

An Analysis of Korean Sentence-Ending Suffixes in Caregiver-Child Interaction*

Kyu-hyun Kim
(Kyung Hee University)

Kyung-Hee Suh
(Hankuk University of Foreign Studies)

Kim, Kyu-hyun and Suh, Kyung-Hee. (2004). An analysis of Korean sentence-ending suffixes in caregiver-child interaction. *Language Research* 40(4), 923-950.

In this paper, we analyze Korean sentence-ending suffixes (SEs) that are frequently used by the caregiver in caregiver-child interaction. Three SEs that are most frequently found in the data examined, *-ci* and its related form *-cianha*, and *-ney*, are analyzed in comparison with the 'unmarked' SE *-a/e*. Also included in the analysis are *-tela* and *-(u)lkka*, which are SEs often employed by the caregiver putatively as markers of self-inquiry. In caregiver-child interaction, the caregiver's use of *-ci/-cianha* indexes his/her trust that the child shares his/her commitment. *-Ney* is used when the caregiver formulates an explanation as something that s/he has fortuitously noticed. The caregiver's use of *-ci/-cianha* and *-ney* indexes an orientation toward downgrading his/her role as the expert vis-à-vis the child and positioning the child as a partner/facilitator co-participating in the given pedagogical activity, i.e., by evoking a shared domain of knowledge and experience (with *-ci/-cianha*) or by formulating a pedagogically motivated observation as something that the child can easily notice (with *-ney*). Indexing of a lapse in memory or lack of knowledge through the use of such SEs as *-tela* and *-(u)lkka* is also motivated toward designing the on-going pedagogical activity as a joint one in which the child is invited to co-participate as a competent partner. The tendency of *-a/e* utterances to be constitutive of a corrective action embedded in a side sequence is noted, which indexes the caregiver's orientation toward organizing pedagogical activities as a collaborative, joint practice by way of minimizing the extent to which the child's incompetence is highlighted.

Key words: sentence-ending suffixes, caregiver-child interaction, pedagogical activities, stance markers

*This work was supported by Kyung Hee University Research Grant in 2004. An earlier version of this paper was presented at the 8th International Pragmatics Conference held in

1. Introduction

In this article, we analyze the functions of the Korean sentence-ending suffixes (hereafter SESs) in caregiver-child interaction. Focusing on the SESs that are extensively used by a caregiver in organizing interaction with a child, we examine various aspects of the contexts in which these suffixes are used as stance markers. Various interactional and pedagogical functions they serve are analyzed with reference to their potential bearing upon the structure of pedagogical discourse and implications for language socialization.

The SESs that we will focus on in this article include *-ci* and its related form *-cianha*, and *-ney*, which are massively used in caregiver-child interaction. Whenever relevant, these suffixes are compared with the unmarked informal ending *-a/e*, and their discourse-organizational and interactional management functions are analyzed in terms of their bearing upon the inherently asymmetrical structure of caregiver-child interaction. Other SESs such as *-tela* and *-(u)lkka*, another group of SESs predominantly used by caregivers, are also examined in the context of analyzing the ways in which the use of these SESs contributes to organizing pedagogical activities.

As noted in Choi (1995) and H. S. Lee (1993, 1999), the meanings and functions of the Korean SESs in discourse often relate to the distinction between old and new knowledge and various assumptions held by the speaker about the listener's background knowledge:

<u>Form</u>	<u>Meaning¹⁾</u>
<i>-a/e</i> (Informal Ending) ²⁾	assimilated information, unmarked form
<i>-ci/-cianha</i> (Committal)	certainty of proposition, shared information
<i>-ney</i> (Factual Realization)	factual information immediately perceived
<i>-tela</i> (Retrieval Solicitor)	information not retrieved from memory

Toronto, Canada, in July, 2003. We would like to thank Christine Holten, Jan Frodesen, Junko Mori, Hyo Sang Lee, Ki-gap Lee, and Jae-Il Kwon for their insightful comments on the earlier draft. We are also grateful to three anonymous reviewers for their thoughtful suggestions.

1) The meanings of *-a/e*, *-ci/-cianha*, and *-ney* have been adapted from Choi (1995: 171) and H. S. Lee (1993).

2) The informal ending marker has two variants, which are conditioned by the vowel of the verb stem.

(used with a WH-word)
 -(u)lkka (Suggestive/Inquiry) information being collaboratively
 inquired into and searched in question

The *-a/e* informal ending is the unmarked form. This suffix packages the information as ‘assimilated,’ i.e., the information that has been assimilated to the speaker’s knowledge (Choi 1995). Statements marked by this suffix serve an information-giving function, often containing information that is not shared by the hearer (example: *i-ken sakwa-i-a*. ‘This is an apple.’). In the context of adult-child interaction, this feature of *-a/e*-marked statements is often constitutive of the asymmetrical structure of pedagogical activities (cf. Mehan 1979).

The other forms of SES presented above, *-ci/-cianha*,³⁾ *-ney*, *-tela*, and *-(u)lkka*, are of particular interest in the instructional setting of caregiver-child interaction. Unlike the unmarked informal ending form *-a/e*, they add a particular modal meaning to the proposition. For example, the suffix *-ci* has a range of diverse but interrelated meanings marking the speaker’s commitment to the truth of the proposition (H. S. Lee 1999, K. Lee 1993). In many contexts, this meaning is displayed in such a way that the hearer’s confirmation is elicited or assumed by the speaker, who thereby indexes his/her trust that the hearer shares the commitment (example: *i-ken sakwa-ci*. ‘This is an apple, isn’t it?’).

In a similar vein, *-cianha* (*ci*-NEG-IE), which is a grammaticalized form containing *-ci* combined with the negative particle *anh* and the informal ending suffix *-a*, also marks the information as shared and agreed to by the hearer. Compared with *-ci*, *-cianha* marks the speaker’s commitment in a more assertive way, more strongly prodding the hearer to confirm that commitment (example: *i-ken sakwa-cianha*. ‘(You must know this.) This is an apple, isn’t it?’). As Choi (1995) notes, *-cianha* often expresses a stronger commitment to the truth of the proposition than *-ci*, conveying a sense that the speaker’s commitment is asserted as ‘unproblematically’ or ‘non-challengeably’ shared by the hearer, and implying a preemptive rebuke if s/he does not share the speaker’s commitment (Kawanishi 1994, Suh 2001).

3) Note that *-cianha* is the suffix *-ci* followed by the negative marker *anh* and the informal ending *-a*. In spite of substantial differences between *-ci* and *-cianha*, we follow Choi’s (1995) categorization in which these two suffixes are subsumed into the same category of markers signaling the speaker’s commitment, as we focus on their common features marking information shared or to be shared.

