

Research Article

Kathrin Weber*

Request for confirmation sequences in Low German

<https://doi.org/10.1515/opli-2024-0019>

received June 5, 2023; accepted April 25, 2024

Abstract: This article examines request for confirmation (RfC) sequences in Low German (LoG) conversation, a dialect variety of German. The study is based on both a quantitative analysis of 200 RfC instances and a qualitative analysis of selected excerpts in the framework of conversation analysis (CA). As for the question design of RfCs, declarative and phrasal formats, as well as modulations and tags prevail in the LoG data. Concerning the response design, LoG is characterized as a polarity system in which language contact with the high variety plays a decisive role in the answer possibility space. In particular, High German response tokens are predominantly used as unmarked response types, while LoG response tokens are deployed as marked types. Moreover, LoG seems to be a language between the poles of token- and repeat-type languages. Full repeats index different degrees of ‘markedness’ in LoG interaction. Contrary to previous studies on polar answers, repeats in LoG are frequently deployed as unmarked responses in subordinate lines of actions. Repeats are also used as more marked answers after understanding displays. This article attempts to stress the importance of investigating non-standard languages and variety contact in CA, thereby addressing the monolingual bias in research on polar questions.

Keywords: requests for confirmation, question design, response design, repeats, polar questions, variety contact, Low German, conversation analysis

1 Introduction

Polar questions and the responses they invite are a prominent area of inquiry in interactional linguistics (e.g., Raymond 2003, Steensig and Drew 2008, Enfield et al. 2010, 2019, Stivers 2022, Bolden et al. 2023). However, as the main body of research is based on insights from standard languages, little is known about how social actions and their response designs vary in non-standard languages. This article studies request for confirmation (RfC) sequences in Low German (LoG), a regional variety of German spoken in the north of Germany.

The results of this study are part of the Scientific Network ‘Interactional Linguistics’, which examines RfCs and their sequential trajectories from a pragmatic typological perspective (König and Pfeiffer, Forthcoming). RfCs are understood as a type of polar question, where a speaker establishes a B-event-statement (Labov and Fanshel 1977, 100). RfCs display partial knowledge about a matter at hand, which has to be confirmed by another interlocutor with a higher epistemic [K+] status (e.g., Heritage and Roth 1995, Heritage 2012a, b, Heritage and Raymond 2012, Couper-Kuhlen and Selting 2018, 227–30). In contrast to information questions indexing a steep epistemic gradient, the slope of the epistemic gradient between the questioner using an RfC and the recipient is more shallow (Heritage 2012b, 32). In addition to the epistemic stance conveyed by RfCs, polar questions often do ‘double duty’ (Schegloff 2007, 169), both enacting a request and serving as a vehicle for other actions like topic-proffering, upshots, understanding checks, candidate understandings, or challenges

* **Corresponding author: Kathrin Weber**, Department of German Linguistics, Friedrich-Schiller-University Jena, Fürstengraben 30, 07743 Jena, Germany, e-mail: weber.kathrin@uni-jena.de

(e.g., Heritage 2002, Koshik 2002, 2005, Heinemann 2006, Schegloff 2007, 169–80, Küttner and Ehmer 2024). This ‘double-barreled’ nature is also reflected in the two-part structure of participant responses (Sacks 1992, 8, Raymond 2013). Moreover, RfCs differ in their form and sequential positioning. They are deployed with negative or positive polarity, as clauses or phrases, with or without question tags (QTs).

The objective of this article is to examine RfC designs, their responsive uptakes, and the sequential trajectories they engender in LoG interaction within the framework of conversation analysis (CA). Section 2 outlines existing research on RfCs, QTs, and response designs in LoG. Section 3 introduces the LoG data from which 200 instances of RfCs were derived for analysis. The linguistic resources routinely used to build RfCs are described in Section 4, and the response system is detailed in Section 5. Section 6 summarizes the results with a special focus on ‘markedness’ of repeats and variety-specific differences between LoG and High German (HG) RfC designs by comparing the results of this study with those of Deppermann et al. (2024).

2 Literature review

To date, no comprehensive empirical studies have been conducted on RfCs, modulations, QTs, or response designs in LoG talk-in-interaction. Even in dictionaries on LoG, no entries address question or response formats (Lindow 1998, Thies 2010), with remarks on syntactic peculiarities focusing mainly on the absence of conjunctions, especially subjunctions, in Low compared to (High) German (Thies 2010, 231–47).

Research on modal particles in interaction has primarily focused on HG (e.g., Thurmair 1989, Schoonjans 2018). The exception is Weber (2020b), whose analysis of the modal particles *wall* [LoG]/*wohl* [HG]) (usually translated as ‘probably’) demonstrates that speakers from the north-west LoG area deploy these particles as resources for indexing both an unknowing [K–] and a knowing [K+] epistemic stance. At the same time, speakers of other German varieties use this modal particle exclusively as an index of a [K–] stance.

Concerning QTs as ‘response mobilizing features’ in interaction (Stivers and Rossano 2010), CA research has primarily focused on HG (e.g., Hagemann 2009, Drake 2016, König 2020), with only a small body of this work analyzing QTs as regional specific phenomena (e.g., Elspaß and Möller 2005, Glaser 2003, Frey 2010, Lanwer 2019). The QT *ne* (‘not’) is described as a supraregional resource in interaction, which varies only in terms of its specific forms, e.g., *net*, *nech*, or *nich* (Duden 2006, 602, Imo 2011, 128). From a historical perspective, some scholars argue that *ne* emerged as a phonetically reduced variant of *nicht* and *nich* (Bublitz 1978, 126, Burkhardt 1982, 164). Lanwer (2019) shows that the QT *ne* is the predominant variant used in north HG by speakers in Westphalia and Low Anglo-Saxony. Regional differences with regard to the interactional impact in the deployment of *ne* are not addressed in Lanwer’s study. In addition to *ne*, the QT *wa* (‘what’) is supposed to be an exclusive northern German variant (Duden 2006, 602), while *woll* seems to be a typical Westphalian QT (Imo 2011, 128). In sum, previous research on QTs has primarily investigated (regional) HG data rather than LoG varieties, considering various social actions that QTs can be attached to. RfCs have not yet been the focus of this research field.

In sum, there are no studies that have examined features of question and response design, the use of modulating resources, and QTs in LoG RfC sequences. While the study by Pfeiffer et al. (Forthcoming) has revealed frequency-based similarities and differences in the design and response system of RfCs in LoG and HG, this article aims to extend those findings by providing an in-depth analysis of LoG RfC sequences.

3 Description of the data set

The data set consists of naturally occurring interactions in LoG, a West Germanic language containing different varieties spoken throughout the north of Germany. Scholars have not reached a consensus as to whether LoG should be defined as a language on its own or as a variety of German (Wirrer 1998). Fundamental structural differences exist between LoG and HG. One of the most important differences is that in LoG neither

the Second High German Consonant Shift (*‘Zweite Hochdeutsche Lautverschiebung’*) nor the phonological process of diphthongization has taken place. Moreover, “the word order of Low German is relatively restricted and tends to be expressed by a default SVO order” (Langer 2003, 284). Based on a synchronic perspective, this article will treat LoG as a variety of German (see also Sanders 1982, 34, Langer 2003, 282). In line with the decline of German dialects, LoG is primarily a spoken variety at this point, used informally among friends and family, particularly by rural, older generations; numbers of middle-aged or younger speakers are decreasing (Adler et al. 2018).¹ Due to the increasing language contact between LoG and HG, the speakers are bilingual (or bilectal) and show interferences in the use of one or the other variety (Hansen-Jaax 1995).

The LoG data in this study comprise approximately 60 h of authentic everyday talk-in-interaction collected in the north-western part of Germany (Weber 2020a). All speakers are native Westphalians who acquired LoG as their first language or in a bilingual fashion, i.e., along with (regional) HG. Consequently, the results of the study do not apply to the entire LoG language area, but are limited to speakers from the Westphalian region. According to the guidelines of the research network’s comparative enterprise (Pfeiffer et al., Forthcoming), 200 RfC sequences were collected from 5.9 h of talk (15 interactions: 11 multiparty interactions and 4 dyadic interactions, min = 09.23 min, max = 32.27 min) by 35 native Westphalian LoG speakers. The majority of speakers are between 50 and 80 years old; only three individuals are younger than 40. The data comprise recordings of co-present interactions between family members sitting around a table talking in over 80% of the cases. In some recordings, the participants are empirically involved in the action of eating (about 20% of cases). Data were coded according to the research network’s coding manual (König et al., Forthcoming). As the data are available in audio only, a multimodal analysis is not possible.

4 Resources for requesting confirmation in LoG

4.1 Syntactic design

In LoG, RfCs are routinely deployed in clause structure ($n = 144/200$; 72%), especially with declarative syntax, i.e., clauses with verb-second position (SVO structure; $n = 108/200$; 54%, Table 1). In 60% of the cases ($n = 65/108$), declarative RfCs are equipped with a tag, as in Extract (1). In 40% ($n = 43/108$), these RfCs are deployed as ‘declarative questions’ without a tag, a typical syntactic RfC design in Germanic languages (Couper-Kuhlen and Selting 2018, 228).

Section 1 outlines that RfCs often have a ‘double-barreled’ nature. Declaratively formatted polar questions are said to convey a bunch of different social actions in interactions, besides the action of questioning (e.g., Seuren and Huiskes 2017). In the LoG data, declarative RfCs with and without a tag are predominantly used as a

Table 1: Syntactic design of RfCs in LoG

Syntactic format	Frequency (total $n = 200$)
Declarative clause	108 (54%)
Phrase	49 (24.5%)
Polar interrogative clause	27 (13.5%)
Subordinate clause	9 (4.5%)
Elliptical confirmables	7 (3.5%)

¹ The terms ‘High’ and ‘Low’ in this study do not refer to register differences as in diglossic contexts, even if there is some degree of stratification in terms of the contextual domains in which LoG is being used. LoG is a variety (or a ‘language’, depending on the respective approach) with its own well-defined system.

means to accomplish three different social actions: (1) topic proffers, (2) understanding displays, and (3) understanding checks. With topic proffers “a speaker *proposes* a particular topic ..., but does not actively launch or further develop the proposed topic” (Schegloff 2007, 169–70). Consider (1). Heidi and Annika are talking about Heidi’s training course. After a sequence closure of the just-prior talk (lines 01–02), Heidi marks a departure from the ongoing sequence and manages a topic change by means of the conjunction *ower* (‘but’) and the following RfC formatted as a tag question (line 03).

Extract 1: LoG-HES02_06 (00:01:24 – 00:01:27), No. 77

- 01 Heidi: [jo kAs UTha:ln];
Yes that is worthwhile
- 02 Annika: [dAt is ganz MOI] so;
That is nice
- 03 Heidi: **ower du hast late FIERowend mAkt; =ne?**
 But you.SG have.2SG.AUX late off work made.PST.PTCP NE_QT
But you got off work late, right
- 04 Annika: (0.3) IK?
Me

In addition to topic proffers, declarative RfCs are also deployed as understanding displays (Heritage 1984, 320–3; see also Zinken and Küttner 2022). With this action type, speakers “wish to show that prior talk has been adequately descriptive and/or they have competently understood its import” (Heritage 1984, 321). Typically, these displays are deployed as confident inferences prefaced with a change-of-state token indexing independent ‘then and there’-understanding “prior to any possible confirmation” (Heritage 1984, 321). Consider (2). Helga refers in line 01 to a recent meeting with a person called Tim, implementing the action of delivering news to Ben. In lines 06–07, he deploys a confident inference prefaced with the change-of-state token *ach ja* (‘I see/I remember’) to index an independent understanding of the class reunion Helga was referring to in line 01. Because of this index of independence, understanding displays require subsequent (dis)confirmation to a lesser extent compared to understanding checks (Heritage 1984, 323).

Extract 2: LoG-GEL01_02 (00:00:01 – 00:00:09), No. 48

- 01 Helga: sAmstach hebbt_wi (0.5) ju TIM auch seijn;
Guess what, we saw Tim on Saturday
- 02 Ben: (0.5) Use ↑TIM?
Our Tim
- 03 Paul: <<f> JO,
Yes
- 04 ja hh°;
Yes
- 05 de hebb (.) de hebb ik siet JOHren nich mehr seijn;
I hadn't seen him in years
- 06 Ben: (0.2) <<f> **ach JA,**
I see/I remember
- 07 **de heff KLAssentreffen hat; =ne,**
 they.PL have.2PL.AUX class reunion had.PST.PTCP NE_QT
They had a class reunion, right
- 08 Paul: de heff KLAssentreffen hat,
They had a class reunion

Finally, declarative RfCs are also used as understanding checks in LoG interaction. Following Heritage (1984, 318–20), this article considers understanding checks to be clarificatory repair-like sequences, where a speaker proposes “a candidate understanding of what an earlier speaker had intended, the producer of an understanding check thereby invites that speaker to confirm (or disconfirm) the adequacy of that proposal” (Heritage 1984, 319). Consider (3). Annika deploys a topic proffer in the form of a telling question referring to a meeting that Heidi attended. Heidi embraces the topic and starts to elaborate on the event in lines 03–04. The beginning of Heidi’s elaboration overlaps with an understanding check of Annika in line 05 as a side sequence, which requires clarification of the organizing institution of that meeting.

