

# Collaborative Turn Completion in Korean Conversation\*

Haeyeon Kim  
(Chung-Ang University)

**Kim, Haeyeon. (2002). Collaborative turn completion in Korean conversation. *Language Research* 38(4), 1281-1316.**

Co-construction, or collaborative turn completion, is one of the attempts to explore interactional and sequential nature of conversation. This research explores the questions of how grammar is shaped by the interaction between speaker and hearer and what social actions are involved in the interaction in Korean. After examining types and frequency of co-construction in Korean conversational data, this research discusses roles and functions of the four most frequently used clausal connectives *-nuntey*, *-ko*, *-myen*, and *-nikka* as a way of characterizing co-construction in terms of semantic, pragmatic properties of the connectives. This inquiry also discusses contexts for the occurrence of co-construction, critically reviewing the claims that pragmatic factors coming from politeness or 'private territory of information', late projectability, and delay of the delivery of the final component are responsible for the production of co-construction. This research shows that co-construction is produced basically by next speaker's efforts to collaborate with current speaker based on shared or assumed knowledge. It shows that semantic, pragmatic properties and social actions are also responsible for the production of co-construction by exploring semantic, pragmatic properties of clausal connectives used in co-construction. In addition, this study explores what social actions are involved in the production of co-construction, focusing on the relationship between social actions and grammar in talk-in-interaction. Finally, this research shows the interactive nature of co-construction, suggesting the need to explore the relationship between interaction and grammar which is constantly shaped by the interaction between speaker and hearer.

**Key words:** co-construction, collaborative turn completion, interaction and grammar, social actions, clausal connectives

---

\*Part of this paper was presented at the 13th International Conference on Korean Linguistics on July 9, 2002, in Oslo, Norway. An earlier version of this paper was read by three anonymous reviewers, and I would like to thank them for useful comments and suggestions. All shortcomings are, of course, mine.

## 1. Introduction

In recent years, there has been much research on the relationship between conversation, social interaction and grammar in interaction-based research of language. A growing number of researchers in the fields of discourse analysis (DA) and conversation analysis (CA) have begun to explore the interactive nature of conversation, paying serious attention to the intricate processes in which the participants are engaged. Many studies have shown diverse aspects of the relationship between conversation and grammar, dealing with topics such as turn taking, turn-constructive units (TCUs), repair, sequence organization, preference organization, and co-construction, among others. The research on co-construction, or collaborative turn completion, is one of such attempts to explore the complex processes in which the participants collaboratively develop each other's talk in a moment-by-moment fashion (Akatsuka, 1997; Ferrara, 1992; Ford, 1993; Goodwin & Goodwin, 1987; Hayashi, 2001; Hayashi & Mori, 1998; Lerner, 1987, 1991, 1996; Lerner & Takagi, 1999; Ono & Yoshida, 1996; among others). Co-construction, or termed anticipatory completion or collaborative turn completion, refers to collaborative production of syntactic units in the interaction between speaker and hearer, practices by which participants in conversation complete a turn-in-progress started by another participant. The research on co-construction has shown that collaborative turn sequences provide evidence for projectable completion points and joint orientation to a notion of 'clause' or 'sentence' as abstract constructive schemas (Langacker, 1987; Ono & Thompson, 1995, 1996). It also has demonstrated implications of the socially distributed nature of talk-in-interaction and the social meanings that are produced through the close monitoring of a turn's trajectory.

In this line of research, I would like to explore the interactive nature of co-construction in Korean conversation by exploring structural contexts where co-construction occurs, paying attention to social actions expressed in co-construction. In this research, first, I will explore the question of what grammatical units (i.e., phrase, clause, and sentence) are involved in co-construction. That is, I will examine the question of what syntactic unit produced by the first speaker is taken up by the second speaker as a part of his/her unit, dealing with the question of how syntactic

characteristics of Korean affect collaborative production of utterances. To do that, I will examine types of co-construction in Korean conversation in terms of the following two categories: (i) co-construction of mono-clausal units, including phrasal units, and (ii) co-construction of two-part multi-clausal units. Second, this research will examine what semantic, pragmatic properties of clausal connectives are responsible for the production of joint utterance construction based on the analysis of frequency of clausal connectives involved in co-construction. Third, this inquiry will deal with the structural and interactional contexts for the occurrence of co-construction, examining the claims that pragmatic factors coming from politeness or 'private territory of information', late projectability, and regular delay of the delivery of the final component are responsible for the production of co-construction (Hayashi, 2001; Hayashi & Mori, 1998; Ono & Yoshida, 1996; Tanaka, 1999). I will claim that the occurrence of co-construction has to do not only with syntactic, semantic environments but also with pragmatic factors such as affiliative or collaborative efforts of the addressee in completing current speaker's on-going turns. Fourth, this research will deal with the question of what social actions are involved in the production of co-construction through an examination of interactional contexts where co-construction occurs, showing how the social actions are related with grammar in the joint production of utterances in Korean conversation.

In sum, this research, through an exploration of some aspects of joint utterance construction in Korean conversation, will show that temporally unfolding talk is closely intertwined in progressively shaping emerging possibilities for concerted participation by multiple participants. The examination of a range of social actions involved in co-construction will show the possibility that grammar and social interactions mutually organize one another.

## **2. Context of the Research**

In the last ten years or so, many discourse analysts and conversation analysts have investigated the relationship between conversation, grammar, and social action. Among many of the research topics, co-construction is one of the best examples that shows the interactive nature of conversation in shaping grammar by accomplishing social

actions. The work on the joint construction of utterances by multiple participants within a turn at talk has been carried out by many discourse analysts and conversation analysts (C. Goodwin & M. Goodwin, 1987; 1992, Hayashi, 2001; Hayashi & Mori, 1998; Lerner, 1987, 1991, 1996; Lerner & Takagi, 1999; Mori, 1996; Ono & Yoshida, 1996). These studies have shown several aspects of practices used in joint utterance construction in English and Japanese conversations, examining the relationship between grammar and social interaction. In addition, the research on co-construction shows how grammatical forms are shaped progressively by collaborative work of the participants with the moment-to-moment unfolding of social interaction. As Hayashi (2001, p. 4) points out, "joint utterance construction allows one to see how grammar within a turn at talk is both a resource for, and an outcome of, contingent and concerted participation by multiple parties to interaction."

Lerner (1987, 1991, 1996), through a series of research on co-construction in English, shows many syntactic environments where collaborative participation is realized among conversational interactants. Lerner (1991) illustrates many examples of multiple TCUs where joint production is achieved, the syntactic formats such as *if X-then Y* and *when X-then Y*, the quotation format *X said-Y*, parenthetical inserts, list structure, prefaced disagreement, and so on. In a similar line of research, Lerner and Takagi (1999), by comparing linguistic resources in English and Japanese, show participants' treatment of sentences-in-progress in terms of a sequentially informed syntax. They isolate and describe the use of language-specific structures as constitutive elements of turn-construction.

In a study of co-construction in Japanese conversation, Ono and Yoshida (1996), based on the low frequency of co-construction, claim that a pragmatic constraint coming from 'private territory' or politeness is responsible for the rarity of co-construction in Japanese. Hayashi and Mori (1998), Lerner and Takagi (1999), and Hayashi (2001), on the other hand, show that co-construction does take place in Japanese in spite of the delayed projectability coming from the verb-final property of Japanese. In a similar way, Lerner and Takagi (1999) show that there are many syntactic cues that furnish speakers with resources for co-construction in Japanese.

The research discussed above has shown that co-construction is one of the most prominent constructions that clearly shows interactive nature of conversation. Most of these studies have focused on the grammatical

aspects of co-construction, claiming that pragmatic factors such as politeness and 'private territory of information' and delay of the delivery of the final component are responsible for the production of co-construction. In this research, on the other hand, will show that the production of co-construction is closely related not only with semantic, pragmatic factors of clausal connectives but also with affiliative or collaborative efforts of the addressee in completing current speaker's on-going turns. To show that, this research will investigate some devices used in Korean talk-in-interaction to accomplish co-construction in turn construction. In addition, this research will be a study that will show how the social actions expressed in conversation interact with and shape grammar through negotiation among speakers.

