

Research Article

Florence Oloff*

Request for confirmation sequences in Czech

<https://doi.org/10.1515/opli-2024-0034>

received July 11, 2024; accepted October 28, 2024

Abstract: This article provides a first description of request for confirmation (RfC) sequences in spoken Czech. Based on 204 sequences from video-recorded ordinary conversations, it provides a quantitative overview of the main syntactic, lexical, prosodic and sequential features of both requests for confirmation and their responses. RfCs in Czech are typically of declarative clausal format, realized in positive polarity, and receive a confirmation. The epistemic asymmetry between the speaker of the RfC and their interlocutor seems to be mainly expressed and negotiated by a complex taxonomy of tags appended to the confirmable, response tokens, and syntactically non-minimal responses. These features represent promising topics for future, more qualitatively oriented investigations of RfCs in spoken Czech.

Keywords: interactional linguistics, request for confirmation, question tags, response tokens, spoken Czech

1 Introduction

This article provides the first systematic exploration of requests for confirmation (RfCs) in spoken Czech, a West Slavic language. While RfCs can take on various syntactic formats, on the action level they basically offer a confirmable to the next speaker for them to (dis-)confirm (König and Pfeiffer forthcoming). While the speaker of the RfC, by formulating a proposition, displays some knowledge on the issue at hand, they simultaneously position themselves in an epistemically weaker position than their addressed co-participant. Based on a data set of 204 examples of RfCs in spoken Czech, taken from video-recorded everyday conversations among friends and family members, this article provides a first quantitative description of their most recurrent features and typical response types they receive, i.e., RfC sequences. To our knowledge, RfCs as a specific type of action have not yet been described for this language. This might also be due to their heterogeneous and unmarked lexico-syntactic format, as RfCs in Czech are mainly declaratively formatted clauses or various phrasal formats. Czech does not provide a specific grammatical format for formulating an RfC (in contrast to, for instance, German, Deppermann et al. (2024), for which a tendency for V2-positions in RfCs can be found). While the epistemic cline between the RfC speaker and their addressed interlocutor can be explicitly marked through turn-final tags, modulations or inference markers, these features are not compulsory. Therefore, the epistemic cline can in some cases only be understood from the specific topical and sequential context of the turn.

Extract 1 illustrates a series of three RfCs in Czech from our data, within a sequence between Karel (KAR) and Anton (ANT) (the parallel conversation of their co-participants has been erased for clarity). Prior to the excerpt, Anton points out that he knows the surroundings of the café terrace where they are currently sitting and that he has also perceived a pub at a terminal tram station. Karel now picks up on this topic, asking about the precise location of this terminal station, simultaneously pointing toward its possible direction (line 01). This gets elaborated throughout several RfCs (marked by a grey background) and requests for reconfirmation (RfRCs, Gipper et al. 2024, König and Pfeiffer 2024):

* **Corresponding author: Florence Oloff**, Leibniz-Institut für Deutsche Sprache, Mannheim, Germany, e-mail: oloff@ids-mannheim.de
ORCID: [0000-0003-0926-7660](https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0926-7660)

Ex. 1 (126_127_128_HAM, simplified)

- 01 KAR: a tam je konečná dvanáctky; [ne,]
and there be-3SG terminal-F twelve-GEN TAG-
and there's the terminus of the line twelve; no,
- 02 ANT: [no_]no_[no,]
PRT+ PRT+ PRT+
[yeah]_yeah_[yeah]
- 03 KAR: [tam je Břevnov; jo,
there be-3SG NAME TAG+
[there's the Břevnov quarter; yes,
- 04 ANT: no_no, to je tady,
PRT+ PRT+ DEM-N be-3SG here
yeah_yeah that's here
- 05 KAR: fakt jo;
fact TAG+
really yeah
- 06 ANT: to je: (.) pět set metrů;
DEM-N be-3SG DEM-F five hundred meter-PL.GEN
that is (.) five hundred meters away
- 07 KAR: vážně, jo;
seriously TAG+
really yes
- 08 ANT: no jasně, to je kousíček;
PRT+ clearly DEM-N be-3SG small.bit-NOM
yes of course it's really close
- 09 KAR: a tam je ta tramvaj, nějaká pivní; nebo co-
and there be-3SG DEM-F streetcar-NOM some beer-ADJ TAG+/-
and there is the streetcar, like some streetcar beer bar or what
- 10 na konečny;]
on terminal-LOC
at the termi[nus]
- 11 ANT: [no prálvě: (0.4) proto sem vás
PRT+ just so that AUX-1SG you-PL.AKK
[yes exac]tly (0.4) this is why I wanted
- 12 tam chtěl táhnout;
there want-PST-SG pull-INF
to drag you there

The three RfCs in Extract 1 (lines 01, 03, and 09-10) all display instances of a clausal declarative format with appended tags, *ne* ‘no’, *jo* ‘yeah’, and *nebo co* ‘or what’, being syntactically representative of the largest group of all 204 RfCs in the given data set (Section 4.1, Table 2). These RfCs in our data set mostly receive confirming responses that are either minimal (containing only one or more response tokens, see line 02) or non-minimal, i.e., containing a confirmatory response token and more talk referring to the confirmable, see lines 04, 11-12). In Excerpt 1, one can notice several versions of *no* ‘yes, right’, which is overall the most frequent response token used for confirming RfCs in our data set. RfCs are different from RfRCs, in that newsmarks such as ‘really TAG+’¹ (line 05) or ‘seriously TAG+’ (line 07) or plain other-repeats (Aldrup 2024) in themselves do not offer a new proposition, do not refer to inferred or presupposed knowledge, and request a *re*-confirmation of something that has already been said (Gipper et al. 2024).

In what follows, we will first offer a short review of RfC-like formats in spoken Czech and some essential features of this language (Section 2). We will then provide a thorough description of the data sets this contribution is based upon (Section 3). The main part of the article is dedicated first to the description of how syntactic, prosodic, and lexical features of RfCs are distributed in our data set (Section 4) and subsequently to an overview of the responses to RfCs and their different formats (Section 5). The results of both sections will then be briefly summarized and discussed (Section 6).

¹ In the gloss, we indicate the initial basic polarity of the tag or response token with + (positive, e.g., PRT +) and – (negative, e.g., TAG–), to avoid misunderstandings regarding, for instance, the Czech response token *no* ‘yes’ and *ne* ‘no’.

2 Literature review

While research on spoken Czech has a long tradition, most research is influenced by pragmatic-functional or sociolinguistic-stylistic approaches. Even if the number of studies inspired by a full-fledged conversation-analytic and sequential approach has been recently growing (e.g., Hoffmannová et al. 2022, Havlík and Zaepernicková 2016, 2019, Oloff 2022, Oloff and Havlík 2018), the scope of most available contributions on spoken Czech is focused on providing overviews or more general descriptions of its various forms and functions (e.g., Čmejrková et al. 2004, Hoffmannová et al. 1999, 2019, Hoffmannová and Müllerová 1999).

Czech is an Indo-European language belonging to the West Slavic branch that displays an elaborate case morphology (see Oloff and Havlík 2018 for a short overview of its main grammatical features). Despite an ongoing reduction of its inflectional system, especially in its spoken form (Townsend 1990, Short 2001, 493–95), Czech allows for relatively free word order, with the position of sentence constituents being overall adjustable with respect to their pragmatic (i.e., rhematic and thematic) functions (Panevová et al. 2014, 190–234). Consequently, there is no specific grammatical or syntactic format foreseen for RfCs, as they can be declaratively or interrogatively formatted to different degrees. An interrogative format can also be formed by putting the pronoun after the inflected verb form (V1 position). However, as the expression of pronouns is not compulsory in Czech, a V1 position can only be unambiguously identified in case of an overt subject (Štícha 1995).

To our knowledge, RfCs in Czech have not yet been investigated in their own right, although they might be included in more general descriptions of questions and other non-declarative sentence types (e.g., Zeman et al. 2019). Polar questions (Stivers 2010, in Czech *otázky zjišťovací*, literally ‘inquiring questions’, e.g., Müllerová 2022a (1982), or *otázky rozhodovací*, literally ‘decision questions’, Štícha 2015, 78–92) can be distinguished from declarative constructions by, e.g., rising final intonation or final mid-falling intonation, as opposed to a falling declarative contour typical of statements (Short 2001, 496, Volín et al. 2022). It is usually the focal element of the question that is put in the final, rhematic position (Panevová et al. 2014, 227–8). Questions without an explicit interrogative format take on their “[...] questioning meaning in the dialogical text (e.g., they call for the confirmation of a supposition, for the removal of uncertainty, etc.) ..., and also behave like questions in dialogue” (Müllerová 2022a (1982), 72–3, our translation²). Polar questions can be responded to by affirmation or denial, which can be done by the corresponding response tokens (typically, *ano* ‘yes’ and *ne* ‘no’) or by repetitional responses of the predicate that can be full, partial, or modified (Müllerová 2022a (1982), 75–6, Grepl 1995, 608). Polar questions “conveying hope, fear or desire for reassurance, confirmation and so on” (Short 2001, 497) are usually tilted in polarity toward the preferred or assumed response (ibid., 496–7). Polar questions have been theoretically described to be used, in case of ‘true’ questions, for controlling, checking, insisting, deliberating, and weighing, and, in case of ‘untrue’ questions, for standard polite requests (e.g., ‘could you pass me the salt’) or for expressing surprise and unexpectedness (Grepl 1995, 608–7). More generally, descriptions of interrogative formats in Czech tend to be mainly inspired by speech act theory and seek to provide an abstract inventory of their communicative functions (e.g., Štícha 1998, 1999). Therefore, a systematic investigation of RfCs in Czech as they naturally occur in specific sequential environments is still missing.

3 Description of data sets

The data set used for this study is composed of seven events of mundane everyday interaction between friends (CAJ, HAM, and HOS), family members (BOL), and/or family members and acquaintances (BAR, FLO, and SOU),

² Original: “Do druhé skupiny patří výpovědi, které podle uvedených kritérií sice jako nepřímé tázací věty vždy označit nelze, které ale v dialogickém textu otázkový význam mají (vyzývají např. k potvrzení domněnky, k odstranění nejistoty atp., srov. vedlejší věty slabě otázkové u Svobody, 1970) a také se v dialogu jako otázky ‘chovají’, tzn. reagující replika má charakter repliky odpověďové [...]”, Müllerová 2022a, 72–3.

Table 1: Overview of data sets for this study

Data set (name)	Year of recording	Length of video recording (min)	Setting	Number of participants	Number of RfCs in 30 min (Total $n = 204$)
BAR	2015	107	Public (bar)	3	30
BOL	2014	66	Private (home)	2	24
CAJ	2014	55	Private (home)	2	43
FLO	2015	73	Private (home)	3	13
HAM	2014	150	Public (bar/terrace)	4	33
HOS	2013	155	Public (bar)	3	25
SOU	2016	58	Private (home)	3	36

see Table 1 for an overview. These were all recorded within a past research project³ by the principal investigator or a research assistant, three of them in the capital region of the Czech Republic (BOL, HAM, and HOS), three of them in Czech Silesia (BAR, FLO, SOU), and one among expatriates abroad (CAJ). All speakers' native language is Czech, and they were in the age range of about 30–40 years at the time of recording, with some being younger or older. Most speakers come from the region where the recordings were made, however, due to some individuals' mobility, possible multilingual skills (such as English, German, or Italian), and age, their use of dialectal features can be rather heterogeneous. The present data set has been curated so as to provide a good mixture of at least two of the three main dialectal regions (Central Bohemia and Silesia, with Moravia missing, for an overview, see Short 2001, 527–31). However, for assessing the impact of the speakers' geographic origin on the frequency of specific RfC or response formats, a data set considering also speakers from other regions would need to be established. All recordings make use of one or two (HAM, HOS) camera perspectives and a supplementary audio recording, which have been synchronized.

