

An Analysis of Collaborative Completion in Korean Conversation*

Kyu-hyun Kim
(Kyung Hee University)

Kim, Kyu-hyun. (2003). An analysis of collaborative completion in Korean conversation. *Language Research* 39(1), 147-182.

From a conversation-analytic perspective, this paper examines various types of collaborative completion (or co-participant completion) in Korean conversation with reference to how they furnish the speakers with the resources for organizing social action. A co-participant's practice of adding continuations to the current speaker's turn in progress constitutes a grammatical practice by which the participants manage intersubjectivity and negotiate alignment. It provides the co-completer with the opportunity to participate in the current speaker's action, with his/her contribution serving as a basis on which the upshot of the current discourse is interactively upgraded. An important aspect of this interactional process is that the participants are collusively co-aligned or grouped against a third party who is thus constituted as the object of such social actions as co-blaming, co-criticizing, co-sympathizing, etc. Systematic attention is paid to the contextual features which enable a co-participant to complete the current speaker's turn in progress anticipatorily. Features of a less 'collaborative' type of co-completion, i.e., gisting, are briefly examined in terms of the ways in which a recipient's preemptive proposal of a candidate understanding is treated by the current speaker as being interruptive of his/her turn. Some of the implications of the findings are noted for their bearing upon various aspects of grammar-interaction interface.

Key words: collaborative completion, co-participant completion, conversation, social action, alignment, candidate understanding, grammar, interaction

* This work was supported by Korea Research Foundation Grant (KRF-2001-041-A00021). An earlier version of this paper was presented at the 15th Conference of the Discourse and Cognitive Linguistics Society of Korea, which was held at Korea University in December, 2002. I would like to thank Dr. Hyun-Jung Koo and three anonymous reviewers for their thoughtful comments.

1. Introduction

From a conversation-analytic perspective (Sacks, Schegloff & Jefferson, 1974), this paper examines the sequential implications of the grammatical practice of collaborative completion in Korean conversation with reference to various ways in which it furnishes speakers with interactional resources for managing intersubjectivity and organizing social action (Lerner, 1991, 1996). Collaborative completion (Sacks, 1992) or co-participant completion (Lerner, 1991) is defined as the practice in which one speaker completes the other speaker's sentence in progress by proposing a candidate understanding in such a way that a single sentence is completed or expanded across the talk of two or more speakers (Lerner, 1991, 1992, 1993, 1996; Schegloff, 1996; Sacks, 1992; Lerner & Takagi, 1999; Diaz, Antaki & Collins, 1996). It provides the speaker with the means of displaying congruent understanding and interactively managing alignment (or disalignment) by virtue of creating a context for co-participation and joint action (Goodwin & Goodwin, 1987).¹⁾

In Korean conversation, a candidate understanding proposed in collaborative completion may take different forms depending upon the part of the other's utterance being completed by the current speaker. For instance, the recipient of a turn in progress may produce a completion for the other speaker's not-yet-materialized turn by providing the predicate component, as shown in fragment (1) : 2)

- 1) In this paper, I will use the terms 'collaborative completion' and 'co-participant completion' interchangeably, which refer to a grammatical practice of contributing an element which is syntactically tied to another's turn in progress. In a broader sense, Jacoby & Ochs (1995) use the term 'co-construction' (Goodwin, 1995; Tylor 1995), which refers to "the joint creation of a form, interpretation, stance, action, activity, identity, institution, skill, ideology, emotion, or other culturally meaningful reality" (Jacoby & Ochs, 1995, p. 171).
- 2) The transcription notion used for this paper has been adapted from Sacks, Schegloff & Jefferson (1974) with some modifications:

[]	Simultaneous utterance	.	Falling intonation	=	Contiguous utterances
,	Continuing intonation	//	Interruption	?	Rising intonation
(0.0)	Intervals between utterances	-	Cut-offs	(.)	Micro-pause
:	Sound stretch	()	Words unclear	(())	Transcriber's remarks
hhh	Audible aspirations	.hhh	Audible inhalations	°	Talk quieter than the surrounding talk

For morpheme-by-morpheme glossing, the following abbreviations are used:

ACC: accusative	ADD: additive	ATTR: attributive	AUX: auxiliary
CIRCUM: circumstantial	CL: classifier	COMM: committal	COMP: complementizer
CONCESS: concessive	COND: conditional	CONN: connective	COP: copula

(1) (S & M)

- 1 S: WAN:::cenhi machwum hanbok
completely tailor-made Korean traditional clothes
- 2 -ulo ay -tul-i:,
-INSTR child-PL-NOM
“With completely tailor-made Korean traditional clothes, the children,”
- > 3 M: ta ip -kwu o -ass -ta//y?
all wear-and come-PST-QUOT:IE
“all came dressed?”

In completing the other speaker's turn in progress, the speaker may provide the main clause following the other speaker's adverbial clause (fragment (2)), or provide an adverbial clause following the other speaker's main clause (fragment (3)):

(2) (Lunch Discussion)

- 1 M: ah:: pillye -tal -la kulay -ss -te -ni,
DM borrow-give:to me-QUOT do:such-PST-RETROS-INTERR
“Ah I asked her to lend me the book, and,”
- > 2 H: an pillyecwu-eyo?
NEG lend -POL
“Did she not lend it to you?”

(3) (N & H)

- 1 H: kuntay kim cayyun-ssi emma-ka te antal-
DC Kim Jaeyun-Mr. mother-NOM more being:nervous
- 2 i-ya.
COP-IE
“But it was Mr. Jaeyun Kim's mother (= the child's grandmother) who was really fretting about it.”

DC: discourse connective	DM: discourse marker	DUB: dubitative	EXCL: exclamative
HEARSAY: hearsay	IE: informal ending	INCHOA: inchoative	INSTR: instrumental
INTENT: intentional	INTERR: interruptive	NECESS: necessity	NEG: negative
NOM: nominative	NOML: nominalizer	ONOMTO: onomatopoeia	PL: plural marker
POL: politeness marker	PROG: progressive	PST: past	QUOT: quotative
REASON: reason	RETROS: retrospective	SIMUL: simultaneous	TOP: topic
VOC: vocative			

- 3 (2.5)
- > 4 N: *po-kosiph-ese-yo?*
 see-want -CONN-POL
 "Because she wants to see him?"

The collaborative completion in fragment (3), where a candidate understanding is proposed in the form of an adverbial clause, is implemented in such a way that the speaker 're-completes' the other speaker's utterance which can be taken as a complete turn.³⁾

Another format of collaborative completion extensively observed in Korean conversation is the one in which the co-participant retroactively fills in an elliptical pre-verbal argument (e.g., a zero-marked subject) of the other speaker's sentence. As in fragment (3), this type of collaborative completion works on a sentence which can be taken as a complete turn (Kim, 2001):⁴⁾

(4) (Lunch Discussion)

- 1 H: *ung. ku-- kuntey ku-- ku mal -i ku*
right that but that that phrase-NOM that
- 2 *mal -ul (yayki--) ihay -lul*
phrase-ACC talk understanding-ACC
- 3 *mos -ha-te -lakwu -yo,*
notable-do-RETRO-QUOT-POL
- "Right. That- but that, that phrase is- I found (people) could not understand that phrase."

3) H's turn in lines 1-2 in (3) can be taken as a complete turn, to which N contributes an adverbial clause, which is normatively placed before its main clause.

4) Here, the sense of 're-completing' the turn which is otherwise already complete draws upon the normative utterance design where a subject or object constituent is not usually mentioned explicitly. As noted in Kim (1993), this type of collaborative completion is a form of other-initiated repair in which the speaker prompts the other speaker to confirm the candidate understanding targeting the latter's elliptical turn, which is thus constituted as a trouble-source turn (Schegloff, Jefferson & Sacks, 1977). In this paper, this 'retroactive' type of re-completion is treated as an instance of collaborative completion along with what may be called the 'progressive' completion in which the recipient of a turn in progress provides a predicate or a main clause component (see fragments (1) and (2)). In future research, these two types of completion should be analyzed in more detail with reference to their distinct bearing upon turn organization and sequential implications. I am thankful to Dr. Hyun-Jung Koo for bringing up this point.

