

〈Regular Papers〉 [Research Paper]

Doing Challenges with Appendor Wh-Questions*

Sally Jones
Nagoya University**

This article will examine a practice of doing challenges in English conversation called the “appendor wh-question”—a linguistic format consisting of a preposition or present participle plus a wh-word question (e.g., *for what*). Using conversation analysis, it was found that the appendor wh-question is used to target the truth/validity of what the co-participant is saying or doing. It is a disaffiliative action that launches the appendor wh-questioner’s own action. This is different to its two other social actions—information-seeking and repair—that are affiliative and promote the activity of the co-participant.

Keywords: conversation analysis, challenges, questions, action ascription

1. Introduction

In our ordinary, mundane conversations, questions can be used to do more than one thing. There are times when someone is simply seeking information with their question, indicating that they do not understand or may even be challenging the truth, validity, etc. of what someone else is doing or saying. This article will analyse one such question in English—the “appendor wh-question”. This is the term I created and use to refer to the linguistic format consisting of a preposition or a present participle plus a wh-question word (these are not themselves repeats). Examples include *for what* and *doing what*. The appendor wh-question is a question format that can be seen as a syntactic extension of a prior turn, as seen in (1). The target *from who* occurs in line 3.

Excerpt (1): CallFriend - English (Northern US) (ENGN6384)

- 1 Rick: o:h I got another gift today.
- 2 (0.5)
- 3 →Kate: from who?

* I would like to thank the editor and the two anonymous reviewers whose comments and suggestions helped to improve and clarify the manuscript. I would also like to thank Makoto Hayashi and the many others for their invaluable feedback, including those at the 22nd Annual Meeting of the Pragmatics Society of Japan. Any errors that are found herein are mine alone.

** Ph.D student.

- 4 (0.5)
5 Rick: from my sister

Kate's appendor wh-question *from who* in line 3 can be syntactically fitted to the end of line 1. Rick's answer to the appendor wh-question is produced in line 5, which can be heard as being a syntactic extension of line 1 and also giving the requested information.

Terasaki (1976, 2004) was the first to examine the appendor wh-question. Terasaki described the appendor wh-question—referring to it as the “appendor question”¹—as being syntactically dependent on a prior turn, but she did not delve into the actions it performs. The appendor wh-question has, however, primarily been examined in terms of repair. Weber (1993)—calling it the “appendor question with wh-word”—examined the appendor wh-question as a repair initiator; that is, the speaker is signalling a problem of understanding with a prior turn. Weber noted that the appendor wh-question requests information that is not located within the turn containing the source of the understanding problem. Egbert, Golato and Robinson (2009) specifically examined the appendor wh-question *for what*. It was found to solicit a turn extension to the turn containing the source of the problem, targeting a referent that is underspecified for the appendor wh-questioner.

There has been, however, no research done on how the appendor wh-question can be used for disaffiliative actions, including challenges.

This article will in particular focus on how a challenge appendor wh-question is understood to be doing challenges. The format of a question alone does not guarantee what social action will be performed, which is made evident through the appendor wh-question having multiple possible actions. This is also evident in other linguistic formats. For instance, Egbert and Vöge (2008) examined how “why” is ambiguous in function as it can be used for information-seeking or challenging. There are a multitude of actions associated with the appendor wh-question, so this gives rise to a problem for the analyst, as well as interactional participants. Given the potentially ambiguous nature of these questions, how can we identify a particular appendor wh-question as being used for a challenge?

To answer the question of whether a challenge is being performed, we can turn to the methodology employed for this study—conversation analysis. The focus of conversation analysis is understanding the social organisation structure underpinning naturally-occurring interaction. With the progression of interaction occurring in real time, conversation analysis focuses on the organisation of interactional sequences in interaction.

¹ Sacks (1992) first used “appendor question” in his 1964–1965 lectures to refer to prepositional phrases that append to a prior, possibly-complete turn by another speaker (e.g., “across the street?”). In this article, the “appendor wh-question” excludes such prepositional phrases without a wh-question word.