The recorded events were also selected to represent different participant constellations, including both dyadic (BOL, CAJ) and multi-party settings with three (BAR, FLO, HOS, and SOU) or more (HAM) participants. Some participants figure in more than one recording, so that the total number of different speakers involved amounts to 17. Regarding the settings, both private homes and public places such as the inside or outside of bars have been considered.

For the study of RfCs, we selected the first 30 min of each recording (once the recording equipment had been fully installed and/or once all participants had arrived and settled themselves) and looked for all RfCs. These are distributed in different ways among the settings, depending on different factors such as, for instance, topical development or the pace of the conversation at the specific moment of recording. Despite this variation, the speakers in our data sample seem to produce an average of about 30 RfCs in 30 min, illustrating their relevance for managing everyday conversation in Czech. Once all of the 3.5 h (i.e., seven times 30 min) had been searched for RfCs, this led to an overall number of 204 RfCs. These have been coded according to the coding scheme presented in the overview paper of this special issue (König et al. forthcoming). Transcription conventions in the quoted examples follow the basic ones set out by Jefferson (2004) and, more specifically for Czech, Kaderka and Svobodová (2006).

4 Designing RfCs in Czech

4.1 Syntactic design

The overwhelming number of RfCs in Czech are in clausal format ($n = 143/204$, 70.1%), whereas about a third ($n = 61/204$, 29.9%) are phrasal. The different types of clausal and phrasal RfCs listed in Table 2 will be illustrated further below.

³ Project “The epistemics of grammar: A comparative study of co-constructions in Czech, French, and German” (2014–2016, Swiss National Science Foundation, grant number 148146, Ambizione).

Table 2: Syntactic design of the RfC

Syntactic format	Frequency (Total $n = 204$)	
Clause	143 (70.1%)	of which $n = 82/143$ (57.3% with tags)
of which	95 Simple declaratives	of which 61 with tags
	15 Complex declaratives	of which 9 with tags
	12 Declaratives + extension	of which 7 with tags
	15 Subordinate clauses	of which 5 with tags
	6 Interrogative formats	of which 0 with tags
Phrase	61 (29.9%)	of which $n = 24/61$ (39.3% with tags)
of which	32 Noun phrases	of which 11 with tags
	13 Prepositional phrases	of which 6 with tags
	10 Adjunctional phrases	of which 3 with tags
	4 Adverbial phrases	of which 2 with tags
	2 Adjectival phrases	of which 2 with tags

In Czech, there is no specific format for forming clausal RfCs (see Section 2). This means that most RfCs in the clausal form are declaratives. In our collection of Czech RfCs, the interrogative mode is introduced mainly by prosody (rising final contour), or, e.g. (subordinate) clauses introduced by *že* ‘that’ (which can also be analysed as an interrogative marker, see Short 2001, 497, Štícha 2015, 48) or by *wh*-words (ex. 190, see in Table 3). Tags also mark

Table 3: Examples for clausal requests for confirmation in Czech

Simple declarative	(90_CAJ)	tam <i>there</i> there she must put the wood.	vona <i>she</i>	musí <i>must-3SG</i>	dát <i>put-INF</i>	to <i>DEM-N</i>	dřevo. <i>wood-AKK</i>
	(127_HAM)	tam <i>there</i> there's the Břevnov quarter; yes,	je <i>be-3SG</i>	Břevnov; <i>(name)-NOM</i>	jo, <i>TAG+</i>		
	(26_BAR)	dělá <i>do-3SG</i> she is doing eyelashes; no,	řasy; <i>eyelash-PL.AKK</i>	ne, <i>TAG-</i>			
Complex declarative	(171_SOU)	ty <i>you.2SG</i> you have this citizenship	ho <i>him</i>	máš <i>have-2SG</i>	to <i>DEM-N</i>	občanství, <i>citizenship</i>	
		protože <i>because</i> because you are married;	jsi <i>be-2SG</i>	vdaná; <i>married-F</i>			
	(109_FLOW)	jasně, <i>clearly</i> of course, you don't have anyone to call	nemáš <i>NEG-have-2SG</i>	komu <i>whom</i>	zavolat, <i>call-INF</i>		
		aby ti <i>to you.2SG-DAT</i> to repair this for you,	to <i>DEM-N</i>	spravil <i>repair-COND.3SG</i>			
		protože vlastně <i>because actually</i> because actually no such person exists.	nikdo <i>no-one</i>	takový <i>like-SG.M</i>	není. <i>NEG.be.3SG</i>		
	(182_SOU)	aha, já <i>INT I</i> aha, I thought that within the frame	myslela <i>think-PST.1SG</i>	že <i>that</i>	v <i>in</i>	rámci <i>scope-LOC</i>	
		te <i>DEM-GEN</i> of this work like that	práce <i>work-GEN</i>	jako <i>like</i>	že: <i>that</i>		

(Continued)

Table 3: Continued

		že <i>that</i>	má <i>have-3SG</i>	to <i>DEM-N</i>	auto <i>car-AKK</i>	že <i>that</i>	jezdí- <i>drive-3SG</i>
		that he has this car that he drives-					
Declarative + extension	(47_BOL)	jako- <i>like</i>	a <i>and</i>	takže <i>thus</i>	von tam <i>he there</i>	vlastně <i>actually</i>	chodil s tebou;(0.2) <i>go-PST.3SG with you-INS</i>
		like- and so he actually went there with you; (0.2)					
		do <i>to</i>	tý <i>DEM-SG.F.GEN</i>	menzy; <i>canteen-GEN</i>			
		to this canteen;					
	(28_BAR)	to <i>DEM-N</i>	jako <i>like</i>	nedělají; <i>NEG-do-3PL</i>	jo, <i>TAG+</i>	na Bulovce- <i>at ((name))</i>	
		like they don't do that; yeah, at the Bulovka (hospital)-					
	(123_HAM)	a <i>and</i>	von je <i>he be-3SG</i>	bez <i>without</i>	portfeje; <i>portfolio-GEN</i>	že jo; <i>TAG+</i>	ten (.) <i>DEM-M</i>
		and he is without portfolio; right; this (.) Málek;					Málek; <i>(name)</i>
Subordinate format	(98_FLOW)	co <i>what</i>	jako; že <i>like that</i>	třeba <i>perhaps</i>	na <i>in</i>	Slovensku teče <i>Slovakia-LOC flow-3SG</i>	Temže, <i>Thames</i>
		like what; that for example in Slovakia the Thames flows,					
	(172_SOU)	že <i>that</i>	si <i>REFL-DAT</i>	nemusel <i>NEG-must-PST.3SG</i>	vybrat; <i>choose-INF</i>	no, <i>TAG+</i>	
		that he didn't have to choose; right,					
Interrogative format	(190_SOU)	jak <i>how</i>	se <i>REFL-AKK</i>	jmenuje <i>name-3SG</i>	ten <i>DEM-M</i>	velký; <i>big-M</i>	Makro; <i>(name)</i>
		how is it called this big (supermarket); Makro;					
	(196_SOU)	aha;; <i>INT</i>	byd- <i>liv-</i>	nebydlela <i>NEG-live-PST.3SG</i>	ona <i>she</i>	náhodou <i>by chance</i>	na <i>on</i>
		aha;; liv- didn't she actually live below?					dole? <i>down</i>

an otherwise declarative structure as possibly interrogative (Cvrček et al. 2010, 296). Only 21 clausal structures (out of 143, i.e., 14.7%) could be identified as clearly interrogative. The remaining cases consist of declarative structures that are more or less simple or complex, and that can include features marking them as RfCs (such as tags, see Excerpt 1). The different types of clausal structures in Czech RfCs are illustrated by examples in Table 3.

Within the group of 143 clausal RfCs, the majority are simple declaratives ($n = 95/143$, 66.4%), followed by complex declaratives ($n = 15/143$, 10.5%) and declaratives that are extended ($n = 12/143$, 8.4%, Table 2). As illustrated by the examples in Table 3, the various types of clausal RfCs in Czech may contain tags or not. Indeed, it should be noted that 61 out of the overall 106 tags (57.5%, Section 4.6) are appended to simple declarative formats (see also Table 2 for a distribution of tags according to syntactic formats). Appended tags such as *jo* 'yes' or *ne* 'no' ($n = 82/143$, 57.3% of the clausal RfCs containing a tag, see also Section 4.6) can mark the otherwise declarative structure of the confirmable as an RfC (ex. 127, 26, Table 3). Also, plain declarative constructions with falling final intonation can be treated as confirmable, both in the case of simple (ex. 90, *ibid.*) and complex (ex. 171, *ibid.*) declaratives, as well as in declaratives that are syntactically extended (ex. 47, *ibid.*). The relative flexibility of syntactic design in spoken Czech can be seen in cases where the syntactic structure is extended after an inserted tag, in all 12 of these instances these extensions are prosodically non-integrated add-ons (Oloff and Havlík 2018, Ono and Couper-Kuhlen 2007), such as replacements (ex. 47, 123, Table 3) or glue-ons (ex. 28, *ibid.*). Apart from declarative clausal structures, some clausal RfCs are formatted as subordinates ($n = 15/143$, 10.5%), typically by the connector *že* 'that' (ex. 98, 172, *ibid.*). Only six clausal RfCs ($n = 6/143$, 4.2%) have a clear interrogative syntactic design, for instance, marked by an interrogative pronoun (ex. 190, *ibid.*) or a post-positioned pronoun (ex. 196, *ibid.*).

As also shown in Table 2, about 30% ($n = 61/204$) of the Czech RfCs are phrases. These are of various types, mainly noun phrases ($n = 32/61$, 52.5%), followed by prepositional ($n = 13/61$, 21.3%) and adjunctive ($n = 10/61$, 16.4%) phrases, and some less frequent cases of adverbial ($n = 4/61$, 6.6%) and adjectival ($n = 2/61$, 3.3%) phrases. Some examples of phrasal RfCs are shown in Table 4.

Table 4: Examples for phrasal requests for confirmation in Czech

Noun phrase	(67_CAJ)	arašídý; <i>peanut-PL.M.NOM</i> peanuts;			
	(164_HOS)	ňáká <i>some-F</i> some nice girl; yeah,	pěkná <i>pretty-F</i>	holka; <i>girl-NOM</i>	jo, <i>TAG+</i>
	(157_HOS)	ten <i>this-M</i> this Adam; yeah,	Adam; <i>(Name)-NOM</i>	jo, <i>TAG+</i>	
Prepositional phrase	(112_HAM)	v <i>in</i> on Sunday,	neděli, <i>Sunday-LOC</i>		
	(137_HAM)	v <i>in</i> in Germany; yeah,	Německu; <i>Germany-LOC</i>	jo, <i>TAG+</i>	
Adjunctional phrases	(70_CAJ)	jako <i>like</i> like fibre?	vláknina? <i>fibre-NOM</i>		
	(46_BOL)	jako <i>like</i> like good food; yeah;	dobrý <i>good-N</i>	jídlo, <i>food-NOM</i>	jo; <i>TAG+</i>
Adverbial phrase	(44_BOL)	furt- <i>constantly</i> all the time- yeah;	jo; <i>TAG+</i>		
Adjectival phrase	(65_CAJ)	Solený; <i>salted-PL.M</i> salted; yeah-	jo:- <i>TAG+</i>		

Like clausal RfCs, phrasal RfCs can be produced with ($n = 24/61$, 39.3%) or without ($n = 37/61$, 60.7%, Table 2) tags, and with various intonation patterns, which mark them as more or less interrogative and thus identifiable as RfCs. Thus, a bare noun phrase with falling intonation such as *arašídý*; ‘peanuts;’ (ex. 74, Table 4) is more declarative than, for instance, phrasal RfCs carrying a rising final intonation (such as *jako vláknina?* ‘like fibre?’, ex. 70, *ibid.*) or a tag (that itself can carry a rising intonation, such as *v Německu; jo*, ‘in Germany; yes;’, ex. 137, *ibid.*). Thus, RfCs in Czech do not have a prototypical syntactic design that allows them to be identified as such. Rather, the various syntactic designs can be identified as RfCs by a combination of prosodic patterns, the presence of tags, and, mainly, their position within a sequence and the epistemic asymmetry they express within it.

