

# Functions of Post-posed Adverbial Clauses in Korean Conversation\*

Haeyeon Kim  
(Chung-Ang University)

**Kim, Haeyeon. (2003). Functions of post-posed adverbial clauses in Korean conversation. *Language Research* 39(4), 911-932.**

In discourse analysis, post-posed adverbial clauses (PACs) as instances of word order variability have been discussed from textual and cognitive perspectives. In recent years, interaction-based research on turn increments has provided a new opportunity for reconsidering word order variability in interactional and sequential contexts. This research explores properties of PACs in Korean conversation from an interaction-based perspective. Arguing against the text-based notion “afterthought” derived from text-organization and information status, this research shows that an interaction-based explanation can provide a better way of understanding word-order variability than does a text-based notion. It shows that the occurrence of PAC turn extensions is closely related to the following interactional contingencies: (i) pursuing recipient uptake, (ii) motivation of presenting an ungently relevant material first, and (iii) recipient design. In addition, this research shows PACs perform the following functions: (i) providing additional, specific, circumstantial information to the host sentential TCU, (ii) performing an action of retroactive reformulation, and (iii) providing an account or explanation for the statement/claim expressed in the host TCU. Finally, it suggests that an interaction-based explanation of word order variability can show the relationship between conversation, social actions, and grammar.

**Key words:** word order variability, post-posed adverbial clauses, afterthought, recipient uptake, recipient design, retroactive reformulation.

## 1. Introduction

In recent years, a number of researchers in interactional linguistics

---

\* This research was supported by the Chung-Ang University Research Grant, 2003. I appreciate the financial help in doing this research. An earlier version was read by four anonymous reviewers, and I appreciate their comments. All errors are mine, of course.

have explored the interactive nature of conversation, paying serious attention to the intricate processes in which participants are engaged. They have dealt with topics such as turn-taking, sequence organization, turn constructional units (TCUs), transition-relevance places (TRPs), repair, co-construction, turn increments, and so on (Ford & Thompson, 1996; Lerner, 1987, 1991, 1996; Lerner & Takagi, 1999; Ochs et al., 1996; Sacks et al., 1974; Schegloff et al., 1977; Tanaka, 1999). In recent years, the study of turn increments has provided a new way to examine word order variability from an interaction-based perspective. Among the instances of word order variability, adverbial clauses have attracted the attention of some discourse analysts (Chafe, 1984; Ford, 1993; Ford & Thompson, 1986; Ramsay, 1987; Schiffrin, 1985, 1987; Thompson, 1985). These studies have discussed differences between pre-posed and post-posed adverbial clauses in written/spoken discourse in terms of information flow and text organization. However, in recent years, interaction-based research has shown the possibility for reconsidering instances of non-canonical word order variability in conversation in terms of turn increments or extensions in their sequential and interactional contexts (Ford, Fox & Thompson, 2001; H. Kim, 2003; K. Kim, 2001; Ono & Suzuki, 1992; Schegloff, 2000).

The purpose of the present research is to examine types, motivations, and interactional functions of post-posed adverbial clauses (PACs) that occur after a possible completion point (i.e., after predicates) of the host turn-constructional unit (TCU) in Korean conversation. In recent years, instances of constructions with non-canonical word order have been reexamined in terms of organization of turns and of turn-taking in conversation. In this line of research, this study will explore PACs as instances of word order variability in Korean, considering discourse, pragmatic, and interactive factors that are responsible for the occurrence of PACs. In this research, PACs are defined as adverbial clauses that occur after a possible completion point of the host TCU, serving as added segments or turn increments.

As is well known, Korean is widely accepted to be a canonical verb-final language and the verb-final constraint is strictly observed in the majority of cases. Thus, the canonical word order constraint stipulates that adverbial clauses precede 'main' clauses. In conversation, however, many instances of adverbial clauses 'violate' the verb-final constraint and they occur after the main clauses, as shown in Excerpt (1).<sup>1)</sup>

---

1) The Korean conversational data are transcribed basically following the transcription

- (1) B: ...배는 좋은 게 뭐냐면,  
 ...pay-nun cohun key mwe-nya-myen, <---A  
 ship-TM good thing what-be-COND  
 ...저녁때 딱 타고, <---B  
 ...cenykttay ttak tha-ko,  
 evening just ride-CONN  
 ...누워 자다보면, <---C  
 ...nwuwe catapo-myen,  
 lie sleep-COND  
 ...아침에 딱 도착해 있는 거야, <---D  
 ...achimey ttak tochakhay issnun ke-ya,  
 morning just arrive be thing-IE  
 ...하루코스니까. <---E  
 ...halwukhosu-nikka.  
 one:day:course-REASON  
 ‘the good thing of making a trip by ship is that you just ride it  
 in the evening and sleep (during the trip) and then wake up in  
 the morning to find that you’ve arrived, because it’s just one  
 day’s trip.’  
 A: ...아하.  
 ...aha.  
 ‘aha.’