This is central to understanding how the appendor wh-question is understood as a challenge. Keep in mind, the appendor wh-question is not limited to doing just this in interaction, but it can be used to do separate or additional actions such as information-seeking or repair (i.e., targeting a problem of understanding). In any case, rather than thinking of the appendor wh-question as implementing an action if certain conditions are met, the action is born through the interaction created by the interactional participants themselves. By analysing the sequential environment, the response to the appendor wh-question and other factors, the analyst can see how the challenge has been implemented. Hence, I am primarily interested in how the appendor wh-question has been used by its speaker and how it is understood as a challenge by their co-participant.

2. Data

The analysis is based on naturally-occurring, mundane interaction between speakers of English. 83 instances of appendor wh-questions (9 of which are challenges) were collected from around 145 hours of audio- or video-recorded data. Descriptive statistics about the social actions of the appendor wh-questions will be given in Sub-Section 3.1.

The data was transcribed using conversation analysis conventions (see Hepburn and Bolden 2012). The majority of the data comes from corpora in the CABank of the TalkBank database (MacWhinney and Wagner 2010). The excerpts in this article come from CallFriend-English (Northern US) (Canavan and Zipperlen, 1996a), CallFriend-English (Southern US) (Canavan and Zipperlen 1996b) and CallHome-English (US) (Canavan, Graff and Zipperlen 1997).

3. Analysis

This section will examine the social actions of the appendor wh-question. They broadly fall into three categories: information-seeking, repair and disaffiliative² actions. Sub-Section 3.1 examines the descriptive statistics concerning the frequency of occurrence for each social action, as well as their final intonation contours. Sub-Section 3.2 will overview the information-seeking and repair appendor wh-questions, while Sub-Section 3.3 will focus on the challenge appendor wh-question.

3.1. Descriptive Statistics

Table 1 gives the descriptive statistics for the social actions of the appendor wh-

² (Dis)affiliation here is based on the conversation analysis concept of preference. It does not concern psychological preference but social solidarity and conflict (Heritage 1984). That is, affiliative actions preserve social solidarity and avoid conflict, whereas disaffiliative ones do not.

question.

Table 1 Frequency (percentages) for each social action of the appendor wh-question

Social Action	Frequency (Percentages)
Information-seeking	44 (53.0%)
Repair	17 (20.5%)
Disaffiliative actions	10 (12.0%)
Excluded	12 (14.5%)
Total	83

Breaking down these numbers, we can see that the information-seeking appendor wh-question is the most common in terms of frequency ($N=44$, 53.0%), followed by repair ($N=17$, 20.5%) and then disaffiliative actions ($N=10$, 12.0%).³ Of the disaffiliative actions, there were nine instances of the challenge appendor wh-question, while one was used for pre-rejection (i.e., the appendor wh-question solicits information before the action being proposed is rejected by the appendor wh-questioner).

Table 2 shows the final intonation contours of the appendor wh-questions, giving us insight into whether intonation might aid in the understanding of the appendor wh-question doing a particular action.

Table 2 Frequencies (percentages) of final intonation contours for each social action of the appendor wh-question

	No contour	Rising contour	Continuing contour	Falling contour
Information-seeking	3 (6.8%)	28 (63.6%)	3 (6.8%)	10 (22.7%)
Repair	1 (5.9%)	11 (64.7%)	0 (0%)	5 (29.4%)
Disaffiliative actions	3 (30.0%)	2 (20.0%)	0 (0%)	5 (50.0%)

The information-seeking ($n=28/44$, 63.6%) and repair ($n=11/17$, 64.7%) appendor wh-questions tended to favour rising contours, whereas the disaffiliative actions ($n=5/10$, 50.0%) tended to favour falling contours. Of the disaffiliative actions, the pre-rejection appendor wh-question ($n=1/1$, 100%) had a falling contour and the challenges also just favoured falling contours ($n=4/9$, 44.4%). It is, however, hard to come to any solid conclusions about the role of final intonation. This due to the relatively low number ($n=9$) of appendor wh-questions doing challenges and the social actions not overwhelmingly favouring a particular contour. In addition, these statistics only give a general

³ 12 instances were excluded due to factors such as not being able to understand the context, being followed by a candidate answer and a lack of a response to the appendor wh-question. (Partial) repeats plus appendor wh-questions are considered to be a separate practice from the one examined in this article.

overview, so it is important to consider the role of intonation in each individual case.