4.2 Polarity

The overwhelming number of RfCs in Czech is realized with positive polarity ($n = 178/204$, 87.3%). RfCs formatted in negative polarity are therefore rather rare in this data set ($n = 26/204$, 12.7%). Within the sample of ten languages, Czech therefore figures among the ones having the lowest ratio of RfCs with negative polarity (see Pfeiffer et al. forthcoming). As suggested by Küttner and Szczepek Reed (2024), this comparatively low proportion might reflect the fact that most participants in the data set are well-acquainted, and that there thus is, for instance, less need to formulate more uncertain updates in the form of negative polar RfCs. But to check this more thoroughly, a more heterogeneous data set with respect to setting types and participants would be needed.

While positive polarity is not specifically marked on verbs or other word types in Czech, negative polarity (for negation in Czech in general, see Short 2001, 510–2) is most frequently expressed with a negative verb form (adding the prefix *ne-* to the inflected verbal form, for example, *přijede* ‘he/she will come’ vs *nepřijede*, ‘he/she won’t come’), or by other lexical elements expressing negativity (such as a freestanding *ne* ‘no(t)’, *nikdo* ‘no one’, *nic* ‘nothing’, *žádná* ‘no(ne)’) (Table 5).

Table 5: Negative polarity marking in RfCs in Czech

Negative polarity marker	Frequency (Total $n = 26$)
<i>ne</i> + inflected verb (negation prefix) only	17 (65.4%)
<i>ne</i> + inflected verb and negative marker combined	5 (2 = <i>nikdo</i> ‘no one’, 2 = <i>nic</i> ‘nothing’, 1 = <i>ne</i> ‘no’) (19.2%)
<i>ne</i> (‘no’, ‘not’)	3 (11.5%)
<i>žádná</i> (‘no’, ‘none’)	1 (3.8%)

Since in Czech negative polarity is marked not only on inflected verbs but also on concurrent pronouns when expressed in the syntactic construction, some RfCs carry double negation markings (e.g., *ježiš to tam vlastně nikdo* ↑*neumí*; ‘jeez no one there actually knows how to do it’, literally ‘jeez that there actually no one doesn’t know how to do’; or *tam* ↑*nic* *nezůstane* ‘nothing will remain there’, literally ‘there nothing doesn’t remain’). This leads to five RfCs in the collection containing double markings for negative polarity (Table 5), corresponding to the standard negation in Czech.

4.3 Modulation

A clear majority of the RfCs in our collection do not contain any modulating elements ($n = 152/204$, 74.5%). The remaining quarter of the RfCs ($n = 52/204$, 25.5%) contain mainly approximators ($n = 34/58$, 58.6%), such as *jako* ‘like’ (Oloff 2022), or epistemic particles, such as *přece* or *vlastně*, which could be translated to something like ‘still’ or ‘actually’ ($n = 12/58$, 20.7%). The total number of modulation markers (58, Table 6) is higher than 52, as a few RfCs contain several modulating elements. For instance, the RfC (ex. 92) *to prostě- to je trošku jako krb; jako kamna*; ‘it simply- it’s a bit like a fireplace; like a stove;’ contains four modulating elements, *prostě* ‘simply’/‘just’, *trošku* ‘a bit’, and two times *jako* ‘like’, that are used in the description of a digital picture

Table 6: Modulation with modulation markers in RfCs in Czech

Modulation marker	Frequency (Total $n = 58$)
Approximators	34 (58.6%)
<i>jako</i> (‘like’)	21
<i>jakože</i> (‘like’/‘as if’)	1
<i>někdy/nějaký/někdy</i> (‘some’/‘somehow’)	7
<i>asi</i> (‘probably’)	2
<i>trošku</i> (‘(a) little’)	1
<i>náhodou</i> (‘by chance’)	1
<i>třeba</i> (‘perhaps’)	1
Epistemic particles	12 (20.7%)
<i>přece</i> (‘still’/‘after all’)	3
<i>no</i> (‘yes’/‘well’)	2
<i>prostě</i> (‘just’)	2
<i>vlastně</i> (‘actually’)	2
<i>však</i> (‘however’/‘after all’)	1
<i>dyt’</i> (‘after all’)	1
<i>stejně</i> (‘anyway’)	1
Mental predicate phrases	6 (10.3%)
<i>já (jsem si) myslela</i> (‘I thought’)	3
<i>(si) myslím</i> (‘I think’)	3
Others	6 (10.3%)
<i>nebo x</i> (‘or x’)	4
<i>jak se jmenuje</i> (‘how is (x) called’)	1
<i>ta</i> (‘that’)	1

shown to the speaker of the RfC for the first time. The remaining modulation markers consist of mental predicate phrases that more explicitly display the confirmable as being issued from a subjective perspective ($n = 6/58$, 10.3%), and some other items that could not be classified as approximators, epistemic particles or mental predicate phrases ($n = 6/58$, 10.3%; Table 6).

The most frequent modulation marker overall is the approximator *jako* ‘like’ (for a similar observation for English, see Küttner and Szczepek Reed 2024), corresponding to 36.2% ($n = 21/58$) of all modulation markers in our sample. *Jako* is used with both phrasal and clausal RfCs, in the former case being often in initial position (e.g. *jako vlákna?* ‘like fibre’, *jako stará?*, ‘like the old (one)’), in the latter being more flexibly positioned within the confirmable TCU (Oloff 2022, e.g., *a voni tě znali jako; jo*, ‘and they like knew you; yes,’ *ona jako dělá- (.) pedikúru manikúru; né*, ‘she is like doing- (.) pedicure manicure; no’).

4.4 Inference marking

Regarding inference marking, i.e., confirmables that are linguistically marked as inferable from prior talk, 164 cases out of 204 (80.4%) do not contain any inference markers. The remaining 19.6% ($n = 40/204$ cases) contain various inference markers, the most frequent ones being *tak* ‘so’/‘then’ ($n = 11/40$ cases), *takže* ‘(and) so’/‘thus’ ($n = 10/40$ cases), and the imperative form *počkej* ‘wait’ ($n = 8/40$ cases). The total number of $n = 42$ cases (Table 7) is due to the fact that two out of the 40 RfCs contain two different inference-marking items.

Table 7: Inference marking in RfCs in Czech

Inference marker	Frequency (Total RfCs containing inference marking $n = 40/204$, 19.6%)
Total number of inference markers	Total $n = 42$
<i>tak</i> ‘so, then’	11 (26.2%)
<i>takže</i> ‘(and) so, thus’	10 (23.8%)
<i>počkej</i> ‘wait’	8 (19.0%)
<i>vlastně</i> ‘actually’	3 (7.1%)
<i>už</i> ‘already’	2 (4.8%)
<i>jo</i> ‘oh’	1 (2.4%)
<i>čili</i> ‘this means’	1 (2.4%)
<i>jasně</i> ‘of course’	1 (2.4%)
<i>proto</i> ‘because’, ‘so that’	1 (2.4%)
<i>teda</i> ‘then’	1 (2.4%)
<i>no tak</i> ‘well so’	1 (2.4%)
<i>to znamená</i> ‘this means’	1 (2.4%)
<i>ježiš</i> ‘jeez’	1 (2.4%)

4.5 Connectives

A total of 116 out of the 204 cases (56.9%) contain an initial connective, a pre-positioned lexical item that connects the RfC to the co-participant’s prior turn(s). These connectives were double-coded with respect to the inference markers (cf. Section 4.4). The total number of 121 connective markers as illustrated by Table 8 relates to five of the examples including two connectives that were counted separately as they were produced as separate prosodic units and not as a single intonational unit.

Most of the 121 connectives are simple connectives, mainly *a* ‘and’ ($n = 37/121$, 30.6%), followed by *jako* ‘like’ ($n = 12/121$, 9.9%), *tak* ‘so’ ($n = 9/121$, 7.4%), and *ale* ‘but’ ($n = 8/121$, 6.6%; Table 8). Together with the combinations of connectives, connectives make up more than two-thirds of the connective items overall ($n = 83/121$, 68.6%). The second largest group ($n = 16/121$, 13.2%) are response tokens, which can be either simple ($n = 9/121$, 7.4%) or combined ($n = 7/121$, 5.8%), followed by some imperative forms ($n = 8/121$, 6.6%) and a variety of adverbial and

Table 8: Connectives in RfCs in Czech

Connective	Frequency (Total, <i>n</i> = 121)
Simple connectives	79 (65.3%)
<i>a</i> ('and')	37 (30.6%, based on <i>n</i> = 121)
<i>jako</i> ('like')	12 (9.9%)
<i>tak</i> ('so'/'then')	9 (7.4%)
<i>ale</i> ('but')	8 (6.6%)
<i>takže</i> ('(and) so')	6 (5.0%)
<i>že</i> ('that')	3 (2.5%)
<i>nebo</i> ('or')	1 (0.8%)
<i>teda</i> ('then')	1 (0.8%)
<i>čili</i> ('this means')	1 (0.8%)
<i>proto</i> ('so that'/'because of that')	1 (0.8%)
Combinations	4 (3.3%)
<i>a takže</i> ('and so')	1 (0.8%)
<i>a tak</i> ('and so')	2 (1.6%)
<i>tak vlastně</i> ('so actually'/'then actually')	1 (0.8%)
Response tokens (simple)	9 (7.4%)
<i>aha</i> ('oh')	2 (1.6%)
<i>jo</i> ('right')	3 (2.5%)
<i>no</i> ('well')	3 (2.5%)
<i>jasně</i> ('of course')	1 (0.8%)
Response tokens (combination)	7 (5.8%)
<i>jo takže</i> ('right so')	1 (0.8%)
<i>no a</i> ('well and')	1 (0.8%)
<i>no ale</i> ('well but')	1 (0.8%)
<i>no tak</i> ('well so')	2 (1.6%)
<i>aha takže</i> ('oh so')	2 (1.6%)
Imperative forms	8 (6.6%)
<i>počkej</i> ('wait')	6 (5.0%)
<i>počkej ale</i> ('wait but')	2 (1.6%)
Various tokens (adverbs and others)	14 (11.6%)
<i>už</i> ('already')	4 (3.3%)
<i>dyt'</i> ('after all')	1 (0.8%)
<i>jak</i> ('how')	1 (0.8%)
<i>co jako</i> ('like what')	1 (0.8%)
<i>ještě</i> ('also')	1 (0.8%)
<i>když</i> ('when')	1 (0.8%)
<i>kvůli</i> ('because of')	1 (0.8%)
<i>ted'ka</i> ('now')	1 (0.8%)
<i>stejně</i> ('anyway')	1 (0.8%)
<i>však</i> ('indeed'/'after all')	1 (0.8%)
<i>ježiš</i> ('jeez')	1 (0.8%)

other tokens (*n* = 14/121, 11.6%). Unsurprisingly, most connectives are used with clausal RfCs (*n* = 92/116, 79.3%), although about a fifth occur in phrasal RfCs (*n* = 24/116, 20.7%). Within the phrasal RfCs, however, *jako* 'like' is the most prominent one (9 out of 24 cases). The use of simple connectives shows that participants explicitly tie their RfCs to previous talk, for instance, by singling out a detail that could or should be elaborated on (ex. 39, *a tos tam byla tak pět let*, 'jo;° 'and so you've been there for about five years, yes;' to a speaker who presented a long storytelling about her student life), or to an aspect related to what the speaker of the RfCs has just heard and needs to revise (ex. 58, *ale to se musí přece natmáčet*, 'but this nevertheless has to soak', an RfC aiming at questioning a step within a reported process of how to prepare almond milk).