### 3. Database and Methodology

#### 3.1. Database

The present study is based on an empirically-grounded micro-analysis of practices in joint construction observed in tape-recorded naturally-occurring Korean conversations. In characterizing the interactional nature of co-construction in conversation, it is imperative that one should look at naturally occurring data to explicate the intricate processes of speakers' efforts in producing co-construction. Thus, I chose four audio-taped face-to-face conversations to carry out the research on interactional and structural aspects of co-construction in Korean conversation:

1. [DEPT]: Multi-party conversation among peer graduate students in a school department office, mainly three students, and some more male speakers in the latter part of the conversation, talking about the graduate study and their home and school life (20 minutes).
2. [AIR]: Dyadic conversation between two female speakers, one graduate student and one stewardess. Talk about their job and school life (25 minutes).
3. [ENGLISH]: Conversation among three female graduate students, mainly talking about learning English (13 minutes).
4. [PREP]: Dyadic conversation between two male speakers in a college-preparation center office. Talk between two teachers, talking about the center and high school students (27 minutes).

Based on these four conversations, I will explore the questions of in what contexts co-construction occur and what social actions are involved in the production of co-construction.

### 3.2. Methodology

In characterizing co-construction in conversation, it is necessary to make a judgment of what turns function as co-constructed turns in Korean conversation. As Lerner and Takagi (1999, p. 53) point out, there is a range of interactionally relevant resources, including syntactic, intonational, semantic and pragmatic resources, which enhance the possibility of co-participant completion in conversation. However, this research mainly focuses on syntactic practices of co-participant completion and semantic and pragmatic properties of clausal connectives used in the preliminary components of compound TCUs, describing a method for participants to determine at any point in the production of an utterance, whether the TCU-so-far constitutes a compound TCU, when seen in terms of the syntactic structures of the TCU. So, first I checked at what levels co-construction takes place, bearing in mind the fact that co-construction can take place in various contexts, i.e., at lexical, phrasal, clausal, or sentential levels.

In Korean, co-construction typically takes place at a point where the first speaker's turn ends in the form of clausal TCUs with clausal connectives, and the points at which the clausal TCUs end with clausal connectives work as transition relevance places (TRPs). Thus, that is a good place where the second speaker starts his/her turn as a way of completing the first speaker's projected turn, resulting in co-construction. In this regard, let us consider the following (1) as a way of defining co-construction in Korean.<sup>1)</sup>

---

1) The Korean conversational data are transcribed basically following the transcription conventions proposed by Du Bois et al. (1993), each line representing an intonation unit. The following are transcription conventions used in the Korean data (Du Bois et al., 1993):

Intonation unit	{carriage return}	Pause	
truncated IU	-	Long	...(N)
truncated word	-	Medium	...
Speech overlap	[ ]	short	..
Transition continuity		Latching	(0)
Final	.	Vocal noises	
Continuing	,	Vocal noises	( )
Appeal	?	Inhalation	(H)

- (1) 1 S: ...달리기 할 때, <---A  
 ...taliki hal ttay  
 running do when  
 'When doing a running race,'
- 2 P: ..예.  
 yey  
 'Yeah.'
- 3 S: ...컨디션에 따라서, <---B  
 ...kentsiyen-ey ttal-ase  
 condition-on depend-CONN  
 'depends on conditions,'
- 4 P: ..따라서,  
 ..ttal-ase  
 depend-CONN  
 'depends and,'
- 5 S: ...뭐 차이가 있고, <---C  
 ...mwe chai-ka iss-ko  
 well difference-NM be-CONN  
 'well, there's a difference,'
- 6 P: ..그렇죠.  
 kuleh-cyo  
 that:be:so-HON  
 'Right.'
- 7 S: ...기록 차이가 있고,  
 kilok chai-ka iss-ko  
 record difference-NM be-CONN  
 'there's a difference in record,'
- 8 P: ...빠르기가 다르죠. <---D  
 ppaluki-ka talu-cyo  
 speed-NM different-HON  
 'running speeds are different.' [PREP]

In (1), the turns numbered 3, 5, and 7 are clausal TCUs that carry clausal connectives. As can be seen in (1), the points where the clausal TCUs end with clausal connective function as TRPs. Thus, in A, when the clausal unit functions as an adverbial clause, at the end of that clause, a backchanneling signal intervenes. At the end of Turn B, the next speaker repeats part of Turn B, at the end of Turn C, another reactive token

follows. Speaker S keeps his turn going, because it has an enumerative clause schema [i.e., clause with *-ko* 'and' + clause with *-ko*, ... like the English construction *and + and + ...*].

When we closely examine Excerpt (1), we can notice that not all clausal TCUs are completed by the next speaker. Only the clausal TCU numbered 7 is completed by the next speaker, which results in co-construction. In this regard, I have checked every turn that ends with clausal TCUs in the present data. Then, I have examined whether they are completed by co-participant's second part, forming mono-clausal or multi-clausal sentential units or not. In examining the present data, the clausal TCUs that are followed by backchanneling signals such as *uh* 'uh', *ung* 'uhhuh', *yey* 'yeah' are not included because the turns-in-progress are continued beyond those points. In the present data, I found total 164 clausal TCUs with clausal connectives, which means that the next speaker starts his/her turn at the points where the clausal units with connectives are used.

Another thing that should be considered is the judgment of whether a turn is used as a way of co-constructing the previous speaker's utterance or not. The judgment of whether previous speaker's turns that end with clausal units function as co-constructed patterns depends on the projectability of the turn in question. The examination of the present data shows that 60 cases (i.e., 36.6%) out of the total 164 clausal TCUs are examples of co-construction in the form of multi-clausal sentential units. In the present, there are 28 instances of collaborative turn completion at a phrasal or mono-clausal level. Based on this statistics, I will examine each case of co-construction, checking what clausal connectives are used in the first part of the co-construction of multi-clausal sentential units. After that, I will examine interactional and structural contexts of the clausal connectives used with the first clausal TCU component. Based on the examination, I will characterize them in terms of the functions or social actions they perform in those contexts. The present study thus provides a close, empirical description of co-construction in Korean grounded in the observable details of participants' conduct in naturally-occurring interaction.



#### 4. Types and Frequency of Co-construction in Korean Conversation

As has been pointed out in the literature on co-construction (Hayashi, 2001; Lerner, 1987, 1992, 1996), the types of co-construction can be divided into two: (i) the co-construction of mono-clausal sentential units, and (ii) the co-construction of two-part multi-clausal sentential units. The co-construction of mono-clausal sentential units refers to cases where the delivery of a co-participant's final part completes another speaker's utterance-in-progress, thus resulting in a complete mono-clausal sentential unit. In this case, the delivery is commonly preceded by an intra-turn pause caused by hesitation, word search, interruption, and/or other speech problems in the TCUs in progress. Let us consider the following (2)<sup>2</sup>:

- (2) A: (11 intonation units of this turn are deleted)  
 ...빨갭게 살이--  
 ...ppalkahkey sal-i-  
 reddishly flesh-NM  
 ...그래 그거를 제거하는,  
 ...kulay kuku-lul ceykeha-nun  
 so that-ACC remove-ATTR  
 ..약간의--  
 ..yakkan-uy--  
 a little-GEN  
 'reddishly flesh-, so, a kind of, which removes it'
- B: ..오퍼레이션?  
 ..opeleyisyen?  
 'Operation?'

---

2) The transcription of Korean examples in this research follows the conventions of the Yale Romanization System. The abbreviations used in glossing Korean examples are as follows:

ACC	: Accusative case marker	ATTR	: Attributive
CIRCUM	: Circumstantial	COMM	: Committal connective
COND	: Conditional connective	CONN	: Connective
CONSEQ	: Consequential	GEN	: Genitive
HON	: Honorific marker	IE	: Informal ending
INTRP	: Interruptive	LOC	: Locative marker
NM	: Nominative case marker	PST	: Past tense marker
REASON	: Reason connective	RETRO	: Retrospective marker
Q	: Question marker	SUPP	: Suppositional
TM	: Topic marker		

- A: ..음 ...했지,  
 ..um ...hay-ss-ci  
 uhm do-PST-COMM  
 'uhm, (I) did.'  
 (7 intonation units of this turn deleted.) [AIR]

As can be seen in (2), the delivery of the co-participant's second component forms a single clausal- or sentential turn constructional unit. That is, in (2), Speaker A talks about her experience of having an operation after experiencing a small accident that happened while serving meals to passengers. In (2), Speaker A does not complete her turn in talking about her experience. Then Speaker B delivers a noun phrase 'operation' as a candidate filler for the missing part of the projected turn. Speaker A accepts the NP as a filler for her turn and completes her turn, simply providing the word *hayssci* (the light verb *ha* 'do' + the past tense marker *-ess* + the sentence ender *-ci*). In this case, the collaboration of the two speakers results in a complete single sentential unit. This example shows that co-construction takes place at a word or phrasal level.<sup>3)</sup>

Co-construction at the mono-clausal level can be mostly found in the

---

3) In the literature (Ono and Thompson, 1996; Hayashi, 2001), it has been reported that in English and Japanese, co-construction takes place at a phrasal level, as can be seen in (1).