3.2. The Other Social Actions: Information-Seeking and Repair

I will now give a brief overview of the information-seeking and then the repair appendor *wh*-questions, noting their similarities and how they can differ from the challenge appendor *wh*-question.⁴

First, the information-seeking appendor *wh*-question was found in a number of sequential environments, such as the announcement of news, tellings and the elaboration of an answer to a question. While the other social actions (repair and challenges) also solicit information, they are doing more than simply soliciting information.

The information-seeking appendor *wh*-question promotes the progressivity of the sequence (i.e., promoting and aiding what their co-participant is doing through their talk) through the solicitation of information. That is to say, information-seeking is affiliative. Taking a look at one instance, in (2), Emma has been talking to Lily about a teacher who has written a book. The target *for what* occurs in line 8.

Excerpt (2): CallHome-English (US) (CHM4569)

- 1 Emma: an:d this first book has been really
 2 a tremendous success.
 3 Lily: o:h grea: [t.]
 4 Emma: [a] tremendous success, in fact
 5 she's also bee:n (.) i:n >um< Israeli just
 6 ah couple of weeks ago,
 7 (0.3)
 8 →Lily: for [wha]tɿ
 9 Emma: [at]
 10 Emma: ed- e- the Israel teachers association at
 11 in Jerusalem.
 12 (.)
 13 Lily: mm h:m.

In this ongoing telling, after Emma initiates talk about Israel (lines 4–6), talk has not been immediately forthcoming. Lily's *for what* in line 8 occurs at a point that projects more talk. This *for what* places constraints on the speaker's response as it specifically targets the elicitation of a purpose. However, this does not hinder the progressivity of the sequence as it serves to push it forward by eliciting more talk from Emma on the topic. Emma gives the requested elaboration (line 10–11), while Lily maintains her role as the story's recipient with “mm hm” (Stivers 2008) (line 13). The appendor *wh*-

⁴ It is important to note that these actions are not completely separate and distinct social actions, but rather there can be significant overlap between the actions themselves or could have a superset-subset relationship, e.g., a challenge solicits information.

question is hence seen to be affiliative as it aids Emma's telling.

The repair appendor wh-question is different to the information-seeking appendor wh-question. This is because rather than promoting the progressivity of the sequence, the repair appendor wh-question suspends it. Repair can be, however, also affiliative because it still promotes and aids their co-participant in what they are doing. As previously mentioned, the repair appendor wh-question targets a problem of understanding. In (3), Jarrod and Therese are talking about a mutual friend. The target *on what* occurs in line 7.

Excerpt (3): CallFriend-English (Southern US) (ENGS6629)

- 1 Therese: is she still babysitting?
 2 (.)
 3 Jarrod: <yea:h>
 4 (.)
 5 Therese: did she ever go to court?
 6 (1.3)
 7 →Jarrod: on what_j
 8 (0.3)
 9 Therese: on that stuff that was going on.
 10 Jarrod: I: don't know,
 11 (2.4)
 12 Therese: >she told me that girl was having ah< (.)
 13 the pain in her some:thing

Therese asks questions about the mutual friend, first in line 1 and then again in line 5 “did she ever go to court”. In response to this second question, we do not get an answer to it, but the appendor wh-question *on what* (line 7). This suspends the progressivity of the sequence because an answer was relevant and expected after the question. Therese responds with “on that stuff that was going on” (line 9) to the appendor wh-question. This seems to resolve Jarrod's problem of understanding and he finally answers the question from line 5 with “I don't know” (line 10). This response not treated as problematic by Therese as she continues talking on a related point. The progressivity of the sequence has thus resumed.

In all, the information-seeking and repair appendor wh-questions will be regarded in this article as affiliative actions as they promote the action of the co-participant. The challenge appendor wh-question is different—as we will see—because it does not promote the action of the co-participant and it is disaffiliative. Rather, it launches the appendor wh-questioner's own action, i.e., a challenge.