In (1), the turn produced by Speaker B consists of five intonation units in the forms of clausal and sentential TCUs. Among those five TCUs, A, B, and C precede the main clause D, showing the canonical word order in

---

conventions proposed by Du Bois et al. (1993), each line representing an intonation unit. A comma (,) indicates a continuing IU, a period (.) a final IU, and a question mark (?) an appeal IU. A hyphen (-) means the word or phrase was truncated, an equal sign lengthening, and brackets overlap, respectively. One, two, and three periods indicate short, medium, and long pauses, respectively. The transcription of Korean examples in this research follows the conventions of Yale Romanization. The abbreviations used in glossing Korean examples are as follows:

- |                             |                              |
|-----------------------------|------------------------------|
| ACC: Accusative case marker | ATTR: Attributive            |
| CL: Classifier              | COND: Conditional connective |
| CONN: Connective            | HEAR: Hearsay marker         |
| HON: Honorific marker       | IE: Informal sentence-ender  |
| LOC: Locative marker        | NM: Nominative case marker   |
| PL: Plural marker           | PST: Past tense marker       |
| REASON: Reason connective   | RETRO: Retrospective         |
| SUPP: Suppositional         | TM: Topic marker             |

Korean. However, we can notice that another adverbial clause marked as E follows the main clause, 'violating' the verb-final constraint. As this excerpt shows, in conversation, some adverbial clauses occur after main clauses, in response to interactional contingencies. In this respect, there is a need to explore PACs in their interactional and sequential contexts.

To explore functions of post-posed adverbial clauses in Korean conversation, this research will first examine adverbial clauses that occur after sentential predicates, functioning as turn extensions. More specifically, it will examine what kinds of adverbial clauses occur after sentential predicates. Also this study will consider whether the adverbial clauses occur with the host sentential TCUs in the same intonation unit or in the next separate intonation unit, considering prosodic factors. Based on the frequency of types and meanings of PACs, this inquiry will explore functions or social actions of the adverbial clauses in their sequential and interactional contexts. It will discuss motivations for the occurrence of PACs in such terms as lack of recipient uptake and recipient design (cf. Sacks & Schegloff, 1979), assuming that the lack of recipient uptake is interpreted as a signal for more specific or additional information from the current speaker. It will explore functions of turn increments in such terms as providing additional information, specifying or revising what has been said, providing circumstantial information, and so on.

In sum, this research will show the interactive nature of conversation manifested in the act of retroactive elaboration performed in the manner of revising, specifying, extending what has been said in the host TCU. In addition, it will suggest that an interaction-based explanation of the use of adverbial turn increments in their sequential contexts can provide a better understanding of word order variability in conversation than do cognitive, text-based approaches.

## **2. Context of the Research**

In the study of discourse, there has been a great amount of research on the functions of different types of adverbial clauses in terms such as information flow, information status, and text-organizing functions (Chafe 1984; Ford & Thompson, 1986; Fries, 1983; Ramsay, 1987; Schiffrin, 1985, 1987; Thompson, 1985). These studies have tried to characterize adverbial clauses such as conditional, causal, temporal, or purpose clauses, mostly in

written discourse. They have dealt with the discourse options associated with the property of “bidirectionality” of adverbial clauses, i.e., the property of being pre-posed vs. post-posed. They have shown functional differences between adverbial clauses which appear as a form of introduction to the material to be modified and those which occur after the “main” clause. They have shown that these two positions, as Ford (1993, p. 11) points out, “are distinct in their roles in managing both the linear flow of information in a text and the attention of the listener as it is guided through the text.”

Chafe (1984) shows functional distinctions between pre-posed and post-posed adverbial clauses in written and spoken discourse in terms of information flow, claiming that the occurrence of PACs is related to the function of “afterthought”. By analyzing some spoken data, Chafe (1984, p. 448) finds out that PACs often “occur as intonationally separate afterthought”. Fries (1983), based on the notion of sentential “theme”, states that initially placed adverbial clauses perform the function of guiding and shifting work in the development of discourse, particularly in written texts such as procedural texts or essays of contrast and comparison. Thompson (1985, p. 55), in her study of purpose adverbial clauses, explores different functions of initial and final purpose adverbial clauses. She claims that initial and final clauses “behave in radically different ways in the organization of the discourse.” She claims that when a text is describing a problem, initial purpose clauses may serve to set up the expectation that a solution will follow. Final clauses, on the other hand, serve the purpose or goal of some action, delimiting the interpretation of only the immediately preceding main clauses. Ford and Thompson (1986) is another study of different functions of conditional adverbial clauses in written and spoken discourse. They show that initial conditional clauses serve a general framework or background-creating function for the discourse that follows them. Sentence-final conditional clauses, on the other hand, serve to modify only some phrase or nominalization in the main clause, displaying a limited scope. In a similar way, Ramsay (1987) claims that the use of initial *if*-clauses is closely related to a discourse organizational function. She also shows that initial *when*-clauses are used to present main events, and that final *when*-clauses do not advance the main line of the narrative. Schifffrin (1985) shows aspects of the use of *because* in spoken English in terms of temporal sequencing and topic continuity.

As we have seen, discourse studies of adverbial clauses have explored functions of adverbial clauses mostly in written and/or spoken narrative discourse. Many of these studies have shown that the use of initial adverbial clauses is most closely related to text-organization along with a wide semantic or pragmatic scope. The occurrence of final adverbial clauses, on the other hand, is related to the function of providing semantic limitation, qualification or grounding for the one main clause to which it is related. When a final clause occurs in a separate intonation unit, it represents an “afterthought”, adding to the prior utterance after its initial planning and production (Chafe, 1984). These discourse studies have been carried out mostly in terms such as a text organizational function, information status, and information flow, among others. These studies have shown that discourse-based approach can provide a new way of explaining properties of adverbial clauses as instances of word order variability.

