

**QUESTIONS AND QUESTIONING IN MONTENEGRIN  
POLICE INTERVIEWS**

**Marijana Cerović**

**BA English and Literature, University of Montenegro  
MPhil English and Applied Linguistics, University of Cambridge, UK**

**Submitted for the requirements of a  
PhD in Communication Studies**

**University of York, UK  
Department of Sociology**

**2010**

## Abstract

Questions are never asked without a reason, and whenever a question is made, it becomes a vehicle for another action. Questions, on their most basic level, endeavour to strike up an epistemic balance between the interlocutors in that the questioner appears to be seeking information. This study builds on the body of existing literature on questioning in interaction. It explores questions and questioning through a corpus of police interviews recorded in a police station in a Montenegrin city, with a particular focus on how the participants to interrogations are managing questions with purpose in Serbo-Croatian. Similar to other types of institutional interaction in the literature, this study shows that when asking questions, detectives have in mind completing a range of smaller ‘jobs’ as well as solving the project in general. Thus, chapter 4 shows how while performing these jobs, close connection is exhibited between the linguistic form, epistemics and action. The detectives, for instance, select from different linguistic forms of ‘do you know’ interrogatives in order to perform different actions, such as asking for information, asking for confirmation or preparing the ground for another activity. Moreover, the roles of participants in interrogations heavily affect the language and interactional techniques they are using. Thus, certain interactional techniques are noted to be tied only to certain types of interviews and to certain tasks of the detectives. Chapter 5 indicates that the detectives use the technique of repeating a part or the whole of the received answer only when speaking with suspects and in order to express doubts about their answers. At the same time, chapter 6 shows that only those interlocutors, who in the course of interrogation realise they are being treated as suspects use rhetorical questions as a defensive technique specific of this interactional identity. This study generally supports the thesis that questioning is never done without a specific action in mind and that a range of possible activities can be performed through the question-answer pairs in interrogation.

## **Acknowledgements**

This research would not have been possible if it wasn't for the good will of those detectives and suspects/witnesses who allowed me to record their interviews. I am also indebted to the people who helped me make initial contacts relevant for getting permission for my data collection.

I am endlessly grateful to the Dorothy Hodgkin Postgraduate Award Scheme for funding my research for the three years of my PhD.

I am grateful to my supervisor Paul Drew for having patience in my delayed coming to York at the beginning of my study. Both to Paul and my second supervisor John Local for being amazing and for setting an academic model to follow; for organizing thought provoking data sessions, workshops and 'communication dinners' which all contributed to the wonderful time I had in York.

Thanks to my friend Ruslan for the linguistic conversations, cinema nights and walks around York. Special thanks to my friends Ellie, Kate and Debs for reading my work and giving me valuable comments. Most of all, I am grateful to all three of them for making our house at St John's Street my second home and all the fun we had together: long shopping sessions with Ellie, watching numerous episodes of *Friends* and lazing/working around cafes in York.

The last but not the least: thanks to my family for being my true friends.

**Author's Declaration**

I, Marijana Cerović, hereby declare that this thesis entitled, *Questions and Questioning in Montenegrin Police Interviews*, is my own work. I have not taken ideas from any author without citation and the data here analysed was collected solely by myself.

..... (Signed)

..... (Date)

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>Chapter one: Introduction</b>	<b>7</b>
1.1 Introduction	8
<b>Chapter two: Interrogative Constructions and Questioning - a Literature Review</b>	<b>17</b>
2.1 Literature review	18
2.2 Defining questions	18
2.3 Linguistic practices for constructing interrogatives	20
2.4 Interrogatives not doing questioning	25
2.5 Non-interrogatives doing questioning	27
2.6 Interrogatives doing questioning and more	30
2.7 What one knows...?	39
2.8 Constraining force of interrogative forms	45
2.9 Questions as adjacency pair parts and sequence initial objects	52
2.10 Monopoly over ‘questions’ in certain interactional contexts	55
2.11 Questioning in legal and police discourse	58
2.12 Conclusion	60
<b>Chapter three: Data and Methodology</b>	<b>62</b>
3.1 Data	63
3.2 Methods	71
<b>Chapter four: the Principal Yes/No Interrogative Constructions in Police Interrogation in Serbo-Croatian</b>	<b>80</b>
4.1 Introduction	81
4.2 Information-seeking <i>li</i> interrogatives	85
4.3 Checking recipient’s state of knowledge	102
4.4 Presequences claiming superior knowledge	118
4.5 Conclusion	132
<b>Chapter five: Repeating as a Way of Challenging and Expressing Scepticism</b>	<b>135</b>
5.1 Introduction	136
5.2 Repeats - sequence pattern	142
5.3 Suspect’s initial responses	154
5.4 Repeats – expressions of scepticism	161
5.5 Suspect’s defensive response to repeats	171
5.6 Conclusion	177
<b>Chapter six: Suspects’ ‘Rhetorical’ Questions</b>	<b>178</b>

6.1 Introduction	179
6.2 Suspects' questions	182
6.3 Detectives' damaging turns in first position	185
6.4 Suspect's question-like responses - turn design	189
6.5 Action performed by suspects' interrogative responses	195
6.6 Detectives' treatment of suspects' rhetorical responses	206
6.7 Conclusion	216
<b>Chapter seven: Conclusion</b>	<b>218</b>
7.1 Conclusion	219
<b>Bibliography</b>	<b>226</b>
<b>Appendices</b>	<b>235</b>
<b>Notes</b>	<b>238</b>

## **CHAPTER ONE**

### **INTRODUCTION**

## 1.1 Introduction

This thesis explores how questions are asked and answered in police interrogations. It utilises the method of conversation analysis (CA) and is done on a naturalistic set of data.

This work came out of my general interest in how language is used in legal settings and my interest in forensic linguistics. It also reflects my ambition of connecting linguistics to ‘real life’ and doing a study which is based on the data produced by people in real communicational encounters. During my stay at an American university in 2004/5, I became increasingly interested in forensic linguistics. However, I was also interested in doing a study which would be useful and practically applicable. Eventually, I decided to do a study on questioning in legal settings. I have found that the issue of questioning is of great interest for the researchers and that a number of studies have dealt with its different aspects. These are both studies on different types of discourse which are mainly composed of questions and answers (Heritage and Roth, 1995; Raymond 2009) and those done on questioning in different languages (Stivers et al., 2010).

I have chosen the site of police interrogations because this is a type of interaction composed mainly of questions and answers – each of which are used routinely as vehicles for other actions (blaming/accusing and denials/defending respectively). This provides an ideal setting in which to study these phenomena; that is how ‘questions’ are constructed, and how ‘questions are designed to perform (and hence be vehicles for) other actions. I thought that this kind of research might be of interest to others as it offers a view of questioning in a specific type of institutional discourse and has a potential of being practically applicable in legal and police settings.

The data I analyse are police interviews with suspects and witnesses. The data was recorded in Montenegro where the police apply a questioning procedure somewhat different from the one encountered in the United Kingdom (UK). My fieldwork has shown that, most often, encounters with suspects and witnesses involve two separate



interviews. The detective in charge of a case interviews the suspect for the first time in a more informal manner, without putting down the information. After this initial interview, another interview is carried out for the purpose of composing a record. This time, a typist is usually present and essentially the same questions are asked, with the difference that following each item the detective sums up the received answers while the typist records them. In certain less complex cases, for instance, reporting of the crime, only one interview is held, in which case the detective can only be writing down the notes in the diary. Contrary to UK police practices, the interviews are not tape-recorded by the Montenegrin police. Another organisational peculiarity is that several Montenegrin detectives occupy a single larger office. Only one or two officers are in charge of a case, but the others who inhabit the office are usually informed about the case so that they all end up asking questions which leads to interesting multiparty dynamics.

When it comes to the terminology, the terms police interviews and police interrogations sometimes overlap in this work and by them I mean interaction with both suspects and witnesses. Indeed, I have considered the interviews both with suspects and witnesses, as well as those of people reporting crime. As one of the main goals of this work is exploring the action of blaming, I did focus more on the interviews with suspects, the rest of the interviews serving as a kind of control. For instance, while the forms which are used as a vehicle for the action of blaming frequently occur in the interviews with suspects, they tend to be less common in the interviews with witnesses and people reporting crime. In this way, certain actions get to be identified more easily.

This thesis makes a contribution to the linguistic literature on Serbo-Croatian, the official language of Montenegro. This is a South Slavic language which is the main language of Serbia, Croatia, Bosnia and Herzegovina and Montenegro, once republics of former Yugoslavia and now independent states. Currently, the language is generally referred to by the ethnic names Serbian, Croatian, Bosnian and Montenegrin, but for the purposes of this study, I will use a more general linguistic term Serbo-Croatian which covers all of the variants spoken in the four former republics.

One of the main issues I am trying to explore here is questioning with a particular institutional purpose, and what questions are used to do beyond the sheer morpho-syntactic form. In the CA literature, this kind of approach is known as action oriented in which:

“‘Action’ or ‘practice’ invokes the vast range of practical, technical and interpersonal tasks that people perform while doing their jobs, living their relationships, and participating in heterogeneous cultural domains. It is central to people’s lives, and therefore central to understanding those lives.’

(Potter and Edwards, 2001, p. 104)

Thus, I explore actions done through detectives’ questioning, especially the action of blaming, having in mind that it is usually through this and similar activities that the detectives are getting the confessions and having the cases solved. Interrogations themselves can be seen as series of questions (actions) the purpose of which is the realisation of some project. They are all about getting business done (i.e. seeking the truth, incriminating the suspect and/or solving the case), so I was interested to know how these ‘jobs’ would be done through question-answer pairs. As the language of this study is Serbo-Croatian, I also focus on how questioning is done in this language, though the results of the analysis are probably applicable to other languages.

Apart from this interest in the activities done through questioning, I am interested in how the participants’ roles get to be realised through question-answer pairs. First of all, the detectives are the ones in power, they are the ones conducting the interviews and this causes these types of interviews to be asymmetric. Drew and Heritage (1992, p. 49) speak about the multiple causes of conversational asymmetry:

‘... institutional interactions may be characterised by role-structured, institutionalised, and omnirelevant asymmetries between participants in terms of such matters as differential distribution of knowledge, rights to knowledge, access to conversational

resources, and to participation in the interaction. In ordinary conversation between friends or acquaintances, by contrast, this is not normally the case’.

In police interrogation discourse one can follow how the detectives exert power through questions and how the suspects and witnesses are expressing their subordinate position through answers or occasionally protesting against or challenging the work done by the detectives’ questions. To begin with, the questioned parties are all witnesses, i.e. they are never told what their suspected status is. However, as the interrogation advances one can note that different parties are asked different types of questions. In this work I explore how the detectives’ treatment of somebody as a witness or suspect is reflected in their questions.

When studying questioning, this study starts from the interrogative form: I set off from what is traditionally considered to be a question, i.e. interrogative form, and then I look at the range of activities that can be done with interrogative form in this interactional environment. So, the chapter 2, the review of the literature, explores the most common linguistic issues surrounding questioning. Chapter 3 outlines the data and methodology applied in this work. In chapter 4 I focus on the detectives and the different forms of ‘do you know’ interrogatives utilised by them. Chapter 5 also focuses on the detectives and shows how language can be used as a device for displaying scepticism and performing the activity of blocking an unwanted line of answering. In chapter 6 there is a shift of the focus onto the suspect. This chapter explores the nature of the activity performed once the suspects start asking questions.

This study will also deal with a number of issues occurring around questioning in the linguistic and CA literature, one of the main issues being what a question actually is. Traditional linguists usually state that declaratives and interrogatives are distinguished from each other by a specific set of syntactic and phonetic/prosodic features. They also assign two distinct functions to these two categories: declaratives are used for making statements whereas interrogatives are used to ask questions (see Quirk et al., 1985). However, such a strict categorization has proved to be problematic. On one hand,

declaratives and interrogatives are coded differently in different languages. Unlike such languages as English or Serbo-Croatian, which have distinct syntactic devices for distinguishing interrogatives from declaratives, there are languages which lack such devices. Languages such as Italian (Rossano, 2010) or Yéllî Dnye, the Papuan language of Rossel Island (see Levinson, 2010), lack morphological or syntactic means of distinguishing polar interrogatives (yes/no interrogatives) from declaratives. Instead, polar interrogatives are of declarative format, so it is expected that they would be distinctively marked prosodically. However, both Levinson and Rossano found that there are no clear ways of indicating interrogativity in these two languages: questions and their answers in Yéllî Dnye seem to closely match in prosody, whereas only 30% of polar questions actually ended with the expected final rise in Rossano's corpus. This indicates that the fields of declaratives and interrogatives overlap in these languages and that their forms and functions are intertwined.

Hence there is language variation in how interrogativity is realised. In English, the principal device for constructing polar interrogatives is subject-auxiliary inversion: while an invented instance of a declarative in this language is 'It is clear', an interrogative form of the same utterance is made by the inverted word order 'Is it clear?'. Wh-interrogatives, on the other hand, are formed by placing a wh-element (who, where, when) at the beginning of the utterance, as in: 'Who told you that?'. While inversion is one of the main markers of interrogative syntax in English, in Serbo-Croatian it is particles and question words that play a more important role in forming interrogatives. Therefore, one way of forming a polar interrogative in Serbo-Croatian is by placing the interrogative clitic *li* after the verb: 'Dolazis li?'-'Are you coming?'. Serbo-Croatian equivalents of English wh-questions are formed in a similar way, i.e. by initial positioning of interrogative words 'ko' (who), 'gdje' (where), 'kada' (when) etc.: 'Ko dolazi?'-'Who is coming?'.

One has to stress, however, that even in such languages in which interrogatives and declaratives are syntactically distinct, questioning and declaring are not strictly tied to interrogative/declarative forms. Instead, these two forms can sometimes be used in quite

similar ways. For instance, questioning can be done both by means of interrogatives and declaratives - though it matters whether the speaker selects one form in preference to the other. Thus, there is a difference in the impact of 'Are you busy?' and 'You're busy?', although both can be considered questioning. For this reason, neither questioning nor declaring can be identified with any of the linguistic forms and this shows that it is difficult to define these categories in terms of descriptive grammar.

A number of scholars proposed that the main role of questions is to request information (Quirk, Greenbaum, Leech and Svartvik, 1985; Huddleston and Pullum, 2002; Stivers and Enfield, 2010) and information seeking emerged as the main defining feature of questioning. Although slightly problematic, as I will show later in this work, information seeking is, at least, something one has to take into consideration when tackling the problem of questions and questioning. Furthermore, scholars like Hall (2008) make a distinction between information-seeking and confirmation-seeking questions:

'At a most basic level, questions are frequently divided into two broadly defined types – those which *confirm known information*, and those which *seek new information*. The fundamental difference between these types is often represented as being that questions which are designed to *confirm* known information will elicit yes/no responses (formally, for example, simple polar interrogative questions – 'so you've hit her on the head ...?'), whereas questions designed to seek new information are those which will elicit a narrative response (for example, wh-/what questions – 'what made you do it?').

(Hall, 2008, p. 70).

So, confirmation-seeking function and whether it is different from information-seeking is another point to be taken into consideration when tackling the problem of questioning.

Directly connected to the issue of information seeking, is the one of informing or providing information. According to the Oxford English Dictionary (OED, 2010) one of the meanings of *informing* is to impart knowledge or learning to another, the recipient of

the declarative utterance. It then follows that asking a question implies asking about somebody's knowledge, and that questions are immediately linked to the matter of knowledge or epistemics. The terms 'epistemic' and 'epistemics' will from now on be used to denote the issues relating to knowledge and to the participants' methods for claiming, deferring or presupposing knowledge rights and responsibilities. The epistemic side of questioning is best explained by Heritage and Raymond (forthcoming): the act of questioning invokes a claim that the questioner lacks certain information; he/she is therefore considered to be in 'K-' position. At the same time, it also invokes the claim that the addressee has or is likely to have the required information. The addressee is, therefore, projected to be in a knowledgeable, or 'K+' position. In this work, I will use the 'K-' to indicate an interlocutor's inferior knowledge and the 'K+' to indicate an interlocutor's superior epistemic position.

The matter of questioning is made even more complex by the fact that different question designs can adjust the depth of the epistemic gradient (difference in states of knowledge) between questioner and respondent. Further, I show that there are four different formats by means of which a person can ask a 'do you know' question in Serbo-Croatian. Each of these formats expresses different claims about the speakers' and listeners' state of knowledge. Some of them claim no knowledge on the part of the speaker, some presuppose that the recipient has knowledge about something, whereas some claim epistemic authority (knowing more than the other) on the part of the questioner. It could be said that whenever a question is asked, some claim is made about who knows what in relation to another party. Moreover, I will show how a single question can potentially incorporate a number of epistemic layers.

As previously mentioned, interrogatives and questions are not the same; 'questioning' cannot be mapped directly onto interrogatives. Interrogatives are syntactic structures; whereas, questioning is an activity. One reason why interrogatives cannot be identified with questions is that there are so many instances of this form which are not doing questioning. In such a way, although 'Isn't she beautiful?' might at first sight look like a question, it is actually not performing the action of questioning. The speaker

is rather expressing an opinion and seeking agreement/disagreement with it, so what the interlocutor can do next is to agree/disagree with the assessment, not provide an answer. Also, the wh-interrogative 'Why don't you take a seat?' rather than asking a question, is ordering somebody or inviting them to sit down. And while there are interrogatives which are not questions, there is a reversed case (i.e. there are forms other than interrogatives which are doing questioning). It is quite easy to imagine that in the right kind of context a single lexical unit can be doing questioning. Asking somebody 'Happy?' by applying to it the right kind of prosodic features can make an equally appropriate and meaningful question as a full formed interrogative.

To make the matter of questioning even more complicated, there is an issue of interrogatives and questions being used to package other actions. In order to describe this phenomenon, Schegloff (2007, p. 169) uses the notion of 'vehicle' (i.e. one action being used as a vehicle for another action). In such a way, although something may seem to be a question, it can perform a range of other activities, from complaints to offers and invitations. Then, 'why do you always do that?' is a question, but, at the same time, it is a complaint about the interlocutor's annoying habit. The question is how we understand that the primary action of these interrogatives is not questioning, but some other activity? How do we understand 'why do you always do that?' as a complaint, not a question? And why is it that these actions are done by means of interrogatives, not declaratives? For one thing, these actions are perceived as stronger when expressed by means of 'question like' forms, probably because they constrain the interlocutor to respond. In this work I examine these issues and develop them further in relation to 'questioning' in Serbo-Croatian.

The idea of packaging other actions inside the question-answer pairs has also been noted in other institutional settings. Atkinson and Drew (1979) focused on the question and answer sequences into which courtroom interaction is mainly organized. Such organization of this type of interaction is determined, first of all, by many rules of what should and should not be said in courtrooms. Speaking about this type of interaction, Atkinson and Drew note:

‘While turns are pre-allocated to the extent that they should constitute either questions or answers, this is only minimal characterisation of turns in examination. Other sequence types, such as challenge-rebuttal and accusation-denial, are locally managed in this system ...’

(Atkinson and Drew, 1979, p. 78)

This means that whatever actions are conducted in examination will have to be fitted within the sequential environment of questions and answers. Atkinson and Drew note that questioners, mostly lawyers, will have to design whatever they intend to do – show that the defendant is at fault or challenge a witness’s evidence in a series of questions. If a counsel wants to allocate blame to a witness or defendant, different from ordinary conversations in which blame can be expressed in form of a statement ‘you did X’, in cross-examinations such actions will have to be built out of the evidence which is collected in a stage-by-stage process in question-answer sequences. In such a way, a counsel in a rape case attributes blame to the witness (rape victim) in the following way: ‘didn’t you te:ll the police that the defendant had been drinking’; the form of a negative interrogative asks a ‘question’, at the same time as the lawyer is also implying something blameworthy or discrediting about the inconsistency in her evidence (she has just previously testified that the defendant had not been drinking). On the receipt of this kind of turn, the witness has to package the alternative action in the form of an answer. She responds with ‘no I told them that there was coo:ler in the ca:r and that I never opened it’, i.e. she first produces the denial of the counsel’s version and then provides her version of the event.

I have now introduced a number of issues which surround questions and questioning. The chapter to follow, the review of the literature, will deal with these issues in some more detail.



## **CHAPTER TWO**

### **INTERROGATIVE CONSTRUCTIONS AND QUESTIONING- A LITERATURE REVIEW**

## **2.1 Literature review**

In this chapter I will try to set out some basic issues that surround questions and questioning. I set off from the traditional attempts at defining the phenomenon of questioning by means of interrogative lexico-morphosyntax and prosody and further I discuss the ‘information-seeking’ criterion which is still utilized as an important premise for determining if something is or is not a question. As this study focuses on questioning in Serbo-Croatian language, I include a brief outline of interrogative lexico-morphosyntax and prosody of this language. I then consider a number of studies which, directly or indirectly, treat the issue of constructional management of questions and how questions can be used to do actions. I give special attention to the matter of action formation. I further consider how, when doing questioning, speakers constantly convey to the recipient their assumptions and presuppositions and their ‘K+’ or ‘K-’ positions (positions of superior or inferior knowledge according to Heritage and Raymond, in press) in order to move forward certain activities and manage rights and responsibilities in communication. Along these lines, I go on to show how the epistemic stance certain questioning forms display can be a form of agency, restricting the recipient’s answering space. Finally, the chapter includes a section on questions as sequence initial objects, which do not themselves perform an action of questioning, but they prepare grounds for an action to come, a brief outline of studies on questioning in legal and police settings and a conclusion.

## **2.2 Defining questions**

Traditionally, linguists have identified questions and their linguistic co-categories according to their formal features. Quirk et al. (1985, p. 803) distinguish between four principal linguistic forms each of which is characterised by a specific set of linguistic features:

- declaratives
- interrogatives
- imperatives

- and exclamation marks.

Thus, interrogatives, frequently identified as questions, have their own set of features, which distinguish them from other linguistic forms. What makes interrogatives different from declaratives, for instance, is subject/auxiliary inversion both in yes/no interrogatives - 'Is it clear?' and wh-interrogatives - 'So an ↑ when other time have I ever done that↑'. Declaratives, on the other hand, have a subject which generally precedes the verb - 'Pauline gave Tom a digital watch for his birthday' (Quirk et al., 1985, p. 803).

Next to the syntactic form, other frequently quoted defining features of questions are rising final intonation and lexical items such as question words - 'when', 'what', 'why' etc.

Linguists have also tried defining questions based on their function. In an attempt to do so, many embraced information-seeking as a defining feature. Thus, Quirk et al. (1985, p. 84), speaking about questions' discourse function, state: 'questions are primarily used to seek information on a specific point'. Huddleston and Pullum (2002, p. 867) hold a similar position and they provide the example 'What time is it?' to illustrate the point. Thus, the main function of 'What time is it?' is to request from the interlocutor information about the current time.

More recently, information-seeking has been utilized as the main criterion for defining questions in the MPI Multimodal Interaction Project, one of the most extensive cross-linguistic research projects on questioning in interaction. For the purposes of the project corpus codebook, Stivers and Enfield (2010) used the informativeness criterion as one of the starting points for defining and coding questions in the ten languages they study. According to them, information questions are information-seeking utterances which, in lexical-morphosyntactic or prosodic sense, are canonically considered to be questions, such as 'What time is it?', or non-canonical ones of the type 'You're cold' which still ask for provision of information as a next relevant action.

Based on these attempts to define questioning, one can begin to realise that questioning is a complex phenomenon, different aspects of which are very difficult to encompass in one simple definition. This chapter will discuss the existing literature on questioning and try to highlight the issues around questions and the areas which need further development.

### 2.3 Linguistic practices for constructing interrogatives

As mentioned previously, syntax is one of the primary resources for constructing interrogatives, in English, the principal device being subject auxiliary inversion (Huddleston and Pullum, 2002, p. 856) or the way Quirk et al. (1985, p. 803) put it, placing ‘the operator’ in front of the subject in case of yes/no interrogatives:

(1)

Is it clear?

Taken from Koshik (2002, p. 1862)

or initial positioning of the wh-element in case of the wh-interrogatives:

(2)

Shelley:            So an ↑ when other time have I ever done that↑

Taken from Koshik (2003, p. 51)

In other languages, too, syntax plays a key role in forming interrogatives. In Serbo-Croatian there is a number of syntactic devices that are applied in order to form equivalents of English yes/no and wh- interrogatives (set out in a) - f) below):

- a) placing the fusion of the particle *da* (considered by Rakić (1984, p. 699), for instance, to be an affirmative particle, the equivalent of English *yes*), and interrogative clitic *li* in front of the verb:

(3)

Dt1:       da li poznajete: BOžović Boža:?  
          p.<sup>1</sup> qp.<sup>2</sup> (you) know: BOžović Božo:?  
          *Do you know Bozovic Bozo?*

The *da li* form is considered by some to be a non-enclitic form<sup>3</sup> of the interrogative clitic *li* because both *da* and *li* perform the same function, that is they form an interrogative marker (Browne, 1971)<sup>4</sup>. For the purposes of this work, it is sufficient to appreciate that one type of yes/no interrogative is formed by placing *da li* in front of the conjugated verb. In example (3) one can see that *da li* is positioned before the verb 'poznajete' (with the inflection for polite version of second person singular, equivalent to French *Vous*). The personal pronoun is omitted which is frequently the case in Serbo-Croatian since the main verb is morphologically marked for person and number. The *da li* type of interrogative, usually perceived by the recipients to be quite formal, is very infrequent in my data and occurs only two to three times in the whole data set.

b) placing the interrogative clitic *li* after the verb:

(4)

Dt1:       imaš       (1)i kući↑ (.) pu:mpu za prskanje voća?  
          have(you) qp. home↑ (.) pu:mp for spraying fruits?  
          *Do you have at home a pump for spraying fruit trees?*

In this example the verb *have* is conjugated for second person singular, and is then followed by the clitic *li*. Then comes the slot for the second person singular pronoun *ti* (you), which is empty in this example. The particle *li* tends to be omitted in spoken discourse, the issue which, to my knowledge, has not been much discussed in the literature. In this work I try to follow the patterns in which the particle appears/is absent.

c) placing the interrogative word *zar* before the verb. These interrogatives are formed in pretty much the same way as the ones formed with particle fusion *da li*. There is a difference, however, introduced mainly by the meaning of *zar*, which is usually perceived as expressing doubt or disbelief (Rakić, 1984, p.

708). *Zar* interrogatives are approximately equivalents of English negative interrogatives, to be discussed further on in this chapter.

(5)

Dt1:        .hh ali zar ne:MA↑     >tu     neke ne<logi:ČNOsti,  
               .hh but zar not:HAS↑ >there some il<logi:CALity,  
               *but isn't there something illogical about that?*

- d) similar to *zar* interrogatives are negations of *li* interrogatives. They do not occur in the data set, but they will be treated briefly in the section on constraining.
- e) there is also an option of forming negative interrogatives headed by the particle *da*, as seen in example (6):

(6)

Dt3:            i   šta   da   te   nije   ZVAO            možda?  
                   and what   p. you not (he)CALLED maybe?  
                   *And could he have possibly called you?*

- f) Serbo-Croatian equivalents of English wh-questions are formed in a similar way, by initial positioning of interrogative words *ko* (who), *gdje* (where), *šta* (what), *kada* (when) etc.:

(7)

Dt1:            a   >šta   si            radio            od   pola   jedan<?  
                   and >what aux.(you)were doing from half   one<?  
                   *And what were you doing from half past twelve?*

In example (7) one can see that the interrogative word 'šta' – 'what' is placed before the cliticized form of the auxiliary verb 'si' and the main verb 'radio' (work), inflected for past tense. The auxiliary 'si' is also in inverted position which double-marks the interrogative mode of the utterance.

One can note that both in English and Serbo-Croatian there are distinct, though quite different syntactic devices for signalling interrogative form. In English this is subject/auxiliary inversion together with question words, whereas in Serbo-Croatian, a language with free word order, although inversion might appear in certain cases, the main interrogative markers are clitics and question words.

Another linguistic level one ought to be considering in combination with syntax is morphology. While verbal morphology does not play a significant role in the formation of English interrogatives, in Serbo-Croatian, its role is more prominent. The fact that verbs are inflected and marked both for person and number creates more options for the speakers to chose from. For example, in the sentence (8) the second person personal pronoun *ti* (you) is absent, its possible position being after the question particle *li*<sup>5</sup>:

(8)

Dt1:            i maš        i    JOŠ   šTO:   da ka:že:š?  
                   (you)have qp. MORE WHAT: to s:a:y?  
                   *Do you have anything else to say?*

The pronoun omission is made possible due to the fact that the verb ‘*imaš*’ is inflected for the second person singular and that Serbo-Croatian in this respect behaves as any other pro-drop language (Italian, Spanish). The pro-drop option is available both for yes/no and wh-interrogatives. This gives a speaker two options: constructing an interrogative with or without the personal pronoun, each of the options having specific implications in communication.

Speakers can also mark interrogatives by a range of different prosodic devices. Additionally, these prosodic cues can be applied to different sections of the interrogatives. In English language, for example, speakers can apply different types of pitch accent (H\* \_ L+H\* \_ L\* \_ o\_) onto the auxiliary in yes/no questions or the initial wh-word in wh-questions since these are the loci of interrogation. Also, different parts in the body of the interrogative can be accented to stress the focus/ topic of the question (Hedberg and Sosa, 2002). In addition, interrogatives can be given rising/falling or even

final intonation. The standard assumption was that yes/no questions would be produced with a rising intonation at the end and that wh-questions would be produced with a falling final intonation. However, a number of research projects have had quite different results. In the set of yes/no questions they studied, Quirk et al. (1985) found that 430 ended in a rise and 290 in a fall. In the case of wh-questions the majority, i.e. 775 out of 858 had falling final intonation. This means that there is no one-to-one correspondence between prosody and grammatical form, which gives speakers a wide range of devices for expressing numerous nuances in communication.

Traditionally it is said that Serbo-Croatian displays four types of accents: short falling (´), short rising (˘), long falling (ˆ) and long rising (˙). Falling accents may occur on the first syllable of a word and rising accents may occur on any syllable except the last. Lehiste and Ivić (1986) look at the interplay between word accent and sentence intonation in Serbo-Croatian. They suggest, first of all, that sentence intonation has primacy over the word accent: they have noted instances in which word accents would undergo modifications under the influence of sentence intonation, but not the other way round (Lehiste and Ivić, 1986, p. 236). When it comes to the general F<sub>0</sub> movement in Serbo-Croatian sentences, they found that it is generally falling. Morphologically unmarked yes/no questions can contain a word with reverse pattern as opposed to that of statements. However, the intonational contour of yes/no questions is mostly falling, like the one in statements. Lehiste and Ivić note the same falling intonation in other types of questions – i.e. Serbo-Croatian equivalents of English wh-questions.

Clearly, both in English and Serbo-Croatian, although quite different, there is a number of syntactic, morphological and prosodic features that come together so that certain content is brought across to the listener. In this study, I focus on how these linguistic resources are packaged together when speakers do questioning in police interrogation settings.



## 2.4 Interrogatives not doing questioning

A number of studies have explored the role of lexico-morpho-syntax in the formation of the action of questioning. Heritage and Roth (1995) study to what extent news interviews are question-driven form of interaction. They explore the role of syntax in carrying out the action of questioning and to what extent grammar plays part in the recognition of questioning by the addressee. For this purpose, they carried out statistical analysis, coding interrogatives which are traditionally identified with questions and non-interrogative forms which also perform questioning<sup>6</sup>. They start off with the syntactic forms determined as questions by Quirk et al. (1985) and they amend the coding by introducing additional questioning forms they came across in their data. Their findings indicate that core grammar ‘...is a significant resource through which the parties, via turn transition, recognize questioning to have been accomplished’ (Heritage and Roth, 1995, p. 21). In their set of British data in 62.9% of cases turn transitions would occur after an interrogative was fully formed. In their US data the percentage is also comparatively high, 49.7%. This indicates that IRs (interviewers) would overwhelmingly apply interrogatives as default forms when doing questioning and that IEs (interviewees) would also orient to the turn format.

Stivers and Rossano (2010) explore what it is about some sequentially initial turns that ensures a response from the interlocutor. They suggest that response mobilization is done through a combination of multiple resources employed simultaneously: through the social action a speaker produces, the sequential position in which it is delivered and through turn design features that increase the recipient’s accountability for responding - interrogative lexico-morpho-syntax, interrogative prosody, recipient-focused epistemicity and speaker gaze. Thus, out of 336 requests for information in Italian and English Stivers and Rossano studied, 70% were done with interrogative lexico-morpho-syntax. The fact that questions as parts of question-answer adjacency pairs need to ensure a second pair part (SPP), could, among other things, explain why questions are extensively produced in interrogative form.

Although the above studies might indicate that questions are mostly executed in the form of interrogatives, a number of other studies suggest that interrogatives do not necessarily do questioning. For instance, Heritage (2002) looks at how news interviewers use negative interrogatives while performing their institutional role of questioning. In example (9) Heritage studies how ABC's Sam Donaldson is questioning President George P. Bush's Budget Director, David Darman, about methods of handling the cost of the US savings and loan bail out of the late 1980s. The sequence begins with a negative interrogative from the interviewer. As Heritage notes, the interviewee in line 04 already names the action the interviewer is performing by means of the negative interrogative in line 01. He states that it is a 'technical argument' and that the interviewer is not asking a question by means of the interrogative, but is expressing an argument. Donaldson then directly contradicts the interviewee, continuing his turn with a second negative interrogative.

(9)

01	IR:	Isn't it a fact, Mr. Darman, that the taxpayers will
02		pay more in interest than if they just paid it out of
03		general revenues?
04	IE:	No, not necessarily. That's a technical argument—
05	IR:	It's not a—may I, sir? It's not a technical argument.
06		Isn't it a fact?
07	IE:	No, it's definitely not a fact. Because first of all,
08		twenty billion of the fifty billion is being handled in
09		just the way you want—through treasury financing. The
10		remaining—

Taken from Heritage (2002, pp. 1435-1436)

Heritage (2002, p. 1436) states 'these data suggest that 'negative' question formulation is a very strong way for an interviewer to project an expected answer—strong enough, when produced in association with question content that contests an interviewee's position, to be treated as having made an assertion and taken a position'.

Furthermore, positive yes/no interrogatives that resemble information-seeking questions are found to perform criticism (Koshik, 2002), challenge (Heinemann, 2008) or direct complaints (Monzoni, 2008). Wh-forms have been found to challenge (Koshik, 2003;

Egbet and Vöge, 2008), perform direct complaints (Monzoni, 2008) and so on. Halldorsdottir (2006) describes how seeming questions can be used for instructing the client how to say something in court, for mitigating crime, formulating the defense story or similar activities. Halonen and Sorjonen (2008) show that interrogatives containing the intensifier *niin* are used to treat the previous speaker's action as exaggeration, and Stokoe and Edward (2008) 'silly questions' to put the already known on record.

It becomes clear that although interrogatives are extensively used as one of the main syntactic vehicles of questioning, their usage is much wider as they can perform a whole range of other actions.

## **2.5 Non-interrogatives doing questioning**

The same way interrogatives, as previously demonstrated, can be used to do actions other than questioning, alternative non-interrogative forms can be doing questioning (Heritage and Roth, 1995). Heritage and Roth point out that a number of these 'unorthodox' questioning practices are sometimes applied for achieving the institutional role of neutralism.

Heritage and Roth (1995) suggest that news interview questioning can be facilitated by means of declaratively formed utterances. They further say that these declarative forms embody statements in which the speaker formulates some matter as one to which the recipient has primary access. Such an utterance makes a recipient's confirmation or denial relevant in the next turn. Heritage and Roth found that a substantial number of these declarative questions are produced with rising final intonation, but their realisation does not necessarily depend on it. One can note that in example (10) below the interviewer produces the declarative in lines 01-03 with a falling final intonation, the kind of intonation which is canonically applied to statements. This goes against the traditional claims that declarative questions are produced with rising final intonation (Quirk et al., 1985, p. 814). Content-wise, one can note that the interviewer produces a statement, by which he claims some knowledge about something that IE has more access to, i.e. David Owen has more access to his own regrets than anybody else.

However, the claimed knowledge is slightly downgraded by the turn's preface 'so' which indexes that this is what the interviewer has inferred, probably based on some previous talk or some general knowledge. This is why the interviewer's utterance in lines 01-03 cannot be heard as stating facts, but rather as seeking confirmation/disconfirmation.

(10)

01	IR:	So in a very brief word David Owen you in no way regret
02		what you did er despite what has (happened) in Brighton
03		this week in the Labour Party.
04	IE:	n- In no way do I regret it.=

Taken from Heritage and Roth (1995, p. 11)

The paradox of non-interrogative forms doing questioning is noted in some other studies. For example, negative tags, appended to statements, of the format 'it's a lovely day, isn't it', are noticed to be understood as questions by the addressees in the news interviews settings (Heritage, 2002). Linguistically, these utterances are defined as statements, asking for agreement/disagreement. However, Heritage's study suggests that, in reality, these utterances are rather treated as yes/no questions as is the case with example (11):

(11)

01	IR:	Well that makes you a Marxist doe[sn't it.]
02	AS:	[Not nece]ssarily makes
03		me a Marxist in the descriptive sense,....

Taken from Heritage (2002, p. 1441)

Heritage notes that the utterance in line 01 is not responded to with a statement of 'agreement' or 'disagreement', but the way interviewees normally respond to yes/no questions to be 'answered', not as assertions to be agreed/disagreed with. It is worth noting here that the recipient (AS) treats the statement in line 01 as a question even

before the tag is produced, which further supports the idea that non-interrogatives can be performing questioning.

Steensig and Larsen's (2008) study, carried out on the data of Danish emergency calls, indicates that a type of utterances - *you say* + a version of what a co-participant had earlier said in conversation are perceived as questions by the callers, usually callers to emergency services. Similarly to example (10), these utterances are declarative in format:

(12)

01	Call-taker: <u>o</u> kay du            si' <u>r</u> ((name of street)) okay you <sub>SG</sub> say <sub>PRS</sub> ((name of street)) okay you     say        ((name of street))
02	(.)
03	Caller:        ' <u>a</u> r, ((house number)) yes, ((house number))
04	(1.2)
05	Call-taker: hv*'a' der g*'alt d*'er, what's wrong there,

Taken from Steensig and Larsen (2008, p. 114)

The *you say X* utterance in line 01 occurs after the caller has reported the case and the call taker is asking for confirmation as to double-check and put on record what the caller had reported. One can see that in line 03 the caller responds with a short 'yes', thus making confirmation relevant, and then reissues the house number. Steensig and Larsen (2008) note that these utterances are performing questioning by minimally asking for confirmation.

Furthermore, Heritage and Roth (1995) note that questioning can be performed by such non-interrogative forms as imperatives or lexical, phrasal and clausal TCUs.

All these studies indicate that there are a number of devices for realizing questioning interactionally: first of all, interrogative grammar as a 'default' syntactic device, but

also declaratives and other linguistic devices, applied for the purposes of achieving special interactional goals. Additionally, it becomes clear that the same way non-interrogative forms can be found doing questioning, the interrogative ones can be found doing activities other than questioning.

These mismatches of form and function have both interactional and research methodological implications. In an interactional sense, they point to the complexities of communication, and to the fact that there is no one to one correspondence between form and function. In the methodological sense, they show that this variety should be taken into consideration when designing studies that concern questioning as a part of communication processes. This has been especially recognized in a number of interactional projects that involved statistical coding, so that researchers set off from the interrogative grammar as a basis for coding, but they took into consideration other forms that can perform questioning (Heritage and Roth, 1995) as well as question content (Clayman and Heritage, 2002; Clayman, Heritage, Elliott and McDonald, 2007).

## **2.6 Interrogatives doing questioning and more**

Going back to the matter of question function: what it is that speakers do when they ask questions, it is worth revisiting the previously mentioned informativeness criterion. As already pointed out, according to Quirk et al. (1985), the main function of the question 'What time is it?' would be to request from the interlocutor information about the time. However, the main problem of claiming something like this is that the above example is decontextualized, so that it would be very difficult to make any strong claims about its function. Additionally, it is a matter of some doubt that it can ever be used as purely information-seeking - would a speaker ever inquire about time just for the sake of knowing it? Most frequently, the information-seeking is tied to a certain context and is done for a certain purpose. Bar-Hillel (1954), studying the use of indexical expressions, makes a distinction between statements and indexical sentences, the former being utterances which are not context dependent and the latter requiring the recipient's familiarity with the pragmatic context of their production. He suggests that in real life

situations it is very infrequent to produce statements of the type 'ice floats on water' which usually do not need context to be understood and he assumes that 90 % of declaratives contain indexical expressions and are, therefore, context dependent.

Likewise, it is more likely that the utterance 'What time is it?' is tied to a certain situation and that it would be asked so that the speaker would not be late, so he/she would have a lunch break etc.

Along the lines of what Bar-Hillel suggested, many projects studying questioning in different languages showed that very rarely question-like utterances are doing pure information-seeking. This is the case only with a small number of studies, such as Egbet and Vöge's (2008) study which showed that interrogatives containing the particle 'wieso' are indeed information-seeking, Raymond's (2009) study which shows yes/no interrogatives asking for information and Halldorsdottir's (2006) lawyers asking questions in order to clarify client's account or to seek information.

What seem to be 'information-seeking questions' change their status due to a number of factors, including speakers' shared knowledge, the grammatical form the speaker opts for, prosody, the slot at which the utterance occurs and so on. The utterance 'what are you doing', for example, might be expected to be doing information-seeking.

However, if uttered in the kitchen while three women are cooking together, by a woman who considers that the other one is doing something wrong, the situation changes.

(13)

01	LINA:	beh:: no- (.) ma cosa ↑fa:i? PRT no (.) but what you-do well no (.) but what are you doing
----	-------	--

\*Cinzia puts knife down - a bump is hearable  
\*(.4)

03	CINZIA:	>gli gnocchi!< ((constricted)) the dumplings gnocchi/dumplings
----	---------	--

Taken from Monzoni (2008, p. 80)

The very fact that one is asking *'ma cosa fa:i?'* while actually looking at what a person does, reduces the probability that the person producing the utterance is actually asking for information. Also, in spite of the fact that Cinzia treated Lina's utterance as information-seeking and supplied the information, there are some elements in Lina's turn which indicate that she is not really looking for information: dispreference markers *'beh::'*, *'no'*, *'ma'*, a pause at line 01 and rising intonation on *'fa:i'*. By means of these, what resembles an information-seeking question is actually heard as challenging what Cinzia is doing. Sensing this, Cinzia opposes the challenge by treating the FPP as information-seeking, but her own dispreference markers: the sound of the knife on the table, (0.4) pause and constricted response in line 03 indicate that Cinzia's SPP is not simply supplying information.

Another issue worth mentioning is the matter of 'new' information. If informing means 'communicating knowledge' (as etymology of the word goes) how often is it the case that speakers ask about something they have no knowledge of? Should only such utterances be considered 'real questions'? Very often speakers require clarification or confirmation, and that in the very core is not seeking for 'new information'.

Additionally, in certain cases, even though they already have certain information, speakers would strategically ask for it. This is quite often identified by studies on institutional talk, as certain institutional goals are achieved in this way. The strategy has been noticed in news interviewers when setting a backdrop of conversation or introducing a question (Heritage and Roth, 1995); call takers in emergency services when putting the information on record (Steensig and Larsen, 2008), or when getting the admission or statement of intent on record in police interrogation (Stokoe and Edwards, 2008).

Conversation analysts treat ordinary conversation as a dynamic category, being composed of numerous patterns of actions.

'In our interactions with others, we don't just talk; conversation is not, to adapt Wittgenstein's phrase, 'language idling'. We are doing things, such as inviting someone



over, asking them to do a favour or a service, blaming or criticizing them, greeting them or trying to get on first-name terms with them, disagreeing or arguing with them, advising or warning them, apologizing for something one did or said, complaining about one's treatment, sympathising, offering to help, and the like.'

Drew (2005, p. 74)

Furthermore, adjacency pairs, considered by conversation analysts to be minimal units of organization, involve carrying out the action through addresser's utterances, so called first pair parts (FPPs) and addressee's responses, so called second pair parts (SPPs). Atkinson and Drew (1979), speaking about the role of sequential placement of utterances within certain adjacency pair types, state that there is a list of instances of adjacency pairs such as questions-answers, requests/invitations-acceptances/rejections, summons-acknowledgements, accusation-denials and so on.

'If a speaker produces an utterance which by virtue of such features as its syntactic form, or conventional properties, is heard as the first part of an adjacency pair, the recipient of that may be expected to produce a second part in the same pair. So not only are the parts in a pair ordered relative to one another, but the next speaker's utterance which follows a first part should not be any second part, but one from that pair to which the first part belongs: hence, for example, return greetings may not be done to requests.'

Atkinson and Drew (1979, p. 50)

Furthermore, Schegloff (2007) talks about single turn constructional units (TCUs) embodying multiple actions. This means that, even when asking for information, questions will always be 'coloured' by some other action, i.e. the information-seeking is done to facilitate another action. The utterance 'what time is it' could then facilitate a number of different activities on different occasions: indicate that it is too late and that the party should split up, tell somebody he/she is late for a meeting and so on. This is why in naturally occurring talk there is an important matter of how certain FPP utterances would be treated by the interlocutor (Schegloff, 1978). Schegloff points

out that question is an adjacency pair category, but actions performed by FPP and SPP speakers tend to be not in tune with each other sometimes. Even though a FPP speaker intends to perform a complaint by saying 'Why is it that we have to go there.' and the SPP speaker can hear it as such, he/she (SPP speaker) might treat it as information-seeking and make the 'answer' relevant next.

Having all this in mind and addressing the following example:

(14)

01	B:	Why don't you come and see me some[times
02	A:	[I would like to

Taken from Atkinson and Drew (1979, p. 58)

one can note that 'why don't you come and see me sometimes', is interrogative in form. Clearly, this utterance can be a first pair part both in a question-answer and an invitation-acceptance/rejection adjacency pair. However, from A's response in line 02- which is an acceptance, one can tell that A has analysed and understood the interrogative in line 01 as an invitation. As Atkinson and Drew state, A does not treat the wh-utterance as a question, neither does B go to correct A's response, which she might have done if she recognized that A misunderstood. Instead, both speakers are in agreement that 'Why don't you come and see me sometimes' is not doing information-seeking, but an action of inviting.

The above example indicates that what seem to be information-seeking interrogatives can be used to facilitate an action of inviting. In a similar way, interrogatives can be utilized to facilitate an action of offering. In example (15) the participants Emma and Barbara are discussing preparations for the American holiday-Thanksgiving. A turkey dinner and pies of various sorts are what is needed for this occasion. In line 01-03 Emma makes a statement of her problem - she only has some of the things she needs for the Thanksgiving dinner. Then, in line 04 Barbara, obviously understanding the problem that Emma has volunteered in line 01-03, ventures an open-ended offer 'What can I

bring' before making it more specific by 'can I bring some pies'. Note that both the general and the more specific offer are expressed in the form of interrogatives – the first one in the form of a wh-interrogative and the second one in form of a yes/no interrogative.

(15)

01	Emm:	a:nd uh:(0.2).t c'z I want to en let me know by tomorrow I've
02		got some=the stuff but I haven't bought the turkey yihknow
03		I'd[l o-:ve ]
04	Bar:	[well what]c'n I: bring down can I bring some pie:s or
05		something

Taken from Curl (2006, p. 1271)

Interrogatives can also be used as a vehicle for an action of complaining. Prior to extract (16) Clara has accused Milly of touching her on entry to the kitchen, and Milly is denying this. Mum is also in the kitchen and her way of dealing with the girls' row is to tell them to leave the kitchen (line 01). In line 04 one can follow how Clara treats this mum's turn. Clara applies an interrogative 'why sh'd I:'ave t' go outside!!=' and although mum in line 06 treats this interrogative as information-seeking, Clara's interrogative is not meant to ask for information. Instead, the action it delivers is protesting/complaining against mum's request from line 01.

