Marked Referential Practices in English Conversation


This paper considers various marked practices by which speakers of English refer to people, including themselves and others, when conversing with their interlocutors. It shows that parties in a conversation sometimes deploy marked ways of reference in order to accomplish various non-referential (i.e., interactional) undertakings. This paper aims to contribute not only to a better understanding of English speakers' referential practices, but also to the teaching of English to Korean learners to whom these marked language use may not be well known. The knowledge of these marked uses can be a very useful interactional resource for the learners and may obviate possible interactional troubles when they interact in the target culture.

I. Introduction

This paper explores how personal reference is done in English, focusing on what speakers accomplish by using the marked instead of unmarked ways of referring to people. Specifically, it will deal with reference to speaker and to third person(s) as observed in conversational discourse.

Personal reference may be divided into two types, depending upon whether those being referred to are conversationalists or not: i.e., reference to speaker or recipient and reference to others. In English, a speaker's unmarked referential option for the speaker him/herself or the addressed recipient involves the use of first and second person pronouns, i.e., I and you. The traditional definition of these pronouns, as represented by the Oxford English Dictionary, is "[words that] stand instead of the names of the speaker and the person spoken to." As pointed out by several researchers, however, it is problematic to regard pronouns as "substitutes" for nouns or names (e.g., Lyons, 1977; Sacks, 1992; Schegloff, 1996; Thavenius, 1983; Wales, 1996; Watson, 1987). On the
contrary, first and second person pronouns are "the central forms for referring to speaker and recipient," for which other nominal forms, if used, should be considered replacements (Schegloff, 1996, p. 442).

Speakers are motivated to adopt strategies that deviate from the noted unmarked practices under various circumstances. A speaker can sometimes use the plural form of the first person pronoun we for self-reference, as when s/he speaks on behalf of a group, or as a representative of an organization. Speakers can also use their own names or other nominal forms in place of either I or you. One particular kind of discourse in which noun phrase (NP) forms and third person pronouns occur quite frequently in self-reference is baby talk (Schegloff, 1996; Wales, 1996). Here the motivation might be that parents recognize the problematic 'shifting' nature of speaker/addressee roles of I and you reference, and prefer to use terms with fixed identity. Outside of baby-talk, the use of NPs for self-reference is rare in English (Wales, 1996, p. 56). When NPs are employed for self-reference, the forms that are selected by the speaker "serve to display the relevance which the referent has to the ongoing talk" (Schegloff, 1996, p. 447) by invoking a specific category of which the referent is a member (e.g., the president, the teacher, or mom). As Schegloff (1996) points out, then, one of the significant features of the first and second person pronouns in English is a masking of the relevance of the referent at that point in the talk.

In order to account for reference to others,1) Schegloff (1996) makes a distinction between locally initial and locally subsequent reference forms, on the one hand, and locally initial/subsequent reference occasions, on the other. Locally initial reference occasions and locally subsequent ones refer, respectively, to the first time in a stretch of talk that someone is referred to, and to subsequent occasions in that stretch of talk in which the person is referred to. NPs including names are locally initial reference forms in that they are regularly used to introduce a referent into a local context; pronouns are typical locally subsequent forms referring to a referent who has already been introduced in a prior context. The unmarked pattern of reference is to use an NP (i.e., locally initial reference form) for first reference (i.e., in locally initial position), and pronoun (i.e., locally subsequent form) subsequently (i.e., in locally subsequent positions). According to Schegloff, this unmarked pattern is associated with "simple" reference, i.e., doing

---

1) Aside from conversation-analytic works being discussed here, there are two other major approaches to reference, which have attempted to explain the ways a third person (or an object) is being referred to over a relatively long stretch of discourse: the distance model (Givón, 1983) and the structural model (e.g., Clancy, 1988; Groz, 1977; Reichman, 1981; van Dijk & Kintsch, 1983). For the discussion of their contributions and limitations, see Oh (2002).
referring only, whereas the marked patterns may be understood to do "complex" reference, i.e., do other jobs than referring.

One crucial factor that Schegloff (1996) identifies as interactionally relevant to the person reference practices in conversation is "recipient design": namely, "reference forms (for locally initial reference) are selected in the first instance with an eye to who the recipient is and what the recipient knows about the referent, or how the recipient stands with respect to the referent" (pp. 458-9). From the perspective of recipient design, we can distinguish between two types of reference forms: i.e., "recognitional" and "non-recognitional" reference forms (Sacks & Schegloff, 1979). Recognitional reference forms (proper name or "recognitional descriptions," e.g., "the woman who sits next to you") convey to recipients that the one being referred to is someone that they know or know about. The prototypical non-recognitional reference forms are expressions such as "someone," "this guy," and non-recognitional descriptions ("a guy at work"). There is a preferred practice of using a recognitional if it is possible, while within "recognitional reference," there appears to be a preference for the use of name over recognitional description. The following table summarizes the preceding discussion of reference to others in English:

