

# A Conversation Analysis of Korean Sentence-Ending Modal Suffixes -*ney*, -*kwun(a)*, and -*ta*: Noticing as a Social Action\*

Kyu-hyun Kim  
(Kyung Hee University)

## Abstract

Kim, Kyu-hyun. 2004. **A Conversation Analysis of Korean Sentence-Ending Modal Suffixes -*ney*, -*kwun(a)*, and -*ta*: Noticing as a Social Action.** *Sociolinguistic Journal of Korea*, 12(1). Drawing upon H. S. Lee's (1993) cognitively-oriented research on the functions of three sentence-ending modal suffixes in Korean that are used to express newly perceived information, -*ney*, -*kwun(a)*, and -*ta*, this study analyzes the distinct meanings of these suffixes from a conversation-analytic perspective (Sacks et al. 1974). The suffix -*ney* is used in the context in which the speaker notices a referent/event and makes an assessment on the spot in such a way that the speaker's stance displayed through the action is formulated as something that is to be immediately oriented to and contingently taken up by the hearer. In contrast, the suffix -*kwun(a)* is used when the speaker is mainly oriented to displaying a stance congruent with the prior talk. The action it organizes is often limited to acknowledging a point of the prior talk or having the hearer acknowledge the speaker's observation, often with a salient topic-curtailing and sequence-terminating import. The suffix -*ta* tends to orient the hearer to the next stage of the speaker's action (e.g., suggestion, warning, offer, etc.) to whose directive force the hearer is variably implicated as a beneficiary/facilitator. The interactional account offered in this paper is shown to complement Lee's cognitive account, with emphasis placed on examining the ways in which these suffixes are used as resources for organizing distinct types of social action.

**Keywords:** sentence-ending suffix, conversation analysis, assessment, sequence

## I. Introduction

In Korean, sentences are marked by sentence-ending modal suffixes which, as evidentials, serve to mark sources of information and index various types of epistemic stance toward the status of information being conveyed and the recipient's knowledge (Chang 1985; Choi 1995; H. S. Lee 1991, 1993, 1999; K. Lee 1993; Kim 2003; Kim & Suh 2002, 2003; Noh 2003). Among these sentence-ending suffixes, there are three suffixes which are used for marking newly perceived information: -*ney*, -*kwun(a)*, and -*ta*. Each of these can be used in the context in which the speaker expresses newly perceived information, as illustrated in (1):

- (1) *ice-cream sandwich an sa -o -ss -ney/-kwun(a)/-ta.*

---

\* This work was supported by the Korea Research Foundation Grant (KRF-2002-041- A00207). The earlier version of this paper was presented at the 9th Annual Conference on Language, Interaction, and Culture, which was held at University of California, Santa Barbara, on May 9th, 2003. I am grateful to three anonymous reviewers for their thoughtful comments.

ice-cream sandwich NEG buy:CONN-come-ANT-SUFFIX  
 "(I've just noticed) you didn't get an ice-cream sandwich."

Note in (1) that any of these suffixes can be used in the given sentence if we suppose that this sentence is produced in the context where the speaker has just noticed that the addressee did not get an ice-cream sandwich.<sup>1)</sup> However, as I will show in the following discussion, the sequential positions where these suffixes are placed and the kind of action organized by them can be differentiated in cognitive and interactional terms (H. S. Lee 1993). They are subtly different in the way the speaker brings a newly observed event to the attention of the hearer and in the way they are sequentially deployed. These suffixes, while sharing the seemingly identical function, furnish the speaker with the resources for displaying distinctive types of stance and organize different types of action in differentially aligning himself/herself with the interlocutor and the observed referent/event.

The distinctive features of these three suffixes are well illustrated in H. S. Lee (1993). On the basis of the analysis of naturally occurring conversational data, Lee proposes that *-ney* expresses newly perceived information which is not based on some evidence and inference, i.e., what he calls 'factual information'. The information it marks tends to be informative and contrary to the speaker's background and thus is likely to be directly integrated into the speaker's knowledge at the moment of noticing. In contrast, *-kwun(a)*, which he calls 'unassimilated', is viewed as marking information which is inferred on the basis of some evidence (also see K. Lee 1993), and the information it marks tends to be uninformative and often congruent with the speaker's background expectation, hence a lesser likelihood to be registered in the speaker's cognitive system. Comparing *-ney* and *-kwun(a)*, Lee points out that the information conveyed with *-ney* is more factual and definitive than that conveyed with *-kwun(a)* (H. S. Lee 1993:152). Furthermore, he notes that the degree to which newly perceived information is registered in the speaker's cognitive system against background expectation (expressed by *-ney*) is stronger than that which conforms to background expectation (as in the case of *-kwun(a)*) (H. S. Lee 1993:157). As for the suffix *-ta*, which is termed as

1) The English equivalent of this sentence is found in naturally occurring conversation: (SN-45):

- 1 Sherri: Hi Carol.=
- 2 Carol: =H[i : ]
- 3 Ruthie: [CA:RO]L, H L : :
- 4 Sherri: You didn' get en iccream sandwich,
- 5 Carol: I kno:w, hh I decided that my body didn't need it,
- 6 Sherri: Yes but ours di:d=
- 7 (??): =hh heh-heh-heh heh-heh-heh .hhhh

As Schegloff (2001) points out, Sherri does the action of 'noticing' in her turn in line 4. Constructed as a negative observation, which notes a failure of action on the part of the addressee (Carol), this turn constitutes a complaint, which attributes agency to the addressee for the noticed failed action and thereby leads her to provide an account (line 5). As I will show in the following sections, this feature is often associated with the sequential context where the suffix *-ney* is used in Korean conversation.

A Conversation Analysis of Korean Sentence-Ending Modal Suffixes *-ney*, *-kwun(a)*,<sup>3</sup>  
and *-ta*

'declarative' in the sense that it is used generally when the speaker presents the information in the manner of declaring or announcing it to the recipient, it is noted that, in certain contexts, the suffix marks newly perceived information in such a way that it expresses information that requires the hearer's immediate attention. It is noted that, in the use of *-ta*, the very communicative goal of conveying the information is to inform the addressee as to its noteworthiness, and the information conveyed is the one over which the speaker has the authority (H. S. Lee 1993:159). Lee's analysis of these suffixes can be summarized as follows:

*-ney* (factual realization): Factual information

- Information that is based on the speaker's factual knowledge (i.e., information that is not based on inference)
- Counter-expectation: conveyed against background expectations assumed among communicators

*-kwun(a)* (unassimilated): Consciously known but unassimilated information

- Information that is non-factual, i.e., not based on the speaker's factual knowledge or belief, but inferred based on evidence
- Information that is non-informative, such that the speaker's communicative goal is not to transfer its propositional content to the address but to express his/her perception of it
- Conforms to background expectations assumed among communicators

*-ta* (declarative): Information which is noteworthy, and thus needs the addressee's attention

- Information over which the speaker has the authority
- Informs the addressee that he or she has just fulfilled something that had been expected

Even though his analysis is based on naturally occurring conversational data, Lee examines these suffixes mainly from a cognitive perspective, e.g., in terms of whether the given information marked by each of these suffixes is informative or non-informative, expected or unexpected, inference-based or directly observed, or directly incorporated into the speaker's cognitive system or not. In this paper, I hope to show from a conversation-analytic perspective (Sacks, Schegloff, & Jefferson 1974) that Lee's cognitive account of these three suffixes can be fruitfully recast in the interactional light, with emphasis placed on examining the sequential environments where they are used for organizing distinct types of social action achieved through the practice of noticing. In this respect, I would like to treat these suffixes as stance markers which the speaker uses and deploys as a resource for displaying his/her stance toward newly perceived referent/event in the course of proffering a topic or taking up and aligning with the interlocutor's interactional move. In particular, as I will suggest in the following sections, some of the differences between these suffixes can be captured by the extent to which the interlocutor's active co-participation in the speaker's action is solicited, or by the manner in which the interlocutor is led to align with the speaker's action.

