

Research Article

Kyu-hyun Kim*

Request for confirmation sequences in Korean

<https://doi.org/10.1515/opli-2024-0010>

received April 29, 2023; accepted September 7, 2023

Abstract: As part of a cross-linguistic investigation of request for confirmation (RfC) sequences, this article provides an overview of distributional tendencies associated with Korean RfC sequences based on an examination of 200 tokens of RfC excerpted from audio- and video-recorded face-to-face ordinary conversations. Various grammatical and contextual features associated with RfCs are analyzed, e.g., as interactional resources for grounding RfCs in inferencing, rendering them modulated in action, or connecting them to prior talk/action. They include negative polarity markers, connective particles (e.g., *-nuntey* ‘circumstantial’), modal markers (e.g., *-keyss* ‘I suppose’), and sentence-ending suffixes (SEs) such as *-na* (‘dubitative’), *-ney* (‘noticing’), and ‘pseudo-tags’ *-ci/cianha*, which are composed of *-ci* (‘committal’). Features of responses to RfCs are examined in terms of response type (e.g., confirmation, disconfirmation, or neither) with special reference to the form and distribution of response tokens, which include not only unmarked interjections such as *ung/ye* (‘yes’) and *ani(-yo)* (‘no’), but also *kule*-marked indexical forms (e.g., *ku(leh)ci* ‘certainly it is’). The findings shed light on the role of SEs, modal markers, and discourse particles as stance-marking resources that crucially shape the function of RfCs, and the compositional features of response turns that constitute or frame a responsive action to RfCs.

Keywords: sentence-ending suffixes, connectives, tags, pseudo-tags, inferencing, modulation, polarity, modal markers, response tokens, epistemic

1 Introduction

This article provides an overview of resources used for formulating request for confirmation (RfC) sequences in Korean from the perspectives of interactional linguistics (Couper-Kuhlen and Selting 2001, 2018) and conversation analysis (Sacks 1992a, 1992b, Sacks et al. 1974). It undertakes a quantitative analysis, drawing upon 200 instances of RfC that were identified in naturally occurring interactions and coded according to the categories developed in the scientific network Interactional Linguistics (König et al. forthcoming).

RfCs are defined as questions that make relevant a confirming or disconfirming response by the recipient in an interaction, in such a way the questioner privileges the recipient with epistemic supremacy while claiming a ‘partially knowing’ position (König and Pfeiffer, forthcoming). An example of RfC is provided in Extract (1), where Yun’s RfC is marked with the sentence-ending suffix (SE) *-ci* (*hophu laynchi-nun hanpen-to mos kapo-ass-ci?* ‘We’ve not even once visited (never been to) Hope Ranch, **right?**):

* **Corresponding author: Kyu-hyun Kim**, Department of Applied English Linguistics & Translation Studies, Kyung Hee University, 26 Kyunghedae-ro, Dongdaemun-gu, Seoul 02447, Republic of Korea, e-mail: khkim@khu.ac.kr

Extract (1): NC Talk 3 05:91, No. 57

(Byen tells a story to Yun and Kyeng, her fellow Santa Barbara residents, about a private beach in the Hope Ranch near Santa Barbara)

213 Yun:→ ((to Kyeng)) hophu laynchi-nun hanpen-to mos
Hope Ranch-TOP once-even not:able

214 kapo-ass-ci?=
go:see-PST-COMM/PSTG
We've never been to Hope Ranch, right?

215 Kyeng:→ = um.
RT/yes
Yes (No, we haven't).

216 Byen: (Byen continues to talk about Hope Ranch)

In Yun's RfC, the 'committal' suffix *-ci*, agglutinated to the verb stem *kapo-ass* ('go and see-PAST'), functions as a 'pseudo-tag' (Section 4.6), with which a more or less flat, slightly recipient-tilted epistemic gradient is established. It indexes the participants' shared commitment to the confirmable at hand (Lee 1999) in such a way that the questioner claims a 'partially knowing' position while endowing the recipient with epistemic privilege.¹

Yun's *ci*-marked RfC launches a sequence in which the recipient is invited as a party to help him raise his commitment 'in collusion' (Kim 2022). This point is supported by the epistemic relationship between Yun and Kyeng, who, as a couple, position themselves as a team (cf. Lerner 1992) drawing upon a shared discourse history in co-constructing the RfC sequence in the context of responding to Byen's telling in the prior context (also see Extract (12)).²

Yun's RfC is responded to by Kyung's straightforward confirmation with the response token *um* ('yes'). Note that this affirmative response token is produced as a *no*-response confirmation in the given context ('No, we haven't'). This discrepancy is attributed to the fact that Korean uses the 'propositional agreement system,' as opposed to the 'polarity agreement answering system' used in English (Levinson 2012, 31, Sadock and Zwicky 1985).

In searching for cases of RfCs to be included in the data collection, systematic attention was given to the details of the interactional environment, which include the situated functions of linguistic signals employed in questions. For instance, care was taken to identify the contexts where the 'committal' suffix *-ci* functions as a 'pseudo-tag' (as in Extract (1)), rather than as a marker indexing the speaker's claim of superior epistemic rights. More generally, close empirical attention was given to grasping the epistemic relationship between the participants, which is often evident or highly indicative in the sequential contexts where RfCs are embedded (Section 4.1). Whenever relevant, information about the participants' respective epistemic status was taken into consideration as an elaborative feature of the contexts where RfCs are embedded (Extracts (1), (12), (21), (22), and (23)).

This article is organized as follows. Section 2 presents a literature review of previous research relevant to the analysis of Korean RfCs, followed by a description of data sets in Section 3. Sections 4 and 5 present analyses of resources used to build RfCs and responses to them, respectively. Section 6 is the conclusion.

¹ Korean has typological features as an agglutinative language with SOV word order, where the subject is often zero-marked, as illustrated in the structure of Yun's RfC in Extract (1), where the subject 'we' is not expressed. Note that the topic particle *-nun* marks the object *Hope Ranch*, functioning as a 'delimiter' (Yang 1973). Used with the negatively-formatted verbal phrase that follows, *Hope Ranch*, formulated as the *nun*-marked 'topic', is foregrounded as a place that is not found (or only peripherally located) in their shared discourse history ("We've not even once visited (never been to) Hope Ranch, right?") (Kim 2021).

² Yun's RfC is formatted with an extreme case formulation (*hanpen-to mos* 'not even once'), which is produced in the context where he is accounting for, or legitimizing, their lack of uptake of Byun's prior telling about Hope Ranch (Pomerantz 1986).

2 Literature review

Previous research addressing topics relevant to RfCs in Korean has illuminated various aspects of the semantic, functional, and interactional features of question design that render the question they mark an RfC. These include the pseudo-tags *-ci* and *-cianha* (involving the ‘committal’ particle *-ci*) and negative polarity. Kawanish (1994), for instance, compares the Korean *-cianha* with the Japanese *-jan(ai)* (‘isn’t it?’), as resources used to mark non-challengeable information, geared to establishing social/cultural common ground between interlocutors. Lee (1999) explicates, from a cognitive perspective, the function of *ci*-marked questions as contextually derived from the meaning of the particle *-ci* as ‘committal’, indexing the speaker’s attitudinal stance displayed as his/her belief in, or commitment to, the truth of the conveyed message. Noh (2009) analyzes, from a sign-based semantic perspective, three forms of confirmation-seeking negative questions – the pre-verbal (short form) *an*, post-verbal (long form) *-ci anh*, and nominalized form *-ke ani* – as resources geared to indexing the speaker’s weak belief, generally accepted belief, and own judgment, respectively. Kim (2010), using elicited narratives as data, shows that negative questions marked with *-ci anh* (‘committal’ *-ci* + *anha* ‘not to do’) are used to convey the speaker’s stronger assertion than those marked with *ani* (NEG:copula), which is geared more to implicating the addressee in a negotiatory relationship of interdependence. Kim (2016), from the perspective of a usage-based grammar, claims that ambiguous interpretations of the meaning of ‘long form’ (post-verbal) negative questions (marked by *-ci anh*) can be disambiguated in terms of a range of parameters that include the speaker’s certainty, polarity, and type of expected response.

In the field of conversation analysis, Park (2009) analyzes pre-verbal negation questions with *an* (*an* + verb) in ordinary conversations, showing that they emerge in contexts where the questioner infers a ‘negative event’ from the recipient’s prior telling. Park (2010) examines negative questions that doctors use in history-taking in their interactions with patients, comparing questions marked with the pre-verbal *an*, post-verbal *-ci anh*, and post-nominalization *-nun-ke-n ep* (‘ATTR-thing:TOP not:exist’). She discusses differences between the three forms of RfC in terms of their mutually distinctive tendency to co-occur with different SESs as well as different degrees to which the claim of epistemic authority is made. Yoon (2010) provides an overview of questions and responses in Korean conversation. She describes the formative aspects of various types of question and response patterns, presenting a typology of social actions that these questions perform in terms of requesting information, requesting confirmation, and initiating repair.

Kim (2015b) analyzes the nominalized negation construction *-nun-ke ani* (‘it is not the case’) used in interrogative and non-interrogative contexts, as a stance marker geared to highlighting the disparity between reality and expectation as a methodic basis for organizing various nuanced, disaffiliative or ironic/humorous actions. Kang (2022) analyzes how the ‘formal style’ post-verbal negation interrogative (formatted with *-ci anh supnikka*) and the particle *-cyo* (‘committal:COP:POL’) is used in a Korean congressional hearing, showing that the ‘committal’ particle *-ci* serves as a resource for making fact-checking inquiries in a context where the questioner attempts to pre-empt the recipient’s projected evasive answer or introduce stance-leads. Kim (2022), comparing the functions of the ‘pseudo-tags’ *-ci* and *-cianha* in ordinary conversations, claims that their differences can be accounted for in terms of whether the recipient is constituted as a facilitator to confirm shared knowledge/experience (with *-ci*) or as a party whose commitment to the confirmable need to be raised from a ‘momentary’ lapse in memory, conduct, or competence (with *-cianha*). Kim’s (2023a) qualitative study draws upon the same data that the present study analyzes, where three forms of negatively formatted RfCs, marked with pre-verbal (*an*), post-verbal (*-ci anh*), and post-nominalization (*-nun-ke ani*) negation, are compared in terms of epistemics, action-formation, and sequence organization (Section 4.2). Kim (2023c) analyzes the interactional functions of the question tag *kuci*, showing that it serves primarily as a resource for empathy display, embodying the speaker’s orientation toward pursuing a reciprocally empathic uptake of the delicate action its host turn-constructive unit (TCU) organizes. The findings indicate that the domain of action where the question tag *kuci* operates may be in a different order than the ‘requests for confirmation’, in that it does not necessarily make relevant confirmation or disconfirmation as a next action (Section 4.6).

Drawing upon these studies, the present study examines, from a quantitative perspective, the functional and interactional features associated with Korean RfCs and responses to them. It aims to provide a basis on which features of RfC sequences can be compared from a cross-linguistic perspective.

3 Description of data sets

Data used for the analysis are audio- and video-recorded Korean conversations. RfCs and responses to them are categorized according to turn design and contextual features. Out of a total of 200 tokens of RfCs, 52 instances are from a set of video-recorded conversations and 148 from audio-recorded face-to-face conversations.³

In the video-recorded data set, *SB (Santa Barbara) 1–3* are video-recorded multiparty conversations involving eight participants: graduate students studying in the United States and their family members. *SB Post-Service Gathering* are multiparty conversations that take place during and after lunch at a church cafeteria. *Bible Study (BS) 1* is a video-recorded interaction of a small Bible study group comprising four members. The audio-recorded data set includes *Lunch Discussion NC (North Campus)*, *NC Talk*, *NC Talk: TA Meeting*, and *NC Talk 3*, which are conversations between graduate students from a university in the United States and their friends, and Park, S.-H. Data 4–5 are conversations between graduate students majoring in linguistics at a university in Seoul, Korea.

4 Resources for designing requests for confirmation in Korean

4.1 Syntactic design

The majority of the RfCs take the clausal form, marked with polar declarative endings ($n = 168/200$, 84%), followed by the clausal form with polar interrogative endings ($n = 19/200$, 9%), the clausal form with connectives ($n = 8/200$, 4%), and the phrasal form ($n = 5/200$, 3%). Table 1 shows the distribution of RfCs in terms of syntactic design.

In Korean, questions are predominantly constructed as declarative questions (Yoon 2010), marked by a declarative ending with a rising intonation (Note 7). About a half of the clausal RfCs marked with SESs are declarative questions constructed as such; there are 79 out of 168 cases (47%) where they are marked by the informal ending suffix *-a/e* (or *-ay* in the case of the verb *ha* ‘do’) or with the politeness marker *-yo*.