4.6 Tags

In our data, 52% ($n = 106/204$) of the RfCs contain a tag ('factual particles', Cvrček et al. 2010, 296). While there is a large variety of tags in our data (11 different types were identified, see also Müllerová 2007), they distribute unevenly in that two tags are by far the most frequent. The first one is *jo* (also used as an affirmative response particle, in that sense best translated as 'yes' or 'yeah'), which is used in 43 RfCs ($n = 43/106$, 40.6% of all tags containing RfCs). In second position with respect to frequency is the tag *ne* 'no', prototypically used as a negative response particle in responsive turns, with 32 cases out of 106 (30.2% of all tag containing RfCs). This means that the most frequent tags in Czech appended to RfCs emphasize (by their concurrent use as (dis) affirming response tokens in spoken Czech) the relevance of a polar response – either confirming or disconfirming – to the RfCs, thereby contributing to disambiguating the declarative syntactic structure of possible RfCs (Section 4.1). The distribution of the tags with respect to the polarity of the RfC (the two right columns in Table 9) illustrates that there is no direct correspondence between the polarity of the RfC and the polarity of the tag. Indeed, 36.5% of the RfCs with positive polarity and tags ($n = 35/96$) have an appended *jo* 'yes', while 32.3% ($n = 31/96$) append a *ne* 'no'. In the case of RfCs with negative polarity and tags ($n = 10$), 8 (i.e., 80%) append a *jo* 'yes' while only one case ($n = 1/10$, 10%) carries a *ne* 'no' tag. While overall rarer (as the remaining 29.2% of the tags are mainly positive with respect to their polarity – apart from *nebo* 'or', 4 cases), the fact that 31 (96.9%) of the negative tags are appended to positive RfCs means that they might take on a specific contrastive function.

Table 9: Tags in RfCs in Czech

Tag	Frequency tags (Total $n = 106$)		Appended to RfC with positive polarity (Total $n = 96$)	Appended to RfC with negative polarity (Total $n = 10$)
<i>jo</i> ('yes', 'yeah')	43 (40.6%)	70.8%	35 (36.5%)	8 (80%)
<i>ne</i> ('no')	32 (30.2%)		31 (32.3%)	1 (10%)
<i>že</i> ('that')	8 (7.6%)	29.2%	7 (7.3%)	1 (10%)
<i>že jo</i> ('that yeah')	8 (7.6%)		8 (8.3%)	
<i>no</i> ('yes', 'yeah')	5 (4.7%)		5 (5.2%)	
<i>nebo</i> ('or')	3 (2.8%)		3 (3.1%)	
<i>vid'</i> ('you see')	3 (2.8%)		3 (3.1%)	
<i>víš</i> ('you know')	1 (0.9%)		1 (1%)	
<i>co</i> ('what')	1 (0.9%)		1 (1%)	
<i>nebo co</i> ('or what')	1 (0.9%)		1 (1%)	
<i>že jo no</i> ('that yes yeah')	1 (0.9%)		1 (1%)	

The remaining 29.2% of the tags ($n = 31/106$) consist of clearly less frequently used ones, such as *že* (literally 'that', 8 cases), *že jo* (literally 'that yes', 8 cases, Komrsková 2017), and *nebo* (literally 'or', 5 cases; Table 9). As it is difficult to render a clear pragmatic translation of these tags in English, Table 9 contains only literal translations of their standard (i.e., as defined by dictionaries) uses as response tokens or conjunctions. While most of the tags are single items, some of these can be combined into a prosodic unit to form more complex tags, albeit being rarer (such as *že jo* 'that yes', 8 cases, or *nebo co* 'or what', 1 case).

Looking at the 43 cases containing *jo* 'yes' as a final tag, these RfCs tend to be short in that they are mostly simple declaratives or phrasal ones. The confirmable they offer mainly refers to facts that can be easily guessed or inferred from prior talk or actions. Thus, they are not particularly 'risky' or challenging confirmables (and only $n = 9/43$, 20.9% carry inference markers), but tend to point at a small detail, thereby working more as topic proffers or go-aheads than offering a candidate understanding that truly aims at resolving an epistemic asymmetry between the speakers. In Excerpt 2, Ludmila (LUD) is in the middle of a longer telling (to her daughter Jana, JAN) about her student life, talking, for instance, about the different student accommodations she experienced.

Ex. 2 (46_BOL)

- 01 LUD: .h: ale blbý bylo že tam nebyla zase kolej;
 .h: but it sucked that there wasn't also a dorm
 02 eeem;; menza; (.) °víš,°
 er:m a canteen (.) y'know
 03 JAN: jo;;
 yeah
 04 LUD: .h a tady dole, (.) tady na °tom:;° kampusu=
 .h and down here (.) here on this campus=
 05 tam byla bezvadná menza. [(fakt-)]
 there was a great canteen [(really)]
 06 JAN: [jako do]brý jídlo, jo;
 like good-N food-NOM TAG+
 [like good food, yeah;
 07 LUD: no dobrý jídlo; (0.3) °jako:° °na-° nato jak jsme to srovnávaly,
 PRT+ good-N food-NOM
 yes good food (0.3) °like° th- the as we were comparing it
 08 jak jsme třeba šly do někých jiných °menz;°
 as we went to some other canteens
 09 tak tam bylo dobrý jídlo:;
 so there was good food;
 10 JAN: mhm;;_mh,

LUD is talking about a campus she moved to during her studies which had no canteen (lines 01-02), contrasting it to another one which had a 'great canteen' (lines 04-05). In that sense, JAN's RfC (line 06) refers to a fact that is clearly not in her domain (as it refers to her mother's experience), but that can be easily inferred, as a great canteen is likely to provide 'good food'. This easily inferable fact is marked by a *jo*-tag and then responded to by a turn-initial *no* (line 07) and a partial repeat of the RfC, marking LUD's higher epistemic position and the RfC's fittedness (Section 5.6). LUD then expands on the confirmable (lines 07-09), revealing the topic-proffering nature of this RfC.

The RfCs using *ne* 'no' as a tag tend to present less certain or less obvious facts. This can relate, on the one hand, to the fact that they cannot simply be inferred from previous talk, and in that sense present a true guess about a specific fact in the other speaker's domain. It should be noted that *ne*-tagged RfCs (with one exception) do not have any inference markers. On the other hand, they seem to offer a new aspect to be confirmed, either as they introduce a new sequence altogether, or by offering a possible deviation from the current topical line of talk. The contrast between the use of *jo* and *ne* as tags can be seen in Excerpt 3. Yveta (YVE) and Marta (MAR) have been talking about healthy nutrition, and YVE now confesses that she likes to have a snack while watching movies (lines 01-02). MAR then enquires about the type of snack she has (line 03), leading YVE to elaborate on the unhealthy nature of her snacks (line 04) and MAR to formulate two differently formatted RfCs.

Ex. 3 (64_65_CAJ)

- 01 YVE: já se pak zadívám na nějaký film, (.) a když je to napínavé; tak:
 I then watch some movie (.) and when it's exciting so:
 02 (0.2) k tomu musím něco při[kusovat;]
 (0.2) with that I have to nib[ble something]
 03 MAR: [°no° a co si] k tomu přikusuješ
 [yeah and what do] you nibble with that
 04 YVE: ani se neptěj; he_he: (.) včera jsem snědla pytlík oříšků.
 don't even ask he_he: (.) yesterday I ate a bag of nuts
 05 (0.2)
 06 MAR: no: já právě že si ulítávám, ale, (.) ale zdravý oříšky ne?
 but healthy-PL.M nuts TAG-
 yeah I fancy exactly (that) but (.) but healthy nuts no?
 07 YVE: ne: právě že ani nebyly [zdravý
 PRT- just that even NEG-be.PST-PL.M healthy-PL.M
 no: precisely (that) they were not even [healthy
 08 MAR: [Solený jo;;
 salted-PL.M TAG+
 [salted yeah
 09 YVE: ne no [(právě)
 PRT- PRT+ just
 no yeah [exactly
 10 MAR: [to já ani doma nemám; (.) todle
 [this I don't even have at home (.) these

When YVE specifies that she ate a whole bag of nuts, MAR first starts by admitting she also likes eating nuts (line 06). Her RfC ‘but healthy nuts no’ then points to an important distinction from a nutritional point of view, as nuts can be served plain or salted, and thus be more or less healthy. By using a *ne*-tag, MAR frames the confirmable as something that cannot be inferred from YVE’s previous statements (although the initial *ale* ‘but’ and YVE subsequent disconfirming response in line 06 illustrate that it might have been more likely that the snacks were not healthy and that therefore the RfC has a possible admonishing flavor to it). When YVE admits that the nuts were ‘not even healthy’, MAR provides a follow-up RfC (line 08) in which she makes their ‘unhealthiness’ explicit. The assumption that the nuts were ‘salted’ can now be safely and easily inferred, and as a consequence, this RfC carries a *jo*-tag. Only when this is minimally confirmed by YVE (line 09), MAR expands on the possible admonishing nature of her first RfC (line 10), contrasting her nutritional choices with her friend’s. If the difference between *jo*- and *ne*-tags lies indeed mainly in the inferrability of the facts they present (and is thus linked to epistemics), or if the difference is a matter of sequential and/or topical management (e.g., if the RfC is in first or second position), remains to be examined more closely. As for the tags *že* and *že jo*, these seem to be appended to RfCs that are clearly more in the domain of the speaker, or at least facts with respect to which the speaker claims more certainty. According to the distribution in our data set, the forms *že* and *že jo* could be possibly linked to specific regions (*že jo* being used by the speakers from the capital/central Bohemian region, while *že* is being used by speakers in the Silesian region). But as their overall numbers (eight cases each, Table 9) are rather low, a larger data set would be needed to check this.

4.7 Prosodic design

Regarding prosodic design, the coded intonation contour (rising, falling or level, see the coding manual, König et al. forthcoming) always refers to the last syllable of the TCU containing the confirmable or the tag. This coding represents a possibly coarse insight into prosodic patterns of Czech RfCs (and future studies should indeed investigate prosodic features in more detail), but the results nevertheless help to reveal some main patterns and trends. Nearly two-thirds of the confirmables ($n = 130/204$, 63.7%) carry a final falling intonation, compared to 22.6% ($n = 46/204$) having a rising and 13.7% ($n = 28/204$) a level final intonation contour. This majority of falling final intonation is maintained in the cases where a tag is appended to the confirmable (see the right column in Table 10, $n = 86/106$, 81.1%), followed by level ($n = 12/106$, 11.3%) and rising intonation ($n = 8/106$, 7.6%). In cases of no appended tag (about half of the RfCs, 98 cases), the falling intonation is still the most frequent one ($n = 44/98$, 44.9%), but a considerable part of non-tagged confirmables carry a rising final intonation ($n = 38/98$, 38.8%, the middle column in Table 10).

Table 10: Final intonation of the confirmable

	Final intonation confirmable (Total $n = 204$)	Final intonation confirmable without a tag ($n = 98$)	Final intonation confirmable with a tag ($n = 106$)
Rise	46 (22.6%)	38 (38.8%)	8 (7.6%)
Level	28 (13.7%)	16 (16.3%)	12 (11.3%)
Fall	130 (63.7%)	44 (44.9%)	86 (81.1%)

The majority of the 106 tags are prosodically non-integrated with respect to the confirmable ($n = 91/106$, 85.9%), one exception being *že jo* with half of its occurrences being integrated and the other half non-integrated (Table 11, and Table 9 shows a translation of the tags). The most frequent tags used are *jo* (40.6%) and *ne* (30.2%), followed by *že* and *že jo* (each 7.6%, see also Table 9, Section 4.6). The remaining 10 tags (9.2% of the 106 cases) occur clearly less frequently.

