Turn-Constructional Practice in Korean Conversation: Organization of Turn Increments*

Kyu-hyun Kim

This paper examines from a conversation analytic perspective various aspects of the interactional work performed by the turn-incrementing practice in Korean conversation. Turn increments are defined as bits of increments tagged onto the immediately prior turn segment that is recognizably complete as a turn. Turn increments are analyzed in terms of (i) their function of retroactively modulating the action of the prior turn unit geared to soliciting recipient uptake and (ii) their role in elaborating the elliptically constructed prior turn unit marking the general upshot and in achieving contiguity with the preceding turn. These interactional features of the turn-incrementing practice are further analyzed with reference to their bearing upon the subsequent context, i.e., in terms of how increments serve as a resource for constructing the next turn. The serial organization of increments is noted to manifest a pattern in which bits of 'clues' are offered in a step-wise fashion. The clue-like features of increments are sequentially exploited by speakers for addressing problems in talk, e.g., for deleting out the other speaker's turn raising a problem of hearing/understanding or for repairing a trouble source 'obliquely' by way of constructing the repair turn with a bit of information incremented on the trouble-source turn. In such contexts, increments are constituted as a minimal cue or a pointer with which the speaker leads the other speaker to grasp the solution to the problem.

1. Introduction

In spontaneous conversation, speakers monitor each other's speech and determine the place to start their turn in such a way that a smooth turn transition is accomplished (Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson 1974). In
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appreciating and projecting the point where the other speaker's turn is possibly complete as a point where they can embark on their own turn, speakers orient themselves to a variety of cues, syntactic, intonational, and pragmatic (Ford and Thompson 1996). In particular, they crucially draw upon grammatical units, i.e., word, phrase, clause, or sentence, which are deployed as turn-constructional units (TCUs) oriented to as resources for projecting transition-relevance place (TRP), i.e., a place where a turn transition can be achieved (Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson 1974, Heritage 1984b).

In some contexts, turns take a particular shape in which a bit of increment is added, by the current speaker or the other party, to a TCU that is possibly complete as a turn (Schegloff 1996). Formulated as a lexicon, a phrase or a clause, such turn increments are tagged onto the immediately prior turn segment which is recognizably complete as a turn in itself. It has been suggested that, in English conversation, the practice of adding bits of increments to a turn unit is designed to serve a variety of special interactional functions (Schegloff 2001).

In this paper, an attempt is made to analyze how increments are organized in Korean conversation, with systematic attention being paid to how grammatical forms available in Korean are utilized by speakers as resources for organizing turns and sequences. Focusing on phrasal, lexical, and clausal items produced as turn increments, this paper aims to identify the ways in which such turn-incrementing practice is interactionally motivated and methodically organized in spontaneous Korean conversation. The dataset analyzed in this study includes face-to-face and telephone conversations recorded in natural settings. Also used as data are segments of overheard conversations and TV interviews written down on the spot.

This paper is organized as follows. In section 2, some of the basic features of turn-incrementing practices in English and Korean are presented. Section 3 analyzes the interactional functions of turn increments in terms of the two aspects of the turn-constructing practice in Korean conversation: the role of increments in modulating the speech action carried out by the immediately prior turn unit designed to negotiate and pursue the recipient's collaborative uptake and the tendency toward constructing elliptical turns and achieving contiguity.
with the preceding turn. Section 4 examines the context-renewing aspect of turn increments by analyzing how they lend themselves as a resource to be used for building the next turn and possibly for proffering a topic to be subsequently developed. In Section 5, some of the salient features of the ways in which increments are deployed as 'clues' are observed and they are shown to have a significant sequential implication in furnishing the speaker with the means of performing repair in an oblique fashion. Section 6 presents the summary and proposes further research agenda for future research.

2. Turn Increments in English and Korean

Ford, Fox and Thompson (to appear (a)) define 'increment' as any non-main clause continuation of a speaker's turn after that speaker has come to what could have been a completion point, or a transition-relevance place (TRP), based on prosody, syntax, and sequential action (Sacks et al. 1974, Ford and Thompson 1996, Tanaka 1999). Examples (1), (2), and (3) are extracts from English conversation containing turn increments. Increments are presented in bold type:

(1) (SN-4)
Mark: .hh I came tih talk tuh Ruthie about borrowing her: notes.
fer (.) econ.

(2) (Virginia)
Wes: How much didj your momma give you. for allowance.

(3) (Post-Mortem, New Year's Invitation)
Bonnie: A:nd (3.0) okay d'you think you c'd dome? pretty much for sure?

In these extracts, the increments are produced and tagged onto the preceding host TCU after it has been already formulated as a complete

---

1. These examples have been excerpted from Schegloff (2001).
turn grammatically, pragmatically, and prosodically (Ford and Thompson 1996). Note that each of the host TCUs followed by an increment is already grammatically complete in the form of a declarative sentence (extract (1)), a WH-question (extract (2)) and a yes-no question (extract (3)). These utterances are also pragmatically complete in the sense that they fully enact the speech action of making an announcement (extract (1)), asking questions seeking information (extract (2)), or requesting confirmation (extract (3)). Furthermore, we can see that they are prosodically complete as signaled by the period marking the falling intonation in (1) and (2) and the question mark marking the rising intonation in (3).2

The Korean language, as an S-O-V language, manifests similar but distinct ways of organizing turn increments. Observe examples (4) and (5):

(4) (After Dinner)
J: *ce-twu sa -ki -n hayss -ketun -yo, *ku chayksang,*
I -ADD buy-NOML-TOP do:PST-INFORM-POL that desk
“I too bought (it) anyway, **that desk.”

(5) (Lunch Talk)
H: *min yengswun-ssi -hanthey `ku³ pili -ess -eyo? chayk?*
Min Youngsoon-Ms-to that borrow-PST-POL book
“Have you borrowed that from Ms. Min Youngsoon? **the Book?”

As in the English examples, the turn increments in (4) and (5) are tagged onto a turn unit otherwise complete as a turn in grammatical, pragmatic, and prosodic terms. In (4), the noun phrase *ku chayksang* ‘that desk’ serves as the object of the verb ‘buy’, which is zero-marked in the preceding utterance. In (5), the noun phrase *chayk* ‘book’ is added to the preceding TCU in such a way that it ties back to its

---

2. In the examples, the period (.) represents a falling intonation and the question mark (?) a rising intonation. The comma (,) marks a continuing intonation (Sacks et al. 1974, Atkinson & Heritage 1984).

3. The degree sign (‘°’) indicates a passage of talk which is quieter than the surrounding talk (Atkinson & Heritage 1984).
pronominal adjective *ku* ‘that’. Both examples illustrate a case where an allusive turn is retroactively elaborated by an increment. The sequential implications of the turn increments in these examples will be discussed in Sections 4 and 5.

In Korean conversation, it is recurrently observed that turns are constructed allusively with elliptical reference forms such as zero-marking or a demonstrative. The arguments in subject or object positions, or adverbials, are often left unspecified in such a way that they are to be retrieved in the given context or further elaborated on by the speaker or the listener. In ordinary Korean conversation, this tendency results in variously multi-faceted uses of turn-increments through the turn-organizational practice in which an increment enriches, elaborates, specifies, or even revises retroactively the meaning of the immediately prior TCU ‘allusively’ formulated, as illustrated in examples (4) and (5) (cf. Kim 2001).