- > 4 K: *salam-tul-i -yo?*
people-PL-NOM-POL
 “People (couldn’t understand it)?”

In the sense that speakers can re-complete the other speaker’s turn which can be taken as a complete turn (fragment (3)), the practice of collaborative completion can be resourcefully exploited as a way of collaborating with the other speaker. Fragment (5) shows a case in which M completes S’s turn by adding the adverb *tto* ‘again’ in empathizing with S’s self-defending account:

- (5) (S & M)
- 1 S: ... *ya kulehkey* (.) *olla -peli -ess -nuntey*
 VOC like:that group:CONN-AUX-PST-CIRCUM
 2 *nay-ka mak ton -kkaci pothay-ka-myense*
 I -NOM recklessly money-even add -go-SIMUL
 3 (*mwe-lul po -l -key*) *iss -e//;*,
 what-ACC see-ATTR-thing:NOM exist-IE
 “Look. The price of that area has gone up, and what do I
 gain by spending more money (to move to the area)?”
 [
 -> 4 M:
kulekey. tto.
 like:that:CONN again
 “(You’re) right in saying that. (Not) again. ((meaning: You
 don’t have to spend more money again.))”

Sometimes, a participant’s co-completion may be invited by the current speaker’s word search. Fragment (6) is a case in point:

- (6) (After Dinner)
- 1 J: *kuliko kay -nun* (.) *apple ha -myen -un* (0.2) *chak*
 and that child-TOP apple say -COND-TOP right away
 2 *nao -ntay ku-*
 come out-QUOT that
 “And when one says apple to that child, it comes out right
 away, that-”
 3 (0.8)

- > 4 M: *spelling-i=*
spelling-NOM
 "(You mean) its spelling (comes out right away)."
- 5 J: *=spelling-i.*
spelling-NOM
 "(Right.) Its spelling (comes out right away)."

As suggested by her cut-off following the demonstrative *ku* and the subsequent gap in line 3,⁵⁾ we find a sense in which J solicits M's help in her search for a word. M responds collaboratively by producing the searched-for word which is linked back to the demonstrative *ku* in J's utterance in lines 1-2 as its post-positioned subject. As Lerner (1991) notes, this would be a type of collaborative completion in which a co-participant produces completion for another's turn where there is a halt in progressivity that results from word search.

As we can see in fragments (1)-(6), the practice of collaborative completion involves the process in which a co-participant adds continuations to the current speaker's turn in various ways, i.e., anticipatorily furnishing the next turn component (as in (1) and (2)), producing an element re-completing another's turn by adding an adverbial (as in (3) and (5)) or by retrieving an elliptical constituent (as in (4)),⁶⁾ or offering a searched-for-word (as in (6)). In all of these cases, the co-participant contributes an utterance which is tied syntactically to the other speaker's utterance.

In the following discussion, I will analyze various interactional processes made possible by the practice of collaborative completion in Korean conversation. Various types of collaborative completion in a variety of sequential contexts are examined with reference to how this practice is relied upon as a resource for managing intersubjectivity and negotiating co-alignment and how it thus serves to organize social action

- 5) As the following fragments demonstrate, the completee whose utterance is completed by the other speaker often pauses mid turn or stretches the final sound, thus giving the sense that the other speaker's collaborative completion is invited. This suggests that collaborative completion is an interactively organized phenomenon that is warranted by the participants' mutual collaboration and co-orientation (also see fragment (1)).
- 6) Recall that fragments (3) and (4) are cases in which co-participant's completion re-completes another's turn that is otherwise complete, i.e., it is made after a turn-constructional unit of the other speaker has reached a possible completion point.

(e.g., blaming, sympathizing, etc.). Some of the implications of the findings for linguistic analyses are also discussed.

The data used in this study contains audio-taped face-to-face and telephone conversations. Also included are segments of overheard conversation which have been written down on the spot.

This paper is organized as follows. Section 2 examines some of the most fundamental sequential features associated with collaborative completion, which is implemented on the basis of commonsense knowledge shared by the participants. Section 3 examines the contextual features of collaborative completion which have a significant bearing upon the way the upshot of discourse is interactively constituted, effectuated, and upgraded. Section 4 addresses the ways in which the practice of collaborative completion is employed as resources for building co-alignment and organizing various types of social action. In Section 5, which includes two sub-sections, some of the differences between distinct types of collaborative completion are briefly sketched. Section 5.1 focuses on the practice of 'gisting' as a type of collaborative completion with rather loose syntactic ties to the utterance it completes. Section 5.2 points to different types of collaborative completion formulated with distinct prosodies and produced in different sequential environments. Some of the implications for linguistic analysis are also discussed. Section 6 presents concluding remarks.

2. Display of Shared Knowledge

Co-participant completion generally occurs in a context in which the recipient of an on-going turn produces a completion for the not-yet-completed turn unit of another speaker. While there are cases in which collaborative completions are not 'collaborative' in their interactional import (Jacoby & Ochs, 1995), it is often the case that speakers rely on the practice of completing the other's utterance in order to display a stance collaborating with the interlocutor's. Consider fragment (7), which is excerpted from a conversation between two couples who are chatting after dinner at the home of one of the couples. In the preceding segment, K, who had his glasses broken, said that he can see better with his bare eyes than before. His wife (M) and the other couple (N and J) join in the activity of topicalizing and assessing K's self-diagnosis. Instances of

collaborative completion are found at lines 3 and 5 and at lines 10 and 13:

(7) (After Dinner)

- 1 N: *nwun-i coh -a -ci -nun -ket ani -ya?*
 eye -NOM good-CONN-INCHOA-ATTR-NOML NEG:COP-IE
 “Maybe your eyesight is getting better.”
- 2 M: *coh -a -ci -nun -ket ani -ya?*
 good-CONN-INCHOA-ATTR-NOML NEG:COP-IE
 “Maybe it’s getting better.”
- > 3 K: *kuntey i -key,*
 but this-thing:NOM
 “But this is,”
- 4 (.)
- > 5 J: *cekung -i toy -nun -keey -yo=*
 adjustment-NOM become-ATTR-NOML:COP-POL
 “getting used to it.”
- 6 K: *=cekung -i toy -nun -ke -//ya.*
 adjustment-NOM become-ATTR-NOML-COP:IE
 “getting used to it.”
- [
 7 M:
 ung.
 yes
 “Yes.”
- 8 K: *lens -lul kapcaki kki -kwiiss-taka*
 lenses-ACC suddenly wear-PROG -INTERR
 “While you’re wearing your contact lenses and suddenly,”
- [
 9 J: *ney.*
 yes.
 “Yes.”
- > 10 K: *hwak ppay -myen -un,*
 ONOMETO take:out-COND-TOP
 “If you take them off suddenly,”
- 11 (.)
- 12 K: *cincca a//n poin-takwu.*
 really NEG see-QUOT
 “Really you can’t see anything, you know.”
- [

- > 13 J: *an poi-e. kkamkkamhay.*
 NEG see-IE dark:IE
 "You can't see anything. It's all dark."
 14 N: *mac-a.*
 right-IE
 "That's right."

Following the other participants' light-heartedly made comment that his eyesight may be getting better, K embarks on explicating his situation at line 3, where he produces a discourse connective (*kuntey* 'but') and the subject marked by the nominative case marker (*i-key* 'this-thing:NOM'). Following a micro-pause, one of the participants, J, wife of N, anticipatorily completes K's utterance by producing the predicate part that is linked back to K's subject, saying that what K is experiencing is to become adjusted to seeing with bare eyes. J's collaborative completion is then repeated by K, who thereby confirms that J's candidate understanding is indeed correct.

Another instance of collaborative completion is found at lines 10-13. In lines 8 and 10, K produces a conditional clause, which signals that more is to come in the projected main clause.⁷⁾ Following a micro-pause, K embarks on producing the main clause starting with the adverb *cincca* 'really,' and just as he goes on to utter the negative, J intervenes and collaboratively completes K's turn in progress, with the consequence that she ends up shadowing the main clause being uttered by K.⁸⁾

These instances of collaborative completion clearly show that J is being actively collaborative with K by way of completing K's turn in progress anticipatorily or in close parallel. The basis on which J can do so at line 5 is the 'shared commonsense knowledge or experience' that we normally

7) What K evokes as he produces completion here is the compound turn-construction unit (TCU) that corresponds to the English *if X - then Y* format discussed by Lerner (1991). In such a compound TCU, the preliminary component (i.e., the *if*-clause) foreshows the production of a final component (i.e., the main clause), which can be anticipatorily produced by a co-participant.