Extract 3: LoG-HES02_06 (00:00:08 – 00:00:13), No. 75

- 01 Annika: wu WAS dat auf versAmmlung so?
How was the meeting
- 02 (-) GEEFT do [wAt]₁,
Did anything happen
- 03 Heidi: [uff]₁-
Ugh
- 04 DU dat_w[as]₂-
It was
- 05 Annika: **[SP]₂Arkasse was dat;=[ne]₃?**
 Sparkasse (German bank) was it NE_QT
It was at Sparkasse, wasn’t it
- 06 Heidi: [DAT]₃ was bi de spArkasse;
It was at Sparkasse
- 07 det was GANZ interessant,
It was very interesting

Besides declarative formats, RfCs in LoG are also produced as phrases in about a quarter of cases ($n = 49/200$, 24.5%), with the majority being nominal (e.g., *dat Grüne* ‘the green one’) or prepositional in nature (e.g., *mit Auto* ‘by car’). 28.5% of all phrasal RfCs are used with a tag ($n = 14/49$). In 8% ($n = 4/49$), these phrases are deployed as a candidate answer (Pomerantz 1988), following an information question as in (4). Previous to the extract, Lukas told Tina that he regularly attends swimming courses.

Extract 4: LoG-BÖR01_07 (00:03:45 – 00:03:48), No. 19

- 01 Tina: !WANN! geih_ih da hEn;
When do you go there
- 02 **DÖNNerdachs?**
Thursdays
- 03 Lukas: (0.3) mh `DÖNNdachs-
uh Thursdays

In contrast to the functional diversity of declarative RfCs, phrasal RfCs are the predominant format to accomplish understanding checks. Consider Extract (5). Following Anna’s narrative about a guided tour of a German food company (lines 01–02), Heinz launches a “side sequence within an ongoing sequence” (Jefferson 1972, 294) in order to clarify the referential food company by proposing the candidate *bi apetito* (‘At apetito’s’) in the form of a phrasal RfC. Anna confirms the RfC in line 05 by using a full repeat, thus closing the side sequence and moving back to the main line of action in line 06.

Extract 5: LoG-HES01_07_09 (00:23:12 – 00:23:20), No. 108

- 01 Anna: un: bÜnt da ja mo wÄ:n up EINladung;
I was invited there once
- 02 von (.) von müllers HERbert;
By Herbert Müller
- 03 Heinz: (0.2) wie-
What do you mean
- 04 bi apeTito;
At Apetito's (German company that produces food)
- 05 Anna: **bi apeTito**;
At Apetito's
- 06 d[e HETT] de: °hh-
They have they
- 07 Heinz: [hm_hm]
information receipt

RfCs are also formatted with interrogative syntax (VSO structure) in the LoG data ($n = 27/200$; on interrogative syntax as a typical format of RfCs, refer to Couper-Kuhlen and Selting 2018, 218). In particular, polar interrogative RfCs are predominantly used to accomplish understanding displays, presenting an inference or a highly likely knowledge about a matter at hand. Consider (6) (larger Extract (6) in 4.2). In line 01, Paul deploys a candidate understanding of Ben's prior turn formatted with interrogative syntax and a negative polarity item. In contrast to declarative understanding displays, interrogatively formatted inferences are not prefaced with change-of-state tokens indexing an independent understanding. Thus, interrogative RfCs require subsequent (dis)confirmation to a greater extent. This is in line with the idea that interrogative questions propose a steeper epistemic gradient than declarative questions (Heritage and Raymond 2012).

Extract 6: LoG-GEL01_02 (00:07:50 – 00:07:52), No. 57

- 01 Paul: **kÜmmst da (.) kÜmmst da NICH mit tousAmm-**
come_you.2SG there come_you.2SG there not with together
You're not coming together
- 02 Ben: < < f>↑nä>;
No (way)

In only 4.5% of the data ($n = 9/200$), RfCs are designed with an SOV structure (*subordinate clause*), like in Extract (7). Ben launches a topic change to an old photo of a mutual aunt and uncle's wedding party. Within a side sequence, Helga starts a remedy of the referred event by deploying an RfC in SOV structure (line 01), which is minimally confirmed by Ben in line 02.

Extract 7: LoG-GEL01_02 (00:16:06 – 00:16:07), No. 61

- 01 Helga: **wo de da an FRIEN sind?**
Where they there are celebrating
Where they are celebrating
- 02 Ben: ja;
Yes

Elliptical confirmables make up only a small part of the corpus ($n = 7/200$, 3.5%). Consider (8). Concerning the social actions that elliptical RfCs and RfCs formatted as subordinate clauses accomplish, no clear picture has emerged in the analysis.

Extract 8: LoG-BÖR09_11 (00:01:04 – 00:01:08), No. 125

- 01 Walter: **SESShunnert to mInn also?**
Six hundred to little so
So, six hundred (euros) to little
- 02 Frank: **wEnn überHAUPT;**
If at all

In sum, in LoG RfC designs are typically formatted with declarative and phrasal syntax, but also – to a lesser extent – with interrogative syntax, subordinate clauses, or ellipticals.

4.2 Polarity

Research on English has shown that polarity influences the preference constraints and the epistemic stance display of polar questions (on *reversed polarity questions*, refer to the study by Koshik (2002), and on *negatively polarized questions* [NPQs], refer to the study by Heritage and Raymond (2021)). NPQs in English can be designed with interrogative or declarative syntax and are supposed to be tilted toward polarity-matched ‘no’-responses. However, Heritage (2002) has shown that negative interrogatives beginning with frames such as *Isn’t it*, *Don’t you* or modal phrases like *Shouldn’t you X* are different from NPQs with regard to the level of preference organization as they strongly invite affirmative responses. Epistemically, these assertive negative interrogatives differ from ‘questioning’ NPQs by (a) referring to shared knowledge, thereby not displaying a relative epistemic gradient to a matter at hand, and (b) the following response design, where responses only briefly acknowledge their interrogative packaging. In sum, specific modulations can have an impact on the preference organization of questions with negative polarity items.

In the LoG data, RfCs are predominantly formatted with positive polarity ($n = 176/200$; 88%); RfCs with negative polarity occur in only a limited number of cases ($n = 24/200$; 12%). Table 2 outlines the lexical items of negative polarity in LoG. In 87.5% of the cases ($n = 21/24$), the item *nich* (‘not’) is used for marking negative polarity in LoG, followed by the negative pronoun/article *kein* (‘no’) and the negative adverb *nix* (‘nothing’). The item *nich* falls into two distinct classes regarding its semantic and syntactic scope: it is used as (1) a negation particle ($n = 18$) and (2) a modal particle ($n = 3$). The following analyses will focus on these two usages of *nich* in RfCs and their preference organization. RfCs with the negation particle *nich* in LoG are directed to states of affairs that are unlikely by virtue of prior talk and thus inferential in nature (Heritage and Raymond 2021, 46–51, Drew 2018; see also Section 4.4). Consider again Extract (6). Ben and Paul are talking about their acquaintance, Margot. In lines 02–03, Ben reacts to Paul’s information request (line 01) with two epistemic disclaimers (lines 02–03). In line 04, Paul tries again by deploying the RfC *kümmst da nich mit tousamen* (‘you’re not coming together’). Based on his understanding of the just-prior turn, Paul marks a contact between Ben and Margot as unlikely. Constructing this RfC with the negative polarity item *nich* (‘not’) displays an orientation toward a ‘no’-type answer. Ben confirms the RfC in line 05 with the response token *nä* (‘no’). In sum, all NPQs with the negative particle *nich* (‘not’) are formatted with either declarative or interrogative syntax. When NPQs are confirmed in LoG, they are responded to with a polarity-matched ‘no’-type response token (Extract 14 shows a disconfirming response to a prior NPQ).

Table 2: Negative polarity marking in LoG RfCs

Negative polarity marker	Frequency (total $n = 24$)
<i>nich/ni</i> (‘not’)	21 (87.5%)
<i>kein</i> [HG]/ <i>kien</i> [LG] (‘no’)	2 (8.3%)
<i>nix</i> (‘nothing’)	1 (4.2%)

Extract 6: LoG-GEL01_02 (00:07:46 – 00:07:54), No. 57

- 01 Paul: (0.6) wu cheit DE eegentlIch;
How is she doing
- 02 Ben: (0.6) kAnn ik di NICH seggen;=
I can't tell
- 03 = ik WEET nich;
I don't know
- 04 Paul: **kÜmmst da (.) kÜmmst da NICH mit tousAmm-**
 come_you.2SG there come_you.2SG there not.NEG.PRT with together
You're not coming together
- 05 Ben: <<f>↑nä>;
No (way)
- 06 (0.6) <<p > nä:> °h;
No
- 07 DE-
She
- 08 (0.7) hEbbt us dat lEwen TO schwor makt;
She made our lives too difficult

On the other hand, RfCs with the modal particle *nich* ('not') are directed to states of affairs that speakers treat as (highly) likely. In its function as a modal particle, *nich* ('not') has lost its negative semantic scope and therefore its negative polarity in the course of grammaticalization (Thurmair 1989, 160–3). Compared to RfCs with negation particles, these RfCs are different with regard to preference organization, as they are tilted towards a 'yes'-type response. All of the *nich* ('not') modal particles occur in RfCs formatted with interrogative syntax. Consider (9). In line 01, Lukas launches an RfC regarding the mode of transportation Tina and Theo used on their last vacation. Both confirm the RfC in lines 02 and 03 with a 'yes'-response token. Thus, RfCs with the modal particle *nich* ('not') are not to be counted as NPQs in the sense of Heritage and Raymond (2021).

Extract 9: LoG-BÖR01_07 (00:14:39 – 00:14:43), No. 32

- 01 Lukas: **wAs dat nich _n dOoppelstocking BUS (-) do,**
 Was.SG that.3SG not.PRT(modal) a double-decker bus there
Wasn't that a double-decker bus
- 02 Theo: ja;
Yes
- 03 Tina: jo;=
Yes
- 04 =do hAm_wi INsätten;
We were on it

As can be seen, making a B-event statement by means of negative polarity is applied (a) rarely and (b) with a small spectrum of lexical items in LoG. The item *nich* is used in two different ways inviting different response types. RfCs with the negation particle *nich* are directed to states of affairs that are treated as unlikely, meaning they are tilted towards a 'no'-response, as previously described for NPQs. However, RfCs with the modal particle *nich* are tilted towards a 'yes'-type response, comparable with Heritage's (2002) negative interrogatives. The difference between Heritage's (2002) negative interrogatives and LoG RfCs is that the first is treated as accomplishing opinion statements to an object of common knowledge, while the latter is still understood as questioning in the information-seeking sense.

4.3 Modulation

Compared to negative polarity, marking epistemic modulation in RfCs with modal particles, modal words or modal phrases is more pronounced in LoG, with modulations occurring in approximately a third of all cases ($n = 60/200$; 30%). In five of those instances, two modal items occur in one RfC, resulting in a slightly higher total number of markers ($n = 65$).

Table 3: Modulation of RfCs with epistemic markers in LoG

Epistemic marker	Frequency (total $n = 65$)
<i>ja</i> ('yes', modal particle)	20
<i>doch</i> ('yes', modal particle)	18
<i>nich(t)</i> ('not', modal particle)	7
<i>denn/dann</i> ('because', modal particle)	5
<i>glöw ik/glaub ich</i> ('I think', modal phrase)	3
<i>wall/wohl</i> ('probably', modal particle)	3
<i>jetzt</i> ('now', modal particle)	2
<i>hal</i> ('just', modal particle)	1
<i>bloß</i> ('only', modal particle)	1
<i>eigentlich</i> ('actually', modal word)	1
<i>eventuell</i> ('possibly', modal word)	1
<i>nu</i> ('now', modal particle)	1
<i>normalerweise</i> ('usually', modal word)	1
<i>siker</i> ('sure', modal word)	1

Table 3 provides an overview of the lexical elements that serve as modal markers in LoG RfCs. On the one hand, the data suggest a structural convergence with HG lexical material due to variety contact (see also Goss and Salmons (2000) on the loss of modal particles in long-term language contact). The HG modal particles *ja* ('yes') and *doch* ('yes') are the most frequent resources. Moreover, the modal particle *nich(t)* ('not') and the modal phrase *ich glaube/ik glöw* ('I believe') are also typical means of modulations in LoG RfCs. With the modal particle *ja* ('yes'), speakers activate a communal or personal common ground in RfCs, indexing that the presented knowledge is shared and highly likely (see Reinecke (2018) on *ja* ('yes') in HG). Consider (10). In line 01, Paul deploys a declarative + tag RfC with the modal particle *ja* ('yes'), indexing shared knowledge and a relatively strong assumption about the proposition.

Extract 10: LoG-GEL01_02 (00:07:44 – 00:07:46), No. 56

- 01 Paul: **nohEr kam SANDra ja; =ne-**
 After that came Sandra yes.PRT QT_NE
After that, Sandra came; right
- 02 Ben: **ja;**
 Yes

The modal particle *doch* ('yes') is also deployed as a means of marking common ground in LoG RfCs, strongly committing to a proposition (Pittner 2007, 75–6). Only in a few cases, speakers contradict a prior turn by using *doch* (Extract 15). Consider (11). With the RfC in lines 01–02, Ben initiates an activity of co-remembering by referring to an event in a club called *Eiskümmel* ('ice cumin'), at which Paul is presumed to have met his wife Sandra for the first time. The modal particle *doch* indexes this situation as part of the common ground.