Actually, this mode of ‘retroactive elaboration’ addressing an allusively constructed portion of the prior TCU seems to be much more widely observed in Korean than in English; in the former, pre-verbal elements like subject or object are often left allusive and incrementally elaborated, while in the latter, host TCUs are often incrementally expanded by post-verbal elements like prepositional or adverbial phrases (cf. examples (1)-(3)). Ford et al. (to appear (b)) observe that increments in English are “regularly done with prepositional phrases, temporal or locative adverbials, infinitival clauses, relative clauses, and other subordinate clauses—all of which regularly occur at the ends of turns in utterances in general.” This tendency in English is well illustrated in extracts (1) and (2) above, and also in extract (6) below. This fragment originates from Goodwin’s research (Goodwin 1979, 1981) which is cited in Ford, Fox and Thompson (to appear (a)). The end of each line constitutes a point of possible grammatical completion:

(6)
1 I gave, I gave up smoking cigarettes.
2 *I-uh: one-one week ago*
3 *today.*
4 actually
Note that the increments added are temporal adverbials (lines 2 and 3) and an adverb functioning as a discourse marker (line 4), which all constitute a syntactic continuation of the prior turn segment.

Referring to Goodwin's seminal research analyzing how the production of grammatical units is shaped by interactional contingencies including lack of recipient uptake, Ford et al. (to appear (b)) point out that these additions, termed increments or 'extensions' (Schegloff 1996, Ford 1993), emerge in environments where reciprocity is a particular issue, e.g., where the speaker faces lack of displayed reciprocity or uptake from the recipient. It is observed that increments are added as a result of what the speaker notices as a potential interactional problem, such as the potential relevance (or non-relevance) of the given information to a particular addressee, lack of secured gaze, or incipient sign of no immediate uptake (Goodwin 1979). As a constituent interpretable as continuation of the immediately prior possibly completed turn, increments engage in the interactional work of pursuing uptake by continuing the action of the just-possibly completed turn and thus offering a renewed point of possible completion (Ford et al. to appear (b), Tanaka 1999).4

While we observe a similar negotiatory process evoked by and reflected in the use of increments in Korean conversation, we find that the Korean incrementing pattern tends to manifest differences in the formal mode of continuing the immediately prior possibly complete turn. As noted by Ford et al. (to appear (b)), given that grammatical resources and interactional patterns work together, we find that the way turn increments do their interactional work in Korean is distinct from the way they are organized and used in English. As I mentioned above, the relationship between increments and their host TCU in Korean is often

4. Ford et al. (to appear (b)) distinguish two types of increments: Extensions, which are constituents syntactically continuous with the immediately prior turn unit, and Unattached NPs, which are not syntactic constituents of the just possibly-completed turn. While both types of increments occur in the environment of lack of uptake at a transition-relevance place and they both provide a second transition-relevance place, the latter is different from the former in that they perform the functionally separate action of assessing or commenting on the prior turn material in such a way that the speaker models the type of stance or assessment to be pursued from the recipient. The instances of increments analyzed in this paper are the first type, which continues the action of the prior turn unit as its syntactic constituent.
that of elaboration in which the former elaborates on the elliptical part of the latter. This tendency mainly draws upon the predominant grammatical practice of not explicitly marking the subject or object or allowing multiple subjects.\(^5\)

Overall, this process in which a prior turn unit is further expanded or elaborated on by increments has often been analyzed in terms of the cognitive process through which an item is later added to the preceding proposition as an ‘afterthought’ (Chafe 1994). However, as I will try to illustrate in the subsequent sections, such a cognitive account is not adequate in that it does not explain a number of ways in which such practice is employed to do various types of interactional work as observed through the participants' displayed orientations indexed in actual sequential structures of conversation.\(^6\) As I will suggest in the following analysis, the cognitive account referring to a speaker's inner operations need to be further enriched by the perspective that takes into account the sequential position and the action context where turn increments are embedded. As suggested in Ford (1993), the ‘interactional’ perspective, rather than the ‘cognitive’ perspective, would furnish us with a more coherent and resourceful means of accounting for what motivates speakers to increment their turn which is otherwise complete.\(^7\)

---

5. This would be a feature shared by languages like Japanese, and a comparative analysis of Korean and Japanese turn-incrementing patterns suggests itself as an interesting research topic. For the analysis of increments in Japanese conversation, see Tanaka (1999) and Mori (1999).

6. Furthermore, from an empirical perspective, the construct ‘afterthought’ would be a notion that may be more germane to the signaling of the speaker’s displayed stance such as the one marked by a change-of-state token (e.g., oh) (Heritage 1984a) or a discourse marker marking a sudden shift in topical orientation (e.g., by the way) (Schegloff personal communication).

7. However, in term of how cognition is interactionally displayed, the consideration of cognition-interaction interface may be worth explicating, as suggested by Sacks (1992). Taking on a sequence of utterances involving an elliptical or allusive statement followed by an elaboration, “I can’t go through with it. I can’t go through with the evening”, where a pronoun (it) is first used and then replaced by a noun phrase (the evening) in the subsequent utterance, Sacks makes the following observation:

What we have here is that the initial formulation of the thing, “I can’t go through with it”, contains a pronoun, it, which is then explicaded. I want to suggest that a statement like “I can’t go through with it” may reflect how the feeling was felt, in contrast to the assertion “I can’t go through with the evening”, which is involved in a characterization for a listener, not a characterization for the speaker-feeler, of
3. Interactional Functions of Turn Increments

3.1. Pursuit of collaborative uptake

As I suggested above, adding bits of material to an already complete turn often has more than a cognitive import of adding an element belatedly as an afterthought; it is more apt to analyze it as being motivated interactionally toward eliciting the recipient uptake. While there may be a range of different ways of soliciting the listener's collaborative uptake, one way to do so could materialize in the form of mitigating the speaker's previous point. Consider extract (7), which has been taken from a telephone conversation between two close friends, Y and S. Here Y is evaluating a city S is thinking of moving to:

(7) (Y & S)

-> 1 Y: ne solcikhi tongney-ntey keki -to /il-cong-uy:::
   you frankly town -COP:CIRCUM that:place-ADD a:kind:of
   “You know, frankly speaking, (it) is a town, that place too,
   a kind of.”

   2 S: [ung.
   Yes.

Here Sacks is offering an account of a sequence of utterances where an amplification or explication occurs in the second utterance for the hearer following the first one involving the speaker's own feelings or thoughts described not by reference to their communicability. While our examples involve not a sequence of sentences but an utterance followed by a post-positional turn increment, this observation may also be relevant to some of the fragments examined in this paper. The production of an elliptical utterance indeed gives a sense that speakers initially present the upshot in terms of their internal and subjective feelings or thoughts that are shown to have been brought to their mind. Allusive utterances, then, present themselves as something to be explicated subsequently for the hearer, or sometimes, by the hearer (Kim 2001). The shift in orientation observed by Sacks can be said to be occurring in Korean cases too, in the form of a transition from an allusive reference to something brought off in the speaker's mind toward explication by a post-positioned increment offered as a characterization for the hearer. The relevance of the interface between cognition and interaction to the analysis of turn increments needs to be further pursued in future research.

8. Ford (1993:102) observes in English conversation that adverbial clauses are often produced as added segments which are the products of speaker-recipient negotiation specifically aimed at achieving interactional ends, i.e., added on in pursuit of uptake.
Note that the deictic locative term *keki-to* 'that place too' is produced as an increment, whose grammatical role in the preceding elliptical TCU (*tongney-ntey* ‘is a town’) would be subject. That is, Y’s turn takes a highly elliptical form of the identificational construction where the subject is zero-marked and the predicate is marked by the circumstantial particle *-ntey*, and the missing subject is subsequently mentioned as an increment (‘that place too’). This increment is further followed by the adjective *il-cong-uy* ‘a kind of’, which is added as another bit of increment retroactively modifying the noun phrase *tongney* ‘town’ in the preceding utterance. Note that this second increment overlaps with S’s acknowledgment, which signals that S is treating the current speaker’s turn up to that point as possibly complete and displays orientation to that point as a transition-relevance place.