(1) a. (English: Santa Barbara Spoken English Conversational Data)

Miles: ... (H) Are they ... teaching ... any more lambada,  
 ... at= uh --

Jamie: ... school?

Miles: .. Yeah.

b. (Japanese: Hayashi, 2001)

Aiko: de! nan'nichikan gurai sore tte.  
 and for-how-many-days about that-one QT  
 'and, for about how many days, that one?'

Mami: ga tookakan.  
 SP for-ten-days  
 'is for ten days.'

In (a), the current speaker Miles utters a preposition *at* with a lengthened syllable, searching for a word to make a complete prepositional phrase, failing to finish his projected turn. At this moment, the next speaker, Jamie, provides a noun 'school' with rising intonation, as a way of providing a candidate word to complete the projected turn. In this context, the next speaker's action of providing a word functions as a collaborative action of co-construction. In a similar way, we can see an action of co-construction in Japanese in (1b), in which a turn that starts with a nominative case marker by the next speaker functions as a collaborative action that completes a noun phrase in the previous speaker's turn. Though such examples may be rare in actual conversational data, they are instances of co-construction where both speakers collaborate with each other in completing a projected turn.

cases when next speaker starts his/her turn at the point where current speaker provides NPs or adverbial phrases that often serve as subjects or adverbials. In such cases, the current speaker's turn frequently functions as the subject of the predicate produced by the next speaker, thus forming co-construction at the mono-clausal level. Let us consider the following (3):

- (3) S: ...에 그런 것들이 있어요.  
 ...yey kulen kestul-i iss-eyo.  
 yeah such things-NM be-HON  
 'Yeah, there are that sort of things (in the textbooks).'  
 ..그래서.. 학생들이=,  
 ..kulatorye.. haksaying-tul-i=  
 so student-PL-NM  
 'So, students,'  
 P: (0)어려워하겠는데.  
 (0)elyeweha-keyss-nuntey,  
 difficult:feel-SUPP-CIRCUM  
 'may feel difficult.' [PREP]

In (3), Speaker S talks about teaching English to students in the class, pointing out that there are many English textbooks that contain difficult materials for students to understand. While Speaker S is in the process of producing his utterance, Speaker P starts his turn at the end of a noun phrase (NP) in the middle of Speaker S's turn, providing a predicate. Thus, the NP in the speaker S's turn functions as a subject, and Speaker P's utterance functions as a predicate for the NP in Speaker S's turn, producing a [Subject + Predicate] format. That is, the delivery of the co-participant's second part forms a single clausal- or sentential TCU, resulting in co-construction. In this case, the collaboration of the two speakers results in co-construction in the form of a complete single sentential unit.

Co-construction of complex-clausal/sentential refers to cases where the delivery of a co-participant's second or final component completes another speaker's utterance-in-progress, resulting in a complete compound TCU, as can be seen in (4).

- (4) Monika: ..선생님이 하나 있는데,  
 ..sensayngnim-i hana iss-nuntey,  
 teacher-NM one be-CIRCUM  
 ..한분 있는데,  
 ..han pwun iss-nuntey,  
 one peson (HON) be-CIRCUM  
 ‘Theres a teacher, there is one (HON) teacher.’
- Maria: ...유부녀예요. <---  
 ..yupwunye-ey-yo  
 married:woman-be-HON  
 ‘she is a married woman.’
- Monika: ..유부녀야 유부녀.  
 ..yupwunye-ya yupwunye.  
 married:woman-be married:woman  
 ‘She is a married woman, a married woman.’  
 (5 more intonation units follow in this turn)[ENGLISH]

In (4), the three speakers talk about a foreign woman who has been employed by the University as an English counselor. The third speaker (not present in the excerpt) has no idea about the woman, but the other two speakers met her before and they know her. Monika talks about her in a clausal TCU with the clausal connective *-nuntey* (It should be noted that there is a self-initiated repair in Monika’s turn, thus the predicate with the connective is repeated). Then, Maria starts her turn as a way of providing the final component, completing Monika’s projected turn before Maria herself starts the final part of her turn. Monika, however, completes her turn by repeating Maria’s turn.

So far, we have seen instances of co-construction in two categories, i.e., co-construction of mono-clausal sentential units and co-construction of multi-clausal sentential units. The examination of the present data shows that there occur 28 instances of co-construction at the mono-clausal level and 60 instances of co-construction at the multi-clausal level. Mono-clausal co-construction occurs at a word-or phrasal level, displaying formats such as [Subject + Predicate], [Predicate stem + affix], and [Modifier + Head] forms. Co-construction of compound multi-clausal units, on the other hand, usually takes the form of [First/Preliminary Component + Second/Final Component]. The first components usually carry clausal connectives which anticipate the second or final components to make complete

sentential units. In the next section, let us consider semantic, pragmatic roles of clausal connectives used in the preliminary components in multi-clausal co-constructed structures.

## 5. Forms and Frequency of Co-construction of Compound Multi-clausal TCUs

In the research on co-construction or co-participant completion in English, Lerner (1987, 1991, 1996) shows how collaborative turn sequences, turn units produced by two or more speakers, provide evidence for the role of syntactic units in projecting completion points. He shows that the compound TCU is a good example that shows incremental and interactional nature of talk-in-interaction. Co-construction that involves co-participant completion can be described as a two-part compound unit. That is, a compound TCU in co-construction is composed of the first/preliminary component and a second/final component. According to Lerner and Takagi (1999, p. 53), the first component of the compound TCU foreshows both a place where a final component could begin and a place from which such a final component can take place. This can then provide an opportunity, although not mandatory, for a co-participant to contribute the anticipated final component. Lerner stresses that a compound TCU can be constituted from a range of interactionally relevant resources in any aspect of the organization of talk-in-interaction.<sup>4)</sup>

---

4) Among many instances of co-construction, Lerner (1991, 1996) provides compound multi-clausal units that are constituted by the syntactic structure of the TCU, namely, structures of multi-clausal units such as [If X + (then) Y], [When X + (then) Y], and [Once X + then Y], among others. He shows the following excerpts as examples of co-construction found in compound turn-constructural units.

(1) a. [If X + (then) Y]

Sparky: An if you and Cheryl got together

David: you don't have enough.

(Lerner, 1996, p. 243)

b. [When X + (then) Y]

Dan: when the group reconvenes in two weeks=

Roger: =they're gunna issue straight jackets

(Lerner, 1991, p. 445)

As can be seen in (1), turns that carry adverbial subordinators such as *if* and *when* produced by the first speaker are completed by the second speaker. In this case, the current turn-in-progress, called the preliminary component, foreshows a possible place for a final component. That is, at the point where the first component is reached, a co-participant produces an utterance in the form of the projected final component at a place it could be due, thereby furnishing an anticipatory completion for the TCU as a

In a similar way to that reported in English, in Korean, compound clausal TCUs provide conversational participants with resources for completion for the TCU as a whole. As is well known, Korean displays a great number of multi-clausal TCUs marked with clausal connectives such as *-ko*, *-nuntey*, *-nikka*, and *-myen*, among others. When clauses are marked with clausal connectives in Korean conversation, the end of those clauses often functions as a transition relevance place where the next speaker starts his/her turn to complete the projected turn, as can be seen in (5).

- (5) S: ...그런데 그 곳이 회복이,  
 ...kulentey ku kos-i hoypok-i  
 by:the:way that point-NM recovery-NM  
 ..되어야 되는데, <---A  
 ..toy-eya toy-nuntey,  
 become-CONN should-CIRCUM  
 'by the way, that (wound) should be recovered,'  
 P: ..그게 안 되는거죠. <---B  
 ..kukey an toynunke-cyo.  
 that not become:thing-HON  
 'that is not getting better.'  
 S: ..그게 왜냐하면 여기,  
 ..kukey waenyahamyen yeki,  
 that why here  
 ..계속 체중을 싣고 다니니까, <---C  
 ..kyeysok cheycwung-ul sitko tani-nikka  
 continuously weight-ACC carry walk-CONSEQ  
 'because I walk around with the weight (on the leg),'  
 P: ..나을 수가 없죠. <---D  
 ..naul swu-ka eps-cyo.  
 recover way-NM not:be-HON  
 'it cannot be cured.' [PREP]

In (5), two speakers, S and P, talk about Speaker P's sprained leg. In this excerpt, the clausal TCUs marked as A and C carry clausal connectives *-nuntey* and *-nikka*, respectively. The turns projected by S are not

completed, but the second speaker, P, starts his turn as a way of collaborating with Speaker S at the end of Speaker S's turn in each case. Thus, the two turns produced by Speaker S function as preliminary components and the turns produced by Speaker P function as final components, resulting in complete whole sentences.