The data I have analyzed in this paper include audiotaped face-to-face conversations (*Lunch Talk*, *TA Meeting*, *Breakfast*, *S & H*, *K & H*, and *Park S.-H. Data*) and a telephone conversation (*Kim M.-W. Data*). Also included in the dataset

are small segments from a videotaped data set (*Golf Practice*, *Swing Practice*, and *Kindergarten Class*)<sup>2)</sup> and segments of overheard conversation that have been jotted down on the spot. Made-up examples were also used when there is a need to illustrate a point succinctly.

## II. *-ney* in conversation: Providing basis of hearer involvement

The context in which *-ney* is predominantly used is where the speaker notices an event/object and describes it in such a way that the noticed event/object is being formulated as the object of co-orientation by the interlocutor. Even though the *ney*-marked noticing may take the form of a self-directed, on-the-spot observation,<sup>3)</sup> the action it organizes provides a basis on which the interlocutor is invited to co-orient to the noticed referent/event and to co-assess or act on it with a keen orientation to the speaker's evaluative stance displayed in the *ney*-utterance. This sequential feature of *ney*-marked assessment can be observed in fragment (2), which shows a segment of conversation between family members taking place at a driving range:

2) I have used transcription conventions of conversation analysis with some modifications (Sacks, Schegloff, & Jefferson 1974; Atkinson & Heritage 1984):

[ ]	Simultaneous utterances	.	Falling intonation	=	Contiguous utterances
,	Continuing intonation	?	Rising intonation	//	Interruption
(0.0)	Intervals between utterances	--	Cut-offs	(.)	Micro-pause
:	Sound stretch	( )	Words unclear	(( ))	Transcriber's remarks
hhh	Audible aspirations	.hh	Audible inhalations	<u>        </u>	Underlining Emphasis

In transcribing the data, I used the Yale system, and for morpheme-by-morpheme glossing, the following abbreviations were used (cf. H. S. Lee 1991):

ACC	Accusative	ADD	Additive	ANT	Anterior
ATTR	Attributive	CL	Classifier	COMM	Committal
COND	Conditional	CONN	Connective	COP	Copula
DECL	Declarative	DM	Discourse Marker	DUB	Dubitative
FR	Factual Realization	HONOR	Honorific	IE	Informal Ending
INC	Inchoative	INSTR	Instrumental	LOC	Locative
MOD	Modal	NECESS	Necessity	NEG	Negative
NOM	Nominative	NOML	Nominalization	QUOT	Quotative
REASON	Reason	SUGG	Suggestive	TOP	Topic Marker
UNASSIM	Unassimilated	VOC	Vocative		

3) The self-directed feature of a *ney*-marked observation is evidenced by the fact that the politeness marker *-yo* may not be used with *-ney* warrantably even in situations where the speaker would be normally required to use it, e.g., when he/she is talking to someone who is higher in social status and/or who is not close. In such a context, the recipient of *-ney*, positioned as a hearer (or as an overhearer), rather than as an addressee, is still expected to orient to upshot of the speaker's *ney*-marked observation as something to take up actively.

A Conversation Analysis of Korean Sentence-Ending Modal Suffixes *-ney*, *-kwun(a)*,<sup>5</sup>  
and *-ta*

(2) (Golf Practice)

- 1 K: *pelley-ka manhi mwu-ney*,  
bugs -NOM a lot bite-FR  
"Uh bugs are biting me a lot."  
2 H: *eh na-twu (.) na-n mayn pal -i -eyyo appa*.  
yes I -ADD I -TOP bare foot-COP-POL dad  
"Right, me too. (.) I'm in my bare feet, dad."  
→ 3 K: *uh(h) kuleh(h)-ney. hh*  
RM like:that-FR  
"Uh(h). (I see) indeed you are. hh"

In line 1, K uses *-ney* in the context of complaining about bugs biting him. This *ney*-marked observation is immediately shared by H, K's son ("Right, me too."), who then further orients to H's complaint by bringing up a more serious state he is in (line 2); he says that he is in bare feet and thereby implying that he is in a worse situation, being vulnerable to more ferocious bug bites than K, who is wearing sneakers.<sup>4</sup> This counter-complaint by his son is confirmed by K in line 3, where he uses another *-ney* in making note of a more serious situation his son finds himself in. Note that K's newly revised, more sympathetic stance toward H, which is displayed through this *ney*-marked observation coupled with a realization marker (*uh*) and sheepish laugh tokens, is proffered to be taken up and appreciated by H.

As a whole, we find that K's *ney*-marked noticing in line 1 offers the observed state-of-affairs (i.e., there being many bugs biting feet) as something to be shared and co-oriented to by the interlocutor, hence as the object to be potentially co-assessed by the interlocutor. While there are cases in which such an opportunity for co-assessment does not materialize due to no explicit uptake from the interlocutor, in this extract H orients to K's act of noticing and its action upshot as a complaint, and reacts to it. While K's other *ney*-utterance in line 3 is not visibly taken up by H (not shown in the data), it serves as a medium by which K displays his revised, more sympathetic stance toward H.

H. S. Lee (1993) observes that *-ney* is used when speaker presents newly perceived information as something that has been expressed immediately at the point of observation, rather than as something that is based on his/her inference. Our observations further suggest that the use of *-ney* orients the hearer to the target referent/event that has just been noticed and the speaker's stance associated with it, and thus furnishes the hearer with the opportunity to co-assess it immediately. Fragment (3) is another case in point:

(3) (Overheard Conversation)

((While driving, the husband notices a car.))

4) Note that he prods his father's revised understanding by adding the address term ('dad') in explicitly directing the attention of the latter to his more vulnerable state.

- 1 Husband: *ya i cha tukihakey saynggiess-ney.*  
 INTERJ this car uniquely look -FR  
 "Hey, (I've just noticed) This car looks unique."
- 2 Wife: *ah nemwu cak -ta.*  
 DM too small-DECL  
 "Oh, its too small."
- 3 Husband: *kulay -to beynz -ya.*  
 like:that-CONCESS Mercedes-Benz-COP:IE  
 "Still, it's Mercedes-Benz."

In (3), the husband uses *-ney* in making an observation topic-initially, which is made about a passing car. With his *ney*-utterance, the husband orients his wife to the target referent and provides for a context in which the noticed referent is interactively constituted as something that can be immediately co-assessed by the wife with respect to his evaluative stance displayed toward it. Note that the husband's *ney*-marked observation is immediately taken up by wife, who disputes her husband's positive assessment,<sup>5)</sup> and in line 3 the husband continues his positive assessment. This fragment shows that, contingent upon the interlocutor's collaborative uptake, the use of *-ney* may engender a sequence of co-assessment.

Fragments (4) and (5) below show additional contexts in which the speaker formulates a referent/event she has just noticed as something to be subsequently oriented to and taken up by the interlocutor. In these cases, the speaker uses *-ney* for constituting the action of providing an account on the basis of her observation made after a potentially face-threatening act. In the conversation shown in extract (4), which takes place at a driving range, Y makes a *ney*-marked observation in response to her husband's (K's) comment on her performance immediately after she hit a fat shot (i.e., a shot made in such a way that the club head strikes the ground first before making contact with the ball). In (5), a woman uses *-ney* as she shows that she has just noticed a ticket-distributing machine at a bank after trying to cut in the line without a numbered ticket. This utterance is produced as a self-directed comment, which is though designed to be heard by the person who gave the ticket to her and the people standing in line (see footnote (3)):

(4) (Swing Practice)

((Y didn't hit the ball properly.))