Extract 11: LoG-GEL01_02 (00:16:34 – 00:16:39), No. 66

- 01 Ben: **do hEs du doch SANdra kennenlernt;**
 There have.2SG.AUX you.SG PRT Sandra met.PST.PCTP
There you met Sandra
- 02 **mit EISKümmel;**
With ice cumin
At the ice cumin club
- 03 Paul: (0.8) <<f>ik>?
Me
- 04 Ben: (0.5) <<f> ↑JA>;
Yes
- 05 Paul: <<f>NÄ nä [nä]₁>;
No no no

On the other hand, Table 3 reveals LoG-specific modal markers which are not applied in HG (see Deppermann et al. 2024). This includes the modal particles *wall* [LoG]/*wohl* [HG] ('probably') and *nu* ('now'). Weber (2020b) shows that with the modal particles *wall* [LoG]/*wohl* [HG], LoG speakers can index an epistemic stance towards the assumed high probability of a matter at hand ([K+] stance; Section 2). Consider (12).

Extract 12: LoG-BÖR01_08 (00:02:18 – 00:02:25), No. 02

- 01 Tina: dessen (.) MÜLLer,
This Müller (name of the teacher)
- 02 de wOhnt ja in VREden;
He lives in Vreden (Westphalian village)
- 03 (0.6)
- 04 Theo: **du KENNST de wall; =nich?**
 You.SG know.2SG him PRT NICH_QT
You know him (well); right?
- 05 den (.) den MÜLLer-
This this Müller (name)
- 06 da LEHrer hier,
The teacher here
- 07 (0.8)
- 08 Theo: von VREden kummt de;
He is from Vreden
- 09 (0.4)
- 10 Jakob: <<p> joa,>
Yes (mitigated)

In lines 01–02, Tina speaks to Jakob about a teacher who offers LoG courses for children, providing his name and his origin. She frames this knowledge as part of the common ground by using the modal particle *ja* ('yes'). After a short delay, Theo, who also has knowledge about this teacher, adds an RfC in line 04 with the modal particle *wall* and the tag *nich* ('not'). Theo expects Jakob to know the person in question, thus treating Tina's action of informing Jakob as inappropriate.² However, Theo's following pursuit, Jakob's delay in responding,

² *Wall* shows both the function of a modal particle and the historical adverb function meaning 'well'. The vital adverb function in LoG, which no longer exists in HG, preserves the older [K+] function of *wohl* in this area.

and his qualified response *joa* ('yes (mitigated)') in line 10 show that Jakob does not have the expected knowledge about the teacher that Theo presupposes.

In sum, LoG speakers deploy modal markers frequently in order to index epistemic stances within RfC actions. Thereby, structural resemblances between LoG and HG due to variety contact but also LoG-specific markers in the question design of RfCs are noticeable.

4.4 Inference marking

Section 4.2 reveals that RfCs with negative polarity are mainly used when formulating inferences from prior talk. There are other linguistic resources in LoG, which overtly mark RfCs as inferential actions. Following Drew (2018), this article understands inferences as ubiquitous interactional actions, where a speaker attributes an implication to a prior speaker's turn. Overall, RfCs in LoG are only rarely marked as inferences ($n = 19/200$; 9.5%). Table 4 provides the different lexical resources that LoG speakers apply to introduce inferential displays. Most of these resources are also deployed in HG, including more implicit markers (e.g., *also* ('so'; $n = 3$)) as well as explicitly attributing phrases (e.g., *du meinst/meenste* ('you mean'; $n = 2$)).

Table 4: Inference marking in LoG RfCs

Inference markers	Frequency (total $n = 19$)
<i>achso/so</i> ^a ('oh I see'; change-of-state tokens)	5
<i>also</i> ('so')	3
<i>ach (ja)</i> (change-of-state token)	3
<i>ah</i> ('oh'; change-of-state tokens)	2
<i>dann</i> ('then'/'so')	2
<i>du meinst/meenste</i> ('you mean')	2
<i>ich dachte</i> ('I thought')	1
<i>oh</i> ('oh', change-of-state token)	1

^a*So* ('oh') is counted as a phonetically reduced variant of *achso* ('oh') as they both mainly occur as prefaces to understanding displays with similar prosodic details (*achso* and *so* are deployed as separate TCUs, prosodically not integrated into the following RfC, with falling intonation). It is unlikely that *so* is to be considered as a variant of the conjunction *also* ('so'), as *also* is used prosodically integrated into the RfC and shares no prosodic or sequential details with *so* ('oh') in the data.

For the LoG data, it is noticeable that speakers frequently use change-of-state tokens as explicit indexes of inferential actions. Extract (13) gives an example of an *achso* ('oh I see')-plus-RfC format. Ben informs Paul about the professional career of an acquaintance's daughter (lines 01–03). In line 04, Paul reacts with the overt understanding marker *achso* ('oh I see'; Golato 2010, 157–61), equipped with accentuation on the second syllable and falling intonation in a separate TCU. After that, he deploys a candidate understanding in line 05. In the LoG data, *achso*-plus-RfC formats are always designed as inferences of prior turns-at-talk and therefore as understanding displays (Heritage 1984, 320–3).

Extract 13: LoG-GEL01_02 (00:02:40 – 00:02:49), No. 52

- 01 Ben: un äh (.) äh DEren dOchtern äh-
And their daugther
- 02 de_s in_äh MÜNchen,
She is (works) in Munich
- 03 °h (-) mh bi de (-) BAYrische hypo,
At the bavarian hypo (bank)

- 04 Paul: **achSO;**
Oh I see
- 05 **BANKmens[chen];**
Banking people
- 06 Ben: [bank]-
Bank
- 07 BANKmenschen;=
Banking people
- 08 =~[ja],
Yes

In sum, RfCs in the LoG data are only rarely (linguistically) marked as inferences from a prior speaker's turn. It is, however, worth highlighting that the speakers use change-of-state tokens frequently as inferential markers. LoG seems to provide almost no variety-specific resources for the explicit marking of inferences. Speakers therefore fall back on HG lexemes.

4.5 Connectives

In 37.5% of all cases, LoG speakers introduce RfC sequences with connectives like conjunctions, subjunctions, discourse markers, or change-of-state tokens ($n = 75/200$). Table 5 reveals the different connective formats. The conjunctions *ower* [LoG]/*aber* [HG] ('but'; $n = 16$) and *un(d)* ('and'; $n = 15$) show the highest absolute frequency in the data. Moreover, change-of-state tokens are used frequently as connectives in the LoG data ($n = 12$). In the following, we focus on the most frequent conjunction *ower/awer* [LoG] ('but') as a turn-initial and TCU-initial practice in LoG.

In the majority of cases, turn-initial *ower/awer* ('but') in LoG is used as a conjunction marking a departure from the ongoing course of action, as Extract (1) shows. In this example, Heidi marks a departure from the ongoing sequence and manages a recipient-oriented topic change (Schegloff 2007, 170) by means of the turn-initial conjunction *ower* ('but'). After a [K-]-display of Annika, Extract (14) starts immediately afterward, where Heidi tries a second time, explaining that she saw Annika passing by in the car. With the RfC in line 02, Heidi deploys an *awer* ('but')-prefaced inference in the TCU-initial position. Thereby, Heidi launches a different line of talk that presents her attribution to Annika's behavior as a lack of mutual perception and thus a presupposed [K-] status of Annika. After this second proffer, Annika embraces the topic by strongly disconfirming Heidi's presupposition in lines 03–05 with a [K+] display.

Table 5: Connectives in LoG RfCs

Connective		Frequency (total $n = 75$)	
<i>ower/awer/aber</i> ('but')	16	<i>was jetzt?</i> ('what now')	1
<i>un(d)</i> ('and')	15	<i>hm_hm</i> (continuer)	1
<i>achso/so</i> (change-of-state token)	5	<i>oh</i> ('oh', change-of-state token)	1
<i>ja</i> ('yes')	4	<i>ja weil</i> ('yes because')	1
<i>oder</i> ('or')	4	<i>weil</i> ('because')	1
<i>ja aber/ower</i> ('yes but')	4	<i>ja wenn</i> ('yes when')	1
<i>ach (ja)</i> (change-of-state token)	4	<i>ne?</i> (question tag)	1
<i>also</i> ('so')	3	<i>nocher</i> ('then')	1
<i>ah</i> (change-of-state token)	2	<i>uk</i> ('also')	1
<i>ja und</i> ('yes and')	2	<i>ich dachte</i> ('I thought')	1
<i>dann</i> ('then'/'so')	2	<i>wie?</i> ('how')	1
<i>ja ja</i> ('yes yes')	2	<i>ja stimmt</i> ('yes right')	1

Extract 14: LoG-HES02_06 (00:01:31 – 00:01:34), No. 78

- 01 Heidi: as ik HEEM föhr;
As I drove home
- 02 **awer du HAS mi ni seijn; =ne,**
 But you.2SG have.AUX me not seen.PST.PTCP; NE_QT
But you didn't see me; right?
- 03 Annika: <<f> DOCH;
Yes
- 04 STIMMT>;
Right
- 05 ik hab noch SEIJN,
I did see (you)

In some cases, however, turn-initial *ower/awer* ('but') marks a contradiction to a prior turn-at-talk. Consider (15). Heinz, his sister Anna, and his niece Svenja are talking about a priest from the village. Anna disaffirms Heinz's request for information in line 03 with the negative response particle *nä* ('no') and a concessive format, leading to a sequence closure. After a short delay, Heinz resumes the topic by deploying an RfC, prefaced by the sequential conjunction *aber* ('but') in line 04. In contrast to turn-initial *ower* ('but') in Extract (1), with *aber* ('but') in (15) Heinz directly ties his RfC to the prior sequence and the ongoing course of action by contrasting his knowledge with Anna's prior turn. By co-constructing it with the modal particle *doch* ('yes'), Heinz displays a strong commitment to the proposition.

Extract 15: LoG-HES01_07_09 (00:05:47 – 00:05:54), No. 98

- 01 Heinz: kann he dann PLATT?
Does he speak Low German?
- 02 IS dat (.) dat IS [doch]_n-
Is that he is a
- 03 Anna: [nä:];
No
- (omission 00:05:49–00:05:51; concessive format + sequence closure)
- 04 Heinz: **aber de kUmmt doch hier ut EMSland; =[ne],**
 But he comes PRT here from Emsland; NE_QT
But he is from Emsland; =right?
- 05 Svenja: [ut] WERLte;
From Werlte

In sum, conjunctions are part of LoG RfCs formats in about one-third of all cases. Focusing on *awer/ower* ('but'), the analysis shows that it can be used both as a turn- and a TCU-initial resource indexing (a) a departure from the ongoing course of action (Extract 1, line 03), (b) a contradiction to a prior speaker's turn (Extract 15, line 04), or (c) a projection of a contrasting proposition within a speaker's turn (Extract 14, line 02). All uses index a contrast in one way or another, either to a previous turn-internal proposition, a prior turn, or to a prior topic.

4.6 Tags

In LoG, RfCs are frequently equipped with tags in 45% of the cases ($n = 90/200$). Table 6 illustrates the different tag formats that occur in RfC question designs in the data.

With regard to the formal resources, only five different lexical items/phrases are discernible: *ne* ('not'), *nich* ('not'), *oder* ('or'), *oder wat* ('or what'), *oder wann* ('or when'), and *kann dat* ('is that possible'). Tags like *wa* or *woll*,

Table 6: Tags in RfC sequences in LoG

Tags	Frequency (total $n = 90$)
<i>ne</i> ('not')	69 (77%)
<i>nich</i> ('not') ^a	11 (12%)
<i>oder</i> ('or')	6 (7%)
<i>oder wat</i> ('or what')	2 (2%)
<i>oder wann</i> ('or when')	1 (1%)
<i>kann dat</i> ('is that possible')	1 (1%)

^aWe found no instances of *nech* ('not') tag variants in the LoG data.

considered typical Northern German tags (Section 2), do not occur in the data. However, this is in line with Harren's (2001, 104–5) study on *wa*, which shows a frequent occurrence of this tag with assessments and not with RfCs.

Concerning the frequency ratios, the supraregional *ne*-tag prevails in the LoG data ($n = 69/90$; 77%) followed by the lexically similar, more regional tag *nich* ($n = 11/90$; 12%). While Harren (2001) shows a frequent co-occurrence of *ne*-turns with modal particles in HG, modulations in tag-attached RfCs in LoG are found in only 39% of cases ($n = 27/69$). In line with Harren (2001, 128), the most frequent co-occurring modal particles with *ne*-tagged RfCs are *ja* ('yes'; $n = 12$) and *doch* ('yes'; $n = 8$). Both serve as markers of an established common ground (Section 4.3). With respect to *nich*, the relative frequency ratios look similar: 36% ($n = 4/11$) of all *nich*-tagged RfCs are constructed with modal particles, while 64% are not ($n = 7/11$). Sequential analyses of RfCs with *ne*- and *nich*-tags in the LoG data show that both exhibit a wide range of similar social actions. Thus, the deployment of *ne* and *nich* in RfCs is not driven by the accomplishment of different social actions in LoG. In addition, *ne* and *nich* are deployed with similar final intonation that is predominantly rise-to-mid and rise-to-high intonation, as indicated in Table 10. In sum, the analyses could not reveal a robust link between final intonation contour and social action. However, for the second most frequent tag, *nich* ('not'; $n = 11$), an age effect is evident in the data, as only older speakers use *nich*, while younger speakers exclusively use the tag *ne*. This apparent-time comparison³ supports the hypothesis of a phonetic erosion from *nich* to *ne*, outlined in Section 2, at least for LoG RfC actions. Accordingly, variety contact might cause a decline of the northern regional variant *nich* in favor of the supraregional variant *ne*.

