- 21 IE: [ne:in, °h das:: hab ich mir
no that I also never
- 22 auch nie als:: (0.5) beruf ausgedacht
thought of as a profession
- 23 >weil ich hab< auch noch andere talente aber
cause I also have other talents but
- 24 °hh das mach ich halt (aus/als) mein spaß
that I just do for fun

At line 14, the interviewer somewhat abruptly (and probably moving along in his interview schedule) asks the interviewee about plans for her future working life. She provides a quite specific answer that, however, has nothing to do with show jumping. The interviewer returns to the topic of show jumping in the turn that interests us: *also °H du meinst dass das (1.0) also für (.) für de für den (.) broterwerb nich reichen wird das springreiten >also* (“so you think that this [1.0] so for, for th- for the (.) bread winning it will not suffice, the show jumping”). This turn does not clarify anything that would have been unclear in the interviewee’s prior turn—in other words, it does not initiate repair. Instead, *also* (“so,” line 17, see Deppermann & Helmer, 2013) already projects a conclusion, which the interviewer then articulates. Note that the interviewee does not simply confirm but expands to provide more background (lines 21–24). This shows that *du meinst* can participate in turns that formulate a conclusion that projects further topical talk.

We suggest that the interpretation format of a phrase and the format of a clause make the following invariant contribution to the design of actions in this domain. Phrasal formats in our collection design the turn as problematizing the prior talk (i.e., such turns accomplish actions that belong in the domain of repair), whereas clausal formats formulate a conclusion that progresses talk (i.e., such turns accomplish actions that belong in the domain of formulations). Interpretations with a clause therefore enact stronger agency than do interpretations with a phrase. Instead of reacting to prior talk to clarify something, they initiate courses of action and progress talk.

The invariant contribution of second person vs. third person grammar. Just like the syntactic format, the choice of interpretation marker (*du meinst* or *das heißt*) makes an invariant contribution to action formation. The second person marking of *du meinst* refers to the domain of the other speaker and problematizes what they have or had “on their mind.” The other speaker has the “ownership” over what s/he has said or has failed to make clear and is accountable for that. In contrast, the third person marking of *das heißt* is apt for referring to items lying outside of the I-you relationship of speaker and hearer: to objects of the conversation, such as expressions used in prior talk.

In Extract 5 (*freunde*), we saw a rare case of a repair initiation with *das heißt*:

- 11 AAC2: **mit freunden kommunizieren.**
 communicate with friends
- 12 (0.5)
- 13 Nils: **mhm; .h**
- 14 (0.5)
- 15 → Nils: **ähm: mit freunden kommunizieren heißt das e mail;**
 PTCL with friends communicate heißen.3SG that e-mail
 ehm to communicate with friends does that mean email
- 16 (0.2)
- 17 AAC2: **nee das heißt (.) ähm (.) mit chatprogrammen das,**
 no that means ehm with chat programs

Extract 5: FOLK_E_00180_SE_01_T_01_DF_01, 00:04:00–00:04:19

In contrast to those repair initiations that are framed with *du meinst*, the trouble source here does not concern relevant information that the prior speaker would have left implicit (compare to Extract 3, “you mean at home”). Instead, it concerns the local meaning of something that is already “out there”: a stretch of prior talk. Differences in the grammatical makeup of *das heißt* and *du meinst* are crucial here. The third person grammar of *das heißt* triadically orients the search for the repairable to a territory outside of the relationship between speaker and hearer. Note that the interviewer repeats the troublesome phrase, *mit freunden kommunizieren*, before initiating repair, thereby scaffolding the search for the

repairable as an object of the conversation instead of offering something that may have been on the other speaker's mind.