3.3. The Challenge Appendor Wh-Question

This section will detail the challenge appendor wh-question. This appendor wh-question is not purely doing information-seeking; nor is it signalling a problem of un-

derstanding. At its core, the challenge appendor wh-question is questioning the validity and truth of what is being said/done. In this sub-section, we will examine three instances of the challenge appendor wh-question and how they are understood to be doing challenges. Excerpt (4) concerns already mentioned information, (5) concerns mobilised cultural knowledge and (6) concerns explicitly-marked, self-evident knowledge.

Looking at (4), the appendor wh-questioner is targeting already specified information. Zoe and Joy had been discussing their hotel arrangements for an upcoming wedding before Joy begins to discuss a social event tied to the wedding — a crawfish boil. The target *for what* occurs in line 16.

Excerpt (4): CallFriend-English (Southern US) (ENGS6910)

- 1 Joy: we think we are just [goin]g to have=
 2 Zoe: [h]
 3 Joy: =[that craw]fish boi:l in the fro:nt=
 4 Zoe: [hh]
 5 Joy: =under the carport,
 6 (0.9)
 7 Joy: cos their back [yar]d i[s n]ot big enou:gh
 8 Zoe: [h] [h]
 9 (1.1)
 10 Zoe: ↑ >what do you mean< not big enough?
 11 (.)
 12 Joy: [we] just looked at it and it's not near=
 13 Zoe: [H]
 14 Joy: =big enough
 15 (.)
 16 →Zoe: ↑ fo:r what.
 17 (.)
 18 Zoe: hh (.) [h
 19 Joy: [for a crawfish boil
 20 (.)
 21 Zoe: ↑ w:hy hh
 22 Joy: it's just not.
 23 (0.9)
 24 Zoe: >use [that table-<] hh
 25 Joy: [> ↑ I don't know<]
 26 Joy: why they went and bought a house <with no
 27 dang yard.>
 28 (.)
 29 Zoe: I know it's just gonna get
 30 wors[:e when we all] when we all=
 31 Joy: [out of all of them]
 32 Zoe: =have kids=

- 33 Joy: =I know it.=(I'll need to have.)
 34 (.)
 35 Zoe: I keep telling them they have to buy
 36 a bigger house they don't listen to me

The appendor wh-question is embedded in a series of practices used to do challenging. Zoe first responds to the announcement (lines 1, 3, 5 and 7) with a prosodically marked, higher pitched “what do you mean it’s not big enough” (line 10). This “what do you mean + [repeat]” format can be used for challenges, whereby the speaker is pointing out a failure to account for knowledge they (should) know (Raymond and Sidnell 2019). There are indications that Zoe has independent knowledge about the backyard (lines 35–36), so she could be seen as taking a stance that the backyard is indeed big enough for the event. Moreover, Joy has already justified her decision with the “cos”-initial turn extension added in line 7 (“cos their backyard is not big enough”). This is the reason that Joy gives for moving the crawfish boil. Joy orients to Zoe’s “what do you mean it’s not big enough” as a challenge through justifying the decision with an account for her claim: “we just looked at it and it’s not near big enough” (lines 12 and 14). Changing the description of the backyard from “not big enough” in the original announcement to “not near big enough” emphasises that the issue is the size of the backyard.

Zoe then proffers the appendor wh-question *for what* (line 16). It is not doing information seeking or repair here—the purpose has just been stated by Joy in the announcement. Zoe should thus already know that the *for what* is taking up and maintaining a challenge against the claim that the backyard not being big enough as it targets already specified information. This can be heard as not being able to make sense of Joy’s claim that the backyard is not big enough, thereby suggesting that moving the crawfish boil is inappropriate.

Of interest is Joy’s response to the appendor wh-question: “for a crawfish boil” (line 19). This response by Joy treats the appendor wh-question as if it were actually just seeking information and by doing so, it—as seen for other formats used for challenges—withholds a response and rejects the challenge at hand by refusing to treat it as a challenge (Koshik 2017; Monzoni 2008).

Zoe pursues an account again with “why?” (line 21)—a practice that can be used for explicit account solicitation (Bolden and Robinson 2011; Egbert and Vöge 2008; Robinson and Bolden 2010). Joy’s response “it’s just not” (line 22) indicates her continued refusal to acknowledge Zoe’s challenge and again withholds an account. Joy is thus orienting towards an account as being not necessary. Altogether, this supports the understanding of *for what* as a challenge.

