German questions and turn-final *oder*

Veronika Drake

English abstract
This conversation analytic paper explores the functions of turn-final *oder* ('or') in mundane German interaction. These *oders* are produced with either upward or level intonation as in *aber das hat denen sicher spaß gemacht oder?* ('but it must have been fun for them oder') and *und äh tourst du bisher alleine oder_* ('and uhm are you planning on travelling alone oder'). The turns they are part of are formulations of understanding in first position and require a response from the co-participant next. I argue that *oder?*-turns create polar constraints and make relevant confirmation or disconfirmation. *Oder_*-turns, in contrast, project an alternative to what was just said and thereby weaken polar constraints.

Keywords: Conversation Analysis, German, polar questions, tag questions, turnfinal tokens, *oder*.

German abstract
Die vorliegende konversationsanalytische Arbeit untersucht die Funktionen von turn-finalem *oder* in deutschen Alltagsgesprächen. Sprecher verwenden *oder* nicht nur als Konjunktion, sondern auch regelmäßig in turn-finaler Position. *Oder* wird entweder mit final-steigender Intonationskontur oder final-gleichbleibender Intonationskontur produziert: *aber das hat denen sicher spaß gemacht oder?* und *und äh tourst du bisher alleine oder_*. Sprecher produzieren *oder*-turns in erster Position und machen einen Turn in zweiter Position relevant. Diese Studie zeigt, dass die beiden unterschiedlichen *oder*-Turns unterschiedliche nächste Turns relevant machen. *Oder?*-Turns fordern Konfirmation oder Diskonfirmation ein, während *oder_*-Turns eine Alternative zu dem was im *oder_*-turn gesagt wurde als nächsten Turn antizipieren und relevant machen.

Keywords: Conversation Analysis, Deutsch, Ja/nein-Fragen, tag questions, tags, *oder*.

1. Introduction[1]

This conversation analytic paper explores the functions of two first-pair part (FPP) formats: FPP's ending in level-intoned *oder_* ('or_') and FPP's ending in upward-intoned *oder?* ('or?'). *Oder* is generally seen as a coordinating conjunction linking two alternatives (Eisenberg 1994; Zifonun et al. 1997). Zifonun et al. (1997), without taking into consideration different intonation contours, note that when *oder* occurs in turn-final position, it is used when the speaker assumes that there is a likely or probable alternative to what was just said, indicating a speaker's greater need for verification. In spoken discourse, interlocutors regularly use the lexical item *oder* in turn-final position, where it marks turn completion. Unlike in English, where turn-final *ors* are produced exclusively with level intonation (Drake 2015), the *oders* in German are produced either with level or with upward intonation (my data corpus did not yield any examples of *oder* with falling intonation). The two resulting formats of *oder*-turns accomplish distinct interactional work and are employed systematically for different interactional outcomes. Excerpts (1) - (4) illustrate both types:[2]

(1)　　**Fun (Call home deu 6312 (7:30) [46])**

```
1 =>   A:    aber das hat denen sicher spaß gemacht oder?
              but that has them surely fun made oder?
              but it must have been fun for them oder?

2      B:    Jaja; und deine mama hat noch angerufen,
              Yesyes; and your mom has also called,
              Yesyes; and your mom also called,
```

(2)　　**Kroger (Call home deu 6692 (5:07) [54])**

```
1 =>   B:    Ja   zum   kroger rei oder?
              PRT to+the kroger into oder?
                into kroger oder?

2      A:    >nein, net zum kroger nei,<
              >no, not to+the kroger into,<
              >no, not into kroger,<
```

(3)　　**The wave (Call home deu 6388 (11:48) [26])**

```
1 =>   B:    >ja,ja;< und die welle ist ok↑ay oder_
              >yes,yes;< and the wave is ok↑ay oder_
              >yes, yes;< and the wave is ok↑ay oder_

2            (.)
```

[2]　For transcription notations, see section 3.

```
3      A:      also:_ generell muss man sagen äh war ich
               well: generally must one say uh was i
               well: in general one has to say uh I was

4              eigentlich ein bisschen enttäuscht von der
               actually  a little disappointed from the
               actually a bit disappointed with the

5              welle hier.
               wave here.
               wave here.
```

(4)   **US Tour (Call home deu 5661 (4:00) [14])**

```
1  =>  A:      und äh: tourst du bisher allei↑ne ↓oder_
               and uh: travel you so far allo↑n ↓or_
               and uhm are you planning on travelling alone or_

2      B:      nja. ich werde: tossi wird äh wohl kommen?
               PRT. i   will: tossi will uh probably come?
               well. I want: tossi is probably going to come?
```

In each of these excerpts, the *oder* is produced as part of a FPP of a question-answer adjacency pair. In response, the recipient provides a second-pair part (SPP):

A: oder?/*oder_* -turn   FPP
B: response   SPP

The FPP's come in the form of phrases and clauses; clauses can be declaratively and interrogatively shaped. The turn material preceding the *oder*-token and the *oder*s themselves are part of one turn. That is, there are no prosodic breaks or pauses prior to *oder*. The *oder* is a constitutive part of the turn and is oriented to as such. In other words, the *oder* is not treated as the beginning of a new turn constructional unit (TCU) but rather as bringing the ongoing turn to a point of possible completion and as such to a transition relevance place (TRP). Upward-intoned *oder* marks the ongoing turn as pragmatically and prosodically complete. Level-intoned *oder*-turns are somewhat more complicated, because the intonation levels or trails off. As such, it might be more complicated for recipients to determine if the *oder* is the beginning of a new TCU or the completion of the ongoing turn. Building on work on so-called trail-off patterns (Local/Kelly 1986; Local et al. 1986; Walker 2004), Walker's (2012) acoustic analysis demonstrates that turn-final conjunctions *but, and, or,* and *so*) are designed and treated as turn-completers. The *oder_* -turns share characteristics with these turn-final conjunctions described by Walker (2012) and turn-final *or* described by Drake (2015). Hence, both upward intoned and level-intoned *oder* complete the ongoing turn, and both types are distinct action formats.

    The SPP's also come in a variety of shapes: type-conforming, non-conforming (see Raymond 2003), confirming/disconfirming, with and without elaborations. Excerpts (1) and (2) illustrate confirming and disconfirming responses. Excerpts (3) and (4), however, feature somewhat different response types. They do not clearly confirm or disconfirm the proposition of the FPP. At first glance, the turns

preceding turn-final *oders* seem to be what Betz et al. (2013) call *confirmable*. A *confirmable* is a turn that makes relevant a confirmation or disconfirmation. The term is broader than "*yes/no*-question," and as such allows for the inclusion of turns that feature declarative and interrogative syntax as well as phrasal and clausal structures (see also Drake 2015). In this way, confirmables are turns that are oriented to as questions by the participants (regardless of their morpho-syntactic composition), as evidenced by the responses given to them.

Yet, my analysis will show that only those turns that end with *oder?* are oriented to as actual confirmables that impose or strengthen polar constraints on the recipient, making relevant either a confirming or disconfirming response next. *Oder_*-turns, in contrast, are oriented to as projecting a probable alternative to what was just said, and thereby relax polar constraints, creating a broader range of appropriate and relevant next turns (this is similar to English turn-final *or*; see Drake 2015). In excerpt (3) above, for example, the response does not directly or exclusively disconfirm the question of "is the wave good?"; it could also be a fitted response to a *wh*-question "how is the wave". My data then show that the claim by Zifonun et al. (1997) about turn-final *oder* holds only partially for level-intoned *oder_* and not at all for upward-intoned *oder?*.

The variants of *oder* are two different formats employed for turn design and action construction. Action construction is concerned with "lexico-syntactic and other linguistic resources that are employed by speakers in designing turns-at-talk in order to conduct particular actions" (Drew 2013:14). Speakers' selection of *oder?* versus *oder_* is systematic. The analysis will show that *oder?* and *oder_* modify the constraints of the FPP they are added to in distinct ways, meaningful to the participants.

2. Prior Literature

Turn-final position is crucial in the turn-by-turn unfolding of talk, as it projects possible turn completion and potential speaker change. It is also an environment, though not the only one, in which interlocutors can produce verbal and nonverbal stance markers (Schegloff 1996). Turn-final lexical tokens have been studied in a variety of languages. For English, this research includes tag questions such as *are they, aren't they, right?* and so on (e.g., Cameron/McAlinden/O' Leary 1989; Heritage/Raymond 2005; Holmes 1982, 1984, 1995; Lakoff 1975; Moore/Podesva 2009), and turn-final conjunctions such as *but, though*, and *or* (Mulder/Thompson 2008; Barth-Weingarten/Couper-Kuhlen 2002; Jefferson 1983; Drake 2015: Walker 2012). In addition to work on English, there is some work on turn-final elements in other languages: Finnish *että* (Koivisto/Laury/Seppänen 2011; Laury/ Seppänen 2008), French *hein* (Beeching 2002), Estonian *et* and *või* (Keevallik 2008, 2009), Swedisch *eller* (Lindström 1997), *dige* in Farsi (Taleghani-Nikazm 2015), German *ne?*[3] (Harren 2001) and other German tokens (Hagemann 2009).