For its part, the suffix *-ney*, which is termed a marker of 'factual realization' (H. S. Lee 1993), is used to mark factual information that has been immediately perceived (example: *i-ken sakwa-ney*. "(I've just noticed) this is an apple."). By using *-ney*, the speaker presents the proposition as an observation that s/he has just made at the current moment (Chang 1985). As we will discuss below, this feature of *-ney* has an important bearing upon the organization of pedagogical activities in terms of the way new information is formulated and brought to the child's attention, i.e., as something that has been fortuitously noticed by the caregiver and thus as something that can be easily grasped by the child as well (Kim 2004).

The suffix *-tela*, which contains the retrospective marker *-te*, is used in a WH-question indexing the speaker's inability to retrieve information from his/her memory. It gives a sense that the speaker is engaging in a search for a piece of information and as a contextual message may solicit the listener's help in retrieving it (example: *i-ke-nun mwusun kulcca-tela?* "What is this letter? (I can't recall what it is)."). In a similar vein, the suffix *-(u)lkka*,⁴ when employed in a WH-question, is used for initiating an inquiry that engages the child in a joint pursuit of an answer (example: *i-key mwe-ikka?* "What would this be? (Let's figure it out).").

In previous research, these and other SESs have often been investigated from a cognitively oriented perspective, mainly in terms of how they are used to indicate the speaker's commitment to the proposition that the speaker makes in his/her inner state of mind or to signal its informational status (e.g., old vs. new knowledge) (Chang 1985, Choi 1995, H. S. Lee 1993, K. Lee 1993). While drawing upon the previous research, we are going to concern ourselves mainly with the interactional aspects of SESs as stance markers, examining the ways in which the speaker's use of SESs to display his/her cognitive and affective stance is interactionally motivated and sequentially occasioned (cf. Cook 1992).

The main source of the data used for the present study is an audio taped informal home tutoring session between a mother and her three-year-old girl (*M & J*). The interaction centers around literacy instruction in which the mother teaches her daughter how to read Korean words presented in a picture book. We have also used clips from videotaped kindergarten classroom data (*Kindergarten Class*), where a female and a male teachers

4) When the suffix is attached to a verb stem that ends with a consonant, the vowel *u* is inserted.

interact with five-year-old preschoolers. Also included are segments of overheard adult-child conversations written down on the spot where the interaction took place.

In the following sections, each of these particles is examined in the context of caregiver-child interaction. We will analyze their functions by looking at how caregiver uses them in formulating questions, explanations, directives, or evaluations in pedagogical contexts. In the next section, we first turn to *-ci/-cianha*.

2. Suffixes *-ci* and *-cianha*: Negotiation of Shared Ground

In caregiver-child interaction that is pedagogically motivated, the suffix *-ci*, along with its related form *-cianha*, is used extensively by caregivers who want to elicit an expected response from a child (Suh 2001).⁵⁾ Consider fragment (1), where the mother (M) uses *-ci* and *-cianha* in posing a question to her 3 year old daughter, Jiyoung (J), during a tutoring session where the child is taught to identify Korean words and letters.⁶⁾

5) In the portion of the mother-child tutoring session data we are focusing on, which lasts approximately 12 minutes, we found as many as 35 *ci*-utterances (23 *-ci*'s and 12 *-cianha*'s).

6) The transcription notation used for this paper was adapted from Sacks, Schegloff, & Jefferson (1974):

// Interruption	=	Contiguous utterances	--	Cut-off
. Falling intonation	,	Continuing intonation	?	Rising intonation
: Sound stretch	[]	Simultaneous utterances	°	Low tone
(.) Micro-pause	()	Words unclear	(())	Transcriber's remarks
(00)		Intervals between utterances		

In transcribing the data, we used the Yale system, and for morpheme-by-morpheme glosses, the following abbreviations are used:

ATTR: attributive	COMM: committal	COND: conditional
CONN: connective	FR: factual realization	HR SAY: hearsay
IE: informal ending	INQ: inquiry	INSTR: instrumental
LOC: locative	MOD: modal	NOM: nominative
NOML: nominalization	NECESS: necessity	POL: politeness
PST: past	RS: retrieval solicitor	TOP: topic
VOC: vocative		

(1) (M & J)

104 M: 'si:kyey:.'

'sikyey (watch)'

((a couple of turns omitted))

->107 M: *i -key mwe-ci?*=
this-thing:NOM what-COMM

108 J: =*kyey*.'

'kyey'

->109 M: *kuleh -ci:: 'chungkyey' ha -l -ttay-*
like that-COMM' chungkyey (stairs)' say-ATTR-when-

110 *to 'kyey' cca -ka nao -ney::, 'sikyey'*

also 'kyey' letter-NOM come out-FR 'sikyey (watch)'

111 *ha -l -ttay -to 'kyey' cca -ka nao-*

say-ATTR-when-also 'kyey' letter-NOM come out-

->112 *ko ttokkatun kulssi (kac-kwu) iss -cianha:*
CONN same letter have-CONN exist-COMM

->113 *kuh -ci:: (.) kulayse (.) .h 'si: kyey:' ilehkey*
like that-COMM so 'sikyey (watch)' like this

->114 *toy -nun -ke -ci::*
become-ATTR-NOML-COMM

[English version]

104 M: 'sikyey (watch).'

((a couple of turns omitted))

->107 M: **What's this?**=

108 J: =It's 'kye.'

->109-114 M: **That's right!** (I see) the letter 'kyey' is also used when you say 'chung-kyey (stairs).' And the letter 'kyey' is also used when you say 'si-kyey (watch).' **They have the same letter, don't they? Isn't that right?** (.) So, (.) .h **it becomes 'si-kyey (watch).'**

In line 107, the mother points to a Korean letter in the picture book and asks J to identify the Korean letter ("What is this?"). Notice that she is using the committal marker *-ci* in her question. This form of question contrasts with a corresponding one ending in the informal ending suffix *-a* (*i-key mwe-i-a* "What's this?"). The latter would be recognized as a genuine information-seeking question, one signaling that the speaker does

not know the answer⁷⁾ (see Section 5). In the case of the *ci*-utterance in (1), in contrast, the mother conveys the sense that she has an answer in mind and expects her child to come up with it; she indexes her expectation that her daughter will be able to come up with the expected answer and thus successfully meet her expectation and confirm the shared ground.⁸⁾ This ‘collusive’ stance indexed by her *ci*-marked question is not overtly expressed but is signaled by *-ci* in a highly subtle way.

In (1), the mother’s expectation is immediately met with the child’s immediate uptake, with her responsive turn being latched onto the mother’s question (line 108). The child’s successful grasp of the expected answer is responded to by the mother’s another *ci*-utterance in line 109 (*kuleh-ci* ‘That’s right’), by which the mother emphatically evaluates the child’s answer as confirming her expectation.