Other grammatical resources frequently used for formulating RfCs in Korean include ‘pseudo-tags’, marked by the ‘committal’ suffix *-ci* or its related form *-cianha* (*ci*:NEG).⁴ RfCs with pseudo-tags constitute about 40% ($n = 68/168$) of the RfCs taking the form of a polar declarative question (Section 4.6).⁵

The remainder of the declarative RfCs ($n = 21/168$, 13%) are formatted with an array of SESs that include *-ney* (‘factual realization/noticed’), *-tay* (‘hearsay’), *-takwu* (‘quotative’), *-kwuna* (‘inferred’), *-(ta/la)may* (‘hearsay’), *-ta* (‘declaration’), and *-tela* (‘retrospective’).⁶

³ Participants’ consent was secured before each recording session.

⁴ Pseudo-tags are constructed with the ‘committal’ SES *-ci*, which indexes the speaker’s certainty of, or commitment to, the proposition (Choi 1995, Lee 1999). *-Cianha* is a grammaticalized form of *-ci* plus negation particle *anh*, which are contracted into a single particle (Kawanish and Sohn 1993). While pseudo-tags function like question tags, they are agglutinated to the verb stem, rather than ‘tagged’ onto the prior turn-constructive unit (as in the case of ‘genuine’ tags). Considering this compositional feature, pseudo-tags are not categorized as ‘tag’ questions in this study (but see discussion in Section 4.6).

⁵ While *-cianh* may be used with an interrogative suffix, e.g., with *-ni* ‘intimate inquiry’ (*-cianh-ni* [Lee 1999]), *cianh*-marked RfCs identified the data are all used with the declarative suffix *-a(yo)*.

⁶ The declarative endings *-tela* (‘retrospective’) and *-ta* (‘declaration’) were used with the question tag *kuci* (‘right?’ [Extract (11)]).

Table 1: Distribution of RfCs in terms of syntactic design

Syntactic format	Frequency (Total <i>n</i> = 200)	
Clausal/SEs		
Polar declarative endings	168 (84%)	
Informal ending suffix <i>-a/e</i> (or <i>-ay</i> in the case of the verb <i>ha</i> ‘do’)		<i>-a/e-yo</i> (67)
with or without the politeness marker <i>-yo</i> (79)		<i>-a/e</i> (12)
Pseudo-tags (68)		<i>-ci</i> (46)
		<i>-ci + kuci?</i> (question tag) (1)
		<i>-cianha</i> (20)
		<i>-cianha + kuci?</i> (1)
Other declarative endings (21)		<i>-ney</i> (‘factual realization/ noticing’) (6)
		<i>-ney + kuci?</i> (1)
		<i>-(ta/la)may</i> (‘hearsay’) (6)
		<i>-takwu?</i> (‘quotative’) (5)
		<i>-kwuna</i> (‘inferred discovery’) (1)
		<i>-ta</i> (‘declarative’) + <i>kuci?</i> (1)
		<i>-tela</i> (‘retrospective’) + <i>kuci?</i> (1)
Polar interrogative endings	19 (9%)	<i>-na?</i> (‘dubitative’) (10)
		<i>-nka?</i> (‘dubitative’) (5)
		<i>-lkka?</i> (‘dubitative’) (1)
		<i>-ni?</i> (‘intimate inquiry’) (2)
		<i>-nya?</i> (‘intimate inquiry’) (1)
Clausal/connectives	8 (4%)	<i>-ko/kwu(yo)</i> (‘and’) (5)
		<i>-se</i> (‘cause’) (1)
		<i>-nuntey</i> (‘circumstantial’) (1)
Phrasal	5 (3%)	<i>-llakwu</i> (‘intention’) (1)

There are 19 instances in the data of RfCs constructed with interrogative endings ($n = 19/200$, 9%), which include dubitative particles (*-na/nka/lkka*) and interrogative particles indexing intimacy (*-ni/nya*) (Yoon 2010).

RfCs marked with a clausal connective ($n = 8/200$, 4%) and phrasal RfCs ($n = 5/200$, 3%) are both produced in the form of an ‘appendor question’ (Sacks 1992b, 559), tied back to the recipient’s prior turn (Goodwin 2013; Extracts (4) and (5)).

The following shows types of RfCs in terms of syntactic design.

4.1.1 Clausal (with a declarative ending)

Extract (2) shows a clausal RfC taking the form of a declarative question, constructed with the pre-verbal negative particle *an*, the verb *hay* – a form where the informal ending *-e* is agglutinated to the verb stem *ha* – and the politeness particle *-yo* (*tiphasit an hay-yo?* ‘You don’t pay a deposit?’), which is produced in rising intonation:⁷

Extract (2): SB Post-Service Gathering, 52:35, No. 47

- 4 Yun: *eh* *ce-nun* *kunyang* *ceil* *ssan-ke*
 PRT I-TOP just most cheap-thing

⁷ Note that, if produced in final intonation, the utterance *tiphasit an hay-yo* would be primarily interpreted as a statement or assertion (‘(I am) not paying a deposit.’).

- 5 *iss-cianh-ayo*
 exist-COMM:NEG-POL
 ‘Well, I just took the cheapest thing (option), you know.’
 (a couple of lines omitted)
- 8 Jinhi:→ *tiphasit an hay-yo?*
 deposit NEG do:IE-POL
 ‘(So) you don’t pay a deposit (as when you subscribe to a regular telephone service)?’
- 9 Yun: *tiphasit an ha-kwu kunyang [...]*
 deposit NEG do-and just
 ‘I don’t pay a deposit and, just, [...]’

4.1.2 Clausal (with an interrogative ending)

Extract (3) shows a clausal RfC taking the form of an interrogative question, constructed with the interrogative ending *-ni*, a form indexing ‘intimacy toward the interlocutor’ and/or ‘the questioner’s seniority’ that can be used among those who are in close terms with each other:

Extract (3): Park, S.-H. Data #4 11:16, No. 183

- 1 Yeri: [...] ku mweci suthati phulayn-i-nka ku
 that what:COP:COMM study plan-COP-DUB that
- 2 (etthekey)
 how
 [...] *What was it? (talking to herself), she was asking how the study plan or something was (going)*
 (A couple of lines omitted)
- 5 Sehi:→ suthati phulayn? (.) yuhak ka-ni?
 study plan study:abroad go-INTERROG
 Study plan? Are you going abroad to study?
- 6 Yeri: ani-yo;,
 RT/no-POL
 No,
- 7 Sehi: kulem.
 then
 Then, what? (=Why did you talk about the study plan?)

4.1.3 Clausal (with a clausal connective)

Extract (4) shows a clausal RfC marked with the clausal connective *-a/e/ay-se* (‘since/because’):

Extract (4): NC Talk: TA Meeting 25:49, No. 149

- (Hani said that one of her students may drop the Korean language class for some unclear reason.)
- 1 Jiho:→ ah mos hayse-yo?
 PRT not:able do:CONN-CAUSE-POL
 Oh (he decided to drop the class) because he was not good enough (at Korean)?
- 2 Hani: yey.
 RT/yes
 Yes.

4.1.4 Phrasal

Extract (5) shows a phrasal RfC formulated as a noun phrase marked by the delimiting particle *-man* ‘only’:

Extract (5): Lunch Discussion NC 27:47, No. 89

- 1 Yun: [...] osip-myeng ta an pat-nuntakulaycacikwu
50-CL all NEG take-QUOT:and
2 ccallakaciko icey samsipo-myeng.
cut:and now 35-CL
[...] She said that she cannot take 50 students (in her class) and cut the number to 35.
3 Hijun:→ yeki applied linguistics haksayng-tul-**man**?
here applied linguistics student-PL-**only**
(including) only the applied linguistics students here?
4 Yun: ney. (1.0) linguistics-eyse han myeng-in-ka o-ko
RT/yes linguistics-from one CL-COP-DUB come-and
Yes. (1.0) There's one student from linguistics and
5 tay-- taypwupwun i-ccok--
mo- most this-side
The majority are from this side (= applied linguistics)-
6 Hijun: ah::
PRT/CST
I see

As these extracts suggest, polar questions are often rendered an RfC (as opposed to a request for information) through being embedded in a sequential place where the gist or upshot of a prior talk/action is represented or ‘formulated’ (Heritage and Watson 1979). For instance, in Extract (2), Jinhi asked in the prior context whether the telephone service plan that Yun had purchased requires a deposit of money (not shown in the data). In lines 4–5, Yun responds by saying that he had purchased the cheapest plan that only requires a monthly payment, suggesting thereby that he does not need to pay a deposit. It is to this that Jinhi, in line 8, can claim a ‘knowing’ position; her RfC initiates a retro-sequence (Schegloff 2007), in such a way that the basis of its use is located in what she has inferentially formulated from Yun’s response in the immediately preceding context (i.e., his telephone service plane does not require a deposit).

A retrospective orientation is also indexed in Sehi’s interrogative question (*yuhak ka-ni?* ‘Are you going abroad to study?’) in Extract (3), which is prefaced by the questioning repeat that draws upon Yeri’s prior turn (*suthati phulayn?* ‘Study plan?’).⁸ In Extract (4), Jiho’s clausal RfCs, marked with the clausal connective *-ese* ‘because’ (‘because he was not good enough (at Korean)?’), is constructed as part of a compound TCU (Lerner and Takagi 1999); it is designed to be “grammatically symbiotic” with Hani’s preceding turn, of which Jiho offers a candidate understanding (Schegloff 1997). Likewise, Hijun’s phrasal RfC in Extract (5) takes the form of an ‘appendor question’ (Sacks 1992b), a common format for other-initiated repair. Produced as an appendage to Yun’s preceding turn, it retrospectively specifies the referent Yun mentioned allusively (‘students’) in terms of academic major (‘only the applied linguistics students here?’).

Overall, in comparison with information-seeking questions, polar questions emerging as RfCs tend to be more ‘deeply embedded’ sequentially, drawing upon an inference made from a prior context. They emerge in the context where a specific aspect of the recipient’s (or the participants’ shared) domain invoked in the prior

⁸ As illustrated in Extract (3), the confirmable posed by RfCs is often warranted by ‘general’ pragmatic knowledge that the questioner brings up as an inferential basis of his/her RfC. This enacts a context in which the recipient’s claim of epistemic rights regarding a ‘specific’ aspect of his/her situated domain is put to test against the questioner’s pragmatic knowledge of ‘general (izable) import’.

talk is further queried into, problematized, or otherwise challenged from the questioner's 'partially knowing' position. As noted above, the use of RfCs often exhibits the questioner's retrospective orientation, displayed cautiously or sometimes *pro forma*, toward recruiting the recipient as an epistemically privileged party to address the confirmable regarding the empirical relevance of the questioner's 'partially-knowing' position. Their use is geared to bringing to the attention of the recipient an aspect of the recipient's (or shared) domain as a 'remedial object', e.g., as worthy of (re-) specification, allusive, or otherwise incomplete (so in need of confirmation or disconfirmation as a form of 'remedy'). This is attested to by the fact that the sequence an RfC initiates predominantly manifests features of 'retro-sequence' (Schegloff 2007), undergirded by a range of *in situ* practices indexing the questioner's inference-based retrospective orientation, which include, among others, formulation (Heritage and Watson 1979), understanding check (as a form of other-initiated repair), or collaborative completion.

A correlative feature of RfCs is that their use may be grounded in, and warranted by, interpersonally shared discourse history and/or normative reasoning. For instance, RfCs may be framed by the participants' shared discourse history, as in Extract (1), or by shared normative reasoning, which renders them not tightly bound by local sequential contexts (Extracts (9) and (17); Kim 2023a).

4.2 Polarity

There are 139 instances of positively formatted RfCs ($n = 139/200$, 70%) and 61 negatively formatted RfCs ($n = 61/200$, 30%).

Negatively formatted RfCs constitute a rich set of grammatical resources in Korean used for organizing requesting actions,⁹ in a way that exhibits the questioner's delicately nuanced, obliquely asserted, or normatively grounded stances. Among the negatively formatted RfCs are 43 RfCs formatted with 'verbal negation', which include pre-verbal negation (*an/mos* V) (*n* = 13/43, 30%), post-verbal negation (*V-ci anh* (*n* = 21/43, 49%)), and post-nominalization negation (*V-nun-ke ani* (*n* = 9/43, 21%)). As Kim (2023a) shows, these three forms of verbal negation shape RfCs into distinctive interactional resources. For instance, post-verbal negation RfCs, formatted with the post-verbal negation *-ci anh* ('committal' suffix *-ci* + auxiliary negative verb *anh*), index the questioner's 'problematizing' stance toward the recipient's (or a shared) domain. Consider Extract (6), where Jiho uses the post-verbal negation RfC topic-initially in problematizing a test question made by Hani, his fellow TA ('Question No. 5 is a little strange, isn't it?'):

Extract (6): NC Talk: TA Meeting 16:47, No. 130

- 1 Jiho: → *o-pen com isangha-ci anh-ayo?*
 five-number a:little strange-COMM NEG-POL
 2 ‘no matter how much sons fight?’ ((Reads English sentence))
Question No. 5 is a little strange, isn’t it? (Jiho reads
the English translation) ‘No matter how much sons fight?’
 (two lines omitted where Hani reads the original Korean sentence)
 3 Hani: *>eh kuntey< cey-ka-yo sasil-un*
 PRT but/by:the:way I-SUB-POL in:fact-TOP
eh but I, in fact, ((Provides an extended account))

9 According to Pfeiffer et al. (forthcoming), Korean tops the list of 11 languages they compared in terms of the extent to which RfCs are formulated with negative polarity.