(16)

01	Mum:	C'N YOU BOTH GO <u>OU:TSI:DE,</u>
02		(0.3)
03	Milly:	I:'m s:ick (.) an' ti:red of[you <u>abs'</u> lutely,
04	Clara:	[why sh'd I: 'ave t' go
05		<u>outside!!='</u>
06	Mum:	= >BECAUSE [ I DON'T WANT [(THINGS BROKEN) IN HE[RE
07	Milly:	[j's [l <u>isten</u> t'me [o <u>ka</u> :y=
08	Mum:	= <u>ou</u> [tside
09	Milly:	[I j's want <u>you</u> t' <u>listen</u> t'me,
10		(0.3)
11	Milly:	I'm <u>sick</u> 'n <u>tired</u> of you <u>constantly</u> (.) <u>putt</u> -in' me
12		down in front of yo[ur ↑FFRIENDS in front of <u>MY</u> =
13	Clara:	[I'm not <u>putt</u> -in' you down
14	Milly:	= <u>friends</u> and in front of[them. [((M points at the camera))

Taken from Dersley and Wootton (2001, p. 622)

Furthermore, in news interviews, a type of institutional interaction characterised by being organized mostly in series of question-answer sequences, one can note a number of activities being done through those turns. One of the possible activities is that of accusation, as already seen from example (9). In the example to follow, taken from Heritage (2002) one can see that so much can be done by applying a single negative interrogative. The example comes from a presidential press conference, featuring American president Bill Clinton.

(17)

01	IR:	W'l Mister President in your zea:l (.) for funds during
02		the last campaign .hh didn't you put the Vice President (.)
03		an' Maggie and all the others in your (0.4) administration
04		top side .hh in a very vulnerable position, hh
05		(0.5)
06	IE:	I disagree with that .hh u- How are we vulnerable because
07		...Here

Taken from Heritage (2002, p. 1432)

First of all, by applying a negative interrogative form, the interviewer is building presuppositions and expectations into her turn. She expresses her preference for a positive response and builds in a presupposition that Clinton has indeed 'put the Vice President an' Maggie' and all of the administration in a vulnerable position. In such a way, the interviewer is stating her position and accusing Clinton of a political failure. It is obvious that the interviewer is here not asking Clinton to provide information about his opinion on the matter, but inviting him to agree/disagree with her position and, in such a way, either accept or reject the accusation. Note that Clinton formulates his response as a disagreement with what the interviewer expresses by her first pair part, addressing it as a statement of opinion, rather than as a question in search of information.

If we go back to the example 'So an ↑ when other time have I ever done that↑' as it occurs within its original sequence:

(18)

01 Shelley: alright, [well don get ma:[d at me.  
02 Debbie: [.hh [.HH I'M NOT MA:D but it jus  
03 seems like it's like you can't do anything unless  
04 there's a gu:y involved an'it jus pisses me o-<I'm jus  
05 bein rea:l ho:nest with ya cuz it's

((23 lines omitted))

29 Shelley: So: I mean it's not becuz hes- hes- I mean it's not  
30 becuz he:s not going it's becuz (0.5) his money's not  
31 (0.5) funding me.

32 Debbie: okay,

33 Shelley:	So an ↑when other time have
34	I ever [done that↑ ] (( <i>higher pitch on "that"</i> ))

35 Debbie: [.hhh ↑well ] I'm jus sayin ↑ it jus seems you-  
36 you base a lot of things on-on guy:s. (·) I do' know:,  
37 it just- a couple times I don- I don-.hh it's not a  
38 big deal.

Taken from Koshik (2003, pp. 55-56)

one can note that only nested inside the sequence in which it actually occurs, the wh- form at lines 33-34 gets to be fully understood. Two friends, Shelley and Debbie, are bickering over the fact that Shelley gave up going to a trip with her friends because her boyfriend is not going. Shelly uses the wh- form as a reaction to Debbie's accusation that she cannot do anything unless there are guys involved. As Koshik explains, the interrogative does not press for an answer; it does not seek from Debbie to state the instances of Shelley's unfaithfulness to her friends, but by using it Shelley primarily challenges her friend's accusation in lines 33-34. Similar types of interrogatives are named rhetorical questions by Quirk et al. (1985, pp. 825-826); by saying that 'they could be responses to previous questions' Quirk et al. hint that these forms could be used to express a challenge. Heritage and Roth (1995) quote a number of similar instances encountered in their news interviews data (for illustration especially see their Savundra case – Heritage and Roth 1995:46-47). Later on in this work, there will be some further discussion about similar types of challenging interrogatives in police interrogation discourse.

Just like news interviews, police interrogation is a type of interaction mainly organized as a series of question-answer adjacency pairs. Note that example (19), taken from a

police interview with a suspect from my own data, is composed mostly of ‘question-like’ forms:

(19)

***Suspect\_fthe\_s\_inf\_2008***

- |         |   |
|---------|---|
| 01      | (.)>pa a čuš što se< (.)pita više[njegova ]<br>(.)>well but listen why refl<(.)asks more[his ]<br><i>Well, why would one believe his word more?</i> |
| 02 Dt3: | [al on je]<br>[but he is]<br><i>but, he is</i>  |
| 03      | POšten čovjek.<br>HONest man.<br><i>an honest man</i>   |
| 04      | (.)   |
| 05 Sus: | a ja nije[sam.]<br>and I not[aux.]<br><i>and I am not?</i>  |
| 06 Dt4: | [što ]: se piTA NJEGova↓ više.<br>[why ]: refl.aSKS HIIs↓ more.<br><i>why would you believe his word more?</i>                                      |

Through these question-answer pairs, a number of actions facilitating specific institutional goals are performed and the suspect does some ‘questioning’ too. In its vernacular meaning, ‘to question’ has a connotation of ‘to doubt’, which so well describes the actions performed by questioning in police interrogation settings.

The reader should by now be aware of the fact that there are a number of factors which make it difficult to define the action of questioning in any straightforward way.

Questioning cannot be tied to a certain syntactic form, nor can it be defined based on a single, for example, information-seeking criterion. Rather than looking for information, a range of different actions can be performed through question-answer adjacency pairs.

## 2.7 What one knows...?

When communicating and performing different actions speakers constantly package their epistemic load into whatever grammatical form they use. Thus, they to various extents and purposes signal to the addressee their state of knowledge: they display the level of knowledge they possess in order to elicit information from the addressees in so called b-events (Labov and Fanshel, 1977); they embody various assumptions and propositions regarding the co-participants' actions, interests, opinions (Heritage 2002; Heritage 2003); they show their superior or inferior knowledge (Heritage and Raymond, 2005), or communicate to the interlocutor their knowledge/ lack of knowledge in order to manage certain social roles (Raymond 2009). On a larger organizational scale, the relative distribution of knowledge between interlocutors is an engine for driving sequence organization other than that of adjacency pairs (Heritage, in press b) and can determine the nature of the action at hand (Heritage, in press a).

Heritage and Raymond (2005) explain that participants are constantly concerned with the management of rights and responsibilities related to knowledge and information. Those participants with more insight into a matter hold primary rights to speak about it. Heritage and Raymond (2005) study how speakers mark this monopoly over information and knowledge when doing assessments. They note that this primacy is reflected, first of all, in who initiates the FPP, since those with first-hand knowledge are expected to do the first position assessment. The speakers doing second assessments will, then, be found to position themselves in relation to first position assessments, performing agreement, disagreement or adjustment.

(20)

01 Lot: h h Jeeziz Chris' you sh'd see that house E(h)mma yih'av  
02 ↓no idea.h[hmhh  
03 Emm: [I bet it's a drea:m.

Taken from Heritage and Raymond (2005, p. 17)

Heritage and Raymond explain that in this extract Lottie initiates first position assessment as a participant with immediate insight into the topic. Emma's response in line 03 ('I bet it's a drea:m.') projects an agreement with Lottie's assessment of the house, and at the same time, by the lexical choice 'I bet' expresses her own lack of knowledge about the house and therefore her supposition or imagining. The authors note that there are also instances of first position assessments when speakers express a downgraded assessment to communicate that the addressee has precedence at giving the assessment. They also show that these dominance - subordination relations, when it comes to information ownership, are expressed via a number of linguistic devices. The speakers use evidentials (it sounds, it feels, it seems) and tags to downgrade first assessments; upgraded first assessments are achieved through negative interrogatives. Speakers can also upgrade or downgrade their second assessments, an action quite difficult to manage as it expresses second speaker's epistemic stance in relation to the position already taken by the first speaker (see Heritage and Raymond, 2005)

Heinemann (2008) shows how the assumed epistemic stance of the addressee can influence the way certain utterances are realized. These utterances, in effect, represent b-events (Pomeranz, 1980; Heritage and Roth, 1995) which inevitably evoke epistemic issues, as they raise matters recipients have more rights to know about than the speaker. In the following extract pensioner Maren reproaches her caregiver Bente for using the wrong soap:

(21)

01 Maren: Det' jo jeres sæbe.  
That's your soap you know.  
02 (0.6)  
03 Maren: Det' jo ikk' min.=  
That's not mine you know.=  
04 Bente: HHHHHH Det' hãndsæbe,=  
HHHHHH It's hand soap,=  
05 Maren: =J\*e[ar\* ]  
=Y\*e[ar\* ]  
[ ]

06	Bente:	[Gø' ] det nɔ'et, [Does ]it matter,
----	--------	--

Taken from Heinemann (2008, p. 56)



Maren is persistent in pointing Bente's 'wrongdoing' throughout several turns, lines 01-05, and it is already clear to Bente what Maren's position concerning the matter is. The question 'does it matter', which Bente produces at line 06, conveys Bente's belief that it matters to Maren what soap is being used. Heinemann explains that the 'does it matter' interrogative is designed to receive a confirming answer of the same polarity - a 'yes' reply. She also explains that the question is formatted in relation to the speaker's state of knowledge. 'Based on the recipient's prior turns at talk the speaker infers what the recipient's stance towards some matter is and he/she uses a 'Same Polarity Question' to assert this inference and invite the recipient to confirm the stance' (Heinemann, 2008) However, if the question is answered positively the recipient is heard as disagreeing with the speaker. A disconfirming response is also not appropriate as it would contrast with the information provided by the recipient in prior talk. Because of that, the recipients treat this type of utterance as unanswerable questions and orient to them as challenges.

In a similar way, Koshik (2002) notes that reversed polarity questions encountered in student - teacher one-to-one writing sessions achieve their value from the epistemic stance of the speaker. Reversed polarity questions (RPQs) are simple positive polar interrogatives, but when posed, both students and teachers orient to a negative answer. Koshik suggests that answers to reversed polarity questions agree with the epistemic stance or implied negative assertion displayed in the interrogative. So, due to the negative stance these interrogatives convey, the interlocutors orient to the negative answer.

(22)

01	ST:	an like (0.2) um(0.5 ) that woulda get em
02		off the hook cause then: how can the law
03		punish em.cause (0.2) they're: rushing
04		ta help the grandparents.
05	TJ:	good idea.
06		(1.0) ((TJ: vertical headshake))
07		[didja tell me that?
09		[((TJ gestures toward ST))
10		(1.5) ((TJ points to text))
11	ST:	think so,
12		(1.0) ((TJ eyegaze on text; ST shifts eyegaze to TJ))

13	TJ:	um:.
14		(1.0) ((TJ &ST eyegaze on text; TJ gestures w/ pen
15		above text from top to bottom of paragraph))
16		is it clear?
17	ST:	no

Taken from Koshik (2002, p. 1862)

Therefore, when the teacher asks 'didja tell me that?' in line 07, he/she is not asking for information that he/she does not have. He/she has already read and commented on the student's paper and knows that the student did not talk about the matter in the essay. Koshik explains that this may be one way in which RPQs in general are understood as such: 'prior to asking the RPQ it has already been established, either from the immediate linguistic context or from the extra-linguistic context, that the questioner has access to the information which answers the question, and it is in this way that RPQs are heard as epistemic stance displays rather than as information-seeking questions' (Koshik, 2002, p. 1869).

Raymond (2009) studies how health visitors, medical staff running surveys and recording data on new mothers and babies, apply two alternative forms when driven by the epistemic value these forms convey. Raymond explains that yes/no interrogatives claim no knowledge on the part of the speaker<sup>7</sup>. Thus, by producing the following utterance:

(23)

HV: Is the co:rd ehm (1.0) dry now.

Taken from Raymond (2009, p. 93)

the HV concedes to the mother's primary rights to talk about the topic. The alternative form, yes/no declaratives, of the form SVO (in his data occurring with either positive or negative polarity and with either rising or falling intonation) claims certain knowledge on the part of the health visitor:

(24)

HV: =An' your tail end's oka:y?

Taken from Raymond (2009, p. 93)

Raymond draws attention to the extraordinariness of this type of interaction: taking place in family homes and being interviews facilitated by a health institution, the interaction constantly fluctuates between institutional and casual, both types involving the baby, the birth experience and the family's living situation. Therefore, health visitors regularly exhibit a concern that that they might convey that certain queries they pose might reflect their personal interest into the matter. Therefore, they juggle between the two alternative forms, managing knowledge distribution at different levels: they speak from the position of professional knowledge, addressing the new mothers who sometimes know more than they do due to their first-hand experience, and at the same time they want to avoid the trap of being made to look personally interested in the matter. Raymond states that both HVs and mothers orient to yes/no interrogatives and yes/no declaratives as constitutively distinct alternatives.

'... that the alternative social relations indexed by these forms, and the distinct actions they thereby enact, provide critical interpretive resources that enable participants to recognize the activities they are designed to index. Thus, HVs can alternate between these two forms in questioning mothers, and thereby manage how each question will be heard (e.g., as personally, professional, or institutionally mandated), and how the mother should respond.'

Raymond (2009, p. 21)

Raymond (2009) also stresses that the aforementioned alternative forms are used in terms of 'claimed' knowledge, they do not reflect a real state of interlocutors' knowledge, but on the basis of the epistemic stance one of two different actions is made relevant next. Thus, a speaker using a yes/no declarative claims to know about the matter formulated in it, and makes its confirmation relevant next. A speaker using a yes/no interrogative claims not to know and conveys a want to find out about the matter

formulated in it, making relevant an answer as a next action. In a similar way Rakić (1984) shows that Serbo-Croatian interrogatives formed by particle ‘li’ and fusion of particles ‘da li’ express the epistemic stance of not knowing and therefore require information, at least taken out of a wider context<sup>8</sup>.

Raymond (2000) shows that epistemic stance can be embodied in interlocutor’s responses too:

(25)

01	Dan:	...(eight) [two two one five si[x,
02	Les:	[.hhhhhhhhh [Oh ↑hello is ↑that
03		Dana,
04	Dan:	It tis.
05	Les:	.hhh ↑Oh Dana:- (.) eh: Gordon’s mum’s he:re?= 06 Dan: =Oh hello: 07 Les: .t.hhhh Uh:m (0.2) .t.hh- (0.3) °gn° eh-Have ↑you heard 08 fr’ m Gordon, ?

Taken from Raymond (2000, p. 311)

Raymond explains that the formulation Leslie uses in lines 02-03 is usually used when the called party sounds ill or strange for any other reason. By using this kind of FPP the speaker is indirectly asking whether there is something wrong with the interlocutor. However, as becomes clear from example (25), Dana and Lesley do not know each other well, which becomes obvious in line 05. After acknowledging Dana’s response, ‘oh Dana,’ Leslie identifies herself by ‘Gordon’s mum here’ rather than stating her name. Raymond explains that Leslie does so, because neither party is able to recognize the other’s voice. However, by using ‘is that Dana’, Lesley is still claiming that Dana’s voice sounds unusual and it is because of this ambiguity that Dana produces a nonconforming verb repeat ‘it tis’ (the notion of conforming/nonconforming responses is to be discussed in section 2.8 on preference). By using this nonconforming verb repeat Dana confirms her identity, but also indicates she does not recognize the caller and does not accept the terms of the FPP, i.e. Lesley’s treating Dana’s voice as accountable. Raymond explains that Dana takes an epistemic distance from the course of action initiated by the FPP.

The strategic use of terms with different epistemic values is of great interest to the present study. If the search for the truth is one of the main goals of police interrogations (Komter, 2003b), it would be expected that police officers, when accomplishing this task, would strategically reveal/hide their own knowledge via grammatical forms they opt for. In this study I will explore this issue of ‘epistemic game’.

## **2.8 Constraining force of interrogative forms**

Some interrogative forms are found to carry more implications than others. Wh-interrogatives, for example, can carry presuppositions that are damaging for the addressee, as they ‘introduce the presuppositions obtained by replacing the wh-word by the appropriate existentially quantified variable, for example who by someone, where by somewhere, how by somehow, etc.’ (Levinson, 1983, p. 184). That is how presuppositions are realized in the utterances of the type ‘when did you stop beating your wife’. These utterances are found to be very tricky to respond to as they carry the load of two presuppositions: a) that x was beating his wife and b) that x stopped beating his wife at some point. However, if the same content was packaged into a yes/no format and we got the utterance: ‘did you stop beating your wife?’ the situation gets to be even worse; there is a presupposition that x was beating his wife and that there is a possibility that he is still doing so. Whereas the wh- ‘questions’ leave the interlocutor more space when replying: in the case of ‘when did you stop beating your wife’, x can easily reply ‘I have never beaten my wife’; yes/no questions are designed to have a more restricted space for the interlocutor to manoeuvre, i.e. either a ‘yes’ or ‘no’ is expected in reply. In the case of ‘did you stop beating your wife?’, then, the grammar of the interrogative pulls x towards supplying either ‘yes’ or ‘no’ as a reply, but whatever option would get x into trouble.

Therefore, one can say that the very grammatical form of yes/no interrogatives ‘restricts’ or ‘constrains’ the answering space for the addressee. Quirk et al. (1985) use the term ‘conduciveness’ to express that by using a certain form speaker is predisposed to a certain type of answer. I use the term ‘constraining’ to talk about the same phenomenon in this work.

The practical application of the constraining force of interrogatives has been noted in different types of institutional interaction, most prominently in news interviews (Clayman and Heritage, 2002; Clayman et al., 2007; Heritage and Roth, 1995; Heritage, 2002; Heritage, 2003). As Heritage (2003, p. 67) notes ‘yes/no questions are recurrent sites of conflict between interviewers and interviewees; when talking about sensitive issues, interviewers pursue interviewees until they take a certain position and reply by either ‘yes’ or ‘no’ (for further details and examples see Heritage, 2003).

As already noted in section 2.3 Serbo-Croatian equivalents to English yes/no interrogatives are formed by means of the particle *li* or the fusion of particles *da* and *li*:

(26)

01	Dt1:	imaš	i	JOŠ	ŠTO:	da	ka:že:š?
		(you)have	qp.	MORE	WHAT:	to	s:a:y?
		<i>Do you have anything else to say?</i>					
02	Sus:	°ne°					
		°no°					
		No					

These forms are usually replied to either by a Serbo-Croatian ‘yes’ or ‘no’ or verb repeats.

So far I have discussed one reason why yes/ no interrogatives are perceived as constraining. That is their a) grammatical form. Another source of constraining force is b) preference structure. Preference structure is a structural phenomenon, studied and discussed in depth by Raymond (2000). Raymond states that once FPP is initiated certain preference/dispreference structure is activated by it, which puts constraints onto the SPP the addressee is going to design. As certain action is initiated by the FPP, it shows a preference for a certain SPP which would perform a matching action. Also, the grammatical form that FPP speaker chooses from a number of options limits the number of forms the SPP speaker can choose from. I will explain Raymond’s observations on the following example:

(27)

01	Dt2:	ne       uzimaš DRO:gu? jel? not(you) take DRU:gs? is it? <i>you don't take drugs right?</i>
02		(.)
03	Sus:	A? HA? <i>Ha?</i>
04		(.)
05	Dt2:	>ne uzimaš dro:gu<? >not (you)take) dru:gs<? <i>you don't take drugs?</i>
06		(0.2)
07		(0.8) ((background voices))
08	Sus:	slabo poorly <i>not often</i>
09		(.)
10	Dt2:	nemo:j nikako to:     ti je o    toga   da zna:š do:n't at all that: you is from that that(you)kno:w <i>don't at all, that's what it's from, just so you know</i>

The grammatical form of the FPP in line 01 'ne uzimaš DRO:gu? jel?' establishes the initial terms for the response to be provided by the SPP speaker. The form initiated is a declarative with an appended tag, by which the FPP speaker makes 'yes' or 'no' relevant next. Moreover, the chosen FPP utterance, negative in form, establishes a preference for a 'no' over a 'yes'. The expected negative reply is what Raymond terms a preferred answer. In addition to the constraints mobilized by the grammatical form of the FPP utterance, the action delivered by this FPP activates a preference for a corresponding SPP action. Raymond notes that most frequently speakers produce responses that conform to the constraints embodied in the grammatical form, and they orient to performing a matching SPP action. In his work, however, Raymond focuses particularly on the deviant cases, those that behave differently from what is 'usual'. So, in the example in line 01, by applying the negative form 'ne uzimaš DRO:gu?', the

detective signals that the 'expected' reply is 'no'. If that was a reply the suspect would have produced, Raymond would term it a conforming answer, as it goes along with the terms proposed in the FPP. However, the speaker produces neither a 'yes' nor a 'no', what Raymond calls a 'non-conforming' reply. He says :

'Fundamentally, type-conforming responses accept the design of a FPP and the action it delivers as adequate, while nonconforming SPPs treat the design of a FPP and the action it delivers as, in some way, problematic.'

Raymond (2000, p. 78)

Non-conforming responses can, then, be understood as the SPP speaker's attempt to avoid the action that either a 'yes' or 'no' would deliver in the sequence. In my example, the detective's utterance at line 1 'you don't take drugs right?' seeks confirmation, but it represents a preliminary to the advice the detective proffers in line 10. By supplying a nonconforming answer, the suspect shows that there is something problematic about the FPP. The dispreferred and non-conforming reply is a sign of resisting the terms of the detective's FPP. There are other elements of dispreference in example (27): a repair in line 03, long silence in lines 06 and 07, which also reveal that the speaker opposes the delivery of the action.

Interrogatives have been observed to change their quality whenever they get some kind of appendage. Interrogatives prefaced by 'and', for example, in health-visitor data are noted to signal a survey filling mode to the interlocutor (Heritage and Sorjonen, 1994). Clayman and Heritage (2002) report that journalists questioning presidents can tilt the question to prefer either a 'yes' or 'no' answer, by appending different types of prefaces to it. However, most often cited forms notorious for their constraining force are negative interrogatives (Clayman and Heritage, 2002; Heritage, 2002; Heritage, 2003).

Quirk et al. (1985) say that there exists a negative orientation in 'questions' which contain a negative form. According to them negative orientation gives away an element of surprise or disbelief, a combination of old and new expectation. Initially, the speaker was hoping for a positive reply, but present evidence seems to point towards the answer



being a negative one. In such a way, by producing an utterance 'aren't you ashamed of yourself?' the speaker is expecting a 'no' answer. There is an implication that the interlocutor is not ashamed, while he/she should be, or that the speaker is surprised he/she is not ashamed.

In the news interviews interaction negative interrogatives get to be revealed in a slightly different light compared to what Quirk et al. (1985) propose about these forms. As previously pointed out, the naturalistic data revealed that negative interrogatives are not understood as information-seeking despite their interrogative form. Clayman and Heritage (2002), Heritage (2002), Heritage (2003) show that neither questioners nor answerers treat negative interrogatives as information-seeking. Contrary to Quirk et al. (1985) Heritage shows that these forms, at least in the context of news interviews, are built to prefer 'yes' answers. To illustrate the point, an IR's utterance 'but shouldn't you be preaching unity now instead of this class warfare which you: which you: talk about.' pushes the IE towards a 'yes' answer. The IR's position also becomes clear, which is that IE should be preaching unity. As the IR takes the position towards the matter treated in the utterance, interviewees, as Heritage reports, recurrently respond to these utterances by agreeing or disagreeing with the interviewer. Their impulse is to use utterances like: 'I do not agree with you' or 'well, prove that.' Therefore, these interrogatives are found to do a much more aggressive job than simply asking for information. For an explanation of how these utterances are heard as taking a certain position, see Heritage (2002).

There are three grammatical variants in Serbo-Croatian that vaguely match negative interrogatives in English as quoted by Mrazović and Vukadinović (1990). These are interrogatives formed:

- by putting the interrogative particle *zar* at the beginning of the utterance. Mrazović and Vukadinović state that these utterances convey a shade of surprise and doubt concerning the content expressed by the utterance. Therefore, by saying:

(28)

Zar je Miloš dobar čovek?<sup>9</sup>  
'Zar' aux. Miloš good man?  
*Is Miloš a good man? (By using 'zar' the speaker builds in a presupposition that Miloš is not a good man)*

the authors claim that the interlocutor expresses surprise and that the meaning of the utterance is approximately 'who claims that?'.  
-

- the second option is made by negating the verb in *li* interrogatives. According to Mrazović and Vukadinović these utterances express doubt and suggest usually a positive answer:

(29)

Nije li Miloš dobar čovek?  
not + aux. qp. Miloš good man?  
*Isn't Miloš a good man?*

Therefore, by asking (28), the speaker would imply that Miloš is a good man. It is interesting that these forms do not occur in my data set.

- another negative interrogative form considered by Mrazović and Vukadinović (1990) is formed by placing the particle 'da' at the beginning of a negated utterance:

(30)

da nije Miloš juče dolazio?  
part. not Miloš yesterday come?  
*Could Miloš have come yesterday?*

Mrazović and Vukadinović (1990, p. 454) note that these utterances express an expectation for a positive answer. They make a comment that the implication of the utterance (30) is I suppose/yes.

Quirk et al. (1985) have noted that polarity can be turned around by means of what they term 'assertive forms'. These are words like *someone, already, really* and so on, which can be incorporated into interrogatives, due to which, the utterances are heard to

prefer either a positive or a negative reply. Quirk et al., thus, state that if *someone* is incorporated into an utterance, it tilts the interrogative towards a 'yes' answer. Therefore, 'did someone call last night?' presupposes that 'someone called last night' and that the reply would be positive. *Really*, on the other hand would give an utterance a negative polarity. Thus, a speaker saying 'do you really want to go now?' expects to get a negative reply. Quirk et al. also note that if a negative interrogative, which otherwise has negative polarity, incorporates one of the assertive items, it gets biased towards a positive reply: 'didn't someone call last night?', then, is designed to get a 'yes' as an answer.

While studying to what extent news interviewers are neutral when interviewing their guests, Heritage (2003) talks about how the above mentioned assertive items are used in the service of the action to be performed. He notes that interviewers, in their attempts not to be explicitly taking a certain position, can still embody preferences by means of incorporating the items like *seriously* or *really*. Heritage found that *seriously* and *really* are used to state a position which contradicts the interlocutor's and to prefer responses that contrast what interviewees would state. Thus, when the interviewer says 'Do you (.) se:riously believe that President Bush, or Bill Clinton again is going to endorse either one of those.', there is a presupposition that neither Bush nor Clinton will do the endorsement and the interviewer's stance is tilted towards 'no'. That is how, only by incorporating one item, an utterance gets to be heard as hostile by the interviewees. In a similar way, the word *any* would tilt the question towards 'no' in 'is there any justification for all that?'.

This section has outlined how participants in conversations can indicate to the interlocutors what kind of response they would 'prefer' in relation to the action initiated by the FPP. Some of the important devices for achieving this goal are: choosing a particular grammatical form, polarity or incorporating expressions which would give an utterance a certain bias.

## 2.9 Questions as adjacency pair parts and sequence initial objects

As I previously pointed out, conversation analysts consider organization of turn taking as one of the most important features of natural interaction. Turn taking is organized in such a way that each participant to a conversation alternatively gives his/her own contribution, which means that only one party is supposed to talk at a time. Each party also exhibits constant responsiveness and monitors what the other party is saying. More precisely, interlocutors constantly monitor what kind of action is being performed by what the other person is saying. As I already mentioned in section 2.6, by uttering 'why don't you come and see me sometimes', speaker A is performing the action of invitation, speaker B monitors what A is saying and having understood A's action as invitation, speaker B is supposed to provide a matching action, which is either acceptance or rejection. Schegloff (2007) states that turns at talk do not just follow each other like 'identical beads on a string' (Schegloff, 2007, p. 1). Instead, they are tightly connected and governed by the kind of action or actions which are being accomplished down the line. This organization of a number of actions enacted through turns at talk Schegloff terms 'sequence organization', which he considers is one of the vehicles for getting some activity accomplished. The notion of sequence organization is also extremely relevant methodologically as it helps the researcher (in the same way it enables participants to real interaction) track down an action or a line of actions the participants to conversations are performing. By means of sequence organization it can be revealed where the actions come from, what is being done through them and where they might be going.

As far as questions or question-like forms are concerned, their real function is best revealed if their development is followed within the original sequence in which they occur. It is by means of this that it becomes clear that actions are not only performed through paired utterances of speakers one and two, but the performance of certain actions is more complex and takes place across a number of turns. Regarded within the original sequence in which they occur, certain question-like forms have been found to be preparing the ground for another action (Schegloff, 1980; Drew, 2005). Therefore, the

interrogative 'what are you doing?' is quite often heard as opening way to invitations. The actual function of this utterance is to obtain the information about the addressee's availability at a certain point, so at the moment the addressee states that he/she is available, that gives the interlocutor a go-ahead for launching the action of invitation. It is, then, said that the interrogatives of the type 'what are you doing?' are sequentially initial objects, usually termed 'preliminaries' or 'pres' (Schegloff, 1980) or 'pre-sequences' (Drew, 2005) and their role is primarily to open way for the speaker's intended action. The following extract, taken from Drew (2005) illustrates the function of these forms.

(31)

01	Emm:	...Wuddiyuh ↑D <u>O</u> in.
02		(0.9)
03	Nan:	What'm <u>I</u> do[in?
04	Emm:	[Cleani:ng?= =hh.hh I'm <u>ironing</u> would <u>ju</u> belie:ve ↑th <u>a</u> :t.
05	Nan:	Oh: bless it[s↓hea:rt.]
06	Emm:	[In f <u>a</u> :c]t I: <u>ire</u> I start'd <u>ironing</u> en I: d-
07	Nan:	I(.) Some <u>how</u> er another <u>ahrning</u> js <u>kind</u> of <u>lea:ve</u> <u>me</u> : co:[ld]
08		[Ye]ah,
09	Emm:	(.)
10	Nan:	[Y <u>i</u> hknow, ]
11	Emm:	[Wanna c'm]do:wn 'av a bah:ta <u>lu:nch</u> w ith me?= 12
13		

Taken from Drew (2005, p. 77)

Emma launches 'what are you doing?' in line 01, which could be genuinely inquiring about Nancy's current activities and could, on the other hand, be preparing the ground for the invitation in line 13. Drew states that Emma makes her invitation when there is an 'auspicious environment' for making one. Emma does not make the invitation in line 06, as Nancy's reply in line 05 described Nancy as being busy ironing and therefore unavailable. However, as she further marks ironing as a tedious activity (lines 07-09), this gives Emma a go-ahead for the invitation job. No matter whether it was Emma's initial intention to invite her friend over for lunch, or just to 'genuinely' ask about her current daily activities, the 'what are you doing?' clearly did the job of pre-invitation and led Emma to the actual invitation making. As Drew notes these

forms ‘play a role that is both sequential, and associated with social action and social solidarity-that of trying to ensure the success of the invitation in being accepted’ (Drew, 2005, p. 91).

Schegloff (1988) reveals an ambiguity phenomenon: sometimes, even though some interrogatives are indeed intended to be ‘genuine’, they are heard as preliminaries by the interlocutor, possibly due to their frequent use in the preliminaries’ slot. Namely, Schegloff came up with a number of cases in which ‘do you know’ + embedded wh-interrogatives, intended to be information-seeking, are understood to be paving the way to some other action. In one of the instances, during the family dinner, the mother asks the children to guess where she is going that evening. The children guess she is going to an ‘eight grade’ school meeting. Then comes the following extract:

(32)

01	Mother:	do you know who’s going to that meeting?
02	Russ:	Who.
03	Mother:	I don’t know.
04	Russ:	OH::..Prob’ly Missiz McOwen(n’ detsa)en
05		prob’ly Missiz Cadry and some of the teachers.

Taken from Schegloff (1988, pp. 57-58)

Schegloff was able to identify this phenomenon by means of other initiated repair, in this case mother’s clarification at line 03. Only at line 03 it becomes clear that mother actually genuinely inquired about who would be present at the meeting. However, for some reason, Russ did not understand it as such: he understood the ‘do you know’ utterance as a preliminary to another action, possibly an action of telling. After the ambiguity was resolved in line 03, Russ finally provides the information in lines 03-04. This case points out that once certain utterances are habitually used in the pre-sequence slot, the interlocutors get to understand them as being asked for a reason, even when they are actually performing the main action.

In connection to what I have outlined above, this work, among other things, focuses on questions asked for a purpose; I study how detectives initiate different actions via their

‘questions’, how these actions are perceived by the co-participants and how and if these activities get to be carried out through question answer-answer adjacency pairs or further down the sequence.

## **2.10 Monopoly over ‘questions’ in certain interactional contexts**

Interrogations are a speech exchange system, which restricts questioning and answering to the different parties. Obviously the detectives do the asking and the suspects/witnesses do the answering. In this respect, interrogations resemble other speech exchange systems which are mainly composed of questions and answers: interviewing, including court and news interviews, medical interaction. A number of studies looking at these types of interaction (Atkinson and Drew, 1979; Frankel, 1990; Clayman and Heritage, 2002; Komter, 2005; Nakamura, 2010) indicate that in such interactional environments the right to ask questions is also restricted to one participant whereas the other participant’s role is to answer.

Studying courtroom examinations, Atkinson and Drew(1979) note that in this type of interaction, as opposed to normal interaction, only one party, generally the council, is given the right to ask ‘questions’. The examined party’s utterances are produced in sequential positions of ‘post-questions’ and are therefore answers to ‘questions’. This rigid type of turn taking is achieved by court procedures which do not allow witnesses to tell stories in their own words and which control the information on which a court’s decision is to be made, the professional hierarchy in court (the judge being the top of the hierarchy and the one with the utmost right to speak) and various rules about what should or should not be said and what form the interaction should take. Additionally, as Atkinson and Drew point out, councils can exert some control over the length of the witness’s answer, for example, by designing a question which expects an answer of a certain length, for example ‘yes’ or ‘no’ or by objecting to the answer for which the question was not designed.

Interviews in general are composed mostly of question-answer pairs. Nakamura (2010) in his study on Japanese students' English speaking skills, the results of which are aimed at improving second language acquisition methodology, recorded teacher-student interviews. In order to make the students ask more questions, he reversed the interviewing roles: students were given a task to interview their teacher. The reversal of the roles points to the normativity of this type of interaction: it is composed of question-answer pairs. It also highlights who normally conducts interviews when it comes to the teacher-student relation: the teacher is the one holding interviews and he/she owns the rights of asking questions, whereas the students are the ones who are normally providing answers.

As already mentioned, the same normativity is found in police interrogations. In her work on understanding problems in an interpreter-mediated police interrogation, Komter (2005) states 'a characteristic feature of police interrogations is the question-answer format, where the police officer typically asks the questions and the suspect or witness typically provides the answers'. She then characterizes interpreter-mediated police interrogation as more complex, as due to the presence of interpreter, the question-answer format is transformed into a question-translation-answer-translation format.

In the following extract taken from Komter (2005), there is another detail which points to the norm of detectives being the ones who ask questions. The detective starts interrogation, the turn being addressed to the interpreter:

(33)

P: U::h you can tell him that he  
uh is not obliged to answer questions

(Taken from Komter, 2005, p. 205)

In this example the detective orients to the forthcoming institutional roles of the participants of this interaction. The detective's role is to ask questions, the interpreter is



going to transfer them into the language the suspect understands and the role of the suspect is to answer (although, according to the law, he is not obliged if not willing to).

Frankel (1990) compared casual conversation and medical interviews interaction, and he found that medical encounters also are highly constrained in terms of utterance and speaker type. Doctors are the ones asking questions, whereas the patients' role is restricted to answering. The doctors are also determining when patients are going to answer or when they are going to give them an opportunity to ask something. Frankel phrases these restrictions as *dispreference for patient initiated questions* and patient initiated utterances in general. Frankel's findings indicate that less than 1% of all utterances by patients occurred in first position. The majority of physician initiated utterances were questions, and patient responses were usually followed by another question. There were no free-standing patient initiated questions. If patients initiated utterances, they were: sequentially modified questions, occurring in non-initial position; occurring in response to what Frankel terms solicits from doctors, such as 'OKa:y?' and 'Awright?'; following announcements, which signal a completed action after which the patient has a chance to enter into the conversation some new information; and patient initiations at boundaries marked by interruption, additional turn components appended to an answer turn. Frankel notes that on certain occasions, patients even phrased their questions as if the doctor has previously enquired about the matter, although as Frankel notes, on searching the transcripts it was obvious that the doctor has never inquired about it.

Clayman and Heritage (2002) found that, news interviews, as opposed to conversational framework in which topics emerge freely, are a more constrained type of interaction in which interviewers question and interviewees answer. Interviewees are not expected to ask questions or make unsolicited comments on previous remarks, initiate changes of topics or divert the discussion into criticism of the interviewer. Illustrating the dispreference for interviewees asking question in news interviews Clayman and Heritage give examples of interviewees asking permission to answer (see the Bush case: p. 132) or asking a permission to ask (example 34: 138). Frankel (1990), studying

medical encounters, found a similar phenomenon, patients asking for permission to ask a question (see example 1, p. 241).

This thesis, among other things, explores how the question asking is distributed between detectives and suspects. Although it is expected that the detectives are the ones asking questions, the readers will further find out that there is an interactional environment in which the suspects start questioning.

## **2.11 Questioning in legal and police discourse**

Of great importance for this work is the research in the area of forensic linguistics, which can broadly be described as the study of language and the law. Coming across a book about the role of a linguist in solving legal cases (Shuy, 1993) a couple of years ago, was what, among other things, inspired me to write this thesis. There is a growing literature in the area of forensic linguistics, but as the space does not allow it, I will only briefly mention a few of them. Forensic linguists explore such topics as the language of the law and court and language as forensic evidence (see Coulthard and Johnson, 2007; Gibbons and Turell 2008). However, as one digs deeper into this area, more specific issues emerge. The contributions to Coulthard and Johnson's (2010) handbook of forensic linguistics uncover some of them: in this issue within the wider topic of legal language forensic linguists study the language of the written law, written as well as spoken modes of the language used in legal communication. They study two interactive contexts: the police interview and the criminal trial. Unavoidable is the issue of forensic linguists as experts in legal processes, and their involvement in providing evidence for the defence and prosecution. Coulthard and Johnson note that this engagement with the socio-legal consequences of the written and spoken texts it describes, is what essentially distinguishes forensic linguistics as a separate sub-discipline.

Of special relevance for the current study are those studies exploring questioning in hostile environments in which a certain pressure is exerted onto the interlocutors due to their connection to a crime. These are studies exploring questioning as a blaming device

in court hearings (Atkinson and Drew, 1979), or as a way of challenging in court or police interrogation (Ilie, 1994; Edwards, 2006). Then come the studies which deal with questioning as a 'story' or a confession eliciting technique (Komter, 2003b; Halldorsdottir, 2006; Komter, 2006; Haworth, 2006; Guimareas, 2007; Stokoe and Edwards, 2008; Kidwell, 2009; Kidwell and Gonzalez Martinez, 2010).

Drew (2006) highlights the importance of documents as a source of research data. He indicates that through documents people can define their social realities, but they may also be used as an interactional resource by participants. Written documents play a special role in legal settings. In this context they become a forensic device. For instance, police interviews are recorded for the future audience of courtroom juries and judges so that some decisions would subsequently be made based on them. In order to ensure a just treatment of the participants in the legal process, it is essential to study how police interrogations are transformed into police records, written documents which later serve as 'the suspect's statement' or as evidence in the further criminal process (see Komter, 2001; Komter, 2003a; Haworth, 2010; Komter, in press). It is likewise important to study how these records are further used as sources of information by public prosecutors, judges, and defence lawyers in the process of decision making (Komter, 2002; Haworth, 2010; Komter, in press).

This thesis also builds on a group of studies which, in this or other way, deal with the police discourse. Such is Heydon (2005), a framework for the critical analysis of police interview discourse, which deals with such topics as the interview structure, the construction of police and suspect versions of events, issues of power and alike. Then, there are studies which focus on some special legal issues such as the role of intentionality in police interrogations, mens rea in legal terms (Edwards, 2008), social issues such as the balance of power and control (Haworth, 2006) or purely discursal problems like the place of reading and writing in police interviews (Rock 2010). Some of them focus on certain extraordinary situations in interrogations, such as the problems of understanding in an interpreter-mediated police interrogation (Komter, 2005) or the questioning of child witnesses (Aldridge, 2010; Heydon, 2005). Others deal with a

specific group of participants within the interrogation process: the role of lawyers in police interviews (Stokoe and Edwards, 2010) or the position of witnesses (Rock, 2010). Sometimes researchers study a particular type of crime, such as violent behaviour (Auburn, Drake and Willig, 1995), racial insults (Stokoe and Edwards, 2007) or sexual crime (Cotterill, 2007). Within a certain type of crime they may focus on a specific type of perpetrators, such as suspected paedophiles (Benneworth, 2007, Benneworth, 2009, Benneworth, 2010). Sometimes the focus changes onto those individuals reporting crime (Drew and Walker, 2010). In any case, regardless of the main focus, the above outlined body of work has greatly influenced the development of this thesis and helped me think about the issues emerging in my own data.

## **2.12 Conclusion**

This study can be positioned with the body of work on questioning in interaction (Schegloff, 1978; Atkinson and Drew, 1979; Schegloff, 1980; Schegloff, 1988; Heritage and Sorjonen, 1994; Heritage and Roth, 1995; Raymond, 2000; Komter, 2001; Clayman and Heritage, 2002; Heritage, 2002; Koshik, 2002; Komter, 2002; Heritage, 2003; Komter, 2003a; Komter, 2003b; Koshik, 2003; Raymond, 2003; Komter, 2005; Edwards, 2006; Halldorsdottir, 2006; Benneworth, 2007; Komter, 2006; Clayman et al., 2007; Guimareas, 2007; Egbert and Vöge, 2008; Halonen and Sorjonen, 2008; Heinemann, 2008; Monzoni, 2008; Steensig and Larsen, 2008; Stokoe and Edwards, 2008; Raymond, 2009; Stivers and Rossano, 2010; Stivers, Enfield and Levinson, 2010; Kidwell and Gonzalez Martinez, 2010; Heritage and Raymond, in press; Heritage, in press a and b). On examining this body of work, it is suggested that there are gaps in the literature that need to be addressed further. For instance, the connection between the interrogative format and action (the action of accusing, for instance) has not been well-developed. As this work explores the matter of how question form participates in the action formation and realization, it strives towards reducing the existing gap. It also contributes to the research on questioning in institutional interaction, as it deals with police interrogation, a type of interaction which is mainly driven by question-answer adjacency pairs. As the corpus utilized by this study is in Serbo-Croatian language, and

to my knowledge, there has been no account of questioning, of construction, use and management of questions in interaction in this language, it opens up a new area of research in this language and contributes to the general linguistic literature on Serbo-Croatian. Additionally, there has not been much work on how witnesses or interviewees use questions. Literature assumes that court interrogations, police interviews, news interviews and similar types of interaction have pre-allocated turn system and that the questioned party would rarely ask questions. My study, however, shows that it is not quite as it has been represented in the literature.

## **CHAPTER THREE**

### **DATA AND METHODOLOGY**

### 3.1 Data

The data set used in this study are police interrogations, recorded between the months of January and April 2008, in one of the major Montenegrin cities. Gaining access to police interrogations was not a very long process, but it was tedious. I attempted getting permission to collect the data through a number of personal contacts employed by the police or those knowing somebody working for the police. One of the contacts was pretty pessimistic about the prospects of getting permission, and he advised me to change the topic of my thesis! Finally, one of the contacts promised he would help me get an appointment with the head of the national police, as that was the only way, he insisted, of gaining official permission. After a period of talking on the phone to different people, I finally got an appointment: I met the head of the Montenegrin national police and he signed off an approval that I could do my research. The approval was then forwarded to an agreed police station. Although one might think that official approval would open doors, getting the data proved more difficult than I had expected. Once in the police station, the most frequent replies I would get from the detectives was that they had no clients coming in that day. So, all I could do was keep on trying: every day at about 8 o'clock I would go to the police station and ask around. Finally, I managed to gain the trust of some of the detectives and they let me record. This is how it would work: the detectives would tell me when exactly they had an interview that I could record. I would come to the office at the given time, ask the participants for their permission, switch on the recording device, leave it on one of the desks and withdraw. Eventually, I collected 24 recordings ranging in length from 2.28 to 61.01 minutes, the total length of the recordings being 6 hours and 51 minutes.

Asking permission involved signing subject consent, which was agreed by the department prior to my fieldwork (see appendix A). Participating in this sort of study is obviously a rather sensitive issue for both the interrogators and the suspects/witnesses. The slight apprehension of the detectives was indicated by their reluctance to participate. As I have already mentioned, the fact that I had official approval did not

mean that detectives were compelled to participate, and a considerable number of them chose not to. When it came to the suspects/witnesses, they equally did not need to agree and I made it clear that their cases would not be jeopardised by not participating in the study. The majority of witnesses/suspects agreed to participate. A small minority did not, but I did not keep a note of the numbers involved. In order to protect the participants' confidentiality, all of the names appearing in the transcripts are anonymized. Any similarity to actual persons, living or dead, is purely coincidental.

As I have already mentioned, the Montenegrin interrogation procedure is quite different from the one in the UK. First of all, while it is obligatory that the police interviews are tape-recorded in the UK, recording is not allowed in Montenegrin police stations (unless a special permission is issued, as was the case with collecting the data for this study). The way interrogation in Montenegrin police stations normally works is that two interviews are conducted for each case, which I here refer to as informal and official ones. The informal interviews, as it was explained to me, are conducted first and are not put on record. Later on, the same interview is conducted again and the official record is being composed, sometimes in the presence of a lawyer (if a suspect has admitted to a crime) and normally in presence of a typist who types up the report as the detective composes it. Offices, in this particular station at least, are usually occupied by a couple of officers, so that the number of detectives taking part in the interview varies, in my data ranging from one to four. The way this works is that only one or two detectives are officially in charge of a certain case, but if others are present in the office at the time of the interview they freely take part in the conversation. This kind of institutional environment makes the interviews interactionally very complex, with much overlapping talk and a lot of background noise, but it gives a wonderful opportunity for studying many simultaneous conversations and how various participants orient to certain interactional phenomena.

As far as the type of the crime is concerned, most of the interviews in my data set deal with wrongdoing of a less serious nature. Only one of them involves somebody's death. A substantial number of cases are financial fraud, usually cases of people reporting that



they have been a victim of this kind of crime. In order to get a bank loan in Montenegro, one needs to provide two guarantors who are willing to commit to paying off the loan if the one who takes it out fails to do so. Fraudsters get hold of an individual's ID, they fill in the required bank forms and forge the ID's owner's signature. They then get the loan by naming the fraud victim as one of their guarantors. The victim only finds out when the bank starts taking money from his/her account, as the forger obviously does not intend to pay off the loan. Other interviews feature people who have committed fraud or some other crime: a man takes out a number of loans forging the guarantors' documents; another one allegedly forges a stolen car's serial number and sells the car to an acquaintance. Another man is a potential participant in a case of arson at a local boxing club. Expensive parts have gone missing from a factory, a number of workers being the main suspects. Drug addicts commit a number of petty or more serious thefts: some shoplifting, stealing disused iron parts from a factory yard or an amount of money from a car parked in the neighbourhood etc. Tables 1 and 2 below give a more detailed picture of the data set.

The interviews in my data set are only audio-recorded, as it was impossible to obtain the video too. This, of course, represents a limitation as the video gives extra possibilities to the researchers and gives a complete picture of the communicational encounters. The lack of video did not, for instance, allow me to properly study non-verbal responses. There are cases in my data in which an interlocutor does not respond verbally, but then, there is a possibility that in such cases he/she responded non-verbally. Although the lack of the verbal response is relevant, I will never find out if in such cases a non-verbal response was provided. In the same manner, I was not able to address the fascinating issue of the role of gaze in police interrogation. This also goes for the role of bodily and facial expressions in the communication between the detectives and interviewees.