After confirming J’s answer with a *ci*-utterance, the mother moves on to introduce a new piece of information (lines 109-110) based on J’s answer, an observation that the letter *kye*, which J has correctly identified in the word *si-kye* (line 108), is also found in another word (*chung-kye*).⁹⁾ This explanation is followed by a more explicit version in lines 110-112, which is marked by *-cianha*, a form that conveys a stronger sense of presupposition about a shared domain. By using *-cianha*, she makes it more explicit that the new explanation which she has just offered is something that her daughter can grasp on the basis of shared grounds

7) The caregiver’s question marked by the informal ending *-a/e* (e.g., *i-key mwe-ya?* ‘What is this?’) is often used in the context in which the target referent is formulated as something the child is more familiar with than the caregiver is, especially when the caregiver shows interest in an object being controlled or created by the child.

8) It is not the case that *ci*-utterances always presuppose the speaker’s knowledge of the matter under discussion. In other contexts, *-ci* may be used in a genuine information-seeking question just as the informal ending *-a/e* is, or in a statement in which the speaker’s assertive stance is conveyed (H. S. Lee 1999). However, even in such a context, the use of *-ci* indexes the speaker’s belief that the interlocutor knows (or should know) the answer and that a successful retrieval of the answer by the interlocutor will recover their shared domain of knowledge. That the use of *-ci* points to and is constitutive of a retrievable domain of shared knowledge is evidenced by the fact that *ci*-marked questions are often situated in the context where the speaker is hearably in a temporary lapse in retrieving the answer, often with a weak sense in which the hearer’s involvement is solicited. Apparently, various uses of *-ci* in different types of utterances, affiliated with distinct prosodic contours, convey an array of subtle contextual messages, the analysis of which is beyond the scope of this article (H. S. Lee 1999).

9) Note that this utterance is marked by *-ney*, whose interactional import will be addressed in Section 3.

("They have the same letter, don't they?").¹⁰⁾ That is, the mother's use of *-cianha* gives a sense in which she prompts her daughter toward understanding her explanation by way of formulating the information as something already shared by the child. The mother then adds two additional *ci*-utterances by which she further highlights the shared nature of her explanation.

As Suh (2001) observes, the caregiver's use of *-ci* in a pedagogically motivated question indexes his/her intersubjective commitment that the child will be able to come up with the expected answer and confirm the shared ground.¹¹⁾ The caregiver's display of the 'intersubjective' trust that his/her commitment is also shared by the child sequentially leads the child to 'complete the picture' by finding ways to display his/her shared commitment and confirm the caregiver's expectation. As shown in fragment (1), the child's successful grasp of the expected answer is often met with the caregiver's repeated use of a series of *ci*-utterance that reconfirm the correctness of the answer and also the mutually shared nature of the given information. Through this practice, the child is led to engage in pedagogical activities in such a way that she is prodded to identify a domain of information which is presented as being mutually shared. An important interactional implication of this practice is that the child is positioned as someone who shares a lot with the caregiver, rather than as a complete novice. A learning process is thus constituted as the one through which

10) Compared with *-ci*, *-cianha* conveys a stronger sense in which the hearer is more explicitly pressured into sharing the speaker's commitment and is rebuked for having not reciprocated the speaker's expectation (Kawanishi 1994, Suh 2001). The combination of *-ci* with the negative particle *anh* and the informal ending *-a* increases its rhetorical force as the speaker not only marks his/her commitment to the truth of the proposition but assumes that the hearer will naturally share the given commitment to the proposition and its action upshot, with the implication that the hearer's not sharing it is to be treated as something problematic. Presumably for the greater rhetorical force with which sharedness of information is presupposed, *-cianha* is often used in a context where the speaker makes his/her previously indirect move more explicit in the face of the hearer's not producing the expected response. Actually, the mother's use of *-cianha* in fragment (1) in elaborating her explanation (i.e., the same letter is present in the two different words that they have just reviewed) may have been motivated to further highlight the shared nature of the information being given in the face of the lack of uptake on the part of the child or any signs suggestive of the child's having a difficulty understanding her explanation.

11) It is important to note that our claim about the suffix *-ci* indexing a speaker's belief that the hearer shares the given information does not hinge upon whether the participants actually share that information. Rather, we propose that the speaker, by virtue of using *-ci*, treats the given information as shared, regardless of whether the hearer actually shares the information or not (Edwards 1999).

the child is guided into identifying and (re)confirming areas of shared experience and knowledge.

The function of *-ci* indexing the speaker's trust about the hearer sharing his/her commitment is also observed in contexts where the caregiver gives a directive to or rebukes a child for disciplinary purposes. Consider the following utterances produced by teachers in a kindergarten class:

(2) (Kindergarten Class)

- (a) *kim hay-cin, cikum chengso-ha-nun sikan-i -ci -yo?*
 Kim Hay-jin now cleaning-do-ATTR time-COP-COMM-POL
Kim Hay-jin, now is the time to clean, right?
- (b) *i -ke manci-myen an toy-keyss-ci -yo?*
 this-thing touch-COND NEG OK-MOD-COMM-POL
You're not supposed to touch this, right?
- (c) *cal mos hayss -ci yeki.*
 well not:able do:PST-COMM here
You didn't do a good job here, right?
- (d) *isangha-ci -yo? ku -ci -yo?*
 strange-COMM-POL that-COMM-POL
It's strange, isn't it?

These utterances are used in the context in which the caregiver, finding a potentially problematic behavior of a child, gives a directive addressing the behavior by evoking the shared domain of knowledge and experience. By formulating his/her remarks with *-ci*, the caregiver reminds the child that the child's on-going behavior is a violation of a code, which is evoked as something that is mutually shared by the child.

As Choi (1995) and Suh (2001) point out, the caregiver's displayed orientation toward having a mutually shared domain confirmed and reconfirmed is often reciprocated by the child who responds to their caregiver's question or explanation with a *ci*-utterance of their own, repeating what the caregiver has just said and using it as the resource to elicit an affirmative response from the caregiver. Consider fragment (3), which has been excerpted from Choi (1995):

(3) PL (1;11) (Excerpted from Choi (1995))

((PL pointing to Grandmothers hairpin))

- 1 PL: *ike hammwuni kke -ya?*
 this grandma thing-IE
 ->2 GM: *ung, hammwuni kke -ya.*
 yes grandma thing-IE
 ->3 PL: *hammwuni kke -ci?*
 grandma thing-COMM
 4 GM: *ung, hammwuni kke -ci.*
 yes, grandma thing-COMM

[English version]

((PL pointing to Grandmothers hairpin))

- 1 PL: Is this Grandma's?
 ->2 GM: **Yes, it's Grandma's.**
 ->3 PL: **It's Grandma's, isn't it?**
 4 GM: Yes, it's Grandma's.

Note that the child, who is one-year and eleven-month old, is repeating her grandmother's utterance as if it were her own observation.