With his post-verbal negation RfC, Jiho seeks agreement, prodding Hani, the epistemically privileged recipient (as the one who made the test question at hand), to be acquiescent to his terms (also Extract (7); Section 4.3).

This feature renders post-verbal negation RfCs distinct from the other two types of negatively formatted RfCs, which are marked with pre-verbal negation (*an* ‘not’ or *mos* ‘not able’) and post-nominalization negation (*-nun-ke ani* ‘ATTR-thing not:COP’). Unlike their post-verbal counterpart, RfCs with pre-verbal negation tend to be more distinctively ‘other-attentive’, to the effect that the recipient is prompted to attend to his/her own epistemic domain in regard to what the questioner inferentially formulated as a ‘negative event’ therein (Pomerantz 1988, Schegloff 1988, Heritage and Raymond 2021; Extracts (1), (2), and (12)). The use of post-nominalization negation RfCs has a deontic and normative character, bringing a ‘deviant’ or otherwise ‘normatively discrepant’ aspect of the confirmable to the attention of the recipient as an object to be co-assessed on shared normative reasoning (Kim 2015b, Kim 2023a; see Min’s RfC in Extract (17)).

In terms of types of responsive action, the majority of positively formatted RfCs engendered confirmation ($n = 85/139$, 61%), with only 17% being responded to by disconfirmation ($n = 24/139$, 17%). Negatively formatted RfCs were found to be less likely to be responded to with confirmation ($n = 31/61$, 50%), and slightly more likely to be responded to with disconfirmation ($n = 15/61$, 25%; Section 5.1).

Among the three types of negatively formatted RfCs, post-nominalization negation RfCs were less likely to be responded to with confirmation ($n = 2/9$, 22%) than pre-verbal negation RfCs ($n = 7/13$, 54%) or post-verbal negation RfCs ($n = 14/21$, 66%). Even though the number of tokens is small, 67% of post-nominalization RfCs engendered disconfirmation or ‘neither’ (confirmation nor disconfirmation)-type response ($n = 6/9$), whereas 46% of pre-verbal negation RfCs ($n = 6/13$) and 24% of post-verbal negation RfCs ($n = 5/21$) did so. A preliminary observation suggests that this skewing may be attributed to the function of the nominalizer *-nun-ke* in post-nominalization negation RfCs, which renders them subject to distinctively ‘outer/metalinguistic (as opposed to inner)’ reading (‘Isn’t it/shouldn’t it be the case that ...?’ [Ladd 1981, Reese 2007]),¹⁰ often being constitutive of a ‘mock-action’ (e.g., mock-tease) that can be assumed to be more likely to be resisted/disconfirmed than confirmed (Extract (17); Kim 2023a).

Other forms of negatively formatted RfCs identified in the data set involve post-nominal negation (Extract (25): ‘Isn’t it (called) the summer Bible school these days?’; $n = 15/61$, 25%), and the form *-(u)lswu ep* ‘cannot’ (*tasi ssu-lswu-nun ep-nun-ke-ci-yo?* ‘He cannot try re-writing it, can he?’; $n = 2/61$, 3%).

4.3 Modulation

In the data, 44 RfCs involve the use of a modulating device ($n = 44/200$, 22%), as shown in Table 2.

While adverbials are resources primarily used to modulate action, interrogative SESs indexing ‘uncertainty’, such as *-nka*, *-na*, or *-lkka* (‘dubitative’ (‘I wonder’)) (Yoon 2010), constitute a set of members through which action modulation is accomplished. They render the RfC they mark a form of ‘self-directed’ musing, geared to mitigating the questioner’s claim of epistemic rights. Extract (7) shows a case where the dubitative interrogative SES *-na* is used in a post-verbal negation RfC as a modulating device:

Extract (7):NC Talk 3 39:03, No. 74

1 Byen: → hansi sipopwun-ey sicakha-n[tako
one fifteen-minute-LOC start-QUOT

¹⁰ Lee (1989) presents a semantic analysis of the pre-verbal and post-verbal negative questions in Korean, which is conducted on the basis of the observation that post-verbal negation questions, unlike pre-verbal negation questions, are subject to both internal and external negation interpretations (also see Kim 2016). Semantic/pragmatic features of the three types of negatively formatted RfCs merit further analysis in terms of the relationship between their compositional features and different scopes/levels of negation, e.g., inner-negative vs outer-negative readings (Ladd 1981, Reese 2007).

Extract (8): SB Post-Service Gathering 47:01, No. 43

- 1 Inho: → na an poi-keyss-ney?
I NEGsee:out-MOD-FR
(I've **noticed** that) I **probably** won't be seen (in the video)?
- 2 Yun: yey?
yes
Pardon?
- 3 Inho: na an poi-keyss-e.
I NEG seen-MOD-IE
I *probably* won't be seen.
- 4 Yun: mwe-yo.
what-POL
What.
- 5 Inho: na cal an nao-keyss-eyo.
I well NEG come:out-MOD-POL
I *probably* won't come out well (in the picture).
(Two lines of turn by Inho's wife omitted)
- 8 Yun: cal nawass-eyo.
well come:out:PST-POL
You came out well.

As modulating resources, the use of the modal marker *-keyss* and the suffix *-ney* index Inho's orientation toward mitigating his epistemic claim; his RfC is shown to be grounded in his supposition (with the modal marker *-keyss*), and the confirmable it proposes is formulated as something he has 'noticed' (with the suffix *-ney*; also see Extracts (19) and (20)).

Inho's RfC becomes a trouble source turn by Yun's repair initiation in line 2 (yey? 'Pardon?'), which prompts Inho to repeat his RfC in a slightly modified form in line 3 ("I probably won't be seen."). Inho's repair turn in line 3 is again met with Yun's repair initiation in line 4, *mwe-yo*. ('What.'), which, produced with falling intonation, indexes that the trouble has resulted not from a problem of hearing or understanding, but from that of referent identification (Schegloff 1997).

Note that the suffix *-ney* ('factual realization/noticing'), initially used to format Inho's RfC in line 1, is not recycled in his repair turn in lines 3 and 5, where *-ney* is replaced by *-e* ('Informal ending') and *-eyo* (informal politeness marker), respectively. This points to the 'positionally sensitive' character of the suffix *-ney* as a modulating device sequentially embedded in the 'initially responsive' position (Schegloff 1987, Kim 2001).¹²

4.4 Inference marking

Inference marking of various types was used in 24% of the RfCs examined ($n = 48/200$). Among these are 20 cases where two or more inference markers are used in a single RfC ($n = 20/48$, 43%). Table 3 shows the distribution of inference markers, served by a wide range of grammatical forms.

Note that the list contains the nominalization marker *-nun-ke*, composed of the attributive/adnominalizer *-nun* and the defective/general noun *-ke* ('thing'), which is agglutinated to the verb stem, with the meaning, "Is it the case/Should it be the case that [...]?" This form, which frequently co-occurs with other inference markers, is used in the context where the speaker inferentially invokes an aspect of shared understanding

¹¹ There are four cases where more than one modulating resource are used in one RfC ($n = 4/44$, 9%); three of them involve *-keyss* + *-ney*, and one involves the adverb *com* ('a little'), used with the SES *-na* ('dubitative' ('I wonder'))).

¹² In cases like Extract (8), where the RfC becomes a trouble source and is repeated or otherwise modified in repair turn, only the RfC in the trouble-source turn was counted as an instance of RfC.

Table 3: Distribution of inference markers

Token	Total (N = 48)	Variants and combinations
<i>kulem(yen)</i> ('then')	11 (two or more 8)	<i>kulemyen</i> 2 <i>kulemun</i> (colloquial) 1 <i>ah/eh</i> + <i>kulem</i> + <i>-nun-ke</i> ('attributive-thing') 2 <i>ah</i> ('oh I see') + <i>kulem</i> 1 <i>ahyu</i> (response cry) + <i>kulemyen</i> 1 <i>ewu</i> (response cry) + <i>kulem</i> 1 <i>kulem</i> + <i>-kyess-ney</i> 1 <i>ah</i> + <i>kulem</i> (TCU-final) 1 <i>SES -ney</i> ('factual realization/noticing') + <i>kulem</i> (TCU-final) 1
<i>kulay(se)</i> ('so')	6 (two or more 2)	<i>kulay</i> 2 <i>kulayse</i> 1 <i>um kulay</i> 1 <i>kulayse</i> + <i>-nun-ke</i> 2
<i>ku(le)nikka</i> ('so/you mean')	5 (two or more 3)	<i>kunikka</i> 1 <i>kulenikka</i> 1 <i>kunikka</i> + <i>-nun-ke</i> 2 <i>-ney</i> + <i>kulenikka</i> (TCU-final) 1
Particles <i>ah/eh/um</i> ('oh (I see)')	10 (two or more 3)	<i>ah</i> 6 <i>ah</i> : 1 <i>ah</i> + <i>-nun-ke</i> 1 <i>eh</i> + <i>-nun-ke</i> 1 <i>um</i> : + <i>ah</i> + <i>-takwu</i> ('quotative') 1
<i>-nun-ke</i> (ATTR-thing) (Is it the case/Should it be the case that [...])?	6	<i>-nun-ke</i> 5 <i>-nun-ke ani</i> (post-noml. neg.) 1
<i>-keyss</i> ('I suppose')	5 (two or more 4)	<i>-keyss</i> 1 <i>-keyss</i> + <i>-ney</i> ('factual realization/noticing') 4
SES <i>-takwu?</i> ('quotative')	2	<i>-takwu?</i> 2
SES <i>-kwuna</i> ('inferred discovery')	1	<i>-kwuna</i> 1
Clausal connective <i>-nuntey?</i> ('circumstantial')	1	<i>-nuntey?</i> 1
Clausal connective <i>-llakwu?</i> ('intention')	1	<i>-llakwu?</i> 1

on the basis of which the noted event/item is to be evaluated (Kim 2023a). Extract (9) shows a case where *-nun-ke* is used with two other inference markers: the change-of-state token/realization marker *ah* and the inference-marking discourse connective *kulem* 'then' (*ah kulem hayngsi chi-si-n-ke*¹³-eyyo? 'Oh, then, is it that (your farther) took (and passed) the public officer qualification examination?'):

Extract (9): SB2 15:20, No. 10

- 1 Orin:→ **ah kulem** hayngsi chi-si-**n-ke**-eyyo?
PRT then civil service exam take-HONOR-ATTR-thing-POL
Oh, then, is it that (your father) took (and passed) the public officer qualification examination?
- 2 Sehi: anyo: selma-yo hhuhh.hh
RT/no:POL not:likely-POL
No, Not in the world hhuhh.hh

In the preceding context, Sehi said that her father is a public official, and in line 1, Orin, with his RfC, is asking if he passed the (highly competitive) public officer qualification examination. This is something that Koreans may normatively infer since high-level public officials in Korea are often those who have passed this

¹³ The form (*u*)*n-ke* is a variant of *nun-ke* that indexes past tense.

examination. With his RfC, Orin exhibits normative orientation toward constituting the target referent (the recipient's father) as someone whose career is praiseworthy (i.e., as someone who passed the highly difficult public officer qualification test). This is demonstrably oriented to by the recipient, Sehi, whose markedly self-deprecating disconfirmation works to counter Orin's move to constitute her father as a praiseworthy stance object ("No, Not in the world hhuhh.hh"). In this process, the nominalizer *nun-ke* plays a significant role as an inference marker, rendering the confirmable anchored in normative or otherwise interpersonally shared reasoning (Kim 2023b; also see Extract (15)).¹⁴

Other inference markers identified in the data involve the SES *-takwu* ('quotative'; Extract (10)), *-kwuna* ('inferred discovery'; Lee 1993, Kim 2004, Kim and Suh 2021), the clausal connective *-nuntey* ('circumstantial'), used to formulate an inference about the prior speaker's 'my-side-telling' (Pomerantz 1980, Park 1999, Kim 2018 [Extract (16)]), and the clausal connective *-llakwu* ('intention'), used as a resource for inferentially attributing a particular intention to the recipient (e.g., 'Why? Because you want to have fun?'; Levinson 2013).

4.5 Connectives

In the data examined, 36% of the RfCs ($n = 72/200$) were used with some form of connective, with many of which also serving as inference markers, as shown in Table 4.