---

[3] In addition to Harren's (2001) work on 'ne?', there is Jefferson's (1980) article "The abominable ne?' ". She discusses *ne?'* as a way to pursue a response after a response was already given or where the recipient of a question has already started to formulate a response. In overlap with this response, the response-pursuing *ne?* is then placed. This practice is different from the focus of this paper, as the *ne?* is not produced as one with the ongoing turn but is produced quite some time after the prior turn has come to completion.

This research establishes that these turn-final tokens are understood and orientated to as turn-final rather than as projecting more talk. Existing research also shows the varying interactional functions participants accomplish by using turn-final tokens. In English, turn-final *or* has been shown to function as an epistemic downgrade, which leaves a second alternative unverbalized, makes disconfirming responses unproblematic, and requires an elaboration next (Drake 2015). Swedish *eller*, a lexical equivalent to *or*, is added to turns that are dispreferred as such, occur within activities that are problematic, and has been shown to relax the preference for confirmation (Lindström 1997). For Estonian, Keevallik (2009) demonstrates that *või* functions differently than Swedish *eller*. *Või* is used when "part of the prior turn is repeated, as a conclusion based on any discursive or contextual matter, as a next question in a series, topic initiator, and even as a mild challenge" (163). In comparison to other turn-final particles in Estonian, *või* also indexes less certainty.

There is little research on German turn-final tokens. While Hagemann (2009) explores German tags such as *ne?, nicht?, nicht wahr?, gell?,* he focuses on intra-turn placement of such tokens and argues that they are used to index evidentiality. More pertinent to my study is König's (in prep.) work on German question tags as discourse markers and Harren's (2001) analysis of the functions and positions of the token *ne?*. Turn-final *ne?* turns the utterance into one that requires a SPP, and it also conveys the speakers' relative certainty about what they have just said. *Ne?* overwhelmingly receives an agreeing SPP, and thus helps in achieving mutually shared knowledge, agreement and understanding. She also reports on some preliminary findings on *oder* based on a collection of five examples. According to Harren, *oder?* in contrast to *ne?* indicates that speakers are not very sure whether or not an agreeing SPP is forthcoming, and thus *oder?* does not indicate mutually shared knowledge, agreement and understanding. König (in prep.) documents the use of *ne* in turn-final, turn-initial, and free-standing position, demonstrating that speakers' relative epistemic status contributes to different uses and orientations to *ne* in these various positions.

In my data, participants also seem to index various levels of certainty and epistemic access when they employ the different versions of *oder*. However, my data suggest that the two variants of turn-final *oder* are implicated in action formation; that is, each format works to create distinct FPP constraints. I show that *oder?* strengthens or imposes polar constraints, whereas *oder_* weakens polar constraints and makes relevant an alternative to the one contained in the *oder_*-turn. My work adds to research on grammar in intonation in interaction, action formation, and to the growing body of cross-linguistic research on turn-final tokens.

3. Data and Methodology

Linguistic resources of a particular language such as syntax and lexis afford different interactional outcomes while also "essentially defin[ing] the possibilities for social action accomplished through talk" (Sidnell 2009:4). Because my aim is to investigate the forms and interactional functions of one specific linguistic resource, namely questions ending in *oder*, my methodology is firmly grounded in

Conversation Analysis (CA) (Hutchby/Wooffitt 1998; Schegloff 2007; Sidnell 2009; ten Have 1999; among others). CA focuses not on what is theoretically possible in a given language, but rather in what we, the language users, actually do with language in everyday social interaction. It acknowledges that language and talk shape each other. Schegloff (1996) notes that talk "appears to be the basic and primordial environment for the use and development (...) of language" (54). Language is not solely seen as an abstract semiotic system that we use in interaction, but rather as a system that is "at least partially shaped by interactional considerations" (Schegloff 1996:55). In other words, grammatical structures emerge in and from interaction. In daily interactions, we rely on linguistic resources to accomplish social action and at the same time shape such linguistic resources.

The analysis here is based on 44 instances of *oder?* and 31 instances of *oder_,* all of which come from the *CallHome deu* corpus (McWhinney 2007).[4] The conversations are all ordinary, mundane telephone conversations between Germans and include interlocutors from various geographic and dialect areas in Germany. One of the participants in each conversation is in the US, one in Germany. The participants in the US volunteered to partake in a research project, for which they were given a complimentary 30-minute phone call from the US to Germany.

All data were transcribed according to the transcription system developed by Gail Jefferson (Heritage/Atkinson 1984). The Jeffersonian system is widely used in conversation analytic work, especially in North American and international contexts; I follow this tradition. To represent intonation contours in a more nuanced way, I supplement the Jeffersonian system with some additional notations to represent intonation (based on the Gesprächsanalytische Transkriptionssystem 2 (GAT2) (Selting et al. 2009). Specifically, I use "?" for rising intonation, "," for slightly rising intonation, "_" for level intonation, ";" for slightly falling intonation, and "." for falling intonation. In line with CA methodology, the transcript itself is a tool representing the data; the analysis is based on the data itself. The phenomenon under investigation in this study has been highlighted using an arrow (=>) and bold font for "oder"-turns in all transcripts of data samples. In all transcripts, the first line is the original German, the second line a word-for-word gloss, the third line an idiomatic translation. Because I am interested in the interactional function of German *oder,* I do not provide translations yet. The analysis will show if English *or* is a suitable translation.

---

[4]   The collection of *oder*-tokens overall is somewhat larger (n=104). However, instances in which *oder* occurred freestanding, was followed by an increment, was not responded to, or was produced in full overlap were excluded from the analysis.

4. Analysis

4.1. *Oder* with rising intonation: Imposing polar constraints

When participants use *oder?*, they formulate an understanding and offer it for dis/confirmation to the co-participant. In all instances, following the *oder?*-adjacency pair sequence, the participants quickly move the conversation forward to a new sequence. In my data, *oder?* occurs overwhelmingly in turn-final position of declarative questions (n=40) and only twice in final position of interrogatively formed *yes/no*-questions. In two cases, the syntax was ambiguous as in *weißt wer des is; oder?* ('(you) know who that is; *oder?*'). Here, the subject pronoun is missing, and could be added prior to the verb *weißt* ('know'), resulting in declarative syntax, or it could be added following the verb, resulting in interrogative syntax. In my collection, the *oder?*-turns receive always either confirming responses (n=19) or disconfirming responses (n=25). Of the responses, 33 are type-conforming responses (i.e., they include a "yes" or "no" token), and only eleven are non-conforming responses (i.e., include no "yes" or "no" token) (see Raymond 2003). In cases of non-conforming responses, the response still clearly confirms (for example via a repeat) or disconfirms the proposition of the *oder?*-turn.

Excerpt (5) below, a longer version of (1) earlier, serves as a first illustration. B is telling A about her visit with friends, whom she showed pictures from a study-abroad trip. She mentions, prior to the excerpt, that her friends served plenty of coffee and champagne, which is why B started to feel sick and announced abruptly that she had to leave. B assesses this incident as 'embarrassing' (line 1).