As the research in discourse has expanded into an analysis of naturally occurring conversation, a number of researchers have tried to explain adverbial clauses from an interaction-based perspective. Recent research on conversation influenced by conversation analysis has explored the relationship between conversation, social actions, and grammar. Among many topics in conversation analysis, the research on turn increments has explored segments that occur after the predicate from an interaction-based perspective (Ford, Fox, & Thompson, 2001; K. Kim, 2001; Ono & Suzuki 1992; Schegloff, 2000). The research has provided a new opportunity to reconsider instances of word order variability in their sequential and interactional contexts. Ford et al. (2001), K. Kim (2001), and Schegloff (2000) claim that turn extensions or increments are closely related to interactional contingencies, including lack of recipient uptake, i.e., in the environments where the speaker faces lack of displayed reciprocity or uptake from the recipient. They show that syntactic extensions of prior turn segments function as action continuations, producing renewed opportunities for recipient uptake. However, these studies have focused on lack of recipient uptake as the most significant factor for the occurrence of turn increments, though they imply that there would be many other interactional contingencies.

As has been shown above, much recent research has been done on the interaction between conversation, social actions, and grammar, showing diverse aspects of conversation. In conversation, forms and types of TCUs are interactionally determined by the negotiation among participants. The present research which explores types, motivations, and functions of PACs

is closely related to the interaction-based research on turn increments. The research on turn increments focuses on lack of recipient uptake in explaining for the occurrence of turn increments. The present research on PACs as instances of turn increments or extensions will explore other motivations, and it will show many interesting aspects of the intricate processes of turn-taking and sequence organization in talk-in-interaction by exploring motivations and functions of PACs used to elaborate the immediately preceding host TCU retroactively.

### 3. Database and Methodology

In exploring properties of PACs as instances of word order variability in terms of turn-constructural practice in Korean conversation, it is necessary to look at naturally occurring data. In carrying out the research on interactional and structural aspects of PACs, I chose three audio-taped face-to-face conversations and two telephone conversations in Korean. Each of the conversation is approximately 20 to 30 minutes long, totaling approximately two hours and fifteen minutes. Among the data, one is a multi-party conversation among graduate students, another two are dialogues between two acquaintances, and the other two are telephone conversations between Koreans studying in the United States. The topics of the conversations are school life, learning/teaching English, and job experiences, among others.

In characterizing properties of PACs in Korean conversation, it is necessary to make a judgment of what added elements function as turn increments or extensions that show word order variability. In this research, word order variability is explored based on the syntactically-defined notion of clauses as conventionalized grammatical categories and the prosodically-defined notion of intonation units. Based on these two notions, we will classify turn increments into four types and examine the frequency of them. Examination of the present data shows that the total number of post-posed adverbial clauses amounts to 40 cases. This number may vary slightly because of the difficulty in making a judgment about PACs.<sup>2)</sup> Based on this frequency in the present database, I will characterize

---

2) For example, it is difficult to make a judgment of whether certain adverbial clauses are part of the preceding sentences or the initial clauses of the following sentences.

PACs in terms of the functions or social actions they perform in their interactional and sequential contexts.

#### 4. Motivations for the Occurrence of PACs in Conversation

In Section 2, we have critically reviewed different types of adverbial clauses in terms of functions they perform in written and/or spoken discourse. As we have seen, differences in types of adverbial clauses have been discussed mostly in terms of information flow and text organization. We have also seen that recent studies in conversation analysis, particularly the research on turn increments, can provide a new, interaction-based perspective for PACs in conversation. As pointed out, previous studies on turn increments have discussed turn increments, mostly focusing on lack of recipient uptake that triggers the occurrence of turn increments. However, in this section, I would like to show that not only the motivation for pursuing uptake from the recipient but also other interactional contingencies are responsible for the occurrence of turn increments, including, PACs.

In discussing turn-taking, Sacks et al. (1974) claim that turn-taking may take place at a TRP, a position at which speakers may change according to turn-taking rules that govern the transition of speakers.<sup>3)</sup> The turn-taking rules show that the question of whether turn-taking may or may not take place at the end of a possible completion point is determined by a locally managed turn-taking system. In addition, Sacks et al. (1974) state that unit-types or turn-constructive units in English are lexical, phrasal, clausal, and multi-clausal constructions. However, this statement is never clear about types and functions of TCUs in conversation. Ford and Thompson (1996), criticizing the inadequacy of the Sacks et al.'s notions of TCUs and TRPs, propose the notion of complex transition-relevance places (CTRPs) by exploring the role of syntax, intonation, and pragmatics in the construction of TCUs. They show that the point where turn-taking place is determined not by syntax alone but by intonational and

---

3) Sacks et al. (1974, p. 704) propose turn-taking rules which stipulate that: if the turn-so-far is so constructed as not to involve the use of a 'current speaker selects next' technique, (i) then self-selection for next speakership may, but need not, be instituted; first starter acquires rights to a turn, and transfer occurs at that place, or (ii) then current speaker may, but need not continue, unless another self-selects (Sacks et al., 1974, p. 704).



pragmatic structures that function as guides when speakers project and complete their turns. In this regard, turn increments should be understood in terms of their grammatical, prosodic and pragmatic properties.