When we consider co-participant completion in Korean, there arises a question of what clausal TCUs constitute the preliminary component in compound TCUs. As has been pointed out earlier, Lerner (1991) reports that clauses with subordinators such as *if*, *when*, and *once* are typical examples found in English. Ford (1993) shows that adverbial clauses such as temporal, conditional, and reason clauses marked with *when*, *if*, *because*, and *as* are examples that constitute preliminary components of co-construction. In Japanese, Hayashi (2001) and Lerner and Takagi (1999) show similar examples of co-construction that involve clausal connective such as *-tara* 'if/when', *-kara* 'because', and *-kedo* 'though'.

Here, let us examine the distributional properties of clausal connectives used in the first component of the TCU in co-construction. As has been mentioned earlier, the examination of the present data shows that 164 turns end in the form of clausal TCUs with clausal connectives. A closer examination shows that only 60 instances out of the total 164 turns that end in the form of clausal TCUs constitute co-construction. Table 1 shows the distribution of the clausal connectives used in the preliminary components in co-construction.

Table 1. Frequency of Clausal Connectives in the Preliminary Components in Multi-clausal Co-constructed Structures

<i>-nuntey</i>	32 (53.4%)
<i>-ko</i>	12 (20.0%)
<i>-nikka</i>	5 (8.3%)
<i>-myen</i>	4 (6.7%)
<i>-ese</i>	2 (3.3%)
others	5 (8.3%)
Total	60 (100%)

As can be seen in Table 1, the most frequently used clausal connectives in the preliminary components of the compound TCUs used in co-construction is *-nuntey*, amounting to more than half of the whole instances of co-construction. The next frequently used connective is *-ko*,

with the frequency of 20% out of the total 60 instances. The connectives *-nikka*, *-myen* and *-ese* come next to *-nuntey* and *-ko*, showing the frequency rates of 8.3%, 6.7% and 3.3%, respectively. There are some other connectives such as *-ule* and *-ciman* used in the present data, but they occur only once, not showing any significant role in co-construction. Based on this frequency, let us discuss some semantic properties of the clausal connectives used in the preliminary components of the co-constructed structures.

## 6. Semantic, Pragmatic Properties of the Clausal Connectives in the Preliminary Components in Co-construction

In this section, let us consider semantic, pragmatic properties of the clausal connectives used in the preliminary components of co-constructions found in compound multi-clausal TCUs.

First, let us consider semantic, pragmatic properties of the connective *-nuntey* in terms of co-construction. As we have seen in Table 1; the clausal connective *-nuntey* is the most frequently used one. There has been much research on the syntactic, semantic and pragmatic properties of *-nuntey* at the sentence level as well as at the discourse level (Kim, 1996; Lee, 1993; Park, 1996, 1999, among others). As has been discussed in the literature, the meanings of the connective *-nuntey* are diverse, and thus it is often translated in terms such as ‘and’, ‘but’, and ‘and so’, among others.<sup>5)</sup> Among the research on *-nuntey*, Park (1996, 1999) tries to characterize *-nuntey* from the perspective of talk-in-interaction. Her research shows that *-nuntey* clauses without main clauses in conversation provide common grounds such as a ground on which the speaker shares his/her stance; an evidential ground; and a factual or an empirical ground. Because of this diverse meanings and discourse functions, the

---

5) The meanings and functions of *-nuntey* are elusive, and many grammarians and linguists have explained the properties of *-nuntey* in diverse ways. For example, Kim (1996), making a distinction between the clausal connective *-nuntey* and the turn-terminal *-nuntey*, claims that one of the main functions of *-nuntey* clauses is to provide a ground for the discourse that follows. He shows that *-nuntey* used as a clausal connective performs the following functions: (i) an explanatory function, (ii) showing contrast, (iii) an introductory function, (iv) marking the point where new referents are introduced, among others. For more detailed explanations of the meanings and functions of *-nuntey*, see Lee (1993), Kim (1996), and Park (1996, 1999).



clausal TCUs with *-nuntey* is the most frequently used in co-construction. Bearing these functions in mind, let us explore the functions of *-nuntey* in conversation more in detail.

One of the contexts in which the *-nuntey* clause functions as a preliminary component in co-construction is found when next speaker produces a final component as a way of collaborating with current speaker. In such a case, next speaker performs a collaborative action based on shared or inferable knowledge.

- (6) a. Y: ...또 언어학회가 4일부터 5일인데, <--  
 ...tto enehakhoy-ka sailpwuthe oil-i-ntey  
 and ling. conference-NM 4th-from 5th-be-CIRCUM  
 'and the linguistics conference is from the 4th to the 5th,'  
 HS: ...4일부터 5일이요?  
 ...sail-pwuthe oil-i-yo  
 4th-from 5th-be-HON  
 'Is it from the 4th to 5th?' [DEPT]
- b. J: ...김철수 선생님은 진짜 젊으시던데,  
 ...Kim Chul-Swu sensayngnim-un cincca celmu-si-tentey  
 Kim Chul-Soo professor-TM really young-HON-CIRCUM  
 'As for Professor Kim Chul-soo, he is really young,'  
 ..목소리는 김철수 선생님밖에 못 들어 봤는데,  
 ..moksoli-nun Kim Chul-Swu sensayngnim-pakkey  
 voice-TM Kim Chul-Soo professor-except  
 mos tul-e po-ass-*nuntey* <--  
 not hear-CONN see-CIRCUM  
 'As for the voice, I have heard only that of Prof. Kim Chul-Soo.'  
 S: ..젊- 이케 좀 소프트하지 전화하시는 목소리가.  
 ..celm- ikhey com soptha-ci cenhwaha-si-nun moksoli-ka  
 ..young- like a:bit soft-COMM telephone-HON-ATTR voice-NM  
 'young, like, a bit soft, his voice over the phone.' [DEPT]

As can be seen in (6), the *-nuntey* clauses occur at terminal positions of the first speakers in (6a) and (6b), respectively. In (6a), when the *-nuntey* clause is produced by Speaker Y, the next speaker starts his turn in the middle of Speaker Y's turn. But it does not function as a final component of the projected turn, thus failing to form a co-constructed schema. Rather, the turn produced by Speaker J functions as a repair initiator. In

(6b), when Speaker J produces a *-nuntey* clause, Speaker S starts her turn in the middle of Speaker J's turn. In this case, the *-nuntey* clause functions as a preliminary component and Speaker S's turn serves as a final component that is used to complete Speaker J's projected turn. That is, in (6b), the two speakers in the excerpt share some common knowledge about the referent (i.e., Professor Kim), resulting in a collaborative response from Speaker S. Thus, Speaker S's collaborative action that comes from shared knowledge about the referent produces a co-constructed schema between the two participants. This observation shows that co-construction takes place when speaker and hearer collaborate with each other according to the shared knowledge among the participants.

Now, let us turn to the property of the *-ko* clause used in co-construction. As has been shown in Table 1, *-ko* is the second most frequently used connective in co-construction in the present data. As is well known, *-ko* is used either to list or enumerate events and states sequentially, sometimes in a chronological order (Kim, 1990).<sup>6)</sup>

- (7) S: ..그러면 칠판에,  
 ..kulemyen chilphan-ey  
 then blackboard-LOC  
 ..한 줄 쓰고, <--A  
 ..han cwul ssu-ko  
 one line write-CONN  
 ..아래 위로 쪽= .. [설명하고] <--B  
 ..alay wilo ccwuk selmyengha-ko  
 bottom top straight explain-CONN  
 'then on the blackboard (I) wrote one line,  
 and explain from top to bottom, and'  
 P: [설명하고] <--C  
 selmyengha-ko  
 explain-CONN  
 'explain and,'

6) A detailed explanation of the meanings and functions of the connective *-ko* is not of concern here. In this research, I discuss *-ko* in relation to its role in co-construction. For more detailed explanation, see Kim (1990).