(5)   **Fun (Call home deu 6312 (7:30) [46])**

```
1    B:    .hh es war ein bisschen peinlich aber_
            .hh it was  a bit   embarrassing but__
            .hh it was bit embarassing but_

2          (0.3)

3    B:    egal.
           doesn't matter.
            doe[sn't matter.
               [
4    A:       [ha↑hihaha. ja, gut. so ist das.
              [ha↑hihaha. PRT, good. so is that.
              [ha↑hihaha.  well good. That's how it is.

5    B:    uh[huhu
           uh[huhu
           uh[huhu
             [
6 => A:      [aber das hat denen sicher spaß gemacht oder?
             [but that has them surely fun made oder?
             [but it must have been fun for them oder

7    B:    Jaja; und deine mama hat noch angerufen,
           Yesyes; and your mom has also called,
           Yesyes; and your mom also called,
```

In line 1, B moves to close down her telling by providing her own assessment *es war ein bisschen peinlich, aber_* ('it was a bit embarrassing, but_'). This assessment is really a self-deprecating move, and potentially, a complaint. As such, the preferred next would be a turn that counters B's assertion. Note that this turn ends in *aber* ('but'). Haselow (2015) shows that German *aber* can occur as what he calls a final particle. As such, it creates a link between the utterance it follows and an implied proposition, a proposition that doesn't need to be expressed. After having reached this TRP, the pause of 0.3 seconds creates yet another opportunity for A to produce an appropriate response. When none is forthcoming, B produces an increment (Couper-Kuhlen/Ono 2007; among others) in line 3, recompleting her prior utterance by adding a syntactically fitted *egal* ('doesn't matter'). B, essentially, now explicitly formulates the proposition previously only implied via the *but*. She's communicating that even if it was embarrassing, it doesn't really matter. This turn is also what Schegloff (2007) calls an aphoristic formulation, which are commonly used in sequence-closing sequences. Next, A produces laughter that seems enthusiastic (note the pitch peak), followed by his own sequence-closing move *ja, gut. so ist das.* ('well, that's how it is') (line 4). This is a very general statement and does not address B's specific telling, her evaluation of it, or her self-deprecating statement. In line 6, A produces the *oder?*-turn, proposing that B's friends must have been entertained by this. In line 7, A immediately produces a confirmation via a double saying of *ja* ('yes') (see Barth-Weingarten 2011a, 2011b; Golato/Fagyal 2008). With it, she effectively closes the sequences and immediately adds another TCU that introduces a new, unrelated topic.

The *oder?*-turn here is formed declaratively, includes the epistemic stance-marker *sicher* ('surely'), which is emphasized, and is produced with falling intonation prior to *oder?*. A formulates an understanding that is connected to talk from the sequence that had just been closed. That is, she reopens this sequence resulting in a post-expansion, by formulating a contrast-implicative *aber* ('but')-turn. As a declarative, a possible next could be simply agreement/disagreement. The *oder?* works to create a confirmable that imposes polar constraints and makes a confirmation or disconfirmation relevant next. Without the *oder?*, then, the turn would not lexically or syntactically be marked explicitly as a confirmable. This *oder?*-turn illustrates several of my findings: It is declaratively shaped and it is followed by a type-conforming response that matches constraints of a *yes/no*-question. Rather than proposing an alternative to what was just said, the *oder?* explicitly marks a declarative as a confirmable and imposes strict polar constraints, requiring not another alternative, but a confirmation/disconfirmation of what was just said next. Immediately after the confirmation, the *oder?*-turn recipient moves the conversation forward by changing the topic.

The vast majority of cases in my collection involve the recipient of a telling formulating the *oder?*-turn. There were, however, four exceptions to this pattern. In these four instances, it is the story-teller who, early on in the telling, employs an *oder?*-turn; this is illustrated in excerpt (6). Here, B is telling A about a mutual friend and that friend's various love interests. In line 1, B introduces one of these love interests – Beate.

(6)   **Lined up (Call home deu 5519 (9:22) [26])**

```
1     B:      und äh dann hat er no die beate im
              and uh then has he still the beate in+the
              and uhm he was still courting beate?=

2 =>          rennen gehabt?=die kennscht ja au oder?
              race had?=the know+you PRT also oder?
               =you do know her too  oder?

3     A:      =>ja_<↑ja_
              =>yes_<↑yes_
              =>yes_<↑yes_



4     B:      .hh ja, u:nd dann ham wir gesagt, ja:, was
              .hh PRT, a:nd then have we said, PRT:, what
              .hh well, and then we said, well, what's

5             isch jetz da?
              is now there?
              happening with that?
```

After introducing the love interest via her first name, B stops himself and launches an understanding check that targets a referent, and inserts a FFP of an adjacency pair sequence: *Die kennscht ja au oder?* ('you know her as well *oder*') (line 2). This *oder?*-turn targets A's familiarity with this new referent. In other words, B checks to see if the reference formulation of only the first name "Beate" is specific enough for A. The modal particle *ja* indexes that B does not claim to have epistemic primacy and does not claim to be telling A anything A doesn't know about (Reinke 2015; quoted in Deppermann 2015). The *oder?* explicitly marks the turn as a question requiring confirmation or disconfirmation. In line 3, A provides this confirmation, indexing that B's reference formulation was sufficient, and B subsequently continues his telling. This *oder?*-turn is also oriented to as requiring a *yes-* or *no*-response, showing that *oder?* explicitly marks a declaratively shaped turn as a confirmable. After the confirmation, the *oder?*-producer swiftly moves the conversation forward (lines 4 and 5).

Excerpt (7) below illustrates that the findings also apply to sequences that include disconfirmations. A and B are talking about the flooding in A's neighborhood. A had sent B pictures of newspaper clippings about the devastation and has explained that the water was coming down next to the street like a river (not shown in the transcript).

(7)   **Kroger (Call home deu 6692 (5:07) [54])**

```
1     B:      A:ch du lie:be zeit;=>.hh ja du    [wolltest-<
              O:h you lo:vely time:=<.hh PRT you [wanted-<
              O:h  my   goo:dness;=>  .hh    PRT   you [wanted-<
                                                  [
2     A:                                        [das ist
                                                [that is
                                                [ the damages
```

```
3              sachschaden von drei millionen dollar sei.
               property damage of 3 million dollars would be
               are worth three million dollars.

4      B:      Ach du liebe zeit.
               Oh you lovely time.
               O:h   my   goodness.

5      A:      mhm,
               mhm,
               mhm,

6 =>   B:      Ja zum kroger rei oder?
               PRT to+the kroger into oder?
                  into kroger oder?

7      A:      >nein, net zum kroger nei,<  alles nur die
               >no, not to+the kroger into,< all only the
               >no, not into kroger,<                everything only along

8              straße runter.
               street down.
               the street.

9      B:      ach du mei:ne güte.
               oh you my: grace.
               oh goo:dness gracious.

10     A:      und ich habe grade mit einer nachbarin
               and I have just with one neighbor
               and I just spoke with my

11             gesprochen, die wohnt einen block von hier
               spoken, the lives one block from here
               neighbor,  she lives a block away from here
```

In response to this telling, B produces an assessment in line 1, showing her appreciation for A's informing (Goodwin 1986). B also formulates the beginning of a new turn in line 1. She latches an inbreath and *ja du wolltest* ('PRT you wanted') onto her assessment. She stresses *du* ('you') and seems to want to say something she just now remembered. Due to the overlap, she abandons this trajectory of talk. In lines 2 and 3, A adds on to the telling by referencing the amount of monetary damage. In line 4, B again produces an appropriate and relevant next assessment. Note that she repeats her prior assessment, but with more emphasis on *liebe zeit* ('oh goodness'), thereby potentially upgrading it.

After a continuer in line 5, B produces the *oder*-turn (line 6). This turn consists of a turn-initial *ja*, a prepositional phrase, and the *oder?*. As a phrase, the turn lacks interrogative syntax. Yet, the *oder?* works again to create explicit polar contingencies: A confirmation or disconfirmation is now a specifically relevant next. The made-relevant SPP is forthcoming immediately in the form of a type-conforming response (lines 7 and 8). The response also partially repeats the *oder?*-turn (the prepositional phrase preceded by a negative element, and *rei* ('into') replaced with *nei* ('into')). The partial repeat demonstrates which portion of B's understanding is incorrect. Following this response, B produces yet another

assessment, this time in third position. Next, A moves the conversation forward by redirecting the topic away from the damage to a conversation with a neighbor (lines 10 and 11) This excerpt also shows that participants move on quickly after the *oder?*-turn.

The next excerpt illustrates that one of the features discussed so far – making relevant exactly two types of responses next (disconfirmation or confirmation) – makes *oder?*-turns especially suited for arguments and challenges of the other speakers. The turn of interest occurs in lines 7 and 8 (note that there is a level-intoned *oder* in line 3; see section 4.2., excerpt (9) for an analysis of it).