Compared to *ne* ('not') and *nich* ('not'), the tag *oder* ('or') with only 7% of the cases ($n = 6/90$) is not strongly conventionalized in LoG interaction. Almost all *oder*-RfCs in LoG are responded to with minimal responses. In only one instance, the *oder*-tagged RfC solicits topic talk and thus a non-minimal answer. Moreover, compared to HG, there is less of a connection between the final intonation of *oder*-RfCs and the complexity of the following actions in LoG (Section 4.7). Again, an age effect in the usage of the *oder*-tag is observable, as it is deployed only by younger speakers. It is therefore likely that the *oder*-tag is an interference from HG and a rather recent tag in LoG.

In sum, while tags are frequently used resources in LoG RfCs, the spectrum of items that serve as tags is noticeably small. The deployment of the two most frequent tags, *ne* and *nich*, is not driven by action or prosody. As noted, an age effect in the use of the tags *nich* and *oder* is evident. The apparent-time comparison for *nich* supports the hypothesis of a phonetic erosion from *nich* to *ne*. Accordingly, variety contact might cause a decline of the more regional variant *nich* in favor of the supraregional variant *ne*. The tag *oder* is mainly used by younger speakers and does not play a decisive role in the LoG RfC design (yet).

4.7 Prosodic design

In addition to the different tag-types, the attachment of tags also impacts the prosodic design of RfCs. Table 7 reveals that the majority of RfC confirmables⁴ with or without a tag are equipped with a final falling intonation

³ The sociolinguistic *apparent-time* term is based on the assumption that speakers exhibit stable generation-specific speech patterns serving as an indicator for investigating language change (Labov 2010, 107).

contour in LoG. However, confirmables without a tag show a higher relative frequency ratio of rising contours. In addition, Table 8 shows the distribution of tags with regard to prosodic integration into the anchor sentence (core proposition). In 98% of the cases, tags are not prosodically integrated. Moreover, Table 9 reveals that tags mainly occur with a final rising contour in 90% of the cases. A more fine-grained prosodic analysis of the tags *ne* and *nich*, analyzed in Section 4.6, reveals that they are predominantly deployed with similar final intonation, namely rise-to-mid and – to a lesser degree – rise-to-high intonation (Table 10). One exception in the data is the tag *oder was* ('or what'), which is always produced as a prosodically integrated tag. In LoG, all non-integrated tags are latched to the confirmable such that no notable pause between the confirmable and the tag occurs. Overall, the data do not contain any cases of tags as resources to accomplish response pursuits after silences.

Concerning RFCs with a tag, a stable pattern of final falling confirmables with an appended final rising is documented in the data. Notable exceptions concern *oder* ('or'), and *oder was* ('or what'), for which level and falling contours can be observed. Contrary to the study on HG *oder* by Drake (2016) and König (2020), the only *oder*-tagged RFC in the LoG data, which solicits topic talk, is not deployed with a level contour – as assumed by both studies – but with falling intonation. Thus, a robust link between the final intonation of *oder* ('or') and subsequent actions cannot be proclaimed for LoG RFCs. This may also be due to the small number of instances and would have to be investigated in more detail in a follow-up study.

Table 7: Final intonation of the confirmable in LoG

	Final intonation confirmable (<i>n</i> = 200)	Final intonation confirmable without a tag (<i>n</i> = 110/200)	Final intonation confirmable with a tag (<i>n</i> = 90/200)
Rise	56 (28%)	51 (46%)	5 (6%)
Level	1 (0.5%)	1 (1%)	0 (0%)
Fall	143 (71.5%)	58 (53%)	85 (94%)

Table 8: Prosodic integration of tags into confirmable in LoG

	<i>ne</i> (<i>n</i> = 69)	<i>nich</i> (<i>n</i> = 11)	<i>oder</i> (<i>n</i> = 6)	<i>oder wat</i> (<i>n</i> = 2)	<i>oder wann</i> (<i>n</i> = 1)	<i>kann dat</i> (<i>n</i> = 1)	Σ (<i>n</i> = 90)
Non-integrated	69 (100%)	11 (100%)	6 (100%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)	1 (100%)	88 (98%)
Integrated	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (2%)

Table 9: Final contour of tag (only non-integrated tags) in LoG

	<i>ne</i> (<i>n</i> = 69)	<i>nich</i> (<i>n</i> = 11)	<i>oder</i> (<i>n</i> = 6)	<i>oder wann</i> (<i>n</i> = 1)	<i>kann dat</i> (<i>n</i> = 1)	Σ (<i>n</i> = 88)
Rise	65 (94%)	10 (91%)	3 (50%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)	79 (90%)
Level	4 (6%)	1 (9%)	1 (17%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	6 (7%)
Fall	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (33%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	3 (3%)

⁴ According to Betz et al. (2013, 138), *confirmables* “are, in the broadest sense, yes/no-questions. The term ‘confirmable’ allows us to include all turns that make relevant (dis)confirmation, regardless of their syntactic or grammatical composition”. In this study, the term *confirmable* is used in a particular way. It refers to the part of the RFC that sets out the core proposition. For example, declarative RFCs without a tag are defined as a confirmable; in declarative RFCs with a tag, ‘confirmable’ only refers to the proposition before the tag (e.g., in the sentence ‘He’s in town; isn’t he?’, ‘He’s in town’ would be the confirmable; refer to König et al., Forthcoming).

Table 10: Final intonation of the tags *ne* and *nich* in LoG

	<i>ne</i> (<i>n</i> = 69)	<i>nich</i> (<i>n</i> = 11)
Rise-to-mid	50 (72%)	7 (64%)
Rise-to-high	13 (19%)	2 (18%)
Step-up	2 (3%)	1 (9%)
Level	4 (6%)	1 (9%)

5 Resources for responses to RfCs in LoG

5.1 Responsive actions

When speakers ask polar questions like RfCs in interaction, they make confirmation or disconfirmation relevant as a next action (e.g., Raymond 2003, Enfield et al. 2019). In LoG interactions, RfCs predominantly receive confirmatory responses ($n = 141/200$; 70.5%), with 60% being response tokens⁵ ($n = 85/141$), 26% full (-expanded) repeats ($n = 36/141$), and 14% token + repeat combinations ($n = 20/141$). Disconfirming responses occur rather rarely in the data ($n = 19/200$; 9.5%), with 79% being response tokens ($n = 15/19$), 10.5% full-expanded repeats ($n = 2/19$), and 10.5% token + repeat combinations ($n = 2/19$). Only four RfCs do not receive a response in the data ($n = 4/200$; 2%). Since the data could only be analyzed in audio form (see Section 3), these four instances might include pure embodied responses like nods. This finding may therefore be biased due to the data format. Moreover, in 18% of the cases, responses neither confirm, nor disconfirm the previous RfC ($n = 36/200$; $n = 8$ response tokens, $n = 2$ full(-expanded) repeats, $n = 1$ token + repeat combination, $n = 25$ other types). These consist of epistemic disclaimers (e.g., *ik weet nich* ‘I don’t know’), conditional confirmations (e.g., *joa*; Gipper and Groß 2024), additional information (e.g., *un die dochter* ‘and the daughter’), concessive response formats (e.g., *ausgeschlossen is dat nich, aber* ‘this is not excluded, but’), *ja aber* (‘yes but’)-constructions (Szczeppek Reed 2015), and corrections (e.g., A: *sechs* ‘six’; B: *sieben* ‘seven’). The following analyses in Sections 5.2–5.6 will be based on the 196 instances where a response follows the RfC action. Consequently, the denominator will be 196 instead of 200.

5.2 Response tokens

Literature on answering systems distinguishes two semantic systems, a truth-value and a polarity system, as well as two formal systems, a non-echo (‘interjection type⁶’)-system and an echo (‘repetition’)-system (Jones 1999, 42). However, Enfield et al. (2019, 280) criticize this rigid division into interjection vs repeat systems, since most languages use both formats in interaction, just with varying degrees of frequency. Following Raymond (2003), RfCs as a subtype of polar questions prefer equivalents of ‘yes’- or ‘no’-response types. To this point, research distinguishes between marked and unmarked interjection options (Heritage and Raymond 2005, 2012, Stivers 2011, 2022, 91–121). With unmarked (minimal) response tokens, speakers just do the action of (plain) confirmation to a prior question (Raymond 2003). Marked response tokens can be subdivided into upgraded, downgraded, and acquiescent interjections (Stivers 2022, 93), challenging the asking itself, the answerability or

⁵ Due to issues in the inter-coder reliability check, partial repeats were excluded from the network’s study (refer to König et al., Forthcoming; see also Section 5.6). About 16% of the confirming response tokens ($n = 14/85$) and 27% of the disconfirming response tokens ($n = 4/15$) are combined with a partial repeat in the LoG data. Thus, if partial repeats were included in the coding scheme, the number of token + repeat combinations would be even higher.

⁶ This article uses the terms *interjection type* and *response token* interchangeably. All papers in the Special Issue prefer the term *response token*, while Enfield et al. (2019) refer to response tokens as *interjections*. Both are part of what Jones (1999) calls the *non-echo answering system*. The same applies to *repeats* (articles in this Special Issue) and *repetitions* (Enfield et al. 2019). Jones (1999) treats these formats as part of the *echo-answering system*. However, all terms refer to the same phenomena.

Table 11: Response tokens used for (dis)confirming RfCs with positive polarity in LoG

	Response tokens	Frequency (<i>n</i> = 104)	Variants and combinations
'Yes'-type responses (confirming)	<i>ja</i> 'yes [HG]'	84	<i>ja</i> (49), <i>jo</i> (13), <i>ja ja</i> (7), <i>ja siker</i> ('yes sure') (4), <i>jau</i> (2), <i>ja eben</i> ('yes as I said') (2), <i>ja genau</i> ('yes exactly') (2), <i>ja hm_hm</i> (1), <i>ja ja ja</i> (1), <i>ja klar</i> ('yes of course') (1), <i>ja richtig</i> ('yes correct') (1), <i>ja hm</i> (1)
	<i>jo</i> 'yes [LG]'		
	<i>jau</i> 'yes [LG]'		
	<i>richtig</i> 'correct'		
	<i>hm_hm</i>		
'No'-type responses (disconfirming)	<i>genau</i> 'exactly'	1	<i>hm_hm ja</i> (1)
	<i>nä</i> 'no'	3	<i>genau ja</i> (1)
	<i>nee</i> 'no'	1	<i>nä nä nä</i> (2)
	<i>nein</i> 'no'	6	
		3	<i>nein nein nein</i> (1)

the action agenda of a prior question. In this section, we will analyze different response tokens and the interactional work they do as part of the 'answer possibility space' (Stivers 2022, 3) in LoG interaction. We will learn that both response formats play a strong role in the data.

In 67% of the cases in the LoG data, the responses include at least one response token of a 'yes'- or 'no'-type ($n = 132/196$ [with repeat combinations; for details on the minimality of response tokens see Section 5.5]; $n = 105$ confirming; $n = 17$ disconfirming; $n = 10$ neither confirming nor disconfirming; $n = 109/196$ [56% without repeat combinations]). In the following, we will focus on confirming and disconfirming response tokens ($n = 122$). Research on answers to polar questions stresses the importance of a question's polarity for the preference organization and the response constraints (e.g., Jones 1999, 8–14). Thus, Table 11 first provides the confirming and disconfirming response tokens and their variants in response to RfCs with positive polarity ($n = 104$). The quantitative assignment is based on the first response token of the responsive action.

The data show that RfCs with positive polarity are predominantly confirmed with variants of 'yes'-response tokens. When studying variety contact of response particles, the assignment of response tokens to one or another variety is methodologically challenging. The historical development and the regional distribution of response tokens are important factors to consider. Regarding the variety contact between HG and LoG, Table 11 reveals that the HG token *ja* ('yes') prevails in the data, followed by the LoG variant *jo* ('yes'; Damme [2015, column 463] for the classification of *jo* 'yes' as a LoG response token). Similar to modal markers (Section 4.3), a growing structural convergence of LoG toward HG is observable, especially when it comes to combinations of response tokens (e.g., *ja genau* 'yes exactly' or *ja eben* 'yes as I said'). In contrast to these forms of structural convergence, the unmarked response token *hm_hm*, which Deppermann et al. (2024) describe as very common for HG, is not frequently deployed in the LoG data. Regarding disconfirming responses in Table 11, the tokens *nee* ('no') and *nä* ('no') prevail. Historically, *nee* [ne:] ('no') has its roots in LoG (*nēn* in Middle LoG; see Kluge and Mitzka 1960, 506). However, today, it is used as a supraregional response token (Elspeß and Möller 2004; see also Imo 2017 and Deppermann et al. 2024 on *nee* in HG data). As for *nä* ('no'), there are no empirical studies on its regional distribution or variety-based specifics. In the study by Damme (2015, column 463), *nä* ('no') appears in a lexical entry in the Westphalian LoG dictionary. Its origin, however, seems to be in the Upper Saxon area (Adelung 1798, column 463). Today, *nä* [nɛ] ('no') also seems to be used both in LoG and in HG (Imo 2017 on *nä* in HG). In the following, we will not treat the use of *nee* ('no') and *nä* ('no') as variety specific. The HG variant *nein* ('no') occurs infrequently in the data, which is in line with existing research (Imo 2017, Deppermann et al. 2024).