- S: ..칠판 가운데 쯤에,  
 ..chilphan kawuntey ccumey  
 blackboard middle around  
 'around in the middle of the blackboard,'
- P: [또 쓰고] <--D  
 tto ssu-ko  
 again write-CONN  
 '(I) write again,'
- S: [또 영어-], 문제 한 줄 쪽= 쓰고, <--E  
 [tto yenge-] mwuncey han cwul ccuwk= ssu-ko  
 again English question one line straight write-CONN  
 'again (I) write an English question in a line,' [PREP]

In (7), two teachers are talking about teaching English in a classroom. Speaker S describes how he teaches English to his students. In doing so, Speaker S lists the process of teaching, saying that he writes (sentences) on the blackboard, explains, writes another question, and so on. Thus, he uses the clausal connective *-ko* as a way of listing the process of teaching, as in A, B, and E. In collaboration with Speaker S, Speaker P starts his turn in the middle of Speaker S's turn, using the same *-ko* clausal TCU simultaneously as in C and D, resulting in an overlapped talk. As this excerpt shows, the *-ko* clausal TCU is frequently used in co-construction because of its semantic property of listing events or states.

Next, let us consider properties of the *-nikka* clausal TCU in terms of co-construction. The meanings of the *-nikka* clausal connective are characterized as showing reason relations, though they carry some other meanings, depending on contexts (For more detailed explanation of the meanings and functions of *-nikka*, see Kim, 1992; Kim & Suh, 1994).

- (8) S: ...그게 왜냐하면 여기,  
 ...kukey waenyahamyen yeki,  
 that why here  
 계속 체중을 싣고 다니니까, <--  
 ..kyeysok cheycwung-ul sitko tani-nikka  
 ..continuously weight-ACC carry walk-CONSEQ  
 'because I walk around with the weight (on the leg),'

- P: ..나을 수가 없죠.  
 ..naul swu-ka eps-cyo.  
 recover way-NM not:be-HON  
 'it cannot be cured.' [PREP]

In (8), both speakers talk about Speaker P's sprained leg. In this context, Speaker S advises Speaker P to go and see a doctor, but Speaker P has not seen a doctor yet. Speaker S says that the leg cannot be cured because the body weight gives a pressure to the sprained leg. Then, Speaker S who knows his physical condition, responds to Speaker S in agreement with the statement. In this context, the clausal TCU with the reason connective *-nikka* produced by Speaker S constitutes a preliminary component, and the utterance produced by Speaker P functions as a final component that completes Speaker S's projected turn, thus resulting in co-construction. As we have seen in Table 1, the frequency of the *-nikka* clausal TCU that occurs in the context of co-construction amounts to 5 cases. The examination of the present data shows that the *-nikka* clausal TCU sometimes occurs in a post-posed position (cf. Kim & Suh, 1994), rather than in a pre-posed position. In such a situation, the post-posed *-nikka* clause cannot function as a preliminary component, thus co-construction cannot take place in such a context. This is one of the reasons of the relatively low frequency of the *-nikka* clausal TCUs in co-construction in the present data.

Now, let us consider the *-myen* clausal TCU that functions as a preliminary component in co-construction. The connective *-myen* shares many properties with the English subordinators *if* or *when*. Here, let us consider the following excerpt in (9).

- (9) Y: (four intonation units of this turn deleted)  
 ..바람 흔들리면 [부딪히고-]  
 ..palam huntulli-myen pwutichi-ko  
 wind sway-COND hit-CONN  
 'When/If swayed by the wind, one may be hit,'  
 S: [바람 흔들리면] 죽지,  
 [palam huntulli-myen] cwuk-ci,  
 wind sway-COND die-COMM

[잘못하면.]

[calmosha-myen]

mistake:make-COND

'if (you are) swayed by the wind, (you) will get killed, if anything goes wrong.'

Y: [예 안 좋아요],

[yey an coha-yo]

yeah not good-HON

..심장마비 걸릴 거 같애 나는,

..simcangmapi kelil ke kath-ay na-nun

heart:attack catch thing seem-IE I-TM

'Right, that's not good. As for me, I may have a heart attack.'

[DEPT]

In (9), the participants are talking about a bungee jump. Speaker Y talks about the danger of doing a bungee jump, and she says that if one is swayed by wind when doing a bungee jump, one will be hit (possibly by some obstacles). At the point where the *-myen* clausal TCU is projected, the next speaker starts her turn, by repeating the *-myen* clausal TCU of Speaker Y's turn, and completes Speaker Y's projected turn. In this situation, the *-myen* clausal TCU produced by Speaker Y functions as a preliminary part, and the utterance that partially repeats and overlaps with the previous turn functions as a final component in co-construction. In this regard, it can be said that the *-myen* clausal TCU serves as a preliminary component in co-construction.

So far, we have seen some semantic and pragmatic properties of the clausal TCUs with the connectives *-nuntey*, *-ko*, *-nikka*, and *-myen*. As far as the present data are concerned, these four connectives that are used in compound multi-clausal TCUs function as preliminary components in co-construction. There are some other clausal connectives that are used in co-construction, but the frequency of those connectives is too low to discuss, as far as the present data are concerned. So I will not discuss them in this research. Here, I have limited the discussion only to a few clausal connectives that show relatively high frequency rates. If one collects and examines more conversational data, one may find more examples of clausal connectives that are used in co-construction.

## 7. Contexts for Co-construction in Conversation

In the previous sections, we have seen some examples of co-construction that occur in mono-clausal TCUs and multi-clausal TCUs. Joint utterance completion in a mono-clausal TCU can be found at a phrasal or mono-clausal level, involving grammatical units such as adverbial phrases, noun phrases, or predicates. In compound TCUs, the clausal TCUs with clausal connectives such as *-nuntey*, *-nikka*, *-ko* and *-myen* serve as preliminary components that invite the second speaker to finish the co-constructed schema. In this section, let us examine contexts where co-construction takes place in more detail.

First of all, co-construction should be understood in terms of turn-taking where speaker and hearer continuously negotiate with each other in projecting their turns. In their pioneering research on turn taking, Sacks et al. (1974) state that some aspects of the turn-taking organization in talk-in-interaction can be context-free, but context-sensitive at each deployment, relying on the situated particulars of each occurrence. In this regard, the production of joint utterance construction can be understood in terms of the notion of a transition-relevance place (TRP) in turn-taking. As is well known, a TRP refers to a position at which speakers may change according to turn-taking rules that govern the transition of speakers. This does not mean that speakers should change at the end of a specific syntactic TCU (sentences, clauses, noun phrases, and so on), but it means that speakers may change at the end of such a unit. In this regard, we can say that the end of clausal TCU constitutes a good point at which speakers may change. But the question of whether next speaker may or may not claim his/her turn depends on the turn-taking rules which stipulate that: if the turn-so-far is so constructed as not to involve the use of a 'current speaker selects next' technique, (i) then self-selection for next speakership may, but need not, be instituted; first starter acquires rights to a turn, and transfer occurs at that place, or (ii) then current speaker may, but need not continue, unless another self-selects (Sacks et al., 1974, p. 704). This means that the question of whether turn-taking may or may not take place at the end of clausal TCUs is determined by a locally managed turn-taking system. In the production of co-construction at a mono-clausal or multi-clausal level, the pauses caused by the interaction between speaker and hearer serve

good TRPs where the next speaker may start his or her turn according to turn-taking rules.

Next thing that should be considered is the issue of the low frequency or rarity of co-construction in some languages such as Japanese. As has been stated earlier, Ono and Yoshida (1996) observe that in Japanese, unlike in English, co-construction of syntactic units is not very common, finding only about 20 cases in about 100 minutes of conversational data.<sup>7)</sup> Based on the observation that the frequency of co-construction is very low, Ono and Yoshida claim that a pragmatic constraint is at work in Japanese conversation, and the constraint is responsible for the rarity of co-construction. The pragmatic constraint coming from 'private territory' or 'the speaker's territory of information' prohibits one from finishing another speaker's sentence or providing additional information unexpressed by the first speaker. However, Hayashi and Mori (1998) claim that the speaker's 'private territory' may not manifest itself as a predetermined structure which restricts the practices of co-construction. Rather, they state, what once belonged to the so-called private territory of one participant can become public or shared through interactive processes, which provide speakers with resources for co-construction. As we have seen in the present Korean data, there are 28 instances of co-construction in mono-clausal TCUs, and 60 instances of co-construction in multi-clausal TCUs. This fact shows that co-construction does take place in Korean conversation. Furthermore, a closer examination shows that co-construction takes place when next speaker is willing to collaborate with current speaker in cases such as when current speaker is hesitating or doing word search or when next speaker tries to show affiliative attitudes as a way of collaborating with current speaker. In this regard, we can say that pragmatic constraints proposed by Ono and Yoshida have to do with a higher principle, such as the Cooperative Principle proposed by Grice (1975) and the maxim of politeness (Leech, 1983; Brown & Levinson, 1987).