If we take the turn as a whole, we find a step-by-step movement in which the speaker backs off in the process of mitigating the assertion as she produces each bit of increment. By producing the first increment, *keki-to* ‘there also’, the speaker shows that this particular city at hand is not the only city to be singled out and downgraded, as signaled by the Additive delimiter *to* ‘also’. The second bit of increment, *il-cong-uy* ‘a kind of’, carries out a further mitigating job by way of marking a back-off from ‘town’ to ‘a kind of town’. It is to be noted that what Y is talking about is a city near Seoul to which S has been seriously considering to move. In this regard, Y’s description of the city as a ‘town’ would constitute a face-threatening act toward S who apparently has chosen the city as her next place of residence. By adding the mitigator ‘a kind of’ as an increment, Y backs off from her original stance that severely downgrades the status of the city at hand and mitigates her potentially face-threatening act initially asserted without redress in her preceding turn unit. By doing so, Y displays her orientation toward circumventing potential challenge or disagreement from S (cf. Davidson 1984, Pomerantz 1984).

While downgrading or backing off is one way of eliciting recipient uptake, upgrading the level of assertion may be another way of pursuing the recipient’s response. Consider extract (8). In the context

---

9. While the utterance is not marked by any sentence-final marker, the circumstantial particle does constitute a transition-relevance place (cf. Park 1998).
preceding this fragment, one of the participants said that one can buy clothes at a bargain price during a certain holiday season:

(8) (Morning Campus Talk)
1 H: kulemyen iship sa pwul -ey pha-nun
   them twenty four dollar-LOC sell-ATTR
2 -ke -cianh -ayo,
   -thing-ASSERT-POL
   "Then you sell (it) for 24 dollars."
3 S: ung.
   Yes.
-> 4 H: (keki) phalshipywuk pwul ccali-lul.
   over:there eighty six dollar value-OBJ
   "(there) what is worth 86 dollars."

In lines 1 and 2 H produces an utterance where the contextually retrievable object is not overtly expressed. Following S’s acknowledging response in line 3, H produces an increment in line 4 in the form of a case-marked phrase (‘what is worth 86 dollars’), which is grammatically connected back to his preceding utterance in lines 1-2 as its object.

Note here that H’s belatedly produced turn increment serves to highlight the contrast between the selling price and the actual value of the item in explicit terms. The assertion of the original price through the use of the turn increment functions to upgrade the newsworthiness of the speaker’s point and solicits the hearer’s appreciative uptake thereof. If the incrementally produced phrase were used in the pre-verbal object position, such an upgraded sense of contrastiveness would be greatly weakened. Also consider extract (9):

(9) (Overheard Conversation)
1 S: salam-tul-i i -ke ip -unikka nemwu nemwu
   person-PL-SUB this-thing put on-REASON very very
2 ippu -tay (.) mommay -ka
   pretty-HEARSAY body shape-SUB
   "People tell me that I’m really pretty in this dress, my figure."
3 K: hhhhh
In S's turn, the initial turn segment is followed by a micro gap, which is then followed by the increment *mommay-ka* '(my) figure is'. Marked by the subject marker *ka*, it retroactively serves as the subject that is zero-marked in the preceding utterance. One thing that should be noted, in this respect, is that the zero-marked subject is assumable to be the first person pronoun 'I' in the given context. With the contextually inferable subject 'I' being assumed, the addition of the turn-increment 'my figure' has the striking effect of counter-expectation by way of transforming what could otherwise end up being a banal statement (made up by the host TCU) into a noticeable act of self-aggrandizement. The resulting utterance thus affectively upgrades the point of the utterance and heightens the hearer's involvement, which would not have been effectuated through what may be called a 'canonical' or 'unmarked' word order. Note in (9) that interlocutor K does not respond to S's statement initially, as represented by the micro-pause, but the production of turn increment elicits his appreciative response in the form of laugh tokens.

These observations suggest that an important feature of turn increments is that they are interactionally motivated toward eliciting the hearer's collaborative uptake. The effectuated speech action is procedurally deployed in a step-wise fashion, e.g., one level up or down in the extent to which its assertive force is modulated after the general upshot of the action is initially conveyed. In many contexts, the upshot of the action is initially conveyed by an elliptically formulated turn, and contingent on the on-going and subsequent interactional contingencies, such as the recipient's lack of uptake or what the speaker recognizes as the projection thereof, bits of information are provided as a turn increment geared to negotiating and enhancing the ground on which the upshot of the current turn is to be collaboratively taken up by the recipient. We thus find in extracts (7)-(9) a sense in which turn increments added in a step-wise fashion have the interactional import of negotiating the ground for soliciting recipient uptake either by downgrading or by upgrading the upshot marked by the preceding utterance. Such a sense of negotiation for collaborative uptake would be lost if those elements formulated as turn increments were used in their so-called 'unmarked' pre-verbal or pre-nominal position as in (7')-(9') below:10
(7) ne solcikhi *keki-to il-cong-uy tongney-ntey*,
    "Listen, frankly speaking, **that place is also a kind of a town,**"

(8) *kulemyen (keki) phalshipywuk pwul ccali-lul. iship sa pwul-ey pha-nun-ke-cianh-ayo*,
    "Then you sell **that thing which has the value of 86 dollars** for 24 dollars."

(9) salam-tul-i i-ke ip-unikka *mommay-ka nemwu nemwu ippu-tay.*
    "People tell me that **my figure** is really pretty in this dress."

Also note that the placement of these components in the pre-predicate position has the effect of creating more intra-turn unit boundaries that potentially serve as a place for the hearer to display his/her acknowledgement of the speaker's turn in-progress and its upshot. On the part of the speaker, this turn-organizational practice would delay the production of the upshot and its appreciation by the listener in relation to the preceding utterance being responded to, thus weakening the responsive force of the turn toward the preceding context (see Section 3.2).11

In some cases, the relationship of increments to the preceding turn unit is more pragmatic, with the interpretation of the meaning of the increments requiring a subtle shift in perspective, and placing them back to their so called 'canonical' grammatical position results in an

---

10. This point is also well illustrated by the following made-up English sentences, which have been cited in Schegloff (2001). Sentences (a) and (b) below apparently have more or less the same basic meaning except that in the latter the adverb 'desperately' is added as an increment:

   (Examples cited in Schegloff 2001)
   a. Raymond desperately wanted to compete in the Olympic games.
   b. Raymond wanted to compete in the Olympic games. Desperately.

Even though these sentences may be treated as synonymous at the sentential level, we clearly find a sense that, in (b), the speaker, with the incremented adverb, is possibly monitoring the effect the preceding utterance has on the listener and upgrading the speech act force of the preceding utterance in such a way that Raymond’s wish is highlighted at a one-up level, while such a contingent sense of post-hoc negotiation is absent in (a).

11. Such a practice increases the possibility of the hearer interrupting the speaker's on-going turn, as the hearer may monitor the speaker's turn for its projected upshot and circumvent its further development by offering a candidate understanding of what the projected upshot may be.
incoherent utterance. Consider extract (10), which illustrates a striking way in which bits of information are added in a step-wise fashion. In the context preceding this extract, the participants talked about a person who claimed that he could drink as many as ten bottles of hard liquor at one time and that he had found it hard to believe that there are people who cannot drink:

(10) (Overheard conversation)

1 G: ihay -lul mos ha-keyss-ta -nun -ke ani -a, understanding-ACC notable do-MOD-DEC-ATTR-NOML NEG-IE

-> 2 swul mos mek-nun -kel. (.) mwul-i -ntey.
liquor notable eat -ATTR-NOML:ACC water-COP-CIRCUM
“The thing is that he says he cannot understand, the fact that there are people who can't drink liquor. Though it (=liquor) is just like water (to him).”