As Suh (2001) observes, this practice strongly suggests that young children are also oriented toward confirming shared ground in interacting with their caregiver. In fact, it is sometimes observed that older children also use *-ci* in making this kind of 'superfluous' confirmation requests, which crucially draw upon the implied meaning of the adult's utterance. Consider fragment (4), where a 12 year-old boy interacts with his grandmother:

(4) (Overheard Conversation)

- 1 Grandmother: *mokyokha -n taum-ey -nun mwun*
 take a bath-ATTR next-LOC-TOP door
 2 *yel -e -twu -e. ttuken mwul-lo*
 open-CONN-leave-IE hot water-INSTR
 3 *mokyokha -n taum-ey -nun mwun*
 take a bath-ATTR next-LOC -TOP door
 4 *yel -e -noh -aya -toy-ntay.*
 open-CONN-leave-NECESS-OK-HRSAY
 5 Child: *chagawun mwul-lo ha-myen kwaynchanh*
 cold water-INSTR do-COND all right

- >6 -*ci* -*yo*,
 -COMM-POL
- 7 Grandmother: *ung*.
 yes

[English version]

- 1-4 Grandmother: Be sure to leave the bathroom door open. (They say) we should leave the door open after we take a hot bath.
- >5-6 Child: **If we take a cold bath, it's OK, right?** (=We don't have to leave the door open, right?)
- 7 Grandmother: Yes.

Note in the child's turn that he is using *-ci* to formulate a confirmation request which safely targets the implicature of the preceding utterance of his grandmother, i.e., one does not have to leave the door open after taking a cold bath. This fragment shows that older children may also be oriented toward enlisting an affirmative response from the caregiver and pursue a shared stance, often as a way of dealing with the adult's directive or rebuke.

While this practice by the child may seriously challenge discourse coherence, because there is no point having the caregiver confirm a proposition that has been proposed by the caregiver herself in the first place, we find that the caregiver tends to be collaborative in confirming the proposition being reiterated by the child. This practice, implicitly supported by the caregiver, furnishes the child with the opportunity to practice interactive skills in negotiating shared knowledge with the interlocutor while being socialized into cherishing the mutually affirmative and collusive relationship. As Tomasello (1999) proposes, this communicative practice involving the use and the understanding of what *-ci/-cianha* organizes in caregiver-child interaction can be taken as being motivated as part of the process through which child is guided to learn to share the adult's perspective and participate in the joint attentional scenes as the social-cognitive grounding of language acquisition.

Overall, the preceding observations suggest that, in caregiver-child interaction, the caregiver's massive use of *-ci/-cianha* invokes a collusive sense of sharing the same stance and interactively create a co-oriented context that would facilitate the child's understanding of the communicative intentions of the adult. The child is thus constituted as a partner/facilitator sharing the same experience and knowledge, whose confirmation is actively

solicited and highly valued by the caregiver. In this sense, we can say that *-ci/-cianha* provides the caregiver with the resource for 'upgrading' the status of the child as a partner of equal status (often with the sense of 'downgrading' the caregiver's own status), i.e., by formulating the targeted information as something shared by the child, rather than some expert knowledge that exclusively belongs to the caregiver.¹²⁾ Given the inherent asymmetrical structure of pedagogical interactions, the caregiver's frequent use of *-ci/-cianha* evidences his/her orientation toward 'masking' the asymmetrical distribution of information and knowledge in interacting with the child learner.

3. Suffix *-ney*: Immediate Observation as a Basis of Action

Another SES that caregivers use predominantly when speaking to a child is *-ney*, which H. S. Lee (1993) calls a marker of *factual realization*. *-Ney* expresses newly perceived information that is factual in the sense that the information is not based on some evidence or inference, with its factuality being assumed by the speaker immediately at the moment of its perception (Chang 1985). Consider fragment (5), which has been excerpted from the mother-child conversation overheard at a museum:

(5) (Overheard Conversation)

((Mother to her young daughter))

1 Mother: *cakun sakakhyeng-kwa khun sakakhyeng-i*
small rectangular-with large rectangular-NOM

2 *moi -e -iss -ney::,*
get together-CONN-exist-FR

(I see) there are small rectangular shapes and large rectangular shapes.

12) It is to be noted that while it is the shared or sharable nature of the information that is indexed by *-ci* or *-cianha*, a crucial feature of these SESs is that they have the interactional import of 'prodding' the interlocutor to get at and retrieve the information at issue. That is, what is important in the use of these SESs is for the speaker to have the interlocutor acknowledge and/or locate the information that is being asserted to be shared, rather than to simply assert that the information is actually shared. It is probably due to this feature associated with the action of prodding (or rebuking in some contexts) that we often find only a weak sense in which *-ci* and *-cianha* serve to upgrade the child's status in caregiver-child interactions. Furthermore, as we have noted above (see footnote (3)), even though we have treated *-ci* and *-cianha* as the single category of SES, they are clearly distinct in the extent to which the interlocutor is prodded to locate the information at issue.

In this utterance, the mother uses *-ney* as she describes the art object to her young girl. Here she presents the description as something that she has just perceived.

In pedagogical contexts, the caregiver frequently uses *-ney* in an explanation.¹³ Consider fragment (1) again, which was examined in the preceding section for the analysis of *-ci*. Recall that in this fragment the mother is explaining that the letter *kyey* is found in two different words. In her explanation she uses *-ney*, thus presenting the information as something she has just noticed (lines 109-110):

(1) (M & J)

104 M: 'si:kyey.'

'sikyey (watch)'

((a couple of turns omitted))

107 M: *i -key mwe-ci?*=

this-thing:NOM what-COMM

108 J: =*'kyey.'*

'kyey'

109 M: *kuleh -ci:: 'chungkyey' ha -l -ttay-*

like that-COMM' chungkyey (stairs)' say-ATTR-when-

-110 *to 'kyey' cca -ka nao -ney::, 'sikyey'*
also 'kyey' letter-NOM come out-FR 'sikyey (watch)'

111 *ha -l -ttay -to 'kyey' cca -ka nao-*

say-ATTR-when-also 'kyey' letter-NOM come out-

112 *ko ttokkatun kulssi (kac-kwu) iss -cianha:*

CONN same letter have-CONN exist-COMM

113 *kuh -ci:: (.) kulayse (.) .h 'si: kyey:' ilehkey*

like that-COMM so 'sikyey (watch)' like this

114 *toy -nun -ke -ci::*

become-ATTR-NOML-COMM

[English version]

104 M: 'sikyey (watch).'

((a couple of turns omitted))

107 M: What's this?=

13) For instance, in the portion of the mother-child tutoring session data that lasts about 12 minutes, *-ney* was used 11 times.

- 108 J: =It's 'kye.'
- >109-114 M: That's right! **(I see) the letter 'kyey' is also used when you say 'chung-kyey (stairs).'** And the letter 'kyey' is also used when you say 'si-kyey (watch).' They have the same letter, don't they? Isn't that right? (.) So, (.) .h it becomes 'si-kyey (watch).'