When we consider the occurrence of PACs in terms of TCUs, TRPs, turn-taking, and recipient uptake, the points where sentence-enders occur are the most prominent possible TRPs in Korean conversation. Those points are characterized to be syntactically, prosodically, and pragmatically completed points. In this respect, there is a need to examine the occurrence of PACs in terms of prosody in the sense that whether the PACs occur in the same intonation unit with the main clause or in a separate intonation unit. Examination of the present data shows that three out of the total forty cases occur in the same intonation units. Excerpt (2) is an example in which an adverbial clause follows the predicate of the host sentential TCU in the same intonation unit.

- (2) S: 차를 갖고 왔어요 이따 빨리 이동하려고, <---  
 cha-lul kacko oa-ss-eyo itta ppapli itongha-lyeko,  
 car-ACC bring come-PST-HON later quickly move-in:order:to  
 갖고- 가져 왔어요.  
 kacko- kacye o-ass-eyo.  
 bring bring come-PST-HON  
 'I drove my car so that I can get (there) early later, bring,  
 brought.'

As shown in (2), an adverbial clause follows the main clause, violating the verb-final constraint which stipulates that the predicate should come at the final position of a sentence and that the subordinate clause should precede the main clause in Korean. Examination of the present database shows that all other instances except three (i.e., 92.5%) occur in next, separate intonation units. This fact suggests that the points at which sentential TCUs end serve as typical CTRPs (cf. Ford & Thompson, 1996). That is, when the current speaker's turn reaches at the end of a sentential unit, the next speaker is most likely to take a turn at that point, according to turn-taking rules (Sacks et al., 1974). Then, the question that can be raised is in what contexts the next speaker does not take a turn at that point, and the current speaker adds segments after the predicate of the main clause.

With respect to the occurrence of post-posed adverbial clauses, Ford, Fox, and Thompson (2001) claim that turn extensions, including PACs, are

closely related to interactional contingency in the sense that they perform a social action of pursuing uptake as a way of solving the problem of a lack of displayed reciprocity. Ford (1993, p. 108, Ford et al., 2001, p. 19) illustrate a PAC in English conversation, as shown in Excerpt (3).

- (3) S: Ya know when it- (.) came from the:  
       I think air conditioning system,  
       it drips on the front of the cars?  
       (.)  
   S: If you park in a certain place?                             <---  
   R: Mm hmm

In (3), we can see that the sentential TCU produced by S is followed by an adverbial clause after a slight pause, resulting in post-posing of the adverbial clause. In explaining the motivation for the occurrence of added segments like a PAC in (3), Ford (1993, p. 108) argues against the notion of "afterthought," a term viewed from the perspective of information flow. Ford (1993) and Ford et al. (2001) claim that such added segments, including PACs, should be reconsidered in terms of interactional factors that result from the interaction and negotiation among participants. More specifically, in (3), S is pursuing acknowledgement of or uptake to his/her utterance from the recipient at a TRP, i.e., at the end of a sentential TCU. However, S fails to get a response from R. Then, as a renewed attempt to get a response from R, S provides a second TRP, at which R responds with a reactive token, displaying reciprocity. As this excerpt shows, interactional contingencies such as lack of recipient uptake are prominent motivations for the occurrence of turn extensions.

First of all, as we have seen, there has been some research on turn increments, and the studies have provided ways of reconsidering PACs in terms of turn increments. In the study of turn increments done in terms of constituency, Ford et al. (2001) state that a turn increment is defined as any non-main clause continuation of a speaker's turn after that speaker has come to what could have been a completion point, or a TRP, based on prosody, syntax, and sequential action (cf. Sacks et al. 1974; Ford & Thompson, 1996; Tanaka, 1999). In a similar way, Schegloff (2000) defines increments as further talk after a possible completion, not functioning as a new TCU, but as a continuation of the preceding TCU, most robustly by making it grammatically fitted to, or symbiotic with, that prior TCU. In

their research on turn increments, Schegloff (2001), Ford et al. (2001), H. Kim (2003), and K. Kim (2001) claim that turn extensions or increments are closely related with interactional contingencies including lack of recipient uptake, i.e., in the environments where the speaker faces lack of displayed reciprocity or uptake from the recipient. They show that addition of more talk by a single speaker in consequential location of a just possibly completed turn unit is interactionally sensitive. That is, syntactic extensions of prior turn segments function as action continuations, producing renewed opportunities for recipient uptake. In this respect, the occurrence of PACs also can be understood in terms of lack of recipient uptake.

When we accept the interaction-based explanation for the occurrence of turn extensions, we can say that recipient uptake is a crucial factor for the occurrence of PACs in Korean. As we have seen, the end of a sentential unit functions as a CTRP, and thus it is the most probable place for speaker change. However, when there is no uptake from the recipient, the current speaker produces an added segment as a way of providing a renewed opportunity for a response from the next speaker, as shown in Excerpt (4).