Here G is repeating the point made in the preceding context in an affectively loaded way, leading the interlocutors to appreciate the newsworthiness of what is being reported. G first produces a reported speech which is allusively formulated (“He says that he cannot understand”). The zero-marked object of the utterance is subsequently produced as a rather heavy increment (‘the fact that there are people who can't drink liquor’), followed by an adverbial clause formulated as another bit of increment (mwul-i -ntey ‘though it (=liquor) is just like water (to him)’).

Note that, as in (9), the final increment (‘though it is just like water’) upgrades the degree of newsworthiness of the event being reported by highlighting the person's fondness of drinking in terms of his treating strong liquor as water. The referent mwul ‘water’ in the adverbial clause, as part of the reported speech, is formulated by the speaker as a rather exaggeratingly definitive metaphoric descriptor, and it is retroactively contrasted with the objective descriptor swul ‘liquor’. Formulated as such, it upgrades the tellability of the story, whose point lies in having the listener appreciate the extent to which the quoted person can easily drink many bottles of strong liquor at one time as if he drank water.
Due to the highly negotiatory nature of increments geared to upgrading the tellability of the story and soliciting the listener's appreciative response, the placing of the turn increments in their so-called canonical pre-predicate position in the main clause results in a pragmatically incoherent utterance, as shown in (10') below. Note in (10') that the metaphoric descriptor mwul 'water', originally produced as an increment stepping up the effect of the story a posteriori and soliciting the listener's heightened involvement, conflicts with the objective descriptor swul 'liquor':

(10') \textit{mwul-i-ntey swul mos mek-nun-kel ihay-lul mos ha-keyss-ta-nun-ke ani-a}

"The thing is that he says he cannot understand that, \textbf{though it (-liquor) is just like water (to him), there are people who can't drink liquor.}"

These observations suggest that, from a pragmatic point of view, turn increments are not elements 'right-dislocated' from their 'canonical' grammatical position, but are elements 'designedly' placed post- positionally to serve particular interactional management functions that otherwise would not be performed in a sequentially appropriate way.

3.2. Presenting upshot first: Achieving contiguity with the prior turn

One of the discourse features of the turn-incrementing practice is that it is often motivated by the need to initially present the general upshot in the context of responding to the preceding turn. In such contexts, increments tend to contain either auxiliary information contextually retrievable or new information elaborating on some allusive reference domain in the host TCU carrying the general upshot that responds to the prior turn in such a way that inter-turn contiguity is strengthened (Kim 2001).

Extract (11) below illustrates a case where the main upshot of the current action is turn-initially conveyed by a turn unit responding to the preceding question and a piece of information of auxiliary nature is added as an increment. In this extract, K and S are a host couple
talking to another couple (J and Y). In the preceding contexts, Y noticed a big blue bear doll in the room and made a positive comment about it. As Y is about to examine the doll closely, S produces the utterance in line 1:

(II) (After Dinner)
((Y is about to have a close look a blue bear doll.))

\[1\] S: \textit{ku} -\textit{ke} -\textit{n} com an coh -ulkkeeyyo //\textit{an} -\textit{i} \\
that-thing-TOP a little NEG good-MOD:POL inside-SUB \\
“That one isn’t nice. \textbf{The inside}.”

\[2\] K: \\
\textit{ku--} \\
that

\[3\] \textit{ku-- kaci-e} -\textit{o} -\textit{n} salam -\textit{i} … \\
that-- have-CONN-come-ATTR person-SUB \\
“That- that- The person who (brought it) …”

In the context of responding to the interlocutor’s displayed interest in the doll, S makes a negative comment about its quality and then adds the subject \textit{an-i} ‘inside-SUB’ as an increment. Here we can note that S’s turn initially makes only an allusive reference to the quality of the doll (“That one isn’t nice.”) and does not mention in what respect the doll is ‘not nice’. The content of S’s comment becomes a little more specific as the increment serves to narrow down the domain of the target by specifying the part of the doll that is not good.

This upshot-first-details-later organization of increments seems to be sequentially shaped and motivated by the speaker’s need to address the preceding context. As this utterance is produced in response to a positive comment about the doll by one of the interlocutors (Y), the upshot of S’s turn in line 1 would lie in countering it by providing a

---

12. As in (7), the added element is overlapped by K’s turn, which suggests that K is oriented to the end of S’s turn as a transition-relevance place.

13. Note that the turn increment is marked by the subject marker -\textit{i} (\textit{an-i} ‘inside-SUB’), which makes the whole utterance an instance of what is called a double subject construction. The increment specifies the reference domain marked by the topic marker -\textit{n} (\textit{ku-ke-n} ‘that thing-TOP’) in the prior turn unit.
negative comment, presumably with a view to telling Y about its negative feature before Y finds it herself and, consequently, to circumventing a situation potentially face-threatening to Y, i.e., a situation where Y has to revise her own judgment after examining the doll. With S's primary interactional concern being to address what she perceives as a premature judgment by the interlocutor, her responsive turn is initially designed in such a way that its upshot is to counter the interlocutor's judgment, with the factual detail regarding where in the doll is not specifically good enough being presented later by an increment after her general upshot is conveyed first.

This and the other examples we discuss in this paper show that in Korean conversation initial turn units tend to be elliptical and the following increments serve to elaborate on some allusive reference domain of the former. Actually, it seems to be the general practice in Korean conversation to construct turns elliptically, and this turn-constructional feature itself is one of the outcomes interactionally and functionally motivated (Kim 1999a). One plausible account of this practice, which seems to be empirically supported in general, is that elliptical utterances, as opposed to fully explicated ones, tend to be designed in such a way that its upshot as a responsive move is pushed forward quickly. If a full noun phrase is used in each of the argument positions in what is called the 'unmarked' S-O-V word order of Korea, it will prevent a quick conveyance of the upshot while weakening contiguity with the immediately prior turn.

This feature is also observed in extract (12) below, where the interviewer (IR) is interviewing a wife of an athlete who used to work at a store. When the interviewee (IE) is asked what she wants to do, she says that she wants to work again. Notice that first she says 'I want to work' and then adds the phrase 'at a store' as an increment, with the former conveying the speaker's general upshot responsive to the IR's question and the latter adding a piece of auxiliary information:
(12) (Overheard TV Interview)
1 IR: cikum mwe ha-kosip-usey -yo.
   now what do-want-HONOR-POL
   “What do you want to do now?”
-> 2 IE: il -ha-kosip-eyo. (. ) kakey-eyse.
   work-do-want-POL store -LOC
   “I want to work. (. ) At a store.”

This observation suggests that the increment in line 2 is motivated, at least partly, by the speaker's interactional move to present first the general upshot expressing her intention to work in response to the IR's question and then, following a micro-pause, mentions the place where she wants to work as a piece of auxiliary information. Note that the quick forwarding of the general upshot by the elliptical host TCU has the interactional import of strengthening the cohesive ties to the preceding turn. In many contexts, allusive turn shaping is motivated by the speaker's orientation toward constructing a turn as the second pair part contiguous to the first pair part in the immediately preceding turn. In (12), the IE's allusive utterance in line 1 is produced as a second pair part responding to the IR's question as its first pair part. If the incremented phrase were used in the pre-verbal position, the resulting utterance (kakey-eyse il-ha-kosip-eyo “At a store I want to work”) would convey a rather different sense in which the speaker is not as responsive to the IR's question in pressing forward her basic stance (i.e., wanting to work) and, furthermore, the pre-verbal place term is likely to be accorded an unintended contrastive interpretation.