The next excerpt examines a case whereby the mobilisation of known-in-common knowledge is a key to understanding how the appendor wh-question is doing challenging. Research into challenging has examined how it can target something that has not

been specified, but should be commonly known. For instance, Bolden and Robinson (2011) claim that “why” communicates a stance that the co-participant’s action or claim does not align with common sense; and Raymond and Sidnell (2019) examined “what do you mean + [repeat]”, whereby the co-participant has failed to consider something that they should know. In this case, the appendor wh-question itself is targeting something that is known-in-common knowledge. In (5), Mel—a high school student living with her brother Bart—is speaking on the phone with her mother, Mary. Throughout the call, Mel had been talking about the difficulties she has been facing. The excerpt comes from talk that is topically different from the immediately prior talk. The target *for what* occurs in line 3.

Excerpt (5): CallFriend—English (Southern US) (ENGS6855)

- 1 Mary: but it’ll work out=Mommy’s proud of you
 2 Mel=hang in there pl[reas-
 3 →Mel: [for ↑ what.
 4 (1.2)
 5 Mary: for suc:ce [edin’.
 6 Bart: [°°wer we will°°
 7 (0.5)
 8 Mel: ↓ su:re doubt not to succeed.
 9 Mary: me and (Daddy) talk- we didn’t go to bed
 10 Thursday night until three thi:rti.

In lines 1–2, Mary gives her daughter words of encouragement and support “but it’ll work out=Mommy’s proud of you Mel=hang in there pleas-”. The “it” refers the many difficulties that Mel has been having, which are the conversational agenda of this call. Both “Mommy’s proud of you Mel” and “hang in there” are hearable as kinds of supportive actions.

Mel utters *for what* in line 3. This has marked prosody (high-pitch, final intonation), which can be indicative of a challenge (Keisanen 2006).⁵ We can also consider its sequential positioning. The appendor wh-question is displacing a sequentially relevant next action that we might expect in this slot, which is an acceptance of the supportive action or gratitude. This displacement makes it hearable as a precursor to disaffiliation (Kendrick 2015; Schegloff 2007b). Lastly, rather than just information-seeking, this appendor wh-question is targeting something that typically should not be specified or justified: a mother’s pride in and support for her daughter. Mary’s use of

⁵ To note, three of the nine challenge appendor wh-questions were produced with a higher pitch, compared to three of the 44 information-seeking and zero of the 17 repair appendor wh-questions. In the case of information-seeking, the appendor wh-questioner was pleading, or was signalling exasperation or incredulity. These high-pitched utterances can hearably relay additional actions, but they still aided the progressivity of their co-participant’s activity.

“Mommy” for self-reference portrays herself as a generic member of a category by using a third-person reference form for self-reference (Land and Kitzinger 2007; Schegloff 1996, 2007a). The use of “Mommy” here has possibly been used to mobilise culturally known-in-common knowledge regarding the unquestionable pride that a mother would have for her child and that a mother supports her daughter. Moreover, this points to Mel’s orientation as having done nothing that would warrant her mother being proud. Hence, the appendor wh-question can be heard as communicating a challenging stance as what might culturally be regarded as unquestionable has been questioned.

After a lengthy 1.2-second gap, Mary responds with “for succeedin” (line 5), orienting towards the *for what* as targeting “Mommy’s proud of you”. As Mary would know best concerning her own feelings for her daughter, she can provide the requested specification (i.e., account) of Mary’s pride in Mel. Mary also resists the self-doubt that the daughter has already expressed by saying that she has been successful and is currently succeeding. Mel, however, responds with “sure doubt not to succeed” (line 8), placing her doubt on the semantic extreme. This serves to reject her mother’s encouragement by suggesting she has not been successful and will continue to be, as well as challenging the mother’s grounds and subsequent account for her pride.

The last excerpt examines a challenge appendor wh-question targeting self-evident knowledge. Unlike the previous two excerpts, the appendor wh-question invokes social outrage. (6) comes from former couple, Irene and David, who have started to argue again about their child, Maddy. Irene and Maddy live in New York together, and will visit David soon in Florida. Just prior to this excerpt, Irene told David that she will tell him in person of the “rules and regulations” for the care of their daughter. The target *like what* occurs in line 13.