- (4) B: ...장난            아니야.  
           ...cangnan    ani-ya.  
           ...trivial:thing not-IE  
           ...나 또        오늘    아이스크림이    속에,  
           ...na tto    onul    aisukulim-i    sok-ey,  
           I    again    today    ice cream-i    inside-LOC  
           ...쓰리레이어    그    무슨        아이스크림,  
           ...ssulileyie    ku    mwusun    aisukulim,  
           three-layered    that sort:of    icecream,  
           ...이따만한    거    사갖고    먹잖아.  
           ...ittamanhan ke    sakac-ko    mekcanha.  
           this:big    thing buy-and eat-IE  
           ...케익은    한    개도    다    먹고.                            <--  
           ..kheyik-un   han kay-to   ta mek-ko.  
           ..cake-TM   one CL-too all eat-CONN  
           'It's not a trivial thing (i.e., serious matter), today I bought an ice  
           cream, something like a three-layered ice cream, ate it, this  
           big-sized one. (Even) I eat a whole cake.'

A: ...정말?  
 ...cengmal?  
 true:words  
 'Is that true?'

In (4), B talks about her eating habit, saying that she bought and ate a big-sized ice cream today. When her turn reaches at the end of a sentential unit with *-cianha* which is often used to seek confirmation from the addressee, there is no response from the recipient.<sup>4)</sup> In such a situation, B produces a clause that provides additional information which states that she eats even the whole of a cake. When viewed from an interaction-based perspective, such an added clause provides another opportunity for the recipient to take a turn. Excerpt (4) shows that A produces a reactive token as a way of responding to the immediately preceding added clause. In this respect, the occurrence of PACs can be said to provide a next possible completion point as a way of dealing with the interactional contingency which emerges when uptake is not immediately forthcoming upon a possible turn completion point.

Second, the occurrence of PAC turn extensions can be explained in terms of a motivation of presenting an urgently relevant material first, and less urgent one later (cf. Givón, 1983).<sup>5)</sup> In the course of exchanging information among participants, speakers have a motivation of presenting a more urgent and relevant thing first, and a less urgent one later. Bearing this in mind, let us take a look at Excerpt (5).

(5) [Two speakers are talking about kindergarten teachers who will visit educational facilities in the United States.]

B: ...그 사람들은 전부 다 자비로 온대.  
 ...ku salam-tul-un cenpwu ta capi-lo on-tay.  
 that person-PL-TM all own:expense-at come-HEAR  
 '(I heard) those (people) all come at their own expense.'

4) For the properties of *-cianha(yo)*, refer to Kawanishi (1994) and Kawanishi and Sohn (1993).

5) Givón (1983, p. 20), in his discussion of topic continuity, proposes a psychological principle regarding the establishment of topic: "Attend first to the most urgent task." He states: "when the topic is most obvious, making the comment is surely a more urgent task. When the topic is less obvious, establishing is more urgent." Though Givón's principle is not exactly the same with the motivation discussed here, his idea and the motivation here share some common properties.

- A: (2.0) 그럴걸요?  
 (2.0) kulelkkelyo?  
 that:be:so?  
 ...다 자비- 다 자비죠?  
 ...ta capi- ta capi-cyo?  
 all own:expense- all own:expense-IE?  
 'Possibly so? All at their own expense-, at their own expense?'  
 ...그 사람들은 다 일반인이니까=. <--  
 ...ku salam-tul-un ta ilpanin-i-nikka=  
 that person-PL-TM all general-be-REASON  
 'because they are all general people (i.e., not public officials).'

In (5), two Korean speakers, public officials, who are studying at US universities are talking about people who will come to the States to visit educational facilities. When B says that they will come at their own expense, B responds to A by repeating part of the immediately preceding turn as a way of seeking confirmation in a sentential TCU. Then, A produces a post-posed adverbial clause. In this excerpt, the topic or issue being talked about between the two participants is 'coming at their own expense', but not what their status is. In this context, B presents a more relevant and urgent material first in a sentential TCU, and then a less urgent thing later in a post-posed adverbial clause. In this respect, the use of PACs as turn extensions is related to the function of presenting a more relevant, urgent material first, and a less relevant thing later. More specifically, when speakers present a more relevant material first in the main clause, a less urgent thing is presented in an added post-posed adverbial clause. When such a motivation is at work, there occur PACs, displaying non-canonical word order variability.

Third, another motivation for the occurrence of PACs as turn extensions can be understood in terms of recipient design (Sacks & Schegloff, 1979).<sup>6)</sup> According to Sacks and Schegloff, speakers produce turns to be understood in terms of what the speaker knows or assumes about the existing mutual knowledge among participants. Sacks and Schegloff (1979, p. 19) provide the following excerpt as an example.

6) Sacks and Schegloff (1979) use the term *recipient design* to explain how reference to persons is made in conversation. However, the notion would apply to explaining some other social actions in conversation.

- (6) A: ... Well I was the only one other than the uhm  
tch Fords? Uh, Mrs Holmes Ford? You know  
uh [the the cellist?  
B: [Oh yes. She's she's the cellist.  
A: Yes  
B: ye//s  
A: Well she and her husband were there ...