Extract (13) illustrates another case where a turn increment is motivated sequentially by the interactional pressure toward achieving contiguity with the preceding turn. In this fragment, the interviewer (IR) asks a question of the interviewee (IE), an actress who is planting young rice plants along with farmers:

14. It may also have the import of preempting the listener's possible misinterpretation of the upshot of the turn in-progress. For instance, the full explication of arguments or descriptors in pre-verbal positions may characterize what the current is doing as providing an 'account', which could be taken by the listener as constituting the incipient stage of a dispreferred response (cf. footnote (13)).
In response to the IR's question about whether she finds it hard to plant rice plants, the IE produces a concessive clause affirming that it IS hard, which is followed by the main clause in which she says that it is fun. What is it that she finds to be fun is explicated subsequently by the following increment ('planting one by one'), which, marked by the subject marker, is constructed as the subject of the preceding utterance.

The motivation of the turn-incrementing practice in (13) could be analyzed as follows. The main point of the IE's response can be observed to lie in highlighting her presumably true affective stance ('fun') in contrast with the one imputed by the IR to her ('hard'). In her utterance, these two descriptors, 'hard' and 'fun', stand to each other in a contrastive relationship. Here the IE is initially responding to the IR's question in partial agreement by saying that what she is doing is indeed 'hard' as was assumed by the IR's question. This portion is constructed in the form of a concessive clause ("Even though it is hard"), which is followed by the main clause in which the IE goes on to describe her experience as 'fun'. Note in the IE's initial response that she is using the same expression as the one used by the IR in his immediately preceding question (himtul 'hard'). The IE's repeat of the predicate used in the IR's immediately preceding question in her answer significantly contributes to achieving turn contiguity through which a smooth exchange of the first pair part (i.e., IR's question) and the second pair part (i.e., IE's answer) is accomplished.

Another point that we can make in (13) is that the turn increment, while containing potentially auxiliary information or situationally inferable information, provides the speaker with the means of intensifying and...
upgrading the import of the information to suit her communicative purpose (cf. extracts (8)-(10)). Note in both IE's and IR's turns that the subject is not explicitly mentioned. Given the situation where the IE's act of planting rice plants is at issue, the assumed subject would be something like 'planting rice plants'. However, there would always be a room for further elaboration, expansion, or even modification of the assumable content of such an elliptical utterance through increments. Notice that the IE's turn increment slightly upgrades the content of the contextually retrievable subject ('planting rice plants') by way of adding a bit of additional information about the manner in which she plants rice plants, i.e., 'one by one'. This would be another case where increments do the interactional work of upgrading the level of assertion carried out by the preceding host TCU.

In some contexts, a turn-initial elliptical TCU serves as a comment or assessment sequentially made to the preceding turn, with the following increment containing contextually retrievable information. Consider (14), which has been excerpted from Lee (2000). In the preceding context, A complained that she did not drink anything at a restaurant where she was serving as a helper.

(14) (N 5)
1 A: euncwu-ney ka-se kw wynhi kalbi mek-unkesk ay.
Eunju-place go-CONN for:no:reason beef rib eat-seem -IE
((three lines omitted))
5 na hanato an mek-ess-e. mwul-pakkey an mek-ess -e.
I notatall NEG eat-PST-IE water-without NEG eat-PST-IE
“I regret that we went to Eunju's place to eat beef rib. ..... I drank nothing. I drank nothing except water.”
> 6 B: taytanhata ne -to. ettehkey kulehkey cham -nya,
great you-ADD how like:that endure-QUES
7 na-nun mos cham -e, salam -tul ta mek-koiss-umyen.
I -TOP notable endure-IE person-PL all eat-PROG-COND
“Great, you are. How could you endure like that? I'd not be able to stand that. If people are eating.”

In response to A’s complaint, B responds by praising B’s act of
endurance, i.e., refraining herself from drinking. B’s turn is initially composed of the assessment term taytanhata ‘great’, which is elliptically constructed, i.e., without its subject. It is geared toward presenting the speaker’s affective stance toward A’s reported action as the general upshot of the current evaluative action being procedurally constituted (Lee 2000:33). Note that the increment following this utterance refers to the contextually retrievable entity ‘you’.

The preceding discussions suggest that adding increments constitutes a social action implemented in the service of various types of subtle interaction management work pursuing recipient uptake and managing turn relationships. This practice is associated with two turn-constructional features observed in host TCUs preceding increments: (i) quick forwarding of the general upshot marked by the allusive turn shape and (ii) strengthening of the turn relationship with the prior turn being responded to. In the examples analyzed above, if the turn-initial TCU were constructed with explicit subject, object or adverbials in their so-called canonical pre-verbal position, its responsiveness to and cohesiveness with the preceding turn would have been substantially attenuated due to the turn-initial mention of a disjunctive pre-verbal element, which is likely to receive contrastive focus. It follows from these observations that the question of how turn expansion through increments is geared toward achieving contiguity with the preceding turn is inalienably intertwined with the practice of pressing forward the general upshot of the social action being enacted in the current turn.

In the following sections, we turn our attention to how turn increments themselves are organized, examining how bits of information added as increments renew the subsequent context (Heritage 1984b) and

15. However, the elliptical nature of the initial evaluative predicate allows the zero-marked subject to refer to entities other than ‘you’ as its zero-marked subject. For instance, the referent of the zero-marked subject may also be assumed to be the event described in the preceding turn (e.g., ‘(That’s) great.’). This point suggests that slight upgrading or downgrading can still be achieved by the use of an increment containing information that may be viewed a posteriori as being easily retrievable from the context. As for the turn increment ne-to ‘you-ADD’, it should also be noted that it serves the role of the subject with respect to the subsequent follow-up evaluation etehkey kulehkey cham-nya, “How could you endure like that?”. This shows that turn increments may serve as an element on which the following turn is built by virtue of being grammatically linked to it. This point will be further discussed in the next section.
how they are oriented to as interactional resources to be used for building a next turn.

4. Increment as a Linkage to the Next Turn: Context-renewing aspect

In the preceding sections, we examined turn-organizational features of turn units expanded by increments. In this section, we examine the features of how turn increments are organized. In particular, we concern ourselves with the context where increments are formulated as an element that can be potentially used for building next turn. Consider extract (15):

(15) (After Dinner)
((S said that she had bought a desk at a very cheap price.))

1 J: ce-twu sa -ki -n hayss -ketun -yo, //ku
    I -ADD buy-NOML-TOP doPST-INFORM-POL that
    chayksang,
    desk
    “I myself also bought (it) actually, that desk.”

3 S: ney.
    yes
    “I see.”

    like:that -up to cheap-CONN-TOP NEG-MOD-COP:POL
    yocum -ey -n
    these days-LOC-TOP
    “I don’t think (it) will be that cheap these days.”

In the context of talking about a computer desk, J says in lines 1-2 that he has bought one too. The object of the utterance (‘the computer desk’), which is thus retrievable from the preceding context, is not mentioned initially. Immediately after producing the utterance with continuing intonation (as marked by the comma), the speaker adds the
phrase *ku chayksang* ‘that desk’ referring to the object not overtly expressed in the preceding utterance, which, as a turn increment, overlaps with S’s response in line 3.

In cases like (15) where the turn increment is a potentially redundant component that can be easily retrieved from the prior context, its addition does not crucially contribute to the given interaction, at least in terms of information management. In this respect, the cognitive account formulated in terms of afterthought would lose much of its analytic force because there would not be much of a point for the hearer to express redundantly the already given information as an afterthought. Rather, I would like to argue that, in some contexts, increments are produced as a way of providing a turn-terminal element that can be resourcefully linked forward to the next turn and to the next sequential action in the context of intensifying the sequential act being initiated in the current turn.