[Table 1. Reference to Third Persons in English Conversations]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Locally initial occasion</th>
<th>Locally subsequent occasion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Locally initial form</td>
<td>Recognitionals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;&lt;Marked use&gt;&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(names; recognitional descriptions)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-recognicals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(&quot;someone,&quot; &quot;this guy&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non-recognitional descriptions; category terms)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locally subsequent form</td>
<td>&lt;&lt;Marked use&gt;&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pronouns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This paper, by introducing some of the marked uses of personal reference in English conversation, aims to contribute not only to a better understanding of English speakers' practices of referring to people, but also to the teaching of English to Korean learners to whom these marked language use may not be well known. Since these marked uses are designed to achieve interactional functions in conversation (in addition to regular referential functions), as will be shown later, it is critical for the learners to at least recognize them. In that regard, this paper may serve a consciousness-raising function by exposing the learners of English to the otherwise imperceptible uses of the target language. The knowledge of these marked uses can be a very useful interactional resource for the learners and may obviate possible interactional troubles when they interact in the target culture.

II. Data and Methodology

With its focus on the interactional functions of the marked patterns of personal reference, this study uses naturally-occurring conversation data only. The data consists of both telephone conversations and face-to-face conversations between friends and family members. All the data were transcribed following the transcription conventions developed by Jefferson (1974) (See the Appendix). As the methodological framework, this study employs Conversation Analysis (CA) (Sacks, Schegloff, & Jefferson, 1974). The framework of CA enables the researcher to take the perspective of the participants themselves and conduct micro-analyses of what is interactionally going on at a given moment in talk-in-interaction. A central premise of CA is its view of talk as a form of "action situated within specific contexts" (Goodwin & Heritage, 1990, p. 287); in other words, talk is produced by speakers and understood by the interlocutors for the action(s) which it may be doing. In so far as participants are oriented to actions in constructing and understanding the talk, academic analysts need to examine what action(s) a spate of talk is being used to do in that particular local, interactional context. CA is therefore distinguished from traditional linguistic research which analyzes talk in terms of its propositional content and/or information transfer: according to CA, "discourse is not just about conveying information ... it virtually always implicates action" (Schegloff, 1997, p. 500, emphasis in original).2)

2) For more elaborate discussions of the framework of CA, see Atkinson and Heritage (1984), Boden and
III. Reference to Speaker

1. Unmarked Pattern

It has been noted that the unmarked way of referring to speaker and recipient in English is to employ the first and second person pronoun, I and you, without regard to the relationship between the speaker and the recipient. Observe the following segment taken from a telephone conversation between two male acquaintances, in which M calls P to invite him to an event that will take place that night, to which P provides a dispreferred response, i.e., a refusal of the invitation:

(1) [Goldberg:1]

1 P: Hello.
2 M: Hi ol' buddy.
3 P: Yeah.
4 M: Hey ya got anything goin t'night/
5 P: Nah. = I don' think I'm goin t'night. =
6 M: Oh rilly/
7 P: No. Hi//uh uh.
8 M: I've got a happen//ing out at Malibu if yo//u wanna come.
9 P: hhh
10 P: Yeah/
11 P: hhh No. I'll th'- I'll pass it up t'night an not go up there. = I'll-
12 I'll see ya tamarr a t' go over t' that other thing with you. = But
13 I'm n//ot goin out tonight. // hhhh
14 M: Yeah.
15 M: Yeah. = Well // (Okeydo )= // I thought I'd // ask ya, y'know jist //t' (get)
16 P: hhh
17 P: Yeah.
18 P: Yeah.
19 P: Yeah.
20 P: Yeah. Okay.

Zimmerman (1991), Goodwin and Heritage (1990), Heritage (1984), and Levinson (1983).
Note at the arrows in lines 4, 5, 8, 11, 12, and 15 that both speakers continuously refer to themselves and the other party with the pronouns I and you without exception. There is no doubt that this is the unmarked pattern for self-reference in English; parties in conversation, however, sometimes deploy "marked" ways of referring to themselves or their recipients as a way of accomplishing various non-referential undertakings. The following section discusses some of these marked patterns of self-reference, with specific reference to the kinds of interactional functions that they achieve.

2. Marked Patterns

1) Use of you for self-reference

It is possible that speakers refer to themselves with the second person pronoun you (Quirk et al., 1985; Schegloff, 1996). Below are examples in which the speaker exploits you for self-reference.

In Segment (2), taken from a family dinner conversation, Virginia has requested that her mother raise her allowance, which is declined outright by the mother. In her first turn in this extract, the mother challenges Virginia by asking what she spends her allowance on:

(2) [VR:7]
1 MOM: W'll what do you spen:d your allowance on. That's
2 [what I have |NEVER b]een able tuh find out.=
3 VIR: [ E VA Y |THA:n! ]
4 MOM: ="hh"hh ((holds breath)) You get it on Satihday;i, (0.7)
5 Wensdee? You nevuh have a penny.
6 VIR: I know. That's 'cause we go ta McDonald's, an:' goes places, 'n (0.7)
7 MOM: You don't really need t'eat that much junk.
8→ VIR: Wul- "hh (hh) (0.4) You don't spend it on junk, yuh spend it
9 on impaw:tant things like-suh-say: I can't drive yet, so I have
10 tuh pay everybody for ga:s.