Similarly, we can observe that formulating a conclusion with *du meinst* is not the same as formulating a conclusion with *das heißt*, as we have seen in Extract 6, reproduced here:

Extract 6: FOLK_E_00130_SE_01_T_01_DF_01_c442

- 16 IE: [k^{hm} kriminalkommissarin
chief inspector
- 17 IR: h: aha also °h du meinst dass das (1.0)
ah so you mean.2S COMP this
ah, so you think that this
- 18 also für (.) für de für den (.)
so for for th- for the
so for, for th-, for the
- 19 broterwerb nich reichen wird das
bread.winning not suffice.INF will this
bread winning it will not suffice, the
- 20 springreiten >al[so
show.jumping so
show jumping so
- 21 IE: [ne:in, °h das:: hab ich mir
no that I also never
- 22 auch nie als:: (0.5) beruf ausgedacht
thought of as a profession

The second person grammar of *du meinst* makes it possible for the interviewer to offer his conclusion as a formulation of the interviewee's *belief*, which makes her account for that belief relevant. In contrast, in the dialect case (Extract 4), the third person grammar of *das heißt* makes it possible for the interviewer to offer a conclusion (the pupil's father is able to speak dialect) as a formulation of objective fact, treated as logically deducible from what the interviewee has said before (the entire family speaks dialect).

To sum up, the two interpretation markers and the two syntactic interpretation formats each make their invariant contribution to the formation of action in the domain of interpretations. Phrasal formats are dependent on the action of the prior turn, whereas clausal formats implement independent actions. *Du meinst* proposes an interpretation that allocates ownership by ascribing intention or belief to the other person on the basis of a prior (typically adjacent) utterance, whereas with *das heißt* a speaker claims to be formulating something that has become deducible over the course of prior talk. One further kind of support for this analysis comes from the different kinds of "target" that interpretations operate back on: Turns with *das heißt* tend to refer to (and infer something on the basis of) complete sequences and multiunit turns including negotiations of subject matters in which both speakers were involved. Turns with *du meinst* tend to refer to (and formulate something on the basis of) adjacent turns and specific elements within the prior turn(s), dealing with what a prior speaker could have meant—confirmed by a chi square test: $\chi^2(1, N = 138) = 38.16$, $p < .001$ (see Table 3).

This finding might also explain the strong association we illustrated in Table 2: *S e c o n d p e r s o n* marking and a phrasal turn format are both practices of dyadic other-orientation. Second person ascribes ownership of the interpreted content to the other speaker, and the phrasal format indexically points back to that person's talk. Speakers use the combination of both to clarify what another person meant in their (adjacent) prior turn and its specific elements (Benjamin, 2012).⁵ The target of the

⁵Benjamin (2012) shows that in case of English *you mean* the trouble source usually doesn't lie in the adjacent TCU it is further away. Benjamin counts cases as further away, in which *you mean* follows the trouble source after a gap or an abandoned initial response. Our focus, however, is on identifying the trouble source in the environment before a speaker change. That is, even if a speaker reacts with *du meinst* only after a gap, we'd count the trouble source as adjacent if it is located in the last TCU said by the prior speaker.

Table 3. Stretches of talk to which interpretations with *das heißt* vs. *du meinst* bear reference ($p < .001$, Cramer's $V = 0.5450967$ [strong effect]).

Refers to ...	<u><i>Das heißt</i></u>	<u><i>Du meinst</i></u>	Overall
A complete sequence (e.g., question-answer-sequence) → post expansion	63 (87.5%)	25 (37.9%)	88
A prior turn, TCU or element → inserted in (pre)seconds or part of a sequence	7 (9.7%)	41 (62.1%)	48
Unclear	2 (2.8%) 72	0 66	2 138

interpretation is a currently “open” not yet completed sequence. On the other hand, third person marking and a clausal format are both practices of triadic orientation to a subject matter. Third person refers triadically to a public object of talk (such as a completed sequence), and the clausal format affords the formulation of content that lies outside of what the prior talk projected (Deppermann, 2012, p. 10). Speakers use the combination of both to formulate the gist or upshot of prior talk. The target of the interpretation in such cases is the whole sequence, and the interpretation turn initiates a postexpansion. Interpretation marker and syntactic format therefore go hand in hand in accomplishing two culturally salient activities: initiating repair on the other's talk with a *du meinst* + phrase versus advancing the topic at hand with a *das heißt* + clause.