The most frequently used type of connectives used with RfCs are ones that contain the indexical component *ku(le)*, e.g., *kulem* ('then') in Extract (9) and *kulenikka* ('so') in Extract (20). They constitute more than a half of the connective identified in the data ($n = 41/72$, 57%), followed by the particles *ah/eh* functioning as a

Table 4: Types of connectives

Token	Total ($N = 72$)	Variations and combinations
Kule-forms	41	
<i>ku(le)n-tey</i> ('but') (15)		<i>kuntey</i> 13, <i>kulente-y</i> 2
<i>kulem(yen)</i> ('then') (11)		<i>kulemyen</i> 4, <i>kulem</i> 1
		<i>ah</i> + <i>kulemyen</i> 1
		<i>ah</i> + <i>kulem</i> 2
		<i>eh</i> + <i>kulem</i> 1
		<i>ayu</i> ('oh my') + <i>kulemyen</i> 1
		<i>eyu</i> ('oh my') + <i>kulem</i> 1
<i>kulay(se)</i> ('so/and then') (7)		<i>kulayse</i> 4, <i>kulay</i> 3
<i>ku(le)nikka</i> ('I/you mean/so') (5)		<i>kunikka</i> 3, <i>kulenikka</i> 2
<i>kulikwu</i> ('and') (3)		<i>kulikwu</i> 3
Particles <i>ah/eh</i> ('Oh I see')	13	<i>ah</i> 11, <i>eh</i> 1, <i>um ah</i> 1
Clausal connectives	7	
<i>-ko/kwu</i> ('and') (5)		<i>-kwu</i> 4, <i>-ko</i> 1
<i>-nuntey</i> ('circumstantial ('but/while')) (1)		<i>-nuntey</i> 1
<i>-ase/ese</i> ('cause') (1)		<i>ah</i> + <i>-ese</i> 1
Response cries	6	<i>ai</i> ('irritated') 3, <i>ui</i> ('rebuking') 1, <i>wa</i> ('wow') 1, <i>as camkaman</i> ('Wait for a second') 1
Other discourse markers	5	<i>kaman</i> ('wait for a minute') 2, <i>ani</i> ('no/well/wait') 1, <i>haythun</i> ('anyway') 1, <i>hakin</i> ('well, you got a point there') 1

¹⁴ This feature is shared by the post-nominalization negation RfC, which involves the nominalizer *-nun-ke* as its compositional element (Section 4.2; also see Min's RfC in Extract (17) [lines 14–15] in Section 5.1).

change-of-state/realization token ('Oh I see' [$n = 13/72$, 18%]), clausal connectives ($n = 7/72$, 10%), response cries ($n = 6/72$, 8%), and other discourse markers ($n = 5/72$, 7%).

Extract (10) shows an example where connectivity to the immediately preceding context is marked by the discourse marker *ani* ('no/well/wait'; Kim 2015), which prefates Yuli's RfC (lines 8–9). In response, Sohi produces the interjection *ney* ('yes') at line 10, a response token indexing politeness (Section 5.2).

Extract (10): SB2 00:20, No. 9

- 1 Sohi: ce ipen-ey santhapapala-ese ka-ketun-yo
 I this:time-LOC Santa Barbara-from go-INFOR-POL
 This time, I fly from Santa Barbara, you know
- 2 Orin: eh::
 PRT
 I see.
 (Five lines omitted)
- 8 Yuli:→ ani, (.) yeki-se (.) eleyi-kaci (.) pihayngi
 PRT/well here-from Los Angeles airplane
- 9 tha-kwu ka-ntakwu?
 on:board:and go-QUOT
 Wait, you are saying that, from here, you take the airplane (rather than the airport bus) to Los Angeles?
- 10 Sohi: ney::
 yes
 Yes
- 11 (0.4)
- 12 Yuli: way,
 why
 Why?

There are seven instances in the data where two connectives are used in an RfC. They involve 6 out of 11 *kule*-form connectives, which are prefaced by *ah/eh* or a response cry. An example is in Extract (9), introduced in Section 4.4, where we find the change-of-state token *ah* is used with the inference connective *kulem* ("Oh, then, is it that (your father) took the civil service examination?"). Another case involves the clausal connective *-ese* ('cause') prefaced by the change-of-state token *ah*, which is found in Extract (4), introduced in Section 4.1 ("Oh, (he decided to drop the class) **because** he was not good enough?").

4.6 Tags

In Korean, question tags typically take the form of the tag-type clause *kuleci* or one of its contracted forms, *kuchi/kuci* ('It is (like) that?'), which involve the 'committal' SES *-ci*. Their use is only sporadically observed as a feature of RfCs. In the data, there are only five instances of RfCs with a question tag ($n = 5/200$, 2.5%).

Extract (11) is a case in point. In the preceding context, Hijun claimed that he does not use honorific expressions when referring to American professors. His friends also pointed out that Hijun similarly did not use honorific expressions when talking about Korean professors with whom he is on close terms. In lines 1–2, Hijun produces a *kuci*-marked RfC addressed to his wife, one of the co-participants. With his wife, he appears to be making a backdown in collusion, as he adds a new observation that serves to revise or granularize his earlier claim ("But when we talk about Korean professors – when we talk about Korean professors, even when we do not know them, we don't talk like that (= We do use honorific expressions), right?"). While there is no hearable uptake from his wife, Kyeng comes forward with a response in lines 5–6, which constitutes partial (dis)confirmation (Section 5.1):

Extract (11): Lunch Discussion NC 54:00, No. 104

(While talking to his friends, Hijun addresses the following question to his wife, one of the co-present participants.)

- 1 Hijun: (Addressing his wife)
 kuntey hankwuk sensayngnim yayki-tul
 but/and:then Korea teacher talk-PL
 2 ha-l-ttay-n-- hankwuk sensayng:- (0.2) yaykiha-l-
 do-ATTR- Korea teacher talk-ATTR-
 time-TOP
 3 ttay-nun mollu-nun salam-i-ntey-twu,
 time-TOP not:know-ATTR person-COP-CIRCUM-even
 4 →(0.2) kulehkey an ha-nta **kuci?**
 like:that NEG do-DECL **that:COMM/QTG**

*But when we talk about Korean professors- when we talk about Korean professors, even when we do not know them, we don't talk like that, **right?***

- 5 Kyeng: kuntey-to kulehkey contay-mal manhi
 but-still like:that honorific-talk much
 6 an ssu-te-lakwu-yo
 NEG use-RETRO-QUOT-POL
 But, still, they still do not tend to use honorific expressions that much.

Extract (11) illustrates the 'remedial' function often associated with the use of the tag *kuci*, which is devoted to pursuing reciprocity while managing the speaker's face and affective stance.

In this article, a large number of questions marked with the tag *kuci* are not treated as RfCs and are thus excluded from the target data, because their use does not make confirmation/disconfirmation a relevant next action. As suggested in Extract (11), tags are specialized for 'affect-displaying' functions (Hepburn and Potter 2010), incrementally produced add-ons geared to pursuing reciprocity (Ford et al. 2002). They emerge in the context of managing both the questioner's and the recipient's face in regard to the (often face-threatening or face-implicative) action of the host TCU, sometimes as an RfC, but more often as a form of question that presupposes the recipient's confirmation (Kim 2023c).

The small number of tags would also be attributed to the availability of 'pseudo-tags', which function like tags. Pseudo-tags, *-ci* and *-cianha*, are constructed with the 'committal' SES *-ci*, which is agglutinated to the verb stem, rather than 'tagged' onto the host TCU. While pseudo-tags are not included in the category of 'tag' in this article (due to their status as an element agglutinated to the verb stem), they comprise about one-third of the RfCs with no tag ($n = 66/195$, 34%). Note that even two of the five RfCs used with a tag involve the use of the pseudo-tag *-ci* or *-cianha*. Excluding these, we have only three RfCs used with a question tag alone (1.5%). The distribution of RfCs with 'tags' is shown in Table 5.

Extract (12) shows an RfC formatted with the pseudo-tag *-ci* (also see Extracts (1), (14), (21), (22), and (23)). In this conversation, Kyeng is talking about a Thanksgiving Day sale at the university store, where she bought clothes for a discount price. In the immediately preceding context, Hani asked Kyeng whether books are on sale too. In line 1, Yun, Kyung's husband responds with *ci*-marked RfC, formatted with pre-verbal negation, with which he prompts Kyung to confirm that books are not on sale.¹⁵

Extract (12): NC Talk: TA Meeting 30:37, No. 151

- 1 Yun:→ chayk-un seyil an ha-**ci**. ku nal.
 book-TOP sale NEG do-**COMM/PSTG** that day

¹⁵ As in Extract (1), Yun and Kyeng work as a team, responding to Hani's question by drawing upon their shared discourse history.

Table 5: Types of ‘tag’

Tag	Frequency (Total $n = 200$)	Variations and combinations
With tag (e.g., <i>kuci</i> ‘isn’t it?’)	5 (3%)	With no pseudo-tag (3) With pseudo-tag <i>-ci</i> (1) With pseudo-tag <i>-cianha</i> (1)
Without tag/With Pseudo-tags	66 (33%)	Pseudo-tag <i>-ci</i> (47) Pseudo-tag <i>-cianha</i> (19)
Without tag/With no ‘pseudo-tag’	129 (64%)	

Books are not on sale, right?

- 2 Kyeng: ku nal chaykpang mwun tat-kwu [...]
that day bookstore door close-and
That day the bookstore section is closed and [...]

Extract (13) is case where the RfC is formatted with *-cianha*, a form of pseudo-tag grammaticalized from *-ci*, conflated with the negation *anh* (Kawanish and Sohn 1993). In the preceding context, Yun said that he was unable to have a renowned professor in Yun’s own field serve on a committee because she is at another university. In line 1, Hijun responds with an RfC marked with the pseudo-tag *-cianha*, affording Yun with an option that the latter could have taken but did not (‘You can ask her to serve as an outside committee member, right?’). Yun responds with partial confirmation with an account in lines 2–3:

Extract (13): Lunch Discussion NC 42:58, No. 98

- 1 Hijun: outsider member-lo toy-**cianh**ayo
outsider member-INSTR become-**COMM:NEG/PSTG:POL**
You can ask her to serve as an outside (committee) member, right?
- 2 Yun: toy-ki-n toy-nuntey amwulayto
become-NOML-TOP become-CIRCUM still
It is doable all right, but still
- 3 menikka (.) discourage toy-nunketkat-te-lakwu-yo
far:REASON (English) become-seem-RETROS-QUOT-POL
As she (= her university) is far away, I am discouraged to do so, I guess

Hijun’s RfC has a strong import of offering a solution to the recipient’s problem, in such a way that the latter is assertively prodded to appreciate its relevance and respond accountably.¹⁶ Compared with the pseudo-tag *-ci*, which is geared to soliciting straightforward confirmation of facts, often ‘in collusion’ (as in Extracts (1) and (12)), the pseudo-tag *-cianha* indexes a more assertive stance of the questioner who orients to raising the recipient’s commitment to the confirmable at hand from a ‘momentary’ lapse (Kim 2022).

The preceding observations suggest that, if we use a radically functional approach, we may treat the pseudo-tags *-ci* and *-cianha* as ‘tags’, though they are SEs agglutinated to the verb stem. If RfCs formatted with pseudo-tags are included in the category of ‘tags’, together with ‘genuine tags’ (i.e., *kuci* tagged on the TCU), the frequency rate would increase to 36% ($n = 71/200$), with 68 pseudo-tags (34%) plus three tags whose host TCU does not involve a pseudo-tag (2%), as shown in Table 6.

¹⁶ The pseudo-tag *-cianha* is distinct in function from the post-verbal negation *-ci + anh* (NEG), in that the use of the former constitutes a ‘flatly unmitigated’ assertion of an epistemic claim made on grounds of a presuppositionally invoked shared grounds. In Extract (13), for instance, if the post-verbal negation *-ci anh* had been used in Hijun’s RfC, it would have rendered it a more mitigated and negotiatory form of inquiry (Section 4.2).

Table 6: Types of ‘tag’ (pseudo-tags included)

Pseudo-tags and tags combined (71)	Frequency (Total $n = 200$)	
With pseudo-tags	68 (34%)	Pseudo-tag <i>-ci</i> (48) Pseudo-tag <i>-cianha</i> (20)
With tag only (<i>kuci</i>)	3 (2%)	

This issue merits a separate analysis of types of ‘tags’ in terms of their formal and functional features, from a cross-linguistic perspective (Enfield et al. 2012).

4.7 Prosodic design

In the majority of the RfCs in the data, the confirmable was produced with rising intonation at the ending ($n = 146/200$, 73%), which suggests that rising intonation constitutes a crucial prosodic feature of RfCs in Korean. Table 7 shows the final intonation of the confirmable, with and without a tag.