Here, the mother uses *-ney* as she relates the child's answer (line 108) to other 'pedagogically relevant' information, i.e., the observation that the same letter is found in two words: *si-kye* and *chung-kye*.¹⁴⁾ By formulating her explanation with *-ney*, the mother shows that she is presenting the information as something that has been fortuitously noticed and that is easily accessible to the child as well.¹⁵⁾

The feature of *-ney* that formulates an explanation as something that can be immediately co-oriented to by the child can be observed if we replace *-ney* with the neutral informal ending *-a/e*. If we replace *-ney* in the *ney*-utterance with *-a/e* in fragment (1), we find the import of the utterance significantly changed; it would function as an information-giving sentence, an utterance in which the speaker shows that the information is part of his or her own knowledge that the child presumably cannot access immediately. The information at issue would thus be constituted as something that requires some work on the part of the child in order for her to grasp it.

It is important to note, in this respect, that the caregiver's frequent use of *-ney* in the context of offering explanations constitutes her as an 'observer,' a person who observes aspects of the current event or the state in the immediate environment and brings them to the attention of the

14) One of the most salient features of the interaction we find in the mother-child tutoring session data is that, throughout the interaction, the modeling of the sound by the mother formulated in phrasal forms is done in a slow, staccato fashion, accompanied by loud volume, high pitch, and vowel lengthening. Often, the interaction gives a sense of a ritualistic event characterized by an exaggerated overtone and a syllable-timed emphasis on sounds with a distinctive staccato rhythm. Based on the syllable-timed rhythm, this modeling activity is organized as a practice highlighting the sound of a syllable which corresponds to a single letter.

15) Again, as we noted in footnote (11) in relation to the use of *-ci*, the issue is not whether the caregiver's information marked by *-ney* is indeed something that can be easily understood by the child. What is at issue is that, by using *-ney*, the caregiver TREATS the information at hand as something that can be immediately noticed and easily understood by the child (cf. Edwards 1999).

child. By using *-ney*, the caregiver displays her orientation toward downgrading her position from that of expert vis-à-vis the child positioned as the novice. In this way, the child is positioned as a competent partner/facilitator who can grasp and share the given explanation by just shifting her attention to it in collaboration with the caregiver.

The suffix *-ney* is also frequently used when the caregiver performs a variety of speech acts such as rebuking, complimenting, or teasing a child (Kim & Suh 2002). Fragment (6) shows a context where the teacher gives a directive to a child by using *-ney* in a kindergarten classroom. This conversation takes place after class, when children are cleaning the classroom and putting toys back in their original place:

(6) (Kindergarten Class)

->1 T: *swuhan-i -kke kkwak cha-ss -ney;*
 Suhan -VOC-thing:NOM chock-full filled-PST-FR

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

(I see) Suhan's (your) basket is full. Let's put it over there now, Suhan.

((after several turns))

->9 T: *swuhan-i -kke -n kkwak cha-ss -ney;*
 Suhan -VOC-thing-TOP chock-full filled-PST-FR

10 *icey oli-e -noh -umyen toy-keyss-e;*
 now lift-CONN-place-COND OK-MOD-IE

(I see) Suhan's (your) basket is full. I think you should put it over there.

In lines 1 and 2, the teacher first makes an observation with *-ney* that the child's basket is full and makes a suggestion that he put it back in its place. As the boy ignores her directive and keeps pushing the basket around, the teacher repeats her observation (lines 9-10), again formulated with *-ney*. The teacher, by using *-ney*, repeatedly brings to the attention of the child an aspect of the current state of affairs the child is involved in, i.e., the child's basket being full of toys, which is formulated as an event just recently perceived. This practice constitutes a highly indirect way of giving a directive that enlists the interlocutor's collaborative work in executing the desired action (Kim 2004). Note in both cases (lines 1-2 and lines 9-10) that the *ney*-utterance is followed by a more direct form of suggestion.

This interactional function of *-ney* is also observed when it is used in a compliment. The following utterances are produced in the context in which the teacher compliments students in a kindergarten class:

(7) (Kindergarten Class)

(a) *sulki -pan -un kongpwu-to yelsimhi ha-ney;*,
wisdom-class-TOP study -also hard do-FR

(I see) you guys in the WISDOM class are studying hard as well!

(b) *e cwunha-twu cal ha-ney-yo;*,
DM Junha -also well do-FR-POL

(I see) Junha (you) is doing well too.

The use of *-ney* in this context gives the sense that the caregiver has just noticed what the children have been doing, and offers a positive assessment thereof. The caregiver thus orients them to an aspect of what they have been performing as something that can be assessed positively and leads them to sustain (or hopefully intensify or upgrade) the level of performance.

As in the previous fragments showing cases where the caregiver uses *-ney* in offering explanations to the child, *ney*-utterances in (6) and (7) show that the caregiver demonstrably places herself in the position of an ‘observer,’ who orients the child to a certain import of the current event in which the children are participating. As a result, the use of *-ney* formulates the caregiver’s action, e.g., giving a directive or complimenting, as being based on an immediate observation made on-the-spot, thus presenting an aspect of the child’s own act or event in-progress as something that can also be easily observed, corrected, terminated, appreciated, or intensified by the child.

This feature of *-ney* seems to serve a very useful pedagogical function, i.e., bringing to the attention of the hearer an aspect of the current event as some special matter to be subsequently addressed by the child, e.g., continued with stronger motivation (as in complimenting/making positive observations) or terminated (as in directive-giving/making negative observations) (cf. Schegloff 2001). That is, the caregiver uses *-ney* in formulating the upshot of the observed event the child is currently engaging in as an activity that can be ‘co-assessed’ by the child (cf. Kim 2004). The use of *-ney* thus helps the caregiver to enact his/her potentially face-impinging

(e.g., either face-threatening or face-enhancing) act in a distanced, oblique fashion by way of having the child take the initiative in designing the next response. If the child subsequently comes out with a response aligned with the upshot of the caregiver's *ney*-marked observation/assessment, they will be praised for having done so more or less 'voluntarily.' If not, the caregiver would still be able to save face because all she did was simply offer an observation that has been fortuitously made on the spot. In this respect, part of the language socialization process Korean children experience is becoming attuned to and appreciative of the caregiver's resourcefully 'motivated' *ney*-marked observations, and learning to respond in a way that displays a co-aligned stance. As in the case of *-ci/-cianha*, this practice constitutes a kind of empathy training (Clancy 1986), through which Korean children are socialized into making a relevant inference interactively and acquiring a socio-culturally meaningful response pattern (cf. Ochs & Schieffelin 1984).