In the next section, we examine next speakers' responses to seek further support for the distinct contributions that the two interpretation markers and the two types of interpretation format make to action formation.

(Dis)confirmations after different interpretation turns

Given that all of the interpretations examined here, whether framed by *du meinst* or *das heißt*, propose content that is based on the other speaker's talk, we generally expect that a response from the other speaker becomes relevant. Indeed, in almost all our cases, next speakers respond in some way to the interpretations framed by *du meinst* and *das heißt*. This is in line with several studies dealing with responses to polar questions or other *yes/no*-type initiating actions, such as *yes/no* declaratives or *yes/no* interrogatives (Raymond, 2003, 2010).⁶ Extracts 3 (*du meinst zu hause* [“you mean at home”]) and 4 (*das heißt dein vater kanns auch* [“that means your father can, too”]) have shown that interpretations with both *du meinst* and *das heißt* can be followed by simple confirmation with a minimal response. However, we also expect differences in terms of how next speakers respond to interpretations embodying different actions.

In a *das heißt* turn, content is articulated as having become evident over the course of prior talk (it is a “conclusion” or “gist formulation”). In a *du meinst* turn, on the other hand, content is articulated as “owned” by the other speaker (it is their “intention” or “belief”). The concept of ownership has been used in conversation analysis and related disciplines in discussions of agency (e.g., Beach, 1990; Enfield, 2017; Rossi, 2012). The flexibility of human agency means that there are decisions to be made in taking up courses of action or in committing to beliefs. The notion of ownership highlights our responsibility and accountability for the things we do and believe. We suggest that allocating ownership of a belief or communicative intention to a participant with *du meinst* puts them in a position where they should “own up” to that belief or intention, which is most unambiguously done with a (dis)confirmation. An interpretation with *das heißt*, in contrast, does not explicitly attribute ownership of the interpreted content to the other person and therefore does not (so pervasively) mobilize a “yes” or a “no.”

The following two cases illustrate typical responses to interpretations with a *du meinst* + phrase and a *das heißt* + clause. In Extract 7, the interpretation with a *du meinst* + phrase receives a polar response token, although the response speaker subsequently elaborates on this confirmation (line

⁶As already stated in the second section, we did not systematically analyze differences between the *yes/no* declaratives *du meinst/ das heißt* and the *yes/no* interrogatives *meinst du* and *heißt das*.

Figure 1. Sheets for the maptask interaction: (a) path indicated [FFM1]; (b) path not indicated [FFM2].

11). This extract stems from an map-task-interaction, in which a pupil has to explain to a classmate a path on a sheet of paper with some pictures of objects or persons (see Figure 1). The classmate's task is to draw the path on another sheet without seeing his fellow classmate and without knowing the solution. In the extract, the pupil explains the last steps of the path ("Ziel," see Figure 1).

Extract 7: FOLK_E_00103_SE_01_T_01_DF_01_c608

- 01 FFM1: **und dann läufst du bis nach unten-**
and then you walk all the way down
- 02 FFM1: **bis ungefähr auf die höhe von-**
roughly until the level of
- 03 (1.9)
- 04 FFM1: **dem unteren bildrand des hähnchens.**
the lower frame of the picture of the chicken
- 05 (0.4)
- 06 FFM1: **und dann müsstest du angekommen sein;**
and then you should have arrived
- 07 (0.4)
- 08 FFM2: **du meinst dann zum ziel einfach.**
you mean.2SG then to.the goal simply
you mean simply to the goal then
- 09 (0.4)
- 10 → FFM1: **ja.=**
yes
- 11 → FFM1: **=einfach ziehn nach unten.**
simply drawing down
- 12 (0.4)
- 13 FFM2: **okay.**