8) This point suggests that quasi-simultaneous repeat or shadowing may be a contingent product of the same interactional process implicated by the practice of collaborative completion. Another option that is less active than either collaborative completion or repetition but is a possible alternative seems to be the production of an acknowledgment token, by which the speaker withdraws a more active contribution at an intra-turn boundary but invites the current speaker to keep talking (Kim, 1999; Lerner, 1991).

get adjusted to a new situation better as time elapses. Actually, this point can be inferred from K's prior remark that he feels his eyesight is improving without glasses. Likewise, as the participants observably display agreement with each other (lines 6-7) and K brings up a related experience of feeling that he can see much less right after taking out contact lenses (lines 8-10), J can still use that same commonsense knowledge and collaboratively complete K's turn, because the sudden removal of contact lenses constitutes an experience that is located at the other extreme end of the continuum of 'getting used to a new situation.' These observations suggest that the practice of collaborative completion operates on the basis of the commonsense knowledge that participants normatively share and actively draw upon in displaying co-orientation to what is going on in the current turn. The collaborative nature of co-participant completion, in its procedural sense, is also evidenced by the occurrence of pauses found mid-turn (lines 4 and 11 in fragment (7)). As observed in footnote (5), the presence of such pauses indicate that the current speaker orients to furnishing the other participants with the opportunity to come in and complete his utterance.

That the practice of collaborative completion often draws upon shared knowledge is also shown by fragment (8) in which we actually find two distinct types of collaborative completion (lines 2 and 6). In this fragment, H is talking to his friends K and M about his linguistic view of the Korean modal marker *keyss*.

(8) (Lunch Discussion)

((H is talking to his friends K and M.))

- 1 H: *nay- nay intuition-ul* -nun *keyss -ilan -ke -nun*,
my my intuition-INSTR-TOP keyss -QUOT:ATTR-thing-TOP
“According to my own intuition, what is called *keyss* is,”
- > 2 K: ***project ha-nun -ke***.
project do-ATTR -NOML
“**to project.**”
- 3 H: *ung. ku- kuntey ku- ku mal -i ku*
right that but that that phrase-NOM that
- > 4 *mal -ul (yayki-)* *ihay -lul*
phrase-ACC talk understanding-ACC

- > 5 *mos -ha-te -lakwu-yo,*
 not:able-do-RETRO-QUOT-POL
 "Right. That- but that, that phrase is- I found (people) could
 not understand that phrase."
- > 6 K: *salam -tul-i -yo?*
 people-PL-NOM-POL
 "**People (couldn't understand it)?**"
- 7 H: *yey.*
 yes
 "Yes."
- 8 H: *ku selmyeng -ul ha-lla kulay -to*
 that explanation-ACC do-INTENT dosuch-CONCESS
 "Even though I tried to explain that ..." ((after another repair
 sequence H continues the story))

In line 1, H embarks on explaining to the participants his view of the function of the Korean modal marker *keyss*. As H pauses after producing the subject part marked by the topic marker, K, who happens to be familiar with H's view of the function of *keyss*, completes H's utterance by proposing his candidate understanding of what will come as a predicate in H's not-yet-completed turn. Note here that what is grasped by K's candidate understanding is formulated as the 'gist' of what is forthcoming in H's turn.⁹⁾

Here, K's collaborative completion is made possible by the fact that he is already familiar with H's view on the modal marker *keyss*. By producing the projected predicate, K demonstrably shows to H that he is able to present the 'gist' of K's upcoming utterance. While a co-participant often employs the practice of collaborative completion as a way of co-aligning with the current speaker, K's collaborative completion here is not taken as collaborative by H, as revealed by his response to K. In lines 3-5, H, after initially acknowledging K's candidate understanding as

9) Collaborative completion done in the form of 'gisting' tends to be message-oriented rather than language-oriented, in the sense that its syntactic ties with the prior turn often are not as tight as in other cases of collaborative completion. Note in (8) that K's contribution in line 2 takes the form of a noun phrase. It does not contain any sentence-ending suffix that would grammatically warrant its status as the predicate of H's not-yet-completed sentence (see Section 5.1). As I will show in Section 5.1, collaborative completion in the form of gisting often seems to be interruptive of the other speaker's turn in progress.

correct, immediately goes on to add that other people have difficulties understanding his view.¹⁰⁾ This remark by H, which brings in a new topic concerning how people respond to his view indicates that his projected upshot goes beyond K's contribution. His quick transition from a brief acknowledgment token *ung* 'yes' to such an account, framed by the adversative *kuntey* 'but', suggests that H is resisting K's candidate understanding. Actually, his subsequent remarks indicates that the major upshot of what he was going to say would have concerned how other people reacted to his view rather than the content of his view itself. By saying so, H implies that K's candidate understanding, which only concerns the latter, is deficient. With his proposed candidate understanding being only partially taken up by H, K's collaborative completion is thus retroactively constituted not as a successful anticipatory completion, but as a preemptive interruption of H's talk.¹¹⁾

In response to H's corrective remark in lines 3-5, K engages in another form of collaborative completion in line 6, where he proposes his candidate understanding of the referent which has been elliptically marked (i.e., zero-marked) in H's turn. As noted in Kim (1993) and Kim and Suh (1998), this instance of collaborative completion is a form of other-initiated repair in which a speaker initiates repair by proposing a candidate understanding of the other speaker's prior utterance and prompts the other speaker to confirm it (Schegloff, Jefferson & Sacks, 1977; Schegloff, 1997). Note, in this respect, that K's candidate understanding targets a generic, non-specific referent (*salam-tul-i-yo?* "You mean people (couldn't understand it)?"), which is easily assumable in the context and thus, if superfluously singled out as an object to be confirmed by the other speaker, is likely to be easily confirmed.¹²⁾

10) Note further that this remark by H is characterized by disfluencies such as cut-offs, repetition, and restarts, which suggest that he finds K's contribution problematic.

11) For an analysis of cases in which collaborative completion functions to interrupt the other's turn whose full materialization is thus circumvented, see Kim (1999) and Kim & Suh (2002).

12) K's candidate understanding of the subject in H's utterance ('people') is likely to be confirmed by H, given that, in his utterance, H is emphasizing the subtleness of his linguistic view rather than pointing to incompetence of a specific group of people to whom he explained his view (presumably the linguists and students studying linguistics he associates with). As Kim (1999) notes, this practice in which what may be called a 'legitimately elliptical' sentential constituent is redundantly retrieved is frequently observed in Korean conversation where we canonically find elliptical utterances that offer the interlocutor the chance to elaborate and build on them by filling in grammatical elements.

In this sense, K's contribution which fills in shared information inferable from the context can be taken as superfluous in terms of its content. However, in terms of the interactional work it is geared to, it serves as a 'go-ahead' signal warranting H's bid to elaborate his explanation. Actually, we find a sense in which this 'overly' collaborative move by K is being made as a way of compensating for the interruption caused by his prior collaborative completion in line 2. This collaborative move by K is taken up by H, who, confirming K's contribution, goes on to talk in detail about how other people react to his idea regarding the Korean modal marker. On the whole, we thus find that K's co-completion provides a secure ground on which H's bid to produce more detailed talk is interactively facilitated. As I will discuss later, K's co-completion here is performed in such a way that it is used in the service of subtle interactional business of negotiating co-alignment. In this sense, note that an implicit collusive alignment is emerging between K and H against 'those people' who do not appreciate H's linguistic view.

As I will elaborate further in the next section, the interactional work that such a collaborative practice is geared to often concerns the marking of the 'upshot,' i.e., the main point that the current discourse is designed to effectuate. As a recipient of the current speaker's talk, the party who completes the current speaker's turn in progress is thus furnished with the opportunity to co-participate in the formulation of an upshot. Given the observation that collaborative completion tends to be relied upon as the practice for displaying shared stance and knowledge, it is not surprising that the discourse domain in which such a practice is deeply implicated is often an upshot-relevant one. This would be so because the kind of formation of alignment and distribution of stance achieved through collaborative completion usually concerns matters of some topical or interactional importance. On this note, we now turn to the examination of the upshot-relevant sequential features of collaborative completion.