(8)   **How far (Call home deu 6388 (10:36) [52])**

```
1      B:     .hh wie lange- wie weit hast du's
               .hh how long- how far have you it
               .hh how long- how far is it

2             denn bis zum meer? wie, w- kannst du
               PRT until to+the ocean? how, w- can you
               for you to the ocean? how, h- can you

3             da zu fuß hinlaufen ↓oder_
               there to foot there+walk ↓oder_
               walk there on foot ↓oder_

4             (0.2)

5      A:     na ja:. zu fuß_ sagen wir mal mit
               well:. to foot_ say we once with
               well:. on foot_ let's say

6             dem rad sind es gut zehn minuten.
               the bike are it good ten minutes.
               by bike it's a good ten minutes.

7  =>  B:     na(h):(h):(h): das ist ja nich so-
               we(h):(h):(h):ll that is PRT not so-
               we(h):(h):(h)ll: that is not that-

8             nich so sehr lang oder?   [.h
               not so really long oder? [.h
               not   really that far  oder?    [.h
9      A:                                [ni(h)cht
                                          [no(h)t
                                          [no(h)t

10            so seh(h)r_ ne(h)e?   [und da von
               so re(h)ally_ PR(h)T? [and there from
               really tha(h)t far_ no(h)o?   [and from
                                          [
11     B:                                [öh:: huhu
                                          [öh:: huhu
                                          [hu:: huhu

12     A:     (home) zum campus sind es fünfzehn
               (home) to+the campus are it fifteen
               (home) to campus it is fifteen
```

```
13          minuten;
            minutes;
            minutes;
```

In this excerpt, B asks A about how far the ocean is from his place (lines 1-3). In lines 5 and 6, A informs B that it takes a good ten minutes to bike there, with the implication being that it is not extremely close ("gut 10 minuten"). In line 7, B challenges this with an *oder?*-turn, albeit it in a joking manner, as evidenced by the laughter infusion. His turn is prefaced with *na(h):(h):(h)* ('we(h);(h):(h)ll'), followed by the claim that this duration is not really that far. Note that B cuts himself off after "so" in line 7 and self-repairs to *nich so sehr lang* ('not really very long'), adding the epistemic stance-marker *sehr* ('very'), which works to weaken the assertion a bit. This turn is problematic at this moment in the interaction, because B goes directly against A's assessment of *gut 10 minuten* ('good ten minute long') as something that is long. The "ja" again indexes that B doesn't assume that he is telling A anything A doesn't already know (Reineke 2015; quoted in Deppermann 2015). In other words, B assumes that A would also judge a good ten-minute-long bike ride as not too long. Yet, just as in example (6), the speaker requires confirmation/disconfirmation of this explicitly via the use of the *oder?*-turn, challenging the co-participant.

This turn is a declarative and as a declarative, it could have engendered responses other than confirmation or disconfirmation, for example, agreement or disagreement. The *oder?*-turn imposes the same kinds of restrictions a *yes/no*-question would: confirmation or disconfirmation. A's response shows that A complies with these restrictions by producing a disconfirmation. The type-conforming response consists of a partial repeat (laughter-infused) and a turn-final "no"-token. By placing the "no" in turn-final position, A indexes some resistance to the challenge, as he delays the confirmation. The *no*-token nevertheless fulfills the polar constraints. This excerpt, just as the other ones, also illustrates that participants move on quickly from the *oder?*-sequence. *Oder?*-turns do not engender sequence expansion.

So far, I have shown that *oder?*-turns, despite their declarative syntax, are oriented to as confirmables that impose polar constraints. *Oder?*-turns also do not result in continued on-topic talk. In the next section, I present several excerpts of *oder_*, showing that the constraints they create for the following SPP are quite different.

4.2. *Oder* with level intonation: Making relevant an alternative

When participants use *oder_*, they also formulate an understanding. This understanding again occupies first position in an adjacency pair sequence. Yet, in contrast to *oder?*, these *oder_*-FPP's do not require, first and foremost, confirmation or disconfirmation. Rather, interlocutors make relevant an alternative to the one contained in the *oder_*-turn. Regardless of the syntax prior to *oder_* (i.e., declarative or interrogative syntax), an *oder_*-turn weaken the constraints of a confirmable, making relevant a response different from confirmations/disconfirmations. Specifically, an alternative to the one expressed in the *oder_*-turn's proposition is

a relevant next. When an alternative is not produced as part of the response turn, this is marked.

In my data, the distribution of *oder_* differs substantially from that of *oder?*: *oder_* is added more often to turns that feature interrogative syntax (n=19) than declarative syntax (n=12). Of the interrogatively shaped turns, 13 are *yes/no*-questions and six are of the format *wh*-question + candidate answer. In contrast to the *oder?*-collection, responses to *oder_*-turns are not (exclusively) confirming or disconfirming. In eighteen cases, there is no clear "yes"- or "no"-answer, in eight instances, disconfirming answers are produced and in five instances, a confirmation is provided. As the excerpts below will show, the presence of a positive token doesn't necessarily mean that the prior turn was confirmed as it was asked. The response types overwhelmingly include an alternative to the one included in the *oder_*-turn, even in cases that include a "yes" token. In other words, a "yes" doesn't necessarily confirm the proposition of the *oder_*-turn. Responses that include a "yes" still provide an alternative to the one in the *oder_*-turn. When responses *do* confirm the alternative of the *oder_*-turn, this confirmation is marked. This supports the argument that *oder_*-turns weaken polar constraints; confirmation or disconfirmation are indirect by-products of either producing an alternative to the *oder_*-proposition or not. Furthermore, *oder_*-turns engender sequence expansion (in contrast to *oder?*-turns). That is, participants do not, as they do following *oder?*-turns, move on quickly to a new topic or subtopic. Excerpt (9) below, a longer version of (8) earlier, serves as a first example.

(9)   Ocean (Call home deu 6388 (10:36) [25])

```
    1      A:     [und- also_ mein zimmer is nicht schlecht?
                  [and- well_ my room is not bad?
```
[and- well_ my room is not bad?
```
                  [
    2      B:     [mhm?
```
[mhm?
[mhm?

```
    3      A:     da scheint nachmittags die sonne rein und
                  there shines afternoon the sun into and
```
I get sun in the afternoon and

```
    4             so?
                  so?
```
stuff?

```
    5      B:     m[m?
                  m[m?
```
m[m?
```
                   [
    6      A:      [is auch nicht so sehr [klein?
                   [is also not so very   [small?
```
[it's also   not   really very [small?
```
                                          [
    7      B:                             [.hh wie lange-
                                          [.hh how long-
                                          [ .hh how long-
```

```
 8 =>   B:      wie weit hast du's denn bis zum
                how far have you it PRT until to+the
                how far is it for you to the

 9              meer? wie, w- kannst du da zu fuß
                ocean? how, w- can you there to foot
                ocean? how, h- can you walk there

10              hinlaufen ↓oder_
                there+walk ↓oder_
                on foot ↓oder_

11      A:      na ja:. zu fuß_ sagen wir mal mit
                well:. to foot_ say we once with
                well:. on foot_ let's say

12              dem rad sind es gut zehn minuten.
                the bike are it good ten minutes.
                by bike it's a good ten minutes.

13      B:      na(h):(h):(h): das ist ja nich so-
                we(h):(h):(h):ll that is PRT not so-
                we(h):(h):(h)ll: that is not that-

14              nich so    sehr lang oder? [.h
                not really that far oder?  [.h
                not   really that  far oder?    [.h
                                           [
15        A:                               [ni(h)cht
                                           [no(h)t
                                           [no(h)t

16              so seh(h)r ne(h)e?    und da von
                so re(h)ally_ PR(h)T? and there from
                really tha(h)t far_ no(h)o?    and from
```

Prior to the excerpt provided here, A described his living situation in the US to B. He provides a positive assessment *nicht schlecht* ('not bad') of his room in line 1 and adds a feature that would warrant a positive assessment in line 3. His first reason for why his room isn't bad is that it gets sun in the afternoon. This is receipted with a continuer from B in line 5. In line 6, A adds a second reason for his prior positive assessment: the room isn't very small. Next, B, in overlap, launches into a new topic via a turn that features a *wh*-question, a polar question, and a turn-final *oder_* (lines 7-10). This *oder_*-turn is rather different in terms of its turn design when compared to the *oder?*-turns in the previous section. B's turn begins as a *wh*-question *wie lange-* ('how lon-'), which is cut-off and restarted as *wie weit* ('how far'). A next TCU features a transition from *wh*-question (*wie, w-* ('how, h-')) to polar question *kannst du* '('can you'). The polar question ends with a turn-final *oder_*. This question, without a final *oder_*, would create polar constraints and make relevant confirmation or disconfirmation. The turn here, because it is formulated with a turn-final *oder_*, projects a possible alternative to the one just mentioned and thereby relaxes the constraints a polar question would impose. In other words, the *oder_*-turn creates different relevancies from a polar question for

a responding turn. There could be an alternative to the one voiced in the *oder_*-turn, and this alternative is being anticipated by the *oder_*-turn.

In this example, the FPP contains both a *wh*-question and polar question. These conflicting constraints are relevant to the co-participant as evidenced by A's response. After a micropause in line 11, A produces a turn-initial "na ja:", indexing some problems with the question (Golato in press). He begins a response that would, arguably, fit a polar question: *zu fuss-* ('on foot') in line 12, but cuts himself off. He then formulates a response that fits the *wh*-question constraints and is couched as a guess (*sagen wir mal* ('let's say')). This portion of the responding turn addresses the *wh*-question that is present in the FPP. Note that A does not confirm or disconfirm directly the proposition of the polar question to which the *oder_* is added. The answer also includes an alternative to the proposition of the *oder_*-turn: A, rather than providing if he can walk to the ocean, mentions the alternative of riding a bike to the beach. Thereby, he shows that there is an alternative to the one included in the *oder_*-turn: biking (as compared to walking).