After FFM2 has finished a move, FFM1 formulates instructions for the last move (lines 01–04). She uses a complex description, maybe because she is not aware of the fact that her classmate is able to see “goal” (*Ziel* in German) written on his sheet. Her classmate needs to draw the line (from the box in the upper right corner) all the way down to the lower frame of the picture of the chicken. She concludes with: *und dann müsstest du angekommen sein*; (“then you should have arrived,” line 06). FFM2, who can see the goal on his sheet, reformulates the complex description with a *du meinst* + phrase turn: *du meinst dann zum ziel einfach*. (“you mean simply to the goal then,” line 14), offering *ziel* as an additional and simpler information. FFM1 confirms this with a type-conforming response (*ja* [“yes”], line 10) and then elaborates the response, specifying with a deontic infinitive *einfach ziehn nach unten*. (“simply drawing down,” line 11). Note that she repeats *einfach* (“simply”) (lines 08/11) from her partner’s turn and also offers information that she has herself given before (line 01, “and then you walk all the way down”). Basically, her expansion offers nothing new but repeats known information succinctly.

Extract 8 provides a typical response to a *das heißt* + clause. It is taken from an interview that Hella conducts with her fellow student, Asmus. They are talking about rockabilly:

Extract 8: FOLK_E_00191_SE_01_T_02, 00:56:52–00:57:31

- 01 Hella: **jetz haste aber immer no nich die frage beantwortet_**
 now you still haven't answered the question
- 02 (0.8)
- 03 Hella: **was mit den männern passiert**
 what happens to the men
- 04 **die keine rockabillydame abkriegen.**
 who don't get a rockabilly lady
 (14s omitted)
- 05 Asmus: **du hast ganz viele alteingesessene,**
 you have a lot of old-timers ones
- 06 (0.4)
- 07 Asmus: **die einfach keine dame haben,**
 who just don't have a lady
- 08 (0.3)
- 09 Asmus: **die seit (0.26) asbach uralt alleine unterwegs sind,**
 who are around alone for ages
- 10 (0.6)
- 11 Asmus: **.hh und äh du has halt die leute die ne freundin haben.**
 and eh you have the people who have a girlfriend
- 12 **das is dann eher der kleinere teil natürlich auch_**
 that 's the smaller part of course then, too
- 13 **sach ich ma die dann_**
 I'd say who then
- 14 Hella: **das heißt jemand von außerhalb kommt nicht in frage.**
 that heißen.3SG someone from outside comes not in question
 that means someone from outside [the group] is out of the
 question
- 15 (0.6)
- 16 Hella: **.h**
- 17 (0.5)
- 18 → Asmus: **.hh das is schwer.**
 it's hard
- 19 → **du kannst dir das nich vorstelln weil äh**
 you cannot imagine that because eh
- 20 → **wie k willst du jemandem erklären, .h**
 how are you going to explain to someone

Table 4. Turn-initial response tokens vs. no response token after interpretations with *du meinst* vs. *das heißt* ($p < .05$, Cramer's $V = 0.2636214$ [small effect]).

	After <i>du meinst</i>	After <i>das heißt</i>
Response token	49 (90.7%)	41 (69.5%)
No response token	5 (9.3%)	18 (30.5%)
	54	59
Overall	113*	

Note. The 113 cases comprise all cases in which an interpretation receives a clearly confirming or disconfirming response, either prefaced by a response token or not. We excluded cases in which no response was given at all and in which the response was not clearly (dis)confirming to compare only the cases in which speakers indicate a pressure to position themselves clearly to the prior interpretation.

Asmus tells Hella about his rockabilly and psychobilly peer group. He mentions several times that it is difficult for his peers to find girlfriends. This leads Hella to the question: What do the peers do if they do not find a “rockabilly girlfriend” (lines 01–04). When Asmus tells her in more detail that only a few of his peers have girlfriends (lines 05–13), Hella concludes with *das heißt* that someone from outside the group is out of the question in terms of partner selection (*das heißt jemand von außerhalb kommt nicht in frage.*, line 14).⁷ After a longish gap, Asmus provides an assessment and an explanation. This response basically confirms Hella's interpretation, but it is not prefaced by any response token. Instead, Asmus provides new information to account for why his fellows do not want or cannot find girlfriends from outside the group (lines 18–20, in his following turn he tells her that it is normal for rockabillies to visit concerts three times a week all over the country, data not shown here). Instead of simply confirming Hella's conclusion, he formulates a “transformative answer” (Stivers & Hayashi, 2010), implicitly contesting her presupposition that someone from outside would at all be willing to be in a relationship with a rockabilly fan or that it would be easy to find one.