- 1 K: *kule -lttay -to iss -ci.*  
 like:that-when-ADD exist-COMM  
 "There are times like that."

- 2 Y: *twi -ss-ttang -ul chi-ess -ney. (.)*  
 behind-of-ground-ADD hit-ANT-FR

5) Note that the wife's utterance is marked by *-ta*, another suffix that expresses newly perceived information. In this context, where she is disputing her husband's assessment, the use of *-ta* organizes her disputing act as the one to be accepted and followed by the husband, whose display of interest toward the target referent is thus trivialized, with the former being obliquely constituted as the party who takes the initiative in evaluating the husband's prior assessment of the target referent. For a more detailed discussion, see Section V.

A Conversation Analysis of Korean Sentence-Ending Modal Suffixes *-ney*, *-kwun(a)*,<sup>7</sup>  
and *-ta*

- 3    *lai-ka com an coha-ss -e*  
lie-NOM a:little NEG good-ANT-IE  
"I hit a fat shot. (.) The lie of my ball was less than perfect. (=I had a tricky lie.)"

K C I

## (5) (Overheard Conversation)

((At a recreation center, people are waiting to be called to pay the registration fee. Each person is having a ticket taken from a ticket-distributing machine and is being called in the order of the number on the ticket. A lady inadvertently goes to the window and attempts to pay the fee without a ticket. Another lady who has been waiting takes a ticket from the ticket-distributing machine for her and gives it to her. Receiving the ticket, she makes the following face-saving remark.))

Customer: *penhophyo -ka iss -ess -ney.*  
number ticket-NOM exist-ANT-FR

"(I've just noticed) there are numbered tickets. (=I didn't know there are numbered tickets.)"

Note that the *ney*-marked noticing in (4) and (5) constitutes a face-saving account for a mistake (hitting a fat shot in (4)) or a social gaffe (cutting in the line without a numbered ticket in (5)) that the speaker has just committed. In these contexts, the speakers' *post hoc* remedial stance is displayed in the way they formulate their account or excuse as something to be appreciated by the hearer, grounding it on the referent/event being mentioned as a just-noticed phenomenon. While these instances of *-ney* do not require verbal response from the hearer, the hearer, as the party who has just made an appeasing comment (in (4)) or provided assistance (in (5)), is invited to grasp the face-managing import of the speaker's 'I-have-just-noticed-that' stance displayed through the action of providing a face-managing account.

As I will further suggest in the following discussion, what crucially distinguishes *-ney* from other suffixes expressing newly perceived information is this sequential feature of the former that invites the hearer to co-orient to the noticed referent/event as a ground on which the action being organized by the practice of noticing is to be relevantly appreciated, assessed, and/or acted upon by the hearer. The kinds of action invited by the *ney*-marked noticing as a subsequent responsive action vary according to whether the *ney*-marked noticing concerns an event or a referent relevant to the speaker himself/herself (as in (2) (line 1), (4) and (5)), the third person referent (as in (3)), or the second person (as in (2) (line 3)). For example, when noticing an aspect of the interlocutor's performance, the speaker may use *-ney* in making a positive or negative assessment. Fragment (6) is a case in point, where a series of positive *ney*-marked assessments is produced by the participants (K and H) who collaboratively assess Y's golf swing:

## (6) (Golf Practice)

((Y, wife of K and mother of H, makes a swing.))

- 1 K: *koyngcangha-ney. (.) cal ha-ney.*  
great -ney well do-FR  
"Thats great. (.) You play very well."
- 2 H: *awuki-ney.*  
kill -FR  
"That's killing me. (=Thats fantastic.)"

In this kind of context where a positive assessment is given through the practice of noticing, the recipient of *ney*-marked positive assessments is led to appreciate the evaluative stance displayed through the action of praise, with her performance being interactively constituted as an object of mutual attention. That is, even though there may not be a visible uptake on the part of the recipient of a *ney*-utterance, the social action organized by *-ney* crucially involves the design feature of other-orientedness displayed toward the interlocutor, or sometimes toward others present as well (see (5)), in such a way that the recipient of *-ney*, as the addressee or, sometimes, as an overhearer, is invited to actively take up the import of the action constituted by the *ney*-utterance.

We often find cases of *-ney* used in offering a positive or negative assessment in caregiver-child interaction, where the child is led to appreciate the caregiver's stance displayed in the *ney*-marked assessment and act accordingly. For instance, they are oriented to the referent/event that is formulated as something that the caregiver has just noticed, and is invited to respond in a way that is appreciative of the caregiver's displayed stance, i.e., either by sustaining or upgrading their performance related to that referent/ event in the case of positive assessment or revising or terminating their course of action in the case of negative assessment. Fragment (7) is a case in which the caregiver uses *-ney* in describing an aspect of the event the child is involved in as something she has just noticed. This conversation takes place in a kindergarten after class, when children are cleaning the classroom and putting toys back in their original place:

(7) (Kindergarten Class)

→ 1 T: *suhan-i -kke kkwak cha -ss -ney:*,  
Suhan -VOC-thing:NOM chock-full filled-PST-FR

2 *oli-e -noh -ca suhan-a.*  
lift-CONN-place-SUGG Suhan-VOC

"(I've just noticed) Suhan's (your) basket is full. Let's put it over there now, Suhan."

In lines 1 and 2, the teacher uses *-ney* in bringing to the attention of the child an aspect of the current state of affairs the child is involved in, i.e., the child's basket being full of toys. What she does through this practice of noticing is to lead the child to appreciate her mildly rebuking stance displayed toward a problematic aspect of the child's performance and has him respond with the kind of action that is appreciative of that stance, i.e., stop pushing around the basket and put the toys back. As I proposed in another paper (Kim & Suh 2003), the use of *-ney* enacts a context where the ability to appreciate and appropriately take up the other's stance obliquely displayed becomes crucially relevant, and the acquisition of such a competence constitutes a significant part of language socialization process for Korean children (cf. Ochs & Schieffelin 1984, Clancy 1986, Cook 1992).

In some contexts, the speaker uses *-ney* in noticing something about an event or a state of affairs involving the interlocutor, and this leads the interlocutor to provide an account (Pomerantz 1980). Consider fragment (8). In this extract, the wife calls her husband in the office and, finding out that he is still there, uses *-ney* in expressly noticing that her husband is still in his office:

(8) (Kim M.-W. Data: 1)

- 1 Husband: *yeposeyyo.*  
hello  
"Hello."
- 2 Wife: *e.*  
yes  
"Yes."
- 3 Husband: *e e.*  
yes yes  
"Yes. Yes."
- 4 Wife: *thoykun an hayss -ney,*  
leaving:the:office NEG do:ANT-FR  
"(I've just noticed) you haven't left the office yet?"
- 5 Husband: *e e.*  
yes yes  
"Yes. Yes."
- 6 Wife: *acik-to iss -ney,*  
still -ADD exist -FR  
"(I've just noticed) you're still there."
- 7 Husband: *wuntong-ha-ko cikum tola -o -ass -e.=*  
workout-do-CONN now return:CONN-come-ANT-IE  
"I've just come back after workout."
- 8 Wife: *=e way tola -o -a? cip -ulo o -ci:.*  
DM why return:CONN-come-IE home-DIR come-COMM  
"Why did you come back to the office? You could have come home right away (after the workout)."
- 9 Husband: *ah kimpap -ul an mek-e -kacikwu.*  
ah see:weed:rice:roll-ACC NEG eat -CONN-CONN  
"Oh, because I have to finish the kimpap (=cooked rice rolled in dried see weed) leftovers."