About a half of the recordings from the data set are transcribed in full. Extracts from other untranscribed conversations were transcribed as the need occurred. This means that, as I was working on a particular phenomenon, the repeats for example, I would find cases of the phenomenon in the so far untranscribed interrogations. So, I would

transcribe only the sections that related to the particular phenomenon that I was investigating at that point. When transcribing, I applied standard CA transcription based on the so called Jefferson system (Jefferson, 2004, see appendix B). I included the activity of typing in my transcripts since typing is an inseparable part of the record taking interviews. I also included such non-verbal activities as banging of the door, squeaking of the furniture, clicking and so on, so that the readers could get some idea of the movement of the interlocutors in the office. The third line of the transcription is italicised and it represents the idiomatic translation into English. I do not indicate the prosodic features of turns in this line as the structures and the word order of the two languages are different and it would not be possible to translate them accurately.

All of the transcribed data are translated into English. I provide two lines of translation for each line of the transcription: the first translation line is literal translation in which I also mark linguistic categories such as particles, reflexives, cases and so on, if necessary. This literal translation gives the readers, non-speakers of Serbo-Croatian, an idea of how this language is structured. The second line of translation provides an idiomatic translation into English, which gives the reader an idea of what the closest English equivalent would be.

I did myself all of the translation. Translating into another language is an ambitious project and translators always face a number of difficulties. First of all, there is always the issue of providing the best possible equivalent, the one which would not be too literal, or not too far from the original meaning. Then, spoken communication is characterised by a lot of cut offs and unfinished utterances which due to their prosodic features make sense in spoken communication, but translated into another language, their translation does not completely convey the meaning. The same goes for some colloquial expressions and single words whose semantic and pragmatic implications cannot be fully translated into English.

What can also be considered a limitation of this study is the fact that due to the length of my data, I did not get the second opinion for my translation. Since translation into

another language can be quite subjective and express a translator's personal understanding of the text, there is a danger of being imprecise in transmitting its meaning. Translating the data into another language unpicks so many issues which should definitely be given more space and attention elsewhere.

**Table 1 gives an insight into the nature of the recordings and general topics of each of the interrogations**

	<b>Recording code</b>	<b>Recording length in mins</b>	<b>Formal/official interview</b>	<b>Witness/suspect</b>	<b>Sex</b>	<b>Number of detectives</b>	<b>Type of offence</b>	<b>Topic of the interview</b>
<b>1</b>	Car_forg_s_inf_2008	13.3	informal	suspect	male	1	forgery	The alleged participation in the forgery of a serial number on a stolen car and facilitating selling the car
<b>2</b>	Oldman_forg_w_off_2008	9.5	official	witness	male	1	forgery	The abuse of witness's ID by a party who took out a bank loan claiming the witness is a loan guarantor
<b>3</b>	Arson_ar_s_off_2008	13.49	official	suspect	male	1	arson	The alleged participation in the arson at a local boxing club
<b>4</b>	Oki_forg_w_inf_2008	4.43	informal	witness	male	1	forgery	The abuse of witness's ID by a party who took out a bank loan claiming the witness is a loan guarantor
<b>5</b>	Oki_forg_w_off_2008	7	official	witness	male	1	forgery	The abuse of witness's ID by a party who took out a bank loan claiming the witness is a loan guarantor
<b>6</b>	Forger_forg_s_inf_2008	38.56	informal	suspect	male	1	forgery	The alleged document forgery by means of which the suspect was able to take out a number of bank loans
<b>7</b>	Director_forg_w_inf_2008	5.55	informal	witness	male	1	forgery	A former steel plant director's alleged business misconduct
<b>8</b>	Director_forg_w_off_2008	29.4	official	witness	male	1	forgery	A former steel plant director's alleged business misconduct
<b>9</b>	Gipsy_forg_w_off_2008	22.52	official	witness	male	1	forgery	The abuse of witness's ID by a party who took out a bank loan claiming the witness is a loan guarantor
<b>10</b>	Cousin_forg_w_off_2008	10.49	official	witness	male	1	forgery	The abuse of witness's ID by a party who took out a bank loan claiming the witness is a loan guarantor
<b>11</b>	Guard_fthe_s_inf_2008	16.23	informal	suspect	male	3	theft	The suspect's alleged involvement in a major factory theft
<b>12</b>	Guard_fthe_s_off_2008	41.1	official	suspect	male	1	theft	The suspect's alleged involvement in a major factory theft

13	Shoplifting_the_s_off_2008	15.49	official	suspect	male	1	shop lifting	The suspect's confessed shoplifting
14	Shoplifting2_the_s_off_2008	13.56	official	suspect	male	2	shop lifting	The suspect's confessed shoplifting
15	Shoplifting3_the_s_off_2008	8.25	official	suspect	male	2	shop lifting	The suspect's confessed shoplifting
16	Woman_forg_w_off_2008	11.08	official	witness	female	1	forgery	The abuse of witness's ID by a party who took out a bank loan claiming the witness is a loan guarantor
17	Medo_fthe_s_inf_2008	39.06	informal	suspect	male	4	theft	The suspect's alleged involvement in a major factory theft
18	Medo_fthe_s_off_2008	38.47	official	suspect	male	3	theft	The suspect's alleged involvement in a major factory theft
19	Suspect_fthe_s_inf_2008	61.01	informal	suspect	male	3	theft	The suspect's alleged involvement in a major factory theft
20	Pots_the_s_inf_2008	58.34	informal	suspect	male	3	theft	The suspect's confessed theft of old iron
21	Pots_the_sus_off_2008	11.54	official	official	male	2	theft	The suspect's confessed theft of old iron
22	Euros_the_s_inf_2008	15.06	informal	suspect	male	2	theft	The suspect's confessed theft of old iron
23	Euroslaw_the_s_inf_2008	2.28	informal	suspect	male	2	theft	The suspect's confessed theft of money from a parked car
24	Euros_the_s_off_2008	18.33	official	suspect	male	1	theft	The suspect's confessed theft of money from a parked car
		<b>Total time: 06.51.00</b>						

Table 2 Data divided by the type of the interview

	Recording code	Recording length in mins	Witness	Denying suspect	Co-operative suspect	Interviews done for composing the record	Type of offense
1	Car_forg_s_inf_2008	13.3		√			forgery
2	Oldman_forg_w_off_2008	9.5	√			√	forgery
3	Arson_ar_s_off_2008	13.49		√		√	arson
4	Oki_forg_w_inf_2008	4.43	√				forgery
5	Oki_forg_w_off_2008	7	√			√	forgery
6	Forger_forg_s_inf_2008	38.56		√			forgery
7	Director_forg_w_inf_2008	5.55	√				forgery
8	Director_forg_w_off_2008	29.4	√			√	forgery
9	Gipsy_forg_w_off_2008	22.52	√			√	forgery
10	Cousin_forg_w_off_2008	10.49	√			√	forgery
11	Guard_fthe_s_inf_2008	16.23		√			theft
12	Guard_fthe_s_off_2008	41.1		√		√	theft
13	Shoplifting_the_s_off_2008	15.49			√	√	shop lifting
14	Shoplifting2_the_s_off_2008	13.56			√	√	shop lifting
15	Shoplifting3_the_s_off_2008	8.25			√	√	shop lifting
16	Woman_forg_w_off_2008	11.08	√				forgery
17	Medo_fthe_s_inf_2008	39.06		√			theft
18	Medo_fthe_s_off_2008	38.47		√		√	theft
19	Suspect_fthe_s_inf_2008	61.01		√			theft
20	Pots_the_s_inf_2008	58.34			√		theft
21	Pots_the_sus_off_2008	11.54			√	√	theft
22	Euros_the_s_inf_2008	15.06			√		theft
23	Euroslaw_the_s_inf_2008	2.28			√		theft
24	Euros_the_s_off_2008	18.33			√	√	theft
		<b>Total time: 06.51.00</b>					

### 3.2 Methods

The method I am applying in my research is Conversation Analysis (CA). CA is based around four primary concepts. First of all, there is the concept of social action and the idea that when people talk they are doing it with a purpose.

‘When people converse, they are not merely talking, not merely describing (their day, what happened, or whatever), not filling time or any of the other characterizations of conversation as a form of language idling. They do things in their turns at talk: They are constructing their turns to perform an action or to be part of the management of some activity.’

Drew (2005, p. 86)

Having this idea in mind, CA analysts study ‘the use of language in conversation (turn design) employed to do things in the social world’ (Drew, 2005, p. 86). We are looking at the construction of social action; in the case of the current study, I am looking at the minimal actions of questions and answers.

The second essential CA notion is that of turn design which involves: ‘a) the selection of an activity that a turn is designed to perform; and b) the details of the verbal construction through which the turn’s activity is accomplished’ (Drew and Heritage, 1992, p. 32). When it comes to questioning, it is very important how a speaker selects syntactic, lexical, prosodic elements of the turn. ‘... because there is always a range of alternative ways of saying something, a speaker’s selection of a particular formulation will, unavoidably, tend to be heard as ‘motivated’ and perhaps chosen’ (Drew and Heritage, 1992, p. 36). Thus, it does very much matter if the question is asked as a positive interrogative ‘Were you there?’, negative interrogative ‘Weren’t you there?’, or a declarative with a tag ‘You were there, weren’t you?’, as each of these three different formats has different implications and therefore selects a different action.

Then, one cannot avoid the notion of sequence. ‘When we think of clumps of turns in ‘action’ terms, we are dealing with courses of action – with sequences of actions that have some shape or trajectory to them, that is with what we call ‘sequence organization’ or ‘the organization of sequences’(Schegloff, 2007, p. 2). Sequence is closely connected to the notion of adjacency: ‘... a very broad range of sequences in talk-in-interaction does appear to be produced by reference to the practices of adjacency pair organization, which therefore appears to serve as a resource for sequence construction comparable to the way turn-constructive units serve as a resource for turn construction’(Schegloff, 2007:, p. 9). At the same time, sequence depends so much on the turn design: for instance, a negatively formed interrogative ‘Didn’t you say that?’ has the force of a declarative and can be heard as challenging, so this has consequences to how the other responds, i.e. it is very likely that the other’s response will have some defensive elements to it.

Intersubjectivity is the fourth CA building block. This notion refers to participants’ (or analysts’) looking at how participants understand one another’s talk. Drew states:

‘Each participant in a dyadic (two-person) conversation (to take the simplest model) constructs or designs a turn to be understood by the other in a particular way - for instance, as performing some particular action. The other constructs an appropriate response, the other’s understanding of the prior turn being manifest in that response. Hence, the first speaker may review the recipient’s response to check whether the other has ‘correctly’ understood his or her first turn; and if first speaker finds from that response that the other appears not to have understood his or her utterance/action correctly, that speaker may initiate repair to remedy the other’s understanding (Schegloff, 1992). The first speaker then produces a response, or a relevant next action, to the other’s prior turn- and so the conversation proceeds, each turn being sequentially connected to its prior turn, but simultaneously moving the conversation forward by forming the immediate context for the other speaker’s next action in the sequence.’

Drew (2003a, p. 135)



This chapter will not provide a detailed outline of CA as a method, as there is a good number of sources elsewhere explaining it in great detail. Interested readers can look at where it all started, a set of Harvey Sacks' lectures from 1964 on (Sacks, 1992), written following Sacks' noticing that suicidal callers to Suicide Prevention Centre, in which he worked, would declare problems hearing the call takers at SPC so as to avoid giving their own name. It is this noticing that inspired Sacks to study human interaction in search for answers about the social world. In this work one can follow how the main CA notions, such as: actions, turn taking, sequence organization, pre-sequences were being developed and many other issues still studied in the field of conversation analysis. In relation to this, it is worth referring to Schegloff's introduction to Sacks' lectures (Sacks, 1992) in which Schegloff writes about his personal memories on how the method emerged and his thoughts on each set of Sacks' lectures.

There is a number of subsequent CA outlines which cover the main CA notions and give guidelines on how to apply the method. Heritage (1984) gives an overview of schools and scholarly thought at the time Sacks initiated CA. He also speaks about the value of naturalistic data, reasons for turning to conversations as a main source for researching social relations, basic assumptions of CA, conversational organization, social actions as a main concern of CA, the notion of intersubjectivity and so on. The same year's publication *Structures of Social Action*, Atkinson and Heritage (1984) covers some important topics related to preference structure, topic organization, the relation of talk and non-verbal activities, aspects of response and similar.

Drew (2003a) gives an overview of CA beginnings, key features and objectives of CA as a methodological approach. This source is a practical guide on how to analyse conversations. Drew gives step by step instructions on how CA analysis should be done and what a researcher should focus on. He stresses the importance of collections and systematic patterns in CA, talks about how collections are to be analysed and so on.

Drew (2005) stresses the reasons for studying interaction, explicates basic concepts underpinning CA's explorations of conversational practices, the importance of constant monitoring by interlocutors of whatever is going on in interaction, CA's focus on a participant's understanding of one another's conduct (actions), connection between the turn design and the speaker's intended action, finding an opportune environment to perform action, accountability of action, methodological value of interactional occurrences such as repair and so on. For an overview of CA and the possibilities of its application in institutional settings see Arminen (2005). For a very detailed and comprehensive coverage of CA topics the reader could also refer to Sidnell (2010), and for an overview of topics in institutional interaction see Heritage and Clayman (2010). All the above given guides have influenced my decision to use CA as a method and they have greatly influenced and shaped the methodology of this thesis.

Essentially, CA gives a researcher more insight into the linguistic phenomena than some of the traditional linguistic methods. As Linell (1998) points out language can be conceptualised in basically two ways, as system or structure, or as discourse, practice or communication. The static approach to language Linell refers to as

'written language bias' (WLB) in the language sciences, which he further explicates as follows '... the point of my claims about the WLB in linguistics is not that linguists deal exclusively with written language. They clearly don't. Instead, the WLB means that the same theories of language have been and still are applied *also to spoken language and interaction.*'

Linell (1998, p. 32)

Linell further states:

'... it must be pointed out that linguists, especially within certain influential and prestigious branches (e.g. generative grammar), actually do not deal with naturally occurring (authentic) written texts at all, but rather with invented, i.e. normatively

redressed and cleaned-up, language, often in the form of contrived isolated sentences, which are both decontextualised and detextualized'

(Linell, 1998, p. 32).

These abstracted examples are then examined and their linguistic aspects: syntax, semantics morphology, phonetics are considered in isolation. Thus, the utterance 'Where were you last night?' would, in this tradition, be described as a question, as having certain features of interrogative grammar, while the action of question is only a minimal representation of what that utterance could be doing as in a real life situation (accusing, criticism etc.). This aspect of language, how language is actually used, is the main focus of interactional linguistics. In such a way, interactional phonetics, for instance looks at how phonetic features depend on its sequential context. For illustration see Local and Kelly (1986) and their analysis of 'well' in different sequential environments.

CA as a method suits the current study for various reasons. First of all, it enables studying language in use and talk produced by speakers in real life situations, which has so much advantage over invented examples frequently examined by linguists. Then, differently from some traditional linguistic methods, CA does not look at one linguistic level only, syntax or prosody, for instance. Instead, it treats a combination of lexico-morpho-syntax and prosody of utterances and how different packages of these features are utilized by interlocutors. This further means that conversation analysts do not look at utterances which are taken out context, but at how interlocutors to whom these utterances are directed, would, in reality, treat them (see Schegloff's introduction to Sacks' lectures, Sacks, 1992). In such a way, CA is able to show how something that is an interrogative, usually assumed to be a question, gets to be treated as an assertion (see Heritage, 2002).

Looking at the example 1.1 below, already discussed on page 47, one can note that the detail of transcription such as lengthening of the sounds, intonation contour or the level

of loudness all give a microscopic image of what the two participants are doing in this interactional encounter.

### Extract 1.1

01 Dt2: ne uzimaš DRO:gu? jel?  
not(you)take DRU:gs? is it?  
*You don't take drugs right?*

02 (.)

03 Sus: A?  
HA?  
*Ha?*

04 (.)

05 Dt2: >ne uzimaš dro:gu<?  
>not(you)take dru:gs<?  
*You don't take drugs?*

06 (0.2)

07 (0.8) ((background voices))

08 Sus: slabo  
poorly  
*not often*

09 (.)

10 Dt2: nemo:j nikako to: ti je o toga da zna:š  
do:n't at all that: you is from that that(you)kno:w  
*Don't at all, that's what it's from, just so you know*

Traditional linguistics would not normally treat some of the features captured in this piece. First of all, one can note that the utterance in line 01 is doing questioning, but in form it is not an interrogative, traditionally considered to be doing questioning. Instead, this utterance is a declarative, which is also negative in form. It seeks a confirmation of the detective's presupposition – expectation that the suspect is not taking drugs. This shows that deciding upon one form other than another makes a difference. For instance, by choosing a negative interrogative Dt2 is showing that he expects to get a negative answer from the suspect (see Raymond, 2000). Further, in line 02 there is another feature of great interest for CA, a pause. Traditional linguistics does not consider pauses in talk, as this element cannot be analysed in the sense of syntax, morphology, phonetics

or semantics. However, pauses in talk play a very important pragmatic role in interaction: they announce a delay or a dispreferred action. Also, one can note that in line 03 the suspect produces the object 'A?'. This object, due to its sequential position, i.e. it occurs following a FPP question, plays a role of an open class repair initiator (Drew, 1997). In line 05 one can note that Dt2 repeats the utterance from line 01, and this indicates that the detective is pursuing the same matter, another important practice in interaction, particularly vital to the context of police interrogation. Additionally, the suspect's response in line 08 is selected from a number of possible options and it is 'not often', which is neither a 'yes' nor 'no', which is of special interest to conversation analysts as it shows how speakers respond to certain face threatening actions.

The adjacency pair notion, as Heritage (1984, p. 254) terms it 'reliable and accountable action template' enables to see interrogation as a structure composed of a string of paired utterances. It also enables detecting a certain normativity by which these utterances are produced: the first pair part (usually a question or what seems to be a question) is most frequently initiated by a detective and the second, response pair part is then provided by the suspect. This template then makes it easier to focus on what the detective intends to achieve by his utterance in first position. For instance, in line 01, extract 1.1 above, it seems that the detective is requesting information, however, on looking more closely, one can note that the detective has a different project under way. As already mentioned, the question expresses the detective's expectations and it expects a negative answer. As a next research procedure CA proposes looking at however the recipient of FPP would respond to it (recipient design). The naturalistic nature of the data provides an opportunity to follow how in reality the interlocutor analyses the prior turn and in what way he/she deals with the action it forwards. As can be seen from the example 1.1 above, in line 03 the suspect initiates a repair, as to indicate some trouble, his problem hearing or understanding the FPP provided by the detective. For what reason the suspect initiates the repair is another question the analyst may ask.

The notion of sequence organization is also relevant to my analysis. Looking at the sequential organization of adjacency pairs reveals how the 'question' trajectory develops

past the first adjacency pair produced by a detective and a suspect/witness. As can be noted from the example 1.1 above, the question in line 01 is not the main item in the sequence. The detective asks the suspect to confirm his expectations, but as this is not the main goal of the sequence, the sequence does not end there. The type of response the detective receives from the suspect determines the way the sequence would further develop. In this case, the suspect gives an indirect confirmation of the detective's assumptions and having received such confirmation, the detective can go on and give advice (action initially intended by the detective): the detective states that the suspect has certain health problems because he was a drug user. Should the suspect have disconfirmed in line 08, the sequence would have certainly developed in a different manner.

A very important CA notion for the current study is that of delay. Heritage (1984) states that delays in talk are used to announce rejections and similar dispreferred actions and can be analysed as their prefatory elements. For this reason, delay is one of the crucial methodological tools in studying aggressive actions such as incriminating, blaming, accusing and so on, inherent to police interrogations, court hearings and similar interactional environments. Delay as an announcement of such actions also seems to be a cross linguistic feature. See, for instance, that delay is used in a similar way both in English (example 1.2) and Serbo-Croatian data (example 1.1).

#### Extract 1.2

01 A: Well yuh had some uh(p) (.) uh fairly lengthy  
02       conversations with thu defendant uh: did'n you?  
03       (0.7)  
04 A: On that evening uv February fourteenth?  
05       (1.0)  
06 W: We:ll we were all talkin.

Taken from Drew (1992, p. 479)

Looking at the example 1.2, taken from a court hearing, one can immediately note a (0.7) pause in line 03 and an even longer (1.0) pause in line 05, both of which signal that the questioned party has analysed prior turns as something that can be unfavourable

for her and therefore shows certain resistance towards the action forwarded by the lawyer's turn in lines 01, 02 and 04. The witness's resistance becomes evident in her response in line 06 – 'Well we were all talkin'. In a similar way, in the Serbo-Croatian example 1.1 above, one can note pauses in lines 06 and 07 which also indicate the suspect's resistance towards the action forwarded by the detective's prior inquiry about the suspect's involvement with drugs. In this extract too the resistance becomes evident in the suspect's non-conforming response 'slabo' – 'not often'.

Another methodological CA practice I am adopting is looking at the turn design of both question and answer in a given adjacency pair. Turn design, first of all, involves absence or presence of turn's prefatory elements such as 'well', 'uh' etc. The fact that these elements are present or absent changes the interactional status of a turn. In such a way, 'well' initiated answers, permit potentially face threatening rejections to be forestalled (Heritage, 1984). When it comes to the design of questions, I look at their formal design, for instance, if they are yes/no or wh-interrogatives, negatively formed interrogatives or whether they occur in some other linguistic form. I also look at how answers are designed: for instance, if an answer is simply 'yes' or 'no', i.e. conforming, or whether neither of these confirming/disconfirming elements are present, i.e. if the answer is non-conforming (for the discussion on conforming/nonconforming responses see Raymond 2000). Turn design further involves combinations of other linguistic elements, choosing certain lexical units rather than others, applying certain prosodic features and so on.

To sum up, in my corpus of police interviews I will be looking into such interactional phenomena as adjacency pairs, turn design, recipient design and sequence organization. I will also study delay as an indicator of dispreferred actions. Moreover, I will be exploring various actions performed through question-answer pairs in this type of discourse.

## **CHAPTER FOUR**

### **THE PRINCIPAL YES/NO INTERROGATIVE CONSTRUCTIONS IN POLICE INTERROGATION IN SERBO-CROATIAN**



## 4.1 Introduction

The focus of this chapter is yes/no interrogatives which contain the verb *to know* and which have the form of ‘do you know X’. I explore three types of these ‘questions’. Looking at the sequential features of these forms, I show how Serbo-Croatian default interrogatives, made by means of a particle *li* tend to be used to ask for information. This same interrogative from which the *li* particle is omitted is confirmation-seeking. When to the non-*li* interrogative form a personal pronoun ‘you’ is added, this form serves as a presequence. I also study the epistemic implications of each of the interrogatives.

The review of the literature on interrogatives (Chapter 2) features some linguistic devices that characterize interrogative morpho-syntax and prosody in English and Serbo-Croatian. As I have explained in that chapter, the primary device for forming yes/no interrogatives in English is subject-auxiliary inversion (see Huddleston and Pullum, 2002, p. 868). Here is an example that illustrates the subject-auxiliary inversion in English:

### Extract 2.1

(1) Is it clear?

(Taken from Koshik, 2002, 1862)

In the literature review chapter I have also pointed out that although the main device for constructing polar interrogatives, inversion is not the only way of achieving this interrogative force. The force of what is referred to as ‘polar question’ can also be achieved without the inverted syntax, for example, by means of a declarative form, normally (but, not always) paired with rising intonation in speech or question mark in writing. See the following example, taken from Raymond (2009, p. 97):

### Extract 2.2

01 HV: And you're feeling well.  
02 (0.7)  
03 M: Yeah.

One can note that in line 03 ‘Yeah’ was produced as a response to the declarative form in line 01. It seems that M treats this turn the way she would treat a yes/no interrogative, in spite of the absence of subject-auxiliary inversion in this example and question intonation which would compensate for the lack of inversion.

Furthermore, as I have pointed out some linguistic devices can alter the default function of certain forms. For example, the addition of tags can turn declaratives into questioning forms or negation which could give interrogatives a force of a statement.

When it comes to Serbo-Croatian, the devices for forming interrogatives in this language are quite different from those in English. Although inversion might occur in certain cases, it is not as important in interrogative formation as are certain particles and clitics. Grammar books and literature related to Serbo-Croatian usually quote four principal devices for forming interrogatives in this language (also outlined in section 2.3)<sup>10</sup>. These are:

- 1) Placing the fusion of the particle *da* and interrogative clitic *li* in front of the verb, often heard by interlocutors as formal (at least in the variant spoken in Montenegro in which my data was recorded).
- 2) Placing the interrogative clitic *li* after the tensed verb, heard by listeners as information-seeking<sup>11</sup>.
- 3) Negating the *li* interrogative
- 4) Placing the interrogative word *zar* before the verb; this type of interrogative is heard by interlocutors as expressing doubt or disbelief and having reverse polarity.

Of the four interrogative types outlined above, type 1 is fairly infrequent in my data<sup>12</sup>, type 3) does not occur at all and there is probably only one example of type 4 interrogative. So it seems that type 2 formed by placing the interrogative clitic *li* after the tensed verb, is the most widely used and significant form for constructing yes/no interrogatives in Serbo-Croatian. Due to the frequency and significance of these interrogatives, they will be the primary focus of this chapter.

A significant feature of the type 2 interrogative is that in spoken interaction it can occur in a number of variations, characterized by the relevant presence or absence of the clitic *li*, and/or additional element – second person singular pronoun *ti* (you). For the sake of clarity, I will further on treat the type 2 interrogative as a default variant and will refer to it as variant a or *li* interrogative variant. *Li* interrogative is illustrated in the following example:

### Extract 2.3

Dt1:        imaš            (l)i kući↑ (.) pu:mpu za prskanje voća?  
              have(you) qp. home↑ (.) pu:mp for spraying fruit?  
              Do you have at home an orchard sprayer?

Another variant of the interrogative occurring in the dataset is variant b characterized by the omission of the particle *li* and consisting of an inflected verb + complement, for the reason of which I will refer to it as *non-li* interrogative. Example 2.4 below, an instance of *non-li* interrogative, shows that the interrogative does not contain any particles, but only a verb *to have*, inflected for the second person singular and a direct object.

### Extract 2.4

Dt1:        >iMAš            teLEfon<.  
              >(you)hAVe teLEphone<.  
              Do you have a phone?

This variant is not considered to be grammatically correct by descriptive grammarians, but these forms are extensively used by speakers and have their own interactional implications.

A third interrogative variant (variant c) with high frequency in the data set is also characterized by the absence of the particle *li*. It essentially consists of a bare inflected verb like the variant b) interrogatives, but in addition to that, it contains a second person singular pronoun *ti*, placed post-verbally. This is why from now on I will refer to this

variant as *non-li + ti(you)* interrogative. Example 2.5 illustrates this variant, showing the verb *to have*, inflected for the second person singular, which is then followed by the second person singular pronoun *ti(you)*.

#### Extract 2.5

01 Dt1:           iMAŠ TI   BRAta: >da   ti   ra<di   tamo.  
                  hAVe YOU BROther: >that you wo<rks there.  
                  *Do you have a brother who works there?*

A fourth variant of the interrogative (variant d - *li+ti* interrogative) encountered in my data contains all the features of the previous three types: an inflected verb, the interrogative particle *li* and second person singular pronoun, as shown in the example 2.6:

#### Extract 2.6

Law:            znaš           li ga(ti )  
                  (you) know qp.him(you)  
                  *Do you know him?*

Due to the relative infrequency of this variant of the *li* interrogative, it is difficult to draw too strong conclusions about it, so I will only mention it here briefly. It is worth noting, though, that all four above-quoted interrogative variants are available to interlocutors only in the second person; variants b and c are only possible in the second person singular and plural, but not in other persons. This may be due to a need for more options for expressing a variety of activities in face-to-face communication.

One way or another, the use of these slightly different interrogative forms is significant, when, at first glance, they appear to express essentially the same content. In this chapter, for instance, I focus on yes/no interrogatives containing a verb *to know* and the fact is that there are four forms available to ask a ‘do you know’ question. As one will note further on in this chapter speakers ask a simple question-like ‘do you know (name)’ in different ways on different occasions. Analyzing the sequences in which these forms occur, it becomes clear that they are used for different purposes. All these four forms

combine different interactional properties and, in such a way, carry different interactional implications. They differ, first of all, by their surface grammatical form, by their turn design and by some phonetic features they exhibit. They occur in different sequential positions, in relation to which, they either introduce a new topic or just echo a previously initiated one. By choosing from one of these forms, speakers can convey different epistemic stances and incorporate different pragmatic presuppositions. All four formats, then, by means of the interactional features they combine, get to be vehicles for doing certain recognizable actions. The information-seeking variant a, for example, combines the following set of interactional features: presence of the particle *li* in its form, tendency to initiate new sequences and introduce new topics. Epistemically, these interrogatives are quite neutral, in that little if anything is presupposed by these forms. Each of the other variants outlined above is distinguished by its own set of features (to be explained in detail later in this chapter). While variant a interrogatives are performing the activity of information-seeking, variant b interrogatives do an activity of asking for confirmation. On the other hand, type c utterances, are heard as ‘questions’ with a purpose, having a certain project to accomplish. In response to these, the listener should be providing an appropriate matching response, performing an action which would ideally agree with the one initiated by the first pair part. Further, in this chapter, I examine each of these individual formats and describe them in more detail.

#### **4.2 Information-seeking *li* interrogatives**

The interrogative particle *li* is a syntactic marker which constitutes the basic form of yes/no interrogatives in Serbo-Croatian. As previously pointed out, the presence/absence of this particle, and/or addition of the second person singular personal pronoun are consequential for constructing the three variations of this basic interrogative form.

Rudin, Kramer, Billings and Baerman (1999) describe the formation of yes/no *li* interrogatives in Bulgarian and Macedonian as inserting *li* into a declarative sentence. This means that in neither of these languages (this is also the case with Serbo-Croatian) is there an overt subject-auxiliary inversion in the majority of cases<sup>13</sup> and the clitic *li* becomes the only syntactic device by which the speaker signals to the interlocutor an

interrogative mode. Discussing the pragmatic quality of *li* forms, Rakić (1985) refers to these interrogatives as ‘informative questions’, as *li* gives these utterances a certain neutrality: by using them the interlocutor simply seeks to be informed. If an information-seeking criterion were a valid criterion for describing questions and questioning, *li* forms could be treated as ‘true questions’ as they seem to be asking for information without any kind of harmful presuppositions on the part of the speaker. I will examine in more detail the interactional properties that *li* forms exhibit in the original sequences in which they occur.

In extract 2.7 below I am focusing particularly on the interrogative in line 26. Extract 2.7 is taken from an interview with a suspect in an arson case. Somebody started the fire in a boxing club in the neighbourhood. The suspect is a former boxer who was a regular visitor to the club. The interview is 13.49 minutes long and the extract below occurs in the ninth minute of the interview. This is a record taking interview. The interviewee is questioned about the crime, but he is never explicitly told he is a suspect in the case.

The matter of whether somebody is treated as a witness or a suspect by the interrogator is sometimes unclear. The questioned party is never explicitly told what their status is. However, it is the character of the questioning which can make it clear. It is through the types of questions they are being asked that the questioned party can determine how they have been treated by the interrogating detective. Where questions move from purely information-seeking to accusatory/implying something, the questioned party finds they are being treated as a suspect. As a consequence of this, one can note different levels of defensiveness in their responses. In extract 2.7, for instance, the interview has a quality of questioning the suspect, although the detective at one point asserts that he and the interviewee are just having an ‘informed conversation’. Because of the nature of questioning, I here refer to the questioned party as a suspect.

Extract 2.7

*Arson\_ar\_s\_off\_2008*

01 (5.1) ((low typing)) ((buzzing))

02 Dt1: imaš (l)i ku↑ći [(.) pu:mpu za prskanje voća?  
have(you)qp. ho↑me [(.) pu:mp for spraying fruits?  
[ ((loud typing))  
*Do you have at home an orchard sprayer?*

03 (0.1) ((loud typing))

04 Sus: [°ne° ]  
[°no° ]

05 [ ((loud typing)) ]  
*No*

06 (2.7) ((loud typing))

07 [ ((loud typing)) ]

08 Dt1: [jesi iMO: nekad.]  
[aux.(you)hAD: once. ]  
*Have you ever had one?*

09 (.) ((loud typing))

10 [ ((loud typing)) ]

11 Sus: [ne NIkad. ]  
[no NEver. ]  
*No never*

12 (0.6) ((loud typing))

13 [ ((typing)) ((buzz)) ]

14 Dt1: [NI↑kaDA: niJE:sam (.)posjeDOVAo,]  
[NE↑veR: not AUX(I) (.)owNEd, ]  
*I have never owned*

15 (1.1)

16 TI: i PO:[rodica? >pitam °ima li°<]  
YOU:and FA:[mily ? >(I)ask °has aux.°<]

17 [ ((typing)) ]  
*I ask if you and your family has one?*

18 (0.1) ((typing))

19 Sus: [niko ]  
[no one ]

20 [ ((typing)) ]  
*No one*

21 (0.1) ((typing))

22 Dt1: ni:ti JA:>niti[moja porodica<pumpu za prskanje vo:↑ća]  
no:r I:>nor [my family <pump for spraying fru:↑it]

23 [ ((typing)) ]  
*neither me or my family a pump for spraying fruit trees*

24 (11.8) ((loud typing)) ((buzz))

25 [ ((buzz)) ((click)) ]

26 [ZNAŠ i ↑KO >BI MOgao< Ovo: , (0.3)]°zapa:°litič  
 [KNOW(you)qp.↑WHO>WOULD Can < This: , (0.3)]°burn:°downč  
*Do you know who might have started the fire?*

27 (1.0) ((clicking))

28 Sus: >pravo da ti< KA:že:m,  
 >honestly that you<(I)TE:l:l,  
*To tell you honestly*

29 (.)

30 Dt1: .hhh[ha]?  
 [ha]?  
*Huh?*

31 Sus: [u ]OPšte: nijesam ni opTE:Rećen, niti me:  
 [at]ALl:not(I)aux. nor woRR:Ied, nor me:  
*I am not even worried nor am I*

32 zani:ma, ka viš[e ni ono da:-]  
 (it)intere:sts, like mor[e nor that:- ]  
*interested, as if it didn't-*

33 Dt1: [NEmam PO:JMA]ko bi mogao  
 [(I)HAv'e't IDE:A]who would can  
*I have no idea who could*

34 biti izvrši[:lac ]<sup>14</sup>  
 be doe[:r ]  
*be the perpetrator*

35 [ ((typing)) ]

36 (2.6) ((loud typing)) ((buzz))

37 DJEla zaPALJEnja↑[(0.2)>°pros°torija <mjesne zajednice  
 OF act of ARSon ↑[(0.2)>°of pre°mises<of area community  
 38 [ ((typing))  
*of arson at the premises in the district*

39 ((typing)) ]

40 (0.2)Mrko(0.8)>I O tom uopšte<ni:sam razmi:ŠLJAo,]  
 (0.2)Mrko(0.8)>AND OF that at all<(I)di:dn't thi:Nk, ]  
*Mrko and I haven't thought about that at all*

41 (4.9) ((typing)) ((background talk))

42 Sus: TO VEĆ KA JE [UZEta sa:↑LA uzeta.]  
 THAT ALREADY WHEN aux[TAKen gy:↑M taken. ]  
 43 [ ((typing)) ]



*When the gym was taken, it was taken*

44 [to NI:ko više nije moga: ništa ]  
[that NO:one anymore not aux. could: nothing]  
45 [((typing)) ((loud typing)) ]  
*no one could do anything about it anymore*

46 [zavr:šiti, i završena priča]  
[fin:ish, and finished story]  
47 [((loud typing)) ]  
*end of story*

In lines 02-19 the detective pursues the matter of the suspect's or his family's possible possession of an orchard sprayer (relating to forensic evidence in the arson case). As one can note, the suspect replies negatively to all of the questions that concern this matter (lines 04, 11 and 19), following which Dt1 dictates the summary of the answers to the typist (line 22) so that it would be put on record. Then comes a long (11.8) filled pause in line 24, in which apart from the typing, it is difficult to know what exactly the participants did due to the lack of visual data. After the pause Dt1 switches the line of questioning and initiates a slightly different topic in line 26. One can note that the *li* interrogative occurs here in a sequentially initial position, which also coincides with the initiation of a new topic. This sequential position also indicates the beginning of a new sequence, i.e. that one 'business' has been completed and that there is a new issue on the table to be dealt with. The shift of the topic in line 26 is further signalled by the detective's increased loudness in the first part of the turn<sup>15</sup>, in which he moves from the previous more factual topic that concerned forensic evidence, to a more abstract one that concerns the suspect's knowledge and his personal view of the mentioned crime. The only linguistic element, which topically links the turn in line 26 to the previous talk, is the demonstrative 'ovo' - 'this' which links this turn to the general topic of arson.

Looking at the above transcript, it becomes evident that typing is an integral part of police interrogation. Doing their job, the police are not only asking questions, they necessarily go about composing and typing a contemporaneous record of the suspect/witness's answers. In the Montenegrin police, at least in the case of 'official interviews', there is usually a typist present during the interrogation who types up the record as the detective composes it bit by bit. On the other hand, in the Dutch police, for

instance, the officer does the typing himself/herself (see Komter, 2003a, for instance). At any rate, in the course of interrogation the questioner moves from one issue or institutional task to another, typing up/dictating the established facts. In such a way, as Komter (2003a) points out, the usual question-answer format of an interrogation is transformed into a question-answer-typing format. Records created during the interrogation have a specific function: they represent first stages in the criminal law process and are official legal evidence (Komter 2001). As record composing is not the topic of this study, for a more detailed account of how questioning and typing alternate in the course of interrogation and the role of typing/composing the record, see Komter (2001; 2003a; 2006, Komter, in press).

When it comes to the matter of topicality, typing has another important function: it indicates that a certain point or a discussed topic is closed and that the witness's answers are being recorded, following which a new topic can ensue. In extract 2.7 above, this kind of delimiting and moving onto another issue can be followed from around line 24. Prior to line 24 the detective sums up the information concerning the possession of the orchard sprayer, which the typist is to put on record. The typing indicates that this job is being done, but it also generates a long (11.8) break in questioning in line 24 which delimits the forensic evidence sequence from the one to follow. The break also allows some time to the detective to shift onto the next issue and one can note that in line 26 he introduces a topic of 'knowledge' which also signals the beginning of a new sequence.

The 'do you know' interrogatives seem to be standard questions used by the police in many other interviews. It could be the case that the detectives are trained to ask this type of question as such a procedure might improve investigation and realization of the institutional task of gathering relevant information about the case. Unfortunately I did not have access to this sort of information.

Looking at the design of the turn in line 26, the first thing that comes to mind is that this turn is formed as a question within a question. That is, it is asking if the suspect knows who the perpetrator of the arson is. This makes it two questions in one, and for this

reason, it is not the most straightforward example of ‘do you know’ questions, but I will consider it here as it makes a very interesting communicational phenomenon. There is a certain extent of indirectness in asking the question this way. Simply asking ‘who could have burned this’ would bear an implication that the suspect has the information for sure. Applying the verb ‘to know’ in line 26, the detective is limiting a number of presuppositions his turn holds. To be more precise, the question asked with the verb *znati* (to know), presupposes that there is an equal possibility that the interlocutor does or does not have information about the perpetrator of the crime. Another turn design feature worth noting is another mitigation in line 26, obtained by the subjunctive form of ‘*bi mogao*’, a verb approximately close to the English modal ‘could’. Bearing in mind all these mitigations, the interlocutor should be expected to understand the turn in line 26 not to be blaming. However, whether this is the case is another matter which will be discussed further on.

A very important aspect to be taken into consideration here is the one of epistemics. The issue of epistemics seems to be an unavoidable one, since when communicating, interlocutors are constantly concerned with managing the levels of their own and co-participants’ knowledge. Stivers, Mondada and Steensig (in press) suggest that if we are to understand how speakers manage issues of agreement, affiliation and alignment, we must understand the social norms surrounding epistemic access, primacy and responsibilities.

Heritage (in press) makes a distinction between epistemic status and epistemic stance, in which epistemic status is the actual state of interlocutors’ knowledge relative to each other (K+ or K-). Epistemic stance, on the other hand, concerns how speakers position themselves in terms of epistemic status in and through the design of turns at talk. Heritage explains that requests for information, for instance, are actions in which resources for communicating epistemic stance are aligned with the real world relative epistemic status of the parties within the action. That is, by asking for information, the requester positions himself/herself in an unknowing (K-) position and the recipient in a knowing (K+) one.

The matter of epistemics and information exchange is very important when it comes to the interrogatives I address in this chapter, as they contain the verb *to know* and explicitly enquire about the interlocutor's knowledge, while at the same time embodying different stances about their own and the interlocutor's knowledge. First of all, the particle *li*, produced in line 26 as 'i', is heard as conveying the speaker's information-seeking mode. By means of the particle *li* Dt1 claims to make no assumptions about whether the questioned party has or does not have the information; and also to have no knowledge himself about who might be the perpetrator of the crime. As Heritage states, the information-seeking mode entails that the speaker is in K- position: in line 26 the detective, according to the form he applies at least, states he is in an unknowing position and inquires if the suspect/witness has some information on who committed the crime of arson.

It is worth considering here how the turn in line 26 is treated by the suspect. First of all, one can note that the suspect's response is non-conforming, i.e. it is neither a *yes* or *no* which are the responses a polar interrogative anticipates. Answering by either *yes* or *no*, the suspect would be simply confirming/disconfirming whether he knows or not, and the detective might then require an expansion of the sequence (asking 'who', for instance). However, by using the 'do you know' *li* interrogative, the detective is not inquiring solely about the suspect's state of knowledge, but essentially inviting the suspect to consider possible perpetrators of the crime and disclose the information. The suspect responds to this turn accordingly: he gives no confirmation/disconfirmation concerning the knowledge itself and provides his commentary on the information-seeking activity and his inability to provide information. He is not interested in the matter, and therefore he cannot know nor provide any information about it. It seems that the particle *li* makes the information-seeking mode more relevant than the 'knowledge' aspect of the inquiry. As one will note in the following section, the interrogatives which do not contain particle *li* carry quite different interactional implications and are responded to in a different manner.

There is a third element to the suspect's response that is worth noting. In spite of the claimed innocence of the form, the suspect responds to the detective's turn as to a 'loaded question'. On the surface, the detective's question in line 26 claims to be asking for information: it has two verbal mitigations (verbs *znati-* to know and *moći-* can/could), it contains a particle *li* which is signalling an information-seeking mode and makes no obvious presuppositions about the suspect's involvement in the crime. However, the question is why the detective would direct such an inquiry to the suspect in the first place. It is, first of all, because he considers there is a likelihood the suspect can provide the information and that he might be in K+ position. The very fact that the detective might think that the suspect might know, poses the question how he may know it, and implies that the suspect may know because he has something to do with it.

At any rate, the suspect has picked up on such a damaging inference and for this reason he treats the detective's turn as inapposite. The suspect gives a dispreference answer in line 28, preceded by another dispreference marker (1.0) pause in line 27. The wording of the reply in line 28 '>pravo da ti< KA:že:m,' - 'to tell you honestly'- can be compared to the phenomenon noticed by Edwards and Fasulo (2006) in *honestly* + complement turns. Edwards and Fasulo note that *honestly* phrases in their police interrogation data announce dispreferred answers to questions. They also report that the complement provides a subjective report (not sure, cannot remember, I prefer X) as an account for failing to provide the requested information. This is followed by no acceptance or other acknowledging response on the part of the police officer. Following the dispreferred phrase, the suspect inferentially denies any kind of knowledge about the matter. This non-conforming answer to a question which is meant to perform only the action it is claiming to perform, probably does not meet the detective's expectations, so he produces a repair in line 30. In line 31 Sus continues his dispreferred answer. Similar to Edwards and Fasulo's examples, the detective does not acknowledge the reply, but once he has received enough information to go on with the report, he starts dictating in an overlap in line 33. The detective does not pursue the matter past this point.

Extract 2.8 also displays specific interactional properties of *li* interrogatives. This extract is taken from an interview with a person who has admitted committing a theft in the neighbourhood. The suspect is a drug user and the theft was principally inspired by his need to obtain drugs. Here the suspect introduces the topic of Migi (a nickname of Sus's acquaintance, another person with a criminal record). I am focusing on lines 24-25 in which the speaker does a self repair, both the repairable and the repaired version containing the clitic *li*.

## Extract 2.8

### *Euros\_the\_s\_inf\_2008*

01 Sus: .hhh >a reci mi oVO< đe je Migi?  
 .hhh >and tell me tHIS< where is Migi?  
*And tell me this, where is Migi?*

02 KA>ko je bilo< s Migiem;  
 HO>w aux. was< with Migi;  
*How was it with Migi?*

03 (0.5)

04 Dt2: Migoni je na:  
Migoni is on:  
*Migoni is*

05 (0.2)  
 06 (0.3) ((background voices))

07 >nekolika ljetovanja:< o[tiša: ]  
 >couple of summers: < w[ent: ]  
 08 [((slam))]  
*away for couple of summers*

09 (.) ((slam))

10 ???: .hhh

11 (0.5)

12 Sus: [>on je DOlje<] već [jelǰ ]  
 [>he is DOwn< ]already[is itǰ]  
*he is already down right?*

13 ???: [Migi ti je- ]  
 [Migi you is- ]  
*Migi is-*

14 Dt1: [ ren]ta ka:

[ ren]t a car:  
rent a car

- 15 (0.1)
- 16 ((flick)) [((flick))]
- 17 Sus: [hə ]  
[hm ]
- 18 (0.4) ((click)) ((background voices))
- 19 Dt2: On će dugo ohhstahhtih(.) >njega dugo nećeš<  
He will long shhhtahyh (.) >him long (you)won't<  
*He will stay long, you won't be*
- 20 gledat(.) BA:š.  
see (.) RE:ally.  
*seeing him for a long time really*
- 21 (0.4)
- 22 Sus: hm:
- 23 (0.1)
- |         |  |
|---------|--|
| 24 Sus: | .hhh a je li:-ZNA:š li je li >onaj<br>.hhh and aux.qp.-KNO:w(you)qp.aux.qp.>that<br><i>and has- do you know did that</i> |
|---------|--|
- |    |   |
|----|---|
| 25 | [DAkić< iz]a:š[a:..<br>[DAkic< we]n:t[out:..<br>26 [((coughing))]<br><i>Dakic go out?</i> |
|----|---|
- 27 Dt1: [NE:će ni on jo:š:=  
[WO:n't nor he mo:re:=  
*he too won't be out some more*
- 28 Sus: I: o:n[je do]lje je li;  
TOO: h:e[is do]wn is it;  
29 [((click))]  
*he is down too right?*
- 30 (1.2) ((rustling)) ((background talk))
- 31 Dt1: SVI:  
ALL:  
*all of them*
- 32 (.)
- 33 Sus: skoro svo: †OVO moje DRU:↓štvo>što sam se ranije<  
almost all:†THIS my CO:↓mpany>what aux.(I)refl.before<  
*almost all of my friends that I was earlier*

34 DRU:žio, [tamo s Kru:]↑ŠKA >°skoro° svi su<  
 HU:ng out,[there from Kru:]↑SKO >°almost°all are<  
 35 ????: [(hushed laughter)]  
*hanging out with, there from Krusko, are almost all*

36 u ZA:tvo:r.  
 in PRI:so:n.  
*in prison*

37 (.)

38 Dt1: ((laughter))

In this extract, as in extract 2.7, one can note the occurrence of the *li* interrogative as a topic initial element in lines 24-25. It is worth looking into how the topic develops and shifts in this extract: in lines 01-02 the suspect inquires about Migi, who as it turns out, is already familiar to the detectives. From line 04 on, the detectives deal with the suspect's request for information, implying that Migi has been locked away and will not come out for a long time (ending in line 20). As the suspect receives the required information, there is some hiatus in lines 21-23, following which the suspect shifts onto a slightly different topic. The topic initiated in line 24 is not completely new, but is a shift to talking about a different person (from Migi to Dakic). What comes to attention, however, when it comes to the topic shift is a self initiated repair from 'je li:-' into 'ZNA:š li', in line 24. Schegloff (1979) notes that self-initiated repair regularly occurs at topic boundaries, and in those cases the trouble being repaired is completely obscure. In case a topic initial turn does not have a self-repair, the next turn usually involves initiation of a repair by somebody else.