Next thing that should be considered with respect to the occurrence of co-construction is the issue of temporality. In the research on co-construction, Hayashi (2001) claims that the analysis of co-construction in

---

7) Ono and Yoshida (1996) show a few examples of co-construction in which the second speaker provides grammatical elements as a way of completing the first speaker's projected turn: (i) the addition of postpositional elements (i.e., particles), (ii) providing predicates (verbs or predicate adjectives), (iii) providing subordinate clauses in multi-unit constructions (i.e., *although*- and *because*- clauses).

talk-in-interaction involves the following three features: temporality, social actions, and embodiment. Among these features, temporality should be one of the most important factors that is relevant for co-construction. For example, as Kim (1996) shows, the question of whether *-nuntey* will be used as a clausal connective or as a turn-terminal affix depends on the factors that are involved in the interaction between speaker and hearer. In this regard, temporality is an important factor in co-construction because when there is a noticeable pause, there is always a chance for the next speaker to start his or her turn. Hayashi (2001) observes that when a co-participant chooses to anticipatorily produce the final component of a multi-clausal unit initiated by another participant, the delivery of the final component is regularly delayed. Hayashi (2001, p. 65) claims that co-construction can be schematized as in the following:

- (10) Speaker A: [preliminary component] +  
 ((lapse of time-- pauses and/or 'filled' pauses))  
 Speaker B: [final component]

According to Hayashi, there occurs a lapse of time recurrently, typically in the form of silence and/or some types of 'filled pauses', between the completion of the preliminary component and the initiation of the final component. The delay can be explained in terms of both the speaker's and the hearer's perspectives. From the speaker's perspective, pauses are often caused by word search or hesitation. From the hearer's perspective, pauses often result from delay of the delivery of the final component. Such delay comes from pragmatic or cultural constraint that prohibits him/her from interrupting the current speaker's turn-in-progress (cf. Ono & Yoshida, 1996).

However, the examination of the present data shows that not all cases show a regular delay in presenting a final component. That is, in some cases, there are slight pauses after the preliminary component of compound clausal TCUs, thus functioning as TRPs. but there are some other cases where there is no pause between the end of the preliminary component and the start of the final component. Let us consider the following excerpt in (11).



- (11) S: [또 영어-], 문제 한 줄 쪽= 쓰고, <--  
 tto yenge-] mwuncey han cwul ccuwk= ssu-ko  
 again English question one line straight write-CONN  
 'again (I) write an English question in a line,'
- P: [설명하다 보면], <--  
 selmyenghata po-myen,  
 explain-COND  
 'as you explain (it),'
- S: [또 이제 그러면], <--  
 tto icye kule-myen  
 again now do:that-COND  
 ..칠판에- 칠판이 크지만,  
 ..chilphan-ey chilphan-i khu-ciman,  
 blackboard-LOC blackboard-NM big-COND  
 ..세 문장 가지고=,  
 ..sey mwuncang kaci-ko  
 three sentence have-CONN  
 'again if I do that, on the blackboard-, although  
 the blackboard is big, with three sentences,'
- P: ..그러네요.  
 ..kuleney-yo  
 right-HON  
 'that's so.' [PREP]

As we have already seen, when Speaker S produces a clausal TCU, the next speaker starts his turn at the same time with the current speaker in the middle of the turn-in-progress. Thus, the turn produced by Speaker P overlaps with the on-going turn. In this context, the speaker P's early start of his turn in the middle of the current on-going turn is carried out because the two speakers share the same experience. In this regard, the question of whether there is a pause or not depends on the interactional and structural contexts where co-construction occurs.

In the study of co-construction, one of the issues that has been discussed is the problem of projectability. In a cross-linguistic study between Japanese and English, Fox, Hayashi and Jaspersen (1996), Lerner and Takagi (1999), and Tanaka (1999) examine potential relationships between turn projection and the syntactic practices on turn-taking, repair, and co-construction. They suggest that Japanese syntax tends to delay

systematically the projection of turn shapes until quite late in the construction of a TCU, while English syntax appears to allow for 'early projection' of possible turn-shapes towards the beginning of a TCU. Tanaka (1999) claims that Japanese tends to result in incremental turn construction, which provides 'limited mid-turn projectability'. As has been pointed out earlier, Ono and Yoshida (1996) claim that the verb-final property of Japanese which delays the projection of turn-shapes is another factor that is responsible for the rarity of examples of co-construction. On the other hand, Hayashi (2001, p. 59) contends that the tendency for later syntactic projectability of turn-shapes in Japanese does not necessarily present problems for participants to achieve joint utterance construction.

When we consider the issue of projectability, Korean faces the same problems because Korean and Japanese are characterized by being verb-final languages. When we consider some examples of co-construction in the present data, the late projection is one of the important factors that determines the shape of the turns in co-construction in Korean. Let us consider the excerpt in (12).

- (12) S: ..쪼끔 아는 문제도 실수가 나왔을, <---  
 ..cokum anum mwuncey-to silswu-ka naw-ass-ul  
 a:bit know question-too mistake-NM occur-PST-ATTR  
 'In a question that (the students) know, they(d) have made a  
 mistake,'  
 (2.5)  
 P: 텐데,  
 they-ntey,  
 SUPP-CIRCUM  
 'would have, (and)'  
 S: ...나왔을 거예요.  
 ...naw-ass-ul ke-yey-yo  
 occur-PST-ATTR thing-be-HON  
 'would have made a mistake.' [PREP]

In (12), Speaker S projects a sentence as a TCU, but in the middle of uttering the final part of his turn, he falters in his speech and does not finish his turn, having a pause with the length of 2.5 seconds. At that point, the next speaker P produces the clausal connective *they-ntey*

'would/might have, (and)' as a way of collaborating with Speaker S. However, such a collaborative effort is not accepted, but Speaker S finishes his turn by producing a totally different sentence-ender. This discrepancy between the two speakers is caused by the fact that in Korean syntactic markers of clausal connectives and sentence-enders come at the end of the projected turn. Thus, in co-construction, the second speaker has difficulty in collaborating with the first speaker.

So far, we have examined the contexts where co-construction occurs, dealing with issues such as turn-taking, pragmatic constraints of politeness or 'private territory', temporality, and late projectability. The examination of the present data shows that such factors are partially responsible for the occurrence of co-construction, and that joint utterance completion comes mainly from the efforts of next speaker to collaborate with current speaker based on assumed or shared knowledge and affiliative attitudes.

## 8. Social Actions and Grammar in Co-construction

In the previous sections, we have seen that co-construction is one of the areas that clearly shows the interaction between speaker and hearer, displaying how speakers negotiate or collaborate with each other in shaping grammar. We have seen that grammatical practices provide resources for co-construction. Thus, we have seen some syntactic, semantic properties of clausal TCUs by examining structural contexts where they occur. For example, *-nuntey's* semantic property of establishing a ground for inviting next speaker's opinions serves as a motivation for co-construction. In this regard, we can say that syntactic environments or semantic properties are not solely responsible, but other factors are also relevant for the occurrence of co-construction. In conversation, participants continuously negotiate with each other, performing social actions. Such processes of negotiation and interaction determine the shape of grammar. The examination of the present data shows that co-construction that involves compound clausal TCUs is closely related with affiliative or collaborative efforts of the addressee in completing current speaker's on-going turns. In this regard, let us consider some social actions that are involved in the production of co-construction.

First of all, the social action that is found in co-construction is to provide grounds for inviting next actions from the addressee. Such an

action is most closely related to the pragmatic properties of the clausal connective *-nuntey*. The social action of providing grounds is directly and closely related with the cooperation between speaker and hearer, which is necessary for a smooth flow of conversation. More specifically, *-nuntey* functions as a marker for cooperation in talk-in-interaction in the sense that the speaker provides a ground for the addressee to take a next turn. In conversation, the responsibility of providing materials for foreground or background is not imposed totally upon a particular party. Rather, both parties (i.e., speaker and hearer) have the responsibility for the smooth flow of information. In this respect, there is a continuing negotiation between speaker and hearer according to the turn-taking system that operates on a turn-by-turn basis. When we try to understand the functions of the clausal TCU with *-nuntey* in terms of talk-in-interaction, we can say that the speaker uses the strategy of using the *-nuntey* TCU as a way of inviting the addressee onto the floor.