Of the 91 tags carrying their own prosodic contour (i.e., those being prosodically non-integrated, Table 12), the monosyllabic ones mostly carry a rising final intonation contour (see also Müllerová 2007) and rarely a

Table 11: Prosodic integration of tags into confirmable

	<i>jo</i> (<i>n</i> = 43/ 106, 40.6%)	<i>ne</i> (<i>n</i> = 32/ 106, 30.2%)	<i>že</i> (<i>n</i> = 8/ 106, 7.6%)	<i>že jo</i> (<i>n</i> = 8/ 106, 7.6%)	<i>no</i> (<i>n</i> = 5/ 106, 4.7%)	<i>nebo</i> (<i>n</i> = 3/ 106, 2.8%)	<i>vid'</i> (<i>n</i> = 3/ 106, 2.8%)	<i>vš</i> (<i>n</i> = 1/ 106, 0.9%)	<i>co</i> (<i>n</i> = 1/ 106, 0.9%)	<i>nebo co</i> (<i>n</i> = 1/ 106, 0.9%)	<i>že jo no</i> (<i>n</i> = 1/ 106, 0.9%)
Non-integ.	39 (90.7%)	28 (87.5%)	6 (75%)	4 (50%)	5 (100%)	2 (67%)	3 (100%)	1 (100%)	1 (100%)	1 (100%)	1 (100%)
Integ.	4 (9.3%)	4 (12.5%)	2 (25%)	4 (50%)	0 (0%)	1 (33%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)

Table 12: Final intonation contour of tag (only non-integrated tags)

	<i>jo</i> (<i>n</i> = 39/ 91, 42.9%)	<i>ne</i> (<i>n</i> = 28/ 91, 30.8%)	<i>že</i> (<i>n</i> = 6/ 91, 6.6%)	<i>že jo</i> (<i>n</i> = 6/ 91, 6.6%)	<i>no</i> (<i>n</i> = 5/ 91, 5.5%)	<i>nebo</i> (<i>n</i> = 2/ 91, 2.2%)	<i>vid'</i> (<i>n</i> = 3/ 91, 3.3%)	<i>vš</i> (<i>n</i> = 1/ 91, 1.1%)	<i>co</i> (<i>n</i> = 1/ 91, 1.1%)	<i>nebo co</i> (<i>n</i> = 1/ 91, 1.1%)	<i>že jo no</i> (<i>n</i> = 1/ 91, 1.1%)
Rise	27 (69.2%)	23 (82.1%)	6 (100%)	1 (25%)	5 (100%)	0 (0%)	3 (100%)	1 (100%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Level	9 (23.1%)	4 (14.3%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (50%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)	1 (100%)
Fall	3 (7.7%)	1 (3.6%)	0 (0%)	3 (75%)	0 (0%)	1 (50%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)

level contour (in case of *jo* and *ne*). The disyllabic ones (being composed of one or several tags, in these cases, the intonation contour of the final syllable was coded), albeit being less frequent overall, show a different pattern, in that they show level or falling intonation contours (*že jo*, *že jo no*, *nebo*, *nebo co*, Table 12, for a translation of the tags see Table 9). Due to their infrequent occurrence in our data set, we cannot, however, make a statement with respect to the systematicity of this pattern.

Combining the quantitative findings from Tables 10–12, the most frequent intonation contours for confirmables in Czech without tags are falling ($n = 44/98$, 44.9%) and rising ($n = 38/98$, 38.8%, Table 10), whereas the main intonation pattern for a combination of a confirmable with appended, non-integrated tag is fall-rise ($n = 65/82$, 79.3%), followed in frequency by a fall-level pattern ($n = 14/82$, 17.1%), and a rise-fall pattern ($n = 4/8$, 50%, see Table 13. Integrated tags ($n = 15/106$, 14.2%) most often combine with level-intonation confirmables ($n = 11/15$, 73.3%, check the right column of Table 13).

Table 13: Distribution of intonation patterns in RfCs with tags

Intonation confirmable	$n = 106$	Intonation of non-integrated tag	Number of non-integrated tags		Number of integrated tags (Total $n = 15/106$, 14.2%)
Fall	$n = 86$	Rise	$n = 82/86$ (95.3%)	65 (79.3%)	$n = 4/86$ (4.7%)
		Fall		3 (3.7%)	
		Level		14 (17.1%)	
Level	$n = 12$	Rise	$n = 1/12$ (8.3%)	0 (0%)	$n = 11/12$ (91.7%)
		Fall		1 (100%)	
		Level		0 (0%)	
Rise	$n = 8$	Rise	$n = 8/8$ (100%)	2 (25.0%)	$n = 0/8$ (0.0%)
		Fall		4 (50.0%)	
		Level		2 (25.0%)	

5 Resources for responses to RfCs in Czech

5.1 Responsive actions

Of the 204 RfCs in our collection, 196 (96.1%) received a response, with 8 cases being not responded to (3.9%). Responses to RfCs can be either verbal (audible) only, embodied only, or both verbal and embodied (Table 14). While audible responses, regardless of their precise length and formatting (cf. Sections 5.2–5.6), represent a clear majority ($n = 179/196$, 91.3%) of all responses, embodied resources are also an important part of responsive action to RfCs in Czech, with 83.2% of all responses containing embodied features. Among these, 8.7% ($n = 17/196$) are realized solely by visible means. Notice also that in 11 cases of the category ‘verbal response only’, the responding participants are not (sufficiently) visible. Consequently, some of these 11 cases might contain embodied responsive features as well, meaning in return that only 22 responses (11.2% out of the 196 responses to RfCs) do demonstrably contain no embodied features.

Table 14: Types of multimodal responses to RfCs in Czech

Response slot	Total $n = 196$	Containing (also) talk	Containing (also) embodied elements
Verbal response only	33 (16.8%) (of which 11 n.a.)	179 (91.3%)	
Verbal and embodied response	146 (74.5%)		163 (83.2%)
Embodied response only	17 (8.7%)		

The embodied elements accompanying or providing the response to the RfC mostly consist of head nods (92 cases with multiple head nods, 34 with single nods, i.e., $n = 126/163$, corresponding to 77.3%). Head shakes are less frequent, with 18 cases of multiple headshakes and 6 single ones (i.e., $n = 24/163$, 14.7%). Subtracting the 4 cases in which both a type of headshake and a nod occur, this means that nearly 90% of all the responses to RfCs rely on (supplementary) head movements. As the majority of responses to RfCs are clear confirmations (80.1%, Table 15, compared to 14.8% of clear disconfirmations), the higher occurrence of head nods is not surprising. Regarding this distribution, it should however also be considered that the polarity of the RfC might also be consequential for the type of embodied resource that can be used to (dis)confirm. Indeed, 15 confirmations do not contain any head nods, of which 9, however, contain single or multiple headshakes (typically linked to an RfC in negative polarity). Also, during 7 disconfirming responses, head nods are carried out. Other frequent embodied resources used for responding consist of facial gestures such as raising or flashing the eyebrows, frowning, blinking or closing the eyes (cf. De Stefani 2021, Dix and Groß 2024, Hömke et al. 2017), which co-occur in about 67 cases (34.2% of all 196 responses to RfCs).

Table 15: Types of RfC responses in Czech

Response types	Total $n = 196$
Confirmation	157 (80.1%)
Disconfirmation	29 (14.8%)
Neither	10 (5.1%)

The data set reveals a clear preference for the confirmation of RfCs, with less than a fifth being disconfirmations (80.1% compared to 14.8%). Only 5.1% ($n = 10/196$) of the responses cannot be said to clearly confirm or disconfirm.

5.2 Response tokens

Of the 179 responses containing lexical or other audible material (Table 16), 152 contain one or more response tokens. In multi-party settings, more than one participant can respond to the RfC, leading to some cases of double responses to a single RfC. In these 13 cases (7.3% of the 179 audible responses overall), only the response of the mainly addressed recipient of the RfC was considered for counting the types and frequency of the response tokens used (see the coding manual, König et al. forthcoming). Nearly 85% of the responses contain at least one ($n = 120/179$, 67.0%) or more ($n = 32/179$, 17.9%) response tokens. In the latter case, the tokens can be produced separately or as multiple or complex clusters of response tokens. Only 27 responses (15.1%) do not make use of any response tokens, illustrating their significance for (dis)confirming responsive actions in Czech.

Table 16: Distribution of response tokens in RfCs

Response types	Total $n = 179$	
One response token	120 (67.0%)	152 (84.9%)
Two or more and response tokens/complex forms	32 (17.9%)	
No response token	27 (15.1%)	

In the 152 responsive turns containing response tokens, we distinguished the production of single tokens, of multiple single tokens (i.e., either with other lexical material in between or with prosodic breaks), and of complex forms containing several tokens uttered without any prosodic break. This led to an overall number of

168 response tokens in the 152 turns considered. The majority are produced as single tokens ($n = 137/168$, 81.5%), with the remaining 18.5% ($n = 31/168$) being clusters of two or more tokens within a prosodic unit. The most frequently used response token is *no* ‘yes’ ($n = 65/168$, 38.7%) or complex forms starting with it ($n = 15/168$, 8.9%), making up nearly half of all response tokens used ($n = 80/168$, 47.6%). The second most frequent token is *jo* ‘yes’, with overall 31 cases or 18.5% of the responses containing response tokens ($n = 24/168$, 14.3%, as single tokens and $n = 7/168$, 4.2%, as complex forms). The negation token *ne* ‘no’ is in the third position, with overall $n = 25/168$ (14.9%), of which 17 are used for disconfirming ($n = 17/25$, 68%). This is followed by non-lexical

Table 17: Types of responses tokens used for responding to RfCs in Czech

Response tokens	Total $n = 168$	Single tokens ($n = 137/$ 168 , 81.5%)	Multiple or complex tokens ($n = 31/168$, 18.5%)	Total $n = 168$
Confirming lexical tokens				114 (67.9%)
<i>jo</i> (‘yes’/‘yeah’)	24 (14.3%)	24 (14.3%) <i>(percentages in this column calculated based on $n = 168$)</i>		31 (18.5%) <i>(percentages in this column calculated based on $n = 168$)</i>
<i>jo jo</i>	3 (1.8%)		7 (4.2%)	
<i>jo jo jo</i>	2 (1.2%)		<i>(percentages in this column calculated based on $n = 168$)</i>	
<i>jo jo jo jo</i>	1 (0.6%)			
<i>jo ano</i>	1 (0.6%)			
<i>ano</i> (‘yes’)	1 (0.6%)	2 (1.2%)		3 (1.8%)
<i>ja</i> (‘yes’)	1 (0.6%)			
<i>ano no</i> (‘yes yes’)	1 (0.6%)		1 (0.6%)	
<i>no</i> (‘yes’, ‘indeed’)	65 (38.7%)	65 (38.7%)		80 (47.6%)
<i>no no</i>	3 (1.8%)		10 (6%)	
<i>no no no</i>	6 (3.6%)			
<i>no- no- no- no- no- no-</i>	1 (0.6%)			
<i>no- no- no</i>				
<i>no jasně</i> (‘yes clearly’)	1 (0.6%)		5 (3%)	
<i>no právě</i> (‘yes right’)	2 (1.2%)			
<i>no ne</i> (‘well no’)	1 (0.6%)			
<i>no jo no</i> (‘well yes well’)	1 (0.6%)			
Lexical negation tokens				25 (14.9%)
<i>ne</i> ‘no’	21 (12.5%)	21 (12.5%)		25 (14.9%)
<i>ne ne</i>	3 (1.8%)		4 (2.4%)	
<i>ne no právě</i> (‘no yes right’)	1 (0.6%)			
Non-lexical tokens				21 (12.5%)
<i>mhm_hm</i>	19 (11.3%)	19 (11.3%)		21 (12.5%)
(affirmation)				
<i>mhm</i> (negation)	2 (1.2%)	2 (1.2%)		
Other tokens				8 (4.8%)
<i>právě</i> (‘right’)	2 (1.2%)	4 (2.4%)		8 (4.8%)
<i>tak</i> (‘so’)	2 (1.2%)			
<i>přesně tak</i> (‘exactly so’)	2 (1.2%)		4 (2.4%)	
<i>přesně tak no</i> (‘exactly so right’)	1 (0.6%)			
<i>že jo</i> (‘(that) yes’)	1 (0.6%)			

tokens, mainly the affirmative and disyllabic token *mh_hm*, typically produced with a fall on the first and a rise on the second syllable ($n = 19/168$, 11.3%), its negative counterpart occurring only twice ($n = 2/168$, 1.2%), being once produced as monosyllabic, once as a disyllabic token. These four tokens correspond to the four most frequent ones in spoken Czech in general (*ne*, *hm*, *jo*, *no*, according to Cvrček et al. 2010, 299). The rest of the lexical tokens used for responding are other variants of ‘yes’ ($n = 3/168$, 1.8%) and a variety of confirmation tokens ($n = 8/168$, 4.8%), such as *právě* ‘right’/‘exactly’, *tak* ‘so’, or *přesně tak* ‘exactly so’ (for an overview on response particles in Czech see Čermáková et al. 2019). Table 17 gives a detailed list of all response tokens in our data.