Looking at the turn in line 24, one can note that both the repairable and the repair contain the particles *li*. This means that the interlocutor did not repair the information-seeking mode in the repaired version. The meaning of the particle *li* is necessarily tied to the epistemic stance the interlocutor displays concerning his/her own knowledge. As previously mentioned, the particle *li* indicates that the speaker is in a K- position and that he/she is looking for information. This means that both the repair and the repairable in line 24 are indicating that the suspect does not have any information about the person called Dakic and as this inquiry is directed at the detective, it puts him in K+ position in relation to the suspect. In a similar manner, the detective in the previously discussed



extract 2.7, by means of the clitic *li*, asks the suspect for information about the perpetrators of arson.

It is interesting to note the epistemic fine-tuning the repair in line 24 does as regards the detective's expected epistemic position. While both the repairable and the repair through the particle *li* indicate that the next action the turn requires is providing information, the two greatly differ when it comes to the expectations concerning the detective's knowledge. By asking 'je li' which was going for 'did that Dakic go out', the suspect would be claiming that the detectives would most certainly have the answer. However, apparently realizing that the detective might not know Dakic, or even more likely that he could not know when certain prisoners leave prison, the suspect makes an epistemic downgrade and repairs the first form into 'znaš li' which carries a presupposition that there might be an equal chance that the detective does not have knowledge about the mentioned individual. This example is similar to the one in extract 2.7 in which the detective mitigates his turn in line 26 by using the verb *to know*. A similar epistemic stance is conveyed by the demonstrative 'onaj' - 'that' in 'onaj Dakic' by which the suspect indicates his own acquaintance with Dakic and reduces his expectation of the detectives being acquainted with the person. Clearly, *li* interrogatives containing the verb *to be* and those with the verb *to know* + complement convey different judgments as regards the knowledge of the addressee. The verb *to know* in combination with *li*, followed by a complement may be pointing to a certain kind of delicacy of the subject matter and to the possibility of the addressee's lack of knowledge. On the contrary, if the speaker uses a verb *to be* in a *li* interrogative, he/she expresses greater expectations as regards the addressee's epistemic competence.

When it comes to the detective's response to the inquiry in lines 24-25, in this case it is more straightforward than the response to the *li* interrogative in extract 2.7, which is complicated by the interrogation context and the fact that it is understood by the suspect as damaging. In the case of extract 2.8, the detective gives a nonconforming reply in line 27 as a response to the *znaš li* interrogative. He produces - 'NE:će ni on jo:š' - 'he too won't be out soon', in which by using the lexical item 'too', he links this

turn back to the previous topic of 'Migi', and as Migi is somebody who is in prison, the response, by implication, states that Dakic is also in prison. In this response, similarly to the one in extract 2.7 (line 28), there is no uptake from the detective as regards the 'do you know' part of the inquiry. That is, there is no confirmation of knowledge about Dakic on the part of the detective, although it is clear that he does have it. Instead, what the detective finds relevant is the information-seeking aspect of the action performed by the suspect's turn in lines 24-25. That is, as the suspect is requesting information, not inquiring about the state of the detective's knowledge, the detective performs a corresponding SPP action. By linking his turn to the case of Migi from the prior talk, he provides information about Dakic's whereabouts.

Extracts 2.9 and 2.10 below are two more instances of 'do you know' *li* interrogatives. The extracts are taken from two separate interviews with the same suspect, a guard working in the factory in which a major theft took place. In extract 2.9 the *li* interrogative I am focusing on occurs in line 08. It occurs towards the end of this interview when Dt1 inquires if the suspect has anything else to add.

#### Extract 2.9

##### Guard\_fthe\_s\_off\_2008

- 01 Dt1: imaš i JOŠ ŠTO: da ka:že:šȓ  
(you)have qp. MORE WHAT: to s:a:yȓ  
*Do you have anything else to say?*
- 02 Sus: °ne°  
°no°  
*No*
- 03 (0.7)
- 04 Dt1: NIŠta.  
NOTHING.  
*Nothing*
- 05 Sus: °ništa°  
°nothing°  
*Nothing*
- 06 (6.7) ((background talk))
- 07 Dt1: moš i nam reĀCI ŠTO bliže oVA:ko, (0.3)

(you)can qp. us te↑LL WHAT closer LIKE: this, (0.3)  
*Can you tell us more precisely?*

08	ZNA:š i što, (you)KNO:w qp.what, <i>do you know anything?</i>
09	(0.5) ((squeak))
10	ŠTA: se PRI:ča: u- u- >gore na:< Baran[di ?< ] WHAT: refl.TA:lk: in-in- >up on:< Baran[da ?< ] <i>What is being said in-in- up in Baranda?</i>
11	[ ((slam)) ]
12	(.) ((click)) (0.1)
13	Sus: °a ništa ° ((bang)) bogomi ni:šta °well nothing° ((bang)) God me no:thing <i>Well nothing, nothing for sure</i>

In extract 2.10 the ‘do you know’ *li* interrogative I am focusing on occurs in line 16 as a part of the detectives’ inquiry into the suspect’s link to another worker in the factory.

#### Extract 2.10

##### Guard fthe s inf 2008

01	Dt2:	sa KOjim od MAJstora si <u>ti</u> NAJbolji. with WHom of MECHANics are <u>you</u> THE BEst. <i>Which mechanic are you most friendly with?</i>
02		(0.8) ((click))
03	Sus:	ni:↓škim JA sa SVAkim da dođem i primim smjenu,i no:↓one I with EVERYbody to come and receive shift, and <i>No one I’m friendly with everybody I come, take over and</i>
04		ono ništa ja°ono moj[e:° ] err nothing I °that mi[ne:°] <i>I do my stuff</i>
05	Dt2:	[ od]MAJstora s <u>kim</u> si [ of]MECHANics with <u>who</u> aux(you) <i>Which mechanic are you</i>
06		dobar, s <u>kim</u> se družiš, s <u>kim</u> (0.4) se good, with <u>whom</u> refl.(you)hang out, with <u>whom</u> (0.4) refl. <i>friendly with, with whom do you hang out, who do</i>
07		GLE[da:š ] (you)SE[e: ] <i>you see?</i>
08	Dt3:	[s <u>BARA:</u> ]nje si >valjda se družiš

[from BARA:]nja (you) are > must refl. (you) socialize  
*You are from Baranja, you must be friends*

09 [s < nekim ]  
[with< someone]  
*with someone*

10 Sus: [sa SVA:]ki:m. nemam ja ŠTA >reć da <-  
[with EVERY:]on:e. not have I WHAT >say that<-  
*With everyone I don't have anything to say that-*

11 Dt2: [kojem ]  
[which one]  
*Which one?*

12 Dt3: [sa SVA]KIjem  
[with EVE]One  
*with everyone?*

13 (.)

14 Sus: e:  
yes  
*Yes*

15 (.)

16 Dt3: a KOji je to. (0.6) [ZNAš li ]MIl[a]¿ and WHICh is that. (0.6) [KNOW(you) qp.]MIl[o]¿ <i>And which one is that? Do you know Milo?</i>
---

17 Sus: [°eto:° ] [e]to  
[°there:° ] [t]here  
*There there*

18 Milo, Eto,  
Milo, THere,  
*Milo there(for instance)*

In both extracts 2.9 and 2.10 one can trace some interactional features of *li* interrogatives which are similar to those occurring in extracts 2.7 and 2.8. Both these examples also exhibit the tendency of *li* interrogatives to occur topic initially (this is the case with other *li* interrogatives which are combined with verbs other than the verb *to know* in extract 2.9, see lines 01 and 07).

In extract 2.9, as Dt1 fails to elicit information from the suspect (lines 01-05), he closes down this first attempt, also delimited by a long break in line 06. Further on, in line 07

the detective renews his attempt at getting the information, and the *znaš li* interrogative occurs with this renewed attempt. Something similar is found in extract 2.10 in which the detective starts his ‘fishing’ about the suspect’s relations with other workers in the factory by asking which of the mechanics the suspect is friendly with. As this attempt proves to be unfruitful, the detective winds down this sequence, the *znaš li* form occurring with the renewed attempt at getting information in line 16.

Both the interrogative in line 08 of extract 2.9 and the one in line 16 of extract 2.10 contain an information-seeking element *li* paired with the verb *to know*. By means of these elements, they are both claiming no knowledge on the part of the speaker and an information-seeking mode. However, example 2.10 is a bit more complex as Dt3 here expresses an ironic stance towards the suspect’s resistance to give information. The ironic effect is created partly from the sequential position in which this turn occurs, more precisely, from what went on in the couple of turns prior to it. The irony is also audible from the prosody in the detective’s repetition of ‘with everyone’ in line 12, which the detective also puts into a colloquial form (although the one used by the suspect was not colloquial) and applies greater loudness to a part of ‘everyone’. Then, there is an interrogative ‘a koji je to’ – ‘which one is that’, and a strategic use of *znaš li* to mark the information-seeking mode, while it should be taken for granted that the suspect would have to know his co-worker. In his response in lines 17-18 the suspect tries to defuse the irony of the detective’s prior turn by ‘°eto:° eto’ which has the meaning of approximately ‘well for instance’ and indicates that Milo is no different to him from other co-workers.

The suspects’ responses to the given *li* interrogatives are along the lines of those in extracts 2.7 and 2.8. In both cases there is no reference of the answerers to the state of their knowledge. Instead, in both cases the interlocutors orient to the information-seeking aspect of the prior turn.

What emerges from the above given examples on a larger scale, however, is something along the lines of the studies which suggest that positive yes/no interrogatives that

resemble information-seeking questions are found to perform other activities (Koshik, 2002; Heinemann, 2007; Monzoni, 2007). These examples indicate that information-seeking rarely comes to the listener as a single component, but is usually used to facilitate some other action. Thus, in extracts 2.7, 2.9 and 2.10, information-seeking is put into the service of carrying out a specific institutional task. For instance, in extract 2.10 the information-seeking mode has an amount of irony built in and the intended action is getting the interviewee to talk. The example which is closest to the ‘pure’ information-seeking mode is the one in extract 2.8 in which the suspect, during a hiatus in the interrogation, does ‘small talk’ and inquires about another wrongdoer, the purpose of which is unclear. The suspect possibly does this to shift the focus of the talk from his misdemeanour onto something else.

### **4.3 Checking recipient’s state of knowledge**

In the previous section I have been describing a fairly standard form of Serbo-Croatian yes/no interrogatives, which is characterized by the presence of a clitic *li* and seem to be asking for information. As I noted in the introduction, there are variations on this form, the first of which is the same interrogative structure from which the particle *li* has been omitted (*non-li* interrogatives). This variant of *li* interrogative will be the main focus of this section.

*Non-li* interrogatives contain a bare verb + complement and the absence of the clitic *li* takes away the obvious interrogative character of these utterances. The form is also frequently characterized by the absence of an overt personal pronoun as person and number are marked via verbal morphology. The phenomenon of omitting the interrogative particle has been noted in other languages which are historically and structurally close to Serbo-Croatian. Mišeska-Tomić (in press) found a correspondence between the syntactic features of Macedonian *li* interrogatives and *non-li* interrogatives. She explains that interrogatives without an overt marker are actually *li* interrogatives from which the clitic *li* has been deleted. In the sense of syntax, the same seems to be true of corresponding Serbo-Croatian interrogatives in my data; *non-li* interrogatives seem to be a truncated version of *li* yes/no interrogatives. Studying the sequential

development of these forms, more differences emerge. It seems that the omission of the particle *li* occurs systematically and that both *li* and *non-li* interrogatives are normally tied to certain sequential positions. Rudin et al. (1999) report that their informants detected subtle difference in meaning between *li* and *non-li* Macedonian interrogatives. Citing Englund (1979) they suggest that *non-li* is most likely to appear in confirmative questions (those which expect or desire a positive answer) whereas *li* is most likely to occur in rejective questions and neutral informative questions. In Serbo-Croatian too, there is an expectation for a positive response built in the *non-li* interrogatives. The very fact that *li* gets to be omitted, takes away the ‘information-seeking’ and ‘no knowledge’ mode and gives way to presuppositions to be built in.

In extract 2.11, I am focusing on lines 23-26, more precisely, on the form of interrogatives containing the verb *znaš* ((you)know) + complement. Note that these utterances (lines 23, 26) are characterized by an absence of the clitic *li* and an overt personal pronoun; the second person singular is marked via verbal morphology.

Extract 2.11 comes from an interview with a suspect in a theft case. The theft took place in a factory located in a suburban area. The suspect is one of the factory fitters.

#### Extract 2.11

01 Dt3: >kako se zove onAj što si ga < z:->  
>how refl. call thAt what (you)aux. him< c:->  
*what is the name of that one that you c-*

02 >reko mu da se < ja:vi:?  
>told him that refl.(he)< co:ntacts:?  
*told him to contact you*

03 ((click))

04 (1.0)

05 Dt1: kojiǰ  
which oneǰ  
*which one?*

06 (.)

07 Dt3: ona:j >kad smo se vraćali:<,
 tha:t >when aux.refl(we)were returning:<
 *that one when we were returning*

08 k[smo se vraća- ]
 whn' [aux.(we) refl.return-]
 *when we were re-*

09 Sus: [i DA viDI:]te:, m
 [and THAT (you)S:]ee:, m
 *so listen,*

10 (0.1)

11 i šutra ujut[ro[došli ]na poso:,-]
 and tomorrow morn[ing[came ]on work:,-]
 *the next morning we come to work*

12 Dt3: [s [a- ]s:::- u] ( [ ] )
 [w [a- ]w:::- in] ( [ ] )

13 [((click))]

14 Dt2: [s AUdijem]
 [with AUdi]

15 PLAvi:m onaj
 BLu:e that
 *that one with the blue Audi*

16 (0.1)

17 Dt1: a:: PE>tko<¿=
 oh PE>tko<¿
 *Oh, Petko?*

18 Sus: =m hhh

19 Dt3: PEtko, prezime?
 PEtko, surname?
 *Petko, surname?*

20 (0.1)

21 Dt1: >Binić.<
 >Binic.<

22 (.)

23 Dt3: >zna:š TOga<?= >(you)kno:w THat<?= <i>do you know that one?</i>
---

24 Sus: =zna:m toga:h.  
=(I)kno:w that:h.  
*I know that one*



25 (.)

26	Dt3:	ZNA:š	PETka	Bini[ća.	]
		(you)KNO:W	Petko	Bini[c.	]
			<i>do you know</i>	<i>Petko Binic?</i>	
27	Sus:			[zna:m	]
				[(I)kno:w]	
				<i>I know</i>	
28	Dt3:	KA>ko	se	< poznajete?	
		HO>w	refl.<(you)k	now?	
			<i>how do you know</i>	<i>each other?</i>	
29		(0.4)			
30	Sus:	h ovahkoh	>iz	viđenja<	#po Barandi#
		h like thhhis	>from	seeing	< #around Baranda#
			<i>just from seeing</i>	<i>him around</i>	<i>Baranda</i>

Prior to this extract Dt2 inquires about the suspect's acquaintance with another person who may be involved in the case, and by doing so, he initiates a new topic. The detective is obviously trying to establish a possible link between the two suspects. The suspect denies knowing the mentioned person, and after Dt4's probing, it becomes clear that Dt2 named the individual wrongly. Dt3 and Dt1 are then trying to come up with the right name of the person they are actually asking the suspect about (lines 01- 15). In line 09 the suspect tries to pursue his own line of the story, but the detectives are set to locate the individual, overlapping with the part of Sus's turn in line 09. Dt1 finally identifies the party as Petko Binic, lines 17-21.

As the identification has been made and the referent determined in line 21, Dt3 addresses Sus by asking '>znaš toga<?' - 'do you know that one?'. It is worth noting here that the transition to this turn is almost immediate: there is only a short silence in line 22. The second *znaš* form in line 26 is also preceded by a micro pause. This greatly differs from the previously discussed *li* interrogatives, which tend to be more sharply boundaried off from the topic of previous talk by longer silences and other interactional devices. This is primarily because *li* interrogatives tend to be sequentially initial and co-occur with newly introduced topics. As can be noted in extract 2.11, the topic of Petko Binic was established prior to the line 23 and the *znaš* form signals that

the 'Petko' topic is still on. Another device which does the same job is the indexical 'toga' - 'that one' in line 23 which topically links the turn in line 23 to previously mentioned Petko and to the wrongly named individual prior to turn 01. The fact that *znaš* forms in lines 23 and 26 are not sharply delimited from the previous talk goes along with both their sequential position and their relation to the current topic. As one can note, the two forms occur further down the sequence and differently from *li* forms which signal new topics, they refer back to the previously introduced ones.

*Non-li* interrogatives have their own epistemic value. While *li* interrogatives express a neutral information-seeking mode with very little presupposed, *znaš* interrogatives are epistemically less neutral. They claim more knowledge on the part of the speaker, or to be more precise, they express speakers' expectations regarding the response at hand. As a consequence of their epistemic load, these interrogatives cannot be purely information-seeking, but their role could be described as seeking confirmation of a speaker's assumptions. By choosing the *non-li* form 'znaš toga' - 'do you know that one' in line 23, the detective conveys to the suspect his epistemic standing. There are two major presuppositions of the detective that become salient in this case: 1) the detective assumes that the suspect has a certain kind of knowledge about Petko Binic (this is sometimes supported by the prosodic features of these utterances: the fact that there is no overt interrogative marker enables the speaker to articulate 'znaš' the way it would be articulated in statements, so that the verb form, which is heard first, can sometimes be heard as stating 'you know'), and 2) he also has the expectation that he would receive an affirmative response. The demonstrative 'toga' line 23, meaning 'that one' is used to make a contrast between Petko and the previously wrongly named individual (something to the effect 'if you do not know the former mistakenly named individual, you would know the latter'). This demonstrative may also imply certain Dt3's distancing from the referent and indicating Dt3's inferior knowledge. This indicates that a single short turn can have a number of epistemic layers.

It is now worth looking at how interlocutors respond to *non-li* forms. Looking back at extract 10 in which Dt3 asks the suspect 'Do you know Milo?' by means of a *li*

interrogative, one could note that the response to this turn is non-conforming and is orienting to its ironic information-seeking quality. As the role of the *non-li* interrogative forms can be summarized as asking for confirmation of the speaker's assumption concerning the addressee's state of knowledge, it is expected that these responses would be more conforming, i.e. they would be responded to by either confirming or disconfirming the interlocutor's assumptions/own state of knowledge. This is exactly what happens in the two occurrences of *non-li* interrogatives in extract 2.12. In line 23 Dt3, by the *non-li* form, expresses that he assumes that the suspect has some knowledge about Petko Binic and asks for a confirmation/disconfirmation of his assumption/suspect's knowledge. In line 24 the suspect produces a matching activity: he responds with a verb repeat 'zna:m' and confirms both the detective's assumptions and his own state of knowledge. The turn does not get to be expanded past the confirmation. Guimares (2007) notes that verb repeats are standard positive conforming responses in Brazilian Portuguese. In the case of *do you know* interrogatives in Serbo-Croatian, verb repeats seem to be a standard way of doing confirmation. This is evidenced by the response to the second *non-li* interrogative in line 27: another verb repeat 'znam' - 'I know', as well as by other examples included in this section.

Once the confirmation has been received in line 27, Dt3 expands the sequence by probing about the suspect's acquaintance: 'kako se poznajete?' - 'how do you know each other?' A confirmation of the suspect's state of knowledge is obviously a base for continuing the interrogation. The fact that the link between the two suspects has been established gives the detective an opportunity for asking some more 'dangerous' questions.

Similar to extract 2.11, extract 2.12 features another example of *non-li* interrogatives. I focus here on the turn in line 34 in which Dt1 asks the suspect '>NA:š DA si ŋga< ZVao.' - 'do you know that you called him?'. This example is similar in format to the example in extract 2.11: the interrogative is formed solely by a verb inflected for the second person singular + complement. In the first case, however, the format was (*you*) *know* + *object*, whereas, in this case, the format is (*you*) *know* + *that clause*.

Extract 2.12

**Suspect\_fthe\_s\_inf\_2008**

01 Dt1: AnDRIću, (0.1 >oli mi samo< re↑ci: ə KAd si  
 AnDRic, (0.1)>will (you)me only< sa↑y: ə WHEn(aux.)you  
*Andric, will you just tell me when*

02 ZVAo ku:ma tvoga,  
 CALLEd go:d father your,  
*you called your godfather?*

03 (0.4)

04 ????: .hhh

05 (0.2)

06 Dt1: nešto mi, (0.4)niJE bi- baš bila ona: tvoja izJAVA,  
 something me, (0.4)noT wa-relly was that:your STATEMENT,  
*that statement of yours wasn't really-*

07 (.)

08 Sus: >pə h ne zna: JA:<sad tačno BAš (.)BAš  
 >wl'h not know: I:<now exactly EXActy(.)EXActly  
*Well, I don't know now exactly exactly*

09 precizno, o>kle ću ja< znat.  
 precisely, f>rom where will I< know.  
*precisely, how can I know?*

10 (.)

11 [>ja misi°m°<.hh]h(.)ja >misi:m[da je ON bi]o u<  
 [>I thin°k°<.hh]h(.)I >thi:nk[that aux.(he)wa]s in<  
*I think, I think that he was in*

12 [ne ZNA:š:ç ] [(flick) ]  
 [not (you)KNO:w:ç]  
*you don't know*

13 ↑BElu:ću.=ne zna:m tačno, [( ) ] [>il da se <  
 ↑BElu:ca.=not kno:w exactly, [( ) ] [>or that refl.<

14 [(flick)][(pen clicking)]  
*Beluca, I don't know exactly, or that*

15 VRAćo iz Beluće.= [kol]ka >je sati bilo,  
 (he was)RETURning from Beluca.= [how]much>aux.hours was,  
*he was on his way from Beluca, what the time was,*

16 [( ) clicking)

17 Dt1: [da ]  
 [yes]  
*yes*

18 ja ne um- ne mogu sad-< ]  
 I not ca- not(I)can now-< ]  
 ((clicking) )  
*I can't now-*

19 (0.3)

20 Dtl: °a:ha:° ((click)) jesi ga- KA si ga DOBIO?  
 °a:ha:° ((click)) did(you) him- WHEN aux. him (you)GOT?  
*aha, did you- when did you get him?*

21 (0.3) (clicking)

22 (0.4)

23 Sus: [.hhh ]neh znah:m ni to sa ta[Čno. ]  
 [.hhh ]noth(I)knoh:w nor that now ex[ACTly. ]  
 24 [(clicking) ] [((clicking))]  
*I don't know precisely that too*

25 (.)

26 Dtl: [ne zna:š [tačno ]  
 [not(you)kno:w[exactly]  
*you don't know exactly*

27 [ ((clickin[g) ] ((clicking))]

28 Sus: [ koli]ko je bi:lo,  
 [how mu]ch aux. wa:s,  
*what time it was*

29 ((click))

30 (0.3)

31 š:e:s:: (.)fpe: še:s sa:tif, ne zna:m bogo°mi°  
 s:i:x:: (.)ffive: si:x hou:rsf,not(I)kno:w God °me°  
*six, five, six, I don't know by God*

32 (2.5)

33 Sus: .hhh (.) °ne zna:m ° tačno,  
 .hhh (.) °not(I)kno:w° exactly,  
*I don't know exactly*

34 (1.1)

35	Dtl:	>NA:š DA si ↑ga< ZVao. >KNO:w THAT aux.(you)↑him< Called. <i>do you know that you called him?</i>
----	------	---

36 (.)

37 Sus: °sna:hnm°

°(I)kno:hhw°  
*I know*

38 (0.5)

39 Dt1: dao si IZJA↑vu: .hhh(0.1) da si  
 gave aux(you)STA↑temet: .hhh(0.1) that aux.(you)  
*you gave a statement that you*

40 ga ZVA:o:, (0.5)PRIje nego SI ,<s:ki:dao špulnu,>  
 him CAL:ed, (0.5)BEFore but AUX.,<(you)r:emo:ved spool,>  
*had called him before you had removed the spool*

41 (0.7)

42 ovaj namotaj.(0.4) jel TAKoǰ  
 this spool. (0.4) aux.+ qp. LIKE THATǰ  
*this spool, right?*

43 (.)

44 Sus: (°nije°)vjerovatno DA JEsam °ja ne znam°  
 (°no° )probably THAT (I)Was °(I) not know°  
*no, I probably was*

Extract 2.12 is also taken from an interview with a suspect in the factory theft case, but with a different interviewee. Dt1 is trying to check the veracity of information recorded in one of the previous interviews with the same suspect. He is checking the information connected to the time of the call the suspect made to his godfather. The suspect is evasive; he claims the lack of knowledge and inability to recollect the exact time the event took place (lines 07-16, 23, 28-33). The detective here recycles the same activity – he asks for information about the time of the call, thus showing he does not accept the previous answer. In line 01-02 he inquires when the suspect called his godfather, to which the suspect replies that he cannot recollect. In line 19 Dt1 makes another attempt asking when the call went through, to which the suspect responds in more or less the same way. This is then followed by (1.1) dispreffering pause in line 34 and the detective’s inquiry about the suspect’s awareness of his own actions.

Similar to the previously discussed *non-li* examples from extract 2.11, Dt1’s inquiry: ‘>NA:š DA si ↑ga< ZVao.’ (‘do you know that you called him?’) in line 35 occurs well into the sequence from the initial introduction of ‘call to the godfather’ in line 01. This inserted sequence, however, still deals with the ‘godfather topic’, and

topically connects back to lines 01 and 02 in which Dt1 introduces the theme of the suspect's godfather and an alleged call which took place at a certain time relevant for the investigation. The connectedness to the prior talk is also signalled by the case marked 'ga' - 'him' which refers back to the godfather. The absence of *li* (the (1.1) pause in line 34 marks Dt1's dispreference) and the Dt1's compressing of the utterance are the devices that make the turn blend in and be seen as the continuation of the prior talk.

'You know that you called him' in line 35 has got a number of presuppositions built in. First of all, this is a response to the suspect's insistence upon claiming no knowledge and his inability to remember. Additionally, the detective reveals his epistemic stance by using the *non-li* interrogative 'NA:š DA si ↑ga< ZVao.' - 'You know that you called him', which, first of all, presupposes that the call in question did happen. This is also supported by the fact that Dt1 and the suspect have previously discussed the time the call was made. Another presupposition incorporated in the utterance is that Dt1 assumes the suspect is aware of the call. This is also slightly suggested by the stretch and even intonation on 'NA:š' which, as it is heard first, sounds as a statement of the addressee's state of knowledge- 'you know'. It is only later in the turn that the intonation turns the utterance into an inquiry. Looking at the structure of this complex clause, one can note that the answer is required by the 'znaš' part, whereas the content of the 'that' clause conveys the information that is 'given' and taken as true. That is, Dt1's *non-li do you know* form makes confirmation/disconfirmation relevant next, while there is an expectation for confirmation built into this turn.

When it comes to how the *non-li* interrogative from line 35 gets to be treated, one can note that the response to it in line 37 is of the same form as the two responses supplied to *non-li* interrogatives in extract 2.11. The verb repeat 'znam' - '(I) know', is simply the suspect's confirmation of his awareness of the proposition embedded in the 'that' clause. Indirectly, it is also a confirmation that the event in question did happen. As in the previous example, the suspect performs a matching activity: as a response to the confirmation-seeking activity performed by the detective in line 35, in line 37 the

suspect confirms the detective's assumptions about his state of knowledge and about the call to the godfather.

After the confirmation has been received in line 37, one can note an expansion of the sequence. The detective confronts the suspect with the fact that he had said something different while giving his previous statement.<sup>16</sup> The confirmation is a minimal affirmative answer which enables Dt1 to continue the interrogation. On the basis of this confirmation, the detective seems to be embedding another action - reproaching and/or incriminating the suspect.

Extracts 2.13, 2.14 and 2.15 below all contain instances of 'do you know' *non-li* interrogatives. Extract 2.13 is taken from an interview with a drug addict and this is a point in the conversation at which Dt3 is set to give advice to the suspect. The *non-li* form occurs in this extract three times, in lines 09, 13 and 17.

#### Extract 2.13

##### *Pots\_the\_s\_inf\_2008*

01 ((rustling))

02 Dt3: šta ZNA:š də-da RA:di:š.>s čime se < bavi:š?  
what(you)KNO:w t- to WO:r:k. >with what ref.<(you)deal?  
*what can you do? what do you do for living?*

03 (0.8)((flick))

04 Dt3: majstORLUkom[neki:m ]  
 crAFt[so:me ]  
*some craft*

05 Sus: [zNA:m da]KRE:či:m(0.3)RA:dio sam  
 [(I)kNO:w to]PA:i:nt (0.3)(I)WO:rked aux.  
*I can paint, I worked*

06 u BANju,(.)prošlo °ljet°o. (.) bio s ĐEvojkom  
 in Spa, (.)last °summer °.(.) was with GIRlfriend  
*in a spa last summer, I was with my girlfriend*

07 do°lje°, U Igloo.  
 do°wn°, IN Igloo.  
*down in Igloo*

08 (1.1)



09	Dt3:	ZNa:š >da krečiš<[je li:] (you)KNo:w>to paint<[is it:] you can paint, right?
10	Sus:	[ zavr]šio sam turistički [(I)fini]shed aux.tourist <i>I graduated from tourist</i>
11		tehniČ°a:r°. techniCI°a:n°. <i>school</i>
12		(2.6)
13	Dt3:	pə zna:š >da krečiš<[>je li< mo:ler. ] so(you)kno:w >to paint <[>is it< pai:nter.] [ ((flick) ) ] <i>so you can paint? a painter, right?</i>
14		(.)
15	Sus:	sNA:m sna:m kNO:w kno:w <i>I can I can</i>
16		(.)
17	Dt3:	pə >znaš da su to fine pare<? well>(you)know that are that nice money<? <i>well you know that that is good money?</i>
18		(0.2)
19	Sus:	°sna:m° °(I)know° <i>I know</i>
20		(0.3) ((crackle))
21		KREČio sam TAmo (.)fonomef KI:ku AUspuh SERvi:s:. PAI:nted aux(I)There(.)£to that£KI:ko EXhaust SERvice:. <i>I painted that Kiko's mechanic shop</i>

Extract 2.14 is taken from an interview with a man suspected of financial fraud. Dt1, in this extract produces the 'do you know' *non-li* form in lines 12-14.

#### Extract 2.14

#### ***Forger\_forg\_s\_inf\_2008***

01	Dt1:	pita:m te >na koji si< NAčin>obezbijedio. <= (I)a:sk you >on what aux.< WAy >(you)provided.<=
----	------	--

*I ask you in what way you provided*

- 02 Sus: =na NA:čin što sam piTA: >ovoga<lično, i:  
=on WA:y what aux.(I)asKED:>this< personally,and:  
*In the way that I asked this one personally and*
- 03 ((flick))(0.2)
- 04 nači, SVAki put >ka smo ga<PI:tali, u restORAN  
means,EVERy time>when aux.(we)him<AS:ked, in restAURANT  
*so, every time we asked him in the restaurant*
- 05 More, đe je[>moja majka RAdila<], reka JE  
More, where aux.[>my mother WORked<],said aux.(he)
- 06 [((sniff)) ]  
*More where my mother worked, he said*
- 07 za VA:S >kolko vam GOD puta treba, evo vi  
for YO:U >how much you INT. times needs, here you  
*for you as many times as you need, here is*
- 08 lična ka:rta, svaki pu ću< potpisat..hhh i  
personal ca:rd, every time will< (I)sign. .hhh and  
*my ID, I will sign every time and*
- (12 lines omitted)
- 09 (0.1)
- 10 ČAK ga je majka i čašĆA:vala i sve.  
EVEN him aux. mother too treAT:ed and all.  
*mother even treated him and all*
- 11 (.)
- |         |  |
|---------|--|
| 12 Dtl: | a:: zna:š da je njemu odbiJENO, pitam te<br>and::(you)kno:w that aux. him deduCTED,(I)ask you<br><i>and do you know that he was deducted, I ask you if you</i> |
| 13      | jesi u toku, .hhh PE:T RA:ta<br>aux.in stream, .hhh FI:VE INSTA:llments<br><i>are informed, five instalments</i>   |
| 14      | po osnovu>ovoga < kre:ditač<br>by base >of this< lo:anč<br><i>based on this loan?</i>  |
- 15 (0.7)
- 16 Sus: reka mi je Ba-Ivan >juče smo se ovaj Ba<kić,  
said me aux.Ba-Ivan>yesterday aux.(we)refl.this Ba<kic,  
*Ba- Ivan told me, yesterday we, this Bakic,*
- 17 >videli smo se JUče reko mi je da će  
>saw(we)aux.refl.YESTERday told(he)me aux.that will  
*we saw each other yesterday, he told me that he will*

18 to do kraja nedelje, neki o:n kredit podiže< preko  
that till end of week, some h:e loan raises< through  
*do it by end of the week, he takes out a loan through*

19 VAS:>valjda<, (0.2)>VEliki kredit< >dvaes iljada<,  
YOU:>(it)seems<,(0.2)>Big loan< >twenty thousand<,  
*you it seems, a big one which is twenty thousand*

20 koliko li(0.3)DA će to da VRAti <čoe:ku.  
how much qp.(0.3)THAT (he)will that to RETurn<ma:n.  
*or something, that he will return it to the man*

Extract 2.15 comes from an interview with a guard, a suspect in the previously mentioned factory theft case. The targeted *non-li* form occurs in lines 07 and 09.

### Extract 2.15

#### ***Guard\_fthe\_s\_inf\_2008***

01 Dt2: >ti tvrdiš da nikog udjeLA, u oVOj krađi nemaš.  
>you claim that no part, in tHIs theft(you)don't have.  
*You claim that you haven't had any part in this theft*

02 (0.1)

03 Sus: ne hh  
no hh  
*No*

04 (3.4)

05 Dt2: niti-niti da ZNAš ko [je uk]rao.=  
nor- nor that(you)KNOW who[aux.st]ole.=  
*Nor- nor that you know who stole it*

06 Dt3: [.hhh ]

07 Dt3:	=ZNA:š KA[ko se]SKI:daju- onaj bakar =(you)KNO:w HO[w are]TA:ken off- that copper <i>Do you know how to remove the copper</i>
---------	---

08 ???: [( )tač°no° ]  
[( )co°rrect°]  
( )*exactly*

09	sa trans[formato(ra)] from trans[forme(rs) ] <i>from the transformers</i>
----	---

10 Sus: [ne z]nam to:  
[not (I)]know that:  
*I don't know that*

- 11 mi: stražari >nikad tamo,-da samo<-,.hhh što  
 we: guards >never there,-to only<-,.hhh what  
*we the guards only*
- 12 istovarimo, primimo i da°mo°  
 (we)unload, receive and gi°ve°  
*unload it, receive and pass it on*
- 13 (0.5)
- 14 Dt2: a °j°eli BIlo KAKih VOzila †Okolo da se  
 and aux.+qp.were some VEHicles †Around to refl.  
*And were there any vehicles to*
- 15 motaju.  
 roam around.  
*drive around?*
- 16 (0.3)
- 17 Sus: °neono°  
 °no°  
*No*

The examples shown above (extracts 2.13-2.15) exhibit some common interactional features. First of all, all the *non-li* interrogatives in these extracts occur further into the sequence and they connect back to the topic which has already been introduced. In extract 2.13, the turns in lines 09, 13 and 17 connect back to Dt3's introduction of the topic of 'skills' in line 02 and also to the fact that the suspect has already stated that he can paint. The turn in lines 12-14 of extract 2.14 is topically linked to the 'guarantor theme', already discussed in line 01 of this extract. As far as extract 2.15 is concerned, the *non-li* interrogative in lines 07 and 09 may seem not to fit the position in which it occurs as it does not overtly connect to the topic of 'taking part in the theft' introduced in line 01. However, if the theft involves removing copper from transformers, then there is a topical connection between lines 01 and 07, and Dt3 treats it as such. Another indication that line 07 sequentially belongs to the previous talk is the way Dt3 latches his turn in line 07 to the preceding turn which was produced by a different detective, Dt2. Dt3's turn is, then, understood as a continuation of Dt2's talk and possibly supporting the action performed by Dt2.

Epistemically these examples suggest a degree of the speaker's familiarity with the interlocutor's state of knowledge. Sometimes the *non-li* forms are even heard as a speaker's statements about an interlocutor's knowledge, ability etc. This is revealed in extract 2.13 in 'pə zna:š da krečiš?'-'so you know how to paint' (line 13) which, due to the bare 'znaš' form which can be heard as *you know* and 'pə' - 'so' at the beginning of the turn (also found in line 16, same extract) which gives these turns a summing-up appearance, is almost heard as a statement, but its interrogative, confirmation-seeking mode is intensified by the increment 'je li moler.'-'is it painter.'. A similar technique is found in extract 2.14, lines 12-13, in which Dt1 supports the declarative sounding *non-li* interrogative, with 'I ask you if you are informed', thereby enhancing the interrogative status of the utterance. The example in extract 2.15 also suggests the detectives' knowledge or expectations concerning the suspect's skills in removing copper from the transformers, possibly based on the fact that the suspect works around the area where transformers are located.

In essence, *non-li* interrogatives, containing a verb *to know*, at least, function as confirmation-seeking inquiries about the interlocutor's presumed state of knowledge, and they show a preference or expectation for an affirmative response. How these presumptions are made on the part of the speaker is another matter. Studying same polarity confirmation-seeking questions, Heinemann (2008) suggests that speakers use the co-participant's prior turns-at-talk to convey their predisposition to an answer of the same polarity as that of the question and they accomplish this conduciveness by framing their question in accordance with their state of knowledge. This is probably how speakers create their assumptions about the other's state of knowledge expressed through *znaš* interrogatives. In extract 2.13 the detective asks for a confirmation of his assumption concerning the suspect's ability to paint (lines 09 and 13) and this case is also reminiscent of *you say* confirmation-seeking noted by Steensig and Larsen (2008) as it is based on the suspect's statement in one of the previous turns that he can paint. The assumption of the suspect's awareness (line 17, extract 2.13) is then based on the fact that it is common knowledge that painters are well paid. In extract 2.14 Dt1 via the *non-li* interrogative conveys that he assumes the suspect must be aware of the fact that

he committed financial fraud. In the case of extract 2.15, the detective seeks confirmation of his assumption that the suspect has the skill of removing copper from the transformers, based on the background knowledge about the suspect (the suspect being a worker in the factory which was subject to theft).

And one can also note that the interlocutor's responses to the *non-li* interrogatives are prevailingly confirmations achieved by verb repeats: in extract 2.13, lines 15 and 19; in extract 2.14 the suspect avoids the verb repeat, as by confirming his own awareness of the fraud, he would implicate himself in the crime. In extract 2.15, although the suspect responds negatively, there is a verb repeat and the suspect complies with the activity performed by the preceding turn. The fact that in most cases examined in this section the detectives did get an affirmative response may suggest that speakers would make assessments of others' knowledge only when they have safe grounds for doing it.

#### **4.4 Presequences claiming superior knowledge**

So far I have looked at two interrogative formats: the *li* form and the same interrogative form from which the clitic *li* has been omitted. The *li* interrogative form seems to be the most open form of question, claiming no knowledge and seeking information, but as previously noted, it is not necessarily perceived as not being damaging. The *non-li* interrogative, on the other hand, is claiming some knowledge, in so far as it is offering this to be confirmed by the recipient. In this section, I am moving onto another variant of *li* interrogative, in which epistemic claims are even greater.

This third interrogative format is also characterized by an absence of the interrogative particle *li*, but differs from the pure truncated version by a post-verbal placement, usually stressed, of the second person singular personal pronoun *ti* (you). This gives these utterances a more interrogative-like form, as the position of *ti* in statements is pre-verbal and post-verbal placement creates an inversion, one of the devices for signalling interrogative form. Function-wise, these forms also differ from the previously-discussed forms and their sequential development is quite unique. Whereas *li* interrogatives function mainly as information-seeking forms and *non-li* ones as confirmation-seeking,

*non-li + ti* interrogatives function as presequences. This means that they are not vehicles for the main activity of the sequence, but they prepare the ground for the main activity to come. In this way, they resemble the phenomenon observed by Schegloff (1988). Schegloff notes that interrogatives of the type ‘do you know who’s going to that meeting’ are normally not interpreted by the recipients as information-seeking, even when intended by the speaker to be such. Instead, recipients usually understand them as pre-announcements or pre-tellings, and that their role is to forward (or block) the sequence into their core action by an appropriate response. *Znaš ti* interrogatives exhibit a sequential development similar to *do you know* presequences singled out by Schegloff (1988), but for the fact that both the speaker and the listener understand these forms as preliminaries.

The turn I am focusing on in extract 2.16 is the one in lines 10-11 ‘zna:>š ↓ti OVOG< MiLI:ća; #ovo:g# >što ima< kuću.’ – ‘do you know this Milic, this one who has the house’. Note the absence of the interrogative particle *li*, and the post-verbal placement of the stressed pronoun *ti* (you).

Extract 2.16 is taken from an interview with a man suspected of committing multiple petty thefts. He would then resell the various objects he stole. The detectives are here trying to get the suspect’s confession for the thefts he committed both alone and in cooperation with others.

#### Extract 2.16

##### *Pots\_the\_s\_inf\_2008*

01 Dt1: >a ti niJESI bio sa nji:m tad<kad je ova:j( )  
>and you nOT aux.were with hi:m then<when aux. thi:s( )  
*and you weren’t with him when this one-*

02 ((click))  
03 (0.4)

04 Dt1: >on je izja↑vio< da si bio?=  
>he aux. decla↑red< that aux.(you)were?=  
*he gave a statement that you were*

05 Sus: =pa je- ZNA:m. pa juče sam ja: dao izjavu,

=well ye-(I)KNO:w. well yesterday aux.I:gave statement,  
*well ye- I know, well, I gave a statement yesterday*

06           da   nije:sam   bio.  
 that not(I)aux. was.  
*that I wasn't there*

07           (0.3)

08           niJE:sam.  
 noT:(I)aux.  
 I wasn't

09           (6.4) ((background talk))

10	Dt1:	zna:>š ↓ti OVOG< MiLI:ćaz- #ovo:g# >što ima< kno:>w ↓you THIS< MiLI:c.č- #tha:t# >what has< <i>do you know this Milic, this one who has</i>
----	------	---

11		ku[ću. ] ho[use. ] <i>the house</i>
----	--	---

12   Sus:           [   sn]a:m oVA:ko:,  
 [(I)kn]o:w lI:KE this:.,  
*I know who he is*

13           (0.2)

14           s:- dolaS:i   kod mo:g stri:ca pon-baš       TA:J ↑DA:n,  
 u:-(he)coM:es by m:y un:cle som-exactly THA:T ↑DA:y,  
*he comes to my uncle's, exactly that day*

15           .hhh>sam ga   VIDIo,<(.)kod MO:g stRI:ca,  
 .hhh>aux.him(I)SAw,<(.)by My: uN:cle,  
*I saw him at my uncle's,*

16           i   on[veli:, ]  
 and he[says:, ]  
*and he says*

17   Dt1:           [koJI da]:n.  
                   [whICH da]:y.  
                   *which day?*

18           (0.2)

19   Sus:           pRIJe: (0.1) možda, >mjesec< DA:na: (.) °#tako#°  
 bEFORe:(0.1) maybe, >mont < DA:ys: (.) °#like that#°  
*maybe a month ago, something like that*

20           (.)ono, (0.1)>pošto mi<-(0.1)BRA:t       >mi je žiVIo<  
 (.)that, (0.1)>since my<-(0.1)BROTHe:r >me aux.liVEd<  
*since my brother lived*

21           kod nje°ga°.=



- by h°im°.=  
at his place
- 22 Dt1: =do:bro?  
=go:od?  
good
- 23 Sus: i on doŠo: s nji:m nešto da >porazgovaraju<,  
and he caMe:with hi:m something that>(they)talk<,  
and he came to talk to him about something,
- 24 #ta ja:zna:(m)#,.hh i piTA me da ne ZNA:Š,  
#what I:kno:(w)#,.hh and(he)asKS me that not(you)KNO:w,  
what do I know, and he asks me would you know
- 25 ko >mi je Obio< kuću.  
who >me aux. Broke< house.  
who broke into my house?
- 26 (0.2)
- 27 °ja° veli:m, Šta MEne PI:ta:š,(.)neMA: PRA:va,  
°I ° sa:y, what ME(you)AS:k, (.)nOT:(he)HAS RI:ght,  
I say why do you ask me? no one has right
- 28 >da me pi:ta< niko. (0.1)>on veli<, PA NE ka:že:m ja:  
>to me a:sk< no one.(0.1)>he says<, WELL NOT sa:y I:  
to ask me that. he says, well, I don't say
- 29 da si TI:., (.)>nego da NIje ko< O TI:h  
that are YOU:., (.)>but that NOT is who< OF THE:se  
that it is you, but could it be some
- 30 TVOji:h drugo:va.(0.3)>°h ja ighh° < ne zNA:m  
YOU:r frie:nds. (0.3)>°h I themhh°<not(I)kNO:w  
of your friends I don't know them
- 31 VaLE, ne dru:ži:m se ni s KI:m, zNA:Š i  
VaLE, not(I)ha:ng out refl.nor with A:ny,(you)kNO:w too  
Vale, I am not friends with anybody, you know
- 32 sa:m >da ti NIkad tamo< NIjesam do:ša:..  
al:one >that you NEver there< Not aux.(I) ca:me:..  
yourself that I never came there
- 33 (4.9)
- 34 Sus: Š[:ta ja znam (to) ]  
w[:what I know(that) ]  
What do I know?
- 35 Dt1: [>a on o:đe kaže,]da si ti prodo te  
[>and he he:re says,]that aux. you sold those  
and he says here that you sold some of those

36 n-njegove neke< stva:ri, i to po:suđe,=  
s-his some< thi:ngs, and those di:shes,=  
*things of his, those dishes*

37 Sus: =VA:le >reko[jelǰ< ]  
=VA:le >said[is itǰ<]  
*Vale said that, right?*

38 Dt1: [e ]  
[yes ]  
*yes*  
(.)

39 Sus: to je POSuđe i:z Tifija.>e< >ODma da vam<  
that is DIShes fro:m Tifi.>well< >IMMEdiately that you<  
*those dishes are from Tifi, to tell you straightaway*

40 °ka:že:m. što sam uzo,°  
°(I)sa:y. what aux(I)took,°  
*that I took*

In lines 1-9 the suspect and Dt1 are rounding up the previous agenda item, which is determining the suspect's connection to another perpetrator and his involvement in the alleged joint-theft. In line 09 there is a (6.4) pause, which boundaries off the previous 'joint-theft' topic and a new item. In line 10 Dt1 initiates a new topic with 'zna:š ti OVOG< MiLI:ćaǰ' - Dt1 inquires about Milic, a party who had reported that his house was broken into and thus initiates the topic of 'house theft'. As can be noted, the 'znaš ti' form, similarly to *li* interrogatives, occurs at the beginning of a new sequence and in the package with the position it occupies, it initiates a new topic. However, there is an important difference in the sequential development that these two forms put forward: while *li* forms introduce the topic and immediately state the business of the turn, i.e. information-seeking, *non-li+ti* forms do a different kind of work. First of all, as the *non-li+ti* form does not contain the clitic *li*, it indicates that it is not asking for information. In the sense of epistemics, it automatically loses the 'not knowing' aspect, and is open to presuppositions. Paired up with a personal pronoun *ti*, the *non-li* format gets a special epistemic weight, so that it is able to hint that there is another project on the way, but it is not until later in the sequence that this project is done.

It is interesting to see how the *non-li+ti* form in the above example is treated by the suspect. By applying this form, the detective seems to be asking for a confirmation of a

connection between the suspect and the damaged party Milic. The form the detective supplies here (no *li* and second person singular personal pronoun *ti*) signals that the detective already knows something about the matter, which is evidenced further by lines 35-36. It is thereby revealed that not only does the detective know that the suspect and Milic are familiar with each other, but also that Milic has given a statement that the suspect had sold some of his belongings. The demonstrative 'ovog', meaning 'this one' in line 10 indicates that there has been some prior talk about the individual. However, the repair Dt1 makes in the same turn from 'zna:>š ↓ti OVOG< MiLI:ćaž-' - 'do you know this Milic?', into '#ovo:g# >što ima< kuću.' - 'this one who has the house', implies that there is a possibility that a first name reference would not be enough for the suspect to identify Milic, and that the suspect may not know Milic after all. This may be done strategically, but this creates an epistemic mismatch claimed by the *non-li+ti* form and the repair in line 10. Either way, the suspect understands this detective's turn as a preliminary to some other business and this proves to be the right kind of interpretation. As one can note, the detective confronts the suspect with the damaged party's statement in lines 35-36, the question from lines 10-11 is a preliminary to this. Foreseeing that there is some kind of project behind the 'do you know this Milic?', the suspect first answers this and qualifies knowing the selected individual 'onako' - 'like that', which accounts for their relationship as superficial and knowing each other only 'by sight'. By doing this, the suspect is already gearing up for his defence. Then, from line 14 on he does the defensive work, explaining his relationship with the damaged party and denying his involvement in the theft (lines 14-16, 19-21, 23-34).