3. Co-telling of Upshot

Fragment (9) shows an instance of collaborative completion in which a collaborative proposal of candidate understanding offers an opportunity of organizing joint action. This segment is part of an overheard conversation

between a mother (T) and her married daughter (M). In line 1, M brings up a topic about two of her close friends:

(9) (Overheard Conversation)

- 1 M: *siyeongi-hako hiswuki-nun hin meli-ka:::*
Siyeong -with Hisook -TOP white hair-NOM
“My friends Siyeung and Hisook, white hairs,”
- > 2 T: *iss-e?*
exist-IE
“exist? (=Do they have (white hairs)?)”
- 3 M: *iss -nun cengto-ka ani -la koyngcanghi manh-a.*
exist-ATTR extent-NOM NEG-CONN very:much many -IE
“It’s not that they have just some, but they really have a lot of them.”
- 4 T: *eccen -ta -nya.*
dowhat-DEC-INQ
“Oh my, what is to be done about it? ((empathetic remark))”

In line 1, M withholds further talk as she reaches a point at which the subject part of the utterance has been produced. Note that she stretches the sound of the final syllable,¹³⁾ which happens to be the nominative case marker, and that the subject it marks projects a predicate component. Her mother T then immediately completes M’s utterance by producing the predicate (*iss-e?* “(Do they) have (white hairs)?”), which is grammatically linked back to the subject uttered by M; T does so by drawing on her normative orientation and grammatical knowledge of Korean relevant to ‘predicating’ (i.e., “white hairs + exist”). As Lerner (1991) and Lerner and Takagi (1999) note about a comparable phenomena in English and Japanese, the co-participant completion in (9) is a case in which an otherwise single TCU is cast into a two-part compound TCU consisting of a preliminary component and the final component [SUBJECT + PREDICATE] (also see fragment (10) below).

It is important to note that T’s collaborative completion provides M with an interactive basis on which she can upgrade the effect of her upshot by working on the material contributed by her collaborative

13) Given the way M designs her subject, i.e., with the final sound stretched, we find a sense that T’s collaborative completion has been solicited by M.

completion. In other words, it interactively warrants further development of talk by M on that topic. If we look at the way M responds to T's collaborative completion, we find that she uses T's candidate understanding (line 3) as a stepping stone on which she proposes a much stronger descriptor ('they have *a lot*'), thus replacing T's commonsensically motivated descriptor of T ('they have *(some)*'). By upgrading the intensity of the description as such, M formulates the upshot of the report as something whose import exceeds commonsensically entertainable normative expectation as indexed through T's collaborative completion. The phenomenon M reports on is thus interactively presented as a 'noticeable problem' that requires more than normative orientation from the interlocutor. That this is an oriented-to feature of the given sequence for the participants is shown by T's empathetic response in line 4, where she demonstrably aligns with and shares M's intense problematizing stance through her empathetic remark acknowledging the 'problematic' nature of the phenomenon being reported by M ("Oh my, what is to be done about it?").

In story-telling contexts, a story-recipient often completes the story-teller's turn in progress as a way of showing that he/she has been closely monitoring the development of the story being told to such an extent that he/she can contribute to co-building the story-line. Collaborative completion in such contexts, often invited by the story-teller, has several significant interactional implications. Consider fragment (10), which is excerpted from a telephone conversation between two female friends (S and M). In this segment of the data, S is telling M a story, which is about an event which took place at an elementary school located in one of the wealthiest areas of Seoul. In the preceding context, S says that the students in that elementary school were once told to bring Korean traditional clothes as part of the school's etiquette education program. The upshot of the story is: even though the students were told that they might just rent the Korean traditional clothes, it happened that, to the surprise of the teachers, every student came dressed in expensive tailor-made traditional clothes (lines 6-12):

(10) (S & M)

- 1 S: *kuntey keki (.) ku mwe-ya .h yeycel-*
by:theway there that what-COP:IE etiquette
- 2 *yeycel kyoywuk-i -nka -lu//l sikhi*
etiquette education-COP-DUB-ACC make:do
- [
- 3 M: *ung:*
yes
“Yes.”
- 4 S: *-ntako hanbok: -ul,*
-QUOT Korean traditional clothes-ACC
“And there, what was it, as a way of teaching
etiquette, (they ...) Korean traditional clothes,”
- 5 M: *ung.*
yes.
“Yes.”
- 6 S: *kunyang kaci -e -o -l salam kaci -e*
simply bring-CONN-come-ATTR person bring-CONN
- 7 *-o -ko pili -e -cwu-l salam pili*
-come-and borrow-CONN-give-ATTR person borrow
- 8 *-e -o -lako hays -nunte//y,*
-CONN-come-QUOT do:PST-CONN
“They said simply that those who will bring them may
bring them and those who will rent them may rent hem,
and,”
- [
- 9 M: *ung*
yes
“Yes.”
- 10 S: *WAN:::cenhi machwum hanbok*
completely tailor-made Korean traditional clothes
- > 11 *-ulo ay -tul-i:,*
-INSTR child-PL-NOM
“In completely tailor-made Korean traditional clothes, the
children,”
- > 12 M: *ta ip -kwu o -ass-ta//y?*
all wear-and come-PST-QUOT:IE
“all came dressed?”
- [

13 S: *kulay:::, (//)*
 like:that:IE
 "Right!"

14 M: *[ah keki an tan-i-*
 DM there NEG attend-

15 *ki -l cal //hayss -ney*
 NOML-ACC well do:PST-FR
 "You've made a good decision not sending your child there."

16 S: *(kunikka) nwun-i hwak tolaka-nun*
 so eye -NOM ONOMETO roll -ATTR

17 *hanpok -tul-ul sensayngnim-to*
 Korean traditional clothes-PL-ACC teacher -ADD

18 *(pissa -se) mos hayss -nuntey*
 expensive-CONN not:able do:PST-CIRCUM all

19 *hanpok -tul-ul ta ip//kwu o -ss -tay*
 traditional clothes-PL-ACC wear -and come-PST-HEARSAY
 "So, they were wearing such fashionable (=eye-opening)
 attires, those Korean traditional clothes which are so expensive
 that even teachers cannot afford. They all came dressed
 like that."

20 M: *[ip -kwu o -ss -tay?*
 wear-and come-PST-HEARSAY

"(they) came dressed (like that.)"

21 S: *eng.*

yes

"Yes."

In line 11, S pauses after she produces the subject of the utterance in progress, the last syllable of which is stretched, thus giving the sense that the interlocutor's contribution is elicited (fragments (6), (7) and (9)). It is at that point that M collaboratively completes S's utterance by producing what can be taken as the predicate of S's not-yet-materialized utterance. Note that this collaborative completion takes place right at the point where the story-teller is going to mark the upshot of the story. That is, it is not the case that M is invited to complete any of S's utterances. Rather,

M is invited by S to co-tell the 'upshot' of the story; the part of the story that is collaboratively completed by M ("the children all came dressed in tailor-made Korean traditional clothes") constitutes the climax of the story which all the preceding material has been leading up to.

In this respect, notice that S's prior telling of the story provides a context in relation to which M can interpret S's utterance and project what is to come in S's later turn. In particular, S's report in lines 6, 7, and 8 ("They said simply that those who will bring them may bring them and those who will rent them may rent them") sets a contrastive context in relation to which the upshot of the story can be subsequently presented (Lerner & Takagi, 1999).¹⁴⁾ With her adverb 'completely' in line 10 uttered at a loud volume and with an elongated syllable (WAN:::cenhi 'completely'), she emphatically highlights her projected upshot as being contrastive with the preceding context, i.e., by formulating it as something that drastically contrasts with her previous report that the students were given the 'option' of either buying or renting the traditional clothes. By taking up successfully S's offer to join her telling of the upshot, M is interactively positioned as a co-teller of the story.

These features of collaborative completion furnishes the participants with the resource for organizing the story as a jointly constructed activity whose co-constructed features have significant interactional implications. Two of the implications are briefly sketched below.