This example shows that not all interpretations receive polar confirmations. Some seem to make an elaboration relevant instead (see Raymond, 2010; Seuren & Huiskes, 2017; Steensig & Heinemann, 2013). Previous research ascribes this to sequential aspects and information status (Seuren & Huiskes, 2017) or matters of epistemic access (Steensig & Heinemann, 2013). We now consider how interpretation markers and syntactic format are associated with different types of response.

Based on our observations in the section “Different Construction of *du meinst*- and *das heißt*-Turns”, we expect that the different linguistic interpretation markers (*du meinst* with second person marking vs. *das heißt* with third person marking) make different responses relevant. *Du meinst* attributes ownership of “content” to the other speaker (as their intention or belief). We therefore expect that next speakers mostly react with a polar response token to “own up” to—confirm or disconfirm—the interpretation. *Das heißt* instead formulates an interpretation regarding a subject matter that has become a deducible object for the participants over the course of prior talk. After such interpretations, responses may be more variable and complex. Therefore next speakers may provide more or something other than a simple confirmation (see Extract 8) to progress the interaction.

A quantitative analysis supports this expectation, $\chi^2(1, N = 113) = 6.597, p < .05$ (see Table 4).

Based on our previous observations and evidence from prior research, we also expect that different interpretation formats (phrasal vs. clausal) afford different reactions from following speakers in terms of information given (new information vs. no new information). Repairs offering a phrasal candidate aim to provide an explication that would be helpful in making sure that an overarching ongoing activity can progress in the intended direction. In response to the candidate, confirmations should be succinct to close the repair sequence. Consequently, we expect that responses to phrasal interpretations will be

⁷Expressing her interpretation in this way may be a strategy that is especially appropriate in interviews to prompt the interview partner to talk about or expand on a certain topic (see Clayman, 1992).

Table 5. information given in responses after phrasal vs. clausal interpretations ($p < .001$, Cramer's $V = .3859347$ [medium effect]),

	Phrasal interpretation	Clausal interpretation
No new information in response	31 (86.1%) (e.g., Extracts 2, 3, 7)	26 (48.1%) (e.g., Extract 4)
New information in response	5 (13.9%) (Extract 5)	28 (51.9%) (e.g., Extracts 1, 6, 8)
	36	54
Overall		90*

Note. For this analysis, we focused only on clear confirmations, since disconfirmations (as dispreferred responses) tend to prompt elaborations anyway, and we were specifically interested in differences regarding the length and format of reactions after the interpretations. Overall, we found that 65.2% of all cases in our collection were followed by clear confirmations (in this regard we didn't find significant differences between *das heißt* and *du meinst*).

minimal and/or not offer new information. Clausal interpretations instead perform next steps within the ongoing interaction, so they offer the possibility to elaborate on what they have made relevant and to formulate something more complex subsequently. Consequently, we expect that speakers responding to clausal interpretations produce a contribution that goes beyond simply (dis)confirming and progress the talk by conveying new information.

Our expectations are supported by a quantitative analysis, $\chi^2(1, N = 90) = 11.82$, $p < .001$ (see Table 5).