Comparing the response to 'zna:>š ↓ti OVOG< MiLI:ćaž', 'ZNAŠ li MiLI:ćaž' (extract 2.10, line 16) and 'ZNA:š PEtka Binića.' (extract 2.11, line 26) one can note that although these three utterances, at first glance, seem to be expressing the same content, i.e. asking about the familiarity with a person, each of them is responded to in a different manner. 'zna:>š ↓ti OVOG< MiLI:ćaž-' gets a much more elaborate response (note for instance that the response to 'ZNA:š PEtka Binića.' is simply 'zna:m' ), which reveals the suspect's defensiveness and resistance towards the

detective's anticipated project. In spite of this blocking work, the detective still delivers the already set main action - he reveals a part of the statement given by the damaged party, thus confronting the suspect with the other party's version of the event. By using the record, the detective contests the suspect's denied participation in the crime, and attempts to incriminate him.

The question is how these forms get to be heard as presequences and as announcing the main business to come? The personal pronoun *ti* gives a special epistemic value to these utterances. *Ti* seems to be creating an epistemic contrast between the speaker and the addressee, in the case of extract 2.16, there is a claimed contrast between Dt2's and the suspect's knowledge. By applying the *znaš ti* form, Dt2 inquires about the suspect's acquaintance with Milic, but also claims to possess himself certain knowledge about the mentioned party and more information about the case Milic had reported. The source of knowledge (Pomerantz, 1984a) is not stated overtly, but is presupposed by the speaker and drawn inferentially by the listener. This might be based on the fact that detectives gain knowledge while doing the background investigation. The detective's professional identity is thus invoked (Raymond and Heritage, 2006) and he claims more right to knowledge (Heritage and Raymond, 2005) and epistemic authority over the questioned party.

This type of interrogative, which claims the epistemic authority of the questioner, can be an effective device for putting pressure onto the questioned party. As such, the epistemically dominant *znaš ti* may be securing a truthful answer. In this case, it could be a device which forces the suspect to confirm his connection with Milic (provided in line 12). *Znaš ti* interrogatives can, therefore, be seen as 'loaded questions' or utterances produced with an aim of accomplishing a specific action.

Extract 2.17 features a similar example to the one previously discussed. It is the turn in line 17 I am focusing on here – 'a >ZNAŠ ti< šTA šmrčeš.' – 'and do you know what you sniff' of the same V + 2<sup>nd</sup> person singular pronoun format as the example in lines 10-11, extract 2.16.

Extract 2.17 is taken from an interview with a person who has admitted having committed theft in the neighbourhood. The questioned party is also a drug user, and the topic of conversation in extract 2.17 is his drug abuse. The interview is the ‘official’ one, and the written record is being composed along with the questioning.

### Extract 2.17

#### *Euros\_the\_s\_off\_2008*

01 (1.2) ((door squeaking + music + typing))

02 Dt1: [a >ČUješ ovo<, je:si li:-]  
[and >LIsten this,< a:re(you)qp.-]  
03 [((typing)) ]  
*Listen to this, are you*

04 (0.1) ((buzz))

05 Dt1: [jesi li NA I:glu? =ili šmrčeš. ]  
[are(you) qp. ON NE:edle?=or (you)sniff.]  
06 [((buzz)) ((rattling)) ]  
*are you on needle or you sniff?*

07 (.)

08 Sus: [šmrčem ]  
[(I)sniff ]  
09 [((rattle))]  
*I sniff*

10 (.)

11	Dt1:	a >ZNAš <u>ti</u> < šta šmrčeš. and >KNOW <u>you</u> < WHAT (you)sniff. <i>and do you know what you sniff?</i>
----	------	--

12 (0.5)

13 Dt1: >a to ti sVE IZlazi < od toga. =>budi SIguran<.  
>but that you aLL COMEs out< from that.=>be SURE<.  
*but, you get all that you get from it, be sure*

14 =ZNA<sup>m</sup> ja:>dosta ovi (ljudi)<  
=KNOW I: >lot of these (people)<  
*I know a lot of these (people)*

15 (.)

16 SVA>šta vam< STAVljaju [čovječe, ]  
EVER>ything you< (they)Put [man, ]

[ ((typing)) ]  
*they give you all kinds of stuff, man*

In line 02 Dt1 starts his turn with – ‘a >čUješ ovo<,’ – ‘listen to this’, where both the disjunctive ‘a’ and ‘>čUješ ovo<,’ indicate an initiation of a new topic. By using these tokens, the detective also draws the suspect’s attention to some possibly delicate topic which is to follow. The delicateness of the issue is also reflected in the repair in line 01 ‘jesi li:-’, especially the stretched *li* and (0.1) pause which follows it. The detective finally packages his turn in line 05 into an alternative *li* question, indicating information-seeking, but at the same time leaving the suspect to choose between the two options ‘sniffing’ and ‘needle’. In line 08, the suspect opts for the ‘sniffing’ option.

Then, in line 11 the detective issues a *znaš ti* form. In comparison to the *znaš ti* example in extract 2.16, this turn is not completely topically disconnected from the previous information-seeking sequence: it is and-prefaced and linked to the prior talk. However, in line 11 there are disjunction markers that indicate a slight independence from the previous turn. Dt1 starts the turn with ‘a’ marker, which usually indicates disjunction from the previous talk and initiation of a new issue. At the same time Matsumoto (1999, p. 254) claims that: ‘it is through the use of *and* that linkage, continuation, and coherence between the successive questions are achieved’. Although the topic is not completely different, and the interlocutors are still focusing on drugs and the suspect’s drug abuse, there is a slight shift in the action performed by Dt1. Whereas in lines 02-09 the detective was eliciting information, the turns in lines 11-17 are doing something different - reproaching and informing the interlocutor. The function of ‘*znaš ti*’ turn in line 10 must then be seen as heralding and forwarding the action to come, which in the case is encouraging the suspect not to take drugs any more.

In this extract too, the *znaš ti* format indicates Dt1’s epistemic authority over the suspect. *Ti*, meaning *you* stands in contrast with an unspoken *I*, the contrast implying a greater insight into the topic on the part of the questioner. By using the *znaš ti* form, Dt1

here claims that he knows better than the suspect himself what kind of substance the suspect uses. This claimed imbalance of knowledge, and claimed epistemic superiority of the detective is also revealed in the absence of a reply and no attempt to reply on the part of the suspect. The *znaš ti* interrogative, in this case, represents what Quirk et al. (1985) call rhetorical questions; although there is a (0.5) gap in line 12, a slot for the suspect's possible response, there is no attempt on the part of the suspect to reply. After a (0.5) pause in line 12, in which, technically, the suspect may have started responding, Dt1 starts a new turn and reveals his knowledge: the drugs the suspect is taking cause health problems, and from his own experience (working in the police) the detective knows that 'they', possibly meaning the drug dealers, sell impure substances to the users. Why this example, unlike the example in extract 2.16, comes to be understood by the interlocutor as a rhetorical question is another matter that is worth looking into. What matters here is that *znaš ti* form in extract 2.17 develops sequentially in a similar way as the example in extract 2.16. In both cases the *znaš ti* turn has the role of being a preliminary. Both examples function as 'questions' with a purpose; also, they both claim epistemic authority on the part of the speaker, and on the basis of this, they announce that there is some more activity to follow. Some differences emerge only in the development of the core activity. Whereas in extract 2.16 the detective tries incriminating the suspect following the suspect's confirmation, in extract 2.17 the main activity of the sequence develops in a different direction. By claiming his superior knowledge in line 11, Dt1 announces another action to follow, which is also the main activity in the sequence. Following this preliminary, Dt1 displays his knowledge (lines 13-17) and at the same time performs the main activity, i.e. informing the suspect and through it warning/reproaching him.

Below is a set of other three occurrences of *znaš ti* interrogatives. Extract 2.18 is taken from an interview with a guard, a suspect in a factory theft. The *non-li ti* form in this extract occurs in lines 04-05.

Extract 2.18

*Medo\_fthe\_s\_inf\_2008*

01 Sus: za sva:[ko:ga: gra:đa:na, tamo: ]  
 for eve:[ry: ci:ti:zen, there: ]  
*for each citizen there*

02 Dt4: [da te pitamo samo- samo da-]da-  
 [that you(we)ask only- only that-]that-  
*let us ask you only- only that-*

03 da >skraćujemo priču<da [da da bi - ]  
 that>(we)cut story<that[that that would-]  
*let us cut the story short in order to-*

04 Dt2:	[ZNAŠ <u>ti</u> : ONO:g ]BI>nića [KNOW <u>you</u> : THA:t ]BI>nic <i>do you know that Binic</i>
---------	---

05	TAmo što živi: <, nedaleko od ha:leḡ THere what lives:<, not far away of wo:rkshopḡ <i>there who lives not too far away from the workshop?</i>
----	--

06 (1.2)

07 Sus: °Bi°:NIća?  
 Binic?

08 Dt2: e:ḡ  
 yes:ḡ  
 yes

09 (0.6)

10 Sus: °ja da zna:m, >tamo ga< ne:ma°.  
 °I that kno:w, >there him< no:t is.°  
*As far as I know there is no such person there*

*(51 lines omitted)*

62 Sus: ne  
 no  
 no

63 (.)

64 Dt4: s pu:ta >nema malo<  
 from ro:ad >not has little<  
*just a little away from the road*

65 (0.2)

66 Sus: ma ne ja: bo[ go ]mi lju:di,  
 well not I: Go[d ]me pe:ople,  
 67 [(thum)]  
*well people, I don't for sure*

In extract 2.19 the detectives question another suspect in the mentioned factory case. In this extract, one can trace the *non-li ti* form in lines 06-07.



## Extract 2.19

### *Pots\_the\_s\_inf\_2008*

- 01 (0.2)  
02 ((click))
- 03 Dt3: pomisLI:Š li ti: ponekad<,  
thiN:K qp. you: sometimes<,  
*does it ever occur to you*
- 04 (0.3) ((clicking))
- 05 ka[:d nekom nešto- ]  
wh[:en someone something-]  
*when someone something-*
- |         |   |
|---------|---|
| 06 Dt1: | [NAš <sup>17</sup> ti >kolko T]O: vrije:di:<? taj-<br>[KNOW you >how much T]HAT: wo:rths:<?that(m.)<br><i>do you know the worth</i> |
|---------|---|
- |    |   |
|----|---|
| 07 | ta- to:. (0.2)>što si< ti: ISkido.<br>that(f.)-that:(n.)(0.2)>what aux.< you: Cut.<br><i>of that- what you cut to pieces?</i> |
|----|---|
- 08 (0.5)
- 09 Dt1: ON Je priJAVio >to da je< ILJAdu Evra:.-  
HE aux. repORted >that that is< THOUsand of Euros:.-  
*he reported that it is a thousand of Euros-*
- 10 KOŠta.  
COSts.  
*it costs*
- 11 (0.1)
- 12 Sus: ahh nemohhgu:ĆE vala:.,=  
wellhh impohhssi:BLE really:.,=  
*well, it's impossible really*
- 13 Dt1: =mogu:ĆE BOga mi,  
=p<sub>o</sub>ssi:BLE GOd me,  
*It's possible by God*

Extract 2.20 comes from an interview with a drug addict who has admitted to a series of petty thefts. In this extract, the targeted *non-li ti* format occurs in lines 05-06.

## Extract 2.20

*Guard ftthe\_s\_inf\_2008*

- 01 Dt2: >znači< čuo,- mož da čuješ AUto  
>means< heard, (you)can to hear CAR  
*It means you heard-you can hear a car*
- 02 [ka stane:, ]  
[when(it)stops:,]  
*when (it)stops*
- 03 Sus: [ne NA pu:t ]TAmo ili neđe nešto, i °tako°  
[not ON ro:ad ]THEre or somewhere something, and °so°  
*Not on the road there or something like that*
- 04 (3.0) ((pen clicking)) ((distant traffic noise))
- |  |
|--|
| 05 Dt2: a reci mi, zNAŠ <u>ti</u> đe >se nalaze,< <u>ti</u><br>and tell me, KNOW <u>you</u> where>are situated,< <u>those</u><br><i>And tell me, do you know where those</i> |
|--|
- |   |
|---|
| 06 transformatori?<br>transformers?<br><i>transformers are?</i> |
|---|
- 07 (0.8)
- 08 Sus: to su bili, u HA:lu. ti..  
those aux. were, in WO:rkshop. those..  
*They were in the workshop, those ones*
- 09 (0.3)
- 10 Dt2: jesi [znao>đe se< NAlaze, ] u[hali . ]  
aux(you)[knew>where refl.<SItuated,]in[workshop.]  
*did you know where they were in the workshop?*
- 11 Sus: [(ne znam ja: )] [DA >da ]da<  
[(not know I: )] [YES >yes ]yes<  
*I don't know yes yes yes*
- 12 Dt2: a ima:te ↑li (0.6)običaj da provjeravate>jesu li <  
and ha:ve(you)↑qp.(0.6)habit to check >are qp.<  
*And do you tend to check if*
- 13 VRAta zaključana od hale;  
DOOrs locked from workshop;  
*the workshop door is locked*

Each of the above examples of *znaš ti* interrogatives (extracts 2.18-2.20) exhibit some similarities to the features of the examples already examined (extracts 2.16 and 2.17). First of all, they are all in sequence initial position, they either introduce a new topic or indicate some kind of shift in the action they are forwarding. In the example from

extract 2.18, lines 04-05, Dt2 cuts into Dt4's turn and introduces into the talk a person who might in certain ways be connected to the crime; similar to this case, in extract 2.19, lines 06-07, Dt1 overlaps with a part of Dt3's turn in order to introduce the topic of the value of the stolen goods. In extract 2.20, shift in the topic occurs after a (3.0) silence in line 04, which boundaries off the previous topic of 'hearing span' from the topic to follow. In line 05 the detective introduces the new topic inquiring about the transformers' location.

Each of the examples has an inflected verb *to know* + 2<sup>nd</sup> person singular pronoun format, which gives these turns similar pragmatic presuppositions. As I have already said, this combination stresses an epistemic superiority of the speaker, so that in extract 2.18, for example, by applying the *znaš ti* form, the detective is claiming closer acquaintance with the individual named Binic. The epistemic superiority is further strengthened by the demonstrative 'onog', meaning 'that one' in the same turn. The example in extract 2.19 is quite similar to the 'rhetorical question' in extract 2.17: the claim of the detective's knowledge about the value of stolen goods conveyed by the *znaš ti* form becomes so strong, that there is no response on the part of the interlocutor. In extract 2.20, respectively, there is a claim of epistemic authority on the part of the detective, although clearly strategic, as the detective cannot know much about the location of the stolen goods he is inquiring about.

Each of the utterances signals that the speaker has got more to say, and is understood by the interlocutors as a preliminary. The main activity, then, takes place further down the sequence. In extract 2.18, confirmation is required on the part of the interviewee, so that the main activity can be forwarded. However, as no confirmation is received straightaway, the detectives prolong the questioning for 51 consecutive turns, trying to get the confirmation necessary for the main action to take place. Finally, as there is still no confirmation by the line 66, the project gets to be dropped. In extract 2.19, the 'rhetorical question' in lines 06-07 requires no response from the interviewee and it on its own announces another action. After a (0.5) pause, during which the suspect could have responded, the detective informs the suspect what the real value of the stolen goods

is, and, by displaying knowledge, performs the main activity in the sequence: informing and reproaching the suspect. The example in extract 2.20 is quite extraordinary. There is an unfitted use of the present tense ‘do you know where those transformers are?’ which could be understood as whether the suspect knows where the stolen goods are currently stored. That is why when the suspect makes other initiated repair in line 08, he applies the past tense to clarify he used to know where the transformers were placed before the theft. In line 10, the detective corrects himself applying the right form in order to clarify the situation.

In this section, I have outlined a variant of *li* interrogative from which the clitic *li* is deleted and which contains a second person singular pronoun *ti*, which gives this form a particular meaning. I focused on the distinction between the use of this variant and the other two variants of the yes/no interrogative, outlined in the previous two sections.

#### **4.5 Conclusion**

In this chapter, I have examined different forms of ‘do you know’ interrogatives which are an important type of ‘question’ in police interrogation settings. I have considered polar interrogatives from my data set, which contain the verb *to know*, and whose format involves presence/absence of the interrogative particle *li*, and the presence/absence of the second person singular pronoun *ti*, the use of which can be optional as in Serbo-Croatian the person is obligatorily marked via verbal morphology. At a first glance, these different forms of ‘do you know’ interrogatives seem to be just enquiries about the interlocutor’s knowledge, but looking closely at their sequential positioning and development, it becomes clear that each form performs a specific action.

Serbo-Croatian grammarians usually state that yes/no interrogatives are constructed by the insertion of the clitic *li* into a declarative or by fronting the declarative with the fusion of the particles *da li* (see Mrazović and Vukadinović, 1993; Klajn, 2005). These grammar books do not mention the possibility of the clitic *li* being omitted nor any difference in meaning which the presence/absence of the second person personal pronoun brings in. My data set suggests that, in actual interaction, three additional

variants of the *li* interrogative are extensively used. Thus, one can ask a ‘do you know question’ by using: 1) an interrogative containing the interrogative particle *li*; 2) the same interrogative without the particle *li*; 3) an interrogative without the *li*, but paired up with a second person singular personal pronoun *ti* and 4) an interrogative containing both the particle *li* and the personal pronoun *ti* (not examined here due to their low occurrence in my data set).

Each of the four forms is characterized by a specific set of interactional features and each form is then utilized by the speakers as a vehicle for a specific action. While *li* interrogatives tend to introduce new topics and ask for information, *non-li* interrogatives link back to the previously initiated topic and do the activity of asking for confirmation. *Non-li* + personal pronoun *ti* interrogatives can also be topic initial, but they act as presequences and they announce the main activity, which gets to be realized further into the sequence.

These formats also differ by the epistemic positions of the speaker they incorporate (see Raymond, 2009). While on the surface they seem to be just asking about the interlocutor’s knowledge as they contain a verb *to know*, when using these forms speakers constantly express their stance about own and interlocutor’s epistemic positions. By means of the information-seeking *li* form the speaker necessarily claims he/she is in K- position, but then, although the form itself doesn’t claim anything about the interlocutor’s knowledge, the very fact it is directed to him/her, would put the interlocutor in K+ position. Since *li* is absent from a *non-li* interrogative, this removes the K- component from this form, and by using it the speaker claims to possess a certain insight into the matter inquired about. This is also achieved by the fact that this form very much resembles declarative form, and by means of this, it incorporates an expectation for a confirmative response of the speaker’s presumption. *Non-li* + *ti* interrogatives create an effect of speaker’s epistemic authority: while asking about the listener’s knowledge, they claim knowledge on the part of the speaker and by means of this epistemic contrast they get to be conducive. The epistemic authority is created by

the absence of *li* which claims K- position, and the contrast created between the personal pronoun *ti* and the unspoken *ja* (I).

The epistemics of a single turn can be further complicated by other elements incorporated into it, one of them being the verb *to know*. By incorporating this verb into a *li* interrogative, for instance, a special effect is achieved. While *li* claims speaker's K-position, the 'do you know' component builds a presupposition about the interlocutor's knowledge, it has a mitigating effect and claims that there is a possibility the interlocutor might not know. Other possible indicators of epistemic stance/status are demonstratives used to mark definiteness, sequential proximity, lack/ presence of knowledge.

What becomes clear by examining the 'do you know questions' is that questioning is a complex phenomenon which involves a number of different activities, very few of which are truly information-seeking. Additionally, expressing views about own and other's knowledge plays a very important role in carrying out these different activities. As Heritage (in press b) states there is an epistemic engine which contributes to sequence organization, apart from the one centred around adjacency pairs. And one could see that different epistemic values of the 'do you know' interrogatives in this chapter contribute to the formation of actions performed by these forms.

**CHAPTER FIVE**

**REPEATING AS A WAY OF CHALLENGING AND EXPRESSING  
SCEPTICISM**

## 5.1 Introduction

This chapter deals with an interactional practice which occurs with some regularity in the police interviews with suspects. The practice is realized through the linguistic device of repetition; more precisely, it is a repetition by the questioning officer of the response provided by the questioned party. The way this phenomenon works is that the detective asks a question, the suspect answers, but as the detective finds this answer unsatisfactory in certain way, he repeats a part or the whole of the received answer in order to challenge it and potentially have the suspect review it.

In the example to follow one can trace the basic features of the phenomenon. Extract 3.1 below is taken from a factory theft interview. Some expensive parts went missing from a factory and the detectives are questioning different factory workers as they believe that some of them might be involved.

### Extract 3.1

#### *Suspect\_fthe\_s\_inf\_2008*

- 01 Dt1: iMAŠ i BRAta >da ti<RAđi ta[mo. ]  
hAVE(you)qp. BROther>that you<WORKs th[ere. ]  
*Do you have a brother who works there?*
- 02 Sus: [°imam ]>imam°<  
[°(I)have]>(I)have°<  
*I have, I have°*
- 03 (0.1)
- 04 Dt1: IMA:š jel?  
(you)HA:ve is it?  
*You have, have you?*
- 05 (0.2)
- 06 >kako z<OVEđ  
>how (he) c<ALLSđ  
*What is his name?*
- 07 (.)
- 08 Sus: Dra°gan°



09 (1.0) ((buzzing))

10 Dt1: ra>DI L <On.  
wo>RKS qp.<He.  
*Does he work?*

11 (0.3) ((buzzing))

12 Sus: >sad je NA Odmor<,  
>now (he)is ON HOLIDAY<,  
*He is on holiday now*

13 (0.7) ((buzz))

14 Dt1: >NA Odmor je<. >ON Holiday(he)is<. <i>He is on holiday?</i>
---

15 (3.6) ((buzzing))

16 Dt1: što je ↑piTA: On da- da napušti posaj  
why aux. ↑askED: He that- that (he)quits jobj  
*Why did he ask about quitting the job?*

The detectives are here questioning the suspect, a mechanic in the factory, about his brother who works in the same factory in which the theft took place. There are two instances of repeats in this extract (lines 04 and 14), and the suspect does not get to respond to either of these. Because the repeat in line 04 has a tag 'jel' - 'is it', I will focus on the repeat in line 14 which is simple and more straightforward in form.

Although the detectives are familiar with the fact that the suspect has a brother and that the brother works in the same factory as the suspect (this gets to be revealed in line 16 when Dt1 asks '*Why did he ask about quitting the job?*') they still question the suspect as if they do not have any of the information. After the suspect confirms he has got a brother in line 02, Dt1 produces a repeat of his answer 'IMAš jel?' - '*you have, is it?*' which already signals that the 'brother topic' will be given a special treatment. Then, following a (0.2) pause in line 05, Dt1 moves on to the name of the brother, and in line 10 he inquires if the suspect's brother works. In line 12 the suspect responds with '>NA Odmor je<' - '*he is on holiday now*'. One can note that this response is non-elliptical in form, which indicates that the suspect has analyzed the detective's prior turn as some kind of trouble. Following this indication of trouble, the

detective produces a repeat *'he is on holiday?'* in line 14 which, as one can note, is quite simple - the *'now'* is omitted from the original suspect's turn and the auxiliary *'je'* is postpositioned. Following the repeat, the detective leaves a space of (3.6) for the suspect to respond, but as the suspect does not find that a response is a relevant next, the detective pursues questioning. One can note that position-wise, the repeat from line 14 occurs in the third turn slot, after the detective has received an answer to his 'question' in the first position. By doing the repeat, Dt1 indicates that he has considered the received answer and has found it in some ways unacceptable. In line 16 Dt1 displays more explicitly why he has found the response to be unacceptable - the suspect has not mentioned the fact that the brother wants to quit his job (which is already familiar to Dt1), the dissembling of which might be an indication of the brother's culpability.

Having in mind the above given example, one can represent the basic repeat sequence in the following way:

Dt: question Sus: answer Dt: partial/full repeat of the suspect's answer
--

More precisely, the first speaker asks a 'question' (an interrogative or any other form that requires an 'answer' as a second pair part). The second speaker provides an answer as an appropriate SPP. In third position, then, the first speaker does some kind of repetition of the received answer.

Next to this basic repeat format, there are instances in which after repeating or partially repeating the suspect's answer, the detective produces some additional material in the same turn. The repeat in extract 3.2, line 07 is a case in point.

### Extract 3.2

*Guard\_fthe\_s\_off\_2008*

01 Dt1: phhhh niti je bilo što sumljivo. kami ↓ni:je

phhhh nor aux. was what suspicious. like me ↓n:o  
*Nor was there anything suspicious, yeah right*

02 (0.4)

03 Sus: a okle sam zNA:? ko je zNA:?  
 and from where aux.(I)kNEW:? who aux.kNEW:?  
*And how could I know? who knew?*

04 (0.8) ((thum thum))

05 Sus: °pi:zdu im materina°  
 °((swears))°

06 (1.0)

07 Dt1:	[KO je znaž ](0.1)↓znali ste VI: Bogo mi
08	[WHO aux.knewž](0.1)↓knew aux.YOU: God me [((writing)) ] <i>Who knew, you knew for sure.</i>

Extract 3.2 is taken from an interview with another suspect in the previously mentioned factory theft case. In line 01 the detective accuses the suspect, a security guard in the factory, that he knew something about the organization of the theft before the theft took place. The detective does the accusation in an indirect way, by '*Nor was there anything suspicious, yeah right*', implying that something must have been suspicious. The suspect too defends himself in an indirect way, by a double interrogative construction '*And how could I know? who knew?*' in line 03, followed by some swearing in line 05. In line 07 Dt1 does a partial repeat of the suspect's answer in line 03 - '*Who knew?*' and then he adds a new element '*you knew for sure*'. The repeat and the appended element together reinstate the accusation, previously made in line 01.

That repeats can either be produced on their own or with a supplementary is supported by the fact that the repeat and the supplementary can be produced collaboratively by the two questioning detectives. This means that the first detective produces a repeat and considers it sufficient, whereas the second detective produces the additional material. This technique is exemplified by extract 3.3 below, lines 11, 13 and 14.

### Extract 3.3

#### *Suspect\_fthe\_s\_inf\_2008*

- 01 Sus: j:es neko, JA bi >vol- znači,< JA: bi  
y:es somebody,I would >lo- znači,< I: would  
*Somebody did, I would li- so, I would*
- 02 prvi volio da se >uvati: >ko je i  
first love to refl.>catch: >who is and  
*first like it to be found out who this is and*
- 03 št[( )<  
wh[( )<  
wh-
- 04 Dt1: [pa ti SI JEDan-TI SI JEDan ↓o(d) tjih.=  
[well you ARE ONE-YOU ARE One ↓o(f) those.=  
*Well you are one of them*
- 05 Sus: =a- JAǰ  
=a- Iǰ  
I?
- 06 Dt1: TI.=  
YOU.=  
You
- 07 Sus: =>nijesam < KUNEm °ti se°.  
=>not aux. (I)<(I)SWEAr °you refl°.  
*I didn't I swear to you*
- 08 (0.5)
- 09 Sus: °>ja t se - ja-<°  
°>I you refl.- I-<°  
*I you- I*
- 10 (0.4)
- |         |   |
|---------|---|
| 11 Dt1: | NIJE:si kuNE:>m ti se.<=<br>NOT:(you)aux. (I)swEA:>r you refl.<=<br><i>You didn't I swear to you?</i> |
|---------|---|
- 12 Sus: =GLA:vu mi si[jeci(evo)]  
=HEA:d me(you)cu[t(here) ]  
*Cut my head off (if I was)*
- |         |  |
|---------|--|
| 13 Dt4: | [šta mis]liš ti, >da mi ne možemo<br>[what thi]nk you,>that we not can<br><i>What do you think, that we cannot</i> |
|---------|--|
- |    |                                       |
|----|---------------------------------------|
| 14 | ispitat,< NA PRI-<br>check, < ON COA- |
|----|---------------------------------------|

*check at the coast*

Extract 3.3 comes from another factory theft case. Prior to line 01 the detectives reveal a witness's statement about the suspect's involvement in the theft and they express their opinion that only people who were trained to dismantle the stolen machine parts could have done the theft. As the suspect is a mechanic in the factory, the statement targets him as a possible perpetrator. In line 04 Dt1 does a direct accusation, stating that the suspect is one of the participants in the theft. In line 05 the suspect uses a repeat-like technique to challenge the accusation, but in line 06 the detective confirms the accusation, so that in line 07 the suspect openly defends himself by '*I didn't I swear to you*'. In line 11 Dt1 challenges the suspect, by doing a full repeat of the suspect's answer, transposing the morphological ending in the first part of the repeat from '*I*' to '*you*'. In the rest of the repeat '*I swear to you*' the detective does a very peculiar thing, he does not transpose the pronoun, and this kind of shadowing of the suspect's answer creates an ironic effect. In line 12 the suspect comes in very quickly with a defensive '*Cut my head off (if I did)*'. One should note here that Dt1 considers a repeat a sufficient device for challenging the suspect's turn from line 07; the suspect perceives it the same way as he does not wait for more and he latches his defence onto the repeat. However, as the suspect starts answering, Dt4 comes in with another question '*What do you think, that we cannot check at the coast*' in lines 13-14, which looks like a supplementary to Dt1's repeat in line 11, although there is also a possibility that it is responsive to the suspect's resistance in line 12. This way or another, there is some evidence here that the challenging move in question can be done with a repeat on its own or with a repeat and a supplementary.

The interactional encounters used in this research include interviews with witnesses, damaged parties (for example a person reporting financial fraud), interviews with suspects who have admitted to their participation in a criminal activity and 'true interrogations' with parties suspected of having committed some crime, but who hold a position of innocence. Looking across these different types of interviews, what becomes evident is an asymmetric distribution of the repeat phenomenon. It, first of all, emerges that the technique is utilized primarily by the detectives. The interlocutors in the

‘subdued’ position, i.e. the suspects/ witnesses do not use it as often, and in those cases when they do use it, the technique serves to counter challenge the open accusations from the detectives.

Another observation is that the phenomenon occurs only in those interviews in the data set in which the questioned party is treated as a suspect. The technique does not occur in the interviews with those interlocutors who are treated only as witnesses, when citizens report a crime, nor in those cases in which the questioned party has admitted to their participation in a criminal activity. This uneven distribution strongly suggests that there is a contesting quality to this technique and that it is primarily used to facilitate some more dramatic activities, such as the activity of doubting. A similar undermining repeat practice can be found in trials, in cross-examinations of witnesses (see Drew, 1992, the case of a rape trial)<sup>18</sup>.

The rest of this chapter explores both the pattern that we find in these repeats and focuses in more detail on each stage within that pattern. So, what I am going to do is firstly describe the pattern of repeats in more detail (section 5.2), then I go on to explore more fully the character of the suspect’s initial responses, looking at the nature of the suspects’ responses targeted by repeats (section 5.3). I will then discuss the ways in which, by repeating what the suspect has said, the detective either challenges or at least implies some scepticism with the claims being made (section 5.4), and then, finally, I will look at how the suspect responds defensively to those repeats (section 5.5).

## **5.2 Repeats - sequence pattern**

There are two principal sequential patterns of repeats and to each of them there is a variation, represented as patterns 1(a), 1(b) , 2(a) and 2(b) below. This makes four communicational strategies that the speakers can follow.

Pattern 1(a):

Dt: ‘question’

Sus : answer

Dt: repeat of the suspect’s answer

Sus: response to the repeat

This pattern can be followed in the next example, taken from an interview with a factory security guard, one of the suspects in the factory theft case.

#### Extract 3.4

##### *Guard\_fthe\_s\_inf\_2008*

01 Dt3:        =a    šTA   ĆEmo        AKO POLigraf KAže də LAžeš.=  
              =and WHAT(we)SHall IF Polygraph SAYS that (you)LIE.=  
              *What shall we do if the polygraph shows that you're lying?*

02                =šTA Onda >da radimo< °s tobom°  
              =WHAT Then >to do     < °with you°  
              *What shall we do with you then?*

03                (.)

04 Sus:        °ne znam°  
              °not (I)know°  
              *I don't know*

05                (0.4)

06 Dt3:        NE Zna:šž=  
              NOT(you)Kno:wž=  
              *You don't know?*

07 Sus:        =okle >ja ne znam Bogomi šta ja ZNAM<,  
              =where>I not know by God what I KNOW<,  
              *How? I surely don't know, what do I know?*

In example 3.4 above, lines 01-02, Dt3 produces a 'question', which builds in an implication that there is a possibility that the suspect is not telling the truth. In line 04 the suspect answers, stating that he does not know what would happen if the polygraph shows that he is lying. Then, in line 06 Dt3 does a full repeat of the suspect's answer 'You don't know?' and in line 07 the suspect produces a defensive response, which contains an unanswerable challenging wh-interrogative (Koshik, 2003). Following line 07, Dt2 introduces a different technique aimed at proving the suspect's culpability.

Another example of pattern 1(a) is found in extract 3.5, taken from the same interview with the factory security guard.

### Extract 3.5

#### *Guard\_fthe\_s\_inf\_2008*

- 01 Dt2: od MAJStora s kim si dobar,  
of MECHANics with whom you're good,  
*Which mechanic are you friendly with*
- 02 s kim se dru:žiš, š kim  
with whom refl.(you)ha:ng out, with whom  
*with whom do you hang out, who do*
- 03 (0.4) se gle[DA:š ]  
(0.4) (you) se[E: ]  
*you meet?*
- 04 Dt3: [s BARA:nje si. >valjda se  
[from BARA:nja (you)are.>must refl  
*You are from Baranja, you must be*
- 05 družiš [s nekim< ]  
(you)socialize [with someone<]  
*friends with someone*
- |         |  |
|---------|--|
| 06 Sus: | [sa <u>SVA:</u> ]ki:m.<br>[with <u>EVERY:</u> ]o:ne.<br><i>With everyone</i> |
|---------|--|
- 07 nemam ja šta reć da: [( ) ]  
not have I what say that:[( ) ]  
*I don't have anything to say that-*
- 08 Dt3: [<SVA: ]kijem>  
[<EVE: ]ryone>  
*with everyone*
- 08 Dt2: [kojeg ]  
[which ]  
*Which one*
- 09 (.)
- 10 Sus: e:  
yes:  
*Yes*

In extract 3.5 the detectives are inquiring into the connection between the suspect and his colleagues. In line 01-03 Dt2 asks the suspect to name the workers in the factory he is particularly friendly with (question). The suspect, however, keeps avoiding naming anybody in particular and claims that he is friends with 'everybody' (answer). In order



to tackle the suspect's persistence, Dt3 changes the technique and produces a partial repeat '*with everyone*' in line 06, the articulation of which is accented by an increased loudness and a stretch, so that it gets to be heard as slightly mocking (at least in the Serbo-Croatian example). The suspect here treats the repeat as a confirmation-seeking request and responds to it with 'e', a confirmation token, meaning 'yes'. The token 'yes' is, however, produced very tentatively, softer than the surrounding talk, which indicates that the suspect is aware that Dt3 and Dt2 are trying to undermine his statement.

A variation on the first repeat pattern can be presented as follows:

Pattern 1(b):
Dt: 'question'
Sus: answer
Dt: repeat
Sus: no response on the part of the suspect

Extract 3.6 below, previously examined as extract 3.1, is taken from the factory theft interview and is an example of the pattern 1(b).

### Extract 3.6

#### *Suspect\_fthe\_s\_inf\_2008*

01	Dt1:	iMAŠ i BRAta >da ti<RA <i>di</i> ta[mo. ] hAVE aux(you)BR <i>O</i> ther>that you<WURks th[ere. ] <i>do you have a brother who works there?</i>
02	Sus:	[°imam ]>imam<° [°(I)have]>(I)have<° <i>I have, I have</i> °
03		(0.1)
04	Dt1:	IMA:š jel? (you)HA:ve is it? <i>You have, is it?</i>
05		(0.2)
06		>kako z<OVE¿ >how (he) c<ALLS¿

*What is his name?*

07           (.)

08 Sus:       Dra°gan°

09           (1.0) ((buzzing))

10 Dt1:       ra>DI L <On.  
               wo>RKS qp.<He.  
               *Does he work?*

11           (0.3) ((buzzing))

12 Sus:       >sad je       NA Odmor<,  
               >now (he)is ON HOLIDAY<,  
               *He is on holiday now*

13           (0.7) ((buzz))

14 Dt1:       >NA Odmor   je<. >ON Holiday(he)is<. <i>He is on holiday?</i>
---

15           (3.6) ((buzzing))

16 Dt1:       što je   ↑piTA: On da- da   napušti posaž  
               why aux. ↑askED: He that- that (he)quits jobž  
               *Why did he ask about quitting the job?*

To be more precise, there are two instances of the pattern 1(b), i.e. there are two repeats by the detective neither of which gets to be responded to by the suspect.

In line 01 Dt1 produces a question, asking for the information of whether the suspect has got a brother. After getting the suspect's confirmation in line 02, Dt1 does a repeat 'IMAŠ jel?' - 'you have, is it?' following which, after a (0.2) pause in line 05, Dt1 moves on to the next interrogation item 'what is his name?' The fact that the suspect does not come into the (0.2) slot and that the detective moves onto the next item, indicates that, in this case, the response was not made relevant.

Another instance of the pattern 1(b) can be noted in the same extract, lines 10-16. In line 10, although the detective already has the information, he inquires if the suspect's brother works. The suspect's answer 'he is on holiday now' is non-elliptical, non-elided in form and points to some kind of trouble. Then, in line 14 the detective

produces the repeat 'he is on holiday?' and leaves a (3.6) pause for the suspect's response, however, the repeat does not get to be attended by the suspect. Finally, one can note that in line16 Dt1 moves onto the next questioning item.

The second interactional pattern can be represented as follows:

<p>Pattern 2(a):  Dt: 'question'  Sus : answer  Dt: repeat of the answer + next component</p>
---

The next two cases are examples of pattern 2(a):

### Extract 3.7

#### *Pots\_the\_s\_inf\_2008*

01 Dt2: FA:ljo se ČUješ li;  
BR:agged refl.(you)HEar qp.¿  
*He bragged, do you hear this?*

02 (0.3)

03 ???: c:=

04 Dt2: [JA i ti: TRA:žili, a ON]je >pobjEGO kroz prozor  
[I and you: LO:ked, and HE]aux.>rAN through window  
*me and you were looking and he escaped through the window*

05 Dt1: [je:s je:s. zna:m °znam° ]  
[ye:s ye:s.(I)kno:w °(I)know°]  
*Yes, yes, I know*

06 Dt2: s DRUge< strane.  
from OTHer< side.  
*from the other side*

07 (0.2)

08 Dt1: >ZA:nj zna:m.<  
>FO:r him (I)kno:w.<  
*I know about that*

09 (1.6) ((Background talk))

10 Dt1: TO↓bro nema [vese °šta°]

GO↓od not has[matter°what°]  
*It doesn't matter*

11 Sus: [to je BA:]↓to re↓ko:,  
[that aux.BA:]↓to sa↓id:,  
*That's what Bato probably said,*

12 si[gur(no)otac ]  
su[re(ly) father ]  
*my father*

13 Dt2:	[BA:To: RE↓ko:.. BA:]ta ću >ja: doves [BA:To: SA↓id:.. BA:]to will >I: bring <i>Bato said? I will bring Bato</i>
---------	--

14	[i tebe (ođe).<] [and you(her)e.<] <i>and you here</i>
----	--

15 Sus: [ MAJ]ka mu u-REkla, i on  
[ MOT]her him u-Told, and he  
*mother told him and he*

16 razgla:sio.  
rumo:ured  
*told everybody*

Extract 3.7 is taken from an interview with a person suspected of a number of petty thefts. In lines 01-04 Dt2 is complaining to Dt1 about the difficulty of getting the suspect to come to the interview: the suspect escaped when the two detectives looked for him in his house and he later bragged about it ('question'). Dt2 confirms that he already knows that, lines 08-10. This interaction between Dt1 and Dt2 does a special accusatory work against the suspect and although not a question in a traditional sense of the word, it still does questioning. In lines 11-12, in his defense, the suspect states that it was his father who said the 'things' (answer). Dt2 produces the undermining repeat in line 13 – 'Bato said?' which is then followed by another supporting element - a threat 'I will bring Bato and you here'.

### Extract 3.8

#### ***Guard\_fthe\_s\_off\_2008***

01 Dt1: phhhh niti je bilo što sumljivo. kami ni:je  
phhhh nor aux.was what suspicious. like me n:o  
*Nor was there anything suspicious, yeah right*

02 (0.4)

03 Sus: a okle sam zNA:?? ko je zNA:??  
 and from where aux.(I)kNEW:?? who aux.kNEW:??  
*And how could I know? who knew?*

04 (0.8) ((thum thum))

05 °pi:zdu im materina°  
 °((swears))°

06 (1.0)

07 Dt1:	[KO je znač ](0.1)↓znali ste VI: Bogo mi [WHO aux.knewč](0.1)↓knew aux.YOU: God me [((writing)) ] <i>Who knew, you knew for sure.</i>
---------	--

Pattern 2(a) can also be recognized in the previously discussed extract 3.8: in line 01 the detective accuses the suspect that he knew something about the organization of the theft before it took place ('question'). The suspect produces a defensive answer in line 03 '*And how could I know? who knew?*', which is then followed by some swearing. In line 07 Dt1 does a partial repeat of the suspect's answer '*Who knew?*' and attaches a new element '*you knew for sure*'. The repeat and the appended element together reinstate the accusation, previously made in line 01.

Pattern 2(b): Dt1: 'question' Sus: answer Dt1: repeat of the answer Dt2: next component
---

Pattern 2(b) shows that other participants to interrogations register the repeat technique as challenging. In both of the following extracts the first detective does a repeat of the suspect's answer and the second detective orients to the interactional function of the repeat and provides the second challenging item.

### Extract 3.9

#### *Pots\_the\_s\_inf\_2008*

01 Dt2: °ali za°što to: radiš.  
°but wh°y that: (you)do.  
*But, why do you do that?*

02 (1.4) ((Background talk))

03 Sus: a ne mogu da šPI:JAm.  
well not can(I) to sP:y.  
*Well, I cannot betray people*

04 (0.3)

05 Dt2: °>ne moš da<špijaš° °>not (you)can to<spy° <i>You cannot betray people?</i>
---

06 (.)

07 Dt3: >miš da tebe ne †špijaju<. >(you)think that you not †(they)spy<. <i>You think that they don't betray you?</i>
---

08 (1.0) ((background talk))

15 Sus: ču juČE ME Grbić >piTA, veli<  
listen yestERDAY ME Grbic >asKS, says<  
*Well, yesterday Grbic asked me, said*

Extract 3.9 is taken from an interview with a possible perpetrator of a line of petty thefts. The sequence occurs towards the end of the interview. Prior to it, Dt2 closes down the pressing aspect of interrogation, and as the more ‘informal’ mode kicks in, the suspect makes a complaint that there are five crimes of others (his accomplices) he would be responsible for. In line 01 Dt2 launches a challenging ‘*But, why do you do that?*’ which the suspect treats as a question, recognizing the reproachfulness of Dt’s turn by (1.4) pause and a disjunctive ‘a’. The suspect, in his defence, reaches here for a moral argument - he does not like to betray people- which portrays him as a morally righteous person. As a response to this kind of answer, in line 05, Dt2 does a repeat of the suspect’s answer – ‘°>ne moš da<špijaš°’ - ‘you cannot betray people’. Dt2 considers the sole repeat a sufficient device for displaying his dissatisfaction with

the suspect's answer. Then, following a micro pause in line 06, another detective - Dt3 comes in to produce an additional item 'You think that they don't betray you?' which also challenges the suspect's answer, but from a different angle. What is important, though, is that both detectives have the same goal, and that is to undermine the suspect's answer from line 03.

Extract 3.10 is more complex, as there are four participants in this conversation:

### Extract 3.10

#### *Suspect\_fthe\_s\_inf\_2008*

01 Dt3: >p ti: si mu <REko, al on tvrdi to:[čovj(eče)]  
>wl'you: aux. him<TOld, but he claims that:[ma(n) ]  
*Well, you have told him, but that's what he claims, man*

02 Sus: [čuhhš ]  
[lihhsten ]  
*Listen*

03 (.)>pa a čuš što se<(.)pita više[njegova, ]  
(.)>well but listen why refl.<(.)asks more[his, ]  
*well, why would you believe his word more?*

04 Dt3: [al on je]  
[but he is]  
*But, he is*

05 PO:Šten čovjek.  
HO:Nest man.  
*an honest man*

06 (.)

07 Sus: a JA nije[sam.]  
and I not[aux.]  
*And I am not?*

08 Dt4:	[ šTO]: se piTA NJEGO[↓va više. ]
	[ WHY]: refl.aSKS HI[↓s more. ]
	<i>Why would you believe his word more?</i>

09 Dt3: [(on je)pošten čovjek.]=  
[(he is)honest man. ]=  
*He is an honest man*

10 Dt3:	= [>vididiš ]ŠTA je URA↑dio<[od svog života.]
	= [>(you)seeeee]WHAT aux.(he)DI↑d<[of his life.]
	<i>You see what he did to himself?</i>

11 Sus: [i- i- ] [i- i- i JA:]

[and- and- ]  
Me- me-

[and-and- and I:]  
me too

Prior to and in line 01 the detectives confront the suspect with the statement of a witness in the case. As a response to this, in lines 02-03 the suspect challenges Dt3's claim, his turn being characterized by a number of standard dispreferring elements- the overlap, 'čuš'-`listen', 'pa'-`well', 'a'-`but'. While defending himself the suspect makes a very clever blocking move – he implies that it is his word against the witness's. In line 04 Dt3 overlaps with another challenging turn which openly targets the suspect's integrity. By saying that the witness is an honest man, the detective implies that the suspect is not, therefore it is the witness who is to be believed more and the suspect should not be trusted. The suspect picks up on the implication, and defends himself one more time (line 7). It is worth noting here that from line 08 on Dt3 and Dt4 apply slightly different, but complementary techniques in order to display their scepticism. Dt4 displays scepticism by means of a repeat in line 08, whereas Dt3 is displaying similar scepticism in a rather different way in line 10, by one more time building in harmful implications into the statement '*he is an honest man*'. Dt4 does a full repeat of the suspect's response from line 03 '*why would you believe his word more?*' This technique challenges the suspect's turn from line 03 in a very subtle way: it targets the appropriateness of Dt3's turn in the face of some external facts (the witness in question committed suicide under the pressure of the case), but is essentially another attack on the suspect's integrity. In line 09 Dt3 repeats in an overlap the previous open challenge '*he is an honest man*', implying the witness is honest and the suspect is not. At the same time, Dt3 obviously registers Dt4's repeat from line 08 - note that just in time Dt4 has completed it, Dt3, just as in the example in extract 3.7, collaborates, launching the additional challenging element, perfectly fitted to the previously produced repeat – '*You see what he did to himself?*'. The fitting of this element can be recognized in the doubling of the syllable in 'vididiš', line 10, whose normal form would be 'vidiš'. It almost looks like some kind of 'deliberation' on the part of the detective about the design of the turn to follow.



So far, I have shown possible variations of the repeat sequence pattern. The repeats' turn design can vary itself. These turns could either be full repeats as is the case with the following example:

Extract 3.11

*Pots\_the\_s\_inf\_2008*

01 Sus:        ne sna:m.  
              not (I) kno:w.  
              *I don't know*

02            (1.5) ((rustling + clicking))

03 Dt1:        nE ZNa:š. nOT (you) KNo:w. <i>You don't know?</i>
--

The fullness of the repeat reflects the fact that they echo the core of the received answer, but do not copy discourse markers such as 'well' or similar, and as already said, they almost invariably transpose personal pronouns or person reference morphological markers.