Excerpt (6): CallFriend - English (Southern US) (ENGS4843)

- 1 David: (oh my baby >you know what,<) I can rais:e
 2 a child.
 3 (0.3)
 4 Irene: °<l’m not talking about tha:t, you know.>°
 5 (0.2)
 6 Irene: it don’t mat:ter.
 7 (1.0)
 8 Irene: obvious:ly if someone is with the chil:d
 9 long time, there’s certain things I need
 10 to ↑ tell you ↓ there’s (0.2) there’s a lot
 11 of (.) things you’re not going to know.
 12 (0.6)
 13 →David: like wha°t° hh
 14 (0.4)
 15 Irene: DAVI:D. (0.2) don’t try to act stu:pid.
 16 I hate when you act like that=just

- 17 [don't ↑ treat me like that?]
 18 David: [p- peo:ple gotta learn so]me time
 19 °anyway [so,°
 20 Irene: [I understand you got- of course
 21 you are going to learn a lot of things
 22 on your own, but of course I'm gonna
 23 tell you a lot of things ↑ about °Mad:dy°.

After David says “(oh my baby >you know what,<) I can raise a child” (lines 1–2), Irene denies the validity of his complaint with “I’m not talking about that, you know” (line 4) and “it don’t matter” (line 6).

Irene then starts telling David about how she needs to tell him many, specific things about Maddy (lines 8–11). This addresses David’s possible misunderstanding of why Irene will inform him of the rules and regulations. Irene explicitly marks what she is saying as self-evident by using the overt, evidential marker “obviously” (line 8). That is, it should not require evidence or reasoning to be understood as true. Although evidential marking can index an epistemic imbalance between what a speaker knows and their co-participant’s assumed knowledge (c.f., Fox 2001; Sidnell 2012), the use of “obviously” implies that there should be no epistemic difference (i.e., level of knowledge) between the participants and thus they should be on the same page. The *if*-formulation also supports this. The *if*-marked clause (“if someone is with the child long time”) does not specify who is “the child” is or who the “someone” is. Hence, Irene is suggesting that this is not specific to just their situation, but is something widely known. Together with “obviously”, Irene treats what she is saying as something that is common knowledge.

David then utters *like what* (line 13). This hearably targets a specification of “things” in line 11. Questions can claim that the speaker is not knowledgeable about what they are asking (Pomerantz 1988). Although there might be an information gap between Irene and David, David’s appendor wh-question is not purely doing information-seeking. David’s *like what* serves to claim ignorance, and to challenge and undermine that her words are indeed self-evident. As the “things” have been overtly marked by Irene as obvious for anyone, asking *like what* makes relevant an elaboration of “things”. This means that if Irene were to specify examples, it would allow David to challenge her that the “things” are indeed obvious. Therefore, David is not only challenging whether what she is saying is self-evident, it is also targeting something more fundamental-whether Irene’s statement is “obviously” true.

Irene’s response to this appendor wh-question is telling of how Irene has understood the action that David is undertaking. Irene not only resists answering David’s question, but also treats it as though David does not have the social right to ask the question. This is evident with her rebuke “DAVID. don’t try to act stupid. I hate when you act like that just don’t treat me like that?” (lines 15–17). By making a direct

complaint, Irene is taking a strong, negative stance (Schegloff 2005). This is seen in several respects: “I hate”-formulation constitutes a complaint about David’s behaviour; address terms are regularly in challenges (Clayman 2010); and Irene makes an explicit formulation of the transgression that David has committed (Drew 1998).

Thus, *like what* is hearable as being disaffiliative. David communicates a challenging stance by not aligning to what Irene has said as self-evident. For David, *like what* is challenging the need for Irene to tell him about the “things” because he can do it himself. David’s account in lines 18–19 (“people gotta learn some time anyway so”) points to this.