In (6), Speaker A first provides the NP 'Fords', but revises and extends the NP into another form 'Mrs Holmes Ford' after a possible turn completion point. However, Speaker A still does not get any recipient uptake, resulting in providing another NP 'the cellist'. At that point, Speaker B starts her turn, which results in overlapping of the utterances produced by Speakers A and B. This excerpt shows that current speaker presents materials according to recipient design in the sense that his or her turn to be understood by the hearer. This notion of recipient design can apply to the occurrence of PACs in Korean conversation, as shown in Excerpt (7).

- (7) [Two speakers are having lunch together, talking about noodles.]

P: (two intonation units deleted)

저희 어머니가 밀가루 음식 못 드시잖아요,  
cehui emeni-ka milkalwu umsik mos tusi-canhayo,  
my mother-NM flour food not take-HON  
아프시니까. <--

aphusi-nikka,  
ache-REASON

근데, 그걸 드시면은,  
kuntey kuke-l tusi-myen-un  
but that-ACC take-COND-TM

...소화가 참 잘 돼요.  
...sohwa-ka cham cal toy-eyo.

digestion-NM very well become-HON

'My mother cannot eat flour food, because she would suffer (from it). But if she eats it, digestion is no problem. (i.e., she has no problem digesting it [the newly produced ramen].')

- S: 음=  
um=  
'uhm.'

In (7), P talks about his mother's eating habit, saying that she cannot eat flour food such as noodles. He states such a fact in a sentential TCU, but fails to get a response from the recipient. The statement expressed in the sentential TCU is new information which is not shared among the speakers. In conversation, some information is old and shared, but some is new and unexpected. When a current speaker provides a new piece of information, the next speaker sometimes does not take a turn even when the current speaker's turn reaches at a possible completion point (here, at the end of a sentential TCU, which is the most probable place for speaker change). In this context, the current speaker provides additional information in the form of a PAC according to the need for more specific information. In this regard, we can say that speakers adopt the turn-constructural practice of turn extensions in the use of PACs as a way of providing additional information to the host TCU according to recipient design.

So far, we have seen that the occurrence of turn extensions displayed in the form of PACs can be explained from an interactional perspective. Examination of the present conversational data shows that PACs can be explained by the following motivations: (i) inviting recipient uptake, i.e., a motivation for providing a renewed TRP for speaker change, (ii) a motivation of presenting an urgently relevant material first, and a less urgent thing later, and (iii) recipient design. Bearing these motivations in mind, let us discuss functions of PACs in the next section in more detail.

## 5. Functions/Social Actions of PACs in Conversation

In Section 4, we have discussed motivations for the occurrence of PACs in conversation. In Korean, adverbial clauses usually occur before main clauses, and they are accompanied by clausal connectives to combine with 'main' clauses. However, in the present data, we can observe 40 instances of adverbial clauses that occur after main clauses. As has been shown, a text-based notion such as "afterthought" cannot explain properties of PACs properly (cf. Hudson, 1991). Rather, interaction-based notions can provide a better explanation for the occurrence of PACs as instances of word order variability. Bearing the motivations for PACs in mind, let us consider functions of PACs in more detail.

First of all, adverbial clauses as turn extensions are used to perform a function of providing additional information expressed in the immediately

preceding host TCU. When PACs perform this function, they often provide additional, more specific information to the preceding sentential host TCU, as shown in Excerpt (8).

- (8) M: ..워싱턴,            ...출신이래요,  
           ..wesingthen,    ...chwulsin-i-lay-yo,  
           Washington    birth:place-be-HEAR-HON  
           '(I heard) she came from Washington.'
- S: ..응=,  
           ..ung=,  
           'ung.'
- M: ..그래 가지고,  
           ..kulay kaciko,  
           ..and    then,  
           ..원래    거기서    선생님이었대요,  
           ..wenlay kekise   sensayngnim-i-ess-tay-yo  
           formerly there   teacher-be-PST-HEAR-HON  
           ..생물   선생님인지.                           <--  
           ..sayngmwul   sensayngnim-i-nci,  
           ..biology    teacher-be-whether  
           'and then, (I heard) formerly she was a teacher there,  
           possibly (she was) a biology teacher (or not).'

In (8), two speakers are talking about an American counselor who has recently been employed by the university. In the M's turn, we can see that M informs S of the counselor's hometown and her former occupation. In this context, M says that the counselor came from Washington, and she was a teacher. Then, M produces an added segment in the form of a PAC, providing additional, specific information by saying that she might have been a biology teacher. As this example shows, M first presents a more 'general' information first, and then she provides specific, additional information in an adverbial clause to the statement presented in the host sentential TCU. In this respect, the occurrence of PACs is related to the function of providing additional, specific information to the host sentential TCU.

Second, adverbial clauses that occur after their host sentential TCUs are used to perform an action of retroactive reformulation by elaborating or modifying what has been said in the preceding host sentential TCU. Such



a use of PACs can be found in the case when the next speaker does not share the information that the current speaker possesses, as shown in (9).

(9) [Two speakers are talking about the whipped creams they bought.]