((17 lines omitted))
In line 8, the mother disaligns herself with Virginia's response (at line 6), characterizing what Virginia spends her allowance on as "junk" and thereby blaming her implicitly. Facing the interlocutor's disalignment, Virginia defends herself by disagreeing with the mother's negative characterization as well as providing her own positive assessment of how she spends her money (i.e., on "important things"). It is in this context that Virginia employs the second person pronoun you to refer to herself (see at the arrow in line 8).

Equivocal on its own between singular and plural usage, you can be used to refer to "everybody," and thereby the speaker him/herself (i.e., as a member of "everybody"). Such a you is a strategic resource for defending self from the interlocutor's disaligning action such as challenge or blame because it can show that the position taken by the speaker is not unique or peculiar to him/her alone, but is shared by everybody, at least everybody in the same situation (Sacks, 1992 [original lectures, Fall 1965 & Spring 1966]). In other words, Virginia distances herself from the activity being described by dropping the I and using the you that refers to herself generically or commonly like others of her age. The fact that the you's here

3) By using you, the speaker presents self as a member of some category, "downgrading his own experience to incidental status in the discourse, phrasing it as something that could or would be anybody's" (Laberge & Sankoff, 1979, p. 281).

4) That Virginia is alluding to the category of her peer group by her use of you can be seen in the
refer to the speaker rather than the recipient is displayed in the next line (line 9), where Virginia uses the unmarked speaker-reference term I in offering an example of the claim that she has just made (i.e., an example of "important things" on which she spends her allowance). In response to this, however, the mother does not change her disaligning stance, and the argument continues. In the omitted lines, Virginia suggests ten dollars for her weekly allowance, in response to which the mother strongly disaligns herself again. Note in lines 35-37 that Virginia uses you for self-reference again while being engaged in self-defense against the mother's challenge/accusation.5)

As is the case in the segment above, one of the environments in which the speaker often refers to him/herself with the second person pronoun you is in some sort of self-defense context. The second person pronoun provides a "built-in-defense" (Sacks, 1992), by allowing the speaker to refer to self "incidentally" by way of referring to everybody (Laberge & Sankoff, 1979; Sacks, 1992). Although it has been traditionally assumed that the impersonal you is an informal equivalent of one (e.g., Huddleston, 1984; Quirk et al., 1985), there is a fundamental difference between these two, since it is only the former that may include the recipient as a referent (Sacks, 1992), and this is "critically related to the discourse function of impersonal you" (Kitagawa & Lehrer, 1990, p. 744). Such a use of you can also be observed in the following excerpt, which is taken from the same conversation:

(3) [VR:15]
1  MOM: 'hmm 'Well that's something else. (0.3) 'I don't think that you should be
2        going to the parties that Beth goes to. She is eighteen years old. An' you
3        are fou:tee:n, da[rlin'.
4  VIR: [I KNOW::, BUT:A:LL THE REST OF MY: PEOPLE
5        MY AGE ARE GWAFFS. I promise.they are sick.

following talk, which is arrived at 120 lines following Segment (2):

1  VIR: Now- see Mo:m, it's like this. eWhen you're my age,
2        you need a lotta extra money becu:z yah need ta do things
3        I mean () I'always haveta pay fer gas yuhknow when Sherry'
4        an' Wen drive me around and everything.

With the unyielding disalignment by her mother, Virginia explicitly indicates the implication of her use of you by including the subordinate clause, i.e., "when you're my age."

5) This is contrasted with the you's in the mother's talk, which do not have any sense of 'everybody,' only targeting the recipient, i.e., Virginia.
... (6 lines omitted))

12 VIR: Gwaff is jus' someb'dy who's really (1.1) I just- ehh! 'hh s- immature.
13→ YOU don't wanna hang around people like that.<
14 (1.9)

In lines 1-3, the mother conveys her disagreement with Virginia's going to the parties that her older sister Beth attends, and in so doing she also blames her implicitly. Virginia responds to this by giving a negative assessment of her peers, characterizing them as "gwaffs." Being requested to explain what "gwaff" means, she answers that it is somebody who is immature, with whom you do not want to hang around. By means of the second person pronoun you (in line 13), Virginia refers to herself as a member of "anybody," which conveys that it is not only her but anybody in her situation who would not want to associate with these peers (i.e., "gwaffs"), and therefore it is normal, and not blamable or attackable as peculiar. As in Segment (2), Virginia's use of you is thus a way of defending herself against the blame that has been laid on her.