Following the *oder_*-adjacency pair, the participants produce further talk related to the *oder_*-turn's proposition (see analysis of excerpt (8) above) rather than moving on to a new topic immediately. This excerpt shows that participants produce responses that are more than just, or different from, confirmations or disconfirmations. Of course, the *oder_*-turn here features two types of questions, and one could argue that A is simply fitting his response to the *wh*-question portion of the FPP. The next excerpt shows that even when the FPP does not include a *wh*-question, respondents still provide answers that fit a *wh*-question more than they would fit a polar question due to the answers including an alternative to the *oder_*-turn's proposition.

Excerpt (10) below illustrates a similar case. A and B are talking about a relative who recently died suddenly.

(10) **Jim (Call home deu 5681 (3:55) [17])**

```
1      A:     Aber dann is er (.) ganz ruhich
              But then is he (.) very calmly
              But then he passed (.) away

2             eingeschlafen::;=äh_ zum schluß hat [er
              fell aslee:::p;=uh_  to+the end has [he
              very peacefully::;=uh_         toward the end    he [ was
                                                                [
3      B:                                                      [m:.
                                                               [m:.
                                                               [m:.

4      A:     sich wieder auf die christliche .hh
              himself again on the christian .hh
              devoted again to the christian .hh
```

```
5            wissen[schaft verlassen und;
                 sci[ence relied and;
                 scien[ce  and;
                      [
6      B:           [mhm.
                    [mhm.
                    [mhm.

7 =>   B:    .h dann hat er- war er vorher und
             .h then has he- was he before and
             .h then has he- was he before and

8            zwischendurch dann nicht mehr oder_
             in between then not anymore oder_
             in between then not anymore oder_

9      A:    Ja=hat'n bisschen rumgedoktert.
             PRT+has a bit experimented.
             PRT=has experimented a bit.
10     B:    ja. [mm.
             yes.[mm.
             yes. [mm.
                  [
11     A:         [hat angst bekommen. h(h)m h(h)m h(h)m
                  [has fear gotten. h(h)m h(h)m h(h)m
                  [got scared. h(h)m h(h)m h(h)m

12     B:    m:m. na ↓ja.
             m:m. ↓well.
             m:m.  ↓well.
```

In line 1 and 2, A describes the passing of the friend. A bolsters the fact that it was *ruhig* ('peaceful') by adding information about the relative's renewed devotion to a religious community (lines 4 and 5). This seems to index that relying on his faith in the end made the death more peaceful. In lines 7 and 8, B produces an *oder_*-turn, which also rather abruptly changes the topic of the talk. This turn targets not the event A was telling B about but background knowledge about the relative's involvement with the religious community. She formulates her turn with a turn-initial *dann* ('then'), which shows that she is formulating a unilateral inference, which has not yet been communicated by the other speaker and which is based on A's prior turn (Depperman/Helmer 2013). She cuts herself off after *er* ('he') and restarts the question with *war er* ('was he').

This turn would be, without the *oder_*, a confirmable creating relevancies for a confirmation or disconfirmation. Because the turn ends in turn-final *oder_*, it creates different contingencies next. As with the previous example, the *oder_* gestures to an alternative to the one just uttered and as such alters the turn's constraints. This can be seen in the response A provides in line 9. His responding turn begins with "ja", but this "ja" is not a confirming "ja" but a turn-initial "ja" particle (Betz 2016). A then adds an alternative to what B had described. B's proposition is about the time frame of the relative's involvement with the religious community. A's response provides an alternative to this timeframe by informing B that the relative tried various things out, but not when or in which order. The response would also fit a first-positioned *wh*-question such as "what did he do". The re-

sponding turn then does not conform to constraints a confirmable as such would create (making relevant confirmation or disconfirmation). It does, however, constitute an appropriate response to *oder_*-questions, as it outlines an alternative to the one included in the *oder_*-turn. After B's acknowledgement in line 10, A elaborates on his previous turn, thereby expanding on-topic talk rather than immediately moving on to a new topic (as is the case with *oder?*-turns).

The next example serves to illustrate the fact that participants respond to *oder_*-turns in ways that fit more with *wh*-questions than polar questions. In excerpt (12) below (provided as excerpt (3) in the introduction), A and B are talking about surfing (the participants are the same as the ones on excerpt (9)). B had asked A if there are many surfers.

(11)   **The wave (Call home deu 6388 (11:42) [26])**

```
1      A:    äh grade wenn irgendwie windiges wetter is,
             uh just when somehow windy weather is,
             uh especially when the weather is sort of windy,

2            dann kommen natürlich einige. >ne?<
             then come of course several. >PRT?<
             then a bunch will   show up of course.  >ne?<

3  =>  B:    >ja, ja;< und die welle ist ok↑ay oder_
             >yes, yes;< and the wave is ok↑ay oder_
             >yes, yes;< and the wave is ok↑ay  oder_

4            (.)

5      A:    also:_ generell muss man sagen äh war ich
             well:_ general must one say uh was I
             well: in general one has to say uh I was

6            eigentlich ein bisschen enttäuscht von der
             basically a bit disappointed from the
             actually a bit disappointed with the

7            welle hier.
             wave here.
             wave here.

8      B:    mm.
             mm.
             mm.

9      A:    also das meer generell hier in der gegend
             well he ocean general here in the area
             well the ocean generally here in this area

10           is irre ruhig normalerweise.
             is crazy calm usually.
             is crazy calm usually
```

In lines 1 and 2, A produces the response to B's question about surfers (not shown in transcript). In line 3, B produces a double saying of "jaja", indicating that the information just provided is already known or unwarranted (Golato/Fagyal 2008).

Rather than engaging with the information B just requested, he launches into a new topic. The abruptness of the topic shift is mitigated somewhat by beginning his next TCU with a turn-initial *und* ('and'), thereby connecting to A's prior utterance grammatically, as the *and*-turn can be understood as a continuation of the prior turn. This *oder_*-turn, which asks about the wave, is formed up with declarative syntax and ends in *oder_*. In this way, it is similar to the *oder?*-turns. Note, however, that rather than imposing polar constraints on the next turn via an *oder?*, the turn ends in *oder_*. A declarative confirmable could make relevant confirmation or disconfirmation next. However, the turn-final *oder_* weakens such relevancies, and the *oder_*-turn projects an alternative to the turn's proposition (i.e., the wave is okay). By doing so, the turn enables the co-participant to give a response that can be something other than a confirmation or disconfirmation. Here, after a micro-pause, A begins formulating his response, which includes a generality "generally one must say" before rephrasing his turn and describing his disappointment with the wave. This response would also fit a *wh*-question along the lines of "how is the wave", and it includes an alternative to the *oder_*-proposition, namely that the wave is disappointing. This is an alternative to the wave being good (note that it is not the opposite of that as in the wave is bad, but an alternative nevertheless). B produces a continuer in line 8 and A proceeds to elaborate on the topic, producing further on-topic talk rather than moving on to a new topic.

Similar to prior excerpts, the next excerpt again shows that the response made relevant by the *oder_*-turn is one that includes an alternative to the one just produced. In this example, the responding turn also includes a negative token. Here, A and B have talked about various topics, including the weather.

(12)   **Took off (Call home deu 4111 (8:12) [3])**

```
1      A: ja ↓montana wird äh hier- wird sehr hei:ß
          PRT ↓montana will uh here- will very ho:t
          PRT ↓montana gets uh here- gets very ho:t as well

2         >im- im- im< sommer auch. [is ja mitten
          >in- in- in< summer also. [is PRT middle
          >in- in- in< the summer.  [it is in the middle
                                    [
3      B:                           [aha,
                                    [okay,
                                    [okay,

4      A: mitten im la:nde.
          middle in+the country.
          in the middle of the country.

5      B: aha,
          aha,
          okay,

6  => A: ähm, ist der ↓Franz ↑da ↓o:da_
          uhm, is  the ↓Fran ↑there ↓o:der_
          uhm, is Franz ↑there oder_
```

```
7      B: NEe, der ist schon abgezogen.=der war eben
          NO:, he is already left.=he was just
          NO:, he already took off.= he was just

8         da.=der   geht ja freitags immer
          there.=he goes PRT fridays always
          here.=on fridays, he always goes=

9      B: =äh [äh nach hau:se.
          =uh [uh to ho:me.
          =uhm [ uhm home.
              [
10     A:     [ach so. dann habe ich ja einen
              [oh I see. then have I PRT a
              [oh I see. then I picked a

11     A: guten- gute nacht erwi- erwischt.
          good- good night caugh- caught.
          go- good night.
```

In lines 1-4, A explains to B that it is rather hot in Montana, because it is in the middle of the country. In line 5, B receipts this information with the token *aha* (Imo 2009). In line 6, A abruptly changes the topic by asking if Franz is there with B. The proposition in the *oder_*-turn is not related to prior talk; the turn-initial *ähm* mitigates the abrupt topic slightly, or put differently, it signals that something disjunctive might be forthcoming. This is the *oder_*-turn of interest. A asks if a third person, Franz, is there with B. The *oder_*-turn is an interrogative, and as such would make relevant confirmation or disconfirmation. The *oder_* weakens these narrow constraints and not only opens up the possibility of an alternative, it also makes this alternative relevant as part of the SPP. In lines 7, 8 and 9, B produces the SPP to this initial action. The SPP contains a negative token "nee" followed by the alternative to the *oder_*-turn's proposition. The responding turn then elaborates further, and the subsequent talk expands the sequence.