These two associations combined lead to the effect that in response to prototypical formulations with a *das heißt* + clause, next speakers frequently elaborate on the topic without confirming the interpretation formally (even if they do indirectly, see Walker, Drew, & Local, 2011).⁸ Repairs with a *du meinst* + phrase, in contrast, make relevant and typically receive succinct confirmation

Conclusion

We have shown how interpretation markers and syntactic format contribute to action formation of turns that offer an interpretation of prior talk. The grammar of the interpretation markers (second vs. third person) as well as the interpretation format (phrasal vs. clausal) each make their invariant contribution to the range of actions done by these turns. Second person marking allocates ownership to the prior speaker and third person marking does not, whereas clausal interpretations embody the current speaker's agency, which is not the case for phrasal interpretations. Second person marking and phrasal format (*du meinst* + phrase), as well as third person marking and clausal format (*das heißt* + clause), go hand in hand, which leads to the typical patterns we can sum up as follows:

Du meinst + phrasal interpretations address problems with specific elements or adjacent turns in prior talk. The phrasal format contributes to the design of these turns as repair initiations, specifically candidate understandings (Antaki, 2012), providing just and no more than the information that will be required to progress the overarching activity. In other words, the phrasal format is instrumental for constituting the *du meinst* turn as a move that implements the sole action of operating on the prior talk in such a way as to address a source of trouble in that prior talk. The grammatical format of *du meinst* with second person marking points to the dyadic relationship and allocates ownership of the interpreted content to the prior speaker. Next speakers respond predominantly with concise (dis)confirmations.

The *das heißt* + clause format instead affords formulating more complex conclusions on the basis of complete sequences and negotiations of subject matters in which both speakers were involved. Clausal interpretations add a new aspect to the other person's prior talk. The turns display the speakers' agency and the turns' independence from prior talk in terms of conclusions and elaborations on the basis of prior context. The grammatical format of *das heißt* with third person marking formulates the interpretation as targeting "objectified" contents made deducible in the conversation so far. Response speakers elaborate on a topic more often, without necessarily formally (dis)confirming the *das heißt* turn with response tokens. In their elaborations they convey information

⁸This is also supported by the fact that only 31.7% of interpretations with a *das heißt* + clause receive a minimal response, whereas this is the case for 57.1% of interpretations with a *du meinst* + phrase.

that is new to the prior speaker and thus progress talk. This is also in line with the previous finding that *das heißt* initiates expanding formulations instead of condensing ones (see Bührig, 1996; Deppermann & Schmidt, 2014; Kaiser, 2017). Overall, these results suggest that linguistic resources play a systematic role in the formation of action.