Partial repeats copy only a part of the answerer's turn, as can be seen in extract 3.12 below:

Extract 3.12

*Suspect\_fthe\_s\_inf\_2008*

01 Sus:        >ne zna: JA:<sa tačno BAŠ (.)BAŠ        precizno,  
              >not know: I: <now exactly EXActy(.)EXActly precisely,  
              *I don't know now exactly*

02            okle            ću    ja znat(.) [ >ja mislim<-    ]  
              from where will I knoww (.) [ >I think< -    ]  
              *How could I know?                            I think-*

03 Dt1	[ >ne ZNA:š        < ]:.. [ >not (you) KNO:w< ]:.. <i>you don't know</i>
--------	--

04            (.)ja >misim da    je on bio u    ↑BE<lu:cu,  
              (.)I >think that aux he was in    ↑BE<lu:ca,  
              *I think that he was in Beluca*

The detective, in this case, copies two lexical items out of the three lines of the suspect's answer. This indicates that full repeats are more likely to occur if the received answer is shorter, whereas they are impossible if the answer is an elaboration, as is the case with example 3.12. What is, then, the difference between a short answer and an elaboration? Keeping the answer succinct gives it certain determination, for example, by saying 'I don't know' in extract 3.11 the suspect seems to be more confident of what he is saying. On the contrary, elaboration gives away a lack of confidence (see extract 3.12). Studying the convergence between troubles-telling and inquisitions, Jefferson (1985) noticed a recurrent feature of the troubles teller/transgressor's talk: it involved very detailed descriptions. She points out that whenever people elaborate a description, they are doing detailing and detailing can be taken as defensive. Jefferson also noticed that bits of the defensive detailing can sometimes be somewhat inaccurate or incomplete or covering up what really happened.

No matter whether the answer is succinct or an elaboration, in each of the above examples it is dealt with by means of the same technique - the questioner's repeat.

### 5.3 Suspects' initial responses

In the previous section I mentioned the fact that suspects' initial (repeated) responses can either be short or elaborate. Another feature of these responses is that they are non-elliptical in form. One can note that in the two extracts below, the highlighted suspect's responses are different in form. In extract 3.13, the response in line 03 is non-elliptical, non-elided, it is longer in form while it could have simply been a 'yes' or 'no'.

#### Extract 3.13

*Suspect\_fthe\_s\_inf\_2008*

01 Dt1:           ra>DI L <On.  
                  wo>RKS qp.<He.  
                  *Does he work?*

02                   (0.3) ((buzzing))

03	Sus:	>sad je NA Odmor<, >now (he)is ON Holiday<, <i>He is on holiday now</i>
04		(0.7) ((buzz))
05	Dt1:	>NA Odmor je<. >ON Holiday(he)is<. <i>He is on holiday?</i>

On the contrary, about twenty lines into the interview (extract 3.14), the response in line 03 has an elliptical marker ‘yes’ + addition.

#### Extract 3.14

##### *Suspect\_fthe\_s\_inf\_2008*

01	Dt1:	a Eš čuo TI: za to:. and aux. heard YOU: for that:. and did you hear about that?
02		(.)
03	Sus:	°eS:am kako nije:sam ( )° °yE:s how no:t (I) °( )° <i>Yes, of course ( )</i>
04	Dt1:	>čuo si za to.< >(you)heard aux. for that.< <i>you have heard about it?</i>

Raymond (2000), in his work on the structure of responding, shows how the omission of the overt ‘yes’ or ‘no’ in response to ‘questions’ does special interactional work.

Raymond states that by answering ‘yes’ or ‘no’, speakers are complying with the terms of a FPP. By contrast, by omitting these markers in their response, speakers indicate they do not accept the terms of the FPP.

So, by responding to ‘does he work?’ by ‘he is on holiday now’ the suspect is signaling his noncompliance with the terms of the received question. First of all, saying ‘no’ would mean that the brother is unemployed, which would be untruthful. As the brother is on holiday, saying ‘yes’ would also in certain way be untruthful, so the suspect goes for the option ‘he is on holiday now’, ‘now’ indicating a contrast between a current and past/future state. Further into the sequence it is revealed that the

brother wants to quit his job in the factory (possibly because of the matter of theft), but the factory director asked him to take a holiday and think it over. It is also revealed that the detectives have already known the information about the brother and him wanting to quit the job. While trying to establish a line of questioning, the detectives still inquire about the things which are already known to them: whether the suspect has a brother, if the brother works and so on. The technique involves asking questions of the type 'does he work?', which, however, lead to more damaging ones. Anticipating where these questions are going, the suspect responds to them in a non-straightforward way, with 'he is on holiday now', not revealing the brother's intentions concerning his job. The non-straightforwardness of the response is designed to slow down the sequence and block the direction in which the question is going. 'He is on holiday now' is being neither 'yes' nor 'no' but still indicates existence of some special state of affairs, i.e. that the brother wants to quit the job. The resisting move from the suspect, in this case, delays the 'why does he want to quit his job' question which carries different implications- that the brother is guilty, that he was suspect's accomplice in the theft and so on.

The resistance of the suspect's initial response can be seen in other examples. The following example (Extract 3.15) is taken from the same interview (factory theft case). The detective is here probing into the relationship between the suspect and another party, a possible witness in the case, who in the meantime tragically died.

Extract 3.15

***Suspect\_fthe\_s\_inf\_2008***

01 Dt1: A JES<sup>te</sup> li se >sretali u kafanu?<reci mi  
AND aux. (you)qp. refl.>meet in tavern? <tell me  
*And were you seeing each other in the tavern, tell me*

02 (.)

03 Sus: m: (0.1) KAd.  
m: (0.1) W<sup>Hen</sup>.  
*When?*

04 (0.5)

05 Dt1: PRIje no je ON  
BEFore that aux. HE  
*Before he*

06 (0.7)

07 Sus: n:e[:]  
n:o[:]  
*no*

08 Dt1: [u]RADIO šta je uradio.  
[d]ID what aux. (he)did.  
*did what he did*

09 (0.8)

10	Sus:	m::::: °ne sna:m.° (0.1) °<ne sjeća se.>° m::::: °not(I)kno:w.° (0.1) °<not (I)remember refl.>° <i>I don't know, I don't remember</i>
----	------	---

11 (0.8)

12 Dt1: >NE sjećaš se<.>oli da t JA< podšetim;  
>NOT(you)remember refl.<.>will that ya' I< remind;  
*You don't remember? Shall I remind ya'?*

In line 01 the detective leads the questioning in a new direction, indicated by a disjunctive 'a' and increased loudness at the beginning of the turn. This turn is also designed as a request for information (marked by the particle *li*) about the suspect's connection to the deceased man; more precisely, the detective is asking about the suspect's encounters with the mentioned party in the local tavern. Although marked as information-seeking, the 'project' behind the question is much wider. It is not asked only for the sake of getting information, but is a preliminary to an activity aimed at incriminating the suspect (most likely the detective already has some information about the 'tavern encounters' received from other witnesses in the case, but checking it and comparing it with the suspect's version gives more opportunity for building up an incriminating case against the suspect). After a slight pause in line 02, the suspect makes a request for clarification in line 03, by 'when', expanding the basic format of the sequence. Launching of 'when' in line 03 can be explained in two ways, but first of all, one should note the 'm:' sound at the beginning of line 03. This sound might indicate that in line 03 the suspect was going for 'm::::: ne sna:m' 'm::::: - 'm::::: I don't know', which he later produces in line 10. One of the reasons he might be

seeking clarification is, first of all, his understanding of where the detective's question is going; Drew (1997) points out that open-class initiators generally signal some kind of trouble. Another factor which might have inspired the clarification is that the suspect remembers that the party inquired about is deceased, so he takes the opportunity to slow down the sequence and make the detective specify the temporal frame of the 'encounters'. This slowing down is a particular way of blocking the intended development of the sequence.

In line 05 the detective does 'before he' and leaves his turn unfinished, indicating some mutual knowledge about the party in question. However, the suspect already negates the request in line 07, which might indicate he resists the action of incriminating performed in this sequence by the detective. The detective completes his clarification in line 08 and having received the clarification, the suspect delays for (0.8) before responding to the request for information in line 10 with a stretched 'm: : :', indicating his state of 'trying to remember', after which he states his lack of knowledge and his inability to remember. One can notice that this response is also type non-conforming. Not knowing/remembers in court cross-examination has been noticed to be avoiding either confirming or disconfirming, and to, in such a way, obstruct the line of questioning (Drew, 1992)<sup>19</sup>. It seems that the same blocking technique is utilized in police interrogation discourse.

I now consider the suspect's response in the previously examined extract 3.16, taken from a factory theft interview:

### Extract 3.16

#### *Guard\_fthe\_s\_inf\_2008*

- 01 Dt2:           sa    kojim od MAJstora    si ti najbolji;  
                   with whom   of MEchanics are you the best;  
                   *Which mechanic are you most friendly with?*
- 02                   (0.8)
- 03                   ((click))
- 04 Sus:           ↓ni:škim, ja sa    svaki:m,    no dođem    i primim

↓no: one, I with everybo:dy, but(I)come and(I)receive  
*No one, I am friendly with everybody, I come and take over*

05 smjenu, i ono ništa ja moj[e:]  
 shift, and err nothing I min[e:]  
*shift and I do my stuff*

06 Dt2: [od]MA:JStora s kim  
 [of]ME:CHAnics with whom  
*Which mechanic are*

07 si dobar, s kim se dru:žiš, š kim  
 aux.(you)good, with whom refl.(you)ha:ng out, with whom  
*are you friendly with, with whom do you hang out, who do*

08 (0.4) se gle[DA:š ]  
 (0.4) (you) se[E: ]  
*you meet?*

09 Dt3: [s BARA:nje si. >valjda se  
 [from BARA:nja (you)are.>must refl.  
*You are from Baranja, you must be*

10 družiš [s nekim< ]  
 (you)socialize [with someone<]  
*friends with someone*

11	Sus:	[sa <u>SVA:</u> ]ki:m. [with <u>EVERY:</u> ]o:ne. <i>With everyone</i>
----	------	--

12 nemam ja šta reć da: [( ) ]  
 not have I what say that:[( ) ]  
*I don't have anything to say that-*

13 Dt3: [<SVA: ]kijem>  
 [<EVE: ]ryone>  
*with everyone*

14 Dt2: [kojeg ]  
 [which ]  
*Which one*

15 (.)

16 Sus: e:  
 yes:  
 Yes

In line 01 Dt2 initiates questioning by '*which mechanic are you most friendly with?*'. The detectives are here trying to establish if there are any special bonds between the suspect and any particular colleagues. The suspect resists naming any of the co-workers, which presumably might implicate them in the crime, i.e. mark them as

possible accomplices. For this reason, he avoids naming anybody in particular. In lines 04-05 he states that he is not friends with anybody and portrays his innocence and non-involvement by saying that he comes to work and goes about his own business. In lines 06 -10 Dt2 gives another try, reformulating the question, but the suspect resists, holding approximately the same position, now stating he is friends with 'everybody'. No matter if he offers 'nobody' as a response or if he uses the all-inclusive answer from line 11, the suspect is not complying with the terms of the 'question'. He denies any 'special bond' with any of his co-workers and, in such a way, blocks the line of questioning.

Extract 3.17 is different in the level of directness:

Extract 3.17

***Suspect\_fthe\_s\_inf\_2008***

01 Dt1: pa TI SI JEDan,- TI SI JEDan od tijeh.=  
well YOU ARE One,- YOU ARE One of those.=  
*Well, you are one of them*

02 Sus: =a- JAǰ  
=a- Iǰ  
*I?*

03 Dt1: TI:. =  
YOU:.=  
*You*

04 Sus: =>nijesam < KU:NEm ti se. =>not aux. (I)<(I) SW:EA r you refl. <i>I didn't I swear to you</i>
---

05 (0.5)

06 Sus: °>ja t se - ja-<°  
°>I you refl.- I-<°  
*I you- I*

07 (0.4)

08 Dt1: NIJesi kuNE:m >ti se.<=  
NOT(you) aux. (I) swEA:R >you refl.<=  
*You didn't I swear to you?*



While in all of the three previous extracts in this section, the initial turns are preliminaries with a ‘project’ to be accomplished further into the sequence, in extract 3.17 the turn in line 01 is a direct accusation. Therefore, the blocking response is stronger in so far as it is an outright denial. Note that the response to line 01 is ‘repeat-like’, which suggests that repeats are generally used to block something which is ‘out of the question’ for the recipient. The additional defensive turn in line 04 is an overt denial, followed by ‘*I swear to you?*’ by which the suspect invokes his own honesty, another way of reducing the damaging effect of the FPP.

In the four extracts, presented above, the blocking nature of the suspects’ initial responses varies. There is certain evasiveness in each of them: they are non-conforming and they claim a lack of knowledge about the crime they are being asked about. They can among other things be claiming non-involvement or invoking honesty. This is an interactional technique used by the suspects in order to avoid their incrimination by the interrogators.

#### **5.4 Repeats – expressions of scepticism**

Repeats can be associated with the repair phenomenon as one of the devices for doing repair is repetition of a part of the previous turn. Repair is usually described as an interactional device indicating some kind of trouble, a problem in speaking, hearing or understanding the talk (Schegloff, 2000). In the following extract, taken from Schegloff, Jefferson and Sacks (1977) Al repeats a single lexical unit from the previous turn, thereby signalling that Ken has committed some kind of error:

#### Extract 3.18

01	Ken:	‘E likes that waider over there,
02	Al:	Wait-er?
03	Ken:	Waitress, sorry,
04	Al:	‘At’s bedder

Taken from Schegloff et al. (1977, p. 377)

Al is, therefore, trying to fix the trouble, and in order to do so, he signals that there is a problem by means of the linguistic device of repetition. As one can see, in line 03 Ken registers Al's repair initiator, repairs 'waiter' into 'waitress' and resolves the trouble. A similar non-acceptance of the received answer is also found in the repeats studied in this chapter. When the detectives just repeat what the suspect said, they are not accepting the received answer as having been a valid one.

Schegloff et al. (1977) note that other than changing/replacing, repair can involve confirming or re-asserting the original version of the trouble source:

#### Extract 3.19

01	A:	Why don't you want to tell it to me.
02	B:	I don't know why.
03	A:	You don't know?
04	B:	No I don't. I'm sorry.

Taken from Schegloff et al. (1977, p. 377)

The repeat here implies that B ought to know, it expresses scepticism. B's apology acknowledges the 'ought to know' element, so that it becomes salient to both A and B. B then reasserts his/her previous position. This kind of re-asserting is typical of the repeat phenomenon in my data. There is certainly a considerable amount of resistance on the part of the recipient of the repeat. The next post-repeat move is either no response (see extracts 3.1, 3.6) or the speaker simply reasserts a previously taken position (see examples 3.4, 3.5, 3.7, 3.10).

Repeats can be found in other sequential environments. Schegloff (1996) studies repeats in third turn position, which, however, do a special kind of confirming.

#### Extract 3.20

01	Marsha:	=He's <u>f</u> lying.
02		(0.2)
03	Marsha:	En <u>I</u> lene is going to <u>m</u> eeet im:, Becuz the <u>t</u> o:p wz ripped
04		off'v iz <u>c</u> ar which is tih <u>s</u> say <u>s</u> omeb'ddy <u>h</u> elped
		th'mselfs.

05	Tony:	Stolen.
06		(0.4)
07	Marsha:	<u>Stolen. Right out in front of my house.</u>

(Taken from Schegloff, 1996, p. 185)

In lines 01 – 04 Marsha reports to Tony, her former husband, that somebody stole the top of their son’s car, so he couldn’t drive back home and had to fly. Marsha does this report in a non- literal way: she says that the top of the car was ripped off, which can mean both ‘stolen’ and ‘torn’ and then does the joking ‘someb’ ddy helped th’mselves’. Schegloff explains that the sense of what had happened was conveyed as an allusion, Marsha does not say that the car was stolen, but goes for a more elaborate version, which requires drawing inferences. In line 05 Tony draws the inference and gives a literal form to what Marsha was saying in the previous turn. Marsha then does a repeat of ‘Stolen’ in line 07. According to Schegloff, by using a repeat in this context, Marsha confirms the allusion she expressed in the statement in the first position.

Although sequentially different, a parallel can be made between the repeats in Schegloff’s work and those treated in this chapter: they both appear in third turn position and they both deal with something that is not overtly said – the confirming repeats deal with the information conveyed inferentially; the repeats produced by the detectives questioning suspects in my data set with the information the suspect knows but resists to convey. By repeating a part or the whole of the suspect’s answer the detectives imply that the suspect is not quite telling the truth.

As already intimated, repeats can be seen as sceptical simply by the virtue of being repeats. However, sometimes there is an extra component added to the repeat, which supports and makes the challenge more direct and obvious. As we have seen in the previous analysis of extract 3.21, one could see that in lines 01 – 10 the suspect tries to slow down and block a particular line of interrogation.

Extract 3.21

*Suspect\_fthe\_s\_inf\_2008*

01 Dt1: A JESTe li se >sretali u kafanu?<reci mi  
AND aux.(you)qp. refl.>meet in tavern? <tell me  
*And were you seeing each other in the tavern, tell me*

02 (.)

03 Sus: m: (0.1) KAd.  
m: (0.1) WHen.  
*When?*

04 (0.5)

05 Dt1: PRIje no je ON  
BEFore that aux. HE  
*Before he*

06 (0.7)

07 Sus: n:e[:]  
n:o[:]  
*no*

08 Dt1: [u]RADIO šta je uradio.  
[d]ID what aux. (he)did.  
*did what he did*

09 (0.8)

10	Sus:	m::::: °ne sna:m.(0.1) <ne sjeća se.>° m::::: °not(I)kno:w.( 0.1)<not (I)remember refl.>° <i>I don't know, I don't remember</i>
----	------	---

11 (0.8)

12 Dt1: >NE sjećaš se<.>oli da t JA< podšetim;  
>NOT(you)remember refl.<.>will that ya' I< remind;  
*You don't remember? Shall I remind ya'?*

In line 11 comes a longish pause and in line 12 the detective does the first undermining move, by producing a repeat '*You don't remember?*'. The detective undermines the received answer by showing scepticism concerning the truthfulness of the received response. The attached interrogative '*Shall I remind ya?*' intensifies the repeat which precedes it and expresses the challenge more overtly. While the repeat challenges by being sceptical, it does not provide any evidence for being such. The attached interrogative essentially shows the detective's epistemic position on which he based the challenge: the detective knows, presumably from the witness's statements, if the suspect was meeting the other party in the tavern. '*Shall I remind ya?*' is also heard as

somewhat ironic. It almost serves as a transition from ‘unsaid’ to ‘said’ for it introduces an even more challenging story which reveals the details of the ‘tavern encounters’.

In extract 3.22 one can note a similar technique of adding a new element onto the repeat. This extract comes just before the previously analysed extract 3.2, and is taken from the same ‘official’ interview with a factory security guard. ‘Official’ means that, while he is doing questioning, the detective is composing a contemporaneous record, writing it down item by item (there were no typists available at this point).

### Extract 3.22

#### *Guard\_fthe\_s\_off\_2008*

01 Dt1: niko:, [hhh ((flick )) ]niti, ((rustling))  
no one:, [hhh ((flick)) ]nor, ((rustling))  
[ ((writing)) ]  
*No one nor*

02 ((writing)) (j)e, (0.5) b:ilo, (0.1)  
aux., (0.5) w:as, (0.1)  
*was there*

03 Sus: sumnjivo ništa.  
suspicious nothing.  
*anything suspicious*

04 ((writing))

05 Dt1: š:to: [ ((writing)) ]  
w:hat: [ ((writing)) ]  
06 [ ((background talk)) ]  
*something*

07 [sumnjivo ]  
[suspicious ]  
*Suspicious*

08 [ ((writing)) ]

09 (3.6)

10 ???: [.hhhh ]

11 [ ((writing)) ]

12 Dt1: phhhh niti je bilo što sumljivo. kami ↓ni:je  
phhhh nor aux.was what suspicious. like me ↓n:o  
*Nor was there anything suspicious, yeah right*

To a question, asked prior to this extract, of whether there were any people lurking around on a specific night, the suspect responds that there was nobody to be seen around. From line 01 on, the detective is putting this answer on record. Note the collaborative work on the part of the suspect in line 03, who completes the detective's turn from lines 01-02. In line 12 the detective does some summing up by doing the repeat of what he has written down '*Nor was there anything suspicious*'. It looks like there is a sort of change of activity going on here, i.e. the repeat is marking the transfer from the activity of writing down onto the activity of challenging. Following the repeat, one can note the attachment '*yeah right*'. This example is striking because both the repeat and the addition to it express scepticism, neither of them expressing it entirely openly. The repeat expresses scepticism by implying that there must have been something suspicious, whereas '*yeah right*', shows disbelief via the sarcastic aspect it incorporates.

Looking back at the already analyzed extract 3.23 below, one can trace some other elements of challenge in the repeat turn. In line 11 the suspect defends himself by saying that it was his father who bragged to the neighbours that he (the suspect) had escaped the police on a particular occasion. Dt2 produces a partial repeat in line 12 – '*Bato said?*'.

### Extract 3.23

#### *Pots the s inf 2008*

01 Dt2: FA:ljo se ČUješ li;  
BR:agged refl. (you)HEar qp.¿  
*He bragged, do you hear this?*

02 (0.3)

03 ???: c:=

04 Dt2: [JA i ti: TRA:žili, a ON]je >pobjEGO kroz prozor  
[I and you: LO:ked, and HE]aux.>rAN through window  
*me and you were looking and he escaped through the window*

05 Dt1: [je:s je:s. zna:m °znam° ]  
[ye:s ye:s. (I)kno:w °(I)know°]  
*Yes, yes, I know*

06 Dt2: s DRUge< strane.  
from OTHer< side.  
*from the other side*

07 (0.2)

08 Dt1: >ZA:nj zna:m.<  
>FO:r him (I)kno:w.<  
*I know about that*

09 (1.6) ((Background talk))

10 Dt1: TO↓bro nema [vese °šta°]  
GO↓od not has[matter°what°]  
*It doesn't matter*

11 Sus: [to je BA:]↓to re↓ko:,  
[that aux.BA:]↓to sa↓id:,  
*That's what Bato probably said,*

12 si[gur(no)otac ]  
su[re(ly) father ]  
*my father*

13 Dt2:	[BA:To: RE↓ko:.. BA:]ta ću >ja: doves [BA:To: SA↓id:.. BA:]to will >I: bring <i>Bato said? I will bring Bato</i>
---------	--

14	[i tebe (ođe).<] [and you(here).<] <i>and you here</i>
----	--

15 Sus: [ MAJ]ka mu u-REkla, i on  
[ MOT]her him u-Told, and he  
*mother told him and he*

16 razgla:sio.  
rumou:red  
*told everybody*

Note the overlap in lines 11-12, an interactional feature which suggests a blocking nature of this turn. The fact that Dt2 is trying to win over the turn shows his urge to stop the suspect from pursuing the previous blocking response. 'Bato said?' targets the part of the received answer which the detective is sceptical of, after which he attaches a more directly challenging element 'I will bring Bato and you here'. The additional element is a threat which supports the previously produced undermining repeat. Bringing in the suspect's father would mean learning the real truth, or even possibly incriminating the father. Although the threat is not specific, it does do the job

of supporting the repeat in its challenge. Once again, one can see that repeats are produced in an environment of challenging. The challenging nature of repeats can also be recognized in the suspect's overlapping turn in line 15; this is a continuation of the previously given argument, the suspect holds the same position from line 11 – it was his father who bragged around about the suspect's misconduct. In section 5.5 I will say more about how the suspects' answers indicate defensiveness following the turns containing a repeat.

Repeats can be heard as challenging simply because of the contentious environments in which they tend to occur. In the following example, previously discussed in section 5.2, the detectives confront the suspect with a witness statement.

#### Extract 3.24

##### *Suspect\_fthe\_s\_inf\_2008*

01 Dt3: >p ti: si mu <REko, al on tvrđi to: [čovj(e)če]  
>wl'you: aux. him<Told, but he claims that: [ma(n) ]  
*Well, you have told him, but that's what he claims, man*

02 Sus: [čuhš ]  
[lihsten ]  
*Listen*

03 (.)>pa a čuš što se< (.)pita više[njegova, ]  
(.)>well but listen why refl<(.)asks more[his, ]  
*well, why would you believe his word more?*

04 Dt3: [al on je]  
[but he is]  
*But, he is*

05 PO:Šten čovjek.  
HO:Nest man.  
*an honest man*

06 (.)

07 Sus: a JA nije[sam.]  
and I not[aux.]  
*And I am not?*

08 Dt4:	[ ŠTO]: se piTA NJEGO[↓va više. ]
	[ WHY]: refl.aSKS HI[↓s more. ]
	<i>Why would you believe his word more?</i>

09 Dt3: [(on je)pošten čovjek.]=



[ (he is) honest man. ]=  
*He is an honest man*

10	Dt3:	= [>vididiš ]ŠTA je URA↑dio<[od svog života.] =>(you) seeee]WHAT aux. (he)DI↑d<[of his life.] <i>You see what he did to himself?</i>
11	Sus:	[i- i- ] [i- i- i JA:] [and- and- ] [and-and- and I:] <i>Me- me- me too</i>

In line 01 Dt3 already launches a direct challenge. In line 03 the suspect attempts to block the accusation with ‘my word against his word’ argument and in lines 04-05 comes another direct challenge, which targets the suspect’s character inferentially. The implication of the challenge is ‘you are not an honest man’ and the suspect makes this implication explicit by his defensive ‘*and I am not?*’ in line 07. Note that the repeat in line 08 comes here after an open challenge, which is not an ordinary occurrence, as direct challenges in most cases follow the repeat. In such a way, the repeat gets to be challenging simply by the virtue of complementing the direct challenge in lines 04-05. These two, however, challenge the suspect’s response in line 03 from two different angles. The open challenge targets the suspect’s character, marking the suspect out to be a dishonest man. The repeat does its part of undermining by targeting the appropriateness of what the suspect said in line 03. As I previously pointed out, this brings into play some external circumstances - the witness in question committed suicide due to the pressure in the case, possibly because the co-workers and other acquaintances were blaming him for the theft. The repeat then supports the previous claim that the witness is an honest man, and what the suspect says in line 03 casts doubt on the evidence of him being an honest man; he puts himself in a bad light. This all indicates that the direct challenge and the one done by means of repeats are complementary challenging techniques, which occur in the same type of sequential environment.

Looking at extract 3.25 below, which comes about a minute after the previously discussed extract, one can note that a similar repeat technique can be utilized for challenging purposes by the suspect. In this case, though, it is not a question-answer sequence and the repeat occurs in the second turn position.

Extract 3.25

**Suspect\_fthe\_s\_inf\_2008**

01 Dt1: a ti: si reKA:(0.7)<njemu>, (0.6)<NEĐo>, (.)  
 and you: aux. said:(0.7)<him> , (0.6)<NEĐo>, (.)  
*and you told him: Nedo*

02 PAzi: (.) š:Ta ćeš da pri:ča:š, (1.2) i NEMOj  
 WAtch:(.)w:Hat will to ta:l:k, (1.2) and DON't  
*watch what you are talking and don't*

03 MEne da pomINJEš u usta.  
 Me to mentIOn in mouth.  
*mention me*

04 (.)

05	Sus:	<u>ja</u> : >njemu< °reko°. <u>I</u> : >him< °said°. <i>I told him?</i>
----	------	---

06 (.)

07 Dt1: da  
 yes  
 yes

08 (.)

09 Sus: nijesam SIgurno.=  
 not(I)aux. Surely.=  
*I didn't for sure*

10 Dt1: =ŽI>va is°tina°<  
 =LI>ve tr°uth°<  
*Pure truth*

11 (.)

12 Sus: SIgurno nijesam.  
 SUREly (I)not aux.  
*I didn't for sure*

In lines 01-03 Dt1 reveals to the suspect a witness's statement, accusing the suspect of threatening another man in a local tavern. The suspect's response to this accusation is almost immediate – in line 07 he responds by repeating a part of the detective's accusatory turn '*I told him?*' The repeat expresses surprise concerning the allegations- the initial 'I' is stretched and stressed. The suspect tries to block the attack and initiates a counter line of dispute. After the detective's confirmation in line 07, which is actually reinstating the previous accusation, comes an openly defensive turn '*I*

*didn't for sure'* from the suspect. The detective reiterates the accusation in line 10 by '*Pure truth*'. As a response, in line 12, the suspect produces another defensive '*I didn't for sure*'. Note that both speakers stick to the previously taken positions.

### 5.5 Suspects' defensive response to repeats

Conversation analysts hold that whatever a certain interactional device does in communication is best displayed in the way the interlocutors respond to it. Essentially, at the heart of CA is the fact that interlocutors constantly convey their understanding or analysis of what the co-participants said. The occurrence of a FPP requires an appropriate SPP. SPP necessarily displays how the speaker has analysed the first to which it responds. If a speaker responds to a FPP with an inappropriate SPP, the FPP speaker can see that he/she has not been properly understood and this opens a possibility for the FPP speaker's repair in the third-turn position. Sidnell (2010, p. 67) states: '...participants in conversation look to a next turn to see if and how they have been understood. As analysts we can exploit the same resource. This is sometimes called the next-turn proof procedure'. Applying the next turn proof procedure, one can note that a considerable degree of defensiveness is displayed in the recipients' responses to the repeat turns, i.e. they are perceived as aggressive, damaging devices.

As already mentioned, the suspect does not respond verbally to some of the repeats, no matter whether they stand on their own or they have an additional element attached. This can be noted in the already analysed extracts 3.26 and 3.27 below.

#### Extract 3.26

*Suspect\_fthe\_s\_inf\_2008*

01 Dt1: iMAŠ i BRAta >da ti<RAdi ta[mo. ]  
 hAVE (you) qp. BROther>that you<WUrks th[ere. ]  
*Do you have a brother who works there?*

02 Sus: [°imam ]>imam<°  
 [° (I) have]>(I) have<°  
*I have, I have°*

03 (0.1)

04	Dt1:	IMA:š jel? (you)HA:ve is it? <i>You have, is it?</i>
----	------	--

05 (0.2)

06 >kako z<OVEǰ  
>how (he)c<ALLSǰ  
*What is his name?*

Note that there is no verbal response after the repeat and the additional element in line 04 above. There is a (0.2) pause in line 05 in which the suspect had a chance to come in. However, there is no attempt from the suspect to respond, unless he responded with a nod.

### Extract 3.27

#### ***Suspect\_fthe\_s\_inf\_2008***

01 Sus: >sad je NA Odmor<,  
>now (he)is ON HOLIDAY<,  
*He is on holiday now*

02 (0.7) ((buzz))

03	Dt1:	>NA Odmor je<. >ON Holiday(he)is<. <i>He is on holiday?</i>
----	------	---

04 (3.6) ((buzzing))

05 Dt1: što je ↑piTA: On da- da napušti posaj  
why aux. ↑askED: He that- that (he)quits jobǰ  
*Why did he ask about quitting the job?*

Note that there is no verbal response from the suspect to the repeat in line 03 above. There is a (3.6) pause in line 04, plenty of time for the suspect to respond. However, the suspect remains silent until the detective goes onto another point. No response can be seen as a kind of defensiveness; it indicates that the suspect has nothing else to add. However, it is necessary to point out that, as I had no access to the video, there is a possibility that in the above cases the suspect responded non-verbally. Even if that would be the case, it is still relevant that no verbal response was made.

As well as not responding to repeats, suspects can express resistance to the work done by the repeat in a more active fashion. In the following, already analysed example, the detectives are questioning a factory security guard (the factory theft case).

### Extract 3.28

#### *Guard\_fthe\_s\_inf\_2008*

- 01 Dt3: =a šTA ĆEmo AKO POLigraf KAže dē LAžeš.=  
=and WHAT(we)SHall IF POLygraph SAys that (you)LIe.=  
*What shall we do if the polygraph shows that you're lying?*
- 02 =šTA Onda >da radimo< °s tobom°  
=WHAT Then >to do < °with you°  
*What shall we do with you then?*
- 03 (.)
- 04 Sus: °ne znam°  
°not (I)know°  
*I don't know*
- 05 (0.4)
- |                    |
|--------------------|
| 06 Dt3: NE Zna:šž= |
|--------------------|
- NOT(you)Kno:wž=  
*You don't know?*
- 07 Sus: =okle >ja ne znam Bogomi šta ja ZNAm<,  
=where>I not know by God what I KNOW<,  
*How? I surely don't know, what do I know?*

After the suspect states that he does not know what would happen if the polygraph shows that he is lying, Dt3 does a repeat of '*You don't know?*' in line 06. Note how the suspect has analysed the repeat: looking at his response to it in line 07, the first thing that comes to mind is that the suspect's response is latched, there is no time between the detective's repeat and the suspect's response to it. Then, one can note that the design of the suspect's turn gives away defensiveness. The suspect treats the repeat as containing the proposition '*you know*', i.e. as accusing him of lying, so he first does a direct negation of this proposition. He then produces an additional TCU '*what do I know?*', an unanswerable challenging wh-interrogative, which also carries the implication '*I don't know*'. This double rejection of the detective's implied accusation very much contributes to the response being perceived as defensive.

As already pointed out, repeats can follow and support other openly challenging turns. In such cases, the suspect can understand repeats as a way of reinstating an open challenge from the preceding talk. Extract 3.29 is an exemplary case: prior to this extract, the detective accuses the suspect of being involved in the factory theft. In line 01 the suspect openly defends himself and his lack of confidence is revealed in line 03 in the confused sounding cut offs.

### Extract 3.29

#### *Suspect\_fthe\_s\_inf\_2008*

01 Sus: =>nijesam < KUNEm °ti se°.  
=>not aux.(I)<(I)SWEAr °you refl.°.  
*I didn't I swear to you*

02 (0.5)

03 Sus: °>ja t se - ja-<°  
°>I you refl.- I-<°  
*I you- I*

04 (0.4)

05 Dt1:	NIJE:si	kuNE:>m ti	se.<=
---------	---------	------------	-------

NOT: (you)aux.(I)swEA:>r you refl.<=  
*You didn't I swear to you?*

06 Sus: =GLA:vu mi sijeci(evo)  
=HEA:d me (you)cut(here)  
*Cut my head off (if I was)*

In line 05 Dt1 starts to undermine the suspect by repeating the previous defensive turn. One should pay attention to the way the suspect responds to the detective's repeat. The suspect's response in line 06 is very quick - he latches it onto the detective's repeat in line 05. This, along with the increased loudness at the beginning of his turn, indicates the suspect's urge to block and take over the turn. The lexical design of the turn goes along with this: '*Cut my head off (if I was)*' is obviously a defensive move. The suspect's defence in line 06 is much more aggressive than the one in line 01<sup>20</sup>. The suspect has treated the repeat as a reinstated attack and a repeated attack gets a more aggressive response.

Previously I have shown how detectives overlap with the suspect's unsatisfactory initial answers in order to block them (see explanation of extract 3.23). Suspects, actually, do the same as a response to a repeat turn.

### Extract 3.30

***Pots\_the\_s\_inf\_2008***

01 Sus: to je BA:↓to re↓ko:,  
that aux.BA:↓to sa↓id:,  
*That's what Bato probably said,*

02 si[gur(no) otac ]  
su[re(ly) father ]  
*my father*

03 Dt2:	[BA:To: RE↓ko:.. BA:]ta ću >ja: doves [BA:To: SA↓id:.. BA:]to will >I: bring <i>Bato said? I will bring Bato</i>
---------	--

04	[i tebe (ođe).<] [and you(here).<] <i>and you here</i>
----	--

05 Sus: [ MAJ]ka mu u-REkla, i on  
[ MOT]her him u-Told, and he  
*mother told him and he*

06 razgla:sio.  
rumo:red  
*told everybody*

Note that in extract 3.30 above the suspect overlaps with the detective's repeat in line 04. Also note, that in his attempt to win over the turn, the suspect applies increased loudness at the beginning of the turn.

In extract 3.31 below the suspect applies another defensive strategy. This extract is taken from an interview with one of the main suspects in the factory theft case.

### Extract 3.31

***Suspect\_fthe\_s\_inf\_2008***

01 Dt1: °ha:° ((click)) jesi ga- KA si ga DObioǰ  
°ha:° ((click)) did(you) him- WHEN aux. him (you)Gotǰ

*aha, did you- when did you get him?*

02 (0.3) ((clicking))

03 Sus: [.hhhh ]neh snahh:m >ni to sad<ta[čno, ]  
 [.hhhh ]noth(I)knohh:w>nor that now<ex[actly, ]  
 04 [((clicking))] [((clicking))]  
*I don't know exactly that either*

05 (.)

06	Dt1:	[ne zna:š [ >°tačno ° < ] [not (you) kno:w [ >°exactly ° < ] <i>you don't know exactly</i>
----	------	--

07 [ ((clickin[g)) ] ((clicking))]

08 Sus: [ koli]ko je bi:lo, ]  
 [how mu]ch aux. wa:s, ]  
*what time it was*

09 ((click))

10 (0.3)

11 š:e:s:: (.) pet, še:s, sati, NE zna:m °bogo mi°  
 s:i:x:: (.) five, si:x, hours, not(I)kno:w °God me°  
*six, five, six, I don't know by God*

12 (2.5)

13 Sus: .hhh (.) °ne zna:m ° tačno.  
 .hhh (.) °not(I)kno:w° exactly.  
*I don't know exactly*

In line 01 Dt1 inquires about the time a certain telephone conversation took place. He formulates the turn as *'when did you get him?'* The lexical item *'when'* potentially leaves space for a number of possible responses, but in his response the suspect goes for a matter of precision. In line 03 he states *'I don't know exactly'* going for the exact time of the call, whereas the response to *'when'* could have been *'last week'* *'on Sunday'* etc. Claiming inability to be precise, leaves the suspect an option of not giving any definite response. In such a way, he blocks the current line of questioning. The suspect may also perceive the interrogation as an occasion of *'relevant'* precision (see Drew, 2003b). However, note that after the blocking repeat in line 06 the suspect goes again for a matter of precision – offering a similar answer *'five, six,'* *'I*



*don't know by God'* . He essentially holds the same position before and after the repeat turn.

## **5.6 Conclusion**

In this chapter I have dealt with an interactional technique of challenging or expressing scepticism concerning the suspect's answer by the questioning officer. Looking at the suspects' initial answers to which the detectives respond by means of a repeat, one can note that they are in some way non-straightforward or detectives find them in some way unacceptable. These answers are non-elliptical, non-elided, claiming not to know or not to remember, they are evasive, invoking honesty, giving resistance and trying to obstruct the line of interrogation.

The detectives treat these kinds of answers from the suspects, among other ways, by means of a full or a partial repeat of the received answer. This is sometimes supported by a supplementary which tends to make the challenge expressed by a repeat more explicit. One has seen that the repeats have some properties of repair initiation as they indicate that there is some sort of trouble with the received answer and as, in a way, they are striving to reset the sequence and have the received answer amended. However, repeat sequences cannot be taken to be quite the same as repair. Since repeats express scepticism and non-acceptance of the received answer, and they have a potentially damaging effect, they unlike real repair, most often involve no repair on the suspect's initial answer. Instead, the suspect sticks to the previously taken position.

This technique of the detectives, used to undermine the suspects' position does create a general atmosphere of intimidation. This could be noted in the suspects' post-repeat turns. An examination of how suspects respond to the repeat turns has shown that they perceive them as threatening. We have seen how their responses to such detectives' turns can be defensive, the defensiveness being expressed by no response from the suspect, through a number of defensive elements in the response turn design, overlapping as to take over the turn, holding the same position since the suspects can perceive the repeat turns as reinstating the prior accusations and so on

## **CHAPTER SIX**

### **SUSPECTS' 'RHETORICAL' QUESTIONS**

## 6.1 Introduction

As I have pointed out in the literature review, interrogations are a speech exchange system, which restricts questioning and answering to the different parties. The detectives are the ones doing the questioning, whereas the suspects/witnesses are the ones answering. This chapter, however, deals with an interactional phenomenon in which the roles of the questioner and the questioned party are slightly reversed and the questioned party starts asking ‘questions’. This kind of sequence is usually initiated by a detective’s turn which in certain way accuses the suspect. In response, the suspect starts applying interrogatives which look backwards onto the detective’s prior turn and challenge or deny its implications.

I have mentioned that in such interactional environments as news interviews or medical interaction there are instances of interviewees asking permission to answer or asking a permission to ask (see Clayman and Heritage, 2002; Frankel, 1990). Similar ‘permission asking’ examples can be found in the police interviews discourse. In the following example (extract 4.1) one can note that in line 01 the suspect drops an initiated interrogative and corrects himself by asking for permission to ask ‘something’. After getting the permission from Dt2, in line 02, the suspect makes the previously dropped inquiry in lines 05-06.

### Extract 4.1

*Medo\_fthe\_s\_off\_2008*

01	Sus:	.hhh <u>K</u> Ako LJUdi s- sau- >mogu l JA pita< što.= .hhh <u>H</u> Ow PEOPLE o- onl- >can qp. I ask< what.= <i>How people- can I ask something?</i>
02	Dt2:	=moš [( ) ]da pitaš. ( ) =(you) can[( ) ]to ask. ( ) <i>You can ( ) ask</i>
03		[( (bang) )]
04		(.)

05 Sus: KAKo me probraste, (0.6) PR:voga od SVIje, (0.7)  
 HOw me picked, (0.6) FI:rst of All, (0.7)  
*How did you pick me, before everybody*

06 da hah DOhuhdem ja a a:mo.  
 to hah COhuhme I h h:ere.  
*to come here?*

07 (.)

08 Dt2: ne[ko je mora- >ne]ko je morao bit<[prvi. ]  
 so[meone aux. had- >so]meone aux.had to be<[first. ]  
 09 [((bang)) ] [((bang))]  
*Someone had to be first*

This example indicates that the suspect recognises the unwritten rule of interrogation that he is only supposed to ask questions if permitted to. This example also occurs towards the end of the interview which indicates that the suspect has waited for the detectives to complete their institutional business, following which the suspect is able to launch the inquiry.

Also see extract 4.2 below, in which the detectives orient to the unwritten rule that suspects are not supposed to ask questions. The detectives are inquiring into the suspect's debts which could potentially have led him to participate in a theft.

#### Extract 4.2

##### ***Suspect\_fthe\_s\_inf\_2008***

01 Dt2: i:, >šta je bilo s tim kreditom<,  
 and:,>what aux. was with this credit<,  
*And what happened to this loan?*

02 (0.1)

03 Sus: °ni:šta° (.) potrošio i sad vrće:m.  
 °no:thing° (.) spent and now (I)retu:rn.  
*I spent it and now I am paying it off*

04 (0.2)

05 Dt2: ad >NA šta si ga potROšio<,  
 and >ON What aux. (you)him spENT<,  
*And what did you spend it on?*

06 (.)

07 Sus: hh pa h to: hh potrebe, (.)kuće:. prod[avnice]  
hh well h that: hh needs , (.)of house:.of sho[op ]  
*Well that, the house needs, the shop*

08 Dt2: [šta : ]  
[what: ]  
*What*

09 SI, prodavnica kuće, >reci nam sad<  
aux.(you), shop house, >tell us now <  
*do you mean shop, house, tell us now*

10 (.)

11 Sus: p[°eto° ]  
wl'[°there° ]  
*Well*

12 Dt2: [>mi smo ču]li druGU< InforMAciju.  
[>we aux.he]ard othER< InforMation.  
*We have heard something else.*

13 (0.3)

14 Sus: m: kojuž  
m: whichž  
*What?*

15 (0.2)

16 Dt2: ((tongue click))a št- (nemoj mi:)- sluša:j  
((tongue click))and wh- (don't me:)-liste:n  
*and-wh- listen,*

17 >nijesmo< MI: TEbe doveli.  
>not aux.< WE: YOu brought.  
*we didn't bring you*

18 (0.5)

19 Dt1: da TI NAs isPITU:ješ, nego mi: TEbe,  
that YOU Us quESTI:on, but we: You,  
*to question us, but us to question you*

In line 12 Dt2 states that they (the police) know about the suspect's debts, but he does not reveal the information. In line 14 the suspect makes what seems to be an inquiry about the information. Following a (0.2) pause in line 15, Dt2 produces a dental click in order to indicate his annoyance by the suspect's inquiry and then states that that they (detectives) did not bring the suspect to the station so he could question them, but so they could question him. Interestingly enough, the statement is produced partly by Dt2

(lines 16 and 17) and partly by Dt1 (line 19), which shows orientation of both detectives to the fact that the suspects' role is strictly 'answering questions'.

## 6.2 Suspects' questions

As noted above, broadly speaking, the speech exchange system in interrogation is question-answer, in which the right to ask questions is restricted to the detectives. However, on better inspection, it becomes evident that police interrogations are not so rigidly organized and that suspects would occasionally ask questions too. For example, instances of suspect's questions which perform an action of clarification do occur, as is the case with the utterance in line 06 in extract 4.3 below.

### Extract 4.3

#### Medo\_fthe\_s\_off\_2008

01 Dt2: ti ove transformatore koji su kra:deni, ne  
you these transformers which are sto:len, not  
*these transformers which were stolen you don't*

02 znaš (.)u kakvom su, (0.2)stanju bili.  
(you)know(.)in what aux., (0.2)state were.  
*know what kind of state they were in*

03 (0.2)

04 Sus: .hhh

05 (1.0)

06 Sus:	KAk- u::->jesu li bili< svi NAmota[ni >ovo o]no< HOw- in::->aux. qp.were< all COil[ed >this t]hat< <i>were they all coiled you mean?</i>
---------	--

07 Dt2: [(da) ]  
[(yes) ]

One can note that in lines 01-02 the detective launches an inquiry for information in the form of a statement, asking whether the suspect knew what condition the stolen transformers were in when they disappeared. After a pause in line 03 and an inbreath in line 04, which shows the suspect's attempt to launch his turn, comes another, longer (1.0) pause in line 05. Finally, in line 06, after two restarts, the suspect forms what is

obviously an inquiry, with a *li* information-seeking particle. This turn is apparently reformulating the detective's inquiry from lines 01-02 and is purely clarificatory by nature. One can note that in 07 the detective responds to this turn simply by 'da' - 'yes', i.e. he confirms the suspect's understanding of the inquiry from 01-02.

Apart from clarifications, the suspects in my data ask questions in order to settle some business, for example to set the time of the next interview. However, there is a more interesting type of 'question', rhetorical by nature, produced by the questioned party, which will be the main focus of this chapter. Extract 4.4 below contains an example of the given interactional practice (lines 6-8).

#### Extract 4.4

##### *Suspect\_fthe\_s\_inf\_2008*

- 01 Dt4: pa >je li TEbe nešto tu< glu:>po da on sad  
well >aux qp. YOU something there< stu:>pid that he now  
*Well, isn't it somewhat stupid that he now*
- 02 odjednom oće da napušti< POsa:.  
suddenly wants to quit< JOB:.  
*suddenly wants to quit*
- 03 [>posle< ovog, ]  
[>after< this, ]  
*after this?*
- 04 Dt1: [a zbog ČEga] je? (.) koji MU JE RAZlog,  
[and becausee OF WHat] is? (.) which HIM IS REASON,  
*And why is it? What is his reason?*
- 05 (0.9)
- |    |      |   |
|----|------|---|
| 06 | Sus: | ne sna:m bogomi, (0.1) pitajte njega.<br>not (I)kno:w God me, (0.1) ask him.<br><i>I certainly don't know, ask him.</i> |
|----|------|---|
- 07 (1.5)
- |    |  |  |
|----|--|--|
| 08 |  | šta ć- šta JA zna:m °čuš° <sup>21</sup><br>what w- what I kno:w °listen°<br><i>listen, what do I know?</i> |
|----|--|--|

In this extract, the detectives question a factory mechanic, a possible suspect in a factory theft. A couple of lines prior to this extract, Dt1 inquires about the suspect's brother who

works in the same factory. We also find out that this brother has considered quitting his job following the factory theft and the detectives want to find out more about this. They do this because there are no viable reasons for him to quit the job: he has been working there for over twelve years and he does not have a new one. That is why the detectives raise the question of why, all of a sudden, the suspect's brother wants to quit the factory job. In lines 01-03 Dt4 probes, asking if the suspect thinks that it is somewhat stupid that his brother wants to quit the job. Dt1 overlaps with Dt4 in line 04, with a double-barrelled turn '*And why is it? What is his reason?*' which supports Dt4's previous turn and carries an implication that the suspect must know something about it. One can note that after a significant (0.9) pause in line 05, the suspect responds to the two previous turns which together carry an imputation against him/his brother. One can note that this suspect's turn consists of two distinct parts. The first bit of the response '*I certainly don't know, ask him.*' is a straightforward response claiming no knowledge. This part of the turn denies the detectives' imputations. The second part of the turn which the suspect appends after a (1.5) pause in line 08 '*listen, what do I know?*' is question-like in form, but performs a rather delicate kind of work. One thing that has to be noted here is that this part of the turn, although interrogative in form, is different from 'real questions' as it does not expect any answer. It is an instance of what, in the literature, is usually referred to as rhetorical questions. One can also note that this part of the turn is not looking forward down the sequence, but backwards to the detective's previous turns and backs up the first, challenging, part of the suspect's turn. Inferentially, it is also claiming no knowledge – '*I know nothing*' and, at the same time, challenging the appositeness of the detectives' turns in lines 1-3. Also, the post positioned element '*°čuš°*' is used to show disapproval of the detectives' questions in the first position. Essentially, differently from the above given clarificatory example in extract 4.3, the interrogative of the extract 4.4, produced by the suspect in line 08 performs quite a different activity to be further discussed in more detail in the rest of this chapter.