Note that the wife's *ney*-utterance displays her inquisitive stance and leads her husband to provide an account for the noticed state of affairs, i.e., regarding why he is still in his office instead of coming home for dinner. As her initial *ney*-marked inquiry in line 4 is responded to by her husband's minimal affirmation in line 5 ("Yes. Yes."), she produces another *ney*-utterance in line 6 which further prompts him to provide an account of why he is still in his office. In this respect, the *ney*-utterance functions as what Pomerantz (1980) calls a 'fishing device': the wife invites or prods her husband to provide the sought-after information (i.e., an account for why he is still in the office) by telling her side of events (i.e., noticing that he is still in the office). And this can be seen by the fact that the husband

DOES provide an account in the subsequent context, explaining why he is still there, saying he has just come back from his workout. This sequence of inquiry further continues as the wife makes a more specific inquiry in line 8, to which the husband provides a further account in line 9.

As we find here, the *ney*-marked indirect action is often followed by an utterance that continues the action, often in a more explicit way. Note that the wife's inquiry, which began with her *ney*-utterance in a highly oblique way (lines 4 and 6), becomes more direct and explicit as she goes on to sustain the inquiry sequence; in line 8, she takes a more explicit form of inquiry. Likewise, we also find in fragment (7) that the teacher's *ney*-marked noticing is followed by an explicit suggestion ("Let's put it over there now"). Though not a full-blown directive, this suggestion by the teacher constitutes a more direct form of a directive than noticing does. Also, in fragment (4), we find that Y continues her action of account-providing, initially done indirectly by her *ney*-marked noticing ("I hit a fat shot."), goes on to provide a more detailed self-diagnosis, saying that she had a tricky lie (line 3). These observations suggest that the sequence of action involving *-ney* is often sustained and further developed subsequently, with the action tending to become more explicit and direct as the sequence progresses.

Overall, we find that *ney*-marked noticing often makes relevant a specific type of action by the interlocutor, which is shaped by the interlocutor's collaborative uptake and appreciation of the speaker stance displayed in the *ney*-utterance. One of the most important features of *-ney*, in this sense, is that it invites the hearer's attention not only to the referent/event that the speaker has just noticed, but also to the speaker's stance displayed through the action organized through the practice of noticing. It is on the basis of a collaborative uptake and appreciation by the interlocutor of the speaker's stance displayed through their act of noticing that the speaker may continue and upgrade their action. Also, when the noticed event concerns the interlocutor, it is again on the basis of the interlocutor's keen orientation to the speaker's displayed stance that the interlocutor is often led to respond in a particular way, as in the case in which they are prodded to reveal what they know as an account for the event that has been noticed by the speaker of *-ney*. So, the most crucial issues that we should think about regarding the use of *-ney* is how various social actions are obliquely executed and interactively organized and sustained by way of the interlocutor's grasp of the speaker's stance displayed toward the noticed referent/event and the action implemented by the practice of noticing. Given that the stance is displayed, not asserted, in the *ney*-utterance, the action constituted through a *ney*-marked noticing is often indirectly performed, and the recipient of *-ney* is expected to be keenly oriented to the speaker's displayed stance in producing the relevant next action.

### III. *-kwun(a)* in conversation: Acknowledging a prior point

The sequential characteristics associated with *-kwun(a)*, another suffix used for expressing newly perceived information, are distinct from those associated with *-ney*. Unlike *-ney*, *kwun(a)*-marked noticing does not participate in organizing diverse types of social action. Rather, its interactional function seems to be limited to acknowledging a prior point and displaying a congruent stance. For instance, the speaker may use a *kwun(a)*-marked utterance in acknowledging a point that has been made by the interlocutor in the prior context, as in fragment (9):

K C I

A Conversation Analysis of Korean Sentence-Ending Modal Suffixes *-ney*, *-kwun(a)* and *-ta*

(9) (Breakfast)

((The mother is telling her son not to skip breakfast, saying that his grandfather had passed away because he did not eat much.))

1 Mother: *emma -ka pap-to mek-ko twu-kay ta mek-eya*  
mother-NOM rice-ADD eat -CONN two-item all eat -NECESS

2 *toy-ntako kulay -ss -cianha kulay -ya*  
OK-QUOT do:like:that-PST-COMM-IE do:like:that-NECESS

3 *kenkanghay-ci -ci.*  
healthy -become-COMM

"I have told you that you should eat enough rice along with two side dishes, haven't I? That's how you can stay healthy."

4 Son: *cincca-eyyo emma?*  
truth -COP:POL mother  
"Is it true, mom?"

5 Mother: *e kulay -ya kenkanghay-ci -ci.*  
yes do:like:that-NECESS healthy -INC-COMM  
"Yes. That's the way to stay healthy."

→ 6 Son: *ah kuleh -kwuna.*  
RM like: that-UNASSIM  
"I see (that's the case)."  
((The sequence is terminated.))

In this conversation, the young boy uses *-kwun(a)* in acknowledging what his mother has said (i.e., his grandfather having passed away because he did not eat much and the need to eat enough rice along with at least two side dishes in order to enjoy a long life). Also note that the *kwun(a)*-utterance is topic-curtailling and sequence-terminating, without giving any salient sense of asking for some responsive move from the interlocutor as in the case of the context in which a *ney*-utterance is found. No uptake by the interlocutor is being made relevant as a next move.

While fragment (9) shows the context in which the speaker uses *-kwun(a)* when acknowledging the interlocutor's point, there are contexts in which the speaker uses what the interlocutor has said in the prior context as evidence and presents an observation inferred from it as something that he has just noticed. In this case, the speaker's inference-based observation is formulated as something to be expectably acknowledged and confirmed by the interlocutor. Consider fragment (10), which has been taken from H. S. Lee (1993):

(10) (S & H)

1 S: *hyeng -un eti nao -si -ess -e -yo,*  
big:brother-TOP where come:out-HONOR-ANT-IE-POL  
"What high school did you go to, then?"

2 H: *awungang.*  
Joongang  
"Joongang High School."

3 (.)

- 4 S: *kyenggi po -a kaci-ku tteleci-ess -kwuna*,  
 Kyengki see-CONN take-CONN fail -ANT-UNASSIM  
 "You failed the entrance examination to Kyengki High School (I can figure)."  
 5 H: ((Smiling))  
 ((They move on to talk about a different topic.))

In response to S's question about which high school H attended to, H says that he went to Joongang High School (line 2). Following a micro-pause in line 3, S makes an inference-based observation, marked by *-kwun(a)*, that H failed to enter Kyenggi High School. As noted in H. S. Lee (1993), this observation clearly shows that *-kwun(a)* is used when the speaker expresses what he calls 'non-factual information', which is inferred based on evidence. In (10), H's reply in line 2 that he graduated from Joongang High School provides evidence on the basis of which S makes an inference that H failed to enter Kyengki High School.<sup>6)</sup> Here, we find a sense in which S's *kwun(a)*-marked inference, based on shared and commonsensical knowledge about high schools in Korea, is constructed with an assertive key (Hymes 2003) as something to be affirmed and acknowledged by the interlocutor.