- (13) Maria: ..대사관에 [있는 영사라나]?  
 ..taysakwan-ey iss-nun yengsa-la-na  
 embassy-LOC be-ATTR consul-is-Q  
 'She is a consul at an embassy?'  
 Monika: (0)[대사관에 있는데], <---  
 [taysakwan-ey iss-nuntey]  
 embassy-LOC be-CIRCUM  
 'She works at an embassy,'  
 Maria: ..서기래나 뭐,  
 ..seki-layna mwe  
 secretary-Q something  
 '(she is) a secretary or something like that?'  
 Monika: ..[응] 서기관인가.  
 ..[ung] sekikwan-i-nka.  
 ung secretary-be-Q  
 'Ung, is she a secretary?' [ENGLISH]

In (13), three speakers are talking about an English counselor at the University Job Information Center. As we can see in (13), the *-nuntey* clause in the utterance of Monika provides a circumstantial background for the next speaker. Anchoring on this circumstantial information, the current speaker could have kept her turn going. But at the point where

*-nuntey* is produced, Maria starts her turn as a way of sharing the same opinion with Monika. Then Monika accepts Maria's turn and reshapes her turn in the form of a *yes-no* question. This means that when the *-nuntey* clause is used, it establishes a ground for the on-going discourse. In this context, the next speaker who shares the same information with the current speaker starts her turn at the end of the *-nuntey* clause as a way of collaborating with the current speaker, which results in co-construction. In addition, we can see in this excerpt that next speaker's social action of collaborating with current speaker shapes forms of grammar.

Second, another social action that is involved in the production of co-construction is seeking confirmation/opinions from the addressee. This action can be found in the case when the current speaker produces only the preliminary component of the co-constructed schema, particularly with rising intonation. In such a case, the preliminary part functions as a type of question, which requires a final component from the next speaker. In such a case, the second speaker provides a final component to complete the initially projected schema. In this case, Some of the clauses with connectives such as *-nuntey* and *-ko* are used. This social action is performed in the case when the speaker does not possess clear and definite information about what he or she is talking about. In such a situation, the speaker uses clausal TCUs with clausal connectives as a way of seeking confirmation or opinions about the information that the speaker is delivering.

(14) A: ..휘핑크림은 우리 나라에서 제작이 안 되는 걸로 알고 있는데?

..hwiphngklim-un wulinala-eyse ceycak-i  
whipped cream-TM our country-LOC production-NM  
an toy-nun kello alko iss-nuntey?  
not become-ATTR thing know be-CIRCUM  
'As I know, whipped creams are not produced in our country,  
(right)?'

B: ...그러니까, ...저거 다 수입품이야,

..kulenikka, ...ceke ta swuipphwum-i-ya  
so, those all imported:goods-be-IE  
'those are all imported goods,'

..내가 산 것도 다 수입품이고.

..nay-ka san kes-to ta swuipphwum-i-ko  
I-NM buy thing-too all imported:goods-be-CONN  
'what I bought are all imported goods, too.'

[AIR]

As can be seen in (14), Speaker A conveys information about whipping creams, saying that whipping creams are not produced in Korea. Speaker S is not confident about her statement. Thus, she produces the *-nuntey* clause with rising intonation, not finishing her turn. In such a situation, the *-nuntey* clause produced by Speaker A constitutes a preliminary component which seeks confirmation or invites opinions about her claim from the addressee. Then, the next speaker, B, completes the projected turn by providing a confirmative statement.

Third, another social action that is performed through an interaction between speaker and hearer in co-construction is providing shared knowledge as a collaborative effort in constructing abstract schemas, as can be seen in (4), which is rewritten as (15) here.

- (15) Monika: ..선생님이 하나 있는데,—  
 ..sensayngnim-i hana iss-nuntey,  
 teacher-NM one be-CIRCUM  
 ..한분 있는데,—  
 ..han pwun iss-nuntey,  
 one peson (HON) be-CIRCUM  
 ‘Theres a teacher, there is one (HON) teacher,’
- Maria: ...유부녀예요. \ <--  
 ...yupwunye-ey-yo  
 married:woman-be-IE  
 ‘she is a married woman.’
- Monika: ..유부녀야 유부녀. \  
 ..yupwunye-ya yupwunye.  
 married:woman-be married:woman  
 ‘She is a married woman, a married woman.’  
 (5 more intonation units follow in this turn) [ENGLISH]

In (15), when Monika produces a clausal TCU, Maria, the next speaker, starts her turn immediately after the point where the connective *-nuntey* is used, resulting in a co-constructed sentence. That is, in (15), Monika’s turn functions as a preliminary component, and Maria’s turn as a final component in co-construction. Then, Monika finishes her turn as she had planned originally. In (15), Maria’s collaborative action in providing the final component results from the shared knowledge between the two speakers because they had met before the referent (i.e., the teacher) they

are talking about.

Fourth, in co-construction, when participants share some common knowledge, the second speaker's turn can perform the function of displaying agreement or disagreement, depending on contexts. Let us consider the following (16).

- (16) a. Sophia: ...(1.0)스무명이면=,  
 ...(1.0) sumwu myeng-i-myen=,  
 twenty person-be-COND  
 ..적은 숫자는 아닌데,  
 ..cekun swusca-nun ani-ntey,  
 small number-TM not-CIRCUM  
 'If there are twenty, the number is not small,'  
 Maria: ..좀 많은데=, <---  
 ..com manhu-ntey=,  
 a:bit many-CIRCUM  
 ..안 하는 것보다는 나올 것 같아서.  
 ..an hanun kes-pota-nun naul kes kath-ase  
 not doing-than-TM good thing seem-REASON  
 'a bit too many, but seems better than not doing (it at all).'
- b. Monika: ...영어 인터뷰 가서,  
 ..yenge intepyu ka-ese-  
 English interview go-CONN  
 ..무료로 해주고,—  
 ..mulyolo hay cwuko,  
 for:free do give-and  
 ...그런 아가씨가 하나 있는데,  
 kulen akassi-ka hana iss-nuntey,  
 such young:woman-NM one be-CIRCUM  
 'went for an English interview, (she) does it for free,  
 there is that sort of a unmarried (foreign) woman.'
- Maria: ..아가씨 아니지. <---  
 akassi ani-ci  
 unmarried:woman not-COMM  
 '(She) is not unmarried.' [ENGLISH]

In (16a), the two graduate students are talking about taking an English

class during the summer vacation. When Maria produces a second part in the middle of Sophia's turn, expressing that she is in agreement with Sophia's statement about the class size. In (16b), on the other hand, Maria produces a second part in the middle of Monika's turn-in-progress, expressing her disagreement with the first speaker. These excerpts show that the second speaker in co-construction performs a social action of expressing agreement or disagreement in producing co-constructed turns.

So far, we have seen social actions that speakers perform in co-constructing abstract schemas through a negotiation between speaker and hearer. As has been pointed out, co-construction can be characterized as collaborative efforts between speaker and hearer in constructing abstract schemas shared between interactants. The examination of the present data shows that the social actions or functions that are at work in co-construction can be summarized as in the following: (i) establishing or providing common grounds or a shared perspective, (ii) showing shared knowledge or demonstrating an understanding, (iii) seeking confirmation or opinions from the next speaker, and (iv) showing agreement or disagreement, among others. As we have seen in the discussion above, social actions that speakers perform shape forms of grammar, and grammatical forms furnish speakers with linguistic resources for social actions.

## 9. Summary and Conclusions

So far, I have discussed collaborative turn completion in Korean conversation as a way of understanding turn-taking mechanisms, sequential nature of turn-taking, collaboration and negotiation between speaker and hearer, and ultimately exploring the relationship between conversation, social actions, and grammar. This research on co-construction has shown complex processes of collaboration and negotiation in constructing abstract schemas shared by participants in conversation. It also has shown implications of the socially distributed nature of talk-in-interaction and the social meanings that are produced through a close monitoring of a turn's trajectory. In a word, this research has explored the complex processes of interaction expressed in co-construction by examining grammatical resources and social actions displayed in Korean conversation.