First, it is important to note that a story-recipient's candidate understanding proposed in the course of collaborative completion serves as a stepping stone on which the story-teller can interactively upgrade her upshot. Note in line 13 that S emphatically accepts M's candidate understanding, and in lines 16-19, she goes on to elaborate and reiterate the upshot by mentioning that the traditional clothes the children were wearing were so expensive that even their teachers could not afford them. Recall that a similar point was made about fragment (9) examined above, where the completee (M) upgrades the descriptive intensity of the predicate on the basis of the candidate predicate proposed by the completer (T).

14) Another factor aiding M to complete S's utterance is of course that the predicate to be contributed is graspable by drawing upon the commonsense knowledge that 'clothes' are to be 'worn' ('In completely tailor-made Korean traditional clothes, the children' + "all came dressed").

Second, as I will demonstrate further below, the practice of collaborative completion is often employed as a way of 'grouping' participants and referents (Sacks, 1992) by offering the other party the opportunity to align with the storyteller against the target referent being negatively described in the story. In fragment (10), M, by way of being invited to participate in the telling of the projected upshot as a co-teller, is invited to share the particular stance of the storyteller being indexed by the story. Note that S's story is constructed in such a way that the target event is being cast in a negative light, with criticism being expressed against the third party implicated in the target event, i.e., the parents of the students in the story as being overly lavish.¹⁵⁾ In this respect, S's solicitation of M's collaborative completion (and S's uptake thereof) implicates M in the process of taking sides with her, thereby interactively grouping M onto the same side as she is against the third party i.e., those 'wealthy' people who do not mind spending lavishly on their children.¹⁶⁾ In sum, the practice of collaborative completion in (10) provides the story-teller and the story-recipient with the means of doing co-blaming as a party co-aligning against the third party i.e., presumably the rich parents who do not mind buying overly expensive clothes for their children.

4. Co-aligning Against Third Party

Fragment (10) which we examined in the preceding section suggests that, as a grammatical practice, co-participant completion is employed as a resource for organizing group alignment by way of enlisting each other's support for the telling of some 'motivated' upshot that attributes blame to a third party. The co-alignment between participants formed

-
- 15) The import of this negative description becomes more clear if we relate it to the context preceding the story where S, who is planning to move, has mentioned that she does not want to move to that wealthy residential area being talked about in her story, which is actually a very popular school district in Seoul. Throughout the sequence, S orients herself to downgrading the popularity of that area as a place to live in by highlighting several negative aspects of the area.
 - 16) That grouping and stance-sharing are crucially implicated by the practice of collaborative completion is manifested by M's statement in lines 14-15 following S's confirmation of her candidate understanding. In that empathetic statement, M explicitly supports S's decision not to move to that particular residential area, thereby demonstrably endorsing S's negative description of the school event and her negative stance toward that area where the school is located.

through collaborative completion is also observed in some of the other fragments we examined above. For instance, in fragment (8), the participants, through collaborative completion, engage in the practice of building collusive co-alignment with each other against some unspecified group of people. In the same vein, we find in fragment (9) that the participants are joined together through collaborative completion as a party who is doing co-sympathizing toward the third party, i.e., two friends of M who have a lot of white hairs. These observations all suggest that 'grouping' or 'stance-sharing', among others, is an interactional business that is accomplished by the practice of collaborative completion, which is crucially brought to bear upon the way social action (e.g., blaming, sympathizing, etc.) is organized.

These observations suggest that the grammatical practice of collaborative completion is employed as a resource for negotiating co-alignment among the participants and attributing responsibilities and blame to the third party. Fragment (11) below is another case in point:

(11) (North Campus Talk 1)

- 1 M: *ama kule -lkke -eyyo. (1.0) non-native*
probably like that-MOD-POL non-native
- 2 *speaker-hanthey-nun (.) TA-twu an cwu-nikka*
speaker-to -TOP TA-ADD NEG give-REASON
“Probably that’s right, because they dont give teaching assistantships to non-native speakers.”
- 3 (9.0)
- 4 M: *ah: ((yawning sound))*
- 5 (3.5)
- 6 H: *shin yengswun -ssi -hanthey*
Shin Youngsoon -Ms-to
- 7 *aku pili -ess-eyo? chayk?*
that borrow-PST-POL book
“Have you borrowed that from Ms. Shin Young-soon? The book?”
- 8 (.)
- 9 M: *mwe -yo?*
What-POL
“What?”

- 10 H: *ki//m sangho kyoswunim.*
 Kim Sangho professor
 "(The book written by) Prof. Kim Sang-ho."
 []
- > 11 M: *ah:: pillye -tal*
 DM borrow-give:to:me
- > 12 -*la kulay-ss -te -ni,*
 -QUOT say -PST-RETROS-CONN
 "Oh, I asked her to lend (it) to me and,"
- 13 (0.8)
- > 14 H: *an pillyecwu-eyo?*
 NEG lend -POL
 "(She) didn't lend (it) to you?"
- 15 M: *an pillyecwu-kwu tosekwan ka-se chac-a*
 NEG lend -CONN library go-CONN find-CONN
- 16 -*po -lakwu(h)*
 -see-QUOT
 "(She) didn't lend (it) to me and told me to look for (it) in
 the library."

In lines 6 and 7, H asks M a topic-initial yes-no question, inquiring whether she borrowed a book from Ms. Shin Young-soon. Following an other-initiated repair sequence through which M raises a problem of hearing or understanding (line 9) and H repairs the problem by elaborating on his trouble-source turn (Schegloff, Jefferson & Sacks, 1977), M responds to H's question, producing an adverbial clause which explains the kind of request she made to the referent (Ms. Shin). As she pauses at a point where the main clause is due, H comes in and collaboratively completes M's utterance in progress.

Often, the party who completes the other speaker's turn in progress is able to do so by monitoring the prior context and the other speaker's turn-so-far, whose turn design provides a clue for the shape and the content of the rest of the utterance being projected. In fragment (11), speaker H anticipatorily produces a main clause projected by M's adverbial clause, which serves as a preliminary component projecting the main clause as its final component (Lerner, 1991; Lerner & Takagi, 1999).¹⁷ Here, such a projection is further warranted by the sequential feature of M's turn containing the adverbial clause, which is produced as a response

(lines 11-12) to H's question (lines 6-7), and also by the grammatical feature of the adverbial clause. These features enable the recipient (H) to project a shape and content of the not-yet-materialized main clause. The contextual features enabling the recipient to project a shape and content of the not-yet-materialized main clause can be analyzed as follows.

First, focusing on the sequential feature of M's turn, which is produced as a response to H's question, we find that M did not produce a straightforward answer such as 'yes' or 'no.' As she did not respond with 'yes' to H's question but with an adverbial clause where she describes the nature of her request made to the referent (Ms. Shin), we find that the adverbial clause that M uses in starting her response constitutes a plausible beginning of an account of some 'problem.'

Second, the grammatical features of M's adverbial clause provide a clue regarding the kind of event that will be described in the not-yet-materialized main clause. Note that M's turn-constructional unit is presented in the form of an adverbial clause, which constitutes a preliminary component projecting the main clause as its final component. Furthermore, M's adverbial clause, which is marked by the retrospective marker *-te*, indicates that M is going to present her own 'personal' experience, i.e., how she 'initiated' an action (i.e., request-making) to Ms. Shin. Also, the particle *-ni* attached to the adverbial clause projects that what is to subsequently follow would be a recount of how Ms. Shin 'reacted' to the action which M initiated. In this respect, we can say that M's adverbial clause constitutes a preliminary component that foreshows its final component as part of the format [*as X* (one's initiation of action) - *then Y* (the other's reaction)] (Footnote (17)).

These aspects of the sequential and grammatical features associated with M's adverbial clause enable the interlocutor (H) (and the analyst as well) to predict that a description of some sort of a problem is forthcoming, which would be caused by Ms. Shin's negative reaction to M's request. It is by drawing upon these features that H is able to propose Ms. Shin's negative reaction (*an pillyecwu-eyo?* "She didn't lend (it) to you?") as his candidate understanding.

17) Some of the formats that Lerner (1991) identifies in English co-completing practices include [If X - then Y], [When X - Y], [Author attribution + Quote], etc. He also notes that otherwise unsegmented turn-constructional units can be cast into a two-part form by other aspects of talk such as the prosody or action format of TCU.