In the LoG data, the HG variant *ja* ('yes') is deployed as both a minimal response and a non-minimal response, predominantly in combination with a repeat (see Section 5.5 for a discussion of token + repeat combinations). Minimal HG *ja* ('yes') occurs as an unmarked closure-implicative token in two sequential environments. First, it is used in series of little questions, as Extract (16) shows. Jakob and Theo are looking at an old picture of Theo's parental home. In lines 02 and 04, HG *ja* ('yes') is used as a minimal response token to the previous RfC that prefers a minimal response. These occurrences follow the maxim described by Heritage and Raymond (2012, 184): 'little questions get little answers' (see also Heritage and Sorjonen 1994). In the majority of the cases, RfCs in this environment are formatted as tag questions.

Extract 16: LoG-BÖR01_08 (00:05:59 – 00:06:08), No. 5/6

- 01 Jakob: DAT is mÜllers FRED siene; =ne,
This belongs to <name>; right?
- 02 Theo: (0.5) ((smacks)) **ja**;
Yes
- 03 Jakob: un DÜT (-) DÜT is_n mEstfol hier; =ne,
And that that is a dung heap; isn't it?
- 04 Theo: **ja**;
Yes

Second, HG *ja* ('yes') as an unmarked response is deployed in understanding checks, realized as side sequences, or what Enfield et al. (2019, 284) call *subordinate action sequences*. Consider (17). In line 01, Tina manages a recipient-oriented topic change by deploying a telling question to Lukas on a surgery of his acquaintance Samuel. In lines 03–04, Lukas launches a side sequence to clarify person reference by proposing the origin of Samuel with an RfC formatted as a tag question. Tina minimally confirms Lukas' RfC with HG *ja* ('yes'), thus accepting the terms of the prior questioning and closing the side sequence. Lukas moves "quickly back to the main line of action" (Enfield et al. 2019, 291) and starts giving information about the surgery. RfCs prior to HG *ja* ('yes') are predominantly formatted as tag questions or – though less frequently – as phrases.

Extract 17: LoG-BÖR01_07 (00:01:55 – 00:02:03), No. 18

- 01 Tina: eeren sAmuel (.) was UK nu operIert;
(Your) Samuel underwent surgery;
- 02 Lukas: °h ja;
Yes
- 03 (0.3) an de (.) Usen SAMuel;
Our Samuel
- 04 dE in DÖRpen; [ni]ch?
The one from Dörpen; right?
- 05 Tina: **[ja]**;
Yes
- 06 Lukas: den SELben arzt den MI operiert hat-
The same doctor who operated on me

In contrast to HG *ja* ('yes'), the LoG response token *jo* ('yes') is for the most part not used as a minimal response token, but in combination with other components – mostly repeats or marked tokens like in (18) (see also Extract 25 in Section 5.5). Prior to the extract, Helga tells Jakob about an LoG teacher from the neighboring village. In line 01, Jakob launches an RfC to clarify person reference, which Theo confirms with the LoG response token *jo* ('yes') and the marked token *richtig* ('correct') in line 03. In contrast to HG *ja* ('yes'), LoG *jo* ('yes') is mainly deployed within marked interjection responses to RfCs, claiming agency and epistemic authority over a matter at hand.

Extract 18: LoG-BÖR01_08 (00:02:48 – 00:02:50), No. 4

- 01 Jakob: aber dE_s ja hier uk LEHrerin;
But she is a teacher here
- 02 Theo: <<f> **jo**,
Yes
- 03 RIChtig;>
Correct

LoG *jau* ('yes') is deployed as an infrequent minimal response token. In contrast to LoG *jo* ('yes'), *jau* ('yes') is more sequence closure implicative – mostly after an extended sequence as in (19). Gisela informs Sebastian in line 01 that the recording device is running. After a first possible sequence closure in line 04, Sebastian resumes the issue in line 06 with the RfC *dann dö_t dat nau* ('so it works'), requesting confirmation regarding the proper functioning of the equipment. In line 07, Gisela confirms the RfC with the LoG response token *jau* ('yes'), thereby (re-)confirming her prior proposition and closing the sequence. In comparison to HG *ja* ('yes'), *jau* ('yes') closes extended sequences and is therefore used as a more marked token in its function as a sequence closure device.⁷

Extract 19: LoG-STEVO2 (00:00:01 – 00:00:09), No. 132

- 01 Gisela: so JETZ löppt_et;
Okay now it works
- 02 Sebastian: (0.7) ja?
Yes (really?)
- 03 Gisela: wEnn (.) wenn DE teken do chOt;
When the digits are running there
- 04 Sebastian: ja;
Yes
- 05 (1.5)
- 06 Sebastian: dAnn DÖ_t dat nAU;
So it works;
- 07 Gisela: (0.3) **jau**;
Yes
- 08 Sebastian: (0.5) gut;
Okay

Concerning disconfirming responses to RfCs, the supraregional token *nee* ('no') occurs as the most frequent unmarked response token in the LoG data. In the majority of cases, *nee* ('no') is deployed as a minimal response token prosodically integrated into the following TCU with no particular prosodic mark-up, as in (20). Prior to the extract, Anna tells Heinz that she will visit a mutual acquaintance for her birthday. In lines 01–02, Heinz deploys an RfC, insinuating that she is having a big party on the day of her actual birthday. Anna responds with *nee* ('no') that is prosodically integrated with the following disconfirming action. It is thus used in *preface*-position (Heritage 1998, 292), projecting same-speaker turn continuation.

Extract 20: LoG-HES01_09_07 (00:00:26 – 00:00:29), No. 86

- 01 Heinz: un de FIERT vandaage;
And she is celebrating today
- 02 UP_n dAch;
On her actual (birth)day
- 03 Anna: **nee die fiert GAR nich**;
No she_3.P.Sg. celebrates absolutely not
No she isn't celebrating at all

⁷ The RfC in Extract (19) does not only check Sebastian's understanding of the situation, it may also be understood as a disaffiliative action. Declaratively formatted questions have been discussed as disaffiliative actions when they are deployed as re-confirmations on something said previously, thereby halting the progressivity of the ongoing sequence (e.g., Antaki 2012, Steensig and Larsen 2008, Küttner and Ehmer 2024). Through the informing provided by Gisela in line 01, Sebastian should know the recording device is functioning properly. Because of the disaffiliative character of the RfC due to its sequential positioning, the LoG response token *jau* ('yes') can also be analyzed as a more marked way of closing a sequence compared to HG *ja* ('yes').

In contrast to *nee* ('no'), the response token *nä* ('no') is frequently used as a marked response, challenging the presupposition or the askability of a prior question. Consider (21). The two siblings, Clara and Benno, discuss whether their uncle needs more care. In lines 01–03, Clara asks Benno if he knew whether their cousin would soon visit their uncle. After displaying resistance to the question's agenda in line 04, Benno responds to the RfC of Clara in line 05 with the marked interjection *nä* ('no'), rejecting the presupposition of the question that he could have knowledge about the matter at hand. A second attempt by Clara in lines 07–08 is also highly rejected by Benno with the HG response token *nein* ('no') in line 09.

Extract 21: LoG-LEV01 (00:15:39 – 00:23:06), No. 168

- 01 Clara: dat wOll ik di jetz GÜStern frOgn;
I wanted to ask you that yesterday
- 02 wat hEff use couSENK;
What has our cousin
- 03 hEff de Irgendwie [AFF]-
Has he something
- 04 Benno: [!MI!] wulls du dat frogn?
You want to ask ME that?
- 05 Clara: ja ih drEppet ja HÄUfiger mol; ne,
You meet from time to time, right?
- 06 Benno: **nä;**
No
- 07 Clara: biem (name of a bar),
At (name of a bar)
- 08 oder biem KORTenspeeln,
Or when playing cards
- 09 Benno: nein;
No

Extract (21) indicates that speakers use HG *nein* ('no') as a marked response token highly rejecting a prior proposition. Consider also (22). In the preceding context, Tina, Theo's wife, got up from the table to turn up the heat. Theo then addresses an RfC to Jakob, asking if he is cold. Jakob emphatically disconfirms the RfC with HG *nein* ('no'), deployed with prosodic mark-up (increased loudness, rise-fall-contour). He adds an assessment (line 03) and a request for halting the action (lines 04–05).

Extract 22: LoG-BÖR01_08 (00:34:23 – 00:34:25), No. 14

- 01 Theo: Is di to KOLT?
Are you cold?
- 02 Jakob: <<f, creaky voice>^NEIN;>
No
- 03 **um gOttes WILlen;**
For god's sake
- 04 (1.5) denn LAT dat-
Then turn it
- 05 (1.2) BLOSS ut;
PRT off

In contrast to RfCs with positive polarity, RfCs with negative polarity are confirmed with variants of 'no'-response tokens. Table 12 provides the different response tokens following RfCs with negative polarity in the LoG data.

Table 12: Response tokens used for (dis)confirming RfCs with negative polarity in LoG

	Response tokens	Frequency ($n = 18$)	Variants and combinations
'No'-type responses (confirming)	<i>nee</i> 'no'	11	<i>nee</i> ; <i>nee nee</i> (1)
	<i>nä</i> 'no'	5	<i>na</i> ; <i>nä</i> (1)
Disconfirming responses	<i>doch</i>	1	
'Yes'-type responses	<i>jo</i> 'yes'	1	

Concerning the different negative polarity items outlined in Section 4.2, RfCs with mere syntactic (e.g., *nich*) or lexical/derivational negation markers (e.g., *kein*, *nix*) show no difference in the preference for upcoming response tokens. With 61% of the cases, the supraregional variant *nee* ('no') is the most common way of confirming an RfC with negative polarity ($n = 11/18$), followed by *nä* ('no') in 28% of the cases ($n = 5/18$). Regarding *nee* ('no'), considerable differences occur in responses to RfCs with negative and positive polarity. Consider (23). Heidi and Annika talk about their farsighted glasses. In lines 01–02, Annika invokes the common ground that Heidi is not as shortsighted as she is by using an RfC equipped with the modal particle *ja* ('yes'). In line 03, Heidi confirms the RfC with the minimal response token *nee* ('no') with falling intonation. While *nee* ('no') following RfCs with positive polarity is predominantly deployed as a preface to other disconfirming actions, *nee* ('no') following RfCs with negative polarity is applied as an unmarked confirming response token in a TCU in its own right.

Extract 23: LoG-HES02_06 (00:11:32 – 00:11:35), No. 80

- 01 Annika: du bist ja auch nich GANZ so-
You are not
 02 (0.2) STARK kurzsichtig wie Ik;=ne-
As shortsighted as I am, right?
 03 Heidi: **(0.4) nee;**
No

Nä ('no') following RfCs with negative polarity is commonly deployed with an affective stance toward the RfC proposition and at the same time contests the askability of the prior question, that is the question's presupposition "that both yes and no are possible answers" (Stivers 2011, 86). Consider (24). Svenja talks about her struggle to stop smoking by naming typical situations in which she threatens to relapse from abstinence. In line 04, Svenja confirms Anna's RfC with the response token *nä* ('no'). She thus treats the alternative of the previous RfC that she could suffer a relapse as inconceivable. In sum, *nä* ('no') following RfCs with negative and positive polarity belong to the group of marked interjections (Stivers 2011). Prosodically, *nä* ('no') can be used with more (e.g., Extract 6) or less prosodic mark-up (e.g., Extracts 21 and 24) in LoG interaction.

Extract 24: LoG-HES01_07_09 (00:13:44 – 00:13:49), No. 105

- 01 Svenja: (0.5) un dann möchte_ik mi UK wall-
And then I would also like to (light a cigarette)
 02 (0.6) mo [Ä:bn]-
Just for a moment
 03 Anna: [aber] das DEI_s nich; =ne?
But you don't do that; don't you?
 04 Svenja: **nä;**
No
 05 NÖ nö;
No no

Disconfirming responses to negative polar questions are designed with HG *doch* (e.g., Pittner 2007, Couper-Kuhlen and Selting 2018, 247–8). *Wohl*, which is also described as a typical disconfirming response token in LoG and North HG (Turco et al. 2014), was not found in the LoG data.⁸ As for *doch* in HG, consider again (14). Heidi launches an RfC in line 02, presupposing that there are different knowledge states about her last encounter with Annika. Annika disconfirms the proposition with *doch* in line 03. She thus claims to have seen Heidi and counters the negative polarity of the prior RfC.

Extract 14: LoG-HES02_06 (00:01:31 – 00:01:32), No. 78 (shortened)

- 02 Heidi: `awer du HAS mi ni seijn;=ne,`
 But you didn't see me; right?
 03 Annika: <<f> **DOCH;**
 Yes

Besides confirming 'no'-response tokens and the disconfirming item *doch*, Table 11 also shows one instance of a 'yes'-type response token used to respond to RfCs with negative polarity. As analyzed in Section 4.2 (Extract 9), 'yes'-response tokens mainly occur after RfCs with *nich* as a modal particle and therefore cannot be defined as proper NPQs.