It is important to note here that what the speaker of *-kwun(a)* is mainly oriented to is to have the interlocutor acknowledge and affirm the inference he has brought up. Actually, this interactive orientation is sequentially manifested by the fact that *kwun(a)*-marked inference tends to be formulated and contextualized in such a way that it is to be preferentially accepted by the interlocutor, often situated in the context in which the recipient of *-kwun(a)* is led to simply acknowledge the upshot of the *kwun(a)*-marked observation. This is often made possible by virtue of the fact that the speaker of *-kwun(a)* implements an action that is inferentially based upon the prior utterance of the interlocutor as its evidence, and with the speaker's stance being displayed to be congruent with the interlocutor's prior remark, the import of the action he/she implements is likely to be affirmed by the interlocutor. Note in (10), in this respect, that in line 5, H DOES acknowledge S's *kwun(a)*-marked inference, which may be somewhat face-threatening to H, by smiling, and presumably by doing so also indicates that he is a bit embarrassed. Overall, in (10), the speaker has the interlocutor acknowledge the point that he has just noticed through an inference based on a commonsensically shared knowledge, a kind of inference that the interlocutor is likely to agree to. By virtue of referring to the interlocutor's prior remark as a basis for making an inference, *-kwun(a)* serves as a grammatical device by which the speaker presents his/her expressed inference as something to be acknowledged and affirmed by the interlocutor. Unlike *-ney*, the

6) This particular inference can be easily made by any Korean people who know about the old days when if one fails to enter a top-notch high school he/she may go to a high school that belongs to what may be called a secondary group. Given that the high school H says he went, Joonang High School, is one of those secondary group high schools, S can easily infer that H failed a top-notch high school, Kyengggi High School.

interlocutor is not invited to engage in any further collaborative action with respect to the speaker's observation, but is positioned to simply acknowledge the speaker's observation.

As the main interactional business achieved through the sequence involving the *kwun(a)*-marked noticing is to acknowledge a point raised by the interlocutor (as in (9)) or have the interlocutor acknowledge the speaker's point which is based on the interlocutor's prior talk (as in (10)), a *kwun(a)*-utterance tends to be topic-curtailling in its import, often bringing the sequence to an end. As I noted in (9), the boy's *kwun(a)*-utterance brings the sequence of talk with his mother to an end. Also note in (10) that H's non-verbal acknowledgement done through the act of smiling, as a response to S's *kwun(a)*-utterance, brings the current sequence to an end, and the participants move on to a different topic.

This feature of *-kwun(a)* is also observed even when a *kwun(a)*-marked noticing is further responded to by the interlocutor. Consider fragment (11):

(11) (Park S.-H. Data: 6)

- 1 F: *ce-lang kati tul -e -o -a -kaciko ce kwuntay*  
 I -with together come:in-CONN-come-CONN-CONN I military
- 2 *ka-iss -nun -tongan -ey moksa-twu toy -kwu*  
 go-exist-ATTR-during:the:time-LOC priest-ADD become-ADD
- 3 *paksa -kwaceng-twu tul -e -ka-kwu.*  
 doctor-program-ADD go:in-CONN-go-ADD  
 "He entered the program at the same time as I did and while I was away in the military he became a priest and also entered the doctoral program."
- 4 S: *ung ne -lang kati- tul -e -o -ass -kwuna.*  
 yes you-with together come:in-CONN-come-ANT-UNASSIM  
 "I see. He entered the program at the same time with you."
- 5 F: *ney ce-lang kati tul -e -o -ass -ci -yo.*  
 yes I -with together come:in-CONN-come-ANT-COMM-POL
- 6 *tto nwuka kati tul -e -o -ass -ci?*  
 also who together come:in-CONN-come-ANT-COMM  
 "Yes, he entered the program at the same time as I did. Let me think who else entered at the same time."

In line 4, S uses *-kwun(a)* as he repeats a part of F's prior utterance as something he has just noticed. Also note that F, in line 5, responds by repeating again the same point, i.e., the point that he entered the MA program at the same time as their mutual friend. This responsive pattern shows that S uses *-kwun(a)* in acknowledging F's prior point, and his *kwun(a)*-utterance leads F to acknowledge the same point again, thus interactively wrapping up the topic as something that has been mutually affirmed. Notice in line 6 in F's turn that he stops talking about the mutual friend they have been talking about and launches a search for another mutual friend that presumably entered the program at the same time as he did, thus closing the current topic and moving on to another.

The preceding observations suggest that, unlike *-ney*, *-kwun(a)* does not project a template in which a variety of responsive actions can be relevantly produced by the recipient. Often, the recipient of *-kwun(a)* does not respond at all, as in (9), or even in the context where the recipient is pushed into a situation where he is required to respond, the upshot of the *kwun(a)*-marked noticing act lies in leading the interlocutor to simply acknowledge what the speaker has just noticed, as we saw in (10). Also, as we saw in (11), the *kwun(a)*-utterance is often situated in a sequential place where the speaker acknowledges a prior point and the interlocutor subsequently acknowledges the same point again in the next turn. This practice suggests that the main use of *-kwun(a)* is the management of the participants' display of congruent stance, i.e., a stance that is congruent with the prior discourse context and/or commonsensical or shared knowledge. With the mutual affirmation and agreement regarding a noticed referent/event being the main interactional business managed by *-kwun(a)*, the *kwun(a)*-marked noticing does not encourage further engagement by the interlocutor on the observed referent/ event except asking for acknowledging it. That is, when the speaker uses *-kwun(a)* in making an inference-based observation, what is at issue is how and whether he or she is able to formulate a point that is likely to be acknowledged by the recipient.<sup>7)</sup> Formulated as such, the *kwun(a)*-marked noticing tends to enact a context in which the recipient is hard pressed to acknowledge the speaker's point.

The sequential feature of *-kwun(a)* that makes the interlocutor's acknowledgement a relevant next action ties in nicely with Lee's observation that *-kwun(a)* marks non-informative information. Lee notes that the information that *-kwun(a)* marks is not from the speaker's factual knowledge, but inferred based on evidence that has just

7) Even though a *kwun(a)*-utterance may be responded to by the interlocutor who produces more than an acknowledgement, such a responsive action often seems to be constituted by a particular type of account that provides a ground for the speaker's act of 'acknowledging' or 'not acknowledging' the point made by the *kwun(a)*-utterance, as illustrated by the students responses ((a) and (b)) to the teacher's *kwun(a)*-marked inference in the following made-up example:

((noticing that a student is dozing on and off))

Teacher: *ne ecey nuckey ca -ss -kwun(a)*,  
you yesterday late sleep-ANT-UNASSIM

"You went to bed late yesterday (I can figure)."

Student: (a) *ney. swukcey ta ha-nulako manhi mos ca -ss -eyo.*

yes homework all do-REASON a:lot not:able sleep-ANT-POL

"Yes. I didn't get enough sleep because I had to finish my homework."

(b) *ani -yo. cam manhi ca -ss -nuntey -yo,*

NEG:COP-POL sleep a:lot sleep-ANT-CIRCUM-POL

"No. I slept enough."

Note in (a) and (b) that the student's account is produced in relation to his stance displayed in his turn-initially situated response of acknowledging or not acknowledging the teacher's observation ('yes' in (a) and 'no' in (b)). This shows that the action of providing an account sequentially made relevant by a *kwun(a)*-utterance is different from that generated by a *ney*-utterance, in that the scope of the former is still being limited to providing a ground for managing the speaker's act of acknowledgment and display of a congruent stance.

been obtained. He observes, "What is expressed with *-kwun(a)* is also not informative, such that the speaker's communicative goal is not to transfer its propositional content to the addressee but to express his or her perception of it" (H. S. Lee 1993:148). Lee presents this feature as a crucial part of his cognitively oriented characterization of *-kwun(a)* as a marker of 'unassimilated information', in the sense that non-informative, expected information is not striking enough to be immediately assimilated or integrated into the speaker's knowledge at the moment of noticing.