As we observed in fragments (9) and (10), the completer's proposed candidate understanding often provides a basis on which the completee can upgrade the extent to which her upshot is 'affectively' formulated and effectuated and thereby strengthens the intensity of the action being constituted on an interactive basis. In this respect, we find in fragment (11) that M, after confirming H's candidate understanding, goes on to further intensify the negative description of the referent by adding a report on her blameworthy action ("(She) didn't lend (it) to me and told me to look for (it) in the library"). Thus, what is achieved through H's collaborative completion is that M is given a collaborative go-ahead for the production of a possibly more negative report about the third party, i.e., Ms. Shin, who is thus depicted as a party to be blamed for not being very considerate. As a whole, by proposing a negative action of the third party as his candidate understanding that completes M's turn, H skillfully displays a stance which is co-aligning with M's stance emerging in her turn in progress and interactively organizes M's report as an implicit co-blaming act toward the third party being referred to in the report.

In most of the fragments examined above, a recipient's co-participant construction leads the current speaker to upgrade the upshot of his/her telling, either at the initiative of the recipient (i.e., completer) or the current speaker (i.e., completee). In some contexts, the recipients go about upgrading the level of action (i.e., blaming) by building on a co-participant's completion. Consider fragment (12), where J is talking about her friend who is overly enthusiastic about educating her young daughter, trying to teach calligraphy as well as reading and drawing:

(12) (After Dinner)

((J has been talking about her friend who is having her young daughter tutored in several skills including reading and drawing.))

1 J: *kulim ·twu cal kuli -eyo. kuntey ku wacwungey*
picture-ADD well draw-IE and that in:the:middle:of

2 *pwukulssi -kkaci kaluchi-te -lawu -yo.*
brush:writing-even teach -RETROS-QUOT-POL

"She draws well too, and in addition to that, the mother is teaching calligraphy as well."

- > 3 M: *ku elin ay -lul,*
that young child-ACC
"To such a young child!"

- 4 K: *myet sal -i -ci?*
 how:many year.old-COP-COMM
 "How old is she?"
- 5 J: *taset sal -i -eyyo.*
 five year.old-COP-IE
 "Five years old."
- 6 M: *kwukminhakkyo tuleka-to nemwu ppal-la.*
 elementary:school enter-even too early-IE
 "It (=caligraphy) is too much even for young elementary school students."
- 7 K: *cham.*
 EXCL
 "Gee."

Note that M, by retrieving the contextually assumable referent marked by the accusative case marker in an affectively loaded way (*ku elin ay-lul*, "To such a young child!"), actively collaborates with the upshot of J's story, thereby co-aligning with J against the third party, i.e., the child's mother, who is thus being constituted as the blamed party. M's co-completion is then followed by another participant's (K's) contribution (line 4), which elicits from J a report that the child is only 5 years old, which further contributes to depicting the mother's act as insensible. In line 6, M comes in again and upgrades the level of implicit criticism by saying that even elementary school students find caligraphy difficult, thus mobilizing further support for M's criticism. In line 7, K joins in with his exclamation co-aligning with the other participants.

Overall, the preceding observations suggest that collaborative completion in which a speaker's turn is anticipatorily completed by another speaker furnishes the speakers with the means of demonstrably co-aligning with each other, often in the context of interactively upgrading the level of upshot against a third party.¹⁸⁾ In the next section, I introduce a special

18) As one of the anonymous reviewers has pointed out, there may be a context in which the co-completor aligns not with the completee but with a third party being targeted in the current discourse, even though I have not found such cases in my data. As I will show in the next section, there are indeed cases of collaborative completion in which the co-completor is not aligning with the speaker of the on-going turn. Interestingly, co-completion in such cases is done by the co-completor's anticipatory proposal of a candidate understanding whose syntactic ties with the on-going turn are not as strong as in the more 'canonical' instances of collaborative completion we have examined. In this respect,

type of collaborative completion in which the co-completer is not necessarily co-aligning with the completee (also see line 2 in fragment (8)). It will be suggested that such ‘non-aligning’ cases manifest turn-design features which are distinct from those found in a more canonical case of collaborative completion.

5. Additional Remarks: Further Implications for Sequential and Linguistic Analysis

5.1. Features of Gisting as a Type of Collaborative Completion

One form of co-participant completion takes the form of ‘gisting,’ whereby a recipient of the other speaker’s on-going turn anticipatorily grasps the gist of what is to come before the other speaker’s turn has reached a completion point. One such instance was found in line 2 of fragment (8) examined above. As suggested by fragment (8), the occurrence of gisting tends to be treated by the current speaker as being interruptive of his/her on-going turn. Consider fragments (13) and (14) below:

- (13) (Lunch Discussion)
- > 1 H: *na-nun ce -ke caymiiss -ulkeskat-te -lakwu*
 I -TOP that-thing interesting-seem -RETRO-QUOT
 2 -*yo, (2.2) social interaction (0.6) -ulo hay-ya*
 -POL social interaction -INSTR do -NECESS
 3 *toy-nun -ke -cyan -ayo ku//ci -yo.*
 OK-ATTR-NOML-COMM-POL that -COMM-POL
 “I think that thing might be interesting. So the research
 topic should be related to social interaction, right?”
- [
- 4 K:
 ney.
 yes
 “Yes.”
- 5 (0.8)

it would be analytically fruitful to examine further how ‘co-aligning’ co-completion differs from ‘non-aligning’ co-completion in terms of turn-design (e.g., syntactic ties with the on-going turn) and prosody.

- > 6 H: *kuntey bilingual ha-nun salam-tul-i*,
 DM bilingual do-ATTR person-PL-NOM
 “And bilingual people,”

7 (1.6)

-> 8 K: ***code switching-i -yo?***
 code switching -COP-POL
 “(You mean) code switching?”

9 H: *ye?*
 yes
 “Huh?”

10 K: *code s//witching-i -yo?*
 code switching -COP-POL
 “(You mean) code switching?”

11 H: *[*
 ye.
 yes
 “Yes.”

12 H: *malha-taka, (.) konlanhan -ke*
 talk -INTERR troublesome-thing

13 *yaykiha-l -ttay -myen yenge -lo hay.*
 talk -ATTR-time-COND English-INSTR do:IE
 “while talking, if they say something troublesome, they use
 English.”

(14) (After Dinner)

- 1 M: *ani kuntey ku -ttay-twu cwungkwuk umsikcem-ey*//
no but that-time-also Chinese restaurant -LOC
[
2 K: *(kuntey) kuciman ()*
CONN but
“Well, but ()”
-> 3 M: *taylyang -ulo ceki hay-ss -e kwuiphay-kaciko*
large quantity-INSTR there did-PST-IE purchase-CONN
4 *(.) //iman won-*
20,000 won
“But, last time, too, from a Chinese restaurant we did that
in large quantities. We purchased food and, with 20,000
won.”
[

- > 5 J: (-ttay) **catering-to hay-se** mek-ss -ta
 -time catering-also do -CONN eat -PST-DECL
- 6 -kule-tay -yo,
 -say -HEARSAY-POL
 "They say that they once ordered catered food. (Literal
 translation: They say that they did catering.)"
- 7 M: *e:: e:: ((in a subdued tone))*
 yes yes
 "Right. Right."

Due to space constraints, I will forego an analysis of these fragments. Let me just point out that in lines 6-8 in fragment (13) and in lines 3-6 in fragment (14), the recipient's act of gisting is taken by the current speaker as being interruptive of her turn. That the current speakers treat the recipient's co-completion as being interruptive in these fragments is sequentially revealed by the way they respond to it (see line 9 in fragment (13) and line 7 in fragment (14)).