Overall, the LoG data suggest a polarity response system, where the use of response token types is determined by the polarity of the prior RfC. In particular, the LoG response token system is a *three-form system*, which contains 'yes'- and 'no'-type tokens as well as additional forms like HG *doch*, which “counter the bias of a negative question” (Jones 1999, 42). Due to variety contact, LoG exhibits a large basic positive and negative response system, containing tokens that can be unequivocally characterized as HG (e.g., *ja* 'yes' or *doch* 'yes (objecting)') or as LoG (e.g., *jo* 'yes' and *jau* 'yes'). Yet, other tokens are not variety specific (e.g., *nee* 'no' or *nä* 'no'). As for non-variety-specific tokens, *nee* ('no') seems to be used as an unmarked token, while *nä* ('no') challenges the askability or the presuppositions of the previous RfC. Regarding variety-specific tokens, it is noticeable that HG response tokens serve as more unmarked ways of responding to a prior RfC, while LoG tokens are used in a more marked way (for an exception, see the use of *nein* ['no'], which is also a marked response token in HG). However, we also see that LoG tokens persist more strongly in confirmations than in disconfirmations. Given that confirmations are preferred over disconfirmations (Stivers et al. 2009), a preference-induced effect is observable as the higher frequency of confirmations might enhance persistence with regard to the LoG 'yes'-token types.⁹

5.3 Clusters of response tokens

In the LoG data, clusters show a low-frequency ratio ($n = 20/132$; 15%). They include forms like *ja siker* ('yes sure'; $n = 5$), *ja eben* ($n = 2$), *ja richtig* ('yes correct'; $n = 1$), *ja genau* ('yes exactly'; $n = 2$), *ja klar* ('yes sure'; $n = 1$), double sayings like *ja ja* ('yes yes'; $n = 7$), and multiple sayings like *nein nein nein* ('no no no'; $n = 1$) or *nä nä nä* ('no no no'; $n = 1$).¹⁰ All clusters do more than simply confirm the RfC. They reinforce the (dis-)confirmatory action, display epistemic primacy, or serve as devices to “properly halt course of action” (Stivers 2004, 260).

5.4 Position of the first response token

Section 5.2 reveals that in only 67% of the cases, the responses include one or more response token(s) in the LoG data ($n = 132/196$; including combinations). In the vast majority of cases, these response tokens occur in

⁸ This does not mean that *wohl* does not exist as a response particle in LoG (anymore). Evidence might be found in a larger data set.

⁹ I would like to thank one of the reviewers for this valuable idea of a preference-induced effect.

¹⁰ Responses starting with a minimal token (e.g., *ja* 'yes') followed by a cluster (e.g., *ja ja* 'yes yes') were not counted as a “cluster.” Therefore, the numbers in Section 5.3 may differ from the numbers in Tables 11 and 12.

turn-initial position ($n = 120/132$; 91%). Eleven instances are used in the turn-final position, occurring mainly after repeats and being closure-implicative. Only in one instance is the response token deployed in mid-TCU-position.

5.5 Minimal and non-minimal responses

Answers containing a response token in the LoG data are designed either minimally, i.e., solo with a stand-alone response token ($n = 43/132$, 33%; e.g., Extracts 16 and 17), or non-minimally, i.e., a response token combined with other components ($n = 89/132$; 67%; e.g., Extract 9). Second response slots (Raymond 2013) in responses to RfCs accomplish many different actions in LoG interaction, e.g., assessments (e.g., Extract 22), corrections, further topic-related informings, accounts, or repeats. In the following, an in-depth analysis of response token + repeat combinations is provided ($n = 23/132$; 17%). In both combinations, response tokens are almost exclusively limited to confirming ‘yes’-type responses. By contrast, confirming ‘no’-response tokens or disconfirming ‘no’-response tokens are found rarely in combination with repeats. Thus, repeat + response token combinations predominantly accomplish confirmations in LoG interaction.

[‘yes’-token] + [repeat]

Extract (25) illustrates a ‘yes’-token + repeat combination in LoG interaction. In the preceding conversation, Svenja elaborates on an encounter with the local priest. In line 01, Heinz launches a phrasal RfC focusing on the origin of this priest. Svenja confirms the RfC with a [yes] + [repeat]-format. Using *jo* (‘yes’), Svenja first seems to accept all terms of the prior RfC. However, by combining *jo* (‘yes’) with a full repeat in the second response slot in line 03, Svenja partially retracts her acceptance by displaying agency over the proposition. She confirms only this spatial alternative compared to other spatially close alternatives that might be projected due to the use of the QT *oder* (‘or’; Drake 2016). The co-occurrence between LoG *jo* (‘yes’) and a full repeat reveals that *jo* (‘yes’) is rather used as a more marked confirmation token in the answer possibility space of LoG speakers (see also Section 5.2).

Extract 25: LoG-HES01_09_07 (00:05:45 – 00:05:47), No. 97

- 01 Heinz: NEUwerlte; =oder-
Neuwerlte; right
02 Svenja: **jo**;
Yes
03 **NEUwerlte**;
Neuwerlte

[repeat] + [yes-token]

Heritage and Raymond (2012) describe the deferred use of type-conforming response tokens as a practice to register qualifications. In LoG, repeats in this format do not display qualifications, but highlight epistemic agency in order to manage sequence closure and secure expansion of a previous turn. Consider again (13). By using a repeat, Ben asserts his epistemic rights over the matter at hand, which seem to be endangered by the preceding independent understanding display of Paul. In this excerpt, the speaker not only confirms the RfC, he also confirms that he has alluded to the categorization of these people as *Bankmenschen* (‘banking people’) with his prior turn in line 03 (Schegloff 1996). However, confirming allusion practices do not prevail in [repeat] + [token] combinations (see also Section 5.6 on confirming allusion practices). The response token in line 08 has a double-barreled nature: it confirms the previous understanding display together with the repeat as a marker of agency, but it also serves as a sequence closure-implicative device (Imo 2013, 188–9).

Extract 13: LoG-GEL01_02 (00:02:41 – 00:02:49), No. 52 (shortened)

- 03 °h (-) mh bi de (-) BAYrische hypo,
 At the bavarian hypo (bank)
- 04 Paul: achSO;
 Oh I see
- 05 BANKmens[chen];
 Banking people
- 06 Ben: [bank]-
 Bank
- 07 **BANKmenschen**;
 Banking people
- 08 =~ja,
 Yes

5.6 Full and expanded repeats

Yes/no-response tokens are described as the most frequent and type-conforming way of responding to polar questions like RfCs (Raymond 2003, Enfield et al. 2019). However, certain languages tend to be so-called ‘echo systems’, in which repeats serve as the most conventionalized way of confirming a polar question (Sadock and Zwicky (1985) and Jones (1999) on *Welsh*; Enfield et al. (2019) on *Tzeltal*). Existing research has described response tokens both as unmarked and as marked types of the answer possibility space (Section 5.2). Repeats, however, are almost exclusively described as marked responses in interaction (Schegloff 1996, Raymond 2003, Stivers 2005, Heritage and Raymond 2012).

‘Markedness’ of repeats is defined at very different levels: (1) on a semantic basis, as repeats assert a prior proposition rather than simply assent to it (Enfield et al. 2019, 284–5); (2) overall frequency, as repeats are often less frequent than response tokens (Enfield et al. 2019, 281), (3) epistemic, sequential, and thematic agency, as recipients claim “epistemic rights over the information required than the original polar question conceded” (Heritage and Raymond 2012, 187; see also Enfield et al. 2019, 292), and (4) sequential positioning, as repeats predominantly do not occur in minimal side sequences, but in ‘primary actions’ that bring new information to the talk (Enfield et al. 2019, 283–4). However, some studies on languages exhibiting a high number of repeats show that repeats are used as unmarked responses in subsidiary sequences (e.g., Keevallik 2010, Brown et al. 2021, Harjunpää and Ostermann 2023). Moreover, these languages also challenge the semantic argument with a minimality–maximality continuum of repeats, where verb-type repeats reassert the prior proposition only minimally (e.g., Hakulinen 2001, Harjunpää and Ostermann 2023). Moreover, Harjunpää and Ostermann (2023, 104–5) argue against the idea of repeats being markers of epistemic agency that in RfCs “the recipient’s greater agentive/epistemic role is sequentially implicated..., which would seem to reduce the need to specifically claim epistemic or agentive rights.”

LoG as a non-standard language exhibits the highest frequencies of repeat responses across the ten languages investigated in the research network (32% of the data; $n = 63/196$; Pfeiffer et al. Forthcoming) – together with the indigenous language Yurakaré (Gipper, Forthcoming). In the network’s framework only full and full-expanded repeats were included in the study; partial repeats were excluded due to inter-coder reliability issues (König et al. Forthcoming). Concerning the syntactic format of repeats in LoG, phrasal and clausal types prevail in the data. Verb-type repeats like in Finnish or Brazilian Portuguese are not grammaticalized in LoG. In 63% of the cases, repeats are used as stand-alone features ($n = 40/63$), while in 37% of the data, the repeat is combined with a response token ($n = 23/63$). 29% of these cases are full-expanded repeats ($n = 18/63$).¹¹ Full-expanded repeats are deployed as both confirming and disconfirming responsive actions in the

¹¹ According to the research network’s framework, full repeats are defined as utterances that reproduce the prior RfC proposition without any deletions. Full-expanded responses repeat the prior RfC and add lexical elements (such as adjectives). We also allow for

LoG data, always displaying some form of epistemic agency to a prior proposition. In over 71% of the cases, the repeat is a full repeat of the prior RfC ($n = 45/63$ ($n = 27$ repeat only, $n = 18$ repeat + token combinations)). Using overall frequency as a criterion for *markedness* (Enfield et al. 2019), repeats seem to be marked response types (roughly 67% response tokens vs 32% repeats). Frequency, however, can be measured in different ways: (a) as an overall frequency, or (b) as an action-based frequency, counting frequencies in a specific sequential environment. The latter approach will be the basis of the following analyses. Since the results on full-expanded repeats do not contribute any new insights, the focus of the article is on full repeats without combinations.

Full repeats in the LoG data always confirm the prior RfC action.¹² The data feature that stand alone full repeats predominantly follow understanding checks ($n = 14/27$; 52%), understanding displays ($n = 12/27$; 44%) or allusions (Schegloff 1996; $n = 1/27$; 4%) in the LoG data. RfCs as topic-proffers or as ‘little questions’, however, are almost exclusively responded to with response tokens. Understanding check sequences as subordinate lines of actions are backward-oriented and prefer minimal responses. However, understanding checks do not only attract (minimal) response tokens (Section 5.2), but also full repeats in LoG interaction. In the majority of cases, these understanding checks are formatted as phrasal RfCs. Consider again Extract (5). Anna is telling about an invitation to a guided tour of a food company called *Apetito*. In lines 03–04, Heinz launches an understanding check in a side sequence by first deploying the open-class repair initiator *wie* (‘what do you mean’), followed by the candidate *bi appetito* (‘At appetito’s’). Anna confirms the RfC in line 05 by using a full repeat with a final falling intonation, thus closing the sequence and moving back to the main line of action in line 06. In line 07, Heinz adds the sequence-closing third *hm_hm*.

Extract 5: LoG-HES01_07_09 (00:23:12 – 00:23:20), No. 108

- 01 Anna: un: bÜnt da ja mo wÄ:n up EINladung;
 I was invited there once
 02 von (.) von müllers HERbert;
 By Herbert Müller
 03 Heinz: (0.2) wie-
 What do you mean
 04 bi apeTito;
 At Apetito's (German company that produces food)
 05 Anna: **bi apeTito**;
 At Apetito's
 06 d[e HETT] de: °hh-
 They have they
 07 Heinz: [hm_hm]
 information receipt

Regarding full repeats as *marked* options, frequency does not serve as a criterion for markedness in understanding check sequences. Minimal response tokens and repeats do not considerably differ based on the action-based frequency ratio in the LoG data ($n = 16$ minimal response tokens; $n = 14$ repeats). With regard to action ascription on the basis of sequential positioning, repeats can be analyzed as unmarked minimal ways of confirming a prior understanding check. Full repeats “seem to claim just the appropriate amount of rights for continuing the action in a way that the question warrants” (Harjunpää and Ostermann 2023, 104). This ascription as an unmarked response is also supported on a prosodic level. The repeat is not equipped with a

deictic and pronominal shifts, pronominalizations, the omission of tags, connectives, inference markers or modulations in the definition of full-(expanded) repeats. Moreover, we allow for the addition or omission of negation particles (for an overview, refer to König et al., Forthcoming).

¹² The prevalence of confirming repeats in the data might be biased by the exclusion of partial repeats, which have among others been discussed as practices to accomplish disconfirmations (Heritage and Raymond 2012, 190–2).