- B: (0)휘핑크림을                 내가   저기   가서   사왔-   샀거든?  
 (0)hwiphing kulim-ul   nay-ka   ceki   kase   sao-ss-   sa-ss-ketun?  
 whipped cream-ACC I-NM   there   go   buy-PST   buy-PST-RETRO  
 ...이마트   가서.   <--  
 ...imathu   ka-se.  
 E-Mart   go-and  
 'I went there and bought whipped creams, went to the E-mart.'
- A: ...응.  
 ...ung.  
 'ung.'

In (9), B says that she bought whipped creams at the E-Mart. In this context, B first reports the fact that she bought whipped creams, using a pronominal element in referring to the store where she bought them. When there is no uptake from the recipient, she realizes that her use of the pronominal element does not provide sufficient information about the place. Then, she adds a segment after the sentential predicate in the form of an adverbial clause, providing more specific information. That is, her incrementing immediately preceding host sentential TCU performs an action of reformulating what has been said before by providing additional information. After producing such an added segment, B gets a response from the next speaker in the form of a reactive token. As this excerpt shows, PACs are used as turn extensions to elaborate the host sentential TCU retroactively either by providing additional information or by reformulating and/or specifying what has been said.

Third, another function of adverbial clauses is providing an account for the statement/claim expressed in the immediately preceding host TCU. Speakers often make a statement or claim upon the contingencies of the ongoing conversation. In this case, post-posed adverbial clauses usually take the reason connective *-nikka*. When a speaker present a statement or claim in the main clause, (s)he produces an account or explanation for the statement or claim, forming a [statement/claim + account/explanation] schema. In addition, such an adverbial clause is added usually in the case when the current speaker faces lack of recipient uptake after the

completion point, as shown in Excerpt (10).

(10)[Two teachers at a college-preparation academy are talking about their students.]

S: (3.3) 아 올해는,

(3.3) a olhay-nun

ah this:year-TM

..학생들이 잘,

..haksayng-tul-i cal,

..student-PL-NM good,

..잘 되겠지요,

..cal toy-keyss-ciyo,

well become-SUPP-HON

...근데 올해 좋은 학생들이 많이 있으니까. <--

... kuntey olhay cohun haksayng-tul-i manhni issu-nikka.

... but this:year good student-PL-NM many be-REASON

'Ah, this year, (I hope) students will make good- good achievements, because (by the way) this year we have many good students.'

P: ..예 예,

..yey yey,

...성실한 애 있으니까,

...sengsilhan ay issu-nikka,

...diligent student be-REASON

'Yeah, yeah, because we have (many) diligent students.'

In (10), S expresses his hope that the students in their academy will make a better achievement than before. When there is no immediate uptake from the recipient, he produces an adverbial clause after the possible completion point (i.e., the end of the sentential TCU). In such a context, the turn increment expressed as a PAC functions as an account for the statement in the main clause. In this respect, the PAC, as a kind of turn increment, forms a [statement/claim + account/explanation] schema, displaying the reason for the claim in the preceding TCU. After that, P produces an affirmative reactive token and another adverbial reason clause to show his agreement with S.

So far, we have explored functions or social actions that PACs perform in conversation. As the exploration shows, adverbial clauses that occur after main sentential clauses perform many interactive functions. The

functions of PACs can be summarized as the following: (i) providing additional, specific, circumstantial information to the host sentential TCU, in particular in face of lack of recipient uptake, (ii) performing an action of retroactive reformulation by elaborating, reformulating, or repairing what has been said in the preceding host sentential TCU, and (iii) providing an account or explanation for the statement/claim expressed in the preceding host TCU.

## 6. Summary and Conclusions

This research has explored types, motivations, and functions of adverbial clause turn extensions (i.e., PACs) in Korean conversation in their sequential and interactional contexts, considering them in terms of turn-constructural practice. Examination of the present conversational data has shown that the occurrence of PAC turn extensions is closely related to the following interactional contingencies: (i) inviting recipient uptake, i.e., motivation for providing a renewed TRP for speaker change (Ford et al., 2001; H. Kim, 2003; K. Kim, 2001; Schegloff, 2000), (ii) motivation of presenting an urgently relevant material first, and a less urgent thing later (Givón, 1983; Hudson, 1991; K. Kim, 2001), and (iii) recipient design (Sacks & Schegloff, 1979). This research has shown that these interaction-based notions can better explain diverse aspects of PACs than does a text-based notion.

In addition, this research has explored functions of PAC turn extensions. It has shown that functions of PACs can be summarized as the following: (i) providing additional, specific, circumstantial information to the host sentential TCU, in particular when there is lack of recipient uptake (Ford et al., 2001; H. Kim, 2003; K. Kim, 2001; Schegloff, 2000), (ii) performing an action of retroactive reformulation by elaborating, reformulating, or repairing what has been said in the preceding host sentential TCU, and (iii) providing an account/explanation for the statement/claim expressed in the preceding host TCU, forming a [statement/claim + account/explanation] schema.

In sum, this research on PACs in Korean conversation has shown the interactive nature of conversation manifested in the act of incrementing turns in the manner of revising, specifying, extending what has been said in the host TCU, to meet the contingent interactional needs of speakers. Finally, this research suggests that an interaction-based explanation of the use of PAC turn extensions in their sequential contexts can provide a

better way of understanding turn increments than does a notion derived from information status and text organization.