### 6.3 Detectives' damaging turns in first position

What is characteristic of these sequences is that they get initiated by the detectives and that is exclusively in the interviews with suspects, not witnesses. The fact that they are used against the suspects not witnesses already says a lot about the nature of these sequences. In the first position, the detectives initiate something that goes along the lines of accusing or incriminating the suspect. These initiating turns are imputing some wrongdoing or motive of wrongdoing on part of the suspect. This can be done in a variety of ways: the accusations/imputations could equally be expressed by the means of interrogatives and statements. They can also be done directly, in which case personal pronoun 'you' can be used, or indirectly, in which case the accusation needs to be worked out inferentially. The levels of directness vary from case to case.

In the following case, extract 4.5, the claim in line 01, damaging for the suspect is expressed by means of an interrogative:

Extract 4.5

*Suspect\_fthe\_s\_inf\_2008*

01	Dt2:	KOme	>si	ti	dužan	< PAre.
		TO WHom	>aux.	you	o↑we(adj.)	< MOney.
		<i>Who do you owe money?</i>				
02		(0.5)				
03	Sus:	°nikome.	(0.1)	((click))	komež°	
		°no one.	(0.1)	((click))	to whomž°	
		<i>No one. To whom?</i>				

Dt2 here investigates the possibility of what were the suspect's motives for allegedly participating in the theft. One obvious reason is that that the suspect has financial troubles and that he wanted to get some quick money. '*Who do you owe money?*' in line 01 accuses via an embedded presupposition – '*you owe money to somebody*'. This turn is direct in the sense that the detective addresses the suspect by using the personal pronoun 'you'; it is less direct in the sense that the accusation is conveyed via

the presupposition. However, the fact that Dt2 presupposes that the suspect owes money to somebody gives special weight to the turn in line 01.

Extract 4.6 is taken from the same factory theft case:

#### Extract 4.6

##### *Suspect\_fthe\_s\_inf\_2008*

01	Dt3:	sluŠA:J >mi i[mamo izjavu < JED]ne osobe ODe liste:N >we h[ave statement< of ON]e person HEre <i>Listen, we have a statement of one person here</i>
02	Dt1:	[pa STANI>jednu< sTVAr] [well STOP>one < tHINg] <i>Well, hold on, one thing-</i>
03		>da si ti<[oSA:M]NE:s pu:ta u toku DA:na:, >that aux.you<[eIG:H]TE:n ti:mes in course of DA:y:, <i>that eighteen times in the course of that day</i>
04	Dt1:	[ ovAJ] [ erR ] <i>err</i>
05		<zVAO NOva da ga ↑pitaš: š:TA JE <(you) cALED NOvo that him(you) ↑ask: w:HAT aux. <i>You called Novo to ask him what</i>
06		pričo> >i šta će pričať u policiju. (he)talked> >and what(he)will talk< in police. <i>he talked about and what he will tell to the police</i>
07		(.)
08	Sus:	JA Zvao °ga°. I Called °him°. <i>I called?</i>

In lines 01-06 Dt3 reveals to the suspect a statement of a witness in the case, which goes against what the suspect is claiming. That means that the imputation is conveyed as a third party attribution: not only does the detective doubt the suspect's story, but he has somebody else to back up his suspicions. The detective's turn, lines 01-06 has a form of a long statement and Dt3 delivers the accusation directly, by using the personal pronoun 'you'.

As well as a more direct way of accusing, detectives could make their accusations/imputations in a more tentative way. In extract 4.7 below one can note that the imputations are not stated openly. It should be understood here that the man who is mentioned as ‘ovoga’ – ‘this’ in line 01, is a deceased man who, before he died, has allegedly been phoned by a number of people. The callers were impersonating the police and threatening the man, which finally led to his suicide. One can note that in line 01 the detective states ‘*There, the family too know who called this man.*’ This is, again, a third party attribution, the detective attributing ‘the state of knowing’ to the deceased’s family. In Dt1’s statement, lines 01-02, the suspect is not directly accused of anything in particular. The beginning of the turn – ‘eno ti’, literally ‘there you’, however, points to the fact that this issue concerns the suspect. The phrase ‘the family too know’ points to the fact that somebody else knows who called the deceased, possibly the police, or other parties. This is a very indirect way of targeting the suspect. It is essentially a fishing device (Pomerantz, 1980), which might potentially get the suspect to confess or say what he knows, but is not saying.

#### Extract 4.7

##### *Suspect\_fthe\_s\_inf\_2008*

01	Dt1:	Eno ↑ti ZNA: I porodica, ko je ZVA: (.) ovoga. <i>There ↑you KNOW: AND family, who aux. CALLED:(.) this.  There, the family too know who called this man</i>
02		(.) da je poLI:cija. <sup>22</sup> <i>(.) that is poLI:ce.  that it is the police</i>
03		(.)
04	Dt4:	to niJ[E - #tə:# ] that noT[aux.-#th:# ] <i>that is not-</i>
05		[(click click)]
06		(.)
07	Sus:	a >esam li ga< J[A zva. ] and >did qp. Him< [I called.] <i>Did I call him?</i>
08	Dt1:	[ PORODi]ca. Ne

[ FAMi]ly. No  
Family. No

(.)

09 Sus: pa=  
so=  
so?

(Six lines omitted)

In the continuation of extract 4.7 similar instances are found.

16 Dt1:	ZNA se TAČno KO je.=
	KNOWS refl. EXActly WHO is.=
	<i>It is known exactly who that is</i>

17 Dt2:	=sna:m[o mi]
	=kno:[w we]
	<i>We know</i>

18 Sus: [ ZNA]:=

[ KNO]:=

*Kno-*

19 Dt1:	NA: se TAČno >ko GA JE< z[va:. ]
	KNOWS: refl. EXActly >who HIM aux.< c[alled:]
	<i>It is known exactly who called him</i>

20 Sus: [KO ]:

[WHO ]:

*Who?*

One can see that in this part of the sequence Dt1 launches imputations against the suspect in two instances, lines 16 and 19. The form of these two detective's turns is virtually the same. Note that the detective, in both instances, uses an impersonal reflexive 'zna se', an approximate equivalent to 'it is known' in English, which does not indicate who has the information. Dt1 indicates that there is somebody who knows, but does not reveal who. It is only in line 17 that Dt2 overlaps with 'we know', claiming that it is the police who have the information. This, again, is a similar detective's technique of 'accusing whilst not accusing'.

Essentially, what can be seen from these examples is that in this type of sequence, in the first position the detectives, either directly or indirectly, launch accusations/imputations

about the suspect's participation in some sort of criminal activity. In the following section I consider how these sequences develop past the detectives' initial turns.

#### 6.4 Suspect's question-like responses - turn design

In this section, I am going to deal with the design of the suspect's turn in second position, which occurs as a response to the detectives' accusations/imputations in the first position and which consists of/contains interrogatives. It would be very difficult to assign any strict form onto a particular interactional phenomenon. However, this type of suspect's second position turn does occur in roughly three distinct patterns.

- i. Interrogatives only:

##### Extract 4.8

*Suspect\_fthe\_s\_inf\_2008*

01 Dt1: Eno †ti ZNA: I porodica, ko je ZVA: (.) ovoga.  
 THere †you KNOW: AND family, who aux. CALLED:(.) this.  
*There, the family too know who called this man*

02 (.) da je poLI:cija.  
 (.) that is poLI:ce.  
*that it is the police*

03 (.)

04 Dt4: to niJ[E - #tə:# ]  
 that noT[aux.-#th:# ]  
*that is not-*

05 [(click click)]

06 (.)

07 Sus: a >esam li ga< J[A zva. ] and >did qp. him< [I called.] <i>Did I call him?</i>
--

In the already quoted extract 4.8 above, in lines 01-02 Dt1 launches his allegations. In line 04 there is an incomplete turn of Dt4. Then, one can note that in line 07 Sus responds to the indirect allegations with a turn which is interrogative in form and which, at first sight, looks as though the suspect is making an inquiry for information.

- ii. Denial + interrogative: The already discussed extract 4.9 is an example of this pattern.

#### Extract 4.9

##### *Suspect\_fthe\_s\_inf\_2008*

01 Dt4: pa >je li TEbe nešto tu< glu:>po da on sad  
 well >aux qp. YOu something there< stu:>pid that he now  
*Well, isn't it somewhat stupid that he now*

02 odjednom oće da napušti< POsa:.  
 suddenly wants to quit< JOB:.  
*suddenly wants to quit his job*

03 [>posle< ovog, ]  
 [>after< this, ]  
*after this?*

04 Dt1: [a zbog ČEga] je? (.) koji MU JE RAZlog,  
 [and becausee OF WHat] is? (.) which HIM IS REAson,  
*And why is it? What is his reason?*

05 (0.9)

06 Sus:	ne sna:m bogomi, (0.1) pitajte njega. not (I)kno:w God me, (0.1) ask him. <i>I certainly don't know, ask him.</i>
---------	---

07 (1.5)

08	šta ć- šta JA zna:m °čuš° what w- what I kno:w °listen° <i>listen, what do I know?</i>
----	--

In lines 01- 04 the detectives imply that the suspect might know why his brother wants to quit the job. In line 06 the suspect responds to these allegations: he first denies knowing, in the form of a negative statement in line 06 (first part of the pattern). Then, after a (1.5) pause in line 07, the suspect applies the second part of the pattern, the interrogative 'What do I know?'.

- iii. The third pattern is the one in which an interrogative like clause comes first and the denial follows: most of these instances come in the form of complex clauses of the type ‘how can I x, when y’, the first part of the complex dependent clause being an interrogative like form, headed by a question word, and the second part of the clause being a denial in form of some sort of statement. See extract 4.10 below:

Extract 4.10

*Suspect\_fthe\_s\_inf\_2008*

01 Dt4:      pre:>lomi bolan<,progoVOri[ka čœk. ]  
             bre:>ak sick<, spEak [like man.]  
             *Come on, man, tell the truth like a man*

02 Dt1:    [ um-        ] [možeš,-     ]  
   [ ca-        ] [(you)can,- ]  
   *Ca- can you-*

03 Sus:    [sa:mo       ] da vi-  
   [on:ly       ] that you-  
   *Let me just-*

04    k -KA>ko ću progoVOrit kad ne znam          ništa<, °ćuš° h- HO>w will (I)spEak when not (I)know nothing<, °lis'n° <i>Listen, how shall I speak when I don't know anything?</i>
---

In line 01 Dt4 tries to get the suspect to tell the truth. In his turn the detective implies that the suspect knows something, but is keeping quiet. In line 02 Dt1 makes some attempt to speak, but he drops out as the suspect overlaps in line 03 and gets the floor. In line 04 the suspect responds to Dt4's allegations from line 01 in form of ‘how can I x when I y’ turn – ‘*How shall I speak when I don't know anything?*’.

Sometimes, however, it happens that the suspect formulates his response to the detective's accusations in two separate clauses, which are not in a dependent relationship. See for example extract 4.11 below:

## Extract 4.11

### *Suspect\_fthe\_s\_inf\_2008*

01 Dt1: KU:nem ti se VIdi, Ako si sa mnom BIo,  
(I)SWE:ar you refl. LOk, If aux(you)with me WAs,  
*Look, I swear, if you were with me,*

02 ne bih ni te:be štedio.  
not(I)would nor yo:u spare.  
*I wouldn't spare you either*

03 (.)

04 Sus:	a >pa- pa- KO bi ga štedio, and >well- well- WHO would him spare, and well- well- who would spare him?
---------	--

05	NE bi BRAta ro<denog. NOT would BROther pr<oper. <i>I wouldn't my own brother</i>
----	---

In lines 01-02 Dt1 states that if he were somebody's accomplice in a criminal act, he would personally not protect the person and he would give away their name. The detective, in this way, indirectly accuses the suspect. He implies that the suspect participated in the crime in question, that he had accomplices and is protecting them by not saying who they were. The suspect responds to these indirect allegations by an interrogative '*who would spare him?*' in line 04, and then in line 05 produces an independent denying statement '*I wouldn't my own brother*', i.e. even if he committed the crime together with his own brother, he would not protect him. This hypothetical defensiveness very much reminds of the phenomena discussed by Edwards (2008) and Benneworth (2010). Edwards found that both suspects and police officers apply the forms containing modal verb 'would' in order to challenge each other. Benneworth notes that hypothetical denials by suspected pedophiles of the type 'If I did then X' as well as 'would' utterances are used as to avoid explicitly admitting or denying.



- iv. Other design features of these turns: looking at the turn beginnings one can note that some of these turns do not have any attachments as is the case with the example in extract 4.12 below.

#### Extract 4.12

##### *Suspect\_fthe\_s\_inf\_2008*

01 Dt2: KŌme >si ti duʃzan < PAre.  
TO WHom >aux. you oʃwe(adj.)< MŌney.  
*Who do you owe money?*

02 (0.5)

03 Sus:	°nikome. (0.1)((click)) komeʒ° °no one. (0.1)((click)) to whomʒ° <i>No one. To whom?</i>
---------	--

One can see that after the accusation in line 01 and a (0.5) pause in line 02, the suspect goes straight onto the denial which is then supported by an interrogative.

Some other turns, however, get to be initiated by what can be roughly termed ‘a number of dispreferred markers’: ‘čuš’ literally ‘listen to this’, ‘a’, literally ‘and’<sup>23</sup>, ‘pa’ – ‘well’. In the already discussed extract 4.13 below, following the detectives’ imputations that Sus might know something about why his brother quit his job, the suspect denies the claims and then challenges the appositeness of the detectives’ turns.

#### Extract 4.13

##### *Suspect\_fthe\_s\_inf\_2008*

06 Sus:	ne sna:m bogomi, (0.1) pitajte njega. not (I)kno:w God me, (0.1) ask him. <i>I certainly don’t know, ask him.</i>
---------	---

07 (1.5)

08	šta ć- šta JA zna:m °čuš° what w- what I kno:w °listen° <i>listen, what do I know?</i>
----	--

Note the final element in the suspect's turn '°čuš°' literally '(you)listen to this'. This element can occur at the beginning of the turn, but no matter what its position is, it is backward looking, doing commentary onto the previous turn and the action it delivers. In this case, it is conveying annoyance with the previously delivered accusations from the two detectives. The element 'čuš', then, is seen as reinforcing the action done by the rhetorical question that precedes it.

An instance of 'a' - 'and' can be seen in extract 4.14, line 03. As already pointed out, this marker is utilised by the detectives disjunctively to mark each new item inquired about in the course of interrogation.

#### Extract 4.14

##### *Guard\_fthe\_s\_off\_2008*

01 Dt1: phhhh niti je bilo što sumljivo. kami ↓ni:je  
 phhhh nor aux. was what suspicious. like me ↓n:o  
*Nor was there anything suspicious, yeah right*

02 (0.4)

03	Sus:	a okle sam zNA:? ko je zNA:?
		and from where aux. (I)kNEW:? who aux.kNEW:?
		<i>And how could I know? who knew?</i>

In this case 'a' occurs at the beginning of a SPP and there is a sense of it being both disjoining and linking. It is linking in the sense that 'and' is topically linking the suspect's response to the turn previously produced by the detective. This gives a sense of stabilizing the sequence and diminishing the effect of the accusation. At the same time it is introducing a challenge to the accusation.

The marker 'pa' is more straightforwardly dispreferred. In studies looking at interaction in English, 'well' is said to be an indicator of incipient disaffiliation, rejection, misalignment (Pomerantz, 1984b). Schegloff and Lerner (2009) show that 'well' prefaced responses to wh-questions in second pair position are forward-looking and they operate as general alerts that indicate non-straightforwardness in responding. 'Pa' -

'well' in the suspects' response to accusations/imputations from the detectives seems to be heard as more confrontational than 'a'.

#### Extract 4.15

##### *Suspect\_fthe\_s\_inf\_2008*

01 Dt4: >što si mu priČA: TI:< da ne priča ništa,  
>why aux.(you)him talked: YOU:< that not(he)talks nothing,  
*Why were you telling him not to say anything?*

02 da [ne o-  
that[not o-

03	Sus:	[nijeSAm - >ču nijesam<,- (.) pə hh [not aux(I)->listen <,- (.) well hh <i>I didn't- listen I didn't well,</i>
----	------	--

04	KA>d sam mu ja< vi:>ko ↓to<, WH>en aux. him I< ye:>lled ↓that<,(he)lies <i>Well, when was I telling him that? He's lying.</i>
----	---

One can see that in line 01-02 Dt4 embeds a presupposition that the suspect was instructing a colleague not to give any kind of statement to the police. In line 03 the suspect overlaps with his response turn. Note that the denial in lines 03-04 has a number of restarts and a number of dispreference markers, two out of three previously discussed: 'ču', 'pa', and then the finally articulated turn is fronted by 'pa'. All these interactional indicators, paired with the increased loudness, contribute to the suspect's turn being heard as highly contentious. However, the truth is that these markers deserve much more attention than they have been given here and need to be looked at more closely in the future.

### **6.5 Action performed by suspects' interrogative responses**

The first thing that can be noted when it comes to the nature of the suspects' interrogatives in second pair part position is that they are rhetorical by nature. There are a number of features usually associated with what in linguistics have been referred to as rhetorical questions. Rhetorical questions have been defined as questions which have interrogative structure, but display the force of a strong assertion, i.e. are

statements (Quirk et al., 1985; Han, 2002, Koshik, 2005). Another feature pointed out is that these are questions which exhibit opposite polarity – a positive rhetorical question is like a negative assertion and vice versa (Quirk et al., 1985; Ilie, 1994; Han, 2002). Some examples studied by Koshik (2002, 2003, 2005) belong to the category of rhetorical questions, but for methodological reasons, she puts them in a category which she calls reversed polarity questions, together with other questions which are not rhetorical, but display opposite polarity. Additionally, rhetorical questions are considered to be a type of question which generally does not expect an answer (Quirk et al., 1985; Han, 2002,). Studying the discursual and pragmatic features of rhetorical questions Ilie (1994) notes:

‘since the rhetorical question functions as a crossbreed between a question and a statement, it shares certain features with each of these two types of utterances. On the one hand, it has an answer like any other question, but it does not request information because the answer is known to the addresser, who has reasons to assume that it will be inferred by the addressee. On the other hand, it indirectly conveys an assertion or a denial, like any statement.’

Ilie (1994, p. 38).

Ilie essentially notes that an addressee can choose between acknowledging a rhetorical and a question force of these interrogatives.

In this section, I explore how what have been termed rhetorical questions are used by speakers, or to be more precise, by suspects in the context of police interrogation.

Extract 4.16 below, contains an example of a rhetorical question produced by the suspect in the case (‘what is °with you°.’ in line 17 further down).

Extract 4.16

*Suspect\_fthe\_s\_inf\_2008*

01 Dt4: KOluko >se ZADR↑žali dire<ktori[četvrt(og)  
HOw much>refl.KE↑pt dire<ctors[four(th)  
*How long did the directors stay on the fourth?*

02 Dt1: [ŠTO I MOžete PROVJERi:ti=

[wWAT AND(you)CAn CHE:ck=  
*What you can also check-*

03 Sus:       =po >jedno< sa[:t  
               =each >one< ho[:ur  
               *for about an hour each*

04 Dt1:                               [I KO strA[ŽA:RA: ANDRIĆ N]eđ[a]  
                                       [AND WITH gu[A:RD: ANDRIĆ N]eđ[o]  
                                       *also with the guard Andric Nedo*

05 Dt4:   [(     ) koliko ] [s]a:t,  
   [(     ) how much] [h]o:ur,  
   *how much, an hour*

06               [s]a:t     ] i     po,           neđe [od- ]  
                   [h]o:r     ]and half, somewhere [from-]  
                   *an hour and a half, from about-*

07 Dt2:   [od     ]  
   [from ]

08               (0.3) ((background noise))

09 Sus:       oko s::: sedam i po,     ja misim do- (0.2)sedam s::-  
               about s::: seven and half, I think till-(0.2)seven s::-  
               *around seven and a half, I think till- seven,*

10               do osam (.) tuda neđe.           #u to vrijeme#.  
               till eight(.)there somewhere. #in that time#.  
               *till eight, something like that, at that time*

11               (0.6)

12 Dt4:       UVE[če. ]  
               EVE[ning.]  
               *In the evening?*

13 Sus:       [e     ] :=  
               [yes ] :=  
               *yes*

In this extract, one can follow how the detectives' allegations are developed across the sequence. Prior to this sequence, Dt1 is reading aloud a statement that the suspect had given previously and checking it with the suspect (parts of this sequence can be seen in lines 02-04). From line 01 of this extract one can note that Dt4 questions the suspect about the events on a specific date, the fourth of January that year. One thing that obviously occurred on this particular day is that the directors of the company dropped in during the suspect's shift to do some work (this had also been recorded in the suspect's statement). Here Dt4 asks for further details about how long the directors stayed in the factory. Although I have emphasized throughout that no question is an innocent

question, some questioning encounters involve less damaging actions than others (questioning a witness vs. questioning a suspect). The inquiry about the length of the directors' staying in the factory, looks as though the detective is asking for information, a kind of interview that can be done with a witness who is being asked for information as to help the investigation into a crime. Following this sequence in which no damaging implications are made by the detective, in the continuation of this extract, in line 14 Dt2 launches a slightly different activity.

14 Dt2: =>vidi reci ti mene<, ZAšto ti komplikuješ  
=>look tell you me<, Why you complicate  
*Look, tell me why do you make*

15 >sam sebe svj < život.  
>alone self your< life.  
*your own life complicated?*

16 (.)

17	Sus:	°ne kompli° >kujem JA: ljudi moji, šta je< °s vama°. °not compli°>cate I: people mine, what is< °with you°. <i>I don't complicate people, what's wrong with you?</i>
----	------	--

18 ???: p hhh

19 Dt2: za:što si, - z[:ašto komplikuješ]  
w:hy aux.(you),- w[:hy (you)complicate-]  
*why- why do you complicate-*

20 Sus: [a VIdi, - >vidi ovu< s]tVAr  
[and (you)LOok,- >(you)look this< t]hING  
*And look- listen to this*

21 [da vas] (.) °pitam°.  
[that you(pol)] (.) (I)°ask°.  
*let me ask you*

22 Dt2 [ea ]  
[yeah ]  
*Yeah?*

In line 14, as if summing up, Dt2 states '*Look, tell me why do you make your own life complicated?*', which carries a number of damaging implications for the suspect. First of all, it is implying that the suspect's previous and current statement(s) are too complicated and are not consistent. That, then, means that the suspect is essentially lying and could potentially be involved in the theft. One can, then, see how

the suspect responds to these implications in line 17, after a micro pause in line 16. He first denies the implications made by the detectives '*I don't complicate people*'. Then, he appends another, interrogative, TCU - '*what is °with you°.*' which obviously is not meant to ask for information about whether, for example, there is something wrong with the detectives. Another thing that can be observed about this interrogative is that it is not forward looking; it essentially looks backwards onto the detective's turn in lines 14-15. Actionwise, it questions the appositeness of the detective's implication loaded question and the appropriateness of some other allegations made by the detectives in this and some prior sequences.

Interestingly enough, the negative polarity rule does not work with this example: '*what is °with you°.*' is a positive question, so, according to the claims that rhetorical questions are characterized by reversed polarity, it would have to function as a negative assertion. It essentially has a value of a positive assertion to the effect of '*something's wrong with you*' or '*you are crazy*'. However, the question is still presumed to be 'rhetorical'. In Ilie's (1994) terms, there is a question and rhetorical force of '*what is °with you°.*' to be recognized by the addressee, but one can note that Dt2 does not attend to this suspect's turn, i.e. he does not verbally recognize either of these two. Instead, he pursues with the same inquiry in line 19. According to the no answer criterion, this example can, then, be counted as rhetorical.

Another example of suspects' rhetorical interrogatives can be found in extract 4.17 below, more precisely in lines 03-06. This extract is taken from the frequently quoted factory theft case. It comes 52.29 minutes into the conversation when the detectives have tried a number of techniques to get the suspect talking.

#### Extract 4.17

##### ***Suspect\_fthe\_s\_inf\_2008***

01 Dt2:            *zašto >(nam) ne pomogneš- samom< sebi*  
                   *why >(us) not(you)help- sole < self*  
                   *Why don't you help us- yourself?*

02                    (0.8)

03	Sus:	>kako ću pomoć, ljudi moji, kad ne znam ništa,< >how shall(I) HElp, people my, when not(I)know nothing,< <i>People, how shall I help, when I don't know anything?</i>
04		>Kako ću pomoć<, ŠTA da rad°im.° >How shall (I)help<, WHAT to(I)d°o.° <i>How shall I help? What can I do?</i>
05		(0.8)
06	Sus:	KA>ko ću pomoć, kad ne znam ništa< °o tome° HO>w shall(I)help, when not(I)know nothing<°about that° <i>How shall I help when I don't know anything about it?</i>
07		(.)
08	Dt2:	zašto >nas bolan la<žeš. why >us sick (you)l<ie. <i>Why are you lying to us man?</i>
09		(.)
10	Sus:	ama NE LAže:m, (0.3)>kunem ti se< u đecu, but NOT(I)Li:e, (0.3)>(I)swear you refl.<in children, <i>but, I am not lying, I swear on my children's life</i>

In line 01 Dt1 launches an inquiry 'why don't you help us' and then cuts off and changes it into - 'yourself?'. Here 'help' stands for 'talk', for the only way the suspect can help the police is to give away useful information or confess his participation in the theft. The detective is also implying that, by cooperating, the suspect would also be helping himself, possibly his punishment would be more lenient. Additionally, through the formulation 'why don't you help us' the detective also implies that the suspect is capable of, but wouldn't help the police, meaning he would not talk. The suspect's response to all these implications comes in line 03 after a (0.8) pause in line 02. Note that the suspect formulates his response by using four interrogative-like forms. In line 03 one can note the first of the detective's implications surfacing: Dt2 was implying that Sus knows something about the theft. The suspect designs his turn in the form of 'People, how shall I help, when I don't know anything?', a complex rhetorical construction, by which he first expresses his attitude towards Dt2's request for information and marks it as impossible or out of the question. By embedding the phrase 'people' into the construction, the suspect points out that



other detective's implications were also out of question. Then, in the second part of this dependent construction comes the denial of what Dt2 was implying.

In line 04 come rather dramatic double interrogatives, which challenge the detective's implication that the suspect can help. Then, again, in line 05 after a (0.8) pause comes another reprimand and a denial of the detective's implication that the suspect knows something about the theft. Note how the detective treats the suspect's turn from lines 03-06. Dt2 responds to all of these interrogatives by '*Why are you lying to us man?*' in line 08. This indicates that Dt2 does not treat the four interrogative-like forms as questions, but he rather treats them as statements. This goes along with the traditional accounts that rhetorical questions have a force of assertions. Dt2 treats lines 03-06 as the suspect's statements of innocence and responds to them by stating that the suspect is lying.

Another extract featuring a number of suspect's rhetorical interrogatives is extract 4.18 below. Note a line of interrogatives produced both by the detective and the suspect, lines 09-26.

This extract is taken from the factory theft case. The suspect being questioned is a mechanic who, just before the factory parts disappeared, dismantled some parts from a transformer. This is why the detectives believe that this person is involved in the theft by preparing the parts to be later stolen by his accomplices. One can note that Dt1 initiates an accusation in lines 01-05.

#### Extract 4.18

##### ***Suspect\_fthe\_s\_inf\_2008***

01 Dt1: AnDRIću, (0.1)samo da mi,- #m da te pitam# jeno.  
AnDRIC, (0.1)only that me,- #m that you (I)ask# one.  
*Andric, just- let me ask you something*

02 .hhh (.) ə: >zbog ČEga ↑nijesi,< ti: prihvatio,  
.hhh (.) ə: >because of WHat ↑didn't,< you: accept,  
*Why didn't you accept*

03 a:: Neđu da: vidiš ove djelove, pošto se ti: u

a:: Nedo to: see these parts, since refl. you: in  
to Nedjo to take a look at these parts, since you

04 nji:h razumiješ, (0.5)tu noć >kad si dolazio  
the:m understand, (0.5)that night>when aux. (you)came  
*know about them, that night when you came*

05 [kod njega<.]  
[by him<. ]  
*by him*

06 Sus: [vidite ](.)sad je grota, >pričat za mrtvijem<.  
[(you)see ](.)now is pity, >talk after dead<.  
*You see, now it is a shame to talk about the dead*

07 >on mene NIje REko- on je- ja sam <(.)  
>he me DIDn't SAY- he is- I aux.<(.)  
*he didn't tell me- he is- I*

08 KA:zo[kako je bilo]  
SA:id[how aux. (it)was]  
*said what had happened*

The turn beginning '*Andric, just- let me ask you something*' gives an impression that an inquiry for information is going to ensue. However, Dt1 launches an accusation in the form of a presupposition embedded into a Wh-interrogative. The accusation is that the suspect refused to look at the dismantled parts at a request of a guard, who saw the parts lying in a heap outside the factory and thought there was something wrong going on. In line 06 the suspect overlaps and states that it is inappropriate to talk about the deceased guard or discuss what he said. Then, in a number of restarts the suspect forms a sort of denial.

In the continuation of extract 4.18 below, Dt1 rebuts with another interrogative – '*For god's sake, how come he didn't tell you?*' reproaching the suspect for the response.

09 Dt1: [>kako ti ]nije<REko, božiji[čoeče, ]  
[>how you ]not< aux.SAid, God's[man, ]  
*For God's sake, how come he didn't tell you?*

10 Sus: [ >on je ]mene<  
[ >he aux.]me<  
*He*

11 RE[ko, ]  
SA[id, ]

told me-

- 12 Dt1:           [>jel       <]TI REKAO OĐE U OČi.  
                  [>aux+qp.<]YOU SAID HERE IN Eyes.  
                  *Didn't he tell it here to your face?*
- 13                (.)
- |         |   |
|---------|---|
| 14 Sus: | >ma ja-a esam mu JA REko, da nije (.)bilo tak°o°.=  |
|         | >well I-and did him I Say,that not aux.(.)was like t°hat°=<br><i>But I- and didn't I tell him that it wasn't like that?</i> |
- 15 Dt3:           >p ti: si mu <REko, al on tvrđi to:[čovj(eče)]  
                  >wl'you: aux. him<Told, but he claims that:[ma(n) ]  
                  *Well, you have told him, but that's what he claims, man*
- 16 Sus:   [čuhš        ]  
  [lihsten ]  
  *Listen*
- |    |  |
|----|--|
| 17 | (.)>pa a čuš što se<(.)pita više[njegova, ]  |
|    | (.)>well but listen why refl.<(.)asks more[his,         ]<br><i>well, why would you believe his word more?</i> |
- 18 Dt3:   [al on je]  
  [but he is]  
  *But, he is*
- 19                POšten čovjek.  
                  HONest man.  
                  *an honest man*

The suspect tries defending himself in lines 10 and 11, but in line 12 Dt1 launches an additional accusatory turn. This turn is in the form of: 'jel TI REKAO OĐE U OČi.', a positive interrogative but in Serbo-Croatian close to the English '*didn't he tell it here to your face?*', embedding the proposition '*he told you to your face*' and asking for a confirmation of the proposition, by which the suspect would ultimately incriminate himself. So, the suspect does not confirm, but in line 14 makes a start of 'ma ja-' possibly going for a statement and then applies an interrogative form 'esam mu JA reko da nije bilo tak°o°.' - '*didn't I tell him that it wasn't like that?*' which is fronted by a dispreferring 'pa'- 'well' and is matching in form the turn previously produced by Dt1. The suspect builds in a proposition that he told the guard '*it wasn't like that*' and is asking the detective for a confirmation of the proposition, by which, the detective would lean towards the suspect not being guilty. In line 15 Dt3 latches and confirms the proposition, fronting his turn by a dispreferring

'well', then adds '*that's what he claims, man*', by which he indicates that he sides with the deceased guard's version of the story. Note that so far both Dt1 and Dt3 have sided with the statement of the late guard. In line 16 the suspect starts his turn by 'čuš >pa a čuš' (he includes all dispreferred markers previously discussed), in such a way, expressing his non acceptance of Dt3's incriminating turn from line 15. The suspect, then, builds his defense by applying an interrogative which is rhetorical by nature 'što se<(.)pita više njegova' - '*why would one believe his word more?*'. The interrogative is not obviously looking for information, but is rather a statement essentially saying it is the suspect's word against the word of the deceased witness or '*you shouldn't believe his word*'. In an overlap, in lines 18-19, Dt3 rebuts the suspect's denial by '*but, he is an honest man*' essentially saying '*we should believe him more*'. Note that Dt3 here provides an answer to the rhetorical form, which in Ilie's (1994) terms means that he respected the question force of the rhetorical question.

In the continuation of extract 4.18, after a millisecond pause in line 20, in line 21 the suspect rebuts by another rhetorical form '*and I am not?*,' which is an inference he drew from the previous contrasting detective's statement '*he is an honest man*'.

20 (.)

21	Sus:	a ja nije[sam.] and I not[aux.] <i>and I am not?</i>	
22	Dt4:	[ ŠTO]: se piTA NJEGO[↓va više. ] [ WHY]: refl.aSKS HI[↓s more. ] <i>Why would you believe his word more?</i>	
23	Dt3:		[(on je)pošten čovjek.]= [(he is)honest man. ]= <i>He is an honest man</i>
24	Dt3:	= [>vididiš ]ŠTA je URA↑dio<[od svog života.] =>(you)seeeee]WHAT aux.(he)DI↑d<[of his life.] <i>You see what he did to himself?</i>	
25	Sus:	[i- i- ] [and- and- ]	[i- i- i JA:] [and-and- and I:]

26	pa š:ta >treBAlo< i JA: >sad da uradim.< so w:hat >shOUld < and I: >now to do.< <i>So what, should I do it too then?</i>
27	(.)
28 Dt3:	hhə hhh

In line 22 Dt4 blocks the suspect's defensive line of answering with a repetition of '*why would one believe his word more?*'. Dt3 overlaps with another rebuttal - '*he is an honest man*' and adds a supporting '*You see what he did to himself?*', i.e. he committed suicide and that is enough proof of his honesty. In line 25, in an overlap, the suspect starts building his defense again, saying he is an honest man too and then in line 26 reaching for another rhetorical form '*should I do it too then?*', (fronted by dispreferred '*So what*') which Dt3 treats with a disapproving sound '*hə hhh*' in line 28.

This and other extracts in this chapter, indicate that detectives and suspects respectively can use interrogatives as a challenging device. Ilie (1994, p. 213), studying the use of rhetorical questions in courtroom proceedings, concludes that unlike genuine questions, which require and elicit answers and which are usually interpreted as first pair parts of question-answer adjacency pairs, rhetorical questions can be both first pair and second pair parts<sup>24</sup>.

Rhetorical questions, used by the suspects in second pair part position, are, in my data, used by the suspects as a way of challenging the detectives' accusations/imputations or as a way of marking detectives' accusatory turns as inapposite. Ilie has drawn some similar conclusions about courtroom interaction. She states that rhetorical questions constitute an alternative way for a cross-examined person to answer questions. Although they convey the same propositional content, the rhetorical question and its corresponding statement reveal different speaker commitments. Whereas the rhetorical

question challenges the justifiability of counsel's question and also implies an emphatic assertion, the corresponding statement simply voices an opinion.

## **6.6 Detectives' treatment of suspects' rhetorical responses**

As I have previously noted, the conventional line about rhetorical questions is that they usually do not need an answer:

'...I might be just raising a question without any suggestion that either of us could give the right answer or should even try to: *Where will we be in ten years' time, I wonder?*. Or the right answer may be deemed so obvious that it would be superfluous for you to give it- this is the so called 'rhetorical question', as when I say *Who's going to notice it anyway?*, with the implication that no one is.'

Huddleston (1984, p. 353)

'The rhetorical question is interrogative in structure, but has the force of a strong assertion. It generally does not expect an answer.'

Quirk et al. (1985, p. 825)

'Rhetorical questions are used to make a comment or an exclamation. A response is not expected.'

Downing and Locke (2006, p. 201)

However, unlike the claims made in the above quotations, my data indicates that although some rhetorical questions do not get an answer, they do get a response of some sort. This means that rhetorical questions in my data and in this kind of setting are not treated just as empty questions. Generally the restriction on the turn taking system disappears here, so somehow suspects are managing to themselves ask questions which then the detectives seriously begin to answer.

First of all, detectives can respond to suspect's rhetorical interrogative turns either by asking another question or by an assertion, which are not necessarily directly answering

the rhetorical question. Note that in the following two extracts, extract 4.19 and extract 4.20 below, Dt4 and Dt1 do not directly answer the suspects' rhetorical turns, but they do not ignore the work these forms are doing.

Extract 4.19

*Suspect\_fthe\_s\_inf\_2008*

01 Dt4: pa >je li TEbe nešto tu< glu:>po da on sad  
well >aux qp. YOu something there< stu:>pid that he now  
*Well, isn't it somewhat stupid that he now*

02 odjednom oće da napušti< POsa:..  
suddenly wants to quit< JOB:..  
*suddenly wants to quit his job*

03 [>posle< ovog, ]  
[>after< this, ]  
*after this?*

04 Dt1: [a zbog ČEga] je? (.) koji MU JE RAZlog,  
[and becausee OF WHat] is? (.) which HIM IS REASON,  
*And why is it? What is his reason?*

05 (0.9)

06 Sus: ne sna:m bogomi, (0.1) pitajte njega.  
not (I)kno:w God me, (0.1) ask him.  
*I certainly don't know, ask him.*

07 (1.5)

08	šta ć- šta JA zna:m °čuš° what w- what I kno:w °listen° <i>listen, what do I know?</i>
----	--

09 Dt4:	>(a) kako mu <u>ti</u> ka< bRAT NE rečeš, >and how him <u>you</u> like< bROTHER NOT (you)say, <i>How don't you, as his brother, tell him</i>
---------	--

10	ŠTA[>đeš napu(šta) ] WHAT[>will(you)qu(it)] <i>why you quit?</i>
----	--

10 Sus: [a i] VI:ko sam bogomi  
[and too] SHO:uted aux.(I) by God  
*And I was telling him for sure*

In this extract the suspect applies a rhetorical form in line 08, rhetorical by the very fact that it concerns something that the speaker himself can answer best, followed by a challenging 'čuš'. Note that in line 09 Dt4 does not answer the suspect's 'what do I know?' question, but he is recognising the challenging nature of this suspect's turn and responding with another question as to counter-challenge.

In extract 4.20 below, the suspect produces a defensive turn in lines 04-05, consisting of a rhetorical question and a denial.

#### Extract 4.20

##### ***Suspect\_fthe\_s\_inf\_2008***

01 Dt1: ku:NE:m ti se: VIdi, Ako si sa mnom BIo,  
(I)sWE:ar you refl. LOkk, If aux(you)with me WAs,  
*Look, I swear, if you were with me,*

02 ne bih ni tebe štedio.  
not(I)would nor you spare.  
*I wouldn't spare you either*

03 (.)

04 Sus: a >pa- pa- < KO bi ga šTEdio,  
but >well- well-< WHO would him sPAre,  
*But well-well-, who would spare him?*

05 NE bi BRAta rođenog.  
NOT would BROther proper.  
*I wouldn't my own brother*

06 (.)

07 Dt1: ma >ka- ka-< >ja ti< KAžem TO:. but >te- te-< >I you< TELL THAT:. <i>But te- te- I am telling you that</i>
--

In this extract as well, in his response in line 07 Dt1 gives no direct notice of the suspect's turn in lines 04-05. However, his turn 'I am telling you that' is a kind of challenge to the suspect's previous rhetorical turn.

Another device detectives can use when responding to suspects' RQ turns in second position is some sort of disapproving sound by which they front their turns to follow. For example, see the already analyzed extract 4.21 below.



Extract 4.21

*Suspect\_fthe\_s\_inf\_2008*

01 Dt3:        =[>vididiš ]ŠTA je URA↑dio<[od svog života.]  
 = [>(you) seeee]WHAT aux. (he)DI↑d<[of his life.]  
*You see what he did to himself?*

02 Sus:        [i-        i- ]                                [i- i- i JA:]  
               [and- and- ]                                [and-and- and I:]  
               Me- me-                                        me too

03                pa š:ta >treBAlo< i JA: >sad da uradim.<  
                   so w:hat >shOUld < and I: >now to do.<  
                   *So what, should I do it too then?*

04                (.)

05 Dt3:        hə hhh (0.2) >pušti tu sad priču,<  
                   hə hhh (0.2) >lEt that now story,<  
                   *Drop that story now*

Note that in line 05 Dt3 fronts his challenging turn by a disapproving sound – ‘hə hhh’. This sound as well as the rest of Dt3’s turn show unacceptance of the suspect’s prior defense in line 03, done in form of a rhetorical question.

A similar interactional practice can be recognised in extract 4.22 below:

Extract 4.22

*Suspect\_fthe\_s\_inf\_2008*

01 Dt4:        pre:>lomi bolan<,progoVOri[ka čoek. ]  
               bre:>ak sick<, spEak [like man.]  
               *Come on, man, tell the truth like a man*

02 Dt1:    [ um-        ][možeš,- ]  
   [ ca-        ][ (you) can,- ]  
   Ca- can you-

03 Sus:    [sa:mo        ]da vi-  
   [on:ly        ]that you-  
   *Let me just-*

04                k-KA>ko ću progo[Vori]t kad ne [znam ništa<,)°ču°  
                   h-HO>w will (I)s[ PEA]k when not[(I)know nothing<,)°lis’n°  
                   *Listen, how shall I speak when I don’t know anything?*

05	Dt4:	[ae: ]	[KA(ko) ]
		[yeah:]	[ho(w) ]
		Well,	how
06		((zumm))	
07	Dt4:	( [:],	
		( [:],	
08	Sus:	[(progo)VO:rit >pa da bi me sad< ubij	
		[(spe)A:k >so that would me now< kill	
		( ) <i>speak if you killed me now</i>	

The suspect's defensive rhetorical turn '*How shall I speak when I don't know anything?*' in line 04 is responded to by the detective by a disapproving 'ae:' which is then followed by a repetition of 'kako'-'how' and a bit of talk which is unintelligible on the recording.

Contrary to the above examples, on other occasions detectives treat suspects' rhetorical interrogatives as real questions. See for example extracts 4.23 and 4.24 below. In extract 4.23, Dt1, in line 01, indirectly accuses the suspect of having some knowledge about the factory theft.

#### Extract 4.23

*Guard\_fthe\_s\_off\_2008*

01	Dt1:	phhhh niti je bilo što sumljivo. kami ↓ni:je phhhh nor aux. was <u>what</u> suspicious. like me ↓n:o <i>Nor was there anything suspicious, yeah right</i>
02		(0.4)
03	Sus:	a okle sam zNA:? ko je zNA:? and from where aux.(I)kNEW:? who aux.kNEW:? <i>And how could I know? who knew?</i>
04		(0.8) ((thum thum))
05	Sus:	°pi:zdu im materina° °((swears))°
06		(1.0)
07	Dt1:	[KO je znaž ](0.1)↓znali ste VI: [Bogo mi]

08 [WHO aux.knewǰ] (0.1) ↓knew aux.YOU: [God me]  
 [((writing)) ]  
*Who knew, you knew for sure.*

09 Sus: [znA: - ]AKO SAM znao  
 [knE:- ]IF aux.(I)knew  
*Kne- if I knew*

10 da[bog ]da mi ikad išta ne trebalo. eto što  
 may[God ]that me ever anything not need. there why  
 11 [((thum))]  
*may I be damn, well, why would I*

After a (0.4) pause in line 02, the suspect challenges Dt1's accusation in line 03, by means of two rhetorical interrogatives. Following this, in lines 04-05 there is some background noise and some quiet swearing by the suspect. Then, in line 07 Dt1 repeats the last bit of the suspect's defensive interrogative turn – '*Who knew*', the repeat serving to pull out the bit of the suspect's turn which is going to be rebutted. Then, Dt1 treats this bit of the suspect's turn as a request for information and provides an answer '*you knew for sure.*', provided to reissue and voice directly the indirect accusation from line 01.

In a similar way, Dt1 answers the suspect's rhetorical form in extract 4.24 below, lines 11 and 13. In line 01 the detective puts his accusations in an alternative 'either or' form – Dt1 is here considering possible ways in which the factory theft could have been done.

#### Extract 4.24

##### ***Guard\_fthe\_s\_off\_2008***

01 Dt1: A ILI je:(0.4)od MA:Jsto:ra NEko RA:dio:, (.)u  
 AND OR aux.(0.4)from ME:CHa:nics SOMEone WO:rked:, (.)in  
*So either some mechanic(s) worked*

02 SARA:Dnji: s TO:BO:m, ILI s IL:Iće:m  
 COOPE:Ration: with Y:O:u, OR with IL:i:c  
*with you or Ilic*

03 (.)

04 Sus: °nije sa mnom ni[ko ]°  
 °not aux. with me no[one]°

*No one worked with me*

- 05 Dt1: [.hh]hh ILI: JE:-(.)ILI SU: RA:dili  
[.hh]hh OR: aux.-(.)OR aux. WO:rked  
*Or it- or the*
- 06 MA:JS↑tori: A VI:(0.4)posMA:trali:.  
ME:CHA↑nics: AND YOU:(0.4)watCH:ed:.  
*mechanics worked while you were watching*
- 07 (0.1)
- 08 Sus: °nijesam bogomi°(0.1)ni- ko bi to:[ pu:]štioǰ  
°(I)didn't by God°(0.1)no- who would that:[ le:]tǰ  
09 [((click))  
*I didn't surely no- who would allow it?*
- 10 (1.1) ((crackling)) ((squeaking))
- 11 Dt1: ko bi PU:štio?  
who would LE:t?  
*Who would allow it?*
- 12 ???: °ne [( °)]
- |   |
|---|
| 13 Dt1: [evo v]VI: vi:DITE: liǰ<br>[here y]YOU: s:EE: qp.ǰ<br><i>Well, you, you see</i> |
|---|
- 14 ((squeak))
- 15 >vidIŠ [DA: ste VI<] PU[Štili]  
>(you)SEE[THAT aux. YOU<] LE[t ]  
*You see that you allowed it*
- 16 Sus: [( )] [ NE:]↓ko E:s  
[ SO:]↓meone YE:s  
*Someone did*

One possibility Dt1 is proposing here is that the mechanics from the factory did it in cooperation with the guards – the suspect and another guard named Ilic are mentioned as possible participants – lines 01-02. The suspect denies this possibility in line 04. The other possibility Dt1 is proposing is that the mechanics stole the machine parts, while guards were watching and not caring to report it – lines 05-06. In line 08 the suspect denies this and uses a rhetorical form- '*who would allow it*' which, by the implication it incorporates supports the denial, claiming '*nobody would allow it*'. Following a longer (1.1) pause, in a similar way as in extract 4.23, Dt1 does a repetition of the suspect's rhetorical question '*Who would allow it?*', in such a way,

redoing the rhetorically meant question and then treating it like a real one and supplying an answer for it – *'Well, you, you see'*. Once again, one can see that treating a rhetorical question as a real one is the detective's technique of forwarding a direct accusation against the suspect.