Excerpt (14) below will serve as another illustration of *oder_*-turns and features again a SPP that disconfirms the *oder_*-turn's proposition, but does so without a negative token, illustrating that first and foremost it is the alternative that it being made relevant. Here, A is telling B about her meeting up with mutual friends. She mentioned (not shown in transcript) that it is generally difficult to get all four friends together, but (shown in line 1) that it was a nice evening again.

(13)   Nice evening (Call home deu 6691 (3:11) [29])

```
1      B:    .hh >aber es war< wieder so:'n netter abend.
             .hh >but it was< again so: a nice evening.
             .hh <but it was< again a rea:l nice evening.

2            (.)
```

```
3     B:    wirklich so: schön.=erst hamma beim helmut
            really so: nice.=first have+we at+the helmut
            really so: nice.=first at helmut's palce we

4           ↓ge↑gessen?
            ↓ea↑ten?
            ↓at↑e?

5 =>  A:    mhm::? mhm, [hat er gekocht oder_
            mhm::? mhm, [has he cooked oder_
            mhm::? mhm, [did he cook oder_
                        [
6     B:                [und-
                        [and-
                        [and-

7           (.)

8     B:    die- die rita hat gekocht. [.hh
            the- the rita has cooked.  [.hh
                 rita     cooked.      [.hh
                                       [
9     A:                               [ah=hihihi[hihi
                                       [ah=hihihi[hihi
                                       [ah=hihihi    [hihi
                                                 [
10    B:                               [hehe
                                       [hehe
                                       [hehe

11    B:    helmut doch nicht. .h ja, und armin war's
            helmut PRT not. .h PRT, and armin was it already
            of course not helmut. .h PRT, and armin was

12          scho ganz peinlich, weil er müsst jetzt auch
            very embarrassing, because he should now also
            already really embarassed, because he should also be

13          mal kochen, aber er konnte irgendwie nicht.
            once cook, but he could somehow not.
            cooking, but he couldn't somehow.
```

After her strong positive assessment of the evening in line 1, B further upgrades this assessment in line 3, following a micro-pause (line 2) and lack of A's uptake. B then proceeds with her telling by providing A with the first part of the evening. They ate at Helmut's place. In line 5, A acknowledges this information with two continuers. He then adds the *oder_*-turn, asking if Helmut was the one who cooked. This question is somewhat unexpected here. This can be seen by the micropause that follows it and the re-starts in B's response. B's response to the *oder_*-turn is one that indirectly disconfirms the FPP, but does so without a negative token. B's response provides an alternative to the one uttered in the *oder_* turn. After A and B both produce some laughter tokens (lines 9 and 10), B then expands the sequence by producing further on-topic talk. She emphasizes that it would be unexpected if Helmut had done the cooking, and adds further talk related to 'cooking' in the following lines.

Once again, the *oder_*-turn is formed up with interrogative syntax. This FPP however doesn't primarily make relevant confirmation or disconfirmation but rather an alternative to the one produced in the *oder_*-turn. Because an alternative is produced, the SPP also, by extension, disconfirms the FPP. The *oder_,* then, works again to alter the constraints a polar question would impose on the SPP, because it gestures toward an alternative. This alternative is then produced in the responding turn.

When participants confirm the proposition of the *oder_*-turn, they do so in marked ways, such as via repeats. By doing so, they work to 'push' against the *oder_*-turn's projecting and making relevant an alternative next. This occurred only five times in my collection. Excerpt (14) below illustrates this. Prior to the excerpt provided, A had told B about how she enjoys ice skating followed by cookies and candles.

(14)   **Fireplace (Call home deu 6446 (2:05) [27])**

```
     1      A:      mit kerzen und feuerplatz und all[em. ha?
                    with candles and fireplace and al[l. ha?
                    with candles   and    fireplace   and    every[thing. ha?
                                                                   [
     2      B:                                               [JA:, so
                                                             [PRT:, so
                                                             [PRT:, kind

     3              ungefähr.       he[hehe
                    approxmimate. he[hehe
                    of like that.        he[hehe
                                           [
     4      A:                        [habt ihr- ihr habt- habt ihr
                                      [have you- you have- have you
                                      [have you- do you have- have you got

     5              einen feuerplatz?
                    a fireplace?
                    a fireplace?

     6      B:      JA:, ham wir;  [ja, ja:? hm, mm.
                    YES:, have we; [yes, ye:s? hm, mm.
                    YE:S, we do;      [yes, ye:s? mhm, mhm.
                                      [
     7      A:                        [ja?
                                      [yes?
                                      [really?

     8  =>  A:      benutzt ihr'n ↑auch od[er_
                    use you    it ↑also   od[er_
                      do you use   it   ↑though od[er_
                                             [
     9      B:                            [>↓ja<=↑vie:l;  v[iel.
                                          [>↓yes<=↑mu:ch; m[uch.
                                          [>↓yes< =  ↑a lo:t;  a[lot.
                                                               [
    10      A:                                              [ja?
                                                            [yes?
                                                            [yes?
```

```
11    B:    im winter; mhm? jaja, wir ham so n:e
            in+the winter; mhm? yesyes, we have so on:e
            in the winter; mhm? yesyes, we have o:ne of those

12          kaminofen.
            chimney oven.
            chimney firepaces.

13    A:    AW::. [okay.
            AW::. [okay.
            AW::. [okay.
                  [
14    B:          [aus guss- also aus eisen; ne?
                  [out cast- well out iron;  PRT?
                  [made from cast- well from iron; ne?
```

In line 1, A produces a follow-up question, introducing a new referent (fireplace), and B produces an agreeing response. In lines 4 and 5, A asks if B and her family have a fireplace, which B confirms in line 6. In overlap in line 7, A makes relevant another round of confirmation via his follow-up question *ja?*. B's *ja:?* and *hm, mm.* in line 6 provide this second round of confirmation. In line 8, A produces the *oder_*-turn of interest. She is asking A if they are using it. Note that A had already told B that she enjoys getting comfortable with candles and cookies, and that when B brought up the fireplace, she agreed with that description, which implies that she not only owns a fireplace but also used it. B's confirmation + repeat can be interpreted as resisting this line of questioning (Bolden 2009). What's more, A continues to produce further turns that continue this very line of questioning in line 7, and again, in line 8 with the *oder_*-turn. A's turn projects an alternative to the one he produces via the *oder_*. Yet, B does not produce such an alternative and instead confirms A's proposition. She does so with low pitch on the confirming "ja". She then upgrades her response by adding *viel* ('a lot'), which is stressed and produced with high pitch, and which is repeated twice. Because *oder_*-turns make relevant an alternative, a response that doesn't include such an alternative is marked. Additional work, such as the double saying and emphasizing, is required to counter the *oder_*-turns' projection of an alternative. Not only does she use the fireplace, she used it a lot. Next, A produces an upward-intoned "ja" in overlap and B provides further explanation of when she uses it and what the fireplace looks like, resulting in sequence expansion. This example shows that when participants confirm an *oder_*-turn's proposition, they take issue with the speaker of the *oder_*-turn anticipating an alternative next.