We can explicate this use of turn increments, observed in (15), as follows. First, we can note that J’s utterance in lines 1-2 is produced in the context where J is making a move to prepare ground for expressing his disagreement in response to S’s claim that the desk she has bought is unreasonably cheap. That is, J’s report that he has bought the same desk is a preparatory move toward expressing his disagreement in lines 4-5. If we look at how J’s turn expressing disagreement is grammatically constructed, we find that it contains no explicit subject, and we can easily observe that the increment ‘that desk’ in J’s turn can be linked forward across S’s acknowledgment token to J’s turn in lines 4-5. As illustrated in (15’), the turn increment, while serving as the object in its preceeding turn, also can be analyzed as being formulated retroactively as the subject of the following turn:

(15’) ... *ku chayksang* ... *kulehkey-kkaci ssa-ci-n anh-ulke-eyyo.*

“... That desk ... won’t be that cheap these days.”

This observation suggests that the formulation of ‘that desk’ as a turn increment may have much to do with this sequential trajectory where the post-positionally produced increment ‘the desk’ is prospectively linked to the subsequent utterance in the context of intensifying the
sequential action. One interactional benefit of formulating turns like that is that the speaker can express his upshot quickly in conveying his disagreement (lines 4-5) as well as in making a preparatory move for that (lines 1-2) by way of making the pre-verbal material lighter in both turns.

Actually, we can make a similar observation about extract (14) examined in the last section. Recall that the turn increment in (14) (ne-to ‘you-ADD’) is also grammatically tied to the next utterance as its subject (… ne-to ettehkey kulehkey cham-nya, “… How could you endure like that?”). In (14), the increment connects the preceding allusive assessment (taytanhata ‘Great’) to the more specific and more upgraded assessments in the subsequent utterances (“How could you endure like that? I’d not be able to stand that. If people are eating”), as shown in (14’) below:

(14’) taytanhata ne-to. ettehkey kulehkey cham-nya, na-nun mos cham-\(e\), salam -tul ta mek-koiss-umyen.

“Great, you are. How could you endure like that? I’d not be able to stand that. If people are eating.”

We thus find a sense in which the turn incrementing practice in (14) also constitutes a preparatory move toward a further intensified assessment, just as it leads to a more explicit mode of disagreement in (15). This phenomenon suggests itself as an intriguing research topic for further research. Actually, as I will discuss in more detail in the next section, increments often serve as clues for the speaker and the hearer to use as resources for building next turn and designing sequential actions variably fine-tuned to interactional contingencies. As noted in Kim (2001), this ‘context-renewing’ feature of turn increments adds to the difficulty of identifying the onset and terminal point of an utterance by virtue of offering the opportunity to serve as the onset of a new utterance.

The way in which a post-positionally produced turn increment serves as a potential linkage to the next turn is strikingly observed in extract (16) below. This fragment is from the Y & S data, a segment of which was presented in extract (7). In extract (16), Y, in line 1, topic-initially
asks a question inquiring into S's plan to move to the city of Pundang.

(16) (Y & S)

\[ \rightarrow 1 \ Y: \textit{ettay neney -nun } \textit{pundang}. \]

How:is you:side-TOP Pundang

“How about you, (about) \textit{Pundang}.”

2

3 S: \textit{ung=}

yes

“How?”

4 Y: \textit{=sayngkak an ha-kwiss-e?}

thought NEG do-PROG-IE

“(You're) not considering (it)?”

Y’s severely elliptical topic-initial question is constructed initially with a single TCU in the form of the interrogative \textit{ettay?}, which in this context can be translated into English roughly as “How about you?” . The interrogative is then immediately followed by two increments: a reference form \textit{neney-nun} ‘(as for) you’ and the place term \textit{pundang}. After a micro-pause, S initiates repair by producing a repair initiator or next turn repair initiator (NTRI) \textit{ung} ‘Huh’, thus suggesting that she has a problem of understanding or hearing (Schegloff, Jefferson & Sacks 1977). S’s NTRI is immediately followed by Y’s utterance (line 4), as signaled by the equal sign (=). Note in line 4 that Y produces another allusive turn, the content of which can be roughly translated into

16. A more detailed analysis of this extract is presented in Kim (1999a).

17. I have treated the turn unit \textit{ettay} as a recognizably complete turn unit because it is hearably complete in grammatical, pragmatic, and prosodic terms. Furthermore, even though the two post-positioned components are uttered in a single intonation unit along with the preceding turn unit, they are produced at a recognizably lower pitch level than the preceding turn unit \textit{ettay}. However, as an anonymous reviewer has aptly pointed out, one should caution against treating any post-positional element as a turn increment, given that Korean allows word order variation to a higher extent than English. We certainly need an empirically grounded criterion according to which we can determine whether a post-positionally produced element is an inherent part of the turn-unit in progress or an increment that is added after a point of completion. This issue needs to be seriously pursued in future research, with special reference to the role of prosody and its bearing upon the organization of turn increments.
English as “(You’re) not considering (it)’.

If we examine Y’s turns in lines 1 and 4, we find that the turn increments in line 1 play a highly subtle sequential role through what may be called an inter-turn tying operation in which the turn-terminal increment is retroactively accorded a grammatical and semantic role in the subsequent turn. First note that the second post-positional element pundang is highly pragmatic; it is not marked clearly in terms of its grammatical position in the preceding utterance. The best guess would be to accord it a sense of ‘about/with respect to pundang.’

Interestingly, the post-positioning of the place term furnishes the speaker with the means of constructing his next turn with reference to it. Recall that an element constructed as a turn increment could be resourcefully used and oriented to by the speaker as a sort of pivotal bridge linking the current turn with the next one by way of serving as the starting point on which the subsequent turn is constructed (cf. extracts (14) and (15)). In (16), the turn increment pundang as well as the preceding one neney-nun ‘(as for) you’ are linked to her next turn by virtue of being progressively formulated as its object and topic respectively:

(16’) ... neney-nun pundang [ung?] sayngkak an ha-kwuiss-e?
   “... You’re not considering [Huh?] Pundang?”

As Kim (1999a) observes, what is accomplished through this grammatical process is a sequentially achieved cancellation of the intervening S’s repair initiator ung? ‘Huh?’ without even addressing it in any overtly responsive way. The recipient’s attempt at repair initiation is shown to have been prematurely produced and is sequentially deleted out (cf. Jefferson 1972).

This practice of utilizing increments for building next turn serves various interactional functions sequentially managed by way of allowing changes in grammatical roles of increments to emerge in the next turn. Through this practice, speakers can go about constructing an allusive...

---

18. As for the first turn increment ne-ney-nun ‘(as for) you’, its being produced as an increment could be motivated toward not highlighting the contrastiveness yielded by the topic marker nun in utterance-initial position.
turns to quickly perform a speech action conveying the general upshot, subsequently elaborated on by increments which, contingent on the interlocutor's next move, could be utilized as the ground for building the next turn and initiating a follow-up action in such a way that the initial upshot can be further developed and intensified (cf. extracts (14) and (15)). This sequential organization of action may have a significant bearing upon topical organization as well, with increments proffering topics to be topicalized subsequently (Lee 2000). Actually, this seems to be one of the most salient aspects of the ways in which turns and actions are organized in Korean conversational discourse. With the tendency to orient to turn-terminal increments as a resource to build the next turn with, increments have the potential to be an important tying device that can be exploited for linking the current turn to the next one and for enacting sequential acts for various interactional tasks.

5. Organizational Patterns of Increments: Increments as Clues

It follows from the observations made above that increments, motivated toward eliciting collaborative uptake through downgrading or upgrading the upshot of the preceding utterance, often manifest turn-design features enacting interactional moves in a step-wise fashion. One feature that we can make note of the way increments are added to a turn unit is that they are offered as a sort of 'clue', i.e., minimal cues for the listener to attend to in appreciating the upshot of the action being constituted. As turn-terminally attached clues, increments would be less subject to the intra-sentential grammatical constraints and would serve as resources for various pragmatic and sequential operations whose scope would be beyond the turn unit to which they are tagged on.