The list in Table 17 illustrates that more than two thirds of all the tokens used for responding ($n = 114/168$, 67.9%) correspond to affirmative response tokens. The fact that *no* is the most frequent, not only among these, but also overall, emphasizes its potential to display a higher or independent epistemic stance of the speaker with respect to the confirmable (Müllerová 2022b (1996), 233, Čermáková et al. 2019, 296). This can be correlated with its epistemically weaker counterpart *jo* (which has been described to express weak agreement or to function as a continuer, Čermáková et al. 2019, 286), which is also the most frequently used tag appended to RFCs (Table 9, Section 4.6). However, and parallel to this, *jo* does mainly respond to RFCs that do *not* contain any tag ($n = 22/31$, i.e., 71%). Indeed, *jo* tends to be used when confirming epistemically low facts, or issues that are not treated as being highly implicative for further elaboration, which is the case in Excerpt 4, in which Nora (NOR), right after a possible closing of a previous larger telling by Jana (JAN) (lines 01-06), opts out of the conversation by telling that she has to take care of some chores. This is receipted by a go-ahead from JAN and a follow-up RFC (line 12).

Ex. 4 (200_SOU)

01 JAN: ona- víš, ona do to:,
she- y'know she (did) this-
02 NOR: jo?
yeah
03 JAN: no to je:;
well that i:s;
04 (0.4)
05 NOR: jo, (.) to on dlouho [xxx]x(h);
yeah (.) that he longtime [xxx]x(h);
06 JAN: [no:,]
[well]
07 (0.3)
08 NOR: .h: ty já si musím odskočit nahoru přepnout pračku ještě zas;
.h hey I have to jump upstairs to change the washing machine once again
09 [(to nevadí; x)]
[(if that's okay)]
10 JAN: [jo:, jo:,] jasně °běž:°
[yeah yeah] of course go ahead
11 <(0.8) ((NOR stands up from table))>
12 JAN: máš velké praní; jo?
have-2SG big-N washing TAG+
you have a lot of washing to do yeah?
13 NOR: <jo_jo; ((leaving the room))>
PRT+ PRT+
yeah_yeah

While JAN's first response to NOR (line 10) provides a go-ahead and permission for leaving the table (note also the use of *jo* as an affirmative, but epistemically neutral receipt of the prior turn, line 08), her following RFC (line 12) requests confirmation with respect to the type of chore, namely doing laundry. However, this is already clear from NOR's previous turn in which she refers to the washing machine (*pračku*) and picks up on the temporal indication *ještě zas* ‘once again’, thereby further demonstrating JAN's acceptance of NOR's account for getting up from the table. Therefore, this confirmable is in no need of a true epistemic confirmation or further elaboration, and NOR simply minimally confirms this RFC with a double *jo* (line 13), then leaving

the room. The double *jo* (within one intonation unit, contrary to the two separate *jo*, line 10) here possibly refers to the evident nature of the RfC and the definitive closing of the sequence, cf. Stivers 2004, or to the fact that the response is given by NOR while already leaving the room, thus being possibly adjusted to speaking-while-moving (cf. Mondada 2014). The exact difference between the production of single vs multiple response tokens (Table 17 indicates 19 cases of double or more *jo*, *no* or *ne*) would merit a separate investigation on a larger corpus and in other types of question–answer sequences.

In case the RfC alludes to a sequentially more implicative epistemic asymmetry, the preferred response token is *no*, as illustrated by the following simple example (Excerpt 5), in which Milan (MIL) introduces a new conversational topic, enquiring about how ‘this development’ went (line 01). Karel (KAR) initiates repair with an RfC (line 02), suggesting a specification of the noun ‘development’, namely, if it indeed refers to the *soccer match* he and his friends just played. This is confirmed by a minimal response using *no* (line 03):

Ex. 5 (111_HAM, simplified)

- 01 MIL: **hele? a jak to je tedka- ee teda; (1.0) ten vývoj;**
listen and how is it now er then (1.0) this development
- 02 KAR: **vývoj fotbalu?**
development-NOM soccer-GEN
the development of the soccer (match)?
- 03 MIL: **no: ,**
PRT+
yes

If the RfC presents an understanding check or initiates repair (such as in the previous example), the response token *no* therefore confirms and positions its speaker in an epistemically higher position than that of the speaker of the RfC. For this reason, *no* can also respond to possibly challenging RfCs (and might, in that sense, be better translated as ‘yes indeed’). In Excerpt 6, Jana (JAN) writes a text message in front of her mother Ludmila (LUD). While JAN voices her writing throughout her typing activity, LUD displays her disapproval of this individual activity by commenting on the address term JAN uses for her friend, ‘little bug’ (line 02):

Ex. 6 (53_BOL)

- 01 JAN: **.th:: (1.0) °prosím° (0.3) tě**
.th:: (1.0)<hi (0.3) there ((please))>
- 02 **(0.9) brou::, (.) čin::; (0.2) ku::,**
(0.9) <babe (('little bug'))>
- 03 **(0.3)**
- 04 LUD: **no pr(h)os(h)imt(h)ě**
well r(h)eall(h)y
- 05 JAN: **°zas-°**
°agai-°
- 06 LUD: **°.h .he h:° ty ji píšeš broučINKu; jo**
you-2SG her write-2SG bug-AKK TAG+
°.h .he h:° you really say babe to her yeah
- 07 JAN: **°°.h: .th::°° no,**
PRT+
°°.h: .th::°° yes
- 08 **(0.7)**
- 09 JAN: **[za:vo:lám] zí:tra:**
[I will call] tomorrow
- 10 LUD: **[he, he; .hf: (.) °hm::;°]**
- 11 **(1.9)**
- 12 JAN: **ču, ču; (0.5) °°.nh hf::°° (0.6) no aby to**
bye bye (0.5) °°.nh hf::°° (0.6) well so that
- 13 **bylo °vtipný;° (.) °a blbý(h)°**
it would be funny (.) and silly(h)

While the RfC (line 06) itself has a typical, epistemically unmarked format (see the use of the *jo*-tag), its larger sequential context and laughter particles frame it as being a challenge (cf. Küttner and Ehmer 2023). Shortly after JAN has voiced the beginning of her text message (lines 01-02), LUD initiates an accusative turn referring to something her daughter should possibly account for (line 04). Note that *no* can also be used for projecting a possible disalignment or modification (and would thus in this case be better translated as ‘well’). The pre- and post-positioned laughter particles (beginning of lines 6 and 10) also convey LUD’s stance toward this address term as being potentially inappropriate. Her RfC indeed alludes to something that is already known to her (as it has just been voiced by JAN, line 02), therefore clearly not pointing to an epistemic asymmetry. This RfC is responded to by a plain *no* (line 07), and, once the text message has been finalized, an extended account re-using the *no* (lines 12-13), claiming JAN’s independent decision regarding the address term and displaying her rejection of LUD’s opinion.

Prefacing elements to the responsive turns to RfCs are very rare ($n = 9/179$, 5%; Table 18), these elements being all non-lexical, such as tongue clicks (Ogden 2013, see also Ben-Moshe and Maschler 2024 for Hebrew) or hesitation particles. It should be noted that the heterogeneous audio quality of the recordings and responsive turns produced in overlap might mean that a few more responsive turns make use of non-lexical prefacing elements, especially tongue clicks. Nevertheless, prefacing responsive turns can be said to be not very important for (dis)confirming in Czech.

Table 18: Prefacing elements in Czech RfCs

Prefacing elements	Total $n = 179$
No	170 (95%)
Yes	9 (5%)

5.3 Clusters of response tokens

As has been already shown in the previous section (Table 17), clusters of response tokens are less frequent than single tokens. Among the 152 responses to RfCs containing response tokens, only 32 (21.1%) contain two or more tokens or complex forms (Table 16, Section 5.2). The complex forms or clusters refer to a series of two or more response tokens that are uttered without a pause or clear prosodic break; i.e., they are produced as one intonational unit.

In our data set, the 24 cases of cluster responses (15.8%, Table 19) consist of either multiple versions of the same token (Stivers 2004), such as *jo_jo*; or *no_no_no*; (15 cases), or of series of different tokens, such as *no:_jasně*; or *no:_právě*; (9 cases). These seem to be related either to RfCs containing more reformulated and self-repaired elements (and thus syntactically less smooth RfCs), or to a series of RfCs related to a similar topic, in which subsequent RfCs are responded to with increasingly multiple tokens (Stivers 2004).

Table 19: Cluster of response tokens in responses to RfCs in Czech

Cluster	Total $n = 152$
No	128 (84.2%)
Yes	24 (15.8%)

5.4 Position of the first response token

The position of the first response token is overwhelmingly initial (132 cases or 86.8% out of the 152 responses containing response tokens), followed by 15 cases with tokens in final position (9.9%) and only 5 with tokens in mid-position (3.3%, Table 20). It should be noted that among the 132 responsive turns with an initial token, 45 are minimal responses in that they contain only one or more response tokens, but no other lexical material (cf.

Table 20: Position of first response token

Position	Total $n = 152$	
Initial	87 Non-minimal responses (57.2%)	132 (86.8%)
	45 Minimal responses (29.6%)	
Mid	5 (3.3%)	20 (13.2%)
Final	15 (9.9%)	

Section 5.5). In these 45 cases (29.6%), the initial position is therefore a default one, as opposed to the 87 (57.2%) remaining occurrences representing non-minimal responses.

Of the 15 cases with final response tokens, 11 contain a full or partial repeat of the RfC, such as illustrated by Excerpt 7 (line 09). This holds also for three out of the five cases with a response token in mid-position. It should, however, be noted that the combination of an initial response token and a (partial or full) repeat is overall more frequent (27 cases). In general, response tokens can be positioned freely around partial and full repeats of the RfCs (overall 41 cases, i.e., 27.0% out of 152 containing various forms of repeats, see also Section 5.6).

The position of the response token indeed relates to sequence management. An initial response token treats the confirmation as the first and thus most (or solely, in case of minimal responses) relevant responsive action. In Excerpt 7, within a longer update that Jana (JAN) gives about her family, Nora (NOR) enquires about her brother Martin's whereabouts (line 01), to which JAN provides an answer (lines 02–03).

Ex. 7 (173_SOU)

01 NOR: kde je Martin [ted',]
 where is Martin [now]
 02 JAN: [Mar]tin je te:d' eee;;
 [Mar]tin is now er:
 03 v Českých Budějovicích se přestěhoval-
 in ((city name)) he moved
 04 (0.4)
 05 NOR: °on se pře°stě[hoval?]
 °he mov[ed?]
 06 JAN: [mhm:; _hm,]
 07 (0.3)
 08 NOR: °a co-° má tam práci; jo:?
 and what have-3SG there work-AKK TAG+
 °and what-° he has a job there; yeah?
 09 JAN: .ts dostal tam práci; no:;
 receive-PST.3SG there work-AKK PRT+
 .ts he got a job there yes
 10 (1.2)
 11 NOR: >>ty já jsem nevěděla že on tu není;<< (že jo;)
 >>wow I didn't know that he's not here anymore<< (huh)

NOR's RfC (Gipper et al. 2024) is only minimally responded to (lines 05–06), not leading JAN to elaborate on this apparent news for NOR. NOR subsequently offers a topic-proffering RfC ('and what- he has a job there yeah', line 08). Instead of immediately confirming this with a response token, JAN provides a partial repeat of the RfC and appends the response token *no* (line 09). It cannot be said if JAN treats NOR's RfC as simply being rather obvious (work being one of the most frequent reasons for moving) and therefore in no need of elaboration, or if she rather resists elaborating on this topic at this moment. In any case, a turn-final response token displays an orientation to sequence closing. This is also visible in the fact that in the next position, NOR offers yet another topic-proffering turn, trying to elicit more information about the brother beyond the preceding sequence closing (line 11).