## References

- Chafe, W. (1984). How people use adverbial clauses. In *The Proceedings of the Tenth Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society* (pp. 437-449). University of California: Berkeley.
- Chafe, W. (1994). *Discourse, Consciousness, and Time: The Flow and Displacement of Conscious Experience in Speaking and Writing*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Du Bois, J., Schuetze-Coburn, S., Paolino, D., and S. Cumming. (1993). Outline of discourse transcription. In J. Edwards and M. Lampert, eds., *Talking Data: Transcription and Coding Methods for Language Research* (pp. 221-260). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Ford, C. (1993). *Grammar in Interaction: Adverbial Clauses in American English Conversations*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ford, C. and S. A. Thompson. (1996). Interactional units in conversation: Syntactic, intonational, and pragmatic resources for the management of turns. In Ochs et al., 134-184.
- Ford, C., B. Fox, and S. A. Thompson. (2001). Constituency and the grammar of turn increments. In C. Ford, B. Fox, and S. A. Thompson eds., *The Language of Turn and Sequence*, (pp. 14-38). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ford, C., and S. A. Thompson. (1986). Conditional in discourse: a text-based study from English. In E. Traugott, C. Ferguson, J. S. Reilly, and A. ter Meulen eds., *On Conditionals* (pp. 353-372). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ford, C., and S. A. Thompson. (1996). Interactional units in conversation: Syntactic, intonational, and pragmatic resources for the management of turns. In E. Ochs, E. Schegloff, and S. A. Thompson, eds. *Interaction and Grammar*, (pp. 134-184). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Fries, P. (1983). On the status of theme in English: Arguments from discourse. In J. S. Petofi and E. Sozer eds., *Micro and Macro Connexity of Texts* (pp. 116-152). Hamburg: Helmut Buske Verlag.
- Givón, T. (ed.) (1983). *Topic Continuity in Discourse*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia:

John Benjamins.

- Hudson, M. Endo. (1991). Discourse functions of postposing in Japanese. Annual Linguistics Symposium, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee.
- Kawanishi, Y. (1994). An analysis of non-challengeable modals: Korean *-canha(yo)* and Japanese *-janai*. *Japanese/Korean Linguistics, Vol. 4*, ed. by Noriko Akatsuka, 95-111, Stanford: CSLI.
- Kawanishi, Y. and S. Sohn. (1993). The grammaticalization of Korean negation: A semantic-pragmatic analysis of *-canh-*. *Harvard Studies in Korean Linguistics V*. ed. by Susumu Kuno et al., 552-561. Seoul: Hanshin Publishing Co.
- Kim, H. (2003). Turn extensions as turn-constructural practice: word order variability in Korean conversation. Paper presented at the 13th Japanese/Korean Linguistics Conference. Lansing, MI: Michigan State University.
- Kim, K. (2001). Turn-constructural practice in Korean conversation: Organization of turn increments. *Language Research* 37(4), 885-922.
- Lerner, G. (1987). *Collaborative Turn Sequences: Sentence Construction and Social Action*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of California, Irvine.
- Lerner, G. (1991). On the syntax of sentences-in-progress. *Language in Society* 20. 441-458.
- Lerner, G. (1996). On the 'semi-permeable' character of grammatical units in conversation: Conditional entry into the turn space of another speaker. In E. Ochs, E. A. Schegloff, and S. A. Thompson eds., *Interaction and Grammar* (pp. 238-276). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lerner, G. and T. Takagi. (1999). On the place of linguistic resources in the organization of talk-in-interaction: A co-investigation of English and Japanese grammatical practices. *Journal of Pragmatics* 31, 49-75.
- Ono, T. and R. Suzuki. (1992). Word order variability in Japanese conversation: Motivations and grammaticization. *Text* 12(3), 429-455.
- Ramsay, V. (1987). The functional distribution of preposed and postposed "if" and "when" clauses in written narrative. In R. S. Tomlin ed., *Coherence and Grounding in Discourse*, (pp. 383-408). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Sacks, H. and E. Schegloff. (1979). Two preferences in the organisation of reference to persons in conversation and their interaction. In G. Psathas ed., *Everyday Language: Studies in Ethnomethodology*,

(pp. 15-21). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

- Sacks, H., Schegloff, E., and G. Jefferson. (1974). A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking in conversation. *Language* 50, 696-735.
- Schegloff, E. (2000). On turn's possible completion, more or less: Increments and trail-offs. UCLA ms.
- Schegloff, E, Jefferson, G., and H. Sacks. (1977). The preference for self-correction in the organization of repair in conversation. *Language* 53, 361-382.
- Schiffrin, D. (1985). Multiple constraints on discourse options: a quantitative analysis of causal sequences. *Discourse Processes* 8, 281-303.
- Schiffrin, D. (1987). *Discourse Markers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Thompson, S. A. (1985). Grammar and written discourse: initial and final purpose clauses in English. *Text* 5, 55-84.
- Tanaka, H. (1999). *Turn-taking in Japanese conversation: A Study in Grammar and Interaction*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Haeyeon Kim  
Department of English  
Chung-Ang University  
221 Huksuk-dong, Dongjak-gu  
Seoul 156-756, Korea  
E-mail: haeykim@cau.ac.kr

Received: Sept. 1, 2003

Revised version received: Nov. 30, 2003

Accepted: Nov. 7, 2003