This cognitive account proposed in terms of non-informativeness can be related to our interactional account making reference to the sequential context associated with *-kwun(a)* in which what the speaker does is basically to affirm what the interlocutor has just said in the prior context or to have the interlocutor affirm a point which is commonsensically inferred from the prior talk. That is, Lee's observation about the non-informative nature of a *kwun(a)*-marked observation can be translated in interactional terms as being associated with or attributed to the sequential features of *-kwun(a)* through which speakers manage their congruent stances in acknowledging each other's point, which is contextually framed to be easily affirmed (e.g., as an inference made from the interlocutor's prior remark or action). What distinguishes *-kwun(a)* from *-ney*, in this sense, is that the former is deployed in such a sequential place where what is due is the interlocutor's minimal involvement in the form of acknowledging a prior point enacted through the inference-ridden display of congruent stance, whereas the latter orients the interlocutor's attention to the action upshot of the speaker's observation as the speaker displays his/her stance toward the prior talk and solicits a particular alignment with it from the interlocutor. *Kwun(a)*-utterances thus tend to be topic-curtailling, with the current sequence being often terminated. *Ney*-utterances, in contrast, tend to be sequence-generating, contingent upon the hearer's uptake sequentially made relevant.

#### IV. Additional remarks: *-ney* vs. *-kwun(a)*

As for the difference between *-ney* and *-kwun(a)* in terms of having the interlocutor orient to the upshot of the speaker's noticing, it can be further pointed out that *ney*-marked assessments are often formulated as a fleeting wise-crack with which the speaker, while resourcefully aligning (or disaligning) with the interlocutor's prior talk, orients the interlocutor to the witty and tactful nature of his/her observation, which is made to collaborate with the interlocutor's prior remark. In such a context, *ney*-utterances often take an exaggerated form of a metaphoric expression or a formulaic expression. Consider fragments (12) and (13):

(12) (Park S.-H. Data: 20)

((S is talking about the turn-taking rule according to which the first to start takes the floor))

309 S: *kulayse ku kyengcaeyng-eyse nuuka iki-nunya -ya*  
so that competition -LOC who win-QUOT-COP:IE

310 *malha-ca -myen.*  
speak-SUGG-COND

"So, in a matter of speaking, the issue is who wins the competition."

→ 311 J: *ku -kes -twu sayngconkyengcaeyng-i -ney,*  
that-thing-ADD survival competition-COP-FR

"(I see) That too is the competition for survival."

312 M: *ku -key ceytaylo kkietul -ttay tayhwa -ka*  
that-thing:NOM properly squeeze-in-when conversation-NOM

313 *ceytaylo toy -nun -ke -ci.*  
properly work-ATTR-NOML-COMM

"That should operate properly so that conversation proceeds properly."

(13) (Park S.-H. Data: 4)

168 J: *pelsse hwankap -i -si -lakwu -yo?*  
already 60:years:old-COP-HONOR-QUOT-POL

"You said he is already 60 years old?"

[  
169 S: *kunkka wenak cacey -pwun -tul-i eli -nikka ...*  
I mean so children-HONOR-PL-NOM young-REASON

"I mean, his children are so young, so, ..."

((Y's overlapping turn is omitted.))

→ 171 J: *heh kumun halapeci-lang sonnye -keyss-ney.*  
then grandfather -with granddaughter-MOD-FR

"heh Then they are a grandfather and granddaughters (=He must look like their grandfather)."

172 Y: *sensayngnim-twu ilen mok-katun-tey po -a*  
teacher -ADD like:this neck-like -place look-IE

"Look at his neck, for example."

In (12), the upshot of J's *ney*-utterance as a formulaic expression, which is accorded a sense of exaggeration in the given context ("That too is the competition for survival."), lies in displaying her strongly collaborative stance toward S's preceding point (lines 309-310). In (13), *-ney* is used with a metaphoric expression. Formulated as an exaggeration by which J collaboratively aligns herself with S's observation in line 169, the *ney*-utterance highlights the point that the professor looks so old that his children look like his grandchildren. As a wisecrack, the locutionary meaning of these *ney*-utterances ("Taking the floor to speak in turn-taking operations is just like competing to survive." in (12) and "They are a grandfather and granddaughters." in (13)) is subdued in such a way that the interlocutors are strongly invited to appreciate the tactfulness or the wittiness of the speaker's collaborative co-assessment. *-Kwun(a)* is rarely associated with such an intensively collaborative perspective- display sequence.

Moving on to another aspect of the context associated with *-ney*, one of the features of *-ney* that H. S. Lee (1993) discusses in his paper is that it marks newly perceived information that is factual, i.e., not inference-based. And he aptly observes that *-ney* is often used for expressing the information that does not conform to the speaker's background expectation (i.e., counter expectation) (also see K. Lee 1993). H. S. Lee attempts to explain this link between factuality and

counter-expectation by pointing out that unexpected information is the kind of information that is more informative and that is thus more likely to be directly perceived and integrated into the speaker's cognitive system, so there is less need for inference and dependence on evidence, hence more factual information. Consider example (14), which has been taken from H. S. Lee (1993) with some modification:

(14) ((In response to an unexpected visit of his friend who earlier said he wouldn't be able to come))

A: *eh o -ass -ney*.  
DM come-ANT-FR  
"Oh, you have come."

While Lee takes a cognitive perspective and makes a point on the basis of this example that *-ney* marks unexpected information which is factual in the sense that it is highly likely to be immediately incorporated into the speaker's knowledge, I would like to take the sequential context more seriously than Lee did. Following the line of interactionally oriented argument that I have been developing in this paper, I would like to propose that this is a case where the speaker, with his *ney*-marked observation, brings into relief the recipient's act (i.e., his unexpected visit) as the object of further assessment, and the recipient is invited to offer an account for his act (see Section II). Indeed, the recipient in such a context usually responds by providing an account of what has happened and what has led him to change his mind. It is easy to see that such an account-fishing action constituted by a *ney*-marked observation would be naturally situated in the context where the interlocutor's act of showing up is unexpected.<sup>8)</sup>

It follows from this observation that, if the speaker expected his friend to come, he would not formulate the noticing of his friend's arrival as something that requires an account, and thus would not use *-ney*, as shown in example (15) below (H. S. Lee 1993):

(15) ((To his newly arrived friend whom he has been expecting))

A: *eh o -ass -kwuna*.  
DM come-ANT-UNASSIM  
"Ah, you have come."

As Lee observes, in such a situation, *-kwun(a)* would be used instead, because the friend's arrival conforms to background expectations assumed among communicators. From an interactional point of view, we can say that this is the sequential context in which *-kwun(a)* is warrantably deployable because what the speaker is expected to do is simply to acknowledge his friend's arrival. Unlike *-ney*, it does not invite the friend to respond in any way, except that the friend

---

8) Recall that this example is reminiscent of fragment (8) we examine above, where the wife's *ney*-marked noticing of her husband's unexpected presence in the office leads the husband to provide an account.

may just redundantly acknowledge the fact that he has indeed come verbally (as in (11)) or non-verbally (as in (10)).

### V. *-Ta* in conversation: Providing basis of speaker-initiated action

Let me move on to our next sentence-ending suffix *-ta* and examine some of the sequential features associated with its use. The suffix *-ta*, which is known as 'declarative', is sometimes used in the context in which the speaker expresses newly perceived information. One of the most salient and most recurrently observed features of the *ta*-marked observation is that it provides a ground on which some 'planned', or 'normatively relevant' next action can be initiated or triggered by the speaker. This point is illustrated in the made-up examples in (16) through (19):

- (16) *pí o -n -ta. tul -e -ka-ca.*  
rain come-ATTR-DECL go:into-CONN-go-SUGG  
"(I've just noticed) It's raining. Lets get in."
- (17) *cha o -n -ta. cosim -hxy.*  
car come-ATTR-DECL caution-do:IE  
"(I've just noticed) A car is coming. Watch out."
- (18) *i -ke mac-iss -ta. mek-e -po -a.*  
this-thing taste-exist-DECL eat -CONN-see-IE;  
"(I've just noticed) This is delicious. Try it."
- (19) *ne machim cal o -ss -ta. tul -e -o -a.*  
you just:in:time well come-ANT-DECL come-CONN-come-IE  
"(I've just noticed) You've come at just the right moment. Come in."

