

A Critical Review of Koivisto, 2013: On the Preference for Remembering: Acknowledging an Answer with Finnish *Ai Nii(n)* (“Oh, that’s right”)

The article *On the Preference for Remembering: Acknowledging an Answer with Finnish Ai Nii(n)* (“Oh, that’s right”) has been published in third issue of journal called *Research on Language and Interaction* in 2013. The writer and researcher of the article is Aino Koivisto from University of Helsinki, and the research was about the functions of Finnish response particle cluster *ai nii(n)*. In the article Koivisto presents that the main function for a Finnish response particle cluster *ai nii(n)* would be representing earlier forgotten but now again remembered knowledge of the speaker. The claim is easy to accept since Koivisto uses well examples from the research data while reasoning it.

Koivisto has done also multiple other qualitative studies relating to interaction linguistics and response particle cluster. Term particle cluster was explained in the article as one of the smallest parts of language which have their own individual meanings. The word *response* in front of the term refers to the interaction linguistics and especially to the speaker turn system and the theory of *third-position turns*. The authentic data of Koivisto’s research was collected from pre-existing large database and it consisted of a collection of 34 transcribed video- and audio recordings. The analysis was done by observing material and comparing it to previous knowledge, studies and hypothesis which was made accordingly those earlier studies as well. In addition to the claim about *ai nii(n)* and its position as a *preference of remembering* Koivisto presents that secondly main function for *ai nii(n)* would be acting as a third-position turn in cases of asking improper or unfit questions. Also, to be added Koivisto was for instance suggesting that there are similarities between Finnish particle cluster *ai nii(n)* and German particle cluster *ach ja*.

To go back last-mentioned thing about similarities between German and Finnish particle clusters, that is in my opinion a bit too straight equation. It requires more research that it could be certainly assumed anything about “synonyms” in other languages. In those studies, in future would be a good idea consider an aspect of cultural differences between another languages, too.

Another notable thing was the structure of the article: it was clear its own way for Finnish reader. In other words, the structure was appropriate for Finnish academic article but not so much for English academic article. That complicated reading a little, although the language of the

article was clear and easy to understand. The structure difference is still a quite understandable since the researcher-writer was Finnish. Also, the used examples were good and eased the understanding a lot and made the main claims to be more believable.

Third thing what stayed in my mind was that there was an assume that the reader would know the field and researched topic well in the text, too. For example, Koivisto has used for interaction linguistic field typical terms as *third-position turn* or *sequence*. That is a matter which requires more explanation from the writer in the article as there is a possibility that the reader doesn't know much about interaction linguistics and in that case the bigger picture stays unclear. Even though that might be too explained with that typical Finnish academic article structure – in those Finnish articles it is assumed that reader truly knows the field and topic of the research or article.

As a conclusion the article of Koivisto was very pleasurable thing to read. The enthusiasm and interest towards the topic of writer were almost touchable and took reader with them. The main claims and points were reasonable, plausible and presented well and clearly with examples. The data was in my opinion credible and authentic, which is typical for linguistic research. Article wasn't a good example of academic article in English from the views of structure and assumes about reader's knowledge, but the reason for that was a quite apparent, too. In future might be good to have more material – it will take more time to research, but results are even more reliable.

References:

- Aino Koivisto (2013) On the Preference for Remembering: Acknowledging an Answer With Finnish *Ai Nii(n)* ("Oh That's Right"), *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 46:3, 277-297, DOI: [10.1080/08351813.2013.810411](https://doi.org/10.1080/08351813.2013.810411)