Table 7: Final intonation of the confirmable with and without a tag

	Final intonation confirmable ($n = 200$)	Final intonation confirmable without a tag ($n = 195$)	Final intonation confirmable with a tag ($n = 5$)
Rise	146 (73%)	146 (75%)	5 (100%)
Level	30 (15%)	25 (13%)	0
Fall	24 (12%)	24 (12%)	0

Note that all five instances of tags were produced with rising intonation. They are all integrated into the preceding TCU prosodically, with no separate contour *vis-à-vis* the confirmable (Extract (11)). A subtle prosodic change, however, was observed in those cases such that the TCU-final verbal predicate is produced with continuing intonation at the ending, which flows into the first syllable of the tag (*ku* ‘that’), followed by the second syllable of the tag (*-ci* ‘committal’), and then produced in rising intonation. While the number of tokens is small ($n = 5/200$), this observation suggests that a ‘level-rise’ prosodic contour, where there is no prosodic ‘break’ between the host TCU and the tag, may be one of the features associated with the Korean RfCs formatted with a tag.

In the next section, we turn to resources used to build responses to RfCs.

5 Building responses to requests for confirmation in Korean

5.1 Responsive actions

Overall, 61% of the responses to RfCs are confirmation ($n = 116/190$), 21% are disconfirmation ($n = 39/190$), and 18% are neither confirmation nor disconfirmation ($n = 35/190$). In the data, there are ten instances of RfCs to which no verbal response was produced.¹⁷ Extracts (14) and (15) show examples of confirmation and disconfirmation, illustrating typical response formats involving response tokens *ney* (‘yes’ (polite)) and *ani-yo* (‘no’ (polite)), respectively.

¹⁷ The ten cases where there is not verbal response involve seven positively formatted RfCs ($n = 7/139$, 5%) and 3 negatively formatted RfCs ($n = 3/61$, 5%).

5.1.1 Confirmation

Extract (14): SB1 10:24, No. 24

- 1 Orin: tak-- tak kasum sal manhi
 chicken chicken breast flesh a lot
 2 mek-ulswuiss-ci-yo?=
 eat:can-COMM-POL
Chicken- chicken breast you can eat as much as you want, can't you?
 3 Sehi:→ =**ney** mac-ayo.
RT/yes correct-POL
Yes, you're right

5.1.2 Disconfirmation

Extract (15): SB Post-Service Gathering 05:44, No. 33

- 1 Jun: eh ka-ass-ta o-si-nke-eyyo?
 PRT go-PST-INTERR come-HONOR-ATTR-thing-COP:POL
 2 mili?
 in advance
eh, is it that he went to Korea and came back in advance?
 3 Hun: → **ani-yo**, ay-man ka-ss-cyo.
RT/no-POL child-only go-PST-COMM:POL
No, only his kid went (to Korea).

'Neither'-type responses include cases of evasive answer (Extract (16)) or partially confirmatory responses being subsequently leveraged into equivocal uptake (Extract (17)).

5.1.3 Neither confirmation nor disconfirmation

Extract (16): Park, S.-H. Data #4 12:12, No. 185

- 15 Yeri: [...] inci kwahak yeyki-nun han cwul-to
 cognitive science talk-TOP one line-even
 16 ssu-cimalkko,
 write-COMM:do:not
I was told not to write even a single line about cognitive science (in the study plan)
 17 Juhi: ung.
 yes
uhuh
 (Seven lines omitted where Yeri elaborates on what one of her senior students had told her about an appropriate topic to write about in her study plan)
 25 Sehi: → ne-n inci kwahak-ccok-ulo ha-kosiph-untay?
 you-TOP cognition science-side-INSTR do-want-CIRCUM
Even though (on your part) you want to study cognitive science?

- 26 Yeri: → yey?
yes?
Yes?/Pardon?
- 27 (0.5)
- 28 Sehi: [ne-nun inci kwahak-ccok-ulo ()
you-TOP cognitive science-side-INSTR
You want to study cognitive science ()
- 29 Yeri: → [kunkka sayngkak-man ha-koiss-nun-ke-
I:mean thought-only do-PROGR-ATTR-thing-
- 30 → ci-yo mengchengha-key
COMM-POL stupid-MANN
*I mean, (It's that) I'm just thinking,
so stupid of me, you know.*

Yeri, in response to Sehi's RfC at line 25, responds initially with the repair initiator *yey?* ('Yes?/Pardon?'), followed by an evasive answer indexing an equivocal stance ('I mean, (It's that) I'm just thinking, so stupid of me, you know.'). It is to be noted that Yeri's repair initiator has the *pro forma* character.¹⁸ While it is oriented to Sehi as a repair initiator, Sehi's repair turn at line 28 is eclipsed by Yeri's transformative answer at lines 29–30 (Stivers and Hayashi 2010). Note further that Yeri's answer in lines 29–30 is prefaced by the turn-initially placed discourse connective *kunkka* ('I mean'), with which she resists the constraints imposed by Sehi's RfC and projects a reshaping of its terms (Kim 2013).

Also consider Extract (17), where Ryu's response to Min's RfCs is neither unequivocally confirming nor disconfirming:

Extract (17): Bible Study #1 29:27, No. 22

- 14 Min: kongpwu-- ha-llakwu theyleypi an po-si-ko
study do-INTENT TV NEG see-HONOR-and
- 15 kunyang chayk-man ilk-usi-n-ke ani-eyyo?
just book-only read-HONOR-ATTR-thing NEG:COP-POL
Isn't it the case that you did not watch the TV because you wanted to study, focusing on reading books?

¹⁸ In Korean, a response to a question is often framed by (*ah*) *yey?* ('oh yes?'), a preface conveying the sense of 'Oh, you're asking me?' or 'Oh, you're selecting me as the next speaker?'. The *pro forma* character of such turn-initially positioned repair-initiator-like prefaces is evidenced by the fact that they are often produced even in two-party interactions, where there is no other potential next speaker than the recipient himself/herself. This feature is also observed in the extract below, where Yun's response to Tohi's RfC takes the form of the repair initiator *yey?* ('Pardon?'), which is prefaced, and followed, by the change-of-state token *ah* (*ah yey?* (.) *ah*). In this case, Yun's response turn is formulated as confirmation, exhibiting his orientation to Tohi's RfC as an offer:

SB Post-service gathering 45:13, No. 41

- 1 Tohi: i-kes com ssa-kaciko ka-si-eya-
this-thing a:little pack-CONN go-HONOR-NECESS
- 2 toy-ci-yo?
become-COMM/PSTG-POL
You need to take some of this, right?
- 3 Yun: → **ah yey?** (.) *ah* nam-umeyn cwu-sey-yo.
CST yes CST leave-COND give-HONOR-POL
Ah yes?/pardon? (.) ah if there's leftover, please do give me some.

We get the sense that Yun is registering Tohi's RfC as implementing a 're-offer' because in the preceding context (now shown in the data), another participant had already offered him the same object, which he agreed to take. In this respect, Yun's use of the *ah*-marked *pro forma* repair-initiator can be analyzed as indexing his stance taking Tohi's (re-)offer as 'unexpected' and possibly superfluous.

- 16 (0.8)
 17 Ryu: → *cheum-ey-n kulay-ss-nuntey-yo,*
 first-LOC-TOP like:that-PST-CIRCUM-POL
 At first, that's what I intended to do but,
 18 Yun: *uhuhuhu*
 (Ryu talks about types of smart TV he is interested in.)

In the preceding context, Ryu mentioned that he had decided to buy a TV, and this is registered by Min as discrepant with Ryu's earlier position because Ryu putatively did not buy the television in order to have more time for studying (lines 14–15). With his RFC formatted with post-nominalization negation *-nun-ke ani* (Section 4.2), Min teases (or 'mock-teases') Ryu, noting Ryu's remark as self-contradictory (Kim 2023a). In his response at line 17, Ryu delimits the relevance of the confirmable 'temporally', marked by the topic-particle *-(nu)n* (*cheum-ey-n* 'at first': "At first, that's what I intended to do but, [...]") (Kim 2018; Note 1). This renders the incipiently confirmatory import of Ryu's response leveraged into equivocal/evasive uptake of Min's RFC (line 17), as he subsequently proceeds to talk about types of smart TV he is interested in buying (also see Yun's response turn in Extract (13) [lines 2–3]).

Other 'Neither'-type responses include knowledge disavowal ('I don't know') or a granularized defensive account elaborative of the speaker's personal circumstances (Extract (6)).

5.2 Response tokens

About half of the RFCs ($n = 87/190$, 47%) identified in the data were answered with a response token. Response tokens typically include 'yes' (*yey/ney* (polite) and *ung/um/eh* (plain)) and 'no' (*ani* (plain), *ani-yo* (informal polite), and *ani-pnita* (formal polite)). As Table 8 shows, I also categorized *kulechi* ('certainly it is') and *kulem* ('of course it is') as response tokens, which contain the indexical form *kule* ('like that'), a highly productive indexical form used for constructing a wide range of discourse markers/connectives (Park 2008).

Among the 87 response tokens, 69 (79%) were used with confirmation (all 'yes'-type or *kule*-form response tokens) and 18 (21%) with disconfirmation (all 'no'-type response tokens involving the form *ani*). Examples of the response tokens *ney* ('yes') and *ani-yo* ('no') are provided in Extracts (14) and (15), respectively, which were introduced in Section 5.1.

Response tokens are used in 59% of confirmations ($n = 69/116$)¹⁹ and 44% of disconfirmation ($n = 17/39$). There is one response token used in the 'neither'-type response ($n = 1/35$, 2.9%), where the negative response token *ani* ('no') prefaces an evasive answer organized as an extended account.

Interjections like *um/ung/yey* ('yes'), as response tokens, are often embedded in a 'subordinate-action' context (Enfield et al. 2019), e.g., a parenthetically engendered sequence. In Extract (1), which is re-introduced below, Kyeng's *um* ('yes') emerges as a response to Yun's RFC that initiates a parenthetical sequence (Mazeland 2007, Schegloff 2007), after which the talk is allowed to move quickly back to the main narrative (i.e., Byen's continued telling):

¹⁹ In the category of confirming answers, 20% of them are repetitional confirming answers with no response token ($n = 23/116$, 20%). While a direct comparison cannot be made with the findings of Enfield et al. (2019), who examined two types of confirming answers to polar question ('repetition-type' vs 'interjection-type') from a cross-linguistic perspective, the low rate of repetitional confirming answers without response tokens (*vis-à-vis* confirming answers with a response token) seems to be more or less congruent with their findings about Korean (Enfield et al. 2019, 290), where 'repetition-type answers' constitute slightly more than 20 percent, as opposed to 'interjection-type answers' that constitute the majority.

Table 8: Response tokens

Token	Total (<i>n</i> = 87)	Variants and combinations
<i>yey/ney</i> ‘yes (polite)’	41	<i>yey</i> 17 <i>ney</i> 13 ... <i>ney</i> 2 ... <i>yey</i> 1 <i>yey yey</i> 3 <i>ney ney</i> 2 ... <i>yey yey</i> 1 <i>yey ... yey</i> 1 ... <i>ah yey eh yey</i> 1
<i>ung/um/eh</i> ‘yes (plain/not polite)’	23	<i>ung</i> 12 <i>um</i> 5 <i>eh ...</i> 3 ... <i>ung</i> 1 <i>um um</i> 1 <i>ung ... ung, ung</i> 1
<i>ani(-yo/pnita)</i> ‘no’	18	<i>ani</i> 8 <i>anniyo</i> 6 <i>aniya</i> 2 <i>anipnita</i> 1 (formal) <i>ah ani ... ani</i> 1
<i>kule</i> -form (‘like that’):	5	<i>kulem</i> (‘of course it is’) 2 <i>kulehci</i> (‘certainly it is’) 2 <i>kulehci eh</i> 1

Extract (1): NC Talk 3 05:91, No. 57

(Byen tells a story to Yun and Kyeng, her fellow Santa Barbara residents, about a private beach in the Hope Ranch near Santa Barbara.)

- 213 Yun: ((to Kyeng)) hophu laynchi-nun hanpen-to mos
Hope Ranch-TOP once-even not:able
- 214 kapo-ass-ci?=
go:see-PST-COMM/PSTG
We’ve never been to Hope Ranch, right?
- 215 Kyeng:→ = um.
RT/yes
Yes (No, we haven’t).
- 216 Byen: (Byen continues to talk about Hope Ranch.)

Extract (18) illustrates a case where *eh*, another informal form of affirmative response token, is used:

Extract (18): Park, S.-H. Data #4 18:54, No. 194

- 1 Inhi: cikum mwe nokumha-kokyesi-n
now something record-PROG:HONOR-ATTR
- 2 ke-eyo?
thing-COP:POL
Now, is it that you’re recording something?
- 3 Sehi:→ **eh** calyo-ttamwuney
RT/yes data-because:of
Yes because of the data (=Because we need the data)

In the data examined, there are three instances of *eh* produced as a response token, as in Extract (18), and they are all used in a non-minimal response, i.e., followed by further response (Section 5.5). The association of *eh* with non-minimal response suggests that, compared with other informal response tokens like *ung/um* ('yes'), which are frequently constitutive of a minimal response, the status of *eh* as a response token is not as fully established.