References

- Antaki, C. (2008). Formulations in psychotherapy. In A. Peräkylä, C. Antaki, S. Vehviläinen, & I. Leudar (Eds.), *Conversation analysis and psychotherapy* (pp. 26–42). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Antaki, C. (2012). Affiliative and disaffiliative candidate understandings. *Discourse Studies*, 14(5), 531–547. doi:10.1177/1461445612454074
- Beach, W. (1990). Avoiding ownership for alleged wrongdoings. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 24(1–4), 1–36. doi:10.1080/08351819009389331
- Benjamin, T. (2012). When problems pass us by: Using “you mean” to help locate the source of trouble. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 45(1), 82–109. doi:10.1080/08351813.2012.646742
- Bolden, G. B. (2010). ‘Articulating the unsaid’ via and-prefaced formulations of others’ talk. *Discourse Studies*, 12(1), 5–32. doi:10.1177/1461445609346770
- Breindl, E., Volodina, A., & Waßner, U. H. (2014). *Handbuch der deutschen Konnektoren 2. Semantik der deutschen Satzverknüpfers*. Berlin, Germany: de Gruyter.
- Bührig, K. (1996). *Reformulierende Handlungen. Zur Analyse sprachlicher Adaptierungsprozesse in institutioneller Kommunikation*. Tübingen, Germany: Narr.
- Clayman, S. E. (1992). Footing in the achievement of neutrality: The case of news-interview discourse. In P. Drew & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Talk at work. Interaction in institutional settings* (pp. 163–198). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Couper-Kuhlen, E. (2014). What does grammar tell us about action? *Pragmatics*, 24(3), 623–647. doi:10.1075/prag.24.3.08cou
- Deppermann, A. (2011). Notionalization: The transformation of descriptions into categorizations. *Human Studies*, 34(2), 155–181. doi:10.1007/s10746-011-9186-9
- Deppermann, A. (2012). Über Sätze in Gesprächsbeiträgen - wann sie beginnen und wann man sie braucht. In C. Cortès (Ed.), *Satzeröffnung. Formen, Funktionen, Strategien* (pp. 1–14). Tübingen, Germany: Stauffenburg.
- Deppermann, A., & Helmer, H. (2013). Zur Grammatik des Verstehens im Gespräch: Inferenzen anzeigen und Handlungskonsequenzen ziehen mit *also* und *dann*. *Zeitschrift für Sprachwissenschaft*, 32(1), 1–39. doi:10.1515/zfs-2013-0001
- Deppermann, A., & Schmidt, T. (2014). Gesprächsdatenbanken als methodisches Instrument der Interaktionalen Linguistik – Eine exemplarische Untersuchung auf Basis des Korpus FOLK in der Datenbank für Gesprochenes Deutsch (DGD2). *Mitteilungen des Deutschen Germanistenverbandes*, 61(1), 4–17. doi:10.14220/mdge.2014.61.1.4
- Egbert, M. (2009). *Der Reparatur-Mechanismus in deutschen Gesprächen*. Mannheim, Germany: Verlag für Gesprächsforschung.
- Enfield, N. (2017). Distribution of agency. In N. J. Enfield & P. Kockelman (Eds.), *Distributed agency* (pp. 9–14). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Fox, B. A., & Thompson, S. A. (2010). Responses to *wh*-questions in English conversation. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 43(2), 133–156. doi:10.1080/08351811003751680
- Garfinkel, H., & Sacks, H. (1970). On formal structures of practical actions. In J. D. McKinney & E. A. Tiryakian (Eds.), *Theoretical sociology* (pp. 337–366). New York, NY.: Allpeton-Century-Crofts.
- Golato, A., & Betz, E. (2008). German *ach* and *achso* in repair uptake: A resource to sustain or remove epistemic asymmetry. *Zeitschrift für Sprachwissenschaft*, 27(1), 7–37. doi:10.1515/ZFSW.2008.002
- Gülich, E., & Kotschi, T. (1987). Reformulierungshandlungen als Mittel der Textkonstitution [Untersuchungen zu französischen Texten aus mündlicher Kommunikation]. In W. Motsch (Ed.), *Satz, Text, sprachliche Handlung* (pp. 199–261). Berlin, Germany: Akademie Verlag.
- Heritage, J. (1985). Analyzing news interviews: Aspects of the production of talk for an overhearing audience. In T. A. van Dijk (Ed.), *Handbook of discourse analysis: Volume 3: Discourse and dialogue* (pp. 95–117). London, England: Academic Press.
- Heritage, J., & Watson, R. D. (1979). Formulations as conversational objects. In G. Psathas (Ed.), *Everyday language. Studies in ethnomethodology* (pp. 123–162). New York, NY: Irvington.
- Jefferson, G. (2004). Glossary of transcript symbols with an introduction. In G. H. Lerner (Ed.), *Conversation analysis. Studies from the first generation* (pp. 13–31). Amsterdam, The Netherlands: John Benjamins Publishing Co.
- Kaiser, J. (2017). Reformulierungsindikatoren im gesprochenen Deutsch: Die Benutzung der Ressourcen DGD und FOLK für gesprächsanalytische Zwecke. *Gesprächsforschung - Online-Zeitschrift zur verbalen Interaktion*, 17, 196–230.