In these examples, the referent/event that the speaker has just noticed provides a basis for some next stage of action (e.g., suggestion, warning, offer etc.) initiated by the speaker. For instance, in (16), the speaker notices that it is beginning to rain and suggests to the hearer that they go indoors. In (17), the speaker notices that the car is coming and, having the hearer orient to the observed event, issues a warning as the next move. In (18), the speaker reports that he has just found the food delicious, and offers the food to the hearer. In (19), the speaker formulates the interlocutor's arrival as an event that he has just noticed and on that basis asks the interlocutor to come in. In all these cases, we find that the referent/event that the speaker has just noticed furnishes the speaker with a basis on which he/she can initiate a move, which is often normatively taken as a relevant next action.<sup>9)</sup>

9) If we replace *-ta* with *-ney* or *-kwun(a)* in (16)-(19), the resulting sentences, though mostly pragmatically coherent (and probably more coherent in the case of *-ney* than in *-kwun(a)*), are accorded a different meaning; the sense that the given action is 'initiated' by the speaker as a 'preliminary' step leading to some next action would be considerably weakened.

A Conversation Analysis of Korean Sentence-Ending Modal Suffixes *-ney*, *-kwun(a)*<sup>21</sup>  
and *-ta*

The recipient of a *ta*-utterance and its following utterance is thus positioned as the recipient of the speaker-initiated action, e.g., as the beneficiary, the follower, facilitator, or the victim subjected to the directive force of the speaker's action. These observations are confirmed by the following segments of overheard conversation:

(20) (Overheard Conversation)

((A and B are waiting at a subway station for a train that is bound for Incheon. Finding that an incoming train is indeed the one bound to Incheon, A produces the following *ta*-utterance.))

A: *inchen -i -ta.*

Incheon-COP-DECL

"It's Incheon (= a train bound for Incheon)."

((As the train arrives and the doors are open, A and B get on the train.))

(21) (Overheard Conversation)

((The wife, who has been looking for her keys in the car, uses *-ta* when she informs her husband that she found them.))

Wife: *yeki iss -ta!*

here exist-DECL

"Here it is!"

((The husband stops looking for the keys.))

Note in both (20) and (21) that the recipients of the *ta*-utterance respond to the speaker's noticing in such a way that they demonstrably orient themselves to the next stage of the given action sequence that is either planned and/or commonsensically relevant. In (20), the recipient of *-ta* joins A in the next planned action, i.e., getting on the train, and in (21), the husband stops searching for the lost keys. In both cases, it is the speaker of *-ta* who takes the initiative in leading the interlocutor to the next stage of the sequenced actions (also see fragment (3) (line 2)).

H. S. Lee (1993) notes that the function of *-ta* is distinct from that of *-ney* or *-kwun(a)* in that *-ta* marks information which is 'noteworthy', which thus needs the addressee's attention. It is also noted that, often, the speaker of *-ta* presents himself as the one who has the authority over the information being conveyed and/or informs the addressee that he/she has just fulfilled something that had been expected. From a more interactional perspective, we can focus on the sequential context in which *-ta* is used and reformulate Lee's notions such as 'noteworthiness', 'speaker's authority', and 'fulfillment' in terms of the kinds of action that the *ta*-marked noticing constitutes and the roles of the speaker and the addressee it enacts. For instance, as observed above in relation to (16)-(21), the recipient of *-ta* is often placed in a position to attend to the import or 'newsworthiness' of the speaker's observation so that he/she can collaboratively participate or react to the speaker's next action. In such a process, the speaker of *-ta* would naturally take the 'authoritative' role as the initiator of the next action,

with the recipient of *-ta* being positioned as the party to follow the speaker's initiative. Also, given that the *ta*-marked noticing provides a ground for some next relevant action, what is implicated in this sequential process would be the initial 'fulfillment' of an action constituted by the practice of noticing as a preliminary move toward a subsequent action.

In some context, that the recipient of *-ta* orients to the speakers projected next action is evidenced by the fact that the recipient of *-ta* often orients himself/herself to the speaker's projected next action by withholding his/her turn and letting the speaker continue to talk. For example, the recipient of *-ta* often initiates repair so that the speaker of *-ta* may continue to talk for further clarification. Consider fragments (22), (23) and (24):

## (22) (TA Meeting)

- 1 K: *kulikavu i -ke -n dictation yensup -un i -ke -l*  
and this-thing-TOP dictation practice-TOP this-thing-ACC  
→ 2 *-lo ha-myen toy-keyss-ta. ( )*  
-INSTR do-COND OK-MOD-DECL  
"And with this, for the dictation practice, We should use this. ( )"  
3 J: *etten -ke -yo?*  
which-thing-POL  
"Which one?"  
4 K: *dictation i -ke -l -lwu iss -ci -yo kunyang*  
dictation this-thing-ACC-INSTR exist-COMM-POL simply  
*mal -ul neh -e -kacikwu ...*  
word-ACC insert-CONN-CONN  
"For dictation, with this, we can simply insert words and ..."

## (23) (Park, S.-H. Data: 56)

- 1 S: *ha-ki silh -takwu sayngkak-ul an hay -ss*  
do-NOML dislike-QUOT thought -ACC NEG do:CONN-ANT  
2 *-ci tangyenhi hay -ya -toy-l -ke -l*  
-COMM naturally do:CONN-NECESS-OK-ATTR-NOML-ACC  
3 *-lwu sayngkak-ha-kwu*  
-INSTR thought -do-CONN  
"I didn't think that that's something I don't like to do. I just thought it as something that I should do."  
4 H: *eh enni -twu minho oppa -lang ttokati*  
DM old:sister-ADD Minhoo old:brother-with same  
→ 5 *sayngkak-ul ha-si -n -ta.*  
thought -ACC do-HONOR-ATTR-DECL  
"Hey, you've got the same attitude as Minhoo."  
6 S: *mwe -lul.*  
What-ACC  
"What."  
7 J: *tangyenhi hay -ya -toy.*  
naturally do:CONN-NECESS-OK  
"That's something that you should do."  
8 H: *kukka-nun tangyenhi hay -ya -toy-l -kke -lakwu.*  
I:mean-TOP naturally do:CONN-NECESS-OK-ATTR-NOML-QUOT

A Conversation Analysis of Korean Sentence-Ending Modal Suffixes *-ney*, *-kwun(a)*<sup>23</sup>  
and *-ta*

"I mean, the idea that that's something you should do."

(24) (K & H)

- 1 H: *an toy-keyss-ta ne-nun.*  
NEG OK-MOD-DECL you-TOP  
"It (=the bed) won't do, for you. (=The bed won't fit you)"
- 2 K: *mwe-ka.*  
what-NOM  
"What."
- 3 H: *caek-ase.*  
small-CAUSE  
"Because it is small."

In (22), K's *ta*-utterance is followed by J's repair initiator by which K is prompted to provide a clarification. In (23), H's *ta*-marked noticing of S's particular position leads S to initiate repair in line 6, which prompts H to clarify his position. In the same vein, In (24), H's riddle-like statement topic-initially made in line 1 triggers K's repair initiator in line 2, whereby H is further prodded to clarify his point. This tendency is also observed in fragment (25), where the recipient of *-ta* produces a continuer ('yes') (cf. Schegloff 1982) and has the speaker continue to talk:

(25) (Lunch Talk)

- 1 J: *test cachey-lul kulehkey nay -twu kwaynchanh-keyyss-ta*  
 test itself -ACC like:that make-CONCESS OK -MOD-DECL  
 "We could make the test itself like that."  
 [ ]
- 2 W: *ney* *ney*  
 yes yes  
 "Yes." "Yes."
- 3 J: *kulenikka cenhye (.) molu -nun mwuncang-ul kac-ta*  
 I: mean totally not:know-ATTR sentence -ACC take-INTERR
- 4 *nay-kwu ...*  
 give-CONN  
 "I mean, we give a totally unfamiliar sentence and..."