In other contexts, the use of you may bring about a sense of shared experience, while still referring to the speaker. With such a use of you, the speaker involves the recipients "in a situation commonly experienced, or curiously as participant in an act not ever experienced" (O'Connor, 1994, p. 48). A couple of examples are provided below. In Segment (4), the participants (two young couples) have been talking about the freezing weather in the east, contrasting it with the weather in LA. At line 1, Vivian begins to talk about a guy, who immediately flies to LA when she tells him about the warm weather in LA.

(4) [CD:27]
1 VIV: [W e l l  t h i s  g u ]y
2 SHA: =?Who[w a s  ?th a t ( )
3 VIV: [ ] [ ]
4 MIC: [m n  n a h  a h ]h a h
5 VIV: [One guy th et ]w a n n a  c a w : I ]w=
6 MIC: [ ( )
7→ VIV: =h e u s u a l l y  c o m e s  ?ou : t. yi h k no w [s o  y o u  j s  t e l l ' m  i t ' s =
8 NAN: [M m h m ,
9 VIV: =e ig h t d y d e g r e e s h i ' l l  g e t  o n n a  p l a n [e
At first, Vivian self-references with the pronoun *I* (in line 5), but shortly switches from the *I* to *you*, as seen at the arrow in line 7. There is no doubt that it is Vivian, and none of the other recipients, who calls and tells the guy about the weather in LA. In fact, the referent is not known to the recipients (except Vivian’s boyfriend Shane), as displayed by Vivian’s choice of the non-recognitional terms (*this guy, one guy that I wanna call*) when she introduces him into the talk. The job accomplished by the referential shift, i.e., from *I* to *you*, appears to be that of displaying the knowledgability of the speaker about what is being told, and at the same time, letting the recipients co-participate in the experience being described.

A similar use of *you* is found in the following segment, which is excerpted from a discussion about automobiles among three men (Curt, Gary, and Mike).

(5) [AD:28]
1  GAR: How long is it gonna last after you get it runnin.
2  CUR: Well I don’know. I’m, [hell in street use uh,
3  GAR: [(Long time?)
4  ???: Tss!
5  CUR: Y’[know street,]=
6  GAR: [’S just like-]=
7  CUR: =street see actually runnin et the drags it’ll last
8  longer then it will on the street.
9  (0.4)
10  GAR: Just li[k e s- ]
11→ CUR: [Cause you-] you- cot- sit down eh-en en watch that
12  damn engine i:dle. And boy it’s just bumpin all (a’ ti-)
13  en kuroomph kuroomph. Yuhknow en thih- the torque ul
14  take it down that’s hard on the mai:ns.

At line 1, Gary asks Curt a question about the engine of his car, and Curt provides a dispreferred response (in the sense that he does not provide the requested information). With
Curt's turn brought to possible completion at line 8. A 0.4 second pause ensues and then Gary begins to say what he was trying to say before but failed to in line 6. Curt, however, interrupts him with a continuation of his prior talk. Note that in line 11, Curt employs the second person pronoun you in apparently describing his prior experience with his car. As in Segment (4), the speaker's use of you allows the recipient to involve him/herself in what is otherwise the speaker's personal experience. Such a you is thus "interpersonal" and "involving" (O'Connor, 1994) in nature and may be considered "an act of camaraderie" (Katagawa & Lehrer, 1990) achieved through assigning a main actor role to the recipient.6

In Korean, the so-called impersonal meaning is usually conveyed by zero anaphora (or more explicitly but less commonly by general nouns denoting 'people'). According to Kitagawa and Lehrer (1990), the extension of the second person pronoun to an impersonal pronoun is quite common but restricted to languages that possess small, closed pronoun sets (e.g., Chinese, English, French, German, Italian, Persian), excluding languages such as Korean and Japanese, which lack clearly defined closed sets of personal pronouns. This may be attributed to the fact that pronouns in Korean or Japanese are "too closely tied to the actual speech act context," and therefore are "simply too loaded with semantic and pragmatic information to be generalized or used impersonally" (Kitagawa & Lehrer, 1990, p. 756). The use of you to denote an impersonal meaning, and especially for self-reference may thus not be easy for Korean (and Japanese) learners to master, due to the lack of corresponding uses in their native language.

2) Use of zero anaphora for self-reference7

Traditionally, zero anaphora (or omission of an overt reference term) has not been considered a legitimate referential device in English. This is primarily due to the fact that English grammar generally requires the presence of overt arguments, whether in the form of a pronoun or other noun phrase(s), whereas the grammar of languages such as Chinese, Japanese, or Korean has no such requirement, thus permitting abundant use of zero anaphora.8 Recently, however, zero anaphora has been acknowledged as a serious

6) As is the case in the preceding two examples, the impersonal you tends to co-occur with the present tense of the verb, since it generalizes the experience being told by the speaker and presents it as if it were some general truth.

7) The discussion in this section is based upon Oh (2005).