- Keevallik, L. (2003). *From interaction to grammar: Estonian finite verb forms in conversation*. Uppsala, Sweden: Uppsala Universitet.
- Mondada, L. (2015). The facilitator's task of formulating citizens' proposals in political meetings. Orchestrating multiple embodied orientations to recipients. *Gesprächsforschung - Online-Zeitschrift zur verbalen Interaktion*, 16, 1–62.
- Raymond, G. (2003). Grammar and social organization: Yes/No Interrogatives and the structure of responding. *American Sociological Review*, 68(6), 939–967. doi:10.2307/1519752
- Raymond, G. (2010). Grammar and social relations: Alternative forms of Yes/No-type initiating actions in health visitor interactions. In A. F. Freed & S. L. Ehrlich (Eds.), *“Why do you ask?”. The function of questions in institutional discourse* (pp. 87–107). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Robinson, J. D. (2016). Accountability in social interaction. In J. D. Robinson (Ed.), *Accountability in Interaction* (pp. 1–44). Oxford, England: Oxford University press.
- Rossi, G. (2012). Bilateral and unilateral requests: The use of imperatives and Mi X? Interrogatives in Italian. *Discourse Processes*, 49(5), 426–458. doi:10.1080/0163853X.2012.684136
- Rost-Roth, M. (2003). Fragen - Nachfragen - Echofragen. Formen und Funktionen von Interrogationen im gesprochenen Deutsch. *Linguistik Online*, 13(1), 325–378.
- Rost-Roth, M. (2006). *Nachfragen. Formen und Funktionen äußerungsbezogener Interrogationen*. Berlin, Germany: de Gruyter.
- Rost-Roth, M. (2011). Formen und Funktionen von Interrogationen. Fragen in grammatischen Beschreibungen, empirischen Befunden und Lehrwerken für Deutsch als Fremdsprache. *Linguistik Online*, 49(5), 91–117.
- Schegloff, E. A. (2007). *Sequence organization in interaction: A primer in conversation analysis, volume 1*. Cambridge, England: 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. doi:10.1353/lan.1977.0041
- Selting, M. (1987). *Verständigungsprobleme. Eine empirische Analyse am Beispiel der Bürger-Verwaltungs-Kommunikation*. Tübingen, Germany: Niemeyer.
- Seuren, L., & Huijskes, M. (2017). Confirmation or elaboration: What do yes/no declaratives want? *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 50(2), 188–205. doi:10.1080/08351813.2017.1301307
- Sorjonen, M., & Raevaara, L. (2014). On the grammatical form of requests at the convenience store: Requesting as embodied action. In P. Drew & E. Couper-Kuhlen (Eds.), *Requesting in social interaction. Studies in language and social interaction* (pp. 243–268). Amsterdam, The Netherlands: John Benjamins.
- Steensig, J., & Heinemann, T. (2013). When 'yes' is not enough – As an answer to a yes/no question. In B. S. Reed & G. Raymond (Eds.), *Units of talk – Units of action* (pp. 213–248). Amsterdam, The Netherlands: John Benjamins.
- Stivers, T. (2010). An overview of the question-response system in American English conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 42(10), 2772–2781. doi:10.1016/j.pragma.2010.04.011
- 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 knowing in conversation* (pp. 82–106). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Stivers, T., & Hayashi, M. (2010). Transformative answers: One way to resist a question's constraints. *Language in Society*, 39(1), 1–25. doi:10.1017/S0047404509990637
- Thompson, S. A., Fox, B. A., & Couper-Kuhlen, E. (2015). *Grammar in everyday talk: Building responsive actions*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Vargas, E. (2002). Die paraphrastische Reformulierung mit explizierender Funktion: Versuch einer semantischen Typologie. In S. Bastian & F. Hammer (Eds.), *“Aber, wie sagt man doch so schön...”. Beiträge zu Metakommunikation und Reformulierung in argumentativen Texten* (pp. 97–106). Frankfurt a. M.: Peter Language.
- Walker, T., Drew, P., & Local, J. (2011). Responding indirectly. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 43(9), 2434–2451. doi:10.1016/j.pragma.2011.02.012
- Weiste, E., & Peräkylä, A. (2013). A comparative conversation analytic study of formulations in psychoanalysis and cognitive psychotherapy. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 46(4), 299–321. doi:10.1080/08351813.2013.839093