Overall, the preceding discussion strongly suggests that an important aspect of the Korean caregiver-child interaction in pedagogical contexts is that the caregiver designs an activity in such a way that her role as the expert is demonstrably downgraded. Massive occurrences of *-ney* in Korean caregiver-child discourse can be accounted for in terms of the ways in which caregivers formulate an explanation or observation as a fortuitously noticed event or an unexpected discovery (Lee 1993, Kim & Suh 2000). As we observed in fragment (1), *-ney* functions to enact a context for formulating a piece of pedagogical information, e.g., an explanation of matters related to literacy, as something that has just been noticed by the caregiver. By formulating the explanation as something that she has immediately observed and realized on the basis of some factual evidence, the caregiver downgrades her role as the expert and presents the information as something that can be easily noticed by the child on the spot.

4. Suffixes *-tela* and *-(u)lkka*: Soliciting Child's Involvement

Even though *-tela* and *-(u)lkka* were found much less frequently than *-ci/-cianha*,¹⁶⁾ they provide the caregiver with resources for indexing an

16) Three instances of *-tela* are found in the 12 minute-long segment of mother-child tutoring session data. No instance of *-(u)lkka* was found in the data, but an informal observation

orientation toward downgrading his/her expertise and masking the asymmetrical structure of pedagogical activities. For instance, *-tela*, when used in a WH-question, indexes the caregiver's inability to retrieve information from his/her memory, giving the sense of "I cannot recall what it is." The caregiver thus invites the child to actively participate in the projected action. Consider fragment (8):

(8) (M & J)

- > 94 M: *i-ke -nun mwusun kulssi-tela?*
 this-thing-TOP which letter -RS
 95 (0.4)
- > 96 M: *mwe-tela?*
 what-RS
 97 (1.0)
- 98 J: *sikyey.*
 sikyey (watch)
- 99 M: *kuleh -ci;;, sikye -cianha;;;*
 like that-COMM watch-COMM

[English version]

- > 94 M: **What is this letter? (=I cannot recall what this letter is.)**
 95 (0.4)
- > 96 M: **What is it? (=I cannot recall what it is.)**
 97 (1.0)
- 98 J: 'Sikyey (watch).'
- 99 M: Right! It's 'watch,' right?

Look at line 94, where the mother points at a word and asks a question formulated with *-tela*. With no response coming from the child, she produces another question, again formulated with *-tela* in line 96. The use of this particle invites the child to identify the word by way of giving a strong sense that the mother is for the moment experiencing difficulty retrieving the sought-for information from her memories and that the child is invited to aid her retrieve the information.

Another SES that is used by the caregiver in encouraging active partici-

suggests that *-(u)lkka* is frequently used by a caregiver when engaging a young child in various forms of pedagogical activities (see fragment (9)).

pation by the child is *-(u)lkka*, whose use in a question marks a weak suggestion or evokes an inquiry. In fact, an informal observation of caregiver-child interaction taking place in a variety of contexts suggests that *-(u)lkka* is used very frequently by the caregiver. Consider fragment (9). In this conversation, which took place at a museum, the mother and the child are talking in front of a piece of modern art created by the natural shapes and movements of water drops through a projector. In line 1, the child asks her mother what the object is:¹⁷⁾

(9) (Overheard Conversation)

- 1 Child: *i -key mwe-i -a?*
 this-thing:NOM what-COP-IE
- 2 (.)
- >3 Mother: *i -key mwe-lkka:?*
 this-thing:NOM what-**INQ**
- 4-7 ((Mother explains that the artwork is created by movements of water.))

[English version]

- 1 Child: What is this?
- 2 (.)
- >3 Mother: **I wonder what this is?**
- 4-7 ((Mother explains that the artwork is created by movements of water.))

In response to her child's question, the mother initially designs her response as a self inquiry marked with *-(u)lkka*, thus indexing that she does not have an answer ready. However, the import of this utterance goes beyond expressing uncertainty. Actually, this utterance constitutes a *pro forma* self inquiry; by using *-(u)lkka*, the caregiver designs her current heuristic move as a joint endeavor in which the child is implicated as a co-investigator.

This feature of *-(u)lkka* is also observed frequently in the context of classroom interaction where the teacher prompts children to volunteer a response, as shown in (10) and (11):

17) Note that the child uses the informal ending *-a* in her question in line 1 in the context of inquiring into something which she does not know but her interlocutor is believed to know (see Section 1).

(10) (Kindergarten Class)

T: *ca nwu -ka palphyo -hay po-**lkka**-yo?*
 now who-NOM presentation-do:CONN see-INQ-POL

Now, who is going to make a presentation?

(11) (Kindergarten Class)

1 T: *kulemyen ciyeng -i -nun myet -pen-ccay*
 then Jiyoung-VOC-TOP how:many-CL-CL

-->2 *iss-nun haksayng-i -**lkka**-yo?*
 exist-ATTR student -COP-INQ-POL

3 S: *sey-pen-ccay.*
 three-CL-CL

[English version]

-->1-2 T: **Then in which (nth) place is Jiyoung?**

3 S: Third row (from the first).

As in the case of other SESs like *-ci*, *-ney*, and *-tela*, this feature of *-(u)lkka* is indexical of the caregiver's interactive orientation toward downgrading her expertise and masking the unsymmetrical structure of pedagogical activities in such a way that the child is positioned as a collaborator rather than a novice.

5. Suffix *-a/e*: Corrections in Side Sequences

The examination of the adult-child interaction data suggests that, while the 'unmarked' informal ending *-a/e* (assimilative) is typically used when the caregiver presents new information or produces an information-seeking question, it is predominantly embedded in contexts in which the caregiver demonstrably finds the child not responding collaboratively or correctly to his/her question and attempts to address explicitly the displayed problem in understanding. In the mother-child tutoring session data examined in this paper, for instance, 14 instances of *-a/e* are found, and except three instances in which this suffix is used with the politeness marker *-yo*,¹⁸⁾

18) It seems that the use of *-a/e*, which has the potential of framing the given pedagogical activity as asymmetrical by way of formulating the information it marks as something not

-*a/e* is found when the mother initiates an explicit corrective move or poses a counteractive question in the face of the child's (often repeated) failure to come up with an expected answer. Consider fragment (12):

- (12) (M & J)
- 331 M: *yo -ke -n mwusun kulcca-ci?*
 this-thing-TOP which letter -COMM
- 332 J: *molla.*
 not:know:IE
- 333 M: *i -ke mwusun kulssi-ess -ci?*
 this-thing which letter -PST-COMM
- 334 (2.2)
- 335 J: ('uyhya.')
- 336 (2.0)
- 337 J: 'uyca.' 'uyca:.'
- 'uyca' 'uyca (chair)'
- >338 M: *i -key 'ca'-cca -i -a?*
 this-thing:NOM 'ca'-letter-COP-IE
- 339 J: *ung.*
 yes
- 340 (.)
- 341 M: 'sa'-cca -ntey, 'sa.'
 'sa'-letter-CIRCUM 'sa'
- 342 J: *mac-ta.*
 right-DECL

[English version]

- 331 M: Which letter is this?
- 332 J: I don't know.
- 333 M: Which letter was this?
- 334 (2.2)
- 335 J: ('uyhya (chair?).')
- 336 (2.0)
- 337 J: 'uyca.' 'uyca (chair).'
- >338 M: **Is this letter 'ca'?**

shared but exclusively owned by the caregiver, is mitigated by the function of the politeness marker *-yo* by which the caregiver lowers his/her status vis-à-vis the child.