8) What would be called zero anaphora in other languages is often discussed in English grammar books in terms of "situational ellipsis" (Quirk, Greenbaum, Leech, & Svartvik, 1985). It is said that the interpretation of situational ellipsis is dependent not on the linguistic context, but on the knowledge of an extralinguistic.
resource in the construction of conversational interaction by English speakers (Oh, 2005, In Press).

English speakers may make use of zero anaphora in referring to self when they wish to present the current talk as a second saying or a re-saying of their preceding talk. As an example, let us consider Segment (6), where three guys, Mike, Gary, and Curt, are engaged in an automobile discussion. In an earlier exchange, Curt asked the others where he could get a special type of spring for his car, but neither Gary nor Mike was able to provide the relevant answer. Immediately before the interaction shown below, Mike suggests that Curt have the spring custom-made (instead of buying a ready-made one), with which both Gary and Curt disagree for financial reasons (i.e., it is too expensive). Mike does not yield, however, and disagrees with them (see lines 1-3: "I don't think it's all that much to get a spring made"):  

(6)⁹ [AD:21]
1 Mike: I don't think it's all that =
2 Gary: [(two hunred =)
3 Mike: =much t'get a spring made,=
4 Mike: =I think theh-the:re use:tu: be a place up'n Toledo thet'd
5 make'em for yuh if you give'm the dimensions you want,
6 (0.3)
7→ Curt: Well? see I don't know any, I wouldn't know what. (0.4)
8 what dimensions t'even start tuh give'em.
9 (0.4)
10→ Curt: Ø Wouldn't know what t'hell eed want.
11 Gary: Go down nere'n measure hi:s. hh

Mike even suggests where to get the service (at lines 4-5). In lines 7-8, however, Curt rejects Mike's suggestion by challenging his assumption that Curt would know the dimensions of the spring that he wants. Mike provides no response to this (see the .4 second pause at line 9), indicating that he refuses to align. At line 10, Curt re-says the context. Prescriptive grammarians tend to consider such examples of situational ellipsis as incorrect English, but as Biber, Johansson, Leech, Conrad, and Finegan (1998) point out, they occur quite frequently in the actual conversation even of educated speakers.

⁹ In Segments (6)–(7), single- and double-lined arrows indicate the earlier utterance to which the zero anaphora is connected, and the token of zero anaphora, respectively. Note also that repeats are marked with shading, and zero anaphora with the symbol Ø.
prior Turn Constructional Unit (TCU), repeating parts of it (i.e., "wouldn't know what"). The second TCU is an elaboration or an upgrade ("the hell") of the first TCU, and it is in this second saying that Curt uses zero anaphora in reference to himself. It seems that one important function of zero anaphora here is to signal to the recipient(s) that the TCU-in-progress is designed to be a second to some prior talk. That is, zero anaphora projects "second-ness" of the current TCU relative to a prior TCU, which the recipients can locate with a repeat as a cue. Note that in contrast to the first saying, the second saying is responded to by one of the recipients, Gary, who suggests a way of discovering the dimensions of the spring (at line 11). As this example illustrates, speakers of a second saying are often oriented to acquiring the recipient's relevant response upon completion of the second saying, which was absent after the first saying. Zero anaphora in this context is thus a way of designing the re-saying to display that it is a re-saying. To say it identically the second time by repeating the entire preceding TCU (including the subject reference term) would have a quite different interactional meaning because it might be heard as being said 'for another first time.' Instead, zero anaphora is the means of precisely marking a TCU as a re-saying or a second saying, which underscores the relevance of responding to it, and therefore, is a type of upgrade in that sense.

Another instance of self-referential zero anaphora of this kind is found in Excerpt (7), which is taken from a telephone conversation between two women. B has just told A that she had witnessed a terrible car accident, of which she did not find any report in the newspaper. In response to B's assessment of the accident (at line 1), A aligns with her (at line 2), and B provides another assessment (at line 3):

(7) [SB:1:11]
1 B: Boy, it was a bad one, though.
2 A: Well that's too bad.
3 B: Kinda // (creepy).
4 A: You know, I looked and looked in the paper - I think
5 I told you f- for that uh f- fall over at the Bowl that
6 night. And I never saw a thing about it,
7 and I // looked in the next- couple of evenings.

---
10) Turn Constructional Units are one of the key resources constituting the turn-taking organization described by Sacks et al. (1974). TCUs are a set of types of units of talk that can be recognizable as themselves constituting a possibly complete turn. TCUs can be sentential, clausal, phrasal or lexical.
From lines 4 to 7, A displays her understanding of B's prior talk by telling a comparable experience of her own (i.e., not finding a report in the newspaper about a terrible accident that the speaker thinks is reportable). With her talk, A is also making a complaint about neglect on the part of the press. In response to her complaint, however, B does not provide any substantial response (see the 1.0 second pause at line 9) other than producing a continuer ("Mm hm") in overlap with A's talk. As in the preceding segment, the recipient's non-alignment (i.e., a lack of recipient uptake) prompts the speaker to re-say the preceding TCU. It is easy to see from the repeated part of the talk ("never saw a ... it") that the TCU at line 10 is a re-saying of the earlier one at line 6. (In fact, if the speaker had not replaced "thing" with "mention," it would have been an exact repetition.) Now observe that the speaker zero-anaphorizes the first person pronoun "I" in the re-saying, thereby displaying its second-ness relative to the first saying. As in Segment (6), the recipient provides an aligning response after the second saying by saying that she did not see the report of that accident, either. In other words, speaker A succeeds in securing an alignment from her interlocutor, which she had not obtained earlier, after re-saying it in a TCU that starts with self-referential zero anaphora.