4. Discussion and Conclusion

This article has demonstrated how the appendor wh-question can be used for challenges. It is different to the two other actions it may perform: information-seeking and repair. The information-seeking appendor wh-question is the most commonly occurring one. It is affiliative because it helps the co-participant in what they are doing or saying. Furthermore, due to the affiliative nature of information-seeking and there being a preference for social solidarity in interaction (Pillet-Shore 2017), it can be easily understood why this is the most common.

The next most common is the repair appendor wh-question. This was regarded as affiliative as well, but differed to information-seeking because it targets a problem of understanding in interaction and consequently results in a suspension of the sequence’s progressivity. The repair has to be attended to before the talk can resume.

The least common is the challenge appendor wh-question. In interaction, there is preference for actions that promote social solidarity rather than weaken it. With the challenge appendor wh-question, it promoted the action of the appendor wh-questioner rather than promoting what the co-participant is doing or saying. A challenge itself is inherently questioning the truth, validity, etc., so it can undermine social solidarity.

First, in excerpts (4) and (5), the responses to the appendor wh-questions treated the challenges as though they were just seeking information. However, the appendor wh-questions were not purely seeking information. Delving deeper in the each of the excerpts, in (4), we saw that the appendor wh-question is targeting just mentioned information, so it cannot be doing information-seeking. Rather, it shows the appendor wh-questioner questioning the validity of this reason to move the crawfish boil. In (5), the appendor wh-question is targeting mobilised common knowledge regarding the pride a mother has for her daughter. The daughter’s rejection of the mother’s account for her pride reveals she was indeed questioning the validity of her mother’s pride.

Lastly, we have (6), where the co-participant explicitly marked what she is saying as true. The appendor wh-questioner, however, questioned its truthfulness and validity. This turned out to be an interactionally volatile move, with the co-participant rebuking the appendor wh-questioner. This is reminiscent of the conversation clarification experi-

ments run by Garfinkel (1967). In these, he asked his students to continually ask for clarification (e.g., using “what do you mean + [repeat]”) of mundane utterances in their everyday lives. It was found that the students’ clarifications would invoke the ire of their co-participants. It was stated that because the students did not seem to take into account any background knowledge, this resulted in social outrage by the co-participants (Garfinkel 1967). Similarly, in (6), the appendor wh-questioner failed to treat an utterance that has been explicitly marked as true to be indeed true. This also results in the undermining of social solidarity.

In conclusion, this article found that the challenge appendor wh-question is dis-affiliative. It launches a challenge tackling the truth/validity of what a co-participant is doing/saying, whereas information-seeking and repair are affiliative in that they aid their co-participant. Future research on this topic would benefit from comparisons with other practices that are used for challenges, such as “why” and “what do you mean”. This article has expanded upon the previous studies on the appendor wh-question, revealing how the action of a challenge is interactionally achieved within conversation.

Transcript Conventions

[overlapping talk onset
]	overlapping talk termination
=	latching
(x.x)	silence (measured in seconds and tenths of seconds)
(.)	micropause (less than 0.2 seconds)
,	continuing intonation (continuing contour with a slight rise)
.	final intonation (falling terminal contour)
?	final intonation (rising contour)
¿	final intonation (rises more than a continuing contour but less than a rising contour)
<u>word</u>	stress in talk through pitch or amplitude or both
°word°	quieter in comparison with surrounding talk
WORD	louder than surrounding talk
:	sound stretch
↓ ↑	marked shifts into lower or higher pitches
>word<	faster than surrounding talk
<word>	slower than surrounding talk
hh	audible aspirations
.hh	audible inhalations
\$word\$	laughing while talking
(word)	possible hearing

References

- Bolden, G. B. and J. D. Robinson. 2011. “Soliciting Accounts with Why-Interrogatives in Conversation.” *Journal of Communication* 61(1), 94-119.
- Canavan, A., D. Graff and G. Zipperlen. 1997. *CallHome American English Speech*. Philadelphia: Linguistic Data Consortium.