5.5 Minimal and non-minimal responses

Responses to RfCs can be minimal, meaning that they consist of a single (or more, cf. Section 5.2) response token, which is the case for 25.1% of the 179 RfCs having received an audible response. A larger part of the RfCs receive a more elaborate response, in that the response token(s) is/are accompanied by more lexical material providing a possible answer to the RfC. These non-minimal responses ($n = 107/179$, 59.8%) are mostly formatted with a response token in the initial position, followed by a more elaborate response ($n = 87$ out of 107 cases, cf. Section 5.4, Table 20). The remaining 27 examples (15.1%) contain elaborate responses without any response token, corresponding to the coding category ‘other’ (Table 21).

Table 21: Minimal and non-minimal responses to RfCs in Czech

Response types	Total $n = 179$
Minimal	45 (25.1%)
Non-Minimal	107 (59.8%)
Other	27 (15.1%)

More than half of these ‘other’ examples consist of partial or full repeats of the RfCs ($n = 16/27$), the other 11 cases provide different types of responses that contain lexical material that is fully different from the one provided in the RfC. Looking at the distribution of all response types with respect to their confirming potential, all minimal responses are confirmatory ($n = 45/45$, 100%, Table 22). For the other response types, we can notice more variation, although confirmation is also the most frequent action carried out both by non-minimal ($n = 83/107$, 77.6%) and by other responses ($n = 17/27$, 63.0%).

Table 22: Distribution of minimal and non-minimal responses according to response types in Czech

Response types	Total $n = 179$		Confirmation	Disconfirmation	Neither
Minimal	45 (25.1%)	$n = 45$	45 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Non-minimal	107 (59.8%)	$n = 107$	83 (77.6%)	21 (19.6%)	3 (2.8%)
Other	27 (15.1%)	$n = 27$	17 (63.0%)	5 (18.5%)	5 (18.5%)

Table 22 shows that disconfirmations are typically in need of more lexical material, although a first disconfirming move seems to be usually tied to a response token (21 non-minimal disconfirming responses as compared to 5 other-formatted ones). The responses providing neither a confirmation nor a disconfirmation (‘neither’) always contain more lexical material than just a response token (i.e., they belong to the categories ‘non-minimal’ or ‘other’).

While a confirmation can be fully implemented by a minimal response ($n = 45$ cases), the more frequent way of confirming an RfC in Czech is by a non-minimal response ($n = 83$ cases). This is not surprising if we consider that RfCs can be part of larger sequences (big packages, Sacks 1992) in which they act as, e.g., topic proffers or requests for information that make an elaboration in the next turn relevant. If an RfC is clearly framed as clarifying a specific and small fact that is relevant, for instance, for following the larger line of talk, a minimal answer to the RfC might be sufficient. In the following example (Excerpt 8), the RfC mainly serves to identify the correct person. While looking at pictures on a smartphone, Marta (MAR) enquires about one of the women who are visible in one of the pictures (line 01). The noun phrase that initiates a repair regarding the referenced person obtains a minimal confirmation, then Yveta (YVE) self-selects again in order to answer MAR’s initial question from line 01 (lines 05–06).

Ex. 8 (96_CAJ)

- 01 MAR: .h a prosim tě, jak se má
.h and please (tell me), how is she
- 02 (0.3)
- 03 YVE: Eliška?
(Name) - F.NOM
Eliška?
- 04 MAR: mhmm; hm,
PRT+
- 05 YVE: tedka byli v Holandsku:, (.) a včera se vrátili,
now they were in the Netherlands (.) and yesterday they came back
- 06 ona tam má nějakou kamarádku,
she has a friend there

In this case, the minimal response confirms and closes the side sequence (Jefferson 1972), allowing to get back to the main (or a different) line of talk right afterward, or, more generally, to lead the talk on that precise topic toward a closing (see also Excerpt 7 regarding final response tokens). If the confirmable itself is more important to the larger sequence, or if it introduces an up-to-then new aspect (which can be either repaired and/or which considerably contributes to the development of the topic or the overall progressivity of the sequence), the confirmatory response will be more than just minimal (cf. Gubina et al. 2024 for a similar observation on German data).

5.6 Full and expanded repeats

Compared to other languages, for instance, English (Küttner and Szczepek Reed 2024), in Czech, repeated elements in responses to RfCs are more frequent. After all, out of the 179 audible responses to RfCs, 57 (31.8%) of the responses re-use at least some of the lexical material from the RfC, while 122, i.e., 68.2%, do not contain any repeated elements (Table 23).

Table 23: Types of RfC responses in Czech with regard to repeated elements from the RfC

Response types	Total <i>n</i> = 179
No repeat	122 (68.2%) (of which 45 minimal)
Full repeat	10 (5.6%) (of which 5 do not contain any response token)
Full expanded	11 (6.1%) (of which 5 do not contain any response token)
Partial	36 (20.1%) (of which 7 do not contain any response token)

According to research on English, repeating lexical material from a co-participant’s turn conveys a stronger epistemic position (Heritage and Raymond 2005). As a consequence, repeats in responses to RfCs in English have been suggested to be rare as they might lead to an ‘epistemic overkill’ in the otherwise already epistemically asymmetrical RfC sequence (Küttner and Szczepek Reed 2024, 29). In co-constructional sequences (Lerner 2004), repeating a co-participant’s pre-emptive completion reclaims, on the one hand, authorship and independent continuation of the turn, but, on the other, it also treats the pre-emptive completion as indeed fitting to the emerging and pre-emptively completed turn (Oloff 2018). While RfCs and pre-emptive

completions are not the same type of action, (partial) repeats as responses both to a pre-emptive completion and to a specific type of RfC might work in a comparable way. Again, in order to investigate this more thoroughly, a larger number of full and expanded repeats in responses to RfCs in Czech would be needed.

6 Conclusion

This article aimed to provide a first systematic description of RfC sequences in spoken Czech. Previous accounts of interrogative formats in Czech already described basic syntactic and prosodic formats as well as recurrent lexical choices for forming interrogative sentences in Czech. However, they mostly refer to theoretical communicative functions and do not single out RfCs as a specific type of interrogative action. Based on 30-min excerpts from 7 video-recorded mundane conversations, 204 examples of RfCs have been quantitatively explored. This led to the description of recurrent features of Czech RfCs according to this data set.

Syntactically speaking, the majority of RfCs in Czech are clausal declaratives, which can be disambiguated from simple propositions by, e.g., the use of tags, rising final contour, and/or their sequential and topical context (i.e., displaying an epistemic cline of the speaker with respect to their interlocutor). Nearly 90% of the RfCs are realized in positive polarity. Modulating or inference-marking elements are rare, with about three-quarters of RfCs containing no modulation marker, and with about 80% containing no inference markers. However, more than 50% of the RfCs contain a connective, most frequently *a* ‘and’. The most frequent tags (that around half of the RfCs are carrying) are *jo* ‘yes’ and *ne* ‘no’, the former – according to a preliminary analysis – marking easily inferable and ‘unrisky’ confirmables, the latter being most likely used for less evident, more uncertain or topically deviating confirmables. As regards prosody, the confirmable frequently carries falling intonation (more than 60%), especially if a tag is appended. Tags are mainly non-integrated (more than 85%) and mostly carry rising intonation, leading to a typical fall-rise pattern in RfCs with tags.

Nearly all the RfCs in our data set (96%) receive a response, in 80% of the cases a confirmation. The high frequency of confirmations raises the question if epistemic asymmetry (respectively its removal) is indeed the strongest driver for using RfCs, or if the main interactional job carried out by prototypical RfCs lies more in providing responsive action that displays the speaker’s high involvement (Section 4.6). The responses to RfCs are mainly audible/verbal, most of which also contain embodied responsive elements (74.5%, Table 14, which are often, but not exclusively, head nods). Regarding the high frequency of combinations of verbal and embodied responses to RfCs in our data, as well as of embodied responses only (8.7%, Table 14), one could wonder if, for instance, head nods should be best coded as interjections or variants of ‘yes’, as suggested by Enfield et al. (2019) for polar answers. Indeed, embodied responses might offer a way to manage the temporality of the response differently, for instance in the case of more complex RfCs, or when RfCs are produced in overlap or represent a possible deviation from the main line of talk. In that sense, a cross-linguistic exploration of multimodal responses (or multimodal responsive *gestalts*, Mondada 2018) to RfCs could investigate in more detail the complementarity of audible and visible responsive actions, and possible preferences for embodied responses in certain languages or settings. Audible responses to RfCs in Czech mostly (more than 80%) contain one or more response tokens, the most frequent ones being *no* ‘yes’ (tilting the response more clearly toward the resolution of an epistemic asymmetry), *jo* ‘yes’ (being epistemically less marked), and *ne* ‘no’. These tokens are mainly in turn-initial position in case of non-minimal responses. Nearly three-quarters of the RfCs are (dis)confirmed by more than just a minimal response, which shows that (dis)confirmation is probably the most important, but not the only responsive action that is made relevant by an RfC. While repeated elements in responses to RfCs seem to be more frequent in Czech than in other languages (including partial repeats: about 30%), it remains to be investigated how/what these confirm or respond to compared to, e.g., response tokens such as *no* ‘yes’ or *ne* ‘no’.

Overall, while recurrent formats of RfC sequences in Czech could be identified, the variety of tokens used as tags and for responding (and their partially overlapping uses in these and other positions) as well as the use and forms of repeats and other syntactic formats will have to be investigated in more detail in future studies. Also, a closer look into possible dialectal specificities regarding lexical, syntactic and prosodic features of Czech RfCs would have to be based on supplementary and more purposefully curated data sets.

Transcription conventions

Based on Jefferson (2004) and Kaderka and Svobodová (2006)

01 SOP	original talk
	<i>interlinear gloss (>Leipzig glossing rules)</i>
	approximate translation
[]	overlap (onset & end)
(.)	micro-pause (<0.2 s)
(0.7)	length of pauses in seconds
?	rising intonation
,	mid-rising intonation
;	mid-falling intonation
.	falling intonation
.h/h	breath (in/out)
he/ha	laughter particle
(h)	laughter particle (intralexical)
(will)	uncertain transcription
((laughs))	comments
< >	delimitation of phenomena noted within (())
:	sound stretch
xxx	incomprehensible segment
<u>extra</u>	prominence of talk
=	latching
wha-	truncation
°okay°	low volume
WELL	increased volume
>>okay<<	accelerated speech

Acknowledgments: I would like to thank the editors of this special issue, Katharina König and Martin Pfeiffer, and the two anonymous reviewers for their valuable feedback and support throughout the writing process.

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

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

Conflict of interest: The author declares no conflict of interest.

References

- Aldrup, Marit. 2024. “Asking the Obvious: Other-Repeats as Requests for Reconfirmation.” *Contrastive Pragmatics* 5 (1–2): 274–306.
- Ben-Moshe, Yotam and Yael Maschler. 2024. “Request for Confirmation Sequences in Hebrew.” *Open Linguistics* 10 (1): 20240028. doi: 10.1515/opli-2024-0028.
- Čermáková, Anna, Lucie Jílková, Zuzana Komrsková, Marie Kopřivová, and Petra Poukarová. 2019. “Diskurzívní markery [Discourse markers].” In *Syntax mluvené češtiny*, edited by Jana Hoffmannová, Jiří Homoláč, and Kamila Mrázková, 244–351. Praha: Academia.
- Čmejrková, Světlá, Lucie Jílková, and Petr Kaderka. 2004. “Mluvená čeština v televizních debatách: Korpus DIALOG [Spoken Czech in Television Debates: The DIALOG Corpus].” *Slovo a slovesnost* 65: 243–69.