Note in this respect that the syntactic ties of the recipient's contribution to the current speaker's turn in fragments (13) and (14) are not as tight as in other instances of co-completions we have examined above; K's candidate understanding in (13) is not syntactically tied to H's turn in progress, and J's completion (*catering-to ha*) in (14) targets only part of M's turn in progress (*ceki ha* 'do that'). Even though these are only preliminary observations, they point to an interesting aspect of grammar-interaction interface; it may be the case that the less strong the syntactic ties are, the less collaborative (or more interruptive) the co-participant's completion is (cf. footnote (9)).¹⁹

Furthermore, as noted in Kim and Suh (2002), this type of co-completion often occurs when the completer targets another's utterance framed by a preface containing the distal demonstratives *ce* 'that (far from both speaker and hearer)' (e.g., *ceke* 'that thing', *ceki* 'there', etc.) (see line 1 in

19) As suggested by Antaki, Diaz and Collins (1996), who draw upon Goffman's notion of 'footing' in analyzing collaborative completion in English conversation, these instances of observably non-collaborative co-participant completion may be taken as cases in which the 'footing' on which the co-completer proposes his/her candidate understanding is not the same as the 'footing' on which the current's speaker turn operates, with the 'voice' or the participant role indexed by the former not being totally congruent with the latter's (also see Levinson, 1988).

fragment (13) and line 3 in fragment (14)). In such contexts, the current speaker tends to resist the recipient's co-completion. Kim & Suh contrast this with the use of the proximal demonstrative *ku* 'that (closer to hearer)', which tends to actively solicit the other's contribution (see line 2 in fragment (6)). This points to one of the ways in which the use of a linguistic form may be crucially implicated as a device for organizing interaction.²⁰⁾

5.2. Confirmation Request vs. Display of Congruent Understanding

While it is beyond the scope of this paper to examine different types of collaborative completion in terms of distinct prosodic features, a preliminary observation suggests that different intonation contours correlate with different degrees in which the recipient anticipatorily grasps the content of the speaker's not-yet-completed turn. For instance, in fragment (15) below, rising intonation, marked by the question marker, is used when the recipient grasp is weaker (line 10), while continuing intonation, marked by the comma, is used when the recipient's grasp is stronger (line 14). In this conversation, H has been telling a story in which his friend's son hurt himself by bumping into a steel chair while chasing pigeons:

(15) (N & H)

- 1 H: *pitwulki-lul po-ko coha -kaciko*
pigeon -ACC see-CONN happy-CONN
- 2 *ili ttwi-ko celi ttwi-ko kule -taka,*
over:here run-CONN over:there run-CONN do:like:that-INTERR
“He was so happy to see pigeons, and while running over
here and over there,”
- 3 N: *mwe-l po -ko -yo?*
what-ACC see-CONN-POL
“He saw what?”
- 4 H: *pitwulki.*
pigeon
“Pigeons.”

20) For a detailed analysis of this aspect of grammar-interaction interface, see Kim & Suh (2002).

- 5 N: *u:ng.*
 yes
 “I see.”
- 6 (1.0)
- 7 H: *kuntey kim cayyun-ssi emma -ka te antal-*
 DC Kim Jaeyun-Mr. mother-NOM more being:nervous
- 8 *i -ya.*
 COP-IE
 “But it was Mr. Jaeyun Kim's mother (= the child's grandmother)
 who was really fretting about it.”
- 9 (2.5)
- > 10 N: ***po-kosiph-ese -yo?***
 see-want -CONN-POL
 “Because she wants to see him?”
- 11 H: *ung? (1.0) ani,-*
 yes no
 “What? No.”
- 12 N: *=ah*
 DM
 “Oh.”
- 13 H: *ay kulehkey toy -n -ke.*
 child like:that become-ATTR-NOML
 “(She was upset over) the child having become like that.”
- > 14 N: ***tachi-nikka,***
 hurt -REASON
 “Because he hurt himself,”
- 15 *elun -tul-un mot po-a -cunu-ci.*
 old:people-PL-TOP not:able see-CONN-give-COMM
 “Old people can't stand things like that.”

In proposing a candidate understanding regarding the reason why the grandmother of the boy who hurt himself was fretting, N adds continuation to H's turn by producing a *because*-clause, marked by the connective *-ese*, which is uttered in rising intonation (marked by a question mark) (line 10), asking if it was because she wants to see the boy. In line 11, H rejects N's candidate understanding and says that it was because the child got involved in the accident. N then produces another *because*-clause in line 14, now marked by a different connective marking reason *-nikka*, in

displaying his revised understanding by confirming the point of H's preceding account (line 14). Note that this adverbial is uttered in continuing intonation (marked by a comma). As Kim & Suh (1994) note, the comparison of the two co-completions serially produced across several turns (-*ese* in line 10 and -*nikka* in line 14) points to distinct types of sequential contexts associated with each connective (i.e., confirmation request vs. display of congruent understanding), thus pointing to ways in which differences between the two comparable linguistic forms can be accounted for in interactional terms (Kim & Suh, 1994, p. 118).

On a more interactional side, the examination of how the participants manage interaction in (15) suggests how strongly they orient achieving intersubjectivity. Note how obliquely H goes about performing an other-initiated repair in such a way that H is prodded to adopt a revised candidate understanding. After producing the next turn repair initiator (NTRI) *ung?* 'What?', he produces a negative response (*no* 'No'), which is preceded by a pause.²¹⁾ Note that N's response in line 12, a change-of-state token (*ah* 'Oh') (Heritage, 1984), is latched upon H's negative response, as represented by the equal sign. That N produces a change-of-state token even before H's repair has started shows how keenly N is oriented toward achieving intersubjectivity; he is projectively showing that he is shifting his stance on his own (i.e., before H offers repair proper) in the direction of displaying a congruent understanding toward what is forthcoming in H's projected repair turn. Following H's repair turn in line 14, N re-does his co-completion and confirms his revised understanding congruent with H's repair.²²⁾

21) A pause which follows an NTRI can often be taken as resulting from the speaker's orientation toward furnishing the speaker of the trouble source turn the opportunity to self-repair the trouble source.

22) It is noteworthy that in his repair turn H does not provide a full explication of the trouble source but simply produces an allusive description containing an anaphoric expression (*ay kulehkey toy-n-ke* 'the child having become like that'). That H is formulating his repair turn 'allusively' can be taken as the evidence that H is also keenly oriented to achieving intersubjectivity on his part i.e., by way of indexing his trust that N is able to grasp the solution to the given problem of understanding without much of his aid. As Kim (2001) observes, this 'recipient-designed' feature of Korean turn-organizational practice is a recurrently observed design feature of repair turns in Korean other-initiated repair sequences, which tend to be built in the form of a clue or a pointer pointing to the source of the trouble rather than in the form of a full explication thereof.

6. Conclusions

As Sacks (1992) notes, one speaker's anticipatory completion of the other speaker's turn in progress with syntactically coherent parts shows one of the ways in which syntax, as a device whose various uses are oriented to and used by the participants for analyzing and producing utterances, is deployed for organizing social action. Indeed, the examination of collaborative completion in Korean conversation suggests that a display of collaborative interest in the common topic indexed by co-completion furnishes the participants with the resource for confirming or asserting intersubjectively shared understanding and for demonstrating their identity as a unit sharing the same stance vis-à-vis a certain party or a member thereof.²³⁾ Furthermore, a preliminary observation suggests that, as illustrated by the practice of gisting (see fragments (13) and (14)), co-completion done in such a way that syntactic ties with the turn being completed are not as strong tends to be interruptive rather than collaborative, which points to an intriguing feature of syntax as organizational device of social action.

While the findings seem to confirm in general the robustness of some

23) One of the conversational extracts Sacks examines contains the following, which is from the group therapy session data containing conversations among teenagers participating in a loosely structured therapy session:

Data extract (Sacks, 1992, pp. 144-145)
 1 Joe: (cough) We were in an automobile discussion.
 2 Henry: discussing the psychological motives for
 3 Mel: drag-racing in the streets

These co-produced utterances are uttered when the speakers greet a new member of the therapy group who has just been introduced to them. One of the issues that Sacks pursues in relation to this extract is how grammar is employed for the task of organizing social action. Sacks notes:

"We get, then, *a kind of extraordinary tie between syntactic possibilities and phenomena like social organization*. That is, an extremely strong way that these kids go about demonstrating that, for one, there is a group there, is their getting together to put this sentence together collaboratively. It is hard to figure out they could do that right off, in anything like as sharp a way as they picked (emphasis mine)" (1992, p. 145).