In this respect, it should be noted that the response token *eh* is often formally indistinguishable from the acknowledgement/change-of-state token *eh*, which, just like response cries, serves as a preface framing a response. For instance, consider Extract (19), where Inho's turn-initial *eh* is not being produced as a response token (comparable to *um/ung* ('yes')), but as a particle/change-of-state token ('oh') framing the upcoming confirmation:

Extract (19): SB Post-Service Gathering 12:43, No. 38

(In the preceding context, Inho said that he was a Catholic.)

- 1 Yun: selyeymyeng-to iss-usi-keyss-eyo.
 baptismal name-also exist-HONOR-MOD-POL
 You must have a baptismal name.
- 2 Inho:→ **eh** iss-ci-yo. ((Nodding emphatically))
 PRT exist-COMM-POL
 Oh I have one.

Inho's prefatory use of *eh* marks his orientational shift, projecting a strong confirmation, as suggested by the exaggerated nodding gesture that accompanies his response, which is also marked with the 'committal' particle *-ci*. It manifests features commonly associated with the English change-of-state token *oh*, used in a response to a question (Heritage 1998). This conveys the sense that Inho is treating Yun's RfC as 'inapposite', or at least superfluous, in that it is inquiring about something that can be readily presupposed; i.e., if Inho was a Catholic, he can be presumed to have a baptismal name.

There are also, in the data, five instances of *kule*-marked response tokens. Compared with 'unmarked' interjection-type response tokens such as *ung/um/eh/yey/ney* ('yes'), which are 'designed not to introduce any pragmatic turbulence' as unmarked way to confirm (Enfield et al. 2019, 291), *kule*-marked forms constitute 'pragmatically marked' members of response tokens, indexing the respondent's more assertive confirmatory stance. Consider Extract (20), where *kuleh-ci* is used as a response token, marked with the politeness particle *-yo*:

Extract (20): SB Post-Service Gathering 05:30, No. 32

- 1 Chen: oyatul-i-ney-yo kulenikka.
 only:son-COP-FR-POL so
 (I've just noticed) that you're the only son, then.
- 2 Min:→ kuleh-ci-yo.
 RT/like:that-COMM-POL
 Right (= Certainly it is).

At line 1, Chen makes an RfC marked by the SES *-ney*, serving as a modulating resource that frames the confirmable as something that has just been 'noticed', accompanied by the inference marker *kulenikka* ('so/then' [(I've just noticed that) you're the only son, then.]) (Sections 4.3 and 4.4). At line 2, Min responds with *kuleh-ci-yo* ('Right (= Certainly it is).'), a form indexing his epistemic authority, which draws upon the fact that the confirmable (i.e., whether Min is the only son) is well within his own epistemic domain.

In this article, 'short' *kule*-forms such as *kulehci/kuchi/kuci(-yo)* ('right/it is like that') or *kulem* ('of course it is') are included in the category of 'response tokens' (cf. Betz 2015), since they manifest features of a 'pre-

fabricated’ token, as clearly demonstrated by the way *kuci* is used as a tag.²⁰ ‘Long’ *kule*-forms, e.g., those that contain modal markers like *-keyss* or *-(u)lke(s)* (e.g., *kule-keyss-ci-yo* ‘I believe so’ or *kule-lke-eyyo* ‘I guess so’), are excluded, on grounds that the modally modulated process of epistemic mitigation renders their compositional structure too heavy/complex to be treated as a ‘token/interjection’.

5.3 Clusters of response tokens

Out of 87 responses to RfCs that involve a response token, 12 cases (14%) involve clusters of response tokens (Table 8). Clustered response tokens collected for this study are all delivered in one intonational contour, produced in a cluster of two, e.g., *yey yey*, as shown in Extract (21):

Extract (21): NC Talk 3 04:51, No. 56

- 26 Byen: ceki way hophu laynchi iss-ci-yo.
 there why Hope Ranch exist-COMM/PSTG-POL
Well, you know Hope Ranch, don't you?
- 27 (Ari): ()
- 28 Kyeng:→ **yey yey**
RT RT
Yes, Yes.
- 29 Yun: hophu laynchi.
Hope Ranch.
 (Byen talks about an area near Hope Ranch.)

Kyeng’s response tokens at line 28, along with Yun’s repeat of the place term Byen used in her RfC (‘Hope Ranch’) in line 29, serves as a ‘go-ahead’ signal with which she lets Byen produce a subsequent telling about Hope Ranch (not shown in the data).

Also consider Extract (22), where we find that two clusters of *yey yey* (‘yes yes’) are produced, preceded by a change-of-state/realization marker (*ah* ‘oh’):

Extract (22): SB Post-Service Gathering 53:05, No. 48

- 1 Jihi: eh kulikwu ceki mweya
 PRT and there what:COP:IE
uh and what was it ((Addressed to herself)),
- 2 ceng sungcho cipsa-nim,
 (name) deacon-HONOR
Uh and then, that, what was it, about what Mr/Deacon Seung-ho Jeong did,
- 3 .h (.) eh (1.0) cinan-pen-ey: inthenayshyenel ku
 PRT last-time-LOC international that
h (.) eh (1.0) last time, international, that,

²⁰ The tag *ku(leh)ci*, as noted in Section 4.6, is a tag-type clause that manifests ‘token-like’ features. Used as a response to the prior turn, *ku(leh)ci* also functions like a ‘token’ that embodies the speaker’s strongly committed and affiliative stance towards the prior turn’s action, which would not be conveyed by the use of “unmarked” interjections like *ung/ney* ‘yes’. This issue – whether (and which of) the *kule*-forms can be treated as interjection-type response tokens – merits further analysis, in relation to the preliminary observation that other types of responsive form, such as *mac-ayo* (‘That’s correct.’), also seem to be gaining a ‘token-like/interjection-like’ status as a resource for expressly acknowledging or acquiescing to the recipient’s claim of epistemic rights, often not accompanied by the response token *ney* (‘yes’) (cf. Extract (14)).

- 4 keki ku mwe ssa-key ha-nun-ke
 there that what cheap-MANN do-ATTR-thing.
there, you know, what was it, that cheap one,
- 5 tisukhawuntu ku-ke phulayn iss-ess-ci-yo.
 discount that-thing plan exist-PST-COMM/PSTG-POL
that thing that offers discount, there was that plan, wasn't it?
- 6 (1.2)
- 7 Hun: kwukcey thonghwa-yo?
 international call-POL
 You mean the international call (service plan)?
- 8 Jihi: >ani ani ani< ceki inthenaysyenel eh:
 no no no there international
- 9 ku mweya motheyl.
 that what:COP:IE motel
 No no no, that, international, eh: what is it. Motel
- 10 (1.0)
- 11 Hun:→ **ah: yey yey** (ha-) ku- **yey yey**
 PRT RT RT that-- **RT RT**
 Oh, yes yes () that- yes yes.
- 12 Jihi: *i-pen sipkwuil nal,*
 this- 19th day
 time
 On the 19th of this month,
- 13 Hun: yey
 yes
 Yes.
- 14 Jihi: *kyoswu-nim-i* *o-sey-yo, (.)*
 professor-HONOR-SUB come-HONOR-POL
- 15 *han kacok-i* *o-si-nuntey, ...*
 one family-SBU come-NONOR-CIRCUM
 A professor is coming (from Korea), with his
 family, and ...
 (Jihi proceeds to make a request, asking for Hun's assistance in helping a visiting professor to find
 a place to stay temporarily)

In response to Jihi's allusively formulated RFC, marked with the pseudo-tag *-ci* (line 5), Hun initially responds by initiating repair at line 7 ("You mean an international call service plan?"). In response to Jihi's repair turn at lines 8–9 where she flatly disconfirms Hun's candidate understanding²¹ and provides a more specific 'clue' (*motheyl* 'motel'; cf. Kim 1999), Hun produces a change-of-state token (*ah*) followed by a cluster of two response tokens (*yey yey*), acknowledging the success of Jihi's repair (line 11).²² The cluster of response tokens is then repeated after an aborted utterance ('() that-'), serving as a go-ahead signal that enables the questioner to move on to her main telling; in the subsequent talk (not shown in the data), Jihi makes a request, asking Hun if he would be able to find a motel for a newly arriving visiting professor to stay temporarily before moving to his apartment.

²¹ Note that her repair turn contains three response tokens produced turn-initially at a fast speed (> ani ani ani < (" > no no no <"), with which she rejects Hun's candidate understanding being totally off target.

²² Here, we find the sense that Hun's production of a cluster of response tokens embodies his orientation towards making up for his delayed uptake of Jihi's RFC.

These observations suggest that response tokens produced in cluster index the respondent's orientation to boosting the sense of 'go ahead' through doubling the confirmatory force of the response token, reciprocating the questioner's interpersonal commitment indexed by the pseudo-tag *-ci* ('committal') in the RfC (line 26 in Extract (21) and line 5 in Extract (22)). Through repeating a response token, the speaker acknowledges the epistemic supremacy attributed to him/her (Levinson 2013), while reciprocally mitigating his/her own epistemic independence. Note, in this respect, that, in Extract (21), Kyeng, as a resident of Santa Barbara, finds herself in a position where she can claim epistemic independence as she responds to Byen's RfC which targets an area near Santa Barbara.²³ Likewise, in Extract (22), Hun is a local who is known to be knowledgeable about accommodation in the area.

5.4 Position of response tokens within the responsive turn

In the data analyzed, the first response token was predominantly produced turn-initially ($n = 83/87$, 95%), with only a small number of response tokens being situated in the final position ($n = 4/87$, 5%). These few instances include cases where the recipient claims epistemic authority regarding the confirmable posed by the RfC, as exemplified in Extract (23). In this conversation, Byen and Ari, who are teaching Korean professionally, are sharing problems associated with teaching Korean in American universities. In response to Byen's RfC marked with the pseudo-tag *-ci*, Ari produces a confirmation in line 6, with the response tokens, produced in the cluster of two, being positioned turn-finally:

Extract (23): NC Talk 3 03:26, No. 54

- 1 Byen: kulentey po-nikka.h (.) hankwuk-pwun-tul-un:
but/and then see-REASON Korean-person-PL-TOP
And, as I see it, for Korean people,
- 2 icyey hankwuke-to ha-ko ilpone-to ha-si-nuntay,
now Korean-also do-and Japanese-also do-HONOR-CIRCUM
now, they speak both Korean and Japanese, but
- 3 ilpone ha-nun pwun-tul-i (.)
Japanese do-ATTR person-PL-SUB
for Japanese speakers,
- 4 yang (.) twul ta ha-si-nun pwun-tul-i
both two all do-HONOR-ATTR person-PL-SUB
- 5 pyello ep-ci-yo?
not:many not:exist-COMM/PSTG-POL
there's few who can speak both languages, right?
- 6 Ari:→ manh-ci anh-ci-yo. **yey yey.**
many-COMM NEG-COMM-POL. **RT RT**
There're not many. Yes Yes.

Ari's response is produced as a transformative answer (Stivers and Hayashi 2010), in which Byen's first assessment made through her RfC, *pyello ep* 'there's few', is downgraded to *manh-ci anh* 'there're not many'. With the response tokens being relegated to turn-final position, Ari's reformulated assessment is produced in

²³ Byen happens to live near Santa Barbara as well, and can thus claim epistemic authority regarding the area. Throughout the sequence where the conversation in Extract (21) was excerpted from, we find the sense that an epistemic battle going on between Kyeng (aided by her husband, Yun, as her 'story consociate' (Lerner 1992)) and Byen (cf. Heritage and Raymond 2005), through exchange of competitive telling about scenic places in the area (also see Extract (1)).

the form of ‘non-type-conforming’ response (Raymond 2003), exhibiting her claim of epistemic independence, and conveying the sense that she is resisting the terms on which Byen’s question is based.

The use of a cluster of response tokens here seems to embody Ari’s orientation to mitigating her claim of epistemic independence, i.e., by reducing the sense of resistance by doubling the confirmatory force of the affirmative response token. With the cluster of response tokens being positioned turn-finally, she exhibits a delicately nuanced stance *post hoc* in resisting the terms of Byen’s *ci*-marked RfC, with which she pursues Ari’s straightforward confirmation. This can be partially attributed to the fact that, while Ari is a more experienced teacher of Korean than Byen and thus can make a stronger claim of epistemic rights, they, as co-participants at a conference, and who have just met for the first time, are not on close terms with each other (cf. Raymond and Heritage 2006).