- Cvrček, Václav, Vilém Kodýtek, Marie Kopřivová, Dominika Kovaříková, Petr Sgall, Michal Šulc, Jan Táborský, Jan Volín, and Martina Waclawičová. 2010. *Mluvnice současné češtiny. 1: Jak se píše a jak se mluví* [Grammar of contemporary Czech: how it is written and how it is spoken]. Praha: Karolinum.
- De Stefani, Elwys. 2021. "Embodied Responses to Questions-in-Progress: Silent Nods as Affirmative Answers." *Discourse Processes* 58 (4): 353–71.
- 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.
- Dix, Carolin and Alexandra Groß. 2024. "Surprise About News or Just Receiving Information?: Moving and Holding Both Eyebrows in Co-Present Interaction." *Social Interaction. Video-Based Studies of Human Sociality* 6 (3): 1–27. doi: 10.7146/si.v6i3.142906.
- Enfield, Nick J., Tanya Stivers, Penelope Brown, Christina Englert, Katariina Harjunpää, Makoto Hayashi, Trine Heinemann, Gertie Hoymann, and Tiina Keisanen. 2019. "Polar Answers." *Journal of Linguistics* 55 (2): 277–304.
- Gipper, Sonja, Katharina König, and Kathrin Weber. 2024. "Structurally Similar Formats Are Not Functionally Equivalent across Languages: Requests for Reconfirmation in Comparative Perspective." *Contrastive Pragmatics* 5 (1–2): 195–237.
- Grepil, Miroslav. 1995. "Výpověď [Statement]." In *Příruční mluvnice češtiny*, edited by Petr Karlík, Marek Nekula, and Zdenka Rusínová, 568–651. Prague: Nakladatelství Lidové noviny.
- Gubina, Alexandra, Emma Betz, and Arnulf Deppermann. 2024. "Doing More than Confirming: Expanded Responses to Requests for Confirmation in German Talk-in-Interaction." *Contrastive Pragmatics* 5 (1–2): 307–346.
- Havlík, Martin and Eliška Zaepernicková. 2016. "Vzájemné ovlivňování prozodie a syntaxe v překryvech replik [Interaction of prosody and syntax in overlapping turns]." *Naše řeč* 99 (1): 33–44.
- Havlík, Martin and Eliška Zaepernicková. 2019. "Temporalita a interakce v rozhovorech: syntaktické a prozodické aspekty projektivity a 'dodatek' [Temporality and interaction in conversations: syntactic and prosodic aspects of projectivity and 'additions']." In *Syntax mluvené češtiny*, edited by Jana Hoffmannová, Jiří Homoláč, and Kamila Mrázková, 25–56, 62–66. Praha: Academia.
- Heritage, John and Geoffrey Raymond. 2005. "The Terms of Agreement: Indexing Epistemic Authority and Subordination in Talk-in-Interaction." *Social Psychology Quarterly* 68: 15–38.
- Hoffmannová, Jana, Jiří Homoláč, and Kamila Mrázková, eds. 2019. *Syntax mluvené češtiny* [The Syntax of Spoken Czech]. Praha: Academia.
- Hoffmannová, Jana, Marie Kopřivová, and Zuzana Laubeová. 2022. "Kumulované diskurzní markery (no ale, no jako, no ne, no tak) a jejich funkce v rozhovoru [Cumulated discourse markers (no ale, no jako, no ne, no tak) and their functions in conversation]." *Korpus – gramatika – axiologie* 26:18–38.
- Hoffmannová, Jana and Olga Müllerová. 1999. *Dialog v češtině* [Dialogue in Czech]. München: Otto Sagner.
- Hoffmannová, Jana, Olga Müllerová, and Jiří Zeman. 1999. *Konverzace v češtině při rodinných a přátelských návštěvách* [Conversation in Czech during family and friendly visits]. Praha: Trizonia.
- Hömke, Paul, Judith Holler, and Stephen C. Levinson. 2017. "Eye Blinking as Addressee Feedback in Face-To-Face Conversation." *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 50 (1): 54–70.
- Jefferson, Gail. 1972. "Side Sequences." In *Studies in Social Interaction*, edited by David Sudnow, 294–338. New York: The Free Press.
- Jefferson, Gail. 2004. "Glossary of Transcript Symbols with an Introduction." In *Conversation Analysis. Studies from the First Generation*, edited by Gene H. Lerner, 13–31. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Kaderka, Petr and Zdeňka Svobodová. 2006. "Jak přepisovat audiovizuální záznam rozhovoru? Manuál pro přepisovatele televizních diskusních pořadů. [How to transcribe an audiovisual recording of an interview? A manual for transcribers of television talk shows]." *Jazykovědné Aktuality* 43 (3–4): 18–51.
- Komrsková, Zuzana. 2017. "What Does *že jo* (and *že ne*) Mean in Spoken Dialogue." *Jazykovědný časopis* 68 (2): 229–37.
- König, Katharina and Martin Pfeiffer. Forthcoming. "Request for Confirmation Sequences in Ten Languages. An Introduction." *Open Linguistics. (Special Issue "Request for Confirmation Sequences in Ten Languages.")*.
- König, Katharina and Martin Pfeiffer. 2024. "Requesting Confirmation or Reconfirmation across Languages: An Introduction." *Contrastive Pragmatics* 5 (1–2): 1–26.
- König, Katharina, Martin Pfeiffer, and Kathrin Weber. Forthcoming. "A Coding Scheme for Request for Confirmation Sequences across Languages." *Open Linguistics. (Special Issue "Request for Confirmation Sequences in Ten Languages.")*.
- Küttner, Uwe-A. and Oliver Ehmer. 2023. "Affordances and Actions: Requests for Confirmation as Devices for Implementing Challenging and Other Disagreement-Implicative Actions." *Contrastive Pragmatics* 5 (1–2): 27–71.
- Küttner, Uwe-A. and Beatrice Szczepek Reed. 2024. "Request for Confirmation Sequences in British and American English." *Open Linguistics* 10 (1): 20240012. doi: 10.1515/opli-2024-0012.
- Lerner, Gene H. 2004. "Collaborative Turn Sequences." In *Conversation Analysis. Studies from the First Generation*, edited by Gene H. Lerner, 225–56. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Mondada, Lorenza. 2014. "Bodies in Action. Multimodal Analysis of Walking and Talking." *Language and Dialogue* 4 (3): 357–403.
- Mondada, Lorenza. 2018. "Multiple Temporalities of Language and Body in Interaction: Challenges for Transcribing Multimodality." *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 51 (1): 85–106.
- Müllerová, Olga. 2007. "Postpozitivní *žejo*, *jo* ve vzpomínkovém vyprávění [Post-positive *žejo*, *jo* in remembered narrative]." In *Čeština v dialogu generací*, edited by Jana Hoffmannová and Olga Müllerová, 291–97. Praha: Academia.
- Müllerová, Olga. 2022a. "Otázka a odpověď v dialogu [Question and answer in dialogue]." In *Dialog a mluvená čeština: Výbor z textů*, edited by Jana Hoffmannová, Lucie Jílková, and Petr Kaderka, 1st ed., 69–85. Sociolingvistická edice 4. Praha: NLN. Original publication: *Otázka a odpověď v dialogu. Slovo a slovesnost* 43 (3), 1982: 200–12.

- Müllerová, Olga. 2022b. "Výskyt a funkce slova no v českých textech prostě sdělovacího stylu [Occurrence and function of the word 'no' in Czech texts of simple communicative style]." In *Dialog a mluvená čeština: výběr z textů*, edited by Jana Hoffmannová, Lucie Jílková, and Petr Kaderka, 1st ed., 230–51. Sociolingvistická edice 4. Praha: NLN. Original publication: Výskyt a funkce slova no v českých textech prostě sdělovacího stylu. *Stylistika* 9, 1996: 222–9.
- Ogden, Richard. 2013. "Clicks and Percussives in English Conversation." *Journal of the International Phonetic Association* 43 (3): 299–320.
- Oloff, Florence. 2018. "Revisiting Delayed Completions: The Retrospective Management of Co-Participant Action." In *Time in Embodied Interaction. Synchronicity and Sequentiality of Multimodal Resources*, edited by Arnulf Deppermann and Jürgen Streeck, 123–60. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Oloff, Florence. 2022. "The Particle *jako* ('Like') in Spoken Czech: From Expressing Comparison to Mobilizing Affiliative Responses." *Frontiers in Psychology* 12: 662115. doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2021.662115.
- Oloff, Florence and Martin Havlík. 2018. "An Initial Description of Syntactic Extensions in Spoken Czech." *Pragmatics* 28 (3): 361–90.
- Ono, Tsuyoshi and Elizabeth Couper-Kuhlen. 2007. "Increments in Cross-Linguistic Perspective: Introductory Remarks." *Pragmatics* 17 (4): 505–12.
- Panevová, Jarmila, Eva Hajičová, Václava Kettnerová, Marketa Lopatková, Marie Mikulová, and Magda Ševčíková. 2014. *Mluvnice současné češtiny 2: Syntax češtiny na základě anotovaného korpusu [Grammar of Contemporary Czech 2: Syntax of Czech based on an Annotated Corpus]*. Praha: Karolinum.
- Pfeiffer, Martin, Katharina König, Kathrin Weber, Arnulf Deppermann, Oliver Ehmer, Sonja Gipper, Alexandra Gubina, Kyu-hyun Kim, Uwe-A. Küttner, Xiaoting Li, Michal Marmorstein, Yael Maschler, Yotam Ben Moshe, Florence Oloff, and Beatrice Szczepek Reed. Forthcoming. "Request for Confirmation Sequences in Ten Languages. A Quantitative Comparison." *Open Linguistics*.
- Sacks, Harvey. 1992. *Lectures on Conversation (1964-1972)*. 2 vols. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Short, David. 2001. "Czech." In *The Slavonic Languages*, edited by Bernard Comrie and Greville Corbet, 455–532. London, New York: Routledge.
- Štícha, František. 1995. "Otázky predikátové: Inference, implicitnost a explicitní výrazy ilokučních funkcí I [Inference, Implicitness and Explicit Expressions of Illocutive Functions I]." *Slovo a slovesnost* 56 (2): 98–109.
- Štícha, František. 1998. "Forms and meanings in yes-no questions (a contrastive study of English, French, German and Czech) I." *Linguistica Pragensia* 8 (2): 73–80.
- Štícha, František. 1999. "Forms and meanings in yes-no questions (a contrastive study of English, French, German and Czech) II." *Linguistica Pragensia* 9 (1): 30–42.
- Štícha, František. 2015. *Česko-německá srovnávací gramatika [Czech-German Comparative Grammar]*. 1st ed. Praha: Argo.
- Stivers, Tanya. 2004. "'No No No' and Other Types of Multiple Sayings in Social Interaction." *Human Communication Research* 30 (2): 260–93.
- Stivers, Tanya. 2010. "An Overview of the Question–Response System in American English Conversation." *Journal of Pragmatics* 42 (10): 2772–81.
- Townsend, Charles E. 1990. *A Description of Spoken Prague Czech*. Columbus: Slavica Publishers.
- Volín, Jan, Michaela Svatošová, and Pavel Šturm. 2022. "Fundamental Frequency Variation in Polarity Questions of Czech." In *Speech Prosody 2022*, 852–56. ISCA. doi: 10.21437/SpeechProsody.2022-173.
- Zeman, Jiří, Jana Hoffmannová, and Lucie Jílková. 2019. "Otázky v mluvené češtině [Questions in Spoken Czech]." In *Syntax mluvené češtiny*, edited by Jana Hoffmannová, Jiří Homoláč, and Kamila Mrázková, 1st ed., 198–217. Praha: Academia.