- Canavan, A. and G. Zipperlen. 1996a. *CallFriend American English-Non-Southern Dialect*. Philadelphia: Linguistic Data Consortium.
- Canavan, A. and G. Zipperlen. 1996b. *CallFriend American English-Southern Dialect*. Philadelphia: Linguistic Data Consortium.
- Clayman, S. E. 2010. "Address Terms in the Service of Other Actions: The Case of News Interview Talk." *Discourse & Communication* 4(2), 161-183.
- Drew, P. 1998. "Complaints About Transgressions and Misconduct." *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 31(3-4), 295-325.
- Egbert, M., A. Golato and J. D. Robinson. 2009. "Repairing Reference." In J. Sidnell (ed.) *Conversation Analysis: Comparative Perspectives* (pp. 104-132). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Egbert, M. and M. Vöge. 2008. "Wh-Interrogative Formats Used for Questioning and Beyond: German Warum (Why) and Wieso (Why) and English Why." *Discourse Studies* 10(1), 17-36.
- Fox, B. A. 2001. "Evidentiality: Authority, Responsibility, and Entitlement in English Conversation." *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 11(2), 167-192.
- Garfinkel, H. 1967. *Studies in Ethnomethodology*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.
- Hepburn, A. and G. B. Bolden. 2012. "The Conversation Analytic Approach to Transcription." In Sidnell, J. and T. Stivers (eds.) *The Handbook of Conversation Analysis* (pp. 57-76). Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- Heritage, J. 1984. *Garfinkel and Ethnomethodology*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Keisanen, T. 2006. *Patterns of Stance Taking: Negative Yes/No Interrogatives and Tag Questions in American English Conversation*. Oulu: Oulu University Press.
- Kendrick, K. H. 2015. "Other-Initiated Repair in English." *Open Linguistics* 1(1), 164-190.
- Koshik, I. 2017. "Responses to Wh-Question Challenges." In Raymond, G., G. H. Lerner and J. Heritage (eds.) *Enabling Human Conduct: Studies of Talk-in-Interaction in Honor of Emanuel A. Schegloff* (pp. 79-104). Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Land, V. and C. Kitzinger. 2007. "Some Uses of Third-Person Reference Forms in Speaker Self-Reference." *Discourse Studies* 9(4), 493-525.
- MacWhinney, B. and J. Wagner. 2010. "Transcribing, Searching and Data Sharing: The CLAN Software and the Talkbank Data Repository." *Gesprächsforschung* 11, 154-173.
- Monzoni, C. M. 2008. "Introducing Direct Complaints through Questions: The Interactional Achievement of 'Pre-Sequences'?" *Discourse Studies* 10(1), 73-87.
- Pillet-Shore, D. 2017. "Preference Organization". *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Communication*.
- Pomerantz, A. 1988. "Offering a Candidate Answer: An Information Seeking Strategy." *Communication Monographs* 55(4), 360-373.
- Raymond, G. and J. Sidnell. 2019. "Interaction at the Boundaries of a World Known in Common: Initiating Repair with "What Do You Mean?"" *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 52(2), 177-192.
- Robinson, J. D. and G. B. Bolden. 2010. "Preference Organization of Sequence-Initiating Actions: The Case of Explicit Account Solicitations." *Discourse Studies* 12(4), 501-533.
- Sacks, H. 1992. *Lectures on Conversation: Volume 1*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Schegloff, E. A. 1996. "Some Practices for Referring to Persons in Talk-in-Interaction: A Partial Sketch of a Systematics." In B.A. Fox (ed.) *Studies in Anaphora* (pp. 437-485). Amsterdam:

- John Benjamins Publishing.
- Schegloff, E. A. 2005. "On Complainability." *Social Problems* 52(4), 449-476.
- Schegloff, E. A. 2007a. "Conveying Who You Are: The Presentation of Self, Strictly Speaking." In Enfield, N. J. and T. Stivers (eds.) *Person Reference in Interaction: Linguistic, Cultural and Social Perspectives* (pp. 123-148). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Schegloff, E. A. 2007b. *Sequence Organization in Interaction: Volume 1: A Primer in Conversation Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sidnell, J. 2012. "Who Knows Best?: Evidentiality and Epistemic Asymmetry in Conversation." *Pragmatics and Society* 3(2), 294-320.
- Stivers, T. 2008. "Stance, Alignment, and Affiliation During Storytelling: When Nodding Is a Token of Affiliation." *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 41(1), 31-57.
- Weber, E. G. 1993. *Varieties of Questions in English Conversation*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.