While this feature can be observed in most of the fragments we

---

19. This practice thus makes it extremely hard to define an utterance unit and to identify where it begins and ends in naturally occurring discourse, because a segment added after a transition-relevance place as an increment always has the potential of starting a new turn (see Kim (1999a) for a more detailed discussion).

20. By this statement I am not claiming that increments are always tied to the next turn. Increments rather should be treated as constituting a point where such a turn tying operation can be 'relevantly' initiated.
examined above, it is also observed in extract (17). In this fragment, Y, comparing two Korean newspapers, the Jungang Daily and the Hankuk Daily, is explaining to S why the former is more popular than the latter:

(17) (After Dinner)
1 Y: salam-tul-i cwungangilpo -lul ceki
   person-PL-SUB Jungang Daily-ACC there
2 hankwukilpo -pota manhi po -nun iywu -cwung-uy
   Hankuk Daily-than many see-ATTR reason-among-POSS
3 hana-ka -yo, kwuin kwangko-hako,
   one -SUB-POL employment ad -with
   “But the Jungang Daily might be OK for us, but one of the
   reasons why there are more people subscribing to the Jungang
   Daily than (10) uhm the Hankuk Daily, is because of its job
   section and,”
4 S: ung::
   yes
   “Yes.”
--> 5 Y: ku:: ku-ke iss -cian -ayo. phan//may:::
   that that-thing exist-ASSERT-POL sale
   “That, you know that thing. Sales.”
   
6 S: Ah phanmay ung.
   DM sale yes
   “Oh, Sales. Right.”
7 Y: ku -ke -ttamey phanmay pwuswu-ka
   that-thing-because sale number-SUB
8 manh-un -ke -lay -yo.
   many-ATTR-NOML-QUOT-POL
   “They say its because of those two sections that so many
   people read it.”

After mentioning one reason in line 3, i.e., a better job section, Y goes on to introduce another reason in line 5. Here Y first produces a turn allusively constructed with demonstrative forms prompting the hearer to
identify the referent (Kim 2001) and then adds the noun *phanmay* ‘sales’ as an increment, which S repeats in overlap for affirmation. This increment is offered as a clue leading the addressee to grasp the target referent which is demonstrably assumed by the speaker to be shared by the address, as evidenced by the way the preceding host TCU is constructed with the demonstrative *ku* ‘that’ pointing to a shared domain of information as well as with the particle -cian asserting intersubjectivity (cf. Kim & Suh 2000, Kim 2001).

The clue-like nature of the increment is also manifested by the fact that the increment *phanmay* ‘sales’ in itself is not the conventional or official term referring to the sales section in newspapers. Rather, as a bare NP, it serves as a clue, both formally and functionally, and only vaguely points to some official name of the newspaper section specialized for presenting advertisements of sales activities (also see extract (16)).

In some contexts, such a clue-giving pattern is so robust that the speaker clings to this pattern even in the face of the interlocutor's repair initiation. Consider extract (18) below. In this fragment, we find an instance of what is called ‘other-initiated repair’. As we had a glimpse of how repair is initiated by the other speaker in extract (16), this type of repair is initiated by the other speaker who shows that he/she has a problem of hearing or understanding a prior turn. It develops in the form of a sequence composed of three components: (i) trouble-source turn, (ii) repair-initiating turn containing a next-turn repair initiator (NTRI), and (iii) repair turn containing repair proper.21 In extract (18), S, in line 4, initiates repair by producing the NTRI *mwe-yo? “What?”*, thus constituting H’s preceding turn in lines 1-2 as a trouble-source turn. In response, H proceeds to repair the trouble source in his repair turn in line 5:

---
21. For the analysis of various types of other-initiated repair sequences in Korean, see Kim (1999b).
In lines 1-2, H asks S whether she borrowed something from Ms. Youngsoon Min. Here he uses the demonstrative *ku* 'that' as a filler, filling in the syntactic slot for the object of the verb borrow. This utterance is immediately tagged upon by the increment *chayk* 'book', which is the grammatical object modified by the preceding demonstrative. Following a micro-pause, S initiates repair in line 4 by producing an NTRI (*mwe-yo? 'what?'), thus showing that she has a problem of understanding the target referent. Interestingly, H, facing S's repair initiation, repairs the problem in line 5 but still does not fully identify the book; he only provides the name of the author in his repair turn in the form of another bit of increment (*kim sangho kyoswunim* 'Prof. Kim Sangho').

As noted in Kim (2001), this repair structure displays a clue-giving pattern in which the speaker, in explicating a referent initially referred to by a demonstrative pronoun *ku* 'that', offers a clue in the form of a turn increment (*chayk* 'book') instead of a full explication. This clue-giving process continues even after the interlocutor raises a problem.
of understanding by initiating repair, with the speaker responding to the repair initiation still with another bit of clue, i.e., the name of the author (kim sangho kyoswunim Prof. Kim Sangho’). This process can be represented as follows:


"Have you borrowed that from Ms. Min Youngsoon? the Book? [What?] (The book written by) Prof. Kim Sangho."

We find here that bits of clues are offered incrementally in a step-wise fashion, though the second increment (kim sangho kyoswunim Prof. Kim Sangho’) is actually a turn on its own which has been prompted by the interlocutor’s repair initiation. In any case, we still find a sense in which these incremented segments are added as bits of clues leading the listener closer to the full explication of the allusive reference. Even though H ends up not providing a full explication even in his repair turn, his turn increment (‘book’) and repair component taking the form of an increment (‘Prof. Kim Sangho’) progressively upgrade the level of specification.

The analysis of extract (18) shows one of the ways in which the practice of organizing increments as bits of clues in step-wise fashion can be sequentially exploited. We find in many contexts of other-initiated repair such as (18) that the organizational pattern of adding bits of information observed in turn increments is also observed in the way repair turn is constructed following an NTRI. As noted in Kim (2001), this repair pattern often enacts a sequence in which the speaker of the trouble-source turn keeps offering bits of information as clues guiding the interlocutor toward the solution instead of providing a full explication.

Some of the interactional implications of this repair pattern observed in (18) can be explicated as follows. Through his persistent offering of clues in the trouble-source turn and the repair turn, H shows that the problem of understanding raised by S’s repair initiation is not a serious problem but something that S is capable of grasping on her own with the aid of a small bit of increment. In the same vein, by formulating his
repair component as if it were an increment to his preceding trouble-source turn and by not directly providing the solution in response to the interlocutor's prompt raising a problem, H engages in a highly subtle sequential act of covering up a problem in talk, i.e., S's proposal that there has been a problem of understanding (cf. extract (16)).

The formal affinity between a turn increment and an increment prompted by the interlocutor's repair initiation is also observed in extract (19), which illustrates another instance of other-initiated repair sequence:

(19) (Lunch Discussion)

((C is leaving.))

1 C: ( ) sam pen ey iss -nya?
   No. three-LOC exist-QUES
   “Is your car at lot No. 3?”

2 ( )

3 (2.5)

4 J: (wuli) ceki parking-un (.) ( ) sey -myeng
   our there parking-TOP three-CL

5 pakk ey anh-toy -nun -keskathay.
   outside-LOC NEG-become-thing-seem:IE
   “There, as for the parking, it looks like only three
   (students) have gotten (it).”

6 H: eti?= where
   “Where?”

7 J: =kwa cencheey-eyse. o -pen-ey.
   department whole -LOC five-CL -LOC
   In the whole department. At lot No. 5.

8 H: kulay?
   thatlike:IE
   Is that so?

In lines 4-5, J tells his friends the news that only three students have obtained a campus-parking permit for lot No. 5, which is the most privileged parking place on campus. In response, H, in line 6, produces a
repair initiator in the form of a category-constrained interrogative (eti? “where?”). In line 7, J, following H's repair initiator eti? “Where?”, offers two phrases marked by a locative case marker. Thus the repair turn seemingly contains a series of two increments that can be postpositionally linked back to the trouble-source turn.