In sum, we have observed in this section that referring to self with zero anaphora may be a useful resource for displaying that the current talk is designed as a re-saying or a second saying, relative to some prior talk. Presenting the current talk as a second saying is an interactional strategy, with which speakers may increase the chance of being aligned with by the recipient by restoring the sequential slot for the recipient to provide an uptake.

11) For more detailed discussions of this and other interactional functions of English zero anaphora, see Oh (2005, In Press).
IV. Reference to Others

1. Unmarked Pattern

It has been noted that the unmarked way of referring to a non-present person in English conversation is to use "locally initial reference forms" such as full NPs or names in a "locally initial reference position," and to use "locally subsequent reference forms" such as pronouns in "locally subsequent reference positions" (Schegloff, 1996).

In an adjacency pair\(^{12}\) sequence consisting of a question and answer, therefore, a pronoun is used in the second pair part (i.e., answer) if the referent was mentioned by name (or other NP) in the first pair part (i.e., question). See the following segment, for example, which is taken from the beginning of the telephone conversation between Ava and Bee.

\(^{13}\) In Segments (8) and (9), the single-lined arrow points to the line containing the first mention of the referent in question, and the double-lined arrow to subsequent mentions of that referent.

(8)\(^{13}\) [TG:1]

1 Ava: 'hh How've you been.
2 Bee: 'hh Oh:: surviving I guess, hh[h!
3→ Ava: [That's good, how's Bob,
4→ Bee: He's fine.
5 Ava: That's good.

\(^{12}\) The "adjacency pair" (Schegloff & Sacks, 1973) is the basic unit of sequence in conversation. An adjacency pair, in its basic minimal form, characteristically exhibits the following features. It is:

a) composed of two turns;
b) by different speakers;
c) adjacentely placed, that is, one after the other;
d) These two turns are relatively ordered, that is, they are differentiated into "first pair parts" (types which initiate some exchanges, e.g., question, request, offer, invitation, announcement) and "second pair part" (types which are responsive to the action of a prior turn, e.g., answer, grant, reject, accept, decline, agree/disagree, acknowledge);
e) pair-type related such that a first pair part makes relevant in the next turn a particular sort of second pair part (e.g., greeting–greeting, question–answer, offer–accept/decline).

(Schegloff, 1995, p. 4, emphasis in original)

The current speaker's production of a first pair part makes it relevant for a next speaker to produce a second pair part. When the relevant second pair part does not occur immediately upon the completion of the first (e.g., silence following a question), it is treated as noticeably or "officially" absent (Schegloff, 1972), thus requiring some special account.
In line 3, Ava initiates a sequence with a question about Bee's boyfriend, referring to him with his name, and Bee provides an answer (in line 4), employing the pronoun he to refer to him.

When the referent, having been introduced by a locally initial reference form (e.g., a name), is talked about in an extended sequence, the unmarked practice is to use the pronominal term for the referent throughout the sequence - provided no other referents are mentioned - as is the case in the following excerpt:

.(9) [TG:14]
1→ Bee: Dihyu have any-cl- You have a class with Billy this term?
2 Ava: Yeh he's in my abnormal class.
3 Bee: mnYeh [how- ]
4 Ava: [Abnor]mal psy[ch.
5 Bee: [Still not gettin married,
6 Ava: 'hhh Oh no. Definitely not. [married.]
7⇒ Bee: [No he's] dicided [definitely?]
8 Ava: ['hhh [O h ]
9 no.
10⇒ Bee: 'hh Bec'z [las']time you told me he said no: but he wasn't=
11 Ava: [No.]
12 Bee: =su:re,
13⇒ Ava: n:No definitely not. He, he'n Gail were like on the outs,
14 yihknowő

In sum, the underlying structure of the unmarked ways of referring to a third person in English is to use a locally initial reference form in a locally initial reference position, and to use a locally subsequent reference form in a locally subsequent reference position.

2. Marked Pattern

In the preceding section, the most common, and in this respect, unmarked practices for referring to a third person have been reviewed. The present section will discuss some of the marked ways of doing third person reference. Studies on English reference have shown that
speakers can and often do make use of the mismatch between form and position with respect
to local initialness/subsequentiality in order to implement non-referential projects of various
kinds (in addition to regular referential functions) (e.g., Fox, 1984, 1987; Schegloff, 1996).