While Sacks develops a number of analytic themes from this piece of data, one of the questions he addresses is how the speakers, marked by the syntactic 'we' is employed, co-construct the sentence and convey an observable sense of 'we are a unit'. In relation to the new arrival who is being greeted by this sentence, the participants co-completion of this sentence provides the resource for grouping (old members as a unit vs. a new member) and organizing a social action (i.e., accepting a new member into the group) on the basis of the collaboratively displayed alignment.

of the generic organizational features of collaborative completion observed cross-linguistically (Lerner & Takagi, 1999), they also point to some of the ways in which various facets of the interaction-grammar interface can be further explicated from a cross-linguistic perspective.²⁴⁾ One cross-linguistically comparable feature that can be explicated through the analysis of the practice of collaborative completion is how participants treat and use each other's turn space in producing a co-completion. For instance, in Korean conversation, the extent to which a co-completing recipient can utilize the current speaker's turn in progress seems to be warrantably higher than in English. While this observation is for now based only on episodic observation, it may lead to a more refined analysis showing cross-linguistic differences in the extent to which a co-completer is allowed to the current speaker's perspective in building his/her turn. A bit of evidence indicating such a cross-linguistic difference is found in fragment (5), which is reintroduced below:

In line 4, M re-completes S's on-going turn by adding the adverbial *tto* 'again' followed by the anaphorically attuned affirmation ("(You're) right in saying that"). Note that the adverbial *tto* is retroactively tied to the

24) For the analyses of collaborative completion in English, see Lerner (1991, 1992, 1993, 1996) and Schegloff (1996). Various aspects of collaborative completion in Japanese are analyzed in Hayashi & Mori (1998) and Tanaka (2000, 2001). A comparative analysis of collaborative completion in English and Japanese is presented in Lerner and Takaesi (1999).

verb used by S in the prior turn ('spend more money'), and it alone can convey the negative message ("You don't have to spend more money"), even though in English translation the negative particle 'not' should be used along with the adverb to convey the same message. Regarding what makes the use of the adverb alone an appropriate completer in Korean, we can first note that it is preceded by an anaphoric affirmation ("(You're) right in saying *that*") which seems to function as a sort of anchor that grounds the following adverb. Second, M's adverb seems to be tied solidly to S's rhetorical question that it re-completes, presumably by virtue of the possibility that M's drawing upon or sharing the perspective being taken by S in her on-going turn. This and other relevant turn-design features need to be further analyzed in future cross-linguistic research with reference to how strongly they are allowed to draw upon the sequential ties with the prior turn and its turn space.

In conclusion, the findings suggest that a recipient's practice of collaboratively completing another's turn in progress is employed as a resource for organizing interaction and social action. Most saliently, it lends itself to the task of performing various subtle social action such as blaming, criticizing, griping, or sympathizing by way of offering the context for displaying co-aligning stance and grouping participants and referents. As noted by Sacks, the grammatical practice of collaborative completion is crucially implicated in the interactional processes by which social action is organized. An analysis of conversational discourse and grammar would greatly benefit from analyzing grammatical practices like collaborative completion as devices or resources for organizing social action, which are bound to be situated in and shaped by the sequential contexts they reflexively constitute through moment-by-moment development of talk.

References

- Antaki, C., Diaz, F., and A. F. Collins. (1996). Keeping you footing: Conversational completion in three-part sequences. *Journal of Pragmatics* 25, 151-171.
- Goodwin, C. (1995). Co-constructing meaning in conversations with an aphasic man. *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 28(3), 233-260.

- Goodwin, C. and M. Goodwin. (1987). Concurrent operation on talk: Notes on the interactive organization of assessments. *IPrA Papers in Pragmatics* 1, 1-54.
- Hayashi, M. and J. Mori. (1998). Co-construction in Japanese revisited: We do finish each others sentences. In N. M. Akatsuka, H. Hoji, S. Iwasaki, and S.-O. Sohn, eds., *Japanese/Korean Linguistics*, Vol. 7 (pp. 77-93). CSLI, Stanford University.
- Heritage, J. (1984). *Garfinkel and Ethnomethodology*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Jacoby, S. and E. Ochs. (1995). Co-construction: An introduction. *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 28(3), 171-183.
- Kim, K.-H. (1993). Other-initiated repairs in Korean conversation as interactional resources. In S.-J. Choi, ed., *Japanese/Korean Linguistics Vol. 3* (pp. 3-18). CSLI, Stanford University.
- Kim, K.-H. (1999). Phrasal unit boundaries and organization of turns and sequences in Korean conversation. *Human Studies* 22, 425-446.
- Kim, K.-H. (2001). Confirming intersubjectivity through retroactive elaboration: Organization of phrasal units in other-initiated repair sequences in Korean conversation, In M. Selting and E. Couper-Kuhlen, eds., *Studies in Interactional Linguistics* (pp. 345-372). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Kim, K.-H. and K.-H. Suh. (1994). An interactional account of *nikka* in Korean conversation. In S. Iwasaki, T. Ono, H. Tao, and H.-S. Lee, eds., *Santa Barbara Papers in Linguistics 5: East Asian Linguistics* (pp. 101-122). Department of Linguistics, University of California, Santa Barbara.
- Kim, K.-H. and K.-H. Suh. (1998). Gendered practice in Korean conversation: Assessment, repair, and collaborative completion. In B.-S. Park and James H.-S. Yoon, eds., *Selected Papers from the 1988 International Conference on Korean Linguistics* (pp. 781-797). ICKL.
- Kim, K.-H and K.-H. Suh. (2002). Demonstratives as prospective indexicals: *ku* and *ce* in Korean conversation, In N. M. Akatsuka and S. Strauss, eds., *Japanese/Korean Linguistics Vol. 10* (pp. 192-205). CSLI, Stanford University.
- Lerner, G. H. (1991). On the syntax of sentences-in-progress. *Language in Society* 20, 441-458.
- Lerner, G. H. (1992). Assisted storytelling: Deploying shared knowledge as a practical matter. *Qualitative Sociology* 15(3), 247-271.

- Lerner, G. H. (1993). Collectivities in action: Establishing the relevance of conjoined participation in conversation. *Text* 13(2), 213-245.
- Lerner, G. H. (1996). On the semi-permeable character of grammatical units in conversation: conditional entry into the turn space of another speaker. In E. Ochs, E. A. Schegloff, and S. A. Thompson, eds., *Interaction and Grammar* (pp. 238-276). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lerner, G. H. and T. Takagi. (1999). On the place of linguistic resources in the organization of talk-in-interaction: A co-investigation of English and Japanese grammatical practices. *Journal of Pragmatics* 31, 49-75.
- Levinson, S. C. (1988). Putting linguistics on a proper footing: Explorations in Goffman's concepts of participation. In P. Drew and A. Wootton, eds., *Erving Goffman: Exploring the Interaction Order* (pp. 161-227). Oxford: Polity Press.
- Sacks, H. (1992). *Lectures on Conversation, Vol. 1*, Oxford: Blackwell.
- Sacks, H., E. A. Schegloff, and G. Jefferson. (1974). A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation. *Language* 50, 696-735.
- Schegloff, E. A. (1996). Turn organization: One direction for inquiry into grammar and interaction. In E. Ochs, E. A. Schegloff and S. A. Thompson, eds., *Interaction and Grammar* (pp. 52-133). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Schegloff, E. A. (1997). Practices and actions: Boundary cases of other-initiated repair. *Discourse Processes* 23, 499-545.
- Schegloff, E. A., G. Jefferson, and H. Sacks. (1977). The preference for self-correction in the organization of repair in conversation. *Language* 53, 361-382.
- Tanaka, H. (2000). Turn projection in Japanese talk-in-Interaction. *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 33(1), 1-38.
- Tanaka, H. (2001). Adverbials for turn projection in Japanese: Toward a demystification of the "telepathic" mode of communication. *Language in Society* 30, 559-587.
- Tylor, C. E. (1995). "You think it was a fight?": Co-constructing (the struggle for) meaning, face, and family in everyday narrative activity. *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 28(3), 283-317.

Kyu-hyun Kim
School of English
Kyung Hee University
1 Hoegi-dong, Dongdaemun-gu
Seoul 130-701, Korea
E-mail: khkim@khu.ac.kr

Received: Dec. 1, 2002

Revised version received: Feb. 18, 2003

Accepted: Feb. 24, 2003