- 339 J: yes.
 340 (.)
 341 M: It's 'sa,' I guess. 'sa.'
 342 J: Right.

In line 331, the mother asks a question about a letter, which is marked by *-ci*. As J responds by saying that she does not know the answer, the mother repeats the *ci*-question, this time formulated with the past-tense marker ("Which letter was this?), thus increasing the sense that the letter at issue is one of the letters they already covered in the preceding context of the tutoring session. After a pause, J comes up with an answer and repeats it in line 337, which happens to be incorrect. The mother then asks a confirmation question formulated with the informal ending *-a* (line 338). Notice that this confirmation question, which is produced after an extended sequence in which the mother's prompt for J to find the answer has failed, indexes the mother's negative stance that problematizes the answer that the child has just produced.

Also consider fragment (13) below, where the mother is having the child practice reading the word *uyca* 'chair.' As J reads the word in a colloquial style, repeatedly pronouncing the diphthong *uy* as mid-central *u* (*uca*) (lines 1, 4, 7, 10, and 16), the mother tries to correct the pronunciation by way of modeling a standard pronunciation.¹⁹⁾ This pronunciation practice takes several stages. First, she models the careful style pronunciation by repeating the whole word in a syllable-timed, staccato fashion (lines 6-8). Second, she proceeds to focus on the target sound (*uy*) by lengthening it (line 11). Third, with no immediate uptake forthcoming (line 12), she repeats the target sound twice with emphasis (line 13).

(13) (M and J)

- 1 J: 'uca:...' ((reads the word *uyca* (chair) as *uca*)
 2 M: *ung 'uysa' ha -l -ttay 'uy' cca -hako*
 yes 'uysa (doctor)' say-ATTR-when 'uy' letter-with

19) Notice that even though J's pronunciation of the first syllable of the word at issue (*u* in *uca*) is an acceptable, colloquial style pronunciation (see lines 1, 4, 7, 10, and 16), the mother persistently prods J to pronounce the first diphthong sound in a careful style, faithful to its syllable structure (*uy* (*u + i*) in *uyca*).

- 3 *hapchye-ci-ese...*,
 combined-CONN
- 4 J: 'uca.' ((pronouncing the sound of the first syllable *uy* as *u*)
5 (.)
- 6 M: 'uy ca...' ((modeling))
 'uyca (chair)'
- 7 J: (*ung*) (.) 'uca...'
 yes
- 8 M: 'uyca.'
- 9 (*1.8*)
- 10 J: 'u//ca.'
 [
- 11 M: 'uy:: ca.' ((lengthens the first syllable))
- 12 (*1.0*)
- 13 M: 'uy' // 'uy' ((repeats the first syllable twice))
 [
- 14 () ; ()
- 15 (*2.0*)
- 16 J: 'uca.' ((still pronouncing the first syllable *uy* as *u*)
17 (*0.8*)
- >18 M: "uca'-ka ani -la 'uy' hay-po-a.
 'uyca'-NOM NEG-CONN 'uy' do-see-IE
- 19 (*1.5*)
- 20 M: 'uy.'
- 21 (*1.0*)
- >22 M: "u'// 'i' hay-po-a. ((splits the diphthong))
 'u' 'i' do-see-IE
 [
- 24 J: 'u.'

[English version]

- 1 J: 'uyca (chair).' ((reads the word *uyca* (chair) as *uca*)
- 2-3 M: Right. It is also found in 'yusa (doctor),' combined with letter
 'uy.'
- 4 J: 'uca.' ((pronouncing the sound of the first syllable *uy* as *u*)
5 (.)
- 6 M: 'uy ca...' ((modeling))
- 7 J: (I see) (.) 'uca...'

- 8 M: 'uyca.' ((modeling))
 9 (1.8)
 10 J: 'u//ca.'
 []
 11 M: 'uy:: ca.' ((lengthens the first syllable))
 12 (1.0)
 13 M: 'uy.' // "uy.'" ((repeats the first syllable twice))
 []
 14 (): ()
 15 (2.0)
 16 J: 'uca.' ((still pronouncing the first syllable *uy* as *u*))
 17 (0.8)
 -->18 M: ***It's not 'uca,' but try 'uy.'**
 19 (1.5)
 20 M: 'uy.'
 21 (1.0)
 -->22 M: ***Try 'u'//and 'i.'**((splits the diphthong))
 []
 24 J: 'u.'

As *J* persists in pronouncing the letter in a colloquial style despite the mother's repeated attempt to correct it by faithfully modeling the target sound, the mother initiates a more explicit form of correction in line 18, telling *J* to say *uy* instead of *u*. After one more round of modeling (line 20), she tries a more analytic approach by separating the two sounds of the diphthong (*uy* -> *u* and *i*) (line 22). It is in this 'last stage' of the practice, where the mother finally resorts to explicitly corrective directives (lines 18 and 22), that the suffix *-a* is used. It is also to be noted that these explicit directives marked by *-a* are produced in an informal conversational style that contrasts with the drill-style of talk in the preceding context. Furthermore, they are sequentially backgrounded from the surrounding utterances not only by being correlated with a shift in style but also by way of being produced in conspicuously lowered tone, as represented by the degree marker (*) in lines 18 and 22. Following Couper-Kuhlen (1992), this prosodic feature frames the sequence containing these explicit directives as a side-sequenced, rhythmically non-integrated format in relation to the host practice sequence.

Overall, fragments (12) and (13) suggest that the suffix *-a/e*, which presents

the information it marks as something exclusively assimilated into the speaker's knowledge and thus indexes the speaker as the expert and the child as the novice, tends to be embedded in the context in such a way that the action of correction is backgrounded or side-sequenced (Jefferson 1972).²⁰) This contextual feature of the suffix *-a/e* shows that the caregiver is still strongly oriented toward highlighting the child's competence and knowledge (and not highlighting her own expert status or the child's incompetence) by minimizing the extent to which the presumably positive character of the on-going pedagogical activity is compromised by the use of *-a/e*.