5. Concluding discussion

As the analysis shows, both *oder?* and *oder_* are produced in turn-final position of FPP's. Yet, participants use *oder?* and *oder_* for distinct interactional ends. *Oder?* is overwhelmingly part of declaratively shaped FPP's, whereas *oder_* is part of both interrogatively and declaratively formed FPP's. *Oder?*-turns then are a way to explicitly mark, through lexical and prosodic means (i.e., the *oder* itself and upward intonation), polar constraints, requiring confirmation or disconfirmation next. They are oriented to as doing just that as evidenced by the responses pro-

duced. *Oder_*-turns, in contrast, via lexical and prosodic means (i.e., the *oder* itself and trail-off/level intonation), gesture to and project an alternative to the one just uttered. Hence, they require an alternative to the one just uttered, not (just) confirmation or disconfirmation. SPP-alternatives, by their very nature as alternatives, although indirectly, disconfirm the FPP-alternative. Thus, SPP do, almost as a by-product, index confirmation/disconfirmation. However, what is made immediately relevant via an *oder_*-turn is an alternative to the one expressed in the *oder_*-turn itself rather than confirmation or disconfirmation as such. When participants *just* provide a confirmation, they do so in marked ways, demonstrating that these responses are not the ones made relevant.

Harren (2001) argues that *oder?*, in contrast to *ne?*, shows a lack of mutually shared knowledge, understanding, and agreement. She proposes that *oder?* generally received disconfirming, disagreeing answers while *ne?* received confirming, agreeing answers, pointing to a lack of mutually shared knowledge between the *oder?*-turn speaker and their co-participants. In my collection, occurrence of confirmations (n=19) and disconfirmations (n=25) is not crucially different. What all of them have in common, though, is that they are problematic as such somehow and that they place clear *yes/no*-type constraints on the co-participant. Not one example in my collection features a response that does not confirm or disconfirm. While *ne?* clearly indexes an expectation for a confirming answer, *oder?* does not index a similar expectation for a disconfirming answer. Participants in my collection do not show a preference for either answer type. Hence, *oder?* works to create polar constraints. Recall that *oder?* is added almost exclusively to declarative turns. By adding *oder?*, participants show that despite the lack of interrogative syntax, their turns require one of two types of responses: confirmation or disconfirmation.

As mentioned in the introduction, Zifonun et al. (1997), propose that turn-final *oder* assumes that there is a likely or probable alternative to what was just said, indicating a speaker's greater need for verification. They do not take into consideration intonation though. My analysis shows that intonation is crucial. Zifonun et al.'s description applies, albeit partially, to *oder_* but not at all to *oder?*. *Oder_* does work to make relevant an alternative, but because *oder_*-turns generally receives an answer that – indirectly and almost as a by-product – disconfirms the FPP-alternative, the idea that speakers require greater need for verification does not hold up. Their understanding is not being verified; they are presented with an alternative. What's more, *oder?*-turns neither gesture toward an alternative nor make one relevant. Rather, they clearly require a polar response as the SPP. It is not specifically a verification of the proposition prior to the *oder?* that participants make relevant. Instead, they make relevant confirmation or disconfirmation.

Turn-final *oder_* seems to be similar to English *or,* which works as an epistemic downgrade (Drake 2015). English turn-final *or* is marked by the same *oder*-final prosody as the German ones. In English, turn-final *or* ends on level, or trail-off, intonation. The syllable prior to *or* is marked by a pitch jump, but the intonation contour lowers with the beginning of *or* and subsequently levels off. English *or* functions as an epistemic marker, indexing a lack of certainty about the proposed understanding. It gestures toward an alternative other than the one contained in the *or*-turn, which is "oriented to as a question format that requires an elaboration" (Drake 2015:301). German *oder_* make relevant an answer that con-

tains an alternative to the one in the *oder_*-turn as well; hence, (indirect) discon-firmations are provided unproblematically, which is also similar to English *or*. While indexing certainty and uncertainty about propositions and negotiation of knowledge seem to be implicated in the *oder*-sequences (see Koenig, in prep), my analysis shows that *oder?* and *oder?* are resources that participants use to formu-late two question formats: *oder?*-questions and *oder_*-questions. German *oder_* is thus a near-equivalent to English *or* and can be translated as such, whereas Ger-man *oder?* is not equivalent to English *or* and seems to be closer related to func-tions of tag questions such as *isn't it?*.

Questions, as firsts in adjacency pairs, conditionally make relevant a second (Schegloff 1968; Schegloff/Sacks 1973). Questions also impose constraints on what kind of a SPP is relevant next. Polar questions and *wh*-questions in both German and English (e.g., Egbert/Vöge 2008; Enfield et al. 2010; Enflield et al. 2012; de Ruiter 2012; Fox/Thompson 2010; Heritage/Raymond 2005, 2012; Raymond 2003; Rost-Roth 2003, 2006; Schegloff/Lerner 2009; Selting 1991, 1992) each impose different constraints. That is, a polar question makes relevant a yes- or no-answer (Raymond 2003) whereas *wh*-questions, minimally, require a responding turn that corresponds to the question's *wh*-word (Schegloff 2007; Schegloff/Lerner 2009; Fox/Thompson 2010). For both formats, type-conforming answers contain the relevant answer whereas non-conforming answer do not. For example, a non-conforming response to a polar question would not contain a "yes" or "no" token, whereas a type-conforming response would. Recipients of such FPPs have a range of possible response types and response formats available, some of which can be used to resist the constraints of the FPPs. Examples of re-sponse types include "non-answers/answers, partial/whole answers, direct/indirect answers" (Enfield et al. 2010:2615); examples of response formats include "partial repetitions, response tokens of various kinds from nods to *yes*, [and] one word an-swers" (Enfield et al. 2010:2615).

In this article, I have argued that turn-final *oder* in German is a resource that allows questioners to create specific constraints as to what is relevant next. While *oder?*-questions explicitly require confirmation or disconfirmation next, *oder_*-questions make relevant an alternative next. Because *oder* allows speakers to de-sign their turns-at-talk in specific ways so as to "conduct particular actions" (Drew 2013:14), *oder*-variants are implicated in action formation. My work further elu-cidates how interactants use local, language-specific resources to jointly shape the "otherwise generic and universal underlying organization of talk-in-interaction" (Sidnell 2009:4); it also further demonstrates how grammar shapes and is shaped by interaction.

6. References

Atkinson, J. Maxwell / Heritage, John (Eds.) (1984): Structures of Social Action. Studies in Conversation Analysis. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Barth-Weingarten, Dagmar (2011a): 'Double Sayings of German *JA*. More Obser-vations on Their Phonetic Form and Alignment Function'. In: Research on Language & Social Interaction 44:2, 157-185.

Barth-Weingarten, Dagmar (2011b): Response tokens in interaction. Prosody, phonetics and a visual aspect of German JAJA. In: Gesprächsforschung 12, 301-370.

Barth-Weingarten, Dagmar / Couper-Kuhlen, Elizabeth (2002): On the development of final *though*: A case of grammaticalization? In: Wischer, Ilse / Diewalds, Gabriele (Hrsg.), New reflections on grammaticalization. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 345-361.

Beeching, Kate (2002): Gender, politeness and pragmatic particles in French. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Betz, Emma (2016, March): Discourse markers from a conversation analytic perspective: The case of turn-initial ja. Paper presented at the 19. Arbeitstagung zur Gesprächsforschung (AGF). Institute for the German Language (IDS), Mannheim, Germany.

Cameron, Deborah / McAlinden, Fiona / O'Leary, Kathy (1989): Lakoff in context: The social and linguistic functions of tag questions. In: Coates, Jennifer / Cameron, Deborah (Eds.), Women in their speech communities: New perspectives on language and sex. London: Longman, 74-93.

Couper-Kuhlen, Elizabeth / Ono, Tsuyoshi (2007): 'Incrementing' in Conversation. A Comparison of Practices in English, German and Japanese. In: Pragmatics 17(4), 513-552.

Deppermann, Arnulf (2015): Wissen im Gespräch: Voraussetzung und Produkt, Gegenstand und Ressource. In: InLiSt 57, 1-31.

Deppermann, Arnulf / Helmer, Henrike (2013): Zur Grammatik des Verstehens im Gespräch: Inferenzen anzeigen und Handlungskonsequenzen ziehen mit *also* und *dann*. In: Zeitschrift für Sprachwissenschaft 32(1), 1-39.

De Ruiter, Jan P. (2012): Questions: Formal, functional and interactional perspectives. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Drew, Paul (2013): Conversation analysis and social action. In: Journal of Foreign Languages 37(3), 1-20.

Drake, Veronika (2015): Indexing uncertainty: The case of turn-final *or*. In: Research on Language and Social Interaction 48(3), 301-318.

Egbert, Maria / Vöge, Monika (2008): *Wh*-interrogative formats used for questioning and beyond: German *warum* (why) and *wieso* (why) and English *why*. In: Discourse Studies 10 (1), 17-36.

Eisenberg, Peter (1994): Grundriß der deutschen Grammatik. Stuttgart [u.a.]: Metzler.

Enfield, N. J. / Brown, Penelope / de Ruiter, Jan P. (2012): Epistemic dimensions of polar questions: Sentence-final particles in comparative perspective. In: Ruiter, Jan P. de (Ed.), Questions: Formal, functional and interactional perspectives. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 193-221.