5.5 Minimal and non-minimal responses

Out of 190 cases where an RfC received a verbal response, 45 were responded to minimally (i.e., with response tokens only (24%)), and 42 non-minimally (i.e., with response tokens followed by a further response (22%)). In the other 103 cases (54%; ‘other’ category), the responsive turn did not involve a response token.

RfCs engendering a minimal response have the character of a ‘casual fact-checking’ question, as can be observed in Extracts (1), (3), (4), (10), (20), (21), and (22). Sequences they organize often manifest features of a pre-sequence (Extracts (10), (21), and (22)) or a parenthetical sequence (Extract (1)).

Examples of a non-minimal response are found in Extracts (5), (9), (14), (15), (18), and (23), where the response token is followed (or prefaced) by an utterance further elaborative of the responsive action.

Examples of the ‘other (than minimal or non-minimal)’ responses, where the response to an RfC does not involve a response token, are illustrated by Extracts (2), (6), (7), (8), (11), (12), (13), (16), (17), (19), (24), and (25).

Concerning their relationship with (dis)confirmation, a large majority of minimal responses are confirmation ($n = 41/46$, 89%), with only five instances being disconfirmation (11%). The majority of non-minimal responses were also confirmation ($n = 30/43$, 70%), with 12 non-minimal responses being disconfirmation (28%), and only one ‘neither (confirmation nor disconfirmation) type’ (2%). As for the ‘other (than minimal or non-minimal response)’ type responses, 45 out of 101 instances are confirmation (44%), 22 disconfirmation (22%), and 34 ‘neither (confirmation nor disconfirmation)’-type responses (34%). These distributional tendencies suggest that, compared with confirmation, which predominantly takes the form of a minimal response, disconfirmation is more likely to take the form of a non-minimal response, and that the ‘neither (confirmation nor disconfirmation)’-type responses are more likely to take the form of ‘other (than minimal or non-minimal response)’.

5.6 Full repeats

Out of 190 instances of verbal response, there are 58 repetitional responses, where an element of the RfC is repeated in the response turn ($n = 58/190$, 31%). Among these are 11 cases of full repeats ($n = 11/190$, 6%), with 47 cases being ‘partial repeat’ ($n = 47/190$, 25%).²⁴ An example of a full repeat response is shown in Extract (24), which is produced in the form of ‘confirming allusion’ (Schegloff 1996):

²⁴ Korean has an agglutinative system in which modal markers, honorific expressions, and SESs serve as stance markers agglutinated to the verb stem, and this often makes it difficult to measure the extent of repeats, e.g., as partial vs full. Repeats as response formats and as a practice merit a closer separate analysis.

Extract (24): NC Talk: Breakfast 20:55, No. 135

(Kyeng is listing food items included in the breakfast combo set she is eating.)

- 21 Kyeng: [...] kulikwu [olenci cwusu hana]=
and orange juice one
[...] *and one orange juice.*
- 22 Hani: [olenci cwusu hana,] =
orange juice one
One orange juice,
- 23 Hani: → = [khephi-nun an tuleka-kwu-yo?
coffee-TOP NEG go:in-and-POL
And coffee is not included?
- 24 Kyeng: [()
- 25 Kyeng:→ khephi-nun an tuleka-yo.
coffee-TOP NEG go:in-POL
Coffee is not included.

In line 23, Hani makes an RfC formatted with pre-verbal negation (*an*), which is built to Kyeng's preceding turn through the turn-final clausal connective *-kwu* ('and') (Kim 2015a) ('And coffee is not included?'). In line 25, Kyeng responds with a full repeat in confirmation. Here, Hani's RfC pre-verbal negation RfC is oriented to as a 'formulation' (Heritage and Watson 1979) of an aspect of Kyeng's prior talk to be confirmed, in terms of both its content and allusive/inexplicit conveyance (i.e., listing of food items contained in the breakfast combo plate where 'coffee' is missing; Kim 2021, 2023a).

Extract (25) is another case in which a confirmatory response takes the form of a full repeat. In the preceding context, Inho used the term *swuyanghoy* ('retreat') in describing the church summer camp activities he enjoyed in his childhood (not shown in the data). In line 1, Chen makes an RfC where he proposes the alternative term *yelum sengkyeng hakkyo* ('the summer Bible school' ['Isn't it (called) the summer Bible school these days?']) as one that is in current use. Inho responds with confirmation, repeating the term used by Chen:

Extract (25): SB Post-Service Gathering 08:24, No. 36

(Inho said that he used to enjoy activities provided by church 'swuyanghoy (retreat)').

- 1 Chen:→ **yelum sengkyeng hakkyo** ani-eyyo yocum?
summer Bible school NEG:COP-POL these:days
Isn't it (called) the summer Bible school these days?
- 2 Inho:→ **yelum sengkyeng hakkyo-ci** icey-nun. =
Summer Bible school-COP:COMMnow-TOP
The summer Bible school it is (called) now.
- 3 Chen: = ney
yes
Right.

Inho's repetitional response in line 2, with the addition of the 'committal' SES *-ci* and a reformulated adverbial expression (*yocum* 'these days' → *icey-nun* 'now'), strongly embodies his epistemic claim of 'ownership' over the confirmable posted by Chen's RfC (Raymond and Heritage 2006; also see Extract (19), a case of partial repeat where the verb stem *iss* ('exist'), used in Yun's RfC is repeated in Inho's response, marked with the 'committal' SES *-ci*). It conveys the sense that Inho is resisting and 'pushing back against' Chen's implicit claim of epistemic rights, embodied in his RfC (Enfield et al. 2019, 286).

Repetitional responses tend to be used with response tokens less frequently than in the case of non-repetitional responses; response tokens are used with 22% of repetitional responses ($n = 13/58$) and 56% of non-repetitional responses ($n = 74/132$, 56%; Note 19). In relation to polarity, responses to negatively formatted RfCs

are more likely to take the form of a repetitional answer ($n = 23/58$, 40%) than those to positively formatted RfCs ($n = 35/132$, 27%). In terms of types of responsive action, repetitional responses were produced slightly more frequently in disconfirmation ($n = 14/39$, 36%) than in confirmation ($n = 34/116$, 29%) or in neither-type response ($n = 10/35$, 29%).

6 Conclusion

The preceding overview of RfC sequences in Korean conversation, primarily from a quantitative perspective, shows how various types and forms of RfCs and responses to them are distributed in naturally occurring ordinary conversations. It elucidates the diverse formative features of RfCs, the turns that house them, and the interactional environments where they emerge, e.g., in regard to the formulation/grounding of confirmable in terms of action modulation, the role of negative polarity, signaling of an inferential or connective link to the prior talk, and organizational features of ‘tags’. On the receiving end, it delineates ways in which responses to RfCs are turn-designedly, and sequentially, shaped, e.g., in terms of linguistic signals functioning as a ‘response token’, the import of its presence (or absence) for response design, (dis)confirmability, and the role of particles prefacing/framing responses, which include particles such as change-of-state tokens and response cries.

The findings provide an empirical basis on which we can further investigate how SESs, clausal connectives, and modal markers, as resources agglutinated to the verb stem, shape RfCs’ action into a particular stance-taking action TCU/turn-finally (rather than TCU/turn-initially, as is often the case in English; cf. Heritage 2002). In particular, pseudo-tags *-ci/cianha* (*ci*:NEG) and post-verbal negation *-ci anh*, which all involve the ‘committal’ particle *-ci*, would merit further comparative analysis, because RfCs they mark are often comparable to RfCs in other languages that involve a tag. By contrast, ‘genuine tags’ in Korean such as *kuci*, incrementally produced as a post-completion element (Kim 2007), often emerge in a context where confirmation/disconfirmation is not a relevant next action; their use seems rather to be primarily specialized for managing the questioner’s delicate stance and affect displayed in the host TCU *post hoc*, often in a way that presupposes the recipient’s affiliation and co-stance-taking (Kim 2023c).

With respect to responses to RfCs, the analysis of ‘response tokens’ in Korean conversation raises the question of how to address clausal-type responses, e.g., forms formatted with the demonstrative *kule-* (‘like that’). Also, particles such as the acknowledgement/change-of-state token *eh*, along with response cries (Goffman 1978), need to be further analyzed in terms of their function of ‘framing’ a response to an RfC, and the interactional features that render them distinct from response tokens of the same form (e.g., the response token *eh* [Extract (19) vs Extract (18)]). In addition, response types observed in RfC sequences in Korean merit a more detailed analysis in terms of the distinction between interjection-type and repeat-type responses, different types/degrees of repeat (e.g., full vs partial), and the organization of conformity-based preferences (Raymond 2003; e.g., in regard to the organization of minimal vs non-minimal responses). These and many other issues raised in this article await further empirical analysis, which could be pursued fruitfully from a cross-linguistic perspective.

Abbreviations

For morpheme-by-morpheme glossing, the following abbreviations are used (Lee 1991):

ATTR	Attributive
CAUSE	Causative
CIRCUM	Circumstance
CL	Classifier
COMM	Committal
COND	Conditional

CONN	Connective
COP	Copula
CST	Change-of-state token
DECL	Declaration
DUB	Dubitative
FR	Factual realization
HONOR	Honorific
IE	Informal ending
INF	Inference marker
INFOR	Informative
INSTR	Instrumental
INTENT	Intention
INTERR	Interruptive
INTERROG	Interrogative
LOC	Locative
MANN	Manner
MOD	Modal marker
NECESS	Necessity
NEG	Negation
NOML	Nominalization
PL	Plural marker
POL	Politeness marker
PROG	Progressive
PRT	Particle
PST	Past
PSTG	Pseudo-tag
QTG	Question tag
QUOT	Quotative
REASON	Reason
RETROS	Retrospective
RT	Response token
SUB	Subject marker
TOP	Topic marker

Transcription conventions

The Yale Romanization System was used for transcribing the Korean data. The transcription notions used for transcribing the Korean data are adapted from the study by Sacks et al. (1974). In the Romanized transcription, double hyphens (--), in lieu of a single hyphen (-), are used to mark cutoffs to distinguish them from the single hyphen marking morpheme boundaries:

[	Overlap
[]	Simultaneous utterances
=	Contiguous utterances
.	Falling intonation
,	Continuing intonation
?	Rising intonation
:	Sound stretch
-	Cutoff
hhh	Audible aspirations

.hhh	Audible inhalations
((.))	Transcriber's remarks
(0.0)	Intervals
> <	Faster than surrounding talk
Underlining	Emphasis

Acknowledgements: I am grateful to Martin Pfeiffer, Katharina König, and two anonymous reviewers for their insightful comments and kind suggestions.

Funding information: Work on this article has been funded by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG, German Research Foundation) Project Number 413161127 – Scientific Network ‘Interactional Linguistics – Discourse particles from a cross-linguistic perspective’, led by Martin Pfeiffer and Katharina König.

Author contribution: The author confirms the sole responsibility for the conception of the study, presented results and manuscript preparation.

Conflict of interest: The Author states no conflict of interest.

Data availability statement: The data sets compiled for the current study are available from the corresponding author on reasonable request.

References

- Betz, Emma. 2015. Indexing epistemic access through different confirmation formats: Uses of responsive (*das stimmt*) in German interaction. *Journal of Pragmatics* 87, 251–66.
- Choi, Soonja. 1995. “The development of epistemic sentence-ending modal forms and functions in Korean children.” In *Modality in grammar and discourse*, edited by Joan L. Bybee and Susan Fleischman, 165–204. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Couper-Kuhlen, Elizabeth and Margret Selting. 2001. *Studies in interactional linguistics*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Couper-Kuhlen, Elizabeth and Margret Selting. 2018. *Interactional linguistics: Studying language in social interaction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Enfield, N. J., Penelope Brown, and Jan P. de Ruiter. 2012. “Epistemic dimensions of polar questions: sentence-final particles in comparative perspective.” In *Questions: Formal, functional and interactional perspectives*, edited by Jan P. de Ruiter, 193–221. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Enfield, N. J., Tanya Stivers, Penelope Brown, Christina Englert, Katarina Harjunpää, Makoto Hayashi, Trine Heinemann, Gertie Hoymann, Tiina Keisanen, Mirka Rauniomaa, Chase Wesley Raymond, Federico Rossano, Kyung-Eun Yoon, Inge Zwitterlood, and Stephen C. Levinson. 2019. “Polar answers.” *Journal of Linguistics* 55 (2), 277–304.
- Ford, Cecilia E., Barbara A. Fox, and Sandra A. Thompson. 2002. “Constituency and the grammar of turn increment.” In *The language of turn and sequence*, edited by Cecilia E. Ford, Barbara A. Fox, and Sandra A. Thompson, 14–38. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Goffman, Erving. 1978. “Response cries.” *Language* 54, 787–815.
- Goffman, Erving. 1979. “Footing.” *Semiotica* 25, 1–29.
- Goodwin, Charles. 2013. “The co-operative, transformative organization of human action and knowledge.” *Journal of Pragmatics* 46, 8–23.
- Hepburn, Alexa and Jonathan Potter. 2010. “Interrogating tears: Some uses of “tag questions” in a child-protection helpline.” In *Why Do You Ask?: The function of questions in institutional discourse*, edited by A. F. Freed and S. Ehrlich, 69–86. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Heritage, John. 1998. “Oh-prefaced responses to inquiry.” *Language in Society* 27, 291–334.
- Heritage, John. 2002. “The limits of questioning: negative interrogatives and hostile question content.” *Journal of Pragmatics* 34, 1427–46. doi: 10.1016/S0378-2166(02)00072-3.
- Heritage, John and Chase Wesley Raymond. 2021. “Preference and polarity: Epistemic stance in question design.” *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 54 (1), 39–59. doi: 10.1080/08351813.2020.1864155.
- Heritage, John and Geoffrey Raymond. 2005. “The terms of agreement: Indexing epistemic authority and subordination in talk-in-interaction.” *Social Psychology Quarterly* 68 (1), 15–38.
- Heritage, John and D. Rodney Watson. 1979. “Formulations as conversational objects.” In *Everyday language: Studies in ethnomethodology*, edited by George Psathas, 123–62. New York: Irvington.