In this research, first I have examined grammatical forms of co-construction in mono-clausal and multi-clausal TCUs, mainly focusing on collaborative turn completion in compound clausal TCUs. The examination shows that there are 28 instances co-construction at a mono-clausal level. Also it shows that there are 164 instances of clausal TCUs that occur at the end of turns, displaying 'incomplete' schemas of sentencehood. After that, I have examined whether the turns that end with clausal TCUs are completed by next speaker, constituting co-constructed schemas. The examination shows that 60 cases out of the total 164 instances are examples of co-construction in the present data.

Based on the frequency analysis of the distribution of clausal connectives in co-construction, I have examined the frequency of clausal connectives used in those co-constructed structures. The examination has shown that the connective *-nuntey* is the most frequently used one, showing the frequency rate of 53.4%. Other connectives that show relatively high frequency rates are *-ko*, *-nikka*, *-myen*, among others. Based on the frequency analysis of the distribution of clausal connectives in co-construction, I have examined semantic, pragmatic properties of the clausal connectives, and have shown how they are related to the production of co-construction. After that, I have discussed contexts for co-construction, dealing with some issues of co-construction in terms of pragmatic constraints, temporality, and delayed projectability, considering the fact that Korean is a verb-final language. I have shown that pragmatic constraints, temporality, and delayed projectability are partial reasons for the rarity of co-construction in verb-final languages. Rather, co-construction is closely related to the shared knowledge of abstract schemas between current speaker and next speaker. When a current speaker produces an utterance, in the form of 'incomplete' clausal TCU, the next speaker completes the initially projected construction based on shared knowledge of the abstract schema of the projected turn. Furthermore, I have shown that collaborative efforts of next speaker in completing the initially projected schemas are important factors in producing co-constructed structures in conversation. That is to say, when next speaker performs a social action of cooperating with current speaker, next speaker's start of his/her turn at the end of a clausal TCU is one of the most important factors for the occurrence of co-construction in talk-in-interaction.

Finally, this research has shown what social actions are performed by

speakers in co-construction. It has shown that the social actions or functions involved in the production of co-construction are: (i) establishing or providing common grounds or a shared perspective, (ii) showing shared knowledge or demonstrating an understanding, (iii) seeking confirmation or opinions from the next speaker, and (iv) showing agreement or disagreement, among others. In this regard, through an exploration of some aspects of joint utterance construction in Korean conversation, this research has shown that social actions that speakers perform shape forms of grammar, and grammatical forms furnish speakers with linguistic resources for social actions.

## References

- Akatsuka, N. (1997). On the co-construction of counterfactual reasoning. *Journal of Pragmatics* 18, 781-794.
- Brown, P. and S. Levinson. (1987). *Politeness*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Du Bois, J., S. Schuetze-Coburn, D. Paolino, and S. Cumming. (1993). Outline of discourse transcription. In J. Edwards and M. Lampert, eds., *Talking Data: Transcription and Coding Methods for Language Research* (pp. 221-260). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Ferrara, K. (1992). The interactive achievement of a sentence: Joint production in therapeutic discourse. *Discourse Processes* 15, 207-228.
- Ford, C. (1993). *Grammar in Interaction: Adverbial Clauses in American English Conversations*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ford, C., B. Fox, and S. A. Thompson. (1996). Practices in the construction of turns: The 'TCU' revisited. *Pragmatics* 6(3), 427-454.
- Fox, B., M. Hayashi, and R. Jaspersen. (1996). Resources and repair: A cross-linguistic study of syntax and repair. In E. Ochs, E. Schegloff, and S. A. Thompson, eds., *Interaction and Grammar* (pp. 185-237). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Goodwin, C. and M. H. Goodwin. (1987). Concurrent operations on talk: Notes on the interactive organization of assessments. *IPrA Papers in Pragmatics* 1, 1-54.
- Goodwin, C. and M. H. Goodwin. (1992). Context, activity and participation. In P. Auer and A. di Luzo, eds., *The contextualization of language* (pp. 77-99). Amsterdam: Benjamins.

- Grice, H. P. (1975). Logic and conversation. In P. Cole and J. Morgan, eds., *Syntax and Semantics 3: Speech Acts* (pp. 41-58). New York: Academic Press.
- Hayashi, M. (2001). *Practices in Joint Utterance Construction in Japanese Conversation*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of Colorado, Boulder.
- Hayashi, M. and J. Mori. (1998). Co-construction in Japanese revisited: We do "finish each other's sentences." In N. Akatsuka, H. Hoji, S. Iwasaki, S. Sohn, and S. Strauss, eds., *Japanese/Korean Linguistics, Vol. 7* (pp. 77-93). Stanford: CSLI.
- Kim, H. (1988). A discourse analysis of the conjunctive morpheme *-nuntey* in Korean spoken narratives. In E. Baek, ed., *Papers from the Sixth International Conference on Korean Linguistics* (pp. 189-204). Seoul: Hanshin Publishing Co.
- Kim, H. (1990). An analysis of the conjunctive morpheme *-ko* in discourse and clause combining in Korean. E. Baek, ed., *ICKL 7: Papers from the Seventh International Conference on Korean Linguistics* (pp. 133-157). Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Kim, H. (1992). *Clause-combining in Discourse and Grammar: An Analysis of Some Korean Conjunctive Morphemes in Discourse*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of Hawaii, Honolulu.
- Kim, H. (1996). Functions of the verbal affix *-nuntey* in Korean conversation. *Language Research* 32(4), 637-664.
- Kim, K. and K. Suh. (1994). The discourse connective *nikka* in Korean conversation. In N. Akatsuka et al., eds., *Japanese/Korean Linguistics 4* (pp. 113-129). Stanford: CSLI.
- Langacker, R. (1987). *Foundations of Cognitive Grammar, Vol. 1*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Lee, K. (1993). *A Korean Grammar on Semantic-pragmatic Principles*. Seoul: Hankook Mwonhwasa.
- Leech, G. (1983). *Principles of Pragmatics*. London: Longman.
- Lerner, G. (1987). *Collaborative Turn Sequences: Sentence Construction and Social Action*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of California, Irvine.
- Lerner, G. (1991). On the syntax of sentences-in-progress. *Language in Society* 20, 441-458.
- Lerner, G. (1996). On the 'semi-permeable' character of grammatical units in conversation: Conditional entry into the turn space of another

- speaker. In E. Ochs, E. A. Schegloff, and S. A. Thompson, eds., *Interaction and Grammar* (pp. 238-276). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lerner, G. and T. Takagi. (1999). On the place of linguistic resources in the organization of talk-in-interaction: A co-investigation of English and Japanese grammatical practices. *Journal of Pragmatics* 31, 49-75.
- Mori, J. (1996). *Negotiating Agreement and Disagreement: The Use of Connective Expressions in Japanese Conversation*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of Wisconsin, Madison.
- Ochs, E., E. Schegloff, and S. A. Thompson, eds. (1996). *Interaction and Grammar*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ono, T. and E. Yoshida. (1996). A study of co-construction in Japanese: We don't "finish each other's sentences." In N. Akatsuka, S. Iwasaki, and S. Strauss, eds., *Japanese/Korean Linguistics Vol. 5* (pp. 115-130). Stanford: CSLI.
- Ono, T. and S. A. Thompson. (1995). What can conversation tell us about syntax? In P. Davis, ed., *Alternative Linguistics: Descriptive and Theoretical Modes* (pp. 213-271). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Ono, T. and S. A. Thompson. (1996). Interaction and syntax in the structure of conversational discourse. In E. Hovy and D. Scott, eds., *Computational Conversational Discourse: Burning Issues—An Interdisciplinary Account* (pp. 67-96). Heidelberg: Springer-Verlag.
- Park, Y. (1996). The Korean connective *nuntey* in conversational discourse. In N. Akatuska et al, eds., *Japanese/Korean Linguistics Vol. 7* (pp. 131-147).
- Park, Y. (1999). The Korean connective *nuntey* in conversational discourse. *Journal of Pragmatics* 31, 191-218.
- Sacks, H., E. Schegloff, and G. Jefferson. (1974). A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking in conversation. *Language* 50, 696-735.
- Tanaka, H. (1999). *Turn-taking in Japanese Conversation: A Study in Grammar and Interaction*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Haeyeon Kim  
 Department of English  
 Chung-Ang University  
 221 Huksuk-dong, Dongjak-gu  
 Seoul 156-756, Korea  
 E-mail: haeykim@cau.ac.kr

Received: Sept. 1, 2002  
 Revised version received: Nov. 20, 2002  
 Accepted: Nov. 27, 2002