Enfield, N. J. / Stivers, Tanya / Levinson, Sephen. C. (2010): Question-response sequences in conversation across ten languages: An introduction, editorial. In: Journal of Pragmatics 42, 2615-2619.

Fox, Barbara. A. / Thompson, Sandra A. (2010): Responses to *Wh*-questions in English conversation. In: Research on Language and Social Interaction 43(2), 133-156.

Golato, Andrea (in press): Turn-initial *naja* in German. In: Sorjonen, Marja-Leena / Heritage, John (Eds.), At the Intersection of Turn and Sequence: Turn-Initial Particles across Languages. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Golato, Andrea / Fagyal, Zsuzsanna (2008): Comparing Single and Double Sayings of the German Response Token ja and the Role of Prosody: A Conversation Analytic Perspective. In: Research on Language & Social Interaction 41:3, 241-270.

Goodwin, Charles (1986): Between and within: Alternative sequential treatments of continuers and assessments. In: Human Studies 9(2/3), 205-218.

Hagemann, Jörg (2009): Tag questions als Evidenzmarker: Formulierungsdynamik, sequentielle Struktur und Funktionen redezuginterner tags. In: Gesprächsforschung 10, 145-176.

Harren, Inga (2001): "Ne?" in Alltagsgesprächen - Interaktive Funktionen und Positionierung in Turn und Sequenz. (M.A. Thesis), Universität Oldenburg, Oldenburg.

Haselow, Alexander (2015): Final particles in spoken German. In: Hancil, Sylvie / Haselow, Alexander / Post, Margje (Eds.), Final Particles. De Gruyter Mouton: Berlin/Boston, 77-110.

Heritage, John / Raymond, Geoffrey (2005): The terms of agreement: Indexing epistemic authority and subordination in assessment sequences. Social Pscychology Quarterly 68(1), 15-38.

Heritage, John / Raymond, Geoffrey (2012): Navigating epistemic landscapes: Acquiescence, agency and resistance in responses to polar questions. In: De Ruiter, Jan P. (ed.), Questions: Formal, Functional and Interactional Perspectives. Cambridge: CUP, 179-192.

Holmes, Janet (1982): The function of tag questions. In: English Language Research Journal 3, 40-65.

Holmes, Janet (1984): Hedging your bets and sitting on the fence: Some evidence for hedges as support structures. In: Te Reo 27, 47-62.

Holmes, Janet (1995): Women, Men and Politeness. London/New York: Longman.

Hutchby, Ian / Wooffitt, Robin (1998): Conversation Analysis. Principles, Practices and Application. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Imo, Wolfgang (2009): Konstruktion oder Funktion? Erkenntnisprozessmarker (change-of-state-token) im Deutschen. In: Günthner, Susanne / Bücker, Jörg (Hrsg.), Grammatik im Gespräch. Berlin: de Gruyter, 57-86.

Jefferson, Gail (1980): The abominable *ne?*. In: An exploration of post-response-inititiation response-solicitation. In: Schröder, P. / Steger, H. (Eds), Dialogforschung. Düsseldorf: Schwann, 53-88.

Jefferson, Gail (1983): Two explorations of the organization of overlapping talk in conversation. In: Tilburg Papers in Language and Literature 28.

Keevallik, Leelo (2008): Conjunction and sequenced actions: The Estonian complementizer and evidential particle *et*. In: Laury, Ritva (Ed.), Studies of clause-combining: The multifunctionality of conjunctions. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 125-152.

Keevallik, Leelo (2009): The grammar-interaction interface of negative questions in Estonian. In: SKY Journal of Linguistics, 22, 139-173.

Koivisto, Aino / Laury, Ritva / Seppänen, Eeva-Leena. (2011): Syntactic and actional characteristics of Finnish *että*-clauses. In: Laury, Ritva / Suzuki, Ryoko (Eds.), Subordination in conversation: A cross-linguistic perspective. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 69-103.

König, Katharina (in prep.): *Question tags* als Diskursmarker? Ansätze zu einer systematischen Beschreibung von *ne* im gesprochenen Deutsch.

Lakoff, Robin (1975): Language and woman's place. New York: Harper & Row.

Laury, Ritva / Seppänen, Eeva-Leena (2008): Clause combining, interaction, evidentiality, participation structure, and the conjunction-particle continuum: The Finnish *että*. In: Laury, Ritva (Ed.), Studies of clause-combining: the multifunctionality of conjunction. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 153-178.

Lindstrom, Anna (1997): Designing social actions: Grammar, prosody, and interaction in Swedish conversation. (9818037 Ph.D.), University of California, Los Angeles.

Local, John / Kelly, John (1986): Projection and 'silences': Notes on phonetic and conversational structure. In: Human Studies 9, 185-204.

Local, John / Kelly, John / Wells, Bill (1986): Towards a phonology of conversation: Turn-taking in Tyneside English. In: Journal of Linguistics 22, 411-437.

MacWhinney, Brian (2007): The TalkBank Project. In: Joan C. Beal / Karen P. Corrigan / Hermann L. Moisl (Eds.), Creating and digitizing language corpora: Synchronic databases (Vol. 1). Houndsmills: Palgrave-Macmillan.

Moore, Emma / Podesva, Robert (2009): Style, indexicality, and the social meaning of tag questions. In: Language in Society 38, 447-485.

Mulder, Jean / Thompson, Sandra A. (2008): The grammaticization of but as a final particle in English conversation. In: Ritva Laury (Ed.), Studies of clause-combining: the multifunctionality of conjunctions. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 179-204.

Raymond, Geoffrey (2003): Grammar and social organization: Yes/no interrogatives and the structure of responding. In: American Sociological Review 68, 939–967.

Reineke, Silke (2015) Wissenszuschreibungen in der Interaktion. Heidelberg: Winter.

Rost-Roth, Martina (2003): Fragen – Nachfragen – Echofragen. Formen und Funktionen von Interrogationen im gesprochenen Deutsch. In: Linguistik Online. Festschrift für Harald Weydt.

Rost-Roth, Martina (2006): Nachfragen. Formen und Funktionen äußerungsbezogener Interrogationen. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter

Schegloff, Emanuel A. (1968): Sequencing in Conversational Openings. In: American Anthropologist, 70(6), 1075-1095.

Schegloff, Emanuel A. (1996): Turn organization: One intersection of grammar and interaction. In: Ochs, Eleanor / Schegloff, Emanuel, A. / Thompson, Sandra, A. (Eds.), Interaction and grammar. Cambridge: CUP, 52-133.

Schegloff, Emanuel A. (2007): Sequence Organization in Interaction. A Primer in Conversation Analysis (Vol. 1). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Schegloff, Emanuel A. / Lerner, Gene H. (2009): Beginning to respond: *well*-prefaced responses to *wh*-questions. In: Research on Language and Social Interaction 42 (2), 91-115.

Schegloff, Emanuel A. /Sacks, Harvey (1973): Opening up closings. In: Semiotica 8(4), 289-327.

Selting, Margret (1991): *W*-Fragen in konversationellen Frage-Antwort-Sequenzen. In: Reis, Marga / Rosengren, Inger. (Hrsg.), Fragesätze und Fragen. Tübingen: Niemeyer, 263-288.

Selting, Margret (1992): Prosody in conversational questions. In: Journal of Pragmatics 15 (6), 583-588.

Selting, Margret et. al. (2009): Gesprächsanalytisches Transkriptionssystem 2 (GAT 2) [Conversation analytic transcription system (GAT 2)]. In: Gesprächsforschung 10, 353-402.

Sidnell, Jack (Ed.). (2009): Conversation analysis: Comparative perspectives. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Taleghani-Nikazm, Carmen (2015): On reference work and issues related to the management of knowledge: An analysis of the Farsi particle *dige* in turn-final position. In: Journal of Pragmatics 87, 267-281.

Walker, Garrett (2004): On some interactional and phonetic properties of increments to turns in talk-in-interaction. In Couper-Kuhlen, Elizabeth / Ford, Cecilia E. (Eds.), Sound patterns in interaction. Cross-linguistic studies from conversation. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 147-169.

Walker, Garrett (2012): Coordination and interpretation of vocal and visible resources: 'Trail-off' conjunctions. In: Language and Speech, 55(1), 141-163.

Zifonun, Gisela / Hoffmann, Ludger / Strecker, Bruno (1997): Grammatik der deutschen Sprache (3 Bände). Berlin: de Gruyter.

Veronika Drake
English Department
Saginaw Valley State University
Science West 355
7400 Bay Road
University Center, MI 48710
USA

avdrake@svsu.edu