- Kang, Sujin. 2022. "Question design in a Korean congressional hearing: An examination of *-cyo* and *-ci anh supnikka*." In *Japanese/Korean Linguistics*, edited by Kaoru Horie, Kimi Akita, Yusuke Kubota, David Y. Oshima, and Akira Utsugi, Vol. 29, 227–41. Stanford: CSLI Publications, California, U.S.A.
- Kawanish, Yumiko. 1994. "An analysis of non-challengeable modals: Korean *-canha(yo)* and Japanese *-janai*." In *Japanese/Korean Linguistics*, edited by Noriko Akatsuka, Vol. 4, 95–111. Stanford: CSLI Publications, California, U.S.A.
- Kawanish, Yumiko and Sung-Ock S. Sohn. 1993. "Grammaticalization of Korean negation: a semantic-pragmatic analysis of *canh-a(yo)*." In *The fifth harvard international symposium of Korean linguistics*, edited by Susumu Kuno, John Whitman, Ik-Hwan Lee, Joan Maling, and Young-Joo Kim, 552–61. Cambridge, MA.: The Harvard ISOKL Committee.
- Kim, Ahrim. 2016. "Revisiting Korean long form negative question: A usage-based perspective." *Linguistic Research* 33 (3), 371–94.
- Kim, Hye Ri Stephanie. 2013 "Reshaping the response space with *kulenikka* in beginning to respond to questions in Korean conversation." *Journal of Pragmatics* 57, 303–17.
- Kim, Hye Ri Stephanie. 2015. "Resisting the terms of polar questions through *ani* ('no')-prefacing in Korean conversation." *Discourse Processes* 52 (4), 311–34.
- Kim, Kyu-hyun. 1999. "Other-initiated repair sequences in Korean conversation: Types and functions." *Discourse and Cognition* 6 (2), 141–68.
- Kim, Kyu-hyun. 2001. "Confirming intersubjectivity through retroactive elaboration: Organization of phrasal units in other-initiated repair sequences in Korean conversation." In *Studies in interactional linguistics*, edited by Margret Selting and Elizabeth Couper-Kuhlen, 345–72. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Kim, Kyu-hyun. 2004. "A conversation analysis of Korean sentence-ending modal suffixes *-ney*, *-kwun(a)*, and *-ta*: Noticing as a social action." *The Sociolinguistic Journal of Korea* 12 (1), 1–36.
- Kim, Kyu-hyun. 2007. "Sequential organization of post-predicate elements in Korean conversation: Pursuing uptake and modulating action." *Pragmatics. Quarterly Publication of the International Pragmatics Association (IPrA)* 17 (4), 573–603.
- Kim, Kyu-hyun. 2018. "Enhancing solidarity through dispreferred Format: The *nuntey*-clause in Korean conversation as a normative basis for leveraging action." *East Asian Pragmatics* 3 (1), 27–57.
- Kim, Kyu-hyun. 2021. "Korean 'topic' particle *nun* as a categorization resource for organizing retro-sequence: Redressing the situated action 'on the periphery'." *Journal of Pragmatics* 183, 225–41.
- Kim, Kyu-hyun. 2022. "Formulating 'tag questions' in Korean conversation: Pseudo-tags *ci* and *cianha* as interactional resources." *The Sociolinguistic Journal of Korea* 30 (4), 59–98.
- Kim, Kyu-hyun. 2023a. "Negatively-formatted requests for confirmation in Korean conversation: Three types of verbal negation as interactional Resources." *Contrastive Pragmatics* 12 (1), 1–50.
- Kim, Kyu-hyun. 2023b. "Nominalizer *nun-ke* in Korean conversation: Impersonalizing through distancing." *Paper presented at the International Pragmatics Association (IPrA) Conference*, Brussel, Belgium.
- Kim, Kyu-hyun. 2023c. "Question tags in Korean conversation: Displaying and soliciting empathy for managing delicate action. *The Sociolinguistic Journal of Korea* 31 (4), 149–73.
- Kim, Kyu-hyun and Kyung-Hee Suh. 2021. "Formulation questions and responses in Korean TV talk show interactions." In *Questioning-answering practices across contexts and cultures*, edited by Cornelia Ilie, 193–226. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Kim, Mary S. 2015a. "A distinct declarative question design in Korean conversation: An examination of turn-final *ko* questions." *Journal of Pragmatics* 79, 60–78.
- Kim, Mary S. 2015b. "Stancetaking in the face of incongruity in Korean conversation." *Journal of Pragmatics* 83, 57–72.
- Kim, Myung-Hee. 2010. "Interactional functions of negative interrogatives in Korean and English conversation." *The Sociolinguistic Journal of Korea* 18 (1), 137–64.
- König, Katharina and Martin Pfeiffer. Forthcoming. "Request for confirmation sequences in ten languages. An introduction." *Open Linguistics*.
- König, Katharina, Martin Pfeiffer, and Kathrin Weber. Forthcoming. "A coding scheme for request for confirmation sequences across languages." *Open Linguistics*.
- Ladd, Robert. 1981. "A first look at the semantics and pragmatics of negative questions and tag questions." *Proceedings of Chicago Linguistic Society* 17, 164–71.
- Lee, Hyo Sang. 1991. "Tense, aspect, and modality: A discourse-pragmatic analysis of verbal affixes in Korean." PhD diss., University of California.
- Lee, Hyo Sang. 1993. "Cognitive constraints on expressing newly perceived information, with reference to epistemic modal suffixes in Korean." *Cognitive Linguistics* 4 (2), 135–68.
- Lee, Hyo Sang. 1999. "A discourse-pragmatic analysis of the committal *-ci* in Korean: A synthetic approach to the form-meaning relation." *Journal of Pragmatics* 31, 243–75.
- Lee, Ik-Hwan. 1989. "kwuke oywupwucenguy uymihaysek [Semantic interpretation of Korean external negation]." *Proceedings from 1989 Conference on Korean Alphabet and Korean Information Processing*, 65–72. Hankwucengpokwahakhoy enekonghakyenkwuhoy [Korean Information Science & Language Technology Research Group].
- Lerner, Gene H. 1992. "Assisted storytelling: Deploying shared knowledge as a practical matter." *Qualitative Sociology* 15 (3), 247–71.
- Lerner, Gene H. and Tomoyo Takagi. 1999. "On the place of linguistic resources in the organization of talk-in-interaction: A co-investigation of English and Japanese grammatical practices." *Journal of Pragmatics* 31 (1), 49–75.

- Levinson, Stephen C. 2012. "Interrogative intimation: on a possible social economics of interrogative." In *Questions: Formal, functional and interactional perspectives*, edited by J. P. de Ruiter, 11–32. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Levinson, Stephen C. 2013. "Action formation and ascription." In *The handbook of conversation analysis*, edited by Jack Sidnell and Tanya Stivers, 103–30. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Mazeland, Harrie. 2007. "Parenthetical sequences." *Journal of Pragmatics* 39 (10), 1816–69.
- Noh, Jini. 2009. "The deployment of three Korean negative interrogatives: A sign-based approach to negative construction in conversational discourse." In *Japanese/Korean Linguistics*, edited by Yukinori Takubo, Tomohide Kinuhata, Szymon Grzelak, and Kayo Nagai, Vol. 16, 304–18. Stanford: CSLI Publications, California, U.S.A.
- Park, Jiseon. 2009. "Pre-verbal negation yes/no question-answer sequences in conversation: Action formation and sequence organization." *Journal of the Linguistic Society of Korea* 55, 75–104.
- Park, Yong-Yae. 1999. "The Korean connective *nuntey* in conversational discourse." *Journal of Pragmatics* 31, 191–218.
- Park, Yong-Yae. 2008. "An analysis of the interactional use of *kulay(yo)* in Korean conversation." *The Sociolinguistic Journal of Korea* 16 (2), 217–48.
- Park, Yujong. 2010. "The relationship between negative questions and sentence final particles in Korean." *Discourse and Cognition* 17 (2), 1–25.
- Pfeiffer, Martin, Katharina König, Kathrin Weber, Arnulf Deppermann, Oliver Ehmer, Sonja Gipper, Alexandra Gubina, Kyu-hyun Kim, Uwe-A. Küttner, Xiaoting Li, Michal Marmorstein, Yael Maschler, Yotam Ben Moshe, Florence Oloff, and Beatrice Szczepk Reed. Forthcoming. "Request for confirmation sequences in ten languages. A quantitative comparison." *Open Linguistics*.
- Pomerantz, Anita M. 1980. "Telling my side: 'Limited access' as a 'fishing device'." *Sociological Inquiry* 50, 186–98.
- Pomerantz, Anita M. 1986. "Extreme case formulations: A way of legitimizing claims." *Human Studies* 9 (2–3), 219–29.
- Pomerantz, Anita M. 1988. "Offering a candidate answer: An information seeking strategy." *Communication Monograph* 55 (4), 360–73. doi: 10.1080/03637758809376177.
- Raymond, Geoffrey. 2003. "Grammar and social organization: yes/no interrogatives and the structure of responding." *American Sociological Review* 68, 939–67.
- Raymond, Geoffrey and John Heritage. 2006. "The epistemics of social relations: Owning grandchildren." *Language in Society* 35 (5), 677–705.
- Reese, Brian. 2007. "Bias in question." PhD diss., University of Texas.
- Sacks, Harvey. 1992a. *Lectures on conversation*, Vol. 1. Cambridge: Blackwell.
- Sacks, Harvey. 1992b. *Lectures on conversation*, Vol. 2. Cambridge: Blackwell.
- Sacks, Harvey, Emanuel A. Schegloff, and Gail Jefferson. 1974. "A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation." *Language* 50 (4), 696–735.
- Sadock, Jerrold M. and Arnold M. Zwicky. 1985. "Speech act distinctions in syntax." In *Language typology and syntactic description*, edited by Timothy Shopen, Vol. 1, 155–96. New York: Academic Press.
- Schegloff, Emanuel A. 1987. "Recycled turn beginnings: A precise repair mechanism in conversation's turn-taking organization." In *Talk and social organisation*, edited by Graham Button and John R. E. Lee, Vol. 1, 70–85. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Schegloff, Emanuel A. 1988. "Goffman and the analysis of conversation." In *Erving Goffman: Exploring the interaction order*, edited by Paul Drew and Anthony J. Wootton, 89–135. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Schegloff, Emanuel A. 1996. "Confirming allusions: Toward an empirical account of action." *American Journal of Sociology* 102 (1), 161–216. doi: 10.1086/230911.
- Schegloff, Emanuel A. 1997. "Practices and actions: Boundary cases of other-initiated repair." *Discourse Processes* 23, 499–545.
- Schegloff, Emanuel A. 2007. *Sequence organization in interaction: A primer in conversation analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Stivers, Tanya and Makoto Hayashi. 2010. "Transformative answers: One way to resist a question's constraints." *Language in Society* 39 (1), 1–25.
- Suh, Kyung-Hee and Kyu-hyun Kim. 1991. "The Korean modal markers *keyss* and (*u*)*lkes*: An interactional perspective." In *Harvard Studies in Korean Linguistics IV*, edited by Susumu Kuno, Ik-Hwan Lee, John Whitman, Joan Maling, Young-Se Kang, and Young-joo Kim, 599–610. Cambridge, Mass., U.S.A.: Department of Linguistics, Harvard University.
- Yang, In-Seok. 1973. "Semantics of delimiters." *Language Research* 9 (2), 84–122.
- Yoon, Kyung-Eun. 2010. "Questions and responses in Korean conversation." *Journal of Pragmatics* 42, 2782–98.