Extract 26: LoG-BÖR03_09_10 (00:05:24 – 00:05:31), No. 42

- 01 Walter: weil (.) wEil ik den rest HOLT noch wall Äben_n bItken wall äh-
Because I want to catch up on the rest of the woods
- 02 (0.5) vör_n Obnd INholn wullt;
For the evenings
- 03 Petra: (0.5) ut_n WALD;
From the forest
- 04 Walter: **ut_n WALD;**
From the forest
- 05 Petra: (0.8) WUNner?
When

Section 5.6 discusses different criteria of markedness and how these criteria can be applied to the action ascription of full repeats as (un-)marked response types in LoG interaction. As for the criterion of sequential positioning, the analysis indicates that full repeats sufficiently confirm previous RfCs in understanding check sequences. These subsidiary actions prefer minimal responses, which leads to a reconstruction of repeats as more unmarked responses in this context. As for the criterion of agency, the analyses reveal different degrees of agency that a speaker can index with a repeat in LoG interaction. In understanding check sequences, agency might be displayed due to the flatter epistemic gradient by the prior phrasal RfC, however, this display is rather minute compared to the index of agency with full repeats after understanding displays or as confirming allusions practices. As for the criterion of frequency, the action-based frequency of full repeats vs response tokens in understanding check sequences feature no significant difference between both response options. Thus, frequency does not serve as a criterion for ‘markedness’ in this environment. As for the semantic criterion, the research literature has discussed verb-type repeats as rather minimal ways of asserting a prior RfC. In LoG, verb-type repeats are not grammaticalized as responsive means of interaction. However, the analysis in Section 5.6 revealed that full repeats in understanding check sequences seem to be attracted by phrasal RfCs – a syntactically reduced variant of repeats compared to clausal repeats. RfCs formatted as tag questions in understanding check sequences seem to attract the minimal HG response token *ja* (‘yes’). Thus, the limitation of full repeats as responses to syntactically reduced phrasal RfCs leads to a categorization more on the minimal end of the minimality-maximality continuum of repeats (e.g., Hakulinen 2001). In sum, the sequential positioning of repeats in subordinate lines of actions, its prosodic design, the limitation to phrasal RfCs, and the action-based relative frequencies with minimal response tokens support the analysis of full repeats as being relatively unmarked response types in LoG.

6 Conclusion

This article detailed some particularities of the RfC question and response design in LoG talk-in-interaction. As for the syntactic design of RfCs, declarative and phrasal types prevail. Moreover, RfCs in LoG frequently contain forms of modulation, e.g., modal particles to index a specific epistemic stance, and tags as attached resources to RfCs. In addition to analyzing frequently deployed design features, this article also examined resources that contribute less frequently to the design of RfCs in LoG. For example, negative polarity as a means of displaying an epistemic stance is not frequently used in LoG RfCs. Furthermore, RfCs are only rarely marked as inferences from a prior speaker’s turn.

As for the LoG response system, three main conclusions can be drawn from this study. First, confirming responses to RfCs outweigh disconfirming responses. This is in line with the results of Stivers et al.’s (2009) comparative study that found an overall (universal) preference for confirmations over disconfirmations. Second, the LoG data suggest a polarity and no truth-value responding system to RfCs, which means that the polarity of the prior RfC determines the preference of the following response form. Third, LoG seems to be

a language between the poles of token- and repeat-type languages, with response tokens being overall more frequent, but repeats also account for a non-negligible share of the data.

In the previous literature, response tokens have been analyzed as marked and unmarked response types, while repeats were classified as marked only. If *markedness* is defined on the basis of the overall frequency ratio, then Enfield et al.'s (2019) generalization that response tokens are preferred over repeats holds also true for LoG. However, the frequency ratio of 68% response tokens vs 32% repeats approximates the one Enfield et al. (2019) observed for Brazilian Portuguese, one of three stand-out cases, which shows a higher reliance on repeat types. The frequency ratio of the LoG data is thus interesting for a Germanic language. Moreover, Enfield et al. (2019, 291) found that “there is no sequential, action, or morpho-syntactic context that we could identify where repetition-type answers were more likely than interjections.” Looking into the action-based frequencies of this study, (minimal) response tokens and repeats occur with similar frequencies in understanding checks. Thus, frequency cannot be applied as a criterion of markedness here. In other sequential environments like series of little questions or topic proffers, however, response tokens clearly prevail in the LoG data.

Concerning *sequential positioning*, previous research on verb-type repeats revealed that repeats mainly occur in responses to requests for new information. By contrast, subordinate lines of actions appear to attract almost exclusively token-based responses (see e.g., Sorjonen (2001, 33–92) on Finnish repeats). The results on LoG repeats are not perfectly comparable to previous research, as verb-type repeats are not grammaticalized in LoG. However, we see that unmarked full repeats are attracted by syntactically reduced – and thus more minimal – phrasal RfCs. Given that *markedness* is defined in a sequentially sensitive manner, repeats in subordinate lines of actions need to be defined as unmarked or minimal means of the answer possibility space. However, we have also learned that repeats compete with HG *ja* (‘yes’) in this environment. Bearing in mind the morpho-syntactic differences of RfCs prior to full repeats and HG *ja* (‘yes’), repeats might be analyzed as low-marked resources displaying epistemic agency to a slightly higher extent than *ja* (‘yes’). However, this difference in the index of agency is minute compared to more marked uses of repeats (e.g., after understanding displays). It should lead us to think about pragmatic markedness not as an ‘either-or’ principle, but more as a continuum of repeats being more or less marked.¹⁴

Finally, this study emphasized the role of variety contact in the investigation of social actions in interaction. For the question design, this article revealed both contact-induced structural convergence of LoG to HG, partly for resources of modulation, inference marking, and connectives, as well as maintenance of language-specific LoG structures in the design of RfCs, e.g., for the modulation marker *wall* or the tags *nich*. Comparing the results of this article with Deppermann et al. (2024) on RfCs in HG, similarities in the question design but also considerable differences in the response design emerge. First, due to the variety contact situation outlined in Section 3, LoG exhibits a larger basic positive and negative response token system containing both HG and LoG token types. On the one hand, the analysis revealed that unmarked responses are mainly formatted with HG tokens, while LoG tokens are mainly deployed as more marked responses. This result raises the question of whether dialectal response tokens generally tend to take on additional functions of stance-taking in the course of variety contact. Jones (1999, 43–4) lends support to this idea by observing stronger modulation of dialectal response tokens for Welsh. This opens up new directions for future interactional research of contact varieties. On the other hand, the data suggest a preference-induced effect as the higher frequency of confirmations might enhance persistence with regard to the LoG ‘yes’-token types. Finally, the comparison with Deppermann et al. (2024) on HG RfCs reveals variety-specific differences in the answer possibility space. It shows that speakers of an HG variety seem to use answer types like repeats differently compared to LoG dialect

¹⁴ Comparing the results of this article and the model study of Enfield et al. (2019) reveals interesting insights and raises further questions. However, a comparison can only be made to a limited extent as (a) only full and full-expanded repeats were included into the network's comparative study, while Enfield et al. (2019) also included partial repeats; (b) Enfield et al. (2019) included body conduct such as head nods into the analysis of interjections, which determined a significant increase of interjection type answers. This study cannot include body conduct into the analysis as the data are available as audio files only; (c) this study concentrates on RfCs while Enfield et al. (2019) examined a wealth of other polar question types (like newsmarks, etc.).

speakers.¹⁵ This study addresses the monolingual bias in CA research on polar questions and answers so far. It shows that there is a value added by including non-standard varieties in interactional linguistic research, allowing us to gain better insights into question and response systems beyond standard languages and the interactional work they do.

Transcription conventions

See Selting et al. (2009) for GAT2 conventions

[]	overlap and simultaneous talk
=	latching
(.)	micropause (shorter than 0.2 s)
(2.85)	measured pause
geht_s	assimilation of words
:, ::, :::	segmental lengthening, according to duration
((laughs))	non-verbal vocal actions and events
akZENT	focal accent
akzEnt	secondary stress
?	pitch rising to high at end of intonation phrase
,	pitch rising to mid
-	level pitch
;	pitch falling to mid
.	pitch falling to low
<<p>>	piano, soft
<<f>	forte, loud
<<h>>	high pitch register
<<p>>	piano, soft
<<all>>	allegro, fast
°h	inbreath, according to duration
h°	outbreath, according to duration
<<creaky voice>>	commentaries regarding voice qualities with indication of scope
(solche)	assumed wording

Abbreviations

HG	High German
LoG	Low German
RfC	Request for confirmation

¹⁵ I would like to thank one reviewer for pointing out, that this discrepancy could also be attributed to two other explanations: The higher amount of repeats in LoG might be (1) an epiphenomenon of different data types in the study on HG and LoG, or (2) an epiphenomenon of different activities and actions, which are part of the HG and LoG data set. As for the first point, the data types of both studies predominantly consist of everyday “make talk”-situations (70–80%) and contain empractic interactions to a comparable extent (20–30%). As for the second point, both studies exhibit a comparable number of understanding checks (HG $n = 39$; LoG $n = 55$). Thus, different activities and actions in the data do not serve as an explanatory basis.

Glossing

See Bickel et al. (2015) on the Leipzig Glossing Rules

2	Person
AUX	Auxiliary
NEG	Negation
QT	Question tag
PL	Plural
PST	Past
PTCP	Participle
PRT	Particle (modal)
SG	Singular

Acknowledgements: I would like to thank all research network members for valuable and intensive discussions about RfCs. In addition, I am also grateful for comments on an earlier draft of the article provided by Katharina König and Martin Pfeiffer. Furthermore, I would like to acknowledge the input from two anonymous referees, who helped me clarify my arguments. Their suggestions improved this article to a great extent. All remaining issues are of course my own responsibility.

Funding information: Work on this article was 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 contributions: 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.

References

- Adelung, Johann Christoph. 1798. *Grammatisch-kritisches Wörterbuch der hochdeutschen Mundart, mit beständiger Vergleichung der übrigen Mundarten, besonders aber der Oberdeutschen; Volume 3 (M-Scr)*. Leipzig: Breitkopf.
- Adler, Astrid, Christiane Ehlers, Reinhard Goltz, Andrea Kleene, and Albrecht Plewnia. 2018. *The current status and use of Low German. Initial results of a representative study*. Mannheim: Institut für Deutsche Sprache.
- Antaki, Charles. 2012. “Affiliative and Disaffiliative Candidate Understandings.” *Discourse Studies* 14 (5): 531–47.
- Betz, Emma, Carmen Taleghani-Nikazm, Veronika Drake, and Andrea Golato. 2013. “Third-position Repeats in German: The Case of Repair- and Request-for-Information Sequences.” *Gesprächsforschung – Online Zeitschrift zur verbalen Interaktion* 14: 133–66.
- Bickel, Balthasar, Bernard Comrie, and Martin Haspelmath. 2015. *The Leipzig Glossing Rules*. Available online at <https://www.eva.mpg.de/lingua/resources/glossing-rules.php>, checked on 2/29/2024.
- Bolden, Galina B., John Heritage, and Marja-Leena Sorjonen, eds. 2023. *Responding to Polar Questions across Languages and Contexts*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins (Studies in language and social interaction (SLSI) 35).
- Brown, Penelope, Mark A. Sicoli, and Olivier Le Guen. 2021. “Cross-speaker Repetition and Epistemic Stance in Tzeltal, Yucatec, and Zapotec Conversations.” *Journal of Pragmatics* 183: 256–72.
- Bublitz, Wolfram. 1978. *Ausdrucksweisen der Sprechereinstellung im Deutschen und im Englischen. Untersuchungen zur Syntax, Semantik und Pragmatik der deutschen Modalpartikeln und Vergewisserungsfragen und ihrer englischen Entsprechungen*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- Burkhardt, Arnim. 1982. “Gesprächswörter. Ihre lexikologische Bestimmung und lexikographische Beschreibung.” In *Konzepte zur Lexikographie. Studien zur Bedeutungserklärung in einsprachigen Wörterbüchern*, edited by Wolfgang Mentrup, 138–71. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- Couper-Kuhlen, Elizabeth and Margret Selting. 2018. *Interactional Linguistics. Studying Language in Social Interaction*. Cambridge, New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Damme, Robert. 2015. *Westfälisches Wörterbuch; Band 3, H-L*. Kiel, Hamburg: Wachholtz.