With the use of a locally subsequent reference form (e.g., a pronoun) in a locally initial
reference position, the speaker can, for example, bring off a feeling of "continuity," as
exemplified by the following segment. In this excerpt, taken from a dinner conversation
among two teenage friends (Liz and E.M.) and their mothers (Nancy and Betsy), E.M initiates
a story-telling sequence about their mutual acquaintance (Andrea), who had run away from
home with her boyfriend to Italy.

(10) [Halloween Dinner]
1 E.M: Did I tell you heard it.
2 Liz: Yeh, about Karen?
3 E.M: [( )]
4 E.M: No: about (1.2) Andrea.
5 Liz: Andrea who?
6 E.M: is coming home,
7 Betsy: Oh [the one who left to go to] Italy?
8 Nancy: [Oh yeah, I remember her.]
9 Liz: [( )]
10 E.M: She called and wants to come [home.]=

... (12 lines omitted))

23 Betsy: =What happened, it didn't work out?
24 E.M:I don't know, I didn't get the details.
25 Liz: She didn't like her, (. boy friend?
26 Nancy: This is so (good.) I never u- drink during the week.=
27 ( ): = [ heh ]
28 ( ): = [ ha ]
29 Betsy: = [mmh ] We'll be so(ho)rry, (. tomorrow.
30 Liz: [tomorrow ha ha ha
31 E.M: [(tomorrowhehehehehehehe
At line 25, Liz provides a candidate answer to Betsy's question (at line 23), but its sequential implicativeness gets lost due to the overlap with Nancy's assessment of the wine that she is drinking. Nancy's talk at line 26 causes the following talk to be sidetracked from the girl (Andrea) and to address various other topics (i.e., falling asleep, jet lag, the Japanese eggplant that they are eating, and Nancy's terrible cooking). Following a four second pause at line 89, Nancy returns to the previous sequence regarding the girl, asking what grade she will be in when she comes back. Note that Nancy employs the pronoun she in referring to the girl (at the arrow in line 90), even though her utterance is preceded by a considerable length of sequence(s) dealing with discrete topics (as well as by the long pause at line 89). In fact, it is her use of the locally subsequent reference form in what would otherwise be a locally initial reference position which successfully restores the local subsequentiality of the reference occasion, thereby "bring(ing) off continuity across an intervening hiatus" (Schegloff, 1996, pp. 451-2).

On the other hand, the deliberate choice of a locally initial reference form where a locally subsequent reference form would be understood can also have important strategic consequences. For example, Segment (11), which has already been discussed in the literature (Fox, 1984, 1987; Schegloff, 1996), illustrates a pattern whereby a full NP is used to display that the sequence containing the first mention of the referent has been brought to completion and that the speaker is thereby initiating a new topical departure (see the arrow below in line 12).

(11) [SN-4:16]
1 Mark: What about that girl 'e use tuh go with fer so long.
An additional example of this marked usage is provided in the next excerpt. The participants at a family dinner have been talking about Beth's dancing. Virginia's first turn in the extract is a response to Wesley, who has just said "I didn't think she was too good. She must be getting better now":

(12) [VR:14]
1 VIR: She's good. 'Cuz pa- (0.8) Paul taught 'er how.
2
3 VIR: Paul dances good.
4 PRU: [>Oh I thought you were the one that [taught her how.<
5 WES: [Oh 'e did?
6 MOM: 'hhh ^Well that's something else. (0.3) ^I don't think that
7→ you should be going to the parties that Beth goes to. She is
8 eighteen years old. An' you are fourtee:n, darlin.'

At line 6, the mother launches a new sequence, which is at least partly achieved by her use of a locally initial reference form (i.e., Beth) in talk which is otherwise apparently referentially continuous with just prior talk about Beth's dancing. As in the preceding segment, the
speaker's use of a full NP (instead of a pronoun) serves to mark a sequence boundary and the initiation of a new topical departure (i.e., her disapproval of Virginia's going to the parties that Beth goes to).

Speakers may exploit the mismatch between reference form and sequential position for other kinds of interactional outcomes as well. One of the most interesting observations made by Fox (1984, 1987) regarding English speakers' referential practices is that a locally initial reference form is recurrently used in a locally subsequent reference position in the interactional environment of disagreement. That is, when the recipient of a statement/question, in which a referent was mentioned, disagrees with the statement/question, he or she employs a full NP when mentioning that referent.14) See the following examples taken from Fox (1987, pp. 62-63):

(13) [US:90]
1 M: Beer is even bedder den wine. Cause it give you more nutrition. Joe lives on beer,
2 ( )
3 ( )

(14) [SN-4:4]
1 S: You didn't come tuh talk tuh Karen?
2 (0.4)
3→ M: No (0.2) Karen: (0.3)
4→ M: Karen'n I're having a fight after she went out with Keith

(15) [AD:8]
1 C: Oxfrey runin- I heard Oxfrey gotta new car.
2 G: Hawkins is ru/nnin.
3→ M: Oxfrey's runnin the same car he run last year,

(16) [NB:III:1]
1 A: Hello
2 B: Is Jessie there?