These features of *-ta* could be more fruitfully addressed as part of its meaning of 'declarative' in general, which inherently presupposes the authoritative status of the speaker as the party who is in the position where he/she can 'declare' something. For now, however, it suffices to point out that the speaker of a *ta*-utterance tends to be given further opportunity to continue to talk, which shows that the sequential feature of *-ta* that projects the speaker's next action is demonstrably oriented to by the recipient of *-ta*.<sup>10)</sup>

## VI. Conclusion

Overall, we find substantial differences between *-ney* and *-kwun(a)* in terms of sequential structures and the kind of social action enacted through them. The *ney*-marked noticing has the hearer co-orient to the noticed referent/event and thereby invites the hearer to co-assess or co-act on it with keen orientation to and appreciation of the speaker's stance displayed in the *ney*-utterance. Various types of social action are obliquely executed and induced by way of the act of displaying stance (with *-ney*) and the responsive act of appreciating it. Often, a *ney*-marked noticing engenders an extended sequence of co-assessment or co-action, with the participants collaboratively engaging in the activities by way of actively responding to the speaker's action and grasping the speaker's stance.

In contrast, the use of *-kwun(a)* concerns the speaker's grasp of some evidence on the basis of which he/she displays stance congruent with it. The main interactional business to which the participants orient themselves when using *-kwun(a)* is to acknowledge the noticed referent/event in the prior talk or enact a sequential context such that the inference the speaker has just made is congruent with the prior context and is likely to be easily acknowledged by the interlocutor. Crudely

10) As illustrated in (22), (24), and (25), *-ta* is often used with modal marker *-keyss*, which is also used frequently with *-kwun(a)* and *-ney* as well (see fragment (13)). Further research should look at various aspects of the contexts in which these suffixes co-occur with the modal *-keyss*, which indexes the speaker's presumptive stance toward the referent/event being observed (Suh & Kim 2001).

put, *-ney* is an 'issue raiser', or a 'problematizer', in both positive and negative senses, which involves the hearer as a potential co-participant whose active engagement is made relevant, whereas *-kwun(a)* is an 'issue closer', by which speakers orient to managing congruent stances, making the action of acknowledgment as a relevant next and often enacting a context where the current topic or sequence is wrapped up on the basis of mutual agreement. So different types of stances and actions organized by *-ney* and *-kwun(a)* have distinct sequential implications; the use of *-ney* tends to be sequence-sustaining (contingent upon the hearer's collaborative uptake) while the use of *-kwun(a)* is often topic-curtailling and/or sequence-terminating. *-Ta* differs from *-ney* or *-kwun(a)* in that the observation it marks constitutes a preliminary action projecting a next action initiated by the speaker. The recipient of *-ta* is thus placed in the position to orient to the next action to be initiated by the speaker (e.g., warning, suggestion, offer, etc.) as its beneficiary or facilitator.

In conclusion, drawing upon H. S. Lee's (1993) analysis of these three sentence-ending suffixes expressing newly perceived information, I have attempted to illuminate some of their interactional features in terms of distinct types of social action they organize through the practice of noticing. Many of the findings I have discussed in this paper are yet preliminary in nature, but I believe it will be rewarding to look at how these suffixes organize interaction and in what sequential positions they are deployed. By taking an interactional perspective, we will be able to analyze various uses of these forms from the perspective of the participants (rather than from the analyst's perspective). In this sense, the interactional approach employed in this paper could complement the cognitive approach in bringing into relief different aspects of the context of language use (cf. Edwards 1999). I hope that the findings of this study will provide a basis on which we can examine in more detail how the differently formulated practices of 'noticing' provide platforms for enacting distinct social actions (Schegloff 2001).

### References

- Atkinson, J. M. and Heritage, J. (ed.). (1984). *Structures of Social Action: Studies in Conversation Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Chang, K. H. (1985). *Hyen-tay kwuke-uy yangsang-pemcwu yenkwu* (A Study of Modality Categories in Modern Korean). Seoul: Tower Press.
- Choi, S. J. (1995). The development of epistemic sentence-ending modal forms and functions in Korean children. In J. Bybee and S. Fleischman (eds.), 165-204. *Modality in Grammar and Discourse*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Clancy, P. M. (1986). The acquisition of communicative style in Japanese. In B. B. Schieffelin and E. Ochs (eds.), *Language Socialization Across Cultures*, 213-250. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cook, H. M. (1992). Meaning of non-referential indexes: A case study of the Japanese sentence-final

- particle *ne*. *Text* 12, 507-539.
- Edwards, D. (1999). Shared knowledge as a performative and rhetorical strategy. In J. Verschueren (ed.), *Pragmatics in 1998: Selected Papers from the 6th International Pragmatic Association Conference*, 64-96.
- Hymes, D. (2003). Models of the interaction of language and social life. In C. B. Paulston and G. R. Tucker (eds.), *Sociolinguistics: The Essential Readings*, 30-47. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Kim, K. H. (2003). Korean modal suffixes as stance markers: Resources of organizing social action and speaker alignment. Paper presented at the 9th Annual Conference on Language, Interaction, and Culture. University of California, Santa Barbara, CA.
- Kim, K. H. and Suh, K. H. (2003). Sentence-ending modal suffixes in Korean caregiver-child interaction: Confirming and noticing as pedagogical action. Paper presented at the 8th International Pragmatics Conference. International Pragmatics Association. Toronto, Canada.
- Lee, H. S. (1991). *Tense, Aspect, and Modality: A Discourse-pragmatic Analysis of Verbal Affixes in Korean from a Typological Perspective*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of California. Los Angeles, CA.
- Lee, H. S. (1993). Cognitive constraints on expressing newly perceived information, with reference to epistemic modal suffixes in Korean. *Cognitive Linguistics* 4(2), 135-167.
- Lee, H. S. (1999). A discourse-pragmatic analysis of the Comittal *ci* in Korean: A synthetic approach to the form-meaning relation. *Journal of Pragmatics* 31, 243-275.
- Lee, K. (1993). *A Korean Grammar on Semantic-Pragmatic Principles*. Seoul: Hankuk Munhwasu.
- Noh, E. J. (2003). A pragmatic account of the Korean sentence-final particle *ney*. *Discourse and Cognition* 10(2), 53-74.
- Ochs, E. and Schieffelin, B. B. (1984). Language acquisition and socialization: Three developmental stories. In R. Schweder and R. LeVine (eds.), *Culture Theory: Essays on Mind, Self and Emotion*, 276-320. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Pomerantz, A. (1980). Telling my side: 'limited access' as a 'fishing' device. *Sociolinguistic Inquiry* 50, 186-198.
- Sacks, H., Schegloff, E. A. and Jefferson, G. (1974). A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation. *Language* 50, 696-735.
- Schegloff, E. A. (1982). Discourse as an interactional achievement: Some uses of "uh huh" and other things that come between sentences. In D. Tannen (ed.), *Georgetown University Roundtable on Language and Linguistics*, 71-93. Washington DC: Georgetown University Press.
- Schegloff, E. A. (2001). Negative and positive complaints: Another exploration of language usage and the constitution of action. Lecture given at the Summer Linguistics Institute. University of California, Santa Barbara.
- Suh, K.-H. and Kim, K.-H. (2001). The Korean modal marker *keyss* revisited: A marker of achieved state of intersubjectivity. *Berkeley Linguistic Society* 26, 271-282.

Kyu-hyun Kim  
 khkim@khu.ac.kr

Received: 2004. 03. 08

Revised version received: 2004. 05. 20

Accepted: 2004. 05. 31

к с і

КСІ