These findings are quite close to what Ilie (1994) found when studying courtroom interaction. Ilie notes a high occurrence of rhetorical questions (50% of her corpus) as answers or parts of answers to information and confirmation-eliciting questions (Ilie, 1994, p. 187). In her data, these are mostly uttered by defendants or witnesses during cross-examinations to challenge the pressure exerted by the cross-examiner and sometimes create a temporary reversal of the power balance in his/her favour. Ilie also found that 48% of rhetorical questions in her corpus are followed by a response.

What extracts 4.23, 4.23 and other similar examples in my data indicate is that detectives treat rhetorical questions as real if they are going on to issue or reissue an accusation. Something similar is noted by Ilie (1994) in the case of a cross-examiner's evaluation of the acceptability of the respondent's rhetorical question as an answer. The non-acknowledgement of the rhetorical force of the question can, therefore, be used as a pretext for rejecting an inconvenient answer (Ilie, 1994, p. 190). In the same way, the detectives acknowledge the question and disregard the rhetorical force of the interrogative suspect's response if that is what is favourable for their current institutional goals.

One interesting feature of detectives' responses to suspects' rhetorical questions is that some of them are fronted by repetitions whereas others are not. If we go back to the extracts 4.23 and 4.24, one can note that before a rhetorical question is answered as 'real', the detectives repeat a part of the suspect's previous, rhetorically intended turn. See the repetition by Dt1 *'Who knew'* in line 07 (extract 4.23) and *'Who would allow it?'* in line 11 (extract 4.24). By doing this kind of repetition, detectives can be doing a couple of things - they overtly recognise the rhetorical value of the suspect's previous turn and by the repetition they are redoing the question and responding to it. Also, as can

be seen from extracts 4.23 and 4.24, when a suspect's previous rhetorical question turn has a number of TCUs, repetitions mark a part of the suspect's turn which is going to be rebutted. And then, of course, the main work repeats are doing is showing scepticism: as I have noted in the previous chapter, by repeating a part of the suspect's answer, the detectives are expressing their sceptical position towards the received answer. See extract 4.25 below:

#### Extract 4.25

##### *Suspect\_fthe\_s\_inf\_2008*

01 Dt1:           poKOJnik. (0.3) pokojnik. (.) NEđo (0.1)  
                   deCEAsed. (0.3) deceased. (.) NEdo (0.1)  
                   *The decesed     the deceased     Nedo*

02 ???:           ((cough))

03 Dt1:           ČIStu SU:mnju DAO na tebe.  
                   PUre DO:ubt GAVE on you.  
                   *clearly suspected you did it*

04                (0.4)

05 Sus:           p ČEmu¿=  
                   by What¿=  
                   *why?*

06 Dt1:           =I     U IZ[JAVi.    ]  
                   =AND IN ST[ATEment.]  
                   *in his statement too*

07 Sus:                               [na osno-]na >osnovu< ČE[ga,     ]  
                                       [on base-]on >base<of WH[at,     ]  
                                       *Base- based on what?*

08 Dt1:   [jer     ]IMA: NJEgova  
   [because]HAS: HIs  
   *Because there's his*

09                >PISmena izja:va<,  
                   >WRItten state:ment<,  
                   *written statement*

10                (0.2)

11 Sus:           pa na osnovu, ČE[GA je]  
                   well on basis, of WH[AT is]  
                   *Well, based on what is it?*

12 Dt1:   [ ČIS]to [sumlja- ]  
   [ PUR]ely [suspects-]

*exclusively suspects*

13 Sus: [na osnovu] čega je,=  
[on basis ]of what is,=  
*Based on what is it?*

14 Dt1:	=>na OS↑novu< ČEGA? iMA: ↓je >na osnovu< čega. =>on BA↑sis of< WHAT? (he)HAD: ↓aux.>on basis< of what. <i>Based on what? He had stuff to base it on.</i>
---------	--

15 (.)iMA: JE puNIh RAZloGA: >DA sumNJA NA tebe<,  
(.) (he)HAD: aux. FULL REasons: >TO SUSPECT ON you<,  
*He had full reasons to suspect in you.*

16 (0.3) >Jesi mu< DOša:, TAJ DA:n(0.2)on je VIDio,  
(0.3)>aux(you)him< CAME:, THAT DA:y(0.2)he aux. Saw,  
*Didn't you come to him that day- he saw*

17 (0.2) poKOJNI:k je vidio, šesne- au: u >ŠESnes  
(0.2) deCEASE:d aux. saw, sixte- aa: at> SIXteen  
*The deceased saw sixteen hundred- at sixteen*

18 časova: DA JE TO pripremljeno<.(0.2) ZA KRAđu.  
hours: THAT aux. THAT prepared<. (0.2) FOR THEft.  
*hundred that it was prepared for the theft*

In lines 01-03 Dt1, via a third party attribution, accuses the suspect of being the main culprit in the case. The suspect fights off the detective's attack by an interrogative in line 05 'p čemuž=' - 'by whatž=', which Dt1 treats as a real question and in line 06 provides an answer. One can then note that the suspect pursues challenging by using a number of RQs down the sequence (see lines 07, 11, 13), which the detective keeps answering up to the line 14, in which he changes the technique and applies a repetition to block the suspect's line of responding. By repeating in line 14, the detective is making it clear that he is about to answer something and challenge what the suspect has said. The repeat of the suspect's answer from line 13 - 'Based on what?' is displaying the detective's scepticism. The detective implies that there was something to base the accusation on. Eventually, following this repeat, Dt1 states his position overtly 'He had stuff to base it on.', following which he reveals the evidence in the case (see lines 15-18).

Repetition, however, does not necessarily front detectives' responses to suspect's rhetorical questions. In extract 4.26 below, one can note that to the suspect's challenging

rhetorical question in line 03, Dt1 gives a straight response in line 04, not headed by a repeat.

#### Extract 4.26

##### *Suspect\_fthe\_s\_inf\_2008*

01 Dt1: TO ĆE ti,- <TO Će ti KAZAti i NJEgov UJA:k, (.)  
 THAT WILL you,- <THAT Will you SAY and HIS UNC:le, (.)  
*You will- his uncle will tell you this too*

02 KOJEME JE [ispriča>. ]  
 WHOM aux. [(he)told>.]  
*to whom he told it*

03 Sus: [a- ko- ]KO- ko >mu je ↑reko<, to:.=  
 [and- who-]WHO- who >him aux. ↑told<, that:.=  
*And who told him that?*

04 Dt1: =ON. po[kojnik] =HE. de[ceased] <i>He, the deceased</i>
---

05 Sus: [a k]O:- ko- >ne no ko<- (.)KO >je to  
 [and w]HO:- who->no but who<- (.)WHO >aux. that  
*And who- who- no but who- who*

06 do<KA:zo; (.) .hhh >nijesam, < gaRA:ntujem ti,  
 pr<OO:ved; (.) .hhh >(I)didn't, <(I)gaRA:ntee you,  
*proved that? I didn't, I can guarantee that*

07 >JA ću ti se zAkLET, na život DVOje ĐEce<  
 >I will you refl. sWeAR, on life OF TWo CHILDren<  
*I will swear on the lives of two of my children*

The repeat is in this example not occurring at the turn initial position possibly because 'And who told him that?' is more 'real question-like' and it is easy to be given a simple single response, which is enough to rebut the suspect's RQ challenge from line 03.

## 6.7 Conclusion

This chapter shows that although interrogations are organized as a speech exchange system in which there is a tendency that the detectives ask questions and suspects



answer, there are still cases when the suspect would ask questions which are rhetorical by nature. This is an interactional practice through which the questioned party's identity and his/her understanding of their own status in the interrogation is revealed. Being on the other end of the questioning, one needs to assess if he/she is being questioned as a witness or a suspect. What happens here is that the sequence is initiated by the detectives' turns which are imputing some wrongdoing or motive of wrongdoing on the part of the suspect. The interviewees hear these initial questions and they start realising they are not treated as witnesses, but as suspects. They, then, use rhetorical questions in their bid of fighting off the detectives' damaging turns and when making these rhetorical questions, one can see them orienting to their identities as suspected of and needing to defend themselves.

The rhetorical forms applied by the suspects perform a special kind of interactional work: they look backwards onto the detectives' prior damaging turns, challenging them or marking the detectives' accusations/imputations as inapposite or inappropriate. Sometimes, apart from challenging, rhetorical questions can be denying by implication as is the case with the rhetorical turns of the type 'What do I know?', the implication being 'I know nothing'. Essentially, rhetorical questions in this type of context are used by suspects as a defensive device. They are sometimes initiated by dispreferred markers, such as 'čuš' literally 'listen to this', 'a', literally 'and', 'pa' - 'well' which all contribute to the suspect's turn being heard as highly contentious. Another important point highlighted in this chapter is that although in the literature rhetorical questions have been described as needing no answer, my data indicates that detectives most often respond to the rhetorical turns produced by the suspects. They may not always be answered directly, but these rhetorical forms are responded to by some sort of challenging turn, either another question or a statement. If suited to their current institutional goals, the detectives would treat rhetorical turns as 'real questions' and they would provide a direct answer, sometimes fronted by 'sceptical' repeats. No matter in which of these ways the detectives respond, their responses are always challenging by nature, which indicates that they perceive the suspects' rhetorical questions as also challenging or unacceptable in certain ways.

## **CHAPTER SEVEN**

## **CONCLUSION**

## 7.1 Conclusion

This thesis is a linguistic study of questions and questioning in police interrogation. As such, it deals with a practical application of linguistic devices by the questioning officers and the questioned individuals.

Chapter 2 has set the scene by reviewing the linguistic and CA literature on questions and questioning and by highlighting the most common issues surrounding this phenomenon. Chapter 3 gave an outline of the data used in this study as well as pointed out the advantages of looking at questions by means of CA as a method. Chapter 4 focused on different forms of polar ‘do you know’ questions and their function in different sequential environments. This chapter also explored the close connection between form, epistemics and action. Chapter 5 showed that a repetition by a questioning officer of a part or the whole of the answer provided by the questioned party is a technique which is used to challenge or to remedy the received answer. Chapter 6 showed that although the detectives are the ones who are expected to ask questions and the suspects are the ones who answer, this is not always the case and there are instances when the questioned party would venture asking something. This chapter exhibited an interactional technique characterised by the questioned party asking rhetorical questions which convey an overt or implied denial and which look backwards onto the detective’s initial turn, challenging and questioning its appositeness.

As this work is a linguistic study of interaction in Serbo-Croatian, it makes a contribution to the general linguistic literature in this language. Also, as this is probably the first study of police interrogations in this language utilising the method of Conversation Analysis, it is a contribution to the CA literature and to the study of this type of institutional interaction.

Looking at how questioning is done in my data, differences emerge between the findings of this study and the way descriptive grammarians talk about the use of interrogative forms in Serbo-Croatian. As I have shown in Chapter 4, while grammarians claim that

there is only one ‘correct’ way of forming polar interrogatives (the ones formed by means of the clitic *li*), my study shows that in actual conversations speakers utilise a number of variations of the *li* interrogative alongside the default form prescribed by the grammar books. As I have already pointed out, a ‘do you know’ interrogative can occur in four different forms: the one with the clitic *li*, *non-li* interrogative, *non-li ti* interrogative as well as a *li ti* interrogative. Each of the variants has its specific interactional features and each of them does a specific interactional work. This indicates that grammarians, who deal with what is grammatical in a language and with language standardization, do not take into consideration these very important functions of ‘grammatically incorrect’ interrogative forms.

This work also contributes to the understanding of how questioning is used to pursue lines of inquiry: when asking questions detectives have in mind completing a range of smaller ‘jobs’, such as checking the previously received information, acquiring new information, putting it on record and so on. That is why questioning has to be understood as a fusion between a form and the activity it facilitates. To be more precise, Chapter 4 explores the connection between interrogative format and action. In this chapter I study how different forms of Serbo-Croatian ‘do you know’ interrogatives are selected by speakers to perform different actions, such as asking for information, asking for confirmation or acting as presequences. What my study also shows is that while the form and action in most cases match, there are still cases of the information-seeking form, for instance, being perceived as threatening, although one would expect them to be perceived as innocent.

On a larger scale, this study is a contribution to how questioning is used to complete a project. The detectives at all times have in mind the completion of the project, i.e. the case they are working on. In such a way, one of the projects the detectives are set to accomplish when questioning suspects is to incriminate them. For this reason, the interrogation of suspects will largely differ from that of witnesses: these two groups of clients have different status and are treated differently by the detectives. So, as we have seen in Chapter 5 the technique of repeating a part or the whole of the interviewee’s

answer is making a challenge or expressing scepticism and it is used exclusively in interviews with suspects. This technique expresses detectives' doubts about the truthfulness of suspects' answers and is aimed at blocking the current line of responding and incriminating the suspect. As this is not the task which is expected to be accomplished in the interviews with witnesses or people reporting crimes, this technique is not present in this type of interviews.

This study builds on the studies dealing with the issue of the connection between the levels of knowledge and questioning (Heritage, 2002; Heritage, 2003; Heritage and Raymond, 2005; Raymond, 2009; Heritage, forthcoming a and b and so on). It essentially highlights the importance of epistemics in action formation. It indicates that building a presupposition about own or others' knowledge into a certain syntactic form will necessarily affect the action which is selected by that form. Moreover, it indicates that one form can incorporate a number of epistemic layers. Thus, when asking 'do you know X (name)' in Serbo-Croatian, this utterance can make a number of epistemic claims. While this is, first of all, a 'question' asking overtly about the interlocutor's knowledge, its meaning is dependent on a number of other factors. First of all, by selecting one of the four forms discussed in Chapter 4 one makes different claims about one's own and others' knowledge, which in combination with 'do you know' can make a number of claims. Then, other elements, such as the demonstrative from the above example, can also contribute to the epistemic stance taken by a certain utterance.

Chapter 6 represents a contribution to the neglected area of questions asked by the people who are not supposed to be asking questions. Although Frankel (1990), Ilie (1994), Clayman and Heritage (2002) have noted this phenomenon in their studies on medical, courtroom and news interview discourse, there have been no detailed studies dealing with this kind of interactional phenomenon in police interrogations. Chapter 6 explores the sequences in which the tables are turned and the questioned party starts asking questions. At first glance, these seem to be regular questions. However, on closer examination, they turn out to be rhetorical by nature. As I have already mentioned, an examination of the interviews in which this technique occurs has shown that it is found

exclusively in interviews with suspects. This indicates that this technique is a defensive device used by the suspects to fight off damaging actions forwarded by the detectives. On a larger scale, the restriction of certain techniques to certain parties also indicates that people's institutional roles heavily affect the language and interactional techniques they are using.

This study gives an insight into some of the questioning techniques utilised in the context of police interrogations in Serbo-Croatian. It shows how both the detectives and the suspects use 'questions' in accordance with the actions required by their respective roles. It has also brought to light some areas for future research which I have been unable to explore fully within the confines of this thesis. For example, there is more room for studying the connection between the linguistic form and action formation in this type of interaction: to examine how both the detectives and the suspects/witnesses utilise linguistic devices in order to manage the tasks generated by this type of interaction. Also, studying interaction between detectives and suspects has shown that there is fruitful research to be done into the existence of alternative forms for performing what seem to be the same or, maybe, only similar actions. For example, there is space to examine how repeats and rhetorical questions are utilised as challenging techniques alongside, or as an alternative to, overt challenges and denials. As this suggests, the possibilities of future research into questions and questioning, and in particular into the linguistic study of interaction in Serbo-Croatian, are rich and varied. As we have seen throughout this study, questions and questioning in interrogation can perform a variety of complex actions; whether they are being used to accuse, to incriminate or to challenge; we have seen that there is no such thing as an innocent question.

Looking back onto the methodological side of the thesis one has to consider the application of CA to another language. So far, the largest body of CA work has been written in English. To my knowledge, there are very few studies in Serbo-Croatian in the CA tradition and no other studies on questioning. Naturally, this lack of literature has been a drawback. First of all, this meant that there were no other sources to compare this study to or to get the necessary information on Serbo-Croatian from. Because of

this, the literature this work has utilised were all Serbo-Croatian sources from other linguistic areas, mostly from the areas of descriptive grammar and generative syntax. For this reason, this study hopes to contribute to filling up the gap in the linguistic literature on this language.

While the lack of the CA literature on Serbo-Croatian has been a drawback, there is a benefit of a large body of literature in English. I have to stress here that while studying the English CA sources I did not encounter any special difficulties applying the method to another language. Moreover, as I was working on the thesis, numerous cross-linguistic similarities came to my attention. Like Moerman (1996) once noted conversational structures first discovered in American English finely describe how talk-in-interaction is sequentially organised in so many different languages. Along the lines of what Moerman noted, this study indicates that Serbo-Croatian, just like English, utilises such interactional categories as dispreference, pauses in speech and delay. Moreover, as one might have noticed from the previous chapters, the functions of a number of challenging and denying devices are very close in the two languages, such as the use of challenging ‘rhetorical’ questions or repeats whose role is to challenge and mark the prior turn as inapposite.

Another matter which I have previously briefly mentioned is translating the data into another language. As I was translating my data into a closest English equivalent, it opened up a number of issues for discussion. First of all, there is an issue of how far the translation goes away from the original. Brody (1994) states that the way texts are translated and presented is never neutral and is a kind of analysis and evaluation of the material. This means that there is always a danger of a translator conveying the way he/she sees the text. There is admittedly a danger of my translation being to an extent subjective, which could be considered one of the potential weaknesses of this work.

To remind the readers, the first line of my transcribed data represents the original naturalistic communication in Serbo-Croatian. The second line is a literal translation into English which allows the readers to get a concept of the structure of the original

language, as well as its semantic and lexical features. The third line of the transcript is an idiomatic translation or a translation into a closest English equivalent. In this line, however, due to the structural differences of the two languages, I do not mark such things as pauses in speech or prosody. This is, first of all, due to the difference in the word order in the two languages: Serbo-Croatian has a free word order, but as one has to translate it into the English SVO, the lines one and three cannot be kept aligned and therefore it is difficult to mark prosody in the translation line. In such a way, the third line of the transcript cannot be said to be a translation into the English naturalistic data, because of which, it only partially transmits what goes on in a certain example.

Another question is the matter of language variants which are very difficult to mark in the translation. Neither the detectives nor the interviewed individuals from my recordings speak a completely standard variant of Serbo-Croatian. Or at certain stages they do, but then they revert to their 'usual' way of speaking. The translation could not completely convey these intricate language matters. For instance, it could not convey if a speaker came from a rural area and was probably not very educated. Also, it could not convey if a person spoke a non-standard 'street' language or if a detective or suspect went into a 'standard' mode.

Likewise, certain semantic items are untranslatable into English. One such token, for which it was difficult to provide a close equivalent in English, is the token 'čuš' literally '(you) listen to this', the meaning of which cannot be fully conveyed by the English 'listen'. This of course, might have had an impact on proper understanding of the action performed by this token, which, in rough terms, is a dispreferred action, supporting other challenging actions.

Basically, the translation issue has already been noted in the work of other researchers in the area of CA, such as Guimaraes (2007). This possibly puts the translation of the data and the impact of the translation on the understanding of the data alongside the previously suggested linguistic areas for development.



This study can be said to have scratched the surface of certain matters which would hopefully be given more attention elsewhere.

## Bibliography

Aldridge, M., 2010. Vulnerable witnesses: Vulnerable witnesses in the Criminal Justice System. In M. Coulthard and A. Johnson, eds. *Handbook of Forensic Linguistics*. London/New York: Routledge, pp. 296-314.

Arminen, I., 2005. *Institutional Interaction: Studies of Talk at Work*. Aldershot: Ashgate.

Atkinson, J. M. and Drew, P., 1979. *Order in court: The organization of verbal interaction in juridical settings*. London: Macmillan.

Atkinson, J. M. and Heritage, J. eds., 1984. *Structures of Social Action: Studies in Conversation Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Auburn, T. S. Drake and Willig, C., 1995. 'You punched him, didn't you?': versions of violence in accusatory interviews. *Discourse and Society*, 6(3), pp. 353-86.

Bar-Hillel, Y., 1954. Indexical expressions. *Mind*, 63, pp. 359-379.

Benneworth, K., 2007. 'Just good friends': managing the clash of discourses in police interviews with paedophiles. In J. Cotterill, ed. *The Language of Sexual Crime*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 16-42

Benneworth, K., 2009. Police interviews with suspected paedophiles: a discourse analysis. *Discourse and Society*, 20 (5), pp. 555-569.

Benneworth, K., 2010. Negotiating paedophilia in the investigative interview: The construction of sexual offences against children. In M. Coulthard and A. Johnson, eds. *The Handbook of Forensic Linguistics*. Oxon: Routledge, pp. 139-155.

Brody, J., 1994. Performance and discourse: Transcribing Latin American languages and cultures. *Latin American Research Review*, 29:3, pp. 249-256.

Browne, W., 1971. On conjoined questions and conjoined relative clauses in English and Serbo-Croatian. *The Yugoslav Serbo-Croatian-English Contrastive Project B. Studies*, 3, pp. 49-63.

Clayman, S. and Heritage J., 2002. Questioning presidents: journalistic deference and adversarialness in the press conferences of Eisenhower and Reagan. *Journal of Communication*, 52, pp. 749-77.

Clayman, S. Heritage, J. Elliott, M. and McDonald, L., 2007. When does the watchdog bark?: Conditions of Aggressive Questioning in Presidential News Conferences. *American Sociological Review*, 72, pp. 23-41

- Cotterill, J. ed., 2007. *The Language of Sexual Crime*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Coulthard, M. and Johnson, A., 2007. *An Introduction to Forensic Linguistics: Language in Evidence*. London/New York: Routledge.
- Coulthard, M. and Johnson, A. eds., 2010. *Handbook of Forensic Linguistics*. London/New York: Routledge.
- Curl, T., 2006. Offers of assistance: Constraints on syntactic design. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 38(8), pp. 1257-1280.
- Dersley, I. and Wootton, A., 2001. In the heat of the sequence: interactional features preceding walkouts from argumentative talk. *Language in Society*, 30 (4), pp. 611-638.
- Downing, A. and Locke, P., 2006. *English Grammar: A University Course*. Abingdon and New York: Routledge.
- Drew, P., 1992. Contested evidence in courtroom cross-examination: the case of a trial for rape. In P. Drew and J. Heritage, eds. *Talk at Work*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 470-521.
- Drew, P., 1997. 'Open' class repair initiators in response to sequential sources of troubles in conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 28, pp. 69-101.
- Drew, P., 2003a. Conversation analysis. In J. Smith, ed. *Qualitative Psychology: A Practical Guide to Research Methods*. London: Sage, pp. 132-158.
- Drew, P., 2003b. Precision and exaggeration in interaction. *American Sociological Review*, 68, pp. 917-38.
- Drew, P., 2005. Conversation analysis. In K. L. Fitch and R. E. Sanders, eds. *Handbook of Language and Social Interaction*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum, pp. 71-102.
- Drew, P., 2006. When documents 'speak': documents, language and interaction. In P. Drew, G. Raymond and D. Weinberg, eds. *Talk and Interaction in Social Research Methods*. London: Sage, pp. 63-80.
- Drew, P. and Heritage, J., 1992. *Talk at Work*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Drew, P. and Walker, T., 2010. Requesting assistance in calls to the police. In M. Coulthard and A. Johnson, eds. *Handbook of Forensic Linguistics*. London/New York: Routledge, pp. 95-110.
- Edwards, D., 2006. Facts, norms and dispositions: practical uses of the modal verb would in police interrogations. *Discourse Studies*, 8(4), pp. 475-501.

- Edwards, D., 2008. Intentionality and *mens rea* in police interrogations: The production of actions as crimes. *Intercultural Pragmatics*, 5 (2), pp. 177-199.
- Edwards, D. and Fasulo, A., 2006. 'To be honest': Sequential uses of honesty phrases in talk-in-interaction. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 39 (4), pp. 343-376.
- Egbert, M. and Vöge, M., 2008. Wh-interrogative formats used for questioning and beyond: German warum (why) and wieso (why) and English why. *Discourse Studies*, 10, pp. 17-36.
- Englund, B., 1979. The functions of yes/no-questions (on basis of Bulgarian and Macedonian material). In: B. Englund et al., eds. *Papers in Slavonic Linguistics 1*. Stockholm: Stockholms universitet, Institutionen for slaviska och baltiska sprak.
- Frankel, R., 1990. Talking in interviews: a dispreference for patient-initiated questions in physician-patient encounters. In G. Psathas, ed. *Interactional Competence*. Washington: University Press of America, pp. 231-62.
- Gibbons, J. and Turell, M. T., eds., 2008. *Dimensions of Forensic Linguistics*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins.
- Guimareas, E., 2007. *Talking about violence: women reporting abuse in Brazil*. Ph.D. University of York.
- Hall, P., 2008. Policespeak. In J. Gibbons and M. T. Turell, eds. *Dimensions of Forensic Linguistics*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pp. 67-94.
- Halldorsdottir, I., 2006. *The client's instructions: lawyer-client interaction and criminal defence case preparation*. Ph.D. University of York.
- Halonen, M. and Sorjonen, M. L., 2008. Using niin-interrogative to treat the prior speaker's action as an exaggeration. *Discourse Studies*, 10, pp. 37-53.
- Han, C., 2002. Interpreting interrogatives as rhetorical questions. *Lingua*, 112, pp. 201-229.
- Haworth, K., 2006. The dynamics of power and resistance in police interview discourse. *Discourse and Society*, 17(6), pp. 739-59.
- Haworth, K., 2010. Police interviews in the judicial process: Police interviews as evidence. In M. Coulthard and A. Johnson, eds. *Handbook of Forensic Linguistics*. London/New York: Routledge, pp. 169-181.

- Hedberg, N. and Sosa, J. M., 2002. The Prosody of Questions in Natural Discourse. In: *Proceedings of Speech Prosody 2002 (the First International Conference on Speech Prosody)*. Aix-en-Provence, France, 375-378.
- Heinemann, T., 2008. Questions of accountability: Yes-no interrogatives that are unanswerable. *Discourse Studies*, 10, pp. 55-71.
- Heritage, J., 1984. *Garfinkel and Ethnomethodology*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Heritage, J., 2002. The limits of questioning: negative interrogatives and hostile question content. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 34, pp. 1427-1446.
- Heritage, J., 2003. Designing questions and setting agendas in the news interviews. In P. Glenn, C. D. LeBaron and J. Mandelbaum, eds. *Studies in Language and Social Interaction: In honor of Robert Hopper*. Mahwah: N.J. Lawrence Erlbaum, pp 57-90.
- Heritage, J., (in press a) Epistemics in action: action formation and territories of knowledge. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*.
- Heritage, J., (in press b). The Epistemic Engine: Sequence Organization and Territories of Knowledge. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*.
- Heritage, J. and Clayman, S., 2010. *Talk in action: Interactions, Identities and Institutions*. Maldon, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Heritage, J. and Raymond, G., 2005. The terms of agreement: indexing epistemic authority and subordination in talk-in-interaction. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 68, pp. 15-38.
- Heritage, J. and Raymond, G., (in press) Navigating epistemic landscapes: acquiescence, agency and resistance in initial elements of responses to polar questions. In J. P. De Ruiter, ed. *Questions*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Heritage, J. and Roth, A., 1995. Grammar and institution: questions and questioning in the broadcast news interview. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 28, pp. 1-60.
- Heritage, J. and Sorjonen, M. L., 1994. Constituting and maintaining activities across sequences: *And*-prefacing as a feature of questioning design. *Language in Society*, 23, pp. 1-29.
- Heydon, G., 2005. *The Language of Police Interviewing: A Critical Analysis*. Basingstoke: Palgrave.
- Huddleston, R. D., 1984. *Introduction to the Grammar of English*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Huddleston, R. and Pullum, G. K., eds., 2002. *The Cambridge Grammar of the English Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ilie, C., 1994. *What else can I tell you? A Pragmatic Study of English Rhetorical Questions as Discursive and Argumentative Acts*. Almqvist and Wiksell International: Stockholm.

Jefferson, G., 1985. 'On the interactional unpacking of the 'gloss''. *Language in Society*, 14, pp. 435-446.

Jefferson, G., 2004. Glossary of transcript symbols with an introduction. In G. H. Lerner, ed. *Conversation Analysis: Studies from the first generation*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, pp. 13-31.

Kidwell, M., 2009. 'What happened?': An epistemics of before and after in 'At-the-scene' police questioning. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 42 (1), pp. 20-41.

Kidwell, M. and González Martínez, E., 2010. 'Let me tell you about myself'. A method for suppressing subject talk in a 'soft accusation' interrogation. *Discourse Studies*, 12(1), pp. 65-89.

Klajn, I., 2005. *Gramatika Srpskog Jezika*. Zavod za udžbenike: Beograd.

Komter, M. L., 2001. La construction de la preuve dans un interrogatoire de police. In B. Dupret, ed. *Le droit en action et en contexte. Ethnométhodologie et analyse de conversation dans la recherche juridique [Law in action and in context: Ethnomethodology and conversation analysis in research in the field of law]* *Droit et Société*, 48, pp. 367-93.

Komter, M. L., 2002. The suspect's own words: The treatment of written statements in Dutch courtrooms. *Forensic Linguistics. The International Journal of Speech, Language and the Law*, 9, pp. 168-192.

Komter, M. L., 2003a. The construction of records in Dutch police interrogations. *Information Design Journal*, 11 (2/3), pp. 201-213.

Komter, M.L., 2003b. The interactional dynamics of eliciting a confession in a Dutch police interrogation. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 36, pp. 433-70.

Komter, M. L., 2005. Understanding problems in an interpreter-mediated police Interrogation. In S. Burns, ed. *Ethnographies of Law and Social Control. Sociology of Crime, Law and Deviance*, 6. Amsterdam etc.: Elsevier, pp. 203-24.

- Komter, M. L., 2006. From talk to text: the interactional construction of a police record. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 39(3), pp. 201–228.
- Komter, M. L., (in press) Travels of a suspect's statement. In J. Conley, C. Heffer and F. Rock, eds. *Legal Lay Communication. Textual Travels in the Legal Process*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Koshik, I., 2002. A conversation-analytic study of yes/no questions which convey reversed polarity assertions. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 34, pp. 1851-77.
- Koshik, I., 2003. Wh-questions used as challenges. *Discourse Studies*, 5, pp. 51-77.
- Koshik, I., 2005. *Beyond rhetorical questions: Assertive questions in everyday interaction*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Labov, W. and Fanshel, D., 1977. *Therapeutic discourse*. New York: Academic Press.
- Leed, R., 1968. The intonation of yes/no questions in Serbo-Croatian. *The Slavic and East European Journal*, 12, pp. 330-336.
- Lehiste, I. and Ivić, P., 1986. *Word and Sentence Prosody in Serbo-Croatian*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Levinson, S. C., 1983. *Pragmatics*. Cambridge/New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Levinson, S.C., 2010. Questions and responses in Yéli Dnye, the Papuan language of Rossel Island. In T. Stivers, N. J. Enfield and S. C. Levinson, eds. Questions and responses in 10 languages [Special Issue]. *Journal of Pragmatics. Advance online publication*, pp. 2741-2755.
- Linell, P., 1998. *Approaching dialogue: Talk, interaction and contexts in dialogical perspectives*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Local, J. and Kelly, J., 1986. Projection and silences: notes on phonetic and conversational structure. *Human Studies*, 9, pp. 185-204.
- Mišeska-Tomić, O., (in press) *Macedonian Grammar*. Bloomington, Indiana: Slavistika.
- Moerman, M., 1996. The field of analysing foreign language conversations. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 26, pp. 147-158.
- Monzoni, C., 2008. Introducing direct complaints through questions: The interactional achievement of 'pre-sequences?'. *Discourse Studies*, 10, pp. 73-87.
- Mrazović, P. and Vukadinović, Z., 1990. *Gramatika Srpskohrvatskog Jezika za Strance*. Novi Sad: Dobra vest.

Nakamura, I., 2010. *Exploring repetition of task as a co-accomplished social interaction*. BAAL 2010 Aberdeen. Aberdeen, 10 September, 2010.

oed.com retrieved 16/09/2010 from

[http://dictionary.oed.com/cgi/entry/50116486?query\\_type=word&queryword=inform&first=1&max\\_to\\_show=10&sort\\_type=alpha&result\\_place=5&search\\_id=cLkL-BsozK3-2124&hilite=50116486](http://dictionary.oed.com/cgi/entry/50116486?query_type=word&queryword=inform&first=1&max_to_show=10&sort_type=alpha&result_place=5&search_id=cLkL-BsozK3-2124&hilite=50116486)

Pomerantz, A., 1980. Telling my side: 'limited access' as a fishing device. *Sociological Inquiry*, 50, pp. 186-98.

Pomerantz, A., 1984a. Giving a source or basis: the practice in conversation of telling 'how I know'. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 8, pp. 607-25.

Pomerantz, A., 1984b. Agreeing and disagreeing with assessments: some features of preferred/dispreferred turn shapes. In J. M. Atkinson and J. Heritage, eds. *Structures of Social Action: Studies in Conversation Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 57-101.

Quirk, R. Greenbaum, S. Leech, G. and Svartvik, J., 1985. *A comprehensive grammar of the English language*. London: Longman.

Rakić, S., 1984. Serbo-Croatian yes/no questions and speech acts. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 8, pp. 693-713.

Raymond, G., 2000. *The structure of responding: type-conforming and non-conforming responses to yes/no type interrogatives*. Ph.D. University of California, Los Angeles.

Raymond, G., 2003. Grammar and social organization: Yes/no interrogatives and the structure of responding. *American Sociological Review*, 68, pp. 939-67.

Raymond, G., 2009. Grammar and Social Relations: Alternative Forms of Yes/No Type Initiating Actions in Health Visitor Interactions., In A.F. Freed and S. Ehrlich, eds. *Why Do You Ask?: The Function of Questions in Institutional Discourse*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 87-108.

Raymond, G. and Heritage, J., 2006. The epistemics of social relationships: owning grandchildren. *Language in Society*, 35(5), pp. 677-705.

Rock, F., 2010. Witnesses and suspects in interviews. Collecting oral evidence: the police, the public and the written word. In M. Coulthard and A. Johnson, eds. *Handbook of Forensic Linguistics*. London/New York: Routledge, pp. 126-138.

Rossano, F., 2010. Questioning and responding in Italian. In T. Stivers, N. J. Enfield and S. C. Levinson eds. Questions and responses in 10 languages [Special Issue]. *Journal of Pragmatics*. Advance online publication, pp. 2756-2771.



- Rudin, C. Kramer, C. Billings, L. and Baerman, M., 1999. Macedonian and Bulgarian li questions: Beyond syntax. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory*, 17, pp. 541-586.
- Sacks, H., 1992. *Lectures on conversation, volumes 1 and 2. Edited by Gail Jefferson with introductions by Emanuel A. Schegloff*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Schegloff, E. A., 1978. On some questions and ambiguities in conversation. in W. U. Dressler, ed. *Current Trends in Text Linguistics*. Berlin: De Gruyter, pp. 81-102. (reprint: In A. J. Maxwell and J. Heritage, eds. *Structures of Social Action: Studies in Conversation Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 28-52.)
- Schegloff, E. A., 1980. Preliminaries to preliminaries: 'Can I ask you a question?'. *Sociological Inquiry*, 50, pp. 104-52.
- Schegloff, E. A., 1988. Presequences and indirection: applying speech act theory to ordinary conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 12, pp. 55-62.
- Schegloff, E. A., 1992. Repair after next turn: The last structurally provided defense of intersubjectivity in conversation. *American Journal of Sociology*, 98, pp. 1295-1345.
- Schegloff, E. A., 1996. Confirming allusions: towards an empirical account of action. *American Journal of Sociology*, 104, pp. 161-216.
- Schegloff, E. A., 2000. When 'others' initiate repair. *Applied Linguistics*, 21, pp. 205-43.
- Schegloff, E. A., 2007. *Sequence Organization in Interaction: A Primer in Conversation Analysis, vol 1*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Schegloff, E. A. Jefferson, G. and Sacks, H., 1977. The preference for self-correction in the organization of repair in conversation. *Language*, 53, pp. 361-82.
- Schegloff, E.A. and Lerner, G., 2009. Beginning to Respond: Well-prefaced responses to wh-questions. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 42(2), pp. 91-115.
- Shuy, R.W., 1993, *Language Crimes: The Use and Abuse of Language Evidence in the Courtroom*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Sidnell, J., 2010. *Conversation Analysis: An Introduction*. Singapore: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Stensig, J. and Larsen, T., 2008. Affiliative and disaffiliative uses of you say x questions. *Discourse Studies*, 10, pp. 113-133.
- Stivers, T. and Enfield, N. J., 2010. A coding scheme for question-response sequences in conversation. In: T. Stivers, N. J. Enfield and S. C. Levinson. eds. Questions and

responses in 10 languages [Special Issue]. *Journal of Pragmatics*. Advance online publication, pp. 20620-2626.

Stivers, T. Enfield, N. J. and Levinson, S.C. eds. 2010. Questions and responses in 10 languages [Special Issue]. *Journal of Pragmatics*. Advance online publication.

Stivers, T. Mondada, L. and Steensig, J. eds., (in press). *The Morality of Knowledge in Conversation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Stivers, T. and Rossano, F., 2010. Mobilizing response. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 43, pp. 3-31.

Stokoe, E. and Edwards, D., 2007. 'Black this, black that': Racial insults and reported speech in neighbour complaints and police interrogations. *Discourse and Society*, 18 (3), pp. 355-390.

Stokoe, E. and Edwards, D., 2008. 'Did you have permission to smash your neighbour's door?' Silly questions and their answers in police-suspect interrogations. *Discourse Studies*, 10, pp. 89-111.

Stokoe, E. and Edwards, D., 2010. Lawyers in interviews. 'I advise you not to answer that question': conversation analysis, legal interaction and the analysis of lawyers' turns in police interrogations of suspects. In: M. Coulthard and A. Johnson eds. *Handbook of Forensic Linguistics*. London/New York: Routledge. pp 155-168.

Appendix A

**A Study of Communication and Language in Police Interviews in Montenegro**

**CONSENT FORM for POLICE OFFICERS**

Name of Officer: \_\_\_\_\_

I confirm that I have read the description of this study and have had an opportunity to talk about it with the researcher. My questions have been answered to my satisfaction.

I agree to the audio recording of my interview in connection with a criminal investigation, subject to consent of all parties involved.

I understand that the researcher has made the following guarantees:

- All information will be treated in the strictest confidence. No personal information will be passed to any other person or organization either in Montenegro or the UK
- All names and other identification information will be erased from the recording
- The interviews will be transcribed and short bits will be used only for academic purposes
- I can ask for the recording to be stopped at any time – and for the recording to be deleted

I consent to take part in the research on the basis of the guarantees outlined above.

**Signed:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Date:** \_\_\_\_\_

***For the researcher:***

I confirm that I have explained the study to the person named above.

**Name:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Signed:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Date:** \_\_\_\_\_

## **CONSENT FORM for INTERVIEWEES IN POLICE INTERROGATION**

Name of Interviewee: \_\_\_\_\_

I confirm that I have read the description of this study and have had an opportunity to talk about it with the researcher. My questions have been answered to my satisfaction.

I agree to the audio recording of my interview in connection with a criminal investigation, subject to consent of all parties involved.

I understand that the researcher has made the following guarantees:

- All information will be treated in the strictest confidence. No personal information will be passed to any other person or organization either in Montenegro or the UK.
- All names and other identification information will be erased from the recording
- The interviews will be transcribed and short bits will be used only for academic purposes
- I can ask for the recording to be stopped at any time – and for the recording to be deleted.

I consent to take part in the research on the basis of the guarantees outlined above.

**Signed:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Date:** \_\_\_\_\_

***For the researcher:***

I confirm that I have explained the study to the person named above.

**Name:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Signed:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Date:** \_\_\_\_\_

## Appendix B

### Transcription Key

[ ]	<b>square brackets</b>	overlapping talk
=	<b>equals sign</b>	no discernible interval between turns (also used to show that the same person continues speaking across an intervening line displaying overlapping talk)
<	<b>“greater than” sign</b>	“jump started” talk with loud onset
(0.5)	<b>time in parentheses</b>	intervals within or between talk (measured in tenths of a second)
(.)	<b>period in parentheses</b>	discernable pause or gap, too short to measure

*Characteristics of speech delivery:*

.	<b>period</b>	closing intonation
,	<b>comma</b>	slightly upward “continuing” intonation
?	<b>question mark</b>	rising intonation question
¿	<b>inverted question mark</b>	rising intonation weaker than that indicated by a question mark
!	<b>exclamation mark</b>	animated tone
-	<b>hyphen/dash</b>	abrupt cut off of sound
:	<b>colon</b>	extension of preceding sound -- the more colons the greater the extension
↑↓	<b>up or down arrow</b>	marked rise or fall in intonation immediately following the arrow
<u>here</u>	<b>underlining</b>	emphasized relative to surrounding talk
HERE	<b>upper case</b>	louder relative to surrounding talk
°here°	<b>degree signs</b>	softer relative to surrounding talk
>this<		speeded up or compressed relative to surrounding talk
<this>		slower or elongated relative to surrounding talk
hhh		audible outbreath (no. of ‘h’'s indicates length)
.hhh		audible inbreath (no. of ‘h’'s indicates length)
(h)		audible aspirations in speech (e.g., laughter particles)
hah/heh/hih/hoh/huh		all variants of laughter
( )	<b>empty single parentheses</b>	transcriber unable to hear word
(bring)	<b>word(s) in single parentheses</b>	transcriber uncertain of hearing
((coughs))	<b>word(s) in double parentheses</b>	transcriber’s comments on, or description of, sound: other audible sounds are represented as closely as possible in standard orthography, e.g., ‘tcht’ for tongue click; ‘mcht’ for a lip parting sound

## Notes

<sup>1</sup> Particle

<sup>2</sup> Question particle

<sup>3</sup> In Serbo-Croatian clitics are short versions of pronouns in genitive, accusative and dative, some auxiliary verbs and a yes/no interrogative marker *li*.

<sup>4</sup> Rakić (1984:699), on the other hand, claims that *da* is just an affirmative particle which can be translated into English as ‘yes’. For further discussion on *da li* and historic linguistic information on *da* see Rakić (1984:699)

<sup>5</sup> The form of the particle *li* in this case is elided, i.e. the speaker did not pronounce the initial sound *l*

<sup>6</sup> CA studies rarely utilize statistics. For quantification and coding see Heritage and Roth (1995), Clayman and Heritage (2002), Clayman et al. (2007).

<sup>7</sup> The interrogative form of the type ‘is the cord dry now?’ normally implies no knowledge on the part of the speaker. However, there are contexts in which it does not do so and in such cases it is used as a repair initiator.

<sup>8</sup> Rakić’s study was carried out within the framework of speech act theory, and we are yet to know how these interrogatives behave in their sequential environment

<sup>9</sup> Mrazović and Vukadinović (1990) use invented examples to illustrate the grammatical phenomena

<sup>10</sup> The data set reveals other possible ways of forming interrogatives. However, these other options shall not be discussed here.

<sup>11</sup> From my own sense of Serbo-Croatian, but also from the judgments of other native, linguistically lay speakers I spoke to, it seems that interrogatives which contain a clitic *li* are heard as claiming no knowledge on the part of the speaker and requesting information. This is supported by the analysis of my data to be outlined further on in this chapter

<sup>12</sup> The only occurrences of *da li* interrogatives in the data set are the two examples below:

01	Dt1:	da li ste VI:- da li poznajete: BOžović Boža:?
		part.qp.aux.YOU:- p. qp.know: Bozovic Bozo:?
		did you- do you know Bozovic Bozo?
02	(0.2)	((background talk))
03	Wtn:	ne no no
04	(3.8)	((background talk))
05	Wtn:	↑to bodno. ↑fr eely. surely
06	(4.6)	((background talk))
07	Dt1:	da ↑LI poznaješ lica Stevović ↑Stevicu?
		part.↑QP (you)KNOW faces Stevovic ↑Stevica?
		do you know persons Stevovic Stevica?
08		(1.4) ((background talk))
09	Dt1:	(S)tevović Stevicu? Stevovic Stevica?
10		(0.8) ((background talk))
11	Dt1:	Marković Branka? Markovic Branka?

Low occurrence of *da li* forms could also be ascribed to dialectal features. Leed (1968:330) notes that this form is more characteristic of eastern variety of Serbo-Croatian (Belgrade) and does not seem to have the

same status in the western variety (Zagreb). As ijekavian variant spoken in Zagreb(Croatia) is spoken in Montenegro too, this could be a reason why *da li* interrogatives do not occur as frequently in my data.

<sup>13</sup> In Serbo-Croatian the exception are the cases with the verb *biti* (*to be*) as a main and auxiliary verb, both in the present and past tense.

<sup>14</sup> In line 33 the detective starts dictating the report to the typist. He starts dictating before the suspect has had a chance to complete his turn in line 32.

<sup>15</sup> The detective also applies increased loudness when initiating the dictation in order to delimit the two distinct institutional tasks: the one of questioning and the one of putting the received information or record (see line 14, for example).

<sup>16</sup> It is a practice in the Montenegrin police to interview suspects a number of times

<sup>17</sup> In this case, the initial sound 'z' in the verb 'znaš' was not pronounced, which is frequently done in spoken language

<sup>18</sup> It is interesting that the similar phenomena occur in two different languages: Serbo-Croatian and English, but in two similar types of institutional interaction: police interrogation and cross-examination in court.

<sup>19</sup> For more detailed analysis of 'I don't know/remember' see Drew (1992)

<sup>20</sup> In the following extract one can note a similar defensive move on the part of the suspect. See line 13.

01 Dt1: KO je uKRA:. uKRA: GA JE tAJ i ta:j (.)  
WHO aux. sTOLE:. sTOLE: HIM aux. thaT and tha:t(.)  
*Who stole it? so and so stole it.*

02 #molim # LIJEpo.ALI[sam ]GA [sKINUO SJA  
#please# NICEly.BUT[aux.(I) ]HIM[tOOK OFF FR]OM  
*fair enough, but I took it off from*

03 Dt2: [pogrije-] [POgiješio si ]  
[mistoo- ] [Mistook aux.(you)]  
*you ma- you made a mistake*

04 Dt1: POSTOLJa:  
STANd:  
*the stand*

05 Dt1: (.)pa MAKar (.) da si ih skinuo u-  
(.)so AT least(.)that aux.(you)them took off in-  
*even if you took them off in-*

06 u HA:l[u. ]  
in WORK:s[hop]  
*in the workshop*

07 Dt2: [po ]GRIješio sam i š[ta ] ću[sad ]  
[mi ]STOok aux.(I)and w[hay] will[now ]  
*I made a mistake and what can I do now*

08 Dt1: [E ] [(clap)]  
[YES]  
*Yes*

09 (.)

10 Sus: nijesam ništa OD toga. pa KAKo ću KAZat kad  
not aux.(I)nothing FROM that. so HOW will(I)SAy when  
*I didn't do any of that, how will I say when*

11 nijesam °ljudi moji° (0.1) >šta je ovo<=  
not aux.(I)°people my° (0.1) >what is this<=  
*I didn't, people, what is this?*

12 Dt1: =nijesam ništa od to[ga je l ](mocking voice)  
=not aux(I)nothing from th[at aux.qp ](mocking voice)  
*I didn't do any of that, is it?*

13	Sus:	[ma NIJEsam ]ništa [but NOT aux.(I)]nothing
----	------	--

---

*But, I didn't do anything*

14 [ni zna:m nit sam odradio ]  
[nor(I)kno:w nor aux.(I) carried out]  
*neither do I know nor did I do it*

15 Dtl: [ne no sam JA doša da ga ]SKI:dam, sedi.  
[no but aux. I came that him ]TA:ke off, sit.  
*No, but I came to remove it, come on*

<sup>21</sup> 'čuš' approximately meaning 'listen to this' is in spoken language used to show disapproval of something

<sup>22</sup> Here Dtl probably means 'impersonating the police' but this does not come across quite clearly

<sup>23</sup> Long before I had to analyze these markers, I translated certain instances of 'a' as 'and' and 'but'; also certain instances of 'pa' I translated as 'well' and 'so'. This might be an indication that these markers can do different sort of things in interaction. For the purposes of this work I will keep them as 'and' and 'well' respectively

<sup>24</sup> Although I have not studied the use of rhetorical questions by the detectives in FPP position, I suspect, based on the examples that I encountered, but have not analysed, that the same phenomenon would occur in my data too