While it is not easy to distinguish a repair component responsive to repair initiation from a turn increment belatedly added to the trouble source turn, we can observe the following. The first increment (kwa cenchezey-eyse 'in the whole department'), which is latched onto the preceding repair initiator (as marked by the equal sign), refers to the domain from which the three students who have gotten the permit are from, and the second increment (o-pen-ey 'At lot no. 5') refers to the particular parking lot where the parking permit being talked about is relevant. Given that J referred to a particular parking lot in his prior turn in lines 4 and 5, H's repair initiator can be taken as targeting which parking lot J is talking about. In this regard, there is a sense in which the second increment is the repair component addressed to H's repair initiator, with the first increment being a delayed increment to the trouble-source turn which happened to be added a bit later than H's repair initiator. The successive production of the two increments in line 7, however, makes it difficult to determine, at least formally, which of them (or whether both of them) constitutes the repair proper:

(19') ceki parking-un sey-myeng pakx-ey ahn-toy-nun-keshay [eti?] kwa cenchezey-eyse. open-ey

"Well, as for the parking, it looks like only three students have gotten it. [Where?] In the whole department. At lot No. 5."

This structure demonstrates the difficulty of making a formal distinction between a post-positioned turn increment and a repair component which has been triggered by the interlocutors repair initiator. In (19), one of the significant interactional implications of organizing repair in the manner of incrementing bits of information would be that the speaker performs repair in a highly oblique way, i.e., in such a way that does not explicitly acknowledge that there has been a trouble source to repair. Even though we find a sense in which J's production
of the repair component (open-ey ‘At lot No. 5’) has been prompted by H’s NTRI eti? “Where?”, which proposes that there has been a problem of understanding or hearing, J designs his repair turn as if it has not been prompted by H’s repair initiation, but is added as another turn increment.

As a whole, the preceding analysis suggests that increments, formulated as clues, lend themselves to the potential use as a turn-linking device and serve as minimal cues with which the hearer is guided toward grasping the upshot of the speaker’s turn. This turn-organizational feature of increments is often interactionally motivated by the speaker’s step-wise enactment of post-upshot-marking moves addressing various aspects of the contingently materialized interactional states. Retroactively remedying some aspects of the preceding utterance while prospectively projecting a rich possibility of further development and enrichment, turn increments furnish the speaker with the means of addressing various interactional management tasks geared to eliciting recipient uptake, presenting upshot, enhancing turn contiguity, and/or continuing and intensifying the current sequential act. Furthermore, the practice of incrementing bits of information to the prior turn segment is widely exploited sequentially as a way of addressing problems in talk in a highly oblique fashion, i.e., in the manner of expanding the speaker’s own trouble-source turn voluntarily rather than being prompted by the other’s repair turn raising a problem.

6. Conclusions

As was noted in the preceding discussion, in order to explicate some of the interactional functions of increments, we should first bring our attention to several aspects of their functional and turn-organizational features as observed in the way turns and sequences develop in natural conversation.

First, one major interactional work increments do is to procedurally negotiate and solicit recipient uptake after a turn is possibly complete, e.g., by upgrading or downgrading the initial upshot contingent upon the listener’s emergent responsive stance. The function of turn increments
eliciting recipient uptake and managing interaction is enacted through the way they are organized in a step-wise fashion. This turn-organizational feature makes it possible to intensify the action implemented by the host TCU by way of enabling the speaker to monitor how the initial action is being received by the hearer and what types of subsequent response are observably projected by the listener.

Second, we should make note of the fact that, in Korean conversation, turns are often constructed elliptically, with increments being added as a way of elaborating on the elliptical part of the preceding turn unit whose allusive design is mainly motivated toward pressing forward the general upshot of the action being initiated and sometimes also for strengthening the current turn’s contiguity with the preceding one. Constructing elliptical turns often involves using ‘light’ pre-verbal elements in the form of demonstratives or zero-marking in such a way that the whole turn is produced as a single TCU uttered in one single intonation unit (cf. Chafe 1987, Du Bois 1985). By constructing a turn elliptically with a single intonation contour, a speaker is able to present the main upshot of the current action quickly while effectuating a smooth turn exchange. This turn-constructional practice, as its outcome, offers a great possibility of adding turn increments for elaboration, providing the speaker with the means of dealing with various interactional contingencies arising from the way the initial upshot is taken up by the interlocutor.

Third, while turn increments work retroactively on their preceding utterance in the sense of playing a particular grammatical or semantic role, they may also be used to tie the current turn to the next turn. By virtue of being placed in a recognizably turn-terminal position, turn increments may serve as a TCU that can be used to construct the next turn and provide a ground for making a further intensified sequential act.

Finally, the step-wise deployment of increments is intertwined with the way they are offered as clues, which is observed both in formal and functional terms. As I have pointed out in the preceding discussion, increments tend to manifest clue-like features not only in their mode of deployment in which bits of information are added, often not framed by any grammatical case, but also in the way in which they are
constituted as minimal cues on the basis of which the listener is guided to the upshot of the action being implemented.

These findings, though preliminary at this stage of research, suggest that the turn incrementing practice cannot be simply analyzed as the act of adding some additional information as an afterthought, the analysis of which faces great difficulties because of its non-observable nature. Furthermore, those increments cannot simply be treated as a right-dislocated element that has been taken out from their original grammatical positions in the preceding utterance. Such a sentence-based perspective is inadequate because it cannot account for a fascinating range of discourse functions and turn-organizational features of turn increments observed in actual conversational discourse. If we analyze turn increments as an afterthought or right-dislocation by focusing on their cognitive and formal properties, they will be relevant to only a small subset of the turn-incrementing phenomenon arbitrarily delineated in non-empirical terms and defined *a priori* by some preconceived notion of sentence grammar that a sentence has to have some obligatory arguments or some 'unmarked' word order (e.g., S-O-V in Korean).\(^{22}\) From such a perspective, we will miss the opportunity to grasp the methodic ways in which participants interactively organize turn increments. The systematicity of this rich phenomenon could be more aptly described and explicated if we analyze it as the practice of adding bits of information to the immediately prior TCU which is already a possibly complete turn for various interactional purposes. By focusing on their turn-organizational and action-constitutive roles, we can see that they are built to do some particular interactional work that will not be enacted without them.

In future research, more systematic attention should be given to examining the types of turn increments and the interactional work they do. As Schegloff (2001) suggests, there are basically three positions at

\(^{22}\) Viewed from this perspective, there does not seem to be any solid ground on which we should treat incrementally constructed utterances as 'marked' cases deviant from the so-called 'unmarked' S-O-V word order in terms of either frequency or any 'markedness' of their functions, given that in Korean conversation the positioning of subject or object in pre-verbal position is likely to result in a 'marked' interpretation accorded contrastive focus that participants often orient to as something to avoid.
which increments are added with reference to the host TCU: (i) immediately after the host TCU is completed, (ii) after a registerable gap following the host TCU, and (iii) following the response by the other speaker. Further research should address how these different positions are motivated by different kinds of interactional contingencies and what kinds of interactional work each type of turn increments is designed to do. Furthermore, interactional functions of turn increments should be further examined in terms of how their turn-organizational features bear upon enacting sequential action. In particular, it would be interesting to analyze in more detail how turn increments relate to the preceding and following sequential developmental trajectories, e.g., how they participate in the sequence in-progress, how they serve as a linkage facilitating a continuous development of the sequence in the subsequent context, and how they initiate or close a sequence. These would be potentially rich areas of research the explication of which will shed light on various aspects of how grammars shape and are shaped by the way turns and sequences are organized and how they serve as resources for organizing interaction (Ochs, Schegloff & Thompson 1996).
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