6. Conclusions

The preceding discussions suggest that SESs frequently employed by the caregiver in caregiver-child interaction provide resources for organizing pedagogical activities in such a way that the child is actively invited to co-participate in the current pedagogical activity positioned as a competent partner. By using *-ci*, the caregiver evokes a shared domain of knowledge and experience and highlights the shared aspect of the information being sought by suggesting that it is something that the child already knows, thus showing that the child is competent enough to retrieve it. By using *-ney*, the caregiver formulates her explanation/observation as a fortuitously noticed event that can be easily noticed by the child as well, thus trivializing the complexity of the intended explanation/observation. By using *-tela* and *-(u)lkka*, the caregiver subtly involves the child in pursuing the given pedagogical task by way of indexing a lapse in memory or lack of knowledge on her part. These tendencies index the caregiver's stance as collaboratively attuned to the knowledge level of the child learner, and his/her orientation toward realigning the inherently asymmetrical caregiver-child interaction as a joint, cooperative activity. The tendency of the caregiver's *-a/e*

20) The mother's orientation toward mitigating the level of assertion implicated in the corrective action and not highlighting the child's incompetence is also observed in fragment (12). As the child wrongly confirms the point that M has raised through the confirmation question (line 339), M, following a micro-pause, produces the correct answer herself. Note that this utterance is formulated with the circumstantial marker *-ney* (line 341), which serves to background her explicit correction (done as other-repair (Schegloff, Jefferson, & Sacks 1977)) in the course of the on-going pedagogical activity.

utterances to be used in the last resort for initiating an explicit correction and to be organized as part of side-sequence further supports this orientation displayed by caregivers.

The findings of this research have implications for understanding the way these SES forms are used as a stance marker and a grammatical resource for organizing interaction (Ochs, Schegloff, & Thompson 1996). By indexing a particular stance on the caregiver's part and also furnishing the child with the opportunity to respond appropriately, SESs offer diverse but systematic interactional frames within various pedagogical activities. The analysis of SESs as stance markers, in this regard, brings into relief the role they play as a language socialization device by which a child is recurrently prodded to take a relevant stance and respond in a particular way and to competently engage in a joint activity with the aid of the caregiver. Caregivers' use of SESs constitutes a recurring context of socialization in which children learn to reciprocate the caregiver's stance/perspective, negotiate common ground of knowledge and experience, and collaboratively design a subsequent conversational move (cf. Clancy 1986, Kim 2002, Tomasello 1999).

The collaborative aspect of caregiver-child interaction as signaled by the use of SESs seems to reflect and instantiate a social ideology that values harmonious and mutually agreeable social relations with others. From a cross-linguistic perspective, a further analysis of the stance-marking role that SESs play in relation to their discourse-organizational functions will shed light on the way languages with SESs like Korean organize interaction differently than languages without such grammatical resources. From the perspective of language socialization, further investigation of interactional patterns occasioned by SESs will illuminate various aspects of the language socialization process that Korean children go through in terms of how they are sensitized to the use of SESs in organizing interaction.

References

- Chang, K.-H. (1985). *Hyentay Kwuke-uy Yangsang-Pemcwu Yenkwu* (A Study of Modality Categories in Modern Korean). Seoul: Tower Press.
- Choi, S.-J. (1995). The development of epistemic sentence-ending modal forms and functions in Korean children. In J. Bybee and S. Fleischman, eds., *Modality in grammar and discourse* (pp. 165-204). Amsterdam:

John Benjamins.

- Clancy, P. M. (1986). The acquisition of communicative style in Japanese. In B. B. Schieffelin and E. Ochs, eds., *Language Socialization across Cultures* (pp. 213-250). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cook, H. M. (1992). Meaning of non-referential indexes: A case study of the Japanese sentence-final particle *ne*. *Text*, 12, 507-539.
- Couper-Kuhlen, E. (1992) Contextualizing discourse: The prosody of interactive repair. In P. Auer & A. De Luzio, eds., *The Contextualization of Language* (pp. 337-364). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Edwards, D. (1999). Shared knowledge as a performative and rhetorical strategy. In J. Verschueren, ed., *Pragmatics in 1998: Selected papers from the 6th International Pragmatic Association Conference, Reims, July 19-24, 1998*.
- Jefferson, G. (1972). Side sequences. In D. Sudnow, ed., *Studies in Social Interaction* (pp. 294-338). New York: Free Press.
- Kawanishi, Y. (1994). An analysis of non-challengeable modals: Korean *canha(yo)* and Japanese *janaí*. In N. Akatsuka, ed., *Japanese/Korean Linguistics*, Vol. 4 (pp. 95-111). CSLI, Stanford University.
- Kim, K.-H. (2002). Interactive classroom discourse as context of learning and socialization. *Sahoyenehak (The Sociolinguistic Journal of Korea)*, 10(2), 213-241.
- Kim, K.-H. (2004). A conversation analysis of Korean sentence-final modal suffixes *-ney*, *-kwun(a)*, and *-ta*: Noticing as a social action. *Sahoyenehak (The Sociolinguistic Journal of Korea)*, 12(1), 1-35.
- Kim, K.-H. and K.-H. Suh. (2002). *The Sentence-Ending Suffix -ney in Korean Adult-Child Interaction: Immediate Observation as an Object of Uptake*. Paper presented at the Linguistic Association of the Southwest (LASSO) 31st Annual Meeting, Los Angeles and Pasadena, CA.
- Lee, H. S. (1993). Cognitive constraints on expressing newly perceived information, with reference to epistemic modal suffixes in Korean. *Cognitive Linguistics*, 4(2), 135-167.
- Lee, H. S. (1999). A discourse-pragmatic analysis of the Committal *ci* in Korean: A synthetic approach to the form-meaning relation. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 31, 243-275.
- Lee, K. (1993). *A Korean Grammar on Semantic Pragmatic Principles*. Seoul: Hankuk Munhwa-sa.
- Mehan, H. (1979). *Learning Lessons: Social Organization in the Classroom*.

Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.

- Ochs, E., Schegloff, E. A., and S. A. Thompson, eds. (1996). *Interaction and Grammar*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ochs, E. and B. B. Schieffelin. (1984). Language acquisition and socialization: Three developmental stories. In R. Schweder and R. LeVine, eds., *Culture Theory: Essays on Mind, Self and Emotion* (pp. 276-320). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sacks, H., Schegloff E. A., and G. Jefferson. (1974). A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation. *Language*, 50, 696-735.
- Schegloff, E. A. (2001). *Negative and Positive Complaints: Another Exploration of Language Usage and the Constitution of Action*. Lecture given at the Summer Linguistics Institute, University of California, Santa Barbara.
- Schegloff, E. A., Jefferson, G., and H. Sacks. (1977). The preference for self-correction in the organization of repair in conversation. *Language* 53, 361-382.
- Suh, K.-H. (2001). Language socialization through sentence-ending modal particles, *-ci* and *-cianha* in Korean caregiver-child interaction. *Sahoyenehak (The Sociolinguistic Journal of Korea)*, 9(1), 237-258.
- Tomasello, M. (1999). *The Cultural Origins of Human Cognition*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

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

Kyung-Hee Suh
 College of English
 Hankuk University of Foreign Studies
 270 Imun-dong, Dongdaemun-gu
 Seoul 130-791, Korea
 E-mail: khsuh@hufs.ac.kr

Received: Sept. 1, 2004

Revised version received: Nov. 3, 2004

Accepted: Nov. 11, 2004