- Deppermann, Arnulf, Alexandra Gubina, Katharina König, and Martin Pfeiffer. 2024. "Request for Confirmation Sequences in German." *Open Linguistics* 10 (1): 20240008. doi: 10.1515/opli-2024-0008.
- Drake, Veronika. 2016. "German Questions and Turn-Final Oder." *Gesprächsforschung - Online Zeitschrift zur verbalen Interaktion* 17: 168–95.
- Drew, Paul. 2018. "Inferences and Indirectness in Interaction." *Open Linguistics* 4 (1): 241–59. doi: 10.1515/opli-2018-0013.
- Duden. 2006. *Die Grammatik. Unentbehrlich für richtiges Deutsch: nach den Regeln der neuen deutschen Rechtschreibung 2006*. Mannheim: Dudenverlag.
- Elspaß, Stephan and Robert Möller. 2004. *Atlas zur deutschen Alltagssprache (AdA), Round 1 (nein (Lautform))*. Available online at <https://www.atlas-alltagssprache.de/runde-1/f10/>, checked on 2/29/2024.
- Elspaß, Stephan and Robert Möller. 2005. *Atlas zur deutschen Alltagssprache (AdA) Round 2 (gell?/oder?)*. Available online at <https://www.atlas-alltagssprache.de/runde-2/f19a-b/>, checked on 2/29/2024.
- Enfield, Nick J., Tanya Stivers, and Stephen C. Levinson. 2010. "Question–response Sequences in Conversation Across Ten Languages: An Introduction." *Journal of Pragmatics* 42 (10): 2615–9.
- Enfield, Nick J., Tanya Stivers, Penelope Brown, Christina Englert, Katariina Harjunpää, Makoto Hayashi, Trine Heinemann, et al. 2019. "Polar Answers." *Journal of Linguistics* 55 (2): 277–304.
- Frey, Natascha. 2010. "Frage-Tags im Schweizerdeutschen: Alles klar, oder?" In *Alemannische Dialektologie. Wege in die Zukunft; Beiträge zur 16. Arbeitstagung für Alemannische Dialektologie in Freiburg/Fribourg vom 07. - 10.09.2008*, edited by Helen Christen, Sibylle Germann, Walter Haas, Nadia Montefiori, and Hans Ruef, 85–96. Stuttgart: Steiner.
- Gipper, Sonja and Alexandra Groß. 2024. "Less than Confirming, and Doing More than that in German and Yurakaré: A Mixed form- and Function-based Approach for Comparing Response Strategies Across Languages." *Contrastive Pragmatics* (1–2): 347–91.
- Gipper, Sonja. Forthcoming. "Request for Confirmation Sequences in Yurakaré." *Open Linguistics*.
- Glaser, Elvira. 2003. "'Is de für Herrn König, oder?'" Zur Sprachgeographie von Gliederungspartikeln." In *Sprachgeschichten. Ein Lesebuch für Werner König zum 60. Geburtstag*, edited by Edith Funk, 63–79. Heidelberg: Winter.
- Golato, Andrea. 2010. "Marking understanding versus receipting information in talk: Achso. and ach in German interaction." *Discourse Studies* 12 (2): 147–76.
- Goss, Emily L. and Joseph C. Salmons. 2000. "The Evolution of a Bilingual Discourse Marking System: Modal Particles and English Markers in German-American Dialects." *International Journal of Bilingualism* 4 (4): 469–84.
- Hagemann, Jörg. 2009. "Tag Questions Als Evidenzmarker. Formulierungsdynamik, Sequentielle Struktur und Funktionen Redezuginterner Tags." *Gesprächsforschung - Online Zeitschrift zur verbalen Interaktion* 10: 145–76.
- Hakulinen, Auli. 2001. "Minimal and Non-Minimal Answers to Yes–No Questions." *Pragmatics* 11 (1): 1–15.
- Hansen-Jaax, Dörte. 1995. *Transfer bei Diglossie. Synchrone Sprachkontaktphänomene im Niederdeutschen*. Hamburg: Kovac.
- Harjunpää, Katariina and Anna Cristina Ostermann. 2023. "Responding to polar questions in Brazilian Portuguese." In *Responding to Polar Questions across Languages and Contexts*, edited by Galina B. Bolden, John Heritage and Marja-Leena Sorjonen, 76–108. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Harren, Inga. 2001. "ne?" in *Alltagsgesprächen - Interaktive Funktionen und Positionierungen in Turn und Sequenz*. Staatsexamensarbeit: Universität Oldenburg. Available online at https://www.researchgate.net/publication/298792177_ne_in_Alltagsgesprachen_-_Interaktive_Funktionen_und_Positionierungen_in_Turn_und_Sequenz, checked on 2/29/2024.
- Heinemann, Trine. 2006. "'Will You or Can't You?': Displaying Entitlement in Interrogative Requests." *Journal of Pragmatics* 38 (7): 1081–104.
- Heritage, John and Andrew Roth. 1995. "Grammar and Institution: Questions and Questioning in the Broadcast News Interview." *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 28: 1–60.
- Heritage, John and Chase W. Raymond. 2021. "Preference and Polarity: Epistemic Stance in Question Design." *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 54 (1): 39–59.
- 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 Geoffrey Raymond. 2012. "Navigating Epistemic Landscapes: Acquiescence, Agency and Resistance in Responses to Polar Questions." In *Questions. Formal, Functional and Interactional Perspectives*, edited by Jan-Peter de Ruiter, 179–92. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Heritage, John and Marja-Leena Sorjonen. 1994. "Constituting and Maintaining Activities Across Sequences: And-prefacing as a Feature of Question Design." *Language in Society* 23: 1–29.
- Heritage, John. 1984. "A Change-of-State Token and Aspects of its Sequential Placement." In *Structures of Social Action. Studies in Conversation Analysis*, edited by J. Maxwell Atkinson and John Heritage, 299–345. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Heritage, John. 1998. "Oh-prefaced Responses to Inquiry." *Language in Society* 27 (3): 291–334.
- Heritage, John. 2002. "The Limits of Questioning: Negative Interrogatives and Hostile Question Content." *Journal of Pragmatics* 34: 1427–46.
- Heritage, John. 2012a. "Epistemics in Action: Action Formation and Territories of Knowledge." *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 45 (1): 1–29.
- Heritage, John. 2012b. "The Epistemic Engine: Sequence Organization and Territories of Knowledge." *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 45 (1): 30–52.

- Imo, Wolfgang. 2011. “‘Jetzt Geh’n Wir Einen Trinken, Gell?’ Vergewisserungssignale (tag questions) und ihre Relevanz für den DaF-Unterricht.” In *Deutsch aktuell. Einführung in die Tendenzen der deutschen Gegenwartssprache*, edited by Sandro M. Moraldo, 127–50. Roma: Carocci.
- Imo, Wolfgang. 2013. *Sprache in Interaktion*. Berlin, New York: De Gruyter.
- Imo, Wolfgang. 2017. “Über Nein.” *Zeitschrift für Germanistische Linguistik* 45 (1): 40–72.
- Jefferson, Gail. 1972. “Sides Sequences.” In *Studies in Social Interaction*, edited by David Sudnow, 294–338. New York: The Free Press.
- Jones, Bob Morris. 1999. *The Welsh Answering System*. New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Keevallik, Leelo. 2010. “Minimal Answers to Yes/No Questions in the Service of Sequence Organization.” *Discourse Studies* 12 (3): 283–309.
- Kluge, Friedrich and Walther Mitzka. 1960. *Etymologisches Wörterbuch der deutschen Sprache*. Berlin, New York: De Gruyter.
- 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*.
- König, Katharina. 2020. “Prosodie und Epistemic Stance: Konstruktionen mit finalem *oder*.” In *Prosodie und Konstruktionsgrammatik*, edited by Wolfgang Imo and Jens Lanwer, 167–99. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Koshik, Irene. 2002. “A Conversation Analytic Study of Yes/No Questions Which Convey Reversed Polarity Assertions.” *Journal of Pragmatics* 34 (12): 1851–77.
- Koshik, Irene. 2005. *Beyond Rhetorical Questions. Assertive Questions in Everyday Interaction*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Küttner, Uwe-A. and Oliver Ehmer. 2024. “Affordances and Actions: Requests for Confirmation as Devices for Implementing Challenging and Other Disagreement-Implicative Actions.” *Contrastive Pragmatics* (1–2): 27–71.
- Labov, William and David Fanshel. 1977. *Therapeutic Discourse. Psychotherapy as Conversation*. New York: Academic Press.
- Labov, William. 2010. *Principles of Linguistic Change. Vol. 2: Social Factors*. Malden: Blackwell.
- Langer, Nils. 2003. “Low German.” In *Germanic standardizations. Past to Present*, edited by Ana Deumert and Wim Vandenbussche, 281–301. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Lanwer, Jens. 2019. “Alignmentmarker in Norddeutscher Alltagssprache (AINA).” *Niederdeutsches Wort* 59: 33–75.
- Lindow, Wolfgang. 1998. *Niederdeutsche Grammatik*. Leer: Schuster.
- Pfeiffer, Martin, Kathrin Weber, Katharina König, Arnulf Deppermann, Oliver Ehmer, Sonja Gipper, Alexandra Gubina, et al. Forthcoming. “Request for Confirmation Sequences in Ten Languages. A Quantitative Comparison.” *Open Linguistics*.
- Pittner, Karin. 2007. “Common Ground in Interaction: The Functions of Medial *doch* in German.” In *Lexical Markers of Common Grounds*, edited by Anita Fetzer and Kerstin Fischer, 67–87. Amsterdam: Brill.
- Pomerantz, Anita. 1988. “Offering a Candidate Answer: An Information Seeking Strategy.” *Communication Monographs* 55(4): 360–73.
- Raymond, Geoffrey. 2003. “Grammar and Social Organization: Yes/No Interrogatives and the Structure of Responding.” *American Sociological Review* 68 (6): 939–67.
- Raymond, Geoffrey. 2013. “At the Intersection of Turn and Sequence Organization: On the Relevance of ‘Slots’ in Type-Conforming Responses to Polar Interrogatives.” In *Units of talk – Units of action*, edited by Beatrice Szczepek Reed and Geoffrey Raymond, 169–206. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Reinecke, Silke. 2018. “Interaktionale Analysen kognitiver Phänomene. Wissenszuschreibungen mit der Modalpartikel *ja*.” In *Sprachliches Handeln und Kognition: Theoretische Grundlagen und empirische Analysen*, edited by Simon Meier and Konstanze Marx, 183–204. Berlin, New York: De Gruyter Mouton.
- Sacks, Harvey. 1992. *Lectures on Conversation*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Sadock, Jerrold M. and Arnold M. Zwicky. 1985. “Speech Act Distinctions in Syntax.” In *Language Typology and Syntactic Description*, edited by Timothy Shopen, 155–96. Cambridge, UK, New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Sanders, Willy. 1982. *Sachsensprache, Hanesprache, Plattdeutsch. Sprachgeschichtliche Grundzüge des Niederdeutschen*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Schegloff, Emanuel A. 1996. “Confirming Allusions: Toward an Empirical Account of Action.” *American Journal of Sociology* 102 (1): 161–216.
- Schegloff, Emanuel A. 2007. *Sequence Organization in Interaction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Schoonjans, Steven. 2018. *Modalpartikeln als multimodale Konstruktionen. Eine korpusbasierte Kookkurrenzanalyse von Modalpartikeln und Gestik im Deutschen*. Berlin, Boston: De Gruyter.
- Selting, Margret, Peter Auer, Dagmar Barth-Weingarten, Jörg Bergmann, Pia Bergmann, Karin Birkner, Elizabeth Couper-Kuhlen, et al. 2009. “Gesprächsanalytisches Transkriptionssystem 2 (GAT 2).” *Gesprächsforschung* 10: 353–402.
- Seuren, Lucas M. and Mike Huiskes. 2017. “Confirmation or Elaboration: What Do Yes/No Declaratives Want?” *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 50 (2): 188–205.
- Sorjonen, Marja-Leena. 2001. *Responding in Conversation: A study of response particles in Finnish*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Stensig, Jakob and Paul Drew. 2008. “Introduction: Questioning and Affiliation/Disaffiliation in Interaction.” *Discourse Studies* 10 (1), 5–15.
- Stensig, Jakob and Tine Larsen. 2008. “Affiliative and Disaffiliative Uses of You Say x Questions.” *Discourse Studies* 10 (1): 113–33.
- Stivers, Tanya and Frederico Rossano. 2010. “Mobilizing Response.” *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 43 (1): 3–31.
- Stivers, Tanya, Nick J. Enfield, and Penelope Brown. 2009. “Universals and Cultural Variation in Turn-Taking in Conversation.” *Proceedings of the National Academy of Science* 106 (26): 10587–92.

- Stivers, Tanya. 2004. “‘No no no’ and Other Types of Multiple Sayings in Social Interaction.” *Human Communication Research* 30 (2): 260–93.
- Stivers, Tanya. 2005. “Modified Repeats: One Method for Asserting Primary Rights from Second Position.” *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 38 (2): 131–58.
- Stivers, Tanya. 2011. “Morality and Question Design: ‘of course’ as Contesting a Presupposition of Askability.” In *The Morality of Knowledge in Conversation*, edited by Jakob Steensig, Lorenza Mondada, and Tanya Stivers, 82–106. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press.
- Stivers, Tanya. 2022. *The Book of Answers. Alignment, Autonomy, and Affiliation in Social Interaction*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Szczepek Reed, Beatrice. 2015. “Managing the Boundary Between Yes and But: Two Ways of Disaffiliating with German ja aber and jaber.” *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 48 (1): 32–57.
- Thies, Heinrich. 2010. *Plattdeutsche Grammatik A – Z. Formen und Funktionen*. Neumünster: Wachholtz.
- Thurmair, Maria. 1989. *Modalpartikeln und ihre Kombinationen*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- Turco, Giuseppina, Bettina Braun, and Christine Dimroth. 2014. “When Contrasting Polarity, the Dutch Use Particles, Germans Intonation.” *Journal of Pragmatics* 62: 94–106.
- Weber, Kathrin. 2020a. *Regionale Auxiliarvariation: Interaktion, Schrift, Kognition*. Berlin, New York: De Gruyter.
- Weber, Kathrin. 2020b. “The German Modal Particle *wohl* between Epistemics and Evidentiality – An Interactional and Regional Perspective.” *Journal of Pragmatics* 170: 334–63.
- Wirrer, Jan. 1998. “Zum Status des Niederdeutschen.” *Zeitschrift für Germanistische Linguistik* 26 (3): 308–40.
- Zinken, Jörg and Uwe-A. Küttner. 2022. “Offering an Interpretation of Prior Talk in Every-Day Interaction: A Semantic Map Approach.” *Discourse Processes* 59: 1–28.