---
14) The speaker, in fact, re-uses the full NP that the interlocutor used in introducing the referent into the talk in disagreeing with him/her (Schegloff, 1996).
3→A: (No) Jessie's over et 'er gramma's fer a couple da:ys.
4 B: A'right thankyou.
5 A: Yer wel:come?

In an argumentative context where participants continuously disagree with each other, it can be observed that full NPs repeatedly occur in each party's talk for reference to the same person, with no respect to the sequential position of the reference. Segment (17), which is taken from the same conversation as Segment (12), offers one such instance. In an earlier sequence, Virginia has requested that her mother get her a dress, but the mother declines the request. In lines 1-3, Virginia complains that her sister Beth gets all the clothes, which meets a disaligning response from the mother (at line 5):

(17) [VR:4]
1 VIR: I'on'tave enough clo:thes.
2 (.).
3 VIR: 'hh Beth gets all the clo:thes.
4 (.).
5→MOM: Well: Beth () spends her own money on her clothes.
6 (.7)
7 VIR: <Well if I got more money 'I could spend my own
8 money.
9→MOM: [But Beth works.
10 VIR: Wull why can't I::?
11→MOM: Beh- oh:, Vuhginia, we've been through this. When you're
12 old enough you ca:n work in the store.
13 (.2)
14→VIR: 'hh Well Beth didn' Beth get tih work b'fore she was sixteen?=

It is interesting to observe (at the arrows in lines 5, 9, 11, and 14) that both speakers keep refusing to employ a pronoun for the referent in a locally subsequent reference position while they continue their disalignment with each other.
V. Conclusion

This paper has considered various marked practices by which speakers of English refer to people, including themselves and others, when conversing with their interlocutors. English has its own unmarked and marked ways of accomplishing personal reference. We have seen that parties in a conversation sometimes deploy "marked" ways of reference in order to accomplish various non-referential (i.e., interactional) undertakings. Some of these marked practices are unique to English (e.g., the use of you for self-reference in some sort of context of defense in English, the use of self-referential zero anaphora to signal the second-ness of the current talk relative to a prior talk), while other practices appear to be shared by English and Korean (e.g., the use of a locally subsequent reference form in a locally initial reference position to bring off the feeling of continuity, or a choice of a referentially more explicit form over a less explicit one in disaligning with the interlocutor).15)

From a pedagogical standpoint, Korean learners of English would not only need to learn a new set of unmarked referential practices of the target language, but would also need to recognize (and perhaps ultimately be able to appropriately use) the marked forms of reference, for example, employing zero anaphora or the second person pronoun for self-reference or exploiting the mismatch between reference form and sequential position for third person reference in order to accomplish special interactional functions.

The application of the observations made here to the teaching of English and to the preparation of language teaching materials should assist (especially advanced-level) Korean learners of English in developing their oral communicative skills in the target language. It is necessary that further research be conducted and that foreign language texts incorporate the findings from all such research, based upon the detailed analysis of naturally-occurring conversations among native speakers, in order to present learners with authentic and effective ways of interacting in the target culture.

15) See Oh (2002) for a discussion of Korean speakers' referential practices in this regard.
Appendix: Transcription Conventions

(Adapted from Ochs, Schegloff, and Thompson, 1996: 461-65)

1. Temporal and sequential relationships

[a point of overlap onset]

[a point at which two overlapping utterances both end]

= If the two lines connected by the equal signs are: (1) by the same speaker, a single, continuous utterance is broken up to accommodate the placement of overlapping talk; (2) if they are by different speakers, the second follows the first with no discernable silence between them (i.e., 'latched' to it).

(0.5) silence represented in tenths of a second.

(.) micropause

2. Aspects of speech delivery

. falling, or final intonation, not necessarily the end of a sentence

? rising intonation, not necessarily a question

'continuing' intonation, not necessarily a clause boundary

år a rise stronger than a comma but weaker than a question mark

:: the prolongation or stretching of the sound just preceding them.

- a cut-off or self-interruption

_word underlining indicates some form of stress or emphasis, either by increased loudness or higher pitch

WOrd upper case indicates especially loud talk

° The talk following the degree sign is markedly quiet or soft

°° The talk between the two degree signs is markedly softer than the talk around it

inflected falling intonation contour

inflected rising intonation contour

↑ sharper rises in pitch than would be indicated by combinations or colons and underlining

> < The talk between the 'more than' and 'less than' symbols is compressed or
rushed

< > A stretch of talk is markedly slowed or drawn out

< The immediately following talk is 'jump-started,' i.e., sounds like it starts with a rush.

hhh hearable aspiration. It may represent breathing, laughter, etc.

^hhh hearable inbreath

3. Other markings

(( )) transcriber's descriptions of events

(word) uncertainty on the transcriber's part

( ) Something is being